

Contents

Introduction

**Working Together: Partners
on Public Lands** 1

Progress in Historic Preservation 4 6

Performance and Funding

**Framing the Program: Goals and
Activities**

**Field Office Planning, Implementation
and Accomplishments** 10 12 15

Appendix: Classification of Activity

Types

In exchange for the savings in time and money that these streamlined procedures confer, BLM agreed to develop this Historic Preservation Program.

Introduction

The 100th anniversary of the Antiquities Act and the 40th anniversary of the National Historic Preservation Act were both celebrated in 2006. Today, just as was the case in 1906, the cultural resources on the public lands are in need of legal safeguards, the attention of land management agencies, and the support of the public.

This need is recognized by the strategic importance that the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Land Management accords to the protection and public access and enjoyment of cultural resources. Additionally, this importance was affirmed when California BLM developed its current Statewide Protocol Agreement (USDI BLM 2004, rev. 2007). The Historic Preservation Program presented here has been developed in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Protocol Agreement. The Protocol document outlines streamlined procedures by which the BLM in California complies with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).

In return for the procedural flexibility that (the) Protocol provides in meeting 36 CFR 800 responsibilities, BLM commits to fulfill the responsibilities enumerated in Section 110 of NHPA. The State Director shall approve a statewide Heritage Preservation Plan (HPP).... The HPP may include, but shall not be limited to, programs of evaluation and National Register nomination, monitoring for historic property condition and ARPA, stabilization and preservation, inventory, documentation of known but unrecorded properties, research, interpretation, training and professional contributions, and public involvement in historic preservation activities (Protocol Sec. III.A)

The Bureau of Land Management manages the public lands for multiple uses and strives to strike a balance between production of energy, food, and fiber on one hand while safeguarding air and water quality,

recreational opportunities, wildlife, and fossil and cultural resources. California BLM understands that protection of cultural resources is crucial to its mission and the interests of the American public. Consequently, the California BLM focuses on protection of cultural resources as a Strategic Priority within its general mission of Resource Protection and as consistent with the Department of Interior's Strategic Goal to "Protect the nation's natural, cultural, and heritage resources."

The Historic Preservation Program has been prepared by BLM Cultural Heritage staff in consultation and coordination with the California and Nevada Offices of Historic Preservation (SHPO).

For California, this Program relies heavily on the results of gap analysis and public input into two key heritage plans:

- the Office of Historic Preservation's *California Statewide 2006-2010 Historic Preservation Plan*
- California State Parks' *California History Plan*.

For Nevada, this Program has drawn on the goals, issues, and data gaps identified in the statewide *Comprehensive Preservation Plan 2003* and two important contextual documents developed by the Nevada SHPO:

- *Archaeological Research in Nevada*

- *Exploration and Early Settlement in Nevada: Historic Context*

The purpose of this Program is to provide a framework for planning and implementing historic preservation projects, for tracking accomplishments, and for directing Cultural Heritage Program funding (Subactivity 1050 funding). On California's and Nevada's public lands (managed by California BLM), subactivity 1050 funding is for proactive cultural resources work; this Program is a means to ensure that Subactivity 1050 funding is not used as project support for other functional areas (e.g. Section 106 compliance).

The heritage management plans of the State of California have been developed in part to respond to changes in the numbers, distribution and diversity of the state's 38 million citizens. The *California History Plan* seeks ways to balance the need for heritage-based tourism and recreation across the state. The SHPO's *Statewide Historic Preservation Plan* seeks to provide guidance and priorities for historic preservation. The statewide heritage planning documents for Nevada are intended to provide protection of cultural resources and historic lifeways while coping with rapid population growth and increasing demand for wildland recreation by the state's 2.6 million residents. California BLM, as part of the historic preservation community and a major provider of recreation opportunities across 15 million acres of California public land and 1.2 million acres of Nevada public land, will seek to coordinate, to the extent feasible,

this Historic Preservation Program with the goals of these state plans.

The preparers of this Program document have sought to bring forth a simple, clear program that will provide the flexibility to respond to external funding initiatives, changing cultural conditions, and the needs of various partners. The Program builds on past successes, counts on partners and volunteers to help accomplish projects, relies on the local expertise and knowledge of the Field Offices to develop plans and projects to implement the program, and links historic preservation funding for individual field offices to performance.

DRAFT

Working Together: Partnerships on Public Lands

BLM relies on its staff of cultural resource professionals and volunteers to accomplish its goals in historic preservation. These partners include other federal agencies, tribal governments and other Native American organizations, State and local governments, and advocacy groups.

The past belongs to all. BLM strives to form partnerships with a broad range of the public in recognition of this incontrovertible fact. Most of the partnerships that help BLM advance the work of historic preservation are formed at the Field Office level; they are too numerous to list. Partnerships at the state office level are far fewer but of great strategic importance.

The Society for California Archaeology (SCA), the second

largest archaeological advocacy society in the US after the Society for American Archaeology, and the BLM cooperate in several historic preservation programs for mutual benefit. BLM assists in the funding of the Annual Meeting and Archaeology Month. The Society administers important aspects of CASSP and of cross-border projects, including annual binational symposia, with the Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia (INAH).

The California Archaeological Site Steward Program (CASSP) is a partnership between the Bureau and the trained site stewards who make up CASSP's membership. BLM provides funding for the CASSP program through a grant from another partner, the Off-Highway Vehicle Division of California State Parks. Another partner, Discovery Works, a private cultural resources firm, provides training, coordination, and communication for the volunteers and BLM. These partners and BLM form a network which works together for the purpose of monitoring individual archaeological sites, developing skills for preservation projects, and educating the general public about historic preservation.

BLM consults, coordinates and cooperates with 110 tribal governments in managing those resources of particular concern to Native Americans. In addition, BLM has formed specialized partnerships with several tribal governments and Native American organizations to advance specific programs and objectives. For example,

BLM supports programs of the California Indian Basketweavers Association and the California Indian Forest and Fire Management Council in order to work together toward preservation and protection of natural resources that are important for preservation of traditional crafts and lifeways. The Passport in Time programs, “Weaving Connections” and “Follow the Smoke,” foster opportunities for non-Native Americans to interact with traditional basketweavers and to learn the importance of managing natural resources that have particular importance to traditional people.

The California and Nevada Offices of Historic Preservation work closely with BLM in administering the Protocol and in providing advice and counsel to Field Offices concerning historic preservation issues. In California, the SHPO worked closely with BLM in an effort to understand how various techniques of harvesting juniper trees affect prehistoric sites on the Modoc Plateau.

The community of private consultants and university researchers in California and Nevada conducts research and investigations on the public lands under permit, agreement, or contract are an important part of BLM’s network of partners. These organizations and individuals often develop findings that later become part of our understandings of the past and of ways to manage and protect evidence of the past. For instance, recently new findings have been developed by BLM, private consultants, and academicians that may enable relative

dating of surface rock features in the California desert through dating anthropogenic modifications to desert varnish and carbonates.

BLM is working with the California Cultural and Heritage Tourism Council, a diverse group of agencies, groups, and organizations, in developing heritage tourism opportunities along Highway 49 in the Mother Lode Country and other travel corridors.

California BLM involves the people who live on, work on, and love the land in the partnerships that make the work of historic preservation achievable and mutual. Partnerships are a key to progress in this Historic Preservation Program.

Progress in Historic Preservation

The diversity of the cultural resources found on public land California and Nevada reflects the great diversity of the land itself. The native population occupied and used what is now public land as far back in time as the end of the Pleistocene era. Although the nature of these uses changed after contact with Euro American settlers, sojourners and explorers, they continue into today.

The archaeological remains they left behind on public lands are highly varied: intricate rock paintings and carvings, giant geoglyphs, fish traps along the extinct shoreline of Lake Cahuilla, coastal shell middens at the foot of the King Range, and cleared rock rings on the Modoc plateau.

European contact gradually displaced native people in the period spanning 1540 to 1850, bringing disease, conquest, and destruction of native resources. Beginning in 1882, reservations for tribes and family groups were

established by Executive Order. By 1900, California's native population was reduced to about 20 thousand people. Today, there are 110 Federally-recognized tribes and 90 approximately unrecognized tribes and groups with which BLM deals with regularly.

The Spanish began settling the deserts in the 1600s. The DeAnza expedition crossed the desert in 1776, eventually arriving at San Francisco Bay. Along their way, they crossed Public Lands administered by the El Centro and Palm Springs Field Offices. The discovery of gold in the Mother Lode country in 1849 brought a flood of prospectors and settlers to California. Many stayed to develop the State, contributing to agriculture and other industries. The advent of the railroad toward the end of the 19th century and the homestead laws further opened markets and fostered settlement. Major military development, especially during World War II and the Cold War, brought rapid expansion in industrial development. The rapid urbanization of the state and the influx of newcomers have increased pressures for recreation on public lands.

In 1978, a study of the California Desert (cited in USDI BLM 2003:4) showed that 36 percent of the archaeological sites had been damaged by natural forces and the activities of people--and that the continuing loss of sites was predicted to occur at the rate of one percent

yearly. Since then public education, law enforcement, and such volunteer programs as the California Archaeological Site Stewardship Program (CASSP) have helped to reduce the rate at which damage occurs.

National Register Listings

St. George Reef Light Station	Corn Springs
Birdwell Rock Petroglyph Site	Gus Lederer Site
Punta Gorda Light Station	Martinez Canyon Rockhouse
SW Lake Cahuilla Recessional Shoreline Archaeological District	McCoy Spring Archaeological Site
Yuha Basin Discontiguous District	North Chuckwalla Mountain Quarry District
Fossil Falls Archaeological District	Archaeological Site CA-SBR-3186 (Aboriginal Rock Cairn)
Saline Valley Salt Tram Historic Structure	Archaeological Site CA-SBR-140 (Lake Mojave Type Site)
Bandit Rock (Robber's Roost)	Black Canyon-Inscription Canyon-Black Mountain Rock Art District
Burro Schmidt's Tunnel	Blackwater Well
Last Chance Canyon	CA-SBr-1008A, 1008B, 1008C (Steamwell Petroglyphs Site)
Long Canyon Village Site	Calico Mountains Archaeological District
Walker Pass	Fossil Canyon Petroglyph Site
Cache Creek Archaeological District	Foxtrot Petroglyph Site (CA-SBR-161)

Willow Creek Rim Archaeological District	Newberry Cave Site
Nelson Springs	Rodman Mountains Petroglyph Archaeological District
Petroglyph Point Archaeological Site	Squaw Spring Archaeological District
Chalfant Petroglyph Site	Kuchamaa (Tecate Peak)
Dry Lakes Plateau	Table Mountain District
Yellow Jacket Petroglyphs	Carrizo Plain Rock Art Discontiguous District
Red Dog Townsite	Piedras Blancas Light Station
Archaeological Sites CA-RIV-504 and CA-RIV-773 (Mule Tank Discontiguous District)	Point Sal Ataje
Blythe Intaglios	Swasey Discontiguous Archaeological District

The work done by BLM's professional cultural resources Staff and volunteers has been impressive—and provides an idea of the scope of the resource to be managed and protected. By 2002, over 1.7 million acres had been inventoried in California and Nevada and over 27,000 cultural properties had been recorded. Forty-seven properties or districts have been listed on the National Register of Historic Places; these 47 listings contain over 1200 contributing properties. The scope of National Register listings includes rock art, prehistoric village sites, traditional cultural properties, archaeological districts, and historic townsites, buildings, and lighthouses.

Significant properties have been acquired, often through partnerships with the Trust for Public Lands. The Conway Ranch in Mono County and the Bittner Ranch in Washoe County were acquired, preserving the cultural landscape of traditional ranches as well as historic ranch structures. The Piedras Blancas Lighthouse was acquired in 2001 through the work of federal, state and local agencies and the dedicated effort of private organizations; a partnership with California State Parks ensures support.

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) have been designated to ensure a higher level of protection for particularly important or sensitive cultural resources. Sixty ACEC's provide such elevated forms of protection as patrols, interpretation, and archeological inventory.

BLM's Regional scale planning efforts are increasingly responsive to historic preservation as a focus of resource management. Overviews, context statements and research designs are being developed as components of regional planning. These documents provide tools for management of cultural resources in their own right as resources on an equal footing with the other managed resources on public lands. The land management plan for the three northeastern California field offices included a combined overview and research design that summarized much of the available scholarly research on the prehistory and history of northeastern California and northwestern Nevada.

Regional planning efforts have also helped to resolve past deficiencies in historic preservation. Revision of the Desert Plan in 2005 incorporated a long range plan to inventory, assess and monitor cultural resources situated along the thousands of miles of off highway travel routes in the California Desert.

California BLM, as have other land management agencies, inherited a legacy of paper documents and other media that document the nature and management of its thousands of cultural resources. In concert with many partners, California BLM has embarked on an ambitious program of converting legacy records to electronic documents, to record all newly documented cultural resources electronically, and to provide for curation of the thousands of records that will be encoded electronically.

Certain programs have contributed disproportionately to progress in historic preservation. CASSP has trained hundreds of volunteers in the techniques and practices of site stewardship and many at-risk sites on public land benefit from the watchful eyes of volunteer stewards. A formal partnership between BLM and Mexico's Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia (INAH) has built understanding of common cultural heritage and shared management problems.

The scope of California BLM's historic preservation projects includes inventory, stabilization, restoration, evaluation, data recovery, information management,

acquisition, listings on the National Register, adaptive re-uses, public involvement, education and interpretation. The intent of this Historic Preservation Program is to build on the cumulative experience of its professional staff and partners to shape and encourage historic preservation in the future.

DRAFT

Performance and Funding

The State Protocol Agreement between California BLM and the Office of Historic Preservation requires development of this Historic Preservation Program (III.A.). This Program document

shall become an Amendment to (the) Protocol and shall guide BLM in achieving measurable progress toward compliance with Section 110 of the NHPA (National Historic Preservation Act).

The Protocol allows BLM to realize efficiencies and cost savings while achieving compliance with 36 CFR 800, the federal regulations which implement Section 106 of the NHPA. In exchange for procedural flexibility and cost savings provided by the Protocol, BLM has agreed to develop and implement this Historic Preservation Program.

Annually California BLM receives funding for implementation of the types of historic preservation activities that are envisioned in this Historic

Preservation Program. Because of a long history of statewide budget constraints, some of that funding has been diverted toward the task of compliance with 36 CFR 800 for such functional areas as recreation, minerals, and management of fuels and rangeland.

Approximately 80% of cultural resources activities for the State are in support of other functional areas. The funding, and the time of cultural resources professionals, are thus directed away from historic preservation and toward compliance activities. This Historic Preservation Program is the vehicle for changing how the time of cultural resources professionals is allocated and to what kinds of activities cultural resources dollars are directed.

The Protocol is a document based on trust reinforced by accountability. In essence, the California Office of Historic Preservation has agreed that California BLM has the capability, the means, and the will to execute many of the regulatory activities delineated in 36 CFR 800. The SHPO exercises diligent oversight through the review processes that are made explicit in the Protocol (III.E.).

When this Historic Preservation Program is adopted, the State and Field Offices will demonstrate measurable accountability toward compliance with Section 110 of NHPA. The performance of the State and the individual

field offices in meeting the goals of historic preservation will become part of the scope of the Protocol's annual review activities.

In Fiscal Year 2007, each Field Office received an equal amount of cultural resources funding to support historic preservation work, administrative functions and tribal consultation. In future years, the funding may be distributed disproportionately among the Field Offices with an emphasis on focusing funds on those Field Offices that are contributing to progress in Section 110 historic preservation and toward professional development.

DRAFT

Framing the Program: Focus and Activity

This Historic Preservation Program sets the overall goals and defines the range of activities in which progress will be made by the Field Offices. The overall goals are established with specific reference to either the current Workload Measures that BLM uses to gauge the performance of its workforce or to the scope of activities which are normally understood to constitute the field of historic preservation.

The Historic Preservation Program has six focal areas: management of cultural properties, management of information, developing fiscal resources, developing and maintaining partnerships, developing the capabilities of BLM's professional cultural resources staff, and outreach and education of the public, the true owners of the public lands. Each focal area has a number of activities that are associated with it. Some,

but not all, of these activities correspond readily to the BLM's Workload Measures for cultural resources (refer to Appendix).

Focus No. 1: Cultural Property Management

Cultural property management is the core of historic preservation for the Bureau of Land Management in California. Four activity areas have been defined for Focus Area No. 1:

- Type A Activities are directed toward knowing what we have; activities include archaeological survey and inventory, historic structures survey and inventory, cultural landscapes and features survey, survey and inventory of traditional plants, and a residual category of "other."
- Type B Activities are focused on more intensive activities at specific properties, including: data-recovery, such detailed recordation as mapping and photography, evaluations, and a residual category of "other."
- Type C Activities refer to actual management of the properties. Management, although it may mean many different things, generally

falls into these activities: stabilization or restoration; emergency treatments; National Register nominations; adaptive re-uses; interpretation; heritage tourism,; and signing; and acquisition.

- Type D Activities are directed toward monitoring and include ongoing monitoring activities and investigations of artifact theft and looting under the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA).

Focus No. 2: Information Management

This focus area refers to the task of orderly development, dissemination and perpetuation of information resulting from non-Section 106 endeavors. As currently understood, such tasks include contributing appropriate current and legacy records to the independent, regional Information Centers for incorporation into the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) or to the Nevada SHPO for incorporation into the Nevada Cultural Resources Information System (NVCRIS), recording and re-recording cultural properties with GPS technology and using those data to populate BLM's GIS, providing means for data access to qualified and legitimate external users, documenting internal processes, digitizing existing records (site records, maps, plans, photographs), and resolving such

longstanding issues as sending backlogs of site and survey records to the regional Information Centers.

Focus No. 3: Developing Fiscal Resources; Creating and Perpetuating Partnerships

This area of focus is directed toward the creating and maintaining the means of accomplishing the work of historic preservation.

- Type A Activities are directed specifically toward efforts to obtain additional funding, whether from external sources through grants and partnerships, or from such internal (federal government) sources as Save America's Treasures and other initiatives and programs. Effort counts in this activity type, since grant proposals and the like are frequently unsuccessful despite the merit of the proposal.
- Type B Activities are the work of developing and maintaining partnerships. These activities may include such activities as implementing a Site Stewardship Program, hosting training for volunteers, implementing volunteer projects.

Focus No. 4: Professional Development

The recognized skills of the cultural resource professionals in the California BLM are a foundation of the Protocol. Developments in the methods and

techniques of cultural resources management continue as technology becomes available and as the experience of the field increases. It is incumbent on BLM's professional staff to keep abreast of changes including ways to collect samples, such technological changes as GIS systems and GPS tools, such ethical shifts as consideration of the concerns of people tracing their heritage to cultural resources on public land, and developments in historic preservation law, regulation, and case law.

Continuing education of BLM's professional cultural resource staff is often deferred, not because BLM is disinclined to make such training available, but because of exigencies of budget and limited staff time. However, since professional development is a mainstay of the Protocol and a key to the trust that the California Office of Historic Preservation has extended to BLM, it is a key element of the Historic Preservation Program.

The types of activities that are included in this focus area are on-the-job (OJT) training, formal coursework, research and conference papers, posters and publications, and internal transfer of skills among BLM's cultural resource professionals. Specifically excluded from the scope of Professional Development is the Annual Meeting, which is required by the Protocol (II.A).

Focus No. 5: Outreach and Education

The final area of focus has to do with contacts, direct or indirect, with the public. Talks and lectures to non-professional audiences, field trips are included within the scope of this focus as well as such sponsored events as Public Lands Appreciation Day.

The scope of historic preservation is changing and California BLM continues to discover new cultural resources. The range of activities that will become appropriate for inclusion in the Historic Preservation Program in the future will continue to change and grow as the Program matures.

Field Office Planning, Implementation and Reporting

The key to this Historic Preservation Program is the effort of the fifteen Field Offices of California BLM. In contrast, the California State Office has a limited and constrained role. The State Archaeologist is responsible for Program oversight, advice and counsel, distribution of base funding for this Program, and allocation of one-time funding to projects of merit or to projects that meet specific criteria.

Under this Program, Field Offices are charged with professional development of the cultural staff and the planning, implementing, and reporting of historic preservation projects and activities that conform to the focuses enumerated above. Underlying these specific charges is the expectation that cultural resources professional staff will function as effective advocates

for advancing historic preservation projects and activities in the context of developing a Field Office's program of work.

This Historic Preservation Program does not require individual Field Offices to develop a specific, written plan for historic preservation. Instead, this Program requires planning for and implementation of historic preservation projects and activities.

Planning and Implementing Historic Preservation

Field offices will develop a List of Potential Projects and Activities which shall be maintained on the Net Drive (T:) in spreadsheet form in a dedicated folder. In the first year following adoption of this Program a minimum of six projects or activities will be entered on this list by each Field Office. Posting this list on the Net Drive allows the planned projects to be reviewed by the Office of Historic Preservation and the Deputy Historic Preservation Officer (State Archaeologist).

This List will be drawn upon by Field Offices as a principal source of projects ready for implementation. As a practical matter, however, opportunities for projects and activities may arise on short notice with no prior planning; therefore the List of Potential Projects and Activities are not envisioned as the sole source of projects that advance to implementation. Projects and activities that are potential candidates for such one-time funding

as the Cultural Resource Enhancement Initiative will also be entered in BPS according to current practice.

Planning for identified projects and activities will include scope and cost statements. These documents will be stored in folders on the Net Drive. Specifications for the cost and scope statements will be developed at a future date by the State Office in consultation with the Field Offices.

Planning for projects also includes development of all appropriate environmental documents and, when the project or activity exceeds the thresholds of the Statewide Protocol (Stipulation VI), completion of Section 106 consultation with the SHPO.

While Subactivity 1050 funds are to be applied to historic preservation projects and activities, Field Office cultural resources staff are responsible for developing additional means for project accomplishment. These means may include in-kind donations of materials, skills and labor, developing grants, securing donations, and negotiating partnerships.

Implementation of projects and activities is the core accountable function of the Field Office responsibility. Implemented projects are reportable in MIS under the appropriate workload measure and to the Office of Historic Preservation.

Beyond this, the Field Offices have broad leeway to implement projects within the framework of existing guidelines and negotiated agreements.

Planning for Professional Development

A well-trained and professionally current cultural resource staff is one of the building blocks of California's Statewide Protocol (III.D). Ensuring the expenditure of subactivity 1050 base funding to maintain the level of training of BLM's cultural resource professionals is likewise a building block of this Historic Preservation Program.

The Individual Development Plan (IDP) is the planning vehicle for ensuring that regular, annual professional development training takes place for each cultural resource professional. It is not the intent of this Program to specify what training shall be incorporated into the IDP, that content is negotiated between the resource professional and supervisor. The training ideally should reflect both the interests of the professional and the types of expertise and skills that the Field Office's preservation priorities require.

Reporting Accomplishments for Training and Historic Preservation

Although IDP's are personnel documents subject to a measure of privacy, the actual delivery of training is a

reviewable component of the cultural resource program of each Field Office. Annual progress in professional development of Field Office cultural resource staff is a requirement of this Program. The means for reporting development accomplishments will be determined at a future date.

Implemented projects and activities will be documented in CRMTracker, a BLM workflow database which is linked to GIS. Incorporation of implementation data into MIS and annual reporting to the Office of Historic Preservation will be done according to practices which will be developed subsequent to adoption of this Historic Preservation Program.

It is fully recognized that the planning and development work may involve as much or more effort than implementation. Nevertheless, the planning and development work done prior to project implementation are not reportable under this Historic Preservation Program.

DRAFT