



BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

Cultural & Historical Resources Working Group

December 12, 2000

1:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.

Upper Skagit Tribal Community Center
25944 Community Plaza Way
Sedro Woolley, WA

AGENDA

1. Introductions
2. Review minutes/agenda
3. Tribal presentations
4. Action items <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Research design- APE
5. Expectations
6. Set agenda for next meeting, January 9, 2001
7. Evaluate meeting *Possible field trip on February 8 to take advantage of full moon.

BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

Cultural & Historical Resources Working Group

December 12, 2000

1:00pm – 4:00pm

Upper Skagit Tribal Community Center
25944 Community Plaza Way
Sedro-Woolley, WA

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, jpiper@puget.com

PRESENT: Connie Freeland (Puget Sound Energy), Jessie Piper (Puget Sound Energy), Gail Thompson (Historical Research Associates), Rob Whitlam, by phone, (Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation), Larry Campbell (Swinomish Indian Tribal Committee), Scott Schuyler (Upper Skagit), Edward Williams (Upper Skagit), Shari Brewer (Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe), John Boggs, (Town of Concrete Heritage Museum Association), Gary Wessen (Wessen & Associates), Alex Maass (Historical Research Associates), Ardis Bynum, by phone, (US Forest Service), Lloyd Pernela (Puget Sound Energy), Lyn Wiltse, facilitator (PDSA Consulting)

The meeting started at 1:20 p.m. and ended at 4:00 p.m.

FUTURE MEETING DATES/LOCATIONS

Future meeting dates are on the 2nd Tuesday of each month:

January 9, from 1:00 to 4:00 p.m. at PSE Office in Mt. Vernon

Possible field trip on February 8

February 13, from 1:00 to 4:00 p.m. at PSE Office in Mt. Vernon

March 13, from 1:00 to 4:00 p.m. at PSE Office in Mt. Vernon

NEW ACTION ITEMS

-
-
- All were asked to get additional comments to Gail re: the Research Design by the end of the week. The Tribes will make additional comments on the Research Design during the 30-day comment period.
 - Jessie: Share Jan Hollenbeck's feedback on the research design.

REPORT ON OLD ACTION ITEMS

- ALL: Gave comments on research design to Gail prior to the next meeting.
- ALL: Reviewed list of Issues and Interests. Jessie did receive feedback from various agencies and will pass that information on to the Solution Team.
- HRA: Contacted Bob Meierendorf re: deposition/erosion/submerged stumps, etc. (his study at Ross Lake)
- HRA: Brought draft of "Unanticipated Discovery Plan" from other projects for this team to consider. This could be part of ongoing orientation program for new employees.
- PSE : Sent copies of research design to interested parties not present of this meeting.

Agenda for December 12, 2000 Meeting (1:00 - 4:00 p.m.) – Skagit Tribal Community Center

1. Introductions
 2. Review minutes/agenda
 3. Tribal presentations
 4. Action items
 - Research design
 - APE
 5. Expectations
 6. Set agenda for next meeting, January 9, 2001
 7. Evaluate meeting
- *Possible field trip on February 8 to take advantage of full moon.

PRESENTATIONS

Scott (Skagit Tribe): Scott reiterated the importance of the Baker areas as a resource. They have a recorded village on the upper end of old Baker Lake.

Larry (Swinomish Tribe): Larry gave a very passionate impromptu talk about the history and culture of the Swinomish Tribal Community. Highlights of his talk are as follows:

- History is very important to the Swinomish Tribe.
- They have spiritual rules regarding culture, environment, finance, and religion. All of these rules are seen as one and the same.
- Their ceremonies are designed to help them remember who they are and who their family is. This is reflected in the individual names they have and the legacy that goes along with those names.
- Salmon is king.
- The tribal custom is not to forget elders, whether they are living or dead. They remember the people who lived and died in the Baker area. If burial sites are disturbed, it would send an upsetting ripple throughout the community.

-
-
- There is also an emphasis on family relationships. They are always reaffirming relationship to one another. They want to be able to take care of their ancestors.
 - They are still learning how to talk about their culture and values with non-native people.
 - They realize that as we go through the relicensing process, we all get to know each other better. They are learning how to work with the scientific community. They are finding out how working with archeologists and anthropologists can be mutually beneficial. The scientists can be good liaisons between tribes and communities.

Shari (Sauk-Suiattle Tribe): In Lawrence's absence, Shari reviewed the cultural and spiritual significance of the mountain goat to the Sauk-Suiattle Tribe. She distributed comprehensive handouts, complete with color printouts and a map of the area. PSE will scan the presentation and make it available on the web.

Highlights of the presentation are as follows:

- The native mountain goat's struggle for survival is symbolic of the Tribe's own history:
 - There were as many as 10,000 mountain goats in Washington State in historic times. This number has dwindled to around 100 in the Darrington area and 368 in the Mt. Baker area.
 - The Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe had a population of 3500 before 1855. By 1920, the number fell to 17. Today the Tribe's enrollment is 200.
 - Archeological evidence shows tribal use of the mountain goat dating back thousands of years.
- The Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe used the mountain goat in various ways:
 - The wool was used in making blankets and clothing.
 - The horns and bones were used to form tools and other implements to sustain a tribal livelihood.
 - It's pure white fat was used to make a beauty cream.
 - The meat was eaten fresh or dried to provide one of the food sources during winter months.
 - The mountain goat spirit was sought in a spiritual quest (like the eagle).
- The Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe promotes a position to preserve and protect herds of mountain goats in the North Cascades for all time.

RESEARCH DESIGN COMMENTS

Rob: Suggested using percentage coverage at Baker in the reservoir drawdown zone. He is concerned about the methodology being proposed. He suggests following the methodology that Bob Mierendorf used at Ross Lake.

Concern was also expressed that only inventory would be taken in 2001 with evaluation activities taking place in 2002. There is no guarantee that drawdown levels would be comparable in 2002.

PSE reported they may be extending the length of the drawdown periods beyond mid-March into April. This, of course, is highly dependent on weather and energy. This extended drawdown period would make it possible to do some evaluation in 2001. There may not be a drawdown in 2002 other than for flood control.

Ultimately the survey needs to be systematic and comprehensive. Efficiency calls for minimizing the number of trips. The soonest the permit (Forest Service) can be issued (includes the Research Design) is 30-45 days after it is applied for.

We may want to start out with a survey and concentrate on the lowest levels first. If it looks like we will be unable to come back to those levels later, then we should make every attempt to combine some evaluation along with the survey.

The desire expressed by the team is to come up with a reliable baseline that is compatible to Mierendorf's. We also need to keep in mind that the basin is dynamic. We need to be able to address these changes.

Scott Schuyler's comments: We need to take advantage of the drawdown in the research design. What we find in the lower reaches may be night and day from what we find in the upper reaches. In this process, our challenge is to integrate tribal knowledge of the land with archeologists' knowledge of the land. Archeology Research Design needs to specify that the lowest drawdown will be targeted for survey. Archeology work is done in compliance with section 106 and that the Secretary of the Interiors Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation be adopted as the professional work standards. Proposed actual surveyed area of 38% coverage is too small and the overall area may need to be expanded to cover all culturally significant areas that are connected to the project area. "Site" as defined in the ARD is far too restrictive. The standard of 10 artifacts per 10 meters needs to be lowered.

Shari asked if it would be possible to get permission (prior to the permit being issued) from the Forest Service to spend some days to get a feel for what we might be looking for when doing the survey. Ardis responded that spending time in the area to "get a feel" for it would be a challenge in that it would be difficult to recreate a forest in an open area.

In this process, our challenge is to integrate tribal knowledge of the land with the archeologists' knowledge of the land. We may want to form a technical working group to explore this challenge. We don't want to make cultural sites vulnerable in our attempt to protect them. This process is part of a recovery of tribal history and culture. A main objective of the process is protection of cultural resources—site protection.

All were asked to get additional comments to Gail re: the Research Design by the end of the week. The Tribes will make additional comments on the Research Design during the 30-day comment period.

AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECT (APE)

It has been agreed that the drawdown areas are part of the APE. Two meetings ago, we decided to defer discussion of upland areas. Jan Hollenbeck wants to issue only one permit. She agrees that we can get the permit and start research on the drawdown areas. After that we can get consensus on the APE for upland areas.

The APE boundary will change, depending on what is found. We may stipulate that the Forest Service would review and approve of the boundary of the upland area before the survey takes place. Larry expressed concern for a buffer around creeks in the upland area. We also need a provision to address future changes so impacts can be addressed before the change occurs.

MEETING EVALUATION

Well-Dones:

- Location
- Presentations
- Smoked salmon (Yum!)
- Good discussion
- Good speaker phone participation

Opportunities for Improvement:

- May want to extend the meeting time.
- Have a meeting on Monday, Wednesday or Friday at the Long house in Darrington

Note: Meetings in 2001 will occur the second Tuesday of each month from 1:00-4:00 p.m.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING—January 9, 2001

PSE Office in Mt. Vernon, WA 1:00 to 4:00

1. Introductions
2. Review minutes/agenda
3. Sauk-Suiattle Tribal presentation by Lawrence (?)
4. Action Items
 - APE
 - Unanticipated Discovery Plan
5. Expectations
6. Set agenda for next meeting (February 13)
 - Field trip?
 - Future meeting times and locations

PARKING LOT

- Decide how to handle action items (open/closed, etc.)
- Show map of general project area, include transmission lines
- Develop “Area of Potential Effects” Map
- Define “cultural resources” in consultation with Tribes and public
- Quorum?
- Familiarization with policies, directives, regulations, laws and interests
- Rotate meeting location to tribal facility?
- Define all applicable jurisdictions, laws and regulations (Rick to share existing information analysis)
- Glossary of terms: what are “protection,” “mitigation,” and “enhancement”?
- Gail to give a presentation on procedures for inventorying and evaluating cultural resources
- Show map of general project area – does it include transmission lines?
- Bob Barnes will give a course on Hydrology 101
- Tribe presentations on cultural/spiritual significance of resources
- Upland area---importance of mountain goats