

**CULTURAL RESOURCES
STUDY PLAN**

**REVISED STUDY PLAN (version 2.0)
TOLEDO BEND RELICENSING PROJECT
FERC NO. 2305**

October 2009

Prepared by:
Sabine River Authority of Texas
Orange, Texas

Sabine River Authority, State of Louisiana
Many, Louisiana

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 General Description of the Toledo Bend Project

The Sabine River Authority of Texas (SRA-TX) and the Sabine River Authority, State of Louisiana (SRA-LA) (collectively, the Authorities) collaborated to develop the Toledo Bend Project (Project) located on the Sabine River. Construction was completed in October 1966. The Project is jointly operated by SRA-TX and SRA-LA through Toledo Bend Project Joint Operations (TBPJO).

The Project was originally planned, licensed, and constructed as a water supply facility, but it also provides multiple uses, such as hydroelectric power generation and recreation. The Project is located approximately 156.5 miles upstream of the confluence of the Sabine River and the Gulf of Mexico. Both the Project and this reach of the river serve as the border between the States of Louisiana and Texas.

The Project Reservoir (which is oriented in a southeast to northwest direction), is approximately 85 miles in length. The Project extends approximately 132 river miles (RM) (channel miles) from Toledo Bend Dam, which is located at RM 147, upstream to above Logansport, Louisiana (i.e., Murvaul Bayou), located at RM 279. The Project occupies lands and waters within Panola, Shelby, Sabine, and Newton Counties in Texas and De Soto, Sabine, and Vernon Parishes in Louisiana. Toledo Bend Reservoir is the largest manmade body of water in the southern United States and the fifth largest in surface area in the country.

The Reservoir has approximately 1,200 miles of shoreline with a water surface area of 185,000 acres at the normal maximum reservoir elevation of 172.0 feet mean sea level (msl). The Toledo Bend Reservoir is 7 miles at its widest point and contains a storage volume of 4,477,000 acre-feet between elevations 162 feet and 172 feet. Primary hydroelectric generation occurs between 168 and 172 feet. The watershed above Toledo Bend Dam is approximately 7,178 square miles with an estimated runoff in 2004 of 3.6 million acre-feet (SRA 2008). Historically, water levels have ranged from 161.3 feet msl to 173.9 feet msl.

As currently licensed, the principal Project works consist of:

- A rolled earth-fill dam with a maximum height of 112 feet and a length of 11,250 feet (including saddle dikes);
- A reservoir covering 185,000 acres with approximately 1,200 miles of shoreline and an active storage capacity of 4,477,000 acre-feet;
- A spillway comprised of a concrete, gravity-type, gated ogee section with a concrete chute and stilling basin located on the left abutment (in Louisiana). The spillway has a maximum length of 838 feet with eleven 40-foot by 28-foot Tainter gates. The top of the gates is at elevation 173 feet and top of the spillway ogee is at elevation 145 feet. A continuous flow of 144 cubic feet per second (cfs) is provided at the spillway;
- A powerhouse located in the right abutment (in Texas) containing two 58,500 horsepower (43.875-MW) vertical Kaplan turbines with direct drive generators, a tailrace channel, and appurtenant electrical and mechanical facilities.

1.2 Relicensing Process

The current Toledo Bend license extends to September 30, 2013. The Authorities intend to relicense the Project using the Integrated Licensing Process (ILP) as promulgated by Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) regulations issued July 23, 2003 (18 CFR Part 5).

Pursuant to the FERC ILP regulations, the Authorities filed their Pre-Application Document (PAD) and Notice of Intent (NOI) with FERC on September 22, 2008. As part of the PAD, the Authorities proposed to undertake a relicensing cultural resources investigation.

Following the Authorities' filing of the PAD and NOI, FERC issued Scoping Document 1 (SD1) on November 21, 2008 and convened scoping meetings and a site tour for agencies and members of the public on December 16 – 17, 2008. Based on the information in the PAD and SD1, as well as information exchanged in the scoping meetings, agencies and other stakeholders had until January 21, 2009 to submit comments and study requests. The Authorities received comments and study requests from six resource agencies, one non-governmental organization, and FERC Staff. In total, these commenters recommended forty-four studies, including one study related to cultural resources. The Authorities have carefully reviewed this recommended study, as well as

its proposed cultural resources investigation proposed in the PAD, and have developed this proposed Cultural Resources Study Plan.

2.0 GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (Section 106), requires federal agencies to consider the effects of their undertakings on historic properties listed in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register). The Commission's issuance of a license for the Project is considered an undertaking, and is therefore subject to the provisions and regulations of Section 106.¹

In furtherance of the Commission's responsibilities under Section 106, the goals of this study are to (a) identify any existing adverse Project effects on historic properties listed in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register, and (b) to develop, in cooperation with the Texas and Louisiana State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs), U.S. Forest Service (Forest Service), and federally recognized Indian tribes, a plan for managing historic properties within the Project's Area of Potential Effects (APE) throughout the term of the new license. Based on the results of research and informal consultation conducted in support of PAD development, comments on the PAD, comments in the scoping meetings and study plan meetings, recommended studies submitted, comments on the proposed study plans, and comments received during the April 29, 2009 Cultural Resources Workshop, the Authorities have identified five primary objectives for meeting these goals:

- (1) Identify through background research, desktop analyses, and field investigations (including subsurface testing) cultural resources within the APE where Project operations or activities are threatening the integrity of historic properties;
- (2) Cooperatively develop with the SHPOs, the Forest Service, and federally recognized Indian tribes a programmatic agreement providing for the satisfaction of the

¹ As state agencies, the Sabine River Authority of Texas and the Sabine River Authority, State of Louisiana are also subject to the requirements of the Texas Antiquities Code (Chapter 191, Government Code of Texas) and Title 25 of the Louisiana Administrative Code, respectively.

Commission's obligations pursuant to Section 106 in the relicensing process and for the management of historic properties affected by Project operations or activities during the new license term through a Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP);

- (3) Develop in consultation with Forest Service, SHPOs, and federally recognized Indian tribes appropriate protection, mitigation, or enhancement (PM&E) measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse affects to the identified resources;
- (4) Develop an HPMP in consultation with the SHPOs, Forest Service, and federally recognized Indian tribes that includes appropriate measures for the long-term management of historic properties within the Project's APE, including any PM&E measures. The HPMP will include a schedule, process, and protocol for implementing PM&E measures and completing additional studies.

3.0 STUDY AREA

The study area for the cultural resources study will be the Project's APE. The Authorities have proposed in the PAD to define the APE for the Toledo Bend Project as:

The Toledo Bend Project APE includes all lands within the FERC Project boundary. The APE also includes any lands outside of the Project boundary where cultural resources may be affected by Project-related activities that are conducted in compliance with the FERC license.

Because the Project boundary encompasses all lands that are necessary for Project purposes, the Authorities believe that this proposed APE is consistent with the manner in which FERC has defined the APE for similar hydroelectric projects.

4.0 BACKGROUND AND EXISTING INFORMATION

4.1 Resource Discussion

The Project's APE and adjacent areas have been the setting of numerous cultural resource studies, beginning in the 1960s. In developing the PAD, the Authorities initiated a database inventory of Texas Historical Commission, Louisiana Division of Archaeology, and Forest

Service files to identify previously recorded archaeological resources within the Project's vicinity. The Authorities also undertook a document review to collect available information regarding previous archaeological surveys conducted in the Project area, including those conducted prior to construction of the dam and reservoir.

As described in the PAD, a review of these sources provided significant information regarding the location and nature of identified archaeological resources within the Project's vicinity. The Forest Service, the University of Texas, and Southern Methodist University have all conducted extensive archaeological studies within Project area. These studies have ranged from literature reviews and pedestrian surveys, to intensive site excavations and systematic sampling analyses. Based on a review of these previous studies and site databases, the Authorities have identified 194 archaeological sites within the Project's proposed APE. This total comprises a variety of site types, including prehistoric camps and villages, historic period farms and homesteads, and several multi-component sites. Of the 194 reported sites, 22 have been determined to be ineligible. The National Register eligibility of the remaining 172 sites has not been evaluated.

In addition to these reported resources, Forest Service archaeologists have recently provided maps indicating that several additional archaeological sites may potentially be located within the Project's APE. Based on discussions with the Forest Service, a majority these sites were identified during field surveys of Forest Service lands but have not been evaluated or otherwise reported to the Texas SHPO.

The information reviewed by the Authorities represents the results of over 40 years of cultural resource studies in the Project area, encompassing nearly the entire APE for the Project. The Authorities propose to build upon this existing database by conducting additional studies at locations within the Project's APE that are currently being affected by Project operations. As necessary, the HPMP will provide additional, detailed measures for managing identified historic properties and completing future studies within the Project's APE.

In addition to reported archaeological sites, the National Register eligibility of Project facilities and structures has not formally been determined, and the character-defining features of the

Project have not been evaluated. The Authorities intend to conduct an architectural and engineering assessment as a component of this Cultural Resources Study.

5.0 PROJECT NEXUS

Section 106 requires the Commission to take into account the effects of its undertakings on historic properties listed in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register. At present, the Authorities have identified three Project-related activities with the potential to directly or indirectly affect archaeological resources within the APE: (a) project operations, (b) shoreline and aquatic recreation activities, and (c) routine maintenance activities. The indirect or direct effects of these activities on archaeological resources may include ground disturbance, sedimentation, looting, or vandalism, as discussed below:

- **Project Operations** - Shoreline erosion and sedimentation may be caused by a number of natural factors, including wave and wind action and seasonal flow variations. Studies of the Toledo Bend Reservoir's shoreline have indicated that a majority of erosion is caused by wave action derived from prevailing winds and power boating. At other hydroelectric projects, operational fluctuations also have been identified as a contributing factor to the shoreline erosion or sedimentation, although such a relationship has not been demonstrated at the Toledo Bend Project. Ground disturbance associated with shoreline erosion could potentially have a direct affect on historic properties within the APE by damaging the integrity of sites or exposing artifacts to looting and vandalism. Sedimentation also may affect the integrity of existing shoreline archaeological sites. Other operational activities, including a drawdown in reservoir levels, could potentially affect archaeological resources by exposing sites within the fluctuation zone to looting and/or vandalism.

- **Shoreline and Aquatic Recreation Activities** - Recreation activities associated with the Project's reservoir may have direct or indirect effects on historic properties. At this time, shoreline erosion related to power boating is the only identified affect of recreational activities associated with the Project. However, activities associated with informal parking areas, access trails/areas, boat launches, mooring locations, campsites, and

shoreline landing sites have been identified at other hydroelectric projects as factors that may contribute to erosion or cause ground disturbance that could potentially affect the integrity of archaeological sites. Ground disturbance that may occur along shorelines as a result of these activities also may expose shoreline sites, and informal access or use areas may cause erosion that facilitates looting or vandalism.

- **Maintenance Activities** - Routine maintenance activities and facility improvements may involve ground-disturbing activities. These activities may take place at Project facilities or at recreation areas within the APE. Maintenance activities and facility improvements could unintentionally affect the integrity of archaeological properties.

In addition to the potential effects to archaeological resources described above, the Authorities have determined that routine maintenance and facility improvements could affect historic buildings and structures within the Project's APE, particularly buildings and structures that are Project works or that are otherwise associated with the Project. Maintenance activities could unintentionally affect the integrity of these resources by modifying or removing the character-defining features of these properties.

At this time, the potential Project effects to archaeological resources include looting, vandalism, sedimentation, and ground-disturbance associated with project operations, routine maintenance activities, and shoreline recreation. The Authorities have concluded that Project effects have the highest potential to impact archaeological sites along the reservoir's shoreline, where erosion, sedimentation, and ground disturbance could adversely affect the integrity of archaeological deposits or expose sites to looting and/or vandalism.

In developing this study plan, the Authorities consulted with the SHPOs, Indian tribes, the Forest Service, and other stakeholders to determine the most efficient and effective approach to studies during the licensing process. The ILP provides for two study seasons, and the APE includes over 1,200 miles of shoreline. Consequently, the parties consulted during the development of the study plan recognized that a complete study of the entire APE was not possible during the licensing process. Based on these discussions, the Authorities developed a study plan that

focuses on locating and assessing archaeological sites within sections of the APE where Project effects are likely to be the most pronounced, including areas of the shoreline and areas that routinely experience high visitor traffic.

The specific methods for the Cultural Resource Study are outlined in Section 6, below. The initial task of this study will involve additional background and documentary research to supplement the information collected during the PAD development process. Task 2 will entail a desktop analysis of this research and the development of a comprehensive cultural resources map and pre-fieldwork report that will assist the Toledo Bend Cultural Resources Working Group² (Working Group) in identifying priority sites for investigation during the licensing phase. Task 3 of this study plan includes archaeological field investigations of shoreline sites, including subsurface testing at priority sites identified by the Working Group. A historic architecture/engineering survey will be included as Task 4 of this study to identify historic buildings and structures within the Project's APE that are potentially eligible for the National Register. Task 5 will include ongoing consultation with federally recognized Indian tribes to identify properties of traditional religious or cultural significance that may be affected by Project relicensing.

This study will allow FERC to meet its obligations pursuant to Section 106, and will help form the basis for developing a programmatic agreement among FERC and the SHPOs. Additionally, this study will assist the Authorities and FERC in identifying processes and measures to be included in the HPMP for ensuring the long-term management of National Register-eligible historic properties within the Project's APE.

6.0 METHODOLOGY

The proposed methods for this study are consistent with professional practices. The overall approach is commonly used in relicensing proceedings and in developing an HPMP for a new license term. The proposed study methods are consistent with FERC's study requirements under the ILP, and provide for the identification and management of historic properties as required

² The Toledo Bend Cultural Resources Working Group includes representatives from the Texas Historical Commission, the Louisiana Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism, the Sabine River Authority of Texas, the Sabine River Authority, State of Louisiana, the Forest Service, and federally recognized Indian tribes whose interests may be affected by the Project,

under Section 106 and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's (Council) implementing regulations (36 CFR Part 800).

6.1 Cultural Resources Study

As noted above, the principal goal of the Cultural Resources Study is to collect sufficient information regarding cultural resources within the Project's APE to assist the Authorities in developing an HPMP that will provide for the long-term management of historic properties throughout the term of the license. Studies conducted during the ILP study phase will focus on identifying cultural and historical resources within the Project's APE that are potentially being affected by Project operations or activities. The proposed tasks associated with the Cultural Resources Study were developed in consultation with the Working Group and other stakeholders. This study will build on the existing information that has been collected over the previous four decades of archaeological research in the Project's vicinity. Based on this information, tasks detailed by this study plan also include field investigations of shoreline areas, including subsurface testing.

Task 1: Literature Review

During the PAD development process, the Authorities undertook a database review of reported archaeological resources within the Project's vicinity. This information has been summarized in the PAD. While this information was useful for providing data regarding the number and types of archaeological sites within the general Project area, additional research and further review of existing reports and documents are necessary to provide a more thorough context for field studies and resource management planning. The Authorities will contract with a qualified cultural resource professional³ to review additional sources of information, as necessary. Additional sources may include (but are not limited to):

- a) Archaeological survey reports, site forms, or building and structure inventory forms on file with the SHPOs;

³ For purposes of this Project, a qualified cultural resource professional is defined as an individual or firm that meets or exceeds the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (36 CFR § 61), the Rules of Practice and Procedure for the Antiquities Code of Texas (Chapter 26, Section 26.5), and Louisiana Administrative Code (Title 25-Cultural Resources, Part I, Chapter I, Subpart A, Section 102) as applicable.

-
- b) Other resources available from the SHPOs, including historic shipwreck databases, maps, and GIS data;
 - c) Reports on cultural resource investigations, maps, and management plans prepared by the Forest Service for lands adjacent to the Project;
 - d) U.S. Department of Agriculture soil survey maps and reports;
 - e) Historic maps of the Project vicinity;
 - f) Historic aerial photographs of the Project area;
 - g) Records related to Project construction, including photographs, maps, and reports;
 - h) Deed and survey records;
 - i) Relevant documents, maps, or reports retained by local historical societies and museums;
 - j) Informant interviews;
 - k) Reports, documents, and maps available from the U.S. National Park Service (NPS) related to the El Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trail;
 - l) Any additional information provided by the Working Group or stakeholders.

Task 2: Desktop Analysis, Mapping, and Pre-Fieldwork Report

The Authorities will use a combination of GIS data, orthophotos, topographic maps, informant interviews, historic photographs, and additional information collected during the literature review to create a comprehensive cultural resources map of the APE. The map will identify:

- a) The locations of reported archaeological sites within the APE, including sites recorded by the Forest Service; and
- b) Areas within the APE that generally have high visitor traffic (e.g., campsites, boat launches, picnic areas); and
- c) Areas along the shoreline where active erosion or other ground-disturbing activities appear to be occurring.

This desktop analysis will be conducted by a qualified cultural resource professional in consultation with an experienced GIS analyst and a fluvial geologist or similar professional with specialized expertise evaluating erosion/sedimentation at hydroelectric impoundments. The Authorities will also conduct an informal survey of Forest Service and Authority staff to identify

areas where vandalism and looting have previously been documented, and will incorporate this data into the desktop analysis and map.

The results of this desktop analysis will be combined with the data gathered during the Task 1 of this study to develop a comprehensive Pre-Fieldwork Cultural Resources Report. The pre-fieldwork report will provide a summary and analysis of available data, including the location of reported sites and areas where looting, vandalism, sedimentation, erosion, and/or other ground-disturbing activities are believed to be occurring. The pre-fieldwork report will also identify those locations where additional investigations are recommended, including (but not limited to):

- Reported archaeological sites and archaeologically sensitive areas within the APE (e.g., shoreline areas near map documented structures and pre-Project stream confluences or terraces) that may be subject to disturbance as a result of Project operations or activities; and
- Locations where data analysis indicates that conditions of active shoreline erosion that may potentially impact archaeological resources, should any be present; and
- Locations where high visitor traffic may potentially affect archaeological resources, should any be present; and
- Sites within the APE where looting and/or vandalism have previously been reported.

A copy of the Pre-Fieldwork Cultural Resources Report will be submitted to the Working Group for their review.

Task 3: Archaeological Field Investigations

The purpose of the archaeological field investigations is to identify archaeological and cultural resources within the Project's APE that are affected by Project operations. The archaeological field investigation will include two components: a visual reconnaissance and subsurface testing. Shoreline areas and areas of high visitor traffic will be the primary focus of field investigations because ongoing Project impacts at these locations currently have the highest potential to affect the integrity of historic properties.

As noted above, the APE for this undertaking includes over 1,200 miles of shoreline, and the timeframe for field studies provided in the ILP is limited. Consequently, the Working Group has determined it is not feasible to conduct a thorough archaeological investigation and subsurface testing program within the entire APE during the relicensing process. Further, such large-scale invasive investigations are neither statutorily required nor in the best interest of these resources, as they may unintentionally contribute to shoreline destabilization and cause increased erosion or sloughing along the reservoir. Most members of the Working Group have also indicated a preference to conduct subsurface investigations during the ILP study phase in a manner that will permit more thorough data recovery at locations subject to Project effects, as opposed to simply conducting an archaeological inventory of lands within the APE. As a result, the Authorities propose to conduct subsurface investigations during the ILP study at a select number of priority shoreline locations recommended by the Working Group. A process and schedule for implementing additional studies at other locations within the APE will be incorporated into the HPMP.

The Authorities will convene a meeting of the Cultural Resources Working Group following distribution of the Pre-Fieldwork Cultural Resources Report. Based on the information provided in the pre-fieldwork report and any other relevant data, the Working Group will develop *a subset of priority sites* that require additional investigation during the ILP study phase. The Authorities will conduct field investigations of these priority sites in accordance with the methodology described below.

Phase I Visual Reconnaissance Survey

The pre-fieldwork report will provide analysis and recommendations based on extensive research and desktop modeling. However, additional ground truthing of this information is warranted to determine if evidence of active erosion, vandalism, looting or other Project effects are discernable at the priority sites identified by the Working Group.

Because a limited timeframe is available to conduct subsurface testing during the ILP study period, the Phase I survey will assist the Working Group in identifying those priority sites where

there are active Project effects and additional subsurface testing and data collection is required. Consultation with members of the Working Group has indicated that a visual inspection of priority sites is important to effectively and efficiently conduct targeted subsurface data collection during the ILP study period.

The Authorities will contract with a qualified cultural resource professional with regional experience to conduct a Phase I survey of priority sites identified by the working group. As a component of this field reconnaissance, the Authorities will:

- a) Conduct an intensive visual inspection and walkover of all priority sites recommended by the Working Group;
- b) Document active erosion, ground disturbance, or other Project effects at priority sites;
- c) As necessary, collect and record cultural material observed during the visual reconnaissance to prevent site looting or vandalism;
- d) If possible, verify the location and type of reported archaeological resources, and provide additional documentation, as necessary;
- e) Document previously unreported archaeological resources identified incidental to the investigation of priority sites (if any);
- f) Prepare site records for all archaeological sites discovered and revisited during the visual reconnaissance;⁴
- g) Prepare recommendations for any follow-up subsurface testing for all priority sites, including (but not limited to) additional monitoring, site evaluation, and/or data recovery measures.

The cultural resources professional conducting field investigations may also undertake limited subsurface testing during the Phase I investigation. This limited testing will serve as a means collecting additional data to assist the Working Group in determining which sites require more

⁴ Site records for archaeological sites discovered and revisited within the Texas portion of the APE will be prepared in accordance with the Texas Archaeological Research Laboratory (TARL) standards. The Authorities will consult with the Louisiana SHPO to determine the appropriate standards for documentation for sites identified or revisited within the Louisiana portion of the APE.

intensive field investigations. All field investigations will be conducted in accordance with state standards.

Documentation for each location investigated as part of the Phase I survey, will also include photographs of ongoing disturbance or erosion that may be related to Project operations, a description of observed cultural material (if any), and coordinates of the locations. For each archaeological sites observed during the Phase I survey, the Authorities will also record (as applicable): resource name and number, elevation or range of elevation, description of environmental setting, general description of the resource, observed cultural features and artifacts, areas of occupation and concentrations of cultural material, pertinent natural features, associated soil types, relationship to waterways, relationship to the Project, observed Project effects on the resource (if any), potential Project effects on the resource, and any recommendations regarding the potential National Register eligibility of each resource.

Any additional documentation required for the locations investigated during the Phase I survey will be developed by the Working Group prior to the commencement of field studies. As applicable, the documentation of each site will be consistent with the requirements of the Texas Historical Commission and the Louisiana Department of Culture, Recreation, and Tourism. Appropriate site forms will be completed and filed for each site.

Based on the results of the survey, the Authorities will prepare a Phase I Cultural Resources Report. The Phase I report will describe the results of the visual reconnaissance, and will provide additional recommendations for Phase II testing, as described below.

Phase II Subsurface Investigations

Following a review of the Phase I report, the Working Group will determine which of the priority sites require additional Phase II Subsurface Investigations. The specific field methods for the subsurface investigations will be determined by the Cultural Resources Working Group. At minimum, the field methods will include a subsurface testing strategy that is consistent with the requirements of the Texas Historical Commission and the Louisiana Department of Culture,

Recreation, and Tourism. The Authorities anticipate that the level of testing will be determined by the Working Group, and that methods will be consistent with the goal of collecting additional site data. These methods may include, shovel testing, and more substantive excavations, including those that will permit a National Register-eligibility determination for select site.

As described below, the Authorities will prepare a comprehensive Phase II Cultural Resources Report at the completion of archaeological field investigations associated with the ILP study phase of the Project. The Phase II report will be submitted to the Working Group for review.

The Authorities will determine the appropriate repository for cultural material collected during the field investigations in consultation with the Working Group, taking into consideration applicable statutes and regulations, including the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) (25 U.S.C. Section 3001).

Task 4: Historic Architecture/Engineering Survey

The purpose of this survey is to identify buildings and structures that are listed in or potentially eligible for inclusion in the National Register that may be affected by Project operations or activities. The Authorities will contract with a qualified cultural resource professional to identify and document historic buildings and structures (including Project works and other Project-related facilities) within the Project's APE. As a component of this survey, the Authorities will:

- a) Conduct a visual inspection of historic buildings and structures within the APE that are a minimum of 50 years old;
- b) Identify buildings and structures that are less than 50 years old but may be eligible for inclusion in the National Register under Criteria Consideration G;
- c) Document and map buildings and structures within the APE that are recommended as potentially eligible for inclusion in the National Register.

As applicable, documentation for each discovered or revisited resource will include (but may not be limited to): resource name and number, location, resource type, description of environmental setting, ownership information, current and historic use(s), current and historic photographs, a

general description of the resource, and recommendations regarding the resource's eligibility for inclusion in the National Register. Documentation of these resources will be consistent with the requirements of the Texas Historical Commission and the Louisiana Department of Culture, Recreation, and Tourism.

Task 5: Consultation Regarding Properties of Traditional Religious or Cultural Significance

The Authorities have undertaken consultation with Indian tribes to identify properties of traditional religious or cultural significance that may be affected by Project operations or activities. While no traditional religious or cultural resources have been identified to date, the Authorities will continue consultation with interested tribes regarding these resources.

6.2 Data Analysis and Reporting

A Draft and Final Phase II Cultural Resources Report combining the results of the Pre-Fieldwork Cultural Resources Report, and the Phase I Cultural Resources Report will be prepared for this study and will include the following elements:

- Project introduction and background;
- Description of the APE and Project effects;
- Historic context statements for the Project's APE,
- Methodology;
- Results of the archaeological field investigations, including descriptions and recommendations regarding the National Register eligibility of each discovered and revisited archaeological site;
- Results of the historic architecture/engineering survey, including descriptions and any recommendations regarding the National Register eligibility of evaluated resources;
- Discussion and analysis of Project effects on identified resources;
- Recommendations for implementing additional studies, monitoring activities, or additional management measures;
- Discussion and recommendations regarding identified properties of traditional religious or cultural significance;

-
- Location maps of
 - The Project's APE;
 - Principal Project facilities;
 - Locations where looting, vandalism, erosion, and/or other ground-disturbing activities have been identified through the desktop analysis;
 - Locations of all discovered and revisited archaeological resources;
 - Locations of all reported archaeological resources within the APE;
 - Any agency or tribal correspondence and/or consultation;
 - Literature citations

The Authorities will consult with the Cultural Resources Working Group, including the Texas and Louisiana SHPOs and interested Indian tribes, regarding the results and recommendations provided in the Phase II report. The Phase II report and subsequent consultation will form the basis for the HPMP, as discussed below.

6.3 Historic Properties Management Plan

Pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800.14(b), the Authorities anticipate that the Commission will enter into a programmatic agreement with the SHPOs and the Council for managing historic properties that may be affected by Project operations through the new license term. The programmatic agreement will provide a cooperative mechanism for ensuring that historic properties are managed in an appropriate manner throughout the term of the new license. The programmatic agreement will be developed in consultation with the SHPOs, Forest Service, and federally recognized Indian tribes, and other stakeholders to specify the tasks that will be addressed in the HPMP. The programmatic agreement also will implement a process and schedule for these parties to review and comment on the HPMP and a deadline for the Authorities to file an HPMP with the Commission.

The measures provided in the HPMP will direct the Authorities' management of historic properties within the Project's APE throughout the term of the license. The Authorities will develop an HPMP in consultation with the SHPOs, the Forest Service, federally recognized Indian tribes, and other stakeholders. Through this consultation, the Authorities will develop a

methodology and schedule for continuing cultural resources investigations and developing PM&E measures, such as routine site monitoring. The HPMP will be prepared in accordance with the *Guidelines for the Development of Historic Properties Management Plans for FERC Hydroelectric Projects*, promulgated by the Commission and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Council) on May 20, 2002. At minimum, the HPMP will address the following items (FERC 2002):

- A schedule and methodology for completing any additional recommended studies and implementing monitoring measures for locations within the APE;
- Additional management measures for identified historic properties within the Project's APE;
- Continued use and maintenance of historic properties;
- Protection of historic properties threatened by Project-related activities, including Project operations, shoreline and aquatic recreation, and routine Project maintenance, and other Project activities or operations;
- Measures for reducing looting and vandalism of sites, including additional monitoring, public outreach, education, and signage;
- Resolution of unavoidable adverse effects on historic properties;
- Treatment and disposition of any human remains that be discovered, taking into account any applicable state laws and the Council's "Policy Statement Regarding Treatment of Burial Sites, Human Remains and Funerary Objects" (February 23, 2007 Washington, D.C.);
- Compliance with the NAGPRA, for tribal or federal lands within the Project's APE;
- Provisions for unanticipated discoveries and of previously unidentified cultural resources within the APE;
- The curation of artifacts and cultural material, taking into account state and federal requirements;
- A dispute resolution process;
- Categorical exclusions from further review of effects;
- Public awareness and interpretation of the historic and archaeological values of the Project; and

-
- Coordination with the Toledo Bend Cultural Resources Working Group—including the SHPOs, Forest Service, federally recognized Indian tribes—and other stakeholders during implementation of the HPMP.

The HPMP will also provide for appropriate management and monitoring measures that will ensure adequate studies are conducted to identify and (as necessary) evaluate the National Register eligibility of historic resources at locations within the APE that may be affected by future Project activities (e.g., recreation improvements, bridge/road construction, and other ground-disturbing activities).

6.4 Curation of Cultural Materials

The Authorities recognize that cultural materials recovered from surveys and tests conducted on Forest Service lands will remain the property of the federal government. In accordance with the Forest Service's policy, these cultural materials will be curated at the Forest Supervisor's Office in Lufkin, Texas.

In consultation with the working group, the Authorities will determine the appropriate curation facility for cultural materials collected on non-Forest Service lands. The Authorities and the Working Group will consider applicable state and federal laws regarding the curation of archaeological materials when determining the appropriate facility.

7.0 SCHEDULE

The preliminary schedule for the conduct of this Study is outlined below:

1. FERC issues the Study Plan Determination: August 7, 2009
2. Study Planning, Literature Review, and Desktop Analysis Commences: August 10, 2009
3. Pre-Fieldwork Cultural Resources Report Distributed to Working Group: September 30, 2009
4. File Progress Report (Authorities): October 3, 2009
5. Cultural Resource Working Group Convenes: October 16, 2009

-
6. ILP Study Phase of Archaeological Field Investigations Begin: November 2, 2009
 7. Historic Architecture/Engineering Survey Begins: November 2, 2009
 8. Phase I Cultural Resources Report Distributed to Working Group: January 4, 2010
 9. Cultural Resource Working Group Convenes: January 29, 2010
 10. Historic Architecture/Engineering Survey Complete: March 31, 2010
 11. Commence HPMP Discussions with Agencies and Tribes: May 1, 2010
 12. ILP Study Phase of Archaeological Field Investigations Complete: May 31, 2010
 13. Phase II Cultural Resources Report Distributed to Working Group: August 30, 2010
 14. File Initial Study Report (Authorities): October 30, 2010
 15. Initial Study Report Meeting (Authorities and Stakeholders): November 15, 2010
 16. File Study Report Meeting Summary (Authorities): November 30, 2010
 17. Continued HPMP Discussions with Agencies and Tribes: December 1, 2010
 18. File Meeting Summary Comments (Authorities): December 30, 2010
 19. File Response to Meeting Summary Comments (Stakeholders): January 28, 2011
 20. Study Plan Resolution/Amendments by FERC: February 28, 2011
 21. File Draft HPMP with the Commission (concurrent with the filing of a Preliminary Licensing Proposal or Draft License Application): May 3, 2011

8.0 BUDGET

To meet the schedule of the ILP and to allow for adequate consultation during the development of the HPMP, the Authorities anticipate that this study will be completed in one study season. Development of the HPMP will extend into the second study season. The estimated budget for the study is approximately \$300,000.

9.0 DISCUSSION OF ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES

The proposed methods for this study are consistent with professional practices and current cultural resource survey methodologies. The overall approach is commonly used in relicensing proceedings and is consistent with FERC study requirements under the ILP. No alternative approaches to this study have been identified at this time.

10.0 REFERENCES

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. 2002. Guidelines for the Development of Historic Properties Management Plans for FERC Hydroelectric Projects. May 20, 2002. Washington D.C.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. 2004. Hydroelectric Licensing Under the Federal Power Act, Final Rule and Tribal Policy Statement. Revised February 23, 2004. Washington D.C.