
**EDDY GULCH LATE-SUCCESSIONAL RESERVE
FUELS / HABITAT PROTECTION PROJECT**

HERITAGE RESOURCE REPORT

Prepared by Candice Cook-Slette

May 1, 2009

Contents

Heritage Resource Report.....	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.1.1 Regulatory Framework.....	1
1.1.2 Methodology.....	1
1.1.3 Existing Conditions	3
1.1.4 Environmental Consequences for Heritage Resources	3

Heritage Resource Report

1.1 Introduction

Archaeological sites, historic buildings, structures, and objects are the fabric of our national heritage. Collectively known as heritage or cultural resources, they are our tangible links with the past. The Klamath National Forest is responsible for, and committed to, protecting and managing these important resources in a spirit of stewardship for future generations to understand and enjoy.

1.1.1 Regulatory Framework

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) sets forth a framework for identifying and evaluating historic properties and assessing effects on these properties. The Cultural Resource Compliance Process, mandated by 36 CFR Part 800 of Section 106 of the NHPA, requires special review of undertakings that could affect properties included or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. The Klamath National Forest uses a programmatic agreement between Region 5 of the U.S. Forest Service, the California State Historic Preservation Office, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to implement the Section 106 process.

1.1.2 Methodology

1.1.2.1 Analysis Methods and Assumptions

Heritage Survey Strategy

A heritage survey strategy was developed based on pre-field information referencing existing literature, maps, oral histories, and tribal consultation. The need for and intensity of survey was influenced by previous reconnaissance efforts, known cultural resources, and the potential for locating heritage resources within the APE. Based on these factors, areas proposed for treatment were rated as having a high, moderate or low potential for heritage resources. A complete description of survey methods and routes is contained in the Heritage Resource Report, which is incorporated by reference and included in the project files.

High potential for historic properties

- Rivers, streams, and springs. These sites have significantly influenced areas of habitation and subsistence or have been used for purposes of resource extraction. Native Americans performed seasonal rounds into the mountains to hunt and gather acorns and vegetal materials. Areas yielding acorns and in close proximity to a water source often show signs of use. Mining activities, particularly hydraulic mining along rivers or confluences, subsequently affected many Native American villages.
- Areas of known mining activity. These were often near rivers due to the reliance on water for mining, and the location of gold-bearing gravels along streams. Peripheral to the primary mine location are often secondary activity areas, which may include water ditches, ditch tender cabins, and holding ponds.
- Major ridgelines, geologic, or landscape features. These types of areas were often used for transportation, vision quests, or spiritual purposes.

- The Deacon Lee Trail. This trail was a major route for transporting supplies and heavy equipment to the Black Bear Mine.

These sites and activity areas received an intensive survey.

Medium potential for historic properties

- Ridgelines not identified as high potential for historic properties. These ridges are not currently documented as major travel corridors for either American Indians or miners.
- Slopes over 35 percent. Steeper slopes may not reveal Native American use, but that does not preclude the potential to locate landscape features that may be significant.
- Sites associated with mining, including water ditches, flumes, holding ponds, or adits.
- Areas previously surveyed.

These sites and activity areas received a general survey.

Low potential for historic properties

- Areas that have not yielded information of past historic use or have low potential to contain historic information based on pre-field information. These areas may include side slopes 30 over 40 percent or areas that have been heavily disturbed.
- Designated road systems and steep slopes or highly disturbed areas.

These areas either received a cursory survey or were not surveyed.

Archaeological field inventories were conducted in the Project Area and are recorded in Archeological Reconnaissance Report ARR#2008050517270.

1.1.2.2 Scope of the Analysis

Geographic Boundary for the Analysis

The Area of Potential Effect (APE) is the Eddy Gulch LSR Project Assessment Area.

Time Frame Boundary

The timeframe for cumulative effects is considered to be 20 years.

1.1.2.3 Measurement Indicators

The indicator is the number of sites adversely affected by proposed treatments and activities.

1.1.2.4 Definitions of Terms Used in this Resource Section

Heritage Resources — The full realm of archaeological, cultural, and historical legacies from our past that are more than 50 years old.

Historic Resources — Historic-era artifacts occurring in sufficient quantity, complexity, and/or groupings of artifacts and historic features/properties that are in excess of 50 years old.

1.1.3 Existing Conditions

Topographic conditions and water sources in the Assessment Area have significantly influenced land use of Native Americans and, to a large extent, Euro-Americans. In general, human use in the Assessment Area follows similar patterns of habitation and resource use, so historic and archaeological sites often overlap each other.

1.1.3.1 American Indian Resources

American Indians resided in the Salmon River drainage for thousands of years prior to contact with Europeans. Areas that sustained American Indian use generally are located within deep canyons adjacent to the Salmon River and secondary streams. These are the areas most likely to contain American Indian cultural resources. Currently, Indian use of the Assessment Area is very low; only one prehistoric site has been recorded. No sacred/spiritual-use sites or traditional plant-gathering sites have been documented.

Members of the Shasta and Karuk tribes continue to be an integral part of communities along the Salmon River and its tributaries. They use the area for gathering of traditional materials and foods, including beargrass, willows, fish, acorns, and mushrooms. Throughout their history, American Indians have utilized fire to enhance conditions for traditional materials; however, this practice is not currently being implemented in the Eddy Gulch area.

1.1.3.2 Historic Resources

Historic resources include trails, mining sites, logging camps, communities, isolated structures, and artifact scatters. Portions of the Live Yankee Gulch and Eddy Gulch watersheds are part of a historic mining district, with numerous mining-related artifacts and sites. Twenty-three historic properties related to mining or other historic uses have been recorded for the APE and were visited. Two sites could not be relocated, and one no longer exists. One site (White's Gulch Arrastra) is on the National Register of Historic Places. No determinations have been made on the other sites.

1.1.4 Environmental Consequences for Heritage Resources

1.1.4.1 Alternative A: No Action

Direct and Indirect Effects. Direct effects include scorching or loss of resources during a wildfire. Depending on fuel moistures, wooden structures or artifacts can be adversely affected or lost even from a relatively low-intensity surface fire. High intensity fire can split stone artifacts (such as those made with obsidian). High temperatures can melt solder in cans and other artifacts. Indirect effects include ongoing deterioration of historic artifacts from weathering, which will occur under any alternative.

Under the no action alternative, fuel levels would support active or passive crown fire over most of the landscape. The high temperatures associated with crown fire would adversely affect historic resources within the fire perimeter. Depending on fire location, this alternative could result in a loss of one structure, loss of wooden artifacts on two other sites, and impacts to the prehistoric site. Stone and metal artifacts would be affected but not lost.

Cumulative Effects. There are no other proposed actions for this area that would affect heritage resources. There are no projected cumulative effects.

Conclusion. The risk of impacting heritage resources is highest under this alternative due to the potential for crown fire throughout most of the APE.

1.1.4.2 Alternative B: Proposed Action

Direct Effects. Direct effects include physical disturbance of heritage resources through site disturbance (road construction), and impacts to or loss of resources to fire during prescribed burns or wildfire. Resource Protection Measures (RPMs) would be implemented on three properties within fuel treatment areas. Properties would be pretreated (such as with hand line and removal of fuels within property boundaries) prior to implementation of fuels reduction activities, which would ensure that they are not burned over or otherwise damaged. No properties are within the alignment of temporary roads or logging access routes; these activities would not affect heritage resources.

Indirect Effects. There are no recorded sites along proposed new road alignments; therefore, there will be no indirect effects from road construction.

Under this alternative, wildfire would burn fewer acres at a lower intensity than under No Action, so there is less risk of losing historic artifacts. Pretreatment of sites should also provide some measure of protection against low intensity wildfire. Indirect effects include ongoing deterioration of historic artifacts from weathering, which will occur under any alternative.

Cumulative Effects. There are no other proposed actions for this area that would affect heritage resources. There are no projected cumulative effects.

Conclusion. Fuels treatments would reduce fire behavior and rate of spread, which would reduce the risk of a heritage site being burned. Pretreatment of three sites will provide some protection against wildfire effects. Improvement and decommissioning of temporary roads and logging access routes would have no impact on heritage resources.

1.1.4.3 Alternative C: Proposed Action without Temporary Roads

Direct and Indirect Effects. Direct and indirect effects are similar to Alternative B.

Cumulative Effects. There are no other proposed actions for this area that would affect heritage resources. There are no projected cumulative effects.

Conclusion. Effects are similar to those listed for Alternative B.