

## APPENDIX H – PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

---

Appendix H includes portions of the Programmatic Agreement between the Forest Service, Idaho State Historic Preservation Officer and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

### Standard and Guidelines

For the purposes of programmatic analysis in the FC–RONRW, mitigation measures are management activities as described within the text of the alternatives themselves, and/or may be included as direction or standards within the Management Plan, which accompanies the FEIS.

The mitigation measure may be either a management action or a standard for implementation by which an activity would take place, which would reduce or eliminate negative social, ecological or economic effects.

The mitigation measures described in this planning process are those relative to the issues being addressed. Some measures, such as PACFISH standards, are referred to or defined, but not specifically described in the document. However, they will be used to mitigate the effects of activities in the Wilderness.

The following interim management direction will be followed for Historic Properties in the FC–RONRW, until such time as consultation on the Historic Preservation Plan is concluded. At that time the Historic Preservation Plan will be implemented in lieu of the direction below.

Known unrecorded Native American and Euro-American archaeological sites were recorded to previous standards as part of the inventory process by 1990, with sites in high visitor use areas given priority. Inventory surveys recorded all heritage resources discovered. Subsequent inventories and review of Forest Service and State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) files suggest that there are numerous unrecorded sites, sites that have not been recorded to present standard, and formally unevaluated sites. The following standards will be used to manage Native American and Euro-American Sites in the FC–RONRW until the Historic Preservation Plan (HPP) is approved:

1. Where recreation or other activities impact significant or unevaluated archaeological sites, the following guidelines will apply. Protective measures should be implemented using least restrictive and intrusive measures first and proceed to more intrusive and restrictive measures as earlier efforts fail to protect the resource.
  - a. Monitoring of site condition and assessment of protection measures should be conducted on an annual basis using professional Archaeologists to complete specific in-depth site monitoring activities and assessments and River Patrol/Back Country Rangers to complete ongoing general site condition assessments, camp use spot checks, and enforcement of protection measures.

## APPENDIX H – PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

---

- 1) Cultural resource sites continually threatened by human activity should be monitored on at least an annual basis.
  - 2) In river corridors and other heavily utilized areas, an annual review will be conducted by the administering National Forest to determine if changes in management and/or protection are needed.
- b. Provide educational opportunities or resource protection messages.
- 1) Educate users using off-site brochures and interpretive opportunities including Middle Fork Times to all successful permit applicants and outfitted parties, Native American Interpreters and portal assistants at launch sites, and providing site-specific camp maps with photos to parties that elect to camp in sensitive sites. Train Wilderness Rangers and portal assistants to emphasize cultural resources as a nonrenewable resource in need of protection. Make training available to outfitters and guides.
  - 2) Signing will be limited to those essential for resource protection, only. Post restoration messages at portals, with site signing to be used only when other resource protection measures fail. Signing will conform to plan and/or minimum tools standards and be implemented upon review of an appropriate ID Team.
  - 3) Interpretation of prehistoric sites along the Middle Fork Salmon Wild River should include, but not be limited to Rattlesnake Cave, Veil Cave, Lower Jackass, and White Creek and should consist of brochures or other means that are in keeping with wilderness values.
  - 4) Site-specific closures involve informing the public through permits and posting notices at portals and at administrative sites. Only as a last effort will site signing be used for resource protection.
2. Evaluate the significance and impacts to archaeological sites:
- a. In camps with visible signs of significant surface features (e.g., pithouses, pictograph panels, dense concentrations of surface cultural materials, etc.) use surface indications to record and determine significance and interpretive potential without resorting to subsurface evaluation methods.
  - b. Where recreation and other activities impact significant or unevaluated cultural resource sites, conduct surface investigations, and when warranted, subsurface testing to determine significance and the range of impacts that are occurring. Thresholds for archaeological test unit evaluation is sites that are degraded to Frissell Class 4 or 5 level or sites that have insufficient surface indications to allow a nondestructive finding of significance or impacts.

## APPENDIX H – PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

---

3. Complete restoration activities where significant archaeological materials (e.g., pithouses, pictographs, and dense artifact concentrations) are threatened by human use. Restoration activities will use methods consistent with archaeological site and wilderness values protection, including:
  - a. Use natural materials (i.e., rocks, logs, brush) to barrier and define use areas and protect features or artifact concentrations; or
  - b. Where sites are degraded to Frissell Class 4 or 5 levels undertake site rehabilitation, such as scarification and seeding or planting of onsite native species. If vegetative rehabilitation fails use structural management controls developed through minimum tools analysis by an appropriate ID Team.
4. Where less impacting methods have failed the following measures will be undertaken in a step-wise progression:
  - a. Where users can easily identify open and closed portions of camps through geomorphic features (e.g., terraces, streams, high benches) or cultural features (e.g., Middle Fork Trail) partial closures may be implemented where camp areas contain no cultural materials or where the cultural materials have been determined to be noncontributing to the site's National Register eligibility through appropriate Section 106 consultation following stipulation 3.b. Where partial camp closures reduce the ability of a specific camp to handle full parties, party size reductions will be implemented as per plan direction.
  - b. Use seasonal or inter-site rest rotation to restore site vegetation to protect significant features or sites.
  - c. Accept recreation impacts through adverse effect consultation with the Idaho SHPO, affected Tribes, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and any interested parties.
  - d. Where partial closures or rest rotation methods are ineffective or recreation impacts are determined to be unacceptable, close the site to impacting uses by closure order.
  - e. Where other methods fail or are unacceptable, complete archaeological data recovery of the impacted campsite following development of a data recovery plan in consultation with Idaho SHPO, affected Tribes, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and any interested parties.
5. Interpret sites and themes appropriate to their significance, condition, location, or other management needs.
6. Monitoring, coordination, and action items.
  - a. Consider prehistoric thematic nomination including southern Nez Perce Trail and pictographs.

## APPENDIX H – PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

---

- b. When management recommendations cannot be fully met, managers will adjust heritage resource priorities based on professional input and consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer.
- c. Where volunteer programs are used for inventory and evaluation, the scheduling of work, report standards, and artifact collection should be carefully monitored and coordinated by qualified Forest Service heritage resource personnel.
- d. As a protective measure, all known pictographs and petroglyphs *will* be thoroughly recorded.
- e. State Historic Preservation Officer consultation *will* be done for each project unless a programmatic agreement is in effect.
- f. The recommendations in the reconnaissance surveys of the Salmon River and Middle Fork of the Salmon River (Knudson 1982, Price 1982, Kingsbury and Stoddard 1996, Matz 2002) will be consulted when activities or projects affect sites along these watercourses.
- g. Prehistoric sites on the Middle Fork which should receive priority attention include: Camas Creek, Cameron Creek, Cow Creek, Hospital Bar, Lower Jackass, Pungo Creek, Rock Island, Sheepeater Hotsprings, Stoddard Creek, Survey Creek, Tumble Creek, White Creek, Wilson Creek, and Woolard Creek.
- h. Prehistoric sites on the Salmon River which should receive priority attention include: Corn Creek, Corey Bar, Bruin Creek, Big Mallard Camp, Indian Creek Bar, and Spindle Creek.
- i. Record historical ruins as part of the regular heritage resources inventory process since site values other than “structural” may exist.
- j. Historic thematic nominations to consider are: the Sheepeater Campaign, the Three Blaze Trail, and the Thunder Mountain Trail (see Historic Trails).
- k. Provide interpretation for historic sites along the Middle Fork of the Salmon Wild River including: White Creek (both historic and prehistoric), Joe Bump’s Cabin, Sater Cabin, and Power House. On the Salmon, sites interpreted should include: Barth Hot Springs (rock carvings plus site), Lantz Bar, Smith Gulch Cabin, and the Jim Moore Place. Interpretation should be in keeping with wilderness values by using off-site brochures, etc.