Additional Information Request No. 8 - Bald Eagles

Bald eagles, which are federally listed as threatened in Washington, winter in the Skagit River Basin. To determine whether issuance of a new license is likely to affect the bald eagle, the staff needs the following information.

a. In your letter dated June 8, 1988, you stated that it is unlikely that project construction had a significant impact on the wintering bald eagle population. Provide the comments of FWS, NPS, and WDW on your statement.

b. Large river flow fluctuations can wash salmon carcasses downstream, reducing the availability of the carcasses as food for bald eagles. You stated, in your letter dated June 8, 1988, that your reduction in project-induced flow fluctuations since 1981 has indirectly contributed to eagle enhancement. You further stated that the FS is reviewing its information on bald eagles to determine whether any additional concerns remain about project operation effects on bald eagles downstream from the project that you should address. (The FS manages the reach of the Skagit River, downstream from the project, that is a designated component of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System.)

- Provide any available information to substantiate your belief that wintering bald eagle use of the Skagit River, downstream from the project, has been enhanced since 1981.
- Provide the comments of FS, WDW, NPS, and FWS on the effects of project operation on bald eagles.
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8.0 BALD EAGLES

Information on the effects of project construction on bald eagles wintering along the Skagit River is provided in the Threatened and Endangered Species Report, Section 7.6. In addition, this report also contains the analysis of bald eagle use of the Skagit River downstream of the project area before and after 1981.

The statement referenced in part 8a of the AIR was not actually in the June 8, 1988 letter, but rather is contained in the 1988 HEP report by Brueggeman, et al. (The report's conclusions are incorporated into the Threatened and Endangered Species Report, Sections 7.6.4.1 and 7.6.4.2.) The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, and Washington Department of Game all accepted the report as submitted to the FERC in June 1988 (letters of acceptance enclosed in Appendix 8).
Appendix B. Agency Consultation - Acceptance of Report "Study of Skagit Dams Original Impacts on Wildlife and Fish Habitats and Populations"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Date of Report Acceptance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Jarvis, National Park Service</td>
<td>Richard Rutz, Seattle City Light</td>
<td>July 20, 1988</td>
<td>August 1, 1988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Art Stendal  
Washington Department of Wildlife  
1531 Forest Ridge Place  
Mt. Vernon, WA 98273

Dear Art:

I am pleased to provide to you, as a member of the Habitat Evaluation Procedures (HEP) Team and as a party to the Skagit Hydroelectric Project (FERC No. 553) relicensing proceedings, a copy of the three volumes that comprise the final product of study, "Skagit Dams Original Impacts on Wildlife and Fish Habitats and Populations." Since no changes were made to the map, the map in your draft report should be transferred to this final report; this will then give you two copies of the map.

I would also like to confirm your acceptance of the findings documented in the report, as agreed in the HEP team meeting held on April 28, 1988 and in subsequent phone calls. Please acknowledge your acceptance of the findings in this report by signing in the designated place below and return this letter to me at the above address.

I will be contacting HEP team members shortly to arrange a meeting to discuss how we may proceed with the Wildlife Issue, now that the Study is complete. If you have any questions, please call me at (206) 684-3108.

Sincerely,

Richard Rutz, Associate Environmental Analyst  
Environmental Affairs Division

Enclosures

As a representative of Washington Department of Wildlife, I accept the report entitled "Study of Skagit Dams Original Impacts on Wildlife and Fish Habitats and Populations."

[Signature]

7-26-88  
(date)
Jonathan Jarvis  
North Cascades National Park Complex  
2105 Highway 20  
Sedro Woolley, WA 98284  

Dear Jon:  

I am pleased to provide to you, as a member of the Habitat Evaluation Procedures (HEP) Team and as a party to the Skagit Hydroelectric Project (FERC No. 553) relicensing proceedings, a copy of the three volumes that comprise the final product of study, "Skagit Dams Original Impacts on Wildlife and Fish Habitats and Populations." Since no changes were made to the map, the map in your draft report should be transferred to this final report; this will then give you two copies of the map.

I would also like to confirm your acceptance of the findings documented in the report, as agreed in the HEP team meeting held on April 28, 1988 and in subsequent phone calls. Please acknowledge your acceptance of the findings in this report by signing in the designated place below and return this letter to me at the above address.

I will be contacting HEP team members shortly to arrange a meeting to discuss how we may proceed with the Wildlife Issue, now that the Study is complete. If you have any questions, please call me at (206) 684-3108.

Sincerely,

Richard Rutz, Associate Environmental Analyst  
Environmental Affairs Division

Enclosures

As a representative of National Park Service - NOCA, I accept the report entitled "Study of Skagit Dams Original Impacts on Wildlife and Fish Habitats and Populations."

[Signature]  8-1-88  
(date)

"An Equal Employment Opportunity - Affirmative Action Employer"  
City of Seattle - City Light Department, City Light Building, 1015 Third Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 625-3000  
App. 8-3
Dear Estyn:

I am pleased to provide to you, as a member of the Habitat Evaluation Procedures (HEP) Team and as a party to the Skagit Hydroelectric Project (FERC No. 553) relicensing proceedings, a copy of the three volumes that comprise the final product of study, "Skagit Dams Original Impacts on Wildlife and Fish Habitats and Populations." Since no changes were made to the map, the map in your draft report should be transferred to this final report; this will then give you two copies of the map.

I would also like to confirm your acceptance of the findings documented in the report, as agreed in the HEP team meeting held on April 28, 1988 and in subsequent phone calls. Please acknowledge your acceptance of the findings in this report by signing in the designated place below and return this letter to me at the above address.

I will be contacting HEP team members shortly to arrange a meeting to discuss how we may proceed with the Wildlife Issue, now that the Study is complete. If you have any questions, please call me at (206) 684-3108.

Sincerely,

Richard Rutz, Associate Environmental Analyst
Environmental Affairs Division

RR:dc

Enclosures

As a representative of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, I accept the report entitled "Study of Skagit Dams Original Impacts on Wildlife and Fish Habitats and Populations."

(signed) (date)
Additional Information Request No. 9 - Cultural Resources

Significant archaeological and historic sites may be located in the project vicinity and affected by continued operation of the project. The documents on archaeology filed with the applicant's letter, dated June 8, 1988, indicate that archaeological sites are likely located along the fluctuation zone of Ross Lake and that archaeological sites may be located also in the fluctuation zone of Diablo Lake. Further, based on a telephone conversation with a member of your environmental staff (Richard Rutz) on August 26, 1988, the project dams and the associated power plants and project buildings may have historical significance.

The National Historic Preservation Act (Act) requires that the Commission staff determine the impacts of projects proposed for relicensing on any archaeological and historic sites listed or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places, including archaeological or historic sites of religious or other cultural concern to local Native American groups. In order to ensure compliance with the Act at projects proposed for relicensing, the staff has recently prepared guidelines for applicants and consulted agencies on the scope of the investigations and documentation necessary to assess the impacts of these projects on National Register listed or eligible sites. A copy of the guidelines is attached.

Therefore, the applicant should file a report on an archaeological or historical survey of the project.

- The report must adhere to the attached Commission staff guidelines.
- The report should incorporate the results of the previous reconnaissance surveys of Diablo Lake and Ross Lake.
- The report should include the results of consultation with local Native American groups, in addition to the results of consultation with the Washington State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and the NPS (Jim Thomson, Regional Archaeologist, Pacific Northwest Regional Office, Seattle, Washington).
- The applicant should take care to include in the survey and the report all project facilities and use areas associated with the project, including the transmission corridor, the Gorge Lake facilities, and any recreation areas. All such locations should receive at a minimum a stage I survey as defined in the guidelines.
- The report should also include a detailed cultural resources management plan to avoid or mitigate impacts to any National Register listed or eligible sites.
- In evaluating the significance of any sites of Native American concern, the applicant should adhere to recently proposed guidelines by the NPS National Register office entitled "Traditional Cultural Properties: Guidelines for Evaluation" by Patricia L. Parker and Thomas F. King. (A copy may be obtained by telephone from Patricia L. Parker at 202-343-9500.)
To protect the confidentiality of site locations:

- File five copies of the report separately from other filings of additional information.
- Include with the other filings, however, a summary description of the investigations, so that agencies and groups or individuals receiving copies of the filing are appraised of the general nature of the investigations undertaken to satisfy the request. The summary should approximate the amount of information that would be included in the exhibit E of an application for relicensing, as defined in the attached guidelines.
APPLICATIONS FOR RELICENSE
GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING
CULTURAL RESOURCES SECTIONS
OF THE EXHIBIT E AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

INTRODUCTION

The process of relicensing hydroelectric projects must consider the impacts of the project on archeological and historic sites in the project area, including any sites of cultural value to Native American and other ethnic groups. In preparing its assessment of the environmental impacts for the project, prior to relicensing, the Commission staff must ensure compliance with the provisions of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (Act), as amended. The Act requires federal agencies to protect, or mitigate for the loss of archeological, historical, or cultural properties that are listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) prior to any licensing action.

In many cases, the existing hydroelectric facilities themselves may represent historical and cultural values. For example, many such developments were constructed in the early 1900s and represent an important contribution to the history and development of the local area. The facilities may also have historical significance with respect to the development of the hydroelectric industry. The development of hydropower has further commonly been at sites previously used for waterpower, such as gristmills, and has often incorporated elements of the previous development, including dams and waterways, into the present facilities. In addition, some developments have been located at sites of natural water features, such as waterfalls and rapids, that may have served as gathering points for man prior to written history. Thus, it is very likely that many facilities, and earlier developments at these locations, are of archeological, historical, or cultural significance.

The once common characteristic shared by most existing hydroelectric developments constructed prior to the passage of the Act is that very few, if any, investigations have been conducted to determine the presence of archeological and historic sites in the impact areas of the developments, the eligibility of any inventoried sites for listing in the National Register, and the project impacts to National Register listed or eligible sites. Such investigations, or surveys, must be performed by a professional archeologist and/or historian in consultation with: (1) the State Historical Preservation Officer (SHPO); (2) the regional office of the National Park Service Office (NPS); and (3) any federal land-managing agency (FLMA) such as the Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management that administers lands in the project area. The surveys are needed in order to reach a determination of eligibility and to provide an analysis of the impacts of the proposed action on any listed or National Register eligible sites. The Commission staff cannot determine the impacts of the projects on such sites and comply with the Act without such information.

In the case where a new license is sought for a facility where no change in project features or operation is proposed, the survey would usually be limited to the project dam, the powerhouse, transmission line, and any other project components.
However, where changes in the project are proposed, including any changes in reservoir elevation or project operation, the survey should be extended to all areas that would be directly or indirectly affected by the proposed changes.

**Project Facilities**

The Exhibit E should contain a discussion of the historical significance of the existing project facilities. Specifically, the applicant must indicate if the existing hydroelectric facilities are listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The determination should be based on consultation with the SHPO, the NPS, and the FLMA, and, if necessary, on a historical assessment of the project facilities conducted by a professional historian.

If it is determined that the facilities are listed or eligible, then the applicant should include as an appendix to the cultural resources section of the Exhibit E, a completed National Register Nomination Form documenting the significance of the facilities: (1) in the case of listed or previously determined eligible facilities, the forms have already been completed, and the applicant simply needs to obtain a copy of the completed form from the SHPO or from the National Register of Historic Places (an office of the National Park Service), and attach a copy of this form to the cultural resources section; (2) if the facilities have not been previously determined eligible, then a form needs to be completed for the facilities in consultation with the SHPO, the NPS, and the FLMA. Project structures should be documented on the same form wherever possible. A single form normally more clearly establishes the relationships between the facilities, and requires less documentation than the treatment of the facilities on an individual basis. However, more than one form may need to be completed, if the facilities are not historically related. National Register Nomination Forms may be obtained from the SHPO, the NPS, or the National Register.

If the project facilities are listed or eligible, the Exhibit E should describe the impacts of the project on the facilities and provide a proposed cultural resources management plan that would be implemented to avoid or mitigate impacts after relicensing of the project. In all cases, repair work and routine maintenance work should be considered as potential impacts and considered in the cultural resources management plan. The mitigation necessary in this case is to conduct any such work after consultation with the SHPO, the NPS, and the FLMA in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Historic Preservation Projects.

Any proposed modifications of National Register listed or eligible facilities must also be described in detail. If the modifications would affect the historical integrity of such facilities, as defined on the Nomination Form, mitigation must be included in the cultural resources management plan for the facilities. Normally, the appropriate mitigation would be: documentation of the affected areas in accordance with the standards of the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) of the National Park Service; any rebuilding of the facilities be conducted in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation; any new structures be constructed so as to blend with the historical character of the facilities in accordance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Historic Preservation Projects; any such mitigative work be constructed after consultation with the SHPO and the HAER and be based on the recommendations of the SHPO and the HAER; and the results of
such work be documented in a report and filed with the Commission for approval within 6 months after the completion of the work.

As for documentation of the project facilities, the description of impacts and the proposed cultural resources management plan must be based on consultation with the SHPO, the NPS, and the FLMA. Copies of letters from the SHPO, the NPS, and the FLMA should be included in the Exhibit E cultural resources section documenting consultation on: (1) the National Register significance of project facilities, (2) the adequacy of the documentation provided in the Exhibit E to determine significance, (3) the adequacy of the description of impacts, and (4) the adequacy of the proposed cultural resources management plan. The Exhibit E documentation, the description of impacts, and the plan should be acceptable to the SHPO, the NPS, and the FLMA. The SHPO letter commenting on the Exhibit E should contain a statement concerning the project’s effect on National Register facilities (i.e., “no effect,” “no adverse effect,” or “adverse effect”). This statement is necessary for staff to satisfy the requirements of the Act, and to consult with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation if National Register facilities would be affected.

Archeological and Historical Surveys

Other areas of project impact (direct or indirect) must be inventoried for archeological and historic sites, and the significance of the inventoried sites determined in terms of National Register criteria. For any sites listed on the National Register or determined eligible for listing, the Exhibit E should also describe the impacts of the project that would occur or potentially occur, and propose measures in a cultural resources management plan to avoid or minimize such impacts.

The Exhibit E should also identify any lands within the project boundary that would not be affected by project construction, operation, and maintenance work, and identify any land management activities conducted by the applicant, such as periodic harvesting of timber, that could affect archeological or historic sites in these locations. The applicant should propose measures in a cultural resources management plan to inventory archeological and historic sites in the areas affected by land management activities, to assess the significance of inventoried sites, and to implement avoidance and other mitigative measures prior to any harvesting or other activity that would affect sites listed or eligible for listing in the National Register. Such investigations would be required prior to the commencement of the associated land-disturbing activity as a condition of any license issued for the project. Other areas of the project not affected by project construction, operation, maintenance work, or land management activities, do not need to be inventoried, because no impacts would occur.

To inventory the sites that would be affected by the proposed project, the applicant should conduct a cultural resources survey of the area of direct and indirect impacts of the project. These areas would consist of the reservoir pool shoreline, to include any fluctuation zone affected by changes in pool elevation; recreation areas; staging areas adjacent to the dam, powerhouse, and other project facilities; and any areas affected by construction, operation, or maintenance of the transmission corridor and access roads. The survey should be conducted in two stages. The Stage I survey would be less-intensive reconnaissance survey designed to define the direct and indirect impact areas of the project, the potential of the areas for containing sites, and the type of more-intensive Stage II survey that should be conducted. The reconnaissance survey would involve a detailed review of the archeological,
ethnographic, and historical literature of the area, a detailed analysis of the location of project facilities and recreation areas, and field visits to the project as necessary to precisely identify impact areas, the potential of each for containing sites, and the type of Stage II work that should be conducted. The Stage II survey would consist of a comprehensive on-foot inventory of all impact areas that the SHPO, the NPS, the FLMA, and the applicant's archeologist concur as having a reasonable likelihood of containing sites, and any additional field investigations, such as subsurface testing, that would be necessary to determine the National Register eligibility of the inventoried sites. It is recommended that areas not having such potential for containing sites should be excluded from further work in the Stage II survey as far as possible.

The scope of the Stage I and II surveys should be determined after consultation with the SHPO, the NPS, and the FLMA, and should be based on the SHPO's, the NPS's, and the FLMA's recommendations. The surveys should also adhere to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation.

The surveys should be documented in a report filed separately from, but concurrently with, the application. The report must be filed separately to restrict the availability of information about archeological and historic site locations, and thereby protect the sites from unauthorized collecting or vandalism. Five copies of the report should be filed. The report should contain a description of all specific information about the surveys, including research design, the location of impact areas surveyed, a description of the inventoried sites, and the location of the sites on maps. The report should describe the sites in sufficient detail to establish the National Register eligibility of the sites. The report should also contain a detailed description of project impacts to the National Register sites, and contain a detailed cultural resources management plan to avoid or mitigate impacts. The report format should conform to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation.

The report should be summarized in the Exhibit E cultural resource section and exclude any reference to specific site locations. The Exhibit E should describe the current status of any ongoing investigations of the project area not included in the report and provide a schedule for filing a report on these investigations. Any such work should be minimal and should be capable of being completed and documented in a report within a short time after filing the application.

Copies of letters documenting consultation and the recommendations of the SHPO, the NPS, and the FLMA should be included in the exhibit E as an appendix to the cultural resources section. The report and survey work should be acceptable to the SHPO, the NPS, and the FLMA. The SHPO letter commenting on the report should contain a statement concerning the effect of the project on any National Register sites (i.e., a statement of "adverse effect," "no adverse effect," or "no effect"). This statement is necessary for staff to satisfy the requirements of the Act and to consult with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation if National Register sites would be affected by the project. If it is determined after consultation with the SHPO, the NPS, and the FLMA that: (1) a substantial amount of field work would be required to complete the Stage I and II surveys; (2) that a number of National Register sites would likely be inventoried; and/or (3) that the impacts to such sites and the project facilities that are listed or eligible for listing in the National Register would likely be adverse and require substantial amounts of mitigation work, then it is recommended that the applicant also consult with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, in addition to the SHPO, the NPS, and the FLMA,
concerning the scope and design of the survey work that should be conducted and the type of mitigation that should be proposed in the cultural resources management plan. Copies of letters documenting consultation and the recommendations of the Advisory Council should be included in the Exhibit E and with the detailed cultural resources report together with the letters from the SHPO, the NPS, and the FLMA.

Such consultation will expedite staff's consultation with the Advisory Council after the cultural resources investigations are completed. The staff must consult with the Advisory Council concerning the effect of a project on National Register sites prior to any relicensing of the project, and normally the Advisory Council should concur with the staff that these investigations have been completed, and that the appropriate mitigation has been recommended as a condition of any license issued for the project.
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**APPENDIX 9**  AGENCY CONSULTATION - TRADITIONAL CULTURAL PROPERTIES
9.0 CULTURAL RESOURCES

The Skagit Project cultural resources study area is shown in Figure 9-1. Section 9.1 provides an executive summary for historic, architectural, and engineering resources in the project area and refers to the separately bound report for this study. Section 9.2 similarly presents an executive summary for archaeological resources in the project area and refers to two separately bound reports on archaeological surveys. Section 9.3 discusses traditional cultural properties and provides the methodology for this ongoing study.

9.1 HISTORIC, ARCHITECTURAL, AND ENGINEERING RESOURCES IN PROJECT AREA

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, requires that the FERC staff determine the impact of projects proposed for relicensing on historic sites listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Preliminary assessments of historic and engineering resources were made in 1983 and 1988. The National Park Service has entered into an agreement with Seattle City Light to undertake survey, research and evaluative studies for the purposes of determining which, if any, historic resources within the Skagit Project area have historical significance. These studies will be completed in 1990 and will include an Historic Structures Inventory and National Register Nomination Form. The report will be submitted to FERC in draft form in October 1989 (NPS, 1989a). The final documentation of historic, architectural, and engineering resources will be to Historic American Building Survey/Historic American Engineering Record (HABS/HAER) Level I standards.

The purpose of the Historic Structures Inventory is to provide a complete listing of all SCL resources constructed in or prior to 1949. The preliminary Inventory excludes engineering/technology sites (the latter have been addressed in the National Register Multiple Property Submission for Hydroelectric Projects in Washington State), but the HABS/HAER report will document all sites. Among other information, the final Inventory will document a building/structure/site's present and historic appearance with narrative and photographs, and will provide a brief history of the resource and its significance, if applicable. The National Register Nomination (also to be completed in 1990) will expand on the information provided in the Inventory. The Nomination will address the context of the entire hydroelectric system and its components, including the two company towns, the various areas of significance of these resources (architectural, political, social, landscape design, among others), and clearly outline which resources within the boundaries of the proposed discontinuous historic district are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

The format and thrust of the Nomination has been reviewed and approved by State Historic Preservation Office staff, and the form will be completed in accordance with standards established by National Register Bulletin No. 16, "Guidelines for Completing National Register of Historic Places Forms." These two historical studies are currently underway, but only preliminary assessments have been made regarding the number of resources that will be addressed in these documents. Conclusions to date show 38 buildings, structures, and sites will be documented in the Historic Resources Inventory; of these, 33 appear to meet established criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. As noted earlier, this figure does not include previously listed engineering and hydroelectric-related features.
9.2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES IN PROJECT AREA

Preliminary assessments and reconnaissance of archaeological resources were performed in 1979 and 1986-87 (NPS, 1987). An intensive survey was performed in 1988 and 1989 to locate resources in the Ross Lake drawdown zone. The survey was performed by National Park Service crews from March to June in both 1988 and 1989, and examined 26.8 km$^2$ (6622 acres) of land in the drawdown zone. The survey was confined to a zone between the maximum high pool level (1602.5-foot elevation above sea level) and the lowest level of the reservoir drawdown for the period of investigation (1491 feet asl). Except on steep slopes, survey crews walked parallel transects spaced about 65.6 feet (20 meters) apart, and all portions of the drawdown zone were examined. All sites were photographed and mapped, and their environmental and physical characteristics were described in detail.

A total of 126 prehistoric sites have been recorded in the project area: 13 of these were previously recorded and 113 were recorded during the intensive survey. A total of 53 isolated prehistoric artifacts or features were found. All prehistoric sites are lithic scatters containing stone tools, flaking debris, and hearths. In addition, 17 historic features or sites were located. The average prehistoric site density for the project area is 4.7 sites/km$^2$. Prehistoric site densities for mapped landform types range from 0.7 to 56 sites/km$^2$. These results are supporting evidence for the claim that prehistoric Indian populations made intensive use of portions of the upper Skagit River Valley. Wave and shoreline erosion related to operation of the reservoir at its varying levels has affected and is destroying the integrity of many of the archaeological sites (but is also responsible for the visibility and accessibility to investigation of many sites).

During the 1989 field season, six prehistoric sites were test-excavated in order to assess their eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. Of these, one appears to be eligible for the National Register.

In the course of the archaeological survey, any historical materials that were found were also evaluated. All historic sites found are from mid-20th century logging of the valley immediately prior to inundation by the reservoir.

All portions of the Ross Lake area have been surveyed except for drawdown areas that could be exposed during an exceptionally low reservoir level (below 1,491 feet). Evaluation of sites for the National Register of Historic Places will be ongoing for the next several years. Fewer than half of the 126 recorded prehistoric sites will need to be tested for eligibility. None of the historic features and sites located in the project area appear to qualify for inclusion in the National Register.

A complete report of final results of the investigations described above, entitled Technical Summary Results of an Intensive Cultural Resources Survey in the Upper Skagit River Basin (NPS, 1989b), prepared by the National Park Service, will be submitted to FERC in draft form in October 1989. This report will be completed in 1990.

A reconnaissance and survey of part of the normally submerged zone in the Thunder Arm of Diablo Lake was conducted in 1987 (NPS, 1987). This survey was done to take advantage of an abnormally low drawdown event for Diablo Lake. The final report for this survey will be
submitted to FERC in October 1989. The complete reconnaissance of the shorelines of Diablo and Gorge lakes is scheduled for early 1990.

9.3 TRADITIONAL CULTURAL PROPERTIES

One kind of cultural significance that a property may possess, and that may make it eligible for inclusion in the Register, is traditional cultural significance: that is, significance derived from the role the property plays in the traditional but often continuing lifeways of a community (Parker and King, 1988).

Due to its location in a rural and backcountry setting, the Skagit Project area is most likely to include current cultural resources of interest to Native Americans, and not the types more likely to be found in urban and suburban areas. Thus, the inventory and evaluation of the "traditional cultural significance" of nonarchaeological and nonarchitectural sites in the study area is designed to examine such properties as:

- a location associated with the tradition beliefs of a Native American group about its origins, its cultural history, or the nature of the world;
- a location where Native American religious practitioners have historically gone, and may still go, to perform ceremonial activities in accordance with traditional cultural rules of practice.

Another property possibly possessing such significance is a site where native Americans go to procure subsistence or ceremonial flora, fauna, or minerals.

The methods used to study traditional cultural values in the Skagit Project area are dependent on the protocol under which tribal business is conducted. This includes the manner in which projects are presented to Indian tribes, how discussions are conducted within tribal constituencies, and how decisions affecting tribal members are made. Since City Light plans to address Indian traditional cultural values, it is important to work within the parameters of these values in order that the study receive consensus from the Indian community.

Most Indian tribal business protocol is embedded in a yearly schedule based on an anadromous fishing economy. This economy requires intensive and continuous work for 4-5 months each year, generally in the summer and early fall (July - October). It usually involves up to 90 percent of the working force in each tribe. The religious practices of the tribal groups follow this schedule in that most traditional religious activities and business relating to them are conducted from November through April. This Indian schedule is often in conflict with that of the non-Indian, nonfishing economic schedule, which is partially based on a farming economy (e.g., spring and summer planting and harvesting; school in fall and winter), or on an urban mechanized economy (e.g., work may occur 24 hours per day and 7 days per week), and on a schedule of Christian religious observances (e.g., no work on Sundays).

Additionally, regular consultation with a number of agencies and institutions is a constant in Indian government business. Much government-to-government business may be concluded by assigned officials. However, decisions affecting something as significant as the traditional cultural values and practices of a large number of tribal members are made only after...
considerable canvassing of the community at-large, often to the point of consensus. Such decisions by consensus are serious and are not arrived at easily or quickly.

Finally, the issue of preserving traditional cultural practices is of great importance to Indian people in the face of constant and escalating development of areas they have considered significant to their cultural values. As areas and locations are lost, others are sought to replace them. Involvement in religious and ritual life is increasing in the Indian communities, as it has in the non-Indian. Because access to traditional locations and practices is currently so fluid, the tribes are developing means to adapt to or manage the change.

The Skagit Project is an example of the kind of project about which Indian tribes have considerable concerns. Because the project may involve mitigation for visual resources, recreation, or erosion abatement for increased non-Indian use, Indian adaptation to or management of such change is necessary. Adaptational management strategies include the manner in which information pertinent to Indian concerns is gathered, distributed, and acted upon within the Indian community. In order to reflect these strategies, a confidentiality protocol and study methodology will evolve with the project. The methodology of the study concerning traditional cultural values and significance is presented with the above considerations in mind.

Traditional cultural properties will be assessed through five tasks described below:

1) Review previous work;

2) Contact Native American communities, consult with federal and state agencies, and develop a confidentiality protocol for protection of sensitive information;

3) Inventory traditional cultural properties and evaluate significance;

4) Document and map inventory sites; and

5) Prepare a report that addresses the FERC request for additional information on traditional cultural properties.

Task 1. Review Previous Work and Publications; Coordinate with Other Field Teams and Land Managers.

JULY AND AUGUST 1989

A review of literature pertinent to the project area and traditional cultural values and significance was completed by the applicant’s consultant prior to initiating contact with tribes that are affected by the project. The affected tribes are the Upper Skagit, Sauk-Suiattle, Swinomish, Colville, and Thompson. The first draft of a confidentiality protocol for conducting the study was developed and forwarded to City Light, the National Park Service (NPS) and the State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (SHPO) for their comments (Appendix 9).
Task 2. Contact Native American Communities, Groups, and Individuals; Protect Confidentiality; Consult with Agencies.

Initial contacts were made with tribal governments by letter (Appendix 9). These letters briefly describe the project and specify existing contacts between the applicant's consultant and tribal members that could serve to facilitate the study. A map of the project area was included in each letter. Consultations also were initiated with agencies and intervenors previously identified, including the NPS and the SHPO. The NPS and SHPO were asked to review the draft confidentiality protocol (Appendix 9).

SEPTEMBER 1989

Within one month of the initial contact letter, the applicant's consultant made arrangements to meet with tribal representatives and/or cultural committees regarding the study. Such arrangements were made whether or not any affected tribe had formally responded to the initial letter. Arrangements were made by telephone where possible and by personal contacts where telephone arrangements were not possible. All subsequent meetings will be arranged similarly.

Discussions between City Light's consultant and each tribal group emphasized potential project impacts on traditional cultural values and significant sites. The confidentiality protocol also was discussed and amended at all of the project meetings. Arrangements were made for additional meetings and field visits to significant sites as deemed necessary. The number of additional meetings and field visits may vary from one tribal group to another.

OCTOBER 1989

After meeting(s) with tribal representatives and/or cultural committees are completed, a report summarizing issues, decisions, and future arrangements will be sent to Seattle City Light and the governing bodies of the affected tribes. This draft report will summarize contacts and meetings to date, revisions in the confidentiality protocol and methodology, and a revised study schedule. Arrangements for field visits will be initiated.

Task 3. Identify and Inventory Properties and Sites with Traditional Cultural Values, and Evaluate for Significance.

NOVEMBER AND DECEMBER 1989

Arrangements will be made for field visits to the project area in the months of November and December. As indicated previously, it is not possible to schedule field visits in summer and early fall since most Indian people are engaged in their primary economic pursuits until late October. When they are not engaged directly in fishing, they are totally involved with activities that support fishing. In November, most tribal members engaged in traditional religious practices hold regular meetings to conduct business. Field visits will occur subsequent to such meetings at areas specified during the meetings. Additional areas may be identified during each field visit. The number and size of areas visited will vary from tribe to tribe and may be impacted by individual and tribal circumstances, as well as by normal SCL operating procedures, such as the maximum yearly drawdown of Ross Lake.
Field visits will consist of identifying and accessing areas of traditional significance within study area boundaries for each affected tribe. A single representative of City Light's consultant will be the only staff to participate in field visits in order to protect site confidentiality.

General areas significant to traditional cultural values will be identified according to drainage systems or topographic features within each of the designated study units (i.e., Ross, Diablo, and Gorge lakes). Site-specific information gathered during such visits will remain confidential until dissemination and range of distribution of information are approved by each tribe. The rationale for additional detail in documentation will be developed by each affected tribe. In some instances, sites may be identified by specific on-the-ground locations with boundaries, while in other instances they may involve certain features of the environment that are scattered throughout the study area. The traditional cultural value(s) associated with each site/area will be described.

The confidentiality protocol will be modified with respect to categories of information to be recorded and mapped during the field visits. Specific categories of significance and confidentiality will be defined in the field.

Access to categories of information by SCL, FERC, and each affected tribe will be discussed during the field visits with each tribe.


DECEMBER 1989

Subsequent to the field visits, City Light's consultant will compile field notes on locations visited. They will keep a map record of areas visited and located. These field notes and maps will not be distributed until approved by the affected tribes. However, a general draft report with a map of areas of tribal concern will be presented to SCL in early December.

The traditional cultural values and tribal areas of concern will be compared with information gathered during other project tasks. Where there is an apparent conflict between traditional cultural values and sites and planned SCL developments, elements of the conflict will be identified and plans for reconciliation or resolution will be developed by City Light's consultant for presentation to affected tribal groups.

JANUARY 1990

Seattle City Light's consultant will meet again with the tribal representatives and/or cultural committees of affected tribes in order to present SCL development plans, the draft report, and more detailed summaries of site visits and to elicit recommendations regarding significant sites/locations. Each summary will include information specific to each affected tribe. Additionally, sites of concern to specific individuals will be presented in the manner agreed upon by that individual and City Light's consultant. The summaries may include maps of general locations significant to traditional values. The summaries will be modified in consultation with the committees. The committees may make recommendations to share information among the affected tribes.
JANUARY AND FEBRUARY 1990

The written summaries will be presented to the governments of each tribe for approval or modification at the regularly scheduled January or February meeting of each governing body. The SCL development plan will be presented to each tribal government. Tribal representatives and/or cultural committees will be invited to this meeting so that discussion regarding project concerns may be conducted. City Light's consultant will present the traditional cultural values and significant sites data in the context of SCL planned developments. Each tribe will consider and recommend mitigation strategies appropriate to its area of concern. The tribal governments determine by resolution the degree to which the information will be shared with other tribal governments, as well as with SCL and City Light's consultant.

Task 5. Report.

FEBRUARY AND MARCH

Approved site summaries, maps, and recommendations will be presented by City Light's consultant to SCL for review. Material included in the approved summaries will be incorporated in a draft project report.

MARCH 1990

At the direction of each tribal government, final recommendations regarding the confidentiality protocol, traditional cultural values, and significant sites will be made by the tribal representatives and/or cultural committees to City Light's consultant at a scheduled meeting.

Seattle City Light's consultant will present the finalized data and recommendation to SCL in a final report. If outstanding issues of tribal concern remain at this point, the final report will include a plan for resolving these issues. The report will be organized according to the FERC request for additional information.

9.4 REFERENCES


APPENDIX 9

Agency Consultation - Traditional Cultural Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>Dr. Astrida Blukis Onat</td>
<td>Review of Confidentiality Protocol</td>
<td>August 22, 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marblemount, WA</td>
<td>BOAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>Dr. Astrida Blukis Onat</td>
<td>Review of Confidentiality Protocol</td>
<td>August 22, 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Archeologist and Historian</td>
<td>BOAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Archeologist</td>
<td>Dr. Astrida Blukis Onat</td>
<td>Review of Confidentiality Protocol</td>
<td>August 22, 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia, WA</td>
<td>BOAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swinomish Tribal Community</td>
<td>Dr. Astrida Blukis Onat</td>
<td>Introduce Project and Confidentiality Protocol</td>
<td>July 24, 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaConner, WA</td>
<td>BOAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Skagit Tribal Council</td>
<td>Dr. Astrida Blukis Onat</td>
<td>Introduce Project and Confidentiality Protocol</td>
<td>July 24, 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedro Woolley, WA</td>
<td>BOAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauk-Sulattle Tribe, Darrington</td>
<td>Dr. Astrida Blukis Onat</td>
<td>Introduce Project and Confidentiality Protocol</td>
<td>July 24, 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>BOAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colville Business Committee</td>
<td>Dr. Astrida Blukis Onat</td>
<td>Introduce Project and Confidentiality Protocol</td>
<td>July 24, 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nespelem, WA</td>
<td>BOAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lytton Indian Band (Thompson Tribe)</td>
<td>Dr. Astrida Blukis Onat</td>
<td>Introduce Project and Confidentiality Protocol</td>
<td>July 24, 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lytton, B.C., Canada</td>
<td>BOAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Whitlam,</td>
<td>Calvin Van Zee</td>
<td>Review of Confidentiality Protocol and Methodology</td>
<td>September 21, 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Office of</td>
<td>Envirosphere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology and Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 9. Traditional Cultural Properties Consultation. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

III. Summary of Personal Consultation

| Swinomish Cultural Committee, La Conner, WA | Dr. Astrida Blukis Onat BOAS | Introduce Project and Confidentiality Protocol | August 17, 1989 |
| Colville/Thompson Tribe, Nespelem, WA | Dr. Astrida Blukis Onat BOAS | Cultural/religious use of project area | Sept. 5, 1989 |
| Bob Mierendorf, National Park Service Archaeologist, Marblemount, WA | Dr. Astrida Blukis Onat BOAS | Prehistoric, proto-historic and current use of project area | Sept. 8, 1989 |
| Upper Skagit Tribal Representative, Sedro Woolley, WA | Dr. Astrida Blukis Onat BOAS | Confidentiality Protocol | Sept. 8, 1989 |
| Swinomish Cultural Committee, La Conner, WA | Dr. Astrida Blukis Onat BOAS | Project methodology and Confidentiality Protocol | Sept. 8, 1989 |
| Jim McDonald Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest Archaeologist Darrington, WA | Dr. Astrida Blukis Onat BOAS | Project methodology and study area | Sept. 19, 1989 |
DRAFT II CONFIDENTIALITY PROTOCOL

The Seattle City Light study for the Skagit Hydroelectric Project Relicensing includes a survey and evaluation of traditional cultural values and significance of the project area to Indian (Native American) tribes and individuals. A major issue with regard to the study is the confidentiality with which the material gathered is treated upon submission of study data, interim reviews, and other reports. While information about traditional cultural values and significance needs to be gathered and evaluated in developing future management policies that take the Indian traditions into consideration, some information pertaining to religious use is considered extremely private within the context of the native religion. Giving up privacy could, for many individual practitioners, equate with giving up the religion.

Records of the U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, State Offices of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, the National Park Service, and those of other agencies and organizations dealing with Indian religious use site locations are exempt from public disclosure pursuant to 5 USC 522 (b) (5). BOAS, Inc., Envirosphere and its subconsultants, and Seattle City Light shall not divulge, and shall take all reasonable steps to insure that no member of its staff or organization divulges, information on specific sites or their location to any person other than the duly authorized representative of Seattle City Light and each affected tribe, unless otherwise authorized in writing by the Contract Manager or the Contract Manager's representative in consultation and agreement with affected tribes. Tribal consultation shall consist of meetings between Seattle City Light representatives and the Culture Committee of each tribe responsible for cultural and religious use issues. Agreement shall constitute a copy of a resolution to that effect passed by each tribal senate or council.

All site specific and resource specific data, including maps produced by the study, will be placed in a separate attachment to each interim report and to the final report of the study. These attachments are to be distributed and available only to the Seattle City Light Contract Manager, the National Park Service, the BOAS, Inc. study team, and the tribes affected by the project. They are not to be reproduced or distributed further. The final report volume, containing the general aspects of Indian religious beliefs and practices, will be distributed to the State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for review. The final report will receive limited distribution beyond the groups identified above according to a plan for access to and subsequent use of this document developed and periodically reviewed by Seattle City Light and the National Park Service in concert with full Indian participation as defined above.

All services, reports, documents, material, and data required by this contract shall become the property of Seattle City Light. A copy of all records and a set of photographic negatives of pictures taken shall be furnished to the Contract Manager. All services, reports, documents, material, and data required by this contract shall be made available to the tribal groups affected by the project.

App. 9-3
August 22, 1989

Robert Mierendorf
North Cascades National Park Complex
Skagit District Office
728 Ranger Station Road
Marblemount, Washington 98267

Subject: Skagit Hydroelectric Project Relicensing Studies:
Cultural Resources

Dear Bob;

As you are aware, the Seattle City Light Department (City Light) is seeking a license renewal for the Skagit River Hydroelectric Project from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). At the direction of FERC, a number of studies have been identified that need to be conducted for the relicensing. In May 1989, City Light contracted with Envirosphere to evaluate and document resource uses, values, and effects of the project for several elements of the environment, including recreation, visual quality, soils, fish, and wildlife. BOAS, Inc. is Envirosphere’s subconsultant for the documentation and evaluation of traditional cultural values for the project, which includes traditional and contemporary Indian religious and cultural uses of the study area.

In order to inventory and evaluate traditional cultural values and use, BOAS, Inc. is consulting with the Swinomish, Upper Skagit, Sauk-Suiattle, Colville, and Thompson tribes regarding the project and its potential for impacting cultural values. In consultation with these tribes, Seattle City Light, FERC, and other involved agencies and intervenors, BOAS, Inc. is developing a protocol to protect the confidentiality of culturally sensitive information. A copy of the draft confidentiality protocol is enclosed for your review and comment. A methodological design prepared to guide our study will be available within the next few weeks and will be sent at that time for your review. It is important to note that both the confidentiality protocol and the methodology are evolving documents. Changes will be made as needed to reflect the concerns and interests of the tribes and other parties. It is likely that neither document will be final until the close of the project in February of 1990. Your participation in this process will be most appreciated.

App. 9-4
We believe that it is important that our various studies be effectively coordinated. If there is anything we can do toward that end, please let us know. If you have any questions regarding the draft protocol or suggestions as to how we can best work together, either Dr. Astrida R. Blukis Onat or I can be reached at (206) 323-1343 in Seattle. We look forward to working with you on this project.

Sincerely,

Sheila Stump
Vice President

cc: Jay Brueggeman, Envirosphere
    Toby Thaler, Seattle City Light
August 22, 1989

Jim Thomson, Regional Archaeologist
Stephanie Toothman, Regional Historian
National Park Service
83 S. King St., Suite 212
Seattle, Washington 98104

Subject: Skagit Hydroelectric Project Relicensing Studies: Cultural Resources

Dear Jim and Stephanie:

As you are aware, the Seattle City Light Department (City Light) is seeking a license renewal for the Skagit River Hydroelectric Project from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). At the direction of FERC, a number of studies have been identified that need to be conducted for the relicensing. In May 1989, City Light contracted with Envirosphere to evaluate and document resource uses, values, and effects of the project for several elements of the environment, including recreation, visual quality, soils, fish, and wildlife. BOAS, Inc. is Envirosphere's subconsultant for the documentation and evaluation of traditional cultural values for the project, which includes traditional and contemporary Indian religious and cultural uses of the study area.

In order to inventory and evaluate traditional cultural values and use, BOAS, Inc. is consulting with the Swinomish, Upper Skagit, Sauk-Suiattle, Colville, and Thompson tribes regarding the project and its potential for impacting cultural values. In consultation with these tribes, Seattle City Light, FERC, and other involved agencies and intervenors, BOAS, Inc. is developing a protocol to protect the confidentiality of culturally sensitive information. A copy of the draft confidentiality protocol is enclosed for your review and comment. A methodological design prepared to guide our study will be available within the next few weeks and will be sent at that time for your review. It is important to note that both the confidentiality protocol and the methodology are evolving documents. Changes will be made as needed to reflect the concerns and interests of the tribes and other parties. It is likely that neither document will be final until the close of the project in February of 1990. Your participation in this process will be most appreciated.

App. 9-6
We believe that it is important that our various studies be effectively coordinated. If there is anything we can do toward that end, please let us know. If you have any questions regarding the draft protocol or suggestions as to how we can best work together, either Dr. Astrida R. Blukis Onat or I can be reached at (206) 323-1343 in Seattle. We look forward to working with you on this project.

Sincerely,

Sheila Stump
Vice President

cc: Jay Brueggeman, Envirosphere
    Toby Thaler, Seattle City Light
August 22, 1989

Dr. Robert Whitlam
State Archaeologist
Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation
111 W. 21st Avenue
Mail Stop KL-11
Olympia, Washington 98504

Subject: Skagit Hydroelectric Project Relicensing Studies: Cultural Resources

Dear Rob;

As you are aware, the Seattle City Light Department (City Light) is seeking a license renewal for the Skagit River Hydroelectric Project from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). At the direction of FERC, a number of studies have been identified that need to be conducted for the relicensing. In May 1989, City Light contracted with Envirosphere to evaluate and document resource uses, values, and effects of the project for several elements of the environment, including recreation, visual quality, soils, fish, and wildlife. BOAS, Inc. is Envirosphere's subconsultant for the documentation and evaluation of traditional cultural values for the project, which includes traditional and contemporary Indian religious and cultural uses of the study area.

In order to inventory and evaluate traditional cultural values and use, BOAS, Inc. is consulting with the Swinomish, Upper Skagit, Sauk-Suiattle, Colville, and Thompson tribes regarding the project and its potential for impacting cultural values. In consultation with these tribes, Seattle City Light, FERC, and other involved agencies and intervenors, BOAS, Inc. is developing a protocol to protect the confidentiality of culturally sensitive information. A copy of the draft confidentiality protocol is enclosed for your review and comment. A methodological design prepared to guide our study will be available within the next few weeks and will be sent at that time for your review. It is important to note that both the confidentiality protocol and the methodology are evolving documents. Changes will be made as needed to reflect the concerns and interests of the tribes and other parties. It is likely that neither document will be final until the close of the project in February of 1990. Your participation in this process will be most appreciated.

App. 9-8
If you have any questions, please contact either Dr. Astrida R. Blukis Onat or Sheila Stump at (206) 323-1343 in Seattle.

Sincerely,

Sheila Stump
Vice President

cc:  Jay Brueggeman, Envirosphere
     Toby Thaler, Seattle City Light
July 24, 1989

Mr. Robert Joe, Sr., Chairman
Swinomish Tribal Community
P.O. Box 817
LaConner, Washington 98257

Subject: Skagit Hydroelectric Project Relicensing Studies:
Cultural Resources

Dear Bob:

The Seattle City Light Department (City Light) owns and operates the Skagit River Hydroelectric Project under a license from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC, No. 553). The project consists of the Gorge, Diablo, and Ross Dams and their associated reservoirs, structures, and facilities. A map showing the general project vicinity is attached. The project area is located within the Ross Lake National Recreation Area in Whatcom and Skagit Counties.

The original 50-year license for the project expired in 1977, and an application for relicensing was filed at that time and accepted in 1979. Since then, the City has conducted a number of studies of fish, wildlife, and other resources in the project area. At the direction of the FERC, several additional evaluations have been identified that need to be conducted for the relicensing.

In May 1989, City Light contracted with Envirosphere to evaluate and document resource uses, values, and effects of the project for several elements of the environment, including recreation, visual quality, soils, fish, and wildlife. BOAS, Inc. is to act as subconsultant in the documentation and evaluation of cultural resources for the project.

Among the cultural resources to be addressed by the Skagit Relicensing study are traditional and current Indian use of the project area. In order to inventory and evaluate this use, BOAS, Inc. has been directed to consult with the Swinomish, Upper Skagit, Sauk-Suiattle, Colville, and Thompson tribes regarding the project and its potential for impacting cultural values.

BOAS, Inc. is requesting permission to contact the culture committee of each of the tribes, where such is available, or the names of individuals charged with cultural resource issues, in order to introduce the project and discuss potential impacts on culturally valuable locations within the project.
will personally meet with the committees and individuals designated in each tribe to develop a plan to inventory and evaluate the cultural resources and to develop mitigation and management recommendations with regard to the resources. Any conclusions and recommendations made to City Light will have the approval of each tribal Senate.

In the instance of the Swinomish, I would like to present the project to the Swinomish Cultural and Environmental Protection Association (SCEPA), of which I am an adjunct member. SCEPA may report to the tribal Senate each month on the progress of work on the Skagit Relicensing study. The Swinomish Senate will make final decisions regarding various aspects of the project.

After introduction of the project, the first item of business needing discussion is a Confidentiality Protocol to address certain locations and resources that relate to religious, and therefore private, use of the project area. A copy of the Protocol in draft form (II) is enclosed.

The time lines for the Skagit Relicensing require that this study be completed in February of 1990. Since I am aware that many tribal members are involved in fishing at this time of year and that it is difficult to schedule meetings, I will call your office in mid-August regarding the progress of my request. I will be glad to come to any meetings on relatively short notice, since I know the fishing schedule allows only brief intervals for official activities until October or later. I may be reached at (206) 323-1343 in Seattle on Mondays and Fridays, or at (206) 466-3163 in LaConner Tuesday-Thursday until the end of August. Thereafter I will be primarily in Seattle.

I am looking forward to consulting with you in this very worthwhile study.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr. Astrida R. Blukis Onat
President

cc: Jay Brueggeman, Envirosphere
    Toby Thaler, Seattle City Light

App. 9-11
July 24, 1989

Mr. Floyd Williams, Chairman
Upper Skagit Tribal Council
2284 Community Plaza
Sedro Wooley, Washington 98284

Subject: Skagit Hydroelectric Project Relicensing Studies:
Cultural Resources

Dear Mr. Williams;

The Seattle City Light Department (City Light) owns and operates the Skagit River Hydroelectric Project under a license from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC, No. 553). The project consists of the Gorge, Diablo, and Ross Dams and their associated reservoirs, structures, and facilities. A map showing the general project vicinity is attached. The project area is located within the Ross Lake National Recreation Area in Whatcom and Skagit Counties.

The original 50-year license for the project expired in 1977, and an application for relicensing was filed at that time and accepted in 1979. Since then, the City has conducted a number of studies of fish, wildlife, and other resources in the project area. At the direction of the FERC, several additional evaluations have been identified that need to be conducted for the relicensing.

In May 1989, City Light contracted with Envirosphere to evaluate and document resource uses, values, and effects of the project for several elements of the environment, including recreation, visual quality, soils, fish, and wildlife. BOAS, Inc. is to act as subconsultant in the documentation and evaluation of cultural resources for the project.

Among the cultural resources to be addressed by the Skagit Relicensing study are traditional and current Indian use of the project area. In order to inventory and evaluate this use, BOAS, Inc. has been directed to consult with the Upper Skagit, Swinomish, Sauk-Suiattle, Colville, and Thompson tribes regarding the project and its potential for impacting cultural values.

BOAS, Inc. is requesting permission to contact the culture committee of each of the tribes, where such is available, or the names of individuals charged with cultural resource issues, in order to introduce the project and discuss potential impacts on culturally valuable locations within the project. I App. 9-12
will personally meet with the committees and individuals designated in each tribe to develop a plan to inventory and evaluate the cultural resources and to develop mitigation and management recommendations with regard to the resources. Any conclusions and recommendations made to City Light will have the approval of each tribal Senate.

In the instance of the Upper Skagit, I would like to present the project to Mr. Harlan Sam and Mr. Floyd Williams, with whom I have consulted previously. If you would prefer other consultation, please let me know. They may report to the tribal Senate each month on the progress of work on the Skagit Relicensing study. The Upper Skagit Senate will make final decisions regarding various aspects of the project.

After introduction of the project, the first item of business needing discussion is a Confidentiality Protocol to address certain locations and resources that relate to religious, and therefore private, use of the project area. A copy at the Protocol in draft form (II) is enclosed.

The time lines for the Skagit Relicensing require that this study be completed in February of 1990. Since I am aware that many tribal members are involved in fishing at this time of year and that it is difficult to schedule meetings, I will call your office in mid-August regarding the progress of my request. I will be glad to come to any meetings on relatively short notice, since I know the fishing schedule allows only brief intervals for official activities until October or later. I may be reached at (206) 323-1343 in Seattle on Mondays and Fridays, or at (206) 466-3163 in LaConner Tuesday-Thursday until the end of August. Thereafter I will be primarily in Seattle.

I am looking forward to consulting with you in this very worthwhile study.

Sincerely,

Dr. Astrida R. Blukis Onat
President

cc: Jay Brueggeman, Envirosphere
    Toby Thaler, Seattle City Light
July 24, 1989

Mr. Lawrence Joseph, Chairman
Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe
5318 Chief Brown Lane
Darrington, Washington 98241

Subject: Skagit Hydroelectric Project Relicensing Studies: Cultural Resources

Dear Lawrence;

The Seattle City Light Department (City Light) owns and operates the Skagit River Hydroelectric Project under a license from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC, No. 553). The project consists of the Gorge, Diablo, and Ross Dams and their associated reservoirs, structures, and facilities. A map showing the general project vicinity is attached. The project area is located within the Ross Lake National Recreation Area in Whatcom and Skagit Counties.

The original 50-year license for the project expired in 1977, and an application for relicensing was filed at that time and accepted in 1979. Since then, the City has conducted a number of studies of fish, wildlife, and other resources in the project area. At the direction of the FERC, several additional evaluations have been identified that need to be conducted for the relicensing.

In May 1989, City Light contracted with EnviroSphere to evaluate and document resource uses, values, and effects of the project for several elements of the environment, including recreation, visual quality, soils, fish, and wildlife. BOAS, Inc. is to act as subconsultant in the documentation and evaluation of cultural resources for the project.

Among the cultural resources to be addressed by the Skagit Relicensing study are traditional and current Indian use of the project area. In order to inventory and evaluate this use, BOAS, Inc. has been directed to consult with the Upper Skagit, Swinomish, Sauk-Suiattle, Colville, and Thompson tribes regarding the project and its potential for impacting cultural values.

BOAS, Inc. is requesting permission to contact the culture committee of each of the tribes, where such is available, or the names of individuals charged with cultural resource issues, in order to introduce the project and discuss potential impacts on culturally valuable locations within the project. I
will personally meet with the committees and individuals designated in each tribe to develop a plan to inventory and evaluate the cultural resources and to develop mitigation and management recommendations with regard to the resources. Any conclusions and recommendations made to City Light will have the approval of each tribal Senate.

In the instance of the Sauk-Suiattle, I would like to present the project to Mr. Paul Harvey and Mr. Kenny Moses, with whom I have consulted previously. If you would prefer other consultation, please let me know. They may report to the tribal Senate each month on the progress of work on the Skagit Relicensing study. The Sauk-Suiattle Senate will make final decisions regarding various aspects of the project.

After introduction of the project, the first item of business needing discussion is a Confidentiality Protocol to address certain locations and resources that relate to religious, and therefore private, use of the project area. A copy of the Protocol in draft form (II) is enclosed.

The time lines for the Skagit Relicensing require that this study be completed in February of 1990. Since I am aware that many tribal members are involved in fishing at this time of year and that it is difficult to schedule meetings, I will call your office in mid-August regarding the progress of my request. I will be glad to come to any meetings on relatively short notice, since I know the fishing schedule allows only brief intervals for official activities until October or later. I may be reached at (206) 323-1343 in Seattle on Mondays and Fridays, or at (206) 466-3163 in LaConner Tuesday-Thursday until the end of August. Thereafter I will be primarily in Seattle.

I am looking forward to consulting with you in this very worthwhile study.

Sincerely,

Dr. Astrida R. Blukis Onat
President

cc: Jay Brueggeman, Envirosphere
    Toby Thaler, Seattle City Light
July 24, 1989

Mr. Jude Stensgar, Chairman
Colville Business Committee
P.O. Box 150
Nespelem, Washington 99144

Subject: Skagit Hydroelectric Project Relicensing Studies:
Cultural Resources

Dear Mr. Stensgar;

The Seattle City Light Department (City Light) owns and operates the Skagit River Hydroelectric Project under a license from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC, No. 553). The project consists of the Gorge, Diablo, and Ross Dams and their associated reservoirs, structures, and facilities. A map showing the general project vicinity is attached. The project area is located within the Ross Lake National Recreation Area in Whatcom and Skagit Counties.

The original 50-year license for the project expired in 1977, and an application for relicensing was filed at that time and accepted in 1979. Since then, the City has conducted a number of studies of fish, wildlife, and other resources in the project area. At the direction of the FERC, several additional evaluations have been identified that need to be conducted for the relicensing.

In May 1989, City Light contracted with Envirosphere to evaluate and document resource uses, values, and effects of the project for several elements of the environment, including recreation, visual quality, soils, fish, and wildlife. BOAS, Inc. is to act as subconsultant in the documentation and evaluation of cultural resources for the project.

Among the cultural resources to be addressed by the Skagit Relicensing study are traditional and current Indian use of the project area. In order to inventory and evaluate this use, BOAS, Inc. has been directed to consult with the Upper Skagit, Swinomish, Sauk-Suiattle, Colville, and Thompson tribes regarding the project and its potential for impacting cultural values.

BOAS, Inc., is requesting permission to contact the culture committee of each of the tribes, where such is available, or the names of individuals charged with cultural resource issues, in order to introduce the project and discuss potential impacts on culturally valuable locations within the project.
will personally meet with the committees and individuals designated in each
tribe to develop a plan to inventory and evaluate the cultural resources and
to develop mitigation and management recommendations with regard to the
resources. Any conclusions and recommendations made to City Light will
have the approval of each tribal Senate.

In the instance of the Colville, I would like to present the project to
your Cultural Committee and to Mrs. Adeline Fredin, with whom I have
consulted previously. I would also like to contact Mr. Ernie McCready,
whose name was given to me by Maxine Williams at Swinomish. If you would
prefer other consultation, please let me know. They may report to the
tribal Senate each month on the progress of work on the Skagit Relicensing
study. The Colville Senate will make final decisions regarding various
aspects of the project.

After introduction of the project, the first item of business needing
discussion is a Confidentiality Protocol to address certain locations and
resources that relate to religious, and therefore private, use of the
project area. A copy of the Protocol in draft form (II) is enclosed.

The time lines for the Skagit Relicensing require that this study be
completed in February of 1990. Since I am aware that many tribal members
are involved in fishing at this time of year and that it is difficult to
schedule meetings, I will call your office in mid-August regarding the
progress of my request. I will be glad to come to any meetings on
relatively short notice, since I know the fishing schedule allows only brief
intervals for official activities until October or later. I may be reached
at (206) 323-1343 in Seattle on Mondays and Fridays, or at (206) 466-3163 in
LaConner Tuesday-Thursday until the end of August. Thereafter I will be
primarily in Seattle.

I am looking forward to consulting with you in this very worthwhile study.

Sincerely,

Dr. Astrida R. Blukis Onat
President

cc: Jay Brueggeman, Envirosphere
    Toby Thaler, Seattle City Light
July 24, 1989

Mr. Bob Pasco, Chairman
Lytton Indian Band
Box 430
Lytton, B.C. VOK1Z0

Subject: Skagit Hydroelectric Project Relicensing Studies:
Cultural Resources

Dear Mr. Pasco:

The Seattle City Light Department (City Light) owns and operates the Skagit River Hydroelectric Project under a license from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC, No. 553). The project consists of the Gorge, Diablo, and Ross Dams and their associated reservoirs, structures, and facilities. A map showing the general project vicinity is attached. The project area is located within the Ross Lake National Recreation Area in Whatcom and Skagit Counties, Washington State, USA. The Ross Lake reservoir also impacts areas of British Columbia in Canada.

The original 50-year license for the project expired in 1977, and an application for relicensing was filed at that time and accepted in 1979. Since then, the City has conducted a number of studies of fish, wildlife, and other resources in the project area. At the direction of the FERC, several additional evaluations have been identified that need to be conducted for the relicensing.

In May 1989, City Light contracted with Envirosphere to evaluate and document resource uses, values, and effects of the project for several elements of the environment, including recreation, visual quality, soils, fish, and wildlife. BOAS, Inc. is to act as subconsultant in the documentation and evaluation of cultural resources for the project.

Among the cultural resources to be addressed by the Skagit Relicensing study are traditional and current Indian use of the project area. In order to inventory and evaluate this use, BOAS, Inc. has been directed to consult with the Upper Skagit, Swinomish, Sauk-Suiattle, Colville, and Thompson tribes regarding the project and its potential for impacting cultural values.

BOAS, Inc. is requesting permission to contact the culture committee of each of the tribes, where such is available, or the names of individuals charged
with cultural resource issues, in order to introduce the project and discuss potential impacts on culturally valuable locations within the project. I will personally meet with the committees and individuals designated in each tribe to develop a plan to inventory and evaluate the cultural resources and to develop mitigation and management recommendations with regard to the resources. Any conclusions and recommendations made to City Light will have the approval of each tribal Senate.

In the instance of the Thompson, I would like to present the project to your Cultural Committee or other individuals charged with cultural issues. I will then correspond and meet with them in order to include Thompson concerns in the project. They may report to the tribal Senate each month on the progress of work on the Skagit Relicensing study. The Thompson Senate will make final decisions regarding various aspects of the project.

After introduction of the project, the first item of business needing discussion is a Confidentiality Protocol to address certain locations and resources that relate to religious, and therefore private, use of the project area. A copy of the Protocol in draft form (II) is enclosed.

The time lines for the Skagit Relicensing require that this study be completed in February of 1990. Since I am aware that many tribal members are involved in fishing at this time of year and that it is difficult to schedule meetings, I will call your office in mid-August regarding the progress of my request. I will be glad to come to any meetings on relatively short notice, since I know the fishing schedule allows only brief intervals for official activities until October or later. I may be reached at (206) 323-1343 in Seattle on Mondays and Fridays, or at (206) 466-3163 in LaConner Tuesday-Thursday until the end of August. Thereafter I will be primarily in Seattle.

I am looking forward to consulting with you in this very worthwhile study.

Sincerely,

Dr. Astrida R. Blukis Onat
President

cc: Jay Brueggeman, Envirosphere
Toby Thaler, Seattle City Light

App. 9-19
The Seattle City Light study for the Skagit Hydroelectric Project Relicensing includes a survey and evaluation of traditional cultural values and significance of the project area to Indian (Native American) tribes and individuals. A major issue with regard to the study is the confidentiality with which the material gathered is treated upon submission of study data, interim reviews, and other reports. While information about traditional cultural values and significance needs to be gathered and evaluated in developing future management policies that take the Indian traditions into consideration, some information pertaining to religious use is considered extremely private within the context of the native religion. Giving up privacy could, for many individual practitioners, equate with giving up the religion.

Records of the U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, State Offices of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, the National Park Service, and those of other agencies and organizations dealing with Indian religious use site locations are exempt from public disclosure pursuant to 5 USC 522 (b) (5). BOAS, Inc., Envirosphere and its subconsultants, and Seattle City Light shall not divulge, and shall take all reasonable steps to insure that no member of its staff or organization divulges, information on specific sites or their location to any person other than the duly authorized representative of Seattle City Light and each affected tribe, unless otherwise authorized in writing by the Contract Manager or the Contract Manager's representative in consultation and agreement with affected tribes. Tribal consultation shall consist of meetings between Seattle City Light representatives and the Culture Committee of each tribe responsible for cultural and religious use issues. Agreement shall constitute a copy of a resolution to that effect passed by each tribal senate or council.

All site specific and resource specific data, including maps produced by the study, will be placed in a separate attachment to each interim report and to the final report of the study. These attachments are to be distributed and available only to the Seattle City Light Contract Manager, the National Park Service, the BOAS, Inc. study team, and the tribes affected by the project. They are not to be reproduced or distributed further. The final report volume, containing the general aspects of Indian religious beliefs and practices, will be distributed to the State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for review. The final report will receive limited distribution beyond the groups identified above according to a plan for access to and subsequent use of this document developed and periodically reviewed by Seattle City Light and the National Park Service in concert with full Indian participation as defined above.

All services, reports, documents, material, and data required by this contract shall become the property of Seattle City Light. A copy of all records and a set of photographic negatives of pictures taken shall be furnished to the Contract Manager. All services, reports, documents, material, and data required by this contract shall be made available to the tribal groups affected by the project.
Dr. Robert Whitlam  
State Archaeologist  
Office of Archaeology & Historic Preservation  
111 West 21st Avenue  
Mail Stop KL-11  
Olympia, Washington 98504  

SUBJECT: SKAGIT HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT RELICENSING STUDIES: REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF TRADITIONAL CULTURAL PROPERTIES METHODS

Dear Dr. Whitlam:

As discussed in correspondence from our subcontractor, BOAS, we are conducting for Seattle City Light a study of traditional and contemporary Indian religious and cultural uses of the Ross, Diablo and Gorge Lake areas. A copy of the confidentiality protocol has been submitted to your office for your formal review. This letter transmits the study methods proposed for the traditional cultural properties study (Attachment A).

We request that you review the protocol and study methods and send your comments to us by Friday, October 13, 1989. Please mail your comments to the attention of Calvin Van Zee of my staff. If you have any questions regarding this request, please call Calvin at 451-4635.

We thank you in advance for your prompt attention to this matter as we are under strict deadlines.

Sincerely,

ENVIROSPHERE COMPANY

J.J. Brueggeman  
Project Manager

JJB/CJV: hjd  
Attachments  
c: BOAS  
T. Thaler, SCL
October 11, 1989

Calvin Van Zee
Envirosphere Company
10900 NE 8th Street
Bellevue, WA 98004-4405

Dear Mr. Von Zee:

Thank you for providing our office the opportunity to review the proposed study methods for identifying traditional cultural properties.

I have enclosed for your information and reference and copy of a National Park Service document on guidelines for the evaluation and documentation of traditional cultural properties. Your proposed methods should be consistent with these guidelines.

Sincerely,

Robert G. Whitlam, Ph.D.
State Archaeologist
(206) 753-4405

Enclosures
October 4, 1989

Calvin Van Zee  
Envirosphere Company  
10900 NE 8th Street  
Bellevue, WA 98004-4405

Dear Mr. Zee:

Thank you for providing our office the opportunity to review the proposed study methods for identifying traditional cultural properties. I have enclosed for your information and reference a copy of a National Park Service document on guidelines for the evaluation and documentation of traditional cultural properties. The proposed methods should be consistent with these guidelines.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert G. Whitlam, Ph.D.  
State Archaeologist  
(206) 753-4405

Enclosure