

April 2007

**SUMMARY OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE MANAGEMENT PLANS
INCLUDED IN THE REPORT ON THE
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE
ROSIA MONTANA PROJECT**

ROȘIA MONTANĂ
SUMMARY OF CULTURAL HERITAGE MANAGEMENT PLANS

CONTROLLED DOCUMENT

<i>Gifford No:</i>		13658.R04	
<i>Status:</i>	Final	<i>Copy No:</i>	
	<i>Name</i>	<i>Signature</i>	<i>Date</i>
<i>Prepared by:</i>	Helen Moore	Helen Moore	12.03.07
<i>Checked:</i>	Gerald A Wait	Gerry Wait	19.04.07
<i>Gifford Approved:</i>	Tim Strickland	T J Strickland	20.04.07

Roşia Montană

SUMMARY OF CULTURAL HERITAGE MANAGEMENT PLANS

C O N T E N T S

	Page
1. INTRODUCTION.....	4
2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: CULTURAL HERITAGE MANAGEMENT PLANS.....	5
3. PART I MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE OF THE ROŞIA MONTANĂ AREA.....	7
4. PART II: MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR HISTORICAL MONUMENTS AND PROTECTED ZONE FROM ROŞIA MONTANĂ	21
5. PART III THE CULTURAL HERITAGE MANAGEMENT PLAN.....	54
6. CONCLUSIONS.....	64
7. ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	65

1. INTRODUCTION

A Management Plan is not a legislative document and is not a substitute for the legislative framework. This document consolidates the information concerning the characteristics and the significance of the site, identifies the organizations and individuals whose interests are tied to this place, identifies the risks and opportunities that could result from conservation and development, as well as providing a global strategy for reaching the common objective – the management of the historical monuments and the protected zone.

The Management Plans for Roşia Montană Project establish the framework for achieving a balance between the apparently competing interests of conservation, sustainable economic development and the interests of the local community. They have been commissioned by S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation S.A (RMGC) to serve both as internal working documents and to be an explicit commitment by RMGC for the responsible treatment of all cultural heritage issues in the context of the project implementation.

In Romania the law does not establish the necessity of a management plan for historical monuments with the exception of historical monuments that are part of the World Heritage List, for which the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs, through its subordinated institutions, is implementing a five-year “protection and management program”, made up of annual programs whose completion is part of the County Council’s obligations. In the Roşia Montană context, the Management Plan offers a framework of directional policies. The completion of the objectives concerning the site’s conservation and sustainable development depend on the way all the parties involved in the site’s management coordinate their actions according to the framework drawn up by the present document.

The structure and the contents of the Management Plan are based on the requests formulated by MMGA by address 8070/24.05.2004, as well as being based on examples of similar documents prepared for historical sites of exceptional value.

This is believed to be the first undertaking of such a planned approach to cultural heritage management in Romania. The purpose of the RMGC *Cultural Heritage Management Plan* is to provide a framework for actions undertaken to mitigate potential project-associated impacts on cultural resources. This action-plan has been developed to ensure Project compliance with Romanian, European Union (EU), International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) guidelines, and World Bank legislation and guidelines.

This Summary of the Cultural Heritage Management Plan has been prepared by GIFFORD to provide an independent, critical review of the Cultural Heritage Management Plan. GIFFORD have provided similar independent quality assurance checks for this project, as well as providing similar advisory and quality review services to other development projects in Europe and Asia.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: CULTURAL HERITAGE MANAGEMENT PLANS

The Cultural Heritage Management Plans are supplementary to the Roşia Montană Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and are comprised of three parts, each of which has a complex structure that is not immediately accessible to a reader coming fresh to the project. The Plans were to some extent intended to 'stand-alone' and therefore contain a great deal of information that is repeated from elsewhere in the Environmental Statement. This document summarises the three Management Plans and presents the most important issues included in each.

The Roşia Montană Project (RMP)'s Cultural Heritage Management Plan (CHMP) provides the framework required to mitigate the potential impacts to cultural aspects resulting from the RMP, as identified in the EIA Chapter 4.9 Cultural and Ethnical Conditions: Cultural Heritage, which in turn is based upon a very detailed discussion of known heritage assets and investigations contained in the EIA Cultural Heritage Baseline Report. The key issues of these documents - which extend to many hundreds of pages of text - have been summarised in an Annex report attached to the RMGC responses to formal questions entitled **Information On The Cultural Heritage Of Roşia Montană And Related Management Issues**. In addition to providing a clear delineation of responsibilities, the management plan also ensures that all management measures are compliant with legislative requirements. The Cultural Heritage Management Plan comprises three parts as follows.

Part I Management Plan for the Archaeological Heritage of the Roşia Montană Area

Part I of the Cultural Heritage Management Plan responds to the requirements for the RMP's Environmental Impact Assessment issued by the Ministry of Environment and Water Management on the 20th May 2005 (Ministerial document no. 8070/20.05.2005, Annex II). This document deals with the management of archaeological heritage in Roşia Montană. In order to enable the evaluation of the management measures this plan includes a significant amount of baseline information and regulatory context, as well as considerations focusing on specific roles and responsibilities. This Plan is concerned with the Archaeological heritage – the sites and underground features that were discovered during the 'preventive archaeology' programmes, and that could be affected by the mining proposals. The realisation of the scale of the Roşia Montană Project (RMP), and the awareness of the potential importance of archaeological remains led to the creation of the Alburnus Maior National Research Programme in 2001 (Order of the Minister of Culture No. 2504 of 07.03.2001, and was implemented under Law No. 378/2001, (further amended by Law No. 462/2003 and Law No. 258/2006, respectively) which integrated and implemented an innovative programme of ethnologic, historic, geologic, geographic and archaeological research and investigations into a single programme – a landmark in Romanian heritage works and one of the most complex heritage projects undertaken in a commercial context in Europe. As required by Romanian law, the project is financially supported by the Roşia Montană Gold Corporation, with scientific direction provided by the **National Museum of History of Romania (MNIR)**. The proposed mitigation works that would be implemented as part of a resumption of mining are considered in detail, ranging from academic objectives to practical management issues, and including a scheme for publishing the results (as of March 2007 four of a total of twelve proposed books have already been published).

Part II Management Plan for the Historical Monuments and the Protected Zones of the Roşia Montană Area

Part II of the Cultural Heritage Management Plan primarily concerned with the historic monuments/buildings, the monumental archaeological sites - 49 structures in all - and the Protected Area of the historic core of Roşia Montană. This outlines the anticipated works that would be required to ensure the conservation of all of these building or monuments. This Plan suggests a mechanism for the implementation of these works based upon the creation of a *Heritage Superintendence* Roşia Montană, to be locally based, and to take on the oversight and

management of implementation. **Table 3-2. Proposed works and costs** sets out the proposed works, costs and timetable for the restoration of these historic monuments.

Part III The Cultural Heritage Management Plan

Part III provides an overview of the Cultural Heritage Management Plan. It provides the structure to ensure RMP's compliance with commitments presented in part I and II. This document also covers the management of cultural aspects that are not covered in part I and II, such as churches and cemeteries. **Part III** provides the structure to ensure RMP's compliance with commitments presented in Parts I and II - the establishment of a Cultural Heritage Foundation. This Foundation is assigned various potential activities which promote cultural tourism and the protection of cultural resources. The creation of a Roşia Montană Cultural Centre and Mining Museum is also discussed probably to be located in the historical centre of Roşia Montană. Management considerations for churches and prayer houses in Roşia Montană are considered in detail, including predicted impacts and proposed mitigation measures. Of twelve cemeteries present in Roşia Montană, five (this is an error in the original: there in fact six (6)) will likely be affected by the Project, and approximately 410 graves will require relocation. Provision for the exhumation and re-inhumation of these graves, with appropriate religious ceremony and archaeological heritage involvement is described. The very important provision for a **Chance-Finds Protocol** to be maintained during construction and mine-working is considered and described in some detail.

The potential provisions for the preservation in situ of Roman galleries and other mine-workings in *Păru Carpeni and Cătălina Monuleşti* are discussed in some detail. Preservation and display proposals for the *Roman Funerary Monument from Tău Găuri* are considered.

Part III is also a component of RMP's Environmental and Social Management System.

Section 4.2.2 of Management Plan I indicates that the Management Plan will be revised annually based on the assessment of aims and goals that have been achieved, and with overall co-ordination by the Executive Committee. The plan will initially be valid for five years, after which, it will be revised as a result of the assessment of the work to that date, and by public consultation.

3. PART I MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE OF THE ROȘIA MONTANĂ AREA

The Historical Significance of the Area, described in exhaustive detail in the Baseline Study of the EIA is summarised in the Part 1 Management Plan – still a lengthy description – on pages 16-21. In brief summary, no archaeological evidence has been recovered to date of pre-Roman (Prehistoric) settlement of the area.

After a thorough review of the EIA Baseline Study and the assessment of impacts and the consequential Cultural Heritage Management Plan, GIFFORD's considered conclusion is that the **Roman Period** is probably the most important in the history of Roșia Montană, followed by the remains of the Hungarian period of the 18th and 19 centuries. The Romans conquered the region (known as Dacia) in 106 AD. The conquest of this new territory was determined by not only strategic reasons, but also economic ones. Most researchers of the Roman period agree that one of the motivations for the conquest of Dacia concerned the riches in precious metals to be found in the area.

It is clear that the metal mining projects in the new territory were added to the Empire immediately following the conquest and paralleled the administrative organization of the new province. The degree of sophistication of extraction and ore processing operations implies the presence of a team of specialized workers. The province of Dacia benefited from colonization with people from the Dalmatian-Illyrian area, where mining was highly developed. Analysis of the epigraphic sources which include inscriptions and wax tablets as well as funerary monuments, indicate an intensely populated area, inhabited by a variety of ethnic groups. A significant collection of wax tablets were discovered by chance in 1855 in the Catalina Monulesti network of mining galleries at a depth of over 100m below the surface, and it is generally accepted that the tablets were hidden inside inaccessible mining galleries during a crisis, probably during the Marcomanic attacks on Dacia between 167-170 AD.

The place-names mentioned in the epigraphic sources may be used to suggest that the generic toponym *Alburnus Maior* refers to a series of permanent or temporary settlements linked to the presence of Illyrian-Dalmatian colonists specialized in the extraction and primary processing of the gold ore, settlements that used self-governance and administration similar to the "Dalmatian system" for organizing and exploiting the gold deposits.

The economic life of Roman Dacia was prosperous until the middle of the 3rd century AD. It was at this time that attacks by varying groups of invaders from neighbouring countries rendered the Roman province unsustainable, and with similar pressure on other Roman provinces occurring across the Empire, the decision was made under the Emperor Aurelian between 272 - 275 to withdraw.

Between the withdrawal of the Romans and the 13th century AD there is little archaeological evidence to suggest habitation and economic use of this area. There are sparse historical references but not enough to allow any coherent story to be assembled.

In the **Medieval Period** two medieval documents dating from 1238 and 1271 mention mining activities in the Cărnic massif, undertaken by the Saxon colonists from Ighiu and Cricau. The present day Roșia Montană is not mentioned, and only toponyms such as Chernech or Terra Obruth appear. This historical information could be interpreted that the medieval mining settlement was an important centre made up of small hamlets located at the foot of the Cărnic Massif, in the administrative area of the town of Abrud, which held an important administrative and political status. Until the end of the 16th century, the Roșia Montană area was not distinguished from the town of Abrud.

King Charles Robert of Anjou decided to transfer the mining domain from the property of the crown to that of local noblemen in 1327–1328 which led directly and stimulated the development of the entire mining area. The series of reforms and laws that regulated mining activities during the period of direct control of the medieval kingdom of Hungary and then later of the principality of Transylvania also stimulated the development of gold mining at an administrative level.

During the first part of the 16th century, ducal families from Bavaria had a series of economic interests in the mining area around Abrud, owning buildings in the town and one of the richest mines in the Rosia

Valley, with its own stamp mills. In 1592 texts mention the inclusion of present day Roşia Montană, under the name of *rubeo flumine* (an exact translation the “red river”) in the territory of Abrud, which had already become a town by the middle of the 15th century. Industrial development in the 17th century was booming as attested by statistics dated to 1676 - 77 stamp mills (*rotae*) at the foot of the Cărnic, 29 at Corna, 17 at Carpinis – this all corresponds to an urban settlement in the area defined as the Historical Centre of Roşia Montană.

Modern and Contemporary Periods (18th-20th Centuries)

In the 18th century, the Habsburg Empire initiated an industrial revolution in the Roşia Montană area and numerous reforms for improving the efficiency of mining were instigated. These trends were mirrored throughout Transylvania at this time. In 1733, artificial pond systems and other water installations were being constructed with special funds from the Treasury of Transylvania.

The entire gold mining area of Roşia Montană underwent a period of development never before experienced during the second half of the 18th century. Private owners or associations of private owners were granted the right to exploit the gold deposits by the state. This system of underground levels was mirrored on the surface by a complex system for the primary processing of the ore, which consisted of artificial ponds that supplied the installations for crushing the ore (stamp-mills) with water. These two components, represented by a multitude of artificial ponds, hundreds of stamp mills and the spoil heaps around the entrances to the mines, have defined the industrial picture of this mining area. The Greek-Catholic churches in the villages of Roşia Montană and Corna were built in the second half of the 18th century (1741 and 1781 respectively). During the 19th century new innovations took place with the exploitation of new areas and the development of exploitation techniques such as the use of electricity in 1908. The highly technical level of the exploitation at Rosia was recognized at an international level during the World Industrial Exhibition of 1856.

After the Great Unification of 1918 the Romanian State took control of mining from the Austro-Hungarian administration. Processes were technologically upgraded until 1948, after which time private exploitation was suppressed. The communist period led to the depopulation and sudden end of traditional processes. During the 1970s open-cast mining took place in the Cetate quarry, the effects of which on the environment are visible today.

Recognition of the archaeological significance of the area

It was recognised as early as the 15th century that the area surrounding and incorporating Roşia Montană was archaeologically significant. This was largely due to the discovery of epigraphic and sculptural material dating from the Roman period, and other stray finds indicating the presence of activity dating to the Roman period and later.

It was during the 19th and twentieth centuries that a greater understanding of the scale and importance of the remains was attained with the discovery of Roman wax tablets and other finds, and funerary stele, and so a better idea of the location of areas of mining, settlement and religious/funerary activity was established.

This basic data led to an understanding of the need for a detailed project design and programme of archaeological fieldwork (which began in 1999/2000 and led to the Alburnus Maior National Research Programme) in order to be in a position to assess the scale and significance of the remains present and then build on this baseline data to produce a detailed management framework and research programme. Prior to this research programme very little fieldwork had been undertaken.

Chapter 2 Description of the archaeological sites from Roşia Montană

In 2000 a study was produced incorporating what was known of the cultural heritage at that time based on literary and archive sources and preliminary investigations undertaken both above and below ground during 1999 and 2000 in order to assess the scale and location of remains (UTAH, INMI (formerly CPPCN), MNUAI 2000). Underground investigations were undertaken within the Carnic, Cetate, Carnicel, Jig-Vaidoaia, Tarina and Orlea massifs and above-ground archaeological fieldwork was undertaken in the

Nanului Valley, the Cetate-Gauri area, Carpeni hill, the Orlea-Tarina area, Carnic massif, the Taul Cornei area, the Corna valley, the Jig-Vaidoiaia massif and the historic centre of Roşia Montană.

The Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs decided to establish the Alburnus Maior National Research Program in spring 2001 (Order of the Minister of Culture No. 2504 of 07.03.2001, and was implemented under Law No. 378/2001, (further amended by Law No. 462/2003 and Law No. 258/2006, respectively), based on the conclusions of the evaluation study and administered on behalf of the Ministry of Culture by the National History Museum and with the financial aid and logistical assistance of S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation S.A, as part of its obligation in the process of seeking authorization for the planned mining activities.

One of the main aims of this program was the extensive research of the archaeological remains and the delineation of the archaeological sites. These have been investigated, both by surface archaeological research and underground mining archaeological research – a premiere for Romanian archaeology.

Based on research results it was possible to identify the following sites:

1. Gauri - Hop - Hăbad - Taul Tapului
2. Valea Nanului (Nanului valley)
3. Carpeni
4. Cârnic Massif
5. Cetate Massif
6. Historic Centre Roşia Montană
7. Jig – Vaidoiaia Massif
8. Tarina
9. Orlea Massif
10. Pârâul Porcului - Taul Secuilor
11. Valea Cornei (Corna valley)
12. Taul Cornei - Corna Sat
13. Balmoesti

The archaeological and historical background to the area is described in detail.

Section **2.3 Interests** describes the large number of stakeholders (interests) or potentially interested parties with regard to the heritage of Roşia Montană. There are individual, public and corporate interests at the local, regional, national and transnational level. For this summary the most important are National and Local responsibilities.

The **National Responsibility** for the Heritage and strategic activities and the archaeological policy domain are the responsibility of the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs (MCC). Operational and some administrative functions are delegated to subordinate institutions by the ministry. In this way, the National Institute of Historical Monuments provides scientific, methodological, and other strategic documents; they develop evidence and administration activities for the heritage; or they undertake projects and research programmes for this domain. The National Office of Historical Monuments controls the planning of the protection of heritage activities at national level, through the design of the National Restoration Plan, according to the Ministry's strategy. They also make some decisions concerning the provision of funds for these activities, either from the budget or from other resources.

Local Responsibility for the Heritage resides with the mayor of the commune and the local administrative council has legal responsibility for the protection of the local archaeological heritage. Also, the development of the tourism potential in order to focus on long-term development of the area is an important consideration, and will require a partnership with the local council of the Roşia Montană. At county level the responsibility of a legal frame return to County Directorate for Culture, Religious Affairs and National Cultural Heritage Alba.

The principal Archaeological Sites (including the Roman galleries) have been listed locally and also nationally on the Historical Monuments List (L.M.I, in the Town planning for the National Territory – Section III, Protected Areas (P.A.T.N./III), as part of the cultural heritage of national interest. These are:

- The Roman Settlement from Alburnus Maior, Orlea area (code LMI AB-I-m-A-00065.01)
- The Roman exploiting mine from Alburnus Maior, Orlea Massif (code LMI AB-I-m-A-00065.02)
- The Roman remains from Alburnus Maior, Carpeni area (code LMI AB-I-m-A-00065.03)
- The Roman funerary- place from "Hop-Gauri" area (code LMI AB-I-m-A-00065.04)
- "Catalina Monulesti" gallery from the Protected Zone of the historical centre of the place (code LMI AB-I-m-A-00065.05)
- The Roman galleries from Cârnic Massif, specific place "Piatra Corbului" (code LMI AB-Is-A-20329)

Legislation and administrative responsibilities relating to the heritage are discussed in section 3 of CHMP III and summarised in this document in section CHMP II pages 25-26. Land ownership related to the archaeological sites identified within the perimeter of the commune is both public and private. See page 10 of the CHMP I.

Results of the Research 2000-2005

The archaeological research over the years since 2000 has defined the areas in which the ancient remains have survived. Four main archaeological monument categories were identified and described:

- habitation areas with related infrastructure (Hop-Gauri, Hăbad, Tăul Tapului, Dealul Carpeni)
- open air sacred areas (Hăbad, Valea Nanului and maybe Carpeni)
- funerary areas (Illyrian settlers' cremation necropolises – Hop, Tăul Corna, Jig-Piciorag, Tarina, Pârâul Porcului – Tăul Secuilor and the funerary areas from Nanului valley and Dealul Carpeni)
- ancient mining areas (parts of the old mining galleries and exploitation of the Cetate and Cârnic massifs).

The most significant discoveries, which are considered to merit **preservation in situ**, are:

- the Roman funerary monument at Tau Gauri
- the Roman habitation (including a funerary enclosure and a possible sacred area) from Dealul Carpeni
- the ancient mining exploitations at Piatra Corbului from the southern-east part of the mountainside Cârnic
- the Roman hydraulic system at the mining sector Paru-Carpeni
- a series of archaeological remains from the Historic Centre Roşia Montană, including the Cătălina Monuleşti gallery (where a significant collection of waxed tablets and a Roman wooden hydraulic system have been discovered) and the ancient exploitation Văidoaia area.

Considering the current condition of the archaeological sites, and the research results from 2000-2005; the general approach for management of the identified heritage resources included the following:

- the development of a mining museum containing:
 - A documentary exhibition themed around three main topics: geology, archaeology and history-ethnography
 - An open air exhibition containing ethnographic elements and industrial elements of the heritage
 - An underground exhibition that includes the Cătălina Monuleşti gallery (which contains remains from all historical periods of mining, from the Roman period age to the contemporary age), which will be complemented in future by replicas of the most important mining structures identified in other massifs from Roşia Montană area
- The in situ preservation of some archaeological remains and their cultural-tourism development e.g. hiking trails taking the visitor to a number of archaeological sites e.g. Tău Găuri, Dealului Carpeni, Piatra Corbului, ancient surface exploitation from Văidoaia area
- Research opportunities for the development and implementation of a multi-disciplinary, programme focused on a new concept for Romanian archaeology – mining archaeological research. This could also lead to educational courses/training and experimental archaeological work related to mining techniques used in all periods.
- There are other tourism options for the Protected Zone Historical Centre Roşia Montană heritage values, taking into account the 35 historical monuments, 3 churches, cultural landscape elements and their archaeological heritage values.
- Publications of research results

Chapter 3: Assessment and Objectives considers the fieldwork and interdisciplinary research undertaken during 2000-2005 and outlines an understanding of the state of preservation of all the areas and monuments investigated and also a quantification of the number of sites within the landscape and their boundaries. In Sections 3.1 the current state of preservation at each site is assessed, and then in Section 3.2 an assessment is made of the archaeological potential for each site. Pages 29-31 detail in tabular form the state of preservation of all of the sites investigated, and on pages 32-33 the table illustrates the cultural resources (finds, scientific data), which could be used in future museum exhibitions or research programmes.

Archaeological Mining Research of the remains studied within the Cârnic Massif, Jig Massif, and Cetate Massif have been quite thoroughly researched to date, whilst the remains within Coş, Carpeni, Orlea and Țarina Massifs, are at a preliminary stage of research. It is possible to see that among the ancient mining workings there is a systematic repetition of the shape and character of the workings from the whole underground mining system. There are also certain types of mining galleries that are typical of a sector or a certain massif, depending on the shape and the mineralized structures.

The **Ancient Mining techniques** and mineworkings are estimated to have extended to a total length of 7 km, of which an estimated 95% was dug with iron tools (chisel and sledge hammer or pick), a technique attested by the tool traces from the walls, and their regular shape, having a plane roof and floor, or having steps or tiers on the floor. Where very hard rocks were encountered (silicified dacite), hand-tool excavation was replaced by fire setting. Two sectors with ancient fire setting mining workings, are the Găuri sector to the south-west of Cetate massif and Piatra Corbului sector situated east of the Cârnic massif.

The discovery within the Păru-Carpeni sector of both hydraulic water wheel drainage systems (located towards the upper part of the massif) and vertical exploitation shafts made up by superimposing timbered trapezoidal galleries represents an important find, because this is the first time that such a discovery has been made by a specialized team of mining archaeologists. The preservation of these remains allows for the development of a working replica, which can later be used in experimental archaeological research of how the ancient hydraulic system worked.

The process of excavation and clearance of the mining galleries by its very nature can threaten the long-term survival of the galleries. Excavation means that the galleries are scientifically dug out, and the soil deposits and archaeological artifacts are removed (for preservation and study), but this process means that empty galleries, shafts and other voids will be left. The removal of the old mine waste, which contributed to stabilizing the mining works, very often leads to rock fractures and the collapse of the mining works. Moreover, during rainy periods, the cleared mining networks become drainage areas for the seepage of water, thus contributing once more to the overall deterioration of the remains, by for example frost-induced rock fractures occurring during the winter season. The temporary timber supports installed during the excavation works do not represent long-term reinforcement structures.

Section 3.2.2 addresses contemporary economical values associated with the archaeological sites and highlights the point that: *“The cultural heritage should also be seen as generating an economic value –or be perceived as a financial resource”*.

Section 3.3 The Identification and evaluation of the main elements for the management of the archaeological sites identifies the opportunities which are perceived to result from the existence of historical monuments in the area. These opportunities are tied to **projects** which have specific objectives and ultimately aim to achieve the following **strategic aims**:

- The long term promotion of the cultural management of the sites;
- The medium to long term development and cultivation of the unique qualities and the special value associated with the sites ;
- The protection of the historical sites, and their promotion as part of a historical mining centre with a special tradition, denoting a number of exceptional components;
- The improvement of the access to a number of sites while promoting a multi-faceted understanding and appreciation of their unique characteristics.

- The promoting of the site's value and a wider interest and involvement in their administration, at the local, regional, national and international level.

Each of the aims presented address a series of **Objectives**. All of them are aimed at implementing the strategic aims previously identified. These are:

- All the policies, programmes, decisions and actions must play a part in the knowledge, protection, preservation and the valuation of the sites, promoting their value, and their preservation for future generations;
- All the policies, the programmes, the decisions and the activities must be based on long –term development principles;
- All the parties implicated, both individuals and organizations – governmental, charitable, commercial interests, with an interest in the administration or the usage of the sites, whether within or outside of the community, will have to become familiar with the value and significance of the sites and also, to the specific concepts and the requests for the preservation, protection and valuation of the cultural and natural heritage.

Section 3.4 includes a discussion of the main management issues for the archaeological sites. The Ideal Aim of the project is considered to be: *“The protection, preservation, and evaluation of the scientific data of the archaeological sites from Roşia Montană area, as an ancient mining site, will reveal the cultural identity and the economical transformation, growth and reconstruction of the area.”*

The management issues are considered under a series of general headings (pages 45-52) as positive and negative and according to the various organizations involved. This includes an explicit recognition that partnerships with a variety of local and regional organizations are the only realistic means for sustainable development and management of the archaeological heritage to be achieved (see sections 3.4.6 and 3.4.9 in particular). Section 3.4.9 introduces the concept of an independent Foundation to manage heritage issues, which is picked-up and discussed in much more detail in the subsequent management plans. The Foundation will manage the majority of initiatives concerned with cultural heritage in a framework of community sustainable development and as a result of this link to “sustainability”, greater detail is provided on the Foundation in the **ESMS Plans, Plan L, Community Sustainable Development Plan**.

Activities the Foundation could undertake which promote cultural tourism and the protection of cultural resources include:

- Establishing, staffing, and operating a museum/cultural heritage centre to store artifacts from the RMGC financed archaeological programme and the RosiaMin museum, training of local guides and setting up a small shop in association with a museum;
- Maintaining and repairing historical buildings;
- Promotion of the industrial mining heritage of Roşia Montană;
- Promotion of the village as a national and international tourist destination.
- Further dissemination from the Alburnus Maior National Research Programme, including archaeological, ethnological, historical building information via web pages, academic papers, or books, leaflets and other publications.

This section concludes with a discussion (**3.4.11 Subsidizing Funds**) of archaeological works proposed, the years in which the works might occur, and a provisional budget for the works, as shown in tabular form:

Specific Action	The amount of funds provided from RMGC budget (US \$)	Planned period
Preventive and supervision of archaeological research		
Surface preventive and supervision monitoring research	577,500	2007-2012
Geophysical investigations by GPR technique (Ground Penetrating Radar)	120,000	2007-2009
Underground preventive and supervision archaeological research	900,000	2007-2012
Subtotal 1	1,597,500	
Promoting activities of the cultural values of the site		

The analysis and public information programme	396,000	2007-2022
Sponsorships of certain cultural associated activities	48,000	2007-2022
Onsite visits	144,000	2007-2012
The attendance at conferences, scientific meetings and cultural exchange etc	140,000	2007-2012
Subtotal 2	728,000	
The publishing programme of the monographic series Alburnus Maior		
Publishing of new scientific volumes	970,000	2007-2012
Reprinting of scientific volumes	150,000	2007-2022
The promotion of the web page for the cultural heritage from Roşia Montană	32,000	2007-2012
Translations	60,000	2007-2012
Subtotal 3	1,212,000	
Restoration Programme		
The restoration of the Roman funerary place at Tăul Găuri	200,000	2007-2008
The Restoration of historical monuments buildings from the Protected Zone of the Historical Centre (35 historical monuments)	1,390,000	2007-2009
The Restoration of historical monuments buildings from outside the Protected Zone of the Historical Centre (6 historical monuments)	285,000	2007-2009
The maintaining of the Protected Zone from the Historical Centre from Roşia Montană	1,710,000	2007-2022
Rehabilitation Works in the area of the archaeological reserve from Dealul Carpeni	16,000	2007-2008
Maintenance and preservation works of the Roman hydraulic system from the mining sector Păru Carpeni	312,000	2007-2012
Subtotal 4	3,913,000	
The new mining museum foundation		
Replicas of the most representative mining structures	8,075,000	2010-2012
Re-opening and re-arranging for public visits of Cătălina Monuleşti gallery	1,297,500	2007-2009
The mining museum foundation	2,490,000	2008-2010
Subtotal 5	11,862,500	
RMGC budget provided for the functioning of the heritage department	6,389,000	2007-2022
TOTAL	25,701,500	

The phasing of the works is as follows:

No.	Site's name	Activity/ Categories of workings/ interventions	Planning
1	Găuri - Hop - Hăbad - Tăul Țapului	Publication of the researches' results (except the ones already published in volumes Alburnus Maior I and II) Restoration of the funerary monument from Tău Găuri Including the funerary monument from Tău Găuri in a public visit tour The museum valuation of the movable heritage items and the researches Archaeological monitoring during construction phase Implementation of the "chance find" protocol	2007 – 2012 2007 – 2009 2009 2010 2007 – 2009 2007
2	Valea Nanului	Publication of the researches' results (except the ones already published in volumes Alburnus Maior I) The museum valuation of the movable heritage items and the researches Archaeological monitoring during construction phase Implementation of the "chance find" protocol	2007 – 2012 2010 2007 – 2009 2007
3	Carpeni	Publication of the researches' results (except the ones already published in volumes Alburnus Maior I) Conservation and restoration of the Roman hydraulic system from Păru Carpeni mining sector Including Carpeni archaeological reservation in a public visit tour The museum valuation of the movable heritage items and the researches	2007 – 2012 2007 – 2012 2012 2010
4	Cârnic	Publication of the researches' results (except the ones already published in	2007 – 2012

No.	Site's name	Activity/ Categories of workings/ interventions	Planning
	massif	volumes Alburnus Maior I) Conservation of the galleries from Pietra Corbului area Including the galleries from Pietra Corbului in a public visit tour The museum valuation of the movable heritage items and the researches Realisation of the 3D model of the ancient galleries from Cărnic massif Archaeological monitoring during construction and operation phase Implementation of the "chance find" protocol	2007 – 2009 2012 2010 2006 – 2007 2007 – 2022 2007
5	Cetate massif	Publication of the researches' results (except the ones already published in volumes Alburnus Maior I) The museum valuation of the movable heritage items and the researches Archaeological monitoring during construction and operation phase Implementation of the "chance find" protocol	2007 – 2012 2010 2007 – 2022 2007
6	Historical Centre Roşia Montană	Publication of the researches' results Finalizing reopening works in Cătălina Monuleşti gallery Including Cătălina Monuleşti gallery in a public visit tour The museum valuation of the movable heritage items and the researches Setting up the new mining museum	2007 – 2012 2007 – 2009 2010 2010 2010
7	Jig – Văidoaia massif	Publication of the researches' results Including Văidoaia East area in a public visit tour The museum valuation of the movable heritage items and the researches Archaeological monitoring during construction and operation phase Implementation of the "chance find" protocol	2007 – 2012 2010 2010 2007 – 2022 2007
8	Țarina	Publication of the researches' results The museum valuation of the movable heritage items and the researches Archaeological monitoring during construction and operation phase Implementation of the "chance find" protocol	2007 – 2012 2010 2007 – 2022 2007
9	Orlea massif	Performing preventive archaeological researches (surface and underground) Publication of the researches' results Legal application for discharge procedures Relocation of the open air exhibition of the Orlea museum The museum valuation of the movable heritage items and the researches Archaeological monitoring during construction and operation phase Implementation of the "chance find" protocol	2007 – 2012 2012 – 2022 2012 2010 2010 – 2014 2012 – 2022 2007
10	Pârâul Porcului - Tăul Secuilor	Continuation of the preventive archaeological researches Legal application for discharge procedures Publication of the researches' results The museum valuation of the movable heritage items and the researches Archaeological monitoring during construction and operation phase Implementation of the "chance find" protocol	2006 2006 2008 – 2022 2010 2007 – 2009 2007
11	Valea Cornei	Publication of the researches' results The museum valuation of the movable heritage items and the researches Archaeological monitoring during construction phase Implementation of the "chance find" protocol	2007 – 2012 2010 2007 – 2009 2007
12	Tăul Cornei - Corna Sat	Publication of the researches' results The museum valuation of the movable heritage items and the researches Archaeological monitoring during construction and operation phase Implementation of the "chance find" protocol	2006 2010 2007 – 2009 2007
13	Balmoșești	To be decided during public consultation process	

Section 3.5 (Factors with potential negative impact) makes the point that as an option 'do-nothing' is likely to mean that the archaeological resources – sites, structures/monuments, and under-ground galleries – will all continue to degrade due to natural causes. Do-nothing does not mean that the sites would be preserved.

Section 3.6 Operational Aims and Managerial Options presents the conclusion of this excursive consideration of the archaeological remains discovered or considered likely to be present, the threats to their long-term survival, the options that are present for making positive beneficial use of those remains. The outcome is a compendium of 118 individual 'projects' or 'policies' (see pages 55-70). These are considered under 44 headings, but for present summary purposes the full set of 'projects' makes the point.

Section 4.3.1 Project Titles, identification elements and priority status tabulates the Projects in a helpful layout:

Project's title	Identification	Priority
Project 1. The proposal of a representative organizational structure that can ensure the functioning of the Heritage Management of Roşia Montană.	RM-ARH1-MNG1	mandatory
Project 2. All the actors need to be made aware of the significance of the sites and the individual features that contribute to this significance.	RM-ARH1-MNG2	important
Project 3. All the stakeholders are to be informed of the administration principles for the sites and of goals sought after through their management.	RM-ARH1-MNG3	important
Project 4. The access to the Management Plan will have to be assured to specialists, inhabitants, owners, managers and stakeholders.	RM-ARH1-MNG4	mandatory
Project 5. The dissemination of information regarding the existence of the sites, their significance and their features will have to be greatly promoted. This first draft of the Management Plan will have to be widely distributed in order to disseminate its contents to all the stakeholders, directly or indirectly.	RM-ARH1-MNG5	important
Project 6. To the extent possible, each actor should be encouraged to be involved in finalizing and implementing the Management Plan.	RM-ARH1-MNG6	important
Project 7. Establishment of the heritage archive for Roşia Montană in a way that controls, coordinates and correlates all the relevant documents for the sites.	RM-ARH1-MNG7	mandatory
Project 8. The administration of the archaeological heritage archive from Roşia Montană.	RM-ARH1-MNG8	mandatory
Project 9. The organization of an informative seminar to present the archaeological heritage from Roşia Montană, the Management Plan and of the legal framework concerning the protection and the preservation of the archaeological heritage at a national level, European level, and International one, and also the mission and the commission of the Heritage Management from Roşia Montană	RM-ARH1-MNG9	recommended
Project 10. The organization of ideas competitions and a competition of projects through which the important themes raised by The Management Plan can be further discussed. These include the preservation and the valuation of the mining, architectural, archaeological heritage, the relationship between the heritage elements and modern architecture.	RM-ARH1-MNG10	recommended
Project 11. The organization of a forum to debate the issues raised by the development and the implementation of the Management Plan.	RM-ARH1-MNG11	recommended / optional
Project 12. The clear outlining of management issues through the organization of thematic workshops, which will take place with work groups	RM-ARH1-MNG12	recommended
Project 13. The establishment of a monitoring plan and the directions that should be followed at each stage of the implementation of the Management Plan.	RM-ARH1-MNG13	important
Project 14. The foundation of the Heritage Management of	RM-ARH1-MNG14	mandatory

Roşia Montană (associated to project 1)		
Project 15. The Attraction of financial resources from all kind of sources, for the starting up of the administration programme of the archaeological heritage and of the sites preserved in situ.	RM-ARH1-MNG15	important
Project 16. The training of all the parts involved in the process of administration of the archaeological heritage regarding the access to all kind of financial sources	RM-ARH1-MNG16	important
Project 17. The inventorying and the classification of the cultural resources component of the archaeological heritage. The identification of the potential for tourism and scientific and educational, learning from each of the individual archaeological sites.	RM-ARH1-MNG17	important
Project 18. Attracting the specialized staff resources for the implementation of the Management Plan .	RM-ARH1-MNG18	mandatory
Project 19. The re-orientation of specialized staff for starting the administration process of the site with an emphasis on hiring from the local community.	RM-ARH1-MNG19	recommended
Project 20. Undertaking a risk analysis for the archaeological heritage. The main stages of the analysis will be: the identification of the present and potential risks; their classification according to the danger they pose to management goals; the establishment of the measures and action- priorities in order to mitigate the risks and their potential impact.	RM-ARH1-MNG20	mandatory
Project 21. Implementation of an action plan for risk situations that reflects similar documents developed at a national or regional level.	RM-ARH1-MNG21	mandatory
Project 22. Undertaking the preventive archaeological research in the Orlea area (surface and underground) (associated with project 89)	RM-ARH2-CERC1	mandatory
Project 23. Undertaking archaeological research in the Țarina area (underground) (associated with project 89)	RM-ARH2-CERC2	mandatory
Project 24. Undertaking archaeological research in the historical Centre Roşia Montană (surface and underground), in particular the mining archaeological studies in Cătălina Monuleşti gallery (associated with project 89).	RM-ARH2-CERC3	obligatory
Project 25. Undertaking archaeological research in the area of the mining sector Păru Capeni (underground) (associated with project 89)	RM-ARH2-CERC4	mandatory
Project 26. Undertaking archaeological research in the Balmoşeşti area (associated with project 89)	RM-ARH2-CERC5	optional
Project 27. The delimitation and the establishment of the protected area for the archaeological reservation at Dealul Carpeni and the mining underground sector Păru Carpeni	RM-ARH2-ZP1	recommended
Project 28. The delimitation and the establishment of the protected area for the Roman Funerary area at Tău Găuri	RM-ARH2-ZP2	recommended
Project 29. The delimitation and the establishment of the protected area for the archaeological reservation at Tăul Secuilor	RM-ARH2-ZP3	recommended
project 30 The delimitation and the establishment of the protection area around the cemetery at Țarina	RM-ARH2-ZP4	recommended
Project 31 The delimitation and the establishment of the protected area at Piatra Corbului	RM-ARH2-ZP5	recommended
Project 32 The delimitation and the establishment of the protected area at Văidoaia East	RM-ARH2-ZP6	recommended
Project 33 The archaeological supervision during the construction phase of the project Roşia Montană	RM-ARH2-ZP6	recommended
Project 34 The archaeological supervision during the operation phase of the project Roşia Montană	RM-ARH2-MNT2	mandatory
Project 35. The comprehensive assessment of the preservation status of the archaeological heritage elements form Carpeni, Orlea, the mining sector Păru Carpeni, Cătălina Monuleşti gallery and the establishment of priorities for action and the elaboration of an emergency action strategy plan .	RM-ARH3-CONS1	mandatory
Project 36. The organization of a preservation programme, which can provide consultation and technical support as well as access to resources for stakeholders.	RM-ARH3-CONS2	important

Project 37.	Implementing a monitoring programme for the preservation state and the behaviour in time of the protected areas containing archaeological heritage values and the archaeological reserves areas. The establishment of several measures and rules for the maintenance archaeological heritage values. Providing up-to-date information in order to constantly adapt the preservation programme.	RM-ARH3-CONS3	mandatory
Project 38.	Implementing an archaeological research programme in the archaeological reserves areas, that complies the desideratum that these constitute resources for research by future generations.	RM-ARH3-CONS4	recommended
Project 39.	The modernization programme and the extending of the existing archaeological storage facility in order to transform it in a deposit for the heritage goods of the future Mining Museum.	RM-ARH3-CONS5	mandatory
Project 40.	Competition of projects regarding the establishment of the new Mining Museum	RM-ARH4-VAL1	important
Project 41.	The implementation of the thematic of the new Mining Museum	RM-ARH4-VAL2	mandatory
Project 42.	The building of the new Mining Museum	RM-ARH4-VAL3	mandatory
Project 43.	The creation of the new Mining Museum	RM-ARH4-VAL4	mandatory
Project 44.	The organization and the arranging of the new Mining Museum	RM-ARH4-VAL5	mandatory
Project 45.	The administration of the new Mining Museum	RM-ARH4-VAL6	mandatory
Project 46.	Competition of projects regarding the organization of the open space exhibition of the future mining museum	RM-ARH4-VAL7	important
Project 47.	The organization of the open space exhibition for the future mining museum	RM-ARH4-VAL8	mandatory
Project 48.	The maintenance and the development of the open space exhibition of the new Mining Museum	RM-ARH4-VAL9	mandatory
Project 49.	Competition of projects regarding the organization of an underground tour for the future Mining museum .	RM-ARH4-VAL10	important
Project 50.	The construction of replicas of the ancient mining structures belonging to the underground circuit of the new mining museum	RM-ARH4-VAL11	mandatory
Project 51.	Arrangement of the tour of Cătălina Monulești gallery	RM-ARH4-VAL12	mandatory
Project 52.	The restoration and the in situ preservation of the Roman hydraulic system.	RM-ARH4-VAL13	mandatory
Project 53.	The organization of the underground tour of the new mining museum.	RM-ARH4-VAL14	mandatory
Project 54.	The maintenance and the administration of the underground tour of the new mining museum.	RM-ARH4-VAL15	mandatory
Project 55.	Competition of projects regarding the touristic tour of the protected areas containing the archaeological heritage values.	RM-ARH4-VAL16	recommended
Project 56.	The implementation, organization and the management of the tourist tour for visiting the protected areas containing archaeological heritage values.	RM-ARH4-VAL17	important
Project 57.	Competition of projects regarding public display of archaeological heritage values from the protected areas and the from archaeological reserves areas.	RM-ARH4-VAL18	recommended
Project 58.	The administration, public display and of the archaeological heritage values from the protected areas and the archaeological reserves areas.	RM-ARH4-VAL19	important
Project 59.	The administration of the museum funds	RM-ARH4-VAL20	mandatory
Project 60.	The dissemination strategy of the scientific information associated with the archaeological sites.	RM-ARH4-VAL21	important
Project 61.	Cultural policies and marketing strategies for promoting of the mining museum and the cultural infrastructure associated to it.	RM-ARH4-VAL22	recommended
Project 62.	The undertaking of an experimental archaeology programme.	RM-ARH4-VAL23	optional
Project 63.	The implementation and the administration of the experimental archaeology programme.	RM-ARH4-VAL24	optional

Project 64.	Cultural policies and marketing strategies for the promoting of the experimental archaeology programme.	RM-ARH4-VAL25	optional
Project 65.	The assuring, within reasonable limits, access for disabled persons.	RM-ARH5-EDIL1	mandatory
Project 66.	Redistribution of traffic on access roadways (the directing of the traffic along adjacent thoroughfare; the roadway access towards the historic centre, within the possible structural features of the road network allowed only to riparian and supplying vehicles).	RM-ARH5-EDIL2	mandatory
Project 67.	The setting up of an integrated system of continuous public transport, that ensures access to the site from more regional centers(Deva, Alba Iulia, Cluj-Napoca). This could be achieved with a multifunctional ticket (train, bus/train- funicular railway- mine train) and with co-ordinated schedules for the variety of means of transport.	RM-ARH5-EDIL3	optional
Project 68.	Providing car parks, both for the local community and for visitors (tourist main car park in Pieței/Square area and others in the secondary areas).	RM-ARH5-EDIL4	mandatory
Project 69.	Providing access from the Historical Centre to all the components of the site (archaeological areas, constructed areas, monuments, natural elements).	RM-ARH5-EDIL5	mandatory
Project 70.	Securing a tourism partnership between Roşia Montană and the upper valley of Arieş.	RM-ARH5-EDIL6	optional
Project 71.	The revision and extension of the water supply system and providing the necessary capacity through the identification and capturing of other supplementary sources.	RM-ARH5-EDIL7	mandatory
Project 72.	The realization of a sewer system and of a purifying system for domestic wastewater.	RM-ARH5-EDIL8	mandatory
Project 73.	The reconstruction and the extension of the electrical distribution system and the street light system, if possible with buried wires.	RM-ARH5-EDIL9	mandatory
Project 74.	Providing ecological toilets at various points along the tourism route within the protected areas containing archaeological values and the archaeological reserve.	RM-ARH5-EDIL10	mandatory
Project 75.	Providing informing panels at various points along the tourism route within the protected areas containing archaeological values and the archaeological reserve.	RM-ARH5-EDIL11	important
Project 76.	Clearly demarcating the tourism route within protected areas containing archaeological values and the archaeological reservation.	RM-ARH5-EDIL12	important
Project 77.	Promoting community involvement in the realization of management aims and in the implementation of archaeological heritage programmes.	RM-ARH6-SOC1	mandatory
Project 78.	The restructuring and the sustaining of the social cohesion.	RM-ARH6-SOC2	important
Project 79.	Supporting of the cultural identity of the area taking into account its significant mining tradition.	RM-ARH6-SOC3	important
Project 80.	Professional training programme for the cultural tourism guides.	RM-ARH6-SOC4	recommended
Project 81.	Professional training programmes in tourism service field.	RM-ARH6-SOC5	recommended / optional
Project 82.	Professional training programmes for other tourism-related fields.	RM-ARH6-SOC6	recommended / optional
Project 83.	Educational programme aimed at the community members from Roşia Montană affirming their cultural identity based on a past mining tradition.	RM-ARH6-SOC7	recommended
Project 84.	The identification within the community of members with practical knowledge about traditional mining.	RM-ARH6-SOC8	recommended
Project 85.	A past for the future - resuming traditional mining practices in Roşia Montană and other traditional customs associated.	RM-ARH6-SOC9	important
Project 86.	The tradition and the oral memory of past mining and of other customs associated with it – pilot project / summer school programme	RM-ARH6-SOC10	recommended
Project 87.	“Treasure searchers” – the practice of mining	RM-ARH6-SOC11	important

during the historical ages at Roşia Montană – practical demonstrations–		
Project 88. Involving persons with practical knowledge about the traditional mining in the experimental archaeology programme.	RM-ARH6-SOC12	optional
Project 89. Continuing the National Research Programme Alburnus Maior	RM-ARH7-EDU1	mandatory
Project 90. The diversity of themes in the fundamental research.	RM-ARH7-EDU2	recommended
Project 91. The initiation of applied research programmes with a view to implementing diverse preservation and valuation methods for cultural and natural resources.	RM-ARH7-EDU3	recommended
Project 92. The valorisation of the research through educational programmes at different levels and through populating programmes.	RM-ARH7-EDU4	recommended
Project 93. Including a variety of subjects related to the mining history of Roşia Montană in the educational curriculum of pre-university classes in the Apuseni Mountains area.	RM-ARH7-EDU5	recommended / optional
Project 94. Providing supplementary educational programmes, aimed at raising awareness and knowledge of the values of the site. These programmes would take place in local and regional schools.	RM-ARH7-EDU6	recommended / optional
Project 95. The development of some vocational training programmes within other related fields for the protection and valuation of the site.	RM-ARH7-EDU7	recommended
Project 96. Specialized advanced-level studies that improve the knowledge about the site through the setting up of a specialized subject of archaeological mining within the public university system.	RM-ARH7-EDU8	mandatory
Project 97. The introduction of the equipment needed for educational programmes.	RM-ARH7-EDU9	recommended
Project 98. Providing an inventory of the archives from Romania, Hungary and Austria regarding the mining history at Roşia Montană and the setting up of a digital inventory of these archives	RM-ARH7-EDU10	important
Project 99. Undertaking of the access protocol and the use of the data contained in the site archive.	RM-ARH7-EDU11	mandatory
Project 100. Assessment of cultural resources and of the industrial and historical heritage elements from the mining area within Romania.	RM-ARH7-EDU12	recommended
Project 101. Setting up an initiative group for the implementation of a centre for archaeological, ethnographic, architectonic and industrial heritage for the mining area within Romania.	RM-ARH7-EDU13	optional
Project 102. Continuation of the Alburnus Maior monographic series to reflect ongoing research and the existing plan for publication.	RM-ARH8-TUR14	mandatory
Project 103. Publishing and printing additional volumes of the monographic series Alburnus Maior.	RM-ARH7-EDU15	mandatory
Project 104. Promotion of cultural values of the list at a national and international level by means of information and advertising campaigns.	RM-ARH8-TUR1	important
Project 105. Providing tourist, programmes and activities for the knowledge and understanding of the site features.	RM-ARH8-TUR2	recommended
Project 106. Promotion of archaeological values of the site, related to regional, national and international values, through information and advertising campaigns.	RM-ARH8-TUR3	recommended
Project 107. Encouraging visitors to explore the heritage values by setting up thematic routes, proper demarcation of interest points and providing any necessary equipment required to view each area.	RM-ARH8-TUR4	recommended
Project 108. Undertaking tourism marketing programmes, in order to identify and attract tourists from targeted groups.	RM-ARH8-TUR5	recommended
Project 109. Promoting the constitutive elements of the archaeological site connected to other valuable mining sites (networking) and promoting permanent strategies that take into	RM-ARH8-TUR6	recommended / optional

consideration results of programmes at the similar sites (benchmarking).		
Project 110. Increasing the tourism potential by grouping activities and services offered (packaging).	RM-ARH8-TUR8	recommended / optional
Project 111. Providing a welcoming / information centre in Piatra Albă and at of some secondary touristic - informative points.	RM-ARH8-TUR9	mandatory
Project 112. Facilitating provision of tourism infrastructure – accommodation, commercial and restaurants.	RM-ARH8-TUR10	mandatory
Project 113. Assessment of the most efficient administration method for the site as a whole (including the Historical Centre and the archaeological heritage areas, natural and cultural landscape elements).	RM-ARH8-TUR11	important
Project 114. To provide some groups of services from external sources to allow for efficient administration.	RM-ARH8-TUR12	recommended
Project 115. Environmental rehabilitation of Roşia Montană area.	RM-ARH9-ECO1	mandatory
Project 116. Constant monitoring of the environment factors in the area.	RM-ARH9-ECO2	mandatory

Pages 91 to 205 of the **Management Plan for the Archaeological Heritage of the Roşia Montană Area** contain a collection of Special Appendices. These include **Legal protection status of the archaeological sites of Roşia Montană area**, and **Site Record Cards** for the identified sites, and a guide to **Archaeological chance finds in Roşia Montană area before 2000** followed by a **Timeline of Rosia Montana** and, finally, **Photographs**.

4. PART II: MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR HISTORICAL MONUMENTS AND PROTECTED ZONE FROM ROȘIA MONTANĂ

Introduction

The structure and the contents of the Management Plan are based on the requests formulated by MMGA by address 8070/24.05.2004, as well as being based on examples of similar documents prepared for historical sites of exceptional value. The Management Plan for the Roșia Montană Historical Centre has the following main objectives:

- To draw up objectives for managing the historical sites and the cultural landscape they are part of, taking into account all the components of the landscape, such natural elements, archaeological and mining-archaeological heritage, to individual monuments and isolated structures;
- To stimulate the public's knowledge of, and interest in the site, and to promote the educational and cultural value of the cultural landscape as a whole;
- To define a management strategy based on the principles of sustainable development and which will pursue a balance between the conservation of the cultural and natural values, and tourism and exploitation of the natural resources;
- To identify the potential economic and cultural benefits of the site and to stimulate the local organisations and institutions to take part in maximizing these benefits without endangering the cultural resource;
- To propose a program of priorities for feasible actions that would contribute to the conservation and highlighting of the site.

The cultural heritage at Roșia Montană includes three essential value aspects:

1. The preserved industrial landscape retains important traces of the history of Roman and medieval exploitation of the area. For the Roman period a series of vestiges are significant as they represent the considerable effort of the Roman administration to extract the gold; during the 2nd – 3rd centuries AD an important Roman mining complex was developed here. The medieval and modern monuments are significant records of the pre-industrial processing technique at a time of transition in production technology on the eve of the Industrial Revolution. This type of processing was used in this area up to the contemporary period (ca. 1948) along with the larger-scale industrial exploitation.
2. This type of exploitation *profoundly influenced the area's landscape*, with its artificial ponds (the "țauri") and stamp mills, gallery entrances, waste dumps and the erosion of mountains surviving as visible traces of this complex industrial landscape.
3. The moment of transition to the industrial era, which in many cases led to the transformation of the mining settlements into towns, is strongly reflected in the configuration of the settlement and is an important part of its unusual character – a traditional mining village in which the urban transformation is strongly integrated with the rural landscape.

The legal status and importance of the historical monuments and protected zone at Roșia Montană

The cultural heritage elements present at Roșia Montană cover two of the three categories of historical monuments as defined by the *Law concerning the protection of the historical monuments (Legea privind protejarea monumentelor istorice = L. 422/2001)*: *monument* and *site*. Also, these elements can be integrated, according to the *Plan for Setting up the National Territory – Section III – Protected Zones (Planului de Amenajare a Teritoriului Național – Secțiunea a III-a – Zone protejate*, approved by Law 5/2000), as follows:

1. Natural protected areas of national importance and natural monuments – Piatra Despicata and Piatra Corbului
2. Cultural heritage values of national interest, respectively
 - *urban zone* - Historic Centre Roșia Montană, village Roșia Montană
 - *industrial architecture, arrangements of lines of communications* - The Roman galleries of the auriferous mining exploitations, comuna Roșia Montană, village Roșia Montană

- *monuments of folk architecture, village dwellings* - houses – 18th – 20th centuries - Comuna Roşia Montană, village Roşia Montană, Alba county

The largest heritage category relevant to the Historical Centre, the *site*, is identified as *Alburnus Maior – Roşia Montană Archaeological Site* (code L.M.I. 2004: AB-I-s-A-00065) which, even though it has no precise geographic delimitation as defined by the law, comprises all the Roman remains and implicitly covers the Historical Centre. The *Historical Centre of the locality* (code L.M.I. 2004: AB-II-s-B-00270) outlines the other important legislative requirements.

The category most commonly represented is that of “monuments”, comprising 41 monuments, which includes two churches and 39 houses (code L.M.I. 2004: AB-II-m-B-00269, from AB-II-m-B-00271 to AB-II-m-B-00311). Additionally, the 6 elements of the Roşia Montană archaeological site, listed as historical monuments, respectively the *Roman settlement at Alburnus Maior in the Orlea Area*; *The Roman mining exploitation at Alburnus Maior, in the Orlea Mountain Massif*; *The Roman remains at Alburnus Maior, in the Carpeni Area*; *the funerary precinct in the “Hop-Gauri” area*; *the Roman galleries in the Cărnic Mountain Massif, at the “Piatra Corbului” site*, *“Catalina-Monulesti” gallery in the protected zone of the locality’s historical centre* (codes LMI 2004: AB-I-m-A-00065.01 – 00065.05, and code LMI 2004: AB-I-s-A-20329) all belong to this category.

The General Urban Plan identified the delimitation of the protected zone of the Historical Centre in 2002, although the territory thus defined does not contain all the areas of heritage value, a matter that will be solved by drafting the PUZ for the Protected Zone Historic Centre Roşia Montană as part of the RMP.

The hierarchy that emerges from the legal framework, which incorporates the entire site and the Roman galleries, consists of:

- group A – *historical monuments of national and universal value* –, which conveys the importance of the archaeological component.
- group B including All the other heritage elements – *historical monuments representative of the local cultural heritage* – the same elements are defined by PATN/III (Plan for Setting up the National Territory – Section III –Protected Zones (Planului de Amenajare a Teritoriului National – Sectiunea a III-a – Zone protejate = P.A.T.N./III) as *monuments of exceptional national value* whose identification and protection represent objectives of *public utility and national interest* (L. 5/2000, art. 3).

The following table presents the legal status of the historical monuments in the protected zone, the Historical Centre of Roşia Montană. At present, S. C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation S. A. owns 14 historical monuments, and owns most of the estates situated on the perimeter of the Protected Zone, the Historical Centre Roşia Montană.

No.	Code LMI 2004	Name	Juridical status (owner)
01.	AB-I-s-A-00065	Alburnus Maior archaeological site	
02.	AB-I-m-A-00065.01	The Roman settlement from Alburnus Maior, Orlea zone	The estate where the monument is situated is privately owned
03.	AB-I-m-A-00065.02	The Roman mining exploitation from Alburnus Maior, Orlea massif	The Romanian State
04.	AB-I-m-A-00065.03	The Roman vestiges from Alburnus Maior, Carpeni zone	The estate where the monument is situated is privately owned
05.	AB-I-m-A-00065.04	The Roman funerary enclosure from “Hop-Găuri” zone	The estate where the monument is situated is privately owned
06.	AB-I-m-A-00065.05	„Cătălina Monuleşti” gallery	The Romanian State
07.	AB-I-s-A-20329	The Roman galleries from Cărnic massif, point “Piatra Corbului”	The Romanian State

08.	AB-II-s-B-00269	The "Dormition/Assumption of the Mother of God" Church	Romanian Orthodox Church
09.	AB-II-s-B-00270	Historical centre of the Roşia Montană locality – „Târgul satului”, The Market, Berg district, Brazilor street and the zone upstream of the market towards the lakes	
10.	AB-II-s-B-00271	Orthodox parish house no. 137	Romanian Orthodox Church
11.	AB-II-s-B-00272	House with commercial space, today cityhall no. 184	Roşia Montană cityhall
12.	AB-II-s-B-00273	House, no. 185	private owner
13.	AB-II-s-B-00274	House, no. 186	private owner
14.	AB-II-s-B-00275	House, no. 191	private owner
15.	AB-II-m-B-00277	House, no. 258	RMGC property and private owner
16.	AB-II-m-B-00278	House, no. 273	RMGC property
17.	AB-II-m-B-00279	House, no. 275	private owner
18.	AB-II-m-B-00280	House, no. 324	private owner
19.	AB-II-m-B-00281	House, no. 326	private owner
20.	AB-II-m-B-00282	House, no. 327	RMGC property
21.	AB-II-m-B-00283	House, no. 328	private owner
22.	AB-II-m-B-00284	House, no. 329	private owner
23.	AB-II-m-B-00285	House, no. 331	private owner
24.	AB-II-m-B-00286	House, no. 332	private owner
25.	AB-II-m-B-00287	House, no. 334	RMGC property
26.	AB-II-m-B-00288	House, no. 340	RMGC property
27.	AB-II-m-B-00289	House, no. 341	private owner
28.	AB-II-m-B-00290	House, no. 342	RMGC property
29.	AB-II-m-B-00291	House, no. 372	RMGC property
30.	AB-II-m-B-00292	House, no. 373	private owner
31.	AB-II-m-B-00293	House, no. 376	private owner
32.	AB-II-m-B-00294	House, no. 383	private owner
33.	AB-II-m-B-00295	House, no. 389	private owner
34.	AB-II-m-B-00296	House, no. 390	private owner
35.	AB-II-m-B-00297	House, no. 391	private owner
36.	AB-II-m-B-00298	House, no. 392	RMGC property
37.	AB-II-m-B-00299	House, no. 393	RMGC property
38.	AB-II-m-B-00300	House, no. 395	private owner
39.	AB-II-m-B-00301	House, no. 397	RMGC property
40.	AB-II-m-B-00302	House, no. nr. 398	RMGC property
41.	AB-II-m-B-00303	House, no. 407	private owner
42.	AB-II-m-B-00304	House, no. 408	RMGC property
43.	AB-II-m-B-00305	House, no. 409	private owner
44.	AB-II-m-B-00306	House, no. 482	RMGC property
45.	AB-II-m-B-00307	House, no. 547	private owner
46.	AB-II-m-B-00308	House, no. 549 (Romano-Catholic Church)	The Romano-Catholic Church
47.	AB-II-m-B-00309	House, no. 551	private owner
48.	AB-II-m-B-00310	House, no. 552	RMGC property
49.	AB-II-m-B-00311	House, no. 553	private owner

Chapter 1 Description of the historical monuments and of the protected zone describes each of these structures or monuments in some detail (pages 11 -17) and continues thereafter to provide a fairly detailed archaeological and historical background discussion (pages 17-28).

Chapter 2 (Evaluation and Objectives) begins with a detailed tabular summary of the degenerating condition or state of preservation of each of the sites/monuments/structures (pages 29-42) and includes the conclusion that: 'As a consequence, intervention, particularly in areas with highly degraded buildings, is essential in order to salvage the Roşia Montană Historical Centre. Chapter 2 continues with a discussion of the various threats to the survival of the various monuments/structures, including the consequences of the recent historic mining operations, depopulation, natural weathering and erosion etc (pages 42-43). This is followed by a brief discussion of some of the principal methods for assessing the 'value' of the surviving monuments, such as the cultural landscape, technological values, historic values, immaterial value, etc (p 43-46).

The management Plan then outlines a set of **Strategic Objectives** (section 2.4) that are worth repeating here in their entirety for completeness and consistency (page 46).

The management Plan aims at ensuring a framework (organizational/institutional, legislative, normative, regulatory) for the conservation of the natural and cultural heritage resources of the Protected Zone Roşia Montană Historical Centre.

This broad objective includes the following:

- protection and highlighting of the architectural, archaeological, landscape, industrial and natural resources, along with their urban and territorial contexts; improving the knowledge and understanding of the site;
- the introduction of elements to explain and interpret the site; its use as an educational resource; support for revitalizing the culture, economy and society of the local community.

The Plan will underline the main challenges which face the site, as well as the opportunities that derive from its protected status. These problems will be addressed through a series of operational objectives and projects, specially formulated to accomplish the strategic objectives, which are as follows:

- promotion of the site's sustainable management;
- ensuring the sustainable development and understanding of the unique qualities of the site and its exceptional value;
- protection of the site's exceptional value, at the same time promoting it as a flourishing centre of urban life in the Apuseni Mountains that benefits from its protected status;
- improvement of physical access and interpretation of the site, encouraging its unconditional use and understanding;
- large-scale promotion of the site's recognition at a local, regional, national and international scale and of the interest and large implications of its management.

A **vision** for the management plan is then expressed (page 47) as:

the protection, conservation and highlighting of the Rosia Montana Historic Centre as the most coherent nucleus that is most representative of the Roşia Montană historic culture, will lead to the affirmation of the site's cultural identity, and will act as a catalyst for economic regeneration and social reconstruction in the area.

A set of three general objectives and some 31 more specific objectives are then outlined. The three general objectives include:

- All the policies, programs, decisions and actions must contribute to the site's protection and conservation while at the same time supporting its exceptional value, substance and authenticity in order to ensure its safe-keeping for future generations;
- All the policies, programs, decisions and actions must be based on the principles of sustainable development;
- All the parties, individuals or organizations (government, charitable, commercial, interested in the management or use of the site, belonging or not to the local community) involved will have to be familiar with the value and significance of the site as well as with the concepts and demands specific to the conservation and protection of the cultural and natural heritage.

Chapter 2 then continues with a discussion of factors that would influence the implementation of the management plan (pages 47 – 51), including such issues as: tourism, research, depopulation as a consequence of recent historic changes in mining operations, the potential for the heritage to act as a catalyst for regeneration, sources of financing, etc.

Section **2.5.2 Operational Objectives and Managerial Options** then provides a discussion of the 31 objectives which are sub-divided as appropriate into 'programs' or tasks – a total of 72 such 'programs' are identified (pages 51 – 64). These objectives and programs/tasks are presented below in tabular form.

Table summarising the projects' titles, identification elements and classification

No.	Project's title	Identification	Classification
1	The proposal of a representative organizing structure, diversified and articulated, that would ensure the functioning of the Heritage Superintendence Roşia Montană.	RM1-MNG1	mandatory
2	Rendering knowledgeable all actors to the site's significance and informing them on all the characteristics that confer this significance.	RM1-MNG2	mandatory
3	Informing actors on the site's management principles and the objectives that derive from them.	RM1-MNG3	mandatory
4	Access to the Management Plan will have to be ensured for all the people who live on the site, for all the owners, managers or bearers of other types of interests.	RM1-MNG4	mandatory
5	The spread of information: the site's existence, characteristics and significance will have to be promoted on a large-scale. This first draw of the management plan, intended for consultation, will have to be distributed by all means in order to make it known to all those interested by the area's regeneration and development.	RM1-MNG5	important
6	As far as possible, each of the actors will have to be encouraged to become involved in the completion and implementation of the Management Plan.	RM1-MNG6	important
7	Control, coordination and correlation of all the documents relevant to the site.	RM1-MNG7	important
8	Organizing competitions of ideas and projects that will approach the important problems raised by the Management Plan: conservation and highlighting the mining, architectural and archaeological heritage; the relation between the heritage elements and new architecture; rethinking the site's functional and economic profile.	RM1-MNG8	important
9	Centralizing all information concerning the site and grouping it in a public and accessible digital database.	RM1-MNG9	mandatory
10	Organizing a forum for debating all the problems raised by the development and implementation of the Management Plan.	RM1-MNG10	recommended
11	The clear identification of management problems by organizing workshops focused on different themes, which would function, divided in workgroups	RM1-MNG11	recommended
12	Establishing a monitoring plan and the indicators to be followed at each stage of the implementation of the Management Plan	RM1-MNG12	important
13	Organizing periodic meetings between the members of the different branches or the partnership structure and the members of the local community	RM1-MNG13	recommended
14	Attracting financial resources from all types of sources in order to get the site's management plan started	RM1-MNG14	mandatory
15	Instructing all the parties involved in the site's management regarding the access to all categories of financing sources	RM1-MNG15	important

16	Inventorying and classifying all the local material resources. Identifying the potential for re-using the abandoned buildings at the site	RM1-MNG16	important
17	Attracting specialized human resources that would initiate the mechanism of development for the Management Plan	RM1-MNG17	important
18	The partial re-directioning of the specialists hired to start the site's management process towards the training of the human resources in the local community	RM1-MNG18	mandatory
19	The elaboration of a risk analysis for the entire site. The main stages of the analysis will be: identifying the present and potential risks; classifying the risks according to the degree of danger involved when related to the management objectives; establishing measures and priority actions in the perspective of eliminating the risks	RM1-MNG19	important
20	The elaboration of an action plan for risk situations, correlated to similar documents developed at a regional or national scale	RM1-MNG20	mandatory
21	The analysis and revision of the limits of the Protected Historical Zone, made up of the Historical Centre, the Protection area for the Historical Centre and the visual and historical context. Monitoring the effectiveness of the limits for the protection of this area's heritage values. The periodical adaptation of these limits as a function of the monitoring results	RM2-PAT1	important
22	The re-evaluation of the site's cultural heritage with the help of criteria and methods detailed by the methodological standards in use. The unification and correlation of the value integration – in LMI and in PATN/III	RM2-PAT2	recommended
23	The order of a study for systemizing, unifying and completing the legislation applicable in the domain for the protection, conservation and promotion of the natural and cultural heritage. The results of this study will be forwarded, as a proposal to improve the legislation, to the competent central public administration branches	RM2-PAT3	optional
24	The elaboration of the methodological standards for evaluation and classification of the cultural landscapes/patrimony, according to the provisions of the World Heritage Convention and of the European Convention on Heritage	RM2-PAT4	optional
25	The extensive study of the changes of the site's landscape as a result of human activities and as testimony to these changes. The planning of the necessary interventions necessary for the conservation and promotion of the relevant landscape components	RM2-PAT5	important
26	Encouraging the protection of sites similar to Roşia Montană inside the Golden Quadrilater or even in a larger area (the site's historical context)	RM2-PAT6	recommended
27	Exhaustive evaluation of the state of conservation of the heritage elements, establishing the priorities for the interventions, elaborating an emergency intervention strategy	RM3-CONS1	mandatory
28	Organizing a conservation program which will ensure technical consultancy and assistance and	RM3-CONS2	important

	render easy access to resources for the benefit of all parties involved in the management of the cultural and natural heritage		
29	Implementation of a monitoring program for surveying the state of conservation and the integrity of construction works. Establishing a set of measures and rules for the maintenance of the built heritage. Ensuring up-to-date information for the continuous adaptation of the conservation program	RM3-CONS3	mandatory
30	The conservation and the setting up of the known or to-be-discovered Roman, medieval or modern galleries (for example the modern and Roman segments of the Cătălina-Monulești gallery, the mining sector at the Păru Crapeni, Pietra Corbului area, Văidoaia area)	RM3-CONS4	mandatory
31	Conservation and restoration of the constructive and technical components of the artificial ponds (control mechanisms, the lock's control tower, dams)	RM3-CONS5	important
32	Implementation of measures for the conservation and stimulation of the landscape's visual characteristics, identified and interpreted through the research program (program 24)	RM3-CONS6	important
33	The conservation and restoration of the elements for the adaptation of the terrain's configuration (walls of delimitation and dry masonry terracing – mauri), as well as the elements marking the property's limits (fences, plantations used for delimitation, etc.)	RM3-CONS7	mandatory
34	Rehabilitation of the pavements and other surface covering treatments	RM3-CONS8	important
35	Revitalization of the existent functions and reactivation of the disappeared ones	RM4-VAL1	important/recommended
36	Introducing new functions	RM4-VAL2	mandatory
37	Creation of a website dedicated to the site, comprising a section of presentation and interpretation, divided in several levels of analytical depth	RM4-VAL3	mandatory
38	Creation of an informational centre for visitors	RM4-VAL4	mandatory
39	Reorganization of the mining museum, in a fitting space in the central Square area	RM4-VAL5	mandatory
40	Organizing, conserving and publicly presenting the collections, archives and any other document concerning the site	RM4-VAL6	mandatory
41	Creation of a centralized database for the site, accessible via the Internet	RM4-VAL7	recommended/optional
42	Thematic diversifying of the fundamental research	RM5-EDU1	recommended/optional
43	Initiation of applied research programs, in the perspective of implementing the different measures for conservation and highlighting the cultural and natural resources	RM5-EDU2	recommended/optional
44	Highlighting the research by educational programs at different levels and by promoting the programs	RM5-EDU3	important
45	Inclusion of certain themes concerning the site in the school curricula for different subjects (history, geography, natural sciences, etc.)	RM5-EDU4	recommended/optional
46	Creation of supplementary school programs in secondary schools and high schools at a local and regional level, means raising the level of awareness	RM5-EDU5	recommended/optional

	and knowledge of the site's values		
47	Development of vocational training programs in fields connected to the conservation and promotion of the site	RM5-EDU6	important
48	Creation of specialized study programs at a superior level, which would highlight and enrich the knowledge about the site	RM5-EDU7	mandatory
49	Introduction of facilities for the educational programs	RM5-EDU8	recommended/optional
50	Ensuring, within reasonable limits, unrestricted access for disabled persons	RM6-EDIL1	important
51	Redistribution of the access roads (direction of the traffic along a road passing at the center's periphery; access for the traffic in the centre, within the limits of the street network's morphological characteristics, only for people who live there and for supply vehicles)	RM6-EDIL2	mandatory
52	Creation of an integrated system of public transport, without any discontinuities, that would ensure access to the site from several regional centers (Deva, Alba Iulia and Cluj-Napoca), with combined tickets (train, bus / train – steam train – mine train) and with coordinated schedules for the different means of transportation	RM6-EDIL3	recommended
53	Ensure parking spaces for the local community (neighborhood parking lots), as well as for visitors (a main tourist parking lot in the Square's area and in other secondary nuclei)	RM6-EDIL4	mandatory
54	Ensuring the access from the Historical Centre to all the site's components (archaeological areas, built areas, monuments, natural elements)	RM6-EDIL5	mandatory
55	Revising and extension of the water-supply system and ensuring the necessary flow of water by identifying and using new supplementary sources	RM6-EDIL6	mandatory
56	Creating a new complete sewer system and a plant for treating the used waters	RM6-EDIL6	mandatory
57	Repairing and extension of the electric-power distribution system, of the TV, telephone and data-transfer systems, all of them with underground cables	RM6-EDIL7	mandatory
58	Promotion of the community's implication in achieving the management objectives and implementation of the site's development and highlighting programs	RM7-SOC1	mandatory
59	Rebuilding and supporting the social cohesion	RM7-SOC2	important
60	Supporting the affirmation of the cultural identity of the community at Roşia Montană	RM7-SOC3	important
61	Promotion of the site's cultural values at a national and international level, through information and advertising campaigns	RM8-TUR1	mandatory
62	Creation of circuits for visitors and of programs for experimenting, learning and understanding the site's characteristics	RM8-TUR2	mandatory
63	Promotion of the site's natural values in connection to the regional values, at a national and international level through information and advertising campaigns	RM8-TUR3	important
64	Encouraging the visitors to explore the site by creating theme circuits, by signaling and exploiting	RM8-TUR4	important

	the points of interest and providing facilities for each category of tourist services proposed		
65	The creation of focused tourist marketing programs, meant to identify and attract tourists from as many and as varied target groups as possible	RM8-TUR5	mandatory
66	The site's promotion in relation to other important mining sites (networking), and permanent adaptation of the promotion strategies by comparing the results with those obtained on other sites (benchmarking)	RM8-TUR6	mandatory
67	The growth of the attractiveness of the tourist offer by grouping together the activities and services (packaging)	RM8-TUR7	important
68	Creation of a reception, information and documentation centre and secondary centers for tourist information in the main areas and points of attraction	RM8-TUR8	recommended
69	Ensuring the indispensable auxiliary facilities – housing, public toilets, shelters, food and commercial points	RM8-TUR9	mandatory
70	Creation of a signaling and explanatory system for the points of interest	RM8-TUR10	mandatory
71	Environmental rehabilitation of Roșia Montană	RM9-ECO1	obligatori
72	Constant monitoring of the environment factors in the area	RM9-ECO2	mandatory

Section 3 then provides an outline for the **Management of the Historical Monuments and the Protected Zone**. This is based upon the suggested creation of a *Heritage Superintendence Roșia Montană*. This is envisaged as a local public organisation, to be comprised of individuals and representatives of existing local organisations 'that will ensure through their activity the site's promotion at a local, regional, national and international level'. The *Heritage Superintendence Rosia Montana* would be composed of an Executive Committee (section 3.1) which would establish sub-groups to consider and implement the objectives/programs/tasks identified in section 2.5.2, in the following theme-groups focused on the main activities

- Research and education
- Protection, Conservation and Restoration
- Tourism
- Public Relations and Promotion
- Resources.

The Executive Committee's role is identified as:

- establishing and implementing the counseling reports
- working to align the interests of groups or individuals
- directing the project management for strategic initiatives
- administering the *Heritage Superintendence Roșia Montană* and other relevant meetings
- creating the annual plan and budget which will have to be approved by the *Heritage Superintendence Rosia Montana*
- evaluating previous plans and budgets
- revising the Management Plan after 5 years
- establishing a budget and obtaining funds for the start of the Management Plan
- monitoring and evaluation of the work of the *Heritage Superintendence Roșia Montană* in achieving the objectives/programs/tasks
- elaboration of primary indicators for the duration of the projects
- evaluating the impact of the implementation – the analysis of data concerning the Management Plan overall:
 - the number of people that use the site: e.g., comparing tourists /resident population, the number of website visitors, etc

- the precise number of tourist and commercial facilities, etc.
- public funds turned to private investments, generated workplaces, etc
- the number of projects or documentations accomplished, concerning the protection
- the number of heritage elements and of the other affected elements
- competence – e.g. the number of qualified personnel
- evaluation of the knowledge concerning the site in target-milieus

In section 3.2 the various objectives and programs are discussed along with the proposed timetables and estimated costs for each. In table 3.1 (pages 76 – 94) the works intended for each of the 49 monuments/structures are identified in some detail, and these are timetabled and costed.

Table 4-1: Annual work plan and RMGC's middle and long-term plans for the historical monuments and protected zone from Roşia Montană area

No.	LMI 2004 Code	Name	Activity/ Categories of workings/ interventions	Estimated costs	Planning	Observations
01.	AB-I-s-A-00065	Alburnus Maior archaeological site				
02.	AB-I-m-A-00065.01	Roman settlement from Alburnus Maior, Orlea sector	Preventive archaeological research	217.500 USD	2007 - 2008	
03.	AB-I-m-A-00065.02	Roman mining exploitation from Alburnus Maior, Orlea massif	Preventive archaeological research	600.000 USD	2007 – 2012	
04.	AB-I-m-A-00065.03	Roman vestiges from Alburnus Maior, Carpeni sector	Including the monument to the public circuit in order to be visited Maintenance workings – permanent activity Elementary preservation and maintenance workings of the Roman hydraulic system situated in Păru-Carpeni sector Research and preservation of the Roman hydraulic system situated in Păru-Carpeni sector	16.000 USD 14.000 USD 250.000 USD	2007 – 2022 2007 – 2022 2007 – 2009 2009 – 2012	
05.	AB-I-m-A-00065.04	Roman funerary precincts from “Hop-Găuri” sector	Starting the monument restoration project Including the monument to the public circuit in order to be visited Maintenance workings – permanent activity	170.000 USD 10.000 USD	2007 – 2012 2007 - 2022	
06.	AB-I-m-A-00065.05	„Cătălina Monuleşti” gallery	Finishing the archaeological research and the underground museum project Including the monument to the public circuit in order to be visited Maintenance workings – permanent activity	1.200.000 USD 97.500 USD	2007 – 2012 2007 - 2022	
07.	AB-I-s-A-20329	Roman galleries from Cărnăc massif, “Piatra Corbului” sector	Including the monument to the public circuit in order to be visited Maintenance workings – permanent activity	50.000 USD	2007 – 2012 2007 - 2022	
08.	AB-II-s-B-00269	Assumption of the Virgin Church (Biserica Adormirea Maicii Domnului)	Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals • Relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks;	84.700 USD	2007 – 2009	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consolidating the stone walls by introducing a reinforced concrete girdle and small reinforced concrete pillars; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Partly remaking the interior and exterior finishing off; • Insuring the spire against horizontal actions (wind, earthquakes, controlled explosions). Maintenance workings – permanent activity 	5.800 USD	2009 - 2022	
09.	AB-II-s-B-00270	Historical centre of Roşia Montană village– “The village trade”(„Târgul satului”), The Market, Berg neighbourhood, Brazilor Street and the area up the Market, towards the lakes	Drawing up and then getting the village planning approvals for the Protected Area the Historical Centre Roşia Montană Restoration/ preservation workings Including the monument to the public circuit in order to be visited Maintenance workings – permanent activity	43.560 USD	2007	
				1.500.000 USD	2007 – 2012	
10.	AB-II-s-B-00271	The Greek Catholic parish house no. 137	Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals	42.350 USD	2007 – 2009	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Making a reinforced concrete girdle at the level of the floor over the first floor and replacing the existing lintels; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off Maintenance workings – permanent activity	5.800 USD	2007 - 2022	

11.	AB-II-s-B-00272	Private trade house, the village hall at the present no. 184	Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals	38.720 USD	2007 – 2009	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Making a reinforced concrete girdle at the level of the floor over the first floor; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements. Maintenance workings – permanent activity	5.800 USD	2007 - 2022	
12.	AB-II-s-B-00273	House, no. 185	Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals	24.200 USD	2007 – 2009	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off; • Insuring the chimneys against horizontal actions (wind, earthquakes, controlled explosions). Maintenance workings – permanent activity	5.800 USD	2007 - 2022	
13.	AB-II-s-B-00274	House, no. 186	Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals	25.410 USD	2007 – 2009	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; 			

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off; • Insuring the chimneys against horizontal actions (wind, earthquakes, controlled explosions). Maintenance workings – permanent activity	5.800 USD	2007 - 2022	
14.	AB-II-s-B-00275	House, no. 191	Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off. Maintenance workings – permanent activity	14.036 USD	2007 – 2009	
				5.800 USD	2007 - 2022	
15.	AB-II-m-B-00277	House, no. 258	Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Making a reinforced concrete girdle at the level of the floor over the first floor and replacing the existing lintels; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off. Maintenance workings – permanent activity	51.183 USD	2007 – 2012	
				6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
16.	AB-II-m-B-00278	House, no. 273	Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation	16.577 USD	2007 – 2012	

			<p>workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off; <p>Maintenance workings – permanent activity</p>	6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
17.	AB-II-m-B-00279	House, no. 275	<p>Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off. <p>Maintenance workings – permanent activity</p>	17.545 USD	2007 – 2012	
				6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
18.	AB-II-m-B-00280	House, no. 324	<p>Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks including the brickworked vaults; • Making a reinforced concrete girdle at the level of the floors over the first floor and the upper storey; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; 	78.650 USD	2007 – 2012	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • replacing the existing lintels; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off; • Insuring the chimneys against horizontal actions (wind, earthquakes, controlled explosions).. <p>Maintenance workings – permanent activity</p>	6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
19.	AB-II-m-B-00281	House, no. 326	<p>Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks including the brickworked vaults; • Making a reinforced concrete girdle at the level of the floors over the first floor and the upper storey; • Remaking the floors over the first floor and the upper storey; • Remaking the framework; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off; • Insuring the chimneys against horizontal actions (wind, earthquakes, controlled explosions).. <p>Maintenance workings – permanent activity</p>	84.700 USD	2007 – 2012	
				6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
20.	AB-II-m-B-00282	House, no. 327	<p>Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Making a reinforced concrete girdle at the 	16.335 USD	2007 – 2012	

			<p>level of the floor over the first floor and replacing the existing lintels;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off. <p>Maintenance workings – permanent activity</p>	6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
21.	AB-II-m-B-00283	House, no. 328	<p>Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Making a reinforced concrete girdle at the level of the floor over the first floor and replacing the existing lintels; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off. <p>Maintenance workings – permanent activity</p>	56.265 USD	2007 – 2012	
				6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
22.	AB-II-m-B-00284	House, no. 329	<p>Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Making a reinforced concrete girdle at the level of the floor over the first floor and replacing the existing lintels; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; 	86.213 USD	2007 – 2012	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off; • Insuring the chimneys against horizontal actions (wind, earthquakes, controlled explosions).. <p>Maintenance workings – permanent activity</p>	6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
23.	AB-II-m-B-00285	House, no. 331	<p>Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off; • Insuring the chimneys against horizontal actions (wind, earthquakes, controlled explosions).. <p>Maintenance workings – permanent activity</p>	49.610 USD	2007 – 2012	
				6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
24.	AB-II-m-B-00286	House, no. 332	<p>Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off; 	15.972 USD	2007 – 2012	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insuring the chimneys against horizontal actions (wind, earthquakes, controlled explosions).. <p>Maintenance workings – permanent activity</p>	6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
25.	AB-II-m-B-00287	House, no. 334	<p>Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off înlocuirea, parțiala; • Insuring the chimneys against horizontal actions (wind, earthquakes, controlled explosions).. <p>Maintenance workings – permanent activity</p>	43.076 USD	2007 – 2012	
				6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
26.	AB-II-m-B-00288	House, no. 340	<p>Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off; • Insuring the chimneys against horizontal actions (wind, earthquakes, controlled explosions).. <p>Maintenance workings – permanent activity</p>	28.677 USD	2007 – 2012	

				6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
27.	AB-II-m-B-00289	House, no. 341	<p>Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off. <p>Maintenance workings – permanent activity</p>	28.677 USD	2007 – 2012	
				6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
28.	AB-II-m-B-00290	House, no. 342	<p>Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off; • Insuring the chimneys against horizontal actions (wind, earthquakes, controlled explosions).. <p>Maintenance workings – permanent activity</p>	38.720 USD	2007 – 2012	
				6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
29.	AB-II-m-B-00291	House, no. 372	<p>Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; 	25.773 USD	2007 – 2012	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off; • Insuring the chimneys against horizontal actions (wind, earthquakes, controlled explosions).; • Remaking the gate framing. <p>Maintenance workings – permanent activity</p>	6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
30.	AB-II-m-B-00292	House, no. 373	<p>Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off; • Insuring the chimneys against horizontal actions (wind, earthquakes, controlled explosions).; • Rebuilding the roof. <p>Maintenance workings – permanent activity</p>	24.321 USD	2007 – 2012	
				6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
31.	AB-II-m-B-00293	House, no. 376	<p>Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Strengthening the existing foundations; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate 	25.410 USD	2007 – 2012	

			<p>dampness;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off. <p>Maintenance workings – permanent activity</p>	6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
32.	AB-II-m-B-00294	House, no. 383	<p>Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off; • Insuring the chimneys against horizontal actions (wind, earthquakes, controlled explosions).. <p>Maintenance workings – permanent activity</p>	24.200 USD	2007 – 2012	
				6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
33.	AB-II-m-B-00295	House, no. 389	<p>Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off ; • Insuring the chimneys against horizontal actions (wind, earthquakes, controlled explosions).. <p>Maintenance workings – permanent activity</p>	50.215 USD	2007 – 2012	

				6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
34.	AB-II-m-B-00296	House, no. 390	<p>Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Building a reinforced concrete girdle and lintels at the level of the first floor; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off; • Insuring the chimneys against horizontal actions (wind, earthquakes, controlled explosions).. <p>Maintenance workings – permanent activity</p>	49.126 USD	2007 – 2012	
				6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
35.	AB-II-m-B-00297	House, no. 391	<p>Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Completely rebuilding the framework; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off; • Insuring the chimneys against horizontal actions (wind, earthquakes, controlled explosions).. <p>Maintenance workings – permanent activity</p>	45.133 USD	2007 – 2012	

				6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
36.	AB-II-m-B-00298	House, no. 392	<p>Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off; • Insuring the chimneys against horizontal actions (wind, earthquakes, controlled explosions).. <p>Maintenance workings – permanent activity</p>	75.141 USD	2007 – 2012	
				6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
37.	AB-II-m-B-00299	House, no. 393	Application of the declassifying procedure from the Historical monuments list			
38.	AB-II-m-B-00300	House, no. 395	<p>Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Making a reinforced concrete girdle at the level of the floor over the first floor and some small reinforced concrete pillars at the corners of the building; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off; • Insuring the chimneys against horizontal actions (wind, earthquakes, controlled explosions).. 	26.136 USD	2007 – 2012	

			Maintenance workings – permanent activity	6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
39.	AB-II-m-B-00301	House, no. 397	Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Making a reinforced concrete girdle at the level of the floor over the first floor and some small reinforced concrete pillars at the corners of the building; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off. Maintenance workings – permanent activity	32.670 USD	2007 – 2012	
				6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
40.	AB-II-m-B-00302	House, no. 398	Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Making a reinforced concrete girdle at the level of the floor over the first floor and the upper storey and some small reinforced concrete pillars at the corners of the building; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off; • Insuring the chimneys against horizontal actions (wind, earthquakes, controlled 	34.122 USD	2007 – 2012	

			explosions).. Maintenance workings – permanent activity	6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
41.	AB-II-m-B-00303	House, no. 407	Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Making a reinforced concrete girdle at the level of the floor over the first floor and some small reinforced concrete pillars at the corners of the building; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off; • Insuring the chimneys against horizontal actions (wind, earthquakes, controlled explosions).. Maintenance workings – permanent activity	34.122 USD	2007 – 2012	
				6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
42.	AB-II-m-B-00304	House, no. 408	Maintenance workings – permanent activity	6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
43.	AB-II-m-B-00305	House, no. 409	Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Making a reinforced concrete girdle at the level of the floor over the first floor and some small reinforced concrete pillars at the corners of the building; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; 	36.300 USD	2007 – 2012	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthening the main front side semi-basement wall; rebuilding the buttresses by connecting them to the wall they are boring; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off; • Insuring the chimneys against horizontal actions (wind, earthquakes, controlled explosions).. <p>Maintenance workings – permanent activity</p>	6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
44.	AB-II-m-B-00306	House, no. 482	<p>Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off. <p>Maintenance workings – permanent activity</p>	26.378 USD	2007 – 2012	
				6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
45.	AB-II-m-B-00307	House, no. 547	<p>Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Making a reinforced concrete girdle at the level of the floor over the semi-basement; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or 	73.205 USD	2007 – 2012	

			<p>the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off; • Insuring the chimneys against horizontal actions (wind, earthquakes, controlled explosions).. <p>Maintenance workings – permanent activity</p>	6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
46.	AB-II-m-B-00308	House, no. 549 (Biserica romano-catolică)	<p>Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Consolidating the stone walls by introducing some reinforced concrete girdles and small reinforced concrete pillars at the corners of the building; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off; • Insuring the spire against horizontal actions (wind, earthquakes, controlled explosions).. <p>Maintenance workings – permanent activity</p>	86.213 USD	2007 – 2012	
				6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
47.	AB-II-m-B-00309	House, no. 551	<p>Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Making a reinforced concrete girdle at the level of the floor over the first floor and the upper storey including some small reinforced 	68.970 USD	2007 – 2012	

			<p>concrete pillars at the corners of the building;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off; • Insuring the chimneys against horizontal actions (wind, earthquakes, controlled explosions).. <p>Maintenance workings – permanent activity</p>	6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
48.	AB-II-m-B-00310	House, no. 552	<p>Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; • Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements; • Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off. <p>Maintenance workings – permanent activity</p>	12.000 USD	2007 – 2012	
				6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
49.	AB-II-m-B-00311	House, no. 553	<p>Restoration/ preservation/ consolidation workings including getting the necessary legal approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaking, relaying and/or grout injecting the damaged stone or brickworks; • Making reinforced concrete girdles and lintels at the level of the floor over the semi-basement; • Waterproofing the socle in order to eliminate dampness; 	22.385 USD	2007 – 2012	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Partly or completely replacing the elements or the parts of the fallen into disrepair elements;• Remaking the interior and exterior finishing off;• Insuring the chimneys against horizontal actions (wind, earthquakes, controlled explosions).. Maintenance workings – permanent activity	6.000 USD	2007 - 2022	
--	--	--	---	-----------	-------------	--

This information is then presented in **Table 3-2. Proposed works and costs** to show the potential budget (or spend profile) on these works throughout the life of the RMP.

Section 4 of the Management Plan includes an extensive collection of bibliographic references. Within the Annexes, Annex 1 includes suggested **Potential parties for the Maintenance / Management of the Heritage** of Roşia Montană. Annex 2 lists **Possible financing sources (in addition to the ones proposed by RMGC)**, and Annex 3 is an **Estimated budget proposed by RMGC**. Annex 4 presents the **Illustrations** for the Management Plan.

Table 4-2. Proposed works and costs*

Activity	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
External special services (supply services contracts) for preventive archaeological researches and archaeological monitoring																
Surface preventive researches	85.000	60000														
Surface archaeological monitoring during construction	42.500	30.000	90.000	90.000	90.000	90.000										
Preservation of the movable heritage items found during preventive archaeological searches or by chance finds	50.000	50.000	50.000	50.000	50.000	50.000										
Underground preventive researches	120000	120000	120000	120000	120.000	120.000										
Underground archaeological monitoring during construction and operation	30.000	30.000	30.000	30.000	30.000	30.000										
GPR survey – Cârşnic & Orlea	40.000	40.000	40.000													
Subtotal 1	367.500	330.000	330.000	290.000	290.000	290.000										
Specific actions (programs) regarding the cultural heritage – restoration and conservation works																
Restoration of the funerary monument from Tăul Găuri	100.000	70.000														
Maintenance of the funerary monument from Tăul Găuri			2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	4.000
Restoration / conservation / consolidation works at Historic Monuments in PZ	250.000	250.000	250.000	250.000	250.000											
Maintenance works at Historic Monuments in PZ						10.000	10.000	10.000	10.000	10.000	10.000	10.000	10.000	20.000	20.000	20.000
Restoration / conservation / consolidation works at Historic Monuments outside PZ	125.000	125.000														
Maintenance works outside Historic Monuments in PZ			2.500	2.500	2.500	2.500	2.500	2.500	2.500	2.500	2.500	2.500	2.500	2.500	2.500	2.500
Maintenance works in the PZ	300.000	300.000	300.000	300.000	300.000	15.000	15.000	15.000	15.000	15.000	15.000	15.000	15.000	30.000	30.000	30.000
Rehabilitation works on Carpeni	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Maintenance and primary conservation of the water wheel in Păru Carpeni	1.000	1.000					1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Research and conservation works of the water wheel in Păru Carpeni			50.000	100.000	100.000	50.000										
Reopening and public access Cătălina Monuleşti	200.000	500.000	500.000													
Maintenance of Cătălina Monuleşti				7.500	7.500	7.500	7.500	7.500	7.500	7.500	7.500	7.500	7.500	7.500	7.500	7.500
Facsimilies – mining structures	500.000	500.000	1.000.000	2.000.000	2.000.000	2.000.000										
Maintenance of the facsimilies							7.500	7.500	7.500	7.500	7.500	7.500	7.500	7.500	7.500	7.500
New Mining Museum	250.000	500.000	1.000.000	500.000												
Maintenance of the New Mining Museum					20.000	20.000	20.000	20.000	20.000	20.000	20.000	20.000	20.000	20.000	20.000	20.000
Subtotal 2	1.727.000	2.247.000	3.105.500	3.163.000	2.683.000	2.108.000	66.500	66.500	66.500	66.500	66.500	66.500	66.500	66.500	66.500	66.500
PR & dissemination																
Publishing Alburnus Maior series	120.000	120.000	120.000	120.000	120.000	120.000	25.000	25.000	25.000	25.000	25.000	25.000	25.000	25.000	25.000	25.000
Book launchings	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000
Reprinting Alburnus Maior series	25.000	25.000	25.000	25.000	25.000	25.000										
Sponsorship	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000
Site visit Roşia Montană	4.500	4.500	4.500	4.500	4.500	4.500	4.500	4.500	4.500	4.500	4.500	4.500	4.500	4.500	4.500	4.500
Other PR activities related to heritage	4.500	4.500	4.500	4.500	4.500	4.500	4.500	4.500	4.500	4.500	4.500	4.500	4.500	4.500	4.500	4.500
Translations	10.000	10.000	10.000	10.000	10.000	10.000										
Web site – cultural heritage of Roşia Montană	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000
Subtotal 3 :	175.000	175.000	175.000	175.000	175.000	175.000	45.000	45.000	45.000	45.000	45.000	45.000	45.000	45.000	45.000	45.000
Subtotal 1 – 3 : Budget allocated by RMGC for heritage actions and programs																
Operational budget for the Patrimony Department of RMGC																

Labour costs	635.000	580.000	580.000	580.000	580.000	580.000	90.000	90.000	90.000	90.000	90.000	90.000	90.000	90.000	90.000	90.000
Internal transportation	38.400	38.400	38.400	38.400	38.400	38.400	15.360	15.360	15.360	15.360	15.360	15.360	15.360	15.360	15.360	15.360
Other administrative costs	18.000	12.000	12.000	12.000	12.000	12.000	9.000	9.000	9.000	9.000	9.000	9.000	9.000	9.000	9.000	9.000
Training for the implementation of the chance find protocol	8.000	8.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000
Conferences, congresses	50.000	50.000	50.000	50.000	50.000	50.000	20.000	20.000	20.000	20.000	20.000	20.000	20.000	20.000	20.000	20.000
Supplies	90.000	90.000	90.000	90.000	90.000	90.000	45.000	45.000	45.000	45.000	45.000	45.000	45.000	45.000	45.000	45.000
<i>Subtotal 2: Operational budget allocated by RMGC for the Patrimony Department</i>	<i>839.400</i>	<i>778.400</i>	<i>774.400</i>	<i>774.400</i>	<i>774.000</i>	<i>774.400</i>	<i>181.360</i>	<i>181.360</i>	<i>181.360</i>	<i>181.360</i>	<i>181.360</i>	<i>181.360</i>	<i>181.360</i>	<i>181.360</i>	<i>181.360</i>	<i>181.360</i>
TOTAL: Estimated budget allocated for heritage activities	3.108.900	3.530.400	4.384.500	4.402.000	3.922.000	3.347.000	292.860	292.860	292.860	292.860	292.860	292.860	292.860	292.860	292.860	292.860
TOTAL GENERAL ESTIMATED BUDGET	25.701.500 USD															

* NOTE: The amounts indicated in this budget are only estimates, presented as an initial guide. The allocation of these amounts by the company is pending of the implementation of the Roşia Montană mining project proposed by S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation S.A.

5. PART III THE CULTURAL HERITAGE MANAGEMENT PLAN

The third part of the Cultural Heritage Management Plan is an overview of the Cultural Heritage Management Plan. It provides the structure to ensure RMP's compliance with commitments presented in part I and II. This document also covers the management of cultural aspects that are not covered in part I and II, such as churches and cemeteries.

Part III is also a component of RMP's Environmental and Social Management System.

Section 1 provides the overall project background, while Section 2 summarises RMGC's **Roşia Montană Project Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS) Plans, Plan A, Environmental and Social Management Plan** and explains how the CHMP is integrated into the RMP operating procedures and is linked to other Management Plans. Section 3 summarises **International Guidelines and Legislative Framework**. This includes international guidance (e.g. from the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the relevant Romanian national legislation.

The main international guidelines include:

- UNESCO Recommendations on International Principles Applicable to Archaeological Excavations (1956);
- The United Nations Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972),
- The Venice Charter (1966).
- The Amsterdam Declaration (1975) European Charter of Architectural Heritage of the Council of Europe,
- Delphi Convention (1985). European Convention on offences relating to cultural property
- Florence Convention on Landscape (2000), devoted exclusively to the protection, management and planning of all landscapes in Europe;
- Granada Convention (1985) of the Council of Europe, Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage.
- And the Valetta Convention (1992) of the Council of Europe, European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage.

The main Romanian legislative documents that guide the protection of cultural heritage in Romania include:

- Law no. 378/2001, which is the main law that regulates activities concerning archaeological and architectural heritage in Romania, outlining the legal framework for archaeological field research, and providing definitions and regulations for areas of protected archaeological heritage. This law also indicates the institutions and special bodies entitled to make decisions regarding the protection of Romania's archaeological and architectural heritage, and also establishes the owner or investor as responsible for financing archaeological research required to obtain an archaeological discharge;
- Law no. 5/2000, published in the Romanian Official Monitor no. 152, 2000, establishes national protected zones of cultural patrimonial value;
- Law no. 182 / 2000, is the main law that regulates activities regarding the portable heritage, outlines the legal framework for the evaluation, classification, export etc of portable heritage items, and provides definitions and regulations for portable heritage items. This law also indicates the institutions and special bodies entitled to make decisions regarding the protection of Romania's portable heritage;
- Law no. 422/2001 requires that conservation of historical monuments must be coordinated by an authorised specialist;
- Law no. 311/2003 *Concerning the Museum and the Public Collections*; and, The General Urban Regulation Decision No. 525/1996. The General Urban Regulation Decision No. 525/1996 defines the urban plan and regulations, which Local Councils are required to prepare and update for the area within their jurisdiction. The Territorial Planning Plan (TPP) and the General Urban Plan (PUG) and the Regulations, constitute the technical and legal basis for any modifications to the area. Collectively, they modify existing land-usage in the comună (village) so as to

incorporate and authorize new public utility projects including mining projects. Both the Guide and the General Urban Regulations are part of the Ministry of Public Works and Land Order 80/N/1996. Additional urban plans and regulations include the Urban Zoning Plan (PUZ) and the Detailed Urban Plan (PUD).

PUGs are prepared by the relevant councils (i.e. city, town, borough), and follow a review/permitting process until the councils approve them. The permitting process includes authorization of the PUGs by various authorities (i.e. ministries of environment, of public works, of internal affairs, of health, of culture, etc.). Taking into account the fact that a series of areas in Roşia Montană are listed under Law 5/2000, in the context of the PUG 2002 of the industrial area of Roşia Montană, RMGC consulted with local authorities and the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs in 2002 to establish a **Protected Zone for the Historic Centre of Roşia Montană** in order to preserve the cultural heritage (churches, historical monuments, and market square) of the significant cultural parts within the village. A special town planning documentation (**PUZ**) is currently being developed for this zone, according to the conditions required by the MCC.

Section 4 then sets out the **RMGC Policy Regarding Cultural Heritage Management**. This explains that one of RMGC's fundamental beliefs when it comes to the management of cultural heritage resources is that these resources belong firstly to the local community where they reside. As such, RMGC's CHMP strives not only to protect Roşia Montană's culture heritage, but also to keep it, and promote it, for the benefit of the local community. RMGC will therefore seek to achieve in a sequential manner, the progressive development for the appreciation of Roşia Montană's cultural heritage. It is also recognised that self-promotion of cultural heritage and history in communities with low incomes is often a secondary priority and therefore links heritage activities into **ESMS Plans, Plan L, Community Sustainable Development Plan**.

Section 5 contains some of the principal information for the CHMP. This begins with a review of the heritage (or patrimony) team in a wider sense and refers to the detailed list of organisations involved as presented in Section 2 of the *Cultural Heritage Baseline Report*. This includes a brief description of the archaeological teams who will be undertaking the site work including the Chance-Finds Protocol.

Section 5.2 describes the Establishment of a Cultural Heritage Foundation in order to ensure the management of cultural heritage objectives within the Roşia Montană Project. This Foundation is assigned the following potential activities which promote cultural tourism and the protection of cultural resources includes:

- Establishing, staffing, and operating a museum/cultural heritage centre to store artifacts from the RMGC financed archaeological programme and the RosiaMin museum, training of local guides and setting up a small shop in association with a museum;
- Maintaining and repairing historical buildings;
- Promotion of the industrial mining heritage of Roşia Montană;
- Promotion of the village as a national and international tourist destination.
- Further dissemination from the Alburnus Maior National Research Programme, including archaeological, ethnological, historical building information via web pages, academic papers, or books, leaflets and other publications.

Other Community development activities by the Foundation that may also contribute to preserving the cultural heritage of Roşia Montană could include:

- Using the Skills Enhancement Programme to train locals in local crafts and encouraging existing artisans and tradespersons;
- Training local people in traditional building skills: carpentry/joinery, lime plasterwork, metal working, etc;
- Teaching regional traditional arts to improve local incomes and increase the tourism potential of Roşia Montană.
- Assist in provision of accommodation and food for visitors to the area.

The Foundation could be based in the Historical Centre Roşia Montană, house no. 342, and would also have a tourism bureau in Piatra Albă, the new town being developed by RMGC (section 5.2.1). Financial support for the Foundation would initially be provided by RMGC as seed funding (section 5.2.2). The initial commitment from RMGC will be further supplemented by continued contributions from RMGC. Once the Project and mining operations cease, the Foundation must be financially independent and viable.

The cultural heritage responsibilities of the Foundation (section 5.2.3) will include:

- Funding any repairs required of all 41 Historical Monuments, not resulting from the Project;
- Managing the Cultural Centre and Mining Museum (**Section Establishment of a Cultural Heritage Foundation**);
- Coordinating with RMGC to organize tours of the modern mine for the public and school trips;
- Promotion of local crafts enterprises, and facilitating and funding ecotourism;
- Securing additional funding and support for cultural heritage initiatives.

In 5.3 the potential establishment of a Roşia Montană Cultural Centre and Mining Museum is discussed. RMGC will provide the resources necessary to establish a Cultural Centre and Mining Museum, probably to be located in the historical centre of Roşia Montană. In addition to displaying items discovered during the RMGC-funded archaeological baseline data collection campaign, the museum will display items of ethnological and historical value such as folk costumes, tools, and furniture that were acquired by RMGC. RMGC will also request from the appropriate regulatory authority to transfer certain Roman era artifacts and historical mining curios (hand tools, stamp mills) currently on public display at the RosiaMin Museum, to the proposed museum.

Section 5.4 is an extended discussion of the Cultural Landscape, noting that some elements of the landscape such as archaeological sites or historic buildings (e.g. houses and churches) are for legal/formal reasons treated separately in Parts 1 and Parts 2 Management Plans respectively. Similarly, Impacts to the visual landscape resulting from the Project will be progressively rehabilitated in accordance with the **ESMS Plan J, Mine Reclamation and Closure Plan**. Socio- economic impacts and the viability of the protected area, both during the life of the mine, and after are considered in detail in the **ESMS Plans, Plan L, Community Sustainable Development Programme**.

Section 5.4 continues with a discussion of the areas adjacent to the Permitted Industrial Zone, identified as a Protected Zone in Roşia Montană which includes the main town square and a concentration of buildings declared as having architectural value. The National Commission of Historic Monuments, through its licenses No. 61 of February 2002 and No.178 of June 2002, has approved the establishment of this Protected Zone. A separate application for a PUZ for the Protected Zone was submitted to Alba County Council during 2006. The Protected Zone, which was established to protect a number of features of cultural value, is located in close proximity to the Jig and Cârnic massifs. The Protected Zone will include 35 of the 41 Historical Monuments present in Roşia Montană. A list of the 41 buildings is provided in **Appendix A to CHMP 111**, with the remaining six, lying in the industrial area. Nonetheless, the project has been designed so that none of these Historical Monuments are directly affected by the project. If required by the legal owners, RMGC will offer to purchase all historical monuments, with the exception of the Greek Catholic church, in accordance with the company's relocation and resettlement programme. As access to the Protected Zone will be maintained throughout the Project, existing owners are not required to sell these buildings. Regardless of ownership, RMGC will commit to maintaining the Historical Monuments at least in their present condition as required by Law 422/2001.

As a means of ensuring the financial viability of the proposed Foundation, RMGC will transfer ownership of all historic buildings to the Foundation once it has been determined that the Foundation is viable.

Section 5.5 Churches and Cemeteries contains a discussion of religious structures. There are a total of 10 churches and 12 cemeteries (not including private cemeteries on private property). However, with the current predominance of the Romanian Orthodox Church in the region and Romania at large, some of

these churches are now deserted or in need of restoration works. There are a total of six churches in Roşia Montană village. Three of these churches are outside of the protected area and include:

- The Romanian Orthodox Church (1741);
- The Greek Catholic Church (1781); and,
- The Pentecostal Prayer House

The three churches within the protected area include:

- The Roman Catholic Church (1866);
- The Unitarian Church (1796); and,
- The Reformed Church (abandoned; early 19th century).

In addition to the churches in Roşia Montană, there are also two churches and two prayer houses in Corna which would be directly affected by the project, including:



- The Romanian Orthodox Church (1719);
- The Greek Catholic Church (1841); and,
- Two Baptist Church prayer houses.



An evaluation of the various considerations and potential options for each of the churches and prayer houses in Roşia Montană and Corna is presented in **Table 5-1**.




The Romanian Orthodox Church and the Greek Catholic Church, together with the Pentecostal prayer house from Roşia Montană village, although located outside the protected area, will not be directly impacted by the Project. However, although some congregants may have chosen to resettle in Piatra Albă, and therefore remain relatively close to their Church, these churches will not be accessible at all times, but will be accessible to regular worshipers within a program to be established in the future with the company. As a result, consultation with representatives of each of the aforementioned congregations was initiated in 2002 and is ongoing. For the churches that will be displaced as a result of the Project, new churches will be constructed in the new resettlement community of Piatra Albă in order to accommodate the various congregations. If there are not enough parishioners from any of the religions to support a congregation in Piatra Albă, a settlement for the value of the church will be negotiated based upon an independent evaluation.




RMGC prepared an inventory of the churches to determine estimated relocation costs of movable items to within 10% of the actual cost of relocation for each of the churches. Between 2000-2001 independent contractors produced detailed investigation related to the architecture and brief history of each church in Roşia Montană and Corna. Archaeological review to investigate the Romanian Orthodox and Greek Catholic churches in Corna will be completed by the archaeological support team prior to Project activities. These investigations will allow RMGC to document and record any patrimonial and cultural information related to these churches.

Table 5-1 *Management Considerations for Churches and Prayer Houses in Roşia Montană* provides in summary form a description of the church, predicted impacts and proposed mitigation measures. The treatment of churches located outside the project area is discussed in section 5.5.1, and the treatment of those within the project area in section 5.5.2.

Name	Location/Geographic Coordinates (Stereo 70)	Directly Affected by Site Development	Protected Monument Status	Photo	Church Considerations and Impact Mitigation/Management Options		
					Architectural Considerations	Parishioner Considerations	Additional Considerations
The Roman Catholic Church (1866) – Roşia Montană	Roşia Montană, Piaţă Str., No. 549 x-535592,9 y-356134,7	No	Historic Monument (LMI code AB-II-m-B-00308; identified in LMI as “house”)		<p>The church contributes to the visual aesthetic of the protected zone.</p> <p>The church resides in the Protected Zone and as a result, cannot be legally moved.</p> <p>The church is in relative good condition with only minor cracking to the exterior.</p> <p>Mitigation/Management:</p> <p>RMGC to ensure the church is maintained in it at least its present condition or better for the life of the Project.</p> <p>RMGC to assist in maintaining the churches post-closure through initiatives proposed by the Foundation.</p>	<p>Approximately 45 congregation will continue to reside in the Protected Zone and use the church during the life of project</p> <p>Access to be maintained to the church in the Protected Zone throughout all phases of the project.</p> <p>The company will assist the congregation during a transition period of five years to maintain and support the activity of the priest and availability of the religious service, based on the number of members of the congregations before and after the implementation of the project.</p> <p>RMGC to ensure the public access to this church during the lifetime of the Project, as well as to undertake specific measures in order to protect the rights and interests of the Roman Catholic parishioners.</p> <p>Public access to be maintained to all the churches located in the Protected Zone Historic Centre Roşia Montană throughout all phases of the project.</p>	Determine an appropriate compensation amount in consultation with members of the Church
The Unitarian Church (1796) - Roşia Montană	Roşia Montană, Brazi Str., No. 530 x-535690,2 y-356284,4	No	No		<p>The church contributes to the visual aesthetic of the protected zone.</p> <p>The church resides in the Protected Zone and as a result cannot be legally moved.</p> <p>There is extensive water damage to the exterior and interior of the church.</p> <p>Mitigation/Management:</p> <p>RMGC to ensure the church is maintained in it at least its present condition or better for the life of the Project.</p> <p>RMGC to assist in maintaining the churches post-closure through initiatives proposed by the Foundation.</p>	<p>There are not regular services held at the church.</p> <p>Access to be maintained to the church in the Protected Zone throughout all phases of the project.</p> <p>The company will assist the congregation during a transition period of five years to maintain and support the activity of the priest and availability of the religious service, based on the number of members of the congregations before and after the implementation of the project.</p> <p>RMGC to ensure the public access to this church during the lifetime of the Project, as well as to undertake specific measures in order to protect the rights and interests of the Unitarian parishioners.</p> <p>Public access to be maintained to all the churches located in the Protected Zone Historic Centre Roşia Montană throughout all phases of the project.</p>	Determine an appropriate compensation amount in consultation with members of the Church
The Reformed	Roşia Montană, Brazi	No	No		The church contributes to the visual aesthetic	At present there is only 1 (one) parishioner	Determine an appropriate compensation

Church (early 19 th century) - Roşia Montană	Str., No. 400 x-535767,7 y-356303,7				<p>of the protected zone.</p> <p>The church resides in the Protected Zone and as a result cannot be legally moved.</p> <p>The church is in a very poor state of repair, with extensive damage to the external render, structural damage to the entrance stairway and floors, and water or mould degradation internally surrounding the mounted pulpit.</p> <p>Other damage includes broken louvers in the bell tower, broken or missing windows, and lifting roof sheeting.</p> <p>Mitigation/Management:</p> <p>RMGC to ensure the church is maintained in it at least its present condition or better for the life of the Project.</p> <p>RMGC to assist in maintaining the churches post-closure through initiatives proposed by the Foundation.</p>	<p>who attends this church and regular services are not held.</p> <p>Access to be maintained to the church in the Protected Zone throughout all phases of the project.</p> <p>The company will assist the congregation during a transition period of five years to maintain and support the activity of the priest and availability of the religious service, based on the number of members of the congregations before and after the implementation of the project.</p> <p>RMGC to ensure the public access to this church during the lifetime of the Project, as well as to undertake specific measures in order to protect the rights and interests of the Reformed parishioners.</p> <p>Public access to be maintained to all the churches located in the Protected Zone Historic Centre Roşia Montană throughout all phases of the project.</p>	<p>amount in consultation with members of the Church</p>
Greek Catholic Church (1781) - Roşia Montană	Roşia Montană, Orlea Str., No. 135 x-535690,3 y-354365,7	No	Historic Monument (LMI code AB-II-m-B-00269)		<p>The walls of the church comprise soil and rock and have been constructed using compressed earth methodology. There is no block-work evident in the external structural walls making relocation unfeasible.</p> <p>Externally the church appears structurally sound. However, internally there are many cracks, some of which are quite structurally significant. There is also some paint degradation due to water infiltration.</p> <p>Mitigation/Management:</p> <p>RMGC to ensure the church is maintained in it at least its present condition or better for the life of the Project.</p> <p>RMGC to assist in maintaining the churches post-closure through initiatives proposed by the Foundation.</p>	<p>Access to the church cannot be safely maintained during operation of the mine.</p> <p>Therefore RMGC wants to take all the measurements to preserve on site the church during the operations period, conserve it and assist the restart of the activity after mine closure.</p> <p>RMGC to construct a church in the resettled community or elsewhere to meet the needs of Greek Catholic parishioners during the mining operations and replace other properties which eventually will not be fully usable during the mine life.</p> <p>At the end of the operations all the costs to move back all the activity to this building will be supported by the company and the newly built church used during the mining period will remain with the Greek-catholic church authority.</p> <p>The company will assist the congregation during a transition period of five years to maintain and support the activity of the priest and availability of the religious service, based on the number of members of the congregations before and after the implementation of the project.</p>	<p>RMGC to ensure the church is maintained in it at least its present condition or better for the life of the Project.</p> <p>Determine an appropriate compensation amount in consultation with members of the Church.</p> <p>This church has historical significance related to the Greek Catholic archpriest Simeon Balint, who also later became Avram's Iancu's prefect in the Revolution of 1848. Simeon Balint is buried in the Church's cemetery.</p> <p>The grave of Simeon Balint will not be directly affected by the Project.</p>

The Romanian Orthodox Church (1741) – Roşia Montană	Roşia Montană, Principală Str., No. 175 x-535550,7 y-354816,3	No	No		<p>The walls of the church comprise soil and rock and have been constructed using compressed earth methodology. There is no block-work evident in the external structural walls making relocation unfeasible.</p> <p>The church is in good condition.</p> <p>Mitigation/Management:</p> <p>RMGC to ensure the church is maintained in it at least its present condition or better for the life of the Project.</p> <p>RMGC to assist in maintaining the churches post-closure through initiatives proposed by the Foundation.</p>	<p>Access to the church cannot be safely maintained during operation of the mine.</p> <p>RMGC to construct a church in the resettled community to meet the needs of Orthodox parishioners during the mining operations and replace other properties which eventually will not be fully usable during the mine life. At the end of the operations all the costs to move back all the activity to this building will be supported by the company and the newly built church used during the mining period will remain with the Orthodox church authority. The company will assist the congregation during a transition period of five years to maintain and support the activity of the priest and availability of the religious service, based on the number of members of the congregations before and after the implementation of the project.</p>	<p>RMGC to ensure the church is maintained in it at least its present condition or better for the life of the Project.</p> <p>Determine an appropriate compensation amount in consultation with members of the Church.</p>
The Pentecostal Prayer House – Roşia Montană	Roşia Montană, Principală Str., No 257 x-535498,8 y-355548,0	No	No		<p>The prayer house is a relatively simple single level structure and in good condition.</p> <p>Mitigation/Management:</p> <p>As the prayer house is relatively new and does not contain unique architectural features.</p> <p>A new prayer house will be constructed in the resettlement area, as required.</p>	<p>The prayer house will not be directly affected by site development activities associated with the Project.</p> <p>Mitigation/Management:</p> <p>RMGC to construct a prayer house in the relocation community, as required, to meet the needs of Pentecostal parishioners.</p>	<p>It is possible that there may not be an adequate Pentecostal population in the resettlement area to warrant a prayer house.</p> <p>Determine an appropriate compensation amount in consultation with members of the congregation and based on the special assessment made by authorized experts.</p>
The Romanian Orthodox Church (1719) - Corna	Corna Sat, No. 707 x-533735,2 y-355558,7	Yes	No		<p>The walls of the church comprise soil and rock and have been constructed using compressed earth methodology. There is no block-work evident in the external structural walls making relocation unfeasible.</p> <p>The Church is considered to be in very good condition with only minor external damage.</p> <p>The church will be directly affected by site development activities associated with the Project</p> <p>Mitigation/Management:</p> <p>RMGC to relocate portions of the church to be used in the construction of a new church in the relocation settlement. These movable assets (cultural items) would be determined through consultation as being unique or of particular sentimental or religious importance.</p>	<p>The church will be directly affected by site development activities associated with the Project.</p> <p>Mitigation/Management:</p> <p>The company will assist the congregation during a transition period of five years to maintain and support the activity of the priest and availability of the religious service, based on the number of members of the congregations before and after the implementation of the project</p>	<p>Determine an appropriate compensation amount in consultation with members of the Church.</p>
The Greek Catholic Church (1841) - Corna	Corna Sat, No. 692 x-533549,3 y-355571,8	Yes	No		<p>The walls of the church comprise soil and rock and have been constructed using compressed earth methodology. There is no block-work evident in the external structural walls making relocation unfeasible.</p> <p>Mitigation/Management:</p>	<p>The church will be directly affected by site development activities associated with the Project.</p> <p>Mitigation/Management:</p> <p>RMGC to construct a similar church elsewhere, as indicated by the authorities of this</p>	<p>It is possible that there may not be an adequate Greek Catholic population in the resettlement area to warrant a church.</p> <p>Mitigation/Management:</p> <p>Determine an appropriate compensation amount in consultation with members of</p>

					RMGC to relocate portions of the church to be used in the construction of a new church, as required, in the relocation settlement. These movable assets (cultural items) would be determined through consultation as being unique or of particular sentimental or religious importance.	denomination, to meet the needs of Greek Catholic parishioners. The company will assist the congregation during a transition period of five years to maintain and support the activity of the priest and availability of the religious service, based on the number of members of the congregations before and after the implementation of the project	the Church.
Prayer house #2 belonging to the Baptist Church - Corna	Corna Sat, without no. x-533999,9 y-355859,0	Yes	No		The prayer house is a relatively simple single level structure and in good condition. Mitigation/Management: Any cultural items would be determined through consultation as importance.	The prayer house will be directly affected by site development activities associated with the Project. Mitigation/Management: RMGC to construct a prayer house in the relocation community, as required, to meet the needs of Baptist parishioners.	Mitigation/Management: Determine an appropriate compensation amount in consultation with members of the Church.
Prayer house #1 belonging to the Baptist Church - Corna	Corna Sat, without no. x-533822,3 y-355598,6	Yes	No		The prayer house is a relatively simple single level structure and in good condition. Mitigation/Management: Any cultural items would be determined through consultation as importance.	The prayer house will be directly affected by site development activities associated with the Project. Mitigation/Management: RMGC to construct a prayer house in the relocation community, as required, to meet the needs of Baptist parishioners.	Mitigation/Management: Determine an appropriate compensation amount in consultation with members of the Church.

Of the 10 churches and houses of worship existing within the Roşia Montană and Corna village perimeter, the two churches and the two houses of prayer in the Corna village will be affected. None of these constructions is included in the category of historical monuments. In the case of the two churches, should they be closed down, a series of measures will be adopted to minimize the impact, among which the preventive archaeological investigation of their sites and a detailed inventory of all worship items. The churches will be affected by the construction of the Tailings Management Facility in the Corna valley. Of these churches, the Greek-Catholic one has already been abandoned by its parishioners, and, presently, there is a service only for special occasions. Under these circumstances, taking into consideration that they will no longer be available for religious services, the construction of new houses of worship within the area of the new Piatra Alba settlement is being considered, according to the needs and desire of the parishioners. No other churches and houses of prayer will be directly affected by the mining project's development.

Thus, 3 of them are located within the Protected Area of Roşia Montană Historical Centre, namely:

- The Roman-Catholic Church (historical monument, code LMI AB-II-m-B-00308);
- The Reformed Church;
- The Unitarian Church.

The three churches from the Protected Area will be restored, with permanent public access maintained throughout the term of the Project.

- the Greek-Catholic church in Roşia Montană (historical monument, code LMI AB-II-m-B-00269);
- the Orthodox church in Roşia Montană, Orlea area;
- the Pentecostal house of prayer from Roşia Montană

Major changes in regards to the location of the industrial objectives of the Project have been made for the protection of the Orthodox and Greek-Catholic Church in Roşia Montană, so that they can be maintained in good preservation conditions along the entire life of the Project; the access to these churches will be agreed upon with the congregations. RMGC have concluded an agreement to cover the material and moral compensations for the Praying House in Roşia Montană.

These are some of the works RMGC plan, to protect and promote in Roşia Montană; special measures in this regard to be applied within the protected area (restoration-consolidation-preservation), as well as within the industrial perimeter (special blasting techniques, buffer areas between the 2 perimeters, permanent monitoring of the vibrations and apply certain blasting methods in accordance with the speed of waves propagation etc). RMGC want this mining Project to ensure high living standards for Roşia Montană locals and, in the same time, maintain and capitalize the cultural heritage and traditional values. In order to make all this possible, RMGC is committed to investing 25 million dollars.

Some 410 graves, out of a total number of 1,905 graves located within the industrial development area of the future mining project and within the Protected Area of Roşia Montană Historical Centre, will be relocated. Approximately 13 ha have been allocated at in the new settlement of Piatra Albă for cemeteries. Wherever the existing graves are affected by industrial objectives, these must be resettled and, should the family request it, a service will be held by a priest, both when opening the grave and upon the subsequent funeral. The grave of the local hero Simion Balint will not be affected directly by the Project. Access to this grave will be maintained throughout the lifetime of the Project, although there is a possibility to restrict access from time to time due to safety reasons.

Section 5.5.3. Relocation of Graves/Cemeteries notes that Romanian legislation does not have specific cultural heritage considerations regarding the relocation of graves. However from a cultural heritage perspective, the cemeteries were considered very significant. RMGC has endeavoured to develop the Project so that the number of graves / cemeteries that require relocation are minimized to the greatest extent possible. Of twelve (12) cemeteries present in Roşia Montană, five (5) will likely be affected by the Project.. A large area has been allocated at the Piatra Albă site for cemeteries, to replace cemeteries in Roşia Montană impacted by the new mine and to fulfil the future requirements for a community of the size of Roşia Montană. It is planned that cemeteries in the Corna Valley/ Gura Cornii area that are impacted

by the new Mine will be relocated. If desired by the family, a service conducted by a priest will be conducted both for the reopening of the grave and the subsequent burial – all costs relating to the relocation of graves and associated ceremonies will be funded by RMGC. A member of the archaeological group will be present during burial site exhumations to monitor archaeological finds and vigilance will be a priority.

Section 5.6 Artefacts and Items of Industrial Heritage – RosiaMin Museum

This notes that a number of culturally representative artefacts and items of industrial heritage are presently located in the RosiaMin museum in the village centre of Roşia Montană. RMGC will consult with RosiaMin and the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs (Ministerul Culturii și Cultelor) in order to be permitted to relocate the movable heritage from the existing museum to ideally be relocated to the proposed Cultural Centre and Mining Museum (see also **Section Establishment of a Cultural Heritage Foundation**). It may be possible that the stamp mills could be relocated to locations where they were actually working, making it easier for viewers to understand how they worked.

Section 5.7 comprises an extended discussion of **Archaeology**. This includes in 5.7.1 a discussion of the archival storage provisions. In section 5.7.2 the potential provisions for the preservation in situ of archaeological remains – particularly Roman galleries and other mine-workings in **Păru Carpeni and Cătălina Monulești** are discussed in some detail. RMGC has made a commitment concerning the preservation in situ of significant mining remains in both sectors. In section 5.7.3 preservation and display proposals for the **Roman Funerary Monument from Tău Găuri** are considered – the project for this has since been approved by MCC and a detailed plan is to be prepared.. Similarly, the Roman remains on Carpeni are discussed in **5.7.4 Roman Building Foundations - Carpeni Hill (in this locality at least two Roman public buildings with hypocaust systems, a necropolis, and probable sacred area were discovered and investigated)**. In section **5.7.5 Replicas** the use of replicas to display cultural heritage features to the public is considered. It is noted that replicas can enhance the visitor's understanding. The underground archaeological investigation uncovered several interesting features of Roman mining techniques that would be ideally viewed as replicas. RMGC propose to fund a series of replicas consisting of several features found during the baseline campaign. The features that will be represented in the replicas may include:

- A descent;
- Spiral stairway;
- Pillar chamber,
- Water wheel;
- Vertical Gallery; and,
- A ventilation shaft;

In Section 5.7.6 the very important provision for a **Chance-Finds Protocol** to be maintained during construction and mine-working is considered and described in some detail. This is considered to be very important by RMGC, and the company has made a firm commitment to this. Issues of **Staff Training Programme** are considered in 5.7.6.1 to enable all construction and miners to have basic skills at recognising archaeological features if encountered unexpectedly during the course of their work, , and **Prioritization of Monitoring Activities** in section 5.7.6.2. **The procedures of Impact Mitigation** are developed in section 5.7.7. This includes in 5.7.7.1 a review of **Non-conformance Reporting and Corrective and Preventative Action so that lessons can be learned and used to refine the implementation of the protocol**, and in **5.7.7.2 Project Reporting and Documentation** procedures are discussed. This includes practical reporting of discoveries and methods of actually implementing the protocol including liaison with the construction and mining teams. The necessity for a much more detailed consideration of the Chance-Finds Protocol was recognised, and in consequence Gifford were commissioned in collaboration with MNIR to produce **ROȘIA MONTANĂ CHANCE-FINDS PROTOCOL** (Report No. 13658.R03) drafted February 2007 and to be finalised in spring 2007..

The Cultural Heritage Management Plan Part III concludes with section **6 References**, which includes both a summary of legislation and a bibliography of works cited. **Appendix A. List of Historical Monuments In Roşia Montană** concludes the document.

6. CONCLUSIONS

This summary presents an independent critical view of the Roşia Montană projects Cultural Heritage Management Plan from the perspective of current legislative requirements and emerging European Best Practice. Several comments will assist in putting this task into context. It has emerged from the supporting documentation that the Roşia Montană landscape has been highly, and negatively, impacted by mining, and especially in the last few decades. The amount of information known about this landscape prior to the Roşia Montană project was not very great, meaning that the project started from a low information base. Despite this, it is very much a man-made landscape seen now in the midst of an overwhelming series of changes. However, this is by no means an unusual case in European cultural heritage management – in fact, although the details may differ, the basic situation is a common one.

The compliance of the project with current Romanian legislation is considered to be clear. It is also clear that appropriate reference has been made to the emerging European standards and guidance. In this respect, a detailed comparison of the Cultural Heritage Management Plan with similar documents elsewhere in Europe is useful. Recent and high profile projects with which the independent reviewing team are familiar include:

- A303 Stonehenge Improvement (UK)
- M3 Tara Hill motorway (Ireland)
- Royal Clarence Yard Gosport (UK)
- Gwynt-y-Mor Irish Sea/Liverpool Bay Windfarm EIA (Wales)
- A13 Thames Gateway (UK)
- St Pancras London Terminal to CTRL Links (UK)
- HMS Sussex deep-ocean archaeological project (Spain)

The substantive content of the Roşia Montană documentation overall is comparable to the management plans developed for these specific projects (with which GIFFORD have direct experience) as well as being fully compliant with European best-practice based upon the European Union supported study of the consideration of Cultural Heritage issues within Environmental Impacts Assessments published as [Planarch 2: Review of Cultural Heritage Coverage in Environmental Impact Assessments](http://www.planarch.org/downloads/library/england_eia-report.pdf) see (http://www.planarch.org/downloads/library/england_eia-report.pdf)

As part of an independent critical review, GIFFORD have been asked to provide, in the spirit of the ‘Non-conformance clauses’ of the Roşia Montană Chance-Finds Protocol, useful suggestions or ‘lesson learned’ to be considered in the implementation phase.

- Create a single table or gantt chart which includes all heritage activities, beginning in 2007 and extending thru to completion – archaeological investigations, building restoration, monuments works, analyses and publication etc. (A similar table may be useful to the company for monitoring budget/spend-profiles, but this is not a concern of this document)
- Clarity of structure – the three parts of the Cultural Heritage Management Plan contain awkwardly overlapping information (e.g. concerning the Foundation), and users may find it easier if such information appears in only one place. This was one of the motivating factors for this Summary document.
- Clarity of structure – might be assisted by a clearer explanation of where topics are considered and why this structure has been adopted.
- Clarity of illustrations and use of illustrations. Some lengthy text sections could be replaced *en toto* or to considerable degree, by the use of illustrative maps and diagrams.

7. ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CHMP - Cultural Heritage Management Plan

EIA – Environmental Impact Assessment Study Report

ESMS - Environmental and Social Management System

INMI - The National Institute for Historical Monuments, Bucharest - formerly CPPCN,

MCRA - Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs (Ministerul Culturii și Cultelor)

MMGA – Ministry of Environment and Water Management

MNIR - The National Museum of History of Romania, Bucharest

MNUAI The National Museum of Union, Alba Iulia

PUD - Detailed Urban Plan

PUG - General Urban Plan

PUZ - Urban Zoning Plan

RMGC - S.C. Roșia Montană Gold Corporation S.A

RMP _ Rosia Montană Project

TPP - Territorial Planning Plan

UTAH - The University “Le Mirail,” Toulouse, France, Unite Toulousane de Archeologie et Histoire

Rosia Montana

Doc. 10384

21 December 2004

Information report¹²

Committee on Culture, Science and Education

General Rapporteur on the Cultural Heritage: Mr Eddie O'Hara, United Kingdom,
Socialist Group

Contents

- I. Information report
- II. Summary of the study visit
- III. Appendices
 - (a) Mission statement
 - (b) Programme of the study visit
 - (c) Map

I. Information report

Introduction

1. Rosia Montana is situated in the modern administrative county of Alba in the Apuseni Mountains of Transylvania, Western Romania. Its Roman name was Alburnus Maior and it has been a site for the mining of both silver and gold continuously for over 2,000 years. There are Roman and pre-Roman (extending over 5 km) and more recent underground galleries (over 70 km in all). The special local conditions permit the conservation of wooden objects. The area is well known as a result of the discovery in Roman galleries at Catalina Monulesti of waxed tablets containing records of mining administration and published in the nineteenth century by the German historian Theodor Mommsen as an important source of information about Roman law. Despite considerable reworking over centuries of the mining sites, there are still remains of Roman mining equipment. There are also associated surface remains such as baths, official buildings, temples, sanctuaries with votive altars, necropoleis, etc.

¹ Approved by the Committee on 2 December 2004

² The current version is reproducing, in a different format, the original report published on PACE's website <http://assembly.coe.int/>, and is intended to help readers; while taking all reasonable care to provide fair quality, RMGC does not assume any liability for the accuracy and/or quality of these reproductions. Interested parties should address the original version.

2. It is a mono-industrial area and there is strong local pressure to exploit the natural resources and provide jobs for the local miners. Currently, opencast mining is being carried out by the Romanian company Minvest. These are scheduled to finish by 2007. A new opencast mining project has been launched by Rosia Montania Gold Company (RMGC), a Romanian Company owned 80% by Gabriel Resources (a Canadian-based Company) with Minvest (owned by the Romanian Government) owning 19.3% and the balance owned by three small Romanian Companies. This has raised concerns on environmental and social grounds (required relocation of a substantial portion of the local population), issues which were less regarded when the Minvest operations were launched, and also on cultural grounds because of the history of the area. The initial RMGC project proposal was open to criticism for its lack of an Environmental Impact Assessment and it was withdrawn for resubmission (not yet made) with this deficiency to be corrected. In the meantime they are funding a major programme of archaeological research of the area in the course of which they are securing archaeological discharges for areas to be mined but also conducting rescue archaeology and providing an archaeological record of the area. They are also buying up property in the area.

3. Attention was first drawn to these issues in 2003 by academics, including the Romanian Academy, and non-governmental organisations, notably Icomos, Europa Nostra and a locally based organisation eponymously called Alburnus Maior. There was criticism of the archaeological discharges so far granted on the grounds that (a) they ignore unresearched sites above ground; (b) they do not cover underground mines; (c) they are procedurally incorrect.

4. The matter was raised by the General Rapporteur in the Sub-Committee on the Cultural Heritage in September 2003. On the invitation of Mr Giorghi Prisacaru, Leader of the Romanian Delegation, a study visit was carried out on 12-14 July 2004. This followed and complemented a similar visit in December 2003 by a delegation of the European Parliament Environment Committee. A considerable amount of documentation has also been assembled, including a report for the Romanian Parliament by a special commission headed by Mr Alexandru Sassu.

5. The study visit had access to everything requested. The major limitation was the time available. It would certainly have been interesting and useful to visit Catalina Monulesti and to assess the local built architectural heritage including the churches. An abundance of relevant information and a valuable overall perspective of the issues were gained. There remains however a number of questions still open that subsequent enquiry has not yet resolved.

The visit

6. The PACE delegation was composed of Mr Eddie O'Hara MP (General Rapporteur on the Cultural Heritage) and Mr Christopher Grayson (Head of Secretariat for Culture, Science and Education). The delegation was accompanied throughout by Mrs Mihaela Draghici (Romanian Delegation Secretary), Mr Dan Chirlomez (Head of Protocol in the Romanian Senate) and Ms Michaela Statescu (interpreter).

7. In advance of the visit a mission statement was issued: see appendix. The programme of the visit is also appended.

Conclusions

8. Three types of cultural heritage are at stake in Rosia Montana: (a) moveable objects such as are collected and displayed in museums locally (including a

new mining museum in Rosia Montana) and in Bucharest; (b) surface structures: protected buildings including churches of architectural importance which are not affected and significant archaeological finds such as the Roman circular funerary monument which are being preserved in situ; (c) underground: excavation continues of the Roman galleries, a visitable section is at present preserved at Orlea but has an uncertain future, a representative section could and should be excavated and preserved at Catalina Monulesti. The question then arises as to how that representative section should be determined.

9. The comments of the President of Alba County Council at the beginning of the study visit resonated to the General Rapporteur throughout: there is a need for both the mineral and the cultural resources to be exploited for the benefit of the local community. All relevant legislation must be observed to ensure that the cultural heritage is not violated; but it cannot be developed and exploited without the means provided by the exploitation of the mineral resources.

10. It would seem that measures are in place to ensure that all three aspects of the cultural heritage are adequately covered at present or as the project may develop. The immediate situation is controlled by progressive archaeological discharge. There is clearly a need for continuous monitoring of the site as excavation and mining proceeds step by step. This calls for continuing flexibility by both the mining company and the archaeologists. There is also a need to ensure the final stages of the project (landscaping, purification of soil and water, tourist facilities and access to museum and other sites).

11. The RMGC project would appear to provide an economic basis for sustainable development of the whole area with positive benefits on environmental and social as well as cultural grounds. From the cultural heritage point of view it might be seen as an exemplary project of responsible development. The funds currently made available by RMGC for research (archaeological, ethnological, architectural) are many times what could be expected from the Government. This has revived the international renown of the site. Further significant finds may still be made.

12. Concern has been expressed by critics over the procedure (allegedly superficial archaeological discharges) and conservation ethics, involving the programmed destruction of Roman galleries. This concern does not appear to be entirely justified. The reworked galleries in the areas of the main pits Cârnic and Cetate appear empty of any archaeologically interesting remains. Tourist access to most galleries would be impossible. However the condition must clearly be imposed of continued archaeological excavation and monitoring of what is found.

13. More important in terms of protecting cultural heritage and the environment would be the application of similar controls to on-going mining on adjacent sites, such as those conducted by the Romanian company Minvest without any archaeological discharge or pollution control.

14. The Romanian Government is aware of and in control of the legal means it has to extract the maximum price from RMGC for the 300 tonnes it has identified in Rosia Montana whilst still leaving an adequate profit motive. For its part, RMGC recognises the price it has to pay. RMGC is reviewing the situation. It has withdrawn its environmental application and is to resubmit the project together with an Environmental Impact Assessment. Meanwhile, it continues to fund archaeological research and publications and to buy up property in the area. There is however no certainty that the project will go ahead and no fixed plan of what it might involve.

15. This present situation of indecision is not at all helpful for the area. Failure to confirm the RMGC project would remove any chance of local development for some time. The current mining activity of Minvest is due to close down in the next few years.

16. Opposition to the RMGC project is substantial. It is not altogether easy to explain. It has been linked to profiteering on local property values. It is very much fuelled by outside bodies, presumably well-meaning but possibly counter-productively. It seems in part at least exaggerated. The supposed environmental risks do not take account of modern mining techniques and in fact the RMGC project will help to clear up existing pollution caused by Minvest. The academic arguments are possibly correct in principle but appear excessively fundamentalist.

17. It seems true that the whole area has not been fully surveyed before archaeological discharge has been given and it is fair to argue that part once declared protected has now been reopened for commercial development. These aspects have to be clarified further. However fundamental principles have to be balanced with practical realities. Research does not necessarily imply the need for everything found to be preserved and the academic ideal of total in situ preservation is perhaps not always and altogether appropriate in a situation of rescue archaeology and a commercial world. This is certainly so in the case of in situ preservation of the Roman galleries at Rosia Montana. There are over 5 km of them, apparently with a limited variety of distinctiveness between them and few surviving remains in them. Most of them are inaccessible, indeed dangerous of access to tourists. Alternative proposals such as designation of the whole area as a cultural landscape to be developed for tourism lack viability. The only available source of funding for this is from the company which wishes to exploit the mineral resources. Certainly there is a need to determine and preserve a representative sample of galleries accessible for tourists, at Catalina Monulesti and/or Orlea, and certainly there is a need for continuous monitoring to ensure the preservation of anything of distinctive archaeological value which is revealed in the course of mining or archaeological exploration. This is the responsibility of the Ministry of Culture.

18. Key words for the sustainable development of Rosia Montana are opportunity for all, flexibility and trust. Comparable discussion surrounded the Ilisu dam project in Turkey and the development of sites for the 2004 Olympic Games in Greece, notably the rowing/canoeing/kayak centre at Schinias/Marathon and the equestrian centre at Markopoulo. There is another project requiring sensitive and sensible rescue archaeology which is closer to home for the Romanians: the recently launched construction of the Transylvanian motorway being carried out by the US company Bechtel.

19. The final decision on the RMGC project is to be taken by the Romanian Government. This is sensitive to pressure from the European Union. The goal of accession in 2007 is of the highest priority and the Government is thus extremely cautious about the environmental and cultural issues at stake. The cultural heritage dimension seems well served by both the company and the governmental bodies. This is reflected in the preliminary conclusions reached by the Sassu report and the delegation from the European Parliament. However the underlying presumption must be that where there is irreconcilable conflict of detail, the cultural interest must prevail. The cultural heritage is a finite resource.

20. A balance of benefit appears achievable to both the needs of the cultural heritage of Rosia Montana and the business of RMGC. If that balance is overturned by the demands of either the Government or the company the project may not go ahead.

In that case there will be a considerable setback to the opportunity for the development of cultural tourism in this area of exceptional historic interest.

II. Summary of the study visit by Mr O'Hara on 11-15 July 2004

Alba Julia local authorities

1. The delegation went first to Alba Julia (Roman *Apulum*), the administrative centre of the County of Alba to meet local representatives MM Atanasiu (President of Alba County Council), Mr Sârbu (Prefect of Alba) and Mr Rustoiu (Director of Culture). Concern was expressed that both the mineral and the cultural resources of the area should be developed. The RGMC proposal offered some 450 mining jobs and over 1,000 related jobs, but mining should only be allowed in areas of no archaeological interest. Assurances were given that relevant legislation was being carefully observed. Museums were planned both above and below ground. However the cultural resource could not be developed and exploited without the exploitation of the mineral resource.

2. En route from Alba Julia to Rosia Montana the road passed through an area marked on the map as "metal-bearing mountains" and signs of largely derelict mining operations from the communist period similar to those of Minvest in Rosia Montana. Particularly stark was the mining of Zlatna (Roman *Ampelum*), once entirely devoted to copper extraction but since 1989 a wasteland (still toxic) of twisted metal machinery, empty factories and half-built apartment blocks. It is an area of high unemployment and there is a high incidence of congenital diseases in children born locally. On the approach to Rosia Montana what looked like a huge white slag heap by the roadside was in fact formed by tailings from Cetate. Isolated mature trees were growing on it but there was no ground cover of vegetation on it. Further on many houses in the area bore blue notices "Property of RGMC".

Introductory meeting in Rosia Montana

3. At the RMGC headquarters the delegation was met by Mr Dan Petrescu, deputising for Mr Richard Hill (Vice-President Operations of Gabriel Resources and Chairman and Managing Director of RGMC) who had been detained in Canada, and a group of archaeologists. These included Dr Paul Damian (Deputy Manager, National Museum of History MNIR Bucharest), Dr Corina Bors (Manager, Archaeology, Heritage Department, RMGC) and Dr Béatrice Cauuet (CNRS, University of Toulouse, France).

4. The delegation was first conducted to an exhibition of archaeological material and planning proposals, especially the plans for relocation of local residents. It was claimed that in a 2001 survey 85% were in favour, 10% against and 5% "didn't know". Also in local elections only 40 out of 1500 were against. The compensation offered for relocation was said to be very attractive compared with an average income of 100 euros per month.

5. **Mr Petrescu** presented the RMGC mining project. He contrasted the ongoing activity by Minvest which would terminate between 2004 and 2007. This was small scale, government subsidised and resulted in uncontrolled production of acid water discharging to a tailings dam of very marginal safety. The proposed RGMC project would employ open pit mining, it would be large-scale and hi-tech. It would involve water management and detox treatment of tailings. It represented 1.6 billion USD over 17 years for Romania, including the funding of cultural heritage, business start-ups and treatment of existing environmental contamination. So far 4.5 million USD had been spent between 2001 and 2003 on archaeology, which was more than the total Romanian national budget for archaeology 1990-2003. The downside would be changes to the local landscape, relocation of part of the village of Rosia Montana (though some of the historic part would be restored) and the loss of some galleries. He

concluded that this was a good example of cultural heritage management meeting national, regional and local needs.

6. None of the maps in evidence proved to provide a reliable indication of the precise location of the facilities in the proposed RMGC project. Mr Hill later insisted the final details of the project had not yet been finally determined.

7. **Dr Damian** explained that he coordinated the Romanian Ministry of Culture "Alburnus Maior" National Research Programme launched in March 2001. He explained that the history of mining in the area was documented from pre-Roman times; major activity occurred in the Roman period (2nd century AD); there was little activity between the 3rd and 14th centuries; subsequent main periods were under the Hungarian empress Marie-Therese (18th century) and under the communists in the 1970s. Haphazard archaeological discoveries occurred from the late 18th century, notably the 25 wax-coated wooden tablets found between 1786 and 1855 and published by Mommsen who was on site in 1851-53. Systematic archaeological exploration was only very recent. In 2000 there was a survey and trial trenches. In 2001 there were major excavations. In 2002-03 the focus was on the Cârnic-Cetate area. The main results of the Alburnus Maior programme so far were (a) excavation of 3sq. km, excavation of over 1,000 graves and uncovering of much evidence of rural and mining life in Roman Dacia; (b) establishment of a database and GIS location system for archaeological researches undertaken since 2001; (c) a series of publications funded by RMGC (already published is volume 1, consisting of 526 pages of the campaigns of 2000-2001; to be published are volumes 2 (circular tomb), volume 3 (necropolis), volume 4 (mines)); (d) preparation of movable exhibitions, of which one is planned for Toulouse in late 2004; (e) a school for Romanian archaeologists.

8. **Dr Cauuet** presented the exploration of the ancient mining networks that she had co-ordinated since 1999. She concentrated on Cârnic 1 (a helicoidal well yielding wood dateable between 675 – 355 BC); Cârnic 2 (a descending gallery of 125 steps cut in the rock); Cârnic 9 (4 levels); Cârnic 13 (with a lead base, a sort of mini ingot from a metal workshop) and Catalina Monulesti (where the wooden waxed tablets with inscriptions had been found in the late 18th and early 19th centuries).

9. **Dr Bors** presented the cultural strategy of the Rosia Montana project: RMGC was fully involved in the "Alburnus Maior" National Research Programme through funding, supporting heritage bodies, training personnel, establishing a computerized database for recording archaeological discoveries, and the GIS project. She asserted that the final purpose of the project was archaeological discharge and setting up a new mining museum at Rosia Montana. RMGC was committed to perform all the necessary investigations and all efforts had been made to avoid any unnecessary irreversible loss. Questions were put about whether the museum would be public or private (a new development in Romania) and on tourist access to ancient mine galleries. Dr Bors said that a RMGC Foundation would be set up to manage the future of the site.

French archaeologists

10. Lunch was taken with the French archaeologists who came from different parts of France and had been working together as a team for some years under Dr Cauuet. It is a fairly new and rigorous discipline and they were very fit, as was to be confirmed later during the visit to the site. Their general objective was to get as much as possible for archaeology in the time available.

Rosia Montana local authorities

11. The lunch was followed by a meeting with the Mayor of the Municipality of Rosia Montana, **Mr Virgil Nicolae Narita**, in his office above the old town hall. Councillors and church representatives were to have been present but the schedule had slipped. Mr Natira had been re-elected in 2000. He explained that the village of Rosia Montana (Roman *Alburnus Maior*) was founded in 131 BC and now had 4,000 inhabitants (approximately 100 families). The municipality he represented was made up of 16 villages. A poll taken in 2000 of those affected by the new mining project showed 86-88% in favour of the proposed investment and relocation, and 11 out of 13 councillors. It was felt that the only future for the area lay in further investment in mining. It was a mono-industrial area and most people were used to mining. Even though there was concern for the environment there was no certainty of EU subsidies. Individuals were left to negotiate their own terms for relocation and 30% had so far done so. This involved 1,600 of the total of 4,000 and affected a quarter of the villages in the municipality. Romanian legislation imposed conditions that had to be respected by the new mining project. The old centre of the village was to be preserved with an open air museum and artefacts. It would be linked to the re-located area by a new road. Other economic activities would be generated by the mining project, including tourism (lakes and the new mining museum) and "parallel exploitation". He mentioned that he himself had been a member of the NGO *Alburnus Maior* and asserted that the aim of those in the association was to protect their own family house and land. It represented at most 190 votes, as opposed to the 700 it claimed, and membership had been falling. It had many connections with people outside the community.

On site visits (a) surface Cârnic and Cetate

12. The meeting with the Mayor was followed by a visit with Mr Petrescu, Dr Bors and Dr Damian to certain surface archaeological sites and the general topography of the area, notably Cârnic and Cetate. In one field a Roman necropolis was being excavated by some 50 people. These were summer workers recruited locally and supervised by Romanian archaeologists. A flip chart was used to demonstrate the work. Of interest was one cremation grave containing a miner's oil lamp.

13. At Cetate attention was drawn to the lunar landscape, polluted water and abandoned machinery of the Minvest mining operations. It was asserted that RMGC would be much cleaner and manage the sequence of mining operations in the open pit to avoid the mining of sensitive galleries discovered in the process until the proper archaeological review/recovery had been completed. An idyllic contrast was provided by the pastoral view from the Piatra Corbului ("Crow's Rock") to a green valley with lake, cottage and horse-drawn cart. This area of Carnic was to remain protected. Access was only by 4x4 vehicles.

14. It was noted that little remains of the civil structure. Two explanations are offered for this: given that "It is strange for people to come only to work, pray and die" (Dr Ioan Piso), it may be that they are still to be found. Dr Bors offered an alternative and more probable explanation that they were temporary structures of which traces have been removed by subsequent surface disturbance. The many graves probably reflect the high mortality rate from mining.

On-site visits (b) Cârnic galleries

15. The surface visits were followed by visits to the underground galleries for which overalls, Wellington boots, gloves, helmets and torches were provided. These proved necessary for the uneven, wet, muddy conditions encountered underground. Strict safety instructions were given and all who entered had first to sign a formal disclaimer. An ambulance was in attendance. The group was guided by Dr Cauuet and her team of archaeologists. Three independent archaeologists (Drs Cataniciu,

Ciudugean and Piso) were, with some reluctance on the part of the company, allowed to join the party.

16. No photography was allowed inside but the whole exercise was filmed extensively by the French archaeological team. Two hours were devoted to visiting the Cârnic galleries indicated earlier by Dr Cauuet. Initial access was by a long, horizontal modern tunnel. This joined up with neatly cut Roman galleries (with patina) and rougher excavated passages. The way wound up and around in a three-dimensional puzzle with occasional ladders up or down. Parts were dangerously open to bottomless pits. Lighting was by individual electric torches or (better) pressurized gas torches. Everywhere was damp and very muddy. Progress was hindered by the sticking of boots in the mud and the banging of helmets on rock. It was often not possible to move upright. Of interest were the Roman lamp niches and varying styles of gallery. Impressive was the difficulty of working in the galleries in near impossible conditions, whether by ancient miners or by modern archaeologists, or indeed by a PACE delegation. This was no tourist excursion and all emerged filthy.

On-site visits (c) Roman circular tomb

17. The following morning began with an early, unscheduled visit proposed by Dr Bors to a Roman circular mausoleum in the Gauri area. The site is isolated and access is very difficult, again only by 4x4. Apparently a new road will be constructed for tourist access to a 10 ha archaeological park containing the site. A formal presentation with on-site flip chart was made by Mihaela Simion, the Romanian archaeologist supervising the excavation and protection work. Volume 2 of the Alburnus Maior publications will be devoted to this complicated funerary structure. Workers were busily installing a corrugated plastic roof covering.

Meeting with NGOs in Rosia Montana

18. This visit was followed by a scheduled meeting with the NGOs. Before this started the delegation was presented by an irate representative of RMGC with an e-mail sent on behalf of the NGO Alburnus Maiorto journalists who were to meet the delegation at the Orlea museum. This e-mail stated that the reason for the visit was "to investigate the archaeological discharge certificate given for the Cârnic Massif by the Minister for Culture and the Cults in January 2004". The General Rapporteur agreed to make a public clarification that this was not the case.

19. The meeting was attended at the outset by some 40 people and was opened by Mr Dan Chirlomez who presented the delegation and helped to conduct subsequent proceedings. By the end participants exceeded 100 and overflowed into the street.

20. **The General Rapporteur** made it clear that the delegation was present at the invitation of the Romanian parliamentary delegation and not of the NGO Alburnus Maior. The aim of the visit was not to investigate archaeological discharges (on which the delegation had no competence). The PACE had received conflicting messages over whether the cultural heritage at Rosia Montana was being taken into account and the study visit was to evaluate, examine and explore. He was aware of the different social, cultural economic and environmental dimensions involved, but his formal concern was with the cultural. He was holding meetings with representatives of RMGC and the Romanian authorities. He was here to listen to the local non-governmental representatives. His report would take full account of all that would be said at the meeting

21. **Dr Ioan Piso** (Professor at the University of Cluj and Director of the National History Museum of Transylvania, Cluj) was himself a miner's son and not in principle against the RMGC or progress as such. He believed however that Romania had more to lose than gain from the present project. When this ended in 10-15 years, the gold would have left the country leaving a few hundred unemployed and a lunar landscape with a 600 ha cyanide lake held back by a 180m high dam only 2 km from the town of Abrud.

22. The archaeological discharges were not acceptable. An area of 1,100 ha had been discharged on the basis of excavations covering only 2.2 ha. The area of Rosia Montana was moreover protected by a law and that could only be over-ruled by another law. It was ridiculous that the galleries visited the previous day, and which were still being excavated in July 2004, had been discharged in January 2004 and the surface above them in December 2002. The archaeological approach was also misconceived. Attention should have been focused on the pattern of civil settlements in the area rather than on isolated temples and graves.

23. He criticised that state authorities for preferring the interests of a foreign company over the protests of local conservationists. Those in the National Commission for Archaeology who had opposed the RMGC project (as himself) had been removed from it. Rumours were circulated of intelligence reports of orders from Budapest. He hoped that Romania would enter the EU with its cultural heritage still intact.

24. **Mr Eugen David** (President of the NGO Alburnus Maior) criticised the decisions of local authorities and the Romanian Government that violated the European Landscape Convention (ratified by Romania in 2002). He drew attention to the transboundary impact of the RMGC project and claimed that its implementation would violate the stipulations of the Initiative on the Sustainable Spatial Development of the Tizsa River Basin. He called for the immediate release of the Environmental Impact Assessment by the RMGC the absence of which was at present delaying the development of any alternative economic activity in Rosia Montana. He asked the Council of Europe to take action.

25. He then presented a petition for all movable archaeological material to remain in Rosia Montana and all immovable remains to be preserved in situ. The petition contained 287 names – from Abrud, Carpenis, Corna, Daroaia Gura Cornii, Gura Rosiei, Rosia Montana.

26. **The General Rapporteur** said he would welcome information on alternative proposals for the protection of cultural heritage and development of the area.

27. **Mr Andrei Jurca** (President of the NGO Pro Rosia Montana) said that both NGOs shared awareness of the importance of the historical traces of mining in the area. He regretted the lack of opposition to the destruction during the communist period of a Roman city and fortress. Much was being recovered now thanks to the money spent on archaeology by RMGC. The mining project included aspects to which his organisation was opposed – such as the relocation of churches.

28. But not every stone was worth preserving. In 2007 the mining subsidy would end; it was also important to think of the economic future of the area and ensure jobs. The present uncertainty was very damaging; the government should take a decision over whether the RMGC or another company should mine the area.

29. Gold mining was known to be polluting. Such problems were not limited to the locality; they had to be monitored and proper counter-measures taken by building a centre with modern facilities. This was what the majority of the local people of Rosia Montana wanted. He pointed out that most of those present in the room were not however from RM. Though 32% had accepted money from RMGC to leave, 60% of the local population wanted to stay. The area had been dedicated to mining for over 2000 years and the miners' torch should be kept going. It was infantile to propose (as did the Romanian Academy) alternatives such as farming on acid soil or an economy based on mushrooms and woodcarving.

30. **The General Rapporteur** ruled out of order speakers from outside the local resident community.

31. **A retired mining engineer** (unnamed) agreed with what had been said about the destruction in the communist period. This had however been necessary to exploit the mines. Romania still needed gold, but this should not go into the hands of a private company such as RMGC. He asserted, despite frequent interruptions, that a large majority of the local community were opposed to the painful process of relocation and did not want to leave.

32. **Mr Ioan Mera** (Orthodox priest from Rosia Montana) regretted that the mutual respect between local miners, farmers and gypsies had broken down since 1995 when differences began to develop over the future of mining in the area. He believed that God had created them to help the land, not to depopulate it. The common position of the various churches (Roman and Greek Catholic, Reformed and Unitarian Protestant, as well as Orthodox) was against the mining project that had already caused irreparable loss and now threatened church buildings and the local community itself. He was opposed to cyanide pollution and relocation of churches and graveyards. As a priest he believed it sacrilege to remove bones once committed to the earth.

33. **Mrs Tatiana Tanase** spoke in defence of life in the community of Rosia Montana in which she had been born and grown up. Without a project such as that proposed by RMGC young people would leave and only a few pensioners would remain. Those who opposed the project should come up with better alternative ideas.

34. At this point the **General Rapporteur** called for an indicative vote, having first identified by a show of hands of those present who were and were not from the local area. Those from the Rosia Montana locality were a clear majority and many more were unable to get in from outside. Of these locals, 75% were in favour of the RMGC project and 25% against.

35. **A miner** then pushed in from outside to speak up for the miners.

36. At this point the meeting broke up in some confusion. The General Rapporteur was faced outside with a barrage of reporters including TV. He refused to make any statement at this stage having made his opening statement in the meeting.

On-site visits (d) Orlea galleries and museum

37. There followed a visit to the Orlea galleries and open-air museum. This took the form of a descent down a long series of 157 stone steps leading to the top level of the Roman galleries. These were similar in section to the Cărnic galleries with Roman lamp niches apparent. However these galleries were lit by electric lights and the floor was flat and concreted. The galleries had been opened to the public in the

1970's. Whether they would be preserved was not certain as at one point the guide pointed to marks in the wall of recent sampling by RMGC. Afterwards he gave a guided tour of the collection of machinery, of wood and iron and the lapidarium of the open-air museum. This area is the property of RMGC. The guide was a former miner. He claimed that there were 25km of galleries. Despite repeated requests that lobbying should cease, the representatives of the NGOs who had been allowed to participate in the visit continued to hector the General Rapporteur throughout the visit.

Debriefing at RMGC

38. The final event of the visit to Rosia Montana was a debriefing (not originally scheduled) with RMGC, now joined by Mr Richard Hill (President and Managing Director). Dr Bors (on contract to RMGC) and Dr Cauuet (independent French scientific research worker) were present and also Dr Damian (from the Romanian Government side).

39. **Mr Hill** regretted past mishandling by the previous management of the emotive issues involved. The company was now taking its responsibilities seriously with regard to the cultural heritage and was working well with the competent Romanian authorities on local and national levels. A proper balance had to be found between economic, social and cultural interests. The project envisaged ore extraction from the total area of Cetate-Cârnic-Orlea-Jig. Around 85% would come from the first two sites. Orlea and Jig were planned for exploitation in year 9 (11-13 years from now). Much could happen in the meantime. The situation would be constantly reviewed as more archaeological remains were uncovered. It should however not be taken for granted that the mining project would go ahead. The final decision had to be taken by the Romanians.

40. **The General Rapporteur** said that he had been impressed by the high quality of the rescue archaeology. This would not have occurred without the funding from RMGC and was a net gain. Having just come from the Orlea museum, he asked if the Orlea galleries or some other visitable gallery-site would be preserved as a museum.

41. **Mr Hill** believed that "cogent snapshots" should be preserved and made accessible to the public. It was difficult to find areas of surface settlement not disturbed by subsequent mining operations. However certain areas such as Piatra Corbului had already been identified for the preservation of surface and underground remains. He was afraid that EU regulations on wheelchair access and emergency exits would rule out most galleries for tourism. While the two main pits of Cetate and Cârnic were identified, the exact siting of the pits to the north (Orlea and Jig) had still to be defined. It was possible that a contiguous preservation area could be determined linking Catalina Monulesti to the north end of the town. He refused to submit detailed maps as the precise scope of the project had still to be finalised.

42. **Dr Cauuet** said that the question of how to develop the two northern areas should be reserved for future discussion. She wanted to preserve a whole mine and not just a representative section. She was interested in excavating parts towards the top end of Rosia Montana where the Roman workshops for treating minerals might have been located. Catalina Monulesti was another interesting area and as the rock there was unstable, the galleries were unlikely to have been reopened since ancient times. She felt that different ways should be found of presenting Roman galleries in order to improve on the concrete floor and lighting of Orlea. The immediate priority however was to complete excavation of the galleries in Cârnic.

43. **Dr Bors** said that 22 other sites had been identified by experts from Bucharest as having archaeological features similar to Rosia Montana

44. **Mr Hill** clarified the situation concerning Catalina Monulesti. That gallery was located in the Protection Area of the Historic Centre of Rosia Montana. Thus it would be preserved as that part of the locality would not be affected by the mining project. He refused to give a blank cheque for the future preservation of Catalina Monulesti. Any such excavations had to be based on their benefit to RMGC. The company was after all out for making a profit and not for archaeological research. But RMGC already had invested a good deal into cultural heritage and should be judged on its record. Modern mining companies had to be responsible and take into account the social implications in order to ensure sustainable development. As an example of how the area could be used later for other purposes, RMGC envisaged the option to leave behind in Rosia Montana a boating lake and football fields as well as archaeological remains. He repeated his appreciation of professional relations with Romanian bureaucracy.

45. The delegation then transferred to Bucharest for meetings the following day with ministers, the Romanian Academy and Romanian parliamentarians and senators.

Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs

46. **Mr Mircea Angelescu** (Director for Historical Monuments and Museums) was interested in the attention being paid to the mining project at Rosia Montana. The Ministry first knew of it in 2000 when an application had been made by RMGC for archaeological discharge. Following an initial survey in 2000, a national research programme "Alburnus Maior" was launched in 2001 and archaeological excavations started (surface and underground). The programme covered archaeology (with GIS mapping and digital software), architecture, ethnography and oral history; it was being funded by the company in line with the European Convention on the Archaeological Heritage (Valetta) and in 2001 amounted to ten times the Ministry's annual national budget for archaeology.

47. The legal position was that an investor could request archaeological discharge when research had been finalised. Reports on such research with conclusions were submitted each year to the National Commission for Archaeology (a consultative body composed of representatives of universities, museums and national research institutes) which then reported to the Ministry, where decisions were taken. The discharge procedure was progressive; it began on the surface; open-pit mining technique then permitted variation in the cutting out of subsequent steps to protect underground galleries that might come to light. He confirmed that discharge certificates had been given for certain underground galleries but refuted claims by lobby groups of irregularities in the procedure. These groups lacked scientific knowledge and confused issues. Almost half of the 400 archaeologists in Romania had been involved in Rosia Montana and the decisions of the National Commission had been unanimous. A team of archaeologists was to maintain an on site watching brief once mining work started (which it had not yet). All the archaeological procedures were in conformity with the legislation in force.

48. As regarded the architectural heritage, a protected area had been set up in the centre of Rosia Montana following discussion in 2002 in the National Commission for Historical Monuments. This area included 99% of the historical monuments, the Catalina Monulesti galleries and the buildings to be rehabilitated for a public museum. It was felt that in this way the cultural identity of the place would be preserved while giving the local community room for sustainable development including tourism.

49. Concerning the development of cultural tourism, the local council had submitted proposals to include the central protected area together with other heritage sites for which archaeological discharges had not been granted (for example the circular tomb monument and the more important galleries in Cârnic) and areas of natural interest (such as Piatra Corbului). He feared however that many of the galleries were too unsafe for tourist access. Talks were on-going with RMGC about a project for the company to open a museum at Catalina Monulesti.

50. **Mr Stefan Ionita** (Director General for Religious Affairs) said that the intention was to preserve the cultural identity of the area. Historic church buildings would not be affected by mining. It was for the local authorities (not the Ministry) to decide on whether to relocate cemeteries. Procedures existed for reintering bones and there had been historical precedents. **Mr Angelescu** pointed out that no cemeteries would be affected by mining but that some lay in the area of the tailings lake and might be submerged. This was an example of emotive propaganda.

Romanian Academy

51. **Acad Dan Berindei** (President of the Section for Historical and Archaeological Sciences) stated that the Romanian Academy was free of political influence; its sole objective was the development of scientific research. It had decided to oppose the RMGC project because the mining project destroyed the area, because the risks of pollution presented greater potential economic disadvantages than advantages for Romania, and because partial preservation of the cultural heritage was no substitute for the total value of a very important site. Archaeological discharges were being conceded too easily. A treasure of humanity was at risk.

52. **Acad Mircea Sandulescu** spoke of the scale of the mining operations proposed – the 400m deep pit, the lunar landscape, the 600ha tailings lake and 180m high dam wall. As a geologist he stressed the danger for the Roman galleries from explosions, the risk of soil slide in the retaining dam and the long time it would take for flora and fauna to be re-established. He pointed out that local people did not want to leave the area and that no laws could force them to do so. The damage to Rosia Montana outweighed any profit and other sites in the Apuseni Mountains had more to offer. The Academy had commissioned a study on alternative activities in the area.

53. **Acad Alexandru Vulpe** believed Rosia Montana was a significant European archaeological site. On-going excavations were revealing it as one of the most significant mining sites in the world. The landscape was of national Romanian importance. The ideal solution would be to develop an archaeological park and leave as much as possible in situ. The 2000 year-old Roman galleries could be a very significant tourist attraction. He contrasted the Hallstatt salt mine (Austria) where nothing now remained of the archaeological material that had been excavated from the necropolis. He underlined the risk of cyanide poisoning which contravened EU legislation and thereby jeopardised Romania's admission to the EU.

Ministry of Environment and Water Management

54. **Mr Ioan Jeleu** (Secretary of State for Environmental Protection) described the structure of the ministry which was divided between environment, water management and European integration. **Mrs Liliana Bara** (Secretary of State for European Integration) detailed on-going negotiations in July and September with the EU on conditions for a transitional period relating to six sensitive environmental directives (Ch 22).

55. With regard to the Rosia Montana project, RMGC had first applied in 2002 for an environmental permit without giving the necessary technical papers (including an environmental impact assessment). In 2003 RMGC withdrew its initial request, undertaking to submit a new request in compliance with regulations. In the meantime EU harmonisation negotiations was going ahead and the situation was changing. Informal advice was being given by the EU Commission. Sensitive activities (such as mining and nuclear plants) would have to receive a permit from the government (rather than any individual ministry). A special commission would have to be set up (with scientific experts from Romania and from neighbouring countries). Water management was part of the environmental permit and the poor record of Minvest in the area had made this a sensitive issue. Cyanide processing was used in the EU but other techniques might be found to be more profitable and less polluting. When the risk involved in the project could be assessed, corresponding conditions would be drawn up (technological and relating to sustainability). The conditions could render the project no longer viable. If accepted, further controls would have to be imposed on the project on a step by step basis with assurances given in the form of monetary (possibly gold) deposits.

56. Pending an application from RMGC and its acceptance, activities such as archaeological excavation and purchasing of property were being carried out at the company's own risk and with no guarantee of the project going ahead.

Ministry of European Integration

57. **Mr Leonard Orban** (Deputy Chief Negotiator for Romania's accession to the European Union) was coordinating negotiations including Ch 22 environment and Ch 1 free movement of goods. Full compliance was now demanded before entry (and no transitional period permitted as had been the case with the earlier round of accessions).

58. The request for the Rosia Montana project had at present been withdrawn by RMGC. The main issues it raised were environmental and Ch 22 was particularly strict (with regard to environment and heritage). All new projects had to have an environmental impact assessment at the project stage. The Romanian Government planned to sign the EU Treaty early in 2005 and join the EU on 1 Jan 2007. The Rosia Montana project was therefore being very carefully watched lest it interfere with this timetable.

Romanian Parliament

59. **Mr Alexander Sassu** (Chairman of the Parliamentary Inquiry Committee on the Rosia Montana Project) explained that his report had been adopted by the Cultural Committee in June last year but not yet debated in Parliament. Nothing had significantly happened in the meantime. With 4 million USD spent on them the archaeological excavations in Rosia Montana were the most important in Romania for 200 years. There was no reason to halt these operations at present.

60. **Mr Radu Mircea Berceanu** (Vice-President of the Chamber of Deputies) said that the question was not a political issue in Romania but more a matter of interested parties - those outside Rosia Montana opposed the project as they could not hope to sell their property at the high prices paid by RMGC. He had visited the area and met young protesters who admitted they had been paid to demonstrate.

61. They both agreed that a balance had to be found between cultural, environmental and economic and social interests. The project was important in cultural

terms, being one of the largest archaeological operations in Europe and if it did not go ahead, no funds would be available for archaeology in the area to continue. The project was also a pilot project for the economic development of the whole area. If it was stopped there would be no such chance again for some time. There would also be a serious social problem as the current mining activity of Minvest was to be closed down over the next 10 years.

62. They contrasted RMGC with companies such as Minvest that showed no respect for cultural heritage or the environment. But RMGC had to be careful if it was going to receive a permit for the new project. The EU Commission and Romanian Government were watching especially carefully the environmental aspects and could intervene decisively against it if Romania's entry into the EU in 2007 was in danger of being compromised.

Further contacts with the media

63. At the end of the meeting with Mr Sassu and Mr Berceanu, the General Rapporteur gave an interview to waiting journalists in which he repeated the statement he had made at the meeting with the NGOs in Rosia Montana and confirmed that he would digest his findings and deliver his first preliminary report to the PACE Committee in October.

64. Finally the General Rapporteur gave an interview to the television journalist Cristina Oancea who was making a programme on gold mining in Romania. Asked about the significance of the Rosia Montana gold mines he referred to the stones from Rosia Montana in the National Museum, to Mommsen's waxed tablets and to the likelihood that much remained to be discovered through the programme of archaeological research which could be developed for tourism to the benefit of the local community. Asked if Rosia Montana would qualify to be designated a Unesco World Heritage Site he said that this depended on what was discovered and how it was developed, and that it would be for Unesco to decide. Asked about the Apuseni area he commented that he was impressed by its beauty. Asked about his most significant impression he said, visiting the gold mines, which had also left a physical impression on his head.

III. Appendices

a) Mission statement (issued before the study visit on 7 July 2004)

Study visit on Rosia Montana by Mr Eddie O'Hara MP (UK) General Rapporteur on the Cultural Heritage, Committee on Culture, Science and Education, Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (Romania, 11-15 July 2004)

Rosia Montana (situated in the Apuseni mountains in the west of Romania) has been a site for gold and silver mining for over 2000 years. A new open cast mining project is under way. The General Rapporteur's attention has been drawn to the threat this poses to a site of cultural and environmental importance.

The aim of the study-visit is to

- evaluate the cultural importance of the site
- examine how far this is being taken into account
- explore scenarios for what might be done

The approach is culturally oriented. It complements environmental (European Parliament), commercial and social studies. It aims to place the cultural issues in the overall context.

The study-visit is being carried out at parliamentary level (and on the invitation of the Romanian delegation to PACE). It is not an expert mission. It is not linked to any non-governmental organisations.

In accordance with past practice, the role of the General Rapporteur is to seek to resolve problems of conflict of interest, to ensure proper account is taken of the cultural heritage and to do this in (and from) a wider European perspective. It is not judgemental, nor is it political in internal or external terms. Relevant recent examples have been investigation of the Ilisu dam on the Tigris in SE Turkey and the Olympic rowing facilities at Marathon.

Mr O'Hara will report back to the Committee on Culture, Science and Education (orally in September with a written report by October). Further discussion will follow. The aim is to assist the Romanian parliament in its handling of the situation.

b) Programme of the study visit by Mr O'Hara to Romania on 11-15 July 2004

Sunday, 11 July 2004

22h15 Arrival of the delegation at Cluj airport and drive to Alba Iulia (24h00)

Monday, 12 July 2004

09h00 Meeting with Mr Mugurel Liviu Sârbu, Prefect of Alba, and Mr Teodor Atanasiu, President of the County Council of Alba

10h00 Drive from Alba Iulia to Rosia Montana

11h30 Meeting with representatives of the Rosia Montana Gold Corporation. Presentations on RMGC by Mr Dan Petrescu, Dr Corinna Bors and Dr Béatrice Cauuet and on the "Alburnus Maior" National Research Programme by Dr Paul Damian (MNIR)

13h30 Lunch in Abrud with members of the French archaeological team

15h30 Meeting with Mr Virgil Nicolae Narita, Mayor of Rosia Montana

17h00 On-site visits (a) surface Cârnic and Cetate (b) Cârnic galleries
Overnight in Albac

Tuesday, 13 July 2004

09h00 On-site visit (c) Roman circular tomb (Gauri)

09h30 Meeting with representatives from Alburnus Maior and Pro Rosia Montana non-governmental organisations

11h00 On-site visit (d) Orlea galleries and open-air museum

13h00 Meeting with Mr Richard Hill, President and Managing Director, RMGC

13h30 Drive to Cluj (via Baia de Aries and Turda Gorges and lunch at Savadisla) visits in Cluj (Rex Matthias statue and St Michael's Church)

18h45 flight departure for Bucharest

Wednesday, 14 July 2004

09h00 Meeting in the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs with Mr Mircea Angelescu, Director for Historical Monuments and Museums, and Mr Stefan Ionita, Director for Religious Affairs

10h00 Meeting in the Romanian Academy with Acad. Dan Berinder, President of the Section for Historical and Archaeological Sciences, Acad. Ioan Sandulescu and Acad. Alexandru Vulpe

11h00 Meeting in the Ministry of Environment and Water Management with and Mr Ioan Jeleu, Secretary of State for Environmental Protection, and Mrs Liliana Bara, Secretary of State for European Integration

12h00 Meeting in the Ministry of European Integration with Mr Leonard Orban, Deputy Chief Negotiator for Romania's accession to the European Union

13h00 Lunch hosted by Mr Gheorghe Buzatu, Vice-President of the Senate

15h00 Meeting in the Palace of Parliament with Mr Alexandru Sassu, Chairman of the Parliamentary Inquiry Committee on the Rosia Montana Project, and Mr Radu-Mircea Berceanu

16h15 Visit of the National Museum of History (Lapidarium and Treasury Hall) and the Curtea Veche (old quarter of Bucharest)

17h00 Interview for Romanian National Television

19h30 Dinner hosted by Mr Ghiorghe Prisacaru, Chairman of the Romanian Delegation

Thursday, 15 July 2004

9h20 Departure of the delegation from Bucharest airport

c) Map

