



Baker River Project License Implementation

Cultural Resource Advisory Group Meeting FINAL Meeting Notes

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

PRESENT

Elizabeth Dubreuil, Cary Feldmann, Mark Killgore, Kim Lane (Puget Sound Energy), Heather Miller (HRA), Julie Stanaszek (Montgomery, Watson, Harza), Greg Griffith, Russell Holter, Alison Brooks, Stephen Mathison, Rob Whitlam, (Department of Archaeology & historic Preservation), Candace Wilson (Facilitator, PDSA Consulting). By phone: Jan Hollenbeck, (United States Forest Service) and Mehdi Shahla (PSE).

DECISIONS: None today

NEXT MEETING: November 17, 10 a.m. – 2 p.m., Skagit Center, Burlington

FUTURE MEETING DATES: No meeting in December. 2011 dates: January 19, February 16, March 16, April 20, May 18, June 15, July 20, August 17, September 21, October 19, November 16, December 21.

OCTOBER 12 AGENDA

1. Lower Baker Dam Improvement Project Presentation by PSE, HRA, and MWH
--Discussion of potential effects and determination if possible
2. Project Updates
 - Phasing of Consultation for Lower Baker FSC
 - Other?
3. Future Meeting Schedule
4. HPMP Update
- Lunch
5. Review notes / agenda / action items for August 18, 2010 meeting
Review recent BRCC meeting activities, licensing updates?
6. Decisions Required at Today's Meeting: None
7. Decisions for next meeting?
8. Evaluate Meeting, set location and agenda for next meeting

NEW ACTION ITEMS

- Mark Initiate a non-disclosure agreement and send the feasibility study to Stephen at SHPO (or send to Elizabeth to forward).
- Elizabeth Send out an Initiation of Consultation letter to the consulting parties that outlines the results of this meeting and a draft of the proposed MOA for 30-day review.



PREVIOUS - STILL RELEVANT - ACTION ITEMS

- Elizabeth and NWAA: Revise APE to include historic district resources for LB FSC and distribute to CRAG with narrative description. **Ongoing.**
- Jan: Share survey results on FS 1106 project with CRAG (2nd phase).
- Elizabeth: Proceed with curation of collections **at the Burke by 9/30/10 with Burke and NWAA. Ongoing. Note: HIT agreement with Burke is being reviewed by PSE Contracts Dept.**
- NWAA: Prepare collections for curation at Burke by end of September. (Due to FS change in schedule, the collection may not be submitted to the Burke until the end of the year. **Ongoing.**
- All: Discuss best action regarding potential issue with WISAARD access to confidential archaeological information. We can put limitations on who can access Baker documents. **Suggest deleting since beyond scope of control.**
- 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. Jessie will email spread sheet of all referenced documents and reports to Elizabeth by end of August.**
- All: Present findings from Treatment Plan collection at a professional conference. **Under consideration.**

LOWER BAKER DAM IMPROVEMENT PROJECT PRESENTATION – Second Presentation

Elizabeth, Mark Killgore, Julie Stanaszek of Montgomery, Watson, Harza (MWH) and Heather Miller of Historical Research Associates (HRA) gave a presentation on the proposed Lower Baker Dam Improvement Project.

Mark gave a brief overview of the dam project, the purpose of which is to provide safe passage of a flood event, protect the dam abutments, and protect sensitive equipment. Rob clarified that this project is part of the FERC License work.

Montgomery Watson Harza has conducted an inspection and prepared a feasibility study with a recommendation that includes prevention of overtopping of abutments during PMF, moving of critical equipment, and automation of spillway gates. The recommendation will also bring the dam to OSHA standards and will improve operations and security.

Heather outlined the HPMP process and the proposed APE; this is the first project to come under the HPMP process. She discussed newly identified resources within the APE: existing generator building, transfer station and shed, and potential effects. History of dam modifications was reviewed along with character defining features.

Alison questioned whether the changes through this project are so great the resource can no longer be listed as a resource and whether this plan could have no adverse effect. Elizabeth and Heather stated their understanding that this meets Secretary of Interior standards for rehabilitation and the HPMP work to establish maintenance guidelines, etc., strengthens that possibility. Alison suggested using an MOA for the project, commenting that the plan is more mitigation than without effect, and that the totality of the project plus the visual effects puts this project over the edge.

Jan commended the design team for taking into account character defining features and commented that she could see why no adverse effect could be recommended. She expressed concern that an acceptance of “change over time” has been misunderstood and needs to come off the table as it is not an historic feature.



Stephen requested information regarding materials to be used and expressed concern that the real project may be more of an impact than the simulation represents.

Julie outlined design features, which include increasing the height of the abutments, widening spillways, and making changes to spillway gate specifications. It is proposed that ten of the 23 existing spillway gates be removed resulting in ten 21' gates, with 3 gates in the center to remain as is to preserve their historical context along with the ski jump. The spillway is no longer used for fish.

Heather commented that the dam's significance lies in its representation of technological change over time. How do you preserve that as a feature? Preservation of the center gates is less cost-effective but preserves a feature. Jan commented that enlarging the gates is both a visual and an actual change.

Russell asked how high the gates go up when open. Greg asked the purpose of the abutment, which is designed to provide a permanent overtopping measure that forces the water flow to the center to protect the sides of the dam. Bedrock at the right is already compromised.

Stephen asked about whether lowering the gates was considered. Julie responded that it had been considered and was not preferred. Cary noted that lowering the gates into the flood during an emergency was more risky.

Julie clarified that the deck will be replaced and widened. OSHA standards will be incorporated, which will result in raising the parapets 3-4 feet. Jan asked if that will change access to the deck and view from the deck. Julie said access will be improved to allow access by a maintenance vehicle. Public tours are only occasionally arranged; public access is not generally available.

Stephen asked about layout around the gatehouse, and that was clarified through photos in the presentation.

Jan asked if the auxiliary buildings newly surveyed date from the significant period. Elizabeth commented that were probably within the period of significance (1924-1959), but that hundreds of hours of research thus far have not provided any information to confirm that. There are gaps in the information. Cary indicated that the 1965 slide destroyed much of the documentation. Elizabeth commented that whether or not the building is eligible, contents of the building are valuable. Stephen noted that if it is in the period of significance and retains integrity then it is probably eligible, which would cause an effect.

Heather presented the findings which recommended no adverse effect.

Greg indicated that SHPO feels there is an adverse effect, and recommended using a simple MOA. Stephen said the MOA would include specific mitigation steps. Elizabeth pointed out that our HPMP process allows for a two-part MOA process that does requires FERC approval, but does not include ACHP. SHPO asked how using the HPMP process differs and Elizabeth asked Jan to confirm the process for everyone. Jan outlined the HPMP process, indicating the process used for this presentation followed the HPMP process as she understood it. Jan commended the Design Team for maintaining the original appearance, and said the project probably meets SOI standards, but she concurs with SHPO that there is an adverse effect.



A two-party MOA will not cause an impact to the project schedule. The design has mitigated for the effects and these can be included in a draft MOA. Timeline for the project is design/engineering through most of 2011, and construction over three non-flood seasons 2012 – 2014.

Stephen suggested that since it is already an adverse effect, one could argue the use of steel which would be lighter and more transparent than concrete.

Greg said it will be important for Stephen to see the plans. Mark said the plans are covered by the Critical Energy Infrastructure Information legislation, but that he felt that SHPO could be accommodated through a non-disclosure agreement.

ACTION: PSE via Mark will initiate a non-disclosure agreement and send the feasibility study to Stephen at SHPO.

Mark outlined the next steps for the project, which will involve working with FERC engineers. Since all their comments have been addressed, design should not change much. Greg indicated that Stephen will need to review the design on an ongoing basis. Elizabeth commented that PSE will ensure a continued architectural historian presence on the project as design is completed.

Stephen commented that SHPO tries to be flexible with industrial projects, but there were many features of this project which put it over the top.

Elizabeth commented that PSE is expected to make a recommendation with their presentations, and this one was more complicated than usual. If the bulk of the consulting parties see an adverse effect, PSE will recommend the same, although FERC has overall authority to decide. The goal is to reach consensus at the local level and to have a consistent process.

A determination for the existing generator building, transfer station and shed (auxiliary buildings) will need to be made and forms completed before the MOA is drawn up. These will be sent to the CRAG and SHPO for concurrence.

Much of the HABS/HAER information is no longer public information; it is filed as classified with the Library of Congress. Should we consider alternatives? Jan commented that it is still important to file the documents as information could be declassified in the future. She recommended also preparing a public report.

Greg suggested that the MOA be conceptual and the details be dealt with outside the agreement.

Jan asked about the APE. Elizabeth said that there are no traditional cultural properties within the district, and the nearest archaeological sites are 5 miles away.

Julie outlined other improvements to the surrounding property. Greg commented that SHPO sees the deck widening as contributing to adverse effect. Stephen said it needs to be similar to what is there – the same style of parapets, and materials and surface of the deck consistent with what is already there.



The group decided tentatively on an adverse effect (pending Stephen review of design) and outlined draft MOA stipulations. The MOA would include the following at a minimum: conceptual design features/intent, inclusion of an architectural historian on the project design process, spillway jump remaining in place, HABS/HAER documentation, and some other form of public documentation agreed upon by consulting parties. The draft would be sent to consulting parties for review and concurrence.

ACTION: Elizabeth will send out an initiation of consultation letter to the consulting parties that outlines the results of this meeting and a draft of the proposed MOA for 30-day review.

DECISIONS FOR NEXT MEETING: None known

FUTURE MEETINGS

The next meeting will be held on November 17 at the Skagit Center and will focus on an updated presentation on the Lower Baker FSC project.

The meeting ended at this point as CRAG members departed for other commitments.

Draft Agenda for November 17, 2010 Meeting at Skagit Center, Burlington

10:00-10:30	Review notes / agenda / action items for October 12, 2010 meeting Review recent BRCC meeting activities, licensing updates (Decisions Required at Today's Meeting: None)
10:30-Noon	Lower Baker FSC Presentation
Noon	Lunch
12:30 – 1:00	Project Updates <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Phasing of Consultation for LB FSC
1:00-1:15	Future Meeting Schedule
1:15-1:30	HPMP Update
1:30 – 1:45	Decisions for next meeting? Evaluate Meeting, set location and agenda for next meeting (January 19?)