Technical Brief 21: Peer Review of Federal Archeological Projects and Programs

Bennie Keel, Barbara J. Little, Martha Graham, Mary Carroll, Francis P. McManamon
National Park Service

Published by the DOI Departmental Consulting Archeologist/NPS Archeology Program, National Park Service, Washington, DC, March 2007.

This Technical Brief describes objectives, organization, and methods that have been used to conduct peer reviews in public archeology projects and programs. In describing this process, we draw upon recent peer reviews managed by several of the authors of this publication, as well as experiences from earlier reviews described in Keel (1993). Thus, this Technical Brief updates guidance and suggested procedures for government agencies and other archeological resources management organizations regarding the use of the peer review process as a means of improving the effectiveness of their projects and programs.

Introduction

The review of research by peers is a hallmark of scholarship. Peer reviews are the conscience of science and scholarship; they provide a necessary check on practitioners and an explicit evaluation of their efforts. Although most often thought of in relation to grant reviews and publication, peer review is also valuable in enhancing the quality of the full range of activities in archeological projects and programs.

The focus of the peer reviews described in this technical brief may vary. In some instances, agencies have requested the review of specific archeological projects. These investigations have ranged from survey projects to identify sites (see for example, the Scope of Work for the Fort Campbell peer review in Appendix B) to projects that involve data recovery or excavation activities as well as identification and evaluation investigations (see for example, the Scope of Work for the Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway peer review in Appendix C). In other instances, agencies have requested peer review of a more general scope, looking at archeological programs that include several projects or other components. The 1995 peer review of the Bureau of Reclamation Phoenix Area Office cultural resource program is an example of this programmatic focus for a peer review (see Appendix A, the letter requesting this program peer review).

This Technical Brief provides guidance to governmental agencies and other programs on the peer review process. Such peer reviews may be full-scale versions, similar to ones completed by the

Departmental Consulting Archeologist (DCA), or they may be smaller, to fit the needs of more localized projects. In either case, the results can lead to cost savings through efficiency, increased effectiveness, and increased support for archeology among members of the public and within agencies. The government agencies and the professionals who participate in these reviews recognize that peer reviews can provide an important contribution to project design and management.

This Technical Brief describes the peer review process within the Federal archeological arena. It also supplies information about the planning, design, and implementation of peer reviews.

Purpose and Goals

In many academic research projects the principal investigator(s) develops a research design, identifies and obtains permission to investigate the resources that fit the project's goals, and raises the necessary funds by obtaining a grant. The researcher plans and conducts the work and publishes the results. Review of the scientific merits of the proposed work by the researcher's peers occurs during the grant application process, in the review of the results by the granting organization, as part of the publication process, and in the reception of the product by the scientific community.

Archeology conducted to comply with Federal historic and archeological preservation laws must follow sound archeological practice and also the regulations, procedures, and guidelines mandated by and developed from those laws. Under these laws archeology is conducted to benefit the American people generally through the preservation of important archeological resources and information.

The first objective of research in public archeology is to identify, evaluate, record and document significant archeological resources. Research may also involve treatment, including excavation for data recovery. The resulting information is used for a variety of practical purposes, including education and fostering an appreciation of the nation's heritage among its citizens. The concomitant benefits that individual archeologists may derive from these endeavors with regard to professional standing and career advancement are secondary.

The principal difference between an exclusively academic research design and one developed for a public project is that the former develops from scientific curiosity while in the latter research needs are conditioned by management requirements for compliance with law, regulation, and policy. Therefore, there are constraints on federal archeology projects that may not apply to academic projects.

However, federal projects involve the same general steps of any research project and have theoretical, methodological and/or substantive goals. The development of the archeological project within Federal historic preservation is a consultative process in the hands of Federal archeologists and their counterparts in the State or Tribal Historic Preservation Office (SHPO or THPO, respectively). Project plans and archeological results also may be reviewed by archeologists and historic preservation professionals of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP). Frequently suggestions made during these consultations result in design improvements. As a result of this coordination, the project has a firm, defensible foundation.

Federal archeological project research design is open to evaluation and criticism. Evaluations occur as part of memoranda of agreement, National Register of Historic Places nominations or determinations of eligibility, determinations of effect, reviews of scopes of work for data recovery plans, and requests for proposals that form the bases for contracts. Depending on the specifics of the project, these evaluations are performed by archeologists, other cultural resources specialists, and perhaps officials of various agencies. These reviews represent a broad range of scientific and legal compliance concerns.

Because such evaluations improve the agency proposal, stipulations for formal peer reviews are often specifically included in memoranda of agreement or agency contracts. In the case of data recovery projects designed to mitigate the loss of important information, such evaluation is done by the agency before a project is announced for bidding. As part of the proposal, the winning bidder also prepares a research design or work plan which provides refinements for conducting the research. It also defines the protocols that will serve as project guides.

Figure 1. Archeologists explaining excavation of a Hohokam pioneer period pithouse, CAP peer review, 1986. (Photo courtesy Bureau of Reclamation/Tom Lincoln)

Before the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), rescue or salvage archeology was handled without input from States, Tribes, or the ACHP. Archeological rescue work was usually controlled by the time and money available rather than by the development of thoughtful and explicit research designs. Today Federal agency archeologists or contractors from the public and private sectors conduct Federal archeological projects. Competition among archeological contractors is the norm unless the work is done by agency personnel. It does not matter who does the project for the peer review process described here to work.

The primary goal of the peer review process is to evaluate the conduct of Federal archeological projects and assess the competence and efficiency of projects relative to archeological practice and legal compliance. An academic peer review rates a project on its scientific merits. Academic reviewers evaluate the theoretical basis, methodologies for data collection and analysis, and how these contribute to the research goals.

In Federal archeology, the peer review examines additional topics as well as these. Is the agency following the stipulations of the compliance documents agreed to under the Section 106 process of NHPA and other regulatory requirements? Are Secretary of Interior Standards being met? Is there an appropriate plan for curation? Have data fulfilled the needs of the research design? Have unexpected data or research domains come to light that need additional investigation? Does the project need to be changed or redesigned to take these findings into consideration?

Federal archeology project peer reviews have been undertaken for a variety of reasons. In some cases, reviews were undertaken when controversy stirred about an undertaking or the archeology associated with it. Some reviews have been conducted because of major disagreement between the agency and the contractor about the work. Allegations or questions may have come from the archeological profession, Indian tribes, the media, special interest groups, or members of Congress. Although the peer review may address conflicts or disagreements, it is not a forum for mediation or adjudication. Agencies have requested reviews by the DCA to investigate whether projects were adequate. Review may be conducted when an agency wishes to improve a project.

Appendix A provides an example of a request from an agency for an archeological peer review. This memorandum is the request from the Area Manager, Phoenix Area Office, Bureau of Reclamation for a peer review of the area office cultural resource program.

In addition to improving specific projects or resolving disagreements, the use of the peer review process in public archeology also serves other purposes:

1. Demonstrating to the professional community, Congress, the Administration, and others that the Federal archeology program produces excellent results;

2. Creating networks for communication among government and academic archeologists that improve archeology;

3. Helping resolve disputes among Federal agencies, contractors, Indian tribes, special interest groups, and the media;

4. Providing Federal archeologists with professional credibility among their managers and the academic community.

Peer Review Topics

The peer review manager in consultation with the agency representative—usually the agency archeologist—establishes a project review agenda and develops a list of suggested review topics to aid the peer review team in their examination. The peer review evaluates the project according to selected criteria, which will vary according to the circumstances. Often the following questions will help frame the peer review.

1. Is the archeological research consistent with the contract, memorandum of agreement, and other covering directives?

2. Is the project within time and budget constraints?

3. Are the agency and the contractor fulfilling the requirements of the contract?

4. Are there unresolved disputes or disagreements between the contractor and the agency related to the archeological work?

5. Are the research and the materials and data recovered consistent with the needs of the research design?

6. Are there gaps in the data? If so, is it possible to fill them?

7. Based upon new findings, should other lines of research be pursued in place of or in addition to those identified in the research design? Is it desirable to suspend a particular line of research?

8. Are the public education and outreach aspects of the project adequate and effective?

9. Are the requirements for consultation with affected parties being met adequately and effectively?

10. Are Federal standards for the cleaning, cataloging, description, analysis, and curation of the material and data recovered being met?

11. Are there adequate and sustainable methods for data management?

This approach accepts previous decisions made by the various consulting parties about the treatment of archeological resources. It also provides an occasion to assess the project to determine if any changes are desirable. This approach steers clear of second-guessing earlier decisions or trying to identify all of the approaches for conducting archeological investigations.

The DCA conducts a limited number of peer reviews. Table 1 lists the peer reviews that the DCA has conducted and summarizes the reasons for them.

Table 1. Peer Review Projects Done by the Departmental Consulting Archeologist, National Park Service, as of 2006

Project/Location/reason for review	*Year*	*Agency*
Dolores Project, McPhee Reservoir, CO Problems between the contractor and the agency about the scope of the investigation and project management	1981	Bureau of Reclamation
Central Arizona Project, AZ Agency wanted to confirm that the scope and focus of the archeological project were appropriate.	1986	Bureau of Reclamation
Jackson Lake Dam, Grand Teton National Park, WY Demonstrate to the members of the Wyoming Congressional delegation that the project-related archeological investigations were adequate and satisfied State interests	1987	National Park Service
Stillwater Wildlife Management Area, Carson Desert, NV Address Native American concerns and evaluate whether historic preservation requirements were being met	1988	Fish and Wildlife Service
Libby Dam Project, Lake Koocanusa, MT Confirm that the agency's historic preservation responsibilities were being fulfilled in a manner sensitive to Native American religious concerns	1989	Corps of Engineers
Alkali Creek Project, ND Provide an independent assessment of the quality, adequacy, and importance of archeological investigations of a flood control system	1990	Soil Conservation Service
Central and Northern Plains Archeological Overview, conducted by the Arkansas	1992	Department of Defense Legacy Program

Archeological Survey. Provide an objective review of the results of this pilot study that synthesized archeological information from the middle third of the United States		
Phoenix Area Office, AZ Provide an objective review of the results of archeological projects conducted through this Bureau of Reclamation program in anticipation of additional work being conducted	1995	Bureau of Reclamation
Fort Campbell, KY and TN Examine dispute between the Fort, contractor and sub-contractor and make recommendations regarding use of contracting for archeological resource management investigations	2004	Department of Army
Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway Archeological Peer Review, Missouri Provide an objective evaluation of archeological investigations and decisions made regarding significance of sites and how to use data recovery for impact mitigation	2006	Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army

Conducting Peer Reviews

A peer review is an activity that must be developed as a partnership between the peer review manager and the agency. The DCA, or one of the senior archeologists in his or her office, serves as the peer review manager. The agency representative is usually the archeologist responsible for the administration and conduct of the agency's archeological program, although another agency official may serve in this role. For the purposes of the following discussion, the "agency archeologist" also is assumed to be the "agency representative." No matter who serves in them, these roles are essential components of the peer review process.

The peer review manager and the agency archeologist work together to coordinate all aspects of the peer review. In undertaking a peer review, one of the peer review manager's goals is to create a partnership with the agency. The creation of such a partnership is the principal ingredient that has made the peer review process successful. Both parties must agree on the scope of the peer review.

Frequent and clear communication between the peer review manager and the agency archeologist is critical to the success of the peer review. Communication bolsters the commitment made by both parties to assure that the necessary actions are completed in a timely manner. For example, the peer review manager provides the agency archeologist with information about the progress of the peer review team's efforts, thereby allowing the agency archeologist to plan appropriately.

The peer review manager judges what is needed by the peer review team to make its assessment and may discuss the peer review with the SHPO or THPO and the ACHP to gather information that should be supplied to the peer review team.

Once the DCA accepts a project for peer review, the peer review manager works with the agency archeologist to undertake the following tasks, at a minimum, in conducting the peer review. Many of the tasks may be done concurrently.

1. Define the peer review's scope, appropriate topics, and schedule.
2. Determine the peer review's cost and secure funds.
3. Plan the peer review team's composition and choose its members.
4. Compile documentation and send it to the peer review team.
5. Schedule the on-site visit.
    a. Arrange travel and lodging.
    b. Reserve meeting space.
    c. Make appointments for interviews.
    d. Prepare the agenda and itinerary.
    e. Arrange for logistical support for the peer review team.
    f. Make arrangements for office space.
    g. Secure equipment for the peer review team's use.
6. Conduct the on-site visit.
7. Prepare the draft report.
    a. Assemble the peer review team member's revisions to the draft report.
    b. Revise the manuscript.

c. Obtain the peer review team's approval of final report.

d. Produce the final report.

e. Compile recommendations for the agency.

f. Complete remaining administrative tasks.

8. Provide final report to the agency official who requested the peer review.

The tasks listed above are described in the following sections of this Technical Brief. The examples cited are drawn from peer reviews conducted by the DCA.

1. Scope of Work

The reasons for selecting a project for peer review normally define the scope of the peer review. If charges of inadequacy have been made, for example, then the peer review will focus on the conduct of the archeological investigations under the agreements and documents covering the project. If the peer review is a response to problems between the agency and the contractor, then the peer review will focus on these matters.

The scope of the peer review should focus on identifying solutions to problems and not foster inappropriate or adversarial investigative roles. In some cases it will be appropriate to broaden the peer review's scope of work to focus on discerning general principles from specific case examples. For example, review of a contracting dispute may yield insights into best practices for contracting.

Appendices B and C provide as examples the scopes of work and suggested topics for the archeological peer reviews done for Fort Campbell and for the Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway

2. Cost and Funding

The peer review manager and agency archeologist must make arrangements to fund the various costs for the peer review and establish the budget parameters within which the peer review manager must operate. For recent peer reviews conducted by the DCA, the requesting agency has provided funds for the peer review team and all travel and logistical costs for the on-site review. Generally there also are administrative costs that the requesting agency has funded. The DCA and DCA staff salaries expended in planning, coordinating, and completing the peer review have not been charged to the requesting agency.

Costs include transportation and per diem expenses of the peer review team members. Other costs are reproduction and postage to provide project information to the peer review team; on-site equipment, materials, and work space for the peer review team; administrative support; peer review report preparation and distribution, and in some cases honoraria. Many of these costs may be covered in-kind by the agency.

3. The Peer Review Team

Ideally, members of the peer review team should be familiar with the requirements of the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA), the NHPA process, general Federal archeological and historic preservation, current professional standards, and Federal procurement and contracting regulations so that they can readily identify efficient, effective solutions to problems related to these topics.

The number of peer review team members may vary, but experience recommends a team of three. A balanced peer review team typically consists of one public archeologist from an agency other than the one responsible for the project, an expert in the archeology of the project area or region, and an expert from outside the research area. Experts may be drawn from the academic, public, or private sectors.

To identify potential peer review team members, the peer review manager compiles lists of suggested reviewers and requests the same from the agency archeologist. The peer review manager also may request independent lists from other involved parties. The peer review manager is responsible for selecting the peer review team and makes every effort to ensure that all reviewers are acceptable to all involved.

Beyond a candidate's professional credentials and availability, other elements to consider may include the following.

1. Does the candidate have a reputation for completing work in a reasonable time?
2. Is the candidate willing to commit the time necessary before the on-site visit to read and review documents and after the visit to review and finish the final report?
3. Does the candidate have a previous relationship or any other consideration with the agency or the project that could be construed as a conflict of interest?
4. Was the candidate an unsuccessful bidder for the contract?
5. Does the candidate work well with others?

While these elements may seem straightforward, ignoring them could make completing an acceptable peer review difficult or affect its timeliness.

Once the peer review manager selects the candidates and establishes a schedule for the peer review, the peer review manager contacts the candidates to determine their willingness to participate and their availability. The peer review manager follows up on a candidate's acceptance to provide information about the project, the schedule, and other details.

4. Documentation

The agency responsible for the archeological project under review compiles and furnishes members of the peer review team with the appropriate documents that describe the peer review's scope of work, the archeological project, research questions, the archeological resources and their significance, the nature of the disagreement/dispute (if any), and background information about local archeology.

The peer review manager may request additional information from other involved parties. In some cases the agency archeologist may send material to the peer review manager, who compiles it to send to the peer review team. The agency archeologist, peer review manager, and others who provide information should compile detailed lists of materials so that all parties know what the peer review team has received.

Appendix D provides an example of the documentation provided or available to the peer review team during the Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway peer review

By the time of the on-site visit, the peer review team should have a thorough knowledge of the project. The peer review team must receive all documentation at least 3 weeks before the on-site visit. Less time would not give the peer review team adequate time to become familiar with the archeological project and the issues included in the peer review's scope of work.

The package of material compiled for the orientation of the peer review team will vary from project to project. For example, material may consist of survey and evaluation reports, NHPA Section 106 documentation, scope of work or request for proposal, research design, and interim or annual progress project reports, if available. Relevant correspondence and internal documents also may be included.

Figure 2. Archeologists sharing information at site of Hohokam village during the CAP peer review, 1986. (Photo courtesy Bureau of Reclamation/ Tom Lincoln)

5. Scheduling

Peer reviews may be most helpful at the midpoint of a project. Typically, field and laboratory work has proceeded to the stage where the peer review team can make a reasonable evaluation of the results. A peer review at the beginning of a project in most cases would be premature because there would be few results to assess. If a project is near completion, the recommendations of the peer review team would be difficult to implement because time and money usually are short at this stage. However, in some cases, a peer review at the end of a project or series of projects can provide an agency with valuable feedback on the design and process of future projects.

In scheduling the on-site visit, it is of course important to find a time that is acceptable to potential team members. The peer review manager should begin developing a schedule for the peer review at least 3 months in advance of the on-site visit. Within such a time frame it is usually possible to accommodate the schedules of all involved and other situations that can affect the timing of the on-site visit. College and university calendars or special events like conventions or athletic contests in the project area, for example, can affect lodging and other travel arrangements. The schedules and commitments of the individuals representing the various organizations who will be interviewed by the peer review team must be considered. The on-site visit must be scheduled so that those who will travel from outside the project area can participate. Although face-to-face interviews often are preferable, telephone or electronic interviews may suffice for short interviews.

6. On-Site Visit

The peer review manager and the agency archeologist plan the on-site visit to use everyone's time efficiently. The peer review manager, usually in consultation with the agency archeologist, develops an agenda for the peer review team's on-site visit. A detailed agenda assures that the on-site visit is carefully structured. Usually the peer review manager, agency personnel, and peer review team arrive the day before the on-site visit begins.

Appendix E provides an example of the agenda developed and used for the Phoenix Area Office, Bureau of Reclamation peer review

During the first session of the on-site visit the peer review manager, the agency archeologist, and the peer review team discuss the agenda in detail and modify it as necessary. Implementing modifications in the agenda may require complex changes in the interview schedule. It is important to determine the final agenda as early as possible. However, it also is desirable to maintain some flexibility and allow for additional follow-up of important issues or topics.

The peer review team can examine any aspects of the project related to the archeological work. The peer review team may request specific interviews in addition to the ones suggested by the peer review manager and agency archeologist; a reasonable effort should be made to accommodate these requests. Each interview focuses on a specific task or topic. Each interview session is allotted a specific amount of time. Sessions usually do not exceed two hours without a break. Maintaining strict adherence to the agenda assures that the peer review team stays focused on the task and adheres to the schedule.

The peer review manager and the agency archeologist provide the necessary administrative support to the peer review team to ensure an efficient review. Meeting facilities, telephones, transportation, and lodging and dining facilities must be available. Secretarial assistance, equipment, and supplies should be available, as needed. The purpose of making these arrangements in advance is to ensure that the peer review team can devote its energies to the peer review. In providing these kinds of administrative support, the peer review manager and agency function as aides to the peer review team.

The first part of the on-site visit is devoted to briefings by the peer review manager and agency personnel. The peer review manager describes and then emphasizes the specific scope of work of the peer review. In some cases, the orientation may be accomplished prior to the on-site visit through conference calls and email. The plan for the rest of the on-site visit will depend on the issues or topics to be reviewed, schedules of individuals, the weather, field conditions, and other variables.

During week-long peer reviews, personnel interviews and field visits normally are concluded by the end of the third day so the peer review team can review its findings and draft its report. Typically the draft report is completed by the evening of the fourth day. Exit interviews with the DCA, agency personnel, and other interested parties are conducted on the fifth day.

The peer review team normally interviews agency personnel such as the project engineer, environmental staff, and archeologists. They may also interview historic preservation officers or staff, other historic preservation specialists, the contracting officer, or contracting officer's technical representative. The peer review team may meet with the contractor or principal investigator and the principal investigator's senior staff, such as field directors, crew chiefs, data control manager, and laboratory director. The peer review team also may meet with the interdisciplinary consultants or members of the professional community, such as geologists, geomorphologists, pedologists, paleobotanists, and paleozoologists. They may also meet with ethnographers and consulting parties such as Indian tribes or their representatives. The peer review team also may interview interested members of the public and Congressional staffers. Interviews may be conducted in person, by telephone, or electronically (such as via email, instant messaging, web camera, or video conference).

The peer review team usually will visit the site or sites currently under investigation and the laboratory facilities of the contractor to get a feel for the day-to-day operation and management of the project.

Figure 3. Discussions at one of the archeological sites between the archeological contractor and peer review team, Central Arizona project, 1986. (Photo courtesy Bureau of Reclamation/ Dan McKeever)

Each on-site visit will vary regarding the parties interviewed because the focus of the peer review will be different in each project. It may be useful to provide the SHPO or THPO and ACHP with a chance to meet with the peer review team due to the regulatory roles of these agencies in historic preservation. Furthermore, the professional staff of the appropriate Historic Preservation Offices are especially knowledgeable about their jurisdiction's archeological resources and can provide important perspectives to the peer review team.

The scope of the peer review and the specific circumstances will determine whether or not the agency archeologist or official attends all of the interviews conducted by the peer review team during the on-site visit. In cases where problems exist among the agency and the contractor, SHPO, THPO, ACHP, or other parties, it may be prudent for the peer review team to meet both with and without the agency personnel. The absence of agency personnel may allow for open and candid discussion that otherwise would be difficult.

The on-site visit is a period of intense work by the peer review team. The peer review manager and agency personnel provide all reasonable support requested to assure that the peer review team's tasks are completed by the scheduled time and make every effort to keep the peer review team on schedule and focused on its task.

7. The Draft Report

The peer review manager and the agency archeologist prepare a proposed outline for the report, making it clear to the peer review team that the topics and proposed outline are only suggestions. The peer review team determines the content of the final report. The purpose of the proposed report outline is to provide the peer review team with guidance. The interviews provide specific and important information and views from a variety of perspectives. The peer review manager always assures the peer review team in each review that the content and recommendations of the final report are entirely the peer review team's responsibility. The peer review team is welcome to change or reorganize the outline and format. Peer Review team members may add or drop topics as they think necessary or appropriate, though departures from the model usually concern format or organization.

The importance of the peer review manager's coordination and careful attention to details in production of the final draft report cannot be overestimated. If the peer review team spends an intensive week interviewing various parties concerned with the project but does not prepare a draft report by the end of that week, it is likely that the completion of the report will be delayed considerably. It is most efficient for the peer review team to complete a draft report by the end of the on-site visit.

Appendices B and C provide examples of suggested report outlines for the Fort Campbell and Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway peer reviews.

8. The Final Report

The production of the final report of the peer review can be a rather simple, but intense task. The peer review manager edits the peer review team's draft report for grammar, style and format, but makes no changes in content. It is best to use the edit-tracking feature of a word processing program so that edits are clear to each peer review team member. The peer review manager sends a revised draft to the authors for revision, with questions as necessary. The authors return marked and revised copies to the peer review manager, who reconciles and enters the revisions. The time it takes to produce the final version depends on the quality of the draft report.

The peer review manager may include separate recommendations in the final report, which is sent to the agency, peer review team members, and other interested parties. While the peer review manager normally endorses most of the recommendations made by the peer review team, occasionally it will be determined that the recommendations do not really improve the project when compared to costs by the agency to implement them. Irrespective of whether the peer review manager supports or rejects the recommendations of the peer review team, a clear explanation should be provided.

Conclusion

Peer reviews for public archeology projects have been and will continue to be important tools for improving both research and preservation activities. They assist agencies in meeting the objectives for which public archeology projects are undertaken.

In addition, peer reviews can help improve public awareness of the value of contributions to knowledge about the nation's cultural past that are central to such projects. When conducted in this comprehensive way, peer reviews have had two important long-term results. First, the agency gains a better perspective on the impacts of sound archeological resources management and therefore can develop effective means to improve its programs. Second, the benefits of public archeology research are clarified for the academic disciplines and therefore can be incorporated appropriately into the most current theoretical and interpretive developments for explaining the archeological record.

DCA Peer Review Reports

Aiken, C. Melvin, Jerald T. Milanich, and Douglas D. Scott
1988 Carson Desert Archaeological Peer Review. Report on file, Archeology Program, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

Anderson, David G. Tristram R. Kidder, and Signa Larralde
2006 Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway Archeological Peer Review. Report on file, Archeology Program, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

Crespi, Muriel, and Hester A. Davis
1989 Libby Dam Historic Preservation: A Peer Review. Report on file, Archeology Program, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

Dean, Jeffrey, Jefferson Chapman, and Douglas W. Schwartz
1981 Report to Bureau of Reclamation on the Dolores Archaeological Project. Report on file, Archeology Program, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

Gradwohl, David M., Timothy A. Kohler, and Gary P. Smith
1994 The Central and Northern Plains Overview: A Peer Review. Report on file, Archeology Program, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

Green, Thomas, Michael Polk, and Lynne Sullivan
2005 Peer Review of Archeological Investigations at Fort Campbell, Kentucky and Tennessee. Report on file, Archeology Program, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

Hannus, Adrien, Terry Del Bene, and Jack Hofman
1990 Peer Review, Alkali Creek Project, Soil Conservation Service, Dunn County, North Dakota. Report on file, Archeology Program, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

Judge, W. James, Bruce D. Smith, George S. Smith, and Jeffrey Zippen
1995 Peer Review - Cultural Resource Program Phoenix Area Office, Bureau of Reclamation. Report on file, Archeology Program, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

Knudson, Ruthann, Frank C. Leonhardy, John S. Sigstad, and Stephen Williams
1987 Peer Review Committee Report for the Jackson Lake Archeological Project. Report on file, Archeology Program, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

Wendorf, Fred D., George J. Gumerman, and Larry Banks
1986 Peer Review Committee Report on the Central Arizona Archeological Project. Report on file, Archeology Program, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

References

Keel, Bennie C.
1993 *The Peer Review of Public Archeology Projects.* Technical Brief 14, Archeology Program, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.
< http://www.cr.nps.gov/archeology/pubs/techBr/tch14A.htm >

APPENDIX A

Memorandum to Departmental Consulting Archeologist from Area Manager, Phoenix Area Office, Bureau of Reclamation, 10 April 1995; Request for Archeological Peer Review of Phoenix Area Office Cultural Resource

United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
Phoenix Area Office
P.O. Box 9980
Phoenix, Arizona 85068-0980

IN REPLY REFER TO:
PXAO-150 ENV-3.00
95003158 7986

APR 10 1995

MEMORANDUM

To: Departmental Consulting Archaeologist, National Park Service, PO Box 37127, Washington, D.C. 20013-7127

From: Dennis E. Schroeder
Area Manager

Subject: Review of the Phoenix Area Office (PXAO) Cultural Resource Program

In 1986 your office conducted a review of this office's (then the Arizona Projects Office) cultural resource program. The main focus of the review was Reclamation-sponsored compliance activities mandated by the National Historic Preservation Act. The final report issued by the review team was complimentary about our program, but it did identify several items where performance and efficiency could be improved. The report also offered alternative approaches for program accomplishment. The review had a positive influence on our conduct of the cultural resource program, and it helped PXAO maintain a preeminent position as an innovative and highly successful Federal archaeology program.

In the 9 years since the last review, our activities have changed dramatically. Major mitigation efforts have been completed for the main Central Arizona Project (CAP) aqueduct system and water distribution network, and the Theodore Roosevelt Dam mitigation program will be completed in 1996. In addition, archaeological mitigation projects that are part of Safety of Dams activities are nearing completion. However, much work remains including mitigation of water delivery projects for the Gila River Indian Community, Tohono O'odham Nation, San Carlos Apache Tribe, development of a repository to house the huge CAP archaeological collection, and management of operating systems.

We feel the time has come to once again conduct a formal review of the PXAO cultural resource program, and to that end I request your assistance. Informal communications between you and Mr. Thomas Lincoln of my staff suggest that you are available to conduct a review within the next several months. Please assemble a review team and charge them to conduct a thorough review of the PXAO cultural resource program. As before, the team should be composed of an archaeologist with regional expertise, an archaeologist with a nonregional specialty, and a Federal cultural resource manager. In addition, I request a fourth member who is a senior Federal manager and not an archaeologist. Addition of a person with a nonarchaeological background will bring a perspective that should compliment the discipline specific members of the team.

Topics and questions that should be considered by the review team include: (1) how much mitigation is enough? (2) has the program been effective in meeting compliance obligations identified in the 1983 Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement? (3) is the PXAO approach to curation appropriate? (4) is the level of Native American involvement appropriate? (5) are there adequate internal checks and balance on the program? (6) is fiscal accountability maintained? (7) public education; (8) data base management; (9) research contribution; (10) future program requirements; and (11) level and involvement of peer review.

PXAO will provide travel and per diem expenses for the team. Travel orders will be issued from this office. Non-Federally employed members will be compensated with an honorarium consulting fee equivalent to a GS-13, step 1, approximately $200 per day. We are budgeting for 10 days ($2,000) each for the two non-Federal reviewers.

I hope that the team can be assembled in the near future, so that their report can accompany our anticipated request to waive the 1 percent funding limitation for the Central Arizona Project. Possible dates to convene the team in Phoenix are the week of June 18th or July 16th, 1995.

I'm looking forward to your involvement with our cultural resource program and a successful review. Please coordinate your efforts with Mr. Thomas Lincoln, Chief, Cultural Resource Branch at 602-870-6761.

Dennis E Schroeder

Program.

APPENDIX B

Scope for the Peer Review Team, Fort Campbell, Kentucky and Tennessee

SCOPE FOR THE PEER REVIEW TEAM
FORT CAMPBELL, KENTUCKY AND TENNESSEE

DEPARTMENTAL CONSULTING ARCHEOLOGIST
ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM, NPS
DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR
August 28, 2003

Purpose

The objective of this review is to assess, at the request of Fort Campbell, the overall quality and effectiveness of archaeological surveys performed at Fort Campbell as technical assistance delivered through the National Park Service Southeastern Archaeological Center (SEAC). In order to make this assessment, the review is expected to consider the purposes that the archaeological surveys were intended to serve, and any other aspects of the projects and the circumstances in which they were performed that are found to have a bearing on the strengths and weaknesses of these projects as they were conceived, organized, and actually implemented. Several aspects of these projects are disputed between Fort Campbell and SEAC.

Other contemporaneous contracts for archaeological services at Fort Campbell, including others administered through SEAC and some administered through other agencies, have not produced similar disputes. The review team should consider comparing the other contracts and their results in order to make comments or recommendations of more general interest regarding the strengths and weaknesses that may be inherent in the general method of IDIQ contracting in addition to comments or recommendations specifically applicable to the contract and projects from which the disputes have arisen.

In order to make this assessment, the review is expected to examine the intended purposes of the contracted projects, the implementation, monitoring, final products, and any other aspects of contract performance and oversight that are found to have a bearing on the quality and adequacy of the resulting studies. The team must independently assess whether or not contracted projects met the goals established by the contracts and how the investigations conducted through contracts contributed to the overall cultural resource management program of the fort.

The scope of the review extends to assessment of the general appropriateness and design of the agreements and contracts used by SEAC at Fort Campbell, the effectiveness of the contracting vehicles and organization, and how future contracts and technical assistance relationships can be structured to be most effective and less likely to produce further disputes.

Duties of the Peer Review Team

The Peer Review Team shall review documents and other materials relevant to the administration, method, strategy, techniques and results of projects carried out through the Fort Campbell-SEAC contract and others at Fort Campbell as needed for comparison. The peer review team also may request other documents that it deems pertinent to its review. Review will include:

- Memorandum of Understanding between Fort Campbell and SEAC;
- Contracts;
- Statements of work for specific projects;
- Delivery orders and correspondence related to delivery orders;
- Other relevant correspondence;
- Draft and final archeological survey reports;
- Curation materials including maps, field forms, photographs and associated records;
- Field locations as necessary.

The Peer Review Team shall also meet and interview individuals from Fort Campbell, SEAC, related NPS offices such as the contracting office, Panamerican Consultants Incorporated (PCI, the consulting firm that conducted the investigations under the SEAC arrangement), and other agencies or individuals who are relevant and necessary in the opinion of the review team. If meeting in person is not feasible, interviews may be conducted by telephone conference calls or by e-mail at the discretion of the review team.

The Peer Review Team shall compile and present a written report that describes in detail the observations and recommendations of the team (see suggested outline below).

Suggested Topics

Fort Campbell Management of Archeological Resources As Related to These Projects

- What is the structure and organization of Fort Campbell's cultural resources management program?
- Have some aspects of the organization and structure of the program particularly affected any of the strengths or weaknesses identified in the projects under review?
- Did the structure and organization of the CRM program help, detract from, or not affect the outcomes of these projects?
- What communications within and from Fort Campbell were necessary for proper description and conduct of these projects, and were these communications effective?

Contract Organization and Structure

- Do the contracts adequately or clearly address specific Section 106 and Section 110 compliance and coordination efforts?
- How are scopes of work written for individual projects undertaken within the contracts?
- Would other forms of contracts have provided better organization and oversight of the technical assistance delivered to Fort Campbell?
- Were the proposed methods for fieldwork, laboratory analysis, curation and reporting adequate and effective?

Contract Oversight and Administration

- Are there adequate internal checks and balances?
- Is fiscal accountability maintained?
- How is communication handled among the participants: Fort Campbell, SEAC and related NPS offices such as the contracting office, PCI, and the COE?
- How were proposed contract modifications handled?
- Were the statements of concern from Fort Campbell plausible and reasonable, and did SEAC response adequately and effectively address the concerns based on the information available to SEAC?

Assessment Topics

- Is data management being handled effectively and efficiently?
- Are appropriate and sufficient reports and maps being produced adequately?

- Is the approach to consultation with affected parties, including Indian tribes, appropriate and sufficient?
- Is the approach to public education and outreach appropriate and sufficient?
- Are the contributions of the program to the advancement of local, regional, and national archeological research and interpretation appropriate and sufficient?
- What future program requirements should be considered?
- Has peer review been utilized appropriately in the program?
- What procedures were used to verify that results as reported were actually accomplished?

Suggested Report Outline

- **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**
- **INTRODUCTION**
- **INTERVIEWS AND ACTIVITIES DURING THE PEER REVIEW**
- **EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE**

Fort Campbell Cultural Management of Archeological Resources

Structure and organization

Discussion

Recommendations

Communication and internal support

Discussion

Recommendations

Contract Organization and Structure

Section 106 and Section 110 compliance and coordination

Discussion

Recommendations

Scopes of Work

Discussion

Recommendations

Contract Oversight and Administration

Internal checks and balances

Discussion

Recommendations

Fiscal accountability

Discussion

Recommendations

Communication

Discussion

Recommendations

Response to concerns

Discussion

Recommendations

Assessment

Fieldwork

Discussion

Recommendations

Laboratory analysis

Discussion

Recommendations

Curation

Discussion

Recommendations

Data management

Discussion

Recommendations

Reports and maps

Discussion

Recommendations

Project Monitoring

Discussion

Recommendations

Contributions of the program to archeological research and interpretation

Discussion

Recommendations

- **OTHER ISSUES**

Consultation with affected parties and Indian tribes

Discussion

Recommendations

Public education and outreach

APPENDIX C

Scope of Work for the Peer Review Team, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Memphis District, Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway Project

SCOPE OF WORK FOR THE PEER REVIEW TEAM U.S. ARMY CORP OF ENGINEERS, MEMPHIS DISTRICT

DEPARTMENTAL CONSULTING ARCHEOLOGIST ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM, NPS DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR July 11, 2005

Purpose.

At the request of the Memphis District Corp of Engineers (Memphis District), the Departmental Consulting Archeologist (DCA), National Park Service (NPS) will conduct a peer review of the archeological work in the Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway in southeast Missouri. The peer review will consider the cultural resources work that the Memphis District conducted in the upper portions (O'Bryan's and Rush Ridges) and Barns and Sugar Tree Ridges of the New Madrid Floodway between 1989 and 2004. In order to comply with various Federal laws and regulations , the Corp of Engineers had to identify archeological resources (historic properties) within the project impact area; determine whether they were significant (eligible for the National Register of Historic Places); and if so, develop, in consultation with the Missouri State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and other consulting parties, a plan to avoid or mitigate adverse impacts.

The peer review will assess the choice of archeological resource identification, evaluation, and data recovery methods and techniques, the effectiveness of their application in the project area, and whether they were appropriate for compliance with required archeological and historic preservation procedures.

The Memphis District has been conducting archeological work (surveying, testing, and mitigation) in the Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway since 1989. During this period, the Memphis District identified and tested approximately 250 sites. The Memphis District, SHPO, and Advisory Council signed a Programmatic Agreement in November 1995/May 1996 regarding the project. The SHPO and Memphis District determined that it should mitigate adverse impacts to 25 sites. Currently, four sites remain to have adverse impacts mitigated.

In 2003, the Quapaw Tribe of Oklahoma contacted the Memphis District with concerns about the professional quality of the archeological work. Subsequently, the Memphis District asked the DCA to conduct a peer review of the Memphis District's archeological work to date in the New

Madrid Floodway. The peer review report may also serve as a planning tool by providing guidance for future archeological survey, testing, and mitigation in the floodway.

Duties of the Peer Review Team.

The peer review team will review existing reports, records, and other materials relevant to the administration, method, strategy, techniques and results of archeological projects carried out under the Programmatic Agreement among the U.S. Army Corps Of Engineers, Memphis District; the Advisory Council On Historic Preservation; and the Missouri State Historic Preservation Office regarding implementation of the Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway Project. The peer review team also may request other documents that it deems pertinent to its review. The review will include -

- The Programmatic Agreement, and the Memoranda of Agreement (MOAs), Scopes of Work (SOWs), contracts, research designs, and statements of work for specific projects;
- Relevant correspondence;
- Final archeological reports, or draft reports when no final has been completed;
- Curation materials including maps, field forms, photographs and associated records;
- Visits to field locations, as necessary.

The peer review team also will meet and interview the Corps district archeologist in charge of the project, project managers, and archeologists who designed and carried out the investigation; representatives of the contracting firms that contracted the archeological work, SHPO, Quapaw Tribe of Oklahoma, and Advisory Council; and other agencies or individuals who are relevant and necessary in the opinion of the review team, including other tribes, landowners, and the general public. If meeting in person is not feasible, the peer review team may conduct interviews by telephone conference calls or by e-mail.

The peer review team will compile and present a written report that describes in detail the observations and recommendations of the team (see suggested outline below). The DCA will provide a hard copy and an electronic copy of the final report to the Commander, Memphis District.

The peer review manager will be the point of contact between the peer review team and any person having comments related to the peer review. Discussions between peer review team members and anyone associated with the peer review or the New Madrid Floodway project will be limited to information gathering contexts and interviews (no independent phone calls, letters, etc.).

Duties of the Memphis District Corp of Engineers.

The district archeologist for the project will serve as the Memphis District representative for the peer review. The district archeologist will develop the scope of work in consultation with the DCA and peer review manager and assist in identifying potential members of the peer review team. The district archeologist will coordinate with other officials of the Memphis District and others as necessary, including the Quapaw Tribe, Missouri SHPO, Advisory Council, and archeological contractors. The district archeologist will provide the peer review manager with materials for the peer review team, including maps showing the area of the peer review and all relevant documents produced to date.

The Memphis District will make the travel and logistical arrangements for the on-site visit.

Peer Review Schedule.

Task	***Schedule***
Define the peer review's scope and schedule.	complete
Plan the peer review team's composition and choose its members.	June - July 2005
Compile documentation and send it to the peer review team.	July 2005
Schedule the on-site visit.	July - August 2005
Make on-site visit arrangements, including - ▪ travel and lodging, ▪ identify peer review topics, ▪ appointments for interviews, ▪ agenda and itinerary, ▪ arrange for office and meeting space, ▪ arrange for office and field support for the peer review team, ▪ identify and arrange for necessary equipment, and ▪ arrange to visit field locations, as necessary.	July - September 2005
Conduct the on-site visit.	October - November 2005
Prepare the draft report.	October - November 2005
Assemble the peer review team member's revisions to the draft report.	October - November 2005
Revise the manuscript.	November 2005

Obtain the peer review team's approval of final report.	November 2005
Produce the final report.	November 2005
Compile recommendations for the agency.	November 2005
Complete remaining administrative tasks.	November - December 2005
Provide final report to agency officials.	December 2005

Suggested Topics.

The review team will address the following questions -

1. Were the archeological methods used for identification and evaluation of sites appropriate?

2. Were the archeological methods for mitigation of adverse impacts appropriate?

3. Considering the operational plan for the floodway and landowner restrictions, what other forms of mitigation, besides data recovery have been feasible?

4. Given the operational plan for the floodway were the sites chosen for mitigation chosen properly?

5. Were the data and materials recovered consistent with the needs of the research designs?

6. Was the approach to treatment of archeological human remains adequately planned for and addressed in the Programmatic Agreement, Memoranda of Agreement, and Scopes of Work?

7. Did artifact analysis and preparation of the archeological materials and data conform to the plans for ultimate, long-term curation?

8. Are the technical reports and any public outreach products or programs adequate and appropriate?

9. Taking into account the SOWs, research designs, and MOAs, was the proper archeological work conducted for each site? What could have been done differently?

10. Based on the peer review, what are the peer review team's recommendations for how the SOWs, research designs, MOAs, or Programmatic Agreement might be modified before work begins on the remaining sites? What factors does the peer review team recommend that the Memphis District consider for future cultural resources work in the floodway?

11. Were appropriate consulting parties brought into the process once their concerns were made known?

Suggested Report Outline

- Executive Summary

  Introduction

  Interviews aAnd Activities During The Peer Review

  Evaluation of Performance - Memphis District Cultural Management Of Archeological Resources in The Bird Point-New Madrid Floodway

  Identification

  Discussion

  Recommendations

  Evaluation

  Discussion

  Recommendations

  Data Recovery

  Discussion

  Recommendations

- Considerations Future Cultural Resources Work in the Floodway
- Other Issues
- References

Appendix 1: Memorandum Requesting Peer Review
Appendix 2: Scope of Work for the Peer Review
Appendix 3: Brief Biographies of the Peer Review Team

APPENDIX D

Documents Available for the Peer Review Team, Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway Archeological Investigations

Documents available for the peer review team's review prior to the on-site visit.

I. Relevant correspondence

1. 2/24/2004 Letter from Jack V. Schere, Colonel, COE District Engineer, DOD, to Dr. Janet S. Matthews, Associate Director for Cultural Resources, NPS

2. 6/22/2004 Letter from Dr. Janet Snyder Matthews to Col. Jack v. Schere

3. 7/11/2005 Electronic Memorandum from FP McManamon, Departmental Consulting Archeologist, Department of the Interior to Colonel Charles O. Smithers III, Colonel, Memphis District Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army

II. Background materials, Programmatic Agreement, and miscellaneous draft documents

1. Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway: A Short Background

2. “Programmatic Agreement Among the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Memphis District, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the Missouri State Historic Preservation Office Regarding Implementation of the Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway Project”(signed November 1995 and May 1996).

3. “Draft Amendment to Programmatic Agreement Among the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Memphis District, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the Missouri State Historic Preservation Office, and the _____ Tribe Regarding Implementation of the Mitigation of Archeological Sites 23NM176/272, 23NM566, 23MI630, and 23MI714, Within the Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway Project.”

4. “Appendix F - Scopes of work and mitigation proposals for remaining sites.” COE, Memphis District, no date

5. “Data Recovery at 23MI714 New Madrid Floodway, Missouri.” COE, Memphis District, no date

6. “Sites 23MI272/167 and 23NM566.” COE, Memphis District, no date

III. Final archeological reports

1. Probability of Archaeological Site Occurrence in the Northern Portion of the Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway: An Analysis of the Distribution of Cultural Resources and Environmental Features, by Niemczycki, Mary Ann Palmer; principal investigator Duncan C. Wilkie / Cultural Resources Consultants. 1987

2. Archeological Investigations in the New Madrid Floodway, Volume I, by Lafferty, Robert H. III, and Kathleen M. Hess, eds. / Mid-Continental Research Associates, Inc. 1996

3. Archeological Investigations in the New Madrid Floodway, Volume II, by Mid-Continental Research Associates, Inc. 1996

4. Archeological Investigations in the New Madrid Floodway, Volume III, by Mid-Continental Research Associates, Inc. 1996

5. Data Recovery (Mitigation) of Sites 23MI578, 23MI605, 23MI651, 23MI652, and 23MI797, Final Report, by Chapman, Shawn, Emanuel Breitberg, and Neal Lopinot / Panamerican Consultants, Inc. 1999

6. Investigations in the New Madrid Floodway: Data Recovery at 23MI706, the Alfred Rush Site and 23MI709, the Hillhouse II Site, Mississippi County, Missouri, by Brown, Sharon, L. Janice Campbell, and Prentice M. Thomas, eds. / Prentice Thomas and Associates, Inc. 2000

7. Historic Archaeology in the New Madrid Floodway: Data Recovery Excavations at the Moxley Farm Site (23MI722), Mississippi County, Missouri, Final Report, by Buchner, C. Andrew, and Emanuel Breitburg / Panamerican Consultants, Inc. 2000

8. Data Recovery at the Hillhouse Site, by Lafferty, Robert H. III, Michael C. Sierzchula, Gina Powell, Neal Lopinot, Carol Spears, Barbara Carter, and Lawrence g. Santeford / Mid-Continental Research Associates, Inc. 2002

9. The St. John's Bayou-Bird's Point-new Madrid Floodway - A Historical Account of the United States Army Corp of Engineer's Efforts in Mississippi River Flood Control in Southeastern Missouri by Banks, Larry D. and Givens, Douglas R./ Documents Archaeology, Incorporated. 2003

10. Data Recovery Excavations at the Clifford LaPlant Site (23NM561) on Barnes Ridge, New Madrid County, Missouri, by Buchner, C. Andrew, Eric S. Alberson, Emmanuel Breitburg, Gina S. Powell, and Neal H. Lopinot/ PanAmerican Consultants, Inc. 2003

11. Investigations in the New Madrid Floodway: Data Recovery at 23MI20, The Burkett Site, Mississippi County, Missouri, Volume I: Final Report, by Thomas Jr., Prentice M. and L. Janice Campbell/ Prentice Thomas and Associates, Inc. 2005

IV. Maps

1. Wyatt and Wickliffe SW Quadrangle topographic maps, showing sites on Rush Ridge and O'Bryan Ridge.

2. Henderson Mound Quadrangle topographic map, showing sites on Barnes Ridge and Sugar Tree Ridge.

3. Henderson Mound Quadrangle topographic map, at larger magnification, showing sites on Barnes Ridge

4. Sketch of BPNM Floodway, “Current Plan of Operation”

5. Photocopies of 3 portions of the La Grange Quadrangle topographic maps (included separately and also listed above)

V. CDs

1. New Madrid #1 - Archeological Investigations of the New Madrid Floodway Volumes I - III

2. New Madrid #2 - Probability of ... and Historic Archaeology ...(pdf files)

3. New Madrid #3 - Data Recovery at 23 MI578 ...

4. New Madrid #4 - Investigations ... at 23MI20, the Burkett site (pdf files)

5. New Madrid #5 - 706-709 FINAL.pdf and Burkett draft.pdf

Documents and information made available during or after the peer review team's on-site visit.

I. Correspondence, background materials and miscellaneous draft documents

1. Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway Plan of Operation. PowerPoint presentation presented to the New Madrid Peer Review Team March 20, 2006. Corps of Engineers, Readiness Branch, Memphis District. (See Appendix 7)

2. Investigations in the New Madrid Floodway: Data Recovery at 23MI25, the Weems Site, Mississippi County, Missouri. Volume I: Draft Report. Prentice M. Thomas, Jr., and L. Janice Campbell, eds. Prentice Thomas and Associates, Inc. 2006.

3. Files pertaining to the New Madrid-Birds Point Floodway Archeological Program

4. Additional information regarding the impact mitigation work at 23MI25, the Weems Site, including -

- "Data recovery at 23MI25, New Madrid Floodway, Missouri, Scope of Work"
- "Mitigation Proposal for Site 23MI25 (Weems Site), New Madrid Floodway, Mississippi County, Missouri"
- 8/5/1998 Letter from Jimmy McNeil, District Archeologist, to Claire Blackwell, Director and Depute State Historic Preservation Officer, Missouri
- 12/15/1999 (approx.) E-mail from Jimmy McNeil to Judith Deel
- 2/15/2000 (approx.) E-mail from Jimmy McNeil to Judith Deel

APPENDIX E

AGENDA AND SCHEDULE FOR PEER REVIEW TEAM FIELD VISIT, CULTURAL RESOURCE PROGRAM REVIEW, PHOENIX AREA OFFICE, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Peer Review
Cultural Resource Program
Phoenix Area Office
Bureau of Reclamation

Peer Review Team Agenda, 17-22 July 1995

Monday, 17 July

8:00-8:10 Welcome—Dennis Schroeder, Area Manager

8:10-8:20 Introductions—All

8:20-8:45 Scope of Work for the Peer Review—Frank McManamon, DCA

8:45-9:00 Brief overview of CAP and PXAO Cultural Resource Program—Lincoln

9:00-9:20 Break

9:20-11:30 Topical Discussion of the Aspects of the Program being Considered by the Peer Review—PXAO staff. Goal is to provide Review Team with as much background information as possible, building upon and referring to the written material already provided to the team members, and to enable the team members to request additional information that had not been provided.

11:30-1:00Lunch

1:00-2:30 Interviews w/ PXAO management—Dennis Schroeder (Area Manager), John Newman (Assistant Area Manager, Resources Management), Larry Morton (Assistant Area Manager, Management Services and Human Resources), Jerri Tharp (Finance Officer), etc. Topics here will include:

- the expectations of management for the CRM program and how it fits into overall area office goals, objectives, and functions;
- management perspective on fiscal and internal controls on program;

- future needs seen by management for cultural resources currently being managed, including archeological collections and records, as well as CRM activities anticipated.

2:30-2:45 Break

Interviews with partners, colleagues, contractors, and constituents. Reclamation staff will participate in some of these discussions, but at least part of the time interviews will be with only the Peer Review team and the partners, etc.

2:45-3:45 State Historic Preservation Officer and staff—Jim Garrison, Bob Gasser, Ann Howard Discuss PXAO Section 106 and Section 110 compliance and coordination efforts.

3:45-4:15 Tonto National Forest—Scott Wood, Forest Archaeologist. PXAO's largest Federal partner in developing and executing the Theodore Roosevelt Dam and Verde River Safety of Dams mitigation projects. Topics should include research, coordination, and public education.

4:15-4:30 Break

4:30-5:30 Teff Rodeffer—Chief, Collections Management, National Park Service, Western Archaeological and Conservation Center. The PXAO current curation program should be the focus of this interview, future curation needs also might be discussed.

5:30-6:30 Peer Review Team meeting to take stock of the day's events, plan for development of recommendations and report preparation.

Tuesday, 18 July

8:30-9:30 Research, Funding, and Internal Program—PXAO CRM staff. Topics will include: PXAO mitigation approach with case studies from Roosevelt Projects, Verde River, and Lake Pleasant. May wish to spend some time discussing data management.

9:30-9:45 Break

9:45-10:15 Jeff Dean, Tree Ring Laboratory, University of Arizona—Jeff serves as ongoing peer reviewer for the program. He will join the Review Team at the Pointe, Monday evening and will be available through Wednesday.

10:15-11:00 Bill Doelle—Desert Archaeology (Roosevelt Community Development Contract

11:00-11:45 Jeff Altschul—Statistical Research, Inc. (Roosevelt Rural Sites Study and Verde River SOD Study)

11:45-1:15 Lunch

1:15-2:15 Glen Rice & Chuck Redman—ASU (Roosevelt Platform Mound Study)

2:15-3:00 Open discussion with CRM staff. This might be a good time to discuss Reclamation's “new” mission and where the CRM program fits in it. Discuss PXAO relationship with the Salt River Project, Reclamation's potential sale of the Salt River Project and implications for CRM, PXAO Section 110 program.

3:00-3:15 Break

3:15-4:00 Continuation of Curation discussion—CRM staff

4:00-5:30 Open time. Might be used to continue discussion with PXAO CRM staff or for Peer Review team to meet alone, with others, to review additional documents, or to begin working on report.

Wednesday, 19 July

7:00 Leave for Tonto Basin. Tour excavation of Salado sites, Visit Platform Mound, Tour Roosevelt Dam Construction Site, Tour Tonto National Forest Visitor Center (Time Permitting). After return to the hotel, brief meeting of the Peer Review team to discuss and consider day's events and any implications for work during following days. Discussion of actions needed for recommendations, report, and Friday's presentation.

Thursday, 20 July

7:00 Leave for Gila River Indian Community. Tour Hohokam and Pima Sites, Inspect GRIC Cultural Program facilities, interview John Ravesloot and staff, meet with tribal government representatives; plan for interviews includes meeting with Cecil Antone, one topic that can be pursued during this meeting is the consultation with and involvement of Native Americans in the cultural resource program.

3:00 (approx.) Visit Arizona Historical Society. Meet with Director, Central Arizona Division Paul Piazza and staff Nancy Dallett and James Hadden. Tour facility, review exhibits, and Discussion of Public Education Program.

Following return to hotel, Peer Review team meeting to discuss day's events and actions needed for recommendations, report, and Friday presentation.

Friday, 21 July

8:30-9:30 Wrap up interviews discussion w/ CRM Staff

9:30-9:45 Break

9:45-10:45 Peer Review Team discussions and final preparations for presentation to PXAO management

10:45-11:30 Exit interview with PXAO Management

11:30-1:00 Lunch

1:00-5:00 Review Team complete draft of report—CRM staff available for additional questions and input

Saturday, 22 July

Departures as scheduled