

**FCRPS Cultural Resources Sub-Committee (CRSC)**  
**Quarterly Meeting Notes**

**DATE:** September 10-11, 2008  
**PLACE:** Welches, OR 97067

**AGENDA**

- **Introductions & Assign Note taker/Timekeeper**
- **GIS Systemwide Update (Connie)**
- **Update on Systemwide PA (Kimberly, Lynne & Gail)**
  - ✓ **Schedule for internal review**
  - ✓ **Schedule for Signature**
  - ✓ **PA Commitments (See PA Att. 2)**
  - ✓ **PA Att. 6**
- **FY08 Performance Indicators (Group)**
- **FY09 Performance Indicators (Group)**
- **FY09 Conference Planning (Group)**
  - ✓ **Volunteers for Planning Committee**
- **Systemwide Update on Treatment Strategies (will be a regular agenda item for group information sharing)**
- **Purpose of FCRPS Cultural Resources Program (Group)**
- **New Long-Term Funding Agreement (Kimberly, Lynne & Gail)**
  - ✓ **Planning for large stabilization projects**
- **TCP Documentation and Eligibility (See PA Section V.)**
  - ✓ **TCP APEs (Group)**
- **Action Items**
- **Schedule FY09 CRSC Mtg. Dates (bring your calendars)**

**Meeting Notes September 10, 2008**

**Attendees:** Jenn Richman, Corps; Gail Celmer, Corps; Kimberly St.Hilaire, BPA; Kristen Martine, BPA; Lynne MacDonald, Reclamation; Lawr Salo, Corps; Ray Tracy, Corps; Sean Hess, Reclamation; Connie Reiner, BPA; David Grant, Corps

**FY08 Performance Indicator Status**

Lawr updated the group on progress to date on the Chief Joe Project Specific PA (PSPA)

Questions about editing HPMPs-how have others done this in the past-some PMs found it was best to keep the editing in house because most editors don't understand the area of cultural resources management, terms used, etc.

The group discussed the target audiences for HPMPs. One audience is project staff who should be included in the review process.

The group discussed the purpose of HPMPs. A main purpose is prioritizing program activities for Section 106 compliance. Also, addressing project O&M functions.

Discussed the need to have HPMPs in alignment with Systemwide PA. The Libby, Albeni Falls HPMPs are on target for this. The Hungry Horse HPMP will need to be revised.

Discussed Agency approval processes for HPMPs:

- Reclamation HPMPs are technical not management documents so is there a need for official sign-off of HPMP?
- Corps has an official review process known as Feature Design Memorandum. PMs are on the approval chain in District then it goes to Division for comparable process. .
- BPA does not have an official sign-off on HPMPs

### **Update on Systemwide PA**

- The FY08 performance indicator for the Systemwide PA (SWPA) were met.
- Still awaiting ACHP comments so no discussion of ACHP comments.
- Estimate that 3-4 weeks will be needed for internal Corps review. Overview of changes since the last review should be provided to expedite the process.
- BPA will wait on internal review until the Corps/BoR review is completely done so we can address any changes.
- Schedule for SWPA review is dependent upon when ACHP comments are provided and the content (how much discussion/revision is needed) so the SWPA schedule was not set.

Discussion of first annual report under SWPA, which may be due March 31, 2010 if the SWPA is signed in FY09. Annual report will only cover activities funded under the joint program. Reporting will be done on final work, not draft or work in progress except for the narrative section of the report which can report on work in progress.

**Systemwide Research Design (SWRD):** Have two years after SWPA is signed to create a draft. Some interested individuals are considering what this will include. Discussion about the need to get away from project-focus in the SWRD. Need to remove impediments to ability to compare data within system. Challenge and difficulties of incorporating any information on TCPs discussed. It would take participation by the Tribes. Need to identify a work group of those truly interested in participation in SWRD. Breakout session at next annual conference would help develop a plan to move forward.

**Attachment 6 SWPA:** Question posed, why do we have Attachment 6? SHPOs and Project Managers (at Projects and FCRPS PMs) in support of the concept so we can efficiently address activities with “little” potential to affect and reduce letter writing. Will need to provide training on use of Att. 6. Need to make more explicit that CR specialist needs to review by moving sentence that CR specialist reviews up to front and bold or capitalize.

General discussion of WA DAHP’s new directive vis-à-vis Secretary of Interior Standards and OPM standards (that allows for experience in addition to education).

### **FCRPS Annual Conference Planning**

E-mail went out to 22 people for two conference calls on the 16<sup>th</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> to assess interest in participation in planning committee. Last time it got down to a small group of regular participants. It did not take that many hours to participate last time; conference agenda development took the most time. Everyone thought the break-out sessions were valuable.

Kristen provided conference planning materials from the last conference. Elder’s conference is advantageous/valuable but need to find a way for the participants to pay for the food, rather than trying to get agency funding.

Location – Requests that it be centrally located and near the river. Some locations discussed. Spokane is a possibility but Umatilla (Wild Horse) is also being considered. Tri-Cities? Hood River?

**FY09 Performance Indicators**

<b>FY09 PI</b>	<b>Interim Milestone</b>	<b>Interim Milestone</b>	<b>Interim Milestone</b>	<b>Final Milestone</b>
<b>1. Systemwide Programmatic Agreement (BPA, Reclamation &amp; Corps)</b>	Send final draft PA to ACHP and address ACHP comments by December 31, 2008	Complete internal review by lead agencies, address review comments by March 31, 2009.	Signature of final PA by 3 lead Agencies by June 30, 2009	Transmit final PA to external parties for signature by Sept. 30, 2009
<b>2. Program Planning and Execution (Corps &amp; BPA)</b>	Corps PMs draft new FY09 SOWs and provide to BPA PMs for cooperative review by January 31, 2009	Corps PMs complete FY10 annual work plans/budgets by March 1, 2009 and submit to Corps and BPA Program Managers		Corps PMs submit all FY09 contract documents to contracting by May 1, 2009
<b>3. Program Planning and Execution (Reclamation &amp; BPA)</b>	BPA PM and Reclamation Archeologist gather input from CGs on FY10 annual plans by March 31, 2009	BPA PM and Reclamation Archeologist work together to develop FY10 annual work plans and provide to CG members and BPA and Reclamation CRSC Co-Chairs by June 30, 2009		BPA PM and Reclamation Archeologist work together to draft technical sections of FY10 SOWs by July 15, 2009

PA - Programmatic Agreement  
 ACHP - Advisory Council on Historic Preservation  
 SOW - Statements of Work  
 PM - Cultural Resource Program Project Managers  
 CRSC - Cultural Resource Subcommittee

Discussion of new Corps contracting milestones; new 31 Jan milestones for SOWs and contracting documents to Contracting by 1 May (we have no control over contracting Division’s schedules as to time contracts are awarded). Submissions of proposed budgets is needed by March 1, earlier in FY09 than in previous year

Discussion of BPA-Reclamation PI.

**GIS Systemwide Update**

Connie Reiner presented an update on the work done thus far on the FCRPS GIS Survey Database. Last update to CRSC was one year ago. Two issues last year were condition of

Nickens data and lack of Libby data. Review of the data provided by Nickens data now 95% done. Libby data sharing agreement signed so site data is available; does not include survey data.

Project by Project Status discussed.

Chief Joe - Lawr will provide special data to Connie and vice versa, discussion of sharing logistics, data dictionaries, timelines. Lots of GIS work needed to finish CJ HPMP so will get a lot done by end of FY08 which can be incorporated in the database.

Albeni Falls – Last data obtained does not contain complete tabular data. All survey data is in polygon form derived from mean low water line to mean high water line. Lawr needs to reconstruct this from historical data but has been stalled for a year. Connie and Lawr will work together on completing the data. Technical discussion of historical maps ensued, format, georectification, extraction of high/low water line. Lawr will send .tiff files of historic maps to Connie.

Libby – Connie has site data for Libby but no survey data. Scanned polygons of 1976 survey maps and crude 1988 maps. Large amount of work needed to georectify and digitize. Discussion of how to proceed. Will attempt to create pre-FCRPS survey polygons and work with FS to obtain data-they have a GIS system that also requires reporting.

John Day – Kristen said 2007 survey data and some 2004 survey is pending. One report is still missing and Kristen thinks she may be able to obtain this from the Umatilla. They have been very helpful providing data.

The Dalles – Good info available on south side but not north side. Some reports may be missing from Corps files. Suggestion to go the WA DAHP for north side for all surveys post 1995, FCRPS or not.

Bonneville – Sparsely populated with survey data. Connie will work with Kristen to determine if more can be done. Prior survey reports sometimes provided without survey maps.

Dworshak – 100% done inputting the available geospatial data provided by Nickens and the Corps. Lawr – any project boundary map? No, but probably the easiest Project to generate project boundaries. Then APE per SWPA.

Lower Granite – 100% done inputting the available geospatial data provided by Nickens and the Corps. (data provided based on one report, but there is likely more data that should be investigated).

Lower Monumental – Are there additional reports/data? The Corps said yes, so discussion on how to obtain them. Connie said she has received some information without spatial data. Kimberly asked PMs to search for this data not Connie, so she can focus on the database, not spend her time searching for reports/information.

Discussion that archeologists could benefit from this resource. Some regional experts in the field would be able to identify missing gaps.

Ice Harbor – Connie has not received reports that involved survey in the Project area. Ray and Gail will follow up with District staff.

Lake Roosevelt - Spokane Arm survey data needs to be revisited. Need to obtain some reports from CCT. Reclamation has some potential data on USGS maps they will provide Connie. Is there reliable data from historical surveys? Mention of Chance, 1994 surveys which Nickens did not include but needs to be obtained. Need to check SHPO database.

**Discussion of how to safely disseminate the data.** Secure web page for non-GIS data users. Need to consider existing data sharing agreements and ensure Connie has copies. Recommend access should be limited to CR personnel. Currently data consists of only survey information not site data. If survey data is made available beyond CR staff, need for explicit statement that the data is not to be used without discussion with CR staff.

## **Systemwide Update on Treatment Strategies**

Ray presented example of a recent site treatment plan at McNary project for a temporary fix (five to ten years and maybe longer) consisting of filter fabric, rock, and pea gravel for recreation purposes. Approximate cost is 200K. Sand was used in the past to address erosion but it was lost in one season at this location. Effective life of stabilization projects needs to be considered. General discussion in agreement of need to account somehow for life and maintenance costs.

One stabilization project at Albeni Falls finished Section 106 but ran into environmental issues such as request for more alternatives analysis. There will be more and more pushback against use of rock due to increase in water temperature (not fish friendly). Softer solutions need a lot more up front work and will cost a lot more. Rock may work the best for CR but planning process is tightening up. Considering the habitat for resident fish, not just ESA-listed species, is required.

As the FCRPS program implements more stabilization, the environmental, planning, and construction costs are going to increase. Need to consider alternatives to stabilization, such as data recovery and other alternatives. Stabilization as a treatment is becoming more and more difficult to accomplish because of increased planning, design constraints, resulting in increased costs.

Sometimes required to add features to stabilization designs for recreation or from fish and wildlife. Discussion of how much other programs should contribute. The Corps and BPA MOA lists what will and will not be funded and it took years to develop. Not always clear cut when it comes to projects that have multiple uses and impacts. .

Discussion of vegetation management: goats to clear one site of noxious tree species but problems with regrowth.

## **Purpose of FCRPS Cultural Resource Program (Group)**

There are new personnel in program. Need for education of program staff about what we are trying to accomplish.

Performance Indicators for FY09 moving back into roles/processes spelled out in the Handbook. Discussion of role of Cooperating Groups (CG) in the overall structure of the Program.

## **New Long-Term Funding Agreement**

Long-term funding questions and need to come up with a plan in FY09. Libby, Albeni, and Chief Joseph have annual, 5-year, and 10-year plans. Need to discuss project priorities with CGs. Also, CRSC needs to discuss how to address proposals for large capital investment projects above and beyond FCRPS program funding. Will long-term plan be based on funding or timing? BPA rate case is separate from Corps and BoR processes but need to coordinate in some way.

## **Meeting Notes September 11, 2008**

Group discussion of funding and staffing issues prior to call to Mike Alder at BPA to discuss long-term planning and funding. Discussion of dedicated FCRPS positions but with part time assistance/backup at GS-9 levels, for example.

Corps asked how funding for large treatment projects, for example, would be planned for and programmed by the Corps for their required match by Project. It can't be only Power funds due to the way the Corps get authorization and appropriation by project by year. Tribes at Lake Roosevelt concerned about limited budget for treatments such as stabilization.

Corps discussion of O&M budgeting two years in advance and how budgets are developed. BPA O&M budget is developed on a five-year timeframe. In looking at future funding needs, we should consider an escalation factor.

Discussion of what future activities should be included in the program. Could we have student interns, for example to help create a pool of future hires as well as get admin/clerical/records management assistance. Inter-agency personnel agreements can draw from a pool of interns. Discussed schedule for creating an internal draft for funding proposal. Then need internal agency review of funding proposal and inclusion of consulting parties.

The HPMPs have long-term plans that need to be the heart of the long-term systemwide program planning. Lawr and Dave will send Libby, AF, and CJ long-term program plans from HPMPs to CRSC members. Everyone needs to submit their existing long-term plans to CRSC before next meeting.

Group discussion – Important to ask assistance of CGs to develop tasks and needs.

Mike Alder spoke about need for post FY12 funding proposal. Current CR funding agreement for Reclamation ends in FY12. Need to begin drafting a new funding agreement in FY09 to be included in the FY12 rate case. This agreement will eventually be approved by agency heads. There will need to be significant tribal involvement. Corps commented that they are on a different funding schedule than Reclamation and their funding will not be expended for several more years. Corps suggested that their new agreement start later than Reclamation's agreement.

Timeframe for new funding agreement discussed. Some concerned about having to re-do every five-years but 15 year commitment may be too long. A five-year commitment could raise concerns about continued commitment so ten years suggested. Reminder we need to look at our needs and funding processes first and the timeframe can be discuss during consultation.

### **TCP Documentation and Eligibility (See PA Section V.)**

SWPA requirements for development of a process for TCP documentation. This should be discussed at the next FCRPS conference. Alternative procedures necessary. Started with Tribal concerns about SHPO involvement in TCPs. Discussed how the standard site forms and the NPS 10-900 form don't fit well for TCPs. Need to consider a different site form for TCPs (like DOE type site forms).

Discussed how to start an alternative process for TCPs. Suggestion to start discussion in CGs by identifying concerns. Discuss whether there is an interest in going through formal NR process. It may be that for some sites, most management concerns could be addressed under Criterion D.

For other TCPs, this does not work. Need to have a breakout session at annual conference so those interested in participating can attend.

Discussed how different SHPOs have different procedures for Determination of Eligibility. Talked about consensus determination procedure and how some SHPOs require 10-900 forms and others don't. Discussed the need to provide sufficient information and rationale, so need for a consistent format. DOEs should not be particularly burdensome if you have generated the information already. Systemwide research design will have context and be able to provide types of properties that are clearly eligible.

For TCPs can there be a new form that can be used as site form and with statement of eligibility as alternative to 10-900?

Kristen/Ray/Sean – will start to develop a draft form for FCRPS that can be used for consensus determinations (not nomination to NR). “10-900 EZ form”

### **TCP APEs**

Question if anyone has defined APE for TCPs. Discussion of current APE definition in Hungry Horse HPMP. Concern about when level of documentation for inventory and evaluation slips into treatment. Also, where do you draw line for documentation of linear features that extend outside of APE?

Discussion of what level of documentation is needed for inventory and evaluation. Suggestion that we need look at the type of resource to determine APE.

### **FY09 CRSC Meeting Schedule**

December 3 and 4 (Seattle)

February 25 and 26 (Boise) June 10 and 11 (Spokane)

September 15 and 16 (Portland)

### **Action items**

Lawr/Dave – Project PA drafts (done), Send 10-year plans to group

Kristen/Ray/Sean – Will develop the draft “10-900 EZ form” by next CRSC meeting

Lynne/Gail/Kimberly – continue work on Systemwide PA

Annual Conference – Three suggested breakout sessions:

TCP documentation (new form)

Systemwide Research Design

Long-term Program Planning