
BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

Cultural & Historical Resources Working Group

September 11, 2003
10:00 p.m.- 4:00 p.m.

Puget Sound Energy Offices
Mt. Vernon, WA

AGENDA

TOLL free conference number - To Call into this Meeting

Step 1 -Dial 1-800-582-8948

Step 2 -Dial Participant code *0529465*(be sure to include the * before & after the code number)

- You will hear hold music if "host" (Facilitator or Team Leader) has not yet dialed into the number
- When "Host" has called in to the number, you will be joined to the call

Agenda

- 1. Introductions**
- 2. Review Minutes/Agenda**
- 3. Action Items**
 - License Application/PDEA Status
 - Study Review Status
- 4. Questions and Answers/FERC – FERC Relicensing timeline**
- 5. HPMP Review**
- 6. Set October 7 Agenda**
- 7. Evaluate Meeting**



Distribution List
Baker River Cultural/Historical Resources Working Group

Organization	Name	Email
National Park Service	Ryan Booth	Ryan_Booth@nps.gov
Equinox Research & Consulting	Kelly Bush	Kelrbush@earthlink.net
US Forest Service	Ardis Bynum	abynum@fs.fed.us
Swinomish Indian Tribal Community	Larry Campbell	lcampbell@swinomish.nsn.us
Puget Sound Energy	Connie Freeland	connie.freeland@pse.com
US Forest Service	Jan Hollenbeck	jhollenbeck@fs.fed.us;
Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe	Jason Joseph	sauk@sauk-suiattle.com
Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe	Norma Joseph	njoseph@sauk-suiattle.com
National Park Service	Bob Mierendorf	bob_mierendorf@nps.gov
Northwest Archaeological Associates	Christian Miss	cjmiss@northwestarch.com
Puget Sound Energy	Jessie Piper	jessie.piper@pse.com
Upper Skagit Indian Tribe	Scott Schuyler	sschuyler@upperskagit.com
WA Dept. Natural Resources	Lee Stilson	lee.stilson@wadnr.gov
WA Office Archaeology & Historic Preservation	Rob Whitlam	robw@cted.wa.gov
PDSA Consulting	Lyn Wiltse	lyn@pdsaconsulting.com
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	Frank Winchell	frank.winchell@ferc.gov

Distribution List
Baker River Cultural/Historical Resources Interested Parties*

Organization	Name	Email
Concrete Heritage Museum	John Boggs	jboggs@wash@aol.com
Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe	Ernie DeCoteau	police@sauk-suiattle.com
Swinomish Indian Tribal Community	Martin Loesch	mloesch@swinomish.nsn.us;
Swinomish Indian Tribal Community	Charlie O'Hara	cohara@swinomish.nsn.us
Skagit County Historical Museum	Karen Marshall	karenm@co.skagit.wa.us
National Park Service	Susan Rosebrough	susan_rosebrough@nps.gov
US Forest Service	Jon Vanderheyden	jvanderheyden@fs.fed.us;
Swinomish Indian Tribal Community/ Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe	Stan Walsh	swalsh@skagitcoop.org
Louis Berger Associates	Pat Weslowski	weslowski@louisberger.com

* Non-confidential communications only (Meeting Agenda and Meeting Notes, announcements, etc.)

BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

Cultural & Historical Working Group

September 11, 2003

10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
PSE Office – Mt. Vernon
1700 East College Way
Mt. Vernon, 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, jessie.piper@pse.com

PRESENT: Jessie Piper, Connie Freeland, (Puget Sound Energy), Jan Hollenbeck (US Forest Service), Kelly Bush (Equinox Research), Scott Schuyler (Upper Skagit Indian Tribe), Chris Miss (Northwest Archaeological Associates), Frank Winchell (FERC) on phone, Dee Endelman, facilitator (Agreement Dynamics).

2003 MEETING DATES

October meeting canceled. November 18 (third Tuesday), December 9, 2003. All meetings will be at the PSE office in Mt. Vernon unless otherwise specified.

All regular attendees are encouraged to let Jessie know if they are unable to attend a meeting.

NEW ACTION ITEMS

- Kelly: Give Swinomish and Sauk-Suiattle Tribes opportunity to clarify their connection to the project (Sec. 3.4) and get that information to Chris by 9/17.
- Kelly: Add more detail regarding methods (Sec. 3.4.1) and get information to Chris by 9/17.
- Jessie: Talk to Deborah (NCN Park) regarding curation possibilities.
- Jan: Let Jessie know if USFS would like to propose an enhancement regarding putting the Baker collection together.

-
- Jessie: Talk to Frank re “listing” versus “eligibility” issues.
 - Chris: Incorporate all edits to HPMP for distribution by September 29.

Agenda for September 11, 2003 meeting, 1:00-4:00

PSE Mt. Vernon Office

1. Introductions
2. Review Minutes/Agenda
3. Action Items
 - License Application/PDEA Status
 - Study Review Status
4. Questions and Answers/FERC – FERC Relicensing timeline
5. HPMP Review
6. Set October 7 Agenda
7. Evaluate Meeting

REPORT ON OLD ACTION ITEMS (Postponed)

- Jessie: Cancel June and July room reservations at PSE Office in Mt. Vernon.
- Jessie: Check again with property owners of properties with towers on the East and West sides of Lake Shannon.
- ALL: Let Kelly know if you want an electronic version of the ethnographic database.
- ALL: Send additional comments/questions on Historic Resources Draft Report to Jessie ASAP.
- Frank: Clarify who will be signatories vs. concurring parties on the Programmatic Agreement.
- Jan and Jessie: By the end of May, draft a protocol for reviewing other Working Group’s PMEs. TCPs may be involved.
- Kelly: Get info to Pat – ethnographic database and the area included (TCPs).
- Jessie: Meet with Chris and Kelly to develop plan for fleshing out HPMP.
- Jessie: Send notice to tribes that Historic Resources report is out for review. Highlight the four themes identified by HRA.
- Scott: Pull together list of tribal issues associated with PMEs (to present at August meeting).

HISTORIC PROPERTIES MANAGEMENT PLAN (HPMP)

We started with TCPs as the area we most wanted to use group time to discuss. If you have comments in addition to what we discuss today, please send to Chris Miss by 9/17 if you want them included in the draft HPMP that goes out on 10/1/03 with the License Application.

3.4 Existing Conditions for TCPs

We decided to add detail regarding the Upper Skagit tribal lineage and how they’re connected to the project. The other tribes will also have the opportunity to clarify their relationship to the project (through Kelly).

3.4.1 Methods

We decided to provide more detail regarding the process (e.g., who met with whom). The CHRWG meetings should also be included as part of the process. We’ll refer to individual consultants in the text as “the contractors.” Particular consultant names will be cited in text as reference citations.

3.4.2 Results

We will add some information that no sites have been identified but some areas of interest have been identified; however, none of these have been evaluated under National Register criteria because the tribes have not yet decided whether to evaluate any of these. We decided if there are areas of interest that won't be evaluated, we'll include these in 5.2.3 so that they'll be included in the management plan without the 106 requirements. Regarding these areas, PSE and the tribes will consult, and if a USFS nexus is established, USFS will be included in plans if a tribe continues to want to bring these areas forward.

4.1.3 Effects of TCPs

We decided to add detail regarding the characteristics (potential character-defining features that we're worried about the project affecting) of TCPs. Kelly will do this.

4.3.3 Assessment of Adverse Effects of TCPs

We decided that we can address non-106 TCPs in 5.2.3. TCPs under 4.3.3 should be limited to 106-eligible properties. Some appropriate PME under 5.2.3 would include topics such as habitat enhancements for resources not addressed by other working groups and access.

5.4.4 Tribal Coordination

We decided to add language to clarify that individual tribes can coordinate with other parties (e.g., PSE, USFS) without necessarily going through the Cultural Resources Advisory Group (CRAG). The Upper Skagit Tribe is considering the best way for PSE to provide an annual Upper Skagit workshop to address management of cultural resources in the area.

5.1.1 Site Specific Measures for Archaeological Sites

Jessie raised the question of whether the group is in agreement (especially USFS and tribes) regarding recommendations particularly around data recovery. She asked how we can have this conversation. Chris answered questions regarding specific sites, noting that she was working on a cost estimate for completing the work. We decided to add that PSE will develop in consultation a treatment plan that includes a research design for data recovery for each of these sites in consultation. This plan will be developed in consultation with the tribes and with concurrence of SHPO and USFS. The treatment plan will be submitted within eight months after the filing of the License Application. We will include in this plan that ways will be sought to protect two specific locations where protection might be feasible.

5.4.5 Curation

USFS doesn't have a curation agreement with North Cascades but PSE could pursue one.

6.3 Schedule

Jessie distributed a proposed schedule for implementation. The group reviewed it and asked clarifying questions. We will convert the dates into "license" schedule language.

5.2 Additional Studies

We should add that PSE should partner with the Concrete Heritage Museum Association on a (possible oral history) project regarding history of Concrete as it relates to the project.

5.4.7 Training and Education

Kelly raised the importance of assuring that training of designated PSE on-site persons be sufficient to pick up on potential activities that would be issues under the Plan, especially unanticipated discoveries. Section 5.4.7.1 seems to address this.

General Comments

- A definition section would be helpful for clarification.
- Acronym list would be helpful.
- It is difficult to tell the difference between the “Project” and the “APE.” Be consistent.
- “Eligible” versus “recommended eligible” – In Historic Structures section, everything is listed as “eligible”; in Archaeological section, everything is listed as “recommended eligible.” Why? They should currently all be “recommended eligible by PSE.” We should add a preface saying that they are being treated as if there is concurrence even though we realize there is not yet. PSE needs to complete a NPS/1090 form to get concurrence from SHPO.
- “Listing” – Should we give PSE a task to apply for listing the eligible properties? Jessie will research this.

CONFERENCE CALL WITH FERC

We asked Frank how many copies of the draft HPMP he wants on 10/1/03. He said two. He also confirmed that PSE can distribute the draft HPMP to the CHRWG members for the 90-day review. We then reviewed the procedural flow chart on page 44 of the second draft HPMP.

HANDOUTS

- Draft Implementation Schedule (6.3)

PARKING LOT

- ~~“How do we address upland areas?” (importance of mountain goats)~~
- ~~Develop “Area of Potential Effects” Map~~
- ~~Coordinate with Terrestrial and Recreation Working Groups~~ *In progress*
- Glossary of terms: what are “protection,” “mitigation,” and “enhancement”?
- ~~Develop TCP (Traditional Cultural Properties) studies~~
- Rotate meeting locations to tribal facilities?
- Possibility of transplanting young cedar trees/Availability of downed cedar for tribal use
- ~~Determine criteria for “livingness” of APE~~ *Will address in HPMP.*
- HYDROPS demo
- How to handle timing/schedule for implementing HPMP

MEETING EVALUATION

Well-Dones

- Food was great!

-
- Kelly's flowers
 - Getting some really important discussions done!

Changes for Next Time

What's Hot?

- HPMP!
- We still like each other!
- GIS products from Joetta (R2).

Studies Status for Solution Team

- All study drafts completed.
- Some movement on TCP studies.

TENTATIVE Agenda for November 18, 2003, 10:00-4:00 p.m.

PSE Office Building, Mt. Vernon, WA

1. Introductions
2. Review Minutes/Agenda
3. Action Items
4. Discuss HPMP comments
5. Update on TCP studies
6. Review of other studies
7. Set dates for final reports
8. Set December 16, 2003 Agenda
9. Evaluate Meeting