



Cultural Resource Advisory Group Meeting Draft Meeting Notes

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

PRESENT

Elizabeth Dubreuil and Ken Wiegand (Puget Sound Energy), Tom Flynn and Dennis Hendrickson (by phone – Puget Sound Energy), Jan Hollenbeck (by phone – USFS), Mary McCormick (by phone - UCACE), Nick Vann (DAHP), Heather Miller and Matthew Sneddon, HRA), Chris Miss, SWCA), Gene Lohrmeyer (Geo-Engineers), Rhoda Lawrence (BOLA), and Candace Wilson (Facilitator, PDSA Consulting).

DECISIONS: None today

NEXT MEETING:

FUTURE 2013 MEETING DATES: Hold 3rd Wednesdays throughout the year. Meetings will most likely be held quarterly. 3rd Wednesdays in 2013: February 20, March 20, April 17, May 15, June 19, July 17, August 21, September 18, October 16, November 20, December 18.

JANUARY 16 AGENDA

1. Safety Moment
2. Review notes / agenda / action items from September 19, 2012 meeting
3. Review recent BRCC meeting activities, licensing updates
4. Decisions Required at Today's Meeting: None
5. Lower Baker Compound Presentation

LUNCH

6. Project Updates
 - 2013 projects
 - MOA (Gulper, Spawning Beaches, LB Dam)
 - Draft DAHP Level II
 - Swift Creek Campground
 - Burpee Hill
 - Baker Club House
7. Decisions for next meeting?
8. Evaluate Meeting, set location and agenda for next meeting

NEW ACTION ITEMS

- **Elizabeth: Convene a special CRAG field trip on January 30th at 11 am to walk the Lower Baker Compound and continue discussion of the proposal. Elizabeth will bring photographic evidence to share after the walk-through to help with the discussion.**

PREVIOUS - STILL RELEVANT - ACTION ITEMS

- Kara: Check with Dan (PM for the GI) to see if September is an appropriate timeframe for them to give a presentation to the CRAG on the GI and coordinate with Elizabeth accordingly. **Ongoing**
- Elizabeth: Proceed with curation of collections at the Burke with Burke and NWAA. **Ongoing.**

SAFETY MOMENT

Chris shared that her company wants them to have a spot locator, even though they are in urban locations and they do not work well in the mountains. PSE uses walkie-talkies and radios, and everyone has to sign in and out. PSE vehicles do have spot locators, and this has been discussed at Baker. There was brief discussion about the safety issues involved with working in the field.

REVIEW NOTES / AGENDA / ACTION ITEMS

Notes

The notes from the September 19, 2012 meeting were approved with one change. Jan asked to be removed as an attendee since she missed the entire agenda since the meeting was so short.

Agenda

The agenda was approved, with one change: The Baker Club House item was scheduled for 12:30 when Rhoda Lawrence of BOLA would call in.

Report on Action items

- Elizabeth: In September send out the draft of the Burpee Hill survey report for all to review. **Completed**
- Kara: Check with Dan (PM for the GI) to see if September is an appropriate timeframe for them to give a presentation to the CRAG and coordinate with Elizabeth accordingly. **Ongoing**
- All: Keep Elizabeth updated on the primary and secondary contacts for your organization. This list will be used for formal communications including approval of study plans and reports. **This was a reminder and can be considered completed.**
- Elizabeth: Proceed with curation of collections at the Burke with Burke and NWAA. **Ongoing.**

BRCC AND OTHER LICENSE-RELATED ACTIVITIES

The Aquatic Resource Group met last week and discussed several issues, including water flow issues at [REDACTED]. That seems to be stabilized for now, and we are looking at a long term fix. We have worked on the FSC, and it should be ready to go by March 1. We are working on the design for the spawning beach program, and that project will start toward fall of this year. The Terrestrial Resource Group is looking at a couple of parcels to purchase adjacent to Burpee Hill. The Recreation Group is planning to meet in the spring; they have purchased some bear-proof dumpsters and had them installed at the campsite. Our next BRCC meeting will be in May; that date should come out in the update later this month.

LOWER BAKER COMPOUND PRESENTATION

Elizabeth reviewed the proposal for the Lower Baker Compound that was sent to CRAG members last week. Limited space, and larger numbers of personnel and activities create issues with laydown and storage whenever there is a construction project. This will be a continuing problem throughout the terms of the license. This project is a proposal to deal with some of these issues. Under the terms of the HPMP, this is a new project and needs CRAG review. APE is yet to be determined, and CRAG input is sought. Consultation will be done with the Tribes as well either through meetings or 1:1.

As for historical resources, Washington Portland Cement Company has silos, a sacking house, the Club House, and remnants of the conveyor systems, the elevator systems, and a coal bin, and the Baker River Hydro district has a cottage and a garage in this area. This is a draft proposal based on what PSE would like to do.

Elizabeth gave an overview of the proposal details. It recommends removal of most of the uninhabited concrete structures, except the Club House, which could be used as a Visitor's Center.

Heather reviewed site history with photos and maps. The plant began in 1905 and was an industrial complex by 1907. Little remains of those buildings today, and some of the area has been covered over with debris that has been dumped over the years. The plant went out of operation around 1918, and Puget bought it, presumably for the dam.

Chris reported on their review of the grading plan to address questions that might be asked, such as whether there would be native sediments. There is considerable fill around most of these buildings. They will review geotechnical investigation and will do some probes to get more information about this.

The second question pertains to whether there are materials that might contribute information about the construction and operation of the Powerhouse? Field investigations and historical research will help address this question. Hazardous materials should also be considered. Dennis said the plan is not to take any soil off site. It will have to be sifted and sorted to replace it on site.

The third question is whether the project will damage archaeological remains. There is a system of tunnels we don't understand. Geotechnical investigations and trenching could help with this.

Gene from Geo-Engineers shared a before and after 3-D visualization of what the site might look like after the project. Dennis outlined features of the new construction being proposed. The drainage system will be standard, a couple of feet below the surface. There will be a settlement pond. The retaining walls are to hold up some of the remaining dirt/debris after the area has been graded. A new building is proposed, with 10-vehicle stalls and hopefully a sky bridge to the other building. The building would have a single story shop on one-end, and a second story area at one end.

Access to the new buildings has not fully been worked out. Elizabeth reviewed current access. The plan is not to change the access points very much. Access points should be provided for the next review.

The pole barn is an existing building that was put in during the 2000's. It would probably just stay in its current location, but if we are thinking about sight lines, perhaps it could be moved.

Mary commented that this is clearly an adverse effect both from the removal of contributing resources and the introduction of new elements. Would it be realistic to cut it off as a historic district and concentrate on mitigation? Focus on sight lines and do good interpretation? Is it worth it to try to think of design changes; it's a modern area now. We could put our efforts into what is left. You don't want to create a false sense.

Elizabeth commented the Club House is individually eligible, and we can focus on that.

Heather commented that if we could move some things, block the sight lines, segregate some things, like the tanks, the cottage, the coal bunker, it could be made into a walking interpretative area.

There is a contributing concrete structure (the storage bin) at one end of the tanks, which was modified for the boom truck; the proposal calls for taking it down and building something more usable for vehicle/equipment storage. The current building has been altered, but it is structurally sound. Perhaps the current building could be retained, and the new building located elsewhere. Part of that structure is involved in the conveyor systems. (The structural engineer did not raise any issues about this building. The sky bridge and sacking building are falling down.) Interpretation of this building would have to be considered: would it be interpreted as a modified building? Sanborn indicates it was constructed in 1919, but the cement company was no longer in operation at that time. Was it part of the dam construction, or is Sanborn incorrect?

Elizabeth suggested a field trip would be helpful for everyone to get a better understanding of the site and what is being proposed. Heather commented that the history of this area is an evolving story. New information from Washington Portland Cement Company showed up in Google Books that has filled in some holes in the historical information.

Dennis reviewed the other buildings proposed. The tanks themselves are in great condition. Newer movable hazardous material containers will replace those already there. Existing gas tanks will be refurbished; the roof structure might be bigger.

Nick commented that in terms of reusing the existing structures that are planned for demolition, it would be useful to keep them intact and within the district, even if they cannot be re-used. As to the storage building attached to the tanks, could the modifications be made such that it can still be a contributing resource? There is some question about how the buildings work together organizationally in this proposal. Is there some way to alter the existing buildings rather than move into the historic district with new construction? And can the pole barn be moved? Organizationally, can this site strategy be altered and still function for PSE?

Dennis said moving the pole barn would not have a big impact, but there is a challenge finding a space big enough for the big vehicle barn. The sack house would have to be taken down to expand it. Heather and Elizabeth commented that, based on the report of the structural engineer, the way the sacking house building is currently configured, it is not really possible to alter it. Elizabeth added that it is the same with the sky bridge. The Club House is different. The sack house would have to be rebuilt. If we do that (expensive), it takes from other things we might want to do, but it depends on what we decide. Space is a big issue for the plant.

Dennis commented that their understanding was that if they took something down in the historic site, they needed to replace it with something else. Right now that whole area around the sack house is blocked off because of that building. Opening up that access point is critical.

Jan questioned the idea of replacing a historic building with something new. If the sack house has to go, not replacing it might be a better alternative.

Dennis commented that if the Club House becomes the interpretive center, building at the sack house location is good because it will be out of sight to the public.

Nick does not buy the argument of replacing the building, but if it is a sight line consideration, that would do more for the district than detract from it. The CRAG looked at the sight lines from the Club House view on the 3-D visual. Interpretive walks could be created on the front side of the tanks.

The goal for this year is to get CRAG consensus on a design concept with an MOA draft. The HPMP has public education funds, a portion of which could probably be applied to this project for interpretation. Interactive gaming application, brochures, panels, interpretive walks, etc. have all been suggested.

CRAG meetings will be held quarterly unless otherwise needed. A CRAG field trip to the Lower Baker Compound is needed to inform CRAG discussion of the proposal.

ACTION: Elizabeth: Convene a special CRAG field trip on January 30th at 11 am to walk the Lower Baker Compound and continue discussion of the proposal. Elizabeth will bring photographic evidence to share after the walk-through to help with the discussion.

ADJOURNMENT

Nick Vann had to leave, and other CRAG members did not return to the meeting after the lunch break, so the meeting was adjourned before completing the agenda. Agenda items will be scheduled for the field trip meeting, January 30.

DECISIONS FOR NEXT MEETING: None known

FUTURE MEETINGS:

- Field trip to Lower Baker Compound, January 30, 11 am. Meet at Lower Baker Visitor Center.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Draft Agenda for Jan. 30th Field Trip Meeting at PSE's Lower Baker Lake Visitor Center, Burlington, Washington.

1. Safety Moment
2. Decisions Required at Today's Meeting: None
3. Project Updates
 - Baker Club House - includes walk-through
4. Walk-through of Lower Baker Compound

LUNCH

5. Discussion – Lower Baker Compound proposal
6. Project Updates, continued
 - 2013 Projects
 - MOA (Gulper, Spawning Beaches, LB Dam)
 - Draft DAHP Level II
 - Swift Creek Campground
 - Burpee Hill
7. Decisions for next meeting
8. Evaluate Meeting, set location and agenda for next meeting (May 15 or June 19)