

PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

AMONG THE

**U.S.D.A. FOREST SERVICE, PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION (REGION 5),
CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,
NEVADA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND THE
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION**

REGARDING THE

**PROCESSES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 106 OF
THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT
FOR MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES BY THE
NATIONAL FORESTS OF THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION**

. TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | i |
| PREAMBLE | 1 |
| STIPULATIONS | 3 |
| 1.0. PURPOSE AND APPLICABILITY | 3 |
| 2.0. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF AGENCY PERSONNEL | 5 |
| 3.0. RELATIONSHIP OF PA TO OTHER AGREEMENTS | 7 |
| 4.0. PROCEDURES | 7 |
| 5.0. PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND ACTIVITIES | 9 |
| 6.0. PARTICIPATION OF INDIAN TRIBES | 13 |
| 7.0. IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES | 14 |
| 8.0. SITUATIONS WARRANTING SHPO CONSULTATION | 21 |
| 9.0. THRESHOLDS FOR ACHP CONSULTATION | 23 |
| 10.0. STAFFING | 24 |
| 11.0. CERTIFICATION | 24 |
| 12.0. RESOLVING DISPUTES OR OBJECTIONS, REVISION, AMENDMENT, TERMINATION, AND EXPIRATION | 26 |
| 13.0. OTHER STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES | 28 |
| 14.0 EXECUTION | 29 |
| APPENDICES | |
| APPENDIX A: Definitions | A-1 |
| APPENDIX B: Forest Service Manual FSM 2360: Heritage Program Management | B-1 |
| APPENDIX C: 36 CFR 800 | C-1 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| APPENDIX D: Exempt and Screened Undertakings | D-1 |
| APPENDIX E: Approved Standard Protection Measures | E-1 |
| APPENDIX F: Supplemental Guidelines for Determinations of Eligibility | F-1 |
| APPENDIX G: Certified Paraprofessional Archaeological Surveyor Program: Standards and Requirements | G-1 |
| APPENDIX H: Region 5 Hazardous Fuels Protocol | H-1 |
| APPENDIX I: Amendments | I-1 |

PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

AMONG THE

**U.S.D.A. FOREST SERVICE, PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION (REGION 5)
CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER
NEVADA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND THE
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION**

REGARDING THE

**PROCESSES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 106 OF
THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT
FOR MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES BY THE
NATIONAL FORESTS OF THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION**

PREAMBLE

WHEREAS, this Regional Programmatic Agreement (Region 5 PA) fully supersedes all provisions of the *First Amended Regional Programmatic Agreement among the USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, California State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding the Process for Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for Undertakings on the National Forests of the Pacific Southwest Region*, executed on August 24, 2001 (RPA); and the *Programmatic Agreement among the U.S.D.A. Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, California State Historic Preservation Officer, and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding the Identification, Evaluation and Treatment of Historic Properties Managed by the National Forests of the Sierra Nevada, California*, executed on December 10, 1996 (SPA); and

WHEREAS, the U.S.D.A. Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region (**Region 5**) has a multiple-use mission to manage its public lands in California and Nevada for a variety of resources, values, products, and uses which may affect historic properties; and

WHEREAS, Region 5's National Forests (**Forests**) include the Angeles, Cleveland, Eldorado, Klamath, Lassen, Los Padres, Mendocino, Modoc, Plumas, San Bernardino, Sequoia, Shasta – Trinity, Sierra, Six Rivers, Stanislaus and Tahoe in California, and the Inyo and Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit in California and Nevada; and

WHEREAS, Region 5 as public land steward is mandated to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (**NHPA**) (16 USC 470), and its implementing regulations, entitled *Protection of Historic Properties* (36 CFR part 800); and

WHEREAS, the Forests have professional staffing and an extensive history of compliance with the provisions of 36 CFR part 800 that demonstrates many undertakings can be implemented using procedures, as set forth in this Programmatic Agreement (**PA**), that have proven effective in managing and preserving historic properties in a less burdensome and more cost-effective, expeditious, and flexible manner than the undertaking-specific process outlined in 36 CFR part 800;

and

WHEREAS, Region 5 works to identify, evaluate, treat, protect, preserve, notify and consult about historic properties, as authorized and required by the: Antiquities Act of 1906 (34 Stat. 225; 16 USC 431-433), Historic Sites Act of 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 USC 461-467), National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (**NEPA**), as amended (83 Stat. 852 et seq.; 42 USC 4321-4347), Archaeological and Historical Data Preservation Act of 1974 (88 Stat. 174; 16 USC 469), American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978 (92 Stat. 469; 42 USC 1996), Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, as amended (**ARPA**) (93 Stat. 721 et seq.; 16 USC 470 et seq.); and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (**NAGPRA**)(104 Stat. 3048-3058; 25 USC 3001-3013); and as mandated under Executive Order 13007, entitled *Indian Sacred Sites*, Executive Order 13175, entitled *Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments*; and Executive Order 13287, entitled *Preserve America*; and

WHEREAS, Region 5 has determined that *undertakings* (as defined in Appendix A) under its jurisdiction have the potential to affect historic properties either included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (**NRHP**), and that these undertakings are subject to consideration under Sections 106 and 110 of the NHPA; and

WHEREAS, Region 5 has consulted with the California State Historic Preservation Officer (**CASHPO**), the Nevada State Historic Preservation Officer (**NVSHPO**) [collectively or individually **SHPO**] and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (**ACHP**) [collectively, **Signatories**] pursuant to 36 CFR part 800.14(b); and

WHEREAS, the Signatories have reviewed the kinds of undertakings on these Forests to consider prudent and feasible management measures that not only take into account the effects of these undertakings on historic properties which are included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the NRHP, but also protect unevaluated properties which might be eligible for the NRHP under criteria at 36 CFR 60.4; and

WHEREAS, 36 CFR 800.14 allows federal agencies to develop alternative procedures, such as this PA, to implement Section 106 if they are consistent with the ACHP's regulations pursuant to Section 110(a)(2)(E) of the NHPA, and the Signatories share a common desire and purpose to exercise their option to develop alternative procedures that would satisfactorily take into account the effects of these undertakings where proper precautions are followed; reduce redundant documentation associated with recurring types of undertakings within areas having adequate prior identification, review, and consultation; and facilitate Forest progress towards meeting Section 110 responsibilities; and

WHEREAS, Forests initiated consultation with Indian tribes that may attach religious and cultural significance to historic properties in Region 5 in January 2008 and requested comments on a preliminary draft agreement; Forests continued consultations with Indian tribes, and Region 5 initiated consultation with associated Tribal Historic Preservation Officers, during a public comment period from April 1, 2009 to May 15, 2009, and continued to consult and receive comments from Indian tribes until September 30, 2009; and continued to consult in 2011 with Indian tribes that provided comments by responding to their comments and considering subsequent comments; and

WHEREAS, Region 5 and Forests will continue to consult with Indian tribes that attach religious and cultural significance to historic properties; and

WHEREAS, Indian tribes have been invited to be Concurring Parties under this agreement; and

WHEREAS, in carrying out its responsibilities, the USDA Forest Service and Region 5 have developed policies and procedures through its directives system (Forest Service Manual (**FSM**) - 2360) (Appendix B) to guide planning, decision making, and activities. Region 5 has professional historic preservation staff in its Heritage Program to advise its Line Officers and to implement historic preservation policies. It is the intent of this agreement to provide a process for continuing, diligent, uniform, and consistent compliance with Sections 106 and 110 of NHPA by Region 5; and

WHEREAS, administration of this PA by Region 5's Regional Heritage Program Leader ensures appropriate oversight and application of PA stipulations and meets PA delegation, dispute resolution, review, amendment, and reporting requirements on behalf of the Regional Forester of Region 5; and

WHEREAS, execution of this PA by the Regional Forester of Region 5 obligates that each participating Forest comply with the stipulations contained herein, and the Forest Supervisors of these participating Forests have concurred with this requirement;

NOW, THEREFORE, the Signatories agree that all undertakings by the Forests shall be implemented in accordance with the following stipulations in order to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties.

STIPULATIONS

REGION 5 shall ensure that the following measures are carried out:

1.0 PURPOSE AND APPLICABILITY

1.1. Definitions of Terms Used in this PA

The terms used in this PA are defined within the body of the PA itself, in appended documents, or Appendix A. Definitions may also be found in FSM 2360 and in 36 CFR 800.16 (a-z) (Appendix C).

1.2 Purpose of this PA

This PA prescribes the manner in which Region 5 and the SHPO shall cooperatively implement this PA in California and portions of Nevada. It is intended to ensure that Region 5 organizes its programs to operate efficiently and effectively in accordance with the intent and requirements of the NHPA and that Region 5 integrates its historic preservation planning and management decisions with other policy and program requirements. The PA streamlines the NHPA Section 106 (**Section 106**) process by eliminating case-by-case consultation with the SHPO on undertakings for which there is no or little potential to affect historic properties and for undertakings that either culminate in no historic properties affected or no historic properties adversely affected with approved Standard Protection Measures (36 CFR 800.4(d)(1) and 800.5(d)(1)).

The PA also requires the effective management of Forest Heritage Programs consistent with the requirements of Section 110 of the NHPA and implementation of the Heritage Program by each Forest in partial exchange for relief from the case-by-case procedural requirements of 36 CFR part 800. Region 5 will develop a Historic Preservation Plan in consultation with the SHPO to help Forests effectively manage their Heritage Programs and address broader historic preservation objectives.

Supplemental procedures attached to this PA by approved amendments provide procedures that are specific to individual programs or functions (refer to Stipulation 12.3).

1.3 Applicability of this PA

(a) This PA, subject to threshold limitations specified in Stipulation 8.0, applies to all programs, funding initiatives, permits, assistance, actions or decisions under the statutory or regulatory authority of Region 5 that, regardless of land ownership, constitutes an undertaking that may affect historic properties. However, this PA shall not apply to tribal lands. Any proposed Region 5 undertaking on tribal lands will require consultation that is outside the scope of this PA and will follow 36 CFR part 800.

(b) If more than one federal agency is involved in an undertaking the Forest/Region 5 shall consult with the SHPO on how it will fulfill its 36 CFR 800 compliance requirements. Forest undertakings shall be considered federal actions subject to the requirements outlined in this PA when they involve non-federal lands, or when Region 5 has provided funding and retains jurisdiction on the expenditure of this funding on specific undertakings.

(c) Region 5 has other programmatic agreements for specific classes of undertakings, projects, or programs. Forests can also use any of the following agreements in lieu of this PA to meet their Section 106 compliance needs (refer to Stipulation 3.0).

- (1) Programmatic Agreement Among the USDA Forest Service, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the California State Historic Preservation Officer Regarding the Management of Forest Service Administrative Buildings in California (1990)
- (2) Programmatic Agreement Among the USDA Forest Service, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the California State Historic Preservation Officer Regarding the Management of Historic Fire Lookout Facilities in California (1990)
- (3) Programmatic Agreement Between the Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding Rangeland Management Activities on National Forest System Lands (1995) (National PA with Region 5 MOU tiered)
 - Memorandum of Understanding Among the USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, California State Historic Preservation Officer and the Nevada State Historic Preservation Officer Regarding Rangeland Management Activities (1996) (extended in 2011)
- (4) Programmatic Agreement Among the U.S.D.A. Forest Service, Pacific Southwestern Region, California State Historic Preservation Officer, and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding Management of Historic Recreation Residence Tracts (2002)
- (5) Programmatic Agreement Among the United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, United States Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management, California State Office, United States Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, California State Historic Preservation Officer, and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for Federally

Funded Programs Administered by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection on NonFederal Lands in California (2004)

- (6) Programmatic Agreement Among the U.S.D.A Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, U.S.D.A. Forest Service, Inter-Mountain Region's Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest, California State Historic Preservation Officer, and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding the Process for Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for Designating Motor Vehicle Routes and Managing Motorized Recreation on the National Forests in California (2006) (extended in 2009)
- (7) Programmatic Agreement Among the Pacific Southwest Region, USDA Forest Service, California State Historic Preservation Officer, Nevada State Historic Preservation Officer, & the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding the Identification, Evaluation, & Treatment of Historic Properties within the Area of Potential Effect of Pack Station Operations & One Outfitter Guide Operation on the Inyo and Sierra National Forests, California & Nevada (2006)
- (8) Programmatic Agreement among the United States Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, the United States Army Corps of Engineers Sacramento District, the California Department of Transportation, the California State Historic Preservation Officer, and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding Undertakings Affecting the Rubicon Trail, El Dorado County, California (2011)

1.4 Effect of this PA

This PA establishes the procedures that govern the interaction between Region 5 and the SHPO. The California and Nevada SHPOs each have respective consultation roles under this PA when an undertaking occurs within their state or an undertaking may affect historic properties within their jurisdiction. The goals of this PA are to enhance planning for protection and management of historic properties under Region 5's jurisdiction or control, and to ensure appropriate consideration of historic properties beyond Region 5's jurisdiction, but which may be affected by its actions.

2.0 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF AGENCY PERSONNEL

2.1 Regional Forester:

The Forest Service Line Officer who has the delegated authority to make and execute decisions on a regional level and is the lead Agency Official for this PA; Forest Supervisors report to the Regional Forester. The Regional Forester meets annually with the State Historic Preservation Officer and may meet more frequently upon request of either Region 5 or the SHPO; consults with the SHPO or ACHP regarding implementation of the PA; ensures Forests meet the requirements of, and implement their programs according to, the PA; and enters into region-wide Programmatic Agreements with the SHPO, the ACHP, and other Agencies for implementing Section 106 in specific circumstances not covered by this PA.

2.2 Forest Supervisor:

The Forest Service Line Officer with the delegated authority to make and execute decisions on a National Forest. The Forest Supervisor is the "Agency Official" (36 CFR 800.2(a)) responsible for implementing the PA on a Forest. Under this PA the Forest Supervisor can concur in determinations

made by professional Heritage Program staff, including but not limited to, Area of Potential Effect (APE), NRHP eligibility, no adverse effect, and no historic properties affected; consult with SHPO as appropriate or when there is unresolved disagreement with Heritage Program staff determinations; ensure necessary training for cultural staff; ensure availability of Heritage Program funding for preservation projects and implementation of the Historic Preservation Program; ensure government-to-government Indian tribe consultation for Section 106 projects consistent with FSM direction and 36 CFR part 800; execute Memoranda of Agreement for adverse effects and Programmatic Agreements which are limited to specific Forests.

2.3 District Ranger:

A Forest Service Line Officer who has the delegated authority to make and execute decisions on a Ranger District. Under this PA the District Ranger can concur in determinations made by professional Heritage Program staff, including but not limited to, APE, NRHP eligibility, no adverse effect, and no historic properties affected; ensure necessary training for cultural staff; ensure availability of cultural resources funding for preservation projects and implementation of the Historic Preservation Program; assists with Indian tribe consultation for Section 106 projects consistent with FSM direction and 36 CFR part 800. Responsibilities for Heritage Program Management are identified in the FSM 2360

2.4 Regional Heritage Program Leader:

The Regional Heritage Program Leader oversees implementation of the PA for the Regional Forester and provides regional PA guidance and advice; identifies needed training; conducts reviews; recommends certification, provisional certification, decertification and recertification of Forests; reviews or develops Programmatic Agreements and Memoranda of Agreement; may lead consultation with the SHPO in specific cases and consults with the SHPO and ACHP on behalf of Regional Forester; and submits reports and information to the SHPO and ACHP concerning implementation of the PA.

2.5 Heritage Program Manager (HPM):

The designated forest-wide coordinator and heritage program lead on a Forest for heritage program activities implemented under this PA. The HPM coordinates consultation with the SHPO, ACHP and other parties on behalf of the Forest Supervisor and other Line Officers. The HPM, without formal SHPO consultation, determines Areas of Potential Effect (APE), certifies determinations of NRHP eligibility as provided by this PA, and determines no adverse effect or no historic properties affected by an undertaking. The HPM also seeks the informal opinion of SHPO staff when appropriate; maintains heritage program records and transmits reports and inventory records to Information Centers; maintains professional knowledge and ability; develops and implements Section 110 programs and projects; and certifies that findings, determinations, and recommendations regarding the identification and management of historic properties meet the professional standards and requirements of this PA. The HPM may delegate some of these responsibilities under this PA to other qualified Heritage Program staff (e.g., Archaeologist GS 193 series; Anthropologist GS 190; Archaeological Technician GS 102; Historian GS 170) as appropriate provided professional oversight is maintained.

2.6 Heritage Program Staff:

Forest or Ranger District staff that are trained in historic preservation specialties, such as historic

or prehistoric archaeology, history, anthropology, ethnography, or architectural history, who may conduct literature searches and cultural resource inventories, record and monitor sites, excavate, process and analyze cultural resource data, maintain heritage databases, maintain heritage records and collections, write reports, stabilize sites, or assist Heritage Program Managers with other historic preservation tasks; and who has the experience and skills pertinent to his or her job duties and responsibilities under this PA. Heritage Program staff generally serve in District or Zone Archaeologist, Assistant Forest Archaeologists, or other assistant positions on Forests.

3.0 RELATIONSHIP OF PA TO OTHER AGREEMENTS

Future development of programmatic agreement documents pertaining to specific types of undertakings is not precluded by this PA. Undertaking-specific programmatic agreements in force at the time of the execution of this PA shall continue according to their terms. Previously approved Region 5 cultural resource modules or other cultural resource management programs approved under existing programmatic agreements may be appended to this PA without revision as the Signatories may agree, and attached in the Amendment section (Appendix I). Any project already approved under RPA or SPA stipulations does not require further review under this PA provided the project has not changed in a way that may affect historic properties and it is implemented in accordance with any approved measures to protect historic properties.

4.0 PROCEDURES

The following procedures shall be implemented by Region 5 under this PA:

4.1 Meetings

The State Historic Preservation Officers and the Regional Forester, with their respective staffs, shall meet annually to review Region 5's implementation of the PA, annual reports of activities, and other pertinent issues. At the annual meeting, the SHPOs and Region 5 shall exchange information relevant to achieving the goals and objectives set forth in this PA. At any time a SHPO or the Regional Forester may convene a meeting to discuss critical issues. This PA encourages its parties, including staff and cultural resource specialists, to meet and consult frequently in order to maintain appropriate communication, to seek informal opinion and advice, and share information and knowledge.

4.2 Communicating by Reporting

Region 5 shall inform the SHPO of activities carried out under this PA by developing and submitting reports annually to the SHPO as specified below. The content and format of these reports will be determined by Region 5 and the SHPO.

(a) *Forests*. At a minimum include:

(1) Information by Forest detailing use of the PA, including Screened Undertakings (Stipulation 7.2), for Section 106 actions submitted no later than December 1 following the prior fiscal year, or by an alternative date negotiated with SHPO by the Regional Heritage Program Leader.

(2) Information by Forest detailing Historic Preservation Program (Section 110) accomplishments for each Forest submitted no later than December 1 following the prior fiscal year, or by an alternative date negotiated with SHPO by the Regional Heritage Program Leader.

(b) Regional Office.

The Regional Heritage Program Leader shall review the reports on Section 106 actions and Section 110 activities submitted by the Forests. Based on that review and other information provided by Forests, the Regional Heritage Program Leader shall develop a summary report for submission to SHPO and ACHP by the Regional Forester, and submit this report by March 1. This report shall also include a list of unanticipated effects reported by Forests. An alternate date may be negotiated between the Regional Heritage Program Leader and the SHPO. The report may identify a need for further review of specific Forest programs if necessary.

4.3 Professional Determinations and Recommendations

This PA authorizes Region 5's professional Heritage Program Managers on each Forest to act on the SHPO's behalf under limited circumstances, including those limits specified in Stipulation 7.0 of this PA. Within those limits, Region 5's Heritage Program Managers may define APEs, conduct inventory, make determinations of eligibility, determine no adverse effects, determine that no historic properties are affected, certify documentation for Screened undertakings, identify appropriate protection measures, and apply exemptions (Appendix D) without involvement of the SHPO. The Line Officer may elect to accept the recommendations and determinations prepared by the Heritage Program Manager or delegated Heritage Program staff (HPM/DHPS) (Stipulation 2.5). When professional determinations and recommendations made pursuant to the limitations in Stipulation 7.0, are accepted by the Line Officer, no SHPO consultation is required. Where disagreements or disputes concerning professional findings exist between Heritage Program staff and Line Officers, the Forest shall request the Regional Heritage Program Leader's review and consider any subsequent recommendations for resolving identified issues. However, when professional determinations or recommendations including, but not limited to, APE, scope of inventory, determinations of National Register eligibility, findings of no historic properties affected or no adverse effect with approved Standard Protection Measures, or application of exemptions or Screened Undertakings are not accepted by the Line Officer and remain unresolved after review by the Regional Heritage Program Leader, the Forest Supervisor shall in each such case initiate consultation with the SHPO, Indian tribes, and consulting parties under 36 CFR part 800 (Appendix C).

4.4 SHPO Involvement in the Region 5 Heritage Program

In keeping with the PA's stated goal of encouraging participation by SHPO in Region 5's Heritage Program, Region 5 or the SHPO may identify opportunities to further this goal. To encourage broad participation by the SHPOs in Region 5's Heritage Program, the following involvement opportunities may be offered:

(a) *Land Management Planning Efforts.* At the earliest stage of the planning process, each Forest responsible for preparing a land use plan or significant amendments or revisions at the regional or local level shall invite the SHPO to participate in the planning effort (FSM 2360). The SHPO may elect to not participate in specific planning efforts. The approach and scope of planned compliance activities shall be identified through these consultation efforts or under 36 CFR part 800. An agreement document specific to the planning effort may be requested by either party. All draft land use plans and related cultural resource plans shall be submitted to the SHPO for review and comment. Completion of the consultation process for planning will be indicated by a Forest's written response to the SHPO's comments, if commenting, on the draft land use or cultural resource project plans.

(b) *Field Tours.* Forests may invite the SHPO/SHPO staff to participate in field tours relating to land use planning efforts or specific undertakings whenever cultural resources may be affected. The SHPO's views will be requested with regard to management of the cultural resources.

(c) *Contact.* Formal consultation outside the scope of this PA will be conducted between the SHPO and the Forest Supervisor. Region 5 Line Officers, in coordination with the Heritage Program Manager or other Heritage Program staff, may also contact SHPO staff informally regarding specific undertakings. The professional staffs at the SHPO and in Region 5 are encouraged to communicate at their discretion on general concerns or issues related to specific undertakings. Informal consultation shall be documented by both SHPO and Region 5 Forest staff; Region 5 documentation shall be retained in appropriate files under the control of the Forest Heritage Program staff.

(d) *Internal Region 5 Program Review.* Region 5 shall invite SHPO participation in internal Forest program reviews pertaining to this PA as appropriate and shall provide reports of reviews, exclusive of findings and recommendations specific to personnel matters. The scope of review opportunities is detailed in Stipulation 5.5 of this PA.

5.0 PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND ACTIVITIES

5.1 Preservation Program.

Region 5 commits to fulfill its responsibilities enumerated in Section 110 of NHPA. The Regional Forester shall implement a region-wide Historic Preservation Program (HPP). The HPP will be an amendment to this PA and shall guide Region 5 in achieving measurable progress toward compliance with Section 110 of NHPA.

(a) The *Framework for Archaeological Research and Management for Forests of the North-Central Sierra Nevada* (FARM) may be implemented as the prehistoric archaeological element of any forest HPP for the Eldorado, Inyo, Sequoia, Stanislaus, and Tahoe National Forests, and the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit. Additional elements and revisions to the FARM shall be reviewed and incorporated into HPPs where approved by the SHPO.

5.2 Curation.

Region 5 will ensure to the greatest extent possible that curation and disposition of all archaeological materials and data from Federal lands are consistent with FSM 2360 and NAGPRA (Stipulation 7.9) as appropriate. Management of non-Federal archaeological materials and data will be consistent with applicable law and professional curation requirements as negotiated with non-Federal landowners or managers. Non-museum collections may be maintained at Forests, but only under appropriate curatorial conditions and with appropriate documentation.

5.3 Data Sharing and Information Management.

(a) *Documentation of Findings.* All cultural resources investigations associated with implementing this PA regardless of findings shall be documented and reasonably conform to the standards in FSM 2360 and written guidance of the SHPO. Region 5's current cultural resource site records, and survey, screened undertaking, and previous coverage reports meet these standards.

(1) In California, Region 5 shall submit to the appropriate Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) inventory reports and Archaeological

Site Records (Department of Parks and Recreation form 523 or equivalent; or R5 Cultural Resource Record (CRRs)) completed to the standards of the Office of Historic Preservation. In Nevada, Region 5 Forests shall submit cultural resource inventory reports and Intermountain Antiquities Computer System (IMACS) forms for archaeological and historic sites and Architectural Resource Assessment forms (ARA) for architectural resources to the NVSHPO along with GIS shapefiles of inventories and resource locations for incorporation into the Nevada Cultural Resources Information System (NVCRIS). The records for previously recorded resources in an APE shall be reviewed to determine if documentation meets current standards. If existing documentation does not meet current standards, or new information should be recorded (e.g., changes in integrity or condition), these records shall be updated.

(2) Region 5 Heritage Program staff shall document all determinations, findings, and recommendations made under this PA and all such actions and related documentation shall be considered by Line Officers prior to making decisions that may affect historic properties. Such actions include, but are not limited to, delineating areas of potential effect, National Register eligibility determinations, applying exemptions, no historic properties affected and/or no adverse effect findings, and other findings and determinations. Prior to making NEPA decisions, the potential effects of undertakings on historic properties must be documented and supported by completed reports, and report approvals dated and signed by HPMs or qualified Heritage Program staff delegated by HPMs, in accordance with the stipulations in this PA. Documented determinations, findings, and recommendations shall be retained as described in Stipulation 5.3(c) of this PA.

(b) *Exchange of Data with SHPO.* Region 5 has developed and maintains corporate databases that include information about cultural resources and cultural resource investigations (INFRA Heritage Module) and geospatial data in a Geographic Information System (GIS) in accordance with Section 112(2) of the NHPA and FSM 2360. The INFRA Heritage Module and GIS database will be updated with newly recorded and re-recorded cultural resource and survey data. Region 5 and SHPO may jointly work to develop or consider ways that facilitate the electronic submission of records for tracking agency actions provided any such information sharing is in accordance with confidentiality requirements in Section 304 of the NHPA, Section 9 of the ARPA, and the Food, Conservation and Energy Act of 2008 (25 USC 3056).

(c) *Records Management.*

(1) Region 5 shall maintain complete, current, and permanent records for cultural resources activities, including but not limited to survey areas, findings, determinations, reports, historic property records, archaeological site records, and correspondence, to fully document fulfillment of its responsibilities under this PA, and other laws, regulations, and policies. Records management shall be consistent with the standards and policies in FSM 2360 and standards and procedures in FSH 2309.12 and developed subsequent to execution of this PA. Records pertaining to undertakings shall be retained in files, under the control of Forest professional Heritage Program staff, which document survey and identification efforts, research designs, peer reviews, and assessment of effects and impacts. Records shall include, but shall not be limited to, cultural resource site records, monitoring and condition reports, determinations of eligibility, images, use allocations, and cross references to other files or documents which contain information pertaining to the individual property.

(2) Information about the location and character of historic properties under the control of Region 5, regardless of ownership of the resource, shall not be disclosed to the general public (FSM 2360) and such information shall not be stored in documents open to the general public if doing so may risk harm to those resources. The Forest Supervisor or Regional Forester as appropriate may

determine, under the authority of Section 304 of NHPA and/or Section 9 of ARPA, that public disclosure of the location and character of historic properties or other cultural resources may risk harm to those resources, which may then qualify such information as exempt from FOIA disclosure. This determination notwithstanding, Region 5 or Forests may characterize historic properties and cultural resources in writing sufficiently for the purposes of required analyses under NEPA and cultural resource information may be disclosed when such disclosure is deemed to advance management purposes or the public interest.

(3) Section 8106 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (25 USC 3056) (FCEA) also exempts from FOIA disclosure information relating to reburials, sites, or resources of traditional or cultural importance to Indian tribes, including human remains and information obtained from tribes during consultation relating to traditional and cultural resources and practices provided in the course of research activities.

5.4 Professional Development and Training

Training and development are key elements in maintaining the effectiveness of the PA. Heritage Program Managers, with assistance from the State Historic Preservation Officer as necessary, will provide timely advice and guidance to forest Line Officers on the requirements and application of the PA. Where Line Officer training in the use and implementation of the PA is needed, the SHPO shall be offered the opportunity to assist Region 5 in such training.

Heritage Program staff, Line Officers, planning staff, and other forest staff, as appropriate, shall receive training in the use and implementation of the PA, including the procedural requirements of 36 CFR part 800 which are to be implemented in instances where the PA does not apply. The Regional Heritage Program Leader shall identify the need for specialized cultural resource management training. Region 5's Heritage Program staff shall meet yearly, usually in conjunction with the Society for California Archaeology meetings, to participate in workshops, training, exchange information, and to discuss issues concerning the Heritage Program. The SHPO shall be offered the opportunity to participate in this annual meeting and assist Region 5 in on-going training of Line Officers and Heritage Program staff in the implementation of the PA. SHPO will also be offered the opportunity to comment on scope and content of training.

Forests, in consultation with the Regional Heritage Program Leader as necessary, shall prepare professional development plans for their Heritage Program staff to ensure that current professional standards in the discipline can be met and maintained, and to identify training needs. Recommended training resulting from any review under Stipulation 5.5 shall be considered when preparing development plans. Training received will be reported as a component of annual reporting (Stipulation 4.2).

Region 5 recognizes that staying current in relevant professional practices and participation of Heritage Program staff in professional societies and annual meetings (e.g., Society for California Archaeology, Society for American Archaeology, Society for Historical Archaeology, California Council for the Promotion of History, Society of Architectural Historians) is integral to: staying abreast of developments and advances in the respective disciplines; acquiring current information useful in making professional recommendations and determinations provided for in this agreement; enhancing professional knowledge and skills; and providing opportunities for leadership and service to the profession.

5.5 Reviews of Forest Performance under this PA

Professional review of Forest program operations is an essential and mandatory component of Region 5's Heritage Program and this PA, especially as it pertains to certification (Stipulation 11.0). Ensuring that such review takes place is a primary responsibility of the Regional Heritage Program Leader under this agreement. Reviews may involve any aspect of a program's function including, but not limited to, documentation, findings and recommendations, resource protection, recordkeeping and curation, security, and professional contributions. It is the intent of such reviews to improve operations at individual Forests and to improve the Heritage Program region-wide.

Three levels of internal review are available to the Regional Heritage Program Leader: Annual Review; Technical Review; and Program Review. Findings of reviews shall be relevant for purposes of assessing certification status of Forests.

(a) *Annual Review.* The Regional Heritage Program Leader shall assess annually each Forest's ability to implement the provisions of the PA. The Annual Review will be based primarily on information and data submitted by each forest for the Annual Report required in Stipulation 4.2 of this PA; however, other data may be considered. The Regional Heritage Program Leader shall document the findings of the annual review and the Regional Forester shall submit that report to the SHPO and ACHP. The ACHP shall be consulted where identified deficiencies involve and/or include recommendations to resolve adverse effects to historic properties. When recommendations to remedy deficiencies receive SHPO concurrence, and ACHP concurrence if participating in resolution of adverse effects, and are accepted by the Regional Forester, the Forest Supervisor shall initiate remedial actions within sixty (60) days from the date the recommendations are accepted by the Regional Forester, unless the Regional Forester sets an alternative schedule in consultation with the SHPO. Depending on the nature of the identified deficiencies, the Regional Forester may elect to place a Forest or Ranger District in provisional status according to the procedures described in Stipulation 11.2 of this PA, or suspend and decertify a Forest or Ranger District under Stipulation 11.3.

(b) *Technical Review.* The Regional Heritage Program Leader shall determine whether Forests are maintaining an appropriate level of technical capability and performance in particular program elements. Such elements may include, but are not limited to, record-keeping, documentation of PA actions, Section 110 actions, curation, inventory documentation, determinations, budget issues, and findings from Annual Reviews. The Regional Heritage Program Leader shall document the findings of the Technical Review and the Regional Forester shall submit that report to the SHPO. When recommendations to remedy any deficiencies receive SHPO concurrence and are accepted by the Regional Forester, the Forest Supervisor shall initiate any remedial actions within sixty (60) days from the date the recommendations are accepted by the Regional Forester, unless the Regional Forester sets an alternative schedule in consultation with the SHPO. Failure to initiate remedial actions within the specified time or failure to address the identified deficiencies shall require the Regional Forester to consider actions under Stipulations 11.2 or 11.3 of this PA.

(c) *Program Review.* The Regional Heritage Program Leader shall determine whether Forest Heritage Programs are fully functional in their ability to implement this PA. Program reviews are broad-based reviews of the Heritage Program at a Forest, although such a review may focus on particular areas of interest. The Regional Heritage Program Leader shall invite the participation of the SHPO, document the findings of the Program Review and the Regional Forester shall submit that report to the SHPO. Should deficiencies be identified, the Regional Heritage Program Leader shall develop recommendations to remedy or address those deficiencies. When such recommendations receive SHPO concurrence if participating and are accepted by the Regional Forester, the Forest Supervisor shall initiate any remedial actions within sixty (60) days from the date the

recommendations are accepted by the Regional Forester, or within the time period set by the Regional Forester in consultation with the SHPO. Failure to initiate remedial actions within the specified time or failure to address the identified deficiencies shall require the Regional Forester to consider actions under Stipulations 11.2 or 11.3 of this PA.

(d) *SHPO Review.* From time to time, in order to ensure that actions of Region 5 professional staff retain a high level of professionalism, the SHPO may request that particular documents be subjected to external professional peer review. This can be done through the review/inspection process or through the normal Section 106 procedures. Region 5 may prepare peer review guidelines in consultation with the SHPO or may elect to accept existing peer review guidelines proffered by the SHPO. The SHPO and Region 5 agree that peer review shall not delay the implementation of undertakings.

6.0 PARTICIPATION OF INDIAN TRIBES

Region 5 recognizes the importance of the continuing government-to-government relationship with Indian tribes and the importance of meaningful consultation on specific undertakings. Region 5/Forests shall follow 36 CFR 800.2(c)(2) (Appendix C) and the procedures and guidelines established in FSM 2360 and FSH 2309.12 when conducting consultation with affected Indian tribes for undertakings under this PA, unless other consultation protocols have been mutually agreed to. Region 5 supports and encourages the sharing of project-specific cultural resource information with Indian tribes when they are consulting parties for an undertaking. Policy and guidance for government-to-government consultation between Line Officers and Tribal Governments are included in the American Indian and Alaska Native Relations sections of the Forest Service Manual (FSM 1563) and Forest Service Handbook (FSH 1509.13).

6.1 Consultation Protocols

Some Forests have consultation protocols or government-to-government consultation agreements that allow for more effective Section 106 consultation. Forests without such protocols or agreements shall complete consultation with Indian tribes within one year of execution of this agreement (if possible) to determine if there is a desire to enter into a separate consultation protocol agreement to support more effective Section 106 consultation and the objectives of this PA. These agreements can establish protocols for carrying out tribal consultation, including how the Forest will address tribal concerns about confidentiality of sensitive information. Such agreements also can determine the types of undertakings and the potential geographic project areas on which a tribe wants to be consulted, and how that consultation will take place, which can lead to tremendous efficiencies for both the Forest and the Indian tribe. It is recommended that Forests enter into such protocols or government-to-government consultation agreements (e.g., Memorandum of Understanding) where there is mutual agreement to do so. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Federal Agency Historic Preservation Programs Pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act (FR vol. 63, No. 79: 20498, 20504, April 24, 1998) include standards and guidelines for consultation that shall be considered when developing such protocols.

6.2 Tribal Historic Preservation Officers

In accordance with Section 101(d)(6) of the National Historic Preservation Act, some Indian tribes with Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPO) may choose to designate the THPO as their tribal representative to assist Forests in identifying tribally significant cultural resources or historic properties potentially affected by a proposed Federal undertaking on non-tribal lands. For

undertakings on Forests, Forest Service Line Officers shall consult with a THPO in lieu of an Indian tribe only when they have been designated by the Indian tribe as the tribal representative for purposes of Section 106 to assist in identifying and evaluating properties of religious and cultural importance to the tribe. THPO consultation does not substitute for consultation with SHPO.

6.3 Non-Federally Recognized Tribes

Non-Federally recognized Indian tribes or communities, or individual members thereof, may be invited to participate as additional consulting parties and shall be encouraged to raise issues, express concerns, provide information and identify resources and places they would like Forests to consider in decision-making. Forests shall initially solicit such input of non-Federally recognized Indian tribes through the public participation opportunities afforded by Region 5's environmental project planning process (NEPA), and any consultation protocols. Forests shall take into account any confidentiality concerns raised by these groups during the identification process realizing that some or all information provided may not be exempt from disclosure under FOIA.

7.0 IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES

The type of undertaking, Area of Potential Effects (APE) (36 CFR 800.16[d]), and existing information help determine identification needs for undertakings considered under this PA. Undertakings are processed to determine whether: (1) they fall into one of the streamlined procedure categories (i.e., Exemptions or Screened Undertakings); (2) existing information is sufficient for identification needs; or (3) a field survey or other information is needed to identify historic properties that may be affected. If an undertaking is Exempt (see below) under the provisions of this PA, it can proceed without further consideration under this PA or 36 CFR 800. If it is a Screened Undertaking, the HPM/DHPS /determines whether the streamlined procedures should be applied based on known information or whether it should be treated as a regular undertaking. All other undertakings require more comprehensive identification efforts to determine whether historic properties are present and could be affected. With the exception of Exemptions, all categories of undertakings are documented as specified in this PA.

7.1 Exemptions

Under this PA, some projects (Appendix D) are generally exempt from further review or consultation because they have no potential to cause effects to historic properties. However, the following exceptions apply:

(a) Any Forest may elect to review a normally exempted project under the terms of this PA or 36 CFR part 800.

(b) The SHPO or ACHP may request that an otherwise exempt project or groups thereof, instead be considered undertakings under this PA or 36 CFR 800.

(c) The SHPO or ACHP may request that a Forest consult with it about a particular exempt project or screened undertaking or groups thereof, prior to continued consideration under this PA.

(d) Should an objection by the public arise to an exempt project prior to implementation, except any project being reviewed under the agency's appeal regulations (Stipulation 12.1), the Forest shall consult with the objecting party and the SHPO for not more than 30 calendar days following receipt to resolve the objection. If the objection is resolved within this time frame, the

parties shall proceed in accordance with the terms of that resolution. If the objection cannot be resolved within this time frame, and the Forest and the SHPO have not agreed to extend the consultation period, the Forest shall submit the disputed exemption for review either under this PA or under 36 CFR part 800 (Appendix C).

(e) Any party to this PA may propose that Appendix D be modified by removal or revision. Such proposals for modification of Appendix D shall be considered pursuant to the provisions for revisions and amendment of this PA at Stipulations 12.2 and 12.3. Appendix D may be revised as a component of PA revision or may be revised at any time upon written agreement of the Signatories to this PA.

7.2 Screened Undertakings

The HPM/DHPS may determine that a specific undertaking subsumed under the list of Screened Undertakings found in Appendix D qualifies for certification as such under the streamlined procedures in this PA. Documentation regarding a Screened Undertaking's certification and exemption from additional review under this PA shall be retained in a Forest's cultural resources or project files, and entered into the Forest Service's INFRA database.

(a) Any Forest may elect to review a normally Screened Undertaking under the non-exempted terms of this PA or 36 CFR part 800.

(b) The SHPO or ACHP may request that a Screened Undertaking, or groups thereof, instead be considered undertakings subject to the identification and other stipulations under this PA or 36 CFR 800.

(c) The SHPO or ACHP may request that a Forest consult with it about a particular Screened Undertaking or groups thereof, prior to continued consideration under this PA.

(d) Should disputes or objections arise to Screened Undertakings or to classes of Screened Undertakings, except any undertaking being reviewed under the agency's appeal regulations or procedures, see Stipulation 12.1.

(e) Should an objection by the public arise to a Screened Undertaking prior to implementation, the Forest shall consult with the objecting party and the SHPO for not more than 30 calendar days following receipt to resolve the objection. If the objection is resolved within this timeframe, the parties shall proceed in accordance with the terms of that resolution. If the objection cannot be resolved within this time frame, and the Forest and the SHPO have not agreed to extend the consultation period, the Forest shall submit the disputed undertaking for review either under this PA or under 36 CFR part 800 (Appendix C).

(f) Any Signatory to this PA may propose that Appendix D be modified by removal or revision of Screened Undertakings or by addition of a previously non-screened class of undertakings. Such proposals for modification of Appendix D shall be considered pursuant to the provisions for revisions or amendment of this PA at Stipulations 12.2 – 12.3. Appendix D may be revised as a component of PA revision or may be revised at any time upon written agreement of the Signatories to this PA.

7.3 Area of Potential Effect

HPM/DHPS shall apply the definition of Area of Potential Effect (**APE**) (36 CFR 800.16[d]) to each undertaking and shall include a description of the APE in the undertaking's Section 106 report. In defining the APE, Region 5 shall consider potential direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to historic properties and their associated settings as applicable, regardless of land ownership. HPM/DHPS are not required to determine the APE in consultation with the SHPO. However, in cases where the APE is subject to question, or multiple federal jurisdictions are involved, or a Traditional Cultural Property has been identified, the Forest shall seek the opinion of the SHPO (Stipulation 8.1(c)).

7.4 Identification and Inventory Needs

Forests shall make a good faith effort to identify all historic properties that may be affected in an undertaking's APE. Where existing information is inadequate, additional identification efforts are likely needed (e.g., field surveys). Consultation with THPOs, Indian tribes, and Native American Traditional Practitioners may also be necessary to identify cultural resources of traditional religious or cultural significance to Tribes (Stipulation 7.5).

The HPM/DHPS staff will design an inventory strategy with prescribed coverage methods based on a Forest's/ District's cultural resource sensitivity model (e.g., a model employing environmental and geomorphic variables such as slope, aspect, elevation, hydrology, flora, landforms, or other landscape attributes and natural features). Such inventory strategy may include a variety of coverage methods to identify historic properties throughout the APE. Inventory strategies employing survey traverses spaced no more than 30 meters apart shall be considered intensive for the purposes of this agreement. A Forest may choose to develop a Forest-wide inventory strategy (FSM 2360) in consultation with the SHPO, and affected THPOs and Indian tribes. Once a Forest-wide inventory strategy has been approved by the SHPO of the affected state(s), the Forest may apply that strategy to applicable undertakings without prior consultation with the SHPO.

Unless otherwise agreed to in consultation with the SHPO, Region 5 shall ensure that project-specific surveys and other efforts to identify historic properties are consistent with the appropriate professional standards in FSM 2360 (Appendix B), and to the extent prudent and feasible with respective guidelines of the California Office of Historic Preservation or Nevada SHPO, and the Secretary of Interior's Standards and Guidelines.

(a) Region 5 will identify historic properties on Region 5-administered lands or other lands where a Region 5 undertaking will occur.

(b) No additional identification efforts are required prior to making decisions about the implementation of undertakings if the APE is entirely within areas that have been previously inventoried; and HPMs determine that the previous identification efforts meet standards under this PA and document these findings for those undertakings. When assessing and certifying the adequacy of previous inventory work (i.e., reports and documentation), HPMs should consider the following measures: when the work was done; who did the work and whether there are any previously identified problems with similar work; what parties were consulted and how; methods that were used; whether survey methodology accounted for both prehistoric, Indian cultural and historic resources; changes in environmental conditions; and adequacy of documentation.

(c) In all cases where Region 5's Heritage Program staff determines that non-intensive inventory is appropriate for an undertaking (e.g., reconnaissance or sample survey), a written justification or strategy shall be prepared and retained in appropriate files. When Reconnaissance or Sampling survey strategies (FSM 2360) are deemed appropriate for an undertaking, the HPM shall seek informally the views of the SHPO staff concerning the justification and strategy for the reduced level of inventory. The SHPO may concur with the proposed approach or request that the Forest initiate formal consultation (Stipulation 8.1(e)).

(1) Region 5's Protocol for Non-Intensive Inventory Strategies for Hazardous Fuels and vegetation Reduction Projects is attached (Appendix H).

7.5 Consultation with Indian Tribes and Native American Traditional Practitioners

Consultation with Indian tribes and Native American Traditional Practitioners is an important component of identification and evaluation activities conducted under this PA. The Forest Supervisor shall ensure that consultation with Indian tribes and Native American Traditional Practitioners begins at the earliest stages of planning for an undertaking and continues throughout the process as appropriate. The Forests recognize the unique role Indian tribes play in determining which historic properties the tribes assign traditional religious or cultural importance. The Forest Supervisor shall ensure that consultation provides an Indian tribe a reasonable opportunity to identify its concerns about historic properties; advise on the identification and evaluation of historic properties, including those of traditional religious and cultural importance to them; identify Native American Traditional Practitioners who should be consulted; provide its views on the undertaking's effects on such properties; and participate in the resolution of adverse effects. The Forest Supervisor shall be prepared to continue consultation throughout the planning and implementation stages of an undertaking. Policy and guidance for consultation is provided in FSM 2360. Any Indian tribe that requests in writing to be a consulting party for a specific undertaking shall be afforded that status.

7.6 Public Involvement and Consulting Parties

Region 5 shall provide adequate opportunity for Indian tribes, consulting parties, and the public to express their views by seeking and considering those views when carrying out actions under this PA. Region 5 shall coordinate this public participation requirement with the agency's project or land management planning processes. Forests shall use the public notification and environmental project planning scoping process in its National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance regulations (36 CFR Part 220) to: notify Indian tribes and the public about proposed undertakings; initiate Section 106 consultation; and identify interested or potential consulting parties. Forests may tailor their consultation efforts to the nature of the undertaking and its potential effects on historic properties. Anticipated public concerns about a project's effect on historic properties will be considered when determining consultation needs. The project planning process under NEPA also offers an opportunity for the public, consulting and interested parties, Indian tribes, non-federally recognized tribes and others to participate in the project planning process. Interested parties shall be invited to consult early in the review process if they have expressed an interest in a Forest's undertaking. Interested parties may include, but are not limited to, local governments; applicants, grantees, permittees, or affected landowners; Indian tribes, organizations, and individuals; and those seeking to participate as consulting parties in a particular undertaking. Forests will also make an effort to identify and invite potential consulting parties and will not rely solely on the requests by those parties. Forests shall make an effort to consult with the SHPO and other recognized consulting parties on the decision to honor requests for consulting party status from additional parties.

The participation of Indian tribes shall be guided by the provisions of Stipulations 6.0 and 7.5 of this PA, by FSM 2360 (Appendix B), and by 36 CFR 800.2(c) (2) (Appendix C).

7.7 Evaluation and Determination of NRHP Eligibility

(a) Unless otherwise agreed to in consultation with SHPO, Forests shall ensure that historic properties that may be affected and cannot be avoided, or protected by the application of standard protection measures (see Appendix E), are evaluated for their significance and a determination be made regarding their eligibility for listing on the NRHP in accordance with the National Register criteria (36 CFR 60.4) and Region 5's Supplemental Guidelines for Determinations of Eligibility (Appendix F). When determining whether a cultural resource site is eligible for the NRHP, Forests will consult with and consider the views of: any Indian tribe that attaches traditional religious and cultural significance to the identified property; and any other consulting party. Forests will consult with and seek the concurrence of the SHPO on NRHP eligibility findings.

(b) HPMs and other Heritage Program staff (e.g., archaeologists, historians or architectural historians) may make NRHP determinations of eligibility under this agreement once Heritage Program staff has been certified by the Regional Heritage Program Leader or delegated HPM staff. HPM certification shall be based on an individual's qualifications based on education, training and experience appropriate for determining whether a specific type of cultural resource (e.g., prehistoric site, historic structure) meets the NRHP Criteria. HPMs shall certify that all formal Determinations of Eligibility completed under this agreement meet appropriate evaluation standards and guidelines and are properly documented.

(c) For expedited ineligibility determinations made by HPMs or certified professional staff using procedures outlined in Appendix F, such determinations shall meet the consensus determination requirements of 36 CFR 800.4(c)(2) for specific undertakings. Ineligible determinations made under this stipulation shall be certified by the HPM and will be submitted to the SHPO on a bi-annual or other agreed on basis.

(d) Except for expedited ineligible determinations made under Stipulation 7.7(c), all Forest findings regarding determinations of eligibility will be submitted to the SHPO for consensus determinations pursuant to 36 CFR 800.4(c)(2). If there is any unresolved disagreement between the Forest and the SHPO regarding a Forest's determination, the Forest will forward the determination to the Keeper of the NRHP who will make a final determination. Until such time as a consensus determination from the SHPO or a final determination by the Keeper of the NRHP is made, the Forest shall avoid or protect the historic property using Standard Protection Measures.

(e) Forests shall document all determinations of eligibility findings, including applicable National Register criteria, and summarize and report those determinations in Region 5's heritage database, annual reports, and other reporting processes agreed to between Region 5 and the SHPO. SHPO may elect to review any evaluation as an element of its oversight role in this PA. The SHPO will provide written concurrence/non-concurrence of Region 5's evaluations within 30 days of receipt of adequate documentation. The SHPO may have an additional 30 days to reply when needed, provided it notifies the forest. The SHPO will provide written consensus/non-consensus determinations for expedited ineligibility determinations on a bi-annual or annual basis provided sufficient documentation supporting forest determinations has been provided.

(f) Forests shall consult with the SHPO under 36 CFR part 800, and as needed the Keeper of the NRHP under 36 CFR 63, when evaluating historic properties that may be eligible for the NRHP

because of their religious and cultural significance to Indian tribes. Any unresolved disagreement resulting from such consultation shall be submitted to the Keeper of the National Register in accordance with 36 CFR 63.3(d).

(g) Forests may assume that a historic property, cultural resource, or groups of resources are eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places, without consultation with the SHPO or Indian tribes, where avoidance or other protection measures identified in Appendix E, or in PA revisions or amendments, will be implemented as the management strategy for managing an undertaking's effects. Assuming eligibility for a particular property neither precludes nor prejudices formal evaluation in the future.

(h) The HPM shall review and approve all research designs for NRHP eligibility evaluations. The HPM may approve without consulting with SHPO a research design including 4 cubic meters or less volume of archaeological test excavation provided no more than 5 percent of the overall site area is affected. For test excavations involving more than 4 cubic meters or affecting more than 5 percent of the overall site area, the Forest shall informally consult with SHPO to determine whether review and consultation is required.

7.8 Determination of Effects to Historic Properties

If an undertaking may diminish a historic property's NRHP values, the Forest shall follow the provisions of 36 CFR part 800 regarding determination of effects, except as provided below.

(a) Undertakings with No Historic Properties

When no historic properties are identified following approved inventory, documentation, and certification by HPM/DHPS, no consultation with the SHPO or ACHP is required prior to making decisions about implementation of an undertaking.

(b) Undertakings with Historic Properties

(1) When historic properties are identified, following approved inventory, documentation, and certification by HPM/DHPS, but will not be affected, and the undertaking can be implemented without the adoption of management measures to protect historic properties, then decisions about implementation of these undertakings may be made without further review or consultation with the SHPO and/or ACHP.

(2) When historic properties are identified, following approved inventory, documentation, and certification by HPM/DHPS, and management or protection measures are needed to avoid or minimize potential adverse effects, the following procedures will be followed as needed:

(a) If HPM/DHPS determine that the nature and scope of a proposed undertaking is such that its effects can be reasonably predicted, and Standard Protection Measures (Appendix E) can be used to protect historic properties, then these Standard Protection Measures will be used to manage and maintain historic properties in manners which ensure that the undertaking will not adversely affect historic properties (i.e., no adverse effect).

(b) When the HPM/DHPS recommend that Standard Protection Measures would protect historic properties (Appendix E) and these conditions are accepted by the Line Officer as part

of the approval of an undertaking, no review or consultation with the SHPO or ACHP is required prior to approving and implementing the undertaking.

(1) Forests may choose to consult with the SHPO, Indian tribes or consulting parties pursuant to 36 CFR part 800, on any undertakings covered by this PA where the use of Standard Protection Measures is proposed.

(2) At its discretion and with the cooperation of the Forests, the SHPO may participate in review or consultation on specific undertakings, or classes of undertakings, where Standard Protection Measures are being used.

(c) Undertakings Requiring Assessment of Adverse Effects and Resolution of Adverse Effects

The Forest Supervisor shall comply with the ACHP's regulations at 36 CFR part 800.5 - 800.6 for undertakings that do not meet the conditions of Stipulation 7.8(a) – 7.8(b)), above. That is, Forests shall comply with 36 CFR 800.5 - 800.6 for undertakings that may adversely affect historic properties and for which it is not possible, or the Forest has elected not to apply standard protection measures prior to the assessment of effects. For cases of inadvertent effects or unanticipated discoveries in projects implemented under the provisions of this agreement, refer to Stipulation 7.10.

7.9 Human Remains

(a) Should inadvertent effects to or unanticipated discoveries of human remains be made on Region 5's lands, the County Coroner (California Health and Safety Code 7050.5(b)) or Sheriff if *ex officio* Coroner (Nevada Revised Statutes 259) shall be notified immediately. If the remains are determined to be Native American or if Native American (Indian) cultural items pursuant to NAGPRA are uncovered, the provisions of NAGPRA and its regulations at 43 CFR 10 and ARPA at 43 CFR 7 shall be followed on federal lands.

(b) If such remains or items are discovered off federal lands within California, for projects authorized by the Forest Service (see Stipulation 1.4), the provisions of the California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (California Health and Safety Code 8010-8030, and California Public Resources Code 5097.98-99) shall be followed.

(c) If Indian burials are discovered off federal lands within Nevada, for projects authorized by the Forest Service (see Stipulation 1.4), the provisions of Nevada's Protection of Indian Burial Sites (Nevada Revised Statutes 383.150-190) shall be followed.

(d) For undertakings on federal lands, the provisions of a Written Plan of Action (43 CFR Part 10.5(e)) or Comprehensive Plan (43 CFR Part 10.5(f)) governing the intentional or inadvertent discovery of human remains and cultural items described in NAGPRA shall be followed in lieu of the above procedures.

7.10 Discoveries and Inadvertent Effects

(a) In the event that either cultural resources are discovered, or historic properties are inadvertently affected, during implementation of an undertaking which has been duly considered under the terms of this PA, the Forest will submit written notification describing the circumstances of the discovery to the Regional Heritage Program Leader and SHPO within two working days (e.g., letter or email notification). Forests will provide written reports describing the status or resolution of the discovery/inadvertent effect every six months until it is resolved.

(b) In the event that properties are discovered during implementation of an undertaking which has been duly considered under the terms of this PA and in which the property cannot be protected, Forests shall address the discovery in accordance with the provisions of 36 CFR 800.13 (see Appendix C). In consultation with the SHPO, ACHP and Indian tribes attaching religious and cultural significance to the property, Forests shall select the appropriate mitigation option.

(c) In the event that properties are discovered during implementation of an undertaking which has been exempted under Stipulation 7.1, the HPM may recommend the use of standard protection measures (Appendix E) where appropriate based on professional judgment. If standard protection measures are not adopted as recommended by the HPM/DHPS, Region 5 shall consult with the SHPO, ACHP, consulting parties, and Indian tribes which may attach religious and cultural significance to the property to identify appropriate mitigation measures.

(d) Where properties are inadvertently encroached on by project activities, and the HPM determines that no effects or not adverse effects to historic properties have occurred (e.g., trees felled into site boundaries or vehicles driven onto sites), SHPO and ACHP notification are not required provided that HPM recommendations are limited to non-disturbing treatment measures and these recommendations are implemented as prescribed. Once these treatment measures are implemented, the case will be considered resolved (Stipulation 7.10(a)). If HPM recommendations will not be implemented, the Forest shall consult with the SHPO on effects and possible resolution, and with the ACHP, Indian tribes and consulting parties as appropriate if an adverse effect has occurred.

(e) If consultation under 7.10 determines that an adverse effect has occurred, the forest will then consult with other consulting parties or Indian tribes as appropriate to identify acceptable mitigation or treatment measures. The results of any interested party or Indian tribe consultation will be included in further consultation efforts with the SHPO and/or ACHP to resolve the inadvertent effects.

(f) In instances where the involvement of the SHPO occurs after steps have been taken under the PA, the Forest Supervisor or other Line Officer shall not be required to reconsider previous findings or determinations unless those findings or determinations are the subject of unresolved disputes or disagreements.

7.11 Emergency Undertakings

Region 5 shall develop an appendix to this PA, through the amendment process in Stipulation 12.0, identifying procedures for protecting historic properties during emergency undertakings, such as wildfire. Until such an amendment is developed and approved, the following shall apply: should Region 5 /Forest find it necessary to implement an emergency undertaking as an immediate response to a declared emergency, undeclared emergency, or another immediate threat to life or property in a manner that would preclude the use of this PA, Region 5 /Forest and its mutual aid partners, will

implement to the extent prudent and feasible any measures that could avoid or minimize harm to historic properties and shall implement measures to rehabilitate and stabilize damages to historic properties caused by agency activities during the emergency. For management purposes, Region 5 may assume the eligibility of a cultural resource or group of resources for inclusion on the NRHP without consultation with the SHPO where proposed rehabilitation and stabilization measures are unlikely to affect prospective NRHP values and measures are needed to prevent further resource damage or destruction. Region 5 shall evaluate any historic property that may be adversely affected by rehabilitation and stabilization measures. Region 5 shall comply with the provisions of 36 CFR 800.12 and 36 CFR Part 78 for such emergency undertakings. Region 5 shall document properties discovered or affected by the emergency undertaking, including post-fire rehabilitation, and shall submit a report to the SHPO.

8.0 SITUATIONS WARRANTING SHPO CONSULTATION

Region 5 shall initiate formal consultation with the SHPO on the following undertakings and shall follow the procedures set forth in 36 CFR part 800 (Appendix C). Notwithstanding, Region 5 and SHPO may agree to continue under the PA in consideration of specific conditions or characteristics of a specific undertaking which would normally require continuation of formal consultation.

8.1 Initiate SHPO Consultation:

(a) Where the Forest has made a determination that an undertaking may have an adverse effect as defined by 36 CFR 800.5(a)(1) (Appendix C), including adverse effects to National Historic Landmarks (NHL) or properties either considered eligible for, or which are listed in, the National Register of Historic Places.

(b) Where the Heritage Program Manager position at a Forest Supervisor's Office is vacant (excluding Acting HPM meeting professional qualifications) or where expertise is required that Region 5 does not possess or cannot obtain (e.g., architectural historian).

(c) Where Region 5 has been designated and acts as the lead agency on behalf of other Federal agencies for an entire undertaking, the designated agency official shall consult with SHPO to determine whether this PA can be used to fulfill requirements of 36 CFR 800, and if there is agreement, act on behalf of all agencies in fulfilling their collective responsibilities under section 106 (36 CFR 800.2(a)(2)). Where more than one federal agency is involved but no lead agency has been agreed to, consultation with the SHPO is required.

(d) Where a Region 5 undertaking may have effects beyond the boundaries of Region 5 Forests in California and Nevada, or may involve other Federal agencies, the Region 5 agency official will consult as appropriate with SHPO and those other Federal agencies. In such cases, Region 5 will either consult with the respective SHPO and agencies regarding an appropriate compliance process either under the terms of this PA, or develop a new PA for that undertaking, or proceed in compliance with 36 CFR part 800 (Appendix C).

(e) Where Region 5 proposes to complete less than an intensive survey of the affected (selected) lands, except where survey requirements are identified in any amendment to the PA, and when informal consultation with SHPO staff yields consensus agreement to proceed with formal consultation (Stipulation 4.4(c)).

- (f) Where an undertaking involves a land exchange or sale when the cultural resources inventory has not been completed and/or cultural resources have been identified.
- (g) Where Region 5 proposes to transfer lands to the State of California or the State of Nevada.
- (h) Where determinations of eligibility involve a historic property that may be eligible as a Traditional Cultural Property.
- (i) Where Traditional Cultural Properties, or historic properties that are sacred sites or also are or may be of religious or cultural significance to an Indian Tribe, may be affected.
- (j) Where land use plans and amendments are initiated.
- (k) Where unresolved disagreements or disputes, internal to Region 5, arise concerning an exempt undertaking.
- (l) Where a Forest declines to participate in any supplemental procedures (Appendix I: Amendments) which would normally govern the undertaking or class of undertaking.
- (m) Where PA stipulations and procedures in the FSM 2360 (Appendix B) may conflict with the procedures established in 36 CFR part 800 (Appendix C).
- (n) Where supplemental procedures appended to this PA require such consultation.
- (o) Where historic properties are discovered and unanticipated, potentially adverse effects are found after completing the procedural steps at Stipulation 7.10 of this PA.
- (p) Where historic properties have not been protected in the manner prescribed during project activities, possible effects may have occurred, and Stipulation 7.10(c) does not apply.
- (q) Where an objection by the public arises to a Screened Undertaking and remains unresolved (Stipulation 7.2(e) of this PA).
- (r) Where a member of the public or an Indian tribe or other Indian group or individual objects at any time to the manner in which this PA is being implemented for a specific undertaking (Stipulation 12.1(b)), except where the subject Undertaking is part of a Forest Service NEPA appeal process under 36 CFR 215.

9.0 THRESHOLDS FOR ACHP CONSULTATION

9.1 Notifying ACHP

- (a) If the Forest Supervisor has found that an undertaking may have an adverse effect on a historic property, and the SHPO/THPO has concurred with this finding, the Forest Supervisor shall notify the ACHP of its finding and determine whether the ACHP will participate in the consultation to resolve adverse effects.
- (b) Notification of the ACHP shall include all documentation prepared regarding the undertaking and meet the documentation standards at 800.11(e).

9.2 Inviting ACHP to Consult

The Forest Supervisor's notice to the ACHP shall include an invitation to the ACHP to consult when:

- (a) The Forest is proposing and developing program alternatives for compliance with NHPA Section under 36 CFR 800.14 (see FSM 2360); or
- (b) The Forest wants the ACHP to participate in the consultation (e.g. where there is no agreement with the SHPO, Indian tribes, or other consulting parties regarding effect to historic properties); and
- (c) The undertaking has an adverse effect upon a National Historic Landmark.

9.3 Consulting with the ACHP

The Forest Supervisor shall formally consult with the ACHP when:

- (a) The ACHP applies its Appendix A to Part 800 "Criteria for Council Involvement in Individual Section 106 Cases" and notifies the Chief Forester of the Forest Service in accordance with 800.6(a)(1)(iii) that it will participate in the consultation to resolve adverse effects.
- (b) Revisions or amendments to this programmatic agreement are proposed (Stipulations 12.2 and 12.3); or
- (c) Disputes need to be resolved (Stipulation 12.1).

10.0 STAFFING

10.1 Professional Staff

Under this PA, Region 5 operates with limited external oversight. In order to successfully act on behalf of the SHPO and to maintain the trust of the SHPO, Region 5 shall continually strive for a high level of professional capability. Region 5 is committed to employing a professional staff. In hiring new full time professional staff, Region 5 will follow Section 112(a)(1)(B) of the NHPA and emphasize the selection of candidates that meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards or the education and experience standards in Office of Personnel Management (OPM) X118 standards. Forests shall employ at least one full-time, permanent professional Heritage Program Manager. Forests which do not have the services of a professional Heritage Program Manager, either on staff or through arrangement with another Region 5 administrative unit, shall consult with the SHPO on all undertakings.

10.2 Professional Capability

When Region 5 is involved in an undertaking requiring expertise not possessed by available Region 5 staff, it may request the assistance of the SHPO in such cases or may obtain the necessary expertise through contracts, Forest Service personnel from other states or Forests, cooperative arrangement with other agencies or institutions, or by other means.

10.3 Non-Professional Personnel

Region 5 may employ technicians, volunteers, and Certified Paraprofessional Archaeological Surveyors (**Paraprofessionals**) who do not meet Secretary of the Interior Standards or OPM X118 standards for professional Heritage Program personnel. In such instances, individuals who do not meet these Standards shall work under the direct technical supervision of Region 5 Heritage Program staff and may not substitute for professional Heritage Program staff in making decisions or determinations regarding the identification and evaluation procedures set out in this PA or in Section 36 CFR part 800. Certification of paraprofessionals will follow the standards and requirements of Region 5's Certified Paraprofessional Archaeological Surveyors program (Appendix G).

11.0 CERTIFICATION

11.1 Certification

The Regional Forester may review, reconsider, or change a Forest's certification status at any time. Region 5, in consultation with the SHPO and the ACHP, will certify each Forest to operate under this PA based upon the following: (1) Forest Line Officers and Heritage Program staff have received required PA training within three months of the PA's effective date; and (2) professional capability to carry out these policies and procedures is available through each Forest's immediate staff or through other means. Upon execution of this PA, Forests with Regional Forester approval to participate under the RPA or SPA will automatically operate under Provisional Certification for no more than four months or until they are either certified or decertified. The SHPO or ACHP may provide recommendations on the certification of Forests to the Regional Forester who will consider these recommendations when making decisions about certification.

(a) Region 5 PA Training

Region 5 PA training for Forest Line Officers and Heritage Program staff shall include the following:

(1) *Forest Line Officers.* Forest Heritage Program Managers and/or trained Heritage Program training cadre will provide a minimum of 2 hours of training for Forest Line Officers focused on a review of the agreement's basic components and the Line Officer's roles and responsibilities. The Forest Heritage Program Manager may recommend that other District or Forest level staff also participate in such training. New Line Officers shall receive the minimum training within 60 days of reporting to a Forest, unless they have received it at a previous duty station.

(2) *Heritage Program Staff.* The Regional Heritage Program Leader will schedule initial training for Forest Heritage Program staff to develop training cadres for each forest. Each Forest's HPM and/or other training cadre are responsible for any required Forest level PA training. All Heritage Program staff and non-permanent Heritage Program staff with PA roles and responsibilities that did not attend the initial regional training will receive a minimum of 5 hours of training. This training will be similar in content to the regional training and focus on a comprehensive review of the agreement, including roles and responsibilities, documentation, reporting, consultation, evaluation, and best practices.

(3) All required training for Line Officers and Heritage Staff shall be completed within the timeframe for Forest certification (Stipulation 11.1).

(b) Participation by Forests in any future Region 5 PA training, and Heritage Program staff completion of any required culture resource management training shall be key considerations for continuing certification of individual Forests.

11.2 Provisional Certification

The Regional Heritage Program Leader, the SHPO, or the ACHP may also recommend that the Regional Forester place a Forest or Ranger District on provisional status based on findings from any of the reviews specified at Stipulation 5.5 of this PA or other identified deficiencies. Provisional status may extend from one to two years, although the term of the provisional status shall be determined by the Regional Forester and shall reflect the complexity of the deficiencies identified. While on provisional status, a Forest or Ranger District will have the opportunity to correct deficiencies that have been identified. Progress in resolving identified deficiencies shall be reported to the Regional Heritage Program Leader every six months or whenever such information is requested by the Heritage Program Leader. Upon expiration of the provisional status term, the Regional Forester, in consultation with the SHPO, shall determine whether identified deficiencies have been satisfactorily corrected. Should the Regional Forester determine that such deficiencies remain uncorrected, or should new deficiencies that the Regional Forester or other Signatories deem significant be identified, provisional status may be extended, or the suspension and decertification process shall be initiated as described at Stipulation 11.3 of this PA.

11.3 Suspension and Decertification

The Regional Heritage Program Leader, the SHPO, or the ACHP may also recommend that the Regional Forester suspend a Forest or Ranger District based on findings from any of the reviews specified at Stipulation 5.5 of this PA or other identified deficiencies. The Forest Supervisor, the SHPO, or the ACHP may also request that the Regional Forester review a Forest's certification status. Upon receipt of such a request, the Regional Forester will notify the requestor and other parties if a review will be conducted. Based on the findings of such a review, the Regional Forest may or may not take any action that would change the certification status of a Forest. If a Forest is found not to have maintained the basis for its certification (e.g. the professional capability needed to carry out these policies and procedures is no longer available, or the Forest is not in conformance with this PA) and the Forest Supervisor has not voluntarily suspended participation under this PA, the Regional Forester will decertify the Forest.

(a) A Forest may ask the Regional Forester to review a decertification recommendation, in which case the Regional Forester will request SHPO participation in the review. The ACHP may also participate if it so chooses.

(b) The Regional Forester will notify the SHPO and the ACHP if the status of a certified Forest changes. In consultation with the SHPO, and the ACHP if it chooses to participate, a Plan of Action that addresses the identified deficiencies will be prepared and approved by the Regional Forester.

(c) When a Forest is suspended or decertified, the responsible Forest Supervisor shall follow the procedures of 36 CFR Part 800 to comply with Section 106.

11.4 Recertification

If a decertified Forest is found to have restored the basis for certification, either under provisional or full performance levels, the Regional Heritage Program Leader will recommend that the Regional Forester recertify the Forest. The SHPO and ACHP shall be notified when the Regional Forester recertifies a Forest. If the SHPO or ACHP objects to the Regional Forester's decision to recertify a Forest, the objection will be resolved under Stipulation 12.1.

12.0 RESOLVING DISPUTES OR OBJECTIONS, REVISION, AMENDMENT, TERMINATION AND EXPIRATION

12.1 Procedure for Resolving Objections

(a) Region 5, the SHPO, the ACHP, or Indian tribes may object to an action proposed or taken by the other pursuant to this PA. The objecting party shall notify the other party in writing of the objection. Within seven (7) calendar days following receipt of notification, the Signatories shall consult for 30 calendar days to resolve the objection. If the objection is resolved within this time frame, the parties shall proceed in accordance with the terms of that resolution. If the objection is not resolved within this time frame, and the Signatories have not agreed to extend the consultation period, the Regional Forester shall submit the objection, including copies of all pertinent documentation, to the ACHP for 30 day comment. Within 30 calendar days following receipt of any ACHP comments, the Regional Forester shall make a final decision regarding resolution of the objection and in writing notify the SHPO and the ACHP of that decision. The objection shall thereupon be resolved. In reaching a final decision regarding the objection, the Regional Forester shall take into account any comments received from the SHPO and the ACHP pursuant to this stipulation.

(b) A member of the public or an Indian tribe or other Indian group or individual may object in writing at any time to the manner in which this PA is being implemented in a specific case (except as part of administrative appeals of NEPA decisions (Stipulation 12.1(d))). The elected leader of an Indian tribe (e.g., Chairman or President) or THPO may also contact the Forest Supervisor or District Ranger on a forest to register a verbal notice of dispute, to be followed by a written notice within 7 days, whenever a historic property of significance to an Indian tribe is being or may be adversely affected by implementation of an undertaking. The Forest shall then consult with the objecting party for a period not to exceed 30 days and, if the objecting party requests, with the SHPO, to resolve the objection. If a dispute involves an undertaking's effect or potential effect on historic properties, the THPO of any tribe whose aboriginal land includes the area where the undertaking is located, may also participate in efforts to resolve the objection if the Indian Tribe or THPO makes such a request to the Forest Supervisor or SHPO. If the objecting party and the Forest resolve the objection within 30 days, the Forest shall proceed in accordance with the terms of that resolution. If the objection cannot be resolved, the Forest shall refer the objection to the ACHP for a 30 day comment period. Within 30 calendar days following receipt of any ACHP comments, the Forest Supervisor shall make a final decision regarding resolution of the objection and shall, in writing, notify the objecting party, the SHPO and the ACHP of that decision. The objection, and any similar objections, shall thereupon be resolved. In reaching a final decision regarding the objection, the Forest Supervisor shall take into account any comments received from the objecting party, the SHPO, and the ACHP pursuant to this paragraph. Any objection filed pursuant to this paragraph shall not prevent the Forest from proceeding with project planning or implementing those portions of an undertaking that are not the subject of the objection. For objections involving possible effects to historic properties, implementation shall cease on those portions of the undertaking that are the subject of the objection and will be deferred until the objection is resolved pursuant to the terms of this paragraph.

(c) Only Signatories to this PA may object or dispute Regional Forester decisions regarding certification, decertification, or recertification. Such objections or disputes shall be resolved under 12.1.

(d) The Forest Service NEPA appeals process at 36 CFR 215 (*Notice, Comment, and Appeal Procedures for National Forest System Projects and Activities*), or successor regulations, shall be used to consider NEPA related appeals involving historic properties. Until a NEPA decision for an undertaking is made, specific objections from Indian tribes, Indians, and interested parties about the identification of historic properties and their values, and the effects to and treatment of historic properties, within an undertaking shall be resolved under this PA's dispute resolution procedures (Stipulations 12.1(a) – 12.1(b)) or 36 CFR part 800 (36 CFR 800.4(d)(ii-iv), 800.5(c)(2-3), 800.9(a)). Once the agency makes a decision on an undertaking, objections and appeals will follow the procedures at 36 CFR 215 or successor regulations.

12.2 Revision of this PA

This PA is intended to be responsive to changing circumstances. Therefore, Region 5, the SHPO, or the ACHP may propose revision of this PA, whereupon the parties shall consult to consider the proposed Revision. "Revision" as used herein refers to the process of review and rewriting stipulations in the PA. Revisions shall only become effective upon written concurrence of the Signatories. Any signatory can recommend that the suggested revisions be considered under the Amendment provisions (Stipulation 12.3) rather than this stipulation. Any disagreements on which stipulation to follow shall be resolved under the resolving objections stipulation (12.1).

12.3 Amendment of this PA

In keeping with the intended responsive nature of this PA, any party or Indian tribe may propose amendment of this PA at any time, whereupon the Signatories shall consult to consider such amendment. "Amendment" as used herein refers to the process of revising all or portions of this PA, extending its effective date, and the process of adding supplemental procedures for specific Region 5 programs when Signatories to the PA wish those procedures to be made explicit. The amendment process culminates in the issuance of an amended PA, which replaces the previous PA on its effective date. Amendments to the PA will only become effective upon approval of all the Signatories.

12.4 Termination, Amendment, Expiration, and Review of this PA

(a) Region 5, SHPO, or ACHP may terminate this PA or any PA Amendment. The party proposing termination shall in writing notify the other Signatories of their intent to terminate and explain the reasons for proposing termination. Within seven calendar days following receipt of such notification, the parties shall consult for up to 90 days to seek alternatives to termination. Should such consultation result in agreement on an alternative to termination, the parties shall proceed in accordance with the terms of that agreement. Should such consultation fail, the party proposing termination may terminate this PA or any PA Amendment by providing the other party with written notice of such termination. Termination hereunder shall render this PA or any terminated PA Amendment without further force or effect

(b) In the event of termination of this PA, Region 5 shall comply with the provisions of 36 CFR part 800 (Appendix C) for all undertakings previously covered by this PA, with the exception of those Supplemental Procedures described in PA Amendments which, by written agreement of the Signatories, may remain in full force and effect. Undertakings previously approved by a Forest under

the terms of this PA shall remain unaffected by its termination. In the event a PA Amendment is terminated, Region 5 shall comply with 36 CFR part 800 for the program or practices subsumed under the PA Amendment except insofar as SHPO, ACHP, and Region 5 in writing agree to subsume such program or practices under this PA.

(c) This PA and Region 5's activities under this PA shall be reviewed by the SHPO and ACHP on about the fourth anniversary of its execution. The purpose of such review shall be to determine whether the terms of this agreement have been satisfactorily implemented and whether the Signatories can agree to extend this PA in accordance with Stipulation 12.4(d).

(d) At midnight of the fifth anniversary of the date of its execution, this PA shall automatically expire and have no further force or effect, unless it is extended by written agreement of the Signatories. Should the PA not be extended and should no successor agreement document be in place at the time of expiration, Region 5 shall comply with 36 CFR part 800 (Appendix C).

13.0 OTHER STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES

In addition to the procedures agreed to in this PA, Region 5 shall follow procedures and adhere to policies detailed in the FSM 2360 (Appendix B) and reasonably conform with standards and guidelines promulgated by the respective state SHPO (California's Office of Historic Preservation and Nevada State Historic Preservation Office). Region 5, in consultation with SHPO, may develop other guidance as necessary as supplemental procedures to this PA (Stipulation 12.3).

14.0 EXECUTION

This PA shall take effect on **the date** it has been fully executed by Region 5, SHPO, and the ACHP,.

Execution of this PA by Region 5, SHPO, and the ACHP, and subsequent implementation of its terms, evidence that Region 5 has afforded the ACHP a reasonable opportunity to comment on an undertaking and its effects on historic properties; that Region 5 has taken into account the effects of an undertaking on historic properties; and that Region 5 has satisfied its responsibilities under section 106 of the NHPA and applicable implementing regulations for all aspects of its undertaking.

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG THE
U.S.D.A. FOREST SERVICE, PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION (REGION 5)
CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,
NEVADA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND THE
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING THE
PROCESSES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 106 OF
THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT
FOR MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES BY THE
NATIONAL FORESTS OF THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION**

SIGNATORY:

United States Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region

Randy Moore
Regional Forester

Date

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG THE
U.S.D.A. FOREST SERVICE, PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION (REGION 5)
CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,
NEVADA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND THE
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING THE
PROCESSES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 106 OF
THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT
FOR MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES BY THE
NATIONAL FORESTS OF THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION**

SIGNATORY:

State of California, Office of Historic Preservation

Carol Rowland-Nawi, Ph.D.
State Historic Preservation Officer

Date

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG THE
U.S.D.A. FOREST SERVICE, PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION (REGION 5)
CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,
NEVADA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND THE
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING THE
PROCESSES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 106 OF
THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT
FOR MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES BY THE
NATIONAL FORESTS OF THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION**

SIGNATORY:

State of Nevada, Historic Preservation Office

Ronald M. James
State Historic Preservation Officer

Date

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG THE
U.S.D.A. FOREST SERVICE, PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION (REGION 5)
CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,
NEVADA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND THE
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING THE
PROCESSES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 106 OF
THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT
FOR MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES BY THE
NATIONAL FORESTS OF THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION**

SIGNATORY:

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

John M. Fowler
Executive Director

Date

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG THE
U.S.D.A. FOREST SERVICE, PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION (REGION 5)
CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,
NEVADA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND THE
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING THE
PROCESSES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 106 OF
THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT
FOR MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES BY THE
NATIONAL FORESTS OF THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION**

I CONCUR:

Thomas Contreras, Forest Supervisor
Angeles National Forest

Date

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG THE
U.S.D.A. FOREST SERVICE, PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION (REGION 5)
CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,
NEVADA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND THE
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING THE
PROCESSES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 106 OF
THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT
FOR MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES BY THE
NATIONAL FORESTS OF THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION**

I CONCUR:

Will Metz, Forest Supervisor
Cleveland National Forest

Date

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG THE
U.S.D.A. FOREST SERVICE, PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION (REGION 5)
CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,
NEVADA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND THE
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING THE
PROCESSES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 106 OF
THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT
FOR MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES BY THE
NATIONAL FORESTS OF THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION**

I CONCUR:

Kathryn D. Hardy, Forest Supervisor
Eldorado National Forest

Date

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG THE
U.S.D.A. FOREST SERVICE, PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION (REGION 5)
CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,
NEVADA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND THE
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING THE
PROCESSES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 106 OF
THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT
FOR MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES BY THE
NATIONAL FORESTS OF THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION**

I CONCUR:

Edward E. Armenta, Forest Supervisor
Inyo National Forest

Date

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG THE
U.S.D.A. FOREST SERVICE, PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION (REGION 5)
CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,
NEVADA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND THE
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING THE
PROCESSES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 106 OF
THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT
FOR MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES BY THE
NATIONAL FORESTS OF THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION**

I CONCUR:

Patricia Grantham, Forest Supervisor
Klamath National Forest

Date

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG THE
U.S.D.A. FOREST SERVICE, PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION (REGION 5)
CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,
NEVADA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND THE
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING THE
PROCESSES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 106 OF
THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT
FOR MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES BY THE
NATIONAL FORESTS OF THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION**

I CONCUR:

Nancy Gibson, Forest Supervisor
Lake Tahoe Basin Management

Date

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG THE
U.S.D.A. FOREST SERVICE, PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION (REGION 5)
CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,
NEVADA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND THE
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING THE
PROCESSES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 106 OF
THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT
FOR MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES BY THE
NATIONAL FORESTS OF THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION**

I CONCUR:

Jerry Bird, Forest Supervisor
Lassen National Forest

Date

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG THE
U.S.D.A. FOREST SERVICE, PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION (REGION 5)
CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,
NEVADA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND THE
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING THE
PROCESSES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 106 OF
THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT
FOR MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES BY THE
NATIONAL FORESTS OF THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION**

I CONCUR:

Peggy Hernandez, Forest Supervisor
Los Padres National Forest

Date

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG THE
U.S.D.A. FOREST SERVICE, PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION (REGION 5)
CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,
NEVADA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND THE
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING THE
PROCESSES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 106 OF
THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT
FOR MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES BY THE
NATIONAL FORESTS OF THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION**

I CONCUR:

Sherry Tune, Forest Supervisor
Mendocino National Forest

Date

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG THE
U.S.D.A. FOREST SERVICE, PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION (REGION 5)
CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,
NEVADA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND THE
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING THE
PROCESSES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 106 OF
THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT
FOR MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES BY THE
NATIONAL FORESTS OF THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION**

I CONCUR:

Kimberly Anderson, Forest Supervisor
Modoc National Forest

Date

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG THE
U.S.D.A. FOREST SERVICE, PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION (REGION 5)
CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,
NEVADA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND THE
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING THE
PROCESSES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 106 OF
THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT
FOR MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES BY THE
NATIONAL FORESTS OF THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION**

I CONCUR:

Earl W. Ford, Forest Supervisor
Plumas National Forest

Date

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG THE
U.S.D.A. FOREST SERVICE, PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION (REGION 5)
CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,
NEVADA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND THE
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING THE
PROCESSES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 106 OF
THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT
FOR MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES BY THE
NATIONAL FORESTS OF THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION**

I CONCUR:

Jody Noiron, Forest Supervisor
San Bernardino National Forest

Date

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG THE
U.S.D.A. FOREST SERVICE, PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION (REGION 5)
CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,
NEVADA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND THE
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING THE
PROCESSES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 106 OF
THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT
FOR MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES BY THE
NATIONAL FORESTS OF THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION**

I CONCUR:

Kevin B. Elliott, Forest Supervisor
Sequoia National Forest

Date

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG THE
U.S.D.A. FOREST SERVICE, PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION (REGION 5)
CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,
NEVADA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND THE
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING THE
PROCESSES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 106 OF
THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT
FOR MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES BY THE
NATIONAL FORESTS OF THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION**

I CONCUR:

J. Sharon Heywood, Forest Supervisor
Shasta - Trinity National Forests

Date

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG THE
U.S.D.A. FOREST SERVICE, PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION (REGION 5)
CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,
NEVADA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND THE
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING THE
PROCESSES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 106 OF
THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT
FOR MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES BY THE
NATIONAL FORESTS OF THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION**

I CONCUR:

Dean Gould, Acting Forest Supervisor
Sierra National Forest

Date

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG THE
U.S.D.A. FOREST SERVICE, PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION (REGION 5)
CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,
NEVADA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND THE
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING THE
PROCESSES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 106 OF
THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT
FOR MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES BY THE
NATIONAL FORESTS OF THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION**

I CONCUR:

Tyrone Kelley, Forest Supervisor
Six Rivers National Forest

Date

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG THE
U.S.D.A. FOREST SERVICE, PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION (REGION 5)
CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,
NEVADA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND THE
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING THE
PROCESSES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 106 OF
THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT
FOR MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES BY THE
NATIONAL FORESTS OF THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION**

I CONCUR:

Susan Skalski, Forest Supervisor
Stanislaus National Forest

Date

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG THE
U.S.D.A. FOREST SERVICE, PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION (REGION 5)
CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,
NEVADA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND THE
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING THE
PROCESSES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 106 OF
THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT
FOR MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES BY THE
NATIONAL FORESTS OF THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION**

I CONCUR:

Tom Quinn, Forest Supervisor
Tahoe National Forest

Date

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG THE
U.S.D.A. FOREST SERVICE, PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION (REGION 5)
CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,
NEVADA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND THE
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING THE
PROCESSES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 106 OF
THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT
FOR MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES BY THE
NATIONAL FORESTS OF THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION**

I CONCUR:

[name], [title]
[name of Tribe]

Date

APPENDIX A
DEFINITIONS

APPENDIX A

DEFINITIONS

The following definitions apply to this PA:

Area of Potential Effects (APE): is the geographic area or areas, whether federally administered or not, within which an undertaking may cause changes in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist. Also see 36 CFR 800.16(d).

Cultural Resource: is an object or definite location of human activity, occupation, or use identifiable through field survey, historical documentation, or oral evidence. Cultural resources are prehistoric, historic, archaeological, or architectural sites, structures, places, or objects and traditional cultural properties. Cultural resources include the entire spectrum of resources for which the Heritage Program is responsible from artifacts to cultural landscapes without regard to eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (FSM 2360.5).

Emergency Undertaking: see Undertaking, a. Emergency Undertaking, below.

Exemption: see Exempt Undertaking, below.

Forest Line Officer: either the Forest Supervisor or District Ranger with delegated authorities for an administrative unit.

Historic Preservation Plan (HPP): is a plan that may be developed and implemented on a Forest consistent with the requirements of Section 110 of the NHPA and the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Preservation Planning (48 FR 44716-44720).

Heritage Program Manager (HPM): is the lead position on each Forest that is responsible for: directing and administering the Forest's complex and multifaceted Heritage Program; planning, developing, and implementing the Forest's cultural resources inventory, evaluation, preservation, and enhancement activities; delegating professional and technical responsibilities to heritage specialists pursuant to this PA; providing professional and technical advice to the Forest Leadership Team; coordinating the Heritage Program internally, and with external agencies, organizations, and the public; curating and controlling access to cultural resource records and collections; and meeting other program management responsibilities under this PA. The HPM shall: meet the professional standards established for either archaeologist, historian or architectural historian, as outlined in 36 CFR 296.8 or in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Professional Qualifications (48 FR 44738-44739); or meet at least Office of Personnel Management X118 GS-170/193-11 journeyman level qualifications; and have the experience and skills pertinent to his or her job duties and responsibilities under this PA.

Heritage Program staff: are trained in historic preservation specialties, such as historic or prehistoric archaeology, history, anthropology, ethnography, or architectural history, who may conduct literature searches and heritage resource inventories, record and monitor sites, excavate, process and analyze heritage resource data, maintain heritage databases, maintain heritage records and collections, write reports, stabilize sites, or assist Heritage Program Managers or other Heritage Program staff with historic preservation tasks. Heritage Program staff must meet at least Office of Personnel Management X118 GS-170/190/193-9 level qualifications to be delegated HPM responsibilities, and have the experience and skills pertinent to his or her job duties and responsibilities under this PA.

“Qualified Heritage Program staff, as used in this PA, generally refers to Forest Service employees in the Archaeologist (GS 193), Anthropologist (GS 190), Archaeological Technician (GS 102), or Historian (GS 170) series).

Historic Property: is any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object, and its associated artifacts, remains, features, settings, and records, that is either listed in or determined eligible for inclusion in the NRHP; or any property not yet evaluated to determine whether it is eligible for the NRHP.

At Risk Historic Property: is a property that the HPM/DHPS identifies as susceptible to being adversely affected by specific undertaking activities. *At risk historic properties* are more commonly identified as part of strategies developed in consultation with the SHPO for specific undertakings or programs (e.g., non-intensive survey strategies). The HPM/DHPS develops and implements an inventory strategy with the focused goal of identifying *at risk* historic properties rather than all historic properties that may be present. An *at risk* historic property is identified based on property characteristics (e.g., flammability or fragility) and undertaking parameters (e.g., fuel load or fire temperature, or equipment weight or type). Examples are wooden structures susceptible to fire from prescribed burning or rock alignments that can be crushed by tracked vehicles. *At risk* historic properties have also been called a *resource of interest*, *heritage resource of interest*, or *archaeological resource of interest* in Region 5.

Indian tribe: means an Indian tribe, band, nation, or other organized group or community, including a native village, regional corporation, or village corporation, as those terms are defined in section 3 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 USC 1602), which is recognized as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians.

Intensive Survey: is a systematic, detailed examination of an area designed to gather information about the number, location, condition, and distribution of historic properties within an undertaking's APE. The need for minimal subsurface testing (e.g., shovel test probes, auguring), in archaeologically sensitive areas as part of an intensive inventory should be assessed where surface evidence may not be adequate when defining an undertaking's APE (e.g., large ground disturbing projects).

No/Little Potential to Affect Historic Properties: is an agency determination that a specific undertaking is a type of activity that does not have the potential to cause effects to historic properties assuming such historic properties are present (36 CFR 800.3(a)(1)).

Native American Traditional Practitioner: is a Native American person who practices the cultural, spiritual, or religious traditions passed to them in a way accepted by their Indian tribe, an Indian tribe's recognized religious or ceremonial leaders, or cultural peers.

Paraprofessional: is a Forest Service employee who receives specialized training to develop technical skills generally related archaeological identification, survey, and recordkeeping. Certification means that individual has met regional standards, and those detailed in Appendix G, or other standards set by the Forests and agreed to by the SHPO.

Reconnaissance survey: is a non-intensive inventory strategy employed when gathering data to refine a historic context; checks on presence or absence of expected property types; estimates distribution of historic properties in a given area; provides general understanding of properties in an area; may

require more detailed survey to meet specific needs.

Regional Heritage Program Leader: is the lead position in Region 5 responsible for directing, administering, and overseeing the region's complex and multifaceted Heritage Program; advising the Regional Forester, Regional Leadership Team, staff directors, and the Director of Public Services about heritage program management issues; coordinating the Heritage Program internally and with external agencies, organizations, and the public; negotiating agreement documents with consulting parties on behalf of the region; overseeing and administering the region's agreement documents, and meeting agreement delegated responsibilities, and delegating responsibilities to Forests pursuant to those agreements. The Region 5 Regional Heritage Program Leader shall meet the professional standards established for either archaeologist or historian, as outlined in 36 CFR 296.8 or in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Professional Qualifications (48 FR 44738-44739), or OPM's X118 journeyman level qualification standards, and shall have the experience and skills pertinent to his or her job duties and responsibilities under this PA.

Sample survey: may employ intensive or reconnaissance survey to inventory less than total area; effectively used to evaluate alternatives and estimate frequencies of properties and types of properties over large areas; may use random, stratified, and systematic designs.

Screened Undertaking: See Undertaking, Screened Undertaking, below.

Standard Protection Measure: is a historic property treatment procedure, listed and described in Appendix E or added by amendment, that when properly applied eliminates or substantially minimizes the adverse effects of undertakings on historic properties; and when properly applied, no historic properties will be affected by the undertaking.

Undertaking: is any project, activity, or program funded in whole or in part under the direct or indirect jurisdiction of the Forest Service, including: those carried out by or on behalf of the Forest Service; those carried out with federal financial assistance from the Forest Service; and, those requiring a federal permit, license, or approval, including Forest Supervisor or District Ranger authorization.

a. *Emergency Undertaking:* is any undertaking that the Forest Supervisor determines must be initiated within 30 days of a natural disaster (including human-caused wildfire) or national security emergency, such that emergency actions are necessary in order to avoid an imminent threat to human life or of major property damage, or as defined in 36 CFR Part 78.

b. *Exempt Undertaking:* is an undertaking that is exempt from review or consultation under the terms of this PA and 36 CFR part 800, pursuant to Stipulation 7.1 and specifically listed in section 1.0 of Appendix D.

c. *Screened Undertaking:* is an undertaking that may be subject to expedited review, documentation, or consultation under the terms of this PA and 36 CFR part 800, based on HPM/DHPS recommendation, pursuant to Stipulation 7.0, and specifically listed in section 2.0 of Appendix D.

APPENDIX B

**FOREST SERVICE MANUAL CHAPTER 2360 –
HERITAGE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT**

APPENDIX C

**36 CFR part 800
(August 5, 2004)**

APPENDIX D

EXEMPT AND SCREENED UNDERTAKINGS

APPENDIX D

EXEMPT AND SCREENED UNDERTAKINGS

1.0 Exempt Undertakings (Class A Undertakings):

1.1 Certain classes of undertakings are considered exempt from further review or consultation under the terms of this PA, as defined in Appendix A, and pursuant to Stipulation 7.1. A Line Officer, HPM or SHPO may recommend that a specific undertaking be reviewed under the terms of this PA rather than be exempt if there is reason to believe that a specific exempt undertaking may affect historic properties. Line Officers and planners do not have to notify nor consult with HPMs about these classes of undertakings unless they have reason to believe that specific Exempt Undertakings may affect historic properties. Projects requiring Standard Protection Measures (see Appendix E) or other conditions for the protection and preservation of historic properties are not considered Exempt Undertakings.

1.2 Exempt Undertakings are not to be reported in Forest Annual Reports.

1.3 Exempt Undertakings (Class A) are:

- (a) Easement acquisitions, where the historic properties received are not considered in exchange for any historic properties relinquished;
- (b) Land acquisitions or transfers of administrative control to the Forest Service, where the historic properties received are not considered in exchange for any relinquished;
- (c) Personal use fuel wood and Christmas tree permits (except on lands in Nevada);
- (d) Installations of signposts and monuments, when no new ground disturbance is involved;
- (e) Non-disturbing broadcast seeding and mulching for establishment of vegetation;
- (f) Removal of log jams and debris jams within waterways using hand labor or small hand-held equipment;
- (g) Removal of illicit narcotics equipment and marijuana gardens from federal land during law enforcement operations, excluding the removal of buildings or structures 45 years of age or older as of the date of removal.
- (h) Non-discretionary actions undertaken by Forests to enforce the law.
- (i) Routine removal of trash and abandoned property less than 45 years of age that does not qualify as a historic property.

2.0 Screened Undertakings (Class B Undertakings):

2.1 HPM/DHPS shall determine whether specific undertakings subsumed in certain classes of undertakings (Class B) may be treated as Screened Undertakings under this PA. Screened Undertakings have no or little potential to cause effects to historic properties if they are present in an

APE. If so determined, such Screened Undertakings must be certified by HPM/DHPS and documented in writing. If the HPM/DHPS determines that an undertaking will have an effect, will continue an on-going effect, or may affect historic properties, the undertaking shall not be considered a Screened Undertaking and shall be subject to the provisions of this PA or 36 CFR part 800, as appropriate. Projects requiring class II or III Standard Protection Measures (i.e., protections other than avoidance; see Appendix E) or other conditions for the protection and preservation of historic properties may not use the streamlined documentation procedures for Screened Undertakings.

2.2. Screened Undertakings are to be reported in Forest Annual Reports.

2.3 Screened Undertakings (Class B) may include:

(a) Land use planning activities that do not authorize specific undertakings (e.g., Wilderness Plans, Wild and Scenic River Plans);

(b) Withdrawal revocations;

(c) Activities whose APEs are entirely within obviously disturbed contexts (e.g., borrow pits), and the disturbances are such that the presence of historic properties is considered highly unlikely;

(d) Activities that do not involve ground or surface disturbance (e.g., timber stand improvement, pre-commercial thinning, non-disturbing wildlife structures, and fuels treatment), and that do not have the potential to affect access to or use of resources by Indians based on the nature of the undertaking or prior or current consultation with Indian tribes;

(e) Transfers of use authorization from one authority to another when actions such as boundary adjustment necessitate changing rights-of-way, easements, or permits from one authority to another (e.g., Forest Service Special Use Permit to a USFA Title V Right-of-Way);

(f) Issuance, granting, or renewal of permits, easements, or rights-of-way that do not authorize surface or resource disturbance and do not have the potential to affect access to or use of resources by Indians based on the nature of the undertaking or prior or current consultation with Indian tribes;

(g) Applications of pesticides or herbicides that do not have the potential to affect access to or use of resources by Indians based on the nature of the undertaking or prior or current consultation with Indian tribes;

(h) Activities limited within stream channels, not including terraces, cut banks, etc;

(i) Activities that involve less than one cubic meter of cumulative ground disturbance per acre;

(j) Installations of barriers, fencing, or signs with “T”-posts or rebar;

(k) Hazards abatement, including elimination of toxic and other hazardous material (excluding remediation of CERCLA sites); and filling, barricading, or screening of abandoned mine shafts, adits, and stopes where such features are not historic or contributing properties, or closure methods only include reversible means such as bat gate (except cupola type), rebar shaft grate, gates,

lugs, fencing, or polyurethane foam (PUF) shaft plug methods where installation (e.g., cement) avoids portal structural features as much as practicable.

(l) Routine trail maintenance limited to brushing and light maintenance of existing tread with hand tools, including chain saws;

(m) Trail maintenance of existing tread on slopes exceeding 30%;

(n) Routine road maintenance and resurfacing where work is confined to previously maintained surfaces, ditches, culverts, and cut and fill slopes within road prism, where there are no known historic properties;

(o) Felling of hazardous trees along roadways, within recreation areas, or other areas for health and safety reasons provided they are left in place or cut up with hand tools, including chain saws, and removed by hand;

(p) Felling and removal of hazard and wind thrown trees from road prisms where deemed necessary for health, safety, or administrative reasons, so long as trees are felled into and removed from within existing road prisms (area clearly associated with road construction, from road surface to top of cut and/or toe of fill) where previous disturbance is such that the presence of historic properties is considered unlikely, and so long as ground disturbance is not allowed off previously disturbed areas associated with road prisms;

(q) Issuances of road use permits for commercial hauling or permits for off-highway vehicle events over existing roads having no historic properties, whenever federal involvement is incidental to activities associated with permit purposes and where there are no known effects to traditional cultural properties based on the nature of the undertaking or prior or current consultation with Indian tribes;

(r) Temporary or long-term closures of roads or trails involving no new ground disturbance;

(s) Construction of snow fences where no new ground disturbance is involved;

(t) Maintenance and replacement in kind of existing nonstructural facilities (e.g., cattle guards, gates, fences, stock tanks, guardrails, barriers, traffic control devices, utility poles, light standards, curbs, sidewalks, etc.) that do not involve new ground disturbance, or where ground disturbance is limited to less than one cubic meter total per acre and in areas where there are no known historic properties or where the presence of historic properties is considered highly unlikely;

(u) Activities or alterations involving facilities or structures that are less than 45 years of age as of the date of the project and will not alter the viewshed of historic buildings, structures, or Districts;

(v) Maintenance (that does not add to nor change the configuration of the existing facilities) to existing electronic communication sites involving no ground disturbance or impacts to known historic properties;

(w) Installation of any off-site historic property protection measures;

- (x) Wildfires, including initial attack, where suppression activities have required no mechanical disturbance of the surface of the ground, including surfaces which may contain prehistoric art, and where no structures have been disturbed;
- (y) Activities to reduce hazardous fuels on private lands, funded in whole or in part using Forest Service grants, including educational and training efforts, hand treatments, mowing, chipping, pile burning, use of hand-held mechanized equipment, and all fuels treatments at private residences;
- (z) Creation of defensible space around homes and structures through the removal of trees, brush, and other vegetation using chainsaws and hand tools, where such activities do not affect the integrity of the setting of historic properties;
- (aa) Placement of geophysical seismic monitoring equipment on surfaced portions or within prisms (area clearly associated with road construction, from road surface to top of cut and/or toe of fill) of regularly maintained roads;
- (bb) Tree planting by hand following a wildfire where low impact method is used (e.g., planting bar; no mechanical auger) and where such activities would not affect the integrity of historic properties if present;
- (cc) Prescribed burning when the APE contains no historic properties or historic properties are considered unlikely;
- (dd) Removal of non-native, invasive plant species using hand tools where such activities would not affect the integrity of historic properties if present.

APPENDIX E

APPROVED STANDARD PROTECTION MEASURES

APPENDIX E

APPROVED STANDARD PROTECTION MEASURES

Heritage Program Managers (HPMs), or delegated Heritage Program staff, shall ensure that Standard Protection Measures are implemented as appropriate for all subject undertakings managed under this PA. When these protection measures are effectively applied, Forests will have taken into account the effects of undertakings on historic properties.

Forests shall provide the funding and staff time necessary to perform all post-project activity necessitated by historic property treatments and protections, monitoring, effects assessments, and documentation recommended by HPM/DHPS as a condition of project approval, or when identified during post-activity assessments. All such work shall be completed within one year of final project activities. If recommended work is not completed within this period of time, Forests shall notify Region 5 and consult with the SHPO on appropriate actions needed to complete the work within agreed upon time periods, or failing to do so, shall comply with 36 CFR part 800.

1.0 Class I: Avoidance

HPM/DHPS shall exclude historic properties from areas where activities associated with undertakings will occur, except where authorized below.

1.1 Proposed undertakings shall avoid historic properties. Avoidance means that no activities associated with undertakings that may affect historic properties, unless specifically identified in this PA, shall occur within historic property boundaries, including any defined buffer zones (see clause 1.1(a), below). Portions of undertakings may need to be modified, redesigned, or eliminated to properly avoid historic properties.

(a) Buffer zones may be established to ensure added protection where HPM/DHPS determine that they are necessary. The use of buffer zones in avoidance measures may be applicable where setting contributes to property eligibility under 36 CFR 60.4, or where setting may be an important attribute of some types of historic properties (e.g., historic buildings or structures with associated historic landscapes, or traditional cultural properties important to Indians), or where heavy equipment is used in proximity to historic properties.

(1) The size of buffer zones must be determined by HPMs or qualified Heritage Program staff on case-by-case bases.

(2) Landscape architects and qualified Heritage Program staff may be consulted to determine appropriate view sheds for historic resources.

(3) Indian tribes, or their designated representatives, and/or Native American Traditional Practitioners shall be consulted when the use or size of protective buffers for Indian traditional cultural properties needs to be determined.

1.2 Activities within historic property boundaries will be prohibited with the exception of using developed Forest transportation systems when the HPM or qualified heritage professional recommends that such use is consistent with the terms and purposes of this agreement, where limited activities approved by the HPM or qualified heritage professional will not have an adverse effect on

historic properties, or except as specified below in sections 2.0 and 3.0 of Appendix E.

1.3 All historic properties within APEs shall be clearly delineated prior to implementing any associated activities that have the potential to affect historic properties.

(1) Historic property boundaries shall be delineated with coded flagging and/or other effective marking.

(2) Historic property location and boundary marking information shall be conveyed to appropriate Forest Service administrators or employees responsible for project implementation so that pertinent information can be incorporated into planning and implementation documents, contracts, and permits (e.g., clauses or stipulations in permits or contracts as needed).

1.4 When any changes in proposed activities are necessary to avoid historic properties (e.g., project modifications, redesign, or elimination; removing old or confusing project markings or engineering stakes within site boundaries; or revising maps or changing specifications), these changes shall be completed prior to initiating any project activities.

1.5 Monitoring by heritage program specialists may be used to enhance the effectiveness of protection measures. The results of any monitoring inspections shall be documented in cultural resources reports and the Infra database.

2.0 Class II: On-Site Historic Property Protection Measures

HPM/DHPS may provide written approval for an undertaking's activities within or adjacent to the boundaries of historic properties based on professional judgment that such activities will not have an adverse effect on historic properties, or under carefully controlled conditions such as those specified below. All activities performed under Section 2.0 (Standard Protection Measures) must be documented in inventory or other Heritage Program Reports (HPMs), or other compliance reports prepared pursuant to this PA.

2.1 The following historic property protection measures may be approved for undertakings under the conditions detailed below:

(a) Linear sites (e.g., historic trails, roads, railroad grades, ditches) may be crossed or breached by equipment in areas where their features or characteristics clearly lack historic integrity (i.e., where those portions do not contribute to site eligibility or values).

(1) Crossings are not to be made at the points of origin, intersection, or terminus of linear site features.

(2) Crossings are to be made perpendicular to linear site features.

(3) The number of crossings is to be minimized by project and amongst multiple projects in the same general location.

(4) The remainder of the linear site is to be avoided, and traffic is to be clearly routed through designated crossings.

(b) Accumulation of sufficient snow over archaeological deposits or historic features to prevent surface and subsurface impacts. Undertaking activities may be implemented over snow cover on

historic properties under the following conditions:

(1) The cover must have at least 12 inches depth of compacted snow or ice throughout the duration of undertaking activities on sites.

(2) All concentrated work areas (e.g., landings, skid trails, turnarounds, and processing equipment sites) shall be located prior to snow accumulation and outside historic property boundaries.

(c) Placement of foreign, non-archaeological material (e.g., padding or filter cloth) within transportation corridors (e.g., designated roads or trails, campground loops, boat ramps, etc.) over archaeological deposits or historic features to prevent surface and subsurface impacts caused by vehicles or equipment. Such foreign material may be utilized on historic properties under the following conditions:

(1) Engineering will design the foreign material depth to acceptable professional standards;

(2) Engineering will design the foreign material use to assure that there will be no surface or subsurface impacts to archaeological deposits or historic features;

(3) The foreign material must be easily distinguished from underlying archaeological deposits or historic features;

(4) The remainder of the archaeological site or historic feature is to be avoided, and traffic is to be clearly routed across the foreign fill material;

(5) The foreign material must be removable should research or other heritage need require access to the archaeological deposit or historic feature at a later date; and

(6) Indian tribe or other public concerns about the use of the foreign material will be addressed prior to use.

(d) Placement of barriers within or adjacent to site boundaries to prevent access to or disturbance of deposits or historic features, or for protection of other sensitive resources on-site, when such barriers do not disturb subsurface deposits or lead to other effects to the site.

(1) Non-intrusive barriers: wooden and other barriers anchored with rebar; rocks/boulders or other items placed on the surface; weed-free straw bales or straw bales anchored with rebar; or other nonintrusive barriers approved by HPMs or qualified Heritage Program staff.

(2) Fencing: "T"-post fencing; snow fencing; orange highway-type fencing; or other fencing approved by HPMs or qualified Heritage Program staff.

(e) Placement of temporary structural support to stabilize and protect historic properties during undertakings where vibrations or stress from equipment use can be effectively abated or to stabilize historic properties at risk of imminent collapse. Engineering staff will be consulted as appropriate to design supports.

(f) Installation or placement of erosion control devices, ditches, features or other treatments within site boundaries when such measures are reviewed by the HPM/DHPS and hydrologist or soil scientist, and HPM approves their use as unlikely to affect the integrity of a historic property.

2.2 The following activity-specific standard protection measures may be approved by HPM/DHPS under the conditions specified below:

(a) Felling and removal of hazard, salvage, and other trees within historic properties under the following conditions:

- (1) Trees may be limbed or topped to prevent soil gouging during felling;
- (3) Felled trees may be removed using only the following techniques: hand bucking, including use of chain saws, and hand carrying, rubber tired loader, crane/self-loader, helicopter, or other non-disturbing, HPM-approved methods;
- (4) Equipment operators shall be briefed on the need to reduce ground disturbances (e.g., minimizing turns);
- (5) No skidding nor tracked equipment shall be allowed within historic property boundaries; and
- (6) Where monitoring is a condition of approval, its requirements or scheduling procedures should be included in the written approval.

(b) For fire, and hazardous fuels and vegetation management projects, HPM/DHPS, in conjunction with fuels, vegetation management, or fire specialists as necessary, shall develop treatment measures for *at risk* historic properties (as defined in SHPO approved Region 5 modules and agreements) designed to eliminate or reduce potential adverse effects to the extent practicable by utilizing methods that minimize surface disturbance, and/or by planning project activities in previously disturbed areas or areas lacking cultural features.

(1) The following standard protection measures apply to fire, hazardous fuels, and vegetation management projects:

- (A) Fire crews may monitor sites to provide protection as needed.
- (B) Fire lines or breaks may be constructed off sites to protect *at risk* historic properties.
- (C) Vegetation may be removed and fire lines or breaks may be constructed within sites using hand tools, so long as ground disturbance is minimized, and features are avoided, as specified by HPMs or qualified Heritage Program staff during fire emergencies (see Stipulation 7.11).
- (D) Fire shelter fabric or other protective materials or equipment (e.g., sprinkler systems) may be utilized to protect *at risk* historic properties.
- (E) Fire retardant foam and other wetting agents may be utilized to protect *at risk* historic properties and in the construction and use of fire lines.
- (F) Surface fuels (e.g., stumps or partially buried logs) on *at risk* historic properties may be covered with dirt, fire shelter fabric, foam or other wetting agents, or other protective materials to prevent fire from burning into subsurface components and to reduce the duration of heating underneath or near heavy fuels.
- (G) Trees that may impact *at risk* historic properties should they fall on site features and

smolder can be directionally felled away from properties prior to ignition, or prevented from burning by wrapping in fire shelter fabric or treating with fire retardant or wetting agents.

(H) Vegetation to be burned shall not be piled within the boundaries of historic properties unless locations (e.g., a previously disturbed area) have been specifically approved by HPMs or qualified Heritage Program staff.

(I) Mechanically treated (crushed/cut) brush or downed woody material may be removed from historic properties by hand, through the use of off-site equipment, or by rubber-tired equipment approved by HPMs or qualified Heritage Program staff. Ground disturbance shall be minimized to the extent practicable during such removals.

(J) Woody material may be chipped within the boundaries of historic properties so long as the staging of chipping equipment on-site does not affect historic properties and staging areas are specifically approved by HPMs or qualified Heritage Program staff.

(K) HPMs shall approve the use of tracked equipment to remove brush or woody material from within specifically identified areas of site boundaries under prescribed measures designed to prevent or minimize effects. Vegetative or other protective padding may be used in conjunction with HPM authorization of certain equipment types within site boundaries.

(2) HPMs or qualified Heritage Program staff shall determine whether fire, prescribed fire, or mechanical equipment treatments within site boundaries shall be monitored, and how such monitoring shall occur.

(3) Use of any standard protection measures on historic properties for fire, hazardous fuels, and vegetation experimental mechanical treatments shall be documented in heritage program reports, detailing equipment type, extraction techniques, conditions of use, environmental conditions, project results, effectiveness of protection measures, need for changes, and recommendations for future use.

(c) For motorized recreation projects, HPMs or qualified Heritage Program staff, in conjunction with motorized recreation specialists and engineers as necessary, shall develop treatment measures for *at risk* historic properties designed to eliminate or reduce potential adverse effects to the extent practicable by utilizing methods that minimize surface disturbance, and/or by planning project activities in previously disturbed areas or areas lacking cultural features. The following standard protection measures apply to motorized recreation projects:

(1) Adoption or implementation of use controls:

(A) Temporary (e.g., during wet season) or long-term closures;

(B) Signage (use restrictions, informational, etc.);

(C) Access exclusions via installation of gates when placed where HPMs or qualified Heritage Program staff determine there will be no effect or no adverse effect, such as placement in disturbed contexts, in road prisms, or at site boundaries;

(D) Adaptive management (protocol that proceeds through stages managed to reduce or eliminate any effect) that includes monitoring, education, signage, and closure in a sequential process.

(2) Use of vegetative screening or surface treatments: broadcast seeding; broadcast slash or straw, etc.; or planting of vegetation to promote screening and natural fencing.

(d) Routine maintenance of roads or trails over 50 years old may be approved by the HPM/DHPS in order to maintain current uses provided work is confined to the existing alignment/prism and previously maintained surfaces, and proposed work or methods are unlikely to affect historic integrity (e.g., brush clearing, cleaning culverts, maintaining ditches and erosion control features, etc.).

2.3 Any specified activities within the boundaries of historic properties shall be reviewed in heritage program reports to assess continuation of or need for changes in the protection measures.

2.4 If standard protection measures cannot provide appropriate protection, undertakings shall be subject to the provisions of 36 CFR part 800.

3.0 Class III: Historic Structure Treatments

HPM/DHPS shall provide written approval (project documentation required) for the specific activities listed in section 3.3, below, involving the routine repair and maintenance of historic structures. All activities performed under section 3.0 Standard Protection Measures must be documented in heritage program reports, pursuant to this PA; none may be performed under exemptions.

3.1 Forests shall emphasize the repair of existing elements, rather than in-kind replacement, whenever prudent and feasible (i.e., where economical; or where materials and skills are available).

(a) Where existing materials clearly are not the original and are not in-character with the original, non-historic and out-of-character materials may be removed and replaced with materials that match or are more compatible with original fabric, design, color, etc. of historic structures.

(b) When applying these protection measures, Forest HPMs or qualified Heritage Program staff shall verify that the proposed work conforms to recommendations set forth in *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*.

(c) Where proposed repair or in-kind replacement, or other historic preservation activities, may affect a structure's historic character (i.e., adversely affect period of significance fabric, materials, workmanship, or design):

(1) Case-by-case consultation pursuant to 36 CFR part 800 is required;

(2) Persons meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Professional Qualifications, or the Office of Personnel Management X118 standards at the journeyman level, for historian, architect, historic architect, landscape architect, or restoration engineer, must review, supervise, or complete the project, as preservation needs dictate.

3.2 All activities approved for the below listed protection measures shall be documented in Forest Heritage Program reports.

3.3 Routine Repair and Maintenance Protection Measures

(a) Structural Elements:

(1) Repair or replacement of siding, trim, or hardware, when done in-kind to match historic material, design, and color.

(2) Repair of window frames or shutters by patching, splicing, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing or replacing in-kind those parts that are either extensively deteriorated or are missing. The same historic configuration of panes shall be retained.

(3) Replacement of window frames to match historic material and design. The same historic configuration of panes shall be retained.

(4) Replacement of glass, when done in-kind to match historic form and design. Window panes may be double or triple glazed as long as the glazing is clear and replacement does not alter the historic window form. This excludes tinted glass, the use of which requires consultation.

(5) Maintenance of features, such as frames, hoodmolds, paneled or decorated jambs and moldings, through appropriate surface treatments such as cleaning, rust removal, limited paint removal, and reapplication of protective coating systems using historic color and texture.

(6) Repair or replacement of doors, when done in-kind to match historic material and form.

(7) Repair or replacement of porches, cornices, and stairs when done in-kind or to match historic material and design, and the style, materials, and character of the structure.

(9) Repair or replacement of foundations when the work does not change the structure's historic appearance.

(10) Repair or replacement of roofs or parts of roofs that are deteriorated, when done in-kind or where matching historic material and design. In areas of high fire danger, fire retardant roofing is allowed. If fire retardant materials are used, the materials must match the original roofing color and be as compatible with the design and character of the building as possible. Adequate anchorage for roofing material to guard against wind damage and moisture penetration shall be provided.

(b) Surfaces:

(1) Painting interior or exterior surfaces, when the new paint matches the existing or historic color. If the existing paint color is not desirable and the historic color is not known, the color should be in keeping with historic color schemes for nearby or similar structures. Damaged or deteriorated paint may be removed to the next sound layer by hand-scraping or hand-sanding. Use of abrasive methods, such as sandblasting, is not covered by this treatment.

(2) Replacement or installation of caulking and weather-stripping around windows, doors, walls, and roofs.

(3) Removal of hazardous materials or surfaces such as asbestos and lead paint, and replacing them with nontoxic materials that resemble the historic surfaces as closely as possible.

(c) Interior Elements:

(1) Replacement of modern appliances and fixtures (e.g., ranges, refrigerators, and bathroom fixtures). When associated historic cabinetry is intact, and the interior, in general, retains its historic appearance, the cabinetry will be retained.

(2) Repair or replacement of floor coverings, when done in-kind to match historic material and design.

(4) Rendering inoperable, but not removing, gas lighting fixtures, when another inconspicuous light source is used.

(5) Floor, wall, or ceiling refinishing in-kind.

(d) Utility Systems:

(1) Installation of mechanical equipment that does not affect the visual integrity or exterior fabric of the building.

(2) Replacement, removal, or upgrading of electrical wiring.

(3) Replacement of floor furnaces and floor registers with surface-mounted wall heating systems or hot water appliances. Repairs to the floors will be done with in-kind materials and design.

(4) Repair, replacement, removal, or upgrading of water and plumbing systems when historic features, such as hand pumps, are left in place. Historic plumbing fixtures should be retained and used if possible.

(6) Replacement of metal water tanks with ones of fiberglass, when the color and texture of the existing or historic tank are replicated or when landscaping camouflages the replacement tank. Redwood tanks with plastic inserts are also feasible. Construction of a structure around a tank to control temperature is allowed when landscaping camouflages the change.

(7) Replacement of and enlarging liquid propane gas systems, if tanks are screened with landscaping materials.

(8) Replacement of communications equipment, when the same size, shape, and general configuration are retained, excluding large antenna and communications dishes.

(9) Replacement of lightning rod wiring with new copper wire.

(e) Surrounding Features (see Ground Disturbing Activities, section 7, below):

(1) Replacement of signs in-kind.

(2) Ongoing maintenance of immediately surrounding landscaping, including such modifications as removing hazardous vegetation, adding vegetation that blends with the historic landscape, or adding rocks to define paths, where not otherwise prohibited, so long as historic landscape characteristics are maintained.

(3) Installation of interpretive signs or exhibit structures which are not attached to historic structures and do not visually intrude on the historic property. Signs should be constructed of materials and painted colors that harmonize with the historic property and its setting.

(4) Repair or replacement of driveways and walkways done in-kind to match existing or historic materials and design.

(5) Repair or replacement of fencing done in-kind to match existing or historic material and design.

(6) Repair, replacement, or addition of exterior lighting that blends with the landscaping and style of the building.

(d) New Materials:

(1) Installation of dry insulation.

(2) Installation of fire or smoke detectors or burglar alarms.

(3) Installation of skirting over a structure's crawl space, if constructed or painted a color to match or blend with the structure.

(4) Installation of security systems or security devices, such as dead bolts, door locks, window latches, and door peep holes.

(5) Installation of temporary door or window covers to secure structures from vandalism during the off-season or after visitor hours.

(e) Ground Disturbing Activities (where no known conflicts with other historic properties, e.g., prehistoric archaeological deposits, may exist):

(1) Excavations for repair or replacement of building footings or foundation work within two feet of existing footings and foundations.

(2) Installation of utilities, such as sewer, water, or storm drains, electrical, gas, or leach lines, and septic tanks, where installation is restricted to specific areas previously disturbed by installation of these utilities.

(3) Tree planting or removal in areas that have been previously disturbed by these activities, including nursery beds and arboreta, provided historic landscaping is maintained.

APPENDIX F

**SUPPLEMENTAL GUIDELINES FOR
DETERMINATIONS OF ELIGIBILITY**

APPENDIX F

SUPPLEMENTAL GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINATIONS OF ELIGIBILITY

In meeting its NHPA Section 106 responsibilities for historic preservation, Region 5 wishes to concentrate on determinations of eligibility to improve knowledge about cultural resources, increase the number of significance evaluations, improve management of historic properties, and facilitate planning for future undertakings. Region 5 would also like to increase the number of determinations of eligibility for undertakings being planned at the landscape scale (e.g., vegetation treatments, prescribed burning), as well as for other undertakings. Several different property types lend themselves to expedited determinations of eligibility, because of the historic characteristics they either obviously possess or lack. Region 5 shall use the documentation standards detailed below, minimizing subsurface testing and site disturbance, to complete consultation on these expedited determinations of eligibility.

When historic properties will be managed and maintained in ways that ensure prospective NRHP values are preserved, or where no historic properties are affected by an undertaking (e.g., use of the Standard Protection Measures listed in Appendix C), then their eligibility for inclusion in the NRHP can be assumed for purposes of the undertaking. If an undertaking may diminish prospective historic property NRHP values, the Forest shall evaluate cultural resources for eligibility for inclusion in the NRHP (36 CFR 60.4). Forests may choose to evaluate cultural resources for eligibility to the NRHP even where they can be protected. Determinations of Eligibility may be completed by a forest under the conditions and stipulations in this programmatic agreement, or through consensus determinations with the SHPO (36 CFR 800.4(c)(2)), or through consultation and determinations made by the Keeper of the NRHP. The Forest Heritage Program Manager will certify all determinations of eligibility performed by the forest under Stipulation 7.7(c) of this agreement.

Forests will consult with Indian tribes where evaluations involve cultural resources that may have cultural or traditional importance to an Indian tribe, and to provide an opportunity for the Indian tribe to comment on a Forest's determination prior to completing the evaluation. Forests may also consult with non-federally recognized tribes, tribal groups, communities, or organization as interested parties to identify similar values that may be associated with resources being evaluated.

There are eight requirements in the Evaluation Process (adapted from the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Evaluation, National Park Service, 1983):

1. Evaluation should not be undertaken using documentation that may be out of date. The current condition of the property should be determined and previous analyses evaluated in light of any new information.
2. Evaluation must be performed by person qualified by education, training, and experience in the application of the criteria. Where feasible, evaluation should be performed in consultation with other individuals experienced in applying the relevant criteria in the geographical area under consideration.
3. Evaluation is completed with a written determination that a property is or is not significant based on provided information. This statement should be part of the record.
4. Evaluation criteria are identified (e.g. NRHP Criteria).

5. Adequately developed historic contexts, including identified property types.
6. Sufficient information about the appearance, condition, and associative values of the property to be evaluated to:
 - a. Classify it as to property type;
 - b. Compare its features or characteristics with those expected for its property type; and
 - c. Define the physical extent of the property and accurately locate the property.
7. Describe the property and its significance in the historical context, and how the criteria would apply to properties in that context, based on the important patterns, events, person, and cultural values identified.
8. Describe the integrity of the property relative to that needed to represent the context. The evaluation should state how the particular property meets the integrity requirements for its type. The integrity of the property is its current condition, rather than its likely condition after a proposed treatment should be evaluated.

1.0 EVALUATION OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES

1.1 General Guidance

Region 5 shall use the National Register criteria (36 CFR 60.4) when making determinations of eligibility; and/or Region 5 evaluation strategies for specific types of cultural resources, or Forest procedures that are or have been approved by the SHPO (Stipulation 7.7).

Region 5 may use NRHP evaluation procedures documented in thematic studies or cultural resource modules previously approved by the California SHPO as individual evaluation and management programs or under prior programmatic agreements. These thematic studies or modules shall be supplemented as necessary to include any additional resources not previously considered. These thematic studies and modules also may be used in Nevada if approved by the Nevada SHPO. Such studies and modules are adopted herein by reference or may be amended to this agreement pursuant to Stipulation 12.1.

(a) Adopted thematic studies include:

(1) *On the Track of Railroad Logging History: A Contextual History for Railroad Logging in California*. Sonia A. Tamez, Dana E. Supernowicz, and James T. Rock. USDA-Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region. 1988 (revised).

(2) *Contextual History: Forest Service Administration Buildings in the Pacific Southwest Region 1905-1970*. Dana E. Supernowicz. Edited by Linda Marie Lux and Judy Rose. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region. 1989

(3) *Fixed Point Fire Detection: The Lookouts*. Mark V. Thornton. Ms. on file, U.S. Forest Service, Region 5, San Francisco. 1986

(4) Contextual History and Classification for Fire Lookouts in California. Adapted from *Fixed Point Fire Detection: The Lookouts* (Mark V. Thornton 1986). USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region.

(5) *Strategy for Inventory and Historic Evaluation of Recreation Residence Tracts in the National Forests of California from 1906 to 1959*. Linda Lux, Judy Rose, Dana Supernowicz, Mike McIntyre, Pam Conners, Jon Brady, Jan Cutts, Joan Brandoff-Kerr and Steve McNeil. USDA Forest Service Pacific Southwest Region and Department of Environmental Design, University of California Davis. 2003 (revised).

(b) Some types of properties can be managed using the California Archaeological Resource Identification and Data Acquisition Programs (CARIDAP) (**California Only**). These programs employ specific criteria to classify archaeological properties that contain limited but easily retrieved information, and whose eligibility under 36 CFR 60.4(d) as individual properties or classes of properties is often problematic. Properties managed according to CARIDAPs are considered ineligible for the NRHP, and need no further consideration under the terms of this PA. The following CARIDAP are included: Sparse Lithic Scatters and Isolated Bedrock Milling Sites.

1.2 Consensus and Expedited Determinations of Eligibility:

To facilitate Region 5's determinations of eligibility when planning undertakings, and to improve accomplishments for determinations of eligibility under the Section 110 requirements of this PA, expedited evaluation protocols apply for the classes of cultural resources listed below, or for which protocols are detailed in programs or procedures previously approved by SHPO.

2.0 Ineligible Properties

Some types of cultural resources are obviously ineligible for the NRHP because of their lack of substantive constituents or features, or because of their lack of integrity; these sites do not meet the NRHP criteria at 36 CFR 60.4. Standardized documentation of such properties provides sufficient information to determine them ineligible for the NRHP and/or provides information needed for agency management purposes. Properties determined ineligible need no further consideration under the terms of this PA. Determinations of Eligibility completed by Forests under Stipulation 7.7(c) of this PA may use the following standards, and when certified by HPMs, these expedited determinations meet the consensus requirements of 36 CFR 800.4(c)(1).

2.1 Ineligible Property Documentation Standards

(a) HPM/DHPS shall determine appropriate data collection procedures commensurate with the cultural materials identified.

(b) General Data Collection Procedures include:

(1) Cultural resource sites shall be recorded using approved documentation standards, or existing records shall be updated to current standards.

(A) Provide general location maps, and site location maps using USGS 7.5' or comparable maps. Prepare cultural resource site sketch maps, as necessary, to show locations of any sampling units, features, or loci.

(B) Take digital or film based photographs of cultural resource site overviews and any features or loci, as appropriate.

(C) For cultural resource sites with features, document all features.

(D) In sites with artifacts, document artifacts in small, single locus areas. Use sampling strategies for larger sites or sites with multiple loci. Use professional judgment to select adequate sample sizes, and describe rationale. Sample loci within sites; document artifacts within samples. Document artifacts by including provenience information; providing descriptions; making illustrations or taking photographs of unique or diagnostic artifacts; measuring, illustrating or photographing, and describing artifacts only once where there are multiple occurrences in sites (or units/loci), and counting thereafter.

(c) Background Research:

Conduct background research to identify meaningful historic contexts or the lack of meaningful historic associations. In addition to standard historical references, review available and applicable atlases, planting records, range condition inventories, historic maps and photographs, ethnographies, oral histories, etc. Incorporate brief narratives of results of background research into site records. If research reveals historic contexts clearly tied to specific events and entities of significance (e.g., named mines associated with the Gold Rush or Nevada's Comstock), exclude sites from this protocol.

2.2 Ineligible Property Consultation Protocols

(a) Forests shall summarize findings of evaluations in determination of eligibility and include brief:

(1) Discussions of the methodology of data collection and documentation;

(2) Descriptions of the cultural resource sites;

(3) Justifications for why sites are ineligible to the NRHP specifying why they do not meet criterion a, b, c, or d, (36 CFR 60.3) and/or why they no longer retain integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association.

(b) Append current site records with general location, site location, and sketch maps, photographs, and any other supporting documentation.

2.3 The following property types may be considered ineligible.

(a) Severely Damaged Sites

Severely damaged sites are sites that have been subjected to erosion, decay, looting, project activities, or other impacts to such a degree that they no longer contain recognizable features, unaltered historic characteristics, or substantial in-tact deposits of cultural materials that may contribute information to understanding history or prehistory. With these degradations, they have lost integrity of design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association as verified by limited testing and field assessments (e.g., shovel test probes, auguring). Or, their historic environments have been altered or they have been isolated from their original historic environments so that characteristics of location, setting, feeling, and association are lost.

(b) Isolated Sites and Artifacts

Some isolated sites consist of ephemeral cultural remains or lack associations meaningful in broader historic contexts. Examples of isolated site types include: alignments lacking associated historic contexts or archaeological deposits; fire altered rock concentrations; borrow pits; tailings piles or adits/shafts; isolated historic ditches; hunters camps/dispersed recreation camps; fire rings; minor trails and associated features not part of identified systems or historically significant trails; minor roads and associated features not part of identified systems or historically significant roads; log decks, landings, sawdust piles, and mill debris; logging stumps/high cut stumps not associated with other logging sites or not features as parts of cultural landscapes in districts or sites; skid trails; fences and fence posts; and utility lines and associated features unconnected to identified or historically significant systems.

Isolated artifacts will not be evaluated as historic properties under this PA and will not constrain management of areas where found unless HPM's recommend otherwise. Isolated artifacts will be recorded to Forest standards.

2.4 Certified Ineligible Property Types

Recording standards and consultation for the following property types are approved under this Programmatic Agreement or through previously SHPO-approved cultural resource programs or procedures. Once appropriately documented and certified by the HPM, they may be determined ineligible for the NRHP under Stipulation 7.7(c).

(a) Isolated Historic Refuse Deposits

Isolated historic refuse deposits are small trash scatters unassociated with other historic remains, that contain only refuse materials with no features suggesting other functions, and that date from after the Gold Rush or Nevada's Comstock to 1960s; sites dating more recently than 1950 are considered not eligible for the NRHP under this agreement. See the Isolated Historic Refuse Deposit protocol, Appendix F - 1, for suggested recording and evaluation details.

(b) Isolated Historic Prospect Pits

Isolated historic prospect pits are small pits dug in exploration for valuable minerals. They are generally small sites, unassociated with other historic remains, contain only excavated pits and associated tailings piles with no artifacts or features suggesting other functions, and date throughout the historic period up to the 1960s, but are generally impossible to date because of lack of associated diagnostic materials. Isolated prospect pits are considered ineligible for the NRHP under this agreement. See the Isolated Historic Prospect Pit protocol, Appendix F - 2, for suggested recording and evaluation details.

(c) Isolated Historic Ditches

Isolated historic ditches are small earthen ditches unassociated with other historic remains, with no associated features such as rock work or flumes, and with contiguous segments totaling no more than 25 meters in length, and little remaining integrity.

3.0 Eligible Properties

3.1 Expedited NRHP Evaluations

(a) Certain types of cultural resources are eligible for the NRHP because they obviously meet at least one of the NRHP criteria at 36 CFR 60.4. Some have visible constituents or features with known historic values. Some classes of sites already have historic contexts established. Standardized documentation of such properties, without test excavating subsurface deposits or conducting specialized analyses, provides sufficient information to determine them eligible. Determinations of Eligibility completed by Forests under Stipulation 7.7, excluding properties determined ineligible under Stipulation 7.7(c) of this PA, may use the following standards; and when certified by HPMs, these determinations meet the consensus requirements of 36 CFR 800.4(c)(1).

(1) Integrity: The key to eligibility for these sites frequently is integrity. Thus, the primary goal of recording and evaluating such sites is determining if they retain sufficient integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and/or association to be eligible.

(b) Expedited NRHP Documentation Standards

Any additional documentation requirements for expedited NRHP evaluations will be developed in consultation with the SHPO. The following information is required:

(1) Specifically describe historic property characteristics, contributing and noncontributing elements, and site integrity

(2) Include general location maps, site and/or district location maps on 7.5' USGS quadrangles (or comparable quality maps), and detailed site sketch maps showing site boundaries and location of all associated features.

(3) Include photographs or illustrations of features that warrant detailed documentation.

(4) Include concise but specific: descriptions of boundaries for sites and/or districts; descriptions and locations of associated features; descriptions of site/district historic characteristics, contributing and noncontributing elements, and integrity; and statements of significance about how all pertinent NRHP criteria apply, and about how identified sites, elements, and historic characteristics contribute or do not contribute to property eligibility (e.g., identify relationships to documented historic contexts, or compare to similar site types in areas where more extensive data are available from excavations). General historic contexts may be used given the nature and characteristics of these property types.

(c) Eligible Property Consultation Protocols

(1) Each Forest shall document its determinations of eligibility, including information about integrity, along with specific arguments for and citations of the applicable criteria. Summary information should be entered into the Forest Service's corporate heritage database. Each Forest will provide summary findings of its determinations of eligibility to the SHPO in accordance with Stipulation 7.7 of this PA, and copies of these determinations to the SHPO when requested.

(2) SHPO shall respond within 30 calendar days if there is agreement or disagreement with a Forest's eligibility determination (Stipulation 7.7(e)), provided sufficient documentation has been

provided, or if additional documentation or clarification is needed. SHPO may also notify the forest that it needs additional time to provide its response (Stipulation 7.7(e)).

(d) Property Types Eligible for Expedited NRHP Evaluations

Sites with visible constituents or features generally considered meeting the eligibility criteria at 36 CFR 60.4, and for which integrity of historic characteristics is to be documented:

- (1) Prehistoric archaeological sites with visible structural remains (e.g., house pits, rock rings);
- (2) Complex rock art sites or rock art sites with accompanying archaeological deposits;
- (3) Prehistoric quarries with distinct geochemical source signatures demonstrated through trace element studies;
- (4) Prehistoric midden sites with features or constituents that can be dated;
- (5) Prehistoric/ethno-historic archaeological sites with ethnographic names (excluding place names lacking physical archaeological evidence).

3.2 Where an assessment of effects to a historic property's characteristics from a proposed undertaking is required, test excavations or specialized analyses of constituents or features may be necessary to identify potential adverse effects and mitigation measures.

APPENDIX F- 1

PROTOCOL FOR ISOLATED HISTORIC REFUSE DEPOSITS

Isolated Historic Refuse Deposits Determinations of Eligibility and Documentation Standards

Under this programmatic agreement, *isolated historic refuse deposits* are considered ineligible for the NRHP when the following documentation requirements are met. Generally, isolated historic refuse deposits are small sites unassociated with other historic remains, contain only refuse materials with no features suggesting other functions, and date from after the Gold Rush or Nevada's Comstock to 1960s; isolated trash dumps dating more recently than 1960 are considered modern and need no further consideration under this agreement.

1.0 Context:

Sullivan and Griffith (2005) have completed a context statement for Arizona waste management practices and refuse deposits. The context covers storage and transfer, final depositories, and treatment for all types of waste properties, everything from kitchen garbage primary transfer stations to regional landfills and processing plants. This is a much more comprehensive study than needed here; but, it provides some basic information about the role of isolated historic refuse deposits. The context statement may be found on the Arizona State Parks website at: www.azstateparks.com.

Historic refuse deposits represent the end products, the final depositories, of the simplest waste management behavior, dumping trash. They are most often waste piles, representing single or minimal uses of areas by individuals or groups. Waste piles are roughly bounded, open, mostly surficial deposits of trash. They are more variable than other waste depositories. When found in proximity to the historic properties generating the trash, they are to be treated as features of those properties (Ibid.:15-16). When isolated from their sources, they qualify under this protocol.

More complex sites may be open dumps, representing multiple uses of areas by individuals or groups. Open dumps are areas generally larger than waste piles, where trash has been repeatedly dumped by multiple individuals or communities. Like waste piles, they are roughly bounded and open; but, open dumps represent long-term deposition from many sources, and may contain multiple loci or considerable depth from trash build-up over time (Ibid.:16). Only the simplest open dumps are included in this protocol, specifically those with surficial deposits.

By definition, isolated historic refuse deposits have no physical proximity to the sources of the waste that establish associations with historic contexts. In addition, the deposits may be mixed with other trash. As such, they have limited or no research potential (Ibid.:15-16, 27). Isolated historic refuse deposits, both waste piles and open dumps separated and located at distances from the sources that generated their rubbish, are commonly found throughout the National Forests in Region 5.

2.0 Historic Context:

Conduct background research to identify meaningful historic contexts or verify the lack of meaningful historic associations (i.e., those that may render the properties eligible to the NRHP). If historic associations are identified, the refuse deposits do not qualify for this protocol. As part of background research, review available: atlases (e.g., cut-over atlases, timber sale atlases, etc.); planting records, range condition inventories, and other records; historic maps; historic photographs; ethnographies, oral histories; and standard historical references. Incorporate brief narratives of results of background research into site records.

2.1 Isolated historic refuse deposits lack integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and, most importantly, association. Isolated historic refuse deposits are disassociated from their sources and thus from their historic contexts. They are ineligible for the NRHP.

2.2 The waste in isolated historic refuse deposits has been removed from its source and may be mixed with other deposits. Isolated historic refuse deposits are not associated with adjacent or nearby eligible properties for which historic contexts are or can be established. They represent variable and idiosyncratic behavior by unknown persons or groups. Without historic contexts, isolated trash dumps do not contribute to property significance.

(a) Isolated historic refuse deposits may be associated with roads (see 2.2(b), below). This protocol does not apply if these deposits are associated with other types of historic properties.

(b) The exception for integrity of association is that for roads, and particularly road use. Many refuse deposits are found at the ends of or adjacent to roads. In most cases, the only association is that for road use; the roads were used to access generally remote areas in order to dump trash well removed from the sources of the trash. The roads themselves may have been originally built long before their use to dump trash, or reengineered many times since original construction and subsequent use for dumping trash, or only be incidental to the use for dumping trash. HPM/DHPS need to apply professional judgment to determine if shared relationships exist between trash dumps and historic roads that together may otherwise make refuse deposits eligible to the NRHP.

3.0 Characteristics:

3.1 Isolated Historic Refuse Deposits may:

- (a) Have a single locus or multiple loci;
- (b) Have only surficial deposits (less than 10 centimeters soil accumulation/deposition), unless they clearly represent single events (no layering/stratigraphy) where holes may have been dug to bury trash or where large artifacts such as buckets may be buried deeper;
- (c) Contain discarded metal, glass, ceramics, bone, rubber, leather, and other historic items;
- (d) Contain from fewer than ten to thousands of items;
- (e) Contain diagnostic artifacts (e.g., maker's marks or labels);
- (f) Date from post-Gold Rush or Nevada's Comstock to 1960;
- (g) Be associated with generalized events or themes such as generic mining, logging, ranching, recreation, hunting, etc.

3.2 Isolated Historic Refuse Deposits cannot:

- (a) Contain loci larger than 500 square meters;
- (b) Contain subsurface deposits (depth of more than 25 centimeters below the ground surface (not the trash pile's surface)) if they are multi-event trash dumps;

- (c) Be associated with or contain any structures or features that suggest functions other than refuse disposal (excluding intrusive features younger than 45 years of age);
- (d) Date from the Gold Rush or Nevada's Comstock to earlier times;
- (e) Be of modern, post-1960 derivation;
- (f) Be associated with specific persons, households, commercial entities, or specifically identified local, regional, or national events.

3.3 Characteristics clarification:

(a) Single episode trash deposits or waste piles:

Isolated historic refuse deposits frequently represent single episodes of trash disposal. In some cases, trash may have been buried by digging holes and scattering dirt over the top of the debris. Such single event, buried, trash deposits qualify as isolated historic refuse deposits.

(b) Multiple episode trash deposits or open dumps:

(1) Other isolated historic refuse deposits may represent multiple episodes of trash disposal, with multiple loci or detectable layering/stratification. Such multiple event trash disposal sites must contain only surficial deposits to qualify as isolated historic refuse deposits.

(2) Refuse deposits with discernible horizontal and/or vertical stratification plus subsurface deposition are considered too complex to qualify under this isolated historic refuse deposit protocol; they may contain sufficient information value to contribute to historic contexts.

(c) Dating:

Refuse deposits frequently can be dated, at least roughly, through mean dates derived from artifact typology. Those that date to the Gold Rush or Nevada's Comstock are of value to understanding one of the most significant historic events in California's or Nevada's history. They are excluded from this protocol. Refuse deposits that can be dated earlier than the Gold Rush or Nevada's Comstock are sufficiently rare that in and of themselves they may contribute information important to history; they are excluded from this protocol. Both may contribute information to historic contexts for the region. HPM/DHPS shall use professional judgment and decide to exclude other refuse deposits from this protocol when they determine those deposits may contribute to historic contexts.

(d) Refuse deposit sites:

(1) Refuse deposits that date up to the end of World War II should be recorded as sites (HPM judgment/Forest site definition requirements).

(2) Trash dumps that date more recently than 1950 are considered ineligible for the NRHP under this agreement, and need not be recorded as sites. Those that have been previously recorded as sites may be evaluated under this protocol.

(A) The year 1950 is used as the cut-off date because of its significance in history and the multitude of historic properties thematically associated with it, and because of the subsequent

proliferation of modern hunting and recreation uses of (and associated material remains in) the Forests after that time.

(B) The 50 year guideline is generally considered unnecessary for application to post-1950 trash dumps unless HPMs or qualified Heritage Program staff identify unusual artifacts or other historic characteristics that may contribute to historic contexts.

4.0 Data Collection Procedures:

4.1 The following are minimal site recording guidelines. Forest HPMs or qualified Heritage Program staff shall determine appropriate data collection procedures commensurate with the historical remains identified.

4.2 Based on HPM or qualified Heritage Program staff recommendations, use metal detectors, augers, shovel probes, or other means to minimally test (i.e., generally < 1 cubic meter of soil removed) for buried materials more extensive than are visible and/or verify likely absence of buried deposits.

4.3 Record isolated historic refuse deposits on Region 5 Cultural Resource Records (CRRs) or update existing records to current standards.

(a) In California: complete the USDA-Forest Service (Region 5) Primary Record (comparable to DPR 523A Primary Record and DPR 523C Archaeological Site Record).

(b) In Nevada: complete the IMACS Site Form, Part A Administrative and Environmental Data, and Part C Historic Sites records.

(c) Maps:

(1) Provide general location maps, plus site location maps using USGS 7.5' or comparable maps.

(2) For sites larger than 100 artifacts or with multiple loci, prepare site sketch maps, showing locations of sampling units and any loci.

4.4 Photos:

(a) As needed, take digital or film based photographs of sites: site overviews; and views of loci.

(b) Use regional photographic standards.

4.5 Artifact documentation:

(a) For small (fewer than 100 artifacts), single locus sites, sample and list artifacts, noting unique artifacts and those with diagnostic characteristics, and covering the various classes of artifacts.

(b) Use sampling strategies for sites with more than 100 artifacts or multiple loci:

(1) Use professional judgment to select adequate sample size; describe rationale;

- (2) Sample all loci within the sites;
- (3) Document artifacts within samples.
- (c) Document artifacts by:
 - (1) Including provenience information; Listing artifacts by types; Measuring, illustrating or photographing, and describing artifacts only once where there are multiple occurrences in sites (or unit/loci); counting thereafter;
 - (2) Identifying and describing, making illustrations, or taking photographs of unique or diagnostic artifacts (e.g., maker's marks, labels, manufacturing characteristics, or other diagnostic attributes);
 - (3) Note if broken artifacts (such as broken dishware) can be determined to be represented by multiple pieces;
 - (4) Describing artifacts with terminology widely used by historic archaeologists.
 - (5) See Appendix F -1, Attachment B for example of Historic Artifact Sheet for optional use in documenting artifacts.

5.0 Attachments

Appendix F - 1, Attachment A: References to Consult for Historic Artifact Terms

Appendix F - 1, Attachment B: Example of Historic Artifact Sheets (Optional)

Appendix F 1 Attachment A

References to Consult for Historic Artifact Terms

This list is not meant to be exhaustive but is a good foundation on which to build a historic reference library and knowledge of historic artifacts.

Refuse Deposits

Sullivan, Michael and Carol Griffith (2005). *Down in the Dumps: Context Statement and Guidance on Historical Period Waste Management and Refuse Deposits*. Arizona State Parks, Phoenix, AZ.

Glass

Baldwin, J.K. (1974). *A Collector's Guide to Patent and Proprietary Medicine Bottles of the Nineteenth Century*. Thomas Nelson, Inc., New York.

Ferraro, P., and B. Ferraro (1964). *The Past in Glass*. Western Printing and Publishing Company, Sparks, NV.

Ferraro, P., and B. Ferraro (1966). *A Bottle Collector's Book*. Western Printing and Publishing Company, Sparks, NV.

Fike, R. E. (1987). *Bottle Book: A Comprehensive Guide to Historic Embossed Medicine Bottles*. Peregrine Smith Books, Salt Lake City.

Kendrick, G. (1966). *The Antique Bottle Collector*. Western Printing and Publishing Company, Sparks, NV.

Miller, G. L., and A. Pacey (1985). *Impact of Mechanization in the Glass Container Industry: The Dominion Glass Company of Montreal, a Case Study*. *Historical Archaeology* 19(1):38-50.

Peterson, A. G. (1968). *400 Trademarks on Glass with Alphabetical Index*. L-W Book Sales, Gas City, IN.

Toulouse, J. H. (1971). *Bottle Makers and Their Marks*. Thomas Nelson Inc., New York.

Toulouse, J. H. (2005). *Fruit Jars, A Collector's Manual*. Thomas Nelson Inc., New York. 2005 reprint, Blackburn Press, Caldwell, NJ.

Wilson, R. E. (1981). *Bottles on the Western Frontier*. The University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

White, J. R. (2000). *Bottle Nomenclature: A Glossary of Landmark Terminology for the Archaeologist*. In Brauner, D. R., ed, *Approaches to Material Culture Research for Historical Archaeologists*, 2nd edition. The Society for Historical Archaeology.

Ceramics

Kovel, R and T. Kovel *Kovels' New Dictionary of Marks*. Crown Publishers, Inc., New York.

Godden, G. A. (1963). *British Pottery and Porcelain, 1780-1850*. Arthur Barker, Ltd., London.

Godden, G. A. (1966). *The Handbook of British Pottery and Porcelain Marks*. Frederick A. Praeger, New York.

Lehner, L. *Lehner's Encyclopedia of U.S. Marks on Pottery, Porcelain & Clay*. Collector Books, Paducah, KY.

Cans

Busch, J. (1981). An Introduction to the Tin Can. *Historic Archaeology* 15(1):95-104.

Duffield, A. Q. Tin Cans and Their Potential: Historical Archaeology's Tin Lining. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 22(2):31-38.

Pulati, E. (1973). *Illustrated Tin Container Guide*. Privately published by author.

Rock, James T. *Beverages: Canned Beer and Soda Notes*. USFS, Pacific Southwest Region.

Rock, James T. (1981). *Tin Can, Notes and Comments*. Manuscript on file, Klamath National Forest, Yreka, CA.

Rock, James T. (1984a). Cans in the Countryside. *Historic Archaeology* 18(2):97-111.

Rock, James T. (1984b). Evaporated Milk: Its Archaeological Contexts. *Northwest Anthropological Research Notes* 18(1):108-116.

Rock, James T. (1987). *A Brief Commentary on Cans*. Manuscript on file, Klamath National Forest, Yreka, CA.

Other References

Adams, W. H. Machine Cut Nails and Wire Nails: American Production and Use for Dating 19th Century and Early 20th Century Sites. *Historical Archaeology* 36(4):66-88.

Adams, W. H. (2003). Dating Historical Sites: The Importance of Understanding Time Lag in the Acquisition, Curation, Use, and Disposal of Artifacts. *Historical Archaeology* 37(2):38-64.

Albert, A. H. *Record of American Uniform and Historical Buttons*. Boyertown Publishing Company, Boyertown.

Anderson, A. The Archaeology of Mass-Produced Footwear. *Historical Archaeology* 2:56-65.

Brauner, D. R. ed. (2000). *Approaches to Material Culture Research for Historical Archaeologists*, 2nd edition. The Society for Historical Archaeology.

Karklins, K. ed. (2000). *Studies in Material Culture Research*. The Society for Historical Archaeology.

Sprague, R. A Functional Classification for Artifacts from 19th and 20th Century Historical Sites. *North American Archaeologist* 2(3): 251-261.

Sprague, R. (2002). China or Prosser Button Identification and Dating. *Historical Archaeology* 36(2): 111-127.

Schild, G. (1972). *Tobacco Tin Tags*. John L. Prentis and Company, St. Louis.

Storino, L. *Chewing Tobacco Tin Tags 1870-1930*. Schiffer Publishing, Ltd., Atglen, PA.

Wells, T. Nail Chronology: The Use of Technologically Derived Features. *Historic Archaeology* 32(2):78-99.

**Appendix F – 1
Attachment B**

Example of Historic Artifact Sheets

| | | |
|--|-------------------------|----------------|
| Historic Artifact Sheet | | |
| Date: Recorder: Site: Locus: Unit: Depth: | | |
| Material | Description of Artifact | # of Artifacts |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Photos/Drawings of Artifacts | | |
| | | |

APPENDIX F - 2

PROTOCOL FOR ISOLATED PROSPECT PITS

Isolated Prospect Pits Determinations of Eligibility and Documentation Standards

Under this programmatic agreement, *isolated prospect pits* are considered ineligible for the NRHP when the following documentation requirements are met. Prospect pits are small excavations dug by miners for the purposes of mineralogical exploration or to establish and maintain ownership of a mining claim. Generally, isolated prospect pits are small sites unassociated with other historic remains, contain only excavated pits and associated waste rock piles with no artifacts or features suggesting other functions, and date throughout the historic period. Prospect pits typically are difficult to date because they frequently lack associated diagnostic materials; isolated prospect pits are considered ineligible for the NRHP under this agreement.

1.0 Context

Evidence of historic-period mining is scattered throughout the National Forests in Region 5. Numerous minerals have been, and are still being, mined, e.g., copper, tungsten, uranium, cinnabar (for mercury), silver, and, of course, gold. The material remains resulting from the exploration for and extraction of these minerals include everything from towns, isolated cabins, mine shafts, adits, and prospects, landscape-altering placer mines, ore processing facilities (e.g. stamp mills), tramways and miner's ditches.

Mining for precious metals has played a significant role in the history of California and Nevada. The following sketch highlights the importance of mining to Region 5's history. This sketch is solely meant to provide an understanding of how prospect pits fit into general mining history, and not to provide a contextual history for specific mining events. Much of the following was first submitted in a context prepared for prospect pits on the Stanislaus National Forest (Moskowitz 2004). Other material has been drawn from historical and archaeological contextual studies being prepared for the Sequoia National Forest (Kelly 2012 and 2012a). While the primary and secondary literature on the Gold Rush, the Comstock and other mining regions is exhaustive, it should be noted that the archaeological study of mining in Region 5 is as yet in the formative stage.

Though often called the "Golden State," the earliest discoveries of gold in California were little remarked upon. In 1816, Robert Jameson, a Scottish geologist, wrote, "On the coast of California, there is a plain for fourteen leagues in extent, covered with alluvial deposit [sic], in which lumps of gold are dispersed" (Jameson 1816: 13). A more verifiable discovery was made in 1827 by Rocky Mountain Jack and Bill Reed, members of Jedediah Smith's trapping party, who reportedly found gold on Virginia Creek (in modern-day Mono County) where it issued from the eastern escarpment of the Sierra (Angel 1881: 21; Wederitz 1978: 13). Though the two men spent a week prospecting in the nearby Mono Basin, their discovery saw no follow-through (ibid). In 1834, an extremely nascent mining industry was established by the priests of the San Fernando, Santa Buena Vista Ventura, and San Gabriel missions when gold was discovered in San Francisquito, Casteca, Placerita, and San Gabriel canyons in southern California (Sampson 1937: 177). These discoveries too made little impression—Richard Henry Dana, who visited California in 1835, observed that the discoveries of gold in southern California "attracted little or no attention, and were not followed up" (Dana 1911: 347). The discovery of gold in San Feliciana Canyon in 1841, however, made a somewhat greater impression: "The news of this discovery soon spread among the inhabitants from Santa Barbara to Los Angeles, and in a few weeks hundreds of people were engaged in washing and winnowing the sands of these gold fields" (Historical Sketch 1876: 11). Davis estimated that some \$80,000 to \$100,000 was recovered from the goldfields of Los Angeles in the years 1840-1841 (Davis 1889:

222-223). Bancroft suggests a rather smaller production figure, reporting that by December of 1843 some 2,000 ounces of gold had been recovered (Bancroft 1888: 50). Nonetheless, in 1843 the first gold sent from California to the United States Mint came from these mines (Cutter 1948: 13). Two years later the placer mines had largely played out; Bidwell found only 30 or so men working, with an average take of 25 cents a day (Bancroft 1888: 50).

The discovery by James Marshall of gold in the tailrace of the sawmill he was erecting for John Sutter in January of 1848 seemed destined to follow the path of earlier discoveries. Sutter was more concerned that the discovery would interfere with the completion of his sawmill and flour mill. In March, the news broke in a small way when *The Californian*, a San Francisco newspaper published a small blurb on the bottom of page two:

Gold Mine Found – In the newly made raceway of the Saw Mill recently erected by Captain Sutter, on the American Fork, gold has been found in considerable quantities. One person brought thirty dollars' worth to New Helvetia, gathered there in a short time. California, no doubt, is rich in mineral wealth; great chances here for scientific capitalists. Gold has been found in almost every part of the country (Californian March 15, 1848).

The drowning of a sailor in Suisan Bay received more coverage. Yet, within months, the news of the discovery had spread throughout California, and miners were rushing to the western foothills of the Sierras, where new discoveries were being uncovered almost daily. By the end of 1848, 6,000 miners had extracted some \$10 million of gold (Bean and Rawls 1988:92). The first miners were Californians who had abandoned their homes and jobs and mined the placer fields of the foothills before winter set in and inhibited travel. Included were many California Indians and Mexican miners, frequently working as laborers for the Euro-Americans, but some working independent claims (ibid:85-86). With California being isolated by mountains, desert, and ocean, the news did not generally reach the States until later.

In July of 1848, Military Governor Colonel Richard B. Mason traveled from his post in Monterey to the goldfields to confirm the discoveries and report to the United States War Department. His report reached the States at the end of the year, and President James K. Polk confirmed the discoveries in his annual message to Congress on December 5, 1848. The news triggered the largest migration in American history: the California Gold Rush (Bean and Rawls 1988:86; Moskowitz 2004; Pittman 1995:11).

Braving arduous journeys on overland emigrant trails, around Cape Horn by sea, or by sea and land via the Isthmus of Panama, forty-niners poured into California and the gold fields. In 1849, 40,000 miners extracted some \$30 million of gold. With the influx of miners, competition for claims resulted in discrimination against Native Americans and foreigners, particularly Mexicans and Chinese; ultimately, exclusionary laws and foreign miner taxes were enacted that kept control in the hands of Euro-Americans. In 1852, the peak year of the Gold Rush, \$80 million of gold was extracted by 100,000 miners. In the years that followed, however, gold production steadily declined until 1865, when it stabilized at about \$17 million per year—a level it would sustain until the turn of the 20th century (Bean and Rawls 1988:92, 125-127). Part of the decline in gold production was the result of an overextended quartz mining industry that had not yet mastered the tools of the trade.

Gold deposits were discovered in numerous locations throughout the state, from the Klamath, Trinity, and Shasta Rivers in northern California to many scattered areas throughout southern California. None were as big as the Mother Lode of the western Sierra Nevada foothills, but all contributed to

gold fever. In its first century, the state's gold production was valued at some \$2 billion (Bean and Rawls 1988:89, 92; Beck and Haase 1974: Map 50).

As the California Gold Rush was slowly transitioning into a more stable industry, the strikes which led to the discovery of the Comstock Lode were being made just across the California-Utah Territory border. Gold placers had been mined in the area since the early 1850s; but, it was not until 1859 that the “damned blue stuff”—silver chlorides—that had been clogging the rocks and sluices of Gold Hill was assayed in Nevada City, California, as silver running \$3,200 per ton (more than twice the value of the gold in the same sample). The resulting rush of '59ers to the Comstock would lead to the formation of Nevada Territory in 1861 and statehood by 1864. Development of the Nevadan mining industry was largely financed by major investments from San Francisco's banking interests. The Comstock had two major booms, the first that ended in 1864, and the “Big Bonanza” that began in 1873 and ended in 1879. Some \$400 million of silver and gold were mined before the Comstock's decline in the 1880s (Bean and Rawls 1988:148-149, 172-174). The discovery of the Comstock spurred the exploration and settlement of the Great Basin and led in short order to the discoveries of Aurora, Bodie, Austin, Eureka, and White Pine (Hamilton and Treasure Hill) among others.

Mining follows generally falls into two trajectories: placer mining and lode or quartz mining. Within these trajectories the suite of tools and techniques tend to be similar, regardless of the commodity being extracted. Placer gold is a generally surficial, secondary, loose, mineral deposit, eroded and washed downstream from a lode deposit. Placer mining can be roughly grouped into two categories or scales: 1) hand placering—a low intensity approach to placer deposits that involves the hand excavation and processing of relatively shallow, gold-bearing gravels, and 2) industrial placer mining—an approach that utilizes well-developed infrastructure to excavate and process deeper placer deposits with little or no hand work. In California the basic tools of hand placer mining—the gold pan and the rocker—were introduced in 1848 by Isaac Humphreys, a miner who had worked in goldfields of Georgia (Hittell 1861: 15). These basic tools were augmented in 1850 with the long tom and in 1851 with the sluice box (c.f. Placer Times May 17, 1850; Sacramento Daily Transcript May 2, 1851). While hand placer mining was and is an enterprise that can be taken on by an individual the work is backbreaking. In banding together to more efficiently work placer deposits the 49ers planted the seeds of industrial mining. By 1852 the basic technologies of industrial placer mining—river mining, ground sluicing, and hydraulic mining—had been introduced. The key trait that marks these technologies as industrial is the construction of supporting infrastructure such as dams, flumes, and miner's ditches.

River Mining

The *Daily Alta California* described the essence of river mining on August 1, 1850: “Companies are formed, long race-ways are constructed, after which a dam is drawn across the river, the water forced into the new canal, and the main river bottom is laid bare to the operations of the miner.” Other operations constructed essentially a cofferdam, with wing, side and downstream dams diverting the river away from mining operations. In addition to the diversion, the river would be harnessed with one or more waterwheels to provide motive power for pumping water from the mine, hoisting materials from the mine workings, and lifting water from the river for the company's sluices. The infrastructure was designedly and necessarily temporary—the dams and ditches would be completed towards the end of summer leaving a month or so for the miners to exploit the newly exposed riverbed before the high water levels of the wet season destroyed the operation (Paul 1947: 125).

Ground Sluicing

For the argonauts of California, ground sluicing was both a simplification of sluicing as well as a means for rapidly stripping away barren soil (Hutching 8). In 1882, DeGroot provided a brief

description of ground sluicing:

Ground sluicing is another step in the direction of hydraulic mining . . . The plan is to bring water in a flume or ditch to a point high enough to produce a strong current as it flows across the mining claim. A ditch or ‘ground sluice’ is dug which is sometimes, but seldom, terminated by a wooden sluice box with riffles. Large quantities of pay dirt are shoveled into the ditch which is moved forward by the action of the water. The descent should be so great that the water will cut its own channel or bed, a small cutting being made first to lead it in the direction required . . . The side banks are eroded naturally by the action of the water, assisted by the miners who break it down with pick and shovel. When the water has been used to the best advantage, and a sufficient amount of rich dirt has been washed the water is shut off or applied to some other locality while the clean-up [sic] is made (DeGroot 1882: 35).

With ground sluicing the placer mining industry acquired its first tool capable of the wholesale modification of entire landscapes.

Hydraulic Mining

While Edward E. Mattison is often credited with the invention of hydraulic mining, Bancroft notes that “a Frenchman named Chabot, in April 1852, used a hose without nozzle upon his claim at Buckeye Hill Nevada co. [sic], to sluice away the gravel which had been loosened by the pick . . . The idea was applied a year later by E. E. Matteson, from Sterling, Conn., with improved pressure to wash down the bank itself, and so save the costly pick and shovel work” (Bancroft 1890: 412). However, Bancroft’s dates are problematic; *Hutchings Magazine* reported in 1857 that Matteson “first commenced the used of this method at American Hill, Nevada, in February, 1852” (Hutchings 1857: 12). Other sources claim the process was invented at Yankee Jim’s by an unknown miner in spring of 1852 and that Matteson, unaware of the process, re-invented the system in April of 1853 (see DeGroot 1882: 149). Hydraulic mining targeted placer gold located in deep, often ancient, deposits of gravel. The technology involves five essential elements: 1) a supply of water with sufficient head or fall, 2) the monitor or nozzle which projects the water, 3) a system for transporting the resulting slurry of rock and gravel to the sluices, 4) a system for de-watering the mine workings, and 5) the network of sluices that captured the gold from the slurry. Hydraulic mines required a prodigious quantity of water, casting it at gravel deposits with a monitor or giant—a counterweighted nozzle assembly. Hydraulic mining was destructive on two levels—not only were entire landscapes devoured by the monitors but the tailings of the hydraulic mining operations choked the streams and rivers leading from the Sierra, causing widespread flooding in the Central Valley, and even interfering with navigation in San Francisco Bay. The practice was essentially outlawed in 1884, in a case brought by valley farmers against Malakoff Diggings, with a federal judge’s ruling that prohibited disposal of runoff in public waterways—the first environmental legal decision issued in the United States (Bean and Rawls 1988:145-146; Moskowitz 2004; Pittman 1995:80, 104-105). Some limited degree of hydraulic mining did occur in the years after 1884, but was predicated on the miners impounding their tailings.

Lode Mining

While lode or quartz mining is often portrayed as superseding placer mining the two industries coexisted. Indeed, in some mining districts a seasonal round evolved whereby miners would target placer deposits during the wet season and lode deposits during the dry season (Kelly 2012a). Paul describes the birth of the quartz mining industry: “quartz or lode mines were first opened in 1849 and 1850 by men whose optimism was the greater because their knowledge was so slight” (Paul 1961: 30). While this enthusiasm led to a “speculative frenzy,” the industry foundered in 1855 as result of an inadequate understanding of mining and milling methods (Paul 1947: 131). Forced to teach itself

the basic fundamentals, the state's mining industry had retooled itself to such an extent that by 1905 it led the world in innovation and education (Curle 1905: 249).

Lode mining is a two-tiered effort involving 1) the excavation of ore, and 2) the extraction and refining of the precious metals. Consequently, quartz or lode mining often required extensive capital investment, expensive machinery, and a significant workforce; these requirements were often met by organized corporations (Bean and Rawls 1988:145-146; Moskowitz 2004; Pittman 1995:80). Underground workings consist of adits (horizontal excavations), inclines or shafts (vertical excavations), and a variety of stopes, winzes and raises that follow mineralized zones. Prior to the advent of heap-leach cyaniding most ore extraction technologies relied upon the high specific gravity of precious metals. Ore would be crushed (often with an arrastra or stamp mill), gravity concentrated (using some form of vibration to sort the pulverized ore by specific gravity) and amalgamated (mixed with mercury). Oftentimes some degree of roasting was required to eliminate problems with sulfides. In later years floatation circuits would float the precious metals out of the concentrates (the products of gravity concentration). Cyanide was first applied to gold deposits in the 1890s and was often used to reprocess the tailings of earlier mining operations.

Prospects

Prospect pits are one of the most common archaeological features associated with mining in the National Forests of Region 5 (Moskowitz 2004). While prospect pits are often the result of miners exploring for the presence of subsurface mineralogical resources, they may also serve to simply establish and maintain ownership of a mining claim—an important issue in mining districts rife with speculative activities. Prospects were dug by placer miners and hard rock miners alike and can vary in size and type from small pits measuring a few feet in diameter and excavated by pick and shovel to trenches left by bulldozers or backhoes. For prospectors the prospect pit represented a means of exploring for placer or lode deposits. For industrial mining operations the systematic placement of prospects helped guide development of mine workings. For speculators the prospect helped establish and maintain claim ownership. Occasionally a number of prospects will be found in association with each other—such groups will often be oriented around an identifiable ledge or vein. While prospects typically have waste rock piles associated with the excavation, occasionally pits will be found with little or no waste rock—such pits may reflect the haulage of rock or gravel for further processing. While the lack of further development in the vicinity of isolated prospects is often regarded as evidence that the miners found little or no mineralogical value, such is not invariably the case; oftentimes miners would leave paying mining claims for the siren song of new mining districts. Ultimately, prospects are more defined by their association with transitory mining behavior rather than the presence (or absence) of mineralogical resources. The small extent of excavation and limited or non-existent artifact assemblage typically associated with prospects is reflective of the small effort put into their development. Prospects are consequently difficult to date—temporally diagnostic artifacts are rare and the extent of work was typically too ephemeral to be captured in the historic record.

2.0 Historic Context

Conduct background research to determine whether there are meaningful historic associations (i.e., those that may render the property eligible to the NRHP). Meaningful historic associations for prospect pits under this protocol include association with a larger mining site or a specific chronological mining context. If a meaningful historic association is identified, the property is not an isolated prospect pit under this protocol. As part of background research, review available: mining claims; atlases (e.g., cut-over atlas, timber sale atlas, etc.); planting records, range condition inventories, and other records; historic maps; historic photographs; ethnographies and oral histories; and standard historical references. Incorporate brief narratives of results of background research into

site records.

2.1 Isolated prospect pits frequently retain integrity of location, design, setting, materials, and workmanship. They sometimes maintain integrity of feeling. However, isolated prospect pits generally lack integrity of association. Isolated prospects by definition are not associated with other sites and features. Under this protocol, isolated prospect pits are ineligible for the NRHP.

2.2 Isolated prospect pits do not have archaeological or historical associations with potentially eligible properties for which historic contexts are or can be established. Without a historic context, isolated prospect pits cannot contribute to property significance. If associations are established between isolated prospect pits and historic properties, be they linear features such as ditches or sites such as mines, integrity of location and association exist. Such associated prospect pits do not meet the criteria for isolated prospect pits.

(a) With the exception of roads (see 2.2(b), below), this protocol is not applicable where there are associations with other features or sites.

(b) The exception for integrity of association is that for roads, and particularly road use. Many prospect pits are found at the ends of or adjacent to roads. In most cases, the only association will be for incidental road use; the roads were used to access areas to prospect. The roads themselves may have been originally built long before their use to prospect, or may have been reengineered many times since original construction and subsequent use for prospecting, or may only be incidental to the use for prospecting. HPM/DHPS need to apply professional judgment to determine if integrity of association exists between adjacent prospect pits and the significance or context of historic roads.

3.0 Characteristics

3.1 Isolated prospect pits may:

- (a) Consist of excavated pits and associated waste rock piles;
- (b) Have a single locus or multiple loci;
- (c) Contain minimal scattered trash (generally ten or less artifacts or minimum number of specimens) in the immediate vicinity with no specific chronological markers or diagnostic artifacts;
- (d) Date throughout the historic period; or
- (e) Be associated with generalized mining activities.

3.2 Isolated prospect pits cannot:

- (a) Contain subsurface deposits (excluding excavated pits and associated waste rock piles);
- (b) Be associated with or contain any mining features other than prospect pits and associated waste rock piles (excluding intrusive features less than 45 years of age);
- (c) Be associated with or contain features that suggest functions other than mineral prospecting (excluding intrusive features less than 45 years of age);
- (d) Be associated with prehistoric quarrying or date to the prehistoric period;

(e) Be of modern, post-1950s derivation; or

(f) Be associated with specific mines or mining complexes, or specific persons, households, or other specific entities or events.

3.3 Characteristics clarification:

(a) Isolated prospect pits are those reflective of transient mining behavior. Generally speaking they reflect the minimum work necessary to establish and maintain ownership of a mining claim. In terms of size, isolated prospect pits eligible for treatment under this protocol will typically measure less than 10 cubic yards (approximately six-feet in diameter by eight feet deep)—such a pit represents several day’s labor by a single individual. Pits with dimensions greater than 10 cubic yards do not reflect transient activity, are more likely to speak to themes significant to a region’s mining history, and are thus generally ineligible for treatment under this protocol.

(b) Numbers of prospect pits:

Isolated prospect pits may be single features or multiple pits scattered proximally around defined areas. Multiple pits within isolated prospect pit sites shall be recorded as features or activity loci. No limits are placed on the numbers of pits that may be included within and defined as sites. However, the key issue for considering sites containing multiple prospect pits should be (1) whether they reflect transient human behavior and (2) whether the grouping of prospects reflects some degree of association with another site or a specific geological feature (geochemistry can be an important data source in considering mining). HPM/DHPS shall use professional judgment to interpret site boundaries based on common forest or regional standards.

(c) Distances between prospect pits:

No specific limits are defined for the distances allowed among prospect pits within sites or between sites. Distances between isolated prospect pit sites and other sites, such as mines, for which associations may be established should be reasonable and based on common practices on the forests or regionally, and using guidelines established by HPMs or qualified Heritage Program staff. Given the role of prospects in the exploration and development of a mining district, consideration should be given to the distribution of prospect pits when drawing boundaries of potential historic districts. Prospect pits that may be associated with mines or other sites for which historic contexts can be or have been established shall be considered features of those sites rather than isolated prospect pits.

(d) Associated trash:

Minimal, scattered, historic trash may be present, but not in quantities that would otherwise qualify as isolated historic refuse deposits, generally ten or less artifacts or minimum number of specimens if working with diagnostic artifacts. Prospect pits are features representing transitory behavior; associated historic trash is uncommon but possible. The Isolated Prospect Pit and Isolated Historic Trash Deposit Determination of Eligibility protocols should not be combined; each is to be used separately for independently isolated resources. Trash that post-dates 1950 is considered modern and intrusive, not historic (see Isolated Historic Refuse Deposit protocol, Appendix F- 1); its presence in isolated prospect pits still allows for the use of this strategy.

(e) Dating:

(1) Most prospect pits cannot be dated. In some cases, associated scattered trash may provide time-sensitive clues. Any isolated prospect pits that can be dated to the 1960s or later are considered modern. They need not be recorded as sites.

(2) Prehistoric quarries do not qualify as isolated prospect pits. Unless historic quarrying or mining, such as that associated with registered claims, can be identified, quarry holes for commonly used prehistoric lithic materials, such as obsidian, basalt, or chert, are excluded from the isolated prospect pit determination of eligibility protocol.

4.0 Data Collection Procedures

4.1 The following are minimal site recording guidelines. HPM/DHPS shall determine appropriate data collection procedures commensurate with the historical remains identified.

4.2 Record isolated historic refuse deposits on CRRs or update existing records to current standards.

(a) In California: complete the USDA-Forest Service (Region 5) Primary Record (comparable to DPR 523A Primary Record and DPR 523C Archaeological Site Record).

(b) In Nevada: complete the IMACS Site Form, Part A Administrative and Environmental Data, and Part C Historic Sites records.

4.3 Locational Information and Maps: Provide general location maps, plus site location maps using USGS 7.5' or comparable maps. For sites with multiple loci, prepare site sketch maps, showing locations of loci. Collect Global Positioning System (GPS) location data and maintain such data under Heritage Program's application in the Forest's Geographical Information System (GIS).

4.4 Photographs: As needed, take photographs (digital or film) of sites: site overviews and views of loci.

4.3 Measurements: Measure circumferences and depths of prospect pits, or representative sample according to Forest guidelines; and circumferences and heights of associated waste rock piles, or representative sample.

4.4 Document all historic artifacts in sites.

(a) Document artifacts: include provenience information; provide descriptions; and illustrate or take photographs of unique or diagnostic artifacts (e.g., maker's marks, labels, manufacturing characteristics, or other diagnostic attributes);

(b) Note modern refuse by documenting general data, e.g., general quantities and types.

References Cited

- Angel, Myron (1881) *History of Nevada*. Oakland: Thompson & West.
- Bancroft, Hubert Howe (1888) *Works of Hubert Howe Bancroft*, vol 35. San Francisco: History Company Pub.
- Bancroft, Hubert Howe (1890) *The History of California*, Volume Seven. San Francisco: History Company Pub.
- Bean, Walton and James J. Rawls (1988). *California: An Interpretive History*. Fifth Edition. McGraw-Hill Book Company. New York.
- Beck, Warren A. and Ynez D. Haase (1974). *Historical Atlas of California*. University of Oklahoma Press. Norman, OK.
- Curle, J.H. (1905) *The Gold Mines of the World*. 3rd ed. New York: The Engineering and Mining Journal.
- Cutter, Donald C. (1948) *Geologic Guidebook Along Highway 49 (Bulletin 141)*. Sacramento: Division of Mines.
- Daily Alta California (various) Digital editions available at: <http://cdnc.ucr.edu/newsucr>
- Dana, Richard Henry (1911) *Two Years Before the Mast*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Davis, William Heath (1889) *Sixty Years in California: A History of Events and Life in California; Personal, Political and Military, under the Mexican Regime; during the Quasi-Military Government of the Territory by the United States and after the Admission of the State into the Union*. San Francisco: A. J. Leary.
- DeGroot, Henry (1882) Hydraulic and Drift Mining. In: *Second Report of the State Mineralogist of California*. Sacramento: State Printing Office. pp. 133-190.
- Historical Sketch (1876) *Historical Sketch of Los Angeles County*. Los Angeles: Louis Lewin & Co.
- Hittell, John S. (1861) *Mining in the Pacific States of North America*. San Francisco: H.H. Bancroft and Company.
- Hutchings (1857) *Mining for Gold in California*. In: *Hutchings' California Magazine*. Vol. II(1) pp. 1-14. Jackson, W. Turrentine (1963) *Treasure Hill: A Portrait of a Silver Mining Camp*. Reno: University of Nevada Press.
- Jameson, Robert (1816) *A System of Mineralogy*. Vol. III. Edinburgh: Neill & Company.
- Kelly, Tim (2012) *The Evolution of Mines and Mining Districts—Seiche Waves and the Boom-Bust Lifecycle*. Draft manuscript on file, Sequoia National Forest.
- Kelly, Tim (2012a) *Archaeological Context for the Keys Mining District*. Draft manuscript on file, Sequoia National Forest.

Moskowitz, Kathy (2004). National Register Evaluation of Unassociated Prospect Pits on the Stanislaus National Forest. Report 05-16-1266. Manuscript on file, Stanislaus National Forest, Sonora, CA.

Paul, Rodman (1947) *California Gold: The Beginning of Mining in the Far West*. Lincoln, Nebraska: U. of Nebraska Press.

Paul, Rodman (1963) *Mining Frontiers of the Far West: 1848-1880*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Pittman, Ruth (1995). *Roadside History of California*. Mountain Press Publishing Company. Missoula, MT.

Placer Times (various) Digital editions available at: <http://cdnc.ucr.edu/newsucr>

Sacramento Daily Transcript (various) Digital editions available at: <http://cdnc.ucr.edu/newsucr>

Sampson, R. J. (1937) Mineral Resources of Los Angeles County. *California Journal of Mines and Geology* v33(3).

Visalia Delta (various) Digital editions available at: <http://cdnc.ucr.edu/newsucr>

Wedertz, Frank (1978) *Mono Diggings: Historical Sketches of Old Bridgeport, Big Meadows and Vicinity*. Bishop, CA: Chalfant Press.

APPENDIX G

**CERTIFIED PARAPROFESSIONAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEYOR PROGRAM:
STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS**

APPENDIX G

CERTIFIED PARAPROFESSIONAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEYOR PROGRAM: STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS

1.0 Certified Paraprofessional Archaeological Surveyor Program

1.1 Certified Paraprofessional Archaeological Surveyors are Forest Service employees who have satisfactorily completed a regionally approved program designed to provide them with the skills to assist professionals in the management of the Heritage Program.

1.2 Region 5 recognizes two classes of Certified Paraprofessional Archaeological Surveyors:

(a) Class I Certified Paraprofessional Archaeological Surveyor:

(1) Class I training is designed to acquaint Forest Service employees with the Heritage Program in sufficient depth to enable them to incorporate cultural resource awareness into their normal functions and program activities;

(2) The Class I level is particularly useful for specialists who must consider historic properties during planning and for sale administrators and contract inspectors who monitor undertakings.

(b) Class II Certified Paraprofessional Archaeological Surveyor:

(1) Class II training is designed to train Forest Service employees to assist Heritage Program professionals with specific program tasks.

(2) Persons who have successfully completed Class II training may be certified as Certified Paraprofessional Archaeological Surveyors.

(3) Under the direct supervision of qualified Heritage Program staff (see clause 2.1, of this part), and subject to HPM approval, Class II Certified Paraprofessional Archaeological Surveyors may perform intensive surveys within undertaking APEs and assist with other program objectives.

2.0 Program Operations

2.1 Class II Certified Paraprofessional Archaeological Surveyors shall work under the direct supervision of HPMS or qualified Heritage Program staff (Archaeologist (GS-193), Archaeological Technician (GS 102), Anthropologist (GS 190) or Historian (GS 170) series) delegated by HPMS.

(a) HPM/DHPS shall determine program participation and permitted activities for Certified Paraprofessional Archaeological Surveyors.

(b) HPM/DHPS shall determine whether proposed undertakings may be surveyed by a Class II Certified Paraprofessional Archaeological Surveyor.

(c) HPM/DHPS shall determine strategies, methods, and other requirements for intensive surveys.

(d) HPM/DHPS shall review all reports prepared by Certified Paraprofessional Archaeological Surveyors.

2.2 For undertakings where historic properties are found within APEs, HPM/DHPS shall prepare site documentation. Only qualified Heritage Program staff may approve the use of Standard Protection Measures (Appendix E of this PA) at specific historic properties within APEs, and the use of this PA for specific undertakings.

3.0 Certified Paraprofessional Archaeological Surveyor Training

3.1 Certified Paraprofessional Archaeological Surveyor training consists of a minimum of 40 hours of classroom training.

(a) This training shall be approved by the Region 5 Regional Heritage Program Leader or HPM as delegated.

(b) The training shall follow the course syllabus outlined in a regional or forest Heritage Program Certified Paraprofessional Archaeological Surveyor training guide, or another syllabus approved by the Region 5 Regional Heritage Program Leader.

(c) The training shall be presented by the Region 5 Regional Heritage Program Leader, Forest Heritage Program Managers, or other qualified professionals.

3.2 Class II Certified Paraprofessional Archaeological Surveyor training includes the above minimum classroom training plus a Forest specific field course composed of:

(a) A minimum of forty hours of archaeological survey fieldwork on the trainee's duty Forest, performed under the direct supervision of the HPM/DHPS;

(b) Completion of two acceptable heritage program surveys and reports, and one acceptable site form.

4.0 Certification

4.1 Certification is achieved through:

(a) Satisfactory completion of all requirements;

(b) Formal examination and evaluation of the trainee by the HPM to assess the trainee's abilities to meet the skills necessary to the Certified Paraprofessional Archaeological Surveyor program;

(c) Formal certification by the Regional Forester, or Forest Supervisor as delegated, based on HPM recommendation once requirements are met and documented.

4.2 Maintenance of certification is attained by:

(a) Attendance at periodic Certified Paraprofessional Archaeological Surveyor update training sessions, offered on regional or Forest levels, at least every two years; and

(b) Participation in at least one acceptable heritage program inventory per year, with direct involvement in both field work and report preparation.

4.3 Decertification results from either:

(a) Work related deficiencies:

(1) Moving to a new Forest or location different from that in which the Certified Paraprofessional Archaeological Surveyor received field training;

(2) Inability of Certified Paraprofessional Archaeological Surveyor to meet required maintenance activities described above;

(3) Identification of serious deficiencies in the Certified Paraprofessional Archaeological Surveyor's work (e.g., inability to identify or adequately record historic properties); or

(b) Ethical violations:

(1) Violations of ethical behavior related to confidentiality of heritage program information;

(2) Behavior that compromises resource or program integrity.

(c) The Forest Supervisor shall report any serious work deficiencies or ethical violations to the Region 5 Regional Heritage Program Leader in a timely manner upon notification of such by the HPM; the HPM shall not accept any survey reports under review until the matter is fully resolved at the Forest and/or Regional levels.

4.4 Recertification may be achieved only for work related deficiencies, other than falsification of records, by:

(a) Completing field training updates to correct locational deficiencies;

(b) Completing training updates specially designed to correct any deficiencies resulting from program inactivity;

(c) Completing update training specially designed to alleviate identified deficiencies in field or report work.

APPENDIX H

REGION 5 HAZARDOUS FUELS PROTOCOL

for

**NON-INTENSIVE INVENTORY STRATEGIES FOR
HAZARDOUS FUELS AND VEGETATION REDUCTION**

PROJECTS

REGION 5 HAZARDOUS FUELS PROTOCOL
for
NON-INTENSIVE INVENTORY STRATEGIES FOR
HAZARDOUS FUELS AND VEGETATION REDUCTION
PROJECTS

1.0 BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

Unhealthy and extreme vegetation density, disease, and insect infestations continue to produce hazardous fuels conditions on public lands that threaten lives and property. The Healthy Forest Restoration Act (HFRA), passed in December 2003, provides direction to reduce hazardous fuels on federal and private lands. The severity of the problem and attendant risk of catastrophic fire due to forest fuels buildup, vegetation composition, insect infestation, and prolonged drought in California were underscored by the disastrous southern California fires in the fall of 2003.

With passage of the HFRA and subsequent Congressional direction, the Pacific Southwest Region (Region 5) has taken aggressive action to reduce the threat to life and property by catastrophic wildfire within fire-dependent ecosystems and wildland urban interface areas. This multi-year effort has treated several hundred thousand acres of federal and adjacent lands in southern California alone. All Forests in Region 5 are planning projects to reduce hazardous fuels and vegetation.

For fuels reduction projects to be effective, hazardous vegetation must be treated or removed on a broad scale, affecting hundreds of thousands of acres, including areas containing historic properties. Two methods are currently being considered to reduce hazardous fuels and vegetation: prescribed burns and mechanical treatments. The use of prescribed burns may be limited by conditions--such as high fuel loading, weather, and air quality restrictions--which leave a narrow window of opportunity for implementing the treatment. Because of the potential limitations on prescribed burning, Region 5 is also using mechanical treatments to reduce hazardous fuels and vegetation.

This protocol for Non-intensive Inventory Strategies for Hazardous Fuels and Vegetation Reduction Projects was originally developed in accordance with stipulation III.B (2)(b) of the *First Amended Regional Programmatic Agreement among the USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, California State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding the Process for Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for undertakings on the National Forests of the Pacific Southwest Region* (2001 (RPA)); and stipulation V.D(1) of the *Programmatic Agreement among the U.S.D.A. Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, California State Historic Preservation Officer, and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding the Identification, Evaluation and Treatment of Historic Properties Managed by the National Forests of the Sierra Nevada, California* (1996) (SPA). The interim protocol was approved by the RPA and SPA Signatories and annexed to the agreements under Stipulation IX of the RPA and Stipulation XIV of the SPA in order to include a hazardous fuels and vegetation reduction program focus. The interim protocol has been updated to conform to this PA and is adopted pursuant to Stipulation 7.4(c)(1). It may be used where necessary, in conjunction with or instead of other stipulations in the PA.

This protocol for non-intensive inventory strategies covers two components: Prescribed Fire Treatments, and Mechanical Treatments. The Prescribed Fire component adds procedures for prescribed burns under a Non-intensive Inventory Strategy for Prescribed Burns, in Areas Previously Affected by Moderate to High Intensity Wildfires, within Impenetrable Brush, and on Steep Slopes. The Mechanical Treatment component includes separate procedures under a Non-intensive Inventory Strategy for Mechanical Treatments to Reduce Hazardous Fuels and Vegetation. Use of this protocol shall be only for fuels and vegetation management projects that Forests implement to reduce hazardous fuels.

2.0 DEFINITIONS

Definitions from the PA apply to this protocol, including those for Area of Potential Effects, Heritage Program Manager, Historic Property, Intensive Inventory, and Undertaking.

2.1 At Risk Historic Property: is further defined for undertakings considered under this protocol as a property that the Forest Heritage Program Manager (HPM) identifies as susceptible to being adversely affected by specific undertaking activities. An at risk historic property is identified based on property characteristics (e.g., flammability or fragility) and undertaking parameters (e.g., fuel load or fire temperature, or equipment weight or type). Examples are wooden structures susceptible to fire from prescribed burning or rock alignments that can be crushed by tracked vehicles.

2.2 Mechanical Treatment: is a project activity involving machinery or mechanized equipment (e.g., bulldozer, excavator, drum roller, range disk, mastication machine, bunchfeller), to remove or reduce vegetation from the landscape. Mechanical treatments have the potential to effect historic properties.

2.3 Prescribed Burn: is the application of low intensity, controlled fire to reduce fuel loads that otherwise support large, hot, uncontrolled wildfire. The assumption is that low intensity prescribed fire has few direct impacts to non-flammable historic properties that have been previously burned over by moderate to high intensity fire.

3.0 PRESCRIBED FIRE TREATMENTS

Any Forest in the Region may elect to utilize the following Non-intensive Inventory Strategy for Prescribed Burns, in Areas Previously Affected by Moderate to High Intensity Wildfires, within Impenetrable Brush, and on Steep Slopes.

3.1 Procedures for Prescribed Fire

(a) The Forest HPM shall define the undertaking's Area of Potential Effects (APE) in consultation with the Forest's fuels and fire specialists. The APE shall include, but not be limited to, areas to which low intensity prescribed fire will be applied, control lines constructed or utilized, and equipment and material storage or staging areas.

(1) An intensive inventory shall be completed in those portions of the APE where at risk historic properties are expected to occur and/or may be affected by the undertaking (e.g., fire, fire control lines). Where intensive inventory is not possible due to inaccessibility or other constraints, refer to clauses 3.1(c) and d, below.

(2) Pre-field research will identify at risk historic properties that may be affected by low intensity prescribed fire in the undertaking's APE. Information sources that may be relevant to pre-field research include homestead entries, historic grazing allotment files, oral interview files, archaeological and historical atlases, and site record files. Predicted archaeological and historical sensitivity within an APE shall be based on available information (e.g., past experience, land Management Plan analyses, pre-field research results).

(b) Procedures in Areas Previously Affected by Moderate to High Intensity Wildfire

(1) Low intensity prescribed fire is unlikely to have an effect on historic properties within areas previously affected by moderate to high intensity wildfire unless those resources meet the definition of at risk historic properties.

i) The Forest's Geographic Information System (GIS) fire history coverage and fire history database shall be used to identify the locations of previous wildfires, and to characterize their intensities where possible. Where previous wildfire intensity is not mapped, the Forest's fuels, fire, and silvicultural specialists shall be consulted to determine whether moderate to high fire intensities can be derived based on other information.

ii) Where previous fire intensity is unknown, the Forest HPM shall treat the proposed burn area as being unburned.

(2) If the Forest's HPM determines that fire history data indicate that moderate to high intensity fire has previously affected portions of the APE, and no at risk historic properties are expected, then intensive inventory within previously affected areas is not required. Instead, non-intensive inventory methods may be used, including pre-field research documentation, sample or reconnaissance field strategies, post-project monitoring, or other less than intensive methods approved by the Forest's HPM.

(3) Non-intensive inventories shall focus on identifying unknown at risk historic properties in the APE.

(c) Procedures for Impenetrable Brush

(1) Where intensive inventory is not feasible because of areas of impenetrable brush, hindered access, or obscured visibility, a non-intensive inventory strategy may be approved by the HPM in lieu of other identification requirements in the PA, or 36 CFR 800. The presence of impenetrable brush within an APE can be identified based on pre-field research, GIS data, or other information; this should be verified with spot field inspections.

(2) The Forest HPM may defer inventory within areas of impenetrable brush, hindered access, or obscured visibility until after initial project implementation. The rationale for the deferred inventory will be based on the area's historic property sensitivity (i.e., the potential for at risk historic properties), and on expected improvements in accessibility or surface visibility after project completion.

i) Prior to implementation of project activity in areas of impenetrable brush, hindered access, or obscured visibility where inventory efforts are to be deferred, the HPM shall develop a post-fire inventory strategy, which will be implemented within one year of completion of the project's activities (see clause 6.1, below).

Region 5 Programmatic Agreement

ii) Where phased undertakings are approved in areas of deferred inventory due to accessibility or visibility constraints, the Forest's HPM may recommend, as appropriate, that inventory be conducted in previously deferred areas subsequent to initial project activity phases in order to: identify historic properties possibly affected by the earlier phases; identify historic properties that may be affected by subsequent phases; and apply Standard Protection Measures (see clause 5.0, below) where historic properties may be protected in subsequent phases of implementation.

(d) Procedures in Areas of Steep Slopes

Where intensive inventory is not feasible because of steep slopes (greater than 30°), a non-intensive inventory strategy (including monitoring; see clause 6.2) may be approved by the HPM in lieu of other identification requirements in the PA. The presence of steep slopes within an APE can be identified based on pre-field research, GIS data, or other information; this should be verified with spot field inspections.

3.2 Prescribed Fire Module

The Prescribed Fire and the Protection of Heritage Resources module, formerly appended to the *Programmatic Agreement among the U.S.D.A. Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, California State Historic Preservation Officer, and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding the Identification, Evaluation and Treatment of Historic Properties Managed by the National Forests of the Sierra Nevada, California* (1996), applies to all hazardous fuels reduction and may also be used by forests covered by this earlier agreement in lieu of the procedures described above in clause 3.1.

4.0 MECHANICAL TREATMENTS

Any Forest in the Region may elect to utilize the following Non-intensive Inventory Strategy for Mechanical Treatments to Reduce Hazardous Fuels and Vegetation.

4.1 Procedures for Mechanical Treatments

(a) The Forest HPM shall define the undertaking's APE in consultation with the Forest's fuels, vegetation management, and/or fire specialists. The APE shall include, but not be limited to, areas proposed for mechanical treatments, equipment and materials storage or staging, and constructed or reconstructed access roads.

(1) An intensive inventory of the undertaking's APE shall be completed. Intensive inventory may not be possible in impenetrable brush fields or on steep slopes (30% or greater) due to accessibility and safety considerations.

(2) Pre-field research will identify at risk historic properties that might be affected by the use of heavy equipment or other mechanical treatments to reduce hazardous fuels and vegetation in the undertaking's APE. Predicted archaeological and historical sensitivity within an APE shall be based on available information (e.g., past experience, Land Management Plan analyses, pre-field research results).

(b) Procedures for Impenetrable Brush

(1) Where intensive inventory is not feasible within areas of impenetrable brush, hindered access, or obscured visibility, the Forest HPM may approve a non-intensive inventory strategy in lieu

of other identification stipulations in the PA, or 36 CFR 800. The presence of impenetrable brush within an APE can be based on pre-field research, GIS data, or other information; this should be verified with spot field inspections.

(2) The Forest HPM may defer inventory within areas of impenetrable brush, hindered access, or obscured visibility until after initial project implementation. The rationale for the deferred inventory will be based on the area's historic property sensitivity (i.e., the potential for at risk historic properties), and on expected improvements in accessibility or surface visibility after project implementation.

i) Prior to implementation of project activity in areas of impenetrable brush, hindered access, or obscured visibility where inventory efforts are to be deferred, the HPM shall develop a post-treatment inventory strategy, which will be implemented within one year of completion of the project's activities (see clause 6.1, below).

ii) Where phased undertakings are approved in areas of deferred inventory due to accessibility or visibility constraints, the Forest's HPM may recommend, as appropriate, that inventory be conducted in previously deferred areas subsequent to initial project activity phases in order to: identify historic properties possibly affected by the earlier phases; identify historic properties that may be affected by subsequent phases; and apply Standard Protection Measures (see clause 5.0, below) where historic properties may be protected in subsequent phases of implementation.

iii) Where post-project implementation inventory would not be effective due to surface visibility constraints, deferred inventory is not required until such time that visibility constraints are no longer an issue.

(c) Procedures for Steep Slopes

Where intensive inventory is not feasible on steep slopes (greater than 30%), the Forest HPM may approve a non-intensive inventory strategy (including monitoring; see clause 6.2) in lieu of other identification stipulations in the PA. The presence of steep slopes within an APE can be based on pre-field research, GIS data, or other information; this should be verified with spot field inspections.

4.2 Assessment of Mechanical Treatments

Where recommended by the HPM, Forests may choose treatment methods on an experimental basis to assess equipment types and use conditions, hazardous fuels reduction effectiveness, and heritage resource protection effectiveness.

(a) Forests shall assess the effectiveness of equipment types, extraction methods, operating restrictions, environmental parameters, site conditions effects, protections, and project results.

(b) Assessment information shall be used to modify treatments within historic properties to achieve the most effective equipment types, conditions of use, project results, and historic property protections practicable.

5.0 STANDARD RESOURCE PROTECTION MEASURES

The Forest's HPM, in conjunction with the fuels, vegetation management, or fire specialists as necessary, shall develop treatment measures for at risk historic properties designed to eliminate or

Region 5 Programmatic Agreement

reduce potential adverse effects to the extent practicable by utilizing methods that minimize surface disturbance, and/or by planning project activities in previously disturbed areas or areas lacking cultural features.

5.1 The Standard Protection Measures (SPM) of the this PA shall be used as necessary to protect at risk historic properties that may be affected by the undertaking.

5.2 The following Standard Resource Protection Measures have been incorporated into the PA. Their use is subject to approval by the Forest HPM.

- (a) Fire crews may monitor sites to provide protection as needed.
- (b) Fire lines or breaks may be constructed off sites to protect at risk historic properties.
- (c) Vegetation may be removed and fire lines or breaks may be constructed within sites using hand tools, so long as ground disturbance is minimized and features are avoided, as specified by the HPM.
- (d) Fire shelter fabric or other protective materials or equipment (e.g., sprinkler systems) may be utilized to protect at risk historic properties.
- (e) Fire retardant foam and other wetting agents may be utilized to protect at risk historic properties and in the construction and use of fire lines.
- (f) Surface fuels (e.g., stumps or partially buried logs) on at risk historic properties may be covered with dirt, fire shelter fabric, foam or other wetting agents, or other protective materials to prevent fire from burning into subsurface components and to reduce the duration of heating underneath or near heavy fuels.
- (g) Trees which may impact at risk historic properties should they fall on site features and smolder can be directionally felled away from properties prior to ignition, or prevented from burning by wrapping in fire shelter fabric or treating with fire retardant or wetting agents.
- (h) Vegetation to be burned shall not be piled within the boundaries of historic properties unless the location (e.g., a previously disturbed area) has been specifically approved by the Forest's HPM.
- (i) Mechanically treated (crushed/cut) brush or downed woody material may be removed from historic properties by hand, through the use of off-site equipment, or by rubber-tired equipment approved by the HPM. Ground disturbance shall be minimized to the extent practicable during such removals.
- (j) Woody material may be chipped within the boundaries of historic properties so long as the staging of chipping equipment on-site does not affect historic properties.
- (k) The Forest's HPM shall approve the use of tracked equipment to remove brush or woody material from within specifically identified areas of site boundaries under prescribed measures designed to prevent or minimize effects. Vegetative or other protective padding may be used in conjunction with the HPM's authorization of certain equipment types within site boundaries.

5.3 The Forest's HPM shall determine whether prescribed fire or mechanical equipment treatments within site boundaries shall be monitored, and how such monitoring shall occur.

5.4 If SPMs cannot provide appropriate protection, the undertaking shall be subject to the provisions of 36 CFR 800.

6.0 POST-PROJECT PROCEDURES

6.1 The Forests shall provide the funding and staff time necessary to perform all post-project activity identification, historic property treatment and protection, monitoring, effects assessment, and documentation recommended by the HPM as a condition of project approval, or when identified during post-activity assessments. All such work shall be completed within one year of final project activities. If the recommended work is not completed within this period of time, the Forest shall notify and consult with Region 5, the SHPO, and the ACHP on appropriate actions needed to complete the work within an agreed upon time period, or failing to do so, shall comply with 36 CFR 800.

6.2 Monitoring shall be implemented under conditions specified by the HPM within non-intensive inventory areas that may contain at risk historic properties; and in treatment areas where deferred inventory was approved. The HPM shall determine the scope and schedule for any associated monitoring.

6.3 Information from any post-project inventory, monitoring, or evaluation shall be used to assess the effectiveness of this non-intensive inventory approach. The results shall be reported in the Forest's Annual PA Report or supplemental report.

7.0 OTHER PROCEDURES

7.1 Reporting

(a) All projects treated under this non-intensive inventory protocol shall be documented in the Forest's Annual PA Report.

(b) The historic property, archaeological survey report, and annual report documentation standards of the PA shall be followed.

(c) Any use of experimental mechanical treatments and SPMs on historic properties shall be documented in the Forest's Annual PA Report or supplemental report, detailing equipment type, extraction techniques, conditions of use, environmental conditions, project results, effectiveness of protection measures, and recommendations for future use.

7.2 Consultation

Indian tribes and Native American groups shall be consulted regarding SPMs used to protect historic properties of interest to them.

7.3 Inadvertent Effects and Unanticipated Discoveries

(a) If an undertaking affects a historic property in an unanticipated manner, the Forest shall notify and consult with Region 5, the SHPO, and the ACHP, and follow the procedures of the Discoveries and Inadvertent Effects stipulation (stipulation 7.10) in the PA.

Region 5 Programmatic Agreement

(b) Unanticipated Discoveries

(1) If an unanticipated discovery of an at risk historic property is made during project implementation and the site has been impacted by project activities, the Forest shall use the process defined in the Discoveries and Inadvertent Effects stipulation (stipulation 7.10) to notify and consult with Region 5, the SHPO, and the ACHP.

(2) If an unanticipated discovery of an at risk historic property is made during project implementation and the site has not been impacted by the time of discovery, project activities shall be halted immediately in the vicinity of the site, and the HPM, in consultation with fuels, vegetation management, or fire specialists as necessary, shall design and implement SPMs to eliminate or minimize impacts, prior to authorizing resumption of project activities.

7.4 Protocol Modifications

(a) Based on new information and assessments and recommendations made, the treatments, protection measures, and other procedures in this protocol for Non-intensive Inventory Strategies for Hazardous Fuels and Vegetation Reduction Projects may be modified by mutual agreement of all parties.

(b) This protocol shall remain in effect for hazardous fuels reduction projects until it is terminated by mutual agreement of all parties.

APPENDIX I
AMENDMENTS