



BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

Cultural & Historical Resources Working Group

August 19, 2002
1:00 p.m.- 4:00 p.m.

Puget Sound Energy Business Office
700 East College Way
Mt. Vernon, WA

PSE Will Provide Snacks and Drinks

AGENDA

1. Introductions
2. Review Agenda and Minutes
3. Review Action Items
4. Dr. Frank Winchell, FERC
5. Finalize APE
6. Finalize UDP
7. Set agenda for September 10 meeting
8. Evaluate Meeting

Distribution List
Baker River Cultural & Historical Resources Working Group

Organization	Name	Email
US Forest Service	Ardis Bynum	abynum@fs.fed.us
Swinomish Indian Tribal Community	Larry Campbell	lcampbell@swinomish.nsn.us
Puget Sound Energy	Connie Freeland	cfreel@puget.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
Puget Sound Energy	Jessie Piper	jpiper@puget.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	pdsa@aol.com

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 Tribal Community	Martin Loesch	mloesch@swinomish.nsn.us
Skagit County Historical Museum	Karen Marshall	karenm@co.skagit.wa.us
Paul Schissler Associates	Paul Schissler	schiss@pacificrim.net
National Park Service	Susan Rosebrough	susan_rosebrough@nps.gov
US FS	John Vanderheyden	jvanderheyden@fs.fed.us;
Skagit System Cooperative	Stan Walsh	swalsh@skagitcoop.org

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



BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

Cultural & Historical Working Group

August 19, 2002

1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

PSE Office
1700 East College Way, Mt. Vernon

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, jpiper@puget.com

PRESENT: Jessie Piper (Puget Sound Energy), Connie Freeland (Puget Sound Energy), Jan Hollenbeck (US Forest Service), Bob Mierendorf (National Park Service), Frank Winchell, (FERC), Marty Loesch (Swinomish Tribe), Lyn Wiltse and Mary Jean Bullock (PDSA Consulting, Inc.)

The meeting started at 1:20 and ended at 4:15 p.m.

FUTURE MEETING DATES

September 10 (*Note: this meeting will START AT NOON and be held at PSE Office, Mt. Vernon*), October 8, November 12, 2002 (locations to be confirmed)

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

INTRODUCTIONS

We welcomed our FERC representative, Dr. Frank Winchell.

NEW ACTION ITEMS

- Larry: Run *Unanticipated Discovery Plan* (draft) by Tribal Councils for feedback.
- Jessie: Send out Aquatics Study Plan when it becomes available.
- Jessie: Send Frank the Research Design and the latest version of the UDP (June 2002).
- Jessie: Check with Leon Hepner at Grant County PUD re: their UDP and Interim Plan.

-
- Jessie: Check also Priest Rapids.
 - Jessie: Check possibility of HYDROPS demonstration at a future meeting.
 - Jessie: Set up Interim Plan Teamlet conference call.
 - Ardis: Check with Chelan County re: sample interim plan.
 - Jessie: Work on completing draft APE to include the FERC boundary.
 - ALL: Give Jessie feedback re: draft APE maps.
 - ALL: Give Jessie input on latest revision of UDP (June/2002).

AGENDA

August 19, 2002 1:00 to 4:00 p.m. at PSE Offices in Mt. Vernon, WA

1. Introductions
2. Review minutes/agenda
3. Action Items
4. Q & A with Dr. Frank Winchell, FERC
5. Discuss Status of APE
6. Discuss Status of UDP
7. Set agenda/location for September 10 meeting
8. Evaluate meeting

ALP STATUS

We are now officially in the ALP. Copies of the Communication Protocol and Process Document will be distributed in the near future with FERC edits re: deferred studies.

Frank assured us that the confidentiality issues have been adequately addressed (under Section 106, Federal Power Act and Public Trust responsibilities).

REPORT ON OLD ACTION ITEMS

- We continued our discussion of Bob's proposal that we change the percentage of survey area in the drawdown zone from 10% in low potential areas to 100%. Jessie proposed that we maintain the 10% sample, since the area classified as low-potential was classified that way mainly due to extreme slope which would be dangerous to attempt to survey. She suggested we add clarifying language in the Research Design that accounts for the fact that some of the low potential area may turn out to have higher potential when ground truthed in the field and that this would be addressed in the final report. She expressed the concern that ground truthing and survey not be equated.

Bob repeated his preference to survey 100% of the drawdown zone and then note reasons for not surveying as exceptions. He stated that inventory strategy for denuded area (e.g, the drawdown) should not be the same as for forested area because of the difference in discovery potential. Jan said the MBSNF inventory strategy was devised for forested areas and that the Research Design should reflect what is really being done in the field.

- ALL: Gave Jessie feedback on RFP/Contractor list by Monday, July 1.
- Jessie: Asked Joetta (R2) to update our APE maps, including dispersed recreation sites within a ¼ mile buffer from the shoreline of both reservoirs. She distributed copies of the new maps to participants.

-
- Jessie reviewed the original Forest Service special use permit to see if it contained specifics that might be helpful in putting together an Interim Plan. There didn't seem to be a pre-existing plan to guide us. FERC policy is that we can do anything that has the agreement of the consulting parties. We can even do major things in the form of an Interim Plan under Section 106 consultation under the new license (as long as it doesn't adversely affect a resource). In other words, we don't have to be formal about doing the right thing as long as the consulting parties agree and are consistent with the intent of the National Historic Preservation Act.

CONTRACTOR UPDATE

The PSE hiring team interviewed the three contractors who submitted proposals for archeological services. They hope to make a final selection within a couple of days. We are awaiting tribal hiring recommendations.

2003 STUDIES/GAPS?

We are currently doing the following:

- Completing Archeology
- PSE planning to meet with tribes re: TCPs
- HBS (Historical Buildings and Structures) Survey is in the planning stages.
- CRMP (now known as the Historical Properties Management Plan or HPMP)
- Other? We agreed that we seem to be in pretty good shape (no obvious gaps) for now.

Q&A WITH DR. FRANK WINCHELL, FERC/APE DISCUSSION

Frank distributed recommended Steps on what this Working Group should do to help fulfill FERC's section 106 responsibilities using the collaborative method during the pre-application process.

1. Find out who all the stakeholders are, contact them, and meet.
2. Set up a Communications Protocol. This should include how meetings will be conducted and how to go about resolving certain issues and disputes. The Communications Protocol allows for everyone to understand the basic ground rules involving the collaborative process and knowing who the consulting parties will be.
3. Come up with a Study Plan.* This should be done prior to conducting any field work. The study plan should involve how the applicant is going to carry out field work, etc., what kind of field work will be done, who will be doing the work, etc.
4. Accurately define the Area of Potential Effect, and get concurrence.
5. Conduct the Cultural Resources Inventory (can be both scientific and heritage resource based) within the Area of Potential Effect (APE). The inventory should be complete enough to incorporate some kind of process (and include sub-surface probing or other method to effectively locate hidden properties within the APE) for making evaluations in terms of NRHP eligibility when cultural resources are located.
6. Take the Inventory(s) and incorporate it into a Historical Properties Management Plan (HPMP) and get concurrence/approval from the group.
7. Once a draft/final HPMP is completed and field along with the license application, a standard FERC Programmatic Agreement (PA) will be drafted by Commission staff and signed by the consulting parties. The PA will be the agreement document used to implement the HPMP.

-
- * Depending on the project specifics, the cultural resources work group may opt to do an Overview after completion of the study plan to guide further work such as inventories, NRHP evaluations, etc. The Overview can also be used as part of the HPMP.

Frank explained that, at a minimum, APE covers FERC project boundaries and anything adjacent that has project related effects. Beyond that FERC would look for hard proof of adverse effects, preferably related to a specific site(s). Frank assured us that we will be able to amend our APE as we go, depending on results of studies.

NOTE: The Primary T-line between the substation and generator is part of the APE.

Bob handed out selected pages related to APE authored by Thomas F. King for the National Preservation Institute. "APE" is defined as:

"the geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause changes in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist. The area of potential effects is influenced by the scale and nature of an undertaking and may be different for different kinds of effects caused by the undertaking 3i6 CFR 800 16(d)

According to Tom, all kinds of effects need to be considered – for example:

- Physical changes to properties (e.g., demolition, alteration)
- Visual effects (e.g., adding an intrusive visual element to the scene)
- Auditory (e.g., introducing intrusive noise into an environment)
- Land use (e.g., facilitating development of a rural area)
- Economic (e.g., facilitating strip development)

HANDOUTS

- Draft Area Of Potential Effects (Map 1 through 7) Unpublished Work Copyright 2001 Puget Sound Energy, Inc.
- Draft *Unanticipated Discovery Plan (June 2002)*
- Selected pages related to APE from Thomas F. King & Claudia Nissley (prepared for the National Preservation Institute, 2000)

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
- 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

MEETING EVALUATION

Well-Dones

- Nice to have Frank/FERC here!

-
- Marty and Jan
 - Good discussions/made progress

Opportunities for Improvement

- Ran over.
- Missed Rob, Tribal Reps, Ardis
- Bring water (and pizza!) next time.

What's Hot?

- Definition of APE
- New contractor

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

September 10, 2002 from 12:00 to 4:00 p.m. at PSE Office in Mt. Vernon

1. Introductions
2. Review Minutes/Agenda
3. Action Items
Interim Plan?
4. Questions and Answers with Frank Winchell of FERC (phone) 1:00-2:00 p.m.
5. APE Status
6. UDP Status
7. Set Agenda for October 8 meeting
8. Evaluate Meeting