

1	James J. Nicita		
2	OSB No. 024068		
3	302 Bluff Street		
4	Oregon City, OR	97045	
5	(503) 650-2496	voice	FILED 08 OCT 6 16:00USDC-ORP
6	james.nicita@gmai	Lcom	
7	-		
8	Of Attorney for P	laintiffs	
9	•		
10			
11		UNITED STATES DISTRICT C	OURT
12			
13		DISTRICT OF OREGON	
14			CV 708 - 4 4 4 -

HEREDITARY CHIEF WILBUR SLOCKISH, a resident of Washington, individually and as Hereditary Chief of the Klickitat/Cascade Tribe,

THE KLICKITAT/CASCADE TRIBE, a confederated tribe of the Yakama Indian Nation,

CHIEF JOHNNY JACKSON, a resident of Washington, individually and as Chief of the Cascade Tribe,

THE CASCADE TRIBE, a confederated tribe of the Yakama Indian Nation,

CAROL LOGAN, a resident of Oregon,

CASCADE GEOGRAPHIC SOCIETY, an Oregon nonprofit corporation,

and

MOUNT HOOD SACRED LANDS PRESERVATION ALLIANCE, an unincorporated nonprofit association,

Plaintiffs.

Case No. _____ ST

COMPLAINT

SUIT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND DAMAGES

PAGE 1 - Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief and Damages

v.

MARY E. PETERS, Individually and as U.S. Transportation Secretary,

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION, an Agency of the Federal Government,

DIRK KEMPTHORNE, Individually and as U.S. Interior Secretary,

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, an Agency of the Federal Government,

JOHN FOWLER, Individually and as Executive Director of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation,

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION, an Agency of the Federal Government,

and

MATTHEW GARRET, Individually, and as Director of the OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, an Agency of the State of Oregon,

Defendants.

7

Plaintiffs allege:

INTRODUCTION

1.

1	Plaintiffs s	eek to preserve and protect Native American sacred and cultural sites,
2	and historical and	archaeological resources in the area of Mount Hood, in Oregon. These
3	sites and resources	have been damaged, and are at further risk of further damage, by the
4	U.S. 26: Wildwoo	d-Wemme highway widening project. This project has been renamed the
5	U.S. 26: Salmon R	liver Bridge to East Lolo Pass Road Project. This damage has and will
6	occur as a result o	f the failure of the Defendants to carry out the applicable laws and
7	regulations for wh	ich they are respectively responsible.
8	The Native Ameri	can Plaintiffs also seek to secure due process of law under the Fifth and
9	Fourteenth Amen	dments to the U.S. Constitution, and redress for the U.S. Government's
10	breach of its fiduc	eary duty to the Native American Plaintiffs.
11	Plaintiffs s	eek:
12 13	` '	larations that Defendants have violated specific provisions of clicable federal and state laws and regulations;
14 15 16 17	hav	larations that in violating these laws and regulations, the Defendants e violated the civil rights of the Native American Plaintiffs and ached their fiduciary duty to the Native American Plaintiffs;
18 19 20 21 22 23	and	injunction to require Defendants to comply with applicable laws regulations and remediate damage to Native American cultural other resources associated with work on the U.S. 26: ldwood-Wemme project;
24 25	(4) the	assessment of appropriate actual and punitive damages.
26 27	(5) the	assessment of reasonable costs, expenses, and attorney fees.
28 29 30		JURISDICTION
31 32		2.

PAGE 3 - Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief and Damages

1	Jurisdiction is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343(3), and 1343(4). This
2	action is brought pursuant to 5 U.S.C. §§701-706; 16 U.S.C. §§ 470(f) and 470w-4; 42
3	U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1988 and the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution
4	of the United States.
5	VENUE
6	3.
7	Venue of this court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b). A substantial
8	portion of the events giving rise to the claims occurred within this Division of Oregon, as
9	alleged below. The segment of U.S. Highway 26 from the Salmon River Bridge to East
10	Lolo Pass Road, and the cultural, historic, and archaeological resources impacted by the
11	highway widening project, are all located within unincorporated Clackamas County,
12	Oregon. The Defendants made the decisions to approve the highway widening project, fo
13	the most part, in Salem, Oregon, and the metropolitan area of Portland, Oregon.
14	PARTIES AND STANDING
15	4.
16	Plaintiff Wilbur Slockish is a resident of the State of Washington. He is an
17	Hereditary Chief of the Klickitat/Cascade Tribe, which is a confederated tribe within the
18	Yakama Indian Nation. He is a direct descendant of Sla-kish, a signatory to the 1855
19	Treaty with the Yakama.
20	A. Slockish, individually and as the representative of the Klickitat/Cascade
21	Tribe, has been harmed by the damage to the historic and cultural resource
22	in which it has an interest, including the Native American Traditional

PAGE 4 - Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief and Damages

1	Cul	tural Property located within the U.S. 26 highway widening project
2	area	2.
3	B. Slo	ckish, individually and as the representative of the Klickitat/Cascade
4	Tri	be, has been harmed by the breach of his and his Tribe's entitlement to
5	be o	consulted regarding the U.S. 26 highway widening project.
6		5.
7	The Klicki	at/Cascade Tribe is a confederated Tribe of the Yakama Indian Nation.
8	The Klickitat/Casc	ade Tribe considers the Mount Hood area, including U.S. 26 highway
9	widening project a	rea, to be a Traditional Cultural Property.
10	A. The	Klickitat/Cascade Tribe has been harmed by the damage to the historic
11	and	cultural resources in which it has an interest, including the Native
12	Am	erican Traditional Cultural Property located within the Dwyer
13	Ме	morial Forest and within the right-of-way of the U.S. 26 highway
14	wid	ening project.
15	B. The	Klickitat/Cascade Tribe has been harmed by the breach of its
16	enti	tlement to be consulted regarding the U.S. 26 highway widening
17	pro	ject.
18		6.
19	Plaintiff Jo	hnny Jackson is a resident of the State of Washington. He is a Chief of
20	the Cascade Tribe.	
21	A. Jac	kson, individually and as the representative of the Cascade Tribe, has
22	bee	n harmed by the damage to the historic and cultural resources in which

1	it h	as an interest, including the Native American Traditional Cultural
2	Pro	perty located within the Dwyer Memorial Forest and within the right-
3	of-	way of the U.S. 26 highway widening project.
4	B. Jac	kson, individually and as the representative of the Klickitat/Cascade
5	Tri	be, has been harmed by the breach of his and his Tribe's entitlement to
6	be	consulted regarding the U.S. 26 highway widening project.
7		7.
8		
9	The Casca	de Tribe considers the Mount Hood area, including the U.S. 26 highway
10	widening project a	rea, to be a Traditional Cultural Property.
11	A. The	Cascade Tribe has been harmed by the damage to the historic and
12	cul	tural resources in which it has an interest, including the Native
13	An	erican Traditional Cultural Property located within the Dwyer
14	Me	morial Forest and within the right-of-way of the U.S. 26 highway
15	wic	lening project.
16	B. The	Cascade Tribe has been harmed by the breach of its entitlement to be
17	cor	sulted regarding the U.S. 26 highway widening project.
18		8.
19		5.
20	Plaintiff C	arol Logan is a resident of Oregon, and is of Native American ancestry.
21	She is a member of	f the Mount Hood Sacred Land Preservation Alliance (hereinafter
22	"MHSLPA"). She	has since the 1980s engaged in advocacy to preserve and protect
23	Native American :	sacred lands within the Mount Hood area, including the project area at
24	issue in this dispu	te.

PAGE 6 - Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief and Damages

1	A.	Logan has been harmed by the damage to the historic and cultural
2	res	ources in which it has an interest, including the Native American
3	Tra	ditional Cultural Property located within the Dwyer Memorial Forest
4	and	within the right-of-way of the U.S. 26 highway widening project.
5		9.
6	Plaintiff C	ascade Geographic Society (hereinafter "CGS") is a nonprofit
7	corporation based	in Rhododendron, Oregon. It is dedicated to preserving and promoting
8	cultural, historical	and natural resources of the Cascade Mountain Range and all the lands
9	and waters that it i	nfluences. Since the 1980s, CGS has undertaken research into the
10	Native American,	Pioneer, and other history in the Mount Hood Area. It has coordinated
11	preservation effor	s with Native Americans, descendants of Pioneers, the Dwyer Family,
12	and other intereste	d parties, directed toward these resources.
13	A.	CGS is harmed by the damage to the historic and cultural, and
14	nat	ural resources in which it has an interest, including the Native
15	An	erican Traditional Cultural Property located within the Dwyer
16	Me	morial Forest, the tree removal within the Dwyer Memorial Forest
17	itse	lf, the Barlow Road, and archaeological sites associated with the
18	Bar	low Road, such as the potential Barlow Road stone toll booth.
19	·	10.
20	Defendant	Mary E. Peters is the U.S. Transportation Secretary. She oversees
21	Defendant U.S. D	epartment of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration.
22		11.

1	Defendant	U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration
2	(hereinafter "FHW	A") is an agency of the United States government, and administers the
3	Federal Aid Highw	ay Program in Oregon authorized by 23 U.S.C. § 101 et. seq., including
4	the U.S. 26: Wildw	rood-Wemme project. FHWA is the lead agency for the U.S. 26:
5	Wildwood-Wemm	e project.
6		12.
7	Defendant I	Dirk Kempthorne is the U.S. Interior Secretary. He oversees the
8	Defendant U.S. De	partment of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management.
9		13.
10	Defendant I	U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management (hereinafter
11	"BLM"), is an ager	cy of the United States government. It owns the Wildwood Recreation
12	Area in Clackamas	County, including the Dwyer Memorial Forest, which is the northeast
13	corner of the Wildy	wood Recreation area. The area of the Wildwood Recreation Area and
14	Dwyer Memorial F	orest located north of U.S. 26 lies partially within the project area of
15	the U.S. 26 highwa	y widening project.
16		14.
17	Defendant I	John Fowler is the Executive Director of the Advisory Council on
18	Historic Preservation	on.
19		15.
20	Defendant A	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (hereinafter "ACHP") is an
21	agency of the Unite	d States government. It is charged with advising other federal agencies

PAGE 8 - Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief and Damages

1 as to the responsibilities and obligations of the latter under the National Historic 2 Preservation Act (hereinafter "NHPA") 3 16. 4 Defendant Matthew Garrett is the Director of the Oregon Department of 5. Transportation (hereinafter "ODOT"), which is the agent of Defendant FHWA for the 6 Federal Aid Highway Program pursuant to 23 U.S.C. § 315. Defendant Garrett has served 7 as ODOT's Director since December 19, 2005. Claims made against Garrett are under the 8 Ex Parte Younger doctrine for his failure to comply with federal law. 9 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS** 10 17. 11 Prior to European settlement, the area of Mount Hood was utilized by several 12 Native American Indian groups, including Sahaptin language groups which include the Klickitat language. In the mid-19th Century, a series of treaties removed Native Americans 13 14 from these areas to the Yakama (Washington), Grande Ronde and Warm Springs (Oregon) 15 reservations. However, many of these Native Americans resisted removal to the 16 reservations and continued to live along the Columbia River and surrounding areas. including the Cascade Mountains. 17 18 18. 19 The Native American history of the Mount Hood area includes complex 20 migrations in search of food sources. A network of Indian Trails developed throughout 21 the area. The Native Americans established villages, campsites, and burial grounds along these trails. European settlers took advantage of this existing network of trails. Pioneer 22

PAGE 9 - Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief and Damages

1 Samuel Barlow utilized such trails, one of which developed into the Barlow Road, the 2 westernmost segment of the Oregon Trail. A number of remnant segments of the Barlow 3 Road traverse the U.S. 26: Wildwood-Wemme project area. When first constructed, U.S. 4 26, furthermore, roughly paralleled the route of the Indian Trail / Barlow Road. 5 19. 6 Defendant FHWA and its agent ODOT widened U.S. 26 from two to four lanes in 7 the 1980s. That project included an Environmental Impact Statement (hereinafter "EIS") 8 pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (hereinafter "NEPA"), 42 U.S.C. § 9 4321 et seq. During the development of the EIS, archaeologist Richard Pettygrew 10 identified an archaeological site as a potential Barlow Road stone toll booth. This artifact 11 was, and remains, located with the U.S. 26 right-of-way owned by ODOT. It is within 12 the project area for the current U.S. 26: Wildwood-Wemme project. 13 20. 14 During the 1980s highway widening project, a rock cluster was discovered 15 adjacent to the project area. This rock cluster was located on land owned by Defendant 16 BLM, in the corner of the Wildwood Recreation Area property that is north of U.S. 26; 17 or alternatively, just within the U.S. 26 right-of-way owned by ODOT. This site is 18 within the current project area for the U.S. 16 Wildwood-Wemme project. Pettygrew 19 examined the rock cluster as a potential Pioneer or Native American gravesite, and found 20 no human remains. Pettygrew had no Native Americans on his archaeological team, and 21 the distribution list for his report included no Native Americans. Later, Yakama elder

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Wilfred Yallup independently identified the rock cluster as a burial cairn identifying surrounding graves but not containing a specific grave underneath it. 21. During the 1980s highway widening project, ODOT negotiated with Michael Jones, presently Curator of Plaintiff Cascade Geographic Society and then with Citizens for a Suitable Highway, an agreement for the protection of certain historic, cultural, and natural resources. These included, but were not limited to, the Barlow Road and the potential toll booth associated with it, the rock cluster later identified as a burial cairn, the Dwyer Memorial Forest, and the Mountain Air Park Pillars, all of which were in fact preserved, and were later to be within the project area of the current U.S. 26: Wildwood-Wemme highway widening project. 22. Throughout the 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s, various elders of the Yakama Indian Nation, including, but not limited to, Wilfred Yallup, Leo Aleck, and Plaintiffs Slockish and Jackson, expressed their interest in the Mount Hood area, including the project area of the current U.S. 26: Wildwood-Wemme project, as a Traditional Cultural Property. 23. In 1998, citizens petitioned ODOT to widen U.S. 26 again in the area of the current U.S. 26: Wildwood-Wemme project. Citizens expressed concerns for safety because this stretch of highway did not include a center refuge lane for turns. The project area, approximately 13 miles of Sandy, Oregon, is located in Township 2 South, Range 7 East, Sections 30, 31, and 32, Clackamas County. It includes the stretch of highway

PAGE 11 - Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief and Damages

1 adjacent to Mount Hood Village, the Mountain Air Park subdivision, and the Wildwood 2 Recreation Area. 3 24. 4 In 2001, the Oregon State Historic Preservation Officer, and Defendants ACHP, 5 ODOT, and FHWA signed a Programmatic Agreement (hereinafter "PMOA") Regarding 6 the Implementation of Minor Transportation Projects. This PMOA provides a 7 streamlined process for the parties to address their obligations under section 106 of the 8 National Historic Preservation Act (hereinafter "NHPA"), 16 U.S.C. §§ 470(f) and 470w-9 4; 36 C.F.R. Part 800. The PMOA lists specific tribes that shall be consulted. These 10 tribes are only Oregon tribes; the PMOA does not include the Yakama Indian Nation, nor 11 any of its confederated tribes such as Plaintiff Klickitat/Cascade Tribe, or the Cascade 12 Tribe. 13 25. 14 Defendant FHWA and its agent ODOT undertook planning for the U.S. 26 15 Wildwood-Wemme project, and in August of 2006 issued its draft Environmental 16 Assessment (hereinafter "draft EA" pursuant to NEPA. The project's Key Number is 17 12840. FHWA and ODOT selected as the "preferred alternative" the "widen to the north" 18 alternative. This alternative would add fourteen (14) feet of paving on the north side of 19 U.S. 26, in order to provide an equal amount of space for a center refuge turn lane in the 20 middle of the highway. This alternative would destroy the rock cluster that Yakama elder 21 Wilfred Yallup had identified as a burial cairn, because this resource was so close to the

PAGE 12 - Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief and Damages

1	pavement of U.S. 2	26 to begin with. It would also involve substantial grading, earth
2	moving, and tree re	emoval in the area Plaintiffs identify as a Traditional Cultural Property.
3		26.
4	The draft E	A included a June 10, 2005 archaeological report by archaeologist
5	Patrick O'Grady. 1	his report was not disclosed to the public. The report makes no
6	reference to the po	tential Barlow Road stone toll booth previously identified by Richard
7	Pettygrew in 1985.	O'Grady failed to locate the rock cluster that had been examined by
8	Pettygrew in 1986	and later identified by Yakama elder Wilfred Yallup as a burial cairn.
9	Neither O'Grady, I	HWA, nor ODOT provided the report to either the Yakama Indian
10	Nation, Plaintiff Sl	ockish, Plaintiff Jackson, or Plaintiff Logan; nor consulted any of these
11	parties for their in	out as to the significance of the rock cluster.
12		27.
13	As part of	the EA process, neither Defendant FHWA or its agent ODOT
14	consulted with Plai	ntiff Klickitat/Cascade Tribe, Plaintiff Slockish, Plaintiff Cascade
15	Tribe, or Plaintiff	Jackson, pursuant to Section 101(d)(6)(B) of the NHPA, 16 U.S.C.
16	470a(d)(6)(B); and	36 CFR § 800.2(c)(2)(ii), regarding the Traditional Cultural Properties
17	within the project a	area.
18		28.
19	After public	c hearings and public comment, FHWA and ODOT issued a Revised
20	Environmental Ass	essment (hereinafter "REA") and Finding of No Significant Impact for
Α1		
21	the project on Febr	ruary 8, 2007.

1 On February 15, 2008, Plaintiffs Carol Logan and CGS, through its Curator, 2 Michael P. Jones, sent memoranda to Defendant FHWA relating that the rock monument 3 identified as a burial cairn had recently been vandalized, and the rocks carried off. 4 Plaintiffs Logan and CGS also requested a new review of the U.S. 26: Wildwood-Wemme 5 project under section 106 of the NHPA. Defendant FHWA responded on February 26, 6 2008 that the Section 106 review prepared with the EA was satisfactory. 7 **30.** 8 Also in February of 2008, Plaintiffs Logan and CGS requested that Defendant 9 ACHP advise Defendant FHWA that an adequate Section 106 review was necessary for 10 the U.S. 26: Wildwood-Wemme project. On April 14, 2008, Defendant ACHP advised 11 Defendant FHWA that because project construction had already commenced, and because 12 no "federally recognized" Indian tribes had come forward to express concerns, no further 13 action was necessary. 14 31. On February 28, 2008, Defendant BLM, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. § 1732, issued a 15 16 permit for tree removal to ODOT in the project area of the U.S. 26: Wildwood to Wemme 17 project. In late March of 2008, contractors for Defendant FHWA and ODOT began 18 cutting trees, including old growth Douglas Fir that comprised the Dwyer Memorial 19 Forest, within the project area. This operation was substantially complete by the end of 20 that month. The permit constituted a federal undertaking under NHPA for which Section 21 106 review was necessary, because the project area constitutes a Traditional Cultural

1 Property of the Native American Plaintiffs in this case. No such review or consultation 2 with the Native American Plaintiffs took place prior to the undertaking. 3 32. 4 On April 8, 2008, Defendant FHWA, pursuant to 23 U.S.C § 139(1)(1), published 5 its Notice of Final Agency Actions on U.S. 26, Wildwood to Wemme: Clackamas 6 County, OR. The Notice appears on pp. 19134-35, Vol. 73, No. 68. 7 *3*3. 8 At some point unknown to Plaintiffs, FHWA and ODOT determined after issuing 9 the REA that they would have to secure additional right-of-way from Defendant BLM on 10 the north side of U.S. 26. The grant of the right-of-way means that the U.S. 26: 11 Wildwood-Wemme project no longer falls within the 2001 PMOA for minor 12 transportation projects, but instead requires full Section 106 review and a separate 13 memorandum of agreement. Defendant BLM issued a Letter of Consent to grant the right-14 of-way to Defendant FHWA on April 2, 2008. It is unknown to Plaintiffs at this time whether the right-of-way has actually been granted. The grant of the right-of-way itself 15 16 constitutes a second, separate federal undertaking under NHPA for which BLM must 17 undertake Section 106 review, because the project area constitutes a Traditional Cultural 18 Property of the Native American Plaintiffs in this case. No such review or consultation 19 with the Native American Plaintiffs has taken place. 20 34. 21 On April 23, 2008, Plaintiff Slockish sent a memo to ODOT, Defendant FHWA, and Defendant ACHP regarding the status of the Dwyer Memorial Forest as a Traditional 22

PAGE 15 - Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief and Damages

1 Cultural Property to him and his people, and the fact that the project area contained 2 burial grounds. On April 25, 2008, Plaintiff Jackson sent out a similar memo to the same 3 Parties. 4 35. 5 The Defendants in this case are required to make decisions that are not arbitrary, 6 capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law. 7 36. 8 On June 20, 2008, Plaintiff CGS filed a Notice of Intent to Appeal in the Oregon 9 Land Use Board of Appeals (hereinafter, "LUBA"), case no. 2008-091. Plaintiff CGS 10 appealed the denial by Clackamas County of CGS's code enforcement request against 11 ODOT for the latter's failure to seek review of the U.S. 26: Wildwood-Wemme project by 12 the Clackamas County Historic Review Board for the project's impacts on the Barlow 13 Trail. LUBA dismissed the case on August 20, 2008. CGS did not appeal the dismissal. 14 37. 15 On June 20, 2008, Plaintiff CGS filed a Notice of Intent to Appeal with LUBA, 16 case no. 2008-092. Plaintiff CGS appealed the failure of the Oregon Department of 17 Environmental Quality to comply with Oregon's land use statute in permitting ODOT to 18 undertake clearance, grading, and construction activities pursuant to an NPDES 1200-CA 19 erosion and sediment control permit. This permit covers the U.S. 26: Wildwood-Wemme 20 project. LUBA dismissed this appeal on August 20, 2008. CGS appealed LUBA's final 21 opinion and order to the Oregon Court of Appeals on September 10, 2008. The case is 22 currently pending.

PAGE 16 - Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief and Damages

1 38. 2 On July 7, 2008, Plaintiffs Slockish, Jackson and Logan filed a Notice of Intent to 3 Appeal with LUBA, case no. 2008-101. These Plaintiffs appealed ODOT's U.S. 26: 4 Wildwood-Wemme project due to ODOT's failure to comply with Oregon's land use 5 statutes. The appeal is currently pending before LUBA. 6 FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF: DEFENDANTS PETERS, FHWA AND GARRETT 7 VIOLATED THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT IN FAILING TO 8 CONSULT WITH THE NATIVE AMERICAN PLAINTIFF TRIBES REGARDING 9 THE TRADITIONAL CULTURAL PROPERTIES WITHIN THE U.S. 26: 10 WILDWOOD-WEMME PROJECT AREA. 11 12 39. 13 Plaintiffs reallege ¶¶ 1-38. 14 40. 15 Defendants Peters, FHWA and Garrett were required to consult with Plaintiffs 16 Klickitat/Cascade Tribe and Cascade Tribe to identify Traditional Cultural Properties 17 within the U.S. 26: Wildwood-Wemme project area prior to commencing the project. 16 18 U.S.C. 470a(d)(6)(B); and 36 CFR § 800.2(c)(2)(ii) They violated these provisions in 19 failing to do so. 20 41. 21 Defendants Peters, FHWA and Garrett were required to take into account the 22 effects on these Traditional Cultural Properties of the U.S. 26: Wildwood-Wemme project 23 prior to commencing the project. 16 U.S.C. 470f; and 36 CFR Part 800. They violated 24 these provisions in failing to do so.

PAGE 17 - Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief and Damages

1	SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF: DEFENDANTS PETERS, FHWA AND GARRET
2	VIOLATED THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT IN FAILING TO
3	ENSURE THAT ITS ARCHAEOLOGIST PATRICK O'GRADY MET THE
4	PROFESSIONAL STANDARD OF ARCHAEOLOGISTS IN LOCATING,
5	IDENTIFYING, AND EVALUATING THE NATIVE AMERICAN BURIAL CAIRN
6	WITHIN THE U.\$. 26: WILDWOOD-WEMME PROJECT AREA.
7	
8	42.
9	
10	Plaintiffs reallege ¶ 1-38.
1	42
12	43.
13 14	As part of their failure to identify Traditional Cultural Properties within the U.S.
15	26: Wildwood-Wemme project area, Defendants Peters, FHWA and Garrett failed to
16	ensure that their agent, archaeologist Patrick O'Grady, met professional standards. 16
17	U.S.C. § 470h-4. 36 CFR § 800.2(a)(1). As part of his archaeological report for the
18	project's Environmental Assessment O'Grady failed to locate the burial cairn within the
19	project area. Because of this failure, he further failed to consult with the Native American
20	Plaintiffs in this case to properly identify the resource. This failure, in turn, resulted in
21	the failure of Defendant's Peters, FHWA and Garrett to properly protect the resource,
22	and it was subsequently destroyed by vandalism.
23	THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF: DEFENDANTS PETERS, FHWA AND GARRETT
24	VIOLATED THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT IN FAILING TO
25	ADEQUATELY TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE EFFECTS OF THE U.S. 26:
26	WILDWOOD WEMME PROJECT ON THE POTENTIAL STONE TOLL BOOTH
27	IDENTIFIED BY RICHARD PETTYGREW IN 1985.
28	44
29	44.
30 31	Digintiffy realizes W 1 29
1	Plaintiffs reallege ¶¶ 1-38.
22	AS

1	Compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA requires an agency to adequately
2	identify historic properties. 36 CFR § 800.4. Defendants Peters, FHWA and Garrett
3	failed to undertake a sufficiently intensive-level archaeological investigation of the
4	potential stone toll booth first identified by Richard Pettygrew in 1985. Defendants
5	Peters, FHWA and Garrett therefore failed to determine whether this resource is eligible
6	for the National Register of Historic Places, and failed to take into account the effects on
7	this resource of the U.S. 26: Wildwood-Wemme project pursuant to NHPA Section 106.
8 9 10	FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF: DEFENDANTS FOWLER ACHP FAILED TO ADEQUATELY ADVISE DEFENDANTS PETERS, FHWA AND GARRETT ON THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER THE NHPA.
11	46
12 13	46.
14	Plaintiffs reallege ¶¶ 1-38.
15	I militario I della Doc
	47.
16	7/.
17	47.
	Defendants Fowler and ACHP have a duty to advise Federal and State agencies on
17	
17 18	Defendants Fowler and ACHP have a duty to advise Federal and State agencies on
17 18 19	Defendants Fowler and ACHP have a duty to advise Federal and State agencies on matters relating to historic preservation. 16 U.S.C. §§ 4701-j. It is part of the consultation
17 18 19 20	Defendants Fowler and ACHP have a duty to advise Federal and State agencies on matters relating to historic preservation. 16 U.S.C. §§ 470I-j. It is part of the consultation process under Section 106 of the NHPA. 16 U.S.C. § 470f; 36 CFR Part 800. Defendants
17 18 19 20 21	Defendants Fowler and ACHP have a duty to advise Federal and State agencies on matters relating to historic preservation. 16 U.S.C. §§ 470I-j. It is part of the consultation process under Section 106 of the NHPA. 16 U.S.C. § 470f; 36 CFR Part 800. Defendants Fowler and the ACHP failed to properly advise Defendants Peters, FHWA and Garrett or
17 18 19 20 21 22	Defendants Fowler and ACHP have a duty to advise Federal and State agencies on matters relating to historic preservation. 16 U.S.C. §§ 470I-j. It is part of the consultation process under Section 106 of the NHPA. 16 U.S.C. § 470f; 36 CFR Part 800. Defendants Fowler and the ACHP failed to properly advise Defendants Peters, FHWA and Garrett or the necessity to determine whether the U.S. 26: Wildwood-Wemme project area is a
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Defendants Fowler and ACHP have a duty to advise Federal and State agencies on matters relating to historic preservation. 16 U.S.C. §§ 470I-j. It is part of the consultation process under Section 106 of the NHPA. 16 U.S.C. § 470f; 36 CFR Part 800. Defendants Fowler and the ACHP failed to properly advise Defendants Peters, FHWA and Garrett or the necessity to determine whether the U.S. 26: Wildwood-Wemme project area is a Traditional Cultural Property, in consultation with the Native American Plaintiffs. It
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Defendants Fowler and ACHP have a duty to advise Federal and State agencies on matters relating to historic preservation. 16 U.S.C. §§ 470I-j. It is part of the consultation process under Section 106 of the NHPA. 16 U.S.C. § 470f; 36 CFR Part 800. Defendants Fowler and the ACHP failed to properly advise Defendants Peters, FHWA and Garrett or the necessity to determine whether the U.S. 26: Wildwood-Wemme project area is a Traditional Cultural Property, in consultation with the Native American Plaintiffs. It erred in asserting that such consultation was not required because no "federally-

1	is not a "minor transportation project" covered by the 2001 PMOA, and that instead a
2	full Section 106 review, with a separate, project-specific Memorandum of Agreement wa
3	required for the project pursuant to 36 CFR, Part 800.
4	FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF: DEFENDANTS KEMPTHORNE AND BLM FAILEI
5	TO COMPLY WITH THE NHPA IN ISSUING A PERMIT TO CUT TREES TO
6	ODOT AND TO DEFENDANT FHWA.
7	
8	48.
9	
10	Plaintiffs reallege ¶ 1-38.
11	
12	49.
13	
14	The tree cutting permit issued by Defendants Kempthorne and BLM is a federal
15	undertaking pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 470w(7)(C). Defendants Kempthorne and BLM were
16	required to undertake Section 106 review for this undertaking. They failed to do so. As
17	par of the undertaking, Defendants Kempthorne and BLM were required to consult with
18	Plaintiffs Klickitat/Cascade Tribe and Cascade Tribe to identify the project area as a
19	Traditional Cultural Property and take into account the effects of the U.S. 26: Wildwood
20	Wemme project pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 470a(d)(6)(B) and 36 CFR § 800.2(c)(2)(ii). The
21	failed to do so.
22	SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF: DEFENDANTS KEMPTHORNE AND BLM HAVE
2 3	FAILED TO COMPLY WITH THE NHPA IN APPROVING A GRANT OF RIGHT
24	OF-WAY TO ODOT AND TO DEFENDANTS PETERS AND FHWA.
25	
26	50.
27	
28	Plaintiffs reallege ¶¶ 1-38.
29	
30	51.

31

1	The grant of	f a right-of-way by Defendants Kempthorne and BLM is a federal
2	undertaking pursua	nt to 16 U.S.C. 470w(7)(C). Defendants Kempthorne and BLM were
3	required to undertak	ke Section 106 review for this undertaking. They failed to do so. As
4	part of the undertak	ing, Defendants Kempthorne and BLM were required to consult with
5	Plaintiffs Klickitat/0	Cascade Tribe and Cascade Tribe to identify the project area as a
6	Traditional Cultural	Property and take into account the effects of the U.S. 26: Wildwood-
7	Wemme project put	rsuant to 16 U.S.C. 470a(d)(6)(B) and 36 CFR § 800.2(c)(2)(ii). They
8	failed to do so.	
9	SEVENTH CLAIM	A FOR RELIEF: DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE, IN VIOLATING
10	THE NHPA, ACT	ED IN A MANNER THAT WAS ARBITRARY AND
11	- I	N ABUSE OF DISCRETION, OR OTHERWISE NOT IN
12	ACCORDANCE W	•
13		
14		52.
15		 -
16	Plaintiffs rea	allege ¶¶ 1-38.
17		
18		53.
19	In failing to	comply with the NHPA, the Defendants in this case acted in a manner
20	that was arbitrary an	nd capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance
21	with law. 5 U.S.C. §	§ 706(2)(A).
22	EIGHTH CLAIM I	FOR RELIEF: THE FEDERAL DEFENDANTS BREACHED
23	THEIR RESPECT	TVE FIDUCIARY RESPONSIBILITIES TOWARDS PLAINTIFFS
24	KLICKITAT/CAS	CADE TRIBE AND CASCADE TRIBE IN VIOLATING THE
25	NATIONAL HIST	ORIC PRESERVATION ACT.
26		
27		54.
28		
29	Plaintiffs rea	allege ¶¶ 1-38.
30		

I		33.
2		
3	The Federa	al Defendants in this case owe a fiduciary obligation to all Indian Tribes
4	as a class. Pit Rive	er Tribe v. United States Forest Service, 469 F.3d 768, 788 (9th Cir.
5	2006). Violations	of NHPA constitute a breach of this fiduciary obligation. Id. In violating
6	NHPA, the Federa	l Defendants breached their fiduciary obligations to the
7	Klickitat/Cascade	Tribe and Cascade Tribe.
8	NINTH CLAIM	FOR RELIEF: IN VIOLATING THE NHPA, THE DEFENDANTS
9	VIOLATED TH	E DUE PROCESS RIGHTS OF PLAINTIFFS SLOCKISH,
10	JACKSON, AND	•
11		
12		56.
13		50.
14	Dlaintiffs r	eallege T 1-38.
15	1 1411141115 1	canege 1-36.
15 16		57.
10 17		57.
18	In violatin	g the NHPA, the Defendants have violated the due process rights
19	guaranteed to Plai	ntiffs Slockish, Jackson, and Logan under the Fifth and Fourteenth
20	Amendments to the	ne U.S. Constitution.
21		
22	WHEREFORE, P	laintiffs pray for the following relief:
23	ത	An order declaring that the Defendants have violated the National
24	(1)	Historic Preservation Act, and in so doing:
25		Thomas Troot various story and in 50 doing.
26		a. The Federal Defendants have breached their respective fiduciary
27		obligations to the Klickitat/Cascade Tribe and the Cascade
28		Tribe; and
29		THOE, AIR:
59 30		b. All of the Defendant's have violated the due process rights of
30 31		
		Plaintiffs Slockish, Jackson, and Logan.
32		

1	(2) An order for preliminary injunction prohibiting Defendants
2	Kempthorne and BLM from granting a right-of-way to ODOT and
3	Defendants Peters and FHWA if this has not yet occurred until
4	the former comply with their obligations under the NHPA.
5	
6	(3) An order for a permanent injunction for the relief requested in
7	paragraph (2) above, as well as for:
8	
9	a. The requirement that Defendants consult with the Plaintiffs
10	regarding the Native American Traditional Cultural Property
11	within the U.S. 26: Wildwood-Wemme project area.
12	
13	b. The requirement that Defendants comply with Section 106 of
14	the NHPA and 36 CFR Part 800, and memorialize this
15	compliance with a Memorandum Agreement among themselves
16	and with Plaintiffs.
17	
18	c. The requirement that the Defendants undertake appropriate
19	remedial measures to address appropriately the damage to the
20	Native American Traditional Cultural Property located within
21	the U.S. 26: Wildwood-Wemme project area.
22	
23	d. The requirement that the Defendants Peters, FHWA and
24	Garrett undertake an archaeological survey on the resource
25	identified by Pettygrew in 1985 to determine if in fact it is a
26	toll booth associated with the Barlow Road.
27	
28	(4) An order assessing actual and punitive damages against the Federal
29	Defendants for their breach of their fiduciary obligations to the
30	Klickitat/Cascade Tribe and the Cascade Tribe.
31	
32	(5) An order assessing actual and punitive damages against the Defendants
33	for violations of the due process rights of Plaintiffs Slockish, Jackson,
34	and Logan.
35	
36	(6) An order awarding Plaintiffs their reasonable costs, fees and expense in
37	this action, including reasonable attorney fees, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. §
38	470w-4 and 42 U.S.C. § 1988.
39	
40	(7) An order imposing all other and further relief as to which Plaintiffs
41	may be entitled and which the Court may deem just and equitable.
42	
43	

1 DATED October 6, 2008 2 3 Respectfully Submitted, 4 5 V OSB/No-024068 302 Bluff Street 8 9 Oregon City, OR 97045 10 (503) 650-2496 voice james.nicita@gmail.com 11 12 13 Of Attorney for Plaintiffs