



## *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 (Puget Sound Energy), Heather Miller (HRA), Chris Miss (Northwest Archaeological Associates), Larry Campbell (Swinomish Indian Tribal Community), Kara Kanaby (UCACE), and Candace Wilson (Facilitator, PDSA Consulting). By phone: Jan Hollenbeck (United States Forest Service).

**DECISIONS:** None today

**NEXT MEETING:** March 8 – Joint meeting with ARG at PSE Skagit Center, Noon – 3 pm

Next CRAG Meeting: April 20, 2011, 10 a.m. – 2 p.m., Skagit Center, Burlington

**FUTURE MEETING DATES:** 2011 dates: March 8 (with Aquatics Resources Group), April 20, May 18, June 15, July 20, August 17, September 21, October 19, November 16, December 21.

#### **FEBRUARY 16 AGENDA**

1. Review notes / agenda / action items for January 19, 2010 meeting
2. Review recent BRCC meeting activities, licensing updates
3. Decisions Required at Today's Meeting: None
4. Project Updates
  - Channel Creek Spawning Beaches
  - March 8 Joint meeting with Aquatics Resources Group

Lunch

4. Project Updates, continued
  - Stabilization Project
  - Elk Habitat Lands
  - Lower Baker FSC
  - Concrete Heritage Museum
  - Annual Projects List
  - Discussion – Combined Mitigation
    - Baker Club House
5. Decisions for next meeting?
6. Evaluate Meeting, set location and agenda for next meeting (April 20)

#### **NEW ACTION ITEMS**

- Chris Check date on current ARPA permit for stabilization work.
- Elizabeth Send Jan a copy of "Salmon on the Baker River".



## PREVIOUS - STILL RELEVANT - ACTION ITEMS

- NWAA Provide monitoring during installation of swim line at Horseshoe Cove.
- Elizabeth Send HPMP letter documenting research on sites in Lower Baker FSC APE and recommending determination continue as ineligible to CRAG members. **Completed.**
- Mark (LB Dam Overtopping Project) Initiate a non-disclosure agreement and send the feasibility study to Stephen at SHPO (or send to Elizabeth to forward). **In process.**
- Elizabeth (LB Dam Overtopping Project) 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. **In process.**
- Jan: Share survey results on FS 1106 project with CRAG (2<sup>nd</sup> phase).
- Elizabeth: Proceed with curation of collections at the Burke by 9/30/10 with Burke and NWAA. **Ongoing.**

## REVIEW NOTES / AGENDA / ACTION ITEMS

### Notes

Notes from the January 19, 2011 meeting were approved as submitted. Final notes will be sent to CRAG members by email.

### Agenda

The revised agenda was approved as sent to CRAG members.

### Report on Action items

Elizabeth: Get more information on the swim line project, e.g. what size blocks, how excavation will be managed, etc. **Completed.** Information was sent by email to CRAG members.

Elizabeth: Send Annual Project List to CRAG members. **Completed.**

## BRCC ACTIVITIES

Cary gave a report on BRCC and Resource Group activities. The BRCC has not met the past couple of months. They reserve a date each month for a conference call in case there is a need. They plan to meet semi-annually face-to face, and the next meeting will be this spring.

Aquatics Resource Group - The Lower Baker FSC is moving ahead with final planning. Agencies are reviewing the designs. The hatchery's first year of operation was good, and it is on track for stepping up operation this year. Soil erosion is in process with the CRAG.

Terrestrial Resource Group - They are in negotiation for additional property for wetlands and elk habitat. They are developing weed control measures and are involved in their annual activities with osprey and eagles.

Recreation Resource Group - They are developing a water safety plan and are working on the development of the Shannon boat launch in conjunction with the FSC construction to fulfill Article 305.



## PROJECT UPDATES

Channel Creek Spawning Beaches – Elizabeth reviewed the status of Channel Creek Spawning Beaches decommissioning. CRAG reviewed the proposal and determined there would be an adverse effect. CRAG discussed ways to lessen effect and determined more information was needed from Aquatics Resource Group (ARG). A joint meeting has been set for March 8, noon to 3 pm at the Skagit Center. Today's discussion is preparation for that meeting, to explore alternatives that might lead to no effect. Heather will attend to assist with the presentation of the proposal to the ARG.

Cary pointed out that PSE has an obligation to restore the property to the USFS, so the Forest Service will need to say what they will accept. They prefer a natural restoration and better fish habitat. The historic element of the property adds a twist to the decommissioning.

Heather asked whether the concrete structures can remain, or will they erode? Cary said that they could leave everything there and still improve the fish habitat. It could be engineered.

Heather mentioned that biologists are not sure how the water will go. Cary said that Channel Creek is manageable; there is not a high risk of washout.

Elizabeth said it is unlikely that the whole system could be left because there is asbestos in the piping, especially with Beach 2. What is the line between no effect and adverse effect?

Heather asked what is most interpretable?

Cary asked what are the most integral pieces? For instance, Beach 2 could be reconfigured to have no function and eliminate the risk. They could engineer around most of it.

Elizabeth suggested that the essential features from 1956-59 are Beach 1, Intakes 1 & 2, the Channel, and the Pump House. Is there value to keeping that?

Heather commented there is only value to keeping those elements if they are interpreted; the resource would have lost so much integrity, it will not be a contributing resource. Jan added that the resource would have lost 60%. Is that counted by space, visibility, size, numbers?

Jan said she doesn't see any way this can not be an adverse action, but that the degree could be lessened. There was general concurrence with this. She asked if we keep those elements, in the future would be consider it a contributing resource or as already mitigated. There was general concurrence that it would no longer be contributing.

Larry asked if the boundaries would be redrawn, but there are other resources in the historic district.

Jan said that a discussion point would be about whose responsibility it would be for long term maintenance. She suggested it might be PSE's but would need to be discussed.

Resources in the historic district that have had adverse effect are the Lower Baker Dam, the Lower Baker Gulper (this will be adverse with either relocation or remodeling), the spawning beaches, and the Upper

# Meeting Notes

February 16, 2011 / 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 pm / PSE Skagit Center, Burlington



Baker Gulper, which has been removed. Larry clarified that nothing prehistoric is present. Left are the Upper Baker Dam, the Fish Trap, the Clubhouse, the houses, and the operator's cottage and garage.

Jan pointed out that the resources differ widely. Elizabeth raised the question of what constitutes the district. Technology is part of it. Jan suggested the paper Balancing Historic Preservation with Scientific/Industrial Facilities as germane. How much does what we do today for fish add value as a historic piece? By not restoring the piece of history, you lose something. But fifty years from now we will reflect on today's technology, too. A primary component of this district has been fisheries. Elizabeth added that it is also hydro-electric.

Jan said even though there is no way to avoid an adverse effect, creative mitigation could provide some sense of value by preserving something interpretable and by interpreting it. Risk and the wider context will have to be weighed.

Elizabeth explored preserving everything except Beach and having the channel diverted. Cary said the sheet pile weir impedes the fish. She asked could the weir pulled out and the channel be diverted to avoid the entire area? The weir has been identified even though it dates from 1980 because it serves the function of something from an earlier time.

Elizabeth noted that the purpose in going to the ARG was to see if there was a way to avoid an adverse effect. As proposed the CRAG is saying it can't be done. Jan commented that is not the only purpose; we can say how to minimize the effect. Heather said that the only thing salvageable that works with their proposal is Beach #1.

Elizabeth said she thought the purpose was to find alternatives to their proposal. If that isn't possible, the CRAG needs to work on mitigation, but mitigation for the whole historic district. Cary said that would be easy to engineer around, and it would be easy to add a fence or bridge. But it needs to be determined that the USFS will accept it.

Heather commented that the CRAG understood the area was unstable, and that was a reason for going to the ARG. Cary said they won't have that answer, but that Beach #1 could be easily buttressed. Beaches 1 and 2 would be too large a site to protect, however.

Elizabeth asked. Is keeping beach 1 more valuable than other mitigation off site?

Jan wants CRAG to attend the meeting as an opportunity for dialogue. There was some general discussion of what CRAG needs to take to the joint meeting with the ARG. Jan suggested doing HAER documentation and preservation of Beach #1 with interpretation, possibly in more than one location, with general concurrence.

Kara asked will there be HAER documentation on the entire system? Elizabeth assured her it would need to be done before any work begins. Who will maintain the site? Is there a deadline to get this done? Cary explained that the license stipulated 3-5 years, and we want to move design development along.

Heather asked if the district will be reevaluated. Elizabeth commented that she will want to include other resources in this MOA and one stipulation would be to reevaluate.



Kara asked if an archaeological survey has been done. Chris has investigated the site. The channel has been very active, so there is a low probability of archeological artifacts.

## Questions for the meeting with ARG

- Can the concrete structures remain or will they erode?
- Can we leave everything as it is?
- What about reconstructing the channel to go around the entire area? (No adverse effect if all but Beach 3 remains).
- What can be preserved?
- Can the inlet channel be preserved?
- What is appropriate mitigation?
- What is most interpretable?
- What will the Forest Service be comfortable with?
- Who will manage what remains?

Elizabeth, Cary, Heather, and Jan will attend the March 8 meeting with ARG.

## **LUNCH**

### **PROJECT UPDATES, continued**

Stabilization Project - Elizabeth displayed an updated drawing that shows the possible use of timber mats instead of building a quarry road. Weather conditions may require the building of the road, but this would be determined when they are actually in the field. Start date is March 7. The window is March 7-21. Low pool level is expected March 1.

The Baker crew is unable to support this work, so it will be contracted out. Contractors under consideration are Catapult, Firney, and Walker. NWAA will monitor and PSE engineers will be on site. Elizabeth has not yet been able to talk with Scott Schuyler in person about these latest changes and will continue her efforts to do so.

The State Fish & Wildlife permit has been issued with the condition of using round rock. Scott Williams is following up with the Forest Service (Greta) to discuss this with WDFW. The Forest Service does not prefer the use of round rock. If it is used, it may need to be keyed in, requiring digging and a retaining wall. Another alternative would be to do mitigation. Elizabeth will update CRAG members by email.

Cary asked if it would be better to wait a year for this project. Elizabeth explained that there has already been a wait of 7-9 years, and the site is deteriorating. The extra low pool levels will give some extra time to work this out, and fall is an option.

Jan asked if the ARPA license is going to be in effect for this work. The application for renewal was turned in some time ago, but the license has not yet been issued.

**ACTION:** Chris            Check date on current ARPA permit for stabilization work.

Elk Habit Lands - Elizabeth displayed maps of the new 267 acre Alder Creek property, west of Grandy Lake, and briefly described features of the property. One of the Terrestrial Resource Group's (TRG) articles is to

# Meeting Notes

February 16, 2011 / 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 pm / PSE Skagit Center, Burlington



provide elk habitat and wetlands as mitigation. Dempsey Lumber used this property. Railroads were mapped by D.B. Thompson. Many of the spurs have been converted to roads. No camps were recorded. TRG has a 3-15 year and 15-30 year management plan, which Elizabeth has reviewed. NWAA has tested holes and prepared a plan to map, survey, and inventory the property, so TRG will know what areas to avoid. Work will start when weather allows, hopefully this spring. Chris and Elizabeth have already driven through the property.

Lower Baker FSC - Elizabeth sent the plans on the LB FSC out for 30-day review and received comments from SHPO. Other CRAG members are encouraged to send in their comments.

Concrete Heritage Museum – A Tennessee museum donated 1600 2-1/2 x 4 inch photos of the Lower Baker Dam project, circa 1924, very detailed, in good condition. John Boggs contacted Elizabeth. PSE already has 300-400 Stone & Webster construction photos, but these are not the same. The museum will allow PSE to scan the photos, conserve them, and possibly store them, but the Museum Board has not agreed to transfer ownership. The photos are from a Robert Underwood's father. There are funds in the HPMP next year that should cover the creation of a library of searchable photos.

Baker Clubhouse – PSE has determined it is not prudent to pursue the Baker Clubhouse project as previously discussed. The cost doubled to \$400,000, and PSE could only recover \$75,000. Ed Schild asked Elizabeth to develop a plan for adaptive re-use of the Clubhouse. Elizabeth suggested that due to all the adverse effects, the Clubhouse be included in the MOA to lock it in for mitigation. It could be used as PSE's Visitor Center, and potentially some offices. Cary added that Ed wants to fulfill compliance with the license, and specifics for use of the Clubhouse have not been determined.

Annual Projects List – Elizabeth reported that Rob and Heather both sent comments on the Annual Project List, and Elizabeth sent out a revision. CRAG members are encouraged to send in any comments. Additional projects will be added to this list as they come up during the year.

## **FTP SITE CHANGE**

Elizabeth announced that the FTP site was moved. She will send out the new link. Login and passwords are the same. She stated that new ftp access has been set-up and is intended for one-time use. If the CRAG or consultants needs to transfer large documents quickly (non-confidential only), we could use one of the new general ftp sites. The CRAG ftp site remains only for the CRAG.

## **DECISIONS FOR NEXT MEETING: None known**

## **EVALUATE MEETING, SET LOCATION AND AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING (April 20, 2011)**

### Evaluate Meeting:

- Turn out
- Heather and Chris here early

### Do Differently

- Need SHPO
- Improve sharing for those on conference call

# Meeting Notes

February 16, 2011 / 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 pm / PSE Skagit Center, Burlington



## **Draft Agenda for April 20, 2011 Meeting at Skagit Center, Burlington**

10:00-10:30	Review notes / agenda / action items for February 16, 2011 meeting Review recent BRCC meeting activities, licensing updates (Decisions Required at Today's Meeting: None)
10:30-Noon	Project Updates/Discussions
Noon	Lunch
12:30 – 1:45	Project Updates/Discussions, continued
1:45 – 2:00	Decisions for next meeting? Evaluate Meeting, set location and agenda for next meeting (June 15?)

## **PARKING LOT**

- Mitigation for multiple projects
- Survey strategy for Alder Creek
- Phased consultation for LB FSC