

**San Juan Islands Monument Advisory Committee  
Meeting Minutes ~ 6-9-2015 ~ Cultural Resources**

**In Attendance:**

MAC members:

Erin Corra, Eric Eisenhardt (joined for a piece of the meeting later in the day)  
Jacquelyn Ferry, Gene Helfman, Mike Jonas, Barbara Marrett, Rhea Miller Tom Reeve  
(Chair), Tom Reynolds, Jamie Stephens

BLM staff:

Marcia deChadenedes (Monument Manager), Nick Teague (Recreation Planner), Lauren  
Pidot (Planner), Rich Bailey (cultural lead for interdisciplinary team)

Public at large (note: some individuals were present for only a portion of the day):

- Boyd Pratt, San Juan Island interested in architectural heritage
- Richard Grout, San Juan Island
- OJ Loughheed, docent and board of keepers of the Patos light
- Russel Barsh, KWIAHT
- Carrie Weaver Newbury, Turn Point Lighthouse Preservation Society secretary
- Troy Olsen, Lummi nation
- Shirley Williams, Lummi nation

**Tom Reeve, Chair:**

Calls the meeting to order. Last meeting's minutes from the last are not ready for review.

**Lauren's remarks:**

- This MAC meeting is in many ways a continuation of the conversation from the meeting on natural resources. Rich will talk about the SJINM cultural/historical resources and the decisions we have around these issues. Then we'll have Q&A with him and discuss resources and what should be in the alternatives.
- We'll be breaking the day up by resource topics rather than by planning issue:
  - maritime/post contact – homesteaders etc.
  - tribal – cultures on the ground, issues around current life ways
- Remember that we are in the “could” rather than the “should” phase – we should be brainstorming the full range of things we could do to meet the purpose and need, not trying to zero in on the right answer at this point.
- We should stay focused on lands, resources, and activities over which the BLM has jurisdiction.
- Remember that there are plan level decisions and implementation level decisions. It's OK to touch on both, but we want to mostly stay focused on the level at which we will actually be working in the plan. The plan will set out the objectives and the available tools for the area; on the ground projects and issues like what our interpretive signs should actually be more appropriate for when we're implementing the plan.

**Rich's presentation:** Provided overview of where the BLM administers lands in the San Juans

- Described the fact that the proclamation looks at cultural/historical values as main components for which the NM was designated and briefly described the related objects and values.
  - In addition to describing the resources more typically associated with the SJINM, he noted that there is a fossil locality that he believes to be on BLM land at Watmough Bay
- In describing the SJINM's archaeological sites he specifically mentioned Indian Island (which has not been inventoried or tested) and Watmough Bay (where U of Washington did collection in the past)
- He described Areas of Traditional Cultural/Religious Importance and noted that we would consult on appropriate management in potential traditional use areas
- He described the historic properties associated with the SJINM, specifically lands that were withdrawn for the purpose of locating aids to navigation (Turn Point and Patos).
- The coastguard still retains part or all of the structures associated with the aids to navigation and the lands surrounding them, though, with the exception of the lighthouse at Cattle Pt., they are in the process of transferring these lands to the BLM:
  - At Cattle Point, there is 1.3 acres of Coast Guard land (including the lighthouse) surrounded by BLM land.
  - At Turn Pt there are ~ 70 acres (including the structures) that are still under Coast Guard but are in the process of being relinquished to the BLM. The BLM is currently providing the management for these areas. Even after the relinquishment is complete the Coast Guard will retain a right of way for continued access to use the facility.
  - MAC members asked how the RMP is affected by fact the some lands are still in the process of being relinquished to the BLM. Lauren explained that the BLM can still plan for these lands in anticipation of receiving them, but that the plan decisions don't go into effect until the lands are under BLM jurisdiction.
  - At Patos, the BLM has an agreement (MOU not an R&PP Lease) with State Parks to engage in cooperative management. The agreement has a sunset clause and does not dictate the direction of the plan.
- Rich provided an overview of Laws, Regulations, and Policy related to cultural and historic resources:
  - American Antiquities Act of 1906: protects resources/regulates site study/excavation and artifact collection; also provides the president with the authority to establish National Monuments.
  - Nat'l Historic Preservation Act: requires the inventory and evaluation of resources, created the Nat'l register of historic places (list and protect)
  - Archaeological Resources Protection Act: creates permitting responsibility and requires tribal and public consultation
  - Native American Graves and Repatriation Act: Recognizes the right of the tribes to reclaim graves.

- American Indian Religious Freedom Act: Agencies must allow tribes to practice and harvest on traditional land and agency cannot impede these actions
  - A MAC member asked about what “Recognized tribes” meant. Rich explained that it meant federally recognized tribal governments; others are welcomed into the public process. The BLM is reaching out to all of the tribes in the area for consultation and potential cooperating agency status. Rich explained that those with treaty rights have the ability to exert those rights.
- BLM Manual 8100 series: Internal guidance
- Executive Order 11593: Covers Inventory & Evaluation
- Executive Order 13007: recognizes tribal rights to access and protect sacred sites for ceremonial purposes.
- Executive Order 13175: requires regular and meaningful consultation with tribes.
- The MAC asked about the BLM manuals and handbooks. They are publically available and can be found here: [www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/info/regulations/Instruction\\_Memos\\_and\\_Bulletins/blm\\_manual.html](http://www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/info/regulations/Instruction_Memos_and_Bulletins/blm_manual.html)
  - Lauren noted that the planning handbook is currently being revised.
- The MAC asked about education and visitor centers:
  - BLM staff explained that the BLM does sometimes have education and visitor centers but that they are often in communities rather than on BLM land. Siting visitor centers in communities, rather than on protected landscapes, is particularly emphasized for NM/NCA lands.
- Rich went over actions we could include in the plan, or require for implementation. (see slides 9 and 10 of the presentation)
  - Rich noted that tribes may ask the BLM for certain restrictions to protect resources and uses. The MAC asked that these requests be communicated to them so that they can inform MAC recommendations. BLM explained that this would be dependent on the tribe’s wishes.
  - He also noted, following a question from the MAC, that the RMP can set the rules for prioritizing cultural resource inventories during implementation, though there are also some requirements guiding when we do inventories. The MAC may want to recommend a particular approach to setting inventory priorities in the RMP.
- Rich went over the preliminary planning issues around cultural resources.
- Rich went over the requirement to place areas eligible for or listed on the Nat’l register of Historical Properties into use allocations through the plan. He noted that these allocations could vary by alternative. He provided some examples of current use at cultural sites and the questions we should consider as we’re applying the use criteria.
- MAC member asked: How do we deal with overlapping planning issue categories and use allocations for specific areas?
  - Allocations can overlap and we can manage for multiple resources in a specific area, though we do need to be careful that all of the management is

consistent. Different alternatives may emphasize different things (recreation, cultural/historical values etc.), though all must meet the purpose and need.

- Only the historic site has a use allocation not the entire parcel.
- After Rich's presentation the MAC voted on amending the agenda to allow public comment to take place before lunch.
- **Public Comments:**  
Russel Barsh– KWIAT: There are requirements around consulting with tribal governments, but many of the locations within the monument are associated with specific families rather than tribes. Using one tribe's narrative for a specific place is not historically or culturally accurate. The BLM needs to discuss management with the specific families that are associated with these places; these families may be spread through different tribes and locations currently. Make sure that there is government to government consultation AND familial connections to the land in the NM when discussing these management options

### **BREAK for lunch**

Marcia facilitated the first part of the meeting after lunch; Lauren was absent for the first half hour or so.

### **Discussion of Maritime/Post-Contact Resources**

- Mike Jonas distributed his write up of a possible Patos and turn pt. draft of range of alternatives
- **Larger Topics to be discussed when drafting range of alternatives:**
  - (Tom R.) non-maritime post contact history in the islands, should be included in the interpretation.
  - Are there sites in the National Monument that are appropriate for the European post contact history beyond Patos, Turn, and Cattle?
    - Chadwick hill – historic trail
    - Not many other sites
      - Blind Island? Homestead at Watmough?
- (Rhea) Traditional cultural/spiritual (non indigenous) involvement with some of these areas – main suggestion was to not promote these areas
  - Special activities with specific permits or closure (to all or to those not involved)
    - coming of age, meditation, ritual etc.
    - Campfires?
- (Tom) Light houses most likely place for on-property interpretive facilities rather than just signage, i.e. museum or display
  - if we do interpretive centers at the light houses, to what extent are those open when not manned (without a docent)
    - What is the seasonal component?
    - Gift shops or other commercial activities? Revenue generation or cost recovery
      - Does the \$\$\$ go to the keeper association, the BLM fund or whatever?

- In general, when there are opportunities for friend groups/partners to run project that support visitor use (not taxed if it's for environmental/cultural education program) – goes back to the organization. Within the agency there is an opportunity for the \$ to go back to the BLM but it goes back to the general fund of the district but not for the site.
- Should there be a docent/caretaker accommodation that's not just a campsite?
  - Use of the historic structures or bringing in a tiny house/trailer (other temporary structures) – Patos camping turn - trailer
  - Issues of access (constrained by access and \$\$\$)– daily access for not staying the night
    - With previous knowledge, private tours can happen or can come during docent hours (Turn Point)
    - Commercial visitation on tour – with special use permit (Turn Point)
      - Residential concerns about these becoming high traffic areas (Turn Point)
- Year round visitation?
  - Seasonal impacts at Patos and Shark Reef
    - Considering seasonal closures
- Q for recreation: should we leave ourselves with the ability to designate routes in Turn pt. if there is an increase in traffic
  - Add picnic tables?
- What additional restoration and maintenance work should we be considering for alternatives?
  - Analysis will be done for the cost of each alternatives
- Facilities to accommodate usage (restrooms potable water) and how this interacts with the historical attributes
  - Rules and regulations about re-plumbing historic residences or updating the wiring
- Some uses are permit type activities and maybe fee type activities – is there a model for fees with certain types of activities
  - Special recreation permits
  - Standard formula and fee for the special permit process
- Where are we in the historical restoration process? Some has already been restored but how much farther do we want to restore?
  - Residence and fog signal building at turn pt. will need more restoration
    - Is waterproof and stabilized but could be refurbished/restored back to period
    - Current thought is that the primary light keepers cabin (NW) is being brought to the 1950s (the last time it was rehabbed) required period furniture
      - To go further, the trailer for the docent is not adequate
        - Patos docent – yurt?

- Patos light house is fully restored
        - Lighthouse license plate fund is a possible source of funding.
      - Some MAC members are taking an August 11 field trip to Turn Pt. and Patos
- Both Turn Pt. and Patos have been evaluated for the historical register
  - Is there overlap with the post European contact characteristics?
    - Yes at Patos, not at Turn Pt. (as far as we know)
- Range of alternatives
  - Passive onsite interpretation (could cover whatever combination of themes)
  - Active interpretation that includes the docent and docent activities (opening the interpretation centers)
  - Could recommend that the interpretation included some pre-contact history of the islands
    - Museum at the one room school house on Stuart Island includes precontact
    - Maybe work with partners to develop a self-guided tour of Patos with brochure of historical/cultural sites. SJINM associated land just one stop.
- Potential to have more access with buoys and changing the docks at both Patos and Stewart
  - Not technically on BLM land, would have to work with other agencies to provide this access/resources (can recommend)
    - Could have an objective around increasing visitation – would also need to partner with other agencies
  - Buoys would be better for the bottom environment than anchors with increased traffic.
  - Docent/administrative access would also be enhanced through work on buoys or docks
  - Dock at Patos?
    - Expanding the old boating dock, below the light house with cement structure
- Tom: Alternative that includes more investment in the facilities for interpretation at Turn Pt. and Patos Island or is the expectation smaller more manageable facilities like currently at Turn Pt.?
- Marcia: Budding network of light houses/partners of light houses working together for the Salish Sea
  - Help with education and keep light house enthusiasts at the table for discussions
- Barbara: County regulations of commercial activity on Stewart Island
  - How would the local community welcome renting out Turn Pt. facilities?
    - Should be included in the range of alternatives
      - May need to put limits on it
- Tom: Turn Point keepers quarters used for a retreat center
- Alternative that would set limits on event sizes, keeping things more or less how they are now.
- Add docent facilities to enhance interpretation – education

- Consider visitor accessibility challenged visitors and interpretation
- Rich Bailey: Can address sites in greater detail through implementation through a cultural resource management plan and/or a recreational management plan
- Lauren Pidot: Sounds like MAC wants to see an alternative that focuses on low impact, passive interpretation, protecting historic resource and an alternative with more active interpretation, more visitors, more facilities, possibly more active restoration.
- Tom: explore reconstruction of previously existing historic buildings (replica or visual reconstruction) (mainly at Patos)
  - Would we even want this in an alternative
    - Yes
  - \$\$\$ could be high
    - hiding/camouflaging/adapting modern necessities within the historic details of these buildings ie security cameras
    - Precedent: restoration/replacement of old water tanks (interpretive center) on Patos that are masking communication towers
    - Can include requirements for this kind of masking in talks with Coast Guard around their needs for the facilities.
- Date to which we would restore too – implementation decision or in the objectives of the RMP decisions?
  - Could be either but want to provide a clear objective (even if not a specific date) in RMP.
  - Should any structure be compatible with the existing structures in terms of physical appearance?
  - Should we only have structures built where there were previous structures
  - MAC member suggested taking part of Turn Pt. part to 1950s, maybe another part to when it was originally built 1800s – in the alternatives
- Rich: restoration is taking it back to a time period. Can also look at rehabilitation – bring it back but for different purposes
  - Restoration: taking it back to an original time period in physical appearance and purpose
  - Rehabilitation: can update a facility’s interior
  - Recreate: new structure made to look like a historic structure (not necessarily defined to a period)

**Brief logistical discussion before going into Tribal Resources discussion:**

- MAC decides to give tribal members attending the meeting a few minutes at the beginning and the end to help discuss tribal issues. It also decides that it does not need time to discuss logistics before the 3:45 public comment period (i.e., the issue-based discussion can go until 3:45).
- The next MAC meeting will be July 8<sup>th</sup> on Lopez, most likely at the Grange
- Lauren wanted people to know that the BLM evaluates its plans every 5 years or so to assess, using monitoring data, whether objectives are being met. This is used to access the need for amendments and revisions.

**Tribal input from Lummi Nation – Troy and Shirley**

- Shirley: described to the MAC the way that revisiting the San Juan Islands is affecting the youth and elders. It's important for children and others to know that they come from more than a reservation. "I want to learn about myself – I don't want to forget." Bringing children here helps us to remember our culture and where we came from. Hopes that a Coast Salish curriculum is integrated with a western curriculum. Troy: Coast Salish People are defined by language, by dialect. The revival and teaching of traditional languages is a way to integrate traditional values back into their culture.

**Tom, Chair:** talked about growing up in Honolulu and the Hawai'ian renaissance. There are now two official languages and Hawai'ian place names and language on signs. Hawai'ian culture is embraced by everyone who lives there and arrives. Could do something similar here in these islands – the BLM could help facilitate the embracing of heritage (language, story and connection to place) with partners. By choosing to live here, one of your obligations is to listen to that story and to spread it

- Talked about treaty rights and the obligation to allow access for traditional/cultural reasons.
- Rhea: people want these areas protected, but by creating a NM is has exposed the area more
  - Take into account, how to provide education for visitors that sets the story or flavor of the area before they even get to these sites
    - Spiritual/educational center – background information with Leave no trace
  - Education should include tribal heritages of these BLM lands and the people's involved
    - Encourage BLM to work with the San Juan County land bank and national parks as cooperative agencies and the tribes of the area to do so
  - Process explored for a story pole about this area perhaps on Lopez Island, off BLM lands – as part of a cultural education
    - Gene: How would such a thing be researched and what would go on it?
      - International boundaries, many tribes and languages
- Tom: Reef netting/traditional cultivation
  - Example of need for access to BLM lands for use
  - Should be in the planning to encourage the reinvigoration of these cultural practices rather than grudging acceptance
  - Encourage the camas cultivation/harvest (prescribed burning would be included possibly) at Iceberg – in the alternatives
    - Good opportunity for public outreach and education
    - Wouldn't work in alternative that would emphasize a more passive approach.
    - Balance potential conflict between listed special designation species and cultural cultivation



- Marcia provided an overview about what BLM is doing to engage tribes with the SJINM:
  - Reaching out to 10 tribes to have individual relationships and conversations with them about the proclamation and the NM and what the opportunities for restoration might mean for them
  - How do they want to participate in the restoration of their story in these places
    - Suggesting that it's not the government's place to decide which tribe gets to interpret or help develop the vision for which area. Tribes might create a forum outside the government where they could work together to determine what they would and wouldn't like to see and where – also could inform the Park service with this information.
  - In telling the story, we don't tell the story but welcome them to tell their story instead in a partnership capacity (no one other than the tribes can tell the story of the tribes.)
- Tom R: Can we encourage the BLM to encourage the tribes to think of this as a resource for the islands instead of just the BLM and park service? So that there can be a consistent story and picture across everything
  - Need a formal recommendation?
    - Rhea wants to have a proposed recommendation for the MAC around this topic
- A member of the public who missed the earlier discussion noted that it sounded like the discussion was only touching on one time period. Tom Reeves clarified that the MAC is interested in the whole timeline of human engagement with the landscape, this is just one part of the day's discussion.
- Tom R: Particularly at Watmough Bay, is there a way we can protect sensitive resources through education rather than just being silent about them, so that visitors treat it as a special place and respect and protect it.
  - Enhance interpretation about the cultural/tribal values and history to include any specifics that the tribes are comfortable with
  - Create outreach/literature about why we don't dig on these lands
  - Could have an alternative that would close the area that we know has remains at Watmough. Could look at excluding people from areas that have known archaeological significance of any type we choose
- Tom R: Should we consider creating a reconstructed native use site? Give visitors an interpretative narrative about what life was back in the day, camas cultivation and real life demonstration
  - Should be included in alternative lists
- Are there places off the SJINM that are appropriate to reconstruct a long house (onsite could create resource impacts)?
  - Land bank land? On the Otis Perkins, with the Reef netting remains are?
  - Empty lot between blossom and the bakery (Lopez village commons)
- There should be interpretive consistency between land managers.
- We can make sure that the visitors that come are informed, respectful, and careful – visitors are going to come and visitation is going to continue to increase

- The office acts as a kind of visitor center on Lopez, but is it also necessary to have one on San Juan Island? Or maybe a traveling library, and online educational opportunities?
- Lauren: The BLM can work on online interpretation and developing a consistent approach with partners outside of the RMP. We might include some interpretive emphasis areas in the RMP, but not the specific interpretive messages.
- Jamie: what about smaller islands like Indian Island or Blind Island?
  - Assume that all land is culturally rich and special or could recommend that actual evaluation be done by the BLM on whatever set of specific properties that may have high recreational use in an alternative?
  - Where we recommend heavy recreation access, should we recommend that the RMP prioritize cultural inventory.
- Would be nice to find out the original names and to use them in interpretation to emphasize the fact that we are not the first people here – would need to work with tribal groups on this; likely multiple names.
- We're considering closing some areas to recreation for habitat/wildlife, should we also consider having cultural no go zones?
- Gene: is there a link for any sort to Native American presence in the area on the NM website?
  - Website under construction but there is intention to add it
- Tom R: How accessible do we make public information?
  - Lauren: the extent to which the BLM posts things online isn't something we would address through the plan, but the MAC is welcome to make recommendations on anything it would like.
- Scoping comments suggested that we have an alternative that downplays the advertising of the monument and limits signage (which would mean restricting or excluding interpretive signage on the landscape).
- Meanwhile what can happen in terms of signage, before the RMP is in place?
  - As long as it is something that is removable and we are not adding permanent things
- Tom R: The BLM must do cultural inventory before ground disturbing activities. BLM staff agree with Tom.
- Try to overlap recreational access with cultural access areas to limit ground disturbance as long as it doesn't interfere with the cultural aspects – though it's not recreation it should be considered as part of our travel planning
- How do you emphasize cultural experience/interpretation of a location while decreasing risk to these cultural/spiritual sites?
  - Varying degrees of signage – places that are identified as limited access zones except for cultural reasons and others that are identified for limited access (please protect the past for the future)
- How do we balance the accustomed use of these lands (particularly where there has been substantial recreational use) with protecting tribal values? Push for inventory and evaluation so that the public can be educated and the area can be protected – probably case by case basis for interpretation
- BLM will honor treaty rights –
  - Includes gathering for tribal use

- Over 50 years old, cultural treaties – considered cultural sites
- Comments during scoping to prohibit shoreline armoring/stabilization in an unnatural way
  - Conflicts with protecting NA/tribal interests where erosion is exposing remains and artifacts.
    - Limit using shoreline stabilization in the alternatives? Allow it as a potential tool or take it off the table entirely?
  - Consider: For specific objects and values biological/cultural etc, if these are threatened the BLM may take extraordinary measures when necessary (with a specific described processes) – should be discussed with tribes and emergency responders
- Traditional uses: the BLM received public comments about current spiritual activities of locals on Lopez. Could protect through special permits and managing the area for solitude/quiet.

### **Additional tribal input from Troy and Shirley of the Lummi Nation**

- Troy: they saw a presentation at U of Victoria on First Nations camas cultivation at U of Victoria. Would like to see tribes engaged in burn, reseeding, cultivating the old traditional plants, indigenous foods gathering
- Shirley: Obama’s Proclamation includes history of the Coast Salish and includes reef netting in the area. Would like to develop a curriculum around that is focused on a neutral territory
  - Cultural revitalization and education
  - Ability to fish together internationally and to fish in accustomed territories
- How successful has it been working with the 10 tribes? When are the tribes coming to the table to discuss this all?
  - Marcia is currently working with them and Rhea is making a suggestion to continue this dialog
- Emphasizing education and spiritual – separate the two topics to avoid conflicts
  - Say that you’re willing to support and honor the spiritual and educational sides individually
    - Start with indigenous colleges/education programs – to help with the education and public outreach
      - Public domain information so as to not overstep boundaries (people may not know what is in the public domain)
  - Envisioning the longhouses, canoe sheds etc. (John Elliot – beautiful totem poles of reef netter)
    - Treaty says they can erect temporary structures for curing – would be healing places
- There is a great play: “What about those promises?” about the San Juan Islands
- Troy: huge task ahead, thanks for preserving land and protecting it in a good way
  - Hard to satisfy everyone but thanks for trying
- Shirley: maps and storyboards including dialects of the people – who was of this territory
  - Linguistic similarities and story similarities

- Anything built ensure that tribes that are willing can add indigenous names to the signage for plants/animals/places

**Other public comments:**

- OJ Lougheed: How many different languages do we speak in this room? – pay attention to linguistic differences that can cause differences in lifestyle and relationships and belief systems
  - Pay attention to the water bodies in San Juan County
- Boyd Pratt: Pay attention to the vernacular landscape. Talking a lot about structures and things, but the landscape itself has a story. Think about history as a continuity – cultures always change through time, not just pre/post contact.
  - Often campsites are on pre-contact/historic sites – can't confine this significance to one time period
  - The islands are historical in and of themselves:
    - Consider why the monument came to be. Public domain process (US owning the property then redispersing them to townships and other government agencies and private agents) – some islands couldn't be utilized so were kind of left out. Need to emphasize this in the interpretation of the NM
    - Use of islands as islands – fascinating in terms of light houses and also have shipwrecks and smuggling
    - Transitional practices
      - Camas on smaller islands when there were pigs on the other islands and the pigs dug up the camas plants
      - From wooly dogs on the islands to sheep
    - Farming practices
  - Continuity of the intermarriages of Coast Salish and Europeans in this area
    - Transformational sites
      - reef netting areas with fisherman shacks nearby
      - euro-American style boats used for traditional reef netting
  - Use oral history to capture the history of all these sites – documented vs on the ground history