



'Baker River Project License Implementation

Cultural Resource Advisory Group FINAL Meeting Notes

Team Leader: Elizabeth Dubreuil (PSE), (425) 462-3609, elizabeth.dubreuil@pse.com.

PRESENT:

Elizabeth Dubreuil (Puget Sound Energy), Jan Hollenbeck (United States Forest Service), Ron Kent (USACE), Heather Miller (HRA), Jessie Piper (Northwest Archeological Associates), and Candace Wilson (Facilitator, PDSA Consulting).

DECISIONS: None today

NEXT MEETING: May 12, 10 a.m. – 2 p.m., Skagit Center

2010 MEETING DATES: May 12, June 16, July 21, August 18, September 15, October 20, November 17, December 15

APRIL 6 AGENDA

1. Review notes/agenda/action items from March 2, 2010 meeting.
2. Decisions today? No
3. HPMP Revision Update
 - Discussion of Section 5
 - Revisit pg. 154: NFS Lands
 - Revisit pg. 154: Actions under Maintenance Guidelines & Archaeological Treatment Plan
 - Review Monitoring forms
 - Revisit 5.3.5 "Archaeological Sites" when monitoring form is revised
 - Review 6.3 Reporting
 - Review Section 6 – CRC Qualifications
 - Review Contractor Compliance
 - Review Curation Plan (HIT Agreements & Burke Guidelines in Appendix L)
 - Review Section 1.5 on confidentiality
 - Further discussion of unresolved areas listed in Comments Log
 - Other issues?
 - Next steps
4. Decisions for next meeting: None known
5. Evaluate meeting, set location and agenda for next meeting (April 21, 2010)

NEW ACTION ITEMS

- Jessie & Elizabeth Send out HPMP Appendix SP (Special Provisions for Contractors) to CRAG for review.



PUGET SOUND ENERGY

The Energy To Do Great Things

- All Send comments on HPMP Appendix SP (Special Provisions for Contractors) to Elizabeth
- Jan Discuss Baker Lake Collection with Steve Denton in the context of the existing HIT Agreement between the USFS and the Burke Museum
- Elizabeth Send updated comment log on HPMP out to CRAG members for review
- Elizabeth Send latest version of Section 5 of the HPMP out to CRAG members without “track changes”

PREVIOUS - STILL RELEVANT - ACTION ITEMS

- NWAA Separate armored/stabilized sites from lag sites and create appropriate monitoring form. **The monitoring form will be revised and sent out for one more review.**
- Elizabeth/Jessie Revise HPMP language to make consistent regarding qualifications to make specific determinations, in accordance with NHPA qualifications, e.g. in the event the CRC is not a professional architect. **Being addressed, will be reviewed by CRAG with final review of HPMP.**
- Jan Rework NFS section of the HPMP (Section 5 – pg. 154) **In process.**
- Elizabeth Proceed with curation of collections at the Burke by 9/30/10 with Burke and NWAA. **Ongoing.**
- NWAA Prepare collections for curation at Burke by 9/30/10. **Ongoing.**
- All: Discuss best action regarding potential issue with WISAARD access to confidential archaeological information.
- Chris: Create structure of documents record. (This refers to a reference index of documents relating to CRAG indicating the date of the latest version.) **Pending.**
- Heather: Collect data for a new table for those buildings that have not been evaluated, and include a DOE schedule. **In process.**
- All? Present findings from Treatment Plan collection at a professional conference. **Ongoing.**

REVIEW NOTES/AGENDA/ACTION ITEMS:

Notes

Notes from the March 2 CRAG meeting were accepted with minor changes. Candace will send out the final notes to CRAG members.

Agenda

The agenda was reviewed and accepted. Some discussion items were postponed for later discussion, as noted below.

Report on Action Items

- Elizabeth Check with legal department about making stipulations on qualifications of the CRC in Section 6 of the HPMP. Elizabeth reported that PSE’s legal department reviewed the qualifications and felt that the CRC is not being asked to act outside of existing regulations, and safeguards are in place within the HPMP. Questions about specific decisions can be addressed as they come up. **Completed.**
- Ron Send Corps inspection form to CRAG members. **Completed.**
- NWAA Separate armored/stabilized sites from lag sites and create appropriate monitoring form. Jessie reported that when she discussed this action item with Chris Miss, Chris did not see the need for two forms, as she believes the form is adequate for both types of sites. If additional measures are needed to assess the armored sites, e.g., setting up measuring stakes, etc., this should be considered in the treatment plan. Jessie thinks the discussion re: the form is confusing the role of



monitoring and the management role. The monitoring form is used to provide information for making management decisions, and the monitor can make recommendations but the CRC and the CRAG make management decisions. The monitoring report will play a role in tracking information. CRAG discussed various concerns that need to be addressed through the monitoring form: datum info, photo points, information that will indicate incremental change. Jan commented that her GPS technician indicated that projection, zone, unit of measure and datum are needed for each site. Elizabeth stated that the zone will not change, but can be added, that northing and easting are on the form, that the projection can be added, but that that is part of the metadata that goes with the actual shape file eventually created. The monitor who collects the data will not necessarily know to include on form-they just collect data. However, PSE has a standard projection and that can be put on the form so the person downloading and correcting the info knows what projection PSE prefers. If it changes as technology changes, then it may need to be updated. Chris, Jessie, and Elizabeth will meet later in the week to discuss the form in the context of the larger issue of how to manage resources, tracking,, and protocols for implementing the HPMP later in the week. **Pending further review.**

- Jessie Update HPMP comment list and send to Elizabeth. **Completed.**
- Elizabeth Send updated Section 5 out to CRAG members. **Completed.**
- All Send items for review out to CRAG members by 3/30/10; inform CRAG if deadline cannot be met. **Completed.**
- Elizabeth Rework Historic Structures section of Section 5 and email to CRAG members. **Completed.**
- Elizabeth Rework Maintenance Guidelines section of the HPMP (pg. 154) to be more specific. **Completed.**
- Elizabeth Rework Curation Plan in Section 5 of the HPMP and develop new appendix with HIT Agreements and Burke Guidelines. **Completed.**

HPMP REVISION UPDATE

Revisit Pg. 154 NFS Lands – This item was postponed. Jan needs to rework this section.

Pg. 154 Actions under Maintenance Guidelines and Archaeological Treatment Plan – Elizabeth had emailed a new paragraph for this section to CRAG members for review. The Corps archaeological historian reviewed the paragraph and approved it. Heather commented that the paragraph assumes everything in the Maintenance Guidelines falls under Secretary of Interior preservation standards. Anything else must be consulted on with the CRAG. Maintenance actions for specific buildings are listed in the Guidelines. Language was reviewed and deemed adequate.

Review Monitoring Forms – See discussion under Review of Action items. This item was postponed.

Review Archaeological Sites – This item is postponed until the Monitoring Form is revised.

Revisit Contractor Compliance – This refers to Appendix SP, Special Provision for Contractors and is postponed.

ACTION: Jessie & Elizabeth Send out HPMP Appendix SP (Special Provisions for Contractors) to CRAG for review

ACTION: All Send comments on HPMP Appendix SP (Special Provisions for Contractors) to Elizabeth



Historic Structures – Elizabeth reviewed the new section. Historic properties will be regularly assessed under the Maintenance Guidelines. Resources that turn 50 or are newly identified will also be included. Wording was changed to make sure the Maintenance Guidelines will be amended to include new properties in the future. There was discussion of how to clarify the procedure for incorporating newly eligible or newly identified properties. This was completed and accepted in the meeting.

CURATION PLAN

Elizabeth shared language prepared after last meeting's discussion. To develop the PSE HIT with the Burke, she has used the Forest Service HIT (Hold in Trust) Agreement as the model, making minor adjustments to meet PSE needs (mainly removing federal stipulations). PSE will need to have a contract with the Burke, and that contract is currently under review. A Scope of Work (SOW) will be attached to the HIT agreement, much like the FS has done as a contractual agreement. There was discussion about how to report on the collection, since a portion belongs to the Forest Service and will be curated at the Burke under the MBSNF HIT Agreement. This led to a larger and unresolved discussion on how to manage the PSE and MBSNF Baker materials as one collection. What if the Forest Service decides to move its collection from the Burke? Was there an intent to keep the collection together in one place? How can PSE require the FS to keep its collection at the Burke, this should be a FS decision since they own the collection collected on their property. PSE will implement the HPMP in regards to the materials collected on their property. This means it goes to the Burke as the parties agreed and if the CRAG agrees. In addition, what does joint management of the collection entail? Do the tribes expect a report? PSE can only require the Burke or any future repository to make information on its collection available to PSE and that is what PSE plans to share with the CRAG and SHPO. PSE assumed the FS would share their report on the Baker collection with the group, too. PSE and the Forest Service need to figure out how to manage the collection jointly, how to get annual reports to everyone on the status of the collection, how to manage if one party wants to move collection, etc. There have been different assumptions about how this might work.

ACTION: Jan Discuss Baker Lake Collection with Steve Denton in the context of the existing HIT Agreement between the USFS and the Burke Museum

FUTURE MEETINGS

Although discussion of the HPMP has not been completed, it was decided to accomplish as much as possible by email for now. The next meeting regular meeting of the CRAG will be held on Wednesday, May 12, at the PSE Skagit Center, starting at 10.00 a.m. to accommodate people's schedules.

ACTION: Elizabeth Send updated comment log on HPMP out to CRAG members for review

ACTION: Elizabeth Send latest version of Section 5 of the HPMP out to CRAG members without "track changes"

DECISIONS FOR NEXT MEETING: None known

EVALUATE MEETING, SET LOCATION AND AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING (April 6, 2010)

Evaluate Meeting:

- Lunch
- People are passionate – care so much
- Jessie's understanding



- Candace asking people to stay
- People staying

Do Differently

- Trust
- Respect
- Candace be more of a referee

Draft Agenda for May 12, 2010 Meeting (Regular CRAG meeting)

1. Review notes/agenda/action items for April 6, 2010 meeting
 2. Review recent BRCC meeting activities, licensing updates?
 - BRCC membership contacts, timing of formalizing resource groups, meeting timing
 - Next steps
 3. Decisions Required at Today's Meeting: None
 4. Project Updates
 - 2010 Projects
 - Next steps
 5. HPMP Revision
 - Check-In on Review Process
 - Historic Buildings & Structures
 - Timeline
 - Next steps
 6. Decisions for next meeting?
- Lunch
7. Erosion Plan Update
 8. Review meeting norms and membership list
 9. Evaluate Meeting, set location and agenda for next meeting (June 16, 2010)
- BREAK
10. Protective Options
 - Review Drawings
 - Next Steps

Pending HPMP Discussion Items – to be discussed via email

1. Section 5
 - (pg. 154) NFS Lands
 - Review monitoring forms
 - Review "Archaeological sites" under Monitoring Program when monitoring form is revised
 - Review Appendix SP (Contractor Compliance)
 - Revisit Curation Plan (HIT Agreements & Burke Guidelines – Appendix L)
2. Other Sections
 - Review 6.3 Reporting
 - Review Section 6 – CRC Qualifications
3. Unresolved areas on Comments Log