

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| COMMENTERS | | | | | |
|-------------|-------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------|-----------|
| Reference | Commentator | Position (If Known) | Office | Comment Format | Date |
| BIA-Cantley | Garry Cantley | | BIA | Handwritten on draft PA | 5/17/19 |
| PHX ADO | Mike Williams | | Phoenix Airports District Office | Comment form | 5/20/19 |
| BIA | BIA | | | Comment Form | 5/21/19 |
| Williams | Stephen Williams | | | Comment Form | 6/9/19 |
| City of PHX | Laurene Montero | City Archaeologist | City of Phoenix | Comment Form | 6/10/19 |
| JR Welch | J.R. Welch | Director | Archaeology Southwest | PDF Comment Form | 6/10/19 |
| ASM | Keith Knoblock | Az Antiquities Act Administrator, Archaeological Records Manager | AZ State Museum | Comment Form | 6/12/19 |
| AZLEG | David Cook | State Representative, Legislative District 8 Az House of Representatives | Arizona State Legislature | PDF Letter/Comment Form | 6/13/19 |
| NPS | Matthew Guebard/ Amy Pallante | Archeologist | National Park Service-Southern Arizona | Comment Form | 6/14/19 |
| Gen. | | General Editorial Comments | | | 6/19/2019 |
| ACHP | Bill Marzella | Program Analyst/BLM Liaison | | Comment Form | 6/25/2019 |
| ACGA | Therese Hicks | Federal Lands Vice-Chair USFS ACGA | AZ Cattle Growers | PDF of Draft PA | 7/15/2019 |
| USACE CO | Travis Bone | U.S. Army Corps of Engineers | Office of Counsel | Comment Form | 7/25/2019 |
| AZGFD | Jon Shumaker | Cultural Resource Compliance Manager | Habitat, Evaluation, & Lands Branch | Comment Form | 7/30/2019 |
| FBF | Stefanie Smallhouse | President | Az Farm Bureau Federation | Comment Form | 7/30/2019 |
| SRP | Daniel Garcia | Senior Cultural Resource Management Specialist | Salt River Project | Comment Form | 7/30/2019 |
| APS | Chris Watkins | Archaeologist and Natural Resource Specialist | Arizona Public Service | Comment Form | 7/31/2019 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-------------|---|---|-----------------|
| Title | | | ACGA | VEGETATION MANAGEMENT AND RANGELAND MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES IN | Rangeland management includes range improvement practices and management of grazing, wildlife, watersheds, etc. See definition of Rangeland management in Appendix A, #43. | 1 |
| 1 | 3 | 26 | ACHP | Bill Marzella, ACHP: Note that the definition of “historic property” here is not consistent with the regs. For example, sites listed under the NRHP need not be only archaeological sites. Also, properties do not need to be at least fifty years old to be considered historic. | See revised text. | 2 |
| 1 | 4 | 34 | BIA-Cantley | “case-by-case” | Suggested change was made. | 3 |
| 1 | | 37 | NPS | Does this mean that parks would adopt the lead agency’s recommendations on identification, effects and mitigation? Furthermore, that parks wouldn’t participate in consultation efforts? | See revised text. | 4 |
| 1 | 6 | 40 | JR Welch | Appears to attempt to enable solo definition of APE by lead agency. Please stipulate mandates for APE definition in consultation with consulting parties, tribes, and interested parties where appropriate, etc. | See revised text for Stipulation IV. | 5 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| | | | | | | |
|---|----|------|-------|---|---|---|
| 2 | 9 | 8 | ACGA | Who at R3 has reviewed and agreed to this? I see only an Archeologist from the Kaibab weighing in? Much of what is in here that should be exempt has been moved to screened, and completely in conflict with what Allen Rowley Director Forests and Rangelands DC office. | <p>This is a region-specific programmatic agreement, not a national programmatic agreement. It has been reviewed by the Region 3 archeologists and Forest Supervisors.</p> <p>From Gary K Ziehe, PhD, CPRM, Regional Range Management Program Manager, Forest Service: “Handbook cannot be inconsistent with law, regulation or other handbooks, so there is no such provision in the new 2209 handbook. There may be some direction in there about getting clearances for maintenance on existing structural improvements when you do your NEPA, but nothing in there about ignoring the appropriate consultation process.</p> <p>The revised 2200 manual and 2209 handbook are supposed to go to the Chief/Secretary for approval to be published in the FR (Federal Register) or online for public comment sometime in November. We still have a way to go before they are finalized and become effective.”</p> | 6 |
| 2 | | 8-10 | AZGFD | It would be really helpful to coordinate with USFWS and include their WSFR (Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration) program in Albuquerque | Agreed and coordination is ongoing. | 7 |
| 2 | 11 | 18 | ACHP | Bill Marzella, ACHP: Would suggest clarifying that this could be state and/or federal responsibilities (to distinguish from Section 106). | See revised text. | 8 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-----------|--|--|-----------------|
| 2 | 11 | 19 | ACGA | ASPT are invited signatories | See Appendix A #45 for the definition of signatories or signatory. | 9 |
| 2 | 14 | 35 | BIA | Propose the following: "...for undertakings involving federal and Tribal lands, the federal land managers or lead federal agency shall follow the Native American... " NAGPRA is applicable to both. | See revised text. | 10 |
| 2 | 14 | 35 | ACHP | Bill Marzella, ACHP: My understanding is that NAGPRA also applies to federal actions on tribal land. | See revised text. | 11 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-----------|--|--|-----------------|
| 2 | 14 | | JR Welch | <p>Appears to attempt to eliminate responsibilities per NAGPRA for federally funded or permitted activities on private or state land. Please take care to confirm (or refute in writing in response to this comment) that fed agencies involved in funding or licensing projects retain responsibilities for dealing with discoveries of Native American human remains and cultural items regardless of land status. Unless all potentially affected tribes agree, it is not acceptable to replace fed with state law. Where there is any doubt, as there certainly is in this instance, BLM is strongly urged to follow applicable federal laws, regulations, and policies. In particular, NAGPRA’s collection provisions unmistakably apply to cultural items removed from state lands, since the state has control of the lands, and possibly to those from private lands depending on the nature of the state’s control of those cultural items.</p> <p>The phrase “undertakings also involving” gives the impression that state law would also apply to the whole undertaking, including the lands owned by the United States, which is obviously incorrect as well as apparently duplicitous. The PA should also spell out that NAGPRA’s excavation and discovery provisions apply to all lands that are controlled or owned by the United States, with “controlled” defined as those lands not owned by the United States but in which the United States has a legal interest sufficient to permit it to apply these regulations without abrogating the otherwise existing legal rights of a person [43 CFR 10.2 (f)(1)]. Although it has been found that that “fact that a Federal permit is required to undertake an activity on non-Federal land generally is not sufficient legal interest in and of itself to “control” the land within the meaning of these regulations and the Act” (60 FR 62139, December 4, 1995), the necessary provisions in the agreement for the lead federal agency to enforce work stoppage (a NAGPRA requirement) on state and local lands indicates sufficient federal control for all of NAGPRA’s excavation and discovery provisions to apply.</p> | NAGPRA applies only to Federal and Tribal lands. | 12 |
| 2 | 15 | 41-on | ACHP | <p>Bill Marzella, ACHP: Unless tribes have specific responsibilities to implement, or an undertaking brought forward under the agreement has the potential to affect tribal lands, suggest they be invited to participate as concurring parties.</p> | See revised text. | 13 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-------------|--|--|-----------------|
| 3 | 17 | 18 | JR Welch | Lamentable that the best we appear able to do is not abridge or debilitate tribal sovereignty. Why not aim at least a bit higher, follow EO 13175 and agency policy, and pledge commitments to upholding and enacting federal fiduciary duties, acknowledging and facilitating tribal sovereignty, etc.? | This is a 106 PA, so we are not able to address EO 13175, but Section 106 does address government-to-government consultation. No changes made. | 14 |
| 3 | 17 | 18 | ACHP | Bill Marzella, ACHP: Capitalized “Signatories” is used here for the first time and not previously defined—is this intended to apply to both signatories and invited signatories? | See revised text. | 15 |
| 3 | 19 | 27 | ACHP | Bill Marzella, ACHP: Don’t see “Parties” defined here or elsewhere. Does this mean Consulting Parties? If so, suggest using the full term for clarity throughout. | See revised text. | 16 |
| 3 | 19 | 27-33 | FBF | This recital is a helpful guideline that outlines the intent of the parties to “minimize redundancy” and “reduce the need for case-by-case review of routine” tasks. This should be taken into account in each protocol henceforth outlined by the draft PA. | Thank you. | 17 |
| 3 | 19 | 28 | Gen. | “the” NHPA | Suggested change was made. | 18 |
| 3 | 19 | 28 | JR Welch | delete “will satisfactorily” and otherwise cease and desist from all attempts to limit, diminish, or discount agency duties under relevant law and policy. | See revised text. | 19 |
| 3 | 19 | 30 | JR Welch | delete “adequate and” and otherwise cease and desist from all attempts to limit diminish, or discount agency duties under relevant law and policy. | See revised text. | 20 |
| 3 | 19 | 30 | ACHP | Bill Marzella, ACHP: “tribal consultation” is repeated twice. | See revised text. | 21 |
| 3 | 19 | 30 | BIA-Cantley | Remove repeated “tribal consultation” | | |
| 3 | 19 | 31-33 | ACGA | This statement clearly aligns with USFS DC intent to minimize redundancy , consultation time and waste of resources revisiting already cleared practices. | No changes made. Thank you. | 22 |
| 3 | 19 | 33 | BIA-Cantley | “treatments can be applied; and” | Suggested change was made. | 23 |
| 3 | 20 | 36 | BIA-Cantley | “(Additional Signatories); and” | Suggested change was made. | 24 |
| 3 | 21 | 38 | Gen | “that there is” | Suggested change was made. | 25 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-----------|--|---|-----------------|
| 3 | 21 | 38-39 | JR Welch | What about levels of consulting party involvement? Please, at a minimum, specify guiding principles for determining “appropriate level” of public and consulting party involvement. The apparent effort here and throughout this agreement to maximize agency discretion and minimize attention to and remediation of adverse effects will continue to raise suspicions, objections, etc. | See revised text. | 26 |
| 3 | 22 | 42-46 | ACGA | On existing permits there should be no need for SHPO to consult unless it is for a NEW PROJECT impacting previously unsurveyed APES. This recital is overreach and puts permittees in potential economic jeopardy for no good reason. It will also cause emotional uncertainties (consider their FEELINGS as claimed to be a valid reason for surveys to be conducted ...p 7). The vast majority of grazing permits have been authorized for much longer than 50 years, and most have been managed cooperatively and successfully between the land management agency and the rancher / steward. Putting operations with a cultural history of ranching in the west under new and unduly burdensome regulations is adverse to the intent of SHPO. Please verify this opinion with R3 under the direction of USFS WO. It appears to be in conflict with directions for streamlined permit renewals. It is also in conflict with the aforementioned (19) recital to minimize redundancy. | This Recital was removed but there are Screened Exemptions for permit renewals involving new activities. “Feeling” is a term in the NHPA that is a property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time. It is not intended to represent emotions. “Feeling” has been added to Appendix A, Definitions. This PA is not writing a new regulation. As indicated above, we clarified reference to new practices. | 27 |
| 3-4 | 22-23 | | ACHP | Bill Marzella, ACHP: Not sure I am comfortable with the text and placement of these clauses. First, the recitals should document only what has occurred/what commitments have been made and not outline a process for future actions or amendments. If changes to the protocols or exemptions/screened undertakings are anticipated, this should be laid out in the Stipulations section. Second, it is not clear what “amendment” means in this context. For example, I agree that Protocols could be added as appendices in future without having to amend the main body of the PA. However, there should be an opportunity to consult on that amendment to the 106 process for those types of undertakings amongst all consulting parties, not only those that are Signatories to this PA. | Recitals 22 and 23 have been deleted. Stipulations 16 and 17 have been revised for clarity in response to ACHP comments. See revised text. | 28 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-------------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1-4 | | | City of PHX | I didn't see a Whereas clause for cities/municipalities with interest in these projects. We have some rangelands within Phoenix, and we would like to be a concurring party. The City of Phoenix has a City Archaeology Office and a City Historic Preservation Office (separate offices). Please include both in continued consultation. | The cities and municipalities invitations can be found recital #12. | 29 |
| 4 | 23 | 1-2 | JR Welch | Delete or re-work. This is objectionable in both form and substance. No basis in law or reasonable practice or rational argument has been laid for this attempt by the signatories, without further consultation, to add whatever activities they please. At a minimum add guiding principles for determining what can be added, as well as consultative duties to engage interested and consulting parties regarding any changes. | See revised text. | 30 |
| 4 | 24 | | SRP | Recommend revising recital to state: This Agreement does supersede other programmatic agreements, other established agency standards, or pertinent permits or agreements without approval by the relevant parties to those agreements. | See revised text. | 31 |
| 4 | 24 | 5-6 | ACHP | Bill Marzella, ACHP: This clause is a little vague. Is it intended to mean existing Section 106 agreements? If so, suggest adding text to that effect. | See revised text. | 32 |
| 4-5 | 26-27 | 10-16 | ACHP | Bill Marzella, ACHP: For clarity, suggest reordering this to earlier in the recitals or combined with an earlier recital where these terms first appear in the text. | See revised text. | 33 |
| 5 | | 4-5 | ACHP | Bill Marzella, ACHP: Again, unclear use of "Parties". Suggest changing as non-federal agencies have no inherent Section 106 responsibilities. | See revised text. | 34 |
| 5 | II | 17-19 | ACHP | Bill Marzella, ACHP: I'm not familiar with the requirements of the Arizona Antiquities Act, but it's not clear why "and/or" is used in this context. Regardless of what type of land the undertaking occurs on, the federal agency is still required to use SOI qualified professionals in its Section 106 undertakings. If there are special requirements in Arizona that apply to state or private lands, those should be listed separately and not as an either/or scenario. | See revised text. | 35 |
| 5 | | 25 | Gen | Participating Agency can recognize, not recognizes | No change made. | 36 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-------------|---|---|-----------------|
| 5 | | 27 | ACGA | Please define ALL types of disposition used. When Roosevelt Dam was being raised and artifacts were being excavated my husband was working on that project with a construction crew. He came home dumb founded by an archaeological team recovering pots only to put them in plastic bags and smash them with their hammers, supposedly because there was not enough space available to store artifacts in-tact. ? I would like to know where these smashed artifacts are stored and who authorized that as an appropriate disposition. | “Disposition” was removed; the focus is on Tribal knowledge. | 37 |
| 5 | | 29 | NPS | Many NPS locations do not utilize paraprofessional for archeology. | This allows for the various agency policies to be followed but does not require the use of non-professionals where their use is not allowed. | 38 |
| 5 | II.C. | 29 | SRP | Define “non-professional” here. Consider using “Individuals not meeting the SOI standards or not permitted by ASM” instead. (Garcia – SRP) | Changed to “others providing archeological assistance”. | 39 |
| 5 | | 29-35 | AZGFD | Significantly conflicts w/Stip. II. A. | We disagree that it conflicts. Nonprofessionals can assist as long as the action meets professional qualification standards under direct supervision. No change to text was made. See definition of para-archaeologist. | 40 |
| 5 | II.C. | 33 | SRP | What is the intent of adding OPM 0193 supervisory archaeologist in this stipulation? OPM 0193 supervisory archaeologist and someone who meets the SOI standards are not equivalent. Also, this seems to conflict with Stipulation II.A. which stipulates that all actions would meet SOI or ASM standards (Garcia – SRP) | This is allowed under federal agency requirements. | 41 |
| 5 | | 38-42 | AZGFD | Are tribes ok w/this? | Tribes are being consulted so they have the opportunity to state their preference. No change was made. | 42 |
| 5 | III.A. | 40-42 | SRP | Who does a consulting party submit opt-out notification to? BLM? (Garcia – SRP) | Added BLM. | 43 |
| 6 | | 4 | BIA-Cantley | “Responsibilities” | Suggested change was made. | 44 |
| 6 | | 4 | AZGFD | Sp.: “responsibilities” | | |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 6 | IV.A | 5-6 | ACHP | Bill Marzella, ACHP: Suggest rewriting this sentence to the active voice to ensure there is no confusion as to how the lead federal agency is designated. Something like: "The federal agencies involved will collectively designate the lead federal agency for each individual undertaking..." | Change accepted. See revised text. | 45 |
| 6 | IV.C | 17-30 | JR Welch | Here, in the whereas clauses, or both guiding principles are clearly called for to keep the process on the rails and avoid arbitrary and capricious actions by agency officials. | No changes made. | 46 |
| 6 | | 22 | NPS | What about tribes that don't sign onto the agreement? NPS can't delegate tribal consultation. | See revised text. | 47 |
| 6 | | 32 | ACGA | This has probably been a standard for decades so the disposition of the smashed pots should be easily determined? | No revision has been made. Please talk to the agencies (ASU?, SRP?, Reclamation?) involved with that project. | 48 |
| 6 | V, et seq | 34-35++ | JR Welch | Adopt by reference the ACHP definition of consultation, especially the effort to reach agreement... Add to glossary | This text was in Stipulation V. We have added the regulation citation. | 49 |
| 7 | VI.A. | 1-2 | USACE CO | Consider whether appropriate to consult with Consulting Parties beyond SHPO regarding the APE. Per 35 CFR § 800.4(a), the agency official shall determine and document the APE in consultation with SHPO/THPO. As currently worded, this PA would increase the requirement beyond what is required in the 800 regs. | See revised text. | 50 |
| 7 | | 26 | AZGFD | s/b 14 days or 10 business days—check document for consistency on these deadlines | Changed to 14 calendar days throughout document some will remain the same as 30 calendar days as indicated in document as required by statute. (Action Item- Global change) | 51 |
| 7 | | 30 | ACGA | Grazing permittee should be consulted for historical reference and copied on all documentation produced. | Addressed in Appendix H.B. | 52 |
| 7 | | 32 | Gen | Should it be comments? | See revised text. | 53 |
| 7 | VI.A | 35 | JR Welch | Either delete "appropriate" or replace that word with "affected and interested" or add other specific, reasonable and action-defining guidance | See revised text. | 54 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-------------|--|---|-----------------|
| 7 | VI(A) | 35-41 | FBF | The criteria for determining APE by considering “location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, and association” is subjective, overly broad, difficult to quantify, and leads to confusion. This is especially true in the case of “feeling” and “association,” which are essentially intangible and therefore open to a wide variety of interpretations. These terms should either be defined in a way that creates objective criteria or disregarded. | Please see Appendix A, Definitions of “location, design, feeling, setting, materials, workmanship, and association”, which are parts of the National Register evaluation process. | 55 |
| 7 | VI.A. | 38-41 | SRP | Delete redundant verbiage “or qualify the property for” “in a manner that would diminish the integrity of...” (Garcia – SRP) | See revised text. | 56 |
| 7 | | 44-45 | ACGA | Please define "Setting" Concerns obviously are about a vast "view scape" being claimed. This needs to be defined much more specifically, and also it would be reasonable for presence of artifacts to be required in entire "setting" ? FEELINGS: Please define, "FEELING" this is VERY vague and almost impossible to measure and validate. HOW will the feelings be scientifically measured? What calibration device with appropriate margin of error sideboards will be used ? (eg: a typically calm rational feeler VS a hyper-excitable feeler). WHAT percentage of verifiable DNA will be the qualifier for the FEELERS feelings to have standing? | Please see Appendix A, Definitions of “location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association”, which are parts of the National Register evaluation process. | 57 |
| 7 | VI.B | 45 | ACHP | Bill Marzella, ACHP: Suggest adding “integrity of...” before setting. | Change accepted. See revised text. | 58 |
| 8 | | 4 | BIA-Cantley | “Evaluation” | Suggested change was made. | 59 |
| 8 | VII.A | 7 | JR Welch | incorporate by specific reference here or add an appendix with the full citations and access points (e.g., urls) for all pertinent guidance. How else would interested and consulting parties know where to turn to assist the signatories in implementing the programs affected by this agreement. Here and elsewhere, write this agreement for the people served by the agencies, not agency insiders. Enable and encourage citizen participation in our governance! | This Agreement is for the use of agencies, who know where to find their applicable references. This is not specifically for public use. Public involvement has its own place in each Undertaking. | 60 |
| 8 | VII.A. 3. | 13-15 | SRP | Add SHPO, ASM, and other applicable reporting standards (Garcia – SRP) | We just provided examples. | 61 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-------------|--|---|-----------------|
| 8 | | 13-15 | ACGA | Where is the Inventory and accounting kept for the raising of Roosevelt Dam? | Please talk to the agencies (ASU?, SRP?, Reclamation?) involved with that project. | 62 |
| 8 | VII.B | 17 et seq | SRP | These are not survey standards. Suggest renaming this section "Guidelines for determining appropriate level of inventory" (Garcia – SRP) | Change has been made. See revised text. | 63 |
| 8 | VII.B | 19++ | JR Welch | Pick one term for referencing 100% survey (e.g., "inventory" and stick to it). Add this and other key terms to the glossary and stick to the definition. | Inventory does not necessarily imply field survey. The two terms are not synonymous. No change made. | 64 |
| 8 | B(3) | 27-30 | FBF | Requiring no further inventory for the APE on a project where a 100% inventory has been previously performed is consistent with Recital 19. We support this survey standard. | Thank you. | 65 |
| 8 | | 27-36 | ACGA | In all likelihood a land management agency does not have a 100% inventory on any grazing allotment. This then REQUIRES the lead federal agency to coordinate with SHPO, Tribes and appropriate land management agencies for all grazing permit renewals. | For those grazing renewals that require new activities, the survey may be requested. Sometimes, targeted areas are requested for survey by the land manager. This would be a screened exemption. Stipulation VIII. may also be useful. | 66 |
| 8 | B(4) | 32-34 | FBF | Mandating ("shall coordinate") that the lead agency work with all other appropriate land management agencies if a less-than 100% inventory is proposed may bog down the process and delay project commencement. Consultation with other agencies should be discretionary at the decision of the lead agency. | Individual land managing agencies involved in the Undertaking has decision-making responsibilities. However, the coordination should be informal, rather than formal consultation, thereby avoiding delays. | 67 |
| 8 | VII.B. 4 | 33 | JR Welch | Specify the exact meaning of "coordinate" or, better yet, revert to already-defined obligations to consult. | "Coordinate" added to Appendix A, Definitions to distinguish it from formal consultation. See revised text. | 68 |
| 8 | VII.B. 4 | 32-34 | City of PHX | "Applicable municipalities" or "Applicable agencies" should also be listed. | See revised text. | 69 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-----------|---|--|-----------------|
| 8 | | 40 | ACGA | Concern about Predictive Modeling and possible misuse of data. Needs side boards | See the definition of predictive modeling in Appendix A #37. | 70 |
| 8 | VII.C | 45-46 | ACHP | Bill Marzella, ACHP: Suggest the more inclusive use of "historic properties" rather than specifically archaeological and TCPs | See revised text. | 71 |
| 9 | VII.C. 2. | 5-6 | USACE CO | Unclear what is meant by: "For purposes of Section 106, unevaluated properties shall be treated as eligible." Does this apply to all unevaluated properties, or just TCPs? Also, it seems overbroad to state that all unevaluated properties would be treated as eligible. Same concern with language in Appendix C, item B. | See revised text. Confirm 36 C.F.R. 800.4 in PA | 72 |
| 9 | | 9 | Gen | should space after the / be deleted? | Suggested change was made. | 73 |
| 9 | | 10 | Gen | should there be an or there before cultural significance | Change incorporated. See revised text. | 74 |
| 9 | VII.C. 3 | 13-15 | SRP | Reword to "...certain classes of properties may be considered eligible for the National Register in accordance with Appendix C without additional consultation" (Garcia – SRP) | Change incorporated. See revised text. | 75 |
| 9 | VII.C. 4 | 18 | SRP | Reconfigure to remove "agreement." Rather, the "lead federal agency, in consultation with ... will determine eligibility" (Garcia – SRP) | This is an informal coordination with the land managing agency before the lead federal agency makes the determination. | 76 |
| 9 | VIII.A. | | JR Welch | Here and throughout, use "historic properties" not just "properties" | See revised text. | 77 |
| 9 | | 35 | Gen | "that the identification, protection requirements" does not seem like proper English. Could the the comma be deleted and the word "and" inserted? | See revised text. | 78 |
| 9 | VIII.A. 3 | 42-44 | ACHP | Bill Marzella, ACHP: "Consultation" seems to be defined as both a process and a specific deliverable. For example, as used here, the distinction is confusing (i.e., what is a "signed consultation"?). This comment also applies to the Assessment of Effects section. Also suggest adding in definitions appendix the definition of consultation as it appears in the regs. | See revised text. Double check document | 79 |
| 9 | VIII.A. 3 | 42-44 | SRP | If each subsequent phase requires a report and consultation where is the value in phased identification and evaluation? This is just repeating the standard process. (Garcia – SRP) | See revised text. | 80 |
| 9 | | 43 | Gen | what is signed consultation? | See revised text. | 81 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-------------|---|---|-----------------|
| 10 | VIII.A.4 | 1 | SRP | Refers to protection measures in Section II. There are none there. (Garcia – SRP) | See revised text. | 82 |
| 10 | IX | 12 | JR Welch | Here and throughout, use “effects on” not “effects to” and otherwise employ the statutory and regulatory terms or explain any and all deviations therefrom. | Suggested change was made. See revised text. Global change: change “effects to” to “effects on” (only for history properties) | 83 |
| 10 | | 13 | BIA-Cantley | “properties.” | Suggested change was made. | 84 |
| 10 | | 26 | Gen | I did not see finding of effect mentioned in Stipulation VII. | See revised text. | 85 |
| 10 | IX.A.2 | 26 | SRP | Stipulation VII does not relate to finding of effect. Revise to IX? (Garcia – SRP) | | |
| 10 | IX.A.2 | 26-27 | JR Welch | Delete “as applicable” or make absolutely clear what conditions would allow the agency to do otherwise. | See revised text. | 86 |
| 10 | | 29-42 | APS | Chris Watkins, APS. These sections require consultation for findings of “No Adverse Effect.” The BLM State Protocol exempts many findings of “No Adverse Effect” from consultation. Will the BLM still be authorized to comply under the State Protocol for this undertaking, or will this PA supersede compliance for vegetation management activities? How will the two agreement documents dovetail in the event of a contradiction? | When the agency initiates the undertaking, they will determine which agreement document will be followed. They will not dovetail. | 87 |
| 10 | | 35 | AZGFD | “Protection/Mitigation Measures” | Added as requested. | 88 |
| 10 | IX.C | 35-42 | SRP | I Recommend replacing “mitigate those effect by applying . . .” with “take protective measures to ensure that the historic property is not adversely affected by applying those protective measures listed in Appendices G and H.” (Garcia – SRP) | Revised as requested. | 89 |
| 10 | | 38 | BIA-Cantley | “and mitigate those effects...” | See revised text. | 90 |
| 11 | IX.E.1.b. | 14 | USACE CO | States: “The lead federal agency shall propose the applicable standard measure...as provided in Appendix F...” but Appendix F (page 32, first paragraph) states: “The lead federal agency may propose...standard measures....” Should be consistent on whether the lead agency shall or may propose. | See revised text. | 91 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-----------|--|--|-----------------|
| 11 | | 2 | Gen | this implies Appendices G and H contain all potential protection measures. Appendix G.D. lines 33-34 say the Agency is not limited to those mitigation/protection measures. | See revised text in G.D. | 92 |
| 11 | | 4 | Gen | should you insert/have an empty line before E.? | Suggested change was made. | 93 |
| 11 | IX.E.1 .c. | 6-7 | USACE CO | References a Historic Property Management Plan being prepared in accordance with Appendix F, but I did not see HPMP mentioned in Appendix F. HABS/HAER is mentioned in the appendix, but not in this stipulation. Perhaps replace HPMP with HABS/HAER. | HPMPs are not necessary for these types of undertakings. All instances of HPMP were deleted. See revised text. | 94 |
| 11 | IX.E.1 .a | 10-12 | ACHP | Bill Marzella, ACHP: We can discuss this further, but suggest that it might not be necessary to notify the ACHP every time an adverse effect determination is made, in the interest of reducing paperwork and streamlining consultation protocols. Suggest instead we are only invited to participate when the specific undertaking meets one of the four notification criteria established in the nPA. | See revised text. | 95 |
| 11 | IX.E.1 | 14, 16, 23 | JR Welch | “applicable”: this is another undefined and unacceptably vague and abuse-inducing term. I see it proliferates on subsequent pages. It must be either excised entirely or defined rigorously at or for each use. At a minimum, the agreement must state the standards, conditions, and guiding principles to be used in determining what’s applicable. | Thank you for your comment. | 96 |
| 11 | | 43 | ACGA | ...other Consulting Parties “And grazing Permittee” | Good comment. Refer to Appendix A, Definition of Consulting Parties, which includes permittees. | 97 |
| 12 | IX.E.1 .g. | 2, 4-5 | USACE CO | References Consulting Parties needing to concur (two references). Better would be to state they must not object within the time frame. Otherwise, may be difficult to get affirmative concurrence from all. | Change was made. Anywhere concurrence is needed, “or no objections have been received” has been added. | 98 |
| 12 | | 13 | JR Welch | “adequately”: this is another undefined and unacceptably vague and abuse-inducing term. It must be either excised entirely or defined rigorously at each use. At a minimum, the agreement must state the standards, conditions, and guiding principles to be used in determining what’s adequate. Why not simply agree that the treatment must be implemented before the start of construction? If this latitude is required for some reason then that reason must be disclosed. | We believe “adequate” is appropriate in this context. | 99 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-------------|--|---|-----------------|
| 13 | X.A.2 | | City of PHX | "Applicable municipalities" or "Applicable agencies" should also be listed. | Revised number X.A.1 and X.B.2 to include municipalities but X.A.2 remains unchanged because it is the federal agency that has responsibility pursuant to 36 C.F.R. 800.13. | 100 |
| 13 | X.A.2. | 2 | USACE CO | Unclear who shall determine actions that the agency official can take to resolve adverse effects. Possibly a word missing. | This was taken straight from 36 C.F.R. 800.13. No changes were made. | 101 |
| 13 | | 5 & 36 | AZGFD | 100 s/b 50' | Reduced to 50 feet for general discoveries without human remains. Kept at 100 feet for discoveries with human remains. See clarifying text in Stipulation X. | 102 |
| 13 | X.A.2. | 8 | USACE CO | What is the process if the SHPO/THPO, Indian tribe, or Council does not respond within 48 hours? Perhaps state the agency official will take into account any recommendations received in a timely manner. | This was taken straight from 36 C.F.R. 800.13. No changes were made. | 103 |
| 13 | X,B.1. | 28 | BIA | Propose the following: "...are encountered on federal or Tribal lands, the land manager or lead federal agency will follow..." NAGPRA is applicable to both. | Change was made. See revised text. | 104 |
| 13 | X | 28-41 | JR Welch | Either acknowledge federal agency NAGPRA responsibilities for federally funded or licensed/permitted undertakings or provide full and explicit rationale and legal authority for the apparent attempt to cancel and avoid these responsibilities. | X.B.1 states the federal agency's responsibility. | 105 |
| 13 | | 38 | AZGFD | Also, the appropriate landowner/manager | See revised text. | 106 |
| 13 | | 45 | AZGFD | Or the ASM, depending upon land jurisdiction. | See revised text. | 107 |
| 13 | | 45 | ASM | It might be helpful here to expand this sentence to clarify that projects conducted on or include state land require a permit from ASM. Perhaps something like "Archaeological investigations shall be conducted in accordance with a permit issued by the appropriate land management agency or from ASM on projects that involve state land." | Change was made. See revised text. | 108 |
| 14 | | 2-5 | ACGA | Roosevelt Lake pot destruction should be covered here? | No revision has been made. Please talk to the agencies (ASU?, SRP?, Reclamation?) involved with that project. | 109 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-------------|---|---|-----------------|
| 14 | XIII.A. and C. | | USACE CO | Stipulations XIII.A. and XIII.C. appear to conflict. A. states 36 CFR § 800.12 shall be followed (which requires notification of, and providing an opportunity for comment by, the Council, SHPO/THPO, tribes, etc. prior to the undertaking), while C. states consultation shall be initiated after the emergency is addressed. Could resolve by deleting C. | Suggested change was made. See revised text. | 110 |
| 14 | XIII.C | 23 | JR Welch | Replace “affected” with “responsible” or other concrete and specific term. Many agencies could be affected; specify the means for determining which one is responsible for acting and what, exactly, it is obligated to do. | Stipulation XIII.C. was deleted. | 111 |
| 14. | XIV | 26-37 | SRP | Annual reporting is a burden for all of these agencies to administer on their own. Will BLM coordinate all annual reporting under this agreement? (Garcia – SRP) | The lead agency for each undertaking is responsible for preparing an annual report. Additionally, Section XIV.A. was revised to include a list of agencies involved in the undertaking. | 112 |
| 14 | | 27 | AZGFD | shall annually compile | Suggested change was made. | 113 |
| 14 | XIV.B | 36-37 | JR Welch | Specify the response to any request for a meeting. Which agency will do what, when, and through what means of communication? | Added: all communications shall be via email unless otherwise requested. | 114 |
| 15 | | 2-6 | ACGA | Any Signatory to this Agreement may request that it be amended, whereupon the Signatories will consult to reach a consensus on the proposed amendment. BLM shall seek input from the concurring parties on any proposed amendments. Any amendment to this Agreement must be signed by all Signatories. BLM will provide electronic copies of the amendment to the concurring parties. | Clarified with ACGA on the October 9 meeting. See revised text. | 115 |
| 15 | | 9 | ACGA | may propose additional protocols | Clarified with ACGA on the October 9 meeting. See revised text. | 116 |
| 15 | | 15 | BIA-Cantley | “...added as an attachment to Appendix F” | Text revised. | 117 |
| 15 | XVII | 15 | JR Welch | Which appendix? | Text revised. | 118 |
| 15 | | 17 | BIA-Cantley | “Withdrawal” | Suggested change was made. | 119 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 15 | | 31-35 | ACGA | Withdrawal from this Agreement by a federal or state land-managing agency shall require the lead federal agency to comply with 36 CFR Part 800 with respect to all undertakings on or affecting lands within that agency's jurisdiction, in lieu of this Agreement. Withdrawal from this Agreement by a federal or state land managing agency does not terminate the Agreement. | Clarified with ACGA on the October 9 meeting. | 120 |
| 16 | XIX.C. | 1 | USACE CO | "full signatory" not defined in PA. Does this mean "signatory" (i.e., Signatory which is not an invited signatory)? | "Full" was deleted. See revised text. | 121 |
| 16 | XX. | 2-3 | USACE CO | Recommend adding a time limit (e.g., 30 days) for parties to attempt to resolve dispute before following the procedures in A. and B. | Change was made. See revised text. | 122 |
| 16 | XIX.C | 2-3 | SRP | It is unclear why any signatory should be able to terminate the entire agreement with respect to all other signatories. Is the intent that the continued participation of certain signatories is critical for this Programmatic Agreement to be implementable? (Garcia – SRP) | This is following the regulations in 36 C.F.R. 800.6. No change was made. | 123 |
| 16 | XII | 40-42 | ACHP | Bill Marzella, ACHP: Suggest changing "shall be" to "may be"—not all historic properties are afforded protection under Section 304 of the NHPA, only those that have been deemed sensitive by the federal agency and in consultation with the Secretary of Interior (Keeper) and ACHP (when we are participating in consultation). | Change accepted. See revised text. | 124 |
| 16 | | 44 | AZGFD | Add AZ statute ARS 39-125 | Suggested change was made. | 125 |
| 17 | XXII | 4 | JR Welch | Specify the scope of the consultation. Signatories only? Those plus consulting parties? Tribes? Interested parties? Etc. | No change was made. The text follows the regulations, which require Signatories only. | 126 |
| 17 | | 18 | Gen | Terms "are" evidence | Suggested change was made. | 127 |
| 17 | - | 18-19 | SRP | Consider revising to read "Execution of this Agreement by BLM, SHPO, ACHP and the undersigned parties, and implementation of its terms, indicates that all parties will take into account the effects of undertakings to historic properties conducted under this Agreement." (Garcia – SRP) | No changes. This is standard language from the ACHP. Only the signatories have the responsibility for executing the PA. | 128 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-------------|---|--|-----------------|
| 17 | End of PA | | USACE | Consider adding language regarding Anti-Deficiency Act compliance. For example: "The Federal Government's obligations under this PA are subject to the availability of appropriated funds, and the stipulations of this PA are subject to the provision of the Anti-Deficiency Act (ADA), 31 U.S.C. § 1341. The Federal Government shall make reasonable and good faith efforts to secure the necessary funds to implement this PA in its entirety. If compliance with the ADA alters or impairs the Federal Government's ability to implement the stipulations of this PA, the Federal Government shall consult in accordance with the amendment and termination procedures found at Stipulations XVI. and XIX. of this PA." | This text was added with some minor modifications. See Stipulation 23. | 129 |
| 17 | End of PA | | USACE | I did not see clarification about when the PA is considered executed or the effective date. Is it when the ACHP signs? Need to specify as some stipulations are dependent upon the precise date (e.g., XXII. Duration) | No change was made. It is executed once the signatories have signed. | 130 |
| 18 | | | City of PHX | Please add a signature line for the City of Phoenix as a concurring party. | It will be added. | 131 |
| 19 | | 15 | JR Welch | Appendix J is not referenced in text or included. It is not appropriate to circulate an advanced draft PA with crucial parts missing. | It was a typo that has been corrected- it was meant to be Appendix I. However, there is now an Appendix J. | 132 |
| 21 | Appendix A.9 | 8-12 | SRP | Include a reference to a BLM document defining this term (Garcia – SRP). | The last sentence only was removed. This is not a BLM definition, it is from the SHPO Survey Report Standards. | 133 |
| 21 | | 14 | Gen | Capitalize Survey. | Suggested change was made. | 134 |
| 21 | 10 | 14-18 | ACHP | Bill Marzella, ACHP: This definition seems to have been lifted from another source and seems too specific or prescriptive. | See revised text. | 135 |
| 21 | | 23 | BIA-Cantley | Remove extra spacing. | Suggested change was made. | 136 |
| 21 | 12 | 25-31 | FBF | "Holders of grazing permits" or "permittees" should be expressly included in the definition of "consulting parties." These permit holders have vast institutional knowledge and are also most likely to be impacted by the determinations made under this PA. They should be an integral part of the communication regarding any Section 106 processes. | See Appendix A, Definition of Consulting Parties, which includes Permittees and lessees. | 137 |
| 21 | App A | 34 | ACHP | Bill Marzella, ACHP: "Heritage resource" seems like more of a European or Canadian term. Suggest using "historic property" if that is what you mean. | See revised text. | 138 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-------------|--|---|-----------------|
| 22 | | 8-10 | ACHP | Bill Marzella, ACHP: Note that the ACHP has recently released guidance on what constitutes an adverse effect, to mean any effect caused by an undertaking, including those that are not physical in nature. See link here for more information: https://www.achp.gov/news/court-rules-definitions-informs-agencies-determining-effects | See revised text. | 139 |
| 22 | | 29 | BIA-Cantley | "or also to iron structures..." | Suggested change was made. | 140 |
| 23 | | 11 | ACGA | 1540, up to 50 years from present | This is how the historic period is defined in Arizona. | 141 |
| 23 | | 13-14 | ACGA | Indirect Effects: includes visual, audible, and atmospheric elements....setting, feeling, | Deleted definition but added to aspects of integrity include "setting" and "feeling" as per National Register guidelines. Added Garrison's table as Appendix J. | 142 |
| 23 | 26 | 13-15 | FBF | The concept of "indirect effects" is subjective, overly broad, and leads to confusion. What are the "atmospheric" elements of a land improvement project? Moreover, "feeling" and "association," which are essentially intangible and therefore open to a wide variety of interpretations, are nearly impossible to define. These terms should either be defined in a way that makes them into objective criteria or disregarded. | Aspects of integrity include "setting" and "feeling" as per National Register guidelines. | 143 |
| 23 | | 24-25 | ACGA | ground-disturbance limited to the original construction footprint, or not to exceed to 2 feet | This is a standard policy. | 144 |
| 23 | | 25 | BIA-Cantley | "Appendix E (Screened Exemptions) ..." | See revised text. | 145 |
| 23 | | 42 | Gen | Add space before #33. | Suggested change was made. | 146 |
| 24 | 39 | 21-25 | FBF | The term "managing livestock" is overly broad. HPMA has no interest or expertise in the day-to-day "management" of livestock, such as nutritional and medical decision-making. While range management is a quintessential job of a livestock grazer, not all aspects of livestock management are also range management. | See revised text. SHPO has no responsibility- the land managers do. | 147 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 24 | | 22, 24-25 | ACGA | SHPO has no need to be involved in managing livestock nor should they have any say in the issuance or renewal of grazing permits. Delete those references! OK to have input in new infrastructure | See revised text. SHPO has no responsibility- the land managers do. | 148 |
| 24 | | 24 | Williams | No definition of Range Improvement was added based upon my suggestion of 12/28/18. A definition of Range Management was added instead. The Range Management definition created by the Core Team is not in keeping with definitions found in range management textbooks. For instance, RANGE MANAGEMENT, 3 rd Edition, by Stoddart, Smith and Box defines Range Management as, "the science and art of optimizing the returns from rangelands in those combinations most desired by and suitable to society through the manipulation of range ecosystems." This textbook definition is broad while the Core Team's is specific. I request again that the Public Rangeland Improvement Act of 1978 (PRIA), Section 3(f) definition of Range Improvement be used in the Programmatic Agreement, and that the definition of Range Management proposed by the Core Team be substituted with a range management textbook definition. The proposed definition of Range Management includes language pertaining to, "...issuing or renewal of grazing or other use permits." In my 12/28/18 comments to #24, Page 30 of Appendix D regarding issuing special use or short term permits not entailing ground disturbance, I pointed out that this is an administrative function usually handled in an office. I also pointed out that there is no potential for an adverse affect to historic properties by this action. This recommendation was accepted. Why does this same reasoning not apply to grazing permit and lease renewals? (Page 24, Line 24,25 – definition of Range Management and Page 35, Lines 10,11 – Appendix G). Grazing permit and lease renewals are administrative functions that have no potential for an adverse affect to historic properties by this action. For the sake of consistency reference to issuing or renewal of grazing or other use permits should be deleted. | See revised text. We modified the definition for range management. | 149 |
| 27 | | 20 | Gen | Period after reviews. | Suggested change was made. | 150 |
| 27 | | 29 | Gen | Semicolon after tasks | Suggested change was made. | 151 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-----------|--|---|-----------------|
| 28 | | 7 | NPS | Who determines what “clearly” retains aspects of integrity | The lead agency, in consultation with SHPO, does. The word “clearly” has been removed. | 152 |
| 28 | Appendix C.A | 10 | SRP | Revise “are automatically considered” to “may be automatically considered” (Garcia – SRP) | Suggested change was made. See revised text. | 153 |
| 28 | | 13 | Gen | End with period. | Suggested change was made. | 154 |
| 28 | | 16 | Gen | Comma after lodges. | Suggested change was made. | 155 |
| 28 | | 33 | NPS | It isn’t clear what action is being required by this statement. What happens if SHPO/THPO has an issue? | Appendix C.D. has been deleted. | 156 |
| 28 | App C | | ACHP | Bill Marzella, ACHP: I have concerns about this process and would be interested in hearing more of the thinking behind this automatic eligibility determination. For example, anyone could state that a TCP exists and it would automatically be considered eligible without further scrutiny? I note that there is no requirement for TCPs to have tribal associations to be considered significant or eligible for NR listing. I also note that the NR criteria assign no greater significance to large sites over small sites, and in most cases exclude gravesites and cemeteries from listing unless certain other criteria considerations are met, so not sure why they would be specifically called out for eligibility here. | See revised text. | 157 |
| 29 | Appendix D | 1 | SRP | Add “12. Driving on or off of existing roads provided that no ground disturbance will occur” (Garcia – SRP) | Off road travel is not exempt under this PA but could be covered under Screened Undertaking #18 and other activities. | 158 |
| 29 | | 2 | NPS | Does “limited” ground disturbance need to be defined? | “limited ground disturbance” is defined in Appendix A, Definitions. | 159 |
| 29 | | 6-7 | Gen | Sentence could be improved, maybe delete activity after monitoring. | Sentence revised. See revised text. This was renumbered to Appendix D.2. | 160 |
| 29 | | 9 | AZGFD | Pond/canal/ditch cleaning/repair/maintenance or lining projects... Add replacement of utility (gas, electric, water) lines within same footprint. Repair and maintenance of earthen berms, non-historic dams | See revised text and new Exemption #1. | 161 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|--------------------|-----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 29 | | 10 | AZGFD | Add and disposal of spoils on existing spoil bank | Suggested change was made. | 162 |
| 29 | | 12 | AZGFD | Delete “native” | No change was made. Refer to Lee’s Ferry PA. | 163 |
| 29 | Appendix D.3 | 12, 24, 38 | SRP | Add “, assuming no ground disturbance will occur.” (Garcia – SRP) | This language is in lines 2-4. No change was made. | 164 |
| 29 | Appendix D | 12, 18, 26, 33, 38 | SRP | Explain how the activities identified in paragraphs 2, 5, 8, 10 and 11 are vegetation management or rangeland improvement related (Garcia – SRP) | No change was made. From a land management perspective, these are all related activities. | 165 |
| 29 | | 14 | ACGA | Does this include existing roads? Why Hand-held tools only? These are not Wilderness designated areas and no reason to be limited to hand tools . Please clarify that chain saws are considered hand-held. | This refers to trails only. Chainsaws were added. See revised text. | 166 |
| 29 | 4 | 14-16 | FBF | Why is this limited to hand-held tools? Effective and low-impact trail maintenance often includes the use of larger than hand-held tools, and this should not be hindered by a requirement to obtain additional clearances. | Using anything other than hand-held tools has been added to Appendix E: Screened Undertakings #6. | 167 |
| 29 | | 16 | AZGFD | Add repair/replacement of water bars and other existing trail infrastructure. | Great idea. Was added as a Screened Undertaking. | 168 |
| 29 | Appendix D | 17 | AZLEG | Add a new exemption section inserting: “Routine regular maintenance of fencing that does not require mechanical ground disturbance.” Reasoning – routine maintenance of trails is exempt but not routine maintenance of fencing? | This type of activity is a screened undertaking that is covered in Appendix E, number 6. Please note that screened activities require no further consultation if the conditions are met and are therefore time saving measures. | 169 |
| 29 | | 36 | AZGFD | Add installation of survey markers. | Covered under Screened Exemption. | 170 |
| 29 | | 38 | AZGFD | Add also repair and maintenance of same. | Suggested change was made. | 171 |
| 29 | Appendix D | 39 | AZLEG | Add a new exemption section inserting: “Project sites previously surveyed within the last 10 years for range or vegetation improvements.” | This is covered in Stipulation VII.B.3., Appendix G.B., and Appendix H.C.1. | 172 |
| 29 | 12. | | AZGFD | Add “Foliar herbicide application to individual shrubs and trees on foot or by ATV-mounted equipment; stump treatment.” | Moved to Screened Undertaking, not within habitation sites. | 173 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-----------|---|--|-----------------|
| 29 | 13. | | AZGFD | Add “Hand planting of tree seedlings or native plants involving minimal excavation of less than 6” | Suggested change was made. | 174 |
| 29 | 14. | | AZGFD | Add “Routine operations, repairs, modification, and maintenance, or the demolition of, any building or structure less than 50 years of age.” | Demolition must remain in Screened Undertakings because it may be on an archeological site. Demolition is covered in Screen Undertaking #20. | 175 |
| 29 | 15. | | AZGFD | Add “Cross-country ATV use, subject to best management practices consisting of avoiding concentrating multiple ATVs in a small area, driving at a slow speed, avoiding wet conditions to prevent rutting, and avoiding obvious archaeological features such as standing masonry walls and wickiups, and ensuring all operators are subject to a cultural resource sensitivity training/tailboard prior to off-road ATV use.” | Addressed as part of herbicide BMPs. | 176 |
| 30 | Appx E. | 2-3 | USACE CO | How is the archeologist supposed to determine whether these actions have the potential to affect historic properties? Some additional clarification is needed. The intent appears to be a different process than the default one at 36 CFR § 800.3(a)(2), since some of these activities could have the potential to cause effects. Or, if that is not the intent, and instead the default process is to be followed, unclear why these specific actions are called out at all. | Thank you. See revised text for clarity. | 177 |
| 30 | | 5 | AZGFD | ...require consultation (with who?) | Language added for clarification. | 178 |
| 30 | | 8 | AZGFD | How different from #8 below? | #8 has been deleted. | 179 |
| 30 | Appendix E | 10 | AZLEG | Amend to add the word “new” after “all types of” will now read “All types of new fence construction..” | Change was made. See revised text. | 180 |
| 30 | | 10 | ACGA | Add the term NEW fence construction | | |
| 30 | 2 | 10-13 | FBF | This should only include new fencing construction, and therefore read “All types of NEW fence construction.” Maintenance on existing fences should not require additional review. | | |
| 30 | | 10-12 | AZGFD | Add signage, kiosks, etc. | Covered under screened undertakings in Appendix E, numbers 3 and 7. | 181 |
| 30 | Appendix E.2 | 12 | BIA | Is the following necessary or misstated: “(see Appendix G for screening process).” | Text deleted. | 182 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-----------|--|---|-----------------|
| 30 | Appendix E | 12, 26 | SRP | Explain how the activities identified in paragraphs 15 and 19 are vegetation management or rangeland improvement related (Garcia – SRP) | All these types of activities are related. | 183 |
| 30 | | 14-15 | ACGA | EXEMPT and should allow for rebuilding fences, t-posts etc since only a few square inches of each t-post disturbance " Aligns with allowing maintenance on previously cleared infrastructure projects to be Exempt." see page 3 lines 31-33 this document 31 minimize redundancy, and reduce the need for case-by-case review of routine 32 administrative, conservation, and land management activities when historic properties will not be affected or when standard protocols and treatments can be applied | See revised text in Appendix E, Screened Undertakings, which clarifies the screening process. | 184 |
| 30 | 3 | 14-15 | FBF | To be consistent with this agreement's intent to minimize redundancy, reduce the need for case-by-case review of routine tasks, and apply standard protocols when possible, this should be removed from this section and included in Appendix D: Exempted Undertakings | See revised text in Appendix E, Screened Undertakings, which clarifies the screening process. | 185 |
| 30 | | 17-19 | ACGA | campsites | Developed campsites would not be handled under this PA. | 186 |
| 30 | | 21-23 | ACGA | Move to EXEMPT to align with USFS intentions to reduce redundancy and burdensome overreach. " Aligns with allowing maintenance on previously cleared infrastructure projects to be Exempt." see page 3 lines 31-33 this document 31 minimize redundancy, and reduce the need for case-by-case review of routine 32 administrative, conservation, and land management activities when historic properties will not be affected or when standard protocols and treatments can be applied | The team clarified what Screened Undertakings consist of. No changes made. | 187 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 30 | 5 | 21-24 | FBF | To be consistent with this agreement's intent to minimize redundancy, reduce the need for case-by-case review of routine tasks, and apply standard protocols when possible, this should be removed from this section and included in Appendix D: Exempted Undertakings | | |
| 30 | | 23 | Gen | culverts, etc. | Suggested change was made. | 188 |
| 30 | | 23-24 | AZGFD | Must allow installation or replacement of culverts, guardrails, and cattle guards within previously disturbed areas of existing road prism or footprint. | The writing team discussed this request at length and decided these types of activities are ground disturbing and would require some level of evaluation for effects to historic properties. Text will remain the same. | 189 |
| 30 | Appendix E | 26-29 | AZLEG | This section should be moved to Appendix D on page 29. This is maintenance of existing range improvements that does not require mechanical disturbance and it should not be further burdened by more archeological screening or reviews. This | Suggested change was made. See Exempted Undertakings #1. | 190 |
| 30 | 6 | 26-30 | FBF | To be consistent with this agreement's intent to minimize redundancy, reduce the need for case-by-case review of routine tasks, and apply standard protocols when possible, this should be removed from this section and included in Appendix D: Exempted Undertakings | The team clarified what Screened Undertakings consist of. No change was made. | 191 |
| 30 | | 26-30 | ACGA | Move to EXEMPT to align with USFS intentions to reduce redundancy and burdensome overreach. Aligns with "allowing maintenance on previously cleared infrastructure projects to be Exempt." see page 3 lines 31-33 this document 31 minimize redundancy, and reduce the need for case-by-case review of routine 32 administrative, conservation, and land management activities when historic properties will not be affected or when standard protocols and treatments can be applied | The team clarified what Screened Undertakings consist of. No change was made. | 192 |
| 30 | | 34 | AZGFD | How different from #1 above? | Was deleted. | 193 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-----------|--|---|-----------------|
| 30 | 8 | 34 | FBF | To be consistent with this agreement's intent to minimize redundancy, reduce the need for case-by-case review of routine tasks, and apply standard protocols when possible, this should be removed from this section and included in Appendix D: Exempted Undertakings | The team clarified what Screened Undertakings consist of. No change was made. | 194 |
| 30 | | 36-38 | ACGA | EXEMPT | The team clarified what Screened Undertakings consist of. No change was made. | 195 |
| 30 | 9 | 36-38 | FBF | To be consistent with this agreement's intent to minimize redundancy, reduce the need for case-by-case review of routine tasks, and apply standard protocols when possible, this should be removed from this section and included in Appendix D: Exempted Undertakings | The team clarified what Screened Undertakings consist of. No change was made. | 196 |
| 30 | | 38 | AZGFD | Add geotech boring . | Added to Appendix E.3. | 197 |
| 30 | Appendix E.9 | 38 | SRP | Add "as long as they do not occur within a historic property or property considered eligible for the National Register." (Garcia – SRP) | Already addressed in opening paragraph. No change made. | 198 |
| 30 | 10 | 40-43 | FBF | To be consistent with this agreement's intent to minimize redundancy, reduce the need for case-by-case review of routine tasks, and apply standard protocols when possible, this should be removed from this section and included in Appendix D: Exempted Undertakings | The team clarified what Screened Undertakings consist of. No change was made. | 199 |
| 30 | Append. E.10 | 43 | BIA | Do you mean to say: "...then the Vegetation Management Protocol will be required." | See revised text. | 200 |
| 30 | | 45-46 | ACGA | Move to EXEMPT to align with USFS intention to reduce redundancy and burdensome overreach. " Aligns with allowing maintenance on previously cleared infrastructure projects to be Exempt." see page 3 lines 31-33 this document Also, if less than 50 years old should be exempt anyway? | The team clarified what Screened Undertakings consist of. No change was made. | 201 |
| 30 | Appendix E.11 | 45-46 | SRP | Redundant with #11 (Garcia – SRP) | Redundant #20 was deleted. See revised text. | 202 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-------------|---|---|-----------------|
| 30 | 11 | 45-46 | FBF | To be consistent with this agreement's intent to minimize redundancy, reduce the need for case-by-case review of routine tasks, and apply standard protocols when possible, this should be removed from this section and included in Appendix D: Exempted Undertakings | The team clarified what Screened Undertakings consist of. No change was made. | 203 |
| 30 | | 46 | Gen | Should semicolon be a period? | See revised text. | 204 |
| 31 | 12. | 1-2 | AZGFD | What does this mean? | Clarified with NRCS via phone call on 08/21/19. No changes made. | 205 |
| 31 | 12 | 1-2 | FBF | To be consistent with this agreement's intent to minimize redundancy, reduce the need for case-by-case review of routine tasks, and apply standard protocols when possible, this should be removed from this section and included in Appendix D: Exempted Undertakings | The team clarified what Screened Undertakings consist of. No change was made. | 206 |
| 31 | 13 | 3-5 | FBF | This recital could be interpreted to include the renewal of grazing permits. Permit renewals should not be included in the requirements for additional review. | Permit renewals are included to address new infrastructure proposals. | 207 |
| 31 | 13 | 3-5 | FBF | To be consistent with this agreement's intent to minimize redundancy, reduce the need for case-by-case review of routine tasks, and apply standard protocols when possible, this should be removed from this section and included in Appendix D: Exempted Undertakings | The team clarified what Screened Undertakings consist of. No change was made. | 208 |
| 31 | | 8-10 | ACGA | Move to EXEMPT to align with USFS intentions to reduce redundancy and burdensome overreach. " Aligns with allowing maintenance on previously cleared infrastructure projects to be Exempt." see page 3 lines 31-33 this document Description states limitations of structural changes color, materials, already. 31 minimize redundancy, and reduce the need for case-by-case review of routine 32 administrative, conservation, and land management activities when historic properties will not be affected or when standard protocols and treatments can be applied | The team clarified what Screened Undertakings consist of. No change was made. | 209 |
| 31 | | 12 | BIA-Cantley | "Seismic activities on the surfaced of..." | See revised text. | 210 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-----------|--|---|-----------------|
| 31 | 16 | 14-15 | FBF | To be consistent with this agreement’s intent to minimize redundancy, reduce the need for case-by-case review of routine tasks, and apply standard protocols when possible, this should be removed from this section and included in Appendix D: Exempted Undertakings | The team clarified what Screened Undertakings consist of. No change was made. | 211 |
| 31 | 16. | 15-16 | AZGFD | S/b Hand cutting of vegetation where slash is lopped and scattered but not dragged, or piled or burned within known site boundaries. | See revised text. | 212 |
| 31 | | 15-16 | APS | Chris Watkins, APS. Can you confirm that hand-cutting vegetation with lop and scatter within historic properties or unevaluated properties will require consultation under this PA? The BLM routinely finds that this activity will have “No Effect” or “No Adverse Effect” and allow it to proceed without consultation under the Arizona State Protocol Agreement. Will the BLM still be authorized to comply under the State Protocol for this undertaking, or will this PA supersede compliance for vegetation management activities? How will the two agreement documents dovetail in the event of a contradiction? | Text was revised, it is now Appendix E.15. No, it is one or the other. The lead federal agency will determine which protocol or agreement to follow. | 213 |
| 31 | 18 | 20-24 | AZGFD | This is dumb. Either it’s an adverse effect or not. Unless you can come up with actual specific examples of eligible sites that were made not eligible because of these activities, then it is not an adverse effect and you do not need to do this analysis which in the end tells us nothing. Need to absolutely exclude areas consisting of “moon dust” and desert pavement; otherwise, where there is salt cedar, pinon-juniper, or mesquite, etc. the work needs to be allowed without going through this 20%/40% business. (How does this differ from protocol at end of PA?) | We are keeping this in the PA and does not differ from the protocol at the end of the PA. Please see Appendix H.B for further detail. | 214 |
| 31 | 19 | 25-26 | FBF | To be consistent with this agreement’s intent to minimize redundancy, reduce the need for case-by-case review of routine tasks, and apply standard protocols when possible, this should be removed from this section and included in Appendix D: Exempted Undertakings | The team clarified what Screened Undertakings consist of. No change was made. | 215 |
| 31 | | 26-27 | ACGA | Move to EXEMPT to align with USFS intentions to reduce redundancy and burdensome overreach. | The team clarified what Screened Undertakings consist of. No change was made. | 216 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-----------|---|--|-----------------|
| 31 | | 29 | ACGA | Move to EXEMPT to align with USFS intentions to reduce redundancy and burdensome overreach. Aligns with allowing "maintenance on previously cleared infrastructure projects to be Exempt." <i>see page 3 lines 31-33 this document</i> <i>If less tha 50 years old why does SHPO need to add that to their work load if it is NOT historic?</i> | The team clarified what Screened Undertakings consist of. No change was made. | 217 |
| 31 | 20 | 29 | FBF | To be consistent with this agreement's intent to minimize redundancy, reduce the need for case-by-case review of routine tasks, and apply standard protocols when possible, this should be removed from this section and included in Appendix D: Exempted Undertakings | The team clarified what Screened Undertakings consist of. No change was made. | 218 |
| 31 | | 29-34 | AZGFD | If stuff is not historic/significant, it is no historic properties affected, see above comments | Was deleted. | 219 |
| 31 | | 31-32 | ACGA | Effectively cannot clean up your own back yard. Ridiculous. | This screening is to determine that the undertaking does not occur within a historic property; otherwise it can proceed. This is only for projects that are federally funded or on federal/state land. | 220 |
| 31 | 21 | 31-34 | FBF | To be consistent with this agreement's intent to minimize redundancy, reduce the need for case-by-case review of routine tasks, and apply standard protocols when possible, this should be removed from this section and included in Appendix D: Exempted Undertakings | The team clarified what Screened Undertakings consist of. No change was made. | 221 |
| 32 | Appendix F | 1-46 | SRP | These are not standard measures for resolving adverse effects. These are HPTP document requirements. (Garcia – SRP) | Revised Appendix F for clarity. | 222 |
| 32 | | 4 | AZGFD | Relevant agencies s/b affected agencies or involved... | Text was revised. | 223 |
| 32 | Appx. F | 4 | USACE CO | States: "The following standard measures will apply to archeological sites..." then mentions HPTP in section A. and HABS/HAER in section B. The quoted language probably is over broad. For example, is it meant to only apply to HPTPs? Would expect HABS/HAER to apply to architectural sites instead. Also, do all of the measures apply to all site? Some may not be relevant to all sites, like laboratory processing. | See revised text. | 224 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-----------|---|--|-----------------|
| 32 | App F | 10 | ACHP | Bill Marzella, ACHP: Suggest adding discussion of specific NRHP criteria and integrity to significance evaluation. | Change accepted. See revised text. | 225 |
| 34 | | 4 | Gen | Add space after July | Suggested change was made. | 226 |
| 35 | | 1 | ACGA | RANGELAND MANAGEMENT PROTOCOL | See changes to the protocols in Appendix G. | 227 |
| 35 | G | 10 | AZLEG | Strike: "Grazing permit and lease renewals" – the mere renewal of a permit or lease should not require historic preservation consultation with numerous entities and parties. The renewal of a permit or lease does not create any new disturbance or threat to historic sites. | The team clarified what Screened Undertakings consist of. No change was made. | 228 |
| 35 | | 10-14 | ACGA | Range management activities covered under this protocol consist of grazing permit and lease renewals; installation maintenance and decommission of fencing, storage tanks and troughs, erosion control structures, corral and holding pen, water pipeline, wildlife guzzlers, cattle guard, and wells; water haul sites (drinkers); dirt tank construction and cleaning; road maintenance (including culverts, ditches, signage, plating); and re-seeding or planting. | The team clarified what Screened Undertakings consist of. No change was made. | 229 |
| 35 | | 21-22, 24 | ACGA | Aligns with allowing " maintenance on previously cleared infrastructure projects to be Exempt." see page 3 lines 31-33 this document 31 minimize redundancy, and reduce the need for case-by-case review of routine 32 administrative, conservation, and land management activities when historic properties will not be affected or when standard protocols and treatments can be applied | The team clarified what Screened Undertakings consist of. No change was made. | 230 |
| 35 | | 27-45 | ACGA | (section highlighted) Prior surveys adequate. Reduce redundancy | The team clarified what Screened Undertakings consist of. No change was made. | 231 |
| 35 | | 28 | Gen | "the" proposed activity | Suggested change was made. | 232 |
| 35 | | 33 | NPS | In the NPS structure, the "section 106 coordinator" is responsible for these actions. | This is a generic term that accounts for any agency title for cultural resource staff. | 233 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-------------|---|--|-----------------|
| 35 | App G | 36 | ACHP | Bill Marzella, ACHP: I'm not familiar with the term "heritage resource report" and it does not appear to be defined elsewhere in the document. Do you mean historic properties treatment plan or similar? | See revised text. | 234 |
| 36 | | a | ACGA | review all reasonable existing information | "all reasonable" was deleted. See revised text. | 235 |
| 36 | | 1-2 | NPS | Does participating agencies refer to all agencies or just the lead agency? | See revised text. | 236 |
| 36 | | 6 | ASM | Please revise sentence to include the Arizona State Museum Archaeological Records Office (ARO) as a key source of information. | See revised text. | 237 |
| 36 | | 9 | NPS | Does no known historic properties refer to all surveys, what about old and outdated inventory work? | See revised text. | 238 |
| 36 | | 9-13 | ACGA | If there are no known historic properties in areas that are being heavily impacted by livestock (e.g. areas where livestock are likely to congregate such as water sources, salt and mineral licks, and shade areas), and the land management agency determines that the areas hold minimal potential for the presence of historic properties, then no further inventory work need be done. | Yes, this is in Appendix G.B. | 239 |
| 36 | | 11-13 | JR Welch | This appears to be an(other) attempt to gain agency discretion over the essential process of historic property identification. At a bare minimum, the PA must specify the principles, procedures, and personnel to be used in determining "minimal potential." | "minimal potential" was changed to "no to little potential" to be consistent with the regulations. | 240 |
| 36 | | 12 | NPS | No known and minimal potential are two different things. Would the minimal potential clause apply to locations that haven't been surveyed at all? | "minimal potential" was changed to "no to little potential" to be consistent with the regulations. | 241 |
| 36 | | 15-16 | ACGA | If impacts will occur in areas that are likely to contain historic properties that are being 15 heavily impacted by livestock, and there has been no previous field survey, | See revised text. | 242 |
| 36 | App G.B.2 | | City of PHX | Second paragraph – for projects like this within Phoenix, we would like to be consulted as part of the process of determining whether cultural resources are present. Maybe add "has determined through consultation with applicable landowners as needed." Sometimes we have information on cultural resources in our records that others do not. | The recommended text has been incorporated. See revised text. | 243 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-----------|--|--|-----------------|
| 36 | Append. G.C | 20 | BIA | Should this read as follows: "It is intended that the Rangeland Management Protocol is applicable to other range management activities. Routine and repetitive range" | No changes. Language from C moved to the first paragraph of the old D. | 244 |
| 36 | | 22 | JR Welch | "installation" of any range improvement, at least for the first time, is neither routine nor repetitive. Maintenance may be OK, but PA must specify that all first-time subsurface disturbances require, at a minimum, surface inspection by a qualified archaeologist. Fence, water, and other structural installations have had and are having massive and incompletely disclosed or remediated effects on historic properties throughout the West. Here and throughout the PA language must seek to immunize from abuse the processes enabled thereby. Facilities and structures with APEs that were not inventoried prior to initial installation require inventory. | Language from C moved to the first paragraph of the old D. | 245 |
| 37 | 4 | 1 | JR Welch | "monitoring" is not in parallel with the rest of the list and should be stipulated as a requirement in addition to the other measures for remedial treatment. | No change made. | 246 |
| 37 | Append. G.D. | 9 | BIA | Consider adding the following: "The protection measures used to minimize and mitigate impacts to historic properties should be documented in the project file." | Suggested change was made as Appendix G.D. (Language from C moved to the first paragraph of the old D) | 247 |
| 38 | | 3 | Gen | could add comma after treatments | Suggested change was made. | 248 |
| 38 | | 11-15 | ACGA | Surveys may or may not be done based on lead Agency. This could be a very valuable tool as grazing typically is a "LOW IMPACT ACTIVITY" . | Thank you, no change made. | 249 |
| 38 | | 12 | JR Welch | Be advised, and consult accordingly, regarding some tribes' views that an and all treatments lethal to plants and animals constitute inappropriate and adverse effects. | Thank you, no change made. | 250 |
| 38 | | 26 | ASM | Please revise sentence to include the Arizona State Museum Archaeological Records Office (ARO) as a key source of information. | Suggested change made. | 251 |
| 38 | | 30 | ACGA | A federal agency is not expected to conduct a 100% survey of the area of potential effects. | No change was made. | 252 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 38-42 | | | AZGFD | <p>I fail to see the value of this. It is not well organized, and is confusing to mash up fire with other physical veg treatments. For example, what is “Pre-field Existing Information Research”? This is essentially a Class I overview. It then talks about the type and intensity of impacts. What does this mean? Is it based on actual data? How do you objectively measure these? Then it talks about the expected nature and distribution of historic properties. This is extremely subjective when you come down to it—if we could do this kind of magic then there would seldom be need for actual survey. I suggest splitting out fire from the rest. Then put some thought into how to rewrite this section. What are the range of possible activities, and what effect(s) can they have on historic properties. Then for things with potential to adversely affect historic properties (“intensive ground disturbance) do 100% survey. For the rest of it, come up with some creative approach/mitigation.</p> <p>For fire, you need to see what tribes think about fire—probably they see it as a natural process but you need to consult and find out. If you’re looking for fire-sensitive sites, you can’t predict this. You can guess, but there is no magic bullet.</p> <p>I just think this section could be much better.</p> | Discussed and revised in the 08/14/19 in phone call. | 253 |
| 39 | App H H.C.1 | 18-19 | ACHP | Bill Marzella, ACHP: This reference is a little obscure—suggest expanding to include full title or include in a bibliography. | See revised text. | 254 |
| 39 | | 18-19 | ACGA | <p>Aligns with allowing "maintenance on previously cleared infrastructure projects to be Exempt." see page 3 lines 31-33 this document</p> <p>31 minimize redundancy, and reduce the need for case-by-case review of routine</p> <p>32 administrative, conservation, and land management activities when historic properties</p> <p>will not be affected or when standard protocols and treatments can be applied</p> | The team clarified what Screened Undertakings consist of. No change was made. | 255 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|-----------------|----------------|-----------|--|--|-----------------|
| 39 | 3 | 26-27 | FBF | This section is inconsistent with VII(B)(4), which mandate cooperation with additional federal agencies. This permissive language should be controlling, as mandatory cooperation will slow down the process and create additional inefficiencies. | Text in VII(B)(4) was revised to make consistent. See revised text. | 256 |
| 39 | | 33 | ACGA | Move to EXMPT | This remains a screened undertaking. | 257 |
| 40 | Appx. H.C.6. | 1 | USACE | Would be clearer to revise first sentence to state: "Any areas of intensive ground disturbance will receive 100% survey, except for as noted in paragraphs 1-3 above, including but not limited to...." (Or if my understanding is not correct, revise to be clear that paragraph 6 applies to even those areas called out in 1-3). | See revised text. | 258 |
| 40 | Appx. H.D/ | First para. | USACE | Relevance of defining two categories of cultural resources affected by fire is not apparent. Are the different categories meant to be treated differently in this PA? Or why are they mentioned? | The first list refers to sites that experience has shown to be susceptible to fire. The second list is intended to capture project- or location-specific situations on a case-by-case basis. No change made. | 259 |
| 40 | Appx. H.E.1. a. | 4-6 | USACE | Not clear what hand line, black line, or wet line are. Would be good to provide a little more context to ensure all parties have the same understanding of these terms. | No change made. These are standard terms used in federal firefighting practices. | 260 |
| 40 | | 10 | Gen | considered to have | Suggested change was made. | 261 |
| 40 | Appendix H.C.6 | 12-14 | SRP | "Sample surveys may be used where existing inventories indicate the site density in the APE is lower than the average site density for the regional area" is methodologically flawed. An appropriate and culturally-meaningful region needs to be defined by the land manager and a valid and accepted density/predictive model needs to be generated from sufficient inventory data in order to accomplish this. Recommend that this only be used when a region has been subject to sufficient valid systematic inventory that has validated regional models (Garcia – SRP) | We feel that the spirit of your comment is captured in the existing text. | 262 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-------------|---|---|-----------------|
| 41 | | 10-46 | APS | Chris Watkins, APS. "Various combinations" of the listed protection measures may be approved by the lead agency without additional SHPO consultation. Can you clarify this? Specifically, will all the protection measures in 2.b. (pg 41, 39-46; pg 42, 1-6) be required, or will the agency have the discretion to select a subset of these protection measures on a project-specific basis? | The lead federal agency may choose any combination of or any quantity of listed protection measures. | 263 |
| 41 | | 10-46 | APS | The implementation of agreed-upon standard site protection measures can be approved without additional SHPO consultation. Will undertakings using these protection measures be allowed to proceed without consultation, or will consultation be required as suggested on pg 10, 35-42? Please clarify. | Once an agency has an adverse effect finding, they may proceed to resolve the adverse effect using the agreed upon standard site protection measures in this PA in lieu of developing a separate MOA. | 264 |
| 41 | | 28 | Gen | should something follow provided? | See revised text. | 265 |
| 41-42 | | 37-6 | Gen | Half of the bullets don't end with periods | See revised text. | 266 |
| 43 | | 6 | BIA-Cantley | "cc: Environmental." | Suggested change was made. | 267 |
| 43 | | 15 | BIA-Cantley | Period after the website link. | Suggested change was made. | 268 |
| 43 | | 18-19 | BIA-Cantley | "rights-of-ways..." | Suggested change was made. | 269 |
| Gen | | | JR Welch | Agreement must clearly recognize the well-documented (by the BLM itself via systematic research in various states and districts) truth that livestock grazing adversely effects almost all types of historic properties and that actions taken to perpetuate, redistribute, concentrate, and enable grazing impacts generally require measures to avoid and reduce effects to soil, water, plant, animal, and cultural resources. | Thank you, no change made. | 270 |
| Gen | | | JR Welch | Whenever possible, use only the terms defined in Appendix A and use them as defined in Appendix A. Some person or persons went to a lot of trouble to set these definitions up, and it is inefficient and vexing to find in the text multiple terms referencing the thing and failing to embrace the Appendix A definitions. Delete Appendix A terms not used in text. | Thank you, we will do a review for consistency. | 271 |

Comment Table- Comments Due June 17, 2019

Cultural Resource PA Draft 3

Please submit comments to Jennifer.Lanthier@GalileoAZ.com by July 31, 2019

| Page # | Recital Number | Line Number(s) | Commenter | Comment | Response | Response Number |
|--------|--------------------------------|----------------|-------------|--|--|-----------------|
| Gen | | | City of PHX | Please provide us with a map illustrating the location of rangeland within Phoenix's jurisdiction. | Any undeveloped land (natural land that is not used for housing, farms, business, or industry) within the City of Phoenix boundaries is considered rangeland. | 272 |
| | | | PHX ADO | FAA is not a land managing agency, and therefore is not eligible to join the PA as a signatory and take advantage of the procedures. This office has no comments. Thank you for the opportunity to participate and review this document. | Thank you for your comment. | 273 |
| | *New to be added to Appendix D | | AZLEG | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintenance or replacement of existing earthen and structural range improvements that do not involve additional ground disturbance beyond the original footprint. This may include, but are not limited to: cattleguards, gates, fences, stock tanks, storage tanks and catchment wings, springboxes, troughs, pipeline, windmills, wells, signs. Minor routine or preventive operation and maintenance activities on facilities and other range improvement structures that do not affect historic structures or previously undisturbed ground. Above-ground pipeline may be placed that does not involve ground disturbance. Vegetation removal where brush or trees are cleared using shearing, chipping, grinding, crushing or shredding using machinery attached to a rubber-tired or rubber-tracked vehicle. New wells may be drilled within a 10ft radius of an existing well. | <p>The first and third bullet points are covered in Appendix E, Screened Undertakings. Screened Undertakings do not require formal consultation, only a cursory review by the agency cultural specialist to ensure the appropriateness of the exemption.</p> <p>The second bullet point has been added to Appendix E, Screened Undertakings.</p> <p>The fourth bullet point has been added to Appendix E, Screened Undertakings.</p> | 274 |