



United States Department of Agriculture
Forest Service

Grasshopper Restoration Project

Heritage Resources Report

Prepared by:
Bobby Saunters
Archaeologist

Barlow Ranger District
Mt. Hood National Forest

10/14/2020 DRAFT

In accordance with Federal civil rights law and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) civil rights regulations and policies, the USDA, its Agencies, offices, and employees, and institutions participating in or administering USDA programs are prohibited from discriminating based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, gender identity (including gender expression), sexual orientation, disability, age, marital status, family/parental status, income derived from a public assistance program, political beliefs, or reprisal or retaliation for prior civil rights activity, in any program or activity conducted or funded by USDA (not all bases apply to all programs). Remedies and complaint filing deadlines vary by program or incident.

Persons with disabilities who require alternative means of communication for program information (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotope, American Sign Language, etc.) should contact the responsible Agency or USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TTY) or contact USDA through the Federal Relay Service at (800) 877-8339. Additionally, program information may be made available in languages other than English.

To file a program discrimination complaint, complete the USDA Program Discrimination Complaint Form, AD-3027, [found online](#) and at any USDA office or write a letter addressed to USDA and provide in the letter all of the information requested in the form. To request a copy of the complaint form, call (866) 632-9992. Submit your completed form or letter to USDA by: (1) mail: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20250-9410; (2) fax: (202) 690-7442; or (3) email: program.intake@usda.gov .

USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer and lender.

1.0 Introduction

The purpose of this report is to analyze the effects of actions proposed under the Grasshopper Restoration Project on cultural resources. Analysis and survey methodology and standards were in compliance with the current Mt Hood National Forest Cultural Resource Inventory Plan as discussed as part of the analysis (s. 2.0). Analysis of effects focused on the identification, documentation, and evaluation of two primary types of resources: pre-contact and historic period archaeological sites (s. 3.1).

Project design criteria (PDC) were developed to minimize potential impacts to cultural resources. Those criteria outline measures for avoidance of historic properties to mitigate any potential effects to cultural resources. Both action alternatives (Alternative 1 and Alternative 2) are expected to have no, or extremely minor, direct effects on all known cultural resources within the project planning area as long as the PDC are followed. (Section 3.2.2). Cultural resources are generally avoided for all federal undertakings resulting in no cumulative effects (Section 3.2.3).

2.0 – Analysis Framework

The regulatory framework that mandates consideration of the effects of proposed undertakings on cultural resources is wide-ranging. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 (amended in 1976, 1980, and 1992) is the principal legislation that governs the treatment of cultural resources during project planning and implementation. Implementing regulations that clarify and expand upon the NHPA include 36 CFR 800 (Protection of Historic Properties), 36 CFR 63 (Determination of Eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places), and 36 CFR 296 (Protection of Archaeological Resources). The Pacific Northwest Region (Region Six) of the Forest Service, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), and the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) entered into a programmatic agreement (PA) regarding the management of cultural resources on National Forest system lands in 2004. The 2004 PA outlines specific procedures for the identification, evaluation, and protection of cultural resources during undertakings involving the Forest Service. It also establishes the process that SHPO utilizes to review proposed Forest Service actions for NHPA compliance.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires agencies to analyze the effects of their proposed actions on sociocultural elements of the environment. A number of other laws drive Forest Service decision making related to cultural resources. These include the National Forest Management Act (NFMA) of 1976, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) of 1979, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) of 1990, Executive Order 13007 (Indian Sacred Sites), and the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA) of 1978.

2.1 - Resource Indicators and Measures

Cultural resources, are defined in various laws, regulations, executive orders, and guidelines and include:

- Historic properties are any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). This term includes artifacts, records, and remains that are related to and located within such properties. The term eligible for inclusion includes both properties formally determined as such in accordance with regulations and all other properties that meet the National Register criteria (36CFR.800.16).
- Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) include historic properties that are eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places because of their association with the cultural practices or beliefs of a living community that are rooted in that population's history, and are important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the community (Parker and Thomas 1990).
- American Indian Sacred Sites located on federal lands. These may or may not be historic properties (Executive Order 13007).
- Cultural uses of the natural environment along with other culturally valued aspects of the human environment including the built environment and human social institutions.

The principal indicators and measures of effects to cultural resources are natural and cultural impacts to those qualities of historic properties that contribute to its eligibility for inclusion in NRHP. These potential effects primarily relate to a property's integrity. To be considered eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, a resource must possess both significance and integrity according to NHPA definitions. Integrity is the ability of a historic property to convey its significance. For example, an archaeological site considered significant for its information potential under criterion D may not be able to convey that significance if the context of the material remains that compose the site are moved, altered, or destroyed.

Table 1. Resource indicators and measures for assessing effects.

Resource Element	Resource Indicator	Measure	Source
Integrity of Historic property	Observable impacts to integrity (e.g. ground disturbance by heavy machinery during harvest, yarding, and decking operations, felling timber in the vicinity of Culturally Modified Trees (CMTs)	Would impacting integrity of historic properties affect qualities that contribute to eligibility for listing on NRHP?	NHPA, 36 CFR Part 800, 2004 PA Stipulation V. A & B

2.2 - Methodology

A pedestrian archaeological survey was completed for the Grasshopper planning area following the methodology and standards outlined in the current Mt Hood National Forest Cultural Resource Inventory Plan (Burtchard and Keeler 1994). This survey included monitoring of previously recorded archaeological sites within the planning area. All documentation and data related to this field work was incorporated into a Cultural Resource Inventory Report and submitted to SHPO for review and concurrence. This analysis, as well as the formal Section 106 Cultural Resource Inventory Report, were overseen and reviewed by an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s qualifications as required by Federal and Oregon state laws.

3.0 – Analysis of the Alternatives

3.1 – Existing Condition

The Grasshopper Restoration planning area is located near the center of the Barlow Ranger District. It is bordered to the north by the Badger Creek Wilderness; on the east by Forest Road 4880 (just east of the road); and to the west and south by the 2018 Rocky planning area. Prominent creeks within the project area, such as Threemile Creek and Crane Creek, provide water to the communities east and northeast of the project area, such as Wamic and Friend, for domestic and agricultural use.

Ethnographic and historic record research resulted in limited information related to sites and activities specifically in the project area. Fourteen archaeological sites have been recorded within the Grasshopper planning area during the current and previous surveys. The sites related to pre-contact lifeways include a lithic scatter, a stand of culturally modified (peeled) cedars, and rock depressions in a talus field. The majority of sites within the project area relate to

historic period timber harvest or fire support, including springboard and culturally-modified stumps, a fire lookout, and communication lines. Additional historic period sites include a relic trail, camps, and cabins related to irrigation ditch development and logging.

Pre-contact Lifeways

The project planning area is part of the lands ceded to the federal government by the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon (CTWSRO) in the Treaty with the Tribes of Middle Oregon in 1855. The CTWSRO consists of Sahaptin, Upper Chinookan, and Numic speaking people who resided along the Mid-Columbia River and its major southern tributaries during the Contact period. The CTWSRO reserved their right to fish, hunt game, and harvest other foods and materials from these lands.

The Sahaptin speaking people of The Dalles, Wayam, and Tygh Valley (Teninos) had paired summer villages along the banks the Columbia River. These villages served as a regional center of trade. Camps near the headwaters of Badger Creek (northwest of the project area) served as a place of feasting and huckleberry gathering (French et al. 1995: Appendix C). The seasonal round drew parties from the Tenino and Wasco inland to several of the drainages within the project area. Huckleberry, cedar, cottonwood, oak, beargrass, lomatium, camas, game, fish, and toolstone are some of the primary resources likely drawn by these people from the project area. Sites associated with these activities have been documented within the project area.

One bark peeled cedar site has been recorded within the Grasshopper planning area (Forest Service Site Number 661NA656) and consists of three peeled cedars (Western red cedar *Thuja plicata*). Increment core analysis has not yet been conducted. Peeled cedar trees are likely indirect indicators of the location and duration for a particular huckleberry patch (Mack 1995). The bark of cedar trees was often peeled to create baskets for huckleberry picking. Peeled cedar stands of varying sizes are located throughout the Mount Hood National Forest and are regularly in the vicinity of huckleberry patches.

One relatively low-concentration lithic scatter (40 lithics within 6000 m²) has been recorded in the planning area (661MC089), consisting of tools, tool fragments, and debitage. Its proximity to a water source in combination with debitage suggests the site may have been related to hunting and or tool manufacture.

Isolated lithic tools have also been recorded within the Grasshopper project area, suggesting that there may be other undiscovered sites yet recorded, hidden under the duff and ground cover. Rock depressions in a talus field (661NA148) may be associated with communication, drying, or processing resources.

Historic Period

The majority of the logging operations found on the eastside of the Cascade Range and south of the Columbia River Gorge were isolated local consumption operators. The farming communities of Dufur, Maupin, Wasco, Friend, and Wamic were some of the primary customers along with

the large number of farms that surrounded them. These sawmills were largely transitory in nature, relocating roughly once a decade after all the accessible timber in an area was exhausted. Operations were usually seasonal. The labor pool came from the local community; most loggers, sawyers, and engineers were also farmers, stockmen, or teamsters. While records of mills in the project area have yet to be found, nearby mills likely harvested timber from within project area beginning in the early twentieth century. H.D. Langille (1903) described the vegetation in Township 4 South, Range 11 East (added to the land reserve in July of 1901) as:

“In the northwest sections the brush is very dense where old burns have taken place. Logging by means of tram or skid roads would be the most practicable method. A large amount of timber has been culled from this township, but no clean cuttings have been made. Conditions similar to these prevail throughout this range.”

Irrigation ditches were necessary for supplying water to ranches and farms for grazing livestock, domestic uses, orchards, and wheat fields to the east of the project area (Coville 1898). Ditches also powered mills and or supplied some portion of town water supplies. The most prominent of those in the project area, Highland Ditch (661EA302), was initially constructed in 1914, stemming from Badger Creek. Due to comprehensive maintenance and widening over many years, Highland Ditch was determined to have a lack of integrity and therefore not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

The Federal Government began managing the land in the project area in the early twentieth century, resulting in the development and use of structures and communication lines. Constructed in the 1930's, Grasshopper Point Lookout (661EA013) consisted of a tower, a modest house, and a garage. Telephone lines ran east to Rocky Butte Lookout (661EA150) and south to Post Point Lookout (661EA149). The lookout was in operation through the 1950's. Today, there are concrete foundations and burned wood fragments from the tower, and concrete foundations, window glass, ferrous metal fragments, and telephone line where the house once stood. The 1939 General Land Office Plat Map shows a trail extending uphill from Crane Creek to the vicinity of the Grasshopper Point Lookout. Portions of the trail (661EA655) were recorded during survey activities in 2019.

Additional historic sites include two cabin sites (661EA222 and 661MC089) and two camps (661EA245 and 661EA680) likely related to twentieth century logging and irrigation. Integrity of those sites has diminished over time due to natural and cultural impacts. While some significant historic properties have been recorded within the project area, there is potential that additional sites would be discovered and recorded after project activities have reduced ground cover and increased surface visibility.

3.1.1 - Integrity of Historic Properties

The resource element used in analyzing the effects of the proposed alternatives on historic properties is the assessment of natural and cultural impacts to those qualities of historic properties that contribute to eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places

(NRHP). The affected resources to be measured are the historic properties located within the area of potential effect, or planning area. Analysis methods are directed by Section 106 of NHPA and its implementing regulation 36 CFR part 800. Section 106 directs all agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings (actions) on historic properties included on, eligible or potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP.

3.2 – Direct and Indirect Effects

3.2.1 – No Action

If no action is taken, changes to the existing conditions over time have the potential to lead to indirect effects to historic properties. Fuel loads would likely increase across the landscape contributing to increased potential for severe wildfire. Severe uncontrolled wildfire would negatively impact the long-term stability of historic properties. Possible effects include loss of perishable artifacts and features, increased erosion and bioturbation, increased tree mortality, and greater resource visibility which increases the possibility of looting. These effects have the potential to alter, destroy, relocate, remove, and otherwise negatively affect historic properties. The dense vegetation found in the existing conditions also depresses productivity and limits access to areas that support culturally significant plants.

3.2.2 - Action Alternatives

Both action alternatives (Alternative 1 and Alternative 2) are expected to have no, or extremely minor, direct effects on all known cultural resources within the project planning area as long as PDC are followed. In most cases, eligible or unevaluated sites would be avoided or properly mitigated throughout the lifetime of any of the proposed actions.

The action alternatives have the potential to cause direct effects on undiscovered cultural resources. This possibility however is limited by PDC that calls for an immediate halt to project work and notification of the East Zone Archaeologist should an inadvertent discovery of cultural resources be made. The cultural resource would be evaluated, and, if necessary, a mitigation plan developed in consultation with SHPO. Prescribed fire treatment specifically has the potential to cause direct effects on undiscovered cultural resources without the option to immediately halt project work; however, considering standard pedestrian survey has been conducted throughout the majority of the treatment area, likelihood of impacts to undiscovered cultural resources is greatly reduced. In most cases, these effects, should they occur, would be minor and unlikely to cause a substantial impact.

An indirect effect may result from the reduction of vegetation as proposed by the action alternatives that happen to coincide with archaeological sites. This would reduce the potential effects of wildfire on archaeological and historic resources within the project area and enhance their long-term stability and integrity.

3.2.3 – Direct and Indirect Effects of Treatment in Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRA)

Treatments in IRA are expected to have no, or extremely minor, direct effects on all known cultural resources within the project planning area as long as the projects' design criteria are followed. There are no known cultural resources within IRA in the project area.

Treatments in IRA have the potential to cause direct effects on undiscovered cultural resources. This possibility however is addressed in the PDC that calls for an immediate halt to project work and notification of the East Zone Archaeologist should an inadvertent discovery of cultural resources be made. The cultural resource would be evaluated, and, if necessary, a mitigation plan developed in consultation with SHPO. In most cases, these effects, should they occur, would be minor and unlikely to cause an impact.

3.2.4 - Cumulative Effects

Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Activities Relevant to Cumulative Effects Analysis

For cultural resources, any effects are limited to site-specific locations. Any cumulative effects would also be limited to cultural resources located within proposed areas of ground disturbance. The PDC for the action alternatives would result in no direct or indirect effects to known cultural resources. Effects to undiscovered cultural resources would be minor and, once known, would be protected from further impacts. For cumulative effects, six previous projects and their related cultural resource inventory reports were considered. Avoidance was used to mitigate any possible effects to cultural resources in all six projects. Cultural resources are generally avoided for all federal undertakings with no cumulative effects. Because this project would have no effect on cultural resources eligible for the NRHP and none of the projects considered for potential cumulative effects affected cultural resources, there would be no cumulative effects to cultural resources as a result of implementing either action alternative.

3.3 - Management Direction

This action is consistent with Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines for protection of cultural resources. Cultural resource inventories were conducted in compliance with the 2004 Programmatic Agreement during the project planning stage (FW-598, FW-600, FW-610, FW-602 and FW-606), the field survey results were fully documented (FS-608), and the potential effects to cultural resources from the proposed projects were assessed (FW-609, FW-610). Cultural resources potentially affected by proposed project activities were evaluated for inclusion on the NRHP (FW-612). All records and documents concerning cultural resources for the project are kept on file at the Hood River Ranger District, Mt. Hood National Forest (FW-626).

The proposed project would not impact any historic properties. Based on the proposed protective measures, the project meets the criteria in the Programmatic Agreement for "No Historic Properties Adversely Affected" determination (Stipulation III (B) 4). This documentation meets the requirements of NEPA to consider cultural resources (40 CFR 1502.16 [g]) early in the planning process (40 CFR 1501.1).

All documentation and data related to this field work were incorporated into a Cultural Resource Inventory Report which was submitted to the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon (CTWSRO) Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO) and the Oregon Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) for review and concurrence. The THPO concurred on August 7, 2020 with the finding of *No Historic Properties Affected* within the Project Area of Potential Effects (APE). SHPO concurred on August 26, 2020 with the finding of *no effect* on any significant archaeological objects or sites (SHPO Case No. 20-1055).

3.4 – Summary of Effects

The proposed actions will have no adverse effect to historic properties. Project design criteria were developed to prevent, eliminate, or mitigate any adverse effect. If no action is taken, changes to the existing conditions over time have the potential to lead to direct or indirect effects, particularly severe wild fire, to historic properties.

3.5 - Other Agencies and Individuals Consulted

All documentation and data related to field work completed in this analysis were incorporated into a Cultural Resource Inventory Report which was submitted to the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon (CTWSRO) Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO) and the Oregon Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) for review and concurrence.

4.0 - References Cited

Burtchard, Greg C. and Robert W. Keeler. 1994. "Mt. Hood Cultural Resource Reevaluation Project: A Consideration of Prehistoric and Historic Land-Use and Cultural Resource Survey Design Reevaluation." Report completed under contract for USDA Forest Service. Laboratory of Archaeology and Anthropology, Portland State University. (Cited in text as (Burtchard and Keeler 1994))

Campbell, William E. 1898. "Map-Township No. 2 North Range No. 8 East of the Willamette Meridian Oregon." Surveyor General's Office, Portland Oregon. (Cited in text as (Campbell 1898a))

Campbell, William E. 1898. "Survey Notes-Township No. 2 North Range No. 8 East of the Willamette Meridian Oregon." Surveyor General's Office, Portland Oregon. (Cited in text as (Campbell 1898b))

Coville, Frederick V. 1898. "Forest Growth and Sheep Grazing in the Cascade Mountains of Oregon." Bulletin No. 15. United States Department of Agriculture, Division of Forestry. (Cited in text as (Coville 1898))

French, Kathrine, Yvonne Hajda, Robert Moore, David Ellis, and John Fagan. 1995. "An Ethnographic Study of the Mt. Hood National Forest, Oregon." Report completed under contract

for USDA Forest Service. Archaeological Investigation Northwest Inc. Gresham, Oregon. Report No. 86. (Cited in text as (French et al. 1995))

French, David H. and Kathrine S. French. 1998. "Wasco, Wishram, and Cascades." in Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 12: Plateau. Edited by Deward E. Walker Jr. Smithsonian Institution, Washington. (Cited in text as (French and French 1998))

Kappler, Charles J. 1904. "Indian Affairs. Laws and Treaties. Vol. II (Treaties.)" Compiled and Edited by Charles J. Kappler, LL. M, Clerk to the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs. Government Printing Office. (Cited in text as (Kappler 1904))

Langille, H.D. et al. 1903. "Forest Conditions in the Cascade Range Forest Reserve, Oregon." Professional Paper No. 9, Plate VI, Department of Interior, United States Geological Survey.

Mack, Cheryl. 1995. "A Summary of Archaeological Data Recovery at Twenty-Four Culturally Modified Tree Sites on the Gifford Pinchot National Forest." U.S. Forest Service, Gifford Pinchot National Forest, Mt Adams Ranger District. (Cited in text as (Mack 1995))

Murdock, George Peter. 1980. "The Tenino Indians." *Ethnology*, Vol. 9, No. 2. University of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Spier, Leslie and Edward Sapir. 1930. "Wishram Ethnography." University of Washington Press. (Cited in text as (Spier and Sapir 1930))

USDA Forest Service. 1943. "Timber Management Atlas, Mount Hood National Forest." On file Hood River Ranger District. (Cited in text as (USDA 1943))

USDA Forest Service, R6. 2004. Programmatic Agreement among the United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service Pacific Northwest Region (Region 6), the Advisory Council On Historic Preservation, and the Oregon State Historical Preservation Officer regarding Cultural Resources Management in the State of Oregon by the USDA Forest Service.