

FCRPS Cultural Resources Sub-Committee
Quarterly Meeting

DATE: Feb. 1 - 2, 2007

TIME: 9:00 AM - 5:00 PM Feb. 1
9:00 AM - 1:00 PM (?) Feb. 2

PLACE: Seattle District Corps of Engineers
4735 E. Marginal Way South
Seattle, WA
206-764-3630 (Lawr Salo)

Meeting Room: Fort Lewis/Computer Training Room

AGENDA

- GIS Update on FCRPS Inventory Areas (Connie Reiner)

- Discuss Comments Received on Draft Systemwide PA
 - ❖ Overview of tribal, SHPO and other agency meetings
 - ❖ Proposed steps and schedule for finalizing PA

- Update on Annual Conference Planning (Allen Pomraning/Pei-Lin Yu)

- Discuss Annual Report Format

- FY07 Performance Indicators & other housekeeping items

FY07 Meeting Schedule

<i>Date</i>	<i>Location</i>
Nov. 9, 2006	Boise
Feb. 1-2, 2007	Seattle
June 4-5, 2007	Spokane
Sept. 12-13, 2007	Portland

FCRPS Cultural Resources Sub Committee
Summary Notes
February 1-2, 2007
Seattle, Washington

The CRSC met at the Seattle District on February 1-2. The meeting started at 9.00 am on the 1st and concluded at approximately 1.30 pm on the 2nd. The bulk of the time was spent on Agenda Item #2 (PA Comments). Participants at the meeting included:

*Kimberley St. Hilaire
Connie Reiner
Lydia Grimm
Rebekah Stiles
Gail Celmer
Jennifer Richman
Robert Eskildsen
Lawr Salo
David Grant
Lynne MacDonald
Pei-Lin Yu*

1. GIS Update on FCRPS Inventory Areas: Connie demonstrated how the GIS database works and reviewed examples of the information she has received from the Corps and Reclamation to aid in that endeavor. There are still a lot of more data, which will need to be inputted into the database, and there was some discussion of how to obtain the data. Everyone was pleased with the applicability of the system. Connie will be contacting the project managers to get the further data she needs.

2. Discuss Comments Received on Draft Systemwide PA: Everyone who participated in the PA comment meetings with the tribes in December in Spokane and the Tri-Cities and with the SHPOs and other federal agencies in early January were encouraged by the progress made and appreciated the comments given. After review, the CRSC agreed that, for the most part, comments received at those meetings and in writing can be addressed. Prior to the meeting, all comments that had been received were entered into a spreadsheet, which was then sorted by broad topical classes. Focus of the meeting was to discuss some of those and reach consensus on what changes would occur in the draft PA to address them. Classes of comments discussed included: the definition of undertaking; the prioritization process and how it can better address non-archaeological resources; the role of cooperating groups (as differentiated from consulting parties); processes to allow for greater inclusion of consulting parties in the process; the systemwide research design, and others. Individuals were assigned revision tasks and a process identified for PA revision. If, during the revision, we find that we do not fully understand a question or concern, the commenter may be contacted to discuss and ensure that we understand the comment. The CRSC agreed that revised text for sections of the PA that received extensive comment may be distributed informally to determine if the edits adequately address the comments.