



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, Kim Lane (Puget Sound Energy), Heather Miller (HRA), Kara Kanaby (UCACE), Jan Hollenbeck (United States Forest Service) and Candace Wilson (Facilitator, PDSA Consulting). By phone: Stephen Mathison (Department of Archaeology & Historic Preservation) and Chris Miss (NWAA, a division of SWCA).

DECISIONS: None today

NEXT MEETING: June 15, 2011, 10 a.m. – 2 p.m., Skagit Center, Burlington

FUTURE MEETING DATES: 2011 dates: June 15, July 20, August 17, September 21, October 19, November 16, December 21.

MAY 18 AGENDA

1. Review notes / agenda / action items for February 16, 2010 meeting
2. Review recent BRCC meeting activities, licensing updates
3. Decisions Required at Today's Meeting: None
4. Project Updates

- Baker Club House

Lunch

4. Project Updates, continued
 - Channel Creek Spawning Beaches
 - Update March 8 meeting
 - Lower Baker Compound Parking Lot
 - Lower Baker FSC
 - Gulper disposition
 - Elk Habitat Lands
 - Stabilization Project
5. Decisions for next meeting?
6. Evaluate Meeting, set location and agenda for next meeting (June 15)

NEW ACTION ITEMS

- **Elizabeth** **Send link to the new website which will replace FTP site.**
- **Elizabeth** **Send Cultural Resources checklist to CRAG for review.**
- **Elizabeth/Kim** **Assess Baker Club House & trailer area for potential impact/damage to the Club House and make recommendations to CRAG**
- **Elizabeth** **Communicate guidelines for use of the Club House site to the contractor**

Meeting Notes

May 18, 2011 / 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 pm / PSE Skagit Center, Burlington



PUGET SOUND ENERGY
The Energy To Do Great Things

- **Elizabeth** **Prepare mitigation/restoration plan for CRAG review.**
- **Jan** **Check with Jon Vanderheyden, District Ranger, about the Forest Service position on decommissioning the Beaches.**
- **Elizabeth** **Develop a MOA for the mitigation plan for the historic district.**
- **Scott Williams** **Send Jan a budget report for the stabilization project.**

PREVIOUS - STILL RELEVANT - ACTION ITEMS

- **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 (2nd 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 February 16, 2011 meeting were approved as submitted. Final notes will be sent to CRAG members by email.

Agenda

The agenda was approved as previously distributed to CRAG members.

Report on Action items

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

Elizabeth Send Jan a copy of “Salmon on the Baker River.” **Completed.**

NWAA Provide monitoring during installation of swim line at Horseshoe Cove. **Completed.**

BRCC ACTIVITIES

Kim gave a report on BRCC and Resource Group activities. The last meeting was held on April 11 to meet the requirement of meeting once or twice a year. The issues covered had to do with impact of the Sockeye Recreational Fishery on the U.S. Forest Service. U.S. Fish & Wildlife and the Forest Service will resolve these issues, and PSE is working with Greta Movassaghi to assist with this.

The ongoing 4E review for future projects was also discussed. PSE is also working with Greta on this. A two-year schedule for future projects that interface with the forest service is being developed.

There was a budget report on license fund balances. TRIG has the biggest with Elk Habitat lands. There is a new PSE website with a portion dedicated to the license. Meeting notes and documents can be posted there.

The project evaluation process for 602 funds was posted to receive comments. None were received and PSE will move to adopt.



Future meetings of the BRCC will most likely be on an annual basis.

ACTION: Elizabeth Send link to the new website which will replace FTP site.

PROJECT UPDATES

Baker Club House– Elizabeth drew attention to the letter she sent to the CRAG to report that trailers were placed by the Baker Club House and the other historic house without proper review and consultation. This was discovered during Elizabeth’s routine monitoring. When the original consultation was done for the Power House project, a lay down and staging area was proposed and approved. The current trailer location was not part of that review. The trailers are temporary and will be removed when the project is done, by 2013. The area was graded and parking is done on back and front sides. Elizabeth reported this situation to PSE managers, and received support from this.

Comments on the letter were received from the Forest Service, SHPO and the Corps. All parties regret this happened. The Corps expressed concern for potential damage to archaeological properties.

Elizabeth has been doing training at staff meetings, preconstruction meetings, and tailgate meetings, to talk about Cultural Resources and has “red-flagged” the lower Baker compound area, especially when digging is being done. She recommends more formal training needs to be done, with guest speakers to help raise understanding among PSE managers and relevant employees of cultural resource issues. Elizabeth has developed a Cultural Resources Checklist, based on one Jan had shared, to help managers keep in mind the extent of their review responsibilities.

Heather asked what would trigger use of the checklist. Kim explained how the managers could change procedure to ensure that the appropriate process would be followed. The historic district would be buffered, essentially requiring an additional permit to move projects forward. An individual has been assigned the responsibility for making sure this happens as part of the permitting process. He is now part of the project team.

Elizabeth recommends that a conversation needs to take place with the Town of Concrete, as they issued a permit for this. We need to make sure they know there are federal restrictions regarding historic properties beyond their responsibility in the historic district. Jan commented that some counties have developed a cultural resource protection process.

Jan asked what kind of project would trigger this. Through the HPMP Elizabeth is supposed to see everything to determine if it is an “undertaking” and has the potential for effect. It can’t be ground based or action based. The trigger should really be anything.

Elizabeth commented that this project had already gone through consultation, but it went outside the scope. As soon as it went outside of scope, it should have come back for review.

Jan commented that project managers often say they need some flexibility, and that can be explored

Stephen asked for more clarification about how this came about? Kim reported that it appears that a couple of trailers were by the river for a previous project. The contractor probably requested a better location. They probably needed more space. They had thought they might use the Club House, but the estimate for that

Meeting Notes

May 18, 2011 / 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 pm / PSE Skagit Center, Burlington



work was too high. They then apparently decided to place the trailers at the Club House location without cultural resource review.

Stephen said this situation adds insult to injury. We had hoped to see improvements to the Club House and now the trailers are there impacting the look of the area. Even though the situation is temporary, it compromises the historic setting. He hopes there will be efforts to restore the area. Kim said that conversation about the Club House is ongoing in a holistic way. It is a matter of putting a plan together, budgeting it, and running it through the right channels. It is very much being discussed and considered now for future action.

Elizabeth said we still need to make sure that what they did doesn't affect the physical condition of the Club House – does grading draw water away or toward the building, for instance? We have some baseline information from BOLA and KPFF to help us monitor it through the next two years.

Stephen asked can we do some drainage or what might be needed to mitigate the grading? Elizabeth agreed that we need to discuss this. Jan said that it is an adverse effect to the setting. Elizabeth commented that it is definitely a temporary structure; no concrete foundations or footers have been placed.

Kim said we will need to assess whether there are drains or whether there are other impacts to the Club House directly.

Kara asked if that is wetlands in front. Elizabeth said it is a drainage ditch, but even so, it is not a good idea to have gravel in it.

Kara asked if the area was shovel tested. Elizabeth said it was pedestrian surveyed. Sewage and water lines are in front of the trailer areas. To the right of the trailers there is a concrete walking path that goes in front of the other house and a fire hydrant. All the lines run parallel. Jan asked if the walking path was affected and was it historic? Elizabeth said it had already been affected and was historic from when the cottages were built in 1925. Heather added that it has not ever been called out as a contributing resource to the district. Elizabeth noted that originally it also extended to each cottage, and much of it has been destroyed. The landscape has been changed since the cottages are gone.

Jan asked if the sewer and water lines will be removed when the trailers are removed? Kim said that would definitely go. Elizabeth said the pad was put there for I&E by the Museum about ten years ago. We don't know what condition it will be in when the trailers are gone.

The plant personnel didn't know this was going to happen either. They have all the maintenance guidelines and might have been able to raise questions.

This probably was decided in a project meeting, and then they would have had to go through the PSE permit person. It's been difficult to trace the exact course of how this decision was made.

Stephen said he thinks the form is a good idea. He would like consideration to be given, because of this event, that there be some positive result for the Club House. He would like to see attempts made to improve the appearance of the Club House, or the drainage, while this project is going on, or at least afterwards, to make sure the setting gets restored. Elizabeth will meet with consultants to develop a plan, meet with the

Meeting Notes

May 18, 2011 / 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 pm / PSE Skagit Center, Burlington



managers to make sure they are on board, and then bring all that to the CRAG. Even cleaning the front steps and taking a look at the drainage would be good to do and to get the project to pay for it. This is PSE's responsibility, not the contractor's. PSE should have enough people in our organization who understand the requirements, so we need to tweak things a little to make sure this doesn't happen again.

Elizabeth said she met with these contractors, so they did get an overview, but if someone at PSE tells them to do something, they will do it. Kim reiterated that it would have been better to go through the process beforehand to work through the decision.

Jan asked if there will be a mitigation plan for the two years and a plan for restoration? Elizabeth said we need to address any immediate issues now, e.g. how gravel is laid, etc. Then we would look at restoration. If the Club House is targeted for a bigger plan, we would encompass that as well. Kim said we can address any current issues pretty quickly. The bigger plan will take more time.

Stephen said part of the excitement about having the Club House renovated for use included some immediate concerns, such as roof drainage. Some of these more critical issues need to be addressed sooner. Whether it is called mitigation or not, they need to be seriously considered to protect the building. Elizabeth said that is part of the maintenance guidelines, part of the license requirements. Parts of the exterior are critical, as well as drainage issues. Cleaning up the moss that is degrading the concrete – that kind of thing can be addressed. Kim said that as license implementation manager he has resources and can have people checking on these issues. Since the money didn't come from the project, we can approach this differently with a phased approach.

Elizabeth said maybe some of the immediate concerns can be addressed by the project.

Jan commented that in her opinion it is in adverse effect even if it is only a two and a half year adverse effect. If there is a plan to do something with the Club House, it is delayed by those trailers – it can't be used for public use. Everything we have talked about has been delayed. She said the immediate issues need to be addressed, and you could call that mitigation. Two and a half years gets people settled. They need to be held to some standard for keeping the area clean, and maybe more. (Lawn chairs, barbecues, geranium pots, dumpsters, equipment?). They need to have some understanding of the requirements of their use.

Elizabeth asked – where to park? Ecology blocks? Fencing? Kim said PSE can restrict it. Elizabeth said we can go to their meetings and tell them. Kara asked will they need to bring in more gravel? So far parking seems to be used for motor pool vehicles. Should the property be sequestered in some way?

Jan asked if the graded area needs to be maintained. Can part of it be restored? Kim said PSE needs to develop a parking plan. Jan suggested that looking at historic pictures might help so that the mitigation plan is in line with the restoration plan.

ACTION: Elizabeth Send Cultural Resources checklist to CRAG for review

ACTION: Elizabeth/Kim Assess Baker Club House & trailer area for potential impact/damage to the Club House and make recommendations to CRAG

ACTION: Elizabeth Communicate guidelines for use of the Club House site to the contractor



ACTION Elizabeth – Prepare mitigation/restoration plan for CRAG review.

LUNCH

PROJECT UPDATES, continued

Channel Creek Spawning Beaches – Update March 8 meeting -

Elizabeth gave an update from the March 8 combined meeting with the Aquatic Resource Group. At the meeting, Scott Williams explained the issues about decommissioning the beaches and Elizabeth and Heather related the issues related to the historic district.

The purpose of the meeting was to come up with a plan for decommissioning that would provide a good fish habitat and also explore how to minimize the effect to the historic district. Much of the conversation was about fish habitat with the fish people. Many of them were unaware of the issues with historic properties. The issue that came up was that the Forest Service would need to maintain anything that is left; PSE will not maintain it. Jan questioned the agreement – would PSE maintain I&E if that is designated mitigation? Yes.

Kim reported that this was further discussed at the April meeting of ARG and conversations are ongoing to resolve this. The alternative matrix, which compares various alternatives for the decommissioning of the spawning beaches will be presented to the CRAG as it was to the ARG. The matrix compares a range of removal, including removal of all structures on site. Jan will check with John Vanderheyden to verify this. Based on that the proposal is now seen as an adverse effect both to this resource and to the district as a whole, especially considering the adverse effects to so many of the other resources (Upper Baker Gulper, Lower Baker Gulper, Lower Baker Dam). Mitigation should be proportional to the loss of the significance of the historic district.

Mitigation options might include: HAER, and Interpretation and education such as adaptive reuse of the Clubhouse as a visitors' Center, roadside sign at turn-off to beaches, offsite mitigation, development of an interactive website, documentary or a 3-D fly through, conservation of Baker River historical documents and drawings for archival purposes. An MOA will need to be filed with FERC.

Heather commented that the major change is to fish passage; the hydro elements still remain. A topic for future conversation is whether there is still a district or only individual resources.

Kim commented that PSE would like to tell the story of its work with fish. Elizabeth recommended I&E would need to be coordinated with other parties, which might include the Town of Concrete. Pam Gardner needs to develop two miles of trails, so there is an opportunity to coordinate with that project to share the history. Other ideas were discussed. The potential for salvage is unknown at this time.

Stephen said at some point the nomination will need to be redone to indicate the changes to the resources.

This project is to be finished within 2 years after completing the hatchery. Mitigation will be wrapped into the decommissioning plan. Elizabeth suggested a draft be completed by fall so there is time to discuss it.

ACTION: Jan Check with Jon Vanderheyden, District Ranger, about the Forest Service position on decommissioning the Beaches.



ACTION: Elizabeth Develop a MOA for the mitigation plan for the district.

Lower Baker Compound Parking Lot

Elizabeth outlined the project area of potential effect on maps for the Lower Baker Compound Parking Lot project. There have been drainage problems. The proposed project is to remove the paving, repair, replace, and construct as needed the drainage system, and repave. The APE is known to have been the location of buildings associated with Washington Portland Cement Company and potentially Baker River Hydroelectric Development Historic District, and has only been pedestrian surveyed. The concern is that digging will uncover historic features.

Chris outlined previous discoveries. Three former bore holes have run into concrete, and historic maps were reviewed in relationship to the APE. Archaeological investigation was recommended based on this information. Jan commented that finds need to be evaluated. If a feature can't be avoided, there would need to be more conversation. Another question is whether they can build over the existing pad or will they need to remove it.

There was discussion about what depth; that will need to be determined in the field. Probes will be done at the pad location, the bunker area, where the spurs may be located, and where the sawmill/carpenter shop was located.

Work will be done end of May or early June. Any finds will be documented and brought to CRAG for review, probably on a quick turnaround. The parking lot project is slated for summer.

Lower Baker FSC – Gulper Disposition

Elizabeth reviewed the components of the LB FSC project. The Gulper was not previously discussed. Elizabeth recommends an adverse effect; it has to be moved. Most people prefer to decommission it; it could be interpreted better through mapping and other means. It can't be repaired without further adverse effect, and it is sinking.

HAER should be considered. Heather suggested doing documentation immediately. Jan suggested the MOA would have documentation for all fish-related elements of the district.

Jan commented that the historic district had not been preserved. Elizabeth commented that the HPMP will need to be reviewed.

Elk Habitat Lands -

NWAA is doing surveys. They have found grades, a logging campsite, and some other odds and ends, dating from 1900-1910. Once that is recorded, we can talk about eligibility, and hopefully they can be avoided. This may be a site for a future CRAG field trip.

Stabilization Project

This project has been completed for a couple of months. The area was restored and stabilized. Kim said Greta commented the rock was a bit white. The swim line was also put in, and that report just went out to CRAG. The stabilization report is forthcoming.

Meeting Notes

May 18, 2011 / 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 pm / PSE Skagit Center, Burlington



Jan requested a copy of the budget for the stabilization project.

Chris reported that they were able monitor at several sites. Drawdown was good, but weather was bad. Elizabeth suggested revisiting the stabilization site in the fall. The final monitoring report will be going out to CRAG shortly.

ACTION Scott Williams Send Jan a budget report for the stabilization project.

DECISIONS FOR NEXT MEETING: None known

EVALUATE MEETING, SET LOCATION AND AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING (June 15, 2011)

Evaluate Meeting:

- Glad everyone was here
- Good lunch
- Nice to have DAHP person

Do Differently

-

Draft Agenda for June 15, 2011 Meeting at Skagit Center, Burlington

| | |
|--------------|--|
| 10:00-10:30 | Review notes / agenda / action items for May 18, 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 (Summer? September 21?) |