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Attendees:
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Siska Williams, GDOT Archaeologist
Jonathan Lowrey, AECOM
Mike Reynolds, Brockington and Associates
Tom Lewis, Cardno
Autumn DuBois, ECA
Matthew Beazley, ECA
David Hahs, Edwards-Pitman Environmental
Katherine Kosalko, Edwards-Pitman Environmental
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Mary Trudeau, Edwards-Pitman Environmental
Charlotte Weber, HNTB
Tina Rust, HNTB (By Phone)
Patrick Smith, Kimley-Horn
Susan Olin, New South Associates
LK Schnitzer, New South Associates
Jera Davis, New South Associates
Scot Keith, New South Associates
Matt Tankersley, New South Associates
Shaun West, TerraXplorations
Robin Arnold, Tidewater Atlantic Research (By Phone)
Andrew Pappas, VHB
Sarah Banguilan, VHB

Introduction by Heather Mustonen:

- The GDOT Archaeology Unit hopes to hold GPTQ meetings more regularly than once a year in the future so we all have a chance to get together and touch base on current issues.
- Overview of meeting agenda/topics.
- Introductions by attendees.

Discussion Topics:

- Environmental Survey Boundaries (ESBs)
  - Heather provided an overview of ESB-related definitions and procedures.
  - ESBs are provided during the early stage of project design. They are intended to encompass all potential design elements and alternatives, within reason. For this reason, no ESC is required when an ESB is provided.
  - ESBs are a product of GDOT scheduling. We now encounter them very often because of our large state program of projects.
  - ESBs should be provided by design to specialists. They are required to start the Resource ID phase in P6.
  - Should include a reasonable maximum extent. Design needs to confirm that it encapsulates design features without being excessively large.
  - Heather has been working with the GDOT PMs and designers to educate them on ESBs and what they should include.
Archaeology surveys used to take place much later in the process, once plans had been developed. That has changed with new schedule requirements, resulting in the development of ESBs.

Heather provided an overview of how design and environmental activities occur in relation to each other.

Scoping – surveys should take place after some initial level of concept design to avoid huge, unreasonably-sized ESBs.

Patrick Smith noted that, if a sub-consultant receives an ESB from their prime that does not seem reasonable or does not seem to cover what it should, then they should not scope based on that. Instead, they should bring it up to their prime and GDOT and make sure that it is appropriate.

If an ESB exceeds original TO assumptions, then it is recommended that the consultant coordinate with the GDOT PM and OES Staff, as well as the prime, rather than putting the survey on hold.

- **Landowner Coordination & Inaccessible Areas**
  - Fenced areas and other types of restricted access areas cannot typically be used to justify no digs. An effort should be made to gain access to the property by contacting the landowner.
  - If that effort fails, coordination with the GDOT archaeologist and GDOT Project Manager is recommended to help contact the landowner or assist with police escort, etc.
  - Pam Baughman noted that it is important to notify GDOT if you encounter an agitated or aggressive landowner, since you may be the first one, so GDOT can coordinate for anyone else who may need to get on their property for the project.

- **Transect Placement and Orientation**
  - Heather provided an overview of appropriate transect placement on GDOT projects and common issues that have come up this year.
  - Transects should be oriented along the roadway.
  - Transects placement should start with coverage of the existing ROW, since the project at a minimum will occur there, and then go out from there.
  - The goal is to maximize coverage within the survey area, whether a defined APE/ESC or more broad ESB.
  - The use of digitally generated shovel test placement in ArcGIS has led to complicated transect and shovel test placement, sometimes leading to coverage gaps or over survey. Preplotting can be a useful field planning tool, however adjustments can be made in the field depending on conditions (i.e. offsets to avoid no digs, etc).
  - Matt Tankersley noted that when attempting straight line transects in ArcGIS, sometimes, when there is a change in direction, shovel tests fall outside of the ESB. He asked if they should still dig those shovel tests. Heather said no, because coverage for the project is only needed within the ESB and having shovel tests outside of it makes it difficult to justify/explain the survey limits in the report.
  - Lauren Falvey emphasized that it is ok to offset pre-plotted shovel tests in the field if they land in an area that you can’t dig to maximize coverage and minimize no digs.
  - Scot Keith asked how much distance is too much from the furthest out transect and the ESB. Heather clarified that we do not need to squeeze in closer interval transects just to cover the edge of the ESB. If the gap is significantly greater than 50 feet, then check in with the
GDOT archaeologist to determine how to proceed. The goal is to stick to as systematic of a method as possible, following the EPM and GCPA standards.

- Daniel Lowrey asked whether a gap of less than 100 feet between the end of a transect and the ESB or ESC edge would need to be covered with a shorter interval shovel test. Heather confirmed that we do not, we can stick to the standard 100-foot intervals.
- Andrew Pappas noted that he has been sent back out before to cover areas with gaps larger than 50 feet and wanted to confirm that we were moving away from that. Heather said we are working towards being on the same page with the “50-foot rule.”
- Andrew also asked about digging transects on a curve and how much deviation in shovel test alignment across transects is acceptable. Heather responded that they do not need to line up exactly but the intervals should remain consistent.
- Daniel noted the difficulty of site delineation on a curve and his desire to eliminate curved transects all together. He said that it makes the map look odd but it is more true to the methods in the EPM and makes sure all shovel tests are truly on a grid while still providing sufficient coverage. Heather asked to see some maps that show what he is proposing so that the GDOT Archaeology Unit could look at it and discuss internally.
- Patrick noted that what Daniel was proposing would make it possible to scope projects based on acreage. Heather noted that GDOT projects typically aren’t scoped by acreage, but instead by project length and number of transects, which more accurately depict the nature of the survey.
- Lauren noted that one issue with scoping by acreage is that the number of shovel tests recovered per acre can vary depending on the shape of the survey area.
- Lauren also noted that she’s seen issues with setting up transects strictly on a grid because it can create gaps in coverage when the road turns and the grid changes direction.
- Lauren and Mike Carlock both noted that it is helpful to think through the shovel test placement strategy for ideal coverage ahead of time, taking into account known disturbances and the ESB size, etc.
- Katie Kosalko asked if ESBs were going to be implemented retroactively to in progress projects. Heather said that, if the APE had already been surveyed, then the APE would not need to be changed, but the fact that the APE was derived from plans should be clear in the report.
- Pam clarified that, in cases where an ESB was provided but was not used for the survey, then GDOT will make comparisons where needed between the APE/ESC that was surveyed and the ESB. Additional coverage maybe required to make sure the area in the ESB is fully covered. But it would just be select areas and will be addressed somewhat on a case by case basis.
- Lauren emphasized that all projects going forward (except reboots and old projects) should have ESBs.
- Mary Trudeau asked if ESBs will also be provided for federally funded projects or if they were just for state funded projects. Heather responded that ESBs will be provided for all projects, regardless of funding.
- Daniel asked how the ESBs should be referred to in reports and Heather replied that a clear definition should be included, indicating that ESBs are provided by design and encapsulate all likely design components/variations. Any other project-specific pertinent information on how the ESB was developed can be included as well.
Lauren and Pam noted that the intention of the ESB is that Design will know what areas have coverage for all environmental specialties, so they will know when they make a change that will require additional surveys.

- **ARPA Permits**
  - Due to the larger volume of GDOT projects, ARPA permits have been needed on more projects lately.
  - Agency specific guidance is in development by the GDOT OES Archaeology Unit.
  - The GDOT Archaeologist assigned to the project will need to review all draft permit applications.
  - USACE permits – GDOT archaeologist submits the permit and makes sure the fees are paid.
  - NPS – submittal will depend on coordination with specific park unit, but permits for Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area (CRNRA) property should be submitted by the GDOT archaeologist.
  - USFS – submitted by consultant after GDOT review.
  - Submittal to other agencies – process is TBD.
  - Heather asked if anyone had any experiences with ARPA permits that might be helpful to share with the group.
    - Scot said his experience with the ARPA permit has varied. The USACE seems to take longer for reviews. Also there has been variations with lake-related permits – can have an associated fee, but not always.
    - Daniel said that he has experienced a lengthy review process with the CRNRA.
    - Patrick noted that the signatory on the permit for some agencies (USFS) are liable for any damages.
    - Andrew got a permit with USFS Oconee Forest that took about 2.5 months, partially due to a lot of turnover in staff. But overall the process was fairly quick.
    - Patrick noted that the GPTQ NEPA subcommittee is working on a best practices for obtaining permits from different agencies. It will eventually be part of the EPM.
  - Permits are required for archaeology on state land through the Georgia DNR Historic Preservation Division (HPD).
  - HPD requires a research design, but there is no specific template for the permit.
  - Pam noted that the determination of whether an ARPA permit will be required should occur as early as possible because it is such a lengthy process. Also, coordination needs to occur to confirm that a permit is actually needed. Sometimes agencies already have coverage for that area and do not want additional survey to be conducted. Be sure this coordination is documented in case the agency changes their minds.
  - Patrick also advised that it is helpful to be familiar with the survey requirements of the agency providing the permit because some, like NPS, have more rigorous shovel testing requirements than the GDOT EPM.
  - Lauren also stated that a map is needed with the permit that shows exactly where Federal land boundaries have been determined to be.
  - Care should be taken to keep the artifacts from Federal lands separate, because the collection from the Federal land will likely go to a separate location than the collection from the non-Federal land.
• Siska Williams noted that, in case they are not aware, the prime and the GDOT PM should be notified if it is determined that an ARPA permit will likely be required, as it will likely affect the schedule.
• Patrick mentioned that you can access property info on the counties’ tax assessor Qpublic websites. Scot warned that the parcel boundaries on Qpublic are not always precisely accurate.

- Short Form Revisions and Beta Testing Phase
  • The Short Form for Negative Findings (SFNF) has been revised to capture additional project situations and will be called the Archaeology Short Report (ASR) moving forward.
  • It is in Word format allowing for better formatting and incorporation of figures into the body of the report, which will reduce the number of attachments. The formatting of the first page is locked because it provides a summary of the findings, which can be used for the NEPA document without including the entire report.
  • Can be used for projects with Isolated Finds, cemeteries in the viewshed for History, and historic streetcar GPR reports, as well as for negative findings surveys.
  • Not for destroyed sites yet – GDOT OES is currently working with SHPO on what that will look like.
  • The new format allows for SHPO concurrence in instances where potential Historic Streetcar resources are identified.
  • This draft version of the ASR will be submitted to SHPO to get feedback prior to being rolled out for use.
  • The ASR will go through a beta testing phase prior to being finalized, to get feedback from consultants after a period of use on different projects.
  • Text boxes are limitless so no need for attachments due to the larger number of words in some section.
  • It will be submitted to GDOT in PDF form.
  • Katie asked if UTM zone and lat/longs are required. Heather confirmed that they are and noted that this is a request by our tribal partners.
  • Scot and Mary asked if the UTM referred just to the zone or to coordinates and Heather replied that it is just the zone.
  • Andrew asked what we would do for the centerpoint for projects that consist of multiple intersections. Heather suggested you say “see table” and then create a table with centerpoints from each intersection.
  • The GDOT archaeologist will add their signature and the appropriate cc line after they complete their review and before submitting to SHPO.
  • A finalized version will be required when SHPO concurrence is needed, similar to Phase I Reports.
  • Heather noted that the form accounts for special situations where a brief historical context may be needed – trolley tracks, etc.
  • Katie asked about the inclusion of landowner notification vs. the field notes in the ASR. Heather said that you provide the landowner notification and recipients separately for project management purposes, but the field notes will be part of the report to serve as an archive of the project.
  • Lauren noted that we did remove the requirement for county maps – it is now optional, but aerial and topographic maps are required.
Sandy Lawrence noted that GDOT county maps are available in the public version of GNAHRGIS.

- **GASF Site/Survey Polygons**
  - GDOT will soon be requiring Digital Data Packages (DDPs) as a deliverable for all projects.
  - The new DDP process will include direct coordination between GDOT and GASF (rather than SHPO sending GDOT’s site and survey info to GASF).
  - The GDOT DDP will need to be in NAD83 because it works best with MicroStation.
  - The GASF DDP has to be in NAD27.
  - Mike is working on a template that automatically converts GIS files into NAD27 so that it will be easy to prepare the GASF DDP.
  - File names should be informative to what it is so that people accessing it years from now will be able to tell what it is.
  - The DDP guidance will be sent out for a comment period among consultants. This will provide an opportunity to let GDOT know if the process does not work well with a firm’s established system for mapping/GIS data processing.
  - Once SHPO has provided concurrence, consultants should provide the final version of the report along with the final ESA transmittal and DDP.
  - Pam noted that this is intended to fit all of the various processes that are necessary to complete archaeology Resource ID together in one process (reports, ESAs, A3Ms, etc.).
  - Mary asked that AOEs be incorporated into these procedural guidelines. Heather said that GDOT will work on adding that.
  - Patrick asked if the ESA was going to GASF too. Pam replied that only the final report and shapefiles for the survey area and site boundaries go to GASF. Those are transmitted to GASF by the GDOT archaeologist.
  - GDOT will officially roll out the DDP procedures after the comment period and coordination with SHPO and GASF to finalize the process.

- **Other things in the Works**
  - Modularized Templates and Updated Report Guidelines
    - GDOT is updating the archaeology report guidelines so that sections can be split out for USACE submittals.
    - The guidelines are also being updated to try to make GDOT reviews more consistent and to achieve consistence with our new ASR instructions.
    - Heather asked that consultants please let GDOT archaeology staff know if they are getting inconsistent comments on reviews. That is not considered an escalation – it just will allow everyone to get on the same page going forward.
    - Pam asked that consultants communicate with the GDOT archaeologist prior to making the revisions if there are any issues or concerns with review comments.
    - Heather stated that the GDOT archaeology staff will also try to reach out more if there is an issue identified during a review that may lead to major revisions so that there is an opportunity to get the consultant’s point of view. Also, some comments are more subjective or up for discussion. GDOT archaeology staff will try to be better about making that clear so that it is clear that there is room for discussion.
    - Pam encouraged the consultants to look over the report guidelines and provide feedback since they are being updated currently.
Heather said that the aim of all of this is having fewer drafts per project to save all of us time and effort.

- **Traffic Ops MOU**
  - In the works – will help to define the APE for these projects.
  - The APE for these types of projects will be very small and the MOU will streamline project survey and reporting.
  - If there is no loop detector proposed, then no GPR will be required for potential trolley resources.
  - Some project activities will be considered outside of the APE, considered as “No Potential to Cause Effect” (NPTCE) activities. This means the project footprint and APE will vary in these instances.
  - This will result in some revisions to the Minor Highway Projects MOU.
  - Sandy explained what the Minor Highway Projects MOU is and that traffic signal projects are currently in that MOU as NPTCE activities, but need to be taken out, as they require survey.

- **Cemetery Evaluations Under Criterion D**
  - SHPO is still interested in a more comprehensive evaluation under Criterion D for above ground features. GDOT has not gone down that road with SHPO yet to determine exactly what that will look like. So for now, cemeteries can remain unknown under D if no excavations occur.
  - The cemetery context is getting close to completion. It will be going to SHPO soon for their review before it can be finalized. This will allow for discussions of evaluations under Criterion D and help set the expectation on level of effort and documentation for these evaluations.
  - Mary asked if probing is still considered a valid way to determine if there are unmarked graves or will GPR be required to definitively prove it. Heather said it is an acceptable method, but, if the cemetery is in the APE and there is a higher probability of grave disturbance, GPR is strongly recommended. That issue should be revisited soon so the parameters for probing vs. GPR can be fleshed out. In the short term, it is recommended that consultants speak with the GDOT archaeologists to determine the acceptable methodology on the project level if there is question on the need for GPR.

- **Environmentally Sensitive Areas**
  - The GDOT Archaeology Unit is working on ESA guidance currently.
  - For sites that have an area that lacks data potential but has not been fully delineated, the ESA should extend around the delineated portion of the site. The ESA is only needed around the unknown portion.
  - Mary asked how you determine the size of that ESA for the unknown portions and if it was purely arbitrary. Heather explained that it is arbitrary to a degree, but landform, historic parcels, etc. can be factored in to help define the ESA.
  - Heather noted that the orange barrier fencing (OBF) placement will no longer be transmitted with the ESA if only ESBs are available. GDOT archaeologists will request that it will be added once plans are available. Or, if the plans are available at the time of the ESA transmittal, then the OBF can be included.
Andrew asked about what to do when we don’t have station numbers. Scot and Heather advised that any other available location info can be included instead, such as intersections, obvious nearby landmarks, mile markers, etc.

Andrew asked what to do if an ESA falls outside of the view shown on the plans. Heather and Lauren both responded an ESA still be transmitted in that case, so that the designers have it in case the project changes or for borrow pits, construction trailers, etc. even if it just shows up on the cover sheet.

Lauren asked that consultants reach out to GDOT archaeology staff if designers are asking for ESA boundaries prior to SHPO concurrence, as there has been a push to do this so that the A3Ms can be completed early. GDOT archaeologists can help determine if they are asking too early and whether consultants actually need to transmit them yet.

Heather also asked that you never transmit boundaries without GDOT staff being able to take a look at them because once they are on the plans, they are very difficult to remove and can cause issues later. It could result in designers changing their plans unnecessarily.

It was clarified that site boundaries are, in most cases, different from its associated ESA boundaries which is another reason that it is important that site boundary files not be provided to design without coordination with the GDOT archaeologist.

- Tales from the Field
  - Mary shared the Phase III work in Houston County.
  - Wes Perrine shared the work on the Russell & Peters Brewery Cave.

*Copy of Meeting Powerpoint Presentation Attached*
Archaeology GPTQ Subcommittee Meeting

April 4, 2018
Agenda

• Environmental Survey Boundaries
• ARPA Permits
• New Short Form Beta Test
• GASF Site/Survey Polygons
• Tales from the Field
  – Favorite/Interesting Field Find
  – Interesting Discoveries or Developments in Archaeology
• Suggestions for Future Team Building Activities
ESB vs APE/ESC

• **Definitions:**
  
  – **Environmental Survey Boundary (ESB):** *Reasonable Maximum Extent*
    
    - Used to survey for environmental resources in Concept Development prior to development of design
    
    - Does not get an additional 100ft buffer
  
  – **Area of Potential Effect (APE):** Defined in 36 CFR 800.16(d)
    
    - **Archaeology** - Project Footprint = All existing and required ROW and easements
      
      - Construction Limits ≠ Project Limits
    
    - **History** - Project Footprint + Viewshed

  – **Expanded Survey Corridor (ESC):** 100ft additional survey coverage for archaeology
    
    - Reduce Need for Addendum Surveys – accounts for future project changes
    
    - Can be waived by Archaeology Team Leader for certain project types
    
    - GDOT Policy
Environmental Survey Boundary

- **P6 Activity # 11412 – Receive Environmental Study Area Layout**
  - Should be provided by Design to all Specialists for consistency in surveys – required to begin Resource Identification.
  - Includes “**Reasonable Maximum Extent**”
    - Accounts for all potential required ROW and easements needed for concept alternatives with buffer to account for uncertainty with goal of *avoiding addendum surveys*
    - Consider potential for cut/fill, erosion control, staging, tie-ins, etc. in development of boundary
    - **Reasonable**: balances potential for design requirements with amount of survey effort required
      - Too large – increased field time and reporting efforts (resource allocation)
      - Too small – addendum surveys/reports required later in project (resource allocation/schedule implications)

- **Timing Considerations**
  - Surveys should take place after some initial level of concept design to narrow down ESB and avoid “worst case surveys”
  - All special studies, including Archaeology, should begin at same time per P6 schedule. Exceptions should be coordinated with OES up front and will need to be reflected with changes to the project schedule. Failure to do so and waiting until after concept development to start Archaeology will affect timing of A3M and Technical Studies.
ESB Considerations

• Design Should Provide the ESB to Specialists for Survey
  – OES does not “Approve” ESBs. Design and PM should confirm their appropriateness if they appear very large. May involve prompting the Designer pending formal guidance.

• Task Order Scoping – Should Not Assume Worst Case
  – Surveys should take place after some initial level of concept design to avoid “worst case surveys”
  – GDOT Internal Hours assume APE/ESC level survey effort unless additional documentation is available
  – Be Explicit in Assumptions
    • Length, # Transects, # STPs, # Sites, Etc.

• Landowner Notification Remains the Same
  – ESB is treated the same during early project development as a more refined APE.
  – OCGA 32-2-9(9) Still Applies
ESB Considerations

What If You Receive An ESB that Exceeds Original TO Assumptions?

• Coordinate with the Prime, PM, and GDOT OES Staff
• Don’t hold surveys until a preferred concept alternative is chosen - Coordinate early with team on best path forward
  • Addendums
• Affects overall project schedule and dependent activities (A3M, Technical Studies, etc.)
  • Project Team Decision
Additional Considerations

- Landowner Coordination & Inaccessible Areas
  - Multiple Avenues of Contact
  - Alert the Prime and GDOT Archaeologists – PM
  - may have received communication from landowner
  - Coordinate with GDOT Archaeologist prior to report submittal

- Transect Placement and Orientation
  - Oriented along the roadway
  - Consideration given to existing ROW, then remaining survey area
  - Goal of maximizing coverage within survey area
  - Field methodology vs. GIS/Mapping Technique
The southside requires three shovel test transects due to the fact that Required ROW is equal to or greater than 100 feet.

Northside: In areas where the Required ROW varies slightly, the shovel test transect should be placed to offer the best coverage of Required ROW.
ARPA Permits

• Agency Specific Guidance is in Development
  – Submittal Process, Associated Fees, Etc.

• OES Review of Draft Permit Applications

• Who Submits the Permit?
  – USACE – GDOT Archaeologist
    • Review Fee tied to 408 Admin Fee
  – Other Agencies – TBD in consultation with GDOT
ARPA Permits

- **USACE**
  - GDOT Archaeologist Submits Permit to Lake Office
    - Review Fee tied to 408 Admin Fee
    - Accounts Payable Coordination

- **NPS**
  - Submittal will depend on coordination with park unit
  - CRNRA (CHAT) will be submitted via GDOT Archaeologist

- **USFS, DOD, Etc.**
  - Submitted directly by Consultant after GDOT Review
Permits for Survey on State Land
  – Required under OCGA 12-3-52(d).
  – Research Design for HPD Review
    • Level of detail will be determined by location and presence of known resources
    • Examples: Pickett’s Mill Phase I/II, Vann House Phase I

ARPA Permit Experiences to Share?
Updated Short Form Template

• Archaeological Short Form Report (ASR)
• Word Format — integrated figures, expandable text boxes
• Formalizes Expanded Use
  – Isolated Finds
  – Cemeteries within Viewshed
  – Historic Streetcar GPR Reports
  – No Destroyed Sites...Yet!
• Allows for SHPO Concurrence
• Updated Instructions
Archaeological Short Report

Tell Us What You Think!

• Beta Testing Phase
• Agency Coordination On-going Processing:

• Prepared in Word, Submitted in PDF
• GDOT Signature and CC Line added to the PDF
• Will require finalized version when SHPO concurrence is required
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SHORT REPORT INSTRUCTIONS

The following instructions are intended for use in the preparation of an Archaeological Short Report for submittal to the Archaeology Unit of the GDOT Office of Environmental Services.

Appropriate Use and Applicability*: This abbreviated report format is approved for use on Phase I archaeological surveys that result in the following findings:
- Negative Finding: no new or previously recorded archaeological sites located with the survey area
- Isolated Finds: with documentation of artifacts(s) and demonstration of adequate shovel test delineation
- Cemetery Within Viewshed: located outside archaeological survey limits but within historic resource survey viewshed. No National Register evaluation is required, however reference to the Historic Resources Survey Report and its resource evaluation is required.
- Possible Historic Streetcar Resources within Project APE: with documentation of historic streetcar lines in association with the project area. Survey methodology, results, and interpretation of GPR surveys in accordance with the 2015 Historic Streetcar Programmatic Agreement is required. When data indicates possible streetcar resources, a recommendation for avoidance or archaeological monitoring shall be included.

A full Phase I archaeological report prepared in accordance with the GDOT Archaeological Report Guidelines must be submitted for all projects that identify new and previously identified archaeological sites within the project survey area. *Any questions regarding the applicability of the Archaeological Short Report to a specific project should be directed to the GDOT Archaeology Team Leader or assigned Project Archaeologist, as appropriate.

Formatting & Figures: The Archaeological Short Report (ASR) template is intended to be flexible in terms of the amount of content and figures that may be included. The first page represents a summary of findings and all required signatures and therefore may not expand beyond one page while the remaining sections of the template are flexible. Figures including maps and photographs are to be incorporated into the body of the short form where appropriate and provided a figure caption with sequential numbering. Consideration should be given to minimizing the amount of white space included in the document, as well as minimizing the use of attachments for supplementary information.

Submittal Process: A PDF of all draft Archaeological Short Reports shall be submitted electronically (email or FTP transfer) to the assigned Project Archaeologist or the Archaeology Team Leader if the project is unassigned. A complete submittal package includes the draft form and all required review documents per current GDOT policy and protocol (i.e. QA/QC documentation, Prime Verification, Errata, etc.) in addition to the landowner notification and a copy of the plans and/or layout provided for survey. Ensure that the Principal Investigator has signed the document under Consultant Certification and that all attachments are included.

PROJECT INFORMATION:

1. Report Title: Report titles should clearly indicate if the survey is an addendum and if so which number addenda the present survey represents.
2. Prime Consultant: Insert company name and contact email.
3. Sub Consultant: Insert company name and contact email.
4. GDOT Project Number: When applicable on older projects.
5. GDOT PI Number: Include Project Identifier(s). If the short report is used for a surplus parcel or other project without a PI number such as a Low Impact Bridge Project (LBP), please include the appropriate identifier (i.e. PM number, LBP Bridge ID, etc.)
6. Date Submitted: Date report is submitted to GDOT.
7. GA SHPO No.: Include HP number for federally funded projects.
8. Document Type: Select proper document type according to project funding.
Digital Data Submittal Process

- New Process Outlined for Digital Data Submittals
  - Digital Data Packages
    - GASF Coordination (site/survey polygons, final reports)
    - GDOT Project Archive (geospatial data)
- Agency Coordination Pending – finalized guidance will be distributed upon final review.
- Consultant Review and Input
GASF Polygon Coordination

• Submittal of final site boundary and survey area polygons

• Direct submittal to GASF by GDOT with final report

• GASF Digital Data Package
  – NAD27 Projection
  – Shapefile Template developed in coordination with GASF
GDOT Digital Data Package

• Project Record of Spatial Data
  – Survey Area, Sites, Shovel Tests, Features, etc.
• Facilitates Addendum and/or Project Reboots
• NAD83 Projection – integrates with project design files more seamlessly than WGS84
• Submitted Upon Approval of Report and ESAs
Other Items In The Works

• Modularized Templates & Updated Report Guidelines
  – Reformatting to Facilitate State-Aid Project Coordination
  – Consistency with Revised Short Report Instructions
  – Review of Common Report Comments
  – Consistency & Clarity of Comments and Guidance

• Traffic Operations MOU
  – Defining the APE for Signal Projects
  – Streamline project survey and reporting
  – Will also involve updates to Minor Highway Projects MOU

• Cemetery Evaluations Under Criterion D
  – Cemetery Context in Progress
Environmentally Sensitive Areas

• Delineation for unknown areas *outside* survey boundary (APE/ESC/ESB)
• Should not include portions of site that are found to lack significant data potential
• If ROW/easements are unknown, OBF placement will wait until limits are determined
Tales From The Field...

• Interesting Finds or Projects?
• New Methodologies?
• Useful Resources?