



Suzanne Steab <suzannesteab@utah.gov>

Fwd: Cultural Review

Lisa Reinhart <lreinhart@utah.gov>
To: Suzanne Steab <suzannesteab@utah.gov>

Tue, Mar 17, 2015 at 8:30 AM

Please post this to the greenbar as a note to file regarding the cultural survey.

Thanks,

Olvd#Jh.lqkduw
Hqylrqp hqwdc#Vflhqwlw
Xwdk#Frdd#Surjudp
Glylvrq#r i#R l#J dv/#dqg#P lqlj
(801) 538-5437 /#(801) 359-3940#Id{ ,

Z he#v\h= <http://ogm.utah.gov>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Jessica Montcalm** <jmontcalm@utah.gov>
Date: Mon, Mar 16, 2015 at 3:54 PM
Subject: Re: Cultural Review
To: Lisa Reinhart <lreinhart@utah.gov>
Cc: Steve Fluke <stevefluke@utah.gov>, Joseph Helfrich <joehelfrich@utah.gov>, Daron Haddock <daronhaddock@utah.gov>

I have reviewed the report, and while the quality of the overall product is sub-par, it is (barely) sufficient for making management decisions. I agree with their recommendations: the corral lacking diagnostic artifacts/potential for subsurface features/associations with important persons should be recommended Not Eligible National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

With regard to the SHPO letter, the recommendation should be one of "No Effect to Historic Properties." This is due to the fact that the site is recommended Not Eligible for the NRHP. Although the site is a "cultural resource," only a determination of Eligible to the NRHP would elevate it to the status of Historic Property. Once a Historic Property comes into play, that is when No Adverse Effect or Adverse Effect come into play.

Hope that is helpful to all. Let me know if there are further questions. - JfM

Mhvvlfid#I1#P rqwfdq /#P V2USD
Dedqgrqhg#P lqh#Uhfalp dwlrq#Surjudp
Glylvrq#r i#R l#J dv/#dqg#P lqlj
(801) 538-5318 /#(801) 359-3940#Id{ ,

Z he#v\h= <http://ogm.utah.gov>

On Mon, Mar 16, 2015 at 11:21 AM, Lisa Reinhart <lreinhart@utah.gov> wrote:
Steve,

I am asking if we can borrow Jessica for a couple hours to review a Cultural Resource Survey prepared by a third party and subsequent recommendations for SHPO. I have attached the report (note it is

confidential) and a draft letter to SHPO to this email for your reference. The Technical Review for this amendment is due April 1st.

As I am sure you are aware, we have to coordinate with SHPO in regards to the cultural and archaeological impacts on proposed mining activities that we review. We received a cultural survey submitted by SUFCO in regards to expansion of their waste rock facility and need to make a concurrence request to SHPO based on that report. It would be very helpful to have someone that actually knows the Section 106 rules to review and support or reject the recommendations from the consultants who performed the survey.

In the future, I wonder if we can continue to use Jessica for this purpose. In consultation with Joe, we think there may be 4-6 of these a year. I thought we could use this as a "trial" run to see how much time it takes Jessica to review it and provide her recommendation. In a brief discussion with her, we thought ball-park 4 hours.

She can code this task to:

Fund 1000, Dept 560, Unit 2410, Appro Unit RED, GCPERMIT, GFSF

Thanks for your consideration,

Olvd#JhLqkdw
Hqylrqp hqwd#VfLhqwlw
Xwdk#Frd#Surjudp
Glylvlrq#iR l/#Jdv/#dlqg#P lqlj
 [\(801\) 538-5437](tel:(801)538-5437) / [\(801\) 359-3940](tel:(801)359-3940) #Id{ ,

Z he#vwh=<http://ogm.utah.gov>