

APPENDIX A

TRIBAL INVOLVEMENT

Throughout the EIS process and pursuant to BPA Tribal Policy and National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) obligations, Bonneville has worked to involve and consult with the affected tribes in the proposed project area: the Kootenai Tribe of Idaho and the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes. On May 3, 2005, Bonneville sent a letter to these tribes inviting a formal consultation process. Although the tribes have not yet requested government-to-government consultation meetings, Bonneville updates their technical and policy representatives on project progress both formally and informally on a continuing basis. Bonneville also meets frequently with members of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, who are under contract to Bonneville to conduct an NHPA Traditional Cultural Properties Study for the proposed project, including an oral history.

The remainder of this appendix summarizes the meetings held and issues raised in the discussions with the Tribes.

Kootenai Tribe of Idaho

On May 3, 2005, Bonneville sent a letter to Mr. Gary Aitken, Tribal Chair, and Ms. Josie Shottanana, of the Kootenai Tribe of Idaho, outlining a government-to-government consultation process when or if desired. The Kootenai Tribe of Idaho responded that their preference was to monitor project progress, attend project information discussions, and review documents until government-to-government consultation meetings are warranted. The Kootenai Tribe of Idaho technical and policy representatives are updated on project progress both formally and informally on a continuing basis. Government-to-government consultation meetings have not been requested.

Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes

On May 3, 2005, Bonneville sent a letter to Mr. Fred Matt, Tribal Chair, and Ms. Marcia Pablo, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, outlining a formal consultation process if desired. The response for government-to-government consultation at the policy level of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes is to monitor project progress until formal government-to-government consultation meetings are warranted. The Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes' technical and policy representatives are updated on project progress both formally and informally on a continuing basis. Government-to-government consultation meetings have not been requested. General project meetings with Preservation Office staff were held to discuss project details. Bonneville also met with the Kootenai Culture Committee's Kootenai Elders Advisory Committee to present the project, specifically the Kootenai River crossing realignment option. The Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes are currently under

contract to assist Bonneville in conducting a Traditional Cultural Properties Study, including oral history of the proposed project area.

Meetings with the Tribes

This section summarizes the meetings held with the Tribes and the questions and issues raised. Representatives from both tribes participated in site trips conducted on August 13, 2002 and April 20, 2004 to provide advice and perspective in developing project alternatives.

June 2, 2005

- Meeting held in Pablo, MT, Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes Preservation Office
- Attendees: CSKT Preservation Department staff, BPA staff

The meeting was conducted to provide representatives of the Preservation staff with an overview of the rebuild project along with the three realignment options. Questions or issues focused on the following:

- Whether Preservation staff, BPA internal archaeologists or contract archaeologists would conduct the cultural resources survey.
- Preservation staff declined the survey work because their survey schedule was heavy at the time and because they do not subsurface test. Most of the project is located on KNF lands whose protocol specifies subsurface testing during cultural resources field surveys. BPA suggested that an archaeological firm might do the field survey.
- BPA asked Preservation staff if they would like to conduct a Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP) survey and staff concurred that they would like to have the opportunity. The TCP survey would include interviews and field trips to the project site with Tribal elders.
- BPA also asked Preservation staff if the CSKT would like to act as a cooperating agency for the NEPA process. Preservation staff suggested that more internal discussions would be needed to answer that question.
- Preservation staff indicated that BPA should present the proposed project to the Kootenai Culture Committee Elders Advisory Committee.
- There is tribal land within the project area and Preservation staff asked that BPA investigate how the proposed project affects the tribal land and that it be surveyed to determine boundaries.

A letter summarizing the above meeting was sent to the Kootenai of Idaho because Tribal representatives were not able to attend.

November 14, 2005

- Meeting held in Elmo, MT, Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes
- Attendees: CSKT Preservation Department staff, Kootenai Culture Committee Elders Advisory Committee, BPA staff

The meeting was conducted to provide all attending with a general description of the proposed project and realignment options. Questions or issues focused on the following:

- What voltage alternative is the river crossing?
- Is this project a done deal?
- Will the Quartz Creek reroute have a cultural resource survey completed on it?
- We prefer that BPA use the existing route rather than infringe on cultural sites through the Cabinet Mountains. We are not in support of the Quartz Creek realignment.
- How about crossing the river closer to town?
- How about using the railroad right of way
- I want to commend you for coming and hearing us today. However, I would like to discourage BPA going into any new territory.
- [While looking at map] Are BPA's preferences highlighted in red?
- Who's receiving power from this line?
- What is the Big Horn Terrace Coalition?
- What is the width of these new structures?
- What is the process for cultural resource methods? Did you look for old maps that show pre-historic trails? Also, those forests are filled with fir, pine, and tamarack. There should be lots of stumps because its been logged before.
- The use of Tribal monitors during construction (if the project proceeds) was discussed.
- The Tribe was asked to put together a proposal for survey work.

April 21, 2006

- Meeting held in Pablo, MT, Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes Preservation Office
- Attendees: CSKT Preservation Department staff, BPA staff

The meeting was conducted to provide CSKT Preservation Department staff with a more detailed description of the proposed realignments. Questions or issues focused on the following:

- Preservation staff expressed concern over disturbance of new areas on the Pipe and Quartz creek realignments. They suggested that BPA stay on the transmission line existing right-of-way in both areas.
- Concern was expressed that building bridges over China and Burrell creeks could impact cultural sites. Preservation staff were in favor of the Kootenai River crossing alternative because moving the line would allow BPA to avoid building a bridge over China Creek.
- Concern was expressed on the location of the Kootenai Trail (an historic tribal trail) in relation to the Pipe Creek realignment. BPA was advised to coordinate with the KNF Libby District Archaeologist and KNF Tribal Liaison to determine where the proposed realignment would cross the trail.

- BPA was advised to coordinate the overall cultural resources survey with the KNF Libby District Archaeologist and KNF Tribal Liaison to make sure all cultural sites have been surveyed.
- BPA was advised to use previously disturbed areas on the existing right-of-way for construction areas such as pulling/tensioning sites. If new areas are to be needed, coordinate with the CSKT and KNF.
- Tribal land is located in mile 26 of the transmission line. BPA needs to determine if any new lands rights are needed.
- BPA suggested that portions of the rock outcrop below Black Eagle Rock might be chipped off to provide a wider access road for construction equipment. Preservation staff needed to see what kind of equipment would carry out the chipping and suggested BPA determine where the Kootenai Trail is located in relation to Black Eagle Rock.
- Concern was expressed with the need to have different transmission pole spacing for new poles. Tribal monitors would be needed at all poles to be placed in new holes during construction.
- Preservation staff suggested that BPA present the project at the next Kootenai Culture Committee Elders Advisory Committee and that KNF representatives and any other interested parties Montana Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) be present.

May 8, 2006

- Meeting held in Elmo, MT, Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes
- Attendees: CSKT Preservation Department staff, Kootenai Culture Committee Elders Advisory Committee, BPA staff, KNF staff

The meeting was conducted to provide all attending with a detailed description of the proposed project and realignment options. Questions or issues focused on the following:

- Why did BPA choose the new Kootenai River crossing realignment?
- Would a bridge be needed at China Creek? BPA:
- What is the distance of the new crossing from the old crossing?
- Has the tribal land been surveyed?
- Why not cross the Kootenai River more to the east?
- The area around Black Eagle Rock is valuable to the CSKT. Chipping off rock may not hold value for others but for the Kootenai it does hold value. Can BPA fly in structures and equipment to build the line rather than widen the road near Black Eagle Rock?
- How many new roads would have to be built west of the gate at the end of Kootenai River Road?
- Is there any other way to access the area behind Black Eagle Rock?
- Can the Tribes give input after June 9, 2006?

An email was sent to the Kootenai of Idaho summarizing the meeting because Tribal representatives were not able to attend.

May 10, 2006

- Field visit held in Libby, MT
- Attendees: CSKT Preservation Department staff, BPA staff, KNF staff, BPA Contract Archaeologist

The field visit was conducted to provide all attending a view of the proposed project and realignment options. Questions or issues focused on the following:

- Can you access structure 23/5 by helicopter because a new road could impact the integrity of the cultural site.
- The whole area is a cultural site to the Tribes.
- The Tribes were not in favor of the proposed China Creek bridge; it may be located within a cultural site. BPA would most likely impact the site.
- Can BPA remove all of the survey flagging from the proposed new crossing structure to the existing crossing structure because it creates adverse impacts to those walking to the Kootenai Falls?
- CSKT staff indicated that the Tribes would prefer the new Kootenai River crossing, although the impact area for the new crossing structure may adversely impact the cultural site.

An email was sent to the Kootenai of Idaho summarizing the field visit because Tribal representatives were not able to attend.