

5—CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

THE SCOPING PROCESS

The scoping process for environmental review is started at the beginning of a project which requires NEPA review. This process is required in order to identify the scope of the project, spectrum of environmental review, the proposed alternatives, their impacts and proposed mitigation.

INTERNAL SCOPING

Project Team

NPS, WSHS, and the Chinook Indian Nation form the core team for this project and manage all activities through close, day-to-day collaboration and weekly compliance, permitting and design meetings. Other agencies and individuals also play key roles for certain aspects of the project. A representative from the Garvin family, owner of the property that underlies much of the Congressional designation, attends relevant meetings to provide guidance on the best way to coordinate park design with on-going uses on neighboring Garvin family lands. WSDOT has provided guidance on how best to provide access and construct right-of-way improvements along US Highway 101. WSRPC has collaborated with partners on proposals to connect state and Federal park units, include connecting trails, complimentary design and interpretation, and other elements.

The project team and partner agencies began scoping in November 2009. The first internal scoping meeting occurred on November 24, 2009 at Fort Clatsop and was attended by FHWA-Western Federal Lands, NPS, WSHS, as well adjacent property owners, and consultants. A facilitator from FHWA guided a discussion on history and significance of the site, site access, landscape context, education opportunities, visitor experience, and methods for interpretation. Discussion topics included park organization, prioritization of site features, and site management and operation.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING

On February 16, 2010, the project team and partner agencies met to complete preliminary Environmental Screening. Participants included the NPS, WSHS, the Chinook Indian Nation and consultants who were engaged to prepare permits and compliance documents.

PUBLIC SCOPING

A public scoping meeting took place in the evening of December 17, 2009 at Fort Columbia State Park. Nineteen people attended this meeting and discussed the proposed alternatives and potential impacts related to those alternatives. The public expressed concern for the protection and preservation of natural and cultural resources, as well as, preserving safety and natural beauty of the site while sharing the stories and history of the site. The public also expressed interest in the opportunity of a trail connection to Fort Columbia from Station Camp-Middle Village.

Additional public comments focused on public facility improvements and expected hours and park fees. The public expressed the interest in minimizing impacts and improvements on the site but formalizing and expanding the interpretation of the site's history.

TRIBAL AND AGENCY CONSULTATION

In addition to including Tribes and agencies in the core project team, the NPS has also offered formal channels for consultation. On December 3, 2009, section 106 consultation letters were sent to the Chinook Indian Nation, the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde, the Chehalis Confederated Tribes, the Cowlitz Indian Tribe, the Quinault Indian Nation, and the Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe. These letters NPS hoped to achieve not only government-to-government consultation, but government-to-government collaboration as requested by the Chair of the Chinook Nation. The NPS used government-to-government collaboration as a guiding principle during this project.

On December 7, 2009 a letter was sent to coordinating agencies, including FHWA, USFWS, Army Corps of Engineers, EPA, WA DAHP, WSHS, WSDOT, WSPRC, WA Department of General Administration, DOE, Pacific County and the Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Council of Governments.



National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior

Station Camp – Middle Village Park
Washington

An agency and tribal scoping meeting took place in the afternoon of December 17, 2009 at Fort Columbia State Park. Twelve (12) people attended the meeting, representing WSPRC, NPS, the Chinook Indian Nation, the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde, FHWA – Western Federal Lands Division, and the WSHS. The agencies expressed interest in the approach for further archaeological investigation, the protection and preservation of natural and cultural resources, as well as, the development of an appropriate interpretive plan for the site.

Participants provided the following comments:

Chinook History:

- Canoe design is a Chinook design (Scarborough name is not a design)
- Bunk house (not currently there) is the edge of the town.
- Town site at this point was North of Hwy 101.
- At first, shovel probes did not reveal any key archeological information. Then archaeology revealed the town location.
- Chinook people are still connected to the site and want to remain connected to the site.
- Chinook “gathering” fish heads from the cannery town site alludes to a scarcity of resources available to native populations after Euro-development.
- Chinook have a long and strong connection to the site.
- It is unknown how many burials are at the site and they are concerned about how potential park development.
- Scot’s broom is “horrible”. Chinook support Scot’s broom removal however we must be sensitive to how it is removed (maybe beetles biocontrol agent).
- Cultural material can still be located on the surface of the site.
- Prior to any development (12 years ago) Chinook held meetings about the site to decide actions or desires for site development.
- Chinook invested and interested in site interpretation. They encourage working with tribal members to develop storyline however

there may be some cultural stories not acceptable for public interpretation.

- Do nothing that disturbs graves or artifacts on the site.
- Before development of any kind it is to reference cultural resources on site for tribes so they know and understand the site and its resources.
- Grand Ronde will defer interpretation to Chinook.
- Assurances to build up rather than down. Use materials that will insulate trails from compacting the ground (sand, geotextiles) reroute the trail around as much cultural material as is known.
- Expand the Riprap for future waterside trail access.
- How do we avoid taboos at a Chinook people’s site without directly exposing some their cultural beliefs that are sacred or not open to the general public? (No smoking, cursing).
- Idea of Chinook Longhouse on the site and that gifted to the tribe.

Fort Columbia:

- Exhibit at Fort Columbia “Chinook Exhibit”
 - About ½ a barracks
 - Displays artifacts form Middle Village
 - Review artifacts before display for Chinook
 - How items can be displayed part of future details design
- Supportive of trail connection to Ft. Columbia.
- Agrees with the focus on reduce impacts and protection of resource.
- Ft. Columbia has been under used
- Circulation issues: in general a transportation study or circulation study is encouraged to find safe solutions to providing increased public access including parking at Columbia.
- Turn pocket at entrance: this is a dangerous entrance, how will increased use be done safely with this entrance?
- Access to shoreline: they prefer to not increase the public access to the shoreline at their site.
- What will a potentially larger scale parking area do to the historic landscape?



General Comments:

- Recommended to have archeological monitoring during wetland delineation (NPS-LEWI will provide monitoring).
- Next cultural resources Inventory (potential days January 12-15).
 - Develop testing methods only for sites that have the potential to be developed.
 - Notify planned work schedules to Tribes and other interested Agencies.
 - Tribes and interested Agencies have the right to review drafts before the next steps.
 - Tribe will review formatting of products for security of sacred information.
- Develop an Interpretive Plan for the State Park, Tribe and NPS for continuity about the site.
- Surface soils should be studied to understand how it can either be of use in protecting cultural material or how it may be needed to have more suitable soil for reduced compaction brought to the site.
- Select culturally valuable plants for landscaping (Labrador Tea).
- Since 2005 the site has been monitored for disturbances and none have been observed.
- Tribe has worked in spirit of cooperation to support good ideas coming forward.
- Concerns: site protection, grave protection, longevity of Chinook on the site, development will recognize Chinook, recognize village site.
- How to enter a plank house (inter panel?).
- Signage on how to be respectful (Hawaiian example).
- Scarborough Hill has positive and negative stories to the site.
- Tribes would like to be contemporary (i.e. First Salmon Ceremony at Ft. Columbia).
- Ft. Columbia could be water access for tribal ceremonies.
- Signage of respectful behavior is important to display subtlety.
- Berms on site are different than how the site was a potential disturbance to the tribe
- “Re-mounding” or adding sand to reestablish a berm context and provide additional protection.

- Perspective on how the houses laid on the land is valuable to express to visitors.
- Removing the viewing mounds would restore the landscape; providing visitors with a more accurate depiction of the village site.

Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service were invited to comment and attend an agency scoping meeting. No formal response or attendance to the agency scoping occurred. Endangered, threatened, proposed, and candidate species and critical habitat protected under the ESA were obtained from the following agencies and can be found in Appendix B: Biological Evaluation:

- NOAA Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Services (NMFS) website research for species lists on May 17, 2010 (NMFS 2010).
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) website research for county species and habitats list on May 17, 2010 (USFWS 2007).
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) *Critical Habitat Portal* website research on May 17, 2010 (USFWS 2010).
- WDFW *Priority Habitats and Species* (PHS) Report dated April 13, 2010 (WDFW 2010a).
- WDFW *SalmonScape* website research on May 17, 2010 (WDFW 2010b).
- Washington Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) Website research conducted on May 17, 2010 (WDNR 2010).

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act

The Washington DAHP was contacted in December 2009 to begin consultation, pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act [36 CFR 800.2(c)(4)]. DAHP is very interested in this project because of the sensitivity of cultural resources at the site. DAHP was also invited to attend a tribal and agency scoping meeting and was requested to advise NPS in the development of a study plan for a cultural resources inventory (CRI) of the site. NPS received a review of the CRI study plan on March 4, 2010. The CRI study was revised and resubmitted to DAHP. NPS then contacted DAHP by phone regarding the revised CRI. DAHP indicated they were satisfied with the revisions and to proceed with the study while keeping DAHP informed of the results.



National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior

Station Camp – Middle Village Park
Washington

NPS met with DAHP on September 23, 2010 to discuss preliminary reviews of the CRI study findings. The report will be transmitted to DAHP for formal concurrence in November, 2010. A letter to DAHP can be found in Appendix A: Relevant Correspondence.

Tribal Consultation

The National Park Service places great emphasis on not only government to government consultation, but also government to government collaboration with both recognized and unrecognized Indian Tribal Nations.

NPS initiated formal consultation in December 2009 with the Chinook Indian Nation, the Confederated Tribes of the Grande Ronde, the Cowlitz Indian Tribe, the Chehalis Confederated Tribes, the Quinault Indian Nation, and the Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe. We invited all of these Tribal Governments to join us at a Dec 17, 2009 scoping meeting. The consultation letters can be found in Appendix A: Relevant Correspondence. Representatives from the cultural committee of the Chinook Indian Nation and the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer from the Confederated Tribes of the Grande Ronde attended and shared comments, concerns, and suggestions, which are recorded earlier in this chapter.

NPS also invited the above six tribes to review the draft CRI design. Representatives from both the tribal council and cultural committee of the Chinook Indian Nation met with the CRI team on site to guide design of the study.

Tribal Chair Ray Gardner and Tribal Council Member Charlie Funk have represented the Tribal Council of the Chinook Indian Nation as part of the inter-governmental project team, which also includes NPS and the State of Washington. Chairman Gardner and Council Member Funk have been very active in guiding the design and making certain that cultural resources associated with the Chinook Indian Nation and the site in general are protected and respectfully interpreted.

FUTURE COMPLIANCE AND COORDINATION

Several permits and further agency coordination and consultation will be needed in order to construct the proposed improvements. This EA and

NEPA process is just one step in the review of this proposal. The JARPA and NEPA review are at a state and federal level with other reviews and permits required at the local county level as described in greater detail below.

Further Agency Consultation

Tribal Consultation and Concurrence – Further tribal consultation will occur concurrent with the public comment period for this EA.

Department of Archeology Historic Preservation – Documents required for concurrence by DAHP will be submitted upon completion of this document, concurrent with the public review period for this EA.

Required Permits and Approvals

Prior to the development of the site and implementation of the proposed action, a number of permits and approvals are required. These include:

Coastal Zone Management (CMZ) Consistency and Certification – This CZM Certification is required due to the location of the project site within one of the 15 coastal counties of Washington State. This program is regulated by the Washington State Department of Ecology. This certification is required of all federal or federally funded projects, activities or developments to determine that the project is consistent with Washington’s Coastal Zone Management Program (WCZMP) to the “maximum extent practicable.”

State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) – This State environmental review is required for every project. In this case the EA and NEPA review is aiding in the SEPA review. The SEPA review is led by Pacific County, the local agency with jurisdiction, as part of their permit review process.

National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) – An NPDES permit is required due to the site area of proposed “disturbance” or soil movement. In this case the importing of soil and area of new impervious surfaces exceeds the one acre threshold. This permit includes the noticing of the project and a stormwater discharge permit from the Department of Ecology.



Shoreline Management Substantial Development Permit (SDP) – An SDP is required for any improvements that occur within 200 feet of the OHWM of a waterbody of significance. In this case the waterbody is the Columbia River, where the proposed improvements lie within the 200-foot shoreline jurisdiction.

Critical Areas Resource Lands (CARL) Variance Application – The CARL is the ordinance that provides regulations to the development of projects located in critical areas and resource lands within Pacific County. A CARL variance is triggered due to the impacts proposed to wetland buffers at the site. This CARL application requires the completion of a JARPA application (more on JARPA below).

Joint Aquatic Resources Permit Application (JARPA) – A JARPA is a joint application that is used by a variety of reviewing agencies to review aquatic resource impacts of a proposal. Due to the potential impacts to wetland buffers from this project a JARPA is required.

Development Permit Application – A development permit application is required in Pacific County for all new development or grading activity. Due to the significance of improvements proposed, this review is triggered.



National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior

Station Camp – Middle Village Park
Washington