

STUDY 11.0

SECTION 106 COMPLIANCE

STUDY 11.0 SECTION 106 COMPLIANCE..... 11-1

- 1. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF STUDY..... 11-1
- 2. RELEVANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT GOALS..... 11-2
- 3. BACKGROUND AND EXISTING INFORMATION 11-2
- 4. PROJECT NEXUS..... 11-3
- 5. STUDY AREA AND STUDY SITES 11-4
- 6. PROPOSED METHODOLOGY 11-4
- 7. CONSULTATION WITH AGENCIES AND TRIBES..... 11-6
- 8. WORK PRODUCTS..... 11-7
- 9. LEVEL OF EFFORT AND COST 11-7
- 10. SCHEDULE 11-8
- 11. REFERENCES 11-8

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

- A FERC GUIDELINES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES
MANAGEMENT PLANS
- B AGENCY CORRESPONDENCE

STUDY 11.0 SECTION 106 COMPLIANCE

The Project is located in Nance and Platte counties, where water is diverted from the Loup River and routed through the 35-mile-long Loup Power Canal, which empties into the Platte River near Columbus. The Project includes various hydraulic structures, two powerhouses, and two regulating reservoirs.

Relicensing the Project is a Federal undertaking by FERC, and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (NHPA), requires Federal agencies to determine whether their undertakings have adverse effects on historic properties (any site, structure, or other property listed on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places [NRHP]). Historic properties include historic structures and archaeological sites.

Although archaeological surveys and excavations have occurred in the past, no formal cultural resources surveys have been conducted within the Project Boundary for this relicensing proceeding. This study will identify and evaluate any historic properties in the Area of Potential Effects, defined in Section 3, Background and Existing Information, and will support FERC’s Section 106 consultation process. The consultation process will provide FERC with information from Nebraska SHPO, Native American tribes, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), enabling informed management decisions.

1. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF STUDY

“Describe the goals and objectives of each study proposal and the information to be obtained;” 18 CFR §5.11(d)(1)

The goal of the Section 106 compliance study is to achieve NHPA Section 106 compliance through a programmatic, ongoing consultation relationship between the District and the Nebraska SHPO.

The objectives of the Section 106 compliance study are as follows:

1. To review existing information with FERC and the Interested Parties (Nebraska SHPO, the Pawnee Tribe, the Iowa Tribe of Kansas and Nebraska, the Omaha Tribe, the Santee Sioux Tribe, and the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska) to identify consultation needs and additional archival and field data collection requirements.
2. To gather sufficient information to identify any historic properties that may be affected by the Project.
3. To conduct field studies to identify and evaluate historic properties, including archaeological properties and elements of the standing structure/built environment as well as properties of traditional religious and cultural value important to Native American tribes.

4. To document the historic properties in the Area of Potential Effects and, as applicable, present management recommendations in technical reports, an ethnographic memorandum, and a historic district documentation package.
5. To develop, in consultation with Nebraska SHPO, Native American tribes, and ACHP, a Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP) in accordance with FERC guidelines (see Attachment A).
6. To develop a Programmatic Agreement (PA) to complete the Section 106 compliance process and to incorporate in the Project license (this is a standard procedure carried out by FERC).

2. RELEVANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT GOALS

“Address any known resource management goals of the agencies or Indian tribes with jurisdiction over the resource to be studied;” 18 CFR §5.11(d)(2)

Compliance with Section 106 requires Federal agencies to consider adverse effects on historic properties through their undertakings, with opportunities for other agencies to comment. The FERC license constitutes such an undertaking, and during its consideration of adverse effects, FERC will consult with the District, Nebraska SHPO, Native American tribes, other federal agencies, and other parties as identified through the relicensing process.

3. BACKGROUND AND EXISTING INFORMATION

“Describe existing information concerning the subject of the study proposal, and the need for additional information;” 18 CFR §5.11(d)(3)

Since the 1930s, numerous archaeological surveys and excavations have occurred in the vicinity of the Project during infrastructure (such as road and civic) improvement projects, including the construction of the Loup Power Canal, and research projects. The Project facilities are located among cultural resources that were identified during these surveys; however, no formal cultural resources surveys have been conducted within the Project Boundary for this relicensing proceeding.

During preparation of the PAD, the District obtained archival information from the Nebraska State Historical Society regarding known (that is, previously identified or reported) cultural resources in the vicinity of the Project, including, but not limited to, historic standing structures locations and descriptions, archaeological resources locations and descriptions, and inventory survey locations. The District also met with Nebraska SHPO to discuss relicensing of the Project and to obtain additional information related to cultural resources.

During early coordination meetings and correspondence, Nebraska SHPO noted that the entire Project is likely considered to be a historic district eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Nebraska SHPO representatives toured the Project with District personnel in June 2007. While the entire extent of the

historic district has not yet been evaluated, the historic district appears to be significant and to meet integrity standards according to definitions under the National Park Service (NPS) guidelines. The District understands the historic district eligible for listing on the NRHP to be particularly directed at the physical plant constructed since the 1930s.

The facility components include the Diversion Weir, Settling Basin, Skimming Weir, siphons, Monroe and Columbus powerhouses (designed during the Art Deco period), Lake Babcock, Sawtooth Weir, and recreation areas. In addition, the dustpan dredge, called Pawnee, has been used continuously since 1937.

Thirteen archaeological sites have been recorded adjacent to the Project between the point of diversion on the Loup River and the confluence of the Loup and Platte rivers. Of particular interest are a group of sites associated with the pre-contact and historic period villages near present-day Genoa. These sites (25NC4, 25NC6, and 25NC20) comprise a large occupation area that is bisected by the Loup Power Canal. While no specific observations point to intact archaeological resources or human remains within the Project Boundary, archival documentation suggests that fill material used during construction in the 1930s was taken from these site locations.

Site 25PT1 and nearby Site 25PT8, along with a cluster of sites downstream along the Loup Power Canal (25PT54, 25PT55, 25PT63, 25PT64, and 25PT65), are also noteworthy. Based on the limited information available, they may retain integrity and have diverse artifact assemblages, though none were formally evaluated. In addition, no cultural materials associated with these sites have been documented within the Project Boundary.

In January 2009, FERC and the District proposed to establish the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for the Project as the Project Boundary, defined in the PAD in Figure 4-1, Sheets 1 through 14. The area within that boundary encompasses the entirety of the District's holdings that are subject to the relicensing effort described in the PAD. On January 23, 2009, Nebraska SHPO concurred that the Project Boundary, as defined in the PAD, is the APE.

4. PROJECT NEXUS

“Explain any nexus between project operations and effects (direct, indirect, and/or cumulative) on the resource to be studied;” 18 CFR §5.11(d)(4)

Granting of a new license by FERC constitutes an undertaking subject to Section 106 compliance. Specifically, Section 106 states that an agency with the “authority to license any undertaking shall, prior to the approval of the expenditure of any Federal funds on the undertaking or prior to the issuance of any license, as the case may be, take into account the effect of the undertaking on any district, site, building, structure, or object that is included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register” (16 USC 470f). Through this Section 106 compliance study, the District will identify and evaluate any historic properties in the APE and will establish a consultation process to

ensure that the Project remains in compliance with Section 106 throughout the life of the license.

5. STUDY AREA AND STUDY SITES

The study area is the APE, or Project Boundary, which encompasses the entirety of the District's holdings that are subject to the relicensing effort described in the PAD. On January 23, 2009, Nebraska SHPO concurred that the Project Boundary, as defined in the PAD, is the APE (see Attachment B).

6. PROPOSED METHODOLOGY

“A detailed description of the study and the methodology to be used;” 18 CFR §5.11(b)(1)

“Explain how any proposed study methodology (including any preferred data collection and analysis techniques, or objectively quantified information, and a schedule including appropriate field season(s) and the duration) is consistent with generally accepted practice in the scientific community or, as appropriate, considers any known tribal interests;” 18 CFR §5.11(d)(5)

The methodology for the Section 106 compliance study includes six tasks, described below. Field studies carried out during the Section 106 compliance study will be conducted in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation Activities (48 FR 44716-44740) as well as any additional guidelines recommended by Nebraska SHPO. Archaeologists and architectural historians contracted to complete these field studies will meet the Professional Qualifications Standards used by the Secretary of the Interior and codified in 36 CFR 61.

Task 1 Phase IA Archaeological Overview

Prior to the field studies, the District will produce an archaeological resources overview, also referred to as a Phase IA investigation, of the APE for the Project. The Phase IA investigation will document the known resources in the vicinity of the Project, provide background for pre-contact and historic-period Native American use of the area, illustrate the land-use history within the APE to provide a better understanding of where intact archaeological resources may likely exist, and provide recommendations for additional fieldwork in specific areas of the APE.

Information will be gathered from consulting parties and during review of existing records and literature on archaeological resources and previous cultural resource studies in the vicinity of the Project (generally within 1 mile of the APE) that are on file with the District and Nebraska SHPO as well as at libraries, museums, historical societies, and other local and regional repositories. Specifically, information will be obtained from the District's extensive library of engineering drawings, maps, and aerial photographs as well as from maps and plats on file at Nebraska SHPO. The

District will identify resource locations on maps and design a field research strategy to survey areas where intact archaeological resources might exist.

The Phase IA archaeological overview will be a written report that will contain sensitive information and will be made available to Interested Parties as necessary to secure a common understanding of the scope of any future proposed field studies and evaluations as appropriate.

Task 2 Phase I Archaeological Inventory and Evaluation

The District will conduct archaeological field studies in areas indicated in the Phase IA investigation as having the potential for intact archaeological resources. The field studies will be conducted to identify and evaluate historic properties, including archaeological properties and elements of the standing structure/built environment as well as properties of traditional religious and cultural value important to Native American tribes. Accompanying each field study will be an analysis of potential adverse effects on any historic properties during the term of the license.

The field studies, known as Phase I investigations, will employ methods that will adhere to Federal standards and state guidelines and will likely involve both surface pedestrian reconnaissance and subsurface shovel testing. Ultimately, the field methods used in specific areas will be determined by the Principal Investigator. The intent of the Phase I investigations is to gather sufficient information on historic properties within the APE to evaluate any resources identified as potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP.

If the data obtained during the Phase I investigations are insufficient to evaluate the resource, it may be subject to additional field investigations, commonly referred to as Phase II evaluations, to gather additional information sufficient for determining NRHP eligibility. The District intends to avoid any potential adverse effects on archaeological properties, so no Phase II investigations are anticipated at this time. Should a potential adverse effect on a non-evaluated archaeological property be identified in the future, the District would then sponsor a Phase II evaluation of that property.

Task 3 Ethnographic Documentation

The District, in consultation with Native American tribes, will document any known places within the APE that are of traditional religious and cultural importance to the tribes. This report will document meetings with and written correspondence supplied by the tribes and will be provided to FERC in the form of a summary memorandum. If locations of traditional religious and cultural importance are identified within the APE by the tribes, the District will consult with FERC, Nebraska SHPO, and the tribes to ascertain the eligibility of these locations for listing on the NRHP and the nature of any adverse effects. If necessary, the District will address these findings in its Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP), discussed under Task 5.

Task 4 *Historic District Inventory and Evaluation*

The District will inventory and evaluate the potential historic district, including standing structures and other engineering features within the APE, identified during early coordination with Nebraska SHPO. This will be done in accordance with Federal standards and state guidelines for documentation and will result in a documentation package for the property. The District does not intend to nominate the property, but understands that Nebraska SHPO wants to document the physical plant, which it believes is eligible for listing on the NRHP. The draft documentation package will be made available to Interested Parties for review and comment, and a final documentation package will be filed with Nebraska SHPO and will provide the basis for managing eligible standing structures in the HPMP throughout the licensing period.

Task 5 *Historic Properties Management Plan*

Based on the results of the studies and documentation efforts discussed in Tasks 1 through 4, the District will prepare an HPMP to summarize the existing conditions of historic properties within the APE, assess reasonably foreseeable adverse effects of operations or maintenance on the historic properties, and establish notification, consultation, and reporting procedures that take into account these effects throughout the licensing period.

The HPMP will be developed according to the “Guidelines for the Development of Historic Properties Management Plans For FERC Hydroelectric Projects” and will capture FERC requirements for ongoing management of historic properties throughout the term of the Project license (FERC, May 20, 2002). The HPMP represents the conclusion of Section 106 consultation and establishes a framework for historic property management while accommodating the business goals of the licensee.

Task 6 *Executed Programmatic Agreement*

The executed Programmatic Agreement (PA) will include signatures from FERC, Nebraska SHPO, Native American tribes, and possibly ACHP to complete Section 106 requirements. The PA is the legal mechanism that implements the HPMP and provides documentary evidence of compliance with Section 106.

7. CONSULTATION WITH AGENCIES AND TRIBES

This study plan has been developed based on discussions with agencies prior to submittal of the PAD and during multiple study plan meetings that followed the submittal of the Proposed Study Plan.

The District presented an overview of the goals, objectives, and activities associated with Study 11.0, Section 106 Compliance, at the Study Plan Meeting held on April 21, 2009; no comments were received at this meeting related to the study of

Section 106 Compliance. In addition, on May 5, 2009, the District met with Nebraska SHPO to discuss the proposed study plan. The District and Nebraska SHPO toured the Project and discussed the historic context of the Project and the goals, objectives, and major tasks of the Section 106 compliance study. Nebraska SHPO did not have any comments on or revisions to this study plan and determined that this study plan meets the needs for Section 106 compliance. The discussions from these meetings were documented in a meeting transcript and meeting notes, respectively, which are available on the District’s relicensing website (<http://www.loup.com/relicense/html/agencymeetingsresources.html>).

The District will consult with FERC, Nebraska SHPO, the Pawnee Tribe, the Iowa Tribe of Kansas and Nebraska, the Omaha Tribe, the Santee Sioux Tribe, and the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska during the studies and documentation efforts discussed in Section 6, Proposed Methodology. The District will monitor the administrative record as consultation proceeds and will provide regular progress reports to keep the consulting parties informed of developments and aware of issues relevant to their interests.

8. WORK PRODUCTS

“Provisions for periodic progress reports, including the manner and extent to which information will be shared; and sufficient time for technical review of the analysis and results;” 18 CFR §5.11(b)(3)

The work products for the Section 106 compliance study include the following five technical reports: Phase IA Archaeological Overview Report, Phase I Archaeological Inventory and Evaluation Report, Ethnographic Report, Historic District Inventory and Evaluation (documentation package), and Historic Properties Management Plan. The communication between the District and Interested Parties will be included in the record.

Updates regarding the study of Section 106 compliance will be included in the study progress reports to be submitted to FERC in December 2009, March 2010, and June 2010.

9. LEVEL OF EFFORT AND COST

“Describe considerations of level of effort and cost, as applicable.” 18 CFR §5.11(d)(6)

It is estimated that the Section 106 compliance study will cost approximately \$200,000 to \$225,000. This work would be completed by qualified archaeologists, architectural historians, engineers, and planners. A range of costs is provided because the costs associated with the fieldwork to support the Phase I Archaeological Inventory and Evaluation Report are dependent on the results of the Phase IA Archaeological Overview Report and the extent of the locations identified as having the potential for intact archaeological resources. FERC uses standardized

programmatic agreement formats to implement HPMPs that require little negotiation or alteration prior to execution.

10. SCHEDULE

“A schedule for conducting the study;” 18 CFR §5.11(b)(2)

“The potential applicant's proposed study plan must also include provisions for the initial and updated study reports and meetings provided for in §5.15.” 18 CFR §5.11(c)

The archaeological field studies and associated consultation are scheduled to be completed in the third and fourth quarters of 2009. The Phase I Archaeological Inventory and Evaluation Report and the Ethnographic Report will be available in the first quarter of 2010. The final Historic District documentation package is expected to be completed by August 2010.

In addition, the District will prepare a consolidated Initial Study Report for Studies 1.0 through 12.0 that describes progress and results (as appropriate) for each study. In accordance with the District's Process Plan and Schedule, the Initial Study Report will be available in August 2010, and a study meeting will be held within 15 days, per 18 CFR §5.15(c)(2). An Updated Study Report will be available in August 2011 to provide information on progress and results for second season studies (as needed).

11. REFERENCES

48 FR 44716-44740. Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation Activities.

16 USC 470f. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended.

FERC. May 20, 2002. “Guidelines for the Development of Historic Properties Management Plans for FERC Hydroelectric Projects.” Available online at <http://www.ferc.gov/industries/hydropower/gen-info/guidelines/hpmp.pdf>.

**Attachment A – FERC Guidelines for the Development of Historic Properties
Management Plans**

Guidelines for the Development of Historic Properties Management Plans For FERC Hydroelectric Projects

May 20, 2002

I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF THIS GUIDANCE

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) requires the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) to take into account the effect of its undertakings on historic properties and to afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Council) a reasonable opportunity to comment. An undertaking includes any project, activity, or program requiring a federal permit, license, or approval. Therefore, many FERC actions, such as issuance of new and original licenses, license amendments, surrenders, and terminations, are undertakings that are subject to Section 106. Section 106 is implemented through the Council's regulations, "Protection of Historic Properties" (36 CFR Part 800).¹ For hydropower licensing actions, FERC typically completes Section 106 by entering into a Programmatic Agreement (PA) or Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the license applicant, the Council, and the State and/or Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO/THPO).² This agreement is then incorporated by reference into the project license when it is issued.

Because it is not always possible for FERC to determine all of the effects of various activities that may occur over the course of a license, the PA or MOA typically provides, and FERC typically requires as a license condition, that the licensee develop and implement a Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP).³ Through an approved HPMP, FERC can require consideration and appropriate management of effects on historic properties throughout the term of the license. In so doing, FERC meets the requirements of Section 106 for its undertakings.

¹ These regulations became effective on January 11, 2001.

² The 1992 amendments to the NHPA include provisions for Indian tribes to assume the responsibility of the SHPO on tribal lands. The Council's regulations use the term Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) to mean the THPO under Section 101(d)(2) of the NHPA for undertakings occurring on or affecting tribal lands.

³ In past hydropower relicensing PAs, FERC has required licensees to develop "Cultural Resources Management Plans" (CRMPs). In this guidance, however, the term HPMP is used, because it more accurately reflects the requirements of Section 106 of the NHPA.

The purpose of this document is to provide guidance for the development of HPMPs.

What is a HPMP?

A HPMP is a plan, implemented pursuant to a FERC license, for considering and managing effects on historic properties of activities associated with constructing, operating, and maintaining hydropower projects.⁴ It establishes a decision-making process for considering potential effects on historic properties, preferably early in project planning. The HPMP should consider and manage the effects on historic properties of actions taken to implement the license over its entire term. For example, the HPMP should take into account other plans that are required (or will be required), such as recreation plans, timber management plans, or fisheries plans.

A good HPMP should identify the nature and significance of historic properties that may be affected by project maintenance and operation, any proposed improvements to project facilities, and public access. It should identify goals for the preservation of historic properties; establish guidelines for routine maintenance and operation; and establish procedures for consulting with SHPOs, THPOs, Indian tribes, historic preservation experts, and the interested public concerning effects to historic properties or contributing elements of a historic district.

The HPMP should be responsive to the purposes of the Project and should be realistic in terms of those purposes. It is not the intent of Section 106 or the HPMP to transform a hydroelectric powerhouse into a “museum” or to jeopardize the ability of the licensee to produce hydroelectricity. Accordingly, the HPMP should recognize the need to fulfill all of the terms and conditions of the Project license, and should not impede the safe and efficient production of energy.

⁴“Project” means any licensed or unlicensed, existing or proposed water power project that is subject to FERC jurisdiction, including minor projects, major projects, exemptions, and major modified projects as defined in the Commission's regulations at 36 C.F.R. § 4.30 (2001).

The HPMP should be:

- Integrated into the licensee's Project decision-making process so that historic preservation needs are considered during Project planning and operation;
- Written in plain English with historic property management terms clearly defined;
- A stand-alone document (not dependent on access to previous studies, although incorporation by reference may be desirable in some cases); and
- Consistent with any other Project management plans, settlement agreements and/or long-range planning documents.

What does the HPMP propose to manage?

The HPMP should provide for the management of properties listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, the National Park Service's official list of properties recognized for their significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture. Such places, are referred to as **historic properties** and may include the project facilities, such as the dam, powerhouse and substations; other kinds of buildings and structures; prehistoric and historic archeological sites; and properties of traditional religious and cultural significance to Indian tribes.⁵

The management of historic properties involves both the long term preservation of historic values of historic properties and consideration of the effects of a licensee's actions on historic properties. Hydroelectric projects may affect historic properties in a number of ways.⁶ Modes of Project operation that cause erosion can result in the loss of archeological sites located along shorelines. Likewise, constructing recreational developments and providing greater public access can damage archeological sites. Even actions which initially seem fairly routine can undermine the integrity of a historic

⁵An applicant may develop a management plan dealing with all cultural resources (a CRMP, for example) as part of a settlement agreement, or based on the needs of Indian tribes, federal land managers, and other agencies. This approach is not required for Section 106 review, but can improve understanding between parties, and facilitate better coordination of all the applicable laws and regulations relating to cultural resources.

⁶"Effect" as defined in the Council's regulations means "alteration to the characteristics of a historic property qualifying it for inclusion in or eligibility for the National Register" [36 CFR § 800.16(j)]

property. For example, since windows are often a character-defining feature of historic buildings, their replacement in a historic powerhouse can significantly alter that property.⁷

Who's responsible for carrying out the plan?

The Project licensee implements the HPMP, pursuant to the license conditions. Therefore, the plan should identify the project staff position (such as Cultural Resource Liaison, project operator, plant operator, etc) responsible for implementing the plan over the course of the license. However, FERC is responsible for enforcing the licensee's compliance with the license and implementation of the HPMP.

Successful implementation of the HPMP is more likely when Project staff is educated about the specific requirements of the plan within the general context of historic preservation law and practice.⁸ Even with this staff training, however, consultants with specialized training may be needed to complete certain aspects of the plan, such as archeological studies, for example.

When is a HPMP prepared and filed?

We encourage applicants to draft their HPMP in consultation with the other stakeholders and submit it at the time they file a license application with the Commission. One advantage to having a draft HPMP completed when a license application is filed is that it provides a convenient means to involve the SHPO/THPO, Indian tribes and other stakeholders in consultation early on, so that they might reach agreement regarding the scope and results of studies, as well as establishing the APE (area of potential effect). Another advantage to early preparation of the HPMP is that it allows the licensee to consider historic preservation in conjunction with other aspects of the project. Completion of a final HPMP is more easily accomplished prior to issuance of a new license, thereby alleviating many delays and compliance problems after issuance.⁹ This can result in a savings of both time and money for the licensee.

⁷ An "adverse effect" is found when a proposed action may alter the characteristics that qualify a historic property for inclusion in the National Register "in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling or association." [36 CFR § 800.5(a)(1)].

⁸ Project staff means the licensee's staff and consultant who implement or are responsible for the project operation.

⁹ When a final HPMP has been completed prior to issuance of a license, Commission staff typically develops a PA that requires the licensee to implement the HPMP upon license issuance.

A three year time frame during the prefiling stage--from the notice of intent to filing an application--allows for plenty of time to coordinate, consult, and draft a HPMP. Prefiling consultation involving the licensee and the various stakeholders and Indian tribes is already required through the Federal Power Act, and provides a good opportunity for completing a draft HPMP at this time. In addition, the revised implementing regulations for Section 106 allow FERC to authorize the licensee to initiate Section 106 consultation on its behalf, pursuant to 36 CFR §800.2(C)(4). This means that the licensee can begin early formal Section 106 consultation with the SHPO/THPO, Indian tribes, and other stakeholders at the time it files notice of intent to file a license application with the Commission. Another factor to consider is that, during the prefiling stage, FERC staff can freely consult with the licensee and other stakeholders without violating the Commission's rules concerning off-the-record communications--which take effect after a license application has been filed with the Commission and becomes contested due to interveners.

A HPMP should not be concluded without the involvement of FERC, as the responsible Federal agency for purposes of Section 106. It is, therefore, advisable to involve FERC in resolving questions or issues that arise in drafting a HPMP, even when the document is drafted prior to filing a license application.

If it is not possible to complete a HPMP before license issuance, the PA will typically require that a HPMP be developed within one year of the issuance of the FERC license.

II. HOW TO DEVELOP A HPMP

Who should prepare a HPMP?

The preparer of the HPMP should be knowledgeable about:

- Hydropower project operations and maintenance;
- Historic preservation law, policy and practice; and
- Management and treatment issues pertaining to all the types of historic properties that may be affected by Project operations.

Standards for Professional Qualification in the areas of archeology, history, architecture and architectural history have been established.¹⁰

Applicants and licensees are encouraged to consult these standards and to seek technical guidance from FERC, the Council, and the appropriate SHPO and/or THPO. The degree of expertise needed to develop a HPMP will depend on the complexity of the Project and its historic preservation issues.

Who should be consulted?

The licensee should develop the HPMP in consultation with various entities. Pursuant to Section 800.2 of the Council's regulations, the Commission may authorize the licensee to initiate consultation with the SHPO/THPO and others, but remains responsible for all findings and determinations.¹¹ The consulting parties include:

- ❑ The SHPO-- The SHPO reflects the interests of the state and its citizens in the preservation of their cultural heritage, and advises Federal agencies in carrying out their Section 106 responsibilities. Because the SHPO usually plays an important role in the implementation of a HPMP throughout the term of the license, preparers of HPMPs are strongly encouraged to involve the SHPOs in the development of the plan;
- ❑ The THPO or tribal representative--If the Project is either on tribal lands or affects historic properties on tribal lands, and the tribe has assumed the responsibilities of the SHPO for Section 106 in accordance with Section 101(d)(2) of the NHPA, the THPO must be consulted. If a tribe does not have a THPO, the applicant and FERC should consult with the tribe's officially designated tribal representative. Because Indian tribes exercise sovereign authority over tribal lands, the participation of the THPO or other designated representative is important to the development and implementation of the HPMP;
- ❑ Indian Tribes--Consultation must also involve Indian tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations that attach traditional religious or cultural significance to historic properties that may be affected by the operation of

¹⁰ See the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards [48 FR 44738-9]. Although the Secretary of the Interior published draft revised standards on June 1, 2000, these standards are not yet final.

¹¹ See 36 C.F.R. § 800.2 (c)(4).

the Project.¹² Such resources may be located on tribal lands, ceded lands, or other lands within the traditional territory of a tribe;

¹² See 36 C.F.R. § 800.16 (n).

- ❑ State and local governments, other federal and state agencies, non-governmental organizations, property owners, and other individuals-- These parties may wish to participate in the development of a HPMP based on the nature of their legal or economic interest in the undertaking or affected historic properties, or their concern with the undertaking's affects on historic properties. For example, the Project may be constructed on lands owned by or under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management; and
- ❑ The Council--The Council oversees the Section 106 process, and may be asked to help resolve disagreements and provide guidance, advice, or technical assistance to FERC, license applicants, licensees, and other consulting parties in completing Section 106 consultation in developing a HPMP.

III. CONTENTS OF A HPMP

A Project's HPMP should be organized in a logical manner, so that information is easy to find and appropriate procedures can be quickly identified. It is only a guide, and is not meant to be rigidly applied to every Project. The following is an example of how the HPMP might be organized.

1. Overview and Executive Summary

The HPMP should begin with a statement of purpose describing the scope of the plan, how it will be used, and the authority under which it is developed (the statutory and regulatory context). This section should also identify who participated in the plan's development, as well as any ongoing commitment and procedures or protocols to continue consultation with Indian tribes, the SHPO/THPO, and other organizations in implementation of the plan. In addition, this section should summarize the contents of the HPMP.

2. Background Information

The HPMP should include:

- ❑ A description of the Project facilities and operation, its location, and the APE;
- ❑ The historic context (time, place, and theme);

- A description of surveys and/or inventories that have been completed, with maps and other graphics, as needed (including analysis of the scope and quality of existing surveys), and those that will be required to identify historic properties that may be affected by planned actions (include survey standards here, such as SHPO standards, that will be followed);
- A description of known and potential historic properties with an explanation of their significance and public values;
- Appendices which include maps, relevant correspondence, and technical studies or summaries of these studies.

3. **Project Management and Preservation Goals and Priorities**

The HPMP should include a description of the goals for operating the project and the goals for historic preservation at the project. A presentation of those preservation goals and standards in conjunction with the plan for project operation will guide implementation of the HPMP and should identify any historic resources that will be accorded special consideration. The goals and standards should take into account the type of historic properties present, such as Traditional Cultural Properties, historical buildings or equipment, or archeological resources. The HPMP should also describe the philosophy guiding management of historic properties within the Project's APE. For example, the licensee could manage a project under the continuity of use philosophy). It should also relate the plan to the specific management structure of the Project; for example, to the processes by which planning and budgetary decisions are made.

4. **Project Effects and Mitigation/Management Measures**

The HPMP should:

- Include a schedule for completing all actions required in the HPMP, and require FERC, as well as the SHPO/THPO, approval of revisions to this schedule, if any are needed;
- Identify, in consultation with the SHPO/THPO and other consulting parties, activities that will be considered exempt from further review under the HPMP because they possess little or no chance of affecting historic properties;
- Develop and implement rehabilitation standards and an oversight protocol;

- Include procedures to evaluate the effects of actions such as project-induced shoreline erosion, construction of fish passage facilities, construction of recreation facilities, and other Project activities on historic properties, and provide for consideration and treatment of adverse effects, as appropriate, in consultation with others;
- Consider relevant future, ongoing, and past effects, as appropriate;
- Include a monitoring protocol and provisions for enforcement, as appropriate;
- Provide for the treatment of human remains (distinguishing between Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA)), if applicable, and State law requirements);
- Describe provisions for public interpretation; and
- Describe procedures to address effects when unanticipated historic properties are discovered and during project emergencies.

5. **Implementation Procedures**

The HPMP should include provisions for:

- Designating a HPMP coordinator;
- Training project personnel;
- An internal decision-making process (Refer to Principle #6 in Section IV);
- Consultation with the SHPO/THPO and others, including the Council if National Historic Landmarks are affected;
- Periodic reporting and meetings;
- Periodic review and revision of the HPMP;
- Actions requiring consultation with the SHPO/THPO, Indian tribes, Federal land managers, and others; and
- Dispute resolution, if not already provided in the PA or MOA.

IV. PRINCIPLES OF HPMP DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

License applicants and licensees are encouraged to apply the following principles in developing and implementing a HPMP for a hydroelectric project.

Principle 1: The HPMP should be responsive to the purposes of the Project, including the safe and efficient production of hydroelectric power, and realistic in terms of those purposes.

The HPMP should be responsive to the purposes of the Project and should be realistic in terms of those purposes. It is not the intent of Section 106 or the HPMP to transform a hydroelectric powerhouse into a “museum” or jeopardize the ability of the licensee to produce electricity. Accordingly, the HPMP should acknowledge the need to fulfill all of the terms and conditions of the Project license, and should not impede the safe and efficient production of energy.

Principle 2: The scope of the HPMP should be clearly defined, and should establish an approach to address effects on private lands.

The HPMP is limited to the consideration of actions that fall under the jurisdiction of FERC and the licensee. The HPMP should recognize that the Project area is not necessarily the same as the area that is affected by project operations and management.¹³ Because Project effects can extend beyond the Project boundary, the geographic scope of the HPMP should not necessarily be limited to Project lands. However, in order to comport with the Council’s regulations, the HPMP cannot compel actions on private lands where the licensee has been denied access. In defining the scope, the plan should:

- Describe and include a map showing the APE, as defined in the Council’s regulations at 36 CFR § 800.16(d);
- Where applicable, identify how to access private lands; and
- Describe outreach efforts that can encourage the treatment of effects on private lands.

Principle 3: The HPMP should be based on sufficient studies to predict the likely effects of Project activities on historic properties, and should provide for the conduct of additional studies that may be needed.

The HPMP should include a description of previous inventories and historic properties that have been identified. It is not good practice to defer all identification and evaluation of historic properties until after the license is issued,

¹³ For major projects and some minor projects, the project area is also called the project boundary.

especially with large and/or complex Projects. However, it is not necessary to complete identification of each and every historic property within the APE before licensing. The HPMP should also specify whether additional identification and evaluation of historic properties are needed, and when they should be done. The HPMP should:

- Identify what additional surveys and evaluation are needed and provide a schedule for their completion;
- Establish procedures to ensure that the pertinent information will be obtained (for example, consultation with Indian tribes regarding properties of traditional religious and cultural significance), and considered prior to the implementation of any action that might affect historic properties; and
- Provide for re-evaluation of historic properties during the term of the license due to changing circumstances, such as the passage of time or changes in the property's integrity.

Principle 4: The HPMP should establish achievable and realistic goals and targets for completing specified tasks that can serve as the basis for budget decisions, staff assignments, and performance measures.

It is important to establish management goals and objectives, and to identify who will carry out the HPMP and how they will do so. In order to facilitate implementation of the HPMP, the licensee might find it useful to develop a field operations manual to provide procedures for staff. This should include a description of how staff will be trained to ensure that the HPMP is properly implemented.

Principle 5: The HPMP should establish management priorities and steps to be taken to ensure long-term preservation of historic properties.

Where historic properties of particular importance to stakeholders have been identified in the APE, the plan should provide for their consideration, avoidance of adverse effects, and, if necessary, treatment. The HPMP should also provide for and establish a schedule for implementing the protective measures, such as monitoring or stabilization; and for public education and interpretation of the historic and archeological values of the project.

Principle 6: The HPMP should establish a decision-making process that provides for the consideration of effects on historic properties early in project planning and include mechanisms for reaching resolution.

The plan should include procedures to consider ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects to historic properties, to promote their proper use, and to encourage beneficial effects. It should also provide for the review of proposed actions by the SHPO and/or THPO and other stakeholders, and should include specific standards for operation and maintenance activities. Procedures in the HPMP should:

- Address possible effects to historic properties resulting from the continued operation and maintenance of the Project;
- Provide for the preservation of historic properties that may be affected by shoreline erosion, other project-related ground disturbing activities, and vandalism--depending on the nature of the effects, could include implementing a program of shoreline monitoring on a regular basis within the APE and follow-up procedures;
- Determine ways to avoid or mitigate adverse effects on historic properties, including consultation as appropriate with the SHPO/THPO, Indian tribes and other stakeholders;
- Determine the process to be followed if previously unidentified properties or effects are discovered;
- Determine how effects on historic resources will be considered in the event of a Project emergency; and
- Establish what, if any, actions have little or no potential for affecting historic properties and can be implemented without any review (exempt activities)
- Establish procedures for dispute resolution.

Principle 7: The HPMP should be developed and implemented in coordination with other plans required by the license.

In addition to project operating plans, recreation plans, and wildlife mitigation plans, the HPMP should be coordinated with other plans and any approved settlement agreement developed either through the traditional or alternative licensing process.

Principle 8: The HPMP should provide for an appropriate level of consultation with others before decisions are made.

The HPMP should establish procedures to identify when and how others, such as the SHPO, the THPO, and Indian tribes, will be consulted in review and decision-making about the management of historic properties. The communication protocol developed for the Alternative Licensing Process might be a useful place to start developing such procedures. It is most useful to consult with others early, before decisions are made, to allow consideration of a range of available options. The HPMP should establish procedures for reaching decisions through consultation, including resolving disputes when they occur.

Principle 9: The HPMP should consider other applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations that provide authority for its implementation and may affect its scope.

Although the focus of a HPMP is the preservation of “historic properties” and compliance with the NHPA, the treatment of historic properties and review procedures included in the HPMP should be consistent with other applicable laws and regulations. For example, if the Project is located on Federal or tribal lands, the HPMP should take into account the requirements of NAGPRA and its implementing regulations, which provide procedures for determining the treatment of Native American human remains intentionally excavated or discovered during ground disturbing activities. The HPMP should therefore:

- Identify applicable Federal, state and local laws and regulations; and
- Establish how the HPMP will be implemented in conjunction with other legal responsibilities.

This is especially important when dealing with the treatment and disposition of any human remains that may be discovered, so that the HPMP is consistent with applicable Federal, state, and local laws, and the Council’s policy on the treatment of human remains.

Principle 10: The HPMP should provide Project staff with ready access to pertinent information, but should also include mechanisms to protect sensitive data and to establish an appropriate level of security to discourage abuses.

Access to relevant information--such as survey data, standards and guidelines, and points of contact for consultation--is important for the effective implementation of the HPMP. However, confidentiality, especially regarding the location of archeological sites and historic properties of traditional religious and cultural significance to Indian tribes, may be needed to provide for long term protection, particularly to protect against such activities as vandalism and looting.¹⁴

Principle 11: The HPMP should avoid the use of jargon, and should use terms consistently and correctly.

Staff at the licensed hydropower projects who will use the HPMP and supervise its implementation may not be familiar with terminology commonly used in historic preservation. If specialized terms are used, they should be defined. For example, terms such as *Phase I archeological survey*, *certified archaeologist*, *state approved contracting archeologist*, *Phase II survey*, and *Phase IA survey*, should be clearly defined so that whoever implements the HPMP is not confused about terminology and meaning.

Principle 12: The HPMP should not be a static document.

The HPMP should provide mechanisms for its periodic review and revision. Any steps to revise, amend, or otherwise alter the plan should be approached in the same manner as the development and approval of the initial HPMP.

Principle 13: Periodic reporting should be a part of the HPMP activities.

The HPMP should establish the scope, contents, and timing of a periodic report and the deadline for submission to the SHPO/THPO, other consulting parties, and FERC. Through this reporting, the licensee and others, most notably the SHPO/THPO, will be able to periodically assess the effectiveness of the plan.

¹⁴Section 304 of NHPA provides that the head of a Federal agency or other public official receiving grant assistance pursuant to NHPA, after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall withhold from disclosure to the public information about the location, character, or ownership of a historic resources when disclosure may (1) cause a significant invasion of privacy; (2) risk harm to the historic resource; or (3) impede the use of a traditional religious site by practitioners (see also 36 CFR § 800.11[c]).

References

- 1993 U.S. Department of Defense Legacy Resource Management Program, Draft Principles of Cultural Resource Management Planning in the Department of Defense.
- 1998 Tom King, Cultural Resource Laws & Practice: An Introductory Guide, Alta Mira Press
- n.d. Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, “Proposed Council Guidelines: Historic Resource Management Plans” (draft).

Attachment B – Agency Correspondence



NEBRASKA STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY
1500 R STREET, P.O. BOX 82554, LINCOLN, NE 68501-2554
(402) 471-3270 Fax: (402) 471-3100 1-800-833-6747 www.nebraskahistory.org

Michael J. Smith, Director/CEO

January 23, 2009

Mr. Neal Suess
President/CEO
Loup Public Power District
2404 15th Street
Columbus, NE 68602-0988

COPY

RE: HP# 0804-127-01 – FERC Relicensing of Loup Power District

Dear Mr. Suess:

Thank you for submitting the referenced project for our review and comment. Our comment on this project and its potential to affect historic properties is required by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, and implementing regulations 36 CFR Part 800.

It is our opinion that the Loup River Public Power complex, consisting of the 35-mile canal system, Columbus and Monroe powerhouses, and associated substations and other structures, is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

In reviewing the proposed Area of Potential Effect (APE) for the relicensing of the Loup Power District, we agree that the APE correctly encompasses all of the District's holdings.

We will look forward to working with you as your relicensing efforts progress, and particularly the Section 106 Review that will form section 4.4.5 of the Environmental Assessment, referenced on page 19 of SD1.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 402-471-4773.

Sincerely,

Jill E. Dolberg
Review and Compliance Coordinator
Nebraska State Historic Preservation Office

Cc: Kim Nguyen, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Frank Winchell, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Ron Ziola, Loup Power District
Lisa Richardson, HDR
George Waldow, HDR

From: Dolberg, Jill [mailto:jill.dolberg@nebraska.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 04, 2009 2:10 PM
To: Madson, Michael J.
Subject: RE: HP#0804-127-01 - FERC Relicensing of Loup Power District

Mike,

I agree that the APE for this project is, in our opinion, the area within the licensed Project Boundary. I apologize for the confusion.

Jill Dolberg
Review and Compliance Coordinator
Nebraska State Historic Preservation Office

From: Madson, Michael J. [mailto:Michael.Madson@hdrinc.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 04, 2009 1:38 PM
To: Dolberg, Jill
Cc: Richardson, Lisa (Omaha)
Subject: HP#0804-127-01 - FERC Relicensing of Loup Power District

Jill - Thank you for sending your letter of January 23 agreeing to the APE proposed in a letter from Loup Power District President Neal Suess on January 5. I think some clarification is in order however to avoid any future misunderstanding regarding the extent of the APE.

Mr. Suess' letter stated that "As recommended by the Commission, the District proposes to establish the project area of potential effects (APE) as required under 36 CFR 800.4 and defined in 36 CFR 800.16 as the area shown in the PAD document (See attached from the PAD: Figure 4-1, 14 sheets) and labeled as the Approximate Project Boundary. The area within that boundary encompasses the entirety of the District's holdings that are subject to the relicensing effort described in the PAD." We specifically targeted the area within the footprint shown on the attached figures (to the January 5 letter) as the Project Boundary currently licensed by FERC. The District holds other properties outside of this area that are not related to the current FERC license or the relicensing effort, including economic development properties and an administrative building in Columbus.

Your response stated that SHPO agreed "that the APE correctly encompasses all of the District's holdings" without specifically targeting the area subject to the relicensing effort. Please clarify that the APE for this project is, in the opinion of the SHPO, the area within the licensed Project Boundary. This clarification is necessary to avoid future misunderstanding about need for historic property identification on District properties that are not related to the relicensing effort.

Sincerely,
Mike

Michael J. Madson, M.S., RPA
Professional Associate

Senior Archaeologist/Cultural Resources Project Manager

HDR ONE COMPANY | *Many Solutions*

701 Xenia Avenue South | Suite 600 | Minneapolis, MN | 55416

Phone: 763-278-5921 | Fax: 763-591-5413 | Mobile: 612-501-6237 | Email: michael.madson@hdrinc.com

PRB Project Office:

140 North Phillips Avenue | Sioux Falls, SD 57104

Mobile: 605-759-1128 | 612-501-6237

THIS IS A CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION

This email and any files transmitted with it may contain PRIVILEGED or CONFIDENTIAL information, including some that may pertain to PRB Project and may be read or used only by the intended recipient. Information concerning the PRB Project is subject to a CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT between HDR/Shannon & Wilson/HWS/HNTB and our clients and may not be shared with any individual or entity that does not have a need to know. If you are not the intended recipient of the email or any of its attachments, please be advised that you have received this email in error and that any use, dissemination, distribution, forwarding, printing, or copying of this email or any attached files is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please immediately purge it and all attachments and notify the sender by reply email or contact the sender at the number listed.