
From: Scott Kreiter
Sent: Tuesday, February 19, 2008 9:26 AM
To: Bob Clubb; Camille Pleasants; Chuck James; David Turner (david.turner@ferc.gov); Frank Winchell; Glenn Hartmann (glenn@crcwa.com); Gordon Brett; Guy Moura; John Devine; Margaret Berger (margaret@crcwa.com); Mary Mayo; Richard Bailey; Rob Whitlam; Robert Easton; Sally Sovey; Scott Kreiter; Shane Bickford; Timothy Bachelder
Subject: Wells Relicensing: Cultural RWG Final Meeting Notes
Attachments: Wells_Cultural_RWG_Notes_013008.pdf; Draft_Wells_HPMP_Outline_013008.pdf; WELLS_SECTION_106_SCHEDULE_013008.pdf

Cultural RWG members,

Please find attached the final meeting notes from the January 30th meeting, the revised HPMP outline, and the revised Section 106 Schedule. The areas of change are highlighted in yellow.

Thanks!
-Scott
Scott Kreiter
Douglas County PUD
509-881-2327

Final Meeting Notes

Cultural Resource Work Group

Wells Hydroelectric Project Relicensing
Douglas County PUD
January 30, 2008

Meeting Coordinator: Scott Kreiter (509) 881-2327

Meeting Objective: To provide an update on the Cultural Resource Investigation and TCP studies. To begin HPMP discussions.

Section 106 Timeline

Douglas PUD provided an update on the Section 106 process. The timeline was revised to reflect FERC's study plan determination and the initiation of the field studies. The CRWG suggested that the timeline be revised to reflect that the draft HPMP will be filed with the Draft License Application in December 2009.

Study Updates

The Colville Tribes provided an update on both the TCP Study and the Inventory and Reconnaissance Study. The draft report for the TCP study is nearly complete. The Inventory and Reconnaissance study is well underway, and requires additional field work in the spring. A detailed progress report was provided by the CCT and is included below.

HPMP Concepts

Douglas PUD provided a draft HPMP outline for discussion purposes. Based on CRWG comments, Douglas PUD will revise the outline and begin drafting the HPMP.

Action: Douglas PUD will revise the Section 106 timeline and send it to the CRWG

Action: Douglas PUD will revise the HPMP outline and send it to the CRWG

Action: Douglas PUD will begin drafting the HPMP

Items of Agreement

None

Items of Disagreement

None

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be scheduled following release of a draft HPMP.



The Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation
P.O. Box 150, Nespelem, WA 99155

(509) 634-2200
FAX: (509) 634-4116



January 30, 2008

Wells Project Report of Progress, Cultural Resources Working Group Update

TRADITIONAL CULTURAL PROPERTY REPORT

The in-house draft TCP report is completed and in the final stages of in-house editing

ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELD WORK AND REPORTING

Task 1: Background Research

Background research was completed prior to the start of fieldwork. Site files with attendant data were compiled and used to conduct site reconnaissance. The background research additionally assisted field crews with providing National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations. However, the background research has not yet been formally integrated with the Berger/Hartmann report. The Excel Spreadsheet of site data has been transferred to an Access database. The project database will require updating throughout the project, all preliminary field data has been added from the 2007 work.

Task 2: Manage GIS-linked Site Form Files Database

The GIS-linked Site Form Files Database has been initiated. As new State of Washington Archaeological Site Inventory Forms are completed, they are saved with the corresponding GPS derived GIS data. Hyperlinks will be used to connect both the completed site forms and site photographs with the GIS data. The Site Condition Forms and Eligibility Recommendation Forms will be linked either separately or, more likely with, the Site Forms.

Task 3: Site Reconnaissance

Site Revisits began on October 2, 2007 and continued until November 8, 2007. During that time, Reconnaissance was completed at 119 (31 along the Okanogan River) of the 170 previously recorded sites in the project area. Site Reconnaissance involved compilation of new State of Washington Archaeological Site Inventory Forms, Site Condition Assessment Forms and National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendation forms.

Task 4: Intensive Survey, Okanogan River

The right bank has been surveyed. During the Intensive Survey, 31 of 40 previously recorded sites have been visited and updated and nine new archaeological sites were recorded. Of the nine

new sites, seven are historic, one prehistoric and one multi-component (historic and prehistoric). Left bank survey, Cassimer Bar and Washburn Island await spring.

Task 5: Intensive Survey, Allotments

The Allotment Survey will begin during the spring field session.

Task 6: Transmission-Lines Corridor Survey

The Transmission Line Corridor survey is near complete. Less than 12 miles remain of the 41 mile long corridor. Of the remaining distance, less than one mile is within cultivated lands. The majority of the remaining corridor to be surveyed consists of the section that crosses Badger Mountain. To date, nine sites have been recorded in the Transmission Corridor. Of these, seven are historic and two are multi-component (prehistoric and historic).

Task 7: Site Forms and Site Locations

Each archaeological site visited, whether previously recorded or new, was recorded in the field on a State of Washington Archaeological Site Inventory Form. Site boundaries were recorded with GPS using a data dictionary utilizing State of Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation GIS Data Standards. All GPS data was differentially corrected and exported into GIS. The field forms will be finalized electronically in the office this winter.

Task 8: Evaluation of Project Effects and Site Condition

Field crews carried copies of a Site Condition Assessment form. The forms were completed for each site encountered, recorded, and filed in the site specific folder. A preliminary short list of critically impacted sites will be prepared by February 15, 2008; after all project area sites have been visited, a final short list of prioritized critical sites will be prepared.

Task 9: Eligibility Recommendations

Blank NRHP eligibility forms were carried in the field. The forms were compiled as sites were encountered and recorded. The forms will be used to generate the NRHP recommendations in the draft and final report.

Reporting

Background materials and copies of field forms were delivered to Steve Hamilton to begin report preparation.

Wells Project Draft HPMP Outline
For discussion at the January 30 CRWG meeting

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Project Description and Background

1.2 Scope and Purpose of the HPMP

1.2.1 Cultural Resource Work Group

1.2.2 Area of Potential Effects

1.3 Legislative Mandates and Relicensing Requirements [*Brief overview of NHPA, with list of applicable laws and regs in an appendix*]

2.0 Identifying Historic Properties [*This section summarizes studies that were used as the basis for this HPMP. Other studies will be summarized in an appendix*]

2.1 Historic Properties Studies

2.1.1 Data Review, 2006

2.1.2 Traditional Cultural Properties Study, 2007

2.1.3 Cultural Resources Field Reconnaissance and Survey, 2007-2008

2.1.4 Evaluation for National Register Eligibility, 2008

3.0 Managing Historic Properties

3.1 Coordination [*Designates coordinator and training requirements*]

3.2 Education and Interpretation

3.2.1 Employee Education Program

3.2.2 Public Education and Interpretation

3.3 HPMP Policies [*Programs for management/protection of historic properties*]

3.3.1 Management Standards for Historic Properties [*This section includes guidelines for how Douglas PUD will protect historic properties when conducting routine activities*]

3.3.2 Management Standards for Traditional Cultural Properties

Note: Comment from RWG was to add a separate section for “new” activities. This is an example table that might be included in Section 3.3.1, which includes all (routine and new) activities.

Activity	Protection Measures
Activities that do not disturb the ground surface (e.g. weed spraying, tree cutting, etc.)	Proceed with activity.
Ground disturbance in areas previously substantially disturbed, or previously surveyed for and found to be devoid of cultural resources.	Proceed with activity.
Replacing existing fences, gates, roads, culverts, irrigation, signs, etc. in same location with same basic footprint.	Proceed with activity.
Encroachment, vandalism and recreation impacts.	Douglas PUD will conduct monthly reservoir shoreline monitoring to identify encroachment by adjacent landowners and larger scale ground disturbances. If effects are identified, Douglas PUD will consult with the SHPO, THPO, and other applicable agencies, pursuant to the process outlined in 36CFR800.
Normal reservoir operations, which may cause shoreline erosion.	In order to identify smaller scale effects, Douglas PUD will conduct archaeological monitoring as described in Appendix E – Wells Reservoir Archaeological Monitoring Program. If effects are identified, Douglas PUD will consult with the SHPO, THPO, and other applicable agencies, pursuant to the process outlined in 36CFR800.
Ground disturbance in areas not previously disturbed and no previous archaeological surveys have been conducted.	Douglas PUD will consult with the SHPO, THPO, and other applicable agencies, pursuant to the process outlined in 36CFR800.
Issuance of permits to adjacent landowners to conduct ground disturbing activities on lands within the APE.	Douglas PUD will not issue permits until the permit applicant has received all required permits from federal, state, or local governments.

3.3.3 Inadvertent Discoveries and Emergency Situations

3.3.3.1 Protocol for Discovery of Archaeological Resources

3.3.3.2 Protocol for Discovery of Human Remains

3.3.3.3 Protocol for Emergency Situations [*Link to Emergency Action Plan or be sure to include Coordinator in chain of communications*]

3.4 Action for Individual Sites

3.5 Monitoring Protocols (See Appendix E)

3.6 Historic Structures

3.7 Curation and Document Management

3.7.1 Curation of Archaeological Materials

3.7.2 Archival of Documents and Photographs

4.0 Consultation [*How Douglas PUD will consult during the new license*]

5.0 HPMP Implementation Schedule [*Include protocol for revising the HPMP, new technologies/directions in historic properties management, etc.*]

6.0 Literature Cited

Appendix A – Consultation Record

Appendix B – Legislative Mandates

Appendix C – Historic Properties Studies Conducted in the Wells Project Area

Appendix D – Historic Properties Identified Within the Wells Project APE

Appendix E – Monitoring Protocol [*Include protocol for anticipated low water events*]

Appendix F – Treatment for Individual Historic Properties

WELLS RELICENSING STEPS FOR SECTION 106 COMPLIANCE

January 30, 2008

TASK		DESCRIPTION	ILP Schedule	Date Accomplished
1	Identify interested parties and stakeholders (36 CFR 800.3(c))	FERC and/or Douglas PUD should identify any tribes, agencies, or other interested parties who have an interest in cultural resources related to the Wells relicensing.	<u>October, 2005</u> : Stakeholder outreach	<u>August 8, 2005</u> : Information Request Letter <u>October 4, 2005</u> : Douglas PUD met with CCT Business Council <u>October 18, 2005</u> : ILP Information Meeting <u>November 18, 2005</u> : First Work Group Meeting
2	Establish policy-level consultation (36 CFR 800.2(c)(ii))	FERC should initiate policy-level consultation with agencies and tribes. FERC may decide to delegate day-to-day consultation to Douglas PUD.	<u>January, 2007</u> : Initial tribal consultation meeting	<u>December 7, 2005</u> : FERC sent delegation letter to RWG <u>May 16, 2006</u> : FERC Initial Tribal Consultation Meeting in Nespelem
3	Define Area of Potential Effect (APE) (36 CFR 800.4(a))	Define the area where cultural resources may be impacted by ongoing project operations. Seek formal concurrence from SHPO and THPO.	<u>January – March, 2006</u> : Pre-ILP consultation	<u>July 18, 2006</u> : Letters to THPO and SHPO seeking concurrence <u>July 25, 2006</u> : SHPO concurrence letter to Douglas PUD <u>October 25, 2006</u> : THPO concurrence letter to Douglas PUD
4	Background research to identify the scope of identification efforts (36 CFR 800.4(a)(2, 3, 4))	A professional archaeological/historic consultant conducts research to summarize previously completed studies in the Project area to obtain an understanding of what is known about historic use in the APE. This information is used to scope additional studies.	<u>March – September, 2006</u> : Gather information for PAD <u>November, 2006</u> : ILP Study Plans Due	<u>December 2006</u> : Wells Cultural Resources Data Review finalized <u>December 2006</u> : Cultural Resources Investigation included in PAD and filed with FERC
5	Study scoping: Identify historic properties (36 CFR 800.4(b)(1))	Develop scope of work for any studies planned to be implemented during the ILP two year study phase.	<u>September 2006 – October 2007</u> : ILP study scoping and FERC Study Plan Determination	<u>May 2007</u> : Scope of work finalized <u>October 11, 2007</u> : FERC issued study plan determination approving study plan
6	Phase I Study – Inventory (36 CFR 800.4(b)(1))	The entire APE is assessed and surveyed for cultural resources consistent with the study plan. A qualified consultant conducts research to determine if any TCPs exist in the APE.	<u>2008</u> : Conduct 1 st season of studies <u>October 2008</u> : File Initial Study Report	<u>January 2007</u> : TCP study initiated <u>July 2007</u> : Cultural Resources Investigation initiated
7	Phase II Study - Evaluation of site eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) (36 CFR 800.4(c))	The Section 106 parties will determine what level of site evaluation is needed to evaluate NRHP eligibility.	<u>2009</u> : Conduct 2 nd season of studies, if needed <u>October, 2009</u> : File Updated Study Report	
8	Assess adverse effects (36 CFR 800.5)	The Section 106 parties will assess the effects of ongoing Project operations on historic properties and develop treatments. A Draft HPMP will be filed with the Draft License Application.	<u>December, 2009</u> : Draft License Application due	
9	Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP)	Douglas PUD will consult with the Section 106 parties to develop a Historic Properties Management Plan which will be filed with the Final License Application.	<u>May, 2010</u> : Final License Application Filed	
10	Programmatic Agreement (36 CFR 800.14)	FERC develops and distributes a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for signature that commits the Licensee to implement the HPMP. This also documents FERC's completion of Section 106 and allows the SHPO and THPO to sign off on FERC's assessment of Project effects on historic properties.	<u>February, 2011</u> : FERC Issues Draft HPMP with draft NEPA document	

Wells Project Report of Progress
Cultural Resources Working Group Update

Provided by Colville Confederated Tribes
At the January 30, 2008 RWG Meeting



The Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation
P.O. Box 150, Nespelem, WA 99155

(509) 634-2200
FAX: (509) 634-4116



January 30, 2008

Wells Project Report of Progress, Cultural Resources Working Group Update

TRADITIONAL CULTURAL PROPERTY REPORT

The in-house draft TCP report is completed and in the final stages of in-house editing

ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELD WORK AND REPORTING

Task 1: Background Research

Background research was completed prior to the start of fieldwork. Site files with attendant data were compiled and used to conduct site reconnaissance. The background research additionally assisted field crews with providing National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations. However, the background research has not yet been formally integrated with the Berger/Hartmann report. The Excel Spreadsheet of site data has been transferred to an Access database. The project database will require updating throughout the project, all preliminary field data has been added from the 2007 work.

Task 2: Manage GIS-linked Site Form Files Database

The GIS-linked Site Form Files Database has been initiated. As new State of Washington Archaeological Site Inventory Forms are completed, they are saved with the corresponding GPS derived GIS data. Hyperlinks will be used to connect both the completed site forms and site photographs with the GIS data. The Site Condition Forms and Eligibility Recommendation Forms will be linked either separately or, more likely with, the Site Forms.

Task 3: Site Reconnaissance

Site Revisits began on October 2, 2007 and continued until November 8, 2007. During that time, Reconnaissance was completed at 119 of the 170 previously recorded sites in the project area. Site Reconnaissance involved compilation of new State of Washington Archaeological Site Inventory Forms, Site Condition Assessment Forms and National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendation forms.

Task 4: Intensive Survey, Okanogan River

The right bank has been surveyed. During the Intensive Survey, 31 of 40 previously recorded sites have been visited and updated and nine new archaeological sites were recorded. Of the nine

new sites, seven are historic, one prehistoric and one multi-component (historic and prehistoric). The remainder of the survey will be completed in the spring.

Task 5: Intensive Survey, Allotments

The Allotment Survey will begin during the spring field session.

Task 6: Transmission-Lines Corridor Survey

The Transmission Line Corridor survey is near complete. Less than 12 miles remain of the 41 mile long corridor. Of the remaining distance, less than one mile is within cultivated lands. The majority of the remaining corridor to be surveyed consists of the section that crosses Badger Mountain. To date, nine sites have been recorded in the Transmission Corridor. Of these, seven are historic and two are multi-component (prehistoric and historic).

Task 7: Site Forms and Site Locations

Each archaeological site visited, whether previously recorded or new, was recorded in the field on a State of Washington Archaeological Site Inventory Form. Site boundaries were recorded with GPS using a data dictionary utilizing State of Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation GIS Data Standards. All GPS data was differentially corrected and exported into GIS. The field forms will be finalized electronically in the office this winter.

Task 8: Evaluation of Project Effects and Site Condition

Field crews carried copies of a Site Condition Assessment form. The forms were completed for each site encountered, recorded, and filed in the site specific folder. A preliminary short list of critically impacted sites will be prepared by February 15, 2008; after all project area sites have been visited, a final short list of prioritized critical sites will be prepared.

Task 9: Eligibility Recommendations

Blank NRHP eligibility forms were carried in the field. The forms were compiled as sites were encountered and recorded. The forms will be used to generate the NRHP recommendations in the draft and final report.

Reporting

Background materials and copies of field forms were delivered to Steve Hamilton to begin report preparation.