

# Goal 4

## Protect and enhance cultural resources

Cultural resources are the evidence of past human activities that are important in history, archaeology, architecture or culture of a community or region. A rich and diverse array of cultural resources exist in the gorge, ranging from 10,000-year-old stone tools to log cabins built by pioneers to vision quest sites still used today by Native Americans. The objectives were written to encompass the three groups of cultural resources, as defined below. For each objective, measures were created to monitor the general conditions, inventory existing information and to facilitate future surveys for public and stakeholder awareness.

### Objectives:

#### **4.1 PROTECT AND ENHANCE SIGNIFICANT ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

The physical remains or ruins of past generations, such as the remains of a rock shelter, an Indian village, or a pioneer settlement. Other examples include petroglyphs, graves, and artifacts like arrowheads and utensils.

#### **4.2 PROTECT AND ENHANCE SIGNIFICANT HISTORIC RESOURCES**

Standing buildings and structures that are at least 50 years old, including log cabins, barns, highways and wagon trails.

#### **4.3 PROTECT AND ENHANCE SIGNIFICANT TRADITIONAL CULTURAL PROPERTIES**

Objects and places associated with beliefs and practices of a living community that are rooted in that community's history and are important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the community. Traditional cultural properties may include a location used by past and present generations of Native Americans for ceremonial purposes or an area where a community has traditionally conducted culturally important economic or artistic activities.

**Objective:** Protect and Enhance Significant Archaeological Resources

**Vital Sign Number:** 4.1.a

**Vital Sign Title:** Condition

**Vital Sign Measure:** Percent of all monitored archaeological sites in good condition.

**Proxy Measure:** Percent of assessments of effect<sup>15</sup> per year resulting in an adverse effect finding.

**What We Know:**

No assessments of effect resulted in an adverse effect finding in 2007 and 2008.

<b>Number of Assessments of Effect on Significant Archeological Resources Conducted</b>		
	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>
Adverse Effect – no resolution	0	0
Adverse Effect – resolved through mitigation	0	0
No Adverse Effect <sup>16</sup>	1	16
No Effect <sup>17</sup>	0	2
<b>Total Assessments</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>18</b>

<b>Percent Resulting in an Adverse Effect Finding</b>	0	0
---	---	---

**Assessment:**

Archaeological resources are physical evidence of past human activity that is an important part of the history of the region. In order to measure the health of archaeological resources in the Scenic Area, one has to know their condition and the change in their condition over time. This indicator was intended to track the physical condition of archaeological resources in the Scenic Area.

Currently, no standard rating of condition is applied to cultural resources in the gorge. Other than “no adverse effect,” staff and project advisers could not reach consensus on a definition of “good condition” for cultural resources. For this reason, the proxy of assessment of effect of proposed developments was used.

An assessment of effect occurs if a proposed land use could potentially affect a significant cultural resource. The assessment determines whether the use would: 1) adversely affect the resource with no way to resolve; 2) adversely affect the resource but with resolution through mitigation; 3) insignificantly affect the resource or 4) have no effect at all. A proposed use is considered to have an adverse effect on a cultural resource when it would alter or destroy characteristics that make the resource significant. Assessments of effect also are conducted when an action, other than a proposed land use, is thought to have had an effect on a cultural resource (e.g. unpermitted construction, train derailment). The table above shows that none (0%) of the assessments of effect conducted in 2007 and 2008 indicated an adverse result would occur from development or other actions.

<sup>15</sup> The number of assessments of effect conducted each year is driven by new project applications. The number and type of applications can vary widely from year to year.

<sup>16</sup> No adverse effect means that the action had some effect on the resource, but that it was not significant.

<sup>17</sup> No effect means that the action had no effect on the resource.

For future reports, staff hopes to develop a comprehensive monitoring program that tracks the condition of an established set of archaeological resources. This program would be developed using a peer review group that includes cultural resource professionals.



Brian Litt

**Objective:** Protect and Enhance Significant Archaeological Resources

**Vital Sign Number:** 4.1.d

**Vital Sign Title:** Inventory

**Vital Sign Measure:** Number of new significant archaeological resources identified each year.

**What We Know:**

An average of five new significant archaeological resources is identified each year.

<b>Inventory of Significant Archaeological Resources</b>		
	<b>1988</b>	<b>2008</b>
Sites Listed in the National Register of Historic Places	2	3
Sites Eligible for Listing on the National Register of Historic Places	14	117
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>120</b>

**Assessment:**

Archaeological resources are physical evidence of past human activity that is an important part of the history of the region. Archaeological resources cannot be protected without knowing where they are and what they are. This indicator tracks the growing inventory of archaeological resources that provides the basis for protection.

Sites are considered significant if they are either listed on the National Register of Historic Places or eligible for listing. Between 1988 and 2008, 104 significant sites were identified. The number of sites identified per year is not available for past data but the average is approximately five per year.

In 1988, the first inventory of archaeological resources in the Scenic Area was compiled. The 1988 inventory includes fourteen archaeological sites that contribute to an archaeological district on the National Register and two other sites that are individually listed on the National Register. Since 1988, one additional archaeological resource has been included on the National Register of Historic Places and 103 additional archaeological resources have been identified as eligible for inclusion on the register. Significant archaeological resources include village sites, burial sites, rock features, petroglyphs, and pictographs. Archaeological resources are identified primarily during the development review process when reconnaissance surveys are required for most development proposals involving ground disturbance and for all proposed uses within 500 feet of a known cultural resource.

**Objective:** Protect and Enhance Significant Historic Resources

**Vital Sign Number:** 4.2.a

**Vital Sign Title:** Condition

**Vital Sign Measure:** Percent of all monitored historic resources in good condition.

**Proxy Measure:** Percent of assessments of effect per year resulting in an adverse effect finding.

**What We Know:**

No assessments of effect resulted in an adverse effect finding in 2007 and 2008.

<b>Number of Assessments of Effect on Significant Historic Resources Conducted</b>		
	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>
Adverse Effect – no resolution	0	0
Adverse Effect – resolved through mitigation	0	2
No Adverse Effect	4	9
No Effect	2	3
<b>Total Assessments</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>14</b>

  

<b>Percent Resulting in an Adverse Effect Finding</b>	0	0
---	---	---

**Assessment:**

Historic resources provide physical evidence of the history of past generations and architecture of the Scenic Area. Loss or deterioration of historic resources diminishes our connection to the past. This indicator was intended to measure the condition of historic resources in the Scenic Area and the change in their condition over time.

Currently, no standard rating of condition is applied to cultural resources in the gorge. Other than “no adverse effect,” staff and project advisers could not reach consensus on a definition of “good condition” for cultural resources. For this reason, the proxy of assessment of effect of proposed developments was used.

An assessment of effect occurs if a proposed land use could potentially affect a significant cultural resource. The assessment determines whether the use would: 1) adversely affect the resource with no way to resolve; 2) adversely affect the resource but with resolution through mitigation; 3) insignificantly affect the resource or 4) have no effect at all. A proposed use is considered to have an adverse effect on a cultural resource when it would alter or destroy characteristics that make the resource significant. Assessments of effect also are conducted when an action, other than a proposed land use, is thought to have had an effect on a cultural resource (e.g. unpermitted construction). The table above shows that none (0%) of the assessments of effect conducted in 2007 and 2008 indicated an adverse result would occur from development or other actions.

For future reports, staff hopes to develop a comprehensive monitoring program that tracks the condition of an established set of historic resources. This program would be developed using a peer review group that includes cultural resource professionals.

**Objective:** Protect and Enhance Significant Historic Resources

**Vital Sign Number:** 4.2.d

**Vital Sign Title:** Inventory

**Vital Sign Measure:** Number of new significant historic resources identified each year.

**What We Know:**

An average of three new significant historic resources is identified each year.

<b>Inventory of Significant Historic Resources</b>		
	<b>1988</b>	<b>2008</b>
Sites Listed on the National Register of Historic Places	35	40
Sites Eligible for Listing on the National Register of Historic Places	0	61
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>101</b>

**Assessment:**

Historic resources provide physical evidence of the history of past generations and architecture of the Scenic Area. Historic resources cannot be protected without knowing where they are and what they are. This indicator tracks the growing inventory of historic resources that provides the basis for protection.

Sites are considered significant if they are either listed on the National Register of Historic Places or eligible for listing. Between 1988 and 2008, 66 significant sites were identified. The number of sites identified per year is not available for past data, but the average is approximately three per year.

In 1988 the first inventory of historic resources in the Scenic Area was compiled. Since 1988, five historic resources have been included on the National Register of Historic Places and 61 historic resources have been identified as eligible for inclusion on the register. They include standing structures and buildings that are at least 50 years old, such as cabins, homes, barns, roads, bridges, and tunnels. Historic resources are identified primarily during the development review process when historic surveys are required for developments that would alter the exterior of buildings and structures that are at least 50 years old, or that would compromise features of the surrounding area that define the historic or architectural character of such buildings or structures.

## Cultural Chapter Endnotes:

### 4.1.a Condition

Source: Margaret L. Dryden, Heritage Resources Program Manager, Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, USDA Forest Service.

While no comprehensive monitoring program in the Scenic Area to track the condition of archaeological resources exists, several on-going monitoring efforts include: checking known cultural resources, primarily on Forest Service lands, to determine if any change in conditions has occurred; checking known sites on private lands to assess compliance with conditions of a land use decision; monitoring of known sites with critical issues on Forest Service lands; monitoring during construction in cases of deep excavation; monitoring pictographs as part of a 50-year study for the Forest Service; and monitoring known cultural resource sites along the shorelines of the Columbia River by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers as part of the Bonneville and The Dalles Dam projects.

### 4.1.d Inventory

Source: Margaret L. Dryden, Heritage Resources Program Manager, Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, USDA Forest Service

Notes: 1) archaeological sites listed on the National Register of Historic Places as part of an historic district also can be listed individually, 2) the Forest Service database of known archaeological resources includes sites that have not been evaluated for eligibility on the National Register of Historic Places. Sites that have not been evaluated are not included in this inventory of significant sites and 3) Data is reported by federal fiscal year. The inventory includes the number of resources identified *through* 1988 and 2008 respectively.

### 4.2.a Condition

Source: Margaret L. Dryden, Heritage Resources Program Manager, Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, USDA Forest Service.

Note: The demolition of an historic structure can be assessed as “no adverse effect” if the structure’s significant features and historical importance are carefully documented prior to its demolition. In this sense, an assessment of effect does not provide a comprehensive evaluation of the *condition* of the resource.

### 4.2.d Inventory

Source: Margaret L. Dryden, Heritage Resources Program Manager, Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, USDA Forest Service.

Notes: 1) The Forest Service database of known historic resources includes sites that have not been evaluated for eligibility on the National Register of Historic Places. Sites that have not been evaluated are not included in this inventory of significant resources and 2) Data is reported by federal fiscal year. The inventory includes the number of resources identified *through* 1988 and 2008 respectively.

Please see [www.gorgevitalsigns.org](http://www.gorgevitalsigns.org) for more information.



Dawn Nielson



Hood River Waterplay



Stephen Datnoff