

April 10, 2019
MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting Attendees

Community Working Group members present:

Pam Bennett – Queen Valley Community Liaison
Jeff Bunklemann – Central Arizona College
Fred Gaudet – Arizona Trail Association
Arlynn Godinez – Superior Unified School District Board / Maricopa County
Rick Cartier – Superior Chamber of Commerce
Todd Pryor – Town of Superior
Jim Schenck – Rebuild Superior and Legends of Superior Trail
Silvia Werre – Top of the World
Ricardo Provencio – United Superiorites
Pamela Rabago – Superior Chamber of Commerce
Bruce Wittig – Queen Valley Fire Department
JoAnn Besich – Superior Optimist Club
Lynn Martin – JF, JI Ranch
George Martin – JF, JI Ranch
Richard Matthews – Queen Valley Water Board
Fernando Shipley – Cobre Valley Regional Medical Center Board
Tiffany Rowell – Superior community
Hank Gutierrez - Superior Copper Alliance
Tweedy Armitage – Superior Historical Society
Anthony Huerta – Town of Superior
Cecil Fendley – Queen Valley Water Board

Community Working Group members not present:

Karen Kitchayan Jones – San Carlos Apache Tribe
Mila Besich Lira – Town of Superior
Sylvia Kerlock – Town of Winkelman
Gloria Ruiz – Town of Winkelman
Tino Flores – Copper Corridor Economic Development Coalition
Anna Flores – Town of Kearny

Resolution Copper Company:

Hesston Klenk – Communities Manager
Kami Ballard – Environmental
Vickey Peacey – Senior Environmental & Permits Manager

Facilitators – Godec, Randall & Associates (GRA):

John Godec, Debra Duerr

Speakers:

LeRoy Shingoitewa – Westland Resources
Scott O’Mack – Westland Resources

Public Guests:

none

Introductions & Housekeeping

John Godec thanked Lynn Martin for baking cookies for the group tonight. He noted that we have some new members, which makes the Chamber of Commerce meeting room a bit small for the group meetings. He mentioned that Todd Pryor has offered the Superior Town Hall as a meeting facility and asked the group if they would agree to that. Members said that would be fine. Godec reminded the group that they had discussed holding CWG meetings in other locations around the region. Group members thought this would be a good idea. Bruce Wittig mentioned that, if a Queen Valley meeting were held, it should be during the fall and winter while winter visitors are here.

Godec told the group that many visitors stopped by the CWG booth at the Apache Leap Mining Festival and he talked with about 70-80 people about the group and the project. He thought this was a successful endeavor, and suggested that the CWG continue to attend these kinds of events in future.

John has a conflict with the normal date of the next meeting, May 8. He wondered if Tuesday, May 7 would work, which it won't. Wednesday, May 15 seems to be a good date, but we need to determine if the facilitators can make that.

Discussion of Native American Cultural Resources Surveys

Scott O'Mack & LeRoy Shingoitewa – Westland Resources

Godec introduced the Westland Resources representatives. LeRoy Shingoitewa is a member of the Hopi Tribe from Moenkopi who is leading the Native American monitoring program. Scott O'Mack is the project manager for the Resolution Copper Project archaeological studies. LeRoy has a BA in Biology from the University of Arizona, and Scott has a BA in Anthropology from the University of Illinois.

O'Mack described the regulations and procedures that govern cultural resources. Laws include National Historic Preservation Act, Sec. 106 (NHPA, 1966), the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA, 1969), the Native American Religious Freedom Act and others. These laws require assessing the effects of projects on cultural resources, protection of cultural resources, ensuring access to Native American religious sites, and reporting discovery of resources.

Cultural resources include prehistoric or historic archaeological sites, historic buildings and structures, cultural landscapes (altered by people), and traditional cultural properties (TCPs). Historic resources need to be at least 50 years old. TCPs are significant because they are based on associations with cultural practices, traditions, beliefs, etc. and are important to maintaining the identity of the community.

Sec. 106 of NHPA requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their actions on cultural resources and assess the effects. To do this, surveys, analysis, and mitigation are conducted. Consultation is required among the lead federal agency, State Historic Preservation

Office, national Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Native Americans and other local stakeholders, and other interested parties.

The National Register of Historic Places is a comprehensive national list of significant historic properties, and all resources identified must be evaluated in terms of their eligibility for the register, based on four criteria:

- Associated with events significant to the broad patterns of history
- Associated with persons significant in the past
- Has distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or is the work of a master
- Has yielded or is likely to yield information important in prehistory or history

Mitigation for adverse effects is required based a treatment plan for the affected resources, generally including the following:

- For archaeological sites, excavation or another form of data recovery
- For buildings, historical research and documentation
- For TCPs, ethnographic research and documentation; other measures unique to each property

O'Mack talked about the kinds of archaeological, architectural, engineering resources and traditional cultural properties that are usually found in this geographic area. It was noted that locations of these resources are not generally considered public information.

He reported that the tailings and mining-related locations surveyed for the Resolution Copper Project are:

- Skunk Camp alternative tailings site
- Near West alternative tailings site
- Pegleg alternative tailings site
- Silver King alternative tailings site
- West Plant
- Oak Flat

He described the survey methods used for field surveys. Transects of 15 meters are walked, all resources are recorded and plotted with hand-held GPS units, and sites are photographed. Resources are left in place. Typical artifacts include projectile points, ground stone artifacts, milling stations where mortars have been formed in rocks along with pestles, pithouse depressions, buried features, architecture (Native American), pottery sherds, dry caves that often include food and other living items, pictographs and petroglyphs, and agave processing sites.

A CWG member asked if there are Spanish artifacts from explorations here, as local people sometimes hear stories of these; O'Mack said that these are rare. Another member wondered what the earliest date is of human habitation around Superior. In this vicinity, sites date from the Archaic Period of 5-6000 BC, although there are earlier Paleo-Indian sites farther south in Arizona.

LeRoy Shingoitewa told the group about the current tribal monitoring program. He is the tribal field director. When this program started, he was asked by his tribe to participate. Because the people working on this monitoring project are not archaeologists, they needed to go through a training program. He realized that in most cases the tribal community members are not really part of the process that O'Mack discussed.

The tribal monitoring program is a pilot program created by the Tonto National Forest (Noni Nez) to involve the tribes to a larger extent in the archaeological study process. A positive aspect of this program has shown to be that as the tribal members learn some things from the archaeologists, the archaeologists learn that the tribes know a great deal about their own history and resources; they are calling it "traditional ecological knowledge". In this way, the monitors represent the "eyes and ears of the tribe" during the cultural resource surveys. LeRoy noted that he is able to learn more about his culture by talking to other tribal members about what they're finding in the field; these people know many stories and are familiar with many types of artifacts.

Resolution is funding the program and Westland Resources is leading the technical studies. Tribes who have agreed to participate in the monitoring program are:

- White Mountain Apache
- Yavapai-Apache Nation
- Mescalero Apache Tribe
- Gila River Indian Community
- Ak-chin Indian Community
- Hopi Tribe
- Zuni Pueblo

The CWG wondered why the San Carlos Apache Tribe isn't part of this program. LeRoy said that they don't really know; they are against the project, but other tribes are not necessarily in favor of it either. They have just chosen not to participate at this time.

The monitoring program currently includes the Peg Leg, Silver King, Near West, Oak Flat, and Skunk Camp sites. Because of the terrain, transects are not practical or even possible. Instead, the tribes are using their knowledge of what they would most likely do to guide the survey areas. The tribal monitors follow behind the archaeologists and look for plants and animals as well as 'things they miss' and other artifacts tribal members are more familiar with. They look for water (considered sacred) and natural resources, and areas they think may be important as TCPs that are then reviewed by tribal historic preservation experts, elders, and members.

Tribal members are also working with Westland on the biological resource studies, focusing on traditional and culturally important plants.

LeRoy said he was invited to attend an environmental justice conference in Washington DC to talk about this program, and he speculated that this type of approach might become the 'norm' in the future. CWG members had the following questions and comments:

- Is this is a new process nationally, or just here?
 - There have been monitors in the past but they just monitored construction of projects and were not involved in the field work and interpretation early on.
- Have you used drones to access hard areas?
 - LeRoy is hoping they can use these in future. These may work well for plant resources and may also provide a bigger picture of certain sites that might be hard to see close-up on the ground.
- Were these corridors used for trade? Have you found any evidence of trade in this area?
 - Yes, there was one instance of finding pots that don't go together. There are examples of finding shells, parrot feathers, and other things that obviously come from other areas.
- How do you protect a site that will end up with tailings on top of it?
 - You can't protect the site but you need to mitigate it by data recovery and excavation.
- Is Peg Leg different from Skunk Camp in terms of the kind and amount of resources?
 - Yes, there are a lot more resources at Peg Leg because of its proximity to the Gila River. Skunk Camp has more evidence of agriculture. O'Mack noted that Superior is at the confluence of the Hohokam and Salado cultures. There is evidence of various layers from different timeframes, different uses, and different cultures.
- Fernando Shipley mentioned that there is an archaeological site in Globe that some people wanted to dig up and interpret. Others felt that sites should not be disturbed for no reason. LeRoy described how tribes used places over time and may have moved on; some destroyed what they left and others didn't.
- Have you found anything very surprising?
 - Some habitation sites are still there even though they have been largely destroyed by cattle.
- Have you given any thought to sharing some of your traditional stories as part of this project?
 - This is a tricky area since there are many secrets that tribes don't reveal. LeRoy admitted that he's been privilege to some stories and information that he's really not entitled to be part of because he's not initiated. However, some people are realizing that if they don't write these stories down, resources will be destroyed.
- What happens if something is discovered that represents a big problem for the tribes?
 - The consultation process is supposed to deal with this. So far, no 'fatal flaws' have been identified.
- Was something similar to this done for Oak Flat?
 - There were surveys several years ago, but now it has been designated a TCP. Consequently, there are commitments to protect it.

The CWG thanked Mr. Shingoitewa and Mr. O'Mack for sharing this interesting presentation and discussion with them.

Discuss HB2701 to Restore Arizona State Parks Heritage Fund

This item is relevant to the work of the CWG because the fund can provide money for historic preservation and improvements. It's money that comes from the lottery and it was swept away by the Legislature in 2010. It would provide \$10 million in grants for historic preservation, outdoor recreation and other improvements to rural areas. Now there is a move to restore it in the Arizona House but it's being held up in the Senate. People are being urged to contact their legislators. Hesston Klenk said the CWG could register as an interested party and make

comments; group comments sometimes have greater weight. There is a form on the website (shown in the flyer in the CWG packets) where you can register to testify, but this would not be necessary – you can just be an interested party. Tiffany Rowell noted that the Recreation User Group (RUG) may also be interested in commenting on the outdoor recreation aspects of it. Klenk suggested that the outcome is dependent on state budget negotiations. Conservative Pinal County representatives would need an incentive to vote for any appropriation of additional funds. He thought that Senator Pratt is a key person. The CWG asked that a link to the site be sent to members (see below*).

** The following is information from the Arizona Legislature:*

- 1. To contact legislators, visit: <https://www.azleg.gov/findmylegislator/>*
- 2. To request to speak on a bill: “The new online Request to Speak application is available for you to sign up to speak without having to be at the capitol. HOWEVER, THE FIRST TIME YOU SIGN UP you must come to the capitol and register. After that you can register from home. Click <https://apps.azleg.gov/> for the Request to Speak website.”*

Public Questions & Comments

There were no members of the public in attendance.

Next Meeting

The next CWG meeting is not scheduled yet, due to a conflict by the facilitator.

Wednesday, May 15 SUGGESTED
5:30 pm
Superior Chamber of Commerce