FY 2007 Idaho Panhandle National Forests
Heritage Monitoring Report

Stephan E. Matz
1/14/2008
Cultural Resource Report (R2007010401573)
Idaho Panhandle National Forests

Front cover photo: *Hobo Creek Logging Camp building after 72 years of North Idaho weather and vegetation growth.*

Executive Summary

Efforts at monitoring site conditions provided significant information on project implementation and site conditions on the IPNF for FY 2007. While there were some problems with project implementation in FY 2007, for the most part the system worked very well. Over 50 projects were reviewed for Section 106 consultation at some level during the fiscal year and 34 sites were monitored for condition and assessed against National Register criteria. The problems encountered were generally due to working out lines of communication within the Forest and Heritage program during a transitional period between Heritage program leaders. The Forest Leadership Team has taken active steps to correct deficiencies in lines of communication that should assure similar problems are few and far between in the coming years. These steps are summarized below and discussed in more detail on pages 7-8:

- ✓ The appropriate Forest or Zone level archaeologist will monitor the NEPA team process for changes that may need additional consultation work and compare the draft and final NEPA document with the NHPA consultation document for inclusion of all appropriate information, effects and mitigation measures.
- ✓ Evaluate all extant cultural resources that may be potentially affected by project actions for significance against the National Register criteria. This will ensure that insignificant sites are not unduly protected, and if inadvertent damage occurs, at least a minimum of information regarding the resource is preserved.
- ✓ Avoidance procedures should be designed to insure inadvertent damage does not occur to significant sites.
- ✓ Where avoidance or other mitigation measure procedures are used a pre-implementation plan-in-hand review must be completed involving the implementation staff and appropriate Zone or Forest Archaeologist.
- ✓ If implementation monitoring is required, designate an appropriate staff member to inform the Forest, Zone or Tribal archaeologist of project implementation schedules in a timely manner.

Given the nature of the resources, climate and active management on the Idaho Panhandle it is likely that historic cultural resource sites will continue to degrade over time. For the most part, those resources that could be saved with the time, staff and money available have been highlighted and actively protected, stabilized and restored as evidenced by the tremendous work accomplished on Forest Service administrative sites, cabin and lookout rentals, Marble Creek historic trails, Hiawatha Trail, Pulaski Trail, Mullen Tree and Road and other historical interpretive sites on the Forest. The remaining mining, logging, trail and homesteading sites are slowly melting into the forest floor and without extremely large commitments of money and effort they will not be saved. The long term outlook for Forest Service budgets and personnel levels is a downward trend, at least with respect to inflation. The Forest will continue its commitment to preserve and protect those significant sites that have already been identified and work toward preservation of a sample of the remaining sites to the extent possible given budgetary conditions.

Table of Contents

Introduction……... 1
Forest Project Monitoring Review……..... 1
Shoshone Park Stream Restoration……... 2
Placer EA Road Reconstruction…… 3
Emerald Creek Garnet Mine…… 3
Moyie Place Hazardous Fuels Project……. 4
57 Bear Paws Fuel Reduction Project……. 6
Shoshone 594 Recreation Residence……..... 6
Recommendations……. 7
Section 106 Implementation Monitoring…… 8
West Lake Shore Road Construction Monitoring……..... 8
Luby Bay Lot 566-B Monitoring…… 9
Heritage Site Monitoring……. 10
Conclusions…….. 14

Tables
1. Summary of Site Monitoring Activities……... 11

Appendices (Confidential material not for public release)
A. Shoshone 594 Recreation Residence Form
B. West Lake Shore Road Reconstruction Form
C. Luby Bay Lot 566-B Monitoring Form
D. Heritage Site Monitoring Forms

Introduction

To fulfill requirements of Sections 106 and 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), the Programmatic Agreement regarding Cultural Resource Management in Idaho (PA), and National Forest Service direction for management of Heritage Assets on the Idaho Panhandle National Forest (IPNF) a Forest-wide monitoring report was instituted. The report details an interdisciplinary review of the Forest's compliance programs, project monitoring required under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act consultation, evaluation of cultural properties to the National Register of Historic Places, and cultural site monitoring for deferred maintenance condition assessments. This report should provide an overall review of site conditions on the IPNF that complements the Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act Accomplishment Report and the Annual Report for the Idaho Programmatic Agreement.

In order to protect sensitive site information exempt from public release under the Freedom of Information Act, Archaeological Resources Protection Act and National Historic Preservation Act, site locations and detailed descriptions are not provided in the body of this report, but are contained in the appendices. Forest Service report and site numbers can be used to find additional information in the Forest and Idaho State Historic Preservation Office files.

Forest Project Monitoring Review

An interdisciplinary team of Forest Supervisor's staff completed a review of five projects that were planned or implemented in FY 2007, plus the Forest Archaeologist reviewed one project that was inadvertently implemented without final consultation. The team consisted of a Wildlife Biologist, Fisheries Biologist, Ecologist, Archaeologist, Recreation Staff and two NEPA Planners that were tasked with determining if the review projects were implemented according to appropriate regulations specific to individual disciplines and NEPA. The Section 106 review was conducted by the Forest Archaeologist, Steve Matz. The team met with the District Ranger and staff that oversaw or implemented the project. The District staffs were given constructive comments in order to improve the implementation of projects under the appropriate regulations.

The following cultural resources laws and implementing agreements were reviewed: Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974, as Amended (P.L. 86-532) (AHPA), Antiquities Act of 1906 (P.L. 59-209), National Historic Preservation Act as Amended through 1992 (P.L. 89-665, P.L. 102-575) (NHPA), Programmatic Agreement between USDA Forest Service Northern Region (Montana) and the Montana State Historic Preservation Office, regarding management of Cultural Resources on National Forest System Lands in Montana (Montana PA; no projects for this year were in Montana), Programmatic Agreement between USDA Forest Service Northern Region (Idaho) and the Idaho State Historic Preservation Office, regarding management of Cultural Resources on National Forest System Lands in Idaho (Idaho PA), and Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (P.L. 96-95) (ARPA).

The six review projects were located on various Ranger Districts and represented a wide array of project types. Other than the Shoshone 594 Recreation Residence project, the remaining projects were selected by the individual Ranger District for review. On October 9, the team visited the Shoshone Park Restoration and Placer EA Road Reconstruction Projects on the Coeur d'Alene

River Ranger District. On October 10, the team reviewed the Emerald Creek Garnet Mining Project on the St. Joe Ranger District. On October 16, the Moyie Place Hazardous Fuels Project was visited on the Bonner's Ranger District. On October 18, the 57 Bear Paws Fuels Reduction Project was reviewed on the Priest Lake Ranger District. While not on the list for review in 2007 the Shoshone 594 Recreation Residence project, on the Priest Lake Ranger District, is included here because it more closely resembles implementation monitoring than required Section 106 monitoring activities. Five of the six projects had issues with implementation of NHPA and the Idaho PA, mostly centered on communication.

Shoshone Park Stream Restoration

This project consisted of the restoration of a stream channel in the Shoshone Park Picnic Area within an historic Civilian Conservation Corp (CCC) constructed picnic area (10SE749/01040101248). The project was inventoried and consultation was completed with the Idaho State Historic Preservation Officer and Coeur d'Alene Tribe under NHPA and the Idaho PA (Report R2005010401460). The report identified potential historic use associated with the Mullan Road historic site and the CCC picnic site. While a representative of the Coeur d'Alene Indian Tribe visited the site there is no mention in the report of specific concerns regarding American Indian cultural or religious sites within the area. Upon inspection by the Forest Archaeologist during the EMS review a few scraps of metal, glass and ceramics were found on the surface of the disturbance area, however, none of the remains appeared to be significant under AHPA, NHPA, Idaho PA or ARPA. In general, the project does not appear to have caused significant impacts to cultural resources, however, not all requirements of the NHPA consultation were completed.

While the Decision Notice stated "No known heritage resources occur near the activity site", it did require any new discoveries of cultural resources to be reported and protected. The NHPA consultation document stated "It is recommended that the District Archaeologist be on hand when the excavating nears the original ground surface." Though not stated directly in the consultation document it is assumed the recommendation was meant to require monitoring during excavation so that any subsurface American Indian and historic Euro-American artifacts observed during construction would be preserved and protected from additional disturbance by heavy equipment. During the project the District Archaeologist position was vacant and the Forest Archaeologist was not informed when the work was started. However, he did inspect the ground surface impacted by the heavy equipment briefly during construction and again during the FY '07 review. He found no significant artifacts or features. The project inspector said he didn't see any cultural material in the work area beyond a small amount of modern trash. Therefore, no immediate actions were taken.

The Decision Memo should have noted the existence of the cultural site and recommendation for monitoring. In order to rectify this situation in the future the Forest Archaeologist will provide a "Project Completion Memo" to the District Ranger and project leader. The memo provides a history of consultation and any requirements for site protection that can be placed in the project file and summarized in the NEPA document. Where monitoring is required a specific "Discovery Plan" will also be included providing information on project monitoring schedules and requirements that can also be included in the project file and summarized in the NEPA document. Where contracts will be prepared for implementation these documents can also be

used to identify specific monitoring or protection requirement stipulations. The District or project leader will notify the Forest Archaeologist when construction will start so that a monitor can be on site in a timely manner.

Placer EA Road Reconstruction

This project consisted of reconstruction and rerouting of an existing public access and timber haul road associated with the Placer Resource Area EA. The Placer Creek Fuel Reduction Project was inventoried and consultation was completed with the Idaho State Historic Preservation Officer under NHPA and the Idaho PA (Report R2005010401426). The original project was submitted by the previous District Archaeologist and reviewed by the previous Forest Archaeologist. It was returned to the Zone Archaeologist with eight comments for revisions, including areas that needed inventory or sites that needed to be recorded. The report was revised, submitted to the Forest Archaeologist and accepted. Subsequently to a final NEPA decision, the road route was changed to follow an old mining road so that an exceptionally narrow and steep section of the original CCC road could be bypassed and recontoured. A review of the changed circumstances under Section 18.1 of the Forest Service Handbook was undertaken for a number of resources, with the exception of Heritage. The present Forest Archaeologist reviewed the 18.1 document during the Forest-wide review and found no discussion for Cultural Resources. Apparently, the project changes were reviewed by the District Archaeologist in the field, however, the result of that review was not discussed in the 18.1 document or other NHPA and Idaho PA consultation documents.

Reconstructed road 2376 appears on the 1937 and 1948 Forest maps and was known to have been constructed by the CCC to service local lookouts and general forest areas. Failure to record, evaluate, and assess the effects of reconstruction of the resource does not meet the intent of AHPA, NEPA, NHPA and Idaho PA. Given the remains were less than 100 years old ARPA does not apply. Why the road was not recorded and evaluated by the previous District or previous Forest Archaeologist is unknown, especially given its history was known to the NEPA team and other similar roads had been recorded in the past. The present Forest Archaeologist inspected portions of both the original and reconstructed route during the present field review, but did not have copies of previous consultation documents to compare to the 18.1 document. Therefore, no immediate actions were taken.

The 18.1 document should have been used to review compliance with NHPA and Idaho PA. In order to rectify this situation, future projects should not be implemented without a “Project Completion Memo” that can be placed in the project file and summarized in the NEPA document. No specific remedies were taken in this case given the site no longer exists in its original form within the project area.

Emerald Creek Garnet Mine

This project consists of mining a garnet deposit within the Emerald Creek area for public use. The project was inventoried and consultation was completed with the Idaho State Historic Preservation Officer and Coeur d’Alene Tribe under NHPA and the Idaho PA (R2005010401436). The report identified a historic railroad logging system in the general area and a corduroy road (10LT21/01040400452) within the project that is eligible to the National Register of Historic Places. In the consultation documentation a member of the Cultural

Resources staff of the Coeur d'Alene Indian Tribe requested notification of impending mining activities so that they could be monitored. Upon inspection by the Forest Archaeologist during the EMS review no American Indian artifacts or features were found within the panel that was being mined and the corduroy road was found to be intact. The project caused no impacts to cultural resources, however, not all requirements of NHPA consultation were completed, as described below.

The ROD required the following notification: "The Forest Service will contact the archaeologist for the Coeur d'Alene Tribe prior to excavations." While Tribal staff were notified in meetings on the Reservation, no specific notification to the archaeologist was undertaken.

In addition, protection of the corduroy road segment described in the NHPA consultation document was not included in the ROD. A review of information provided to the NEPA project file within the Heritage Specialist Report and Project Completion Memo could find no mention of the corduroy road segment within the NEPA file, suggesting that notice was not provided until after the ROD was signed

The ROD should have noted the existence of the cultural site and recommendations for notification of the Tribal archaeologist should have been followed. In order to rectify this situation in the future the Forest Archaeologist will provide a "Project Completion Memo" and "Discovery Plan" that will be included in the project file and summarized in the NEPA document. Where contracts will be prepared for implementation these documents can also be used to identify specific monitoring or protection requirement stipulations. The District or project leader will notify the Forest Archaeologist when construction will start so that he can inform the Coeur d'Alene Tribal Archaeologist in a timely manner for monitoring. No specific remedies for the site were taken in this case given the lack of significant impacts.

Moyie Place Hazardous Fuels Project

The Moyie Place Hazardous Fuels Reduction Project is scheduled to harvest about 1.5 mmbf of timber from 13 units. The project was inventoried and consultation was completed with the Idaho State Historic Preservation Officer under NHPA and the Idaho PA (Report R2005010401368). The report identified eight historic properties within the analysis area. Upon inspection by the present Forest Archaeologist during the review a burn pile was found within 10BY287/01040701551, a historic habitation site associated with the Meadow Creek townsite. Harvest boundaries and activities were reviewed by the Zone Archaeologist, Tom Sandberg, with the project staff during the design process. The location of the site was placed on timber sale maps as a single dot and the unit boundary was placed immediately adjacent to the site. The unit was subsequently harvested, piled and burned over snow cover. While no damage was done during harvest it appears that either slash was piled outside of the unit within the site or collapsed cultural remains outside of the unit and within the site were mistaken for piled debris and burned in post harvest activities. While the archaeological remains had not been evaluated to the National Register of Historic Places, artifacts and features impacted by the burn pile appear to be significant under NHPA and the Idaho PA. Given this was not a construction project and the remains were less than 100 years old AHPA and ARPA do not apply.

In addition, American Indian related sites, 10BY309/01040701931 and 10BY434/01040701928, and associated buffer zones were inspected by the Forest Archaeologist during the review. A 100 foot wide buffer along a high bench that was considered high probability for American Indian cultural remains was found to be properly located and no harvest activities had occurred within the zone. No cultural remains were found within the harvest unit and it appears that the buffer zone was effective in protecting the sites and the high potential zone. However, it was noted that regenerated vegetation within10BY309, located within a power line corridor, was recently cleared under maintenance provisions of a special use permit to the Northern Lights Power Company. No artifacts or damage was noted due to clearing within the previously defined site boundaries.

Both the NHPA report and NEPA document identified 10BY287 for avoidance measures, however, the harvest activities were located so closely to the site that inadvertent damage occurred. While the site was identified on timber sale maps, only a single point was used to identify a site that was as much as 5.7 acres in size. It is surmised that Forest staff burning piles in the area didn't realize that the wooden remains outside of the harvest boundary were within the site. The Forest Archaeologist inspected the ground surface impacted by the burn pile and determined no immediate action was necessary to stabilize or protect the site given it is on a flat geomorphic surface surrounded by forested vegetation.

Proposed changes include additional buffer zones between project activities and eligible cultural properties, identification of accurate site boundaries on project implementation maps that are exempt from general public review, field review of site locations and any mitigation measures with contractors and staff immediately prior to project implementation by the Project lead and/or Zone Archaeologist when avoidance procedures are used, and evaluation of previously unevaluated sites to the National Register when avoidance procedures are used as mitigation. Buffer zones that protect archaeological and historical sites should be based on project activities and the sensitivity of the site. Use of geomorphic features such as terraces or benches and/or cultural features such as roads and trails that are easily identified on the ground should be used when ever possible. If natural or cultural buffers are not available buffer distances sufficient to generally preclude inadvertent damage based on the type of planned activity should be used to protect sites (i.e., greater than one tree length for felling, turning distance for heavy equipment, flame length or spotting distance for prescribed burns or piling burning, and etc.). Where a site is larger than a point in size an accurate polygon or line should be used to identify no activity zones on harvest or other activity maps. This method of identification should only be used if the maps are exempt from public review to protect sensitive site location information. If site locations are shown on project maps a procedure needs to be developed for distribution that excludes these maps from general public distribution and targets only those with a need to know. Prior to each independent activity the NEPA and NHPA documents should be reviewed by the project lead or other authorized individual to assure that inadvertent damage does not occur to significant sites. Information necessary to avoid damage to sites should be provided by the project lead or authorized individual to implementation crews and contractors prior to implementation. Evaluation of sites to the National Register of Historic Places prior to project implementation when avoidance procedures are planned will assure at least the minimal information necessary to understand the site is gathered. A thorough recordation of the site and

inadvertent damage will be conducted during the FY '08 year and reported within the Idaho PA annual report.

57 Bear Paws Fuel Reduction Project

The 57 Bear Paw Fuels Reduction Project was designed to remove overstocked timber within a wildland urban interface in the Priest Lake area. The project was reviewed by the Zone Archaeologist, Tom Sandberg, who determined that the project fell within previously cleared project areas and no additional inventory was necessary. No National Register eligible properties were located within the Area of Potential Effect and a recommendation was provided that the project could proceed with no further cultural resource work. Consultation was completed with the Idaho State Historic Preservation Officer under NHPA and the Idaho PA (Report R2004010401345). The project report was reviewed by the previous Forest Archaeologist, Cort Sims, and found to be adequate. No additional cultural resources were noted during the project review and all pertinent laws and regulations were followed for design and implementation of the project.

Shoshone 594 Recreation Residence

On 2/14/2006, the Forest received the Determination of Eligibility and Effect form from the SHPO requesting additional information necessary to comment on effects for this recreation residence remodel project (Report R2005010401493). A draft Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) and supporting information was prepared by then Forest Archaeologist, Cort Sims. Prior to receiving the final plans for the addition, Cort retired, and Steve Matz was hired as his replacement. The MOA was held at the Supervisor's office while waiting for final plans and was not forwarded to the SHPO for review or signature.

On 4/26/2007, Steve Matz was completing a review of Recreation Residences along Priest Lake and noted construction of the addition to Shoshone 594 (10BR1076/01040802424). He photographed the cabin, addition and other structures on the recreation residence lot and returned to the office to discuss the situation with the Recreation Residence administrator and District Ranger. After a discussion of the situation it was noted that the plans had been forwarded to Steve for review, but he confused this project with another recreation residence project and did not complete the consultation. In the meantime, the District was under the impression that all consultation work had been completed and the project was authorized to proceed.

As with other compliance problems, the solution appears to be centered on better communication between the Supervisor's Office and the Ranger District. A process that requires formal notification of compliance with Section 106 regulations prior to implementation through a Project Completion Memo signed by the Forest Archaeologist was agreed upon to reduce future compliance problems.

As for measures to reduce adverse effects from the project, the proposed mitigation measures for this project were:

- ✓ Data Recordation, including:
    - Set of measured drawings of the original structure
    - Black and white archival photographs of the exterior of the structure
    - Measured drawings of the addition

- Recreation residence historic overview

✓ Use of similar material in construction of the addition as found in the original, including:
- Exterior siding will match the existing simulated log, drop-siding
- Roofing will match the existing brown sheet metal
- Windows will be clad, wood frame, multi-pane

The mitigation measures were completed for this project even though they were not submitted to the SHPO for review prior to construction. Black and white photographs were submitted with the original site form and additional archival quality photographs of the addition and the measured drawings are provided in Appendix A. The recreation residence historic overview was previously provided under a separate project. Siding, roofing and windows were all constructed as per the directions in the MOA.

Recommendations

A formal review of five projects on the Idaho Panhandle National Forest and the sixth project implemented without sufficient consultation, suggests additional work on communication between District staffs and Archaeologists at the Zone and Forest level needs to occur and appropriate information regarding the potential to effect significant cultural sites should be incorporated into NEPA and implementation documents. To this end the following recommendations are provided:

✓ The appropriate Forest or Zone level archaeologist will monitor the NEPA team process for changes that may need additional consultation work and compare the draft and final NEPA document with the NHPA consultation document for inclusion of all appropriate information, effects and mitigation measures.
- ➢ At a minimum provide a Project Completion Memo to the District Ranger and project leader that details the final status of consultation and any necessary mitigation measures and Discovery Plans for project implementation monitoring.
- ➢ Integrate this notification process into the District or Zone project review process, as appropriate.
- ➢ Display and describe avoidance or other mitigation measures in a manner that provides staff and contractors with appropriate site locations and descriptions while meeting the requirements under NHPA, ARPA and FOIA for protection of sensitive information. That is, the number and type of cultural resources and any mitigation measures may be displayed in NEPA documents and contract packages in a manner that can not be used to otherwise vandalize or loot the sites. Site specific descriptions or other location information must be protected by using restricted documents and maps that are not available for general public review and are marked “Exempt from Public Release”.
- ➢ Tribal comments for NEPA documents should be gathered at a Government-to-Government level, while comments for Section 106 consultation may be developed between staffs.

✓ Evaluate all extant cultural resources that may be potentially affected by project actions for significance against the National Register criteria. This will ensure that insignificant sites are not unduly protected, and if inadvertent damage occurs, at least a minimum of information regarding the resource is preserved.

- ✓ Avoidance procedures should be designed to insure inadvertent damage does not occur to significant sites, to include:
    - ➢ Geomorphic features such as terraces or benches and/or cultural features such as roads and trails that are easily identified on the ground should separate the site from project actions when ever possible.
    - ➢ If natural or cultural buffers are not available, buffer distances used to protect sites should be sufficient to generally preclude inadvertent damage based on the type of planned activity (i.e., greater than one tree length for felling, turning distance for heavy equipment, flame length or spotting distance for prescribed burns or piling burning, and etc.).
- ✓ Where avoidance or other mitigation measure procedures are used a pre-implementation plan-in-hand review must be completed involving the implementation staff and appropriate Zone or Forest Archaeologist.
- ✓ If implementation monitoring is required, designate an appropriate staff member to inform the Forest, Zone or Tribal archaeologist of project implementation schedules in a timely manner.

Section 106 Implementation Monitoring

The following projects were monitored as a result of specific requirements in Section 106 documents. Each monitoring activity is briefly summarized and its implications are discussed.

West Lake Shore Road Construction Monitoring

Consultation documents for the reconstruction of the West Lake Shore road (R2006010401535) required monitoring for buried cultural materials during stump pulling and road reconstruction activities. Even though no surface cultural resource remains were found during the inventory, it was thought that the area was high probability for American Indian cultural remains. Therefore, the Forest Archaeologist, Steve Matz, made site visits on 5/3 and 5/4/2007 to monitor ground disturbing activities.

On 5/3, Matz visually inspected the cleared ground prior to and during stump pulling activities and sampled the disturbed ground with a shovel and 1/8 inch mesh screen. The previously disturbed road construction zone from P10+50 (north end of project where it intersected the existing West Lake Shore Road) to P13+50 was visually inspected to determine if any artifacts were on the surface. This area was then sampled by taking a full shovel of material periodically within the cleared area and screening it for artifacts. Numerous areas where stumps were pulled were inspected, however, it was not always possible to get close enough to the equipment to see or document stratigraphy. Therefore, additional shovel scrapes were excavated at the location of individual stumps. From P 12+98 to 11+50 intermittent ash pockets were found that were sampled through screening multiple shovel fulls of ash. Once the previously disturbed area had been sampled with shovel scrapes Matz visually inspected the remaining area from P12+98 to P17+50 and returned by way of an old service road adjacent to the new construction. No surface or subsurface artifacts were found, except for the remains of modern trash immediately adjacent to the existing West Lake Shore road edge at the north end of the project.

On 5/4, Matz returned and inspected the work from P15+50 to 21+00. He again found several ash pockets, but after conducting shovel scrapes in the area recovered no artifacts. In addition,

shovel scrapes were excavated every 5-10 meters along the route and in some cases multiple shovel scrapes were excavated in the same area. By the end of the day it had started raining and he visually inspected the remainder of the project to P27+00, where a stubby beer bottle, an Olympia beer can with church key opening, several pieces of clear bottle glass and a tin lid were found.

The artifacts and ash pockets appear to be associated with past road use and possible logging activities. Artifacts can be explained by "random" trash disposal along the well used West Lake Shoreline Road and do not represent a significant assemblage. The ash lenses may be associated with past slash disposal, either from logging or recreation residence use. There were no cultural materials associated with any of the ash lenses and while they may be culturally created, appear to be insignificant from a National Register standpoint. A monitoring form and photos are included in Appendix B.

Luby Bay Lot 566-B Monitoring

The garage construction project at Luby Bay Lot 566-B was consulted on under two separate reports. The initial investigations using visual inspection and 12 shovel probes found the American Indian camp site (10BR1080/01040802415) to be eligible to the National Register (R2005010401408), however, additional 1x1 meter testing units demonstrated that cultural material in the construction zone was very sparse, limited in scope and non-contributing to the eligibility of the site (R2006010401562). In order to be certain that the testing program did not overlook buried cultural components that would be destroyed during construction, on site monitoring by a professional archaeologist was required.

On 8/7/2007 Tom Sandberg and Jyl Wheaton-Abraham monitored excavation of the foundation construction for a new garage. Excavation of the foundation trenches had already been finished and so Tom and Jyl completed a visual inspection of the trench walls and back dirt pile and screened a sample of the back dirt through 1/8 inch mesh. Several whole cans with severe rust and about 20 fragments of cans, glass and ceramics that probably post dated the turn of the 20th Century were located in the back dirt pile and trench floor. The association of the materials is uncertain, but may have been associated with dispersed recreation use of the lake shore or of the original cabin. The assemblage provided no significant archaeological information and was not recorded further. About 12 pieces of fire broken rock were found on the surface of the pile and in the trenches, however, no artifacts of certain American Indian association were found in the screen, back dirt pile or trenches. Finally, two possible features were located in the trench walls, identified as F-1 and F-2.

On 8/8/2007, Steve Matz, Sarah Wilson and Linda Clark joined Tom and Jyl in an assessment of the artifacts and features. The trenches were inspected, photographed and material removed and screened to assess the significance of the find.

F-1 was located in the southern trench wall and consisted of a lenticular deposit of rock, wood and charcoal about 53 cm long and six cm deep in profile. Given the disturbed nature of the trench wall a depth from the surface was impossible to determine, however, it seemed to sit on top of the sterile, coarse, orange sands between 30 and 40 cm below the surface. The frequent rock was small cobble size and about half or less of it was fire broken. The profile was cleaned

up and photos were taken using a shovel, trowel and brush to remove the overburden. The overburden was screened through 1/8" mesh and no artifacts other than small pieces of fire broken rock were located. A sample of the front 20 cm of the feature were then excavated with trowel and no artifacts other than a few pieces of fire broken rock were recovered. The overburden was then removed for about 50 cm back from the trench wall and another sample of the feature was removed and screened. Again, only a few pieces of fire broken rock were recovered and the excavation was abandoned.

F-2 was located on the west trench wall and consisted of a sub-rectangular or lenticular intermittent deposit of rock with occasional organic staining below the rock layer. The cobble feature was overlain by natural and mixed soil deposits capped by a heavily burned horizon containing wood, charcoal and ash. The feature was several meters across, 10-30 cm thick and about 30-50 cm deep, overlaying the sterile, coarse, orange sands. The rock was large pebble or moderate cobble size and generally a single intermittent layer thick, except at the north end where it was several cobbles thick. The soil above the north end of the feature was compact and appeared to be relatively undisturbed, while that at the southern end was very loose and friable. About 10 cm above the coble layer was a thick deposit of what appeared to be modern wood, charcoal and ash from a burn pile. The material that was recovered during clean-up of the profile was screened and no artifacts were recovered. The profile was photographed and further excavation was abandoned.

Given the rare nature of cobbles in the deposits the features appear to be cultural, however, their function is uncertain given a lack of associated artifacts or other cultural remains. Previous excavations within the site found few or no cobble sized rock, except that which had been fire affected, suggesting that cobbles within the site were brought in by humans. To date, only a single broken projectile point and flake have been found within the general area of F-1 and F-2. Given the lack of lithic artifacts, bone, or macro botanical remains the features are considered as noncontributing and no further archaeological work is recommended. A monitoring form and photos are provided in Appendix C.

Heritage Site Monitoring

In 2007, 34 sites were visited by the Forest Archaeologist for purposes of determining site condition and deferred maintenance needs. The purpose of the monitoring effort was to document the condition of sites that were Priority Heritage Assets, generally found outside of projects, or had not been visited in 20 to 40 years. In addition, sites visited during project inventories or field trips were included to round out the overall selection of monitored sites for FY 2007.

Each site that could be located was photographed and described on monitoring forms. At least one photo of each site was taken, and in many cases, multiple photos showing site condition or significant aspects of the site were taken. The monitoring form provides a description of the basic site condition, to include recommendations regarding site protection or maintenance items and a record of discussions with District staff, where appropriate. Where a site could not be relocated a monitoring form was completed that documented the attempt to locate the site. The site monitoring forms and photos are included in Appendix D, while a summary of each is provided in Table 1, below.

Table 1. Summary of Site Monitoring Activities.

State No.	FS No. (0104-)	Name	Date Visited	Comment
10BR0165	0800247	Priest River Experimental Station HQ	4/17	Minor nonconformities on some buildings and Mess Hall-Convention Center construction without consultation years ago; otherwise good condition with minor repair.
10BY0033	0700041	Snyder Guard Station	8/28	Overall good condition, restoration work progressing well.
10KA0049/ 10KA0179	0300351/ 0300449	Mullen Tree and Road	9/13	Interpretive site needs restoration work; road in good condition within recreation site. Outside of recreation site it could not be relocated owing to additional road construction and use.
10KA0061	0300358	Blackjack Splash Dam	8/17& 21	Poor condition; little of the dam is left; now interpretive site with sign; didn't investigate other associated features due to river crossing.
10KA0070	0300374	Cabin	6/22	Could not relocate.
10KA0108	0400399	Honeysuckle Splash Dam	8/22	Poor condition; abutment on road side has little integrity and the section across the river couldn't be seen from the road or river bank.
10KA0109	0300400	Sands & Deception Cr. Logging System	8/22	Chute logs in poor condition. Three of four features noncontributing.
10KA0110	0300401	Wolf Lodge Road	8/14	Destroyed by modern road years ago; change to ineligible.
10KA0111	0300402	Deception Cr. Experimental Forest HQ	8/22	Buildings removed and site partially bulldozed years ago; located and recorded dam upstream from HQ. Site eligible for dam feature and archaeological potential only.
10KA0200	0301663	Spades Lookout	8/14	Poor condition; vandals kicked out windows and hacked supports; change to ineligible.
10KA0213	0400726	Breakwater Splash Dam	8/22	Poor condition; abutments nearly gone, although earthern berm intact.
10KA0230	0301686	Jarvis Homestead and Mine	8/22	Adit in poor condition; remaining features couldn't be located; concur with ineligible recommendation.
10KA0231	0301687	Laverne Cr. Splash Dam	6/22	Poor condition; lower most single log remaining; concur with ineligible recommendation.
10KA0255	0301710	Water Fill Site	8/15	Poor condition; structural flats and a few logs and artifacts only materials found.

Table 1. Continued.

State No.	FS No. (0104-)	Name	Date Visited	Comment
10SE0001	0101201	Cinnabar Cr. Oven	6/20	Good condition; front of oven collapsed.
10SE0017/ 10SE0664	0102480	Pulaski Escape Tunnel Trail	4/12	Poor condition; site brushed out and artifacts being collected (also see FY '06 Annual Report for further description).
10SE0108	0400589	Hobo Cr. Camp 5	9/21	Poor condition; some stacking of artifacts by visitors.
10SE0109	0400590	Hobo Cr. Steam Donkey	9/21	Fair condition; boiler starting to rust and outer walls collapse.
10SE0110	0400591	Hobo Cr. Splash Dam	9/21	Poor condition; partially collapsed and logs are extremely rotten.
10SE0145	0400625	Camp 3	9/19	Cabin in good condition; remaining features in poor condition.
10SE0205	0200671	Avery Work Center	6/25	Overall good condition; needs minor repair and updates for personnel use.
10SE0220	0200686	Red Ives Ranger Station	8/7-8	Overall good condition; needs minor repair work.
10SE0238	0200703	Gold Nugget Mine	7/17	Deteriorated significantly since 1982 visit.
10SE0239	0200705	Sherlock Cr. Cabin	7/17	Could not relocate; concur with ineligible determination.
10SE0240	0200706	Sherlock Cr. Cabin	7/17	Poor condition; no wooden structure remains; concur with ineligible determination.
10SE0261	0400726	Camp 7 Splash Dam	9/19	Poor condition; rock embankments intact, but center log structure mostly gone.
10SE0388	0100833	Jack Waite Mine	6/19 & 7/18	Poor condition; buildings removed ca. 1979 leaving only foundations and few scattered artifacts.
10SE0452	0100881	Spyglass Lookout	8/21	Stairs removed to prevent vandalism; overall good condition.
10SE0470	0100904	Magee Ranger Station	10/24	Good condition; needs minor repair work, except barn, which is starting to sway at the ridgeline.
10SE0514	0200938	Halsey Homestead	8/21	Poor condition; most features bulldozed and cleaned-up years ago; change to ineligible.
10SE0519	0200942	Lower North Fork to Magee Trail	8/21	No sign of trail remains; concur with ineligible recommendation.
10SE0749	0101248	Shoshone Park	8/17	Good condition; in process of restoring picnic pavilions and cabin.
10SE0874	0401319	Avery Patrol Cabin	10/24, 6/20	Exterior restoration nearly complete; interior walls installed.
10SE1261	0202476	Red Ives Dam	9/5	Excellent condition for cement dam.

Most of the sites visited in FY 2007 were originally recorded in the late 1970s or early 1980s and show their age. The greatest challenge on the IPNF is managing historic sites with wood and metal in dense vegetation and high rainfall. Many sites are impossible to find today, given the poor original site record and rate of deterioration. Most of the historic sites that were eligible in 1978 are in such a state of disrepair that they are no longer eligible, especially for architectural or engineering merit.

Six of the sites monitored in FY ’07 were damaged by Forest Service projects or management decisions. Damage to the Jack Waite Mine, Halsey Homestead, Priest River Experimental Forest HQ, Wolf Lodge Road, and Deception Creek Experimental Forest HQ occurred many years ago and the reasons for lack of consultation are difficult to trace. It appears that damage to the Jack Waite Mine, Halsey Homestead, and Deception Creek Experimental Forest involved efforts to remove unwanted trash and structures from the Forest. Building additions and maintenance activities at the Priest River Experimental Forest and reconstruction of the Wolf Lodge Road happened over time with little recognition of the need for consultation in these particular cases. With respect to the Priest River Experimental Forest HQ, efforts were generally made to follow the Secretary’s standards and preserve the historic integrity of the structures. However, in some cases repairs or changes were made that were not consulted on and did not maintain the historic fabric of the structure or the site. Overall, there is a renewed effort to follow the requirements of the Section 106 process. Damage to the Halsey Homestead and Wolf Lodge Road are severe enough that they are no longer eligible to the National Register of Historic Places. Removal of buildings at the Deception Creek Experimental Forest and Jack Waite Mine led to these sites being eligible for their archaeological potential only.

Damage due to Forest Service clearing of vegetation at the Pulaski Escape Tunnel Trail was found in early FY ’07 and documented in the FY 2006 Annual Report. Additional monitoring of the site has shown that vegetation clearing within the Nicholson Cabin site has lead to increased vandalism through unauthorized collection and removal of artifacts from their original positions. Efforts in FY ’08 will be to excavate a sample of the site and collect diagnostic artifacts that are in danger of removal by increasing numbers of visitors.

Two of the sites were vandalized or impacted by non-Forest Service actions. The Mullen Road is still in good condition within the interpretive site, however, outside of this area user created roads have made documenting the original alignment problematic. Several attempts were made to find the road within the Fourth of July Pass area, but it was nearly impossible to discern the original route from the many wood cutter, hunter and ATV trails. In addition, the John Mullen statue in the interpretive site had the face hacked off and replaced with permanent ink features some time in the past. Spades Lookout, located on a major ATV route has had the support structure and guy wires hacked with axes and the windows kicked out in the recent past. This lookout is recommended as ineligible based on being less than 50 years of age and in poor condition.

Three sites could not be relocated during the present project. One of two Sherlock Creek cabins (10KA239) was not found at its mapped location and extensive survey up and down the creek failed to locate any remains. Another set of cabin remains (10KA70) that was noted as being destroyed in 1970 could also not be relocated. The Lower North Fork – McGee Trail could also

not be relocated, possibly owing to timber harvest and heavy vegetative regrowth. Minor artifact collection and piling was seen on several sites, but does not seem to be a major issue in most cases. Those sites that are heavily visited have generally been nearly destroyed by years of visitation and there is not much left to save.

Seventeen of the sites suffered from natural deterioration owing to the North Idaho climate and dense vegetation. In a few cases it was not possible to find entire features, while in most cases standing or nearly standing historic structures were entirely collapsed. Many of the logging splash dams, chutes and flumes are in active flood plains or steep stream systems that have caused severe impacts to the main structure. The center of most of the splash dams had been washed out leaving only minor cribbing features on one or the other end. In those cases where the center of the dam had not washed away, the logs had deteriorated to the point that most of the spillways and other features were nearly unrecognizable. No intact logging flume sections were found, while most log chutes had only a few small sections of cut logs still in place. Except for restoration work completed at Camp 3, all other sites with structural remains were in a severe state of decay. If there were any structural remains they consisted of partially or totally collapsed walls. In many cases only a structural flat or sill log remained to mark the structure's location. The door to the Cinnabar Creek Oven had partially collapsed several years ago, but is still sufficiently intact to be rebuilt, if accomplished in the next several years. The Hobo Creek Steam Donkey's boiler has started to fail due to rust. An attempt will be made this winter to contact logging museums to see if repair is possible.

Finally, the Forest Service is committed to protection, use and maintenance of its historic compounds. The Priest River Experimental Forest HQ, Snyder Guard Station, Avery Work Center, Red Ives Ranger Station, Magee Ranger Station, Shoshone Park Picnic Area, and Avery Patrol Cabin all have had extensive restoration and maintenance work accomplished in the last several decades. Continued use of the R-1 Historic Preservation Team and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards is intended to keep these gems shining.

Conclusions

Efforts at monitoring site conditions provided significant information on project implementation and site conditions on the IPNF for FY 2007. While there were some problems with project implementation in FY 2007, for the most part the system worked very well. Over 50 projects were reviewed for Section 106 consultation at some level during the fiscal year and 34 sites were monitored for condition and assessed against National Register criteria. The problems encountered were generally due to working out lines of communication within the Forest and Heritage program during a transitional period. The Forest Leadership Team has taken active steps to correct deficiencies in lines of communication that should assure similar problems are few and far between.

Given the nature of the resources, climate and active management on the Idaho Panhandle it is likely that historic cultural resource sites will continue to degrade over time. For the most part, those resources that could be saved with the time, staff and money available have been highlighted and actively protected, stabilized and restored as evidenced by the tremendous work accomplished on Forest Service administrative sites, cabin and lookout rentals, Marble Creek historic trails, Hiawatha Trail, Pulaski Trail, Mullen Tree and Road and other historical

interpretive sites on the Forest. The remaining mining, logging, trail and homesteading sites are slowly melting into the forest floor and without an extremely large commitment of money and effort they will not be saved. The long term outlook for Forest Service budgets and personnel levels is a downward trend, at least with respect to inflation. The Forest will continue its commitment to preserve and protect those significant sites that have already been identified and work toward preservation of a sample of the remaining sites to the extent possible given budgetary conditions.

Appendix A: Shoshone 594 Recreation Residence Form

This confidential appendix is not available for public release.

Appendix B: West Lake Shore Road Reconstruction Form

This confidential appendix is not available for public release.

Appendix C: Luby Bay Lot 566-B Monitoring Form

This confidential appendix is not available for public release.

Appendix D: Heritage Site Monitoring Forms

This confidential appendix is not available for public release.