

**GPTQ Archaeology Subcommittee Meeting**  
 GDOT Office of Environmental Services  
 September 5, 2012

**Attendees:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Email</b>
Jim Pomfret	GDOT Archaeology	<a href="mailto:jpomfret@dot.ga.gov">jpomfret@dot.ga.gov</a>
Eric Duff	GDOT Cultural Resources	<a href="mailto:eduff@dot.ga.gov">eduff@dot.ga.gov</a>
Sandy Lawrence	GDOT History	<a href="mailto:slawrence@dot.ga.gov">slawrence@dot.ga.gov</a>
Heather Mustonen	GDOT Archaeology	<a href="mailto:hmustonen@dot.ga.gov">hmustonen@dot.ga.gov</a>
Sara Gale	GDOT Archaeology	<a href="mailto:sgale@dot.ga.gov">sgale@dot.ga.gov</a>
Pam Baughman	GDOT Archaeology	<a href="mailto:pbaughman@dot.ga.gov">pbaughman@dot.ga.gov</a>
Siska Williams	GDOT Archaeology	<a href="mailto:siwilliams@dot.ga.gov">siwilliams@dot.ga.gov</a>
Glenn Bowman	GDOT Environmental Services	<a href="mailto:gbowman@dot.ga.gov">gbowman@dot.ga.gov</a>
Katy Allen	FHWA	<a href="mailto:katy.allen@dot.gov">katy.allen@dot.gov</a>
Melissa Dye	ESI	<a href="mailto:mdye@esinc.cc">mdye@esinc.cc</a>
Terri Russ	ESI	<a href="mailto:truss@esinc.cc">truss@esinc.cc</a>
Chris Clement	SEARCH	<a href="mailto:clement@searchinc.com">clement@searchinc.com</a>
Scot Keith	New South Associates	<a href="mailto:skeith@newsouthassoc.com">skeith@newsouthassoc.com</a>
Tom Lewis	Edwards-Pitman	<a href="mailto:tlewis@edwards-pitman.com">tlewis@edwards-pitman.com</a>
Lynn Pietak	Edwards-Pitman	<a href="mailto:lpietak@edwards-pitman.com">lpietak@edwards-pitman.com</a>
Dina Bazzill	ECA	<a href="mailto:dina.bazzill@eca-usa.com">dina.bazzill@eca-usa.com</a>
Autumn Dubois	ECA	<a href="mailto:autumn.dubois@eca-usa.com">autumn.dubois@eca-usa.com</a>
Chris Koch	GT Hill	<a href="mailto:ckoch@gthillplanners.com">ckoch@gthillplanners.com</a>
Patrick Smith	URS	<a href="mailto:patrick.n.smith@urs.com">patrick.n.smith@urs.com</a>
Adam Archual	HNTB	<a href="mailto:aarchual@hntb.com">aarchual@hntb.com</a>

**Meeting Minutes:**

Jim Pomfret opened the meeting with introductions and then presented the agenda topics derived from the consultant community and the GDOT Archaeology Unit. Discussion surrounding each agenda item is as follows:

1. **Scoping for Archaeological Assessments:** Scoping was discussed as it relates to the use of Negative Findings Short Forms. It was stated that when scoping for a project, it should always be assumed that resources will be found and a report will be needed. Scoping for a short form should not be done as it jeopardizes the project schedule when a supplemental is required to complete a report that was not originally included in the contract scope. There have been several instances in the last year where a short form was included in the scope and resources were identified, thereby leading to project delays and schedule shifts. Any questions regarding appropriate scoping for a specific project or special situation

should be directed to Jim Pomfret. Chris Koch noted that they often provide two cost estimates, one for a short form and one for a report. It should be assumed during scoping that resources will be encountered and the contract should reflect this level of fieldwork and documentation.

2. **Field Methods:** It was noted that “no dig” designations should be used as a last resort during field surveys and rationale/justification for their use must be included in the report, either in the text or on the graphic. Areas of disturbance should be shovel tested to confirm disturbance and gather information regarding its nature and/or extent. If field conditions such as standing water are present at the time of the initial survey (due to a recent rain event), a revisit may be necessary to complete the survey in drier conditions. Any areas not shovel tested should be photographed and documented appropriately. It was noted that the language of the Environmental Procedures Manual (EPM) should be strengthened to clarify these specific requirements. Jim Pomfret noted that additional EPM changes are coming and he will begin work on those in the next month or so.
3. **Shared Resources (Archaeology/History):** Jim Pomfret noted that archaeologists should be coordinating with project historians for shared resources such as cemeteries, Civil War sites, canals, trolley lines etc, as required in the 2011 EPM update. The resource boundary and eligibility should be discussed across disciplines to avoid conflicting information and evaluation for the same resource. The goal is to send one, consistent evaluation to SHPO for any given resource and each respective document should reference the other discipline’s report as needed. Eric Duff suggested that a generalized list of shared resources would be added to the EPM during future updates. The issue of ruins was also addressed and it was discussed that bridge abutments, trolleys, etc. are considered ruins and generally treated primarily as archaeological sites; however, the project historian should be consulted early to make sure everyone is on the same page regarding responsibilities and evaluations. It was noted that additional guidance in the form of context studies (eg. Trolleys, cemeteries, etc.) is currently being developed and will help with the future coordination and evaluation of these shared resources.
4. **Consultant Evaluation Process:** Sara Gale provided an update on the forthcoming Consultant Evaluations. The goal is to evaluate performance by a Consultant throughout the life of a project. The process will be automated through Sharepoint and the questions included in the form were previously routed to Consultants for review and comment. Sara noted that the questions would be routed again to provide input from companies recently prequalified for GDOT work under 106.f. New firms will also need to coordinate with Sara on the necessary approval process to gain access to Sharepoint and the form. Sara noted that it is important that Consultants log in to the system every 30 days to avoid having to obtain permissions again. The goal is to go live with the evaluations on January 16, 2013 and GDOT staff is working internally to develop consistent reviews and evaluation criteria. A general overview of the process was provided and included:

- The evaluations will cover the whole project/process; however milestone documents will serve as triggers for evaluation (Short Form, Report, AOE, Mitigation Documents, etc).
- The GDOT archaeologist assigned to the project will complete the form including numerical scores and written justifications.
- Jim Pomfret will review and approve each evaluation before sending to the Consultant.
- The Consultant will be able to respond and scores may be adjusted before finalization.
- The final evaluation will be transmitted to the Consultant, Prime, and GDOT Project Manager.

Concern was expressed by Chris Koch that evaluations could be a problem for the consultants in that the consultant's clients/primes may believe that the consultants are being singled out and having problems since no other resource groups are doing this. It was noted that this form will eventually roll out to other specialties in Environmental Services and that Cultural Resources is serving as the pilot group. Glenn Bowman noted that this evaluation process is an important step to achieving the accountability expected by the taxpayers. He emphasized that we need to deliver quality documents on time and bring Consultants who struggle up to the standards required, or let them go. Eliminating numerous reviews will help streamline the environmental process and project delivery. He noted the current office policy is for him to be notified of documents requiring a third draft and for a face to face meeting to be held to address document deficiencies in an effort to shorten review times and deliver projects on time.

Katy Allen inquired about whether this would apply for local projects and noted that it would be beneficial if this was rolled out to local governments to help their process and identify gaps in their work programs. Katy also indicated that it would be helpful to track who the project sponsor for each project/evaluation was so that this information could be used to evaluate work for local governments. It was also discussed that with MAP 21, there is a spotlight on streamlining project delivery and quality control is a vital component of that. These evaluations will be very good in the eyes of FHWA in terms of streamlining project delivery and demonstrating that everyone is aware of the requirements for environmental documentation and meeting them on the first round.

5. **Map Symbology:** Pam Baughman discussed the Archaeological Report Guidelines that were rolled out in the 2011 EPM update and noted that any questions or concerns over the guidelines can be directed to her for future updates to the document. Consistency in comments regarding map symbology was discussed and it was noted that a set symbology for common symbols (APE, ESC, no digs, positive and negative shovel tests, etc.) would be a useful addition so that it was clear what GDOT expected. Currently it is requested that symbols be consistent and allow for all map information to convert to black and white. It was suggested that a GIS style template be developed and incorporated into the guidelines. Concerns were expressed that not all companies have ArcMap capabilities so it was

suggested that an ArcMap template be established along with standard symbols that cover a range of technical capabilities. A subcommittee will be created to develop this template.

6. **Consistency in GDOT Reviews/EPM Requirements:** Pam Baughman noted that the report guidelines are also new to GDOT staff and the Archaeology Unit is currently working on internal consistency of reviews to ensure that they are consistent in what and how they review reports, while recognizing natural variation in review. It was noted that any concerns or issues with consistency between reviewers should be directed to Jim Pomfret and any issues or concerns with the written guidelines themselves should be directed to Pam Baughman. Concern over scope creep related to document review and new requirements was discussed and it was noted that the EPM and Report Guideline versions should be included in each document to avoid issues. If revisions are requested that are not covered in the EPM version associated with the signed contract, this should be brought to the attention of the GDOT reviewer. Jim Pomfret noted that he tries to only update the EPM once per year and the date of last revision should be available next to the Cultural Resources section of the document (Chapter V).
7. **Metal Detection:** Heather Mustonen discussed increased metal detection on GDOT projects and noted that additional guidance will be added to a future addition of the EPM. The 2011 EPM update called for use of metal detection at the discretion of the Principal Investigator and in consultation with GDOT. Future requirements will include metal detection in delineation of all sites with an historic component, whether identified through shovel testing or with above ground features. Metal detection will be required along all delineation transects, however site boundaries that are expanded beyond the two consecutive shovel tests will not require additional shovel testing. Survey corridors that have a high potential for specific site types (Civil War, historic house sites, etc.) should be planned in coordination with the GDOT archaeologist to determine the appropriate methodology. The same is true for any Phase II work. Patrick Smith inquired about delineation off of positive metal detection hits (grid vs. cruciform) and Heather noted that this would be taken into consideration and addressed in the official guidance. Sampling strategies and the possibility of infield artifact analysis was also discussed to address concerns over increased curation costs due to the requirements for a micro-environment for metal artifacts. These changes will be incorporated into the EPM after the necessary coordination with SHPO and the Advanced Metal Detection for Archaeologists/Georgia Council of Professional Archaeologists is completed.
8. **GNAHRGIS:** Jim Pomfret indicated that all responses to his request for comments on GNAHRGIS will be provided to Eric Duff for transmittal to ITOS/UGA. The comments received included defaulting to county boundaries instead of congressional districts, addition of survey polygons (scheduled to finish by mid-2013), addition of quad names, more user friendly report search, more readily accessible site information without scrolling through the quick form, addition of old maps (Sanborns, 15min quads, county maps, etc.), labeling of sites on maps, submission of site forms through GNAHRGIS, and additional search capabilities for information included on the site forms. Eric noted that the current

phase of GNAHRGIS runs through 2016 so there would be ample time to address new comments. He did note that site polygons would not be available in this phase because of the large cost associated with this task. Jim Pomfret reminded the group that site location data should be submitted in NAD27 so that it is accurately represented in the geodatabase. The site files recently commented that a large number of sites are being reported using the wrong datum and all conversions should be done before submitting draft forms.

9. **Underwater Archaeology:** Siska Williams indicated that future updates to the EPM would include additional requirements for maritime resources, including the need for additional scoping for underwater surveys. She noted that a more expanded, holistic view of the any waterways within the APE for any given project will need to be considered and incorporated into the historic context and background research for a survey. It was noted that the presence of shoals, mills, etc. should be considered in scoping and subsequent surveys to ensure that maritime resources are adequately addressed. Currently underwater surveys are included in a project if there is high potential in the project area and in coordination with the GDOT archaeologists and Chris McCabe, the State Underwater Archaeologist (who gets a copy of all GDOT reports with maritime resources). Scot Keith requested that the requirements be well defined in the EPM to aid in proper scoping. It was also noted that guidance on treatment of waterlogged artifacts will also be necessary with the new requirements. Siska indicated she will be meeting with the GDOT Bridge office to gather information on general bridge design in relation to the drilling and placement of pilings so that it can be considered in relation to nearby archaeological resources. Katy Allen stated that Ecology deals with the same issues when dealing with protected aquatic species and it should also be considered if archaeological work has potential to affect ecological resources. The ESC for underwater surveys will likely be larger than 100-ft and will be developed in coordination with GDOT and in consideration of resource potential.
10. **100-ft Expanded Survey Corridor Waiver:** Jim Pomfret reiterated the requirement for the 100-ft ESC but noted in specific instances he will waive it. Waivers will be based on the nature of the project (ie. will ROW ever be required?) and will require assurance from the Project Manager/Designer that no new ROW will be required. If any project should potentially have the ESC waived, Jim should be consulted and will make the final determination.
11. **Landowner Letters:** If landowner letters are generated out of a contract from the Environmental Services office, they should be sent to Jim Pomfret (or the project archaeologist) for signature. If the contract originates out of the Office of Program Delivery, the letters should be sent to the GDOT PM for review and for signature by the OPD Office Director. Letters should be updated if a survey occurs more than one year after the original letter was sent out. Future updates to the EPM will require an example of the distributed landowner letter as an appendix in the archaeology report.
12. **Environmentally Sensitive Areas:** Recommendations for establishment of an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) should be included in the report for each resource as

necessary so that it is flagged for the project archaeologist and NEPA. The EPM now requires preparation of an ESA memo by the consultant for any eligible/unknown resources and this should be addressed to the Project Manager. The draft letter should be sent to the project archaeologist who will provide the appropriate personnel to be copied and distribute the final letter. An example letter is provided on the EPM, however the letters should be drafted on company letterhead. The GDOT GIS and CAD groups are currently working on guidance for receiving/transmitting DGN's between the Office of Environmental Services and Design groups that will help with future ESA transmittals.

**Action Items:**

1. Additional language regarding no digs will be added to the EPM. (Jim Pomfret)
2. A generalized list of shared resources will be generated and included in the EPM. (Jim Pomfret)
3. Consultant Evaluation questions will be distributed to Consultants for comment. Any Consultant requiring Sharepoint access will coordinate with Sara Gale for permissions. (Sara Gale)
4. A Map Symbology Subcommittee will be formed to develop GIS symbology template and/or standards for inclusion in the EPM/Report Guidelines. (Pam Baughman)
5. GDOT will coordinate with SHPO and AMDA on metal detection requirements/consideration prior to inclusion in the EPM. (Heather Mustonen)
6. GNAHRGIS comments will be transmitted to ITOS/UGA for consideration/incorporation. (Jim Pomfret/Eric Duff)
7. Guidance on Underwater Survey will be added to the EPM. (Siska Williams)