

# Cultural Resources

## Affected Environment

Human use of Oregon and Washington is believed to span the Late Pleistocene through the Holocene Epochs, a period of 14,000 or more years. In the Pacific Northwest Region, the Forest Service has documented over 40,000 cultural resource sites, which include archaeological sites, historic structures, traditional cultural properties, and historic properties of religious and cultural significance to Indian Tribes. The following listed site types are illustrative but are by no means exhaustive:

- Pre-contact archaeological sites include quarries, stone tool manufacturing sites, hunting camps, plant processing areas, fishing stations, villages, plant gathering locations, shell middens, rock art, rock alignments, pit houses, peel trees, rock shelters, trails, cairns and stone rings.
- Historic period archaeological sites include refuse dumps, homesteads, mines and mining camps, logging camps, ditches, flumes and dendroglyphs.
- Historic structures include lookouts, guard stations, railroad grades, bridges, wagon roads, trails, roads, standing structures in homesteads, mining camps and logging camps, lighthouses, ranger stations, corrals and line shacks.
- Traditional cultural properties and historic properties of religious and cultural significance include plant gathering locations, fishing and hunting stations, rock art sites, and sites important in legend and myth. Traditional cultural properties can be associated with any cultural group while historic properties of religious and cultural significance are specific to American Indian Tribes.

## Issue for Analysis

### Issue 1 – Effects of Proposed Activities on Cultural Resources

**Description:** Adverse effects are impacts to the integrity of a property, destroying a portion or all of the property and the information that it could yield, or destroying characteristic features of the property. These effects can be direct or indirect. A direct adverse impact occurs during the activity itself, such as when a road is built through a historic property and the construction process destroys the site. An indirect adverse impact can occur as a side effect of the activity or after the activity is complete, such as runoff from a road that eventually erodes a historic property adjacent to it

**Issue Indicator for Analysis:** Site condition and integrity (level of damage to a site and the surrounding area/setting of the site).

**Measure:** Site monitoring

**Methodology:** According to Federal regulations for the protection of historic properties,<sup>1</sup> the Forest Service, “may use a phased process to conduct identification and evaluation efforts” because specific locations will not be identified prior to the project decision. Phased compliance allows the agency to conduct surveys and complete the section 106 consultation process after the

---

<sup>1</sup> 36 CFR 800.4 (2)(b)

decision has been made. The Forest Service, in consultation with the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office and the Washington Department of Archeology and Historic Preservation will develop specific protocol documents for the aquatics restoration project, which will be inserted into the appendices of the newly revised *Programmatic Agreement Among the USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office Regarding the Historic Properties Management in the State of Oregon by the USDA Forest Service*. The Washington Department of Archeology & Historic Preservation office requested the protocol be included within the appendix of this document. All Forest Service units in the region must review and use all existing exemptions when applicable, in both the 2004 Oregon Programmatic Agreement and the 1997 Washington State Programmatic Agreement or current existing Programmatic Agreements. If cultural resource sites which are listed on, or have the potential to be listed on, the National Register of Historic Properties are identified, they would either be avoided or any potential impacts would be mitigated following processes developed in consultation with the appropriate State Historic Preservation Office and any other interested parties, including American Indian Tribes.

**Spatial and Temporal Boundaries:** The area of potential effect is the area where there is the potential for direct and indirect effects to cultural resources. This boundary may vary based on the type of sites known or predicted to be in the planning area as well as the potential effects of the project. For the 1,600 proposed projects, there would be separate areas of potential effect identified for each individual project.

The temporal scope for the assessment for cultural resource environmental effects includes both short and long-term projects. For the purposes of this analysis, impacts to cultural sites are primarily immediate to site condition and integrity. But, there could be long-term impacts associated with the proposed actions, such as culvert removal which could increase water flow, therefore increasing bank erosion on existing and new sites.

## **Environmental Consequences**

Under the regulations an adverse effect is found when an undertaking may alter, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of a cultural resource that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register. Adverse effects may include reasonably foreseeable effects caused by the undertaking that may occur later in time, be farther removed in distance or be cumulative.

### **Direct and Indirect Effects**

The project design criteria for each proposed action would minimize and mitigate impacts to sites in order to preserve the site condition and integrity. There is potential, however, for eligible sites to be impacted.

The table below displays information showing the relationship between the issue, site condition and integrity and potential effects. The issue column shows the aquatic restoration activity. The site condition and integrity column lists what type of resource could be effected. The potential effects column describes the potential effect to the resource. Potential direct impacts would affect eligible sites, historic district or traditional cultural properties, or historic properties of religious and cultural significance. The hydrologic corridors (rivers, streams, tributaries) all are considered high probability areas for cultural resources throughout the region, these areas have high site density. An example of an indirect effect would be culvert removal where the water flow increases, therefore increasing bank erosion on existing and new sites. Reviewing the table

below, there are multiple areas where there are potential effects to eligible sites due to unknown information related to project locations and specifics.

**Table 1. Proposed action and associated ground disturbance table**

Issue	Indicator- Site Condition & Integrity	Potential Effects
Fish passage restoration stream simulation, small dam removal	Removing bridge, culvert	Removal of an eligible property would result in adverse effect. Culvert removal could increase water flow, therefore increasing bank erosion on existing and new sites.
Beaver dam analogues/beaver dam habitat improvement:	Planting will also cause minimal disturbance.	None.
Large wood, boulder, and gravel placement and channel reconstruction/relocation	Uprooting trees and use of heavy machinery has a high potential to cause ground disturbance/site damage.	Identified eligible sites should be avoided, but again, the flexibility in locations of the large, wood and boulders may be limited which would have potential to effect site condition and integrity.
Bull trout protection	Low potential for ground disturbance.	Can the electrofishing/manual means no effect fish species with significance to Tribes? First Foods?
Fencing and stream-crossing to protect aquatic restoration projects: legacy structure removal	Use of heavy machinery has a high potential to cause ground disturbance/site damage.	Identified eligible sites may be impacted due to location restrictions, removing structures (staging areas, access to legacy structures, demolition and removal of legacy structures) and site condition and integrity could be compromised.
In-channel nutrient enhancement:	Low potential for ground disturbance.	None.
Off- and side-channel habitat restoration and set-back or removal of existing berms, dikes and levees and streambank restoration	Use of heavy machinery has a high potential to cause ground disturbance/ site damage.	If project requires full archeological survey, new sites could be identified that will need to be evaluated for National Register of Historic Places eligibility. Again, location limitations on the removing of off-channel fill and plugs have potential to effect site condition and integrity.
Relocation of recreation impacts: Is intended to close or better control dispersed and designated campgrounds and other recreation infrastructure along streams and within riparian areas.	Minimal ground disturbance will occur when pulling in slash and logs to redefine use areas from hand dragging material. Boulder placement will cause new ground disturbance if placed in previously undisturbed areas. If campground is 50 years old, will need to be evaluated. Could potentially have adverse effect.	If project requires full archeological and aboveground survey, new sites could be identified that will need to be evaluated for NRHP eligibility. Again, location limitations on what dispersed and developed sites, OHV trails, etc. to remove and restore have potential to effect site condition and integrity.
Juniper removal and riparian vegetative planting	Will be conducted in riparian areas to help restore plant species composition and structure that would occur under natural fire regimes. Includes the planting of native riparian species. Activities may include the following: planting conifers, deciduous trees and shrubs;	None.

Issue	Indicator- Site Condition & Integrity	Potential Effects
Riparian vegetation treatment and controlled burning	Includes reintroduction of low- and moderate-severity fire into RHCAs to help restore plant species composition and structure that would occur under natural fire regimes	Various levels of fire intensity affect cultural resources in different ways.
Non-system road decommissioning	Includes hydrologically decommissioning roads, including culvert removal in perennial and intermittent streams.	Significant ground disturbance up to several feet in depth would be associated with subsoiling and ripping roads. There will be limited flexibility in the project design on the location of the non-system road decommissioning which could have potential to effect site condition and integrity. Culvert removal could increase water flow, therefore increasing bank erosion on existing and new sites.

\* Proposed actions have incorporated project design criteria to minimize impacts to cultural resources. Similar actions are grouped.

The table illustrates potential direct and indirect effects on the proposed action. However, every Forest Service unit will implement the project design criteria in order to minimize or avoid impacts to cultural resources (see project design criteria). These include:

- pre-implementation surveys to determine whether sites exist;
- ensuring compliance with section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and concurrence with State Historic Preservation Offices;
- avoiding sites and properties listed or having the potential to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places;
- consultation with associated American Indian Tribes; and
- halting work if previously unidentified sites are discovered during project implementation.

By following these design criteria, direct and indirect effects to cultural resources should be minimal to nonexistent.

### Cumulative Effects

Throughout the region there are multiple projects occurring that could contribute to cumulative impacts to cultural resources. These include, but are not limited to vegetation management, fire and fuels, road decommissioning, mining and recreation and have the potential for effects to overlap with effects from the activities in the proposed action. However, use of project design criteria as stated in the direct and indirect effects section would result in minimal to no effects. Therefore, there would be no adverse cumulative effects to cultural resources.

### Consistency Statement

The proposed action is consistent with Forest Service Handbook 2309.12, the implementing regulations for the National Historic Preservation Act (36 CFR 800), and other relevant laws.