

Lee Vining, FERC Project No. 1388
CULTURAL AND TRIBAL RESOURCES TWG 2 MEETING NOTES
FEBRUARY 24, 2021; 1:30 PM – 3:00 PM PDT

**These meeting notes are documentation of general discussions from the meeting held on the above-noted date. These notes are not a verbatim account of proceedings, are not meeting minutes, and do not represent any final decisions or official documentation for the project or participating agencies.*

1. Attendees

Relicensing Team Members

Audry Williams, SCE
Carissa Shoemaker, ERM
Finlay Anderson, Kleinschmidt
Kelly Larimer, Kleinschmidt
Lynn Compas, HRA
Matthew Woodhall, SCE
Shannon Luoma, Kleinschmidt
Shelly Davis-King, DKA

Agencies, Tribes, and Interested Stakeholders

Ashley Blythe-Haverstock, USFS
Christina McDonald, North Fork Rancheria of Mono Indians of California
Monique Sanchez, USFS
Monty Bengochia, Bishop Paiute Tribe
Ron Goode, North Fork Mono Tribe
Sean Scruggs, Fort Independence Indian Community of Paiute Indians

2. Compiled Action Items for Relicensing Team

- The Relicensing Team will do better about having communications come from one person – Audry Williams is to be lead contact hereafter.
- Sent a copy of the presentation to the Fort Independence Indian Community of Paiute Indians.
- Research the archaeological dates on artifacts in this area in the Eastern Information Center data, provide to North Fork Mono Tribe if found in the data.
- Develop a timeline on how/when to share the draft PAD with Tribes, as Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians has requested a copy of the Tribal Resources PAD section.

3. Welcome and Introductions

- Audry Williams introduced the meeting and addressed the confusion that arose from previous project email communications over the past month
- Matthew Woodhall provided a Safety moment
- Introductions of team and all participants
- Shelly Davis-King emphasized that Bishop Creek and Lee Vining Creek studies are completely different projects, with different studies for each

4. Relicensing Process

- SCE provided a Lee Vining Project overview
- The Relicensing Team provided a FERC relicensing overview
- Review of notes/comments from January TWG
- Comment: Christina McDonald, North Fork Rancheria of Mono Indians of California
 - Do you have a list of references created for Cultural/Tribal so far?



- Response: Relicensing team - A list of references has been shared on the Lee Vining website (sce.com/leevining), the "Draft PAD References Cited". This list was last updated in November but will continue to be updated as we develop the PAD.
- Comment: Ron Goode, North Fork Mono Tribe
 - Why are you starting the relicensing process so early? This is 7 years ahead. Have you been on a long-range term program with 5-year studies, what is that timeline? You're indicating that you've never done any studies, you must have had studies 30 years ago and if there is a long range plan with 5-year studies we should know what needs to be updated and get into what we haven't been studying.
 - Response: Relicensing team – Yes, there have been previous studies. Other resource areas may have an every 5-year requirement, but the Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP) does not currently have a 5-year requirement. The HPMP was primarily for transmission line resources. The project footprint is small and mostly sloped. There is only one site within the project boundary, so there wasn't a requirement for a cultural resource study every 5 years.
 - Response: Relicensing team – There has never been a Tribal resources study, or a Native American ethnography for this project; we will be starting from scratch. Need Tribal input because of this.
 - Response: Relicensing team – That is a good question regarding the timing. For the regulatory process, the PAD needs to be filed 5 to 5.5 years prior so we do start having these conversations 7 years out, like we are doing here.
- Comment: Ron Goode, North Fork Mono Tribe
 - What is your actual FERC boundary buffer distance – 50 feet, 150 feet?
 - Response: Relicensing team – The buffer around project features and creeks varies from 50 to 100 feet.
 - Response: Relicensing team – The proposed APE is the FERC boundary. If in the studies find an effect happening outside of the FERC Boundary because of project operations, the proposed APE boundary can be modified. The study area is a 0.5-mile radius for cultural and a 5-mile radius for Tribal, from the proposed APE/FERC boundary.
 - Response: Relicensing team – There was a survey 30 years ago during the last relicensing, but we are unsure about the thoroughness of the survey. The National Historic Preservation Act existed at the time of the last relicensing. We have only found reference to Tribal outreach from the previous relicensing, no specific records. The APE will be resurveyed.
- Comment: Fort Independence Indian Community of Paiute Indians
 - Sean Scruggs I'm working with SCE on an Owens Valley project. Tribal input was not used and lots of agencies don't know how to act in these situations. That is why it is fortunate that the THPOs exist now and that agencies talk to us now. We need to have the Tribal information included.

5. Other TWGs' Potential Studies

- The relicensing team listed the potential studies / study requests that are being discussed in the other resource TWGs
- Comment: Ron Goode, North Fork Mono Tribe

- Are there plant gathering areas for Tribes in this area? These are not typically included in a botanical study.
- Response: Relicensing team - Yes, there are gathering areas and they would be included in the Cultural/Tribal studies. Ethnobotanical resources are discussed in the tribal resources section unless the botanists reach out to the tribes to elicit information.
- Response: Relicensing team – we've been working with some folks who have gathering areas in the project area. An ethnobotanical study will occur and we will look at these areas. We will make sure then need to address if the gathering areas are affected by vegetation management, trail maintenance, or other project activities. We can ensure that those areas are protected-- that's why it's critical your information makes it to us so we can include it. An ethnozoological analysis may be needed as well.
- Comment: Ron Goode, North Fork Mono Tribe
 - I appreciate the gathering areas being included in the study. We will also want to know when and where SCE uses herbicides, especially in the APE. It's important that you try to develop an ethnobotanical list of what the Indian community is interested in giving to the scientists.
 - Response: Relicensing team – We have a copy of the Kerckhoff ethnobotany document and we could use that as a model/template.

6. Summary of Existing Resources

- The Relicensing team summarized existing Cultural and Tribal resources in the Project vicinity

7. Discussion of Resource Management Objectives / Potential Study Requests

- The relicensing team summarized the currently planned studies
- The relicensing team asked if everyone is comfortable with the response provided regarding the issues and confusion that arose earlier in the month; no stakeholders responded
- Comment: Fort Independence Indian Community of Paiute Indians requested a copy of the presentation as he attended via the phone.
- Comment: Ron Goode, North Fork Mono Tribe
 - What is the archaeological date on artifacts in this area? Wondering specifically about the arrowheads photo in the presentation.
 - Response: Relicensing team – There are lithic scatters recorded, but I don't know if there were diagnostic artifacts. The arrowheads photo is just a general picture, not specific to this project. We are still going through Eastern Information Center data, if I find this information, I will let you know.
- Comment: Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians (via an in-person meeting presented by the relicensing team)
 - The Tribe, having participated in many hydroelectric relicensings are aware that the Tribal and Cultural resources portion of the Preliminary Application Document (PAD) has likely been prepared and they would like to see a copy before it goes out to the general public. Why hasn't this been shared since the Tribal document is supposed to discuss what the Tribes think? They would like to know what work has been done, and what is being discussed now.

- Response: Relicensing team - We should be able to do that as time allows, we will develop a timeline on how to do that.
- Comment: Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians (via and in person meeting presented by the relicensing team)
 - The Tribe is unaware of any ethnography that has been prepared for the immediate area and believes this should be in the Study Plan. They asked if this will be part of the project, and I assured them that indeed there would be an ethnohistory prepared and ethnographic interviews conducted. They shared that they had worked and consulted with Yosemite National Park on several projects in Tuolumne Meadows and know about the trails and resource areas there. This project is right next door and we have Tribal members whose grandparents and great grandparents came from Mono Lake.
- Comment: Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians (via in person meeting presented by the relicensing team)
 - The Tribe is aware of the Emma Lou Davis field notes, and requests that they be investigated and documented when the field work begins. These documents have never been published or used, and since this is the first time that an ethnographic overview will be prepared, it is a perfect time for looking into these.
- Comment: Monty Bengochia, Bishop Paiute Tribe requested copies of any Bishop Creek Reports
 - The relicensing team will follow up with the Bishop Paiute Tribe. An interim report has been prepared and had already been sent. The team will confirm receipt.

8. Schedule & Next Steps

- Reviewed the proposed upcoming meeting date
- Draft meeting notes to be circulated for review
- Additional action items are underlined above

9. Upcoming TWG Meetings

Aquatics 3	March 29, 2021 10am
Terrestrial 3	March 31, 2021 10am
Cultural and Tribal 3	March 31, 2021 1:30pm
Recreation and Land Use 3	April 1, 2021 10am