



'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), Jessie Piper (Northwest Archeological Associates) and Candace Wilson (Facilitator, PDSA Consulting). Attending by Phone: Rob Whitlam and Russell Holter (Department of Archaeology & Historic Preservation).

DECISIONS: None today

NEXT MEETING: March 17 – Field Trip to Lower Baker FSC

2010 MEETING DATES: March 17 (Field Trip), April 6 (HPMP Discussion), April 21, May 19, June 16, July 21, August 18, September 15, October 20, November 17, December 15

MARCH 2 AGENDA

1. Review notes/agenda/action items from January 27, 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
 - Revisit Sections 5.3.2 Para. 2 re CRC qualification/professional archaeologist
 - Revisit 5.3.5 Intro & Monitoring Program
 - Review Monitoring form and revisit 5.3.5 "Archaeological Sites" when revised
 - Review 6.3 Reporting
 - Review Curation Plan
 - 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 (February ____, 2010)

NEW ACTION ITEMS

- Elizabeth Check with legal department about making stipulations on qualifications of the CRC in Section 6 of the HPMP
- Ron Send Corps inspection form to CRAG members



- NWAA Separate armored/stabilized sites from lag sites and create appropriate monitoring form
- NWAA Revise monitoring form for lag sites
- Jessie Update HPMP comment list and send to Elizabeth
- Elizabeth Send updated Section 5 out to CRAG members
- All Send items for review out to CRAG members by 3/30/10; inform CRAG if deadline cannot be met

PREVIOUS - STILL RELEVANT - ACTION ITEMS

- 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. **Ongoing.**
- Elizabeth/Jessie Add statement to section 6 on CRC qualifications, if necessary, to cover professionals to meet Secretary of Interior guidelines. **In process.**
- Elizabeth Rework Historic Structures section of Section 5 and email to CRAG members. **In process.**
- Elizabeth Rework Curation Plan in Section 5 of the HPMP and develop new appendix with HIT Agreements and Burke Guidelines. **Ongoing.**
- Elizabeth Rework Maintenance Guidelines section of the HPMP (pg. 154) to be more specific. **In process..**
- All Review HPMP Section 1.5 on Confidentiality **Pending**
- 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: Determine best action regarding potential issue with WISAARD access to confidential archaeological information.
- Elizabeth: Follow up with Forest Service on Protective Options project. **In process**
- 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 January 27 CRAG meeting were accepted as presented. The February 17 meeting was cancelled. Candace will send final notes to everyone.

Agenda

The agenda was reviewed and accepted with no changes.

Report on Action Items

- Elizabeth Check wording of 2002 amendment to NHPA regarding qualifications for person acting for agency and making determinations, such as for APE and eligibility. **Completed.** There was discussion about the need to stipulate qualifications of the CRC Coordinator to ensure that Secretary of the Interior guidelines are followed in making determinations. Further conversation was deferred to the Section 6 discussion.



ACTION: Elizabeth Check with legal department about making stipulations on qualifications of the CRC in Section 6 of the HPMP.

- 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. **This will be ongoing with editing.**
- Elizabeth/Jessie Add statement to section on CRC qualifications, if necessary, to cover professionals to meet Security of Interior guidelines. **In process.**
- Jan Provide copy of “Hold in Trust” Agreement for curation at the Burke to Elizabeth. **Completed.**
- Elizabeth Proceed with curation of collections at the Burke by 9/30/10 with Burke and NWAA. **Ongoing.** Elizabeth reviewed the Hold in Trust (HIT) Agreement from the Burke and will tweak it and send it to PSE’s legal department for review. She will keep it as consistent as possible with the Forest Service HIT and meet PSE’s needs. There may be some differences because the Forest Service is a federal agency and PSE is private. The FS boxes will be on the FS HIT agreement with a schedule for PSE payment. The FS HIT is completed except for entering the quantities of material.
- NWAA Prepare collections for curation at Burke by 9/30/10. **Ongoing.** NWAA will report to CRAG on this at a summer meeting (June).
- Elizabeth Rework Historic Structures section of Section 5 and email to CRAG members. **In process.**
- Jessie Clean up Contractor Compliance and draft appendix with special provision language for contracts for construction and field work for the HPMP and send to Elizabeth. **Completed.**
- Elizabeth Rework Curation Plan in Section 5 of the HPMP and develop new appendix with HIT Agreements and Burke Guidelines. **Ongoing.**
- Jessie Write language to support CRAG’s interest in including I&E in projects for Training and Education section in the HPMP, Section 5. **Completed.**
- Elizabeth Send up to date Section 5 of the HPMP to all CRAG members. **Completed.**

HPMP REVISION UPDATE

Elizabeth reported that she had filed for an extension for finalizing the HPMP.

Training & Education – There was discussion about how to ensure Tribes and other parties can propose programs, and language was tweaked to provide that openness.

Ron suggested specifically calling out state vs. federal heritage protection laws. Since this is a FERC undertaking, federal laws will apply with the exception of discovery of human remains on non-federal lands in which case SHPO’s forensics archaeologist will be called.

There was discussion of appropriate terminology for identifying cultural resources/heritage and consistency in referring to protocol for Treatment of Human Remains.

Law Enforcement - Training needs to be done in conjunction with Article 318, the Law Enforcement Plan. Language was changed to clarify this stipulation.

Public – There was discussion of what kinds of projects would be developed. Projects will need to be identified a year ahead so they can be included in the budget. Projects could include events, pamphlets, information for a SHPO poster, etc. The budget provides funding every two years for all public education. This item requires a good faith effort of compliance (not strict) so funding may not be available in a bad rate



year. The funding can be carried over, so more funding may be available another year. Elizabeth explained that most CRAG projects fall under the Operations & Maintenance budget.

A paragraph was added that provides for the CRAG to recommend proposals for cultural resource I&E to new projects put forth by other groups.

pg. 154 NFS Lands – Discussion on this section was postponed until Jan can provide FS language necessary.

pg. 154 Actions under Maintenance Guidelines & Archaeological Treatment Plan – Discussion on this section was postponed until Elizabeth can provide revisions to CRAG.

Section 5.3.2 – This item was taken care of previously.

Monitoring Form – A revised monitoring form was reviewed. The new form is simpler and does not call for comparison in the field. Changes to the form include removal of GPS datum and addition of pool elevation and number of shovel probes under the reservoir section. The form is always coordinated with digital records. There was discussion of digital storage location and accessibility

There was discussion about how the form would be used in different conditions. Elizabeth commented that she felt the form is used primarily to determine general impacts to sites over time to see if treatment measures agreed to are working. If treatment for the site is not working, then the CRAG should address. If certain sites need more specific, quantifiable info collected, then we should capture that.

Jan raised a concern that the form does not lead to data that is quantifiable or measurable. She would like to see photo points and X/Y coordinates included on the forms. She would also like to see projection, NAD, and how data was collected. Elizabeth tried to explain that the datum and projection are determined when data is downloaded from the GPS units, not at the time the form is completed. Specific site datums have been established for archy sites and these have been GPSed. If CRAG members want actual GIS data, then that data comes with the information about the datum and projection used. This is now easy to change on the fly and any data can be re-projected for your needs. However, communication about data and the way it was collected, corrected, and projected is key and should be shared. Referencing the wrong coordinates to the wrong projection can present problems. QA and QC can also be shared. At this time PSE uses NAD 83 datum and projects in State Plane Washington North. Monitoring forms and maps will be shared.

Jan is concerned that incremental changes won't be noticed and tracked in a repeatable way that allows the CRAG to act in time if a site is being eroded. Stabilization areas are already mapped. Armored sites need more specific information. The proposed monitoring form is too general.

ACTION: Ron Send Corps inspection form to CRAG members

There was discussion of the reason for annual visits, what is being collected, and the importance of measuring silt. Ron suggested that when there are no more lithics to collect, a site might be removed from the treatment list. In response to Jan's concerns about measuring silt cover, Jessie said that the information about silt collection cover is not as simply correlated with artifact visibility as we had anticipated. It is a geo morph



issue, and deposition patterns will not be understood through monitoring. Silt deposition is highly variable, even across a site.

Elizabeth shared that PSE is working to establish a centralized area where GIS data can be made available to folks who need it (not confidential info). We have base data now-like roads, water, buildings, etc. We are adding collected data every day like, bathymetry, LIDAR, etc. Currently, Elizabeth has base data incorporated into a general database for Baker River sites, but plans to do more. Data collected through monitoring could be brought into GIS and then analyzed and easily shared with CRAG.

ACTION: NWAA Separate armored/stabilized sites from lag sites and create appropriate monitoring form

ACTION: NWAA Revise monitoring form for lag sites

FUTURE MEETINGS

The next meeting of the CRAG to discuss the HPMP will be held on Tuesday, April 6, at the PSE Offices in Bellevue, starting at 9:30 a.m..

ACTION: Jessie Update HPMP comment list and send to Elizabeth

ACTION: Elizabeth Send updated Section 5 out to CRAG members

ACTION: All Send items for review out to CRAG members by 3/30/10; inform CRAG if deadline cannot be met

DECISIONS FOR NEXT MEETING: None known

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

Evaluate Meeting:

- Good discussion
- Requalifying issues

Do Differently

- More people
- Do action items by due dates

Draft Agenda for April 6, 2010 Meeting (HPMP Discussion)

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 (Historic Structures)
 - Revisit monitoring form
 - Revisit 5.3.5 "Archaeological Sites" when monitoring form revised
 - Review 6.3 Reporting
 - Review Section 6 – CRC Qualifications
 - Revisit Contractor Compliance

Meeting Notes

March 2, 2010 / 9:30 a.m. – 3 p.m. / Sammamish Rm, Web-X, Call



PUGET SOUND ENERGY
The Energy To Do Great Things

- Revisit Curation Plan (HIT Agreements & Burke Guidelines in Appendix L)
 - 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)

Draft Agenda for April 21, 2010 Meeting (Regular CRAG meeting) (This agenda was set Jan. 20)

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
- Lunch
4. Project Updates
 - 2010 Project List Report
 - Next steps
 5. HPMP Revision
 - Check-In on Review Process
 - Timeline
 - Next steps
 6. Decisions for next meeting?
 7. Erosion Plan Update
 8. Review meeting norms and membership list
 9. Evaluate Meeting, set location and agenda for next meeting (May 19, 2010)

BREAK

10. Protective Options
 - Review Drawings
 - Next Steps