
BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

Cultural & Historical Resources Working Group

March 15, 2004
10:30 p.m.- 4:00 p.m.

Baker Lodge
Concrete, WA

AGENDA

TOLL free conference number - To Call into this Meeting

Step 1 -Dial **1-866-280-6429**

Step 2 -Dial Participant code **144995** followed by # sign

You will hear hold music if "host" (Facilitator or Team Leader) has not yet dialed into the number

- When "Host" has called in to the number, you will be joined to the call

1. Introductions
2. Review February 10, 2004 Notes and Agenda
3. Action Items/Schedule
4. DOE Update
5. Study Update
6. HPMP Update
10. Set agenda for April 13 meeting
11. Review Parking Lot
12. Evaluate Meeting
13. Plan celebration for May
 1. PSE host a celebration at Upper Skagit Hotel?
 2. A barbecue at Baker Lodge

Distribution List
Baker River Cultural/Historical Resources Working Group

| Organization | Name | Email |
|---|-----------------|------------------------------------|
| National Park Service | Ryan Booth | Ryan_Booth@nps.gov |
| Equinox Research & Consulting | Kelly Bush | Kelrbush@earthlink.net |
| US Forest Service | Ardis Bynum | abynum@fs.fed.us |
| Swinomish Indian Tribal Community | Larry Campbell | lcampbell@swinomish.nsn.us |
| Puget Sound Energy | Connie Freeland | connie.freeland@pse.com |
| US Forest Service | Jan Hollenbeck | jhollenbeck@fs.fed.us; |
| Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe | Jason Joseph | sauk@sauk-suiattle.com |
| Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe | Norma Joseph | njoseph@sauk-suiattle.com |
| US Army Corps of Engineers | Ronald Kent | ronald.J.Kent@nws02.usace.army.mil |
| National Park Service | Bob Mierendorf | bob_mierendorf@nps.gov |
| Northwest Archaeological Associates | Christian Miss | cjmiss@northwestarch.com |
| Puget Sound Energy | Jessie Piper | jessie.piper@pse.com |
| Upper Skagit Indian Tribe | Scott Schuyler | sschuyler@upperskagit.com |
| WA Dept. Natural Resources | Lee Stilson | lee.stilson@wadnr.gov |
| WA Office Archaeology & Historic Preservation | Rob Whitlam | robw@cted.wa.gov |
| PDSA Consulting | Lyn Wiltse | lyn@pdsaconsulting.com |
| Federal Energy Regulatory Commission | Frank Winchell | frank.winchell@ferc.gov |

Distribution List
Baker River Cultural/Historical Resources Interested Parties*

| Organization | Name | Email |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Concrete Heritage Museum | John Boggs | jboggs@wash@aol.com |
| Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe | Ernie DeCoteau | police@sauk-suiattle.com |
| Swinomish Indian Tribal Community | Martin Loesch | mloesch@swinomish.nsn.us; |
| Swinomish Indian Tribal Community | Charlie O'Hara | cohara@swinomish.nsn.us |
| Skagit County Historical Museum | Karen Marshall | karenm@co.skagit.wa.us |
| National Park Service | Susan Rosebrough | susan_rosebrough@nps.gov |
| US Forest Service | Jon Vanderheyden | jvanderheyden@fs.fed.us; |
| Skagit River System Cooperative | Stan Walsh | swalsh@skagitcoop.org |
| Louis Berger Associates | Pat Weslowski | weslowski@louisberger.com |

* Non-confidential communications only (Meeting Agenda and Meeting Notes, announcements, etc.)

BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

Cultural & Historical Working Group

March 15, 2004

10:30 a.m.– 4:00 p.m.
Baker Lodge
Concrete, WA

FINAL MEETING NOTES

Mission: *“To develop alternatives and recommendations addressing cultural, historical and archeological resources for the Baker River Project relicensing process.”*

Team Leader: Jessie Piper (425) 462-3609, jessie.piper@pse.com

PRESENT: Jessie Piper, Connie Freeland (Puget Sound Energy), Jan Hollenbeck (US Forest Service), Kelly Bush (Equinox Research), Ron Kent (US Army Corps of Engineers), Bob Mierendorf (National Park Service), Chris Miss (Northwest Archaeological Associates), Rob Whitlam by phone (WA Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation), Frank Winchell (FERC); Charlie O’Hara (Swinomish Indian Tribal Community)

FUTURE MEETING DATES – 2004

April 13, May 11, and June 8. Meeting locations to be announced.

All regular attendees are encouraged to let Jessie know if they are unable to attend a meeting.

Revised Agenda for March 15, 2004, 10:30-4:00 p.m.

Baker Lodge

1. Introductions
2. Review February 10, 2004 Notes and Agenda
3. Action Items/Schedule
4. DOE Update - Jessie
5. Slide show/erosion discussion – Bob
6. LUNCH
7. HPMP Update
8. Set agenda for April 13 meeting

9. Evaluate Meeting

NEW ACTION ITEMS

- Jessie: Amend February notes (page 4) reference to Frank & stewardship – he was with the US Corps of Engineers, not FERC
- Chris: revise HPMP at 1.2 re: signatories to PA
- Jessie: re-send DOE cover pages with signatures to Rob, FERC, Jan
- ALL: review the new HPMP, Jessie will email notes on areas to focus on
- Jessie: follow-up with Kelly Cahill re: curation costs
- Jessie/Jan: Re: Listing process. Discuss meaning of “cooperate” and whether/how to include this in the HPMP language –ongoing discussion
- Kelly, Chris, and Jessie: complete PME table on page 83 and append to HPMP
- ALL: Bring outdated reports, HPMP versions, and other documents to next meeting for shredding
- Jessie: find location for next meeting
- Jessie: send hard copy of PME packet to Rob
- Kelly: Check with Tribes re: PME packet
- Chris: use track changes in next HPMP version so CHRWG can track changes from March 22 comment period

REPORT ON OLD ACTION ITEMS

- Jessie – sent Frank reminder to send his HPMP comments – Frank sent comments, reviewed again on airplane
- Jessie – checked on Lodge for March 15 meeting – Yes
- Jessie/Jan: Re: Listing process. Discuss meaning of “cooperate” and whether/how to include this in the HPMP
- Frank – checked in with Steve Hocking re: License Article Language (see below)
- Jessie – checked in with Frank re: his conversation with Steve Hocking on License Article Language; pass information on to CHRWG members so we can make a decision (see below)
- Teamlet (Chris & Jessie) - HPMP Section 5.3.7 Outreach and 5.3.7 Public Education – fill out objectives. PME 6.5– what are elements we can support?
- Jessie – provide CHRWG with new PME package for review – Jessie handed out today. These are the Proposed Actions that were sent out to Policy and Solution teams.
- Jessie: Meet with Cary Feldmann re: wording for 4.2.1 and send out to Working Group members for approval so it can be sent to Louis Berger to be translated into license Article language. – some rewording to look at this afternoon – it is in the PME packet (6.6.4)
- Jessie: Follow-up with Kelly C. re: curation costs; still following up on this
- Bob: Bring slide show on Ross Lake site stabilization to March 15 meeting. – brought it, and it was excellent.

NEW MEMBER

Charles O'Hara, Director of Planning for the Swinomish Indian Tribal Community, joined us for the first time. Larry Campbell has taken a leave of absence for health reasons, so Charlie will be representing the Swinomish in our meetings.

LICENSE ARTICLE

Frank talked to Steve Hocking and Keith Brooks at FERC. Keith says that if the PA is terminated the licensee goes back to Section 106. FERC will look at the wording again. Connie says there's been lots of discussion on License Article Language in the Legal Working Group. Frank is still working with License Article Language, but says it is not as important as the HPMP. The PA is where the mechanics are, and the bottom line is to not chuck the HPMP.

Rob wants to know what happens if the PA is terminated, since in his mind that means the HPMP is also terminated. Jan says the terms of the PA are what gives the HPMP its authorization, in absence do 106; if PA can say in absence of PA do 106, why can't the License Article also say that? Kelly: 106 can mean many things and the HPMP will be the specific way of doing 106.

Bob: in a previous discussion, one concern was the potential that the HPMP could be questioned to the point of delay. We would then enter into limbo-land and that situation could drag on. If the Plan is questioned for a while, then we can't implement it. Resource measures may need to take place and there is a potential they would be delayed.

The PA/HPMP sequence is: FERC approves the HPMP, the PA is sent out, there is a possible final draft of HPMP, then the final PA and the final HPMP are issued together. The PA gets signed but doesn't come into effect until the HPMP is approved.

Bob wants to know who gives the HPMP the stamp of approval. Tribal representatives attend the CHRWG meetings, but doesn't approval have to come from the Tribal Councils? Frank says the HPMP gets approved through the Working Group, is attached to the PA, and then sent out. The HPMP won't be issued until everything is settled.

Jan insists the PA and License Article need to be in the same language. Right now the PA and the License Article Language say different things. The License Article says implement the HPMP. The PA says to revert to 106. The License Article needs to say the same thing. Frank will talk to Keith about this.

Jan says the Forest Service wants to be signatory to the PA. Frank says the signatories are FERC, ACHP, and SHPO. The Licensee (Puget), the Forest Service, and the Tribes and any others all sign as concurring parties. Jan says anyone with responsibility in this process should be a signatory. Frank says the Licensee and USFS are not signatories.

If Forest Service or Tribes have a problem with the HPMP, they can appeal to FERC. Frank: dispute resolution is in the PA. If there is no resolution, the Advisory Council gets involved, then if no resolution, FERC has the final say.

DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY (DOE)

Historic Buildings & Structures

Puget submitted documentation to OAHP in the form of the revised report (Russell Holter of OAHP ok'd this). There was a major change since the walkabout at the Project with Russ. OAHP thinks the Upper Baker Powerhouse should be considered a contributing component of Baker River Hydroelectric Historic District. Lisa Mighetto (HRA historian) talked to the Baker River Project fisheries manager, Doug Bruland, about the Powerhouse's role in fisheries. Doug said Powerhouse does have a relationship with fish management because of the need to keep fish out of the turbines. We decided we couldn't separate the Powerhouse from the dam and fish passage. In the February 2004 *Historic Buildings & Structures* report it is identified as a contributing component.

Archaeology

The Determination of Eligibility forms were sent to SHPO with a request for concurrence. The letter was cc'd with forms to FERC, Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie, and the three tribes. Jessie brought extra copies of the DOE form to the meeting for Bob, Ron, and Kelly. The information is basically what is in the archaeology report, just on the DOE form and in a different format.

SHPO has 30 days to comment. Jan would have liked to have CHRWG comments summarized in the cover letter. Rob has nomination form, but no signature. Jessie will have Ed Schild, Director of Energy Production, sign the cover sheet and send it to OAHP.

SITE STABILIZATION – Slide Show from Bob Mierendorf

Bob claims not to be an expert on site stabilization but has had some special training and has been involved in stabilization of several sites at North Cascades National Park (NCNP). Two are of the sites have relevance to the Baker situation.

Site #1 is on Ross Lake

- Site has state and local significance and is superlative in the Northwest.
- Dated 8500 to 200 years BP, covers more than 40 acres, concentration is in the middle of the site.

The site was threatened from erosion by reservoir waves along Ross Lake during annual drawdown and exacerbated by fluctuating pool levels. There was severe undercutting, as much as 8 feet into the bank with a loss of intact soil and site integrity. With the consensus of Skagit Tribes, Seattle City Light and NPS, the Park stabilized over 100 feet of shoreline. They utilized the design expertise of the Park's erosion control crew and the park geologist. The erosion control crew did the stabilization work using Park equipment. It took three seasons to complete the project, at a total cost of about \$100,000, because they had only April and May to do the work.

The process included use of a backhoe, stockpiling gear and rock, and building a temporary haul road. Locally acquired rock was brought in by barge at full pool. The barge was fitted with a hydraulic boom. The backhoe had a fork for placing rock.

First, a toe trench was dug along the edge at the depth of the height of the first rock (to prevent undercutting). Water permeable geo-textile was placed between the site soil and the rock wall, with the

footing rocks resting on the fabric. The footing rocks tilted into the slope. At the top, cedar cribbing was pinned to the chert wall and was the most technologically difficult aspect. The final feature was a spring seep hole for drainage during spring melt.

The area was then revegetated with native plants collected on-site and propagated in the NPS greenhouse. It provided good coverage after only one growing season. An unanticipated feature provided more stabilization when the embayment trapped lots of driftwood, which eventually formed an interlocking mass that very nicely breaks wave action and deters canoe-ers and kayakers from landing on the spot.

Archaeologists did regular monitoring during construction. Impact to the edge of the site due to this construction was considered a reasonable sacrifice for the protection provided by the final outcome. The temporary haul road disappeared from wave action. The design was simple from an engineering standpoint, but it is good to have experienced people to plan and carry out the work. It's good to make use of local expertise and incorporate existing boulders if possible.

Site #2 is along the Skagit River

- Site was recorded in mid-1970s
- Bob began monitoring in 1984
- Test excavated in fall of 1991, four cultural layers, to 2 m deep; site was determined eligible to the NR
- Abundant charcoal, soot, FMR, and salmon bones, dozens of fish teeth
- Five radiocarbon dates span 600 years
- Cultural deposits buried by Skagit River sands, inferred to representing salmon smoking and drying
- Shows Little Ice Age flood plain aggradation, indigenous use was continuous over this span
- Dated from 590 to 170 B.P.; greasy, oily matrix

The site was threatened by erosion of artifacts, and exposure, particularly after Skagit River flood events. High floods of 1989, 1990, 1995, and 2003 inundated it. It sustained heavy flood erosion and artifact exposure. Specific effects became apparent as the 1990 flood receded, with soil loss, exposure and loss of anchoring for plant roots. The site also had impacts from being in a public use area.

They decided to protect the site in place with SHPO approval and tribal review of protection plan. It was funded by Seattle City Light as a recreation improvement. It required a hydrologic permit because it was in a flood plain. NCNP maintenance and trails staff carried out all the work using Park equipment.

The first step was to armor the base of the terrace with large, native boulders. A trench was dug at the base of the terrace for anchoring geo-textile (biodegradable coconut fabric) to hold sand fill. It will biodegrade in under a decade). The fabric was anchored with wooden stakes.

After placing native willow or dogwood wands horizontally on a nice bed of soil, they were covered with soil. The fabric is rolled out, soil is put on top, then another layer of wands. Then the fabric is folded and staked; the wands are placed horizontally to promote a long root system, which anchors the soil and aids in stability of the finished product, which is informally referred to as the veggie burrito).

The raft launch and vehicle access point was relocated nearby but off the sensitive area, with placement of boulders and vegetation designed to route people off sensitive areas. They did re-soiling of some tree root systems growing in the site deposits in order to keep the trees alive.

Results: cost was about \$15,000 for the archaeological component (\$75,000 total, roughly), but hard to estimate because much of the cost was incurred as part of the overall recreational improvement project.

The native plants have thrived. There was very little site damage in 2003 flood, despite extremely high floodwaters that covered the area up to the access road. There was slight erosion at the edge of the "veggie burrito", which was five years old at the time.

Lessons, warnings, and considerations:

- Get help in planning (cr.nps.gov/seac/stabil-clearinghouse.htm) or search engine for “archaeological site stabilization.”
- It can be tough to get crew, equipment, materials, and get started.
- They had to look for outside funding.
- Each stabilization problem requires a unique solution; sometimes stabilization is cheaper than data recovery and vice versa.
- Site stabilization has to be well-planned; need to understand hydrology of site; lots of observations needed over all seasons.

Example of an unsuccessful (and/or ugly) stabilization project was shown from Lake Britt, a reservoir operated by Pacific Gas and Electric:

- Constructed rock gabion wall – did not blend in with surroundings, did not hold up, caused more erosion, required expensive re-model and restabilization in greater area.
- Slides shown from another site stabilization from the same reservoir using fabrics under horizontal chain link fence (used on top to deter illegal excavation) to save eroding bank of large arch site. Not sure how successful it has been. Does not blend in. If pothunters learn these projects are for site protection, they can find the sites by spotting the highly visible stabilization fences.

Ron: At an eroded site at Upper Hanson Dam, they have tried to stabilize elk habitat by using sedge plantings. Bob thinks that would work well with a real shallow approach. Ron wonders if at Upper Baker it could work in the upper 10-15 feet of sites. He points out the importance of monitoring stabilized sites regularly.

Chris: we only have one site where stabilization will work, and the question is how much of the site we can actually save. The trend is towards preservation, not data collection, so sites get covered up and are no longer accessible, so we may need some baseline data to know what we’re protecting. Bob: if testing programs were adequately funded, you would have the base sample for data before protecting, but really just we often have a minimum amount of testing to determine if we should protect.

Charlie wonders how you balance data recovery with protection for groups with cultural affiliation. Chris says the river will eventually take the site; so another decision is when to recover or protect.

HISTORIC PROPERTIES MANAGEMENT PLAN (HPMP)

The revised HPMP was mailed out on 3/5. We hope to have one more review before the final goes to FERC.

Ron noticed the flow chart (page 93) was missing. Chris replaced it with a chart of Section 106 steps, since it the process that we were depicting in the flow chart. We were trying to clarify that on MBSNF land, the FS oversees an action, or PSE will do it and the FS will monitor it. Jan says she took a lot of time with the flow chart, and hasn't had time to review the new chart. She says we're not really discussing who does the work (it will get done) (it's to be addressed later). The point is that the Forest Service will retain all appropriate authority on MBSNF land.

Chris: the pragmatic process of approving - does Puget have to take up a whole other coordination for that? Jan is concerned whether being part of the CRAG will give the Forest Service the appropriate role? Also, the Forest Service will have an interest in actions whether or not it's on Forest Service land.

HPMP Review – sections to focus on

- All highlighted sections
- 4.1.1 Effects on arch sites: reservoir model added (Pages 76-78)
- 4.3 PME general effects section revised (Pages 82-84)
- 5.1. new section on specific PME effects (Pages 90-01)
- 5.3.1 Undertakings excluded on case-by-case review. Pay special attention to highlighted areas (Page 95 & Appendix C)
- 5.3.1 Unplanned work (Page 95)
- 5.3.7 Training and Education - changed after discussion in last meeting (Pages 100-101)
- 6.O Funding table (Pages 107-118)
- All Historic Building & Structure info (revised by HRA)
 - 3.3. HBS Investigations (Pages 41-69)
 - 4.1.2 HBS effects (Pages 78-79)
 - 4.2.2 HBS effects (Pages 81-82)
 - 5.1.2 HBS management measures (Page 87-90)
 - 5.3.1 sections on Action & Review for Historic Districts (page 95)

Wording: acceptance vs. issuance? Once FERC issues the license, the licensee has 30 days to decide whether they will accept it. FERC wants us to use the term “issuance” in the HPMP, as it is what is used in the PA. If we use “issuance,” the implementation schedule and on page 104 and 105 will need to be changed.

Jan wants to know why curation is shown as a one-time occurrence, as we will probably collect other artifacts and documentation over the life of the license. Jessie used it as a place holder since we do not know exactly when we will have the need to archive. She'll revise to show it as a one-time cost (collection accession) plus “as needed” or something like that.

In 6.1, there is inconsistency between text and table. The table says the coordinator will be on board 6 months after license acceptance. It actually needs to be at time of acceptance. Jessie needs to go over table 6.1 and the funding schedule 6.2 to make sure that they match.

Jan wants to know in planning for HABS/HAER documentation for historic districts, what are the values we aim to document by that means since HABS/HAER is mitigation for adverse effects. Jessie says some of the money is earmarked for known mitigation (e.g., loss of spawning beaches) and some is contingency funding since over the license it is reasonable to expect some change in the historic structures (e.g., changes to cement silos for safety reasons).

Jan wants to know what happens if we don't spend the money. Jessie says the money may not get spent but suggests that there is other kind of documentation we can do, for instance, for the spawning beaches we could do an oral history video walkover. And since the fisheries work is adapted to new information, we don't know what will be considered a historic structure or component 20 or 30 years from now. Some of the money can be used if we set up documentation standards, a system to capture information over time that creates a fisheries archive.

We need to get comments on this version of the HPMP to Jessie by next Monday (March 22) so we can get another draft out. We will use track changes this time so people will be able to see what has changed.

Jan would like to see a draft of the Baker PA. Frank says the PA doesn't exist until after FERC does its detailed analysis of the license application, but he can send out a sample PA. Jan wants a copy of this PA, not just a general sample. Frank says it is boilerplate, an agreement document that says these are the people involved, and it has a dispute resolution section.

PROTECTION, MITIGATION, AND ENHANCEMENT

Jessie distributed the most recent PME packet, which was sent out to the Policy and Solution teams. Rob wants a copy; Kelly will check with tribes to make sure they have a copy.

We had talked about the possibility of a mapping exercise; however, many of the PMEs don't have a location attached to them yet. Regarding PMEs for habitat acquisition, will we have to survey those lands? We will if there are proposed actions on them (modification). Once the lands are in holdings and an action is proposed, then that would be a project run through the CRAG, so if Puget acquires lands outside the APE, that is addressed in the HPMP.

What about where PSE funds the FS, e.g. 2.1: PSE funds FS rehabilitation of Bayview Campground? Jan says by virtue of it being a PME and a requirement of this license, it is a PSE or FERC action; who does the work and how it's processed will be discussed later. PSE could ask the Forest Service to do the whole thing; the Forest Service could say it won't happen and come up with something else in lieu.

How does another cultural coordinator review the process since Forest Service has authority on their land? It's a joint venture, but the decision will be Forest Service. If there is a failure in compliance, it will fall on the Forest Service or FERC. In the Legal Working Group, some attorneys were having problems with PSE funding things on Forest Service land; who is responsible if it doesn't get done? Frank reminds

us there are things that can be done outside the license. Connie says other people want to see all things attached to the license. Charlie thinks people see the license as leverage, so without it they have no say.

The current PME chart doesn't address all the PMEs. The group would like to see all current PMEs in the table and list potential conflicts; at least it gives a starting point showing the data at the time the HPMP was finalized. It can go in an appendix, as a dated set current as of January 30. We will add a column that says "no known potential conflict" and one that says "insufficient data." Maybe in the future as actions are proposed, we can record them in this same format.

The Cultural Resources Enhancement Fund (CREF) provides the ability to do unforeseen things in the future (\$380,000 annually beginning in 2013 or 2014). The Baker River Coordinating Committee will provide a format for regular consultation. Ed Schild, PSE's Director of Energy Production, wants to have a license that everyone feels good about and hopes that the relationships formed during the relicensing process continue. Jessie clarified that any funding for any necessary tribal capacity should route through the settlement discussions. Jan asks how the Forest Service staff is going to be funded for actions? Everyone needs to deal with capacity and how it's going to be funded (settlement). Jessie says that it is a policy level discussion.

SCHEDULE

- Monday March 22, 2004 – provide HPMP comments to Jessie, particularly on highlighted sections and those focus areas noted above.
- Friday April 2 - Final CHRWG Review Draft HPMP will be distributed.
- Tuesday, April 13 – next CHRWG Meeting (Mt. Baker Lodge and Mt. Vernon are booked; location TBA).

DISPOSAL OF OUTDATED REPORTS

Bob brought up the importance of protecting confidential documents we have distributed through CHRWG over the course of the relicensing. We don't want old drafts of confidential reports and documents, etc., lying around. Jessie can take care of them at PSE with a commercial shredder if people bring outdated reports to the next meeting. Please keep close track of Baker River cultural documents distributed to you so that we can continue to protect confidential information.

HANDOUTS

- Bob's link to site stabilization on the internet (cr.nps.gov/seac/stabil-clearinghouse.htm)
- PME package 3-10-04
- CHRWG Timeline

PARKING LOT

- Coordinate with Terrestrial, Aquatic, and Recreation Working Groups
- Glossary of terms: what are "protection," "mitigation," and "enhancement"?
- Rotate meeting locations to tribal facilities?
- Possibility of transplanting young cedar trees/Availability of downed cedar for tribal use

-
- HYDROPS demo

MEETING EVALUATION

- **Well-Dones**
- Charlie!
- Bob's slide show
- Great fireman (Bob)!

Changes for Next Time

- Too cold; needs to be warmer
- We miss Lyn and Mary Jean

What's Hot?

- HPMP deadline
- License Article Language
- Party

May Celebration Ideas:

1. PSE host a celebration at Upper Skagit Hotel?
2. A barbecue at Baker Lodge

TENTATIVE Agenda for April 13, 2004, 10:00-4:00 p.m.

1. Introductions
2. Review March 15, 2004 Notes and Agenda
3. Action Items/Schedule
4. Comments on TCPs
5. DOE
6. PMEs
7. HPMP
8. Plan celebration
9. Set agenda for May 11 meeting
10. Review Parking Lot
11. Evaluate Meeting