

**HISTORIC PROPERTIES MANAGEMENT PLAN
ROANOKE RAPIDS & GASTON HYDROPOWER PROJECT
FERC PROJECT NUMBER 2009**

prepared for

**DOMINION VIRGINIA POWER/
DOMINION NORTH CAROLINA POWER**

SEPTEMBER 2005



**Tetra Tech EC, Inc.
1000 The American Road
Morris Plains, New Jersey 07950**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
1.0 OVERVIEW AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
2.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION	2
2.1 Project Description.....	2
2.2 Historic Context	3
2.3 Previous Cultural Resources Surveys	6
2.3.1 Lake Gaston	7
2.3.2 Roanoke Rapids Lake	7
2.3.3 Lower Roanoke River	7
2.4 Known and Potential Historic Properties.....	8
2.4.1 Site Relocation and Evaluation of Conditions	8
2.4.2 Project Related Effects on Actively Eroding Shoreline Areas and Other High Probability Areas Selected for Testing	9
2.4.3 Archaeological Potential of Islands	10
2.4.4 Sites Recorded Within Drawdown Zone	10
2.4.5 Lower Roanoke River	11
3.0 PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND PRESERVATION GOALS AND PRIORITIES	11
3.1 Protect Known Historic Properties	12
3.2 Provide HPMP Implementation Worker Education Program.....	15
3.3 Offer Opportunities for Public Interpretation	15
3.4 Review Effectiveness of the HPMP.....	16
3.5 Consult with VA and NC SHPOs, Roanoke Canal Commission, the City of Roanoke Rapids, the Tuscarora Indian Nation and the Commission	16
4.0 PROJECT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION/MANAGEMENT MEASURES	17
4.1 Activities Exempt from Further Review Under HPMP	17
4.2 Procedures to Evaluate Effects of Proposed Actions.....	17
4.2.1 Phase IA Investigation - Review Proposed Action and Dominion Cultural Resources Files	17
4.2.2 Phase IB Cultural Resources Field Investigation.....	18
4.2.3 Phase II Cultural Resources Field Investigation.....	19
4.2.4 Phase III Data Recovery or Alternative Mitigation	20
4.3 Enforcement Provisions	20
4.4 Treatment of Unanticipated Discoveries of Cultural Resources and Human Remains	21
4.5 Public Interpretation.....	21
5.0 IMPLEMENTATION OF HPMP.....	22
5.1 Activities Stipulated in the HPMP	22
5.1.1 Monitor Erosion at Archeological Sites 31Hx7, 31Hx8, 44Mc108, 44Mc111, 44Mc113, 44Mc659 and 44Mc660	22

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE	
5.1.2	Field Investigations to Identify and Protect Cultral Resources Potentially Affected through the Construction of Recreation Facilities Identified in Article RC1 of the Settlement Agreement.....	22
5.1.3	Implement Measures to Protect Cultural Resources such as the Roanoke Navigation Canal, the Roanoke Power Canal, and Canal-Related Structures that may Potentially be Affected by the Proposed Roanoke Canal Trail	23
5.1.4	Design Brochure on Prehistory and History of the Project Area.....	23
5.1.5	Design Signage for Public Display	24
5.1.6	Develop and Present Worker Education Program for Dominion Personnel Responsible for Managing Cultural Resources.....	24
5.2	Dispute Resolution.....	24
6.0	REFERENCES CITED.....	24

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
APPENDIX B	MAPS SHOWING PREVIOUSLY RECORDED SITES (FROM NSA 1998, REPORTS 1 AND 2)
APPENDIX C	MAPS SHOWING AREAS UNDERGOING ACTIVE EROSION (OBSERVATIONS MADE IN 1997) (FROM NSA 1998, REPORTS 1 AND 2)
APPENDIX D	MAPS SHOWING RELOCATED AND NEWLY DISCOVERED SITES IN THE PROJECT AREA (FROM NSA 1998, REPORTS 1 AND 2)
APPENDIX E	MAPS SHOWING AREAS COVERED BY TASK 4 SURVEY SHOWING NEW SITES RECORDED (FROM NSA 1998, REPORTS 5 AND 6)
APPENDIX F	PLAN AND PROCEDURES ADDRESSING UNANTICIPATED DISCOVERIES OF CULTURAL RESOURCES AND HUMAN REMAINS
APPENDIX G	PROJECT CORRESPONDENCE WITH VA AND NC SHPOS AND ROANOKE CANAL COMMISSION

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 – Project Location

Figure 2a – Special Management Areas that Contain Sites Determined Eligible or Potentially Eligible to the NRHP

Figure 2b – Special Management Areas that Contain Sites Determined Eligible or Potentially Eligible to the NRHP

Figure 2c – Special Management Areas that Contain Sites Determined Eligible or Potentially Eligible to the NRHP

Figure 2d – Special Management Areas that Contain Sites Determined Eligible or Potentially Eligible to the NRHP

DOMINION ROANOKE RAPIDS & GASTON HYDROPOWER PROJECT HISTORIC PROPERTIES MANAGEMENT PLAN

1.0 OVERVIEW AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On July 15, 2003, following several years of negotiations, Virginia Electric & Power Company (operating as Dominion Virginia Power/North Carolina Power) (Dominion) filed a comprehensive Settlement Agreement (Agreement) signed by Dominion and 13 other parties in a collaborative proceeding. On March 31, 2004, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) approved the Agreement and issued a new license for the Roanoke Rapids and Gaston Hydroelectric Project (Project). On March 4, 2005, the Commission issued a license order approving a revised settlement agreement and amending Dominion's license. The original project license was issued on January 24, 1951, with a term expiring on January 1, 2001. Since 2001, Dominion operated the project under annual licenses up until the issuance of the current license. Dominion's goal for project operation is to meet Dominion's electrical generating load requirements while maintaining FERC license compliance.

The Commission, The Commonwealth of Virginia State Historic Preservation Officer (VA SHPO), and The State of North Carolina State Historic Preservation Officer (NC SHPO) entered into a Programmatic Agreement (PA) on July 30, 2003. In the Commission's March 31, 2004 License Order for the Roanoke Rapids and Gaston Development, the Commission amended the PA to include the Tuscarora Indian Nation at stipulations I.A, I.B.; the lead sentences of II, III, and IV; III.A. and afforded Tuscarora Indian Nation the opportunity to participate in accordance with those stipulations. The PA requires that the Commission's Licensee develop and implement an Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP) for managing historic properties that may be affected by the Commission license issued to Dominion, for the continued operation of the Project in Brunswick and Mecklenburg Counties, Virginia and Halifax, Northampton, and Warren Counties, North Carolina. A copy of the PA is included within Appendix A. The requirement to develop an HPMP is also noted at paragraph 126 of the Commission's Order Approving Settlement Agreement and Issuing New License (March 31, 2004) and in Article 425 of the license. In December 2004, Dominion contracted with Tetra Tech FW, Inc. (TtFW) to develop an HPMP for this project. This HPMP was developed by Sydne B. Marshall, Ph.D., TtFW's Supervising Archeologist.

This HPMP has been developed by Dominion as part of FERC's compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, 1966, as amended, and its implementing regulations issued by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (36 CFR Part 800.) Dominion developed this HPMP following the FERC's *Guidelines for the Development of Historic Properties Management Plans for FERC Hydroelectric Projects* (May 20, 2002). The Project's *Plan and Procedures for Addressing Unanticipated Discoveries of Cultural Resources and Human Remains* (Appendix F) has been developed taking into account the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's *Policy Statement Regarding Treatment of Human Remains and Grave Goods* (September 27, 1988, Gallup, NM.), North Carolina's *Unmarked Human Burial and Human Skeletal Remains Protection Act* (NCGS Chapter 70 Article 3), and Virginia's laws regarding the violation of sepulture (CVA Chapter 18.2-126), abandoned graveyards (CVA

Chapter 57-36), and required permit for archeological excavation of human remains (CVA 10.1-2305).

This HPMP provides project background information, outlines project management and preservation goals and priorities, presents project effects and mitigation/management measures, and provides a schedule for implementing the activities stipulated. The HPMP should be considered a dynamic document. The HPMP will be used by Dominion staff to ensure that the HPMP goals will be achieved. The HPMP gives explicit guidance (steps) to Dominion staff on how to accomplish the goals. Dominion's Supervisor-Reservoir is responsible for implementing the HPMP.

2.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2.1 Project Description

The Project is located immediately downstream from the Corps' John H. Kerr dam and reservoir (Figure 1). The Gaston development consists of: (1) a concrete and earthen dam, which is located about 34 miles downstream from the Kerr dam at river mile (RM) 145.5, measuring 3600 feet in length, with a maximum height of about 105 feet; (2) a concrete ogee-type spillway, measuring 550 feet in length, with 11 steel radial gates measuring 40 feet wide by 38 feet high; (3) a 34-mile-long impoundment (Lake Gaston), with a total storage volume of 450,000 acre-feet (AF), 20,000 AF of which is usable storage, and a surface area of 20,300 acres at a normal water surface elevation of 200.0 feet mean sea level (msl); (4) intakes integral with the concrete and masonry powerhouse; (5) three vertical shaft, fixed blade turbines and one vertical shaft Kaplan turbine, having a total installed capacity of 225 MW and a maximum hydraulic capacity of 44,000 cubic feet per second (cfs); (6) four 14.4-kilovolt (kV) generators connected to two 230-kV transformers; and (7) appurtenant facilities.

The Gaston development was built between 1960 and 1962, with commercial operation beginning in February 1963. The development produces an average of 336,362 megawatt-hours (MWh) annually. The Gaston development occupies about 252 acres of federal land administered by the Corps.

The Roanoke Rapids development consists of: (1) a concrete gravity dam, which is located 42 miles downstream from the Kerr dam and 7.5 miles downstream from the Gaston development at RM 138, measuring 3,050 feet long (includes powerhouse) and a maximum of 72 feet high; (2) a concrete ogee-type spillway, measuring 1,133 feet in length and having 24 spillway bays; (3) an 8-mile long impoundment (Roanoke Rapids Lake), with a total storage volume of 77,140 AF (20,640 AF useable storage) and a surface of 4,600 acres at a normal water surface elevation of 132.0 feet msl; (4) intakes integral with the concrete and masonry powerhouse; (5) four Kaplan turbines (three fixed-blade propeller and one variable-pitch blade), having a total installed capacity of 104 MW and a maximum hydraulic capacity of 20,000 cfs; (6) a 7,800-foot-long by 80-foot-wide tailrace channel; (7) four 14.4-kV generators connected to two 110-kV transformers; and (8) appurtenant facilities.

The Roanoke Rapids development was built between 1953 and 1955, with commercial operation beginning in September 1955. The development produces an average of 336,408 MWh annually. The Roanoke Rapids development does not occupy any federal lands.

Dominion operates the project to meet peak load requirements of its electrical system within the framework of the Pennsylvania - New Jersey - Maryland Regional Transmission Operator (PJM RTO). The Roanoke Rapids and Gaston Dams are operated in close coordination with the US Army Corps of Engineers Kerr Dam and Reservoir just upstream of the Gaston Reservoir. Gaston normally operates with approximately one foot elevation change between 199 and 200 feet. Roanoke Rapids Reservoir normally fluctuates between 127 and 132 feet. Roanoke Rapids also provides continuous flow to the lower Roanoke River for maintenance of downstream water quality, as well as fish and wildlife habitat. From March 1 through June 15 the flow from Roanoke Rapids is steady (no load following) to support anadromous fish spawning. For the remainder of the year it generally operates in a peaking or load following mode. In the load following mode, discharges vary between the minimum flow (varies between 1500 cfs and 3500 cfs) and 20,000 cfs on a daily basis.

2.2 Historic Context

Cultural resources are known to exist within the Lake Gaston and Roanoke Rapids Lake project area (Appendix B). Human occupations have been documented archeologically to date from as early as 9500 BC, the Paleoindian period, through the Archaic, Woodland and protohistoric periods, up to the early eighteenth century. Euroamericans entered the area in 1715 and soon established plantations above the floodplain of the Roanoke River.

The earliest occupations documented in the project area (i.e. Halifax, Northampton, Warren Counties, North Carolina and Brunswick and Mecklenburg Counties, Virginia) are represented by a small number of isolated Paleoindian Clovis artifacts found in surface contexts. No radiocarbon dates or stratified sites are associated with this time period. In the Piedmont of North Carolina and Virginia, the transitional late Paleoindian/Early Archaic are represented by Hardaway-Dalton points, eared projectile points with vestigial fluting. Sites associated with Clovis and Hardaway-Dalton points are relatively few and far between.

By contrast, the North Carolina Piedmont contains evidence of a high density of Archaic sites. The Archaic Period is subdivided into Early, Middle, and Late subperiods. Early Archaic sites (8000 - 6000 B.C.) are distinguished by the presence of corner-notched, side notched and bifurcate based projectile points. Sites of this subperiod demonstrate a preference for highly siliceous microcrystalline lithic sources. Subsistence focused on the exploitation of Holocene plant and animal resources, especially white-tailed deer, hickory nuts, and acorns. Settlement patterns included use of both floodplains and inter-riverine uplands in a seasonal round based on the availability of resources and presumably on a social system that included base camps during fall and winter months and foraging camps over the balance of the year.

Middle Archaic sites (6000 - 3000 B.C.) are characterized by a distinctive series of projectile point types. Particularly concentrated in the Roanoke River basin is the Halifax projectile point type. At this time, a greater diversity of tools were used suggesting that a broader spectrum of

hunting and gathering and, consequently, a more varied diet was typical. In addition, a variety of local stone sources were used for manufacturing tools.

Late Archaic sites (3000 - 1000 B.C.) are again distinguished by characteristic tool types (e.g. Savannah River biface and Gypsy stemmed projectile). Hunting and gathering continued as a subsistence base until limited horticulture began to be practiced in the North Carolina and Virginia Piedmont. The proliferation of small sites and variety of projectile point styles and tool types including ground stone tools suggests that the overall population had grown by this time. Smaller territories were associated with various populations that began to exchange non-utilitarian objects. Soapstone vessels, grooved stone axes, elaborate ground stone tools and ornaments, and native copper are associated with many Late Archaic sites.

The following cultural stage recognized in the North Carolina and Virginia Piedmont is the Woodland Period. The hallmark of the Woodland Period is the presence for the first time of ceramics among the tool kit. Early Woodland ceramics are characterized in the Piedmont of North Carolina by the Badin Series, pottery typified by a dense, hard paste with sand temper and cord or fabric-impressed exterior surface treatments. Small stemmed project points such as the Small Savannah River and Gypsy Stemmed are thought to be contemporaneous with the Badin Series ceramics. The major mode of subsistence during the Early Woodland was hunting and gathering. However, the bow and arrow is an additional technological innovation distinguishing Early Woodland from the Late Archaic subperiod.

Middle Woodland sites are marked by a change in ceramics to those of the Yadkin and Uwharrie Series. Middle Woodland ceramics are manufactured of fine sand tempered ware with plain, simple-stamped, fabric-impressed, cord-marked, or net-impressed exteriors. Differences in ceramic type are defined based on vessel shape, temper, and exterior treatment. Often they are associated with particular varieties of triangular projectile point types. During Middle Woodland times, the floodplains were used for settlements while uplands were used for hunting and gathering activities. During this period, some prehistoric peoples constructed mounds, a practice that continued into the Late Woodland subperiod. Such practices have been interpreted as indicative of complex social behavior.

Late Woodland Piedmont sites (A.D. 1200 – European Contact) tended to be located on broad, fertile floodplains along the major waterways, along the floodplains of minor streams, and in the uplands on broad toeslopes overlooking the floodplains. Distinctive ceramic types typify this cultural subperiod, primarily defined based on patterns of exterior surface treatment (simple stamped, cord-marked, cob-marked, and check stamped impressions) and temper (primarily sand tempered until the historic period when crushed quartz temper became more common). Coe referred to these ceramics as the Vincent Series and later Clements Series. Horticulture was an important element of the local economy. Corn, beans, squash, and fruit were grown although hunting and gathering continued to be important components of local subsistence. Site density indicates that population growth was a factor at this time.

The earliest historic period sites within the project area are attributed to the Occaneechi who had settlements along the Roanoke River in the mid-seventeenth century. The Occaneechi controlled European Trade with Native Americans in the area, acting as middle men and controlling the

types of trade goods that were brought west, e.g. firearms and metal tools were not distributed to other Native American groups. After 1676, the Occaneechi left the Roanoke River basin moving to the Eno River. Consequently, after this time Virginian traders began to exchange goods directly with the Virginia - North Carolina Piedmont tribes.

European settlement in what became Halifax, Northampton, and Warren Counties, North Carolina and Brunswick and Mecklenberg Counties, Virginia began during the period between 1720 and 1730. With few developed roads, the area remained home to small subsistence farmers who earned money by producing household crafts rather than by producing agricultural goods for market.

The Revolutionary War had little impact on the project area. Following the war, some improvements were made to local roads and to the Roanoke River to facilitate transportation. The Roanoke Navigation Company was funded by both the Virginia and North Carolina legislatures in 1817. One of the local improvements was the construction of a canal and locks around the falls of the Roanoke at Weldon. The canal was completed in 1834. Soon after completion, some of the lower locks were damaged by flooding but were never repaired.

As the transportation network in the region improved, tobacco became an important cash crop. The Raleigh & Gaston Railroad, from Emporia, Virginia to Raleigh, North Carolina, was under construction in the mid-1830s. The portion from Emporia to the Roanoke River was completed first, by 1838. The community of Gaston, North Carolina was established at the southern end of this line, on the north side of the Roanoke River. The line was soon thereafter extended to Henderson, North Carolina. By 1840, a railroad linking Wilmington, North Carolina to the Roanoke River at Weldon, North Carolina was completed. Consequently, Weldon became a major market and transportation center for the middle Roanoke River area, and cash crops became more important to local farmers. However, by 1860, southern Virginia and northern North Carolina remained primarily rural with barter still a common form of exchange.

The local economy was greatly disrupted by the Civil War. Railroads that ran through Weldon were the lifeline of the Confederacy. Supplies and troops were transported by rail throughout the theater of the Civil War. The major military target in the area was the Wilmington and Weldon Railroad's bridge over the Roanoke River. Union forces attacked the bridge in July of 1863 but the Confederate forces were successful at protecting this target. No major engagements occurred in the vicinity of the Lake Gaston and Roanoke Rapids Lake areas but the farms were generally untended during this period.

Farming slowly revived as the major industry in the project area during the Reconstruction Period. Major cash crops included cotton, corn, and tobacco. Due to impacts from plant disease and poor commercial conditions, tobacco's importance to the local economy diminished. By 1920, cotton was the major crop. By the twentieth century, local farms were typically smaller (less than 100 acres) and owner-operated and tenant farms were well represented within the five counties that make up the project area.

By the early 1950s, following two world wars and the Great Depression, the local labor force was diminished. The presence of factories in local cities further drew labor away from farms as

many young people chose factory work over farming for their life's work. Growth of industrialization in the area was encouraged by the construction of Roanoke Rapids Lake and Lake Gaston in 1955 and 1960, respectively. These facilities were built to produce hydroelectric power for the region.

2.3 Previous Cultural Resources Surveys

In 1955, the University of North Carolina conducted investigations of selected portions of the project area. Approximately 74 prehistoric archeological sites were recorded based on survey of lands that were in agricultural use or that had been recently cleared of vegetation in preparation for scheduled project flooding (Personal communication, Stanley South, University of South Carolina, with Sydne Marshall, TtFW, 1999). In 1997, Dominion conducted reviews of archeological site files maintained by the NC SHPO, the University of North Carolina Department of Anthropology at Chapel Hill (UNC), and the VA SHPO. Dominion also conducted archeological field investigations within the Project's Area of Potential Effect (APE). This work was documented in a series of reports produced by New South Associates (NSA) under contract to TtFW (then Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation (FWENC)):

Roanoke Rapids and Gaston Hydropower Project: Cultural Resources Overview and Survey of Eroded Shoreline in Locations of Previously Recorded Sites, Halifax, Northampton, and Warren Counties, North Carolina, Volumes I and II. Report 1 of 6. NSA 1998 for FWENC. On file, Dominion Generation, Glen Allen, Virginia. (NSA 1998a)

Roanoke Rapids and Gaston Hydropower Project: Cultural Resources Overview and Survey of Eroded Shoreline in Locations of Previously Recorded Sites, Brunswick and Mecklenburg Counties, Virginia. Report 2 of 6. NSA 1998 for FWENC. On file, Dominion Generation, Glen Allen, Virginia. (NSA 1998b)

Roanoke Rapids and Gaston Hydropower Project: Cultural Resources Testing/Evaluation of Archaeological Sites 31Hx34 and 31Wr160, Halifax and Warren Counties, North Carolina, Volumes I and II. Report 3 of 6. NSA 1998 for FWENC. On file, Dominion Generation, Glen Allen, Virginia. (NSA 1998c)

Roanoke Rapids and Gaston Hydropower Project: Cultural Resources Testing/Evaluation of Archaeological Site 44Mc113, Mecklenburg County, Virginia. Report 4 of 6. NSA 1998 for FWENC. On file, Dominion Generation, Glen Allen, Virginia. (NSA 1998d)

Roanoke Rapids and Gaston Hydropower Project: Cultural Resources Survey of High Probability Areas Parallel to the Shoreline, Halifax, Northampton, and Warren Counties, North Carolina, Volumes I and II. Report 5 of 6. NSA 1998 for FWENC. On file, Dominion Generation, Glen Allen, Virginia. (NSA 1998e)

Roanoke Rapids and Gaston Hydropower Project: Cultural Resources Survey of High Probability Areas Parallel to the Shoreline, Brunswick and Mecklenburg Counties,

Virginia. Report 6 of 6. NSA 1998 for FWENC. On file, Dominion Generation, Glen Allen, Virginia. (NSA 1998f)

A summary of the results of this work is included within Sections 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3 and throughout Section 2.4 of this HPMP.

2.3.1 Lake Gaston

A total of 365 archeological sites had been previously recorded within the Lake Gaston project area and its immediate vicinity. Of these, 237 were located within North Carolina and 128 were located within Virginia. The majority of sites represent prehistoric period sites. A few prehistoric sites also contain historic period components. The prehistoric periods represented primarily date to the Archaic and Woodland periods. Many of the sites do not contain diagnostic cultural materials and therefore may not be precisely attributed to a particular prehistoric period or subperiod.

2.3.2 Roanoke Rapids Lake

Reviews were conducted of archeological site files maintained by the North Carolina Archeology and Historic Preservation Section of the Division of Archives and History that functions as the North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office (NC SHPO), the University of North Carolina Department of Anthropology at Chapel Hill (UNC), and the Commonwealth of Virginia's Department of Historic Resources (VA SHPO). A total of 107 archeological sites were previously identified within the project area and immediate vicinity of Roanoke Rapids Lake. Like those sites recorded in the Lake Gaston project area and vicinity, these sites are predominantly prehistoric though not all may be attributed to specific defined time/cultural periods or subperiods (NSA 1998a and 1998b).

2.3.3 Lower Roanoke River

The archeological site data files consulted did not contain information about any sites recorded in the Lower Roanoke River portion of the project area (NSA 1998a and 1998b). While site frequencies may be low in this area, the lack of previously recorded sites may be a reflection of the fact that little archeological survey had been conducted in this portion of the project.

The Roanoke Canal Commission has informed Dominion of a number of historic-period archeological resources located downstream from Roanoke Rapids Dam on Dominion property. These resources include remnants of canal-related structures that are visible above the ground surface. Additional cultural resources may also be present either related to the former canal or possibly related to former Native American habitation of the area. This portion of the APE has not undergone systematic cultural resources survey and therefore a reliable inventory of the extant resources is not available. Dominion is, however, aware that the area from the Roanoke Rapids Dam downstream to the Roanoke Canal Museum may be characterized as highly likely to contain archeological cultural resources that have the potential to be eligible to the National Register of Historic Places.

2.4 Known and Potential Historic Properties

2.4.1 Site Relocation and Evaluation of Conditions

In January 1997, Dominion conducted a survey of selected areas of both Lake Gaston and Roanoke Rapids Lake. The focus of the survey was on the locations of previously identified archeological sites (50 locales including 44 in North Carolina and 6 in Virginia) (Appendix C) that were identified exposed to active erosion. The purpose of the survey was to relocate sites as possible, assess their current condition, and assess their potential to meet criteria for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. Of 44 locations in North Carolina, 15 previously recorded sites were successfully relocated and 2 new sites were coincidentally recorded. Portions of four of these sites located within the project area were recommended as warranting further examination for potential National Register eligibility (Sites 31Hx34, 31Wr158, 31Wr159, and 31Wr160). Of six locations previously mapped within actively eroding areas along Virginia shoreline, four sites were successfully relocated (Sites 44Mc108, 44Mc111, and 44Mc113, and 44Mc558) and were recommended as warranting further examination for assessment of their potential National Register eligibility.

In the Fall of 1997, additional field investigations were conducted by Dominion to address the potential of the recommended eligible sites to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Consultation with the North Carolina and Virginia SHPOs in August 1997 resulted in agreement to conduct a staged approach to this analysis. The North Carolina SHPO agreed that Dominion would initially look at two of the four North Carolina sites since there were so many similarities among all four of the sites. If the two sites displayed characteristics that meet National Register of Historic Places criteria for listing then Dominion would also investigate the remaining two sites. However, if the first two sites did not meet these criteria, then the remaining two sites would not be examined further. Testing conducted at 31Hx34 and 31Wr160 indicated that the sites had undergone extensive disturbance due to erosion and that they could not be recommended as potentially eligible for the NRHP. Following a discussion by telephone, the NC SHPO confirmed its concurrence with Dominion that none of the four NC sites was potentially eligible for the NRHP. NC SHPO did not call for any additional investigations at the four sites (letter, January 13, 1998, Mr. David Brook, NC SHPO to Dr. Sydne B. Marshall, FWENC).

The VA SHPO agreed in August 1997 that four sites (Sites 44Mc108, 44Mc111, 44Mc113, and 44Mc558) that had been relocated should be evaluated for their potential to meet criteria for nomination to the NRHP. In the fall of 1997, Dominion discussed with the VA SHPO plans to create a conservation area that included the locations of 44Mc108, 44Mc111, and 44Mc113. The VA SHPO indicated that if Dominion could assure the VA SHPO at this time that these sites would not be affected by the project, then field investigations would not be necessary. Therefore, Dominion proceeded to investigate Site 44Mc558 to determine if the portion of that site located within the project area was potentially eligible for nomination to the NRHP. The tested portion of the site within the project area proved to be eroded and deflated due to the construction of a house. The VA SHPO agreed that although the site as a whole may retain integrity, the portion of the site within the project area did not warrant further testing in

connection with the relicensing project (letter, October 9, 1997, Mr. David Dutton, VA SHPO to Dr. Sydne B. Marshall, FWENC).

2.4.2 Project Related Effects on Actively Eroding Shoreline Areas and Other High Probability Areas Selected for Testing

In the fall of 1997, Dominion conducted a survey of shoreline areas located in locales with high archeological potential that were subject to active erosion (Appendix D). These were locales where there had not been previously identified archeological sites. Fifty seven new sites were identified within North Carolina and Virginia (50 along Lake Gaston and 7 along Roanoke Rapids Lake). Seven of the North Carolina sites were recommended as potentially eligible to the NRHP (Sites 31Hx34, 31Wr158, 31Wr159, 31Wr160, 31Hx202,202**, 31Wr171, and 31Wr180).

Since four of the sites, 31Hx34, 31Wr158, 31Wr159, and 31Wr160, were comparable in archeological context, the NC SHPO suggested that Dominion perform Phase II investigations at sites 31Hx34 and 31Wr160. NC SHPO and Dominion agreed that if results supported the recommendation that these sites were potentially eligible to the NRHP, then Dominion would perform Phase II investigations at 31Wr158 and 31Wr159. Phase II investigations resulted in Dominion's recommendation that sites 31Hx34 and 31Wr159 are not potentially eligible to the NRHP. With concurrence of the NC SHPO, no further investigations were performed at sites 31Wr158 and 31Wr159 (letter, January 13, 1998, Mr. David Brook, NC SHPO to Dr. Sydne Marshall, FWENC).

Three additional North Carolina sites, discovered in high probability areas selected for testing, were also recommended as potentially eligible to the NRHP (31Hx202,202**, 31Wr171, and 31Wr180.) Sites 31Hx202,202** and 31Wr180 contain disturbed deposits within the Project boundary but have the potential to contain potentially significant deposits in portions of the sites located outside of the Project boundary. Site Wr171, recommended by Dominion as potentially eligible to the NRHP, is located within a protected elevated landform that will not be impacted by the Project. The NC SHPO agreed with Dominion's recommendations that these three sites may have the potential to be eligible to the NRHP but requested no additional work because the Project will not affect the sites (letter, October 9, 1998, NC SHPO to Dr. Sydne Marshall, FWENC; record of telephone conversation, November 24, 1998, Mr. Mark Mathis, NC SHPO discussion with Dr. Sydne Marshall, FWENC.)

In Virginia, six locations were examined and four sites were recorded along the Lake Gaston shoreline. Sites 44Mc657 and 44Mc658 were recommended as not eligible to the NRHP. Sites 44Mc659 and 44Mc660 were recommended as potentially eligible to the NRHP. Rather than require Phase II testing, VA SHPO agreed that Dominion may periodically monitor these sites for any changes due to factors such as erosion and consult if major changes are observed (notes of July 10, 1998 meeting attended by VA SHPO, NC SHPO, Brunswick County VA Director of Planning, Dominion, Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation, and HARZA Engineering Company; e-mail, November 12, 1998, VA SHPO to Dr. Sydne Marshall). These sites are located within Project-designated Special Management Areas. Regular monitoring and reporting of observations is addressed in Section 3.1 of this HPMP.

2.4.3 Archaeological Potential of Islands

Dominion conducted a preliminary evaluation of the islands within Lake Gaston and Roanoke Rapids Lake. The focus was on islands one acre or larger that had previously recorded archeological sites associated with them. Some observations were made about the potential of some other islands to contain potentially significant cultural resources. Observations were made of 17 islands within Lake Gaston. Five of these islands contained locations of previously recorded archeological sites. Several of the sites that have been successfully relocated have the potential to meet the criteria for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. Portions of the islands are exposed to active erosion that may affect cultural resources. For example, the Army Corps of Engineers is addressing erosion impacts to a significant archeological site located on Buggs Island in Lake Gaston.

The vegetation on most of the other islands in Lake Gaston serves as protection against erosion. Most of the islands examined were in a stable state, with no eroding surfaces. These islands represent relatively undisturbed areas that have not been systematically surveyed and which may contain potentially significant cultural resources. If changes in the project result in newly initiated erosion, then subsurface investigation of these islands may be warranted to determine if they contain cultural resources that may be deemed significant.

Roanoke Rapids Lake contains eight islands. Four of the islands are remnants of a former natural levy system and have the potential to contain buried cultural resources. Another of the islands is a portion of a hill that formerly overlooked the Roanoke River and has good potential to contain cultural resources though possibly not in a deeply buried context. The three remaining islands are largely inundated and their potential to contain cultural resources has not been assessed.

2.4.4 Sites Recorded Within Drawdown Zone

The Lake Gaston and Roanoke Rapids Lake impoundments resulted in the inundation of all or portions of most of the previously recorded sites noted in Sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2. It is not known if most of these sites meet the criteria for nomination to the NRHP. At least two of the sites within Roanoke Rapids Lake, 31Hx7 (Gaston Site) and 31Hx8 (Thelma Site) that had been originally recorded in the late 1950s as substantial, deeply buried, stratified prehistoric sites with numerous cultural features, artifacts, and some human remains are considered to be eligible to the NRHP. Currently, these two sites are largely inundated with small portions of the sites exposed as wetland/and or small islands, depending upon the water level in the lake (e.g. normally fluctuates between water elevation 127 to 132 feet). In 1985, staff archeologists from NC SHPO conducted a small salvage project at Site 31Hx7 to recover human remains and associated grave goods that were eroding from the site. In 1997, observations made of the above-water portions of 31Hx7 and 31Hx8 indicated that they appeared to be stabilized by vegetation with no obvious areas of new erosion or exposed cultural materials or features. Future efforts to more systematically assess the potential NRHP eligibility of many of the as yet unevaluated sites that are inundated may only occur when the lake levels are reduced enough to expose the sites.

It should be noted that there is an additional site within Lake Gaston that has been determined to be eligible to the NRHP. Site 44Mc491 (Buggs Island Site) is a stratified site located on Buggs Island, owned by the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and located within Lake Gaston. The site shows signs of extensive erosion and has been investigated by the USACE. As property of the USACE, Site 44Mc491 and other potential cultural resources located on Buggs Island are not addressed within this HPMP.

2.4.5 Lower Roanoke River

The USFWS previously contended that a NRHP-listed prehistoric site, 31Br90 (Rhodes Site), located within the Roanoke River National Wildlife Refuge is within the project's area of potential effect (APE). While Dominion understands that this site has experienced erosion along the banks of the Roanoke River, Dominion believes that the erosion at the site is primarily due to high flow events attributable to releases by the USACE through the Kerr Reservoir. The water flows in the vicinity of the wildlife refuge attributable to the Roanoke Rapids and Gaston operations do not account for the erosion at the noted archeological site. This site is not within the project APE and will not be addressed further.

3.0 PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND PRESERVATION GOALS AND PRIORITIES

The Project APE is shown in Figure 1 and is defined in the Programmatic Agreement (PA) (Appendix A) as follows:

“Area of potential effects means the geographic area or areas within which a new license issuing to Dominion for the Project, and the consequent operation for a period of 30 years or more, may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of Historic Properties, if any such properties exist. The Roanoke Rapids and Gaston Project's APE includes all the lands within the Project's licensed boundaries” (PA, footnote 2, p.3).

The main goals of the HPMP are to: protect historic properties; provide training to Dominion personnel responsible for implementing the HPMP; develop opportunities for public interpretation of cultural resources within and around the Roanoke Rapids and Gaston Hydropower Project, assure ongoing consultation with the VA and NC SHPOs, the Roanoke Canal Commission and the City of Roanoke Rapids about the management of cultural resources by Dominion; and to periodically evaluate the effectiveness of the HPMP for the project. Each of these goals is discussed as follows, focusing first on the purpose of the goal, the management activity associated with addressing the goal, and then looking at appropriate management decisions that respond to the goal and the management activity.

While using this HPMP, refer to the referenced appendices that contain a summary of information gleaned from the project area during various stages of previous investigation:

Appendix A contains a copy of the Programmatic Agreement for the Project.

Appendix B contains maps that show sites recorded prior to the flooding of the Roanoke Rapids and Lake Gaston impoundments.

Appendix C contains maps that show areas of active erosion with the project area.

Appendix D shows the locations of relocated archeological sites and new sites recorded in 1998.

Appendix E contains maps that show the areas within the project APE that have been surveyed and the locations of additionally recorded new sites

Appendix F contains the Plan and Procedures Addressing Unanticipated Discoveries of Cultural Resources and Human Remains developed for this project.

Appendix G contains cited correspondence with NC and VA SHPOs.

3.1 Protect Known Historic Properties

Purpose: Protect Historic Properties

- Historic properties are those cultural resources, i.e. archeological (prehistoric and/or historic period), architectural, and Traditional Cultural Properties) that meet the criteria (36 CFR 63) for inclusion within the NRHP.
- Although numerous archeological sites have been previously recorded within the project APE, only a small number of the sites have been either evaluated to determine their potential to meet NRHP criteria for listing in the NRHP or have been recommended as potentially eligible to the NRHP. Three sites have been determined to be eligible to the NRHP.
 - Site 44Mc491 (Buggs Island site) This is a large site located on Buggs Island in Lake Gaston, just east of Kerr Dam. Buggs Island is owned by the USACE. Cultural resources on the island, including 44Mc491 are managed by the USACE (NSA 1998a) As stated in Section 2.4.4, this site will not be addressed further in the HPMP.
 - Site 31Hx7 (the Gaston Site). Originally recorded in 1955, this site was noted as a substantial, deeply buried, stratified prehistoric site with numerous cultural features, artifacts and human remains. Currently, the site is largely inundated by the Roanoke Rapids Lake impoundment. Small portions of the site are exposed as wetland and/or small islands during periods of low water (e.g. water elevation 127 to 129 feet). Observations made of the site in 1997 indicated that the condition of the site was stabilized by vegetation. No obvious signs of new erosion or exposed cultural materials or features have been observed since a 1985 inspection by the NC SHPO (NSA 1998a).
 - Site 31Hx8 (the Thelma Site). This site was recorded originally in 1955. It was described as a deeply buried, stratified prehistoric site. The site contained numerous cultural features, artifacts and human remains. Currently the site is largely inundated by the Roanoke Rapids Lake impoundment. Observations made of the site in 1997 indicated that the site condition was stable with no signs of erosion or exposed cultural materials (NSA 1998a).
- Eight sites have been recommended as potentially eligible to the NRHP.
 - Site 44Mc108. This site was first recorded in 1970 and was relocated in 1997. The site's original setting was on a levee on the southwest side of the Roanoke River. Pottery and projectile points including Savannah River points, two miniature vessels, celts, and a bird

effigy on a bowl rim were recovered prior to disturbance by construction for Route I-85. Additional prehistoric artifacts were observed in 1997 and the site was recommended as potentially eligible to the NRHP (NSA 1998, Report (NSA 1998b)).

- 44Mc111. The site was recorded in 1970 and its location described as on a levee on the southwest side of the Roanoke River. Prehistoric ceramic sherds and projectile points were recovered from the site. In 1997, the site was relocated. Additional prehistoric stone cultural materials and ceramic sherds were recovered. The artifacts suggested a series of Middle and Late Woodland, Protohistoric, and Historic period Native American base camps. The site was recommended as potentially eligible to the NRHP (NSA 1998b).
- 44Mc113. This site was originally recorded in 1970 along a levee on the south and southwest side of the Roanoke River. The site contained prehistoric ceramic sherds and projectile points. The site was relocated in 1997 when additional stone artifacts and ceramic sherds were recovered. The site was recommended as potentially eligible to the NRHP (NSA 1998b). Additional testing was performed at this site and reported in NSA 1998, Report 4. VA SHPO reviewed the report but requested additional information to determine if the site is eligible to the NRHP. Dominion planned to protect the site as if it were eligible to the NRHP and VA SHPO agreed that no additional field investigation would be required at that time (letter, August 14, 1998, Mr. David Dutton, VA SHPO to Mr. Kenneth Baker, Virginia Power).
- 44Mc659 (Bracey-1 Site). Artifacts recovered from this site suggest a Late Woodland open air camp site. Few sites of this time period are documented in this type of setting within the Virginia Piedmont. The integrity of the archeological deposits appears to be good and the site was recommended as potentially eligible to the NRHP (NSA 1998f).
- 44Mc660. Artifacts recovered from this site suggest a Late Woodland open air camp site. Few sites of this time period are documented in this type of setting within the Virginia Piedmont. The integrity of the archeological deposits appears to be good therefore the site was recommended as potentially eligible to the NRHP (NSA 1998f).
- 31Hx202,202**. This site is represented by a prehistoric period lithic scatter and a historic late eighteenth-to-early nineteenth century domestic site. A cellar and a privy are located within 15 meters of the shoreline as are a possible historic period dump. This site was recommended as potentially eligible to the NRHP based on its historic period resources. This time period has been rarely documented archeologically within this area of the Roanoke River Valley (NSA 1998e). Because this site contains disturbed deposits within the APE, it will not be addressed further in the HPMP.
- 31Wr171. This site contains Late Archaic period cultural materials in what appears to be undisturbed context. This time period is not well represented in the archeological record of the project area and the site has been recommended as potentially eligible to the NRHP (NSA 1998e). As stated in Section 2.4.2, this site is located within a protected elevated landform that will not be impacted by the project and thus will not be addressed further in the HPMP.
- 31Wr180. This prehistoric period site has a relatively high density of artifacts including a sherd type (Smyth/Radford type) that may relate to the Late Woodland period. Given these characteristics, the site is recommended potentially eligible to the NRHP (NSA 1998e). However, because this site contains disturbed deposits within the APE, it will not be addressed further in the HPMP.

The sites that have been determined eligible to the NRHP or have been recommended as potentially eligible to the NRHP are indicated on Dominion project management maps (Appendices B through E).

Management Activity: Inspect Known Historic Properties Sites 31Hx7, 31Hx8, 44Mc108, 44Mc111, 44Mc113, 44Mc659 and 44Mc660 are located within Project-designated Special Management Areas (Sensitive Areas, Figure 2). Dominion protects such areas from development or other ground-disturbing activities. The locations of these sites should be visited annually to observe whether conditions are stable or if there has been any disturbance due to vandalism or erosion. Should the designation for these areas as Special Management Areas be modified, Dominion will consult with the appropriate SHPO(s) to determine if cultural resources investigation may be needed at that time.

1. Dominion's Supervisor-Reservoir, or his designee, will conduct an inspection of each site location on an annual basis, at low water (i.e. water elevation 127 feet or lower).
2. The inspection will be made from the water by boat or by land, as appropriate for each site.
3. Digital photographs will be taken and compared with photographs taken of the sites in previous inspections.
4. The Supervisor-Reservoir or his designee will look for visual evidence of erosion
5. The Supervisor-Reservoir or his designee will look for evidence of damage as a result of site vandalism (i.e. purposely removed vegetation, back dirt piles on or newly exposed surfaces)
6. The Supervisor-Reservoir or his designee will look for evidence of human remains or other artifacts (worked stone tools or ceramic sherds) noticeable on exposed surfaces or eroding from the banks of the sites
7. The Supervisor-Reservoir or his designee will summarize observations made during inspections and include annual summaries in tabular format. This Summary Table will be a component of the Historic Properties Management Plan Implementation Summary Report (HPMP Implementation Report). Dominion will provide a HPMP Implementation Report on a 5 year review cycle in coordination with the Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) Report to the VA and NC SHPOs, the Roanoke Canal Commission, the City of Roanoke Rapids, the Tuscarora Indian Nation (Tuscarora Nation), and the Commission.

Management Decision: Consult SHPO as appropriate

- Inspect sites annually to observe conditions
- Provide summary of observations on a 5-year reporting basis in coordination with the Project SMP.
- If notable changes are observed in conditions at sites, consult with SHPO to determine if further action is appropriate.
- If status of Special Management Areas changes, consult SHPO to determine if additional steps may be necessary to protect sites.

3.2 Provide HPMP Implementation Worker Education Program

Purpose: Familiarize Dominion personnel with cultural resources issues, the HPMP, and Dominion's responsibilities in implementing the HPMP.

Management Activity: Develop project-specific education program

- Qualified archeologist will develop worker education program tailored to Dominion's project and workforce

Program will present concepts of cultural resources management in a simple, understandable format. Program will review key elements of the HPMP including the Unanticipated Discoveries Plan and the steps to follow in evaluating potential cultural resources needs triggered by proposed projects. Develop a Monitoring Protocol and Provisions for Enforcement that may be presented to refresh personnel and introduce new staff to cultural resource concepts and project-specific issues

- Management Decision: The Monitoring Protocol and Provisions for Enforcement will be incorporated into the facility's Annual Station Environmental and Safety Awareness Training Program.

3.3 Offer Opportunities for Public Interpretation

Purpose: Provide opportunities for the public to learn of the prehistory and history of the project area and the Project itself.

Management Activity: Develop informative signage and pamphlets that would be available to the public

- Dominion will develop and install one weather-tolerant sign that displays information about the prehistory and history of the project area and the Project. This will be displayed at the Roanoke Rapids Day Use Area. This will be comparable in size and style to signage developed and installed downriver by the Roanoke Canal Commission.
- Dominion will develop and produce a brochure that will summarize the prehistory and history of the project area and the Project so that the public may read them and keep them for future reference. The brochure will be available for the public within the Roanoke Rapids Power Station Office and downriver at the Canal Museum created by the Roanoke Canal Commission.
- Development of the sign and brochure will be in consultation with the NC SHPO, VA SHPO, Tuscarora Indian Nation and the Virginia Council on Indians.

Management Decision: The public interpretive display will be developed in coordination with the development of the Roanoke Rapids Day Use Area and will be installed within one year of the completion of the day use area development. The pamphlet will be designed and made available for distribution within one year following the completion of the development of the Roanoke Rapids Day Use Area.

3.4 Review Effectiveness of the HPMP

Purpose: Evaluate the effectiveness of the HPMP.

Management Activity: Every five years, Dominion will determine if modifications would improve the effectiveness of the HPMP.

Management Decision: Develop recommendations for changes to the HPMP that may be discussed with the VA and NC SHPOs, Roanoke Canal Commission, the City of Roanoke Rapids the Tuscarora Nation, interested County representatives, and the Commission

3.5 Consult with VA and NC SHPOs, Roanoke Canal Commission, the City of Roanoke Rapids, the Tuscarora Indian Nation and the Commission

Purpose: To provide VA and NC SHPOs, the Roanoke Canal Commission, the City of Roanoke Rapids the Tuscarora Nation, and the Commission with an opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of the HPMP and Dominion's success at implementing the HPMP.

Management Activity: Develop a Historic Properties Management Plan Implementation Summary Report (HPMP Implementation Report). The HPMP Implementation Report will be distributed for review according to a schedule coordinated with the 5-year SMP review cycle. The report will summarize, in table format, all Dominion cultural resources consultations and/or surveys performed for recreation, terrestrial, and aquatic enhancements that have been reviewed due to their potential to result in soil disturbance in areas not disturbed previously. The HPMP Implementation Report will:

- Describe the proposed enhancement, the type of cultural survey or other activity performed, the results of the survey or other activity, and actions taken (e.g. consulted with SHPO and/or others; performed mitigation; no action determined appropriate; etc.).
- Summarize annual observations made of historic properties listed in Section 3.1.
- Include summaries of Dominion's cultural resources activities as an update to a HPMP implementation summary table.
- Report the status of Dominion's public interpretation projects.
- Recommend modifications to project HPMP that would improve its implementation if appropriate.

Management Decision: Develop a format for the HPMP Implementation Report and its associated Summary Table that will present the cultural resources activities and considerations in which Dominion participated over the 5-year reporting period. The HPMP Implementation Report will be provided to the VA and NC SHPOs, Roanoke Canal Commission, the City of Roanoke Rapids and the Tuscarora Nation, for a 30-day review and comment period on a 5-year review cycle in coordination with the SMP Report review cycle. Following a consideration of review comments, Dominion will file the HPMP Implementation Report with the Commission.

4.0 PROJECT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION/MANAGEMENT MEASURES

The purpose of this HPMP is to consider and manage the effects on historic properties of actions taken to implement the license over the entire term. The HPMP takes into account the recreation, fisheries, and terrestrial management plans developed for the Project and the permits that Dominion issues for docks, bulkheads, riprap, and dredging. Dominion's Supervisor-Reservoir is responsible for the implementation of the HPMP.

4.1 Activities Exempt from Further Review Under HPMP

Actions that do not involve ground-disturbing activities and that do not require a permit from Dominion North Carolina Power and Dominions Virginia Power are exempt from further review under this HPMP. Types of projects covered by this exemption include: routine maintenance projects; safety-related activities; proposed activities located within previously disturbed areas such as areas that have previously been graded, mined, excavated, or landscaped.

Areas that would not be exempt from further review would include proposed project areas (actions or activities) that are located within 100 feet of previously recorded potentially significant archeological sites or located within areas defined by Dominion as Habitat Conservation Areas or Special Management Areas.

The Supervisor-Reservoir will review applications for docks, bulkheads, riprap, and dredging (project) to determine the likelihood of the presence of cultural resources based on information on file within Dominion. If the proposed project is within an area determined to have cultural resources sensitivity, the Supervisor-Reservoir may require a cultural resources survey. Surveys would be performed by DOI-qualified cultural resources professionals selected by Dominion. Project applicants will be responsible for paying the costs of the survey. If a survey reveals the presence of a cultural resource that is recommended as potentially eligible to the NRHP, the Supervisor-Reservoir has the right to deny a permit for the proposed project.

4.2 Procedures to Evaluate Effects of Proposed Actions

4.2.1 Phase 1A Investigation - Review Proposed Action and Dominion Cultural Resources Files

Phase 1A Investigation: relies on background literature review to identify the location, character, and significance of known cultural resources in the area of a proposed action and the potential of the proposed action to affect historic properties. The Phase 1A investigation will rely on information contained within Dominion's Project archives. Should these data not prove sufficient, the Supervisor-Reservoir may determine that additional documentation is necessary to address a particular action under consideration.

Purpose: to determine if a proposed project (e.g. action described in the Settlement Agreement or license or permitted activity through Shoreline Management Plan permitting process may affect

- a known archaeological site that may be potentially significant

- an area previously surveyed and known not to contain potentially significant archeological resources
- an archeologically sensitive area not previously surveyed

Management Activity: compare proposed project location with Cultural Resources Management Maps

- Determine if project area is located within 100 feet of a potentially significant previously recorded archeological site (see list in Section 3.1). (Appendices B, D, E)
- Determine if project area has been characterized as actively eroding or previously disturbed by other ground-disturbing activity (e.g. by machine excavation or underground utility line) (Appendix E)
- Determine if the area has been previously surveyed for cultural resources (Appendix E)

Management Decision: based on the results of the above-noted Management Activity

- Project area is located within 100 feet of a previously recorded potentially significant archeological site. Delay project pending SHPO consultation and possible followup studies by a DOI-qualified professional archeologist.
- Previous ground-disturbing activity may be documented or observed therefore no project effect on cultural resources expected. Project may proceed. Dominion includes project description and permit considerations in the HPMP Implementation Report that will be distributed to VA and NC SHPOs, Tuscarora Nation, Roanoke Canal Commission, the City of Roanoke Rapids and the Commission on a 5-year review cycle in coordination with the SMP.

4.2.2 Phase IB Cultural Resources Field Investigation

Phase IB Investigation: an on-the-ground inventory of the APE for a proposed action that confirms the presence of known cultural resources and that may result in identification of previously unrecorded cultural resources. A Phase IB investigation may involve the excavation of shovel tests placed at 50-foot intervals within the APE or implementation of an alternative investigative strategy approved by Dominion's Supervisor-Reservoir and the respective SHPO.

Purpose: To identify if a proposed project area that has been deemed potentially archeologically sensitive (i.e. located within 100 feet of a previously recorded potentially significant archeological site or categorized as such by previous cultural resources studies) contains cultural resources that may be affected by a proposed project not associated with routine maintenance.

Management Activity: Engage services of a qualified archeologist to conduct Phase 1 survey such as a walkover survey and/or systematic subsurface shovel testing (e.g. perform an identification level archeological field survey.) The actual scope of work will depend upon the proposed project location and size of the proposed activity. The archeologist will perform the Phase I survey and will write a report that describes the Phase I investigation and the results. Dominion will provide this report to the appropriate SHPO, the Tuscarora Indian Tribe, the Roanoke Canal Commission the City of Roanoke Rapids and the Commission.

Management Decision: Review results of the Phase IB Survey and the associated recommendations.

- If the Phase IB survey did not locate cultural resources, then the proposed action may proceed following consultation with SHPO.
- If the Phase IB survey locates cultural resources that the archeologist recommends as not potentially significant, then the Dominion Supervisor-Reservoir consults with SHPO. If consensus is reached on the recommendation, then the action may proceed.
- If the Phase IB survey locates cultural resources that the archeologist recommends as potentially significant (i.e. demonstrates good integrity, identifiable limits, structure, function, and cultural/historical context – see definition under 4.2.3.1), then Dominion’s Supervisor-Reservoir consults with SHPO. If SHPO concurs with evaluation, then a Phase II investigation is recommended unless action may be designed to avoid the resource. Alternative project locations will be reviewed as discussed in Sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.2.

4.2.3 Phase II Cultural Resources Field Investigation

Phase II Investigation: limited archeological excavations and analyses, or other investigations such as documentation of structures, to assess the National Register eligibility of individual resources and an assessment of the project effects on historic properties.

Purpose: To determine if a cultural resource recommended as potentially significant and that cannot be avoided by a proposed action, qualifies as significant.

The criteria for sites eligible to the NRHP may be found at 36CFR60.4. A site is eligible to the NRHP if it contains qualities that are significant in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture and possesses integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association and:

- *Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history;*
- *Is associated with the lives of persons significant in the past;*
- *Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction; or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or,*
- *Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.*

Management Activity: Engage services of a qualified archeologist to collect data sufficient to determine if a cultural resource qualifies as significant. Consult with SHPO prior to tasking field investigation. The archeologist will perform a Phase II investigation and write a report that describes the Phase II investigation and the results. Dominion will provide this report to the appropriate SHPO, the Tuscarora Indian Tribe, the Roanoke Canal Commission the City of Roanoke Rapids and the Commission.

Management Decision: Review results of the Phase II Survey Report and the associated recommendations, and consult with SHPO.

- If the Phase II investigation indicates that the cultural resource does not qualify as significant, project may proceed following consultation with SHPO.

If the Phase II investigation indicates that the cultural resource qualifies as significant. Dominion Manager consults with SHPO. If SHPO concurs with the recommendation that the cultural resource is potentially eligible to the NRHP and if the project is not amended to avoid the resource, consultation with SHPO will continue. A qualified archeologist will develop the scope of work that will serve as mitigation of project effects. Dominion Manager will consult with the SHPO and gain consensus on the appropriate mitigation (may involve further Phase III field investigation, monitoring, or another alternative treatment measure).

4.2.4 Phase III Data Recovery or Alternative Mitigation

Phase III Investigation: investigation activities designed to mitigate effects upon a historic property that an action would affect. This may include data recovery, documentation, restoration or other measures. Such investigations would be preceded by development of an action-specific Memorandum of Agreement that has been approved by Dominion, the respective SHPOs, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the Commission, and, as appropriate, the Roanoke Canal Commission, the City of Roanoke Rapids and the Tuscarora Nation.

Purpose: To mitigate adverse impacts to significant archeological resource.

Management Activity: Dominion Supervisor-Reservoir works with project proponent and qualified archeologist and consults with the SHPO to avoid project adverse impacts, minimize project adverse effects through possible design modifications and or through data recovery or an alternative mutually agreed-upon method. If NRHP-eligible resource may not be avoided, Dominion's archeologist develops a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) and Dominion consults with the appropriate SHPO, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the Roanoke Canal Commission, the City of Roanoke Rapids and the Tuscarora Nation, as appropriate and files the MOA with the Commission for approval. When an appropriate MOA is agreed upon, the archeologist will perform the Phase III mitigation and write a report that describes the Phase III mitigation and the results. Dominion will provide this report to the consulting parties.

Management Decision: Review results of the Phase III Mitigation and consult with SHPO, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the Roanoke Canal Commission, the City of Roanoke Rapids, the Tuscarora Nation, and the Commission. When consulting parties concur that mitigation has been successfully achieved, the action may proceed.

4.3 Enforcement Provisions

Purpose: To assure that potential action effects are considered prior to construction of licensed projects.

Management Activity: Dominion Supervisor-Reservoir works with license applicants to avoid impacts to historic properties and applies procedures outlined within the Project's Shoreline Management Plan Procedures.

Management Decision: Dominion will not issue a permit or easement to any entity without following steps to consider potential impacts to historic properties. Should an applicant violate the protocol laid out by this HPMP by constructing a proposed project prior to review by Dominion, then Dominion reserves the right to request the applicant to remove the project at the expense of the responsible entity.

4.4 Treatment of Unanticipated Discoveries of Cultural Resources and Human Remains

Purpose: Dominion would be responsible for addressing action impacts to cultural sites and human remains should they be exposed as a result of ground disturbing activities by Dominion or one of its Licensees; shoreline erosion on Lake Gaston or Roanoke Rapids Lake; erosion on the islands within the lakes, or erosion of one of the inventoried historic properties, or in the case that resources are exposed in the event of a Project operation emergency.

Management Activities: Steps that Dominion should follow in the event that unanticipated finds of cultural materials or human remains are made within the project, are contained within the project-specific Plan and Procedures Addressing Unanticipated Discoveries of Cultural Resources and Human Remains, located within Appendix F.

Management Decision: Dominion should consult with the VA and/or NC SHPO (depending upon the location of the find), the Roanoke Canal Commission, the City of Roanoke Rapids, the Tuscarora Nation, the county representatives for the relevant county in which the find occurred, and the Commission should human remains be discovered in a non-contemporary context. If Dominion discovers contemporary contexts with human remains, local law enforcement agencies and the local medical examiner should be consulted.

4.5 Public Interpretation

Purpose: Interpreting for the public the historic and archeological values of this Project as per the Project PA.

Management Activities: Dominion Supervisor-Reservoir will work with Dominion to establish budgets that would be available to implement public interpretation programs. Dominion will plan public interpretation programs that include:

- Coordinate with the Roanoke Canal Commission and the City of Roanoke Rapids to inventory canal-related and other cultural resources located on Dominion property east of the Roanoke Rapids Dam.
- Develop one weather-tolerant sign to be placed within the Roanoke Rapids Day Use Area.
- Develop a brochure that summarizes the prehistory and history of the project area and the history of the Lake Gaston and Roanoke Rapids Dams. This brochure would be available for the public in the Dominion Roanoke Rapids office and at the Roanoke Canal Museum.

Management Decision: The prioritization and scheduling of these projects will be coordinated with the recreation enhancements included in Dominion's new license.

5.0 IMPLEMENTATION OF HPMP

5.1 Activities Stipulated in the HPMP

Dominion's commitment for managing the cultural resources within its property will be ongoing. Dominion will consult with the VA and NC SHPOs, the Tuscarora Nation, the Roanoke Canal Commission, the City of Roanoke Rapids and the Commission as specified above. A Summary Table that summarizes all cultural resources considerations that are performed throughout a year will be developed and expanded as appropriate. Dominion will provide a HPMP Implementation Report to the VA and NC SHPOs, the Tuscarora Nation, the Roanoke Canal Commission, the City of Roanoke Rapids and the Commission on a 5-year review cycle in coordination with the SMP. Dominion may choose to consult with these entities at additional times should issues arise that require direction from these entities.

5.1.1 Monitor Erosion at Archeological Sites 31Hx7, 31Hx8, 44Mc108, 44Mc111, 44Mc113, 44Mc659 and 44Mc660

Within two years of the acceptance of this HPMP, a permanent datum point or GPS-defined location shall be selected at each of these sites and marked by an appropriate means (metal stake or other material). These data points will be used as the standard point against which annual observations will be compared. Field observations will be conducted during periods of low water. Observations to be noted will include: the date of the field observation; the condition of vegetation on the non-submerged portions of the sites (i.e. an indication of the stability of the site); notations about areas of new erosion; and evidence of vandalism. These observations will be summarized in a table and will be included in the HPMP Implementation Report that Dominion will provide on a 5-year review cycle in coordination with the SMP. The report will be provided to the SHPOs, the Roanoke Canal Commission, the City of Roanoke Rapids, Tuscarora Nation, and the Commission. If a condition is noted that requires immediate attention (e.g. extreme erosion is observed, skeletal material is observed exposed from either site, or recent evidence of vandalism is noted), the Supervisor-Reservoir will immediately consult with the appropriate SHPO and the Commission. Should human remains be observed, the steps outlined in the Unanticipated Discoveries Plan (Appendix F) will be followed.

5.1.2 Field Investigations to Identify and Protect Cultural Resources Potentially Affected through the Construction of Recreations Facilities Identified in Article RC1 of the Settlement Agreement

Thirteen recreational enhancements have been identified by Dominion. One area, Goat Island was previously surveyed by Dominion. Results indicated that the island does not contain historic properties that would be affected by Dominion's actions (letter, January 13, 1998, Mr. David Brook, NC SHPO to Dr. Sydne Marshall, FWENC; Record of telephone conversation, November 24, 1998, Mark Mathis, NC SHPO discussion with Dr. Sydne Marshall, FWENC). Dominion will not conduct additional investigations at the Goat Island enhancement area.

Within two years of the acceptance of the HPMP, Dominion will perform Stage 1B field examination at the 12 remaining proposed enhancements:

Kerr Tail Race Bank Fishing Area
Hawtree Creek Boat Landing Site Area
Stonehouse Creek Bank Fishing Area
Gaston Day Use Area
Thelma Bank Fishing Area
Roanoke Rapids Tail Race Bank Fishing Area

Mill Creek Bank Fishing Area
Nocarva Water to Land Area
Gaston Tailrace Bank Fishing Area
N Side Gaston Bank Fishing Area
Roanoke Rapids Day Use Area
N Side Roanoke Rapids Dam Area

The investigations will be performed by DOI-qualified cultural resources professionals and will entail a walkover inspection and mapping of any surface cultural resources followed by excavation of systematic subsurface shovel tests (STs) excavated at approximately 30-meter intervals within the action APEs. Soils from the STs would be screened through .25-inch mesh hardware cloth, and recovery of artifacts with provenience noted by ST and soil association within each ST. For the Roanoke Rapids Day Use Area and the Kerr Tail Race Bank Fishing Area, additional background research will be conducted prior to field inspection. The results of these field and documentary investigations will be included within a report that Dominion will distribute to the NC and VA SHPOs, the Tuscarora Nation, the Roanoke Canal Commission, the City of Roanoke Rapids, and the Commission for review and comment prior to development of the enhancements. Should potentially NRHP-eligible cultural resources be identified in any of the enhancement areas, Dominion will consult with the respective SHPO prior to development to determine if Phase II and possibly Phase III investigations may be appropriate. All investigations would be completed and their results reviewed by the consulting agencies prior to Dominion's development of the areas.

5.1.3 Implement Measures to Protect Cultural Resources such as the Roanoke Navigation Canal, the Roanoke Power Canal, and Canal-Related Structures that may Potentially be Affected by the Proposed Roanoke Canal Trail

In coordination with the Roanoke Canal Commission and the City of Roanoke Rapids, Dominion will take measures to protect the cultural resources that may be affected by the proposed Roanoke Canal Trail. Dominion will inventory the resources that are present on Dominion property along the proposed trail. Dominion will work with the Roanoke Canal Commission and the City of Roanoke Rapids to identify which of the inventoried resources may merit protection and possibly public interpretation. Dominion, the Roanoke Canal Commission and the City of Roanoke Rapids will work together to design the layout of the trail in a way that will take advantage of the known cultural resources and possibly create additional opportunities for public interpretation along or near the proposed trail. This will be accomplished within two years of the acceptance of the HPMP.

5.1.4 Design Brochure on Prehistory and History of the Project Area

Dominion will develop a brochure that would inform the public about the prehistory and history of the project area. Once designed and printed, this brochure will be available to the public through Dominion's Lake Gaston office and through the Roanoke Canal Museum. The contents of the brochure will be based on information gathered during previous cultural resources tasks

and during surveys performed in anticipation of the proposed enhancements (Section 5.1.2.) Dominion will complete this within two years of the acceptance of the HPMP.

5.1.5 Design Signage for Public Display

Dominion will develop an interpretive outdoor display that will contain information about the prehistory and history of the project area and about the Roanoke Rapids & Gaston Hydropower Project. The sign will be comparable to that used by the Roanoke Canal Commission in their outdoor display located downriver from the Project. The sign will consist of a kiosk-type structure with a shingled roof that protects two parallel wooden posts that support a sign that measures approximately 4 x 8 feet. The sign will be placed within the Roanoke Rapids Day Use Area. The planning and design of this display will take place within one year of the completion of the Day Use Area.

5.1.6 Develop and Present Worker Education Program for Dominion Personnel Responsible for Managing Cultural Resources

Within one year of the acceptance of the HPMP, Dominion will develop a worker education program that would familiarize the key Roanoke Rapids & Gaston Hydropower Project personnel with the basic cultural resources management concepts and issues that they as managers may need to address. The training will familiarize personnel with the HPMP. The program will include a review of the Project's *Plan and Procedures Addressing Unanticipated Discoveries of Cultural Resources and Human Remains* that would be followed in the event that such discoveries are made within the project area. A training module will be developed that will be incorporated into and presented as part of Dominion's annual Station Environmental and Safety Awareness Training.

5.2 Dispute Resolution

If at any time during the implementation of this HPMP and the Programmatic Agreement, the VA SHPO, NC SHPO, Dominion, or the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation objects to any action or any failure to act pursuant to the Programmatic Agreement or the HPMP, they may file written objection with the Commission. Resolution will be achieved following the steps pursuant to Section IV of the PA (see Appendix A).

6.0 REFERENCES CITED

NSA 1998a. *Roanoke Rapids and Gaston Hydropower Project: Cultural Resources Overview and Survey of Eroded Shoreline in Locations of Previously Recorded Sites, Halifax, Northampton, and Warren Counties, North Carolina, Volumes I and II*. Report 1 of 6. Prepared by New South Associates for Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation. On file, Dominion Generation, Glen Allen, Virginia.

NSA 1998b. *Roanoke Rapids and Gaston Hydropower Project: Cultural Resources Overview and Survey of Eroded Shoreline in Locations of Previously Recorded Sites, Brunswick and*

Mecklenburg Counties, Virginia. Report 2 of 6. Prepared by New South Associates for Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation. On file, Dominion Generation, Glen Allen, Virginia.

NSA 1998c. *Roanoke Rapids and Gaston Hydropower Project: Cultural Resources Testing/Evaluation of Archaeological Sites 31Hx34 and 31Wr160, Halifax and Warren Counties, North Carolina, Volumes I and II.* Report 3 of 6. Prepared by New South Associates for Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation. On file, Dominion Generation, Glen Allen, Virginia.

NSA 1998d. *Roanoke Rapids and Gaston Hydropower Project: Cultural Resources Testing/Evaluation of Archaeological Site 44Mc113, Mecklenburg County, Virginia.* Report 4 of 6. Prepared by New South Associates for Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation. On file, Dominion Generation, Glen Allen, Virginia.

NSA 1998e. *Roanoke Rapids and Gaston Hydropower Project: Cultural Resources Survey of High Probability Areas Parallel to the Shoreline, Halifax, Northampton, and Warren Counties, North Carolina, Volumes I and II.* Report 5 of 6. Prepared by New South Associates for Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation. On file, Dominion Generation, Glen Allen, Virginia.

NSA 1998f. *Roanoke Rapids and Gaston Hydropower Project: Cultural Resources Survey of High Probability Areas Parallel to the Shoreline, Brunswick and Mecklenburg Counties, Virginia.* Report 6 of 6. Prepared by New South Associates for Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation. On file, Dominion Generation, Glen Allen, Virginia.