

APPENDIX L

Cultural Resource Use Categories

Identifying and Evaluating Cultural Resources

The following information is found in BLM Manual 8110.

.4 Categorizing Cultural Resources as to Uses. Categorizing cultural resources according to their potential uses is the culmination of the identification process and the bridge to protection and utilization decisions. Use categories establish what needs to be protected, and when or how use should be authorized. All cultural resources have uses, but not all should be used in the same way. Cultural resources can be allocated to the various recognized use categories even before they are individually identified. The clear advantage in doing this is that it allows Field Office managers to know in advance how to respond to conflicts that arise between specific cultural resources and other land uses. Relative to the national Programmatic Agreement, categorizing resources to uses provides a mechanism for the Field Office manager and the SHPO to confer and concur on how to handle most routine cases of conflict in advance, enabling the Field Office manager to put decisions into effect in the most appropriate and most timely manner.

.41 Allocations to Use Categories.

A. Field Office managers shall allocate to appropriate use categories all cultural properties known and projected to occur in a plan area. Allocations are made in land use plans (RMP), and may be applied both to individual properties and to classes of similar properties. Appropriately qualified staff professionals recommend suitable uses for each cultural property or class of properties, considering the properties' characteristics, condition, setting, location, and accessibility, and especially their perceived values and potential uses. A cultural property may be allocated to more than one use category or it may pass from one category to another (e.g., from Scientific Use to Public Use, as when an archaeological property becomes appropriate for in-place interpretation and conservation for future scientific use, upon completion of scientific investigation). During the compliance process for proposed land uses, allocations allow Field Office managers to analyze needs and develop appropriate mitigation and treatment options. Allocations should be consistent with historic context documents and State Historic Preservation Plans.

B. Allocations should be reevaluated and revised, as appropriate, when circumstances change or new data become available. Conditions and/or criteria for revising allocations must be included in the RMP, or else revisions may require a plan amendment.

C. A Field Office more than 1 year from an RMP start may assign cultural resources to use categories through an implementation plan (e.g., integrated or interdisciplinary plan, coordinated resource management plan, or landscape management plan) that implements any commitment in an existing land use plan to manage cultural resources appropriately (even if only a commitment to comply with the national Historic Preservation Act; see next to last sentence in .41A). Assignments made in implementation plans do not become full allocation decisions until incorporated in an approved RMP.

.42 Use Categories

A. Scientific Use. This category applies to any cultural property determined to be available for consideration as the subject of scientific or historical study at the present time, using currently available research techniques. Study includes methods that would result in the property's physical alteration or destruction. This category applies almost entirely to prehistoric and historic archaeological properties, where the method of use is generally archaeological excavation, controlled surface collection, and/or controlled recordation (data recovery). Recommendations to allocate individual properties to this use must be based on documentation of the kinds of data the property is thought to contain and the data's importance for pursuing specified research topics. Properties in this category need not be conserved in the face of a research or data recovery (mitigation) proposal that would make adequate and appropriate use of the property's research importance.

B. Conservation for Future Use. This category is reserved for any unusual cultural property which, because of scarcity, a research potential that surpasses the current state of the art, singular historic importance, cultural importance, architectural interest, or comparable reasons, is not currently available for consideration as the subject of scientific or historical study that would result in its physical alteration. A cultural property included in this category is deemed worthy of segregation from all other land or resource uses, including cultural resource uses, that would threaten the maintenance of its present condition or setting, as pertinent, and will remain in this use category until specified provisions are met in the future.

C. Traditional Use. This category is to be applied to any cultural resource known to be perceived by a specified social and/or cultural group as important in maintaining the cultural identity, heritage, or well-being of the group. Cultural properties assigned to this category are to be managed in ways that recognize the importance ascribed to them and seek to accommodate their continuing traditional use.

D. Public Use. This category may be applied to any cultural property found to be appropriate for use as an interpretive exhibit in place, or for related educational and recreational uses by members of the general public. The category may also be applied to buildings suitable for continued use or adaptive use, for example as staff housing or administrative facilities at a visitor contact or interpretive site, or as shelter along a cross-country ski trail.

E. Experimental Use. This category may be applied to a cultural property judged well-suited for controlled experimental study, to be conducted by BLM or others concerned with the techniques of managing cultural properties, which would result in the property's alteration, possibly including loss of integrity and destruction of physical elements. Committing cultural properties or the data they contain to loss must be justified in terms of specific information that would be gained and how it would aid in the management of other cultural properties. Experimental study should aim toward understanding the kinds and rates of natural or human-caused deterioration, testing the effectiveness of protection measures, or developing new research or interpretation methods and similar kinds of practical management information. It should not be applied to cultural properties with strong research potential, traditional cultural importance, or good public use potential, if it would significantly diminish those uses.

F. Discharged from Management. This category is assigned to cultural properties that have no remaining identifiable use. Most often these are prehistoric and historic archaeological properties, such as small surface scatters of artifacts or debris, whose limited research potential is effectively exhausted as soon as they have been documented. Also, more complex archaeological properties that have had their salient information collected and preserved through mitigation or research may be discharged from management, as should cultural properties destroyed by any natural event or human activity. Properties discharged from management remain in the inventory, but they are removed from further management attention and do not constrain other land uses. Particular classes of unrecorded cultural properties may be named and described in advance as dischargeable upon documentation, but specific cultural properties must be inspected in the field and recorded before they may be discharged from management.

Upper Missouri River Breaks National Monument

In order to allocate the numerous known sites and sites "projected to occur" (those yet to be found or recorded) into the identified use categories, criteria must be established which employ a combination of easily recognizable site type and site attribute information that can, for example, differentiate between small, short duration, limited activity sites and large, complex multiple-activity sites. For prehistoric resources the criteria are weighted to emphasize the "information potential," since the determination significance for such sites is generally related to their scientific value. For historic resources, the criteria are more reflective of site "condition and integrity" characteristics, which play a greater role in the evaluation of historic properties.

It is also important to recognize that it is possible for sites to be placed into more than one use category. As an example, a prehistoric site with little or no scientific value could be placed in a Discharge from Management category, but also be useful in the Experimental Use category. Similarly, an historic site could be placed in the Public Use category, but require stabilization and preservation efforts and therefore warrant placement into the Conserve for Future Use category as well.

Prehistoric Resources

Since over 90% of prehistoric sites in the planning area are defined as lithic scatters, it is important to be able to identify potential discriminating elements that can be used to segregate such a large category of prehistoric resources into different use categories. A qualitative assessment of certain aspects of material culture (relative diversity and quantity of artifactual materials) and complexity (spatial patterning of artifacts, presence/absence of features, presence/absence of buried deposits, etc.), coupled with a quantitative measure of site size (in acres) can be utilized to meet the purposes identified. These values will serve as indirect indicators of relative site function, relative duration of occupation, research value, and importance.

The important aspects of material culture include:

Artifact diversity – variety of cultural materials present such as raw material types, variety of materials present bone, stone, ethno botanical qualitatively measured from low to high.

Artifact quantity – relative quantity of material culture present (less than 50 items, hundreds, thousands, etc.) a qualitative measure intended to capture "magnitudes of difference."

Site complexity – as indicated by any spatial patterning in distribution of cultural material, the presence or absence of associated features, the presence of buried deposits and stratigraphy. Site complexity is qualitatively measured from low to high.

Site size – a quantitative measure, looking for modal patterns in overall site size that may reflect a number of things, site function, duration of occupation, etc. These variables will serve as a model to distinguish between the small, more redundant and transient, or temporary, limited use lithic scatters, and larger, longer occupied, camps/habitation sites, and/or extractive use locations.

Based on the model presented above, it is expected that use categories to be reflected as follows:

Scientific Use

Prehistoric sites that exhibit high diversity and large quantity (>50 artifacts) of material culture, high complexity (spatial patterning of artifacts/activities, presence of features, stratified or buried deposits), and relatively larger size properties would be placed into the Scientific Use category.

Conservation Use

Sites that are representative of rare, or exceptional examples (functionally or temporally) would be considered for Conservation Use.

Traditional Use

In consultation with Native American groups, certain types of prehistoric sites retain particular importance and significance (Deaver 1986). These site types most commonly include: burial locations, pictograph/petroglyph sites, and vision quest locations. Medicine wheels, dance grounds and intaglios (e.g., Napi Figures) also are in this category, but none are known to occur on public lands in the planning area. In addition, certain tipi ring sites may also fit this use category but need to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Collectively these sites amount to less than 1% of recorded cultural resources in the planning area.

Public Use

Prehistoric sites could be considered for Public Use (interpretation) in those few instances where interpretive potential is high and site integrity could be insured through protective measures. Such uses should not be attempted without full consultation with interested Native American groups. Consequently, such prehistoric sites still require evaluation on a case-by-case basis. Current opportunities include the Nez Perce Trail and the Cow Island Crossing.

Experimental Use or Discharge from Use

Sites with low diversity and limited quantity (<50) of artifacts; low or limited complexity; and small size (redundant small surface lithic scatter, information potential is exhausted with initial site recordation). Sites will be individually evaluated prior to placement into Experimental Use or Discharge from Use categories.

Historic Resources

Unlike prehistoric resources, historic properties are more commonly determined to be significant for reasons other than their “scientific value.” Similarly, condition and integrity also tend to play more obvious roles in the evaluation of historic properties, which contain architectural or structural remains. Historic resources in the planning area also vary greatly in size, function, and complexity; ranging from small trash dumps, homesteads and other agricultural developments, early exploration and river transportation, wood hawker activity, military establishments, and abandoned wagon roads.

Scientific Use

Historic sites with archaeological and historical values and generally poor, structural integrity (collapsed or deteriorated), would be placed in this category.

Conservation Use

Historical sites that are rare or exceptional examples that retain integrity would be considered for Conservation Use. In the planning area this would include well-preserved remnants of homesteads (Hagadone). It should be noted that the defined use categories are not necessarily mutually exclusive, and that many sites can be placed in both the Conservation Use category (need to stabilize and preserve the architectural features) and the Public Use Category and possibly Scientific Use for example.

Traditional Use

Historic sites in this category would potentially include any sacred areas, traditional cultural properties, or plant gathering areas that have been historically utilized by Native American groups that have historically occupied the area. These sites would be determined in consultation with tribal representatives that have demonstrated historical use in the planning area. To date, Native American traditional use areas have been yet to be identified.

Public Use

Historic sites that would be considered for Public Use include those where the interpretive potential is high and site integrity could be insured through protective

measures. In addition, consideration is given for those standing structures that could be preserved and maintained for adaptive re-use for administrative or recreational uses. Historical themes that would lend themselves to interpretation include:

Early Exploration

Lewis and Clark Corps of Discovery
Fur Trade Era

Historic Transportation Routes

Steamboat Era/Woodhawkers
Cow Island Crossing
Judith Landing
Stafford Ferry
Ervin Ridge Road

Historic Homesteading/Ranching

Hagadone
Gist Bottom
Middleton
Nelson

There are also numerous standing cabin structures and homesteads on public lands across the planning area that may potentially be sufficiently preserved, to be considered for a program of adaptive reuse and utilized

as BLM administrative structures and/or in a recreational cabin rental program.

Experimental Use or Discharge from Use

Like prehistoric sites, individual sites would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis before assignment to either the Experimental Use or Discharge from Use categories. In general, properties assigned to these categories would have been determined to contain little or no scientific or historical value. Sites in these categories would generally include isolated trash dumps and artifact scatters, isolated features such as prospect pits or claim markers, and collapsed structural remains that no longer retain integrity of design or workmanship. Only those sites that have been formally determined to be Not Eligible for the National Register of Historic Places would be placed into either of these categories.

Cultural properties are evaluated with reference to National Register criteria for the purposes of assessing their historical values and their public significance. Such evaluations are carefully considered when cultural properties are allocated to use categories. Although preservation and nomination priorities must be weighted on a case-by-case basis, Table L.1 serves as a general guide illustrating the relationship between National Register evaluation and allocation to use categories.

<p align="center">Table L.1 Relationship Among Cultural Resource Use Categories, National Register Eligibility, and Preservation/National Register Nomination</p>			
<i>Cultural Resource Use Category</i>	<i>National Register Eligibility</i>	<i>Preservation/National Register Nomination</i>	<i>Site Types Generally Included</i>
Scientific Use	Usually Eligible	Long-term preservation not critical; medium National Register nomination priority.	<p>Prehistoric: Sites with high artifact count and diversity, high complexity, and larger size;</p> <p>Historic: Sites with archaeological and historic values, and generally poor structural integrity.</p>
Conservation for Future Use	Always Eligible	Long-term preservation is required; highest nomination priority.	<p>Prehistoric: Sites inherently complex, or rare, or fragile and exhibit exceptional scientific values (e.g. deeply stratified deposits, or large quarries);</p> <p>Historic: Sites inherently complex, or rare, or fragile, generally significant standing structures (stabilization and preservation required).</p>

Table L.1
Relationship Among Cultural Resource Use Categories, National Register Eligibility,
and Preservation/National Register Nomination

<i>Cultural Resource Use Category</i>	<i>National Register Eligibility</i>	<i>Preservation/National Register Nomination</i>	<i>Site Types Generally Included</i>
Traditional Use	May Be Eligible	Long-term preservation is desirable; nomination priority is determined in consultation with the appropriate cultural group(s).	<p>Sites and locations determined in consultation with Tribal Groups.</p> <p>Prehistoric may include: Burial locations, vision quest locations, pictographs and petroglyphs, certain tipi ring sites;</p> <p>Historic/Modern: Plant gathering locations, areas considered sacred for religious purposes, etc.</p>
Public Use	Usually Eligible	Long-term preservation is desirable; high nomination priority.	<p>Prehistoric: High interpretive potential and can insure protection;</p> <p>Historic: High interpretive potential and can insure stabilization and protection, and/or adaptive reuse.</p>
Experimental Use	May Be Eligible	Long-term preservation is not anticipated; low nomination priority.	<p>Prehistoric: Lithic scatters of limited artifact density and complexity;</p> <p>Historic: Trash scatters, collapsed structures with no integrity or context</p>
Discharge from Management	Not Eligible	Long-term preservation and management are not considerations; nomination is inappropriate.	<p>Prehistoric: Isolated finds, surface lithic scatters <50 items;</p> <p>Historic: Isolated prospect pits; trash scatters <50 items, sites <50 years old</p>

