

## Heritage Resources

The vast majority of the watershed has felt the impact of human use. Some impacts, although not currently measurable, occurred between the 18<sup>th</sup> and mid-19<sup>th</sup> centuries. These would have included impacts to forest tree species age and diversity, wildlife populations, soils, viewsheds, fragmentation/openings ratios, and the demographic profile of the area (Indian-to-colonial at low-to-moderate population density). The most dramatic changes, however, took place after the development of rail lines into the area in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries.

### Reference Conditions

**Pre-historic** – Pre-historic conditions for this area are integral to understanding the presence of people on the landscape for the last several thousand years. Studies of pollen and spores from the region and comparative data (e.g., Carbone 1976; Davis 1983; Wilkins 1977) indicate that a southward displacement of boreal floral and faunal species followed the terminal glacial retreat. Pockets of tundra vegetation, dominated by spruce, fir and pine, extended from the north into the uplands region of the Appalachian range between 25,000 and 15,000 BP (before present). The transition to more modern flora begins between 12,500 and 10,000 BP with an increase in deciduous forest species, including oak and ironwood. This period coincided with the first probable human use of the region. This epoch also saw the extinction of many faunal species including elephant, camel, mastodon, giant bison, giant peccary, giant beaver, ground sloth, and woodland musk ox. By 10,000 BP, the transition to a mixed coniferous-deciduous forest had begun.

By 7,500 BP, mixed hardwood forests were present on the Allegheny Plateau, with the expansion of birch, oak and hickory communities. Continued warming trends led to mixed hardwood forests at higher elevations. Around 5,000 BP spruce forests experienced resurgence in Pennsylvania and West Virginia, probably indicating the spread of diverse open forest canopies and bog settings (i.e., the growth of *Picea rubens*). Modern climatic conditions were probably in place by around 3,000 BP, although various peaks-and-valleys in temperature and moisture regimes continued to the present. These conditions affected both the vegetation mixes and fish/wildlife species and by direct extension, subsistence patterns for people.

Human use of the landscape during the PaleoIndian and Early/Middle Archaic sequences (ca. 11,000-6,000 BP) was largely restricted to hunting/gathering/fishing, and establishment of domestic sites. The bedrock types in this area may have encouraged quarrying for raw material to make stone tools. The presence of potential campsites in the form of rock shelters also may have encouraged human use of this and nearby landscapes at this time.

The implications of the early prehistoric period on the reference condition of the watershed are minimal. Some modification of plant communities occurred through harvest and selective protection; some animal populations were controlled through hunting and trapping; and the use of fire as a habitat management tool may have occurred. However, by and large, human populations are perceived to have been too small during the early periods (Paleo-Indian and Early/Middle Archaic) to cause significant effects on the environment.

In contrast, Late Archaic and Woodland Period societies (ca. 6,000 BP to 1600+ AD, including early European colonization/contact) had increasingly noticeable impacts on the environment. Larger populations, new technologies, an evolving subsistence strategy, and associated increases in the size and duration of occupation of villages, all led to deeper and more widespread human impacts. The major activities that changed the environment were: intentional encouragement and protection of plant communities; burning to open up the understory and enhance game habitat, targeting berry and mast species, and contributing to an oak presence; the adoption of horticulture and agriculture over the last 2,000 years, requiring cleared gardens and fields, many near streams and rivers; and biodegradation of local environments associated with, for example, long-term village locations.

In summary, subsistence activities and residential sites would have had an effect on the health and diversity of the forest community, size and behavior of wildlife species, and fragmentation of the forest. Activities and presence also increased sedimentation rates in the streams near villages. The Native American population was displaced through disease and war, starting in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. The effect of smallpox on the Native American was enormous; by some estimates more than half the pre-European population was killed by smallpox before they had even laid their eyes upon a wagon. Thus, the pre-contact patterns of their lifestyle are now known only through archaeology, oral history and a handful of early settlers' or explorers' accounts.

**Historic Conditions** – Much of what follows below is derived from the Monongahela's *Historic Property Management Plan* (Swanson et al. 2004). By the early 1750s, the Greenbrier Valley had a number of small settlements, with pioneers moving into the area from the Valley of Virginia. By 1754, on the eve of the French and Indian War, an estimated 50 families had settled in the valley, particularly around Muddy, Howard, Anthony, Spring Lick, and Knapp Creeks (Rice and Brown 1993:20-21). Even then, it appears there were settlements in what is now Pocahontas County.

After Braddock's Defeat in 1755, the frontier erupted in violence, and some of this was directed at settlements along the Greenbrier. There were at least two forts built to defend that region. Beginning with the surprise attack by the Shawnee in 1755, Indian raids drove the settlers out of the valley and back across the Alleghenies (Rice 1986:21-25).

The next wave of settlement entered the upper Greenbrier Valley after 1769. By the time of Dunmore's War in 1774, the region was already settled, at least at the lower elevations (Rice 1986:7, 29-34; Rice and Brown 1993:28-29; Environmental Protection Agency 1981a:2.123). By that time, settlement had again reached up into what is now Pocahontas County, with settlers spreading along streams like Knapp, Anthony, Indian Draft, Deer, Wolf, Second, and Sitlington Creeks. When Lewis's army left for Point Pleasant, it has been estimated that the total number of settlers within the Greenbrier Valley was between three and four thousand (Davis 1978:60; Rice 1986:31). These settlers erected forts for protection. Most were little more than fortified residences for neighboring families. Among them was Fort Greenbrier, near what is now Marlinton.

By around 1800, it is estimated that some 150 families lived in what is now Pocahontas County. Two decades later, in 1821, the county was created from northern Greenbrier and southern

Randolph counties. Huntersville was designated the county seat the following year (Flegel 1992:11; Doran 1987:42; Pocahontas County 1997:4, 72).

One of the most important events to occur in upper Pocahontas County was the construction of the Staunton-Parkersburg Turnpike. Initial surveys began in 1823. Even though work began in the 1820s, serious construction did not commence until 1838, with work simultaneously progressing from the east and west ends. Irish immigrants did most of the labor. Completed in 1847, the Staunton-Parkersburg Turnpike generally followed the course of what is now U.S. Route 250 across the crest of the Alleghenies (Hriblan et al. 1996:5, 13-14, 23-25). The route went through the communities of Bartow and Durbin (Daley and McClung c. 1990).

The successful completion of the Staunton-Parkersburg Turnpike inaugurated the construction of smaller, auxiliary turnpikes that connected with the main line. Foremost of these were the Huttonsville and Marlin's Bottom Turnpike, and its extension, the Lewisburg and Marlin's Bottom Turnpike, both constructed in the 1850s. Other roads constructed or improved during this period included the Beverly-Fairmont Turnpike; the Huntersville Road, between Bartow and Huntersville; and the Huntersville Turnpike, between Huttonsville and Huntersville (Davis 1978:69; Rice 1986:141-144; Lesser 1993:1).

The Staunton-Parkersburg Pike was important to the course of the Civil War. By the end of 1861, there were Federal fortifications on Cheat Mountain just west of Pocahontas County. In opposition were Confederate fortifications at Camp Bartow, near the present day Ranger Office, and at Camp Allegheny, atop Allegheny Mountain on the east side of the Upper Greenbrier Watershed. All of these positions were along the Staunton-Parkersburg Turnpike.

On October 3, 1861, a Federal force out of Fort Milroy, on Cheat Mountain, attacked Camp Bartow in the battle of Greenbrier River. The Federals were repulsed and fell back to Cheat Summit. Camp Bartow was soon abandoned as the Confederates pulled back to Camp Allegheny, located further east on the turnpike (Davis 1978:73). Camp Allegheny itself was attacked on December 13, 1861 by 1,900 Federal troops out of Fort Milroy, under the command of Brigadier General Robert H. Milroy. Col. Edward Johnson and his 1,200 Confederate defenders repulsed the attack.

After the assault on Camp Allegheny, the situation along the Staunton-Parkersburg Turnpike remained static for the rest of the winter. There was, however, a small raid from that area down into the Greenbrier Valley. In early January 1862, after skirmishing with Confederates at Marlin's Bottom (Marlinton), a few hundred Federals conducted a raid on Huntersville. After destroying Confederate supplies, the Federals returned to their base in the mountains (Davis 1978:74; Pocahontas County 1997:45-46).

As late as 1873, upper Pocahontas County was only sparsely settled, and covered by thick forest. The northern, higher regions were carpeted by red spruce, while the lower portion of the county had stands of white pine (White 1873). In the years that followed, from the early 1870s to the early 1900s, river logging became a prominent economic activity, particularly along the lower reaches of the Greenbrier River, from the Marlinton area and south. In 1891, the county seat was moved from Huntersville to the logging and tanning town of Marlinton, which had become the center of the local timber industry (Flegel 1992:11).

By the end of the 1890s, the county had its first and greatest railroad. A subsidiary of the Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad, it was later known as the “Greenbrier Division of the Chesapeake and Ohio,” usually referred to as the Greenbrier Division. Work began on this railroad in 1899 with a crew of 1500 men, laying up to one mile of track a day. In this fashion, the line was constructed to Marlinton and Cass by 1900, to Durbin by 1902 and finally reaching Winterburn by 1905 (Lewis 1998:77, 80; Pocahontas County 1997:179). This rail line allowed timbering on a scale previously unimaginable in the county. Between 1901 and 1920, there were seven band saw mills and associated communities along the West Fork Greenbrier River, and two mills/communities along the East Fork. The photo below shows the mill site at Burner on the West Fork circa 1905.



**Figure HR-1. Burner Mill Site, Circa 1905**

The area was also subjected to slash fires and was more severely flooded as a result of increased surface runoff. Recognizing the devastation brought about by unregulated logging, President Wilson declared the boundaries of the Monongahela National Forest in 1920. Subsequently, significant reforestation was accomplished through the efforts of the Civilian Conservation Corps in the 1930s. Under the stewardship of the National Forest, the area is once again thriving, albeit with significantly altered floral, faunal, sediment, and hydrological regimes.

Exhaustion of the forests, coupled with the Great Depression, brought about a precipitous economic and social decline. Many towns and small communities were abandoned. Within the assessment area, the infrastructure aspects of this settlement/industrial system (i.e., homes, farms, schools, mill sites, transportation systems, etc.) tended to cluster around the Bartow – Durbin corridor, and the West and East Forks of the Greenbrier River. Within NFS lands, much of this infrastructure now exists only as archaeological sites and some “cultural landscapes”.

From 1750 to 1870 the population of Pocahontas County increased from 2 to 4,069. By 1920, near the end of the railroad logging era, the population was over 15,000 (Lewis 1998). For the past 10 years the population of Pocahontas County has remained near the 9,000 level.

### **Current Conditions**

Given the current state of research in the watershed area, it is not possible to characterize in any meaningful way prehistoric use of landscape. This inability is due to the fact that relatively few site evaluations (beyond administratively dismissing Isolated Finds and severely disturbed sites) have been conducted. Thus, while many sites have been identified, we do not know when they were occupied or what types of activities their inhabitants were engaged in. Some of the previously recorded sites have a very high potential for yielding important information on prehistoric utilization of the area. Until these sites are evaluated, however, our knowledge of the prehistory of the project area will remain unknown. It is known that the area has a high potential for locating prehistoric resources based on the results of previous surveys, coupled with the facts that the area is a natural transportation hub: the East and West Forks of the Greenbrier River meet near Durbin where they form the Greenbrier River, rivers flow both north and south (Shaver’s Fork flowing north and the Greenbrier flowing south) and gaps over the Allegheny Front are located directly to the east.

The results of previous archaeological surveys indicate that most historic period activity in the area was related to resource extraction, particularly mining and logging. A comparatively small proportion of historic period sites located in the watershed were devoted to human habitation. The historic period occupation of the area directly within the watershed was, and continues to be, focused on the towns of Durbin and Bartow, although there were many smaller communities and mill sites along the West and East Forks of the Greenbrier River.

There are numerous sites and features left on the landscape. They are the correlates to the standing architecture and functional outbuildings of the historic economy. We would therefore expect the remains of communities, houses, barns, outbuildings, mills, blacksmith shops, schools, logging camps, mining structures, etc. to still be identifiable. Also, the footprints of transportation systems, and vegetative “artifacts” in the form of complete and partial cultural landscapes (apple orchards, pine plantations, sugar bushes, openings, and more) will likely be located. Their distribution is heavily biased toward the main transportation arteries.

Cultural resource surveys have been conducted over a portion of the watershed assessment area, in order to determine more accurately the types and locations of sites that may be affected by construction disturbance related to watershed improvement and other Forest Service management activities. Potential ground-disturbing impacts related to watershed improvement

include alterations to roads, drainages and riparian systems. Road alterations may consist of creating new roads or improving or closing existing roads. Drainage improvements may include enlarging existing culverts and drainages, and constructing more cross-drains. Potential riparian modifications include the construction of in-stream structures, as well as stream bank stabilization. Other potential Forest Service activities include the implementation of ongoing land management plans such as timber sales, range activities, and mineral and natural gas leasing, among others.

Other potential threats to the integrity of historic and prehistoric sites (discovered and undiscovered) include unregulated development on private lands, natural/anthropic processes such as erosion, and vandalism/looting.

Currently, the nature, extent, and scope of potential impacts in the Upper Greenbrier Watershed from future projects have yet to be determined. Therefore, it is not possible to identify specific areas that require archaeological survey. The work reported on here thus represents an attempt to provide a broad characterization of the types and density of cultural resources to be found in the project area.

The most recent surveys of the assessment area located a number of archaeological sites. Prehistoric sites ranged from small lithic scatters covering only a few square meters to large base camps that extend over several thousand square meters. Historic sites consisted primarily of the remains of activities associated with resource extraction. These include railroad grades and other transportation-related features, and logging and mining camps. A single historic period home site was located.

A total of 53 Heritage Resource surveys have been conducted either wholly or partially within the current watershed assessment area between 1980 and 1994. The total area in acres covered by these surveys is shown at the base of Table HR-1. It should be kept in mind that many of these surveys were not conducted in a manner consistent with current standards; many of these areas would need to be re-surveyed prior to any management actions involving ground disturbance.

This previous survey data indicates that all of the heritage surveys were project-driven. Surveys have been conducted primarily for timber sales, but have also been conducted for special use permits, recreation, energy extraction, roads, and lands.

A total of 126 heritage resources have been recorded in the Upper Greenbrier Watershed. Of these, 39 represent the remains of prehistoric resource exploitation and/or habitation, while 83 represent Euro-American historic period activities; four represent multi-component prehistoric deposits. Heritage sites include old sawmills, school, home sites, bridges, cemeteries, transportation arteries, railroad grades, logging camps, other campsites, rock shelters, lithic scatter, mines, and unidentified structures. Also, and significantly, several Civil War battlefields and camps are located within the watershed. It should be noted that a good portion of these sites were recorded in 1977 and 1978 during the initial Cultural Resources Survey of the Forest (Davis 1978). This survey involved checking old maps and West Virginia Geological Survey site records for sites on Forest lands. It did not involve any fieldwork.

**Table HR-1. Previous Heritage Surveys in the Upper Greenbrier River Watershed**

Project Name	Acres in Watershed	Project Name	Acres in Watershed
Little River West TS	600	Abes Run TS	396
Mountain Lick Creek TS	738	Mullenax Run TS (add-on)	18
Laurel Fork May and West Campground	24	Vista-Cheat Mountain 250-92	1.2
Small Sales, FY 1982	163	Elklick TS	740
Frank Mountain TS	952	Buffalo Lake Trailhead Parking	2
Small Sales, FY 1983	333	Small Sales, FY 1991	22
Simmons Run TS	214	Miles Run TS	197
Wildell TS	1185	Buffalo Ridge TS	2
Pig Ear Pine TS	419	Mountain Lick OA	1025
Johns Camp Sale	20	Burner Settlement OA	827
Fox Run Sale	114	Gaudineer Knob Toilet Replacement	1.4
Little River Flagstone Quarry	21	Burner Mountain OA	5845
Beulah Sale	265	Phase I Survey, Timber Sales	2030
Mullenax Run Sale	1007	May OA	6288
5-mile Flagstone Permittee	12	Phase I Survey, Timber Sales	7291
Newman ROW	1	Suter Run OA	155
Little River Camp Spruce	131	East Shavers Fork OA	201
Small Sales	28	Thornwood Gas Pipeline Amendment	1.8
Small Sales	12	Columbia Gas Wells	1.3
Fox Run TS (add-on)	54	Natural Gas Drilling Sites	76
Small Sales	20	Helicopter Landing	10
Buffalo Fork Lake Road	113	Glady Fork Watershed	83
Pocahontas County 4h Road	0.5	Divide Pulp TS	3
Frank Mtn. Wildlife Opening and TS	18	Grassy Mountain TS, Compartment 82	81
4H Camp Bath House	24	Osceola OA	23
Little Beech Mountain TS	505	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>32,341</b>

As previously mentioned, numerous sites have already been recorded in the Upper Greenbrier Watershed assessment area. These sites have, however, only been identified and avoided during Forest management activities (flagged and avoided); their true potential to aid in understanding the long-term ecological conditions of, and human impact to, the watershed have not been realized. Potential for sites in the assessment area is high. Given the previous patterns of site location in the watershed, and the relative ubiquity of water, any area (e.g. bottom, bench, terrace, saddle) with a slope of 10 percent or less has the potential to yield both prehistoric and historic resources. There is a strong trend towards prehistoric horticultural/agricultural (and fishing) village/base-camp sites along the lower terraces and floodplains; lithic workshops and/or quarries (at outcrops); “traditional use” sites at higher elevations and vistas; and hunting/gathering sites scattered throughout the area. There are so few burials known throughout the state that there is no reliable pattern that can be inferred at this point.

Except in flood plains and core areas of historic development, existing sites should have retained much of their physical integrity. Speculation for locating additional sites is that many of the same factors making an area attractive in the past (e.g., water, vistas, drainage, slope) makes them attractive today. Thus, an increased emphasis on site discovery (vs. site area avoidance)

during “compliance” archaeology would increase our sample size.

No prehistoric sites have been intensively evaluated or investigated to date. Preservation of features within sites that contain organic (or carbonized) remains is relatively uncommon in the region’s acidic soils, but can occur, particularly in protected locations. Historically, frequent large-scale flooding events have probably reduced the preservation potential of valley-bottom sites, but first and second order terraces, and bedrock-protected streamside locations, may offer good preservation potential. Within prehistoric archaeological sites, fire hearths and storage pits tend to retain the greatest amount of organic or carbonized/organic materials for analysis. In addition, natural features such as ancient ponds, bogs, and wetlands offer the opportunity to do palynological cores reflecting changes, which may complement such analyses. Just about all site types have the potential to have hearths (which may contain the charred remains of nuts, seeds, bones, wood). Storage pits are generally associated with more sedentary, horticultural societies, both later in time and generally lower in elevation than other sites types/time periods.

The floodplains along the Greenbrier River have been well scoured over time, and the slopes in much of the watershed would be prohibitive (or at least discouraging) for agriculture; therefore, these areas may not have good potential for the presence or preservation of such features. Finally, we know that the highest elevations have little or no potential or history for long frost-free seasons; so, by process of elimination, we would expect that the lower hills would be prime “preservation” areas for sites with features associated with agricultural/horticultural settlements.

### **Desired Conditions**

Heritage resources are identified and their eligibility as historic properties for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) determined. If warranted, eligible sites are nominated for listing in the NRHP. Qualified researchers and scholars are provided access to data needed to further our knowledge of the prehistory and history of the area of the Forest and the region.

People visiting the National Forest can find opportunities to explore, enjoy, and learn about cultural heritage. As visitors travel through landscapes and experience diverse environments and cultures, they can make a personal connection with the land and people and have the opportunity to reflect on the relevance of the past and the land to their daily lives (Forest Plan, p. II-38).