

**Final  
Meeting Summary  
Cultural Resources Working Group  
JANUARY 13, 2005**

**Attendees:**

|               |                 |                                  |
|---------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| Present:      | Emily Armstrong | Kearns & West                    |
|               | Lou Beihn       | Pacific Legacy Liaison           |
|               | Melvin Carmen   | North Fork Mono Tribe            |
|               | Kathy Childers  | Big Sandy Rancheria              |
|               | Laughing Coyote | Native Earth Foundation          |
|               | Tom Jackson     | Pacific Legacy                   |
|               | Steve Marsh     | USFS                             |
|               | Mark Newquist   | SCE                              |
|               | Darinda Otto    | Shaver Crossing Railroad Station |
|               | Bill Pistor     | Kearns & West                    |
|               | Lorrie Planas   | USFS                             |
|               | Cindy Whelan    | USFS                             |
|               | Mary Adelzadeh  | North Fork Rancheria             |
|               | Mark Smith      | USFS                             |
| On telephone: | Van Button      | FERC                             |
|               | Geoff Rabone    | SCE                              |
|               | Dorothy Sherman | Mono Nation                      |
|               | Tom Taylor      | SCE                              |

**Introductions, Groundrules; Review Agenda & Revise, if Necessary; Review Past Action Items:**

Bill asked the group introduce themselves and reviewed groundrules and the draft agenda. Bill asked Tom Jackson if the draft HPMP will be out in February. Tom said they are still on track for that date. Laughing Coyote asked for an HPMP status update. Bill said Tom is currently drafting the document and February is the target date to present the draft material. Tom said he will provide a handout summarizing effects and treatment measures discussed by the work group since October. We'll try to clarify some suggestions made in the work group today.

Cindy Whelan distributed a handout regarding USFS comments on the remaining sites they have not previously commented on. It is a complete package of what USFS knows about each site to date (See Action Item #1 below).

Lorrie mentioned the site-specific responses distributed by Cindy and said they used the same format as Pacific Legacy. Cindy said that the sites are grouped by ALP, historic, prehistoric and overlapping sites from the transmission separation projects and the ALP. Lorrie said there are 16 sites listed in the ALP that are also listed in separation project. She asked how those sites would be treated. Tom Taylor said that sites affected by the

transmission separation project will be addressed there and that ALP sites will be dealt within the ALP. Lorrie clarified that this group won't discuss the sites only affected by the transition project but the overlapping sites will be addressed by both projects. Tom said essentially they will be addressed in both processes.

**Meeting notes review:** Lorrie clarified on page 2 of the December meeting notes. She said in regard to bracken fern gathering sites around Shaver Lake, people didn't want to deal with locked gates. She further clarified on page 3 that who will actually be filling in the SJ&E railroad grade data gaps is still in question. She thought Tom Jackson would be working with Darinda. An architectural evaluation of the cabin itself is lacking. Darinda said she looked at the preliminary survey and found sites they missed, especially in the Three Mile section. She has a draft report and a map that she is working to add more sites to. Tom said we need to understand the resource as it relates to the project, so if Darinda has information that shows the impact, we will work with her to understand those affects (See Action Item #2, below).

Lorrie asked about the sensitive plants handout on page 3 and Joanna's question of management of plant resources. Tom said that discussion will occur at the February meeting since Joanna is not available today.

The group approved the meeting notes.

**Impacts and management discussion:** Tom Jackson said the group has been working since October to discuss impacts and management of resources. The first handout is a compilation of the information considered by the work group and the management approaches or recommendations provided by the work group. There are some unresolved issues in the right column. Today he would like to try to address some of these outstanding issues with a goal of developing consensus on how the issues will be addressed in the HPMP. Then, the group can talk about how appropriate these management activities are for other resources of the same type. Lorrie said the Forest Service will have to look at every site to give a clearer response in the end. Tom said there are limited numbers of project affects on the resources and a limited number of types of properties we are addressing. Work group recommendations have been consistent and he thinks the group can get to consensus on the management approach.

Tom said that the group still needs to determine if a site is being affected in a recreational setting. This requires management that addresses those recreation impacts, which needs to be determined by the Forest Service and FERC. Cindy said this particular site is a license required recreation element and we would view it as part of the license. Van said eventually the FERC environmental document is going to have to reference the management recommendations and we would not want recommendations that the Forest Service was unable or unwilling to administer.

Laughing Coyote asked if the group needs to examine each site and then provide recommendations. Bill said that is what we have done over the past few months, but in terms of recreation, the group has asked the Forest Service to provide guidance. Tom

said he is trying to point out that this recreation issue is a particularly complicated management issue, and we need to identify a range of management options that the Forest Service, FERC, and the work group are willing to entertain.

Cindy said the Forest Service actually did make particular recommendations on that site. That information is provided in the package she distributed today. The Forest Service comments need to be added in to the document Tom handed out. Cindy said that some of the sites need additional comments.

Laughing Coyote asked if the work group is providing recommendations to these sites today. Tom said no; we have to deal with where there is uncertainty, like on page 3 of the December meeting notes, for example. He would like clarification on the notion of surface collection of tools and what that means.

The group discussed various ways to protect the sites in question. Tom asked about the process for collecting materials. Is it a one time event, or what does the notion of continual monitoring mean? Some group members suggested things like planting native species over sites or collecting surface artifacts and then planting native species. Others thought that the artifacts there now should be left as is or buried.

Tom introduced the question of periodic monitoring of the sites. How does this tie into managing the resource? He talked about the possibility of the caretakers or hosts conducting periodic monitoring. Laughing Coyote said that it can't be assumed that a campground caretaker or someone similar would be able to identify important artifacts. Ron thinks that the group should not worry about collecting right now and focus on studying the sites while information is still available.

Van said there are two kinds of sites; good sites and sites that are eroded and over collected. Tom said the two sites we have discussed so far are significant sites and eligible for the National Register. He asked if there is value in collecting material from the sites that are in good shape. Van said it might be valuable to place the items somewhere where the community could enjoy them. Laughing Coyote said it has as much value left in the ground to the Native American community.

Bill asked what the other group members thought about collecting at sites. Cindy said the Forest Service doesn't ever recommend collecting at sites, they recommend covering. The Forest Service would look at individual sites to determine what kinds of materials are available on a site by site basis. Van said he thinks FERC, the Forest Service, and the Native Americans are saying to leave things in place. We should emphasize the agreement that group members think the best option is to leave sites undisturbed or to ensure that they stay undisturbed in the future. Cindy asked if there is data recovery option. Van said yes, if a site is actively affected or at risk. The group needs to discuss that option for certain situations.

Bill summarized the discussion. The group seems to be in favor of some sort of monitoring or policing, it is just a matter of determining the details. He asked Tom if he

had enough information to put something together. Tom said yes, but we need to elicit what the group's conception of monitoring entails. The illegal activity needs to be addressed through monitoring.

Laughing Coyote asked if it is the responsibility of the licensee to provide the monitoring and a trained person to do the monitoring. Van said yes, FERC can require SCE to do that. Laughing Coyote said a Native American might be very helpful in this situation. He asked if Van could provide an example of a project where the licensee has an agreement with Native Americans to do monitoring (See Action Item #3 below).

Cindy mentioned a third party monitor like a contractor or a group that is responsible for monitoring. The Forest Service would be interested in discussing someone other than itself being the responsible monitoring party. Tom asked what the role of the monitor is. Laughing Coyote said the monitor would have a list of sites he visits every month where he assesses the condition of the sites. Van said the more site specific the recommendations, the better. He also recommended a set of recommendations for prevention and a set of recommendations for how often a site should be checked. Van said he can provide the Crane Valley Monitoring Plan as an example (See Action Item #4 below).

Ron discussed his experience with monitoring sites and how it is important to have a trained professional like a law officer deal with the collectors. He suggested a plenary-like action where stakeholders sign-off on a document stating that they will alert someone when they see illegal activity going on out there.

Tom Taylor said that they can give the SCE people training, but we don't want people getting into confrontations out there. SCE can observe what is happening at the sites, but he thinks preservation measures should be in place in the plan and evaluated to determine if they are working or not.

Tom asked what the next steps are if the monitor discovers damage. How does he report it and what does he do? Laughing Coyote said it seems the protocol is to notify the Forest Service and let them deal with the situation. Lou asked about the follow through from the Forest Service. Her experience has been that the Forest Service doesn't follow through when notified of site disturbance. Cindy suggested finding someone other than the government to take care of the sites like tribes, the licensee, or a review group.

Cathy said that public outreach and education can have a huge impact. She suggested devising some sort of campaign funded by FERC or SCE. The group discussed the value of this and the magnitude of involvement possible. Van said it might be appropriate to have a section in the HPMP that is dedicated to a public outreach plan. Laughing Coyote supports the public education idea. He asked if the protection and management of the sites rests with the licensee. Van said yes, but we are just trying to figure out the best way to do this. A public education plan is a small part of the larger picture.

Tom said he will keep building the HPMP based on this discussion. The group asked that as much information as possible be distributed before the meeting.

Bill reviewed the action items and said the next meeting is scheduled for February 10.

The meeting was adjourned.

*Action Items from the January Meeting*

**Action Item #1:** Ryan Bricker (Kearns & West) will distribute the USFS Summary of Comments on Reports Associated with Archaeological Resources in the Mammoth Pool APE to the remainder of the CRWG.

**Action Item #2:** Tom Jackson and Darinda Otta will work offline and look at the information Darinda has been compiling on historical resources located on her property.

**Action Item #3:** Van Button to provide examples of other FERC projects where the licensees have agreements with the Native Americans to do monitoring.

**Action Item #4:** Van Button to provide the group with the Crane Valley monitoring plan.