

Vital Signs Indicators Project: Cultural Resources Subgroup Meeting Notes

Tuesday, January 08, 2008

Gorge Commission office, White Salmon, WA

Attendees:

Greg Griffith, Washington Dept. of Archaeology and Historic Preservation

Marge Dryden, USFS - Scenic Area

Cheryl Mack, USFS – Gifford Pinchot

Jeremy Fivecrows, Columbia River Intertribal Fish Commission

Sarah Thompson, Columbia River Intertribal Fish Commission

Sally Donovan, Donovan & Associates

Sally Duncan, OSU Institute of Natural Resources

Jeff Tryens, Gorge Commission consultant

Brian Litt, Gorge Commission

Angie Kenney, Gorge Commission

Jennifer Kaden, Gorge Commission

The meeting was conducted primarily by conference call due to inclement weather.

After introductions, Greg Griffith recapped the last subgroup meeting (held December 11) and noted that many attending today's meeting were not at the first meeting. Jennifer Kaden noted the two main goals for today's meeting were to finalize the cultural resource objectives and to begin identifying indicators. A draft set of indicators should be ready for review prior to the next joint meeting of the Technical Advisory Team and Community Advisory Team, January 28.

Objectives: Angie Kenney explained that draft objectives were produced by staff and consultants last summer for each resource. The group discussed the 3 proposed objectives for the goal to protect and enhance cultural resources:

- 4.1 Protect and enhance significant archeological and prehistoric resources.
- 4.2 Protect and enhance significant historic resources.
- 4.3 Protect and enhance traditional cultural properties.

The group discussed the definitions of "significant" and "cultural resource." With guidance from Jeff Tryens, the group decided to use footnotes to define these terms – as opposed to defining them within the objectives. Management Plan definitions were agreed upon.

Brian Litt raised an issue identified by the Community Advisory Team – cultural resources of local significance. Cheryl Mack raised the issue that some tribes use more encompassing definitions of cultural resources than the Management Plan. Jeremy Fivecrows offered to post definitions of cultural resource used by the Yakama and another tribal government. The group discussed whether to add a 4th objective related to cultural resources of local or tribal significance. After much discussion, the group determined that cultural resources of local and tribal significance would be captured by the 3 objectives and by eligibility for state or national registers.

Greg Griffith raised a concern about the word "prehistoric" and questioned how that was different from historic. The group agreed that "prehistoric" was covered by or included in "historic" resources and decided to strike the words "and prehistoric" from Objective 4.1.

Marge Dryden, Cheryl Mack and Sally Donovan raised the question of why the word "significant" isn't used in Objective 4.3. It was noted that the term "important" is used in the definition of traditional cultural properties (TCP) to help determine significance. Greg Griffith noted that a TCP still has to meet state or national eligibility criteria to be significant, but that evaluation includes how the community values the identified resource. The group agreed to add the term "significant" in Objective 4.3.

The adopted objectives, as modified, are:

- 4.1 Protect and enhance significant archeological resources.
- 4.2 Protect and enhance significant historic resources.
- 4.3 Protect and enhance significant traditional cultural properties.

Footnotes will be included to define "cultural resource," "significant," "historic resource," and "traditional cultural property."

Indicators: Jeff Tryens discussed the group's task: to identify indicators (or measures) at a societal level. Indicators will measure how cultural resources are doing from a global perspective. ("What's the state of the resource?") He distinguished indicators from key performance indicators. Jeff recommended we identify indicators for each objective.

An indicator such as "Percent of known archeological sites protected" was discussed. The difficulty of measuring whether an archeological resource is protected was raised. Marge estimated that maybe 10 out of 1,000 sites have had a conditions assessment done. Jeff encouraged the group to think about what is important to measure and not worry so much about how it will be measured or how the measurement might appear – that's part of the next phase of the indicators project. Marge discussed her on-going monitoring program and its limitations.

Sally Duncan raised the question of whether we wanted to have an indicator that points to the ability to take care of cultural resources.

A preliminary indicator "Incidents of vandalism and violation" was discussed.

Jeff Tryens suggested a draft indicator for Objective 4.1: "Percent of monitored archeological sites that are undisturbed per year." The group agreed it was a good start as an indicator that measured something meaningful and was feasible to measure.

Jeff offered another draft indicator for Objective 4.1: "Percent of sites damaged where mitigation/enforcement occurs." The group agreed.

Marge raised the question of what is meant by protect? Enhance? The group agreed enhancement can mean interpretation, public awareness, enhancing the value of a resource (e.g. through education), restoring an historic building, etc.

For objectives 4.2 and 4.3 the group agreed to generally repeat the two indicators identified by Jeff Tryens. To address enhancement of cultural resources, the group came up with:

- "Number of historic resources rehabilitated" (and agreed to define "rehabilitate" as defined by the Secretary of the Interior's standards)
- "Number of outreach efforts" (with subgroups for type of outreach/education/interpretation programs).

Jennifer said she would write up the draft indicators so far and post them on the WIKI.

Wrap-up: Group members were given 2 tasks prior to the next subgroup meeting: 1) Review meeting notes, and 2) Edit and expand upon draft indicators. Both documents will be available on the WIKI.

Next Meeting: The next cultural resources subgroup meeting was scheduled for **10:00 a.m., Tuesday, January 22** at the Gorge Commission office.

- notes prepared by Jennifer Kaden