



United States Department of Agriculture
Forest Service

Waucoma

Huckleberry Enhancement

Heritage Report

Prepared by:
Trent M. Skinner
Archaeologist

Hood River Ranger District
Mt. Hood National Forest

05/20/2019 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 Waucoma Huckleberry Enhancement Project on cultural resources. Analysis of effects focused on the identification, documentation, and evaluation of two primary types of resources: precontact and historic period archaeological sites. Places that may support resources of contemporary tribal or public interest, (i.e. culturally significant plant locations), were also considered. Project design criteria were developed to minimize potential impacts to these resources. The proposed action will have no adverse effect to historic properties.

2.0 – Regulatory 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 principle 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. 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 CMTs)	Would impacting integrity of historic properties effecting 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 Waucoma 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 include monitoring of previously recorded archaeological sites within the planning area. All documentation and data related to this field work is being incorporated into a Cultural Resource Inventory Report and will be submitted to SHPO for review and concurrence. This analysis, as well as the formal Section 106 report, were completed by an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s qualifications as required by Federal and Oregon state laws.

3.0 – Analysis of the Proposed Action

3.1 – Existing Condition

The Waucoma planning area is located along the eastern crest of the Cascade Range, just south of the Columbia River. The Hood River Valley is found to the east and a prominent north-to-south trending ridge immediately to the west. This ridgeline and others feed directly into the planning area from lower elevations near the Columbia River and the communities of Cascade Locks and Hood River. The proximity to these communities and the area's abundant upland resources, such as timber, game, berries-principally huckleberry, bear grass, and cedar, have likely drawn people to the Waucoma planning area for millennia.

Previous surveys recorded twenty-one archaeological sites within the Waucoma planning area. The majority, twelve, relate to early twentieth century timber harvesting. Additional historic period sites include two recreation related relic trails, and one communication line once used by Forest Service administration for fire support. The remaining six sites relate to precontact lifeways and include several stands of bark peeled cedar and stacked rock features.

Archaeological sites related to timber harvesting form the dominant site type within the planning area. The Davenport Bros. and later Stanley-Smith Lumber Companies extracted roughly seventy percent of the merchantable timber from the planning area between 1901 and 1916 (USDA 1943). The companies employed a unique logging system to clear cut the land. A flume four foot deep and five foot wide extended for six miles into the planning area from the Green Point Mill, which is now site of the Kingsley Reservoir. A series of large donkey engines would drag felled trees to the side of the flume where they were sawed into proper lengths before traveling to the log pond of the Green Point Mill. Once cut, the lumber journeyed down another nine mile flume to the company's planning mill and wholesale yards at Belmont and Ruthton (Hood 1913).

The Stanley-Smith Lumber Company operated three logging camps within the project area. These were spread out along the six-mile length of the log flume, and include Camp #1 in the east, Camp #2 (666EA070), which was later known as Camp #4, midway through the planning area, and Camp #3 in the west (666EA073). Log ponds were constructed near each camp to ease handling of the logs and contribute to the water supply needed to operate the flume.

The Stanley-Smith Lumber Company's flume and canal system (Forest Service Site number 666EA071) drew water from a smaller series of ditches and flumes originating at Black, Rainy (666EA038), and North Lakes (666EA066). To prolong the flow of water and lengthen the logging season, a stacked rock dam was built at Black Lake which raised the water level by several feet (666EA038). By 1920, the Stanley-Smith Lumber Company

Forest Service administration focused on areas just west of Waucoma during the first two decades of the twentieth century. By 1911, a guard station was established near Rainy Lake. A fire lookout was also established on Mt. Defiance some time during this same period, and a communications line (666EA 068) ran from it back to the Rainy Lake Guard Station. Large

portions of the planning area were transferred under Forest Service control through a land exchange in 1927 (USDA 1943). Administration primarily fell to the Columbia Gorge Ranger District. During the 1930s, several thousand sheep grazed in the planning area each year. By the late 1930s, recreational infrastructure was improved at Black and Rainy Lakes. By 1943, the units clear cut by the Stanley-Smith Lumber Company were largely covered with Douglas-fir saplings. Additional logging followed in the planning area during the second half of the twentieth century (USDA 1943).

The Upper Chinook speaking Hood River Wasco and Cascade people were the principle users of the planning during the early contact period, and likely for millennia prior (Spier and Sapir 1930: 153-173). Their descendants largely belong to the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon (CTWSRO). The CTWSRO were formed under the Treaty with the Tribes of Middle Oregon in 1855 and consist of Sahaptin, Upper Chinook, and Numic speaking people who resided along the Mid-Columbia River and its major southern tributaries during the contact period. Prior to European contact, a well-established trail followed the ridgeline running north-to-south along the planning area's western boundary from village sites in the area of Cascade Locks to Lost Lake (Campbell 1898a). The entire planning area is located within lands ceded to the federal government by the CTWSRO in the treaty of 1855. However, the Warm Springs tribes reserved their right to fish, hunt game, gather roots and berries, and harvest other foods and materials from these usual and accustomed lands (Kappler 1904: 714).

A variety of ethnographic, ethnohistoric, and archaeological data suggest the planning area was a particularly important source of huckleberry. Ethnohistorical material consists of numerous records, reports, newspaper articles, and journals written for reasons other than purposefully documenting aboriginal lifeways. Langille (1903) for example recorded in his forest conditions report for parts of the planning area that:

"On the divide between Hermann and Green Point Creeks there is an old burn now partly restocked and overgrown with huckleberry bushes. Formerly this was a favorite haunt of the Indians, but the white man's fires have blocked their trails, and their visits have discontinued."

The map accompanying Langille's 1903 report places this old burn scar partially within the planning area. Just a few years prior to this, William Campbell (1898b) reported passing through huckleberry picking camps in the vicinity of Black Lake during his General Land Office (GLO) survey of the area.

Ethnohistorical sources also demonstrate that berries, both wild and cultivated, remained an important agricultural resource in the Hood River Valley during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Members of the CTWSRO played an important role in their harvest:

"Indians come to the berry fields year after year from the Warm Springs and Yakima reservations and from Celilo...the number of Indian berry harvesters have been dwindling for some unknown reason during the past several years. In former years the tribesmen visited the valley 500 strong. The Indian dances, given in a

huge fir and pine grove west of the city, were an event of the berry harvest time. The last big dance was given in 1911.” - (Hood 1916).

Several ethnographic studies were completed over the last century that speak directly to huckleberry gathering within the planning area. Each study consulted with aboriginal informants to expand our knowledge of precontact lifeways. An ethnographic study was completed for the Mt. Hood National Forest in 1995. In it, the vicinity of Waucoma Ridge, to include a large portion of the planning area, was identified as one of ten important upland resources areas found on the forest (French et al. 1995). In his discussion of the Hood River Wasco and Cascade people Suphan (1974: 37) reported:

“Berry and nut gathering, done chiefly in the fall, took them to the ridges lying south of the Columbia and north of Mt. Hood...Access was by way of Hood River Valley or up Herman Creek. There along Waucoma Ridge at Rainy Lake, Green Point Mountain, Wahtum Lake, Indian Mountain, and Lost Lake, blackberries, huckleberries, salmonberries, cranberries, and hazel nuts were gathered.”

Peeled cedar trees are likely indirect indicators of the location and duration for a particular huckleberry patch (Mach 1995). The bark of cedar trees was often peeled to create baskets for huckleberry picking. Stands of peeled cedars are located throughout the Mount Hood National Forest. The largest site recorded to date (35HR31, Forest Service Site Number 666NA067) is located within the Waucoma planning area and contains more than fifty peeled cedars (both Western Redcedar *Thuja plicata* and Yellow Cedar *Callitropsis nootkatensis*). Increment core analysis established a data range of 1833 to 1950 for the peel scars of these cedar trees. The planning area is also located near the greatest concentration of peeled cedar sites on the forest. Site 35HR31 is located along the eastern boundary of this concentration, with other sites documented near Black, North, and Rainy Lakes both inside and east of the planning area (35HR27, 35HR29, 35HR30, 35HR31, 35HR32, 35HR51, 666NA032, 666NA109, and 666NA169). Additional sites are found near Wathum and Ottertall lakes in the south (35HR24 and 35HR25).

3.1.1 - Resource Indicator and Measure

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 – Proposed Action Environmental Consequences

If no action is taken under the proposed project, 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 depress productivity and limits access to areas that support culturally significant plants.

3.2.1 - Direct and Indirect Effects of Proposed Action

The proposed action is 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. In most cases, eligible or unevaluated sites would be avoided or properly mitigated throughout the lifetime of any of the proposed actions

The proposed action has the potential to cause direct effects on undiscovered cultural resources. This possibility however is addressed in the project design criteria 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 a significant impact.

The habitat and access to plants that are of cultural importance would experience both direct and indirect effects from the proposed action. Huckleberry and other vegetation of cultural importance would experience long term benefits because of the reduction in competing vegetation and cover. Reduced vegetation and cover would also allow for greater access to areas that support culturally important plant communities.

An additional indirect effect may result by reducing the accumulations of fuels through the proposed action. This would reduce the severity of potential wildfires and enhance the long term stability of archaeological and historic resources within the planning area.

3.2.2 - 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 project design criteria for the proposed action would result in no direct or indirect effects to cultural resources. For cumulative effects, four previous projects and their

related cultural resource inventory reports were considered. Avoidance was used to mitigate any possible effects to cultural resources in all four projects. Cultural resources are generally avoided for all federal undertakings with no cumulative effects. Because this project would have no effect on heritage 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 heritage resources as a result of implementing the proposed action.

3.3 - Consistency with Management Direction

This action is consistent with Forest Plan goals to protect important cultural resources. Cultural resource inventories were conducted in compliance with the 2004 PA 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 heritage 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 heritage 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 significant heritage resources. 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).

3.4 – Summary of Effects

The proposed action 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 to historic properties, particularly severe wild fire.

3.5 - Other Agencies and Individuals Consulted

All documentation and data related to field work complete in this analysis is being incorporated into a Cultural Resource Inventory Report and will be submitted to Oregon 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))

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))

Hood River Glacier. 1913. August 14. "Busy Scenes at Lumber Camp: Green Point Mill is Active." (Cited in text as (Hood 1913))

Hood River Glacier. 1916. June 15. "Berry Harvest is Under Way." (Cited in text as (Hood 1916))

Hood River Glacier. 1920. June 24. "Indications Good for Huckleberries." (Cited in text as (Hood 1920))

Hood River Glacier. 1922. August 10. "Indians Harvest Huckleberries." (Cited in text as (Hood 1922))

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)).

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))

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))