

Heritage Summary for 2500-8: BAER Assessment Iron Complex, Shasta-Trinity National Forest

Prepared by
Michael Dugas
North Zone Archaeologist
Inyo National Forest
September 03, 2008

Objectives

- * Identify recorded heritage resource sites located within the area of potential effect (APE) of the Iron Complex.
- * Analyze direct/indirect effects and potential future effects to heritage resources.
- * Propose specific BAER treatments and estimate monetary costs to prohibit future damage to Class I Heritage Resource properties (historic and prehistoric resources determined as eligible to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), per criteria in 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 60.4). Per Forest Service Manual (FSM) 2361 direction, Class II sites (defined as heritage resources with either unknown or not yet evaluated for NRHP significance) are afforded the same consideration and protection as Class I sites.

Definition of Heritage Resources

Heritage resources include prehistoric resources, historic resources and Native American resources such as traditional gathering and ceremonial areas. Prehistoric sites are the remains from human activities that predate written records and include village sites, temporary camps, lithic (stone tool) scatters, milling features related to subsistence procurement, rock features and burials. Historic sites are typically physical properties or built items that remain from human activities that occurred after written records. In North America this time period is generally considered to be when Europeans made contact with the North American continent in AD 1492. In the west, the time of historic contact was in the early 19th century with the influx of French and Russian fur trappers, and other European colonists in search of gold. Historic archaeological sites and structures may include town sites, homesteads, agricultural or ranching features, mining-related features, refuse concentrations, cabins, houses, churches, etc. Many areas have been used throughout time in prehistory and historic times and therefore contain both prehistoric and historic remains. These are referred to as multi-component sites.

Area of Potential Effect

In accordance with standards established for heritage resource investigations related to BAER projects in Region 5, California National Forest lands, the APE for the Iron Complex Fire is identified as encompassing: (1) all areas within the perimeter of the burned area; (2) all areas of ground disturbance created by fire suppression; (3) locations with potential for fire-related soil erosion, flooding, debris flows, etc; (4) locations where looting and vandalism will be increased due to increased visibility of sites because of the fire and (5) locations of proposed ground-disturbing watershed rehabilitation-related treatments.

Thirty-one (31) previously recorded cultural resources were identified within the Iron Complex perimeter (see Table 1). All of these resources were assessed for whether their historic and research value would be at risk from post-fire processes such as erosion or vandalism and potential need for treatment in order to protect that value. Due to limited time frames for assessment, various fire intensity conditions (based on

BARC maps), and limited research potential for some of the sites, a limited number of these sites were visited.

Table 1. Values Potentially at Risk

Fire Name	Within Burn
Buckhorn	3
Carey	0
Cedar	10
Eagle	16
Granite	0
Ironside	2
Zeigler	0

Buckhorn: All three sites within the Buckhorn Fire are sparse prehistoric lithic scatters with relatively low research value. Two of the three burned at a low intensity and one did not burn at all. Due to the low research potential, minimal threat from fire and remote location, these sites were not field inspected.

Cedar: One prehistoric and nine historic sites lie within the Cedar Fire perimeter. The prehistoric site is a sparse lithic scatter bisected by a road on a ridge top. Due to accessibility issues and the low burn intensity, it was not visited. Seven of the nine historic sites were visited and assessed for BAER treatments. The other two include the Eagle Peak Lookout which was burned down in 1973, and a small historic refuse scatter located in a low burn intensity area on a tributary to Haysend Creek.

A series of historic sites relating to mining activities along the Trinity River were inspected. Four of the five sites inspected along the river could be adversely affected by increased water/sediment flow as a result of the fire which burned with moderate to high intensity. One site, a sparse scatter of historic materials in Rowdy Bar Creek canyon will continue to wash downstream. It has limited research potential and is already out of context and needs no BAER Treatments. The three remaining sites are at risk from down slope erosion from the steep (30°-45°) slopes directly southeast. The threat to these sites is from down slope sliding which might cover the sites with sediment, thus obscuring archaeological features. The other more immediate threat is from looting. Bottle collectors were encountered while monitoring sites for this fire.

Eagle: Twelve prehistoric and four historic sites are located within the fire perimeter. Nine did not burn, six burned at very low intensity and one burned moderate to hot. This was the only site monitored for BAER treatments.

Ironside: Two prehistoric sites lie within the fire perimeter. One has been determined not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and requires no protection measures. The other, Ironside Mountain, is a sacred natural feature utilized by the Chimariko Indians for a few days each summer. It burned hot near the rock but here are no archaeological remains to be protected. The only potential problem might be if a BAER treatment was proposed to occur during a period when the mountain was being used.

Treatments Needed Under BAER for Identified Values at Risk

All cultural resources addressed here are either eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or are potentially eligible for listing. These types of heritage resources are non- renewable resources that hold important historical and research value that contribute to the understanding of our

national and cultural heritage. Once these resources have been destroyed the information lost cannot be restored.

Cedar Fire: Several sites have been identified as having values at risk within the Cedar Fire; however, there are limited treatments under BAER that could mitigate those effects. One site on lower Bidden Creek burned moderately hot, exposing historic artifacts and features which are vulnerable to looting. The site has easy access to the public, further exacerbating the problem. The site is on a large terrace adjacent to Bidden Creek and has a steep (30°) slope directly to the east. The site is also in danger of increased fire-related erosion resulting from vegetation loss and hydrophobic soils. The site is in danger of losing important historical values and should be stabilized. Treatment will focus on stabilizing the current site condition and preventing any further damage that may result from increased exposure to the elements and the public.

It is recommended that the main scatter of historic materials on its southern end be mulched. A location map and sketch map of the proposed treatment area will be provided to the BAER implementation team, and should be distributed to the work crew prior to implementation. The BAER implementation team should coordinate with the Weaverville District Archaeologist to guide the placement of the mulch.

Three additional cultural resources have values at risk on the northwestern side of the fire along the Trinity River. The fire burned moderate to high in intensity on the slopes directly above these resources and low to moderate on-site. These three historic sites are extremely vulnerable from increased erosion and sediment deposition from the adjacent slope which varies from 35-45°. The erosion issues relate more to increased sediment deposition on-site along the steep slopes, rather than from increased flows in Stetson and Little Stetson creeks which border the sites. In addition to increased sediment deposition on these sites, there will be an increase in trees falling on the site as many will not survive.

Compounding the problem is increased visibility of artifacts enticing looters to remove cultural items. When visiting the sites on Stetson Creek a couple were encountered with a backpack and pick in hand. They stated that they were collecting “pop bottles”. When advised of the illegal nature of collecting historic artifacts on federal land, they indicated that they were not “old”. I advised them that these sites were indeed historic and they left slightly disgruntled. Two of the three sites on Stetson and Little Stetson creeks showed signs of fresh looting. Our cursory inspection of the sites identified features not documented on the original archaeological record; further testimony to the increased visibility after a fire.

The large size of these archaeological sites, high number of potential tree falls, and inaccessibility (across river) issues, make traditional BAER treatments impractical. I would recommend that the site be more fully assessed, by documenting previously unknown heritage features (ie. foundations, artifacts, etc.) that could be potentially covered by a depositional event resulting from the effects of the fire. This documentation would be in lieu of stabilization treatments which are impractical and expensive for sites of this size (2 acres total). The only approved emergency stabilization treatment listed under FSM 2523 that appears to apply is 2.f (Other Measures) which includes patrolling. Patrolling could deter immediate artifact looting. If the site was to be patrolled now, the only way to monitor its effectiveness in subsequent years would be to have better baseline data on what is present now.

I recommend that the district archaeologist and an assistant visit the three sites, and, while patrolling, record any additional archaeological features or looting pits not present on the existing site record. Their presence on the sites will deter looting and provide better baseline data for future monitoring.

Eagle Fire: A single prehistoric site on Squaw Camp Saddle burned with moderate to high intensity. Additional artifacts associated with the prehistoric period and evidence of historic period use was also

noted during the BAER assessment. The fire burned off most of the brush and grass from the site and left many standing trees that may die and fall in the near future. The site is bisected by a 4WD road which is used frequently during hunting season.

Given the steep side slopes and lack of vegetation on the site it is expected that the site will be subject to increased fire-related erosion. Further, artifacts are more exposed making it likely that the site could be looted by hunters and other recreational users. It is recommended that the site be mulched for stabilization and camouflaging. Further, the road bisecting the site should be water barred on either end (off-site) to direct water off the road bed and protect the site from further erosion. No water bars or other ground disturbing rehab work should be completed on-site.

All sites should be monitored the following year to assess the effectiveness of the BAER treatment.

Cost of Implementation: (Table 2)

Treatment: Implementation costs of mulching at the sites on the Eagle and Cedar Fires are based on a discussion with the BAER implementation leader Annette Mankins on Sept.2, 2008. The site on the Eagle Fire is more remote and will take more time to get personnel and mulch to the project area. Two vehicles are required for the assessment and patrolling of the sites on the Trinity River as a vehicle will have to be left at both ends of the kayak route into the sites. Otherwise there is no other viable access into the sites there on the south side of the river.

Table 2. BAER Treatment Budget.

Fire	BAER Treatment	Duration	Cost
Cedar	Spread weed-free mulch over a portion (0.5 acre) of a historic site in Bidden Cr.	1.0 day	\$*****
Cedar	Further condition assessment and patrolling at three historic sites along Trinity River: 2-person crew (District Archaeologist@ \$*****/day, GS-7 archaeologist @ \$*****/day) = \$*****/day 2-vehicles@ \$*****/ day (\$***** vehicle cost + \$***** gas)= \$*****/day Total= \$*****/day	3.0 days	\$*****
Eagle	Spread weed-free mulch over a prehistoric site on Squaw Camp Saddle (0.5 acre)	1.0 day	\$*****

Post Implementation Monitoring: The two mulched sites should be monitored in the spring to evaluate the effectiveness of the mulching treatment. This should be done by the district archaeologist. The monitoring will take a day for each site. Assuming a rate of \$300.00 for the District Archaeologist, the monitoring treatments will add another \$***** to the total cost.

The final cost of all BAER treatments for five sites amount to \$*****.