
BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

Cultural & Historical Resources Working Group

February 10, 2004
10:00 p.m.- 4:00 p.m.

Baker Lodge
Concrete, WA

AGENDA

TOLL free conference number - To Call into this Meeting

Step 1 -Dial **1-866-280-6429**

Step 2 -Dial Participant code **144995** followed by # sign

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

1. Introductions
2. Review January 13, 2004, Notes and Agenda
3. Action Items/Schedule
 - License article language approved?
4. TST Report
5. Begin PME review/mapping (will include ground disturbing within first five years of license)
6. HPMP comments
7. Update/Comments on reports: Archaeology, TCP, HBS
10. Set agenda for March 9 meeting
11. Review Parking Lot
12. Evaluate Meeting
13. Plan celebration for May

Ideas: 1) Have PSE host a celebration at the Upper Skagit Hotel?

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
US Army Corps of Engineers	Ronald Kent	ronald.J.Kent@nws02.usace.army.mil
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;
Skagit River System Cooperative	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

February 10, 2004

10:00 a.m.–4:00 p.m.
Baker Lodge
Concrete, WA

AMENDED FINAL 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 (Puget Sound Energy), Jan Hollenbeck (US Forest Service), Kelly Bush (Equinox Research), Ron Kent (US Army Corps of Engineers), Bob Mierendorf (National Park Service), Chris Miss (Northwest Archaeological Associates), Rob Whitlam by phone (WA Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation), Frank Winchell by phone (FERC)

FUTURE MEETING DATES – 2004

March 15, April 13, May 11, and June 8. 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.

TENTATIVE Agenda for February 10, 2004, 10:00-4:00 p.m. PSE Office Building, Mt. Vernon, WA

1. Introductions
2. Review January 13, 2004, Notes and Agenda
3. Action Items/Schedule
 - License article language approved?
4. TST Report
5. Begin PME review/mapping (will include ground disturbing within first five years of license)
6. HPMP comments

-
7. Update on TCP studies
 8. Archaeology Report comments
 9. HBS Report comments
 10. Set agenda for March 15 meeting
 11. Review Parking Lot
 12. Evaluate Meeting
 13. Plan celebration for May

Ideas:

- Have PSE host a celebration at the Upper Skagit Hotel?

NEW ACTION ITEMS

- Jessie – send Frank reminder to send his HPMP comments
- Jessie – check on Lodge for March 15 meeting
- Jessie/Jan: Re: Listing process. Discuss meaning of “cooperate” and whether/how to include this in the HPMP language.
- Frank – check in with Steve Hocking re: License Article Language
- Jessie – check in with Frank re: his conversation with Steve Hocking on License Article Language; pass information on to CHRWG members so we can make a decision
- Teamlet (Chris & Jessie) - HPMP Section 5.3.7 Outreach and 5.3.7 Public Education – fill out objectives. PME 6.5– what are elements we can support?
- Jessie – provide CHRWG with new PME package for review
- Jessie: Meet with Cary Feldmann re: wording for 4.2.1 and send out to Working Group members for approval so it can be sent to Louis Berger to be translated into license Article language.
- Jessie: Follow-up with Kelly C. re: curation costs.
- Bob: Bring slide show on Ross Lake site stabilization to March 15 meeting.

REPORT ON OLD ACTION ITEMS

- Jessie: Arranged meeting location for February 10, 2004 and notified members.
- Jessie: Updated contact list.
- Bob: Has not yet shared Table of Contents from Ross Lake Management Plan with Chris because it hasn't had tribal review yet. He did give her a chapter of the plan that lists the stabilization strategies considered for sites, with no specific site information.
- Jessie/Jan: Re: Listing process. Discuss meaning of “cooperate” and whether/how to include this in the HPMP language. Ongoing discussion
- ALL: Got comments to Chris on October version of HPMP.
- ALL: Got comments on Historic Building Structures and Archaeology reports to Jessie.
- Jessie: Get together teamlet of Jan, Kelly, Rob to propose wording for Draft License Article 4.1.1 but were unable to resolve it to send out to the entire team to review by the end of the month. This discussion will be continued.
- Jessie: Met with Cary Feldmann re: wording for 4.2.1 –still in progress. Need to complete and send out to Working Group members for approval so it can be sent to Louis Berger to be translated into license Article language.

-
- Jessie: Still needs to follow-up with Kelly C. re: curation costs.
 - Bob: Will bring slide show on Ross Lake site stabilization to March 15 meeting.
 - Jessie: Checked with Frank regarding signature requirements for Determination of Eligibility documentation.

LICENSE ARTICLE LANGUAGE

We haven't reached resolution on the Draft License Article Language. Frank wants to check in with Steve Hocking. He'd prefer to resolve it at the Working Group level. He's concerned that if we send it up to the Solution Team and Legal Working Group (non-cultural resources people) it will get muddled. He doesn't want to wordsmith and suggests we leave it to the next meeting.

Rob prefers to resolve it as soon as possible to make sure we don't hamper the process. Jan – regardless of what the group comes up with, it will go through lawyers. The Forest Service doesn't hang all its interests on it. She prefers we document our concerns and move on. Frank will talk to Steve Hocking and Jessie will check in with her boss Kris Olin to let him know why the CHRWG hasn't approved the Draft License Article yet. Jessie will check in with Frank and pass on information to the CHRWG members.

PME 6.5 EDUCATION & INTERPRETATION

The group discussed the proposal for Education & Interpretation stewardship program drafted by Saul Weisberg of North Cascades Institute (NCI). The Recreation Working Group wants other working groups to comment on whether they would be willing to support this PME.

Bob reminded us that he is a board member and teaches for NCI. Because of National Park Service restrictions preventing potential conflict of interest he is not a voting member of NCI and can't make proposals or decisions. NCI has a proven record and has enlisted volunteers for all kinds of programs, including for example, vegetation restoration. But he is a neutral party regarding recommending NCI or anyone else. Any comments he makes are objective and address the value of a stewardship program.

NCI is a non-profit education institute since 1986. It has proven a variety of programs for young, old and in between throughout the North Cascades Ecosystem. There is no other organization quite like it. There are a few smaller, regional outfits focusing on Puget Sound, the Columbia River and part of the Okanogon, but not many projects have been up and running for a long time with proven expertise like NCI.

Forest Service knows stewardship can work with specific direction and feels there is potential for enhancement of historic properties, protecting plants, preventing vandalism, etc. through a stewardship program of some kind. Parts of program could be decided annually, contracted for periods, e.g., every five years. The Forest Service has site stewardship programs and they are proven valuable.

Ron (USACOE) - It appears the proposal came up with a list of projects and possible use of volunteers. He is concerned how it would interface with cultural resources, since only the second measure includes cultural resources and looks as if it's just added on. How can volunteers be used to work with cultural resources due to confidentiality of information about site location and content? Also, since it is a felony to dig into sites, site protection is really a law enforcement issue.

The proposal is too broad. Maybe a subset of projects within it and involvement of a few volunteers would be helpful in monitoring sites. Stewardship can be difficult to accommodate in monitoring and there is always concern when it appears you're doing something to save money when you need professional expertise. It's tough to sell by saying volunteer efforts will save dollars, but with a realistic connection and a program that works, it can save money. It comes down to the resource dollar. Programs may be improved by response to project specifics.

Stewardship gets the public involved. Volunteers bring interested effort and energy. The primary function is public education, but there is concern regarding individual sites, and education may not be a function of stewards. Not all the tasks need to be stewards. Different tasks could involve tribal people and tasks don't need to involve confidential information. If there were a responsible stewardship program, it might resolve issues with confidentiality.

When Frank was with the US Army Corps of Engineers before coming to FERC, they tried to foster stewardship programs and is interested in promoting relationships with avocational societies to take a role and report to SHPOs. There is value in public exposure. It gets non-technical people involved in protection of cultural resources. Protection can be education that there is sensitivity in cultural resources. The Skagit River Stewards are highly visible. Local people meet in the field with Forest Service personnel and professional educators.

There is some value for cultural resources work under the supervision of the Forest Service and archaeology supervisors. A critical element is input from tribal concerns regarding disclosure; some site types can be discussed only on a need-to-know basis. Maybe it would be okay as long as there were small groups, supervised by professionals, with information not given out to the larger groups. The key is that the tribes would need to agree to it.

But how would it work? Is the service provider given money, and they don't have a cultural resources staff, they call the Forest Service and say "We have volunteers – how can you use them?" It's not necessary for them to be cultural resource personnel. They won't get confidential information. The product would be a public document or something from Puget that has no more information than the public normally gets.

The proposal too broad, it is packing too much and is not feasible. Also, we have concerns that farming the project out to an outside entity would not allow the CRAG to develop education and interpretation that comes out of our own knowledge and experience. It is more relevant to draw on the relationships we've created and to be able to respond to needs that are identified as other PME's are put into motion. We would lose some of our ability to fine-tune the learning experience to the project as needed. It doesn't mean there are not parts of the education and interpretation that could not be contracted out. The role of professional educators is valuable. Puget has an education program (run by former educator) that we might like to build on with involvement of CRAG and BRCC.

The PME should be written from the Puget point-of-view as a goal and responsibility as part of the license application but should not be written from the point of view of any particular service provider.

How Puget implements it (find partners, leverage land and resources, etc.) should be fed through the BRCC. If anything in particular is proposed through an undertaking (e.g. interpretive signs) it would be an action under the HPMP that would invoke CRAG review to make sure the cultural concerns are addressed.

This proposal may have too many specifics that actually miss the intent. It is like a template with a lot of blanks. It needs to address the actual education and interpretive needs of the project and some of those won't emerge until later. The cultural resources part of a stewardship program may be limited, e.g. concern for protection from vandalism. This PME is not comprehensive about what we can support, but we agree that we want to look at elements of it. It should be more programmatic, not about who's going to do it. Protecting habitat, discouraging mudding, dissuading from vandalism – these are programmatic ideas.

We are reticent to go too far without tribal members present. They might say that if there is any funding available for CR they should be a part of that rather than having an outside organization.

What would the appropriate strategy be to respond to this? Counter-proposal or spring off of this?

How does the proposal relate to and parallel the HPMP? What are elements we like?

What are the specifics? If they are not in this PME, they can be in HPMP rather than saying coordinator will work with Puget and CRAG etc. The Education section of the HPMP is vague, very broad, doesn't say what we will do and how we interface. We can state in the HPMP and in PME particular goals and interest in reaching out to land users (e.g., brochures, interpretive signs, etc.).

- What are our goals?
- What elements of the proposal do we like?
- What is an acceptable minimum plan?
- HPMP Section 5.3.7 Outreach and 5.3.7 Public Education – goals and objectives for public outreach and education.
- PME – what are elements we can support? A sentence or two – The CRAG will identify areas where the role of professional educators can assist with CR enhancement. We need to link CR goals of Education and Interpretation with multiple resource opportunities..

ARCHAEOLOGICAL DISTRICT

Chris shared information on the proposed archaeological district, including boundaries and contributing sites.

The district is large enough to encompass sensitive area. Drawn to include eligible properties and exclude extraneous area.

In drawing up the boundaries, NWAA tried to find viable boundaries that were recognizable in the field. They started with a 40-meter boundary around each site, centered on shovel probes.

The group was concerned about the use of the edge of the old river channel as a boundary since it is inundated and may shift around so it is difficult to pinpoint where the boundary really is. We could use an elevation but that can also be problematic.

After extensive discussions, the group decided to:

- Continue the boundary around the southernmost site rather than mapping it as a discontinuous site
- Change the eastern boundary to the high-water line

Rob forwarded this draft DOE to Michael Hauser at OAHP. NWAA needs to elaborate on significance. Check in on description (mix of mid-Holocene cultural contacts, scientific importance, educational needs).

From the management point of view, Jessie thinks having boundaries that are discernable in the field can help Puget sensitize Project personnel.

DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY

Puget signs the DOE letter on behalf of FERC, sends it to SHPO with copy to Frank at FERC (with notice to FERC Secretary). If documents are sent too late to get into record via Frank, they will need to go directly to Secretary, so we want to get any confidential cultural documents into Frank as soon as possible to make sure they go only in non-public file.

HISTORIC BUILDINGS & STRUCTURES

Concern re: 60/40 content of proposed districts. HRA revised boundaries to leave out non-contributing components wherever feasible and now meets the ratio. The 60/40 rule applies to the period of significance and not to all non-contributing components regardless of period of significance.

UPDATE ON TRADITIONAL CULTURAL PROPERTY (TCP) STUDIES

The Status of TCP Investigations document is aimed for March 1. We are clarifying some of the TCP language in the HPMP.

HISTORIC PROPERTIES MANAGEMENT PLAN (HPMP)

Chris is gone February 12-19 but will have a computer so will continue to work via email. We will have a finalized PME package to review for the next HPMP draft to flesh out some of the mitigation to specific actions.

Many of the PMEs still seem either up in the air or not detailed enough for us to determine effects and propose mitigation. The spawning beaches do seem slated to go away, because the river is taking them and they can't be stabilized.. So we will need to discuss some specific mitigation. What other kinds of documentation besides HAER might we consider? There may be something more appropriate. A combination of HAER, photos, aerials, literature, interpretive signs, booklets, etc. It would be good to set up standards for on-going documentation. Will need to consult to determine what level of documentation that is appropriate. Chris has information on levels of documentation that are required.

Those measures that are fairly certain we should address to the extent possible (“This PME has the potential to effect...”). Others will have to be captured in our programmatic measures (“At this time, the final plan for this PME is not available for review; when available the plans will be reviewed for potential impacts, etc.”).

SITE STABILIZATION

Bob will give a presentation on Ross Lake site stabilization at our next meeting. Plants were part of the treatment, including willow and dogwood.

SCHEDULE

The HPMP version incorporating comments will be out February 23.

HANDOUTS

Draft Archaeological District Information (NWAA)

PARKING LOT

- Coordinate with Terrestrial, Aquatic, and Recreation Working Groups
- Glossary of terms: what are “protection,” “mitigation,” and “enhancement”?
- Rotate meeting locations to tribal facilities?
- Possibility of transplanting young cedar trees/Availability of downed cedar for tribal use
- HYDROPS demo

MEETING EVALUATION

Well-Dones

- Kelly is a good facilitator!!
- Chris’ work on the archaeology district

Changes for Next Time

- Start at 10:30 next time

What’s Hot?

- PMEs
- Draft License Article
- Finalize HPMP

May Celebration Ideas:

1. PSE host a celebration at Upper Skagit Hotel?
2. A barbecue at Baker Lodge

TENTATIVE Agenda for March 15, 2004, 10:00-4:00 p.m.

PSE Office Building, Mt. Vernon, WA

1. Introductions
2. Review February 10, 2004 Notes and Agenda
3. Action Items/Schedule

-
-
4. DOE Update
 5. Study Update
 6. HPMP Update
 7. Set agenda for April 13 meeting
 8. Review Parking Lot
 9. Evaluate Meeting