

## **Lewis River Hydroelectric Projects Relicensing**

**Merwin Hydroelectric Project (FERC No. 935)**  
**Yale Hydroelectric Project (FERC No. 2071)**  
**Swift No. 1 Hydroelectric Project (FERC No. 2111)**  
**Swift No. 2 Hydroelectric Project (FERC No. 2213)**

**USDA Forest Service**  
**Gifford Pinchot National Forest**

### **EXISTING INFORMATION ANALYSIS**

## **11. HERITAGE RESOURCES**

Prepared by: Rick McClure<sup>1</sup>, Forest Archaeologist  
Updated April 2002

### **I. Existing Situation**

The purpose of this Existing Information Analysis (EIA) is to describe continuing effects of project operation on the resource, establish additional study needs where information is incomplete and identify preliminary Forest Service objectives for protection of the resource. Heritage resources within the four Lewis River Hydroelectric Projects include at least 30 prehistoric archaeological sites, ten historic archaeological sites, isolated artifacts and other features. Completion of the survey and evaluation process is expected by December 2000. Preliminary survey results indicate that project operations permitted under FERC are adversely affecting archaeological site integrity. Existing data pertaining to heritage resources within the four project areas is summarized by individual project as follows:

#### **Yale Hydroelectric Project**

Initial archaeological survey of the Yale Project area took place in 1951 and 1952, and was conducted by archaeologists from the University of Washington (Bryan 1953, 1955). Six archaeological sites were identified and sampled. In conjunction with project relicensing, PacifiCorp completed a series of technical studies to inventory and evaluate heritage resources within the Yale Project area in 1996 and 1997. The studies included prehistoric and historic archaeological sites, traditional cultural properties, and historic resources. Study results are summarized in a Final Technical Report, completed in 1999 (PacifiCorp 1999).

---

<sup>1</sup> (509) 395-3399

Cultural resources surveys by Heritage Research Associates, Inc. included systematic inspection of approximately 1,885 acres of exposed reservoir shoreline and Swift bypass reach. The 11 mile Merwin-Yale transmission line corridor was also surveyed. Eight prehistoric archaeological sites, five historic archaeological sites, and a series of prehistoric isolated finds were identified. Five prehistoric sites (45CW102, 45CW102, 45CW103, 45CW105, 45CW106) within the project area were determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Eleven hydroelectric facilities and auxiliary structures associated with the Yale Project were also identified and evaluated. None of the properties met the criteria for eligibility. A historic bridge was also identified in the project area but determined *not eligible* under National Register criteria. Ethnological context statements were developed for traditional Cowlitz and Klickitat/Yakama Indian use, but specific traditional cultural properties were not identified within the project area.

Historical Research Associates, Inc. is currently developing a management plan for heritage resources within the Yale Project area.

### **Swift No. 1 and Swift No. 2 Hydroelectric Projects**

An initial archaeological survey of Swift Reservoir was conducted in 1957 by an archaeologist from the University of Washington (Denman 1957a-d, as cited in Goetz 1998). No sites were identified in the project area.

In 1989 a cultural resource survey was completed for the proposed Drift Creek Land Exchange, including 250 acres of National Forest land adjacent to the Drift Creek arm of Swift Reservoir (Brackett 1989). The survey documented a series of five isolated prehistoric artifacts along the reservoir margin within the Swift No. 1 Project area. Two historic trails were identified outside the reservoir margin.

In conjunction with FERC relicensing, a systematic cultural resources survey of approximately 900 acres of exposed shoreline was completed during a drawdown of Swift Reservoir in 1998 (Goetz 1998). The survey was conducted by Historical Research Associates, Inc., and resulted in the documentation of two prehistoric archaeological sites and nine isolated artifact clusters. Of the two prehistoric sites identified, one was determined *not eligible* for the National Register of Historic Places and the other, designated "J-1", remains unevaluated.

In 1999 additional surveys by Historical Research Associates, Inc. incorporated lands surrounding Swift Forest Park, the Swift No. 2 power canal and vicinity, and several other parcels of PacifiCorp-managed land surrounding the Swift Project dam and reservoir. No heritage resources were identified.

### **Merwin Hydroelectric Project**

Initial archaeological survey within the Merwin Project occurred relatively recently, decades after construction and flooding of the reservoir. A survey in 1990 by Oregon State Museum of Anthropology staff was prompted by illegal digging within the reservoir area (O'Neil 1991). Two prehistoric sites were identified and tested. Several isolated artifacts were also documented.

For purposes of the FERC relicensing effort, Historical Research Associates, Inc. completed an archaeological survey of the Merwin Project drawdown zone in October 1999. Approximately 620 acres were systematically inspected following application of a landform-based model of site potential (Wessen and Hess 1999). Eighteen prehistoric and five historic-period archaeological sites were recorded (Harza et al., 2000). A total of 55 isolated finds were also recorded (52 prehistoric; 3 historic). Twelve prehistoric sites were sampled through test excavation. At least seven of these sites contain intact subsurface cultural deposits, suggesting that they are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Analysis is in progress, and Historical Research Associates, Inc. plans completion of the technical report by December 2000.

### **Additional Studies and Plans**

Studies to identify Traditional Cultural Properties within the entire Lewis River Hydroelectric Project area will include a series of oral history interviews conducted by representatives of the Yakama Nation and Cowlitz Tribe. The studies were initiated in 1998. A confidential oral history report has been completed by the Yakama Nation. The Cowlitz Tribe's study is in progress.

Historical Research Associates, Inc. has prepared a draft Plan and Procedures For Dealing With the Unanticipated Discovery of Cultural Resources including Human Remains During Relicensing Studies.

## **II. Management Direction**

The Gifford Pinchot National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan Amendment 11 (1995:2-25 to 2-27) provides management direction for all National Forest System lands and their associated resources directly affected by or within the vicinity of the Lewis River Hydroelectric Projects. Forest-wide standards and guidelines for heritage resources also apply to projects that are permitted, but not performed by the Forest Service. The following pertain to this Existing Information Analysis:

- 1) Project areas will be examined for heritage resources by a qualified specialist. The inventory will be conducted as early as feasible in the project planning stage.
- 2) Heritage resource inventory work will be coordinated with the State Historic Preservation Officer.
- 3) All heritage resources, including sites and structures, will be evaluated to determine eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places.
- 4) Potential effects of project activities on heritage resources will be assessed.

- 5) Heritage resources eligible for the National Register will be protected from potential effects of project activities or their historic values conserved through appropriate mitigation.
- 6) Heritage resources eligible for the National Register will be protected from depredation resulting from public use and natural deterioration.
- 7) Measures to avoid or mitigate project effects and to protect heritage sites and structures will be developed in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer.
- 8) Suitable heritage resources should be developed and interpreted for recreational use when adequate provisions are available to protect the resource.
- 9) Specific heritage resource site locations are exempt from disclosure to the general public.
- 10) Development of heritage resource management plans should be coordinated with local tribes where appropriate.
- 11) Traditional food and plant material gathering sites used by Native Americans may be managed for continued production of native roots, berries, nuts, herbs, beargrass, and other plant materials typically gathered from the land.
- 12) Consultation with affected tribes will be conducted early in the planning process and will occur on a government-to-government basis. Conflicts will be resolved collaboratively, with affected tribes involved in the planning process.

### **III. Information Analysis**

Heritage resource inventories for FERC relicensing of all four Lewis River Hydroelectric Projects are nearly complete, and have included field survey of approximately 3,405 acres within the three reservoirs and adjacent lands. Existing information for each project was examined with respect to Forest Service management direction.

#### **Yale Hydroelectric Project**

Archaeological surveys for the Yale Project were the first to be completed as a part of PacifiCorp's FERC relicensing effort. The inventory and evaluation process was initiated prior to use of a collaborative process and formation of a Cultural Resource working group.

Nine prehistoric archaeological sites were identified in the project area. All are described as lithic scatters. Seven sites are located within the reservoir drawdown zone; two lie within the Yale-Merwin transmission line right-of-way. Subsurface testing was utilized to assess size, depth, content, and integrity of each site. Five of the sites were determined eligible to the National Register of Historic Places. 45CW101 and 45CW102 are multicomponent sites within the transmission line corridor. Radiocarbon dating indicates occupation as early as 4,000 years BP, with subsequent occupation during the late prehistoric period. Both sites have been damaged by looting activity. 45CW103, 45CW105, and 45CW106 all lie within the drawdown zone, and contain intact subsurface cultural deposits. All three sites appear to represent occupations after ca. 2,000 BP, but there is some evidence to suggest that site 45CW105, the largest site in the project area,

contains an earlier component. 45CW105 contains the highest artifact density of all sites in the project area and produced a more diverse artifact assemblage than other sites.

None of the isolate artifacts identified during the survey are considered eligible for the National Register. Five historic archaeological sites were identified, including a trash scatter, house/cellar site, ditch and two grades. None were determined National Register-eligible. Historic hydroelectric structures, including Yale Dam, associated facilities, and company housing were also documented, evaluated and found ineligible.

The Final Technical Report on heritage resources within the Yale Hydroelectric Project (PacifiCorp 1999) does not include a formal assessment of project effects. Observations included in the site descriptions indicate possible erosion effects across the surface of site 45CW105 and erosion of site 45CL469 severe enough to compromise eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. Artifact theft through illegal digging has been a problem at sites 45CW101 and 45CW102, but no link to hydroelectric project operations is indicated in the technical report.

Six prehistoric archaeological sites were identified in the Yale project area in 1951 and 1952, prior to dam construction and flooding of the reservoir. The Final Technical Report mentions that one or more of the sites encountered during the 1997 drawdown area survey may correspond to sites recorded in 1951/1952. Original field records, maps, and artifact collections from the earlier survey are currently held in the Burke Museum at the University of Washington campus in Seattle, Washington. It does not appear that these materials were examined as a part of the background research for the more recent Yale project study. Representatives of the Cowlitz Tribe and Yakama Nation were not aware of any effort to repatriate human remains described in an early report (Bryan 1953). The Final Technical Report contains no clear assessment of the six sites. Several, including 45CL420, a site with a circular housepit and cairn burial excavated in 1952, may lie below the 464 ft. elevation drawdown level.

### **Swift No. 1 and Swift No. 2 Hydroelectric Projects**

Isolated artifacts recorded during a 1989 Forest Service survey in the Drift Creek areas were determined *not eligible* for the National Register of Historic Places. Two prehistoric archaeological sites and nine isolate artifact locations were documented during the 1998 survey of the Swift Reservoir drawdown zone. Site W-1 is a small lithic scatter sampled through a series of subsurface test units. The site was determined *not eligible* for the National Register of Historic Places. The second site, designated J-1, is a larger lithic scatter on an island near the high-water mouth of Drift Creek. No subsurface sampling was conducted at site J-1, and the site remains unevaluated. No historic archaeological sites or standing historic structures were identified during the 1998 survey.

Supplemental surveys of the Swift Forest Park area, Swift No. 2 power canal vicinity, and other PacifiCorp land surrounding the Swift Project dam and reservoir identified no additional heritage resources. In May 2000, the Forest Service provided PacifiCorp with information regarding a potential historic archaeological site on National Forest land within the Area of Potential Effects for the Swift #1 project. The site is the location of Pine Creek Guard Station, built by the Forest Service in 1922.

Forest Service archaeologists have documented over a meter of sediment loss through erosion within the drawdown zone of Swift Reservoir in the vicinity of Drift Creek (Brackett 1989). Later survey by Historical Research Associates, Inc. noted significant erosion, including sediment deflation at archaeological sites J-1 and W-1, attributing the effects to reservoir wave activity and drawdown fluctuation (Goetz 1998). Deposition of silt and tephra was also noted in several areas in the upstream portions of the reservoir.

### **Merwin Hydroelectric Project**

Plans for the 1999 archaeological inventory of the Merwin Project area were developed in consultation with representatives of the Yakama Nation, Cowlitz Tribe, Washington State Historic Preservation Officer, and USDA Forest Service as part of the collaborative relicensing process. Archaeological site data collected during the 1999 survey of are currently being analyzed and evaluated. Seventeen prehistoric and five historic-period archaeological sites were recorded. A total of 55 isolated finds were also recorded (52 prehistoric; 3 historic). On the basis of integrity, twelve prehistoric sites were selected for test excavation sampling. A research design prepared by Historical Research Associates, Inc. (Wessen and Hess 1999) provides criteria for assessing site integrity and identifies research themes that will guide evaluation of information potential. The research design acknowledges that prehistoric sites may also have cultural heritage values, and indicates that representatives of the Yakama Nation and Cowlitz Tribe will develop criteria to assess these values.

Surveys of the Yale and Swift projects found that archaeological isolates were not significant. In contrast, the research design for the Merwin project area survey assumes that isolates may provide important information, particularly when considered part of a National Register-eligible archaeological district. Research themes and associated questions identified in the research design require synthesis of local prehistory and consideration of relationships to the larger region. To meet these objectives, and effectively evaluate the resources identified during 1999 surveys, a synthesis of archaeological data from all of the Lewis River hydroelectric projects is both necessary and appropriate.

A case in point involves site 45CL420 within Yale reservoir, excavated in 1952. Excavations were conducted by an archaeologist from the University of Washington, under contract to Pacific Power and Light, parent company to PacifiCorp. A circular housepit feature, one of the only known examples from western Washington, was sampled in the excavation, but a detailed analysis never completed. Samples were collected from a fire hearth within the house structure. Analysis of the 45CL420 material, coupled with results from the later projects, would apply directly toward specific research questions relating to culture change, and most specifically to the shift from forager to collector strategies.

Field observations during the 1999 survey of the Merwin Reservoir drawdown zone indicate that virtually all of the archaeological sites identified are subject to continuing erosion. The erosion is attributed primarily to reservoir pool level fluctuations (Wessen

and Hess 1999). According to local residents, several archaeological sites within the reservoir drawdown zone have also been subject to the depredations of artifact collectors.

### **Traditional Cultural Properties**

Ethnological Context Statements prepared for the Yale Hydroelectric Project encompass the entire Lewis River Hydroelectric Projects area (PacifiCorp 1999). These studies are based on historical research. This portion of the Lewis River includes ancestral lands of the Lewis River Cowlitz and Klickitat peoples. Descendants of these groups are today enrolled as members of the Yakama Nation and Cowlitz Tribe. Prior to about 1830, some of the project area may have been within the territory of the Upper Chinookan-speaking Cathlapootle people. Traditional use of the project area during the 19<sup>th</sup> century was typically associated with a trail variously known as “McClellan’s Trail” or the “Klickitat Trail.” Several native place names have been recorded for features or places along the trail, but they are difficult to precisely locate. Aside from the trail, specific sites and features associated with traditional cultural use have not been identified through ethnohistoric sources. Historic accounts indicate that traditional subsistence activities within the Lewis River area included fishing for salmon and steelhead, hunting of deer and elk, and the gathering of various plant resources.

Consultation with representatives of the Cowlitz Tribe and Yakama Nation led to plans for a Traditional Cultural Properties study based on contemporary oral history. The study, which is still in progress, considers the area of all four Lewis River projects. Cultural Resources Program staff from the Yakama Nation have conducted oral history interviews and made field visits to the area. Field visits have included surveys for culturally-significant plants on lands adjacent to the three reservoirs. A confidential report prepared by Yakama Nation staff summarizes current and traditional use by tribal members. A similar study by the Cowlitz Tribe remains to be completed.

## **IV. Preliminary Forest Service Objectives**

1. Ensure appropriate consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), Cowlitz Tribe, and Yakama Nation, and other interested parties, as per Section 106 of the NHPA.
2. Inventory and evaluate all heritage resources within the project area.
3. Assess project effects to significant heritage resources.
4. Develop and implement a Cultural Resources Management Plan including a Memorandum of Agreement for the management of heritage resources in the project area. Components of the plan should include consideration of the following:
  - Resource protection strategy (e.g, site stabilization, monitoring, law enforcement).
  - Measures to mitigate project effects through information recovery (e.g., excavation).
  - Management of culturally-significant plant species or habitats.
  - Collections curation plan. (See Recreation EIA 8-10, item 10.)
  - Interpretation of cultural history and heritage resources. (See Recreation EIA 8-10, item 10.)

## V. Information Needs

As part of the Alternative Licensing Process, a collaborative working group was formed to address Cultural Resources issues associated with relicensing of the Lewis River Hydroelectric Projects. The Cultural Resource Group (CRG) identified the need for six individual study plans, and developed a set of objectives for each. The status of each study plan is summarized below. Study plan objectives are presented in *Study Plan Document For The Lewis River Hydroelectric Projects*, issued in June 2000 (Harza 2000). Supplemental recommendations specific to two of the study plans are incorporated in the following summary.

**CUL 1 – Traditional Cultural Properties Inventory and Assessment.** This study was begun in 1999 with completion of a final report expected in 2001.

**CUL 2 – Archaeological Resources Inventory and Assessment.** Surveys of the Yale Project, Swift bypass reach, Merwin-Yale Transmission Line, and Swift Reservoir were completed between 1996 and 1999. A research design for the survey of the Merwin Project area and some additional parcels was completed and approved in 1999. An archaeological survey of Merwin reservoir was also completed in 1999. Reports for the Yale and Swift Projects have been completed. Completion of the draft report for the Merwin survey is expected by January 2001.

### ***Specific recommendations:***

- (a.) The draft plan for this study calls for the compilation of information “on archaeological surveys and resources in the APE for the 4 project study areas.” It is recommended that appropriate published, archival, and oral history data be synthesized to prepare prehistoric and historic context statements for the project area, similar to the ethnological context statements developed for the Yale Project. At a minimum, they should include information generated from previous archaeological research within the Lewis River basin, unpublished historical data from private, institutional, and agency sources, and re-examination of archaeological collections from the initial 1951-1952 survey of the Yale Project area.
- (b.) Complete the archaeological inventory of select parcels of project-associated lands not covered by previous surveys. Survey of the small parcel of National Forest land containing the reported location of the historic Lewis River Guard Station, near Swift Forest Camp, is needed as a part of this effort.
- (c.) Conduct subsurface sampling at site “J-1”, within Swift Reservoir, to gather information for purposes of significance evaluation. Prepare site evaluation.
- (d.) Evaluation of sites documented during 1999 Merwin Reservoir survey using criteria established in the research design and linked to the context statements.

(e.) Evaluation of archaeological resources using cultural values criteria developed by Cowlitz Tribe and Yakama Nation, as noted in the 1999 research design.

**CUL 3 - Historical Hydroelectric Structures Inventory and Assessment.** An inventory and evaluation report was completed and approved in 1999.

**CUL 4 – Historical Non-Hydroelectric Structures Inventory and Assessment.** An inventory and evaluation report was completed and approved in 1999.

**CUL 5 – Assessment of Impacts of Project Alternatives on National Register-Eligible Cultural Resources.** The expected start date for this study is 2001 with completion planned in 2002. A monitoring plan to assess long-term impacts on select archaeological sites within the Yale Project area was completed in October 2000.

**CUL 6 – Cultural Resource Management Plan.** Portions of this plan are currently under development, with completion expected in 2002.

Specific recommendations:

The management plan should consider the long-term disposition of archaeological materials collected in 1951-1952 during initial archaeological investigations for the Yale Project. The collections are currently housed at the Burke Museum, University of Washington, Seattle. Of particular concern is the possible inclusion of human remains from a burial associated with site 45CL420.

## VI. REFERENCES

Brackett, Kathy A.

1989 Cultural Resource Survey Report, Drift Creek Land Exchange. USDA Forest Service, Gifford Pinchot National Forest, Mount St. Helens National Volcanic Monument. Report submitted to Washington State Historic Preservation Officer.

Bryan, Alan L.

1953 An Appraisal of the Archaeological Resources of the Yale Reservoir on the Lewis River, Washington. Reprinted in *Archaeology in Washington* 4:61-69 (1992).

1955 Archaeology of the Yale Reservoir, Lewis River, Washington. *American Antiquity* 20(3):281-283.

Goetz, Linda Naoi

1998 *Results of a Cultural Resources Inventory of the Swift Reservoir*, Skamania County, Washington. Historical Research Associates, Inc. Seattle. Report prepared for PacifiCorp.

Harza [Engineering Company]

2000 Study Plan Document For the Lewis River Hydroelectric Projects. Prepared for PacifiCorp and Public Utility District No. 1 of Cowlitz County by Harza Engineering Company, Bellevue, Washington.

Harza, EDAW, EA, HRA, Hardin-Davis, NHC, WDFW

2000 1999 Technical Study Status Reports for the Lewis River Hydroelectric Projects. Prepared for PacifiCorp, Portland, Oregon.

O'Neil, Brian L.

1991 *Archaeological Investigations at Lake Merwin, Cowlitz and Clark Counties, Washington*. Report prepared by the University of Oregon State Museum of Anthropology, for PacifiCorp. Eugene, Oregon.

PacifiCorp

1999 *Final Technical Report, Cultural Resources, Yale Hydroelectric Project, FERC Project No. 2071*. Confidential report, PacifiCorp, Portland, Oregon.

Wessen, Gary C. and Sean C. Hess

1999 A Research Design for Archaeological Inventory and Evaluation Studies Associated with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Relicensing of Hydroelectric Projects on the Lewis River, Washington. Historical Research Associates, Inc., Seattle. Report prepared for PacifiCorp.