# PROGRESS REPORT ON THE HOPI TRIBE'S INVOLVEMENT IN THE TRANSITION TOWARD IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE OF THE GLEN CANYON DAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Prepared and Submitted by

Kurt E. Dongoske
Tribal Archaeologist
Cultural Preservation Office



Reviewed and Approved by

Leigh Jenkins, Director
Cultural Preservation Office
The Hopi Tribe

Submitted to

Mr. Dave Wegner, Program Manager
Glen Canyon Environmental Studies
Bureau of Reclamation
P.O. Box 22459
Flagstaff, Arizona 86002-2459

July 30, 1996

## Introduction

In 1991 the Bureau of Reclamation and the Hopi Tribe entered into a Cooperative Agreement No. 1-FC-40-10560, entitled Cooperative Agreement for Hopi Tribe Coordination with the Glen Canyon Environmental Studies and the Glen Canyon Environmental Impact Statement, as a means to allow for Hopi Tribe involvement in the technical programs. This involvement focused on the technical areas of archaeological resource studies, cultural resource coordination, ethnography, hydrology, and GCD-EIS coordination. The Hopi Tribe participated as a full cooperating member of the Cooperating Committee directing the overall GCD-EIS program.

In 1992, the Bureau of Reclamation initiated the Section 106 process of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended. This process identifies that any change in the operations of the Glen Canyon Dam is considered a federal undertaking and as such requires the identification, evaluation, and consideration of all historic properties within the area of potential effect of that undertaking. This process also mandates consultation with concerned Native American Tribes for the identification, evaluation, and treatment of historic properties of significance to these Native American Tribes. The Hopi Tribe participated in this process to identify, evaluate, monitor, and be an equal participant in the long term management of all historic properties, sacred areas, and areas of traditional Hopi cultural use that are within the Glen Canyon Dam's area of potential effect. The Hopi Tribe is a Consulting Signatory to the Programmatic Agreement for the Glen Canyon Dam which specifically delineates the responsibilities of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The Hopi Tribe's concerns include not only cultural resource aspects, but also the impacts of operations of Glen Canyon Dam on the biological and physical processes and resources, including the endangered fish in the mainstem Colorado River and in the Little Colorado River (LCR).

In March of 1995 the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Operation of the Glen Canyon Dam was issued by the Bureau of Reclamation. On the following September 30, 1995 the Cooperative Agreement No. 1-FC-40-10560 between the Hopi Tribe and the Bureau of Reclamation was successfully concluded. The period beginning October 1, 1995 and ending with the Secretary of the Interior signing the Record of Decision for the Glen Canyon Dam Final Environmental Impact Statement is considered a transition period in which efforts will be activated toward implementing the preferred alternative. During this period, the Bureau of Reclamation has entered into a Cooperative Agreement with the Cultural Preservation Office of the Hopi Tribe for the collection and analysis of cultural resources along the Colorado River, Glen and Grand Canyons below Glen Canyon Dam, Arizona. This Cooperative Agreement No. 1425-96-FC-81-05007 and entitled Glen Canyon Dam Transition Monitoring Program is to be a part of the Transition Monitoring and Long-term Monitoring studies that are being conducted to determine future options for operations of the Glen Canyon Dam.

This Cooperative Agreement identifies a cultural resource monitoring program that will collect information for the Glen Canyon Dam Programmatic Agreement and the Glen Canyon Dam Transition Monitoring program being conducted to determine future cultural resource impacts related to the operations of the dam. The Hopi Tribe will benefit from the augmentation of its information data base on the cultural resource knowledge of the Colorado River and provide an avenue for dispersion of scientific information to the tribal population and the elders.

Two major areas of monitoring and coordination are proposed under this agreement: 1) Cultural Resource Monitoring and 2) Transition Monitoring and Adaptive Management Coordination. The primary objectives of these work areas are to ensure that a consistent and appropriate level of monitoring of the cultural resources occurs during the Transition Monitoring period and that the Hopi Tribe is provided the resources to adequately participate in the Transition Monitoring and Adaptive Management programs.

The Hopi Tribe's scope of work encompasses the implementation of activities related to the transition period until the finalization and implementation of the Final Glen Canyon Dam Environmental Impact Statement Record of Decision. The scope of work includes the monitoring of sacred places and places and resources of traditional cultural importance to the Hopi people within the Glen and Grand Canyons, and guidance and development of specific technical and cultural resource recommendations. The primary focus of the Hopi Tribe's involvement is concentrated on providing a traditional Hopi perspective and related concerns within all aspects of the transition period in order to develop the appropriate monitoring, management, and research needs that are sensitive to a Hopi cultural perspective.

According to the objectives outlined in the cooperative agreement, this progress report addresses the advancement and action that has been accomplished by the Cultural Preservation Office for the period beginning April 1, 1996 and ending June 30, 1996, encompassing the third quarter of the 1996 fiscal year, towards fulfillment of those objectives. This report fulfills the July 1996 deliverable requirement of the cooperative agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Hopi Tribe.

## Progress Completed Towards Fulfillment of Objectives

The first objective is to represent the Hopi Tribe in all Transition Work Group meetings and associated technical work subgroup meetings during the transition period and the concurrent development of the Long-term Monitoring and Adaptive Management Programs and the development and implementation of the Research Center. Efforts to accomplish this objective by the Cultural Preservation Office, during this reporting period, consisted of representing the Hopi Tribe at one Transition Work Group meetings, three Grand Canyon Research Monitoring and Research Center planning meetings, and two meetings of the signatories to the Glen Canyon Dam Programmatic Agreement.

**Transition Work Group Meetings**

On 21 May 1996, Mr. Kurt Dongoske, Tribal Archaeologist with the Cultural Preservation Office, attended the Transition Work Group Meeting held at the La Quinta Inn, Phoenix, Arizona. The meeting was chaired by Mr. Bruce Moore of the Bureau of Reclamation, Upper Colorado Regional Office. During the meeting the GAO audit of the Glen Canyon Dam EIS was discussed and it was stated that the GAO's draft report would be done near the end of July, with the final report available in September. Also discussed at this meeting was the Temperature Control Studies for the feasibility of the selective withdrawal structure. The Temperature Control Studies will look at two critical issues: the feasibility of delivering warm water to the Little Colorado River confluence and whether the warming of the Colorado waters will effect the food base in the system; especially the upper portion in Glen Canyon reach. These two studies are to be completed over the next two years. The temperature studies are proceeding on schedule and under budget. If these two critical issues are successfully resolved, then the Bureau of Reclamation will initiate the NEPA compliance sometime in 1998. Also discussed, were the preliminary results of the Beach/Habitat Building Test Flows.

**Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center Subgroup Meetings**

Mr. Michael Yeatts, Hopi/GCES Archaeologist attended a planning meeting of the subgroup for the Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center on April 18, 1996. The meeting was held at the La Quinta Inn in Phoenix, Arizona. Dr. D. L. Garrett chaired the meeting. The subgroup participants discussed generating the first draft of the Research Center's research protocols and how these protocols would apply to the bifurcating of the monitoring work into contract or institutionalized programs. Also discussed was the issue of how the Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center is being established and under what program within the Department of the Interior and the process that established Dr. Garrett as the Chief of the center. Finally, the subgroup participants discussed the preliminary language for the Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center's charter. Subsequent to this meeting the Hopi Tribe, through a letter signed by the Hopi Tribal Chairman Ferrell Secakuku, commented on the preliminary language of the charter and the research and monitoring protocols.

Kurt Dongoske attended a meeting of the subgroup for the development of the Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center on May 14, 1996. The meeting was held at the Fountain Suites in Phoenix, Arizona. Dr. L. D. Garrett, Chief, of the Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center chaired the meeting. During this meeting the participants of the subgroups discussed the Research Center's charter and reviewed a preliminary final draft. Dr. Garrett indicated that he was looking at 1998 implementation of long-term monitoring program by the Research Center.

Kurt Dongoske, attended another meeting of the subgroup for the development of the Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center on June 17, 1996. The meeting was held at

the Fountain Suites in Phoenix, Arizona. Dr. Garrett advised the group that the Research Center's three program manager positions have been advertised and that they were only open and available to Department of the Interior personnel. Kurt Dongoske expressed his concern that there would not be personnel with the appropriate qualifications and experience within the Department of the Interior to adequately represent, administer, and integrate tribal concerns or understand the federal trust responsibility and tribal sovereignty issues. Dr. Garrett expressed his perspective that the FACA charter for the Adaptive Management Work Group, the Historic Preservation Plan, the Endangered Species programs defined under the Biological Opinion and the Selective Withdrawal are all issues that will significantly influence and direct the Research Center's extent. Dr. Garrett went on to explain that the Research Center is a program directly under the Secretary of the Interior and that the Tribes represent a potential major political force at the Adaptive Management Work Group table. The subgroup participants discussed the draft research and monitoring protocols and guidelines for the Research Center currently remain the same and will be revised in the Research Center as the long-term monitoring and adaptive management process evolves. The subgroup participants began an initial review of the draft management objectives to clarify stated objectives and to identify information/research needs. In response to this meeting a letter was sent to Dr. Garrett from the Ferrell Secakuku, Chairman of the Hopi Tribe, regarding Hopi concerns for the selection of the Cultural Program manager and that the tribes should have a voice in the selection of the individual.

The second objective is to provide transition monitoring and management consultation to the Bureau of Reclamation concerning archaeological, sacred, and places and resource of traditional importance within the context of a Hopi cultural perspective. Assistance and consultation will be provided to the Bureau of Reclamation as part of their National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106 responsibilities pursuant to the Glen Canyon Dam Operations Programmatic Agreement. Principally this objective has been accomplished through the Hopi Tribe's participation in the meetings of the signatories to the Programmatic Agreement and through the review and comment on the National Park Service's cultural resource monitoring trip reports and the annual monitoring report. The principal Hopi representatives to the Programmatic Agreement meetings are Mr. Dongoske and Mr. Michael Yeatts, Hopi/GCES Archaeologist.

Between April 10-14, Mr. Dongoske and Mr. Yeatts attended the Society for American Archaeology's annual meetings which were held in New Orleans, Louisiana. Mr. Dongoske and Mr. Yeatts, representing the Cultural Preservation Office, participated in a symposium, entitled "Below the Dam: Cultural Resources and the Colorado River Below Glen Canyon Dam," organized by Dr. Signa Larralde, Bureau or Reclamation, and Jan Balsom, Grand Canyon National Park. The Cultural Preservation Office's participation in the Glen Canyon Environmental Studies and the Glen Canyon Dam Programmatic Agreement was represented by a paper, entitled "Öngtupka niqw Pisisvayu, Salt Canyon and the Colorado River: The Hopi People and Management of Glen Canyon Dam," authored by Dr. T.J. Ferguson, Leigh Jenkins, Kurt E. Dongoske, and Michael Yeatts.

On 20 May 1996 Mr. Dongoske attended a meeting of Glen Canyon Dam Programmatic Agreement Signatories at the La Quinta Inn in Phoenix, Arizona. Meeting participants discussed the results of the spring Habitat/Beach Building Experimental Test Flow, which appears to have been a success at the Palisades archaeological site. The draft reports for the Habitat/Beach Building Experimental Test Flow cultural resources research must be distributed to the Bureau of Reclamation by 30 September 1996. Review comments will be submitted back to the researchers for revisions by mid October and the final reports are due to Dr. Larralde and Ms. Balsom by 15 November 1996 for integration into the final report submittal to the Glen Canyon Environmental Studies by 31 December 1996. Also discussed at this meeting were the plans to publish the Society for American Archaeology symposium proceedings, final drafts of the proceeding's papers are due to Signa Larralde by July 1, 1996.

Mr. Yeatts and Mr. Dongoske spent a good portion of the first half of the month of June reviewing and developing comments on the first draft of the Historic Preservation Plan. The Hopi Tribe's comments on the draft Historic Preservation Plan were transmitted to Dr. Signa Larralde, Regional Archaeologist, Upper Colorado Region, Bureau of Reclamation, by a letter, date 12 June 1996, and signed by Chairman Ferrell Secakuku. Several of the general comments of the Hopi Tribe concerning the Historic Preservation Plan centered around the structure, content, and associated philosophical viewpoint of the draft. One comment concerned the considerable and superfluous overlap between the Historic Preservation Plan and what is delineated in the Programmatic Agreement and the Monitoring and Remedial Action Plan.

The Programmatic Agreement defines the process of achieving compliance with section 106 of the NHPA and defines the roles and responsibilities of the participating signatory parties in this process. The Monitoring and Remedial Action Plan specifies the mechanics of conducting the monitoring, research, and other activities associated with identifying and mitigating adverse effects to the cultural resources. What the Hopi Tribe felt was currently lacking is a unifying document that defines the broader goals for the preservation of the historic properties and identifies how these goals would be achieved through the implementation of activities identified in the Monitoring and Remedial Action Plan. Moreover, such a plan must recognize the important historical aspects for which these sites were nominated and delineate a research program that will maintain and integrate this historic information. While the Hopi Tribe recognized the necessity for establishing a procedural framework for management, much of what was presented in this draft simply reiterates concepts contained in the Programmatic Agreement and Monitoring and Remedial Action Plan. More emphasis needed to be placed on the theoretical constructs in which the monitoring and data recovery efforts are implemented and how the resultant data is evaluated and interpreted.

Another comment of the Hopi Tribe concerning the draft Historic Preservation Plan pertained to the orientation of the Long-Term Research Goals/Domains. The Hopi Tribe was generally pleased to see that aspects of archaeological research were being addressed as a

long-term need for the management of the cultural resources within the canyon. The Hopi Tribe was concerned, however, that as the document was currently written there was no process or methods presented for obtaining scientific information regarding most of the discussed theoretical and cultural research domains. Moreover, the "methodological research domain" was not a research domain; it was, in fact, a suggested data acquisition approach to collecting information specifically on erosion. The Historic Preservation Plan did not address the collection of archaeological, anthropological, and historical information which was ultimately what 36CFR800 identifies as important to preserve if the eligible sites themselves cannot be preserved. The Hopi Tribe suggested that there needs to be a discussion of how the "theoretical and cultural" research domains are addressed through the "methodological" section. Incorporated into this revision would either be an expanded "remedial action" section or a new section that specifically addresses data recovery.

Additionally, regarding the identified "theoretical and cultural" domains, the Hopi Tribe was concerned about their strong slant towards traditional archaeological assumptions regarding culture history, site formation and function, concepts of regional population movement, and notions regarding site use, disuse, and abandonment. These Long-Term Research Goals/Domains currently did not provide for the integration of the tribal perspectives on prehistory, history, and the dynamic natural and cultural processes that formed the archaeological record. Given that six Native American tribes are signatories to the Programmatic Agreement, it is absolutely essential that these perspectives are provided an avenue to be considered within the context of the greater research domains. The Hopi Tribe suggested that this be a central issue of discussion at the next meeting of the signatories to the Programmatic Agreement with the intent of broadening the research goals and domains to incorporate a more holistic view of history.

The Hopi Tribe's final general comment regarding the Historic Preservation Plan concerned the lack of specific integration of the cultural resource program as it was currently expressed within the Historic Preservation Plan with the Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center and the Bureau of Reclamation's specific section 106 responsibilities. The Research Center serves a pivotal role as science broker between the Adaptive Management Work Group and the collection of scientific information for long-term management decisions. The Hopi Tribe envisions the Historic Preservation Plan as establishing a long-term framework for research realms and management priorities regarding cultural resources within the canyon. It is the role of the Research Center to ensure that the broad research goals in the Historic Preservation Plan are realized in the long-term monitoring and associated research programs. Moreover, the Research Center would provide the necessary technical overview to ensure that the scientifically appropriate and most cost effective research was obtained. Finally, the Research Center would ensure the integration of the cultural resource information into the overall adaptive management equation for operations of Glen Canyon Dam. The Hopi Tribe suggested that the integration of the Research Center into the Historic Preservation Plan be developed for the next draft of the Historic Preservation Plan by Dr. Signa Larralde and Dr. L. Dave Garrett, Chief, of the Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center. This effort would serve to educate Dr. Garrett to the intricacies of the 106

process and the mandates that the Bureau of Reclamation is responsible.

On 25 June 1996 Mr. Kurt Dongoske met with Signa Larralde, Regional Archaeologist, Upper Colorado Region, Bureau of Reclamation, Ms. Jan Balsom, Cultural Resources Manager, Grand Canyon National Park and Mr. Norm Henderson, Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, at the Lab of Anthropology, Northern Arizona University campus regarding the submitted comments on the first draft of the Historic Preservation Plan. Only the Grand Canyon National Park, the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office, the Pueblo of Zuni, and the Hopi Tribe submitted comments on the Historic Preservation Plan. A review of the comments and a discussion concerning the suggested changes to the Historic Preservation Plan was done by the meeting participants. A consensus was reached on what changes and direction the next draft of the Historic Preservation Plan should be and how to present these proposed changes at the next meeting of the Signatories to the Programmatic Agreement. It was decided to meet again on 18 July 1996 to prepare for the presentation of the changes to the Historic Preservation Plan to the Signatories on 19 July 1996.

During the month of May, Mr. Yeatts prepared an article, on cultural resource management and research issues surrounding the Habitat/Beach Building Experimental Test Flow, for the GCES newsletter .

The third objective consists of designing appropriate avoidance measures for the protection of shrines and other areas of traditional importance. Buffer zones may be established according to the relative sensitivity of the individual resource types.

The Hopi Tribe considers all ancestral puebloan archaeological sites to be places of traditional cultural importance and to contain shrines if they represent habitation sites. As such, a considerable amount of effort is expended, toward accomplishing this objective, by the Cultural Preservation Office in reviewing and commenting on the monitoring and suggested remedial action reports generated by the National Park Service. Through this commenting process, the Hopi Tribe communicates their traditional concerns and recommendations for the appropriate management and remedial measures for the protection of these important places.

During this reporting period, Mr. Dongoske and Mr. Yeatts reviewed and commented on the Grand Canyon National Park's 96-2 River corridor monitoring report.

The fourth objective is to actively develop a Hopi transition monitoring program to assure the effective management and preservation of Hopi sacred sites and resources of traditional importance. Additionally, the Hopi Tribe will assist in the development of an agreement document delineating the proper treatment of human remains as specified under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. This will include all proposed monitoring activities associated with the Interim Flows during this transition period and their potential impacts on Hopi traditional cultural properties and sacred places.

Efforts toward achieving this objective was initiated by Mr. Yeatts in conjunction with the Habitat/Beach Building Experimental Flow. Mr. Yeatts developed and coordinated the Hopi Tribe's research and monitoring of the sand deposition in arroyo mouths at selected sites along the Colorado River corridor. The purpose of this study is to quantify the amount of sediment the Habitat/Beach Building Experimental Flow would deposit in the mouths of the side channel arroyos and whether this sediment deposition would be sufficient to retard the active side channel erosion of archaeological site. As a part of this effort during this reporting period, Mr. Yeatts prepared and submitted to Dave Wegner, Program Manager, GCES a preliminary report on the results of the Hopi Habitat/Beach Building Experimental Test Flow Research.

Additionally, Mr. Yeatts conducted remapping of the Hopi Habitat/Beach Building Experimental Test Flow Research study sites. This remapping consisted of a day trip to Lee's Ferry on April 5, 1996 to remap the Lee's Ferry site and a river trip from May 8-21, 1996 to remap the downstream sites. Also during this reporting period, Mr Yeatts continued to analyze the Hopi Habitat/Beach Building Experimental Test Flow Research data and initiate the generation of a report documenting the results of the Hopi Habitat/Beach Building Experimental Test Flow Research.

Additionally, Mr. Yeatts is planning a Hopi Monitoring River Trip, in conjunction with the Park Service's fall monitoring trip, to evaluate the current condition and status of properties of traditional importance to the Hopi within the Glen and Grand Canyons.

Objective five is to review reports and other technical documentation to assure that a Hopi traditional perspective and the associated concerns are duly considered and additionally to prevent inadvertent public dissemination of privileged and restricted cultural knowledge.

This objective is concurrently achieved through the efforts of the Cultural Preservation Office in participating in the Transition Work Group, all related subgroups, and the review and comment on all reports, and proposals reviewed in conjunction with the Programmatic Agreement or other aspects of the transition period. See above for a detailed accounting of these activities.

The sixth objective is to develop the Hopi/NAU office which will provide education opportunities and support for Hopi students and other students interested in pursuing technical and scientific fields. Coordinate and integrate this program with the development of the Research Center.

Toward this end, Mike Yeatts and Kurt Dongoske have been establishing a branch of the Cultural Preservation Office within the Department of Anthropology at Northern Arizona University. Currently, Mr. Yeatts is occupying the office on a part time basis. The office has recently received a phone line, associated parking accommodations, and a computer. Mr. Yeatts continues to establish the general organization of the office and, in conjunction with the Anthropology Department, is developing a draft of an informational brochure which

explains the organization, structure, and goals of the Hopi/NAU program. Mr. Yeatts also meets frequently with Dr. Downum and recently attended a class of Dr. Miguel Vasquez where they were establishing a world-wide web page for information about Hopi. Mr. Yeatts also has compiled a list of Hopi and other students who are interested in the Hopi program and has contacted other students via telephone.

The seventh objective is to review proposals, work plans, intended fieldwork, and review draft and final reports to prevent any potential conflicts described above in the previous objectives.

This objective is accomplished through the efforts detailed in objectives 1 through 5. Please see above discussion under these respective objectives for a detailed accounting of efforts and accomplishments achieved during this reporting period.

The above summarizes the Hopi Tribe's involvement as a Cooperating Agency in the development of the Glen Canyon Dam Environmental Impact Statement as of June 30, 1996. If you should have any questions concerning this progress report or if you need additional information please contact Mr. Leigh Jenkins, Director, or Mr. Kurt Dongoske, Tribal Archaeologist, at 602/734-2441, extension 202, or 602/734-2244.

REVIEW AND CONCURRENCE

7/31/96

Leigh Jenkins, Director
Cultural Preservation Office
The Hopi Tribe