

Lake Chelan/Rocky Reach Meeting Minutes

To: Distribution List
From: Scott Kreiter
Date: June 26, 2001
Subject: Lake Chelan/Rocky Reach Cultural Resource Issues
Attendees: Refer to Sign-Up Sheet
Location: Chelan PUD Retail Operations Conference Room
Time: 10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Meeting Purpose

- 1) Provide update on ongoing studies
- 2) Outline upcoming tasks and begin development of CRMP

Lake Chelan Schedule and Upcoming Tasks (see handouts)

The working group reviewed the Section 106 Compliance Table and Schedule. Scott Kreiter, Chelan PUD (PUD), pointed out that the highlighted sections are steps that have been initiated or finalized since the last meeting.

Step 1

Scott (PUD) explained that technically the step is not complete until the PUD receives the responses from both the Colville Confederated Tribes (CCT) and Yakama Nation (YN). Guy Moura (CCT) informed the group that as the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Adeline Fredin (CCT) has the authority to move forward with Section 106 consultation.

Step 6

Per previous working group meeting discussions, Vera Morgan, Morgan Consulting Services (MCSI), followed up and informed the group that she would be removing chapters 7 and 8 from the background overview. She will summarize the data included in those two chapters and add the summary at the end of chapter 6.

Step 8

Camas Consulting had been selected from the CCT and Archaeological Frontiers was selected from the YN to complete the traditional cultural properties (TCP). Guy (CCT) mentioned that the draft report is currently in the review process. Scott (PUD) stated that the draft has also been completed for the YN, but he wasn't planning to release it until the CCT report is submitted. Scott also had questions about how the report should be distributed. Scott said he would check with the CCT and YN before distributing the reports.

Step 9

Archaeological Investigations Northwest (AINW) completed site testing on Lake Chelan in June. Later in the meeting the group discussed the brief updates that were provided by the consultant.

Step 11

Vera (MCSI) has begun writing the draft Cultural Resources Management Plan (CRMP). The completion date is set for November 2001.

Step 12

Frank Winchell, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), was present to discuss the programmatic agreement (PA). He explained that FERC would prepare the PA, which would be the standard PA with the three signatories. Frank further explained that the three signing parties are FERC, SHPO and the Advisory Council. A tribe could be a signatory as the THPO if there are tribal lands involved. Scott (PUD) stated that he had researched whether allotments were considered "tribal lands" under Section 106, but had received conflicting answers.

Lake Chelan Study Update (see handouts)

Scott (PUD) distributed three site testing progress reports and draft copies of the site maps. The results of the fieldwork are in the process of being analyzed, but the reports did note some preliminary results. Vera (MCSI) commented that the maps were very thorough and well done. She also noted that a positive site boundary has not been identified for site #45CH217 mainly because most of the site is inundated. Vera (MCSI) recommended that a temporary site boundary be added to the map.

It was pointed out that the Forest Service site, FS#061702-078 (Lightning Creek) needs GPS coordinates. Vera (MCSI) stated that she would provide written comments.

Bob Mierendorf, National Park Service (NPS) (via teleconference) provided comments regarding the preliminary results. He briefly mentioned that the analysis from the blood residue could be very useful and that high quality obsidians seem to be coming from the Northwest. He also informed the group that NPS has not granted permission to test at NPS sites, but anticipated they will. In March, Bob stated that the permit application and letter were sent to both CCT and YN, and so far no formal comment has been received from either tribe. Guy (CCT) informed Bob (NPS) that the application is being reviewed by the CCT. Scott (PUD) indicated that he did not realize that the permit was still pending and wondered if comments have not been received within 30 days if it would be acceptable to move ahead. Guy (CCT) stated that he would discuss the status with Adeline Fredin (CCT). Bob (NPS) noted that he does not anticipate any difficulties in having the permits by next field season. It was discussed, and he will request that the permit is extended at least through summer 2002.

Guy (CCT) discussed the CCT interest in the Lake Chelan ice age. Their interest is to determine when the lake was ice free in order to determine when the area may have been inhabited. Bob (NPS) mentioned that the only exact information is from radio carbon dating back to 8500 BP from a site about four miles up the Stehekin Valley. Lake clay with macrofossils and organics typically associated with a lake or swamp were also found at the site. Also, near Buckner Orchard a lake bottom deposit was found that was anaerobic and water logged. This information would be useful in the CRMP or Overview as a research question for the area.

Vera (MCSI) said that the determinations of eligibility forms have been completed for the pictographs. The group discussed options for dating the pictographs, and it was decided that a recommendation could be made in the CRMP.

Next Steps - PA and CRMP (see handout)

Scott (PUD) mentioned there has been a question of the relationship between the Background Overview and the CRMP. Frank (FERC) said that the CRMP should be complementary to the Background Overview. Vera (MCSI) explained that the overview would be a stand-alone document, but would be referenced in the CRMP.

The group reviewed the CRMP outline. Frank (FERC) suggested that all of the documents; the Overview, CRMP, testing data and survey data should all be volumes of a set. Powys Gadd (USFS) agreed and stated it makes sense to have a compilation of the different efforts bound together as a joint document, especially for submittal to the SHPO and FERC. Vera (MCSI) pointed out that the testing and survey data would be separate reports so that AINW should be informed to keep them separate so that the survey data and historical research could be added to the survey document. It seems that we should have three volumes of the documentation on Lake Chelan: The overview (Volume

1), the survey data and historical research (Volume 2) and the testing data (Volume 3). Therefore, she suggested that she or Scott (PUD) should contact John Fagan (AINW) and request separating the testing and survey data.

Guy (CCT) brought up the monitoring element of the CRMP. Ardis Bynum (USFS) asked how coordination with the erosion control efforts would occur. Scott (PUD) explained that right now all sites are being considered eligible, but once the results are received back from AINW it will be helpful when determining the level of monitoring for the sites. Guy (CCT) recommended developing a list of cultural sites that coincide with erosion sites.

Another component that has not been determined or discussed is the costs associated with the CRMP. Scott (PUD) informed the group that he has contacted different utilities to find out their cost ranges, and the average was about \$30,000 per year. He pointed out that the cost printed in the Preliminary Draft Environmental Assessment (PDEA) is an educated guess/placeholder until a cost is known.

Scott (PUD) concluded by asking whether there were CRMPs from other utilities that FERC thought were really good. Frank (FERC) said that the Crane Valley Project, Mokolunne Hydro Project, Cowlitz River Project all provided exceptional CRMPs. Scott (PUD) will follow up and try to obtain a copy of one of those for working group review.

Bob (NPS) provided comments on the CRMP outline.

1. Between Chapters 1 and 2, site significance and historic context is missing. **Action:** Vera will include as new chapter.
2. Chapter 3 suggested public education instead of interpretation. Education is broader.
3. Chapter 3, recommended revising Native American Participation/**Consultation**
4. Chapter 5, Procedures for Review of Proposed Actions, should include consideration for management conflicts
5. Chapter 5, add additional element, PUD Compliance, stating PUD will convey with National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).

Powys (USFS) commented that the introduction should include an identification of the participating parties as well as siting the laws.

The group also discussed the status of the draft overview that had been submitted to SHPO for review and was reportedly made available in the SHPO library. The group felt that the document should not be made available until the errors and missing information were corrected. Scott said he would check with the SHPO to see that the document is removed. Powys (USFS) suggested that documents should not be sent to the SHPO for review until they are final.

Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP)

Guy (CCT) informed the group that he is fairly certain that the CCT would not want the TCP report to be distributed to all working group members. Scott's (PUD) understanding was that the YN report was developed for working group review. However, he would check with Johnson Meninick for concurrence prior to working group review. Guy (CCT) requested not releasing the CCT TCP for working group review until after CCT has reviewed the report and discussed how they want it released.

Rocky Reach Schedule (see handout) and Next Steps

The working group reviewed the Section 106 Compliance Table and Schedule. Scott (PUD) again pointed out that the highlighted sections are steps that have been updated since the last meeting.

Step 1

Guy Moura (CCT) stated the status is the same for Rocky Reach as Lake Chelan, and that is that Adeline Fredin (CCT) has indicated that she is prepared to move forward with consultation.

Step 10

Western Shore Heritage Services was selected to conduct the fieldwork. The survey work started June 26. The group discussed permits. Powys (USFS) informed the group that an ARPA permit is not needed unless work will be done

on Forest Service land. Scott (PUD) responded by saying that he does not believe that the consultant plans on surveying on the small piece of Forest Service land, but the consultant is planning on contacting her. It was also mentioned that if a Bureau of Land Management (BLM) permit is not obtained, then a state permit is required. Scott (PUD) stated he would check on the permitting questions. But he did state that the consultant is not conducting any shovel testing. In regard to private land, Scott (PUD) noted that some private landowners have not granted access to their land.

In order to prevent the errors that occurred with Lake Chelan, Guy (CCT) requested that Vera (MCSI) conduct periodic field observations. He also asked Scott for a copy of the field schedule.

Next Meeting

To be determined.

Action Items

Lake Chelan

- ✓ Guy will discuss status of permit application with Adeline.
- ✓ Scott will talk to AINW about separating testing and survey data into two documents.
- ✓ Scott will generate a list of cultural sites that coincide with erosion sites.
- ✓ Frank will send Scott the PA
- ✓ Scott will check with Carol Gleichman on the latest HRMP guidelines
- ✓ Scott will contact the SHPO to have the Background Overview removed from the shelves.

Rocky Reach

- ✓ Scott will e-mail field schedule to Guy.
- ✓ Scott will check with Western Shore Heritage regarding permits.

Reference materials are posted on the Web sites, www.chelanpud.org/relicense and www.chelanpud.org/rr_relicense
Please contact Rosana Sokolowski, (888) 663-8121, Extension 6371, if hard copies are required.

- ✓ Sign-up Sheet
- ✓ Distribution List
- ✓ Section 106 Compliance Table (Lake Chelan and Rocky Reach)
- ✓ Lake Chelan Cultural Resources Schedule
- ✓ Lake Chelan Cultural Resource Management Plan Outline
- ✓ AINW Progress Reports and Site Maps
- ✓ Rocky Reach Field Investigations Study Plan