



Hualapai Department of Cultural Resources

P.O. Box 310

Peach Springs, Arizona 86434

Office: 928.769.2223 FAX: 928.769.2235

October 8, 2014

HDCR File 2014-751

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Ms. Karen Baker and Mr. Aaron Yue
Topock Project Manager
DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL
5796 Corporate Avenue
Cypress, California 90630

Ms. Pamela S. Innis
Topock Remedial Project Manager
Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
P.O. Box 25007 (D-108)
Denver, Colorado 80225-007

Reference: *October 7, 2014 Letter to Pacific Gas & Electric Groundwater Remedy Infrastructure Site Verification Field Work*

Dear Ms. Baker, Mr. Yue, and Ms. Innis,

On behalf of the Hualapai Tribe, we appreciate being able to respond to the above mentioned letter received via electronic mail on October 8, 2014 and we appreciate DTSC being concerned with various processes as we all should be, when this project is so large and vast. We would like to request that we be able to review draft field protocols prior to the final product being approved by DTSC. Additionally, we do have a question regarding excluding archaeological sites from monitoring. The letter stated that PG&E is proposing a reduced list of archaeological sites for the upcoming archaeological monitoring activity in regards to CUL-1a-3a. Why is this being considered? We also do not agree that sites should be excluded from monitoring as this is a violation of the CUL-1a-31 annual monitoring program. Also, we would like to review the list or lists of proposed excluded archaeological sites and if this is approved by DTSC, we urgently require a field visit of the "proposed excluded sites," and written justification as to why any sites would be excluded.

In view of the recent archaeological monitoring activity that took place during the week of September 8th, 2014, the following issues were observed by Hualapai:

1. There were no buffer zones included in the surveys. Surveys and monitoring best practice processes include at a minimum, 25 feet on either side of the “foot-print.”
2. For some sites recordation was not being done on-site at the time of the monitoring. The recordation happened the next day. Usually, best practice includes site recordation, on the spot.
3. Foot-print in some areas, does not consider the full size of the construction areas, and on the other hand foot prints are excessive, i.e., FW1 area. Wattle has been placed on site however, in-situ desert varnish is six inches from the wattle. That is not a large enough buffer-zone.
4. Handouts of the maps given on the day of the visit, rather than sending to Hualapai in advance so we can review site records.
5. No site records were brought into the field by A&E staff for review A&E or by monitors.

As an example of site boundary-buffer inconsistencies, and not knowing if the foot-print for IRL 3, and IRL2 are on “the proposed exclusion list,” there are documented cultural sites¹ within the arsenic monitoring “circles” and in close vicinity to the IRL3-IRL2 locations. In particular, IRL3 for the proposed MW-25 arsenic monitoring well is of grave concern as there are cultural/archaeological materials just feet away from the MW-25 proposed flagged well-stake that is currently in the ground. Our concern for this particular area (not to mention the entire cultural Topock landscape) perhaps is not being understood? While in the field in July for a TWG site walk, Hualapai requested through Mike Cavalier and Yvonne Meeks that IRL-3 arsenic wells not be drilled as data from IRL-1, 2, and 4 supposedly would be sufficient. They actually agreed to this, and our mistake was that we did not follow up the conversation with appropriate documentation. The September TWG 90% walk-through presentation ignored our request and IRL-3 arsenic wells are back in the mix. Why can the wells not be phased?

We appreciate our on-going consultations and collaborations with the Topock Remediation Project and look forward to meaningful dialogue through-out the up-coming years. We look forward to hearing from you on these matters. If you have any concerns please feel free to contact myself, or Dawn Hubbs, Program Manager and we will be happy to assist you.

Sincerely,



Loretta Jackson Kelly, Director and Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Hualapai Department of Cultural Resources

Cc: Ms. Sherry Counts, Chairwoman, Hualapai Tribal Council
Mr. Rudy Clarke, Hualapai Council
Ms. Carrie Imus, Hualapai Council

¹ Within close proximity: CA-SBR-11979; 11939; 11905; 11937; 11938; 11940; 11905 and recorded isolates: 36-020394; 36020393. This list does not include intangible cultural value assessment features or areas near IRL1-4.