



FCRPS Cultural Resources Sub-Committee (CRSC) Quarterly Meeting

December 4-5, 2012, Seattle, WA

Date: December 4-5, 2012

Time: December 4th – 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.
December 5th – 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Place: December 4th – Old Federal Building, rm. 163 (909 First Ave., Seattle, WA 98104)
December 5th – Jackson Building, Eagle Rm. (915 Second Ave., Seattle, WA 98104)

Agenda

December 4th

8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

- Introductions
- Approval of previous meeting notes
- Action Item review
- Executive Briefing results
- FY13 Performance Indicators
 - BOR-BPA
 - COE-BPA
- Program Goals & Measures
 - Client Survey – status and updates
 - FCRPS Cultural Resources database
- 2012 System Wide Conference Wrap-Up
 - Schedule for submission of break-out session notes
 - What worked? What didn't work?
 - Ideas for next time
 - Designation of conference planning lead for 2014 Conference
- Cooperating Group Issues
 - Area of Potential Effects (APE) determinations
 - Status review
 - Issue for discussion – single part vs. multipart APEs
 - Issue for discussion – moving APEs into the G2G process
 - Determinations of Eligibility
 - What's working and what's not working?
 - Lessons learned – Palus Village DOE
 - Challenges of integrating input from four tribes
 - Boundary issues

December 5th

8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

- 2012 Annual Report
 - Schedule
 - Roles & responsibilities
- System Wide Research Design – Action Plan development
 - Project Delivery Team
 - Schedule
 - Budget
 - Assignments
- FCRPS Cultural Resources Handbook Revision
 - Summary of comments received
 - Issues that need to be resolved prior to finalization
- Archaeological stabilization projects
 - Recent lessons learned
 - Funding/contracting strategies
- Review & Update Action Items

FY2013 Meeting Schedule

Dec 4 – 5, 2012 – Seattle

Mar 12-13, 2013 – Troutdale

June 25-26, 2013 – Boise

Sept 18-19, 2013 – Walla Walla

December 4th

8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Attendees

Gail Celmer	ACOE – Northwestern Division	Gail.C.Celmer@usace.army.mil (503) 808-3850
Lawr Salo	ACOE – Seattle District	lawr.v.salo@usace.army.mil (206) 764-3630
Alice Roberts (Day 1)	ACOE – Walla Walla District	Alice.K.Roberts@usace.army.mil (509) 527-7274
Katherine Pollock	BPA	khpollock@bpa.gov 503-230-3768
Mike Flowers	BoR – Grand Coulee Power Office	mflowers@usbr.gov (509) 633-9233
Sean Hess	BoR – Pacific Northwest Region Office	shess@usbr.gov (208) 378-5316
Kristen Martine	BPA	kdmartine@bpa.gov (503) 230-3607
Shelby Day	BPA	smday@bpa.gov 503-230-5601
Eric Peterson	BPA	ecpetersen@bpa.gov (503) 230-3786
Melanie Wadsworth	BPA	mlwadsworth@bpa.gov (503) 230-5143
Susan Tracey	BPA	sltracey@bpa.gov (503) 230-4659

September 2012 Meeting Notes Approved

Action Items for Oct. – Dec. 2012 Reviewed and Updated

Interagency Executive Meeting

FCRPS Cultural Resource Program Managers from BPA, the Corps, and Reclamation met with JOC Chairs, managers, and Executives on November 30, 2012 to provide a program status report. This meeting occurs biannually. Discussion points included:

- *Stabilization Maintenance:* There are long term costs associated with stabilization structures. The JOC Chairs want a system for tracking and reporting maintenance costs.
- *Client Survey:* The client survey will be finalized this spring. Sixty to 80 people will take the survey.
- *Performance Indicators (PIs) and Program Goals:* Reviewed PIs and Program Goals for FY13.
- *Program Funding and Contracting:* Corps staff discussed challenges associated with acquiring matching appropriated funds. Agency Program Managers are developing a Funding Agreement that will be signed by the three Lead Agencies to support acquisition of appropriated matching funds. Executives encouraged Program Managers to improve the contracting execution rate for Reclamation projects, which has been below 90%. Execution rates are based on actual expenditures and costs paid out, and are influenced by untimely invoicing by some contractors. If the execution rate does not improve, funds may be directed to other Operation and Maintenance work. Group discussed feasibility of using non-tribal contractors to improve program execution at both Corps and Reclamation projects, and the Executives approved this if necessary to improve execution rates.

Washington SHPO and Systemwide Programmatic Agreement (PA)

Agency staffs continue to work to acquire the Washington State Historic Preservation Officer's (SHPO) signature on the Systemwide PA. WA SHPO has stated that she will sign the document if the Colville Confederated Tribes (CCT) sign it. Guy Moura (Acting CCT THPO/Program Manager) has said that he will bring the document back to tribal council for consideration if the Agencies attach an ACHP letter clarifying their interpretation of language to the PA, and consider including the letter when the Systemwide PA undergoes five year review in 2014. Agency legal staffs are considering this proposal.

Area of Potential Effects (APE) for the Grand Coulee Mainstem

Defining the APE for the Grand Coulee Mainstem was a FY12 PI. This PI was not met. All other APEs across the FCRPS have been defined. BPA and Reclamation Executives are considering next steps, which may include continued discussions at the technical level, or an invitation for Government to Government consultation on the issue.

Roles and Responsibilities

The Agencies developed a table intended to clarify roles and responsibilities for program work in 2010 as part of a facilitated program alignment process. This document was updated in 2012 to address program changes, rotating duties, and new staff. The document was distributed and reviewed by the group.

FY13 Performance Indicators (PIs)

The FY13 PI reporting system has been changed to better reflect accomplishments. In the past, an agency either met the full performance level (stretch) of a PI, or failed to meet it. Restructuring permits agencies to receive partial credit (mid-range) for performance. The status of FY13 PIs follows.

- *PI #1:* Will complete survey for 20% of high priority areas at each Corps Project in FY13. Survey may not take place at some Projects that have already been inventoried.
- *PI #2:* Eight Determinations of Eligibility (DOE) for sites at Grand Coulee were transmitted to consulting parties for consensus determinations in October. This exceeds the PI requirement to transmit two DOEs for the Grand Coulee Project by the end of FY13. This PI has been met.
- *PI #3:* Work to transmit Corps FY13 draft Statements to BPA Project Managers for review by Dec. 31 is on schedule.
- *PI #4:* Work to draft FY14 SOWs for Reclamation Projects is on schedule.

Program Goals

The group reviewed scheduled work to accomplish long term Program Goals for FY13.

- *APE:* APE is defined for 13 Projects. Some Corps APEs may be adjusted in FY13 to address new real estate data. BPA and Reclamation Program Managers are working with agency Executives to establish a path for completing the Grand Coulee Mainstem APE.
- *Inventory:* Corps is conducting survey on 20% of high priority lands at each Project. Reclamation Coop Groups are developing inventory plans at Grand Coulee and Hungry Horse. The Spokane Tribe is contracted to complete 5,000 acres of survey on the Spokane Arm in FY13.
- *Determinations of Eligibility:* Agencies must complete 140 DOEs by the end of FY17 (2-3 per Project annually). The FY13 DOE target for Grand Coulee has been met. Meeting this target at Hungry Horse is contingent upon the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribe completing a Multiple Property Document that includes all 23 sites at the Project. The Corps is developing plans to meet this target and has contracted to complete several DOEs in FY13. The group discussed challenges associated with completing the DOE consultation process with the WA SHPO, including the requirement to submit all DOEs on 10-900 forms. Corps districts plan to expedite the DOE process through creation of Districts or Multiple Property determinations.
- *Mitigation:* Goal is to complete one mitigation or treatment and have one in the planning process at each Project annually. Progress is slower than expected because the planning process (environmental compliance and stabilization design) is taking two to three years. Group discussed how to get credit for creative mitigations such as public education, brochures, etc. that already exist or are being developed by the program. There was also discussion of a need to develop an expedited system for documenting adverse effects and tying these to specific mitigations.
- *Client Survey:* BPA has contracted with Portland State University to develop Client Surveys. Three have been drafted: one for internal Lead Agency use, one for program participants to evaluate relationships and use of program products, and one for regional stakeholders that don't participate in the program to assess how they use/might use program products in the future. Many comments were received during the Pilot Surveys administered in September. Agencies hope to finalize questions and implement the final survey in April or May of 2013.

FCRPS Cultural Resources Database

BPA continues to develop an Access Database that will track site information and the NHPA section 106 compliance process for the 3,700 sites in the FCRPS. The group discussed characterizations of temporal periods and ethnic affiliations, condition assessment and ARPA citations, types of impacts, and condition classifications. The current draft database uses monitoring classifications from various site forms in use across the system. The group agreed to use MT, ID, OR, and WA SHPO temporal classes.

2012 System Wide Conference Wrap-Up

The FCRPS Systemwide Cultural Resource Conference was held on October 23-25, 2012, in Spokane, WA at the Northern Quest Resort and Casino. Conference discussions focused on mitigation and TCPs, including a presentation by Paul Loether of the National Park Service Keeper's Office on the Bulletin 38 revision process, and a panel discussion. Conference evaluations have been reviewed, and comments were positive. BPA is assembling conference notes. The target date for distributing notes to conference participants is January 30, 2013.

Cooperating Group Issues

Area of Potential Effects (APE) Determinations: BPA and Reclamation continue to work with the CCT to complete the Grand Coulee Mainstem APE. Grand Coulee Spokane Arm and Hungry Horse are done. APEs for all Corps Projects are done, but there has been some additional legal review of the APEs in the Walla Walla District. Other Corps Districts are updating APE boundaries based on new real estate information. Some Coop Groups have expressed a desire to make separate "indirect effects" APEs, and the factors that should be considered in those determinations (visual effects, economic development, etc). CRSC members expressed that there is a need to prioritize direct effects first because erosion is such an active force in the reservoirs. They also discussed advantages and disadvantages of developing a consistent set of criteria for defining APEs across the system. Currently each Project has developed a unique set of criteria.

Determinations of Eligibility. The CRSC discussed various topics related to DOEs:

1. How do the Agencies work with private land owners if a TCP is identified on their property and Agencies plan to complete a DOE for that property? If Agencies involve private landowners how do Agencies manage sensitive information while affording landowners a voice in the process?

2012 Annual Report

The FY12 Annual Report is scheduled for distribution to Systemwide PA consulting parties on March 31, 2013. The Corps is coordinating assembly of the report this year. Project Managers and Archaeologists are updating information in tables and appendices. A section on maintenance costs associated with mitigation will be included in the FY13 Annual Report, but the CRSC should include descriptions of mitigation accomplishments in report project appendices this year. BPA will develop an Executive Summary for the FY12 report and post it on the FCRPS Cultural Resource Program web site this spring.

December 5, 2012

Systemwide Research Design – Action Plan development

About a half dozen people commented on the draft Systemwide Research Design at length. Agency staffs assigned to the Research Design revision will work to address comments, and conduct technical and peer reviews. Procedural steps include assembling comments, creating a SOW to address comments/complete technical editing, completing another review of the draft, and finalizing the document. Target date for completion of the next draft of the Research Design is 2014.

FCRPS Cultural Resources Handbook Revision

The FCRPS Cultural Resource Handbook is being updated to include new program information and agreement documents developed since 2005. The updated Handbook will serve as a resource for Agency staff that work in the program.

Archaeological Stabilization Projects – Lessons Learned in FY12

Group discussed lessons learned during stabilization projects implemented at the Grand Coulee, Albeni Falls, Chief Joseph, and Bonneville Projects.

1. Need a minimum of two to three years for project planning (not one year as previously assumed). This includes environmental review and stabilization design.
2. Need to consider availability of Project Delivery Team, as well as access (need for easements), and Endangered Species Act protections/permits.
3. Need to ensure contractor proposal is based on current data (At one site, bank had eroded by several feet by the time the contractor implemented project, and rock volume calculations needed to be increased). Need to ensure National Environmental Policy Act analysis is current.
4. Need to consider unpredictable weather/site conditions. Had to bring in specialized equipment at one stabilization site because there was not a hard freeze at the lake and work needed to be completed in unstable, muddy conditions. At another site, a barge damaged newly installed reno mats. At a third site, a barge could not be used because water was too shallow, and materials had to be transported to the site with a helicopter. In some areas, windy conditions or unstable soils make establishment of vegetation difficult.
5. Ensure other scheduled work does not interfere with project implementation (a debris removal project was scheduled for the same area/time at one stabilization site, increasing project costs)
6. Delays in project planning and implementation may result in loss of funds in a given fiscal year.
7. There can be unexpected delays in the contracting process.
8. NHPA consultation process (in this case, completion of the research design) can take time and may not be in control of the Agency.
9. Need to ensure monitoring is implemented at sites where new technologies such as the Envirolock System are used to evaluate effectiveness.
10. Need to look at various alternative treatments when proposing stabilization projects, and consider predicted long term effectiveness of proposed treatments, and long term maintenance costs.
11. Need to increase frequency of on-site monitoring during construction by an archaeologist during construction (once every two weeks is not enough). This could have eliminated the need for some follow-up repairs.
12. Should plan for 20% contingency to address unexpected problems/costs.
13. Need to include language that prohibits taking photos and/posting photos on public/social networking sites in future contracts.