

**NON-SURVEYED APPLGATE TRAIL SITE:  
EAST I-5 MANZANITA REST AREA MET VERIFIED**

**Appendix D5. Future Studies**

**Potential Issue** There is a question of future archaeological studies beyond the subsurface reconnaissance studies already conducted (Sections II.A.7.d) & V.A.4). Should additional Phase III Investigations and data recovery studies, the most intensive, and intrusive level of archaeological studies, or something similar, be completed prior to the HETC recommending an interpretive trail from the rest area north along the *Trail* to the Harris cairn, and beyond to the vicinity of JA-7? Kelly Rarey and Mike Walker, members of the HETC, remembered the discussion with the OMNCH staff about this question. The potential issue was vandalism and degradation of *Trail* resources, especially the Harris cabin site after public interpretation.

Preliminary “rough” ideas about archaeological field investigations and levels of investigation follow. The author acknowledges that what he doesn’t know about these investigations would fill volumes.

- Literature Survey
- Phase I Archaeological Investigation
  - Reconnaissance-level Pedestrian Survey
  - Reconnaissance-level Subsurface Exploratory Probing
- Phase II Archaeological Field Investigation

Phase I Archaeological Investigation with Technical Report. The purpose of this task is for consultant to establish the presence or absence of archaeological sites on, or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), which may be in the Area of Potential Effect (APE) for the project. Investigations under this task must comply with *Guidelines for Conducting Field Archaeology in Oregon*, SHPO, April 2011. These investigations must include pedestrian survey and/or subsurface exploratory probing. Subsurface probing must be conducted in areas where ground visibility is low and in areas of high probability for archaeological resources, unless documented proof of previous fill is available (i.e. as built geomorphological work).

Phase II Archaeological FIELD Investigation. If cultural sites have been identified during the Phase I study, Phase II investigation may be required. Phase II investigations must be used to establish National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility, which includes establishing vertical and horizontal site boundaries. The Phase II investigation must comply with *Guidelines for Conducting Field Archaeology in Oregon*, SHPO, April 2011.

- Phase III Archaeological Investigation: Data Recovery Study

SHPO’s 2007 *Guidelines for Conducting Field Archaeology in Oregon* probably get at the concern of the HETC with the issue of *Phase III Investigation: Data Recovery Study*. The objectives for Phase I and II Investigations outline the core requirements for Phase III investigation. The Phase I and II investigations establish the foundation and framework for this **last, most intensive, and intrusive level of archaeological study**. The Oregon SHPO uses the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation’s *Recommended Approach for Consultation on*

*Recovery of Significant Information from Archaeological Sites* for guidance on data recovery investigations (see [www.achp.gov/archguide.html](http://www.achp.gov/archguide.html)) in both federal and state projects.

### **Archaeological Field Investigations & Levels of Investigation**

- Phase I Investigation: Identification Study
- Phase II Investigation: Evaluation Study
- Phase III Investigation: Data Recovery Study
- Oregon State Historic Preservation Office. April 2007. *Guidelines for Conducting Field Archaeology in Oregon*. Salem, OR. [http://www.oregon.gov/oprd/HCD/ARCH/docs/draft\\_field\\_guidelines.pdf](http://www.oregon.gov/oprd/HCD/ARCH/docs/draft_field_guidelines.pdf).
- Oregon State Historic Preservation Office. April 2011. *Guidelines for Conducting Field Archaeology in Oregon*. Salem, OR. [http://www.oregon.gov/oprd/HCD/ARCH/docs/state\\_of\\_oregon\\_archaeological\\_survey\\_and\\_reporting\\_standards.pdf](http://www.oregon.gov/oprd/HCD/ARCH/docs/state_of_oregon_archaeological_survey_and_reporting_standards.pdf)
- Oregon State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). Downloaded May 28, 2015. *Guidelines for Historic Resource Surveys in Oregon*. These guidelines do not provide standards and procedures for archaeological surveys. Salem, OR. [http://www.oregon.gov/oprd/HCD/SHPO/docs/guidelines\\_for\\_historic\\_resource\\_surveys\\_2011.pdf](http://www.oregon.gov/oprd/HCD/SHPO/docs/guidelines_for_historic_resource_surveys_2011.pdf).
- Oregon State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). Downloaded May 28, 2015. *State of Oregon Archaeological Survey and Reporting Standards*. Salem, OR. [http://www.oregon.gov/oprd/HCD/SHPO/docs/arch\\_standards.pdf](http://www.oregon.gov/oprd/HCD/SHPO/docs/arch_standards.pdf).
- Oregon Parks and Recreation Department. December 2013. *Guidance for Recording and Evaluating Linear Cultural Resources*. Oregon State Historic Preservation Office. Salem, OR. <http://www.oregon.gov/oprd/HCD/SHPO/docs/ORLinearResourcesGuidancev2.pdf>

It is obvious to the author that some level of a Phase III Investigation: Data Recovery Study occurred with the UO's 2010 subsurface reconnaissance. Artifacts were removed from the site, but with limitations.

- University of Oregon. May 27, 2010. *Subsurface Reconnaissance of the I-5 Chancellor Quarry Stockpile Project, and Metal Detector Survey Within the George and Mary Harris 1854 - 55 DLC (35JO246), Josephine County*. Museum of Natural and Cultural History Report No. 2011-002. Eugene, OR.

*Systematic Subsurface Reconnaissance*. Sursurface reconnaissance conducted by the Museum involved excavating 30x30 cm shovel probes placed at 20-meter intervals along 53 north-south rows, also spaced at 20 m intervals (Figure 6.2). . . . Hand-excavation of the 441 shovel probes removed and sifted approximately 15.1 m<sup>3</sup> of sediment (Report No. 2011-002, pps. 34 - 36).

*Results of the Metal Detector Survey*. "Four hundred eleven alerts were flagged during the metal detector survey of 32 20x20 m survey blocks located within a portion of the Harris Homestead, of which 115 (28%) were examined (Table 5.2). Of the 115 sampled alerts, 53 proved to be only surface items, while 68 required shovel probes. A total of 221 items (177 MNI) were located by the metal detector survey (Table 5.3). These included modern trash associated with homeless camps, nails, wire and other debris from erecting the right-of-way fence and I-5 construction, and historic artifacts presumably stemming from the Harris Homestead and travelers using the Willamette Valley to Jacksonville Wagon Road (Report No. 2011-002, p. 41)

Should additional Phase III Investigations and data recovery studies, the most intensive, and intrusive level of archaeological studies, or something similar, be completed? Of special concern were surface conditions that did not have a 100% recovery.

**Attempt To Contact** Walker tried to answer this question of future archaeological studies needed, beyond the pedestrian survey and subsurface reconnaissance studies already conducted by the UO, by contacting Paul Baxter, Archaeologist, Paul Baxter, Archaeologist, Museum of Natural & Cultural History & State Museum of Anthropology, UO. Walker first wrote a March 28, 2015 snail mail letter which he also sent as an email attachment. The text of the email/letter follows in its entirety.

March 28, 2015 Email/Letter

Paul Baxter, Archaeologist  
Museum of Natural & Cultural History & State Museum of Anthropology  
University of Oregon  
1680 East 15th Avenue  
1224 University of Oregon  
Eugene, Oregon 97403-1224  
541-346-0810  
541-619-7031 Cell  
Email: pbaxter@uoregon.edu  
Web: www.uoregon.edu

Dear Paul:

The officers of the HNAHS wonder if you can assist us. One of its committees, the Hugo Emigrant Trails Committee (HETC), has land use questions about archeological inventories and clearances that may be necessary to develop an interpretive Applegate Trail (*Trail*) through the study area covered by the University of Oregon's (UO) Report No. 2011-002. Our potential issue is adverse impacts to the archaeological site and objects, and the historic site from the proposed interpretive *Trail* because of the very shallow, and therefore extremely fragile archaeological and historic resources located there. We also have a concern about vandalism and illegal digging if the location of the *Trail* and the Harris Cabin cairn are made available to the general public through an interpretive program.

As background the HETC, HNAHS, is still hard at work inventorying, mapping, and interpreting the *Trail* in the Rogue Valley. We are now at the stage of "implementing" a professional *Trail* signage MOU project with the National Park Service (NPS) and Jackson County, Oregon at Emigrant Lake near the Hill Cemetery.

Currently we are investigating signing a future MOU with the NPS for *Trail* signage at the East I-5 Manzanita Rest Area. As you know, the rest area is just south of the UO's 2010 study area and 2011 report (i.e., University of Oregon Museum of Natural and Cultural History's 2011 Report No. 2011-002 entitled, *Subsurface Reconnaissance of the I-5 Chancellor Quarry Stockpile Project, and Metal Detector Survey within the George and Mary Harris 1854-55 DLC (35J0246), Josephine County*). We will forever remember the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) for getting us together on this project, and the ODOT and UO for respecting us as partners. It was a rewarding experience that Kelly Rarey and I would jump at the chance to repeat.

As you know in 2011, with the UO's permission, the Hugo Land Use Committee (HLUC), working with the HETC, used part of Report No. 2011-002 in land use testimony to Josephine County (JO CO) on a land use application (LUA; Attachment 1 [Appendix D3]). Part of the HLUC's testimony was the position that, if the LUA was approved, the UO's recommendations from Report No. 2011-002 should be translated into conditions of approval to protect the known archaeological and historic resources.

The HETC and HNAHS now have land use questions about Federal and/or State of Oregon archeological inventories and clearances that may be necessary to develop an interpretive *Trail* through the study area covered by Report No. 2011-002 (see previous for potential issues). Equally important is the question of

any needed site review by JO CO for the *Trail* proposal. For example, would the following local rules apply for a proposed interpretive *Trail* because it was a “land use” that needed a local LUA?

1. Evaluation of the archaeological site for its significance - if found to be significant, the county will apply the provisions of the Goal 5 rule (Policy 1 of of JCCP Goal 7), or
2. Establishment of a historic sites review committee to determine conflicts with primary historic resources and requests for alteration (Policy 3 of of JCCP Goal 7), or
3. Employ a review process pursuant to the historic review provisions of Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance (Policy 4 of of JCCP Goal 7).

I will follow up with a telephone call to you about the question of Federal and/or Oregon archeological inventories and clearances that may be necessary, and I will also contact the JO CO Planning Office per any applicable county rules.

With the UO’s permission, we would like to use parts of Report No. 2011-002 in supporting a draft MOU with the NPS for *Trail* signage at the East I-5 Manzanita Rest Area. We would not use information from the UO’s report about specific locations of resources.

Have a great day.

Sincerely,

Mike :)

*/s/ Mike Walker*, Education Chair  
Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society

Attachments:

Attachment 1. Hugo Land Use Committee. May 18, 2011. *Email/Letter to James Black, Planner, Josephine County Planning Department*. From John Makepeace, Wayne McKy, and Mike Walker, Members of the HLUC, HNAHS, Hugo, OR.

Email copies:

Jim & Rene Ford, Co-Project Leaders, GLO Field Review SubCommittee, HETC, HNAHS

Without a response to his March 28, 2015 email/letter, Walker attempted to contact Baxter via the telephone. On May 14, 2015 Walker left telephone recordings at Baxter two telephone numbers.

541-619-7031 Cell (May 14, 2015, 8:00 a.m.)

541-346-0810 (May 14, 2015, 8:05 a.m.)

On Saturday, May 16, 2015, Walker provided a status report to Jim and Rene Ford, Co-Project Leaders, HETC, HNAHS, at their home.

In summary, depending on the issue of future studies, the signage being considered for the EI-5Man Site could be in one or two phases. The basic Phase One Signage would be located in the East I-5 Manzanita Rest Area. Phase Two Signage would be an interpretive trail connected to the signage in the rest area, but also located outside the rest area to the north as an interpretive trail.

Should a “Phase III Archaeological Investigation: Data Recovery Study”, or something similar, be completed prior to the HETC recommending an interpretive trail from the rest area north along the *Trail* to the Harris cairn and beyond to the vicinity of JA-7?

If additional studies are not required, or necessary, the signage project could be a combination of both phases. If additional studies are recommended, the project would be the basic Phase One Signage.

Treatment of this issue is documented in *Non-Surveyed Applegate Trail Site: East I-5 Manzanita Rest Area Site* in two sections: 1. II.A.7.d) and 2. V.A.4.

Walker, Mike, Member, HETC; Draft May 15, 2015. *Non-Surveyed Applegate Trail Site: East I-5 Manzanita Rest Area Site*. Hugo, OR.

C:\Users\Mike\Documents\Genealogy\Applegate\_Trail\Mapping & Marking\Signage\EastI-5Manzanita\_RestArea\Trail\_Site\_Verification\Final Walker Paper\EI5Man\_EastManzanitaRestArea\_SITE\_APPENDICES\_D5\_053115.wpd