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Flagging the Trail: One Hundred Years of Managing Cultural Resources
Introduction

The vision for this book was to encompass, in a concise history, the "Region 3 Heritage Program, 1970-2000." This study would include "A chronology of important program developments and significant events, by decade." It was to reflect the author's "experience and perspectives as associate regional archeologist and regional historian" (Purchase Order 43-8371-3-0049, dated February 19, 2003). The research for this book was the suggestion of Regional Archeologist Judith Propper who also ensured that funds would be available for its completion and publication. The assignment, coming at the end of the twentieth century, gives the author a convenient platform for looking back at the efforts of the Southwestern Region to manage its many historic and prehistoric resources.

Archeologists will be aware of the fact that, among the many things they do not agree upon, the spelling of the name of the game is very conspicuous. The archaic spelling is still favored by some whereas others use the spelling version prescribed in the "U.S. Government Style Manual." Dee Green favored the latter and Judy Propper favors the first. Others, both in-service and elsewhere, are split. As a result, the reader will see both "archaeology" and "archeology" throughout this book. I have tried to scrupulously follow the spelling used in the documents cited. Where that was not a factor, I have used the "Style Manual" form, "archeology."

While I researched and wrote the core content of the book, others contributed various examples and recollections. Judy Propper supplied photographs and many of the meeting summaries, highlights (in shaded boxes), and budget writeups; Joel Johnstone provided sections on computer technology and applications; and a number of past and present forest archeologists shared their memories of the "old days."

This history is dedicated to Dee F. Green (1934-2002), who served as regional archeologist in Region 3 from 1973 to 1985. His leadership and his commitment to professionalism helped establish a solid foundation for the region's cultural resource/heritage program. He initiated the Region 3 cultural resource publication series just over 30 years ago, on October 4, 1974.

Flagging the Trail: One Hundred Years of Managing Cultural Resources
Antecedents

Recognition of Cultural Resources

The archeologists who now work for the Forest Service were trained and hired in the second half of the 20th century. Most of the laws and regulations that enable their work date from the same period (see Appendix A for a summary of some of the most relevant laws). But it would be shortsighted to begin this history of the cultural resource program in the Southwestern Region without an acknowledgement that our roots go deeper than 50 years into the past.

Archeologists and other explorers were active in the Southwest as early as the nineteenth century. William H. Jackson photographed ruins at Mesa Verde in 1874. The first reported exploration of a cliff dwelling happened in 1875. In that year, William H. Holmes recovered a nearly intact pot from the debris of fallen walls at Mesa Verde. He took the artifact back to the National Museum. The well-known Wetherill brothers began harvesting pottery from the ruins in the 1890s and many of those pots ended up in museums (Howard 1969).

Edgar L. Hewett wrote a benchmark in scientific study of the prehistory of the Southwest when he gave the General Land Office his brief report on “Historic and Prehistoric Ruins of the Southwest and Their Preservation.” Published

Figure 1. The remote cliff dwellings of the Sierra Anchas, Tonto National Forest, were already being explored in the early 1900s. Photo by Southern Pacific Railroad, 1917. FS Photo 164759.
as a "Circular" in 1904 by the Government Printing Office, Hewett argued in his report that prehistoric ruins can all contribute to the advancement of knowledge and are worthy of preservation. He noted that knowledge of the number and location of ruins had been accumulating for "many years" and that they had become recognized as being very numerous and of great value. He argued that exercise of the government's existing legal authorities would be sufficient for their protection, in the short term, but that further legislation was needed. His call for action was a prime mover in the subsequent enactment of the Antiquities Act of June 6, 1906.

The effect of Hewett's report upon the nation's forests was swift. W. A. Richards, commissioner of the General Land Office (the Department of the Interior official with overall responsibility for the Forest Reserves until 1905), wrote in 1904 to the forest supervisor in Flagstaff, Arizona as follows. Regarding historic and prehistoric ruins, "... you are directed to exercise special care in their preservation." And regarding permits, he wrote "... I will state that there appears to be no special statute forbidding scientific research on the public lands, or requiring that permission shall be obtained before undertaking the same or removing objects of value from the public domain" (letter dated October 15, 1904; reproduced in Hewett 1904). Similar letters were sent to all supervisors and to Indian agents and others.

In the early 1900s there was considerable interest in the creation of national parks dedicated to the preservation of cultural remains. In most cases, the proposals for such parks were dead ends, but at least a few of the proposals were successful, and some ruins gained recognition as national monuments. In the Southwestern Region there were three areas under Forest Service administration that achieved this status: Bandelier (transferred from the Santa Fe to the National Park Service (NPS) in 1932); Gila Cliff Dwellings (transferred from the Gila to the NPS in 1933); and Tonto National Monument (transferred from the Tonto to the NPS in 1933). As an example, consider the checkered history of Bandelier National Monument, established February 11, 1916 on the Jemez Forest Reserve (Presidential Proclamation 1322). The Jemez later became part of the present day Santa Fe National Forest.

Bandelier was proposed, supported and opposed for national park status more times than this modest history can encompass. Over a dozen bills had been introduced into either the House or Senate before 1920. Bandelier was boosted as a supporting pillar for New Mexico's desire for statehood, as a local economic plus and as a haven for cultural resources. Alternatively, it was described by critics as a negative impact, for taking lands out of production, as an intrusion into Indian interests, and as an unneeded level of ruins protection (Althere 1985).

The National Park Service, founded in the same year as Bandelier National Monument, did not want the Bandelier land at first. Later, it changed position and wanted not only the
monument but many surrounding acres as well. The NPS bid for a 300,000-acre park there, if successful, would have eliminated any need for Forest Service administration in what is now the western Santa Fe National Forest (Rothman 1989). Even the name sparked debates because some boosters wanted it to be named for the geographic feature (Pajarito) or given a cultural name. Hewett, who first supported the park proposal, later argued that the 1906 Antiquities Act (Public Law 59-209) had provided the Forest Service with the tool for protection of ruins. “…No serious vandalism [had] occurred in Pajarito Park for more than ten years,” he wrote (quoted in Althere, 1985 p. 278). Finally, Bandelier National Monument was transferred from Forest Service administration to the National Park Service in 1932 (Presidential Proclamation 1991).

The nascent Forest Service reacted with amazing speed when the Antiquities Act was enacted. The 1906 edition of “The Use Book” (Pinchot 1906) contained both a full citation of the act (page 178) and direction to forest officers regarding reporting and protection of antiquities (page 69 and 70). They were to arrest anyone who injured or appropriated monuments or objects, but only,

After the Secretary of Agriculture has determined any monument or object of historic or prehistoric interest, or after the President has proclaimed “historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest.” upon a forest reserve, to be national monuments…(op. cit., p. 70)

Chief Forester Graves recognized that protection of ruins was part of the job for the Forest Service. In the 1915 “Use Book” he cited the law (30 Stat. 980) and said that it is prohibited to appropriate, injure or destroy any object of antiquity on lands of the United States. He also explained that permits were available at no charge subject to special rules and regulations (Graves 1915, p. 132).

Permits

Before there was a cultural resource program, before there were Forest Service archeologists, there were permits. Permits were the mechanism to allow lawful exploration of prehistoric sites. Issuance of permits was provided for in the Antiquities Act of 1906 but only institutions could receive a permit and then only with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. Absent a permit system the nation’s archeological resources would have been locked up or exploited only by the lawless. In the wording of the act, there were penalties for those who “appropriate, excavate, injure or destroy” ruins except under authority of a permit. In other words, it was OK to excavate/destroy a site so long as one had a permit.

The government invented a process by which an institution could obtain permission to study a ruin. It must have seemed to the museums and universities like an unwelcome intrusion of the government into academic affairs. However, the number of bulky permit files, which have accumulated in the regional office, demonstrates that many institutions were undeterred by the bureaucratic procedures of permits. In fact, the ink was barely dry on the Antiquities Act when the Jemez Forest Reserve issued its first antiquities permit. It authorized the School of American Archaeology to excavate and collect antiquities in Rito de los Frijoles (permit files dated 1907).

There are many more permits, and among them are the oldest, stored at the Smithsonian of which copies have not been retained in Albuquerque. Those old permit files give evidence of past interest in the archeological sites of the Southwest. Prestigious museums, such as the Peabody and the American Museum of Natural History, and universities from across the nation, applied for the privilege of exploring in the Southwestern Region.

The permit provisions of the 1906 act accurately reflected professional opinion of the day. Sites were to be used, not “managed.” The concept of
cultural resource management was still years away. Section 3 of the act is the key to the permit system:

Permits for the examination of ruins, the excavation of archaeological sites, and the gathering of objects of antiquity upon the lands under [the Secretary of Agriculture's] jurisdiction may be granted ... to institutions which [he] may deem properly qualified to conduct such examinations, excavation, or gathering, subject to such rules and regulations as [he] may prescribe; Provided, That the examinations, excavations, and gatherings are undertaken for the benefit of reputable museums, universities, colleges, or other recognized scientific or educational institutions, with a view to increasing the knowledge of such objects, and that the gatherings shall be made for permanent preservation in public museums (16 USC 431).

Validation of the bona fides of an institution was accomplished by the participation, per regulation, of the Secretary of the Smithsonian.

The Secretary received a copy of every application and was asked for an opinion regarding the qualifications of the applicant institution to perform the planned work. Authority to sign permits was retained at the Secretary of Agriculture's office (for example, see Clark Wissler's permit, dated 1912, Appendix B).

Studies conducted on Southwestern national forests contributed substantially to our knowledge of the archeology of North America. Numerous important sites were studied as a result of Forest Service permits. For example, Emil Haury recorded the Mogollon Village site on the Gila in 1921 and returned to excavate there in 1933. His work was conducted under permit from the Department of Agriculture. From this, and other studies, Haury developed the definition of Mogollon culture and distinguished it from other contemporary prehistoric cultures in the Southwest (Haury 1936). Sandia Man Cave was excavated on the Cibola National Forest in 1936 by Frank Hibben. That site was nominated to the National Historic Landmark program by Albert Schroeder in 1959. The lack of agreement among archeologists over the validity of the site's dates and content (Preston 1995) does not detract from its historic significance as an example of Forest Service permitted archeology. Permits were issued to the University of New Mexico for work there in 1936, 1938 and 1948. The American Museum of Natural History received a permit to excavate at Koytii on the old Jemez National Forest (permit dated August 8, 1912).

In Arizona the Smithsonian Institution's Bureau of American Ethnology (Jesse Walter Fewkes), received permits to investigate Elden Pueblo and other sites in the Flagstaff area in the 1910s and later; the Museum of Northern Arizona (Harold Colton and John McGregor) investigated Winona Village.

Figure 3. Excavations at Elden Pueblo, 1926, under the direction of Jesse Walter Fewkes. Smithsonian, National Anthropological Archives.
Ridge Ruin, and other sites in the Flagstaff area under permit in the 1930s to 1940s; Gila Pueblo (Harold Gladwin) investigated Round Valley Ruin, Rye Creek Ruin, Indian Point Ruin and other sites in Tonto Basin in the late 1920s and 1930s; and the Field Museum of Natural History (Paul S. Martin) investigated the Pinelawn Site on the Apache-Sitgreaves in the late 1930s to early 1950s. These important archeological sites, as well as many others, were examined by scholars who worked under the authority of the Antiquities Act with facilitation by Forest Service officers.

Among the prehistoric sites on the national forests that were excavated and stabilized for public display, one stands out for its record of repeated educational use. Elden Pueblo, on the Coconino National Forest, was excavated by the Smithsonian and partially restored in 1926. There were excavations at the site again in 1978 with the help of the Youth Conservation Corps and the Young Adult Conservation Corps. Thereafter, thanks to Forest Service efforts, academic partnerships, and community involvement, there have been many seasons of archeological work coupled with public interpretation especially for children ("Southwestern Region Administrative Bulletin," June 1982).

Compared to more recent legislation, the Antiquities Act is a marvel of conciseness, and the implementing regulation is a model of brevity. Even so, it was not simple to apply for a permit. As an example of the permit process in the early twentieth century, consider the case of the Field Museum of Natural History. The museum applied for permission to conduct preliminary archeological explorations on the Apache National Forest in 1939. The university would have been advised to follow the procedures specified in the Forest Service Manual (FSM), Section 2700, Land Use Management. The applicant was required to submit six copies of the application form that was described in FSM 2784. It would take weeks for the copies to pass up and back down the chain of approving officials.

It would be difficult to overstate the importance of the archeological research that resulted from Forest Service permits in the first 50 years after the Antiquities Act was enacted. Most of the largest sites were discovered and explored in this period and the cultural periods of the Southwest were defined. Not all of that work was located on national forest lands but much of it was. Unaided by in-house professional advice, the Forest Service administered the use of cultural resources.

Historic Structures

The Southwestern Region began to consider the preservation of historic structures before the flood of legislation in the second half of the century formalized the process. The earliest instance that is reflected in the files of the regional office is recorded in Circular 62-0-02 dated September 29, 1941 and was filed under "IMPROVEMENTS" in the old filing system. The acting regional forester announced that five national forests had properties that had been approved by the Southwestern Region for preservation as historic landmarks. The circular makes reference to a memorandum dated October 12, 1938 (unfound) which apparently requested nominations.

The Region's proposed landmarks were: Hannagan Cabin and John Kerr Cabin, Apache National Forest; Borracho Cabin and Santa Barbara Cabin, Carson National Forest; Lobo Canyon Ranger Station and Tajique Ranger Station, Cibola National Forest; Grudgings Cabin, Gila National Forest; and Panchuela Ranger Station, Gallinas Ranger Station and Bland Ranger Station, Santa Fe National Forest.

Some of those structures, like Borracho Cabin, John Kerr Cabin (Tularosa Ranger Station), and Panchuela Ranger Station, survive today. Most do not. The Grudgings Cabin site was destroyed by a forest fire in 1991. The cabin was a ruin at the time of the fire, only three walls were standing and they were only a few logs high. Apparently the earlier interest in preservation of the site had been forgotten or
over-ruled. All of the wood parts of the cabin were consumed and William Grudgings' headstone ("William Grudgings, Waylaid and murdered by Tom Wood, October 8, 1893") was the only thing left standing ("CR Update," May 1991).

Sadly, there was an episode of deliberate destruction of cabins and other historic properties. Particularly in the 1950s through the early 1970s, the Forest Service had a jaundiced view of the many old miner's shacks and line cabins that dotted the national forests. The reason was that "undesirable" persons, such as "hippies," had taken up residence in some of these structures. This constituted an illegal "use" of the land and represented a lifestyle considered objectionable by many Forest Service officers. The properties that the squatters occupied typically lacked maintenance, all modern improvements and sanitation. It was not difficult to think of those cabins as being hazardous and, therefore, subject to being razed in the interest of public safety. Cabins were also removed as part of general "cleanup" in wilderness areas.

Once a decision was made to eliminate a cabin it was either burned ("winter lightning") or pushed over by a dozer. No effort was made to determine any historic qualities and no opinion was sought from historic specialists. There is no documentation about either the properties or the decisions that led to their destruction. All that is left today are some foundations and the often heard comment, "It's too bad we burned down all those cabins."

An indication of early regional office interest in historic Forest Service structures can be found in Engineering Staff files. There are several volumes of photographs showing views of virtually every cabin, barn and other administrative structure used by the Forest Service. Fire lookout towers are so well represented among the region's historic photos that it is clear that there was intent to record every one. Many were photographed during construction, while in use and then again after renovation. The thoroughness of the photographic recording eased the work of putting together a history of fire towers in the region (Steer and Miller, 1989).

**Borrowed Expertise**

There were no professional archeologists in the Forest Service during its first 5 decades so line and staff officers processed excavation permit applications and generally looked out for the archeological sites. Most probably had little academic interest in the sites and ruins. Nevertheless, they ensured that only qualified institutions received permits. The contacts with university and museum archeologists that were made as a result of permit administration provided a pool of experts available for contracting and consultation to assist the Forest Service when professional help was needed.

![Figure 4. The newly completed Penasco Ranger Station, Carson NF, was photographed in 1932 by W. G. Coogler. FS Photo 271341.](image-url)
A retired regional forester recalled that forest supervisors and rangers were well aware of the value of cultural resources before there were archeologists on the staff. For example, a road being constructed to Gila Cliff Dwellings in the mid-1960s uncovered prehistoric artifacts. On that occasion, a traveler from Arizona observed the damage that had happened at the site and asked her Congressman to intervene. He phoned the regional forester who, in turn, phoned the forest supervisor to get the facts. The forest supervisor knew the situation and could report that professional archeologists from a state agency were on their way to investigate the site. That is how the Forest Service got the professional services in those days (Bill Hurst, personal communication, 2003).

Funding

In these early years, there were no funds specifically appropriated to the Forest Service for cultural resources. There was a decision by the Comptroller General of the U.S. in 1955, however, which would later serve the cultural resource program very well. It started with a timber sale that had been proposed for the Apache National Forest in which a prehistoric site had been discovered. A road was going to be built through the Indian ruins. The School of American Research mapped the site and did some excavation within the road prism.

The Forest Service wondered if it could use funds appropriated for the Federal Highway Act to pay for the archeological work. The problem was that the act did not specifically envision expenditures of this sort. The Comptroller General found that Congress, in the Antiquities Act and elsewhere, had shown that it intended to prevent destruction to ruins situated on government lands. It follows, he wrote, that where destruction cannot be avoided then reasonable action may be taken to obtain information prior to destruction of the site. In short, the cost of archeological salvage was a “necessary cost of construction” (Comptroller General letter dated December 6, 1955 to Forest Service (Albuquerque)).
The 1960s: Good Intentions, Small Staff

Introduction

Although we generally think of the Forest Service cultural resource program as beginning in the 1970s, in Region 3 the concept of an archeology program actually crystallized in the late 1960s. According to a 1973 letter from the regional forester to the Chief, “The region instituted a formal inventory of archeological and historic values as early as 1968” (2360 letter dated July 23, 1973 from Regional Forester Wm. D. Hurst to the Chief). The letter goes on to say, “As field personnel proceed with field work and as a part of multiple use surveys and reports, archaeological sites are identified and inventoried on a form developed for that purpose.” This decade saw the hiring of the first archeologists in the region and the beginning of a program to inventory and protect archeological and historic sites.

Legislative Context

The National Historic Preservation Act

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) (P.L. 89-665) was enacted in 1966. It had little impact on the Forest Service at the time but it would become the foundation of policy and procedures in the next decade. NHPA is the law that provided for establishment of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the state officials who would oversee Federal compliance with the law, the State Liaison Officers, later called State Historic Preservation Officers or SHPOs. It also provided for an expanded Federal listing of significant historic properties, the National Register of Historic Places, which would contain many more sites than just those of National Historic Landmark quality. Section 106 would become the bread and butter of Federal archeology work. It provided that a Federal agency must allow the Advisory Council an opportunity to comment on any federally-funded or licensed undertaking that would adversely affect sites listed on the National Register. Later amendments broadened this even more to include sites that are simply eligible for listing on the National Register.

The National Environmental Policy Act

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) is another law that influenced the Forest Service to build a staff of archeologists. The sights of this law were set much broader than just archeology but it does include the discipline in its concerns. The act states that it is the:

continuing responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means, consistent with other essential considerations of national policy, to improve and coordinate Federal plans, functions, programs, and resources to the end that the Nation may .... (4) preserve important historic, cultural and natural aspects of the national heritage.

Neither of the acts mentioned here made use of the term “cultural resource.” For several years it was necessary to use a convoluted expression, such as “archeological sites, buildings, districts, etc.” when referring to the application of these laws. Forest Service reports and correspondence from the 1960s that were reviewed for this history did not use the term “cultural resource.”

Compliance

Although there were no regulations for implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act in the 1960s, the regional office files contain a couple of examples of activities that would later be thought of as routine project-related compliance. At the Sandia Ranger District’s administrative site on the Cibola National Forest, activities related to the construction of a new district office uncovered archeological remains. The construction site was inspected by the new archeologist working in the regional office and then the regional forester wrote to the Museum of New Mexico authorizing “salvage excavation” (2360 letter dated July 31, 1969 from Wm. D. Hurst to Dr. George H. Ewing, Museum of New Mexico).
In 1969 the regional forester wrote to the Cibola forest supervisor under file designation “2360 Special Interest Areas – Archeological” concerning the “Cibola – Archeological Clearance of Pinyon-Juniper Control Areas.” In this letter the regional forester strongly encouraged the protection of a hogan discovered in the project area: “This is one sample structure of a culture rapidly becoming extinct that we could save for future generations at no expense and with little trouble.” The letter goes on to caution the forest supervisor that his proposed action regarding the hogan would undermine “any form of cooperation that the rangers might have in our fledgling archeological program” (2360 letter dated August 18, 1969 from Wm. D. Hurst to forest supervisor, Cibola NF).

Law Enforcement

No evidence has survived in the regional office of specific law enforcement actions in the 1960s, although we know that pothunting was widespread in the Southwest during this time.

Enhancement

First National Register Sites

The National Register of Historic Places (hereafter referred to as the “National Register”) originated with the National Historic Preservation Act. Originally, the National Register was much different from what it is today. That first version was limited in scope, consisting of existing nationally significant National Park Service properties and properties that had been declared eligible for designation as National Historic Landmarks. New guidelines had to be developed, in consultation with the states and Federal agencies, for identifying properties of state and local significance (Proposed Rules, 36 CFR 60.2 dated August 29, 1975). The purpose of the National Register was to identify significant properties important in history or prehistory and, therefore, worthy of preservation. The first sites on national forest lands in the Southwest to be nominated were all in the category of listed National Historic Landmarks. Any such landmark that had been accepted by the NPS was automatically placed on the National Register of Historic Places.

First impressions by Forest Service officers of the National Register program probably did not encompass the true nature of the program. That is not surprising because the administrators of the National Register initially sent out signals very different from what later became operating procedure. The files reflect a belief that an agency was required to simply scan its collective memory of sites that might be of national interest. Once that was done, a simple form was completed and sent to the Keeper of the National Register. File copies of the oldest National Register forms show that procedures in use then bear little resemblance to those that evolved in the next decade.

The earliest Landmark and National Register forms were completed by out-Service archeologists. For example, Big Bead Mesa and Sandia Man Cave in New Mexico and the Winona site in Arizona all were recorded by Albert Schroeder between 1959 and 1962. Those sites, as well as the C. Hart Merriam base camp site (which was in private ownership at the time), were all recorded on a very simple NPS form, “National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings.” One box on the form requests “exact location” but a very inexact township and range was
apparently sufficient to get Big Bead Mesa listed as a National Landmark.

These four sites were designated National Historic Landmarks in the early 1960s and were among some 800 landmarks that were established prior to the National Historic Preservation Act. They were listed on the National Register in 1966 and were the only Region 3 sites placed on the National Register in the 1960s. It appears that they were nominated with little direct Forest Service participation because copies of the paperwork were requested from NPS years later when the Southwestern Region worked on bringing its National Register files "up to date" (2360 letter dated October 29, 1974 from John T. Koen to Director, NPS).

In forwarding copies of nomination forms to the region, the NPS explained some of the process used in the 1960s (H34 WR PSH letter dated December 3, 1974 from Bruce M. Kilgore, Associate Regional Director, Western Region, to John T. Koen). These early landmarks were considered only on the basis of their significance and integrity as identified in theme studies and information on them was not too complete. Since the enactment of the National Historic Sites Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-665), more comprehensive information on historic landmarks is required, particularly relating to location and boundaries, for publication in the National Register of Historic Places, which is a nationwide list of cultural sites of national, regional and local significance.

Interpretation and Public Outreach

Very little attention was given to the "enhancement" aspect of cultural resources in the 1960s. In fact, the term is from a subsequent decade and would not have been recognized in the 1960s as a part of the Forest Service archeologist's work. As it came to be understood, enhancement implies the deliberate preservation and promotion of historic and prehistoric resources for public use and enjoyment. That is not how the Forest Service was operating when its first archeologists were put to work. The emphasis then was on basic protection of the resource through location and avoidance strategies.

However, a 1968 memorandum report on excavations at Tijeras Pueblo did envision an interpretive use of the materials found there. Carl Johnson, the regional office archeologist, wrote that if the proposed administrative site could be moved elsewhere, then "Tijeras Pueblo could be left intact at this time; then, as money and demand warrant, the entire site could be excavated and developed as an interpretive exhibit" (2360 letter dated March 22, 1968 from Johnson to "the files").

There is one big exception to the general lack of prehistoric cultural interpretation at this time. In 1964, the region met with the National Park Service to plan a joint visitor information service center for the Gila Cliff Dwellings, the first such cooperative effort in the nation ("Southwestern Region Administrative Bulletin," Oct, 1964). The new visitor center was dedicated on May 31, 1969, built on Forest Service land and jointly operated with NPS. The exhibits had been jointly planned and financed (op. cit. May 1969).

There were also some small-scale interpretative projects. For example, the Carson National Forest had a cluster of interpretive signs posted at U.S. Hill Vista along the historic trail, El Camino Real. They told the story of early Spanish settlement via the trail and also the story of U.S. Army forces that had marched to Taos to put down a revolt in 1847 ("Southwestern Region Administrative Bulletin," June, 1969).

Forest History

Perhaps the most significant interpretive effort of the 1960s occurred in what we now think of as the Forest History Program. First, it is far too grand to suggest that there was a "program" for history in the 1960s. It is probably a stretch to claim that there was a program in later years.
except at the Chief's office level. What there was could best be described as a fluctuating interest in history. Regional Forester Kennedy clearly had an interest in the history of the Southwestern Region because he was willing to assign Ed Tucker, the chief of the branch of Administrative Management, to the job of collecting oral stories and artifacts. The time that Tucker invested in his history project probably represents the greatest single commitment of resources to history ever seen in the region.

If we can make the claim of program status for history it would be because of the continuing investment in maintaining Tucker's collection in the museum at the Continental Divide Training Center (CDTC) during the late 1960s. There was no professional history staff, no budget and no policy or directive that spelled out goals. In spite of that, the collection was preserved and remains today an important link with the early days of the Forest Service.

The Southwestern Museum Collection

Credit for this first systematic collection of historic artifacts and oral history must be given to a Forest Service employee who took on the job without formal preparation. At the end of his career as a line officer, Edwin A. Tucker was given the assignment of de facto historian. He was given, by Regional Forester Kennedy, a bit more than a year (1964) to pursue the collection of historical artifacts as well as the stories of the pioneers who helped establish the Forest Service in the Southwest (Tucker and Fitzpatrick 1972). He sorted through the records of the agency as well as those of the General Land Office and researched newspapers, books and periodicals. These documents and the artifacts he collected from offices and retirees form the nucleus of the Southwestern Museum Collection.

Tucker's most interesting sources were the men who had actually lived through the early days of the Forest Service. Their memories were preserved in taped interviews with Tucker. These were the first oral histories collected in the region and they form much of the content of Tucker's books, "The Early Days" (Tucker 1989, 1991 and 1992). The tapes are still preserved in the regional office by the Heritage staff.

The collection of Forest Service memorabilia was first displayed in a museum setting at Continental Divide, New Mexico. Artifacts included tools, maps, books and much more. A dedication ceremony opened the facility at the CDTC on September 25, 1965. Chief Cliff presided over the ceremonies ("Southwestern

Figure 6. This photograph of a display at the Continental Divide Museum was made on opening day in 1965.

Flagging the Trail: One Hundred Years of Managing Cultural Resources
The museum's location was advantageous in that sufficient space, both outdoors and in the building itself, allowed display of many artifacts and the creation of office settings. A disadvantage of the site was that the location was off the beaten path and, therefore, few visitors benefited from the displays.

The museum had a short life because tightened budgets forced the region to close first the museum and then the training center in the early 1970s. The collection would lie in storage under the care of the Coconino National Forest for 2 decades before it would again be available for public viewing. During this time the boxed artifacts were in a basement at the supervisor's office and at various locations around Flagstaff. Some portions of the collection, notably the "big wheel," went missing (Gillio 1986).

**Personnel**

It may have never occurred to a Forest Service line officer before the 1960s that a staff archeologist would be a useful person to have at hand. There was no particular legislative requirement for an agency to have such a person on staff. There was no "cultural resource program." Nor were there many examples of other land management agencies with archeologists, other than the National Park Service. The preservationist mission of the Park Service, as opposed to the conservationist philosophy of the Forest Service, made it unlikely that the former would be considered a model for the latter.

Then, late in 1966 Joe Janes became the first archeologist to be employed in the Southwestern Region. At least in part, this was because the Forest Service wanted to conduct some archeological excavations near Gila Cliff Dwellings (2710 letter dated August 17, 1966 from R. Coatley to the regional forester). Joe was already an employee but he was a visitor information specialist working at the Gila Cliff Dwellings Information Center.

Joe had taken a degree in anthropology and had worked on an excavation for the Museum of New Mexico (2710 letter from Hurst to the Chief dated July 19, 1966). In September of 1966 the Gila forest supervisor was requested to draft a Civil Service position description to reclassify Joe Janes from the forestry technician series into the archeologist series, GS-193 (6150 letter dated September 8, 1966 from J. Morgan Smith, assistant regional forester, to forest supervisor, Gila National Forest).

Carl Johnson, hired in 1968, became the region's second archeologist. Johnson worked in the regional office for about 4 years in the Recreation staff. At that time the job title "regional archeologist" first appears in correspondence but Johnson served in a sub-staff position, one level down in the organizational chain of command compared to later incumbents in that position. He was called upon when archeological materials were encountered and recognized by other Forest Service employees in the course of their work on the national forests. He was also frequently borrowed by other regions for short details and asked to give advice about how to deal with sites or interpret the new...
laws. At the time, many of those regions still did not have even a single archeologist of their own.

Supplementing the Staff

It should be noted that site recording in this decade generally was accomplished by employees who were not trained as archeologists. In a sense, this might be seen as the seed for the later para-archeologist program. One of the first sites to be recorded using the Region 3 site form 2300-2 (created in 1968, probably by Carl Johnson) was for Gallinas Ruins on the Cibola National Forest. That site form was filled out by District Ranger Bernard H. Brunner (see Appendix C). In the 1960s, sites were recorded by any interested employee who had the time to fill out the form and who happened to notice the site while conducting his regular assignment on forest lands.

As noted earlier, the region instituted a formal ongoing inventory of archeological and historical values in the late 1960s (2360 letter dated July 12, 1973 from Wm. Hurst, regional forester, to the Chief). There was no systematic survey, however, and people who recorded sites were not trained to recognize the potential importance of potsherd scatters and other smaller cultural manifestations. In spite of the limitations, this haphazard approach did yield one important result. It emphasized to the region's line officers that literally thousands of prehistoric sites could be found on the national forests of the Southwest (Anon. 1977).

Data Management

The Southwestern Region entered the archeology age with only primitive filing systems available. High tech at that time was paper in steel file cabinets. Data management could not be called the "heart and soul" of cultural resource management, but it is certainly equivalent to some important piece of the anatomy. To start to manage a resource, you have to know what you have. With paper files scattered throughout offices in the region it was difficult to know the answers to many important management questions and finding answers was very time consuming. A better way had to be found to manage the growing volume of site information.

The region began to take some "baby steps" toward data management in the 1960s. By current standards, those first efforts were almost laughable but they appeared to be cutting edge then. The “Southwestern Region Administrative Bulletin” (October 1969) printed a photograph of an employee sending data (not archeological) via teletype to a time share computer. This first computer capability was to be followed soon by a UNIVAC 1108. This new technology would not be open to use by all. Computational power was so expensive that it was unthinkable that a single staff like Recreation could install its own computer, or even have a share of what was being installed elsewhere in the building. (Note: a UNIVAC 1108 was a "general purpose automatic data processing computing system." Input/output was via magnetic tape and its magnetic core section stored 65,536 words, equal to a 64K machine today – there were no "bits" in those days.) (Joel Johnstone, personal communication, 2003.)

Accomplishments

Few records survive regarding the specific accomplishments of the 1960s. Yet, as the decade came to a close, an official archeological presence had been established in the region and there was awareness, at least in some quarters, that archeology was an emerging program area. The region had already embarked upon an inventory of important archeological and historic sites. And significant time and funding had been devoted to gathering and preserving the history of the Forest Service in the Southwest.

Funding

Specific funds were not identified in the Forest Service budget for archeology in the 1960s. Nevertheless, toward the end of the decade funds were somehow made available to cover the first forest and regional archeologists and to implement occasional special projects.
The 1970s: Building a Foundation

Introduction

The 1970s saw development of the basic framework, organization, and philosophy of Region 3's cultural resource management program. As Regional Archaeologist Dee Green noted, "In 1974, the region began an active cultural resource program in order to provide proper management for the resource and in order to more fully comply with Federal law and regulation" (Green 1977). By the end of the decade, every national forest in the Southwest but two had a forest archeologist. National and regional policies were in place and annual regional expenditures on cultural resources were approaching a million dollars. The region's archeologists were actively engaged in the profession and leading the way in many areas of the Forest Service's new cultural resource management program. In retrospect, even if it did seem that there was too much to do, it was a good time to be a Forest Service archeologist.

Program Name

The term "cultural resources" slipped into usage by the Forest Service sometime in the mid-1970s. A letter from the Chief's office notes "a serious failure to comply with the law for cultural and historic resources consideration" (8410 letter dated February 4, 1974 from Deputy Chief to regional foresters). At the same time the Forest Service Manual directed that cultural resources must be discussed in all environmental statements (FSM 2361.12). The first use of the term in a Region 3 publication may have been in 1975. Dr. Jon Nathan Young, at that time a NPS employee, stated in a paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for American Archaeology: "Cultural resources include archeological, architectural, and historic objects, structures, sites, and districts" (Green 1975, p. 5). It was 1978 before the Southwestern Region changed the name of its publication series to reflect the change of emphasis to "cultural resources" rather than "archeology."

Organizationally, "archeological areas" had long been a type of "special interest area" (file designation 2360) in the Forest Service Recreation program, so this became the logical home for the new cultural resource management program. Evan DeBloois, retired Washington Office archaeologist, was asked about the program name and he remembered it this way.

The transition from the original 2360 program which was titled "special interest areas" and included all the miscellaneous programs no one else wanted, but primarily focused on archaeology areas, was a gradual one. I can't recall when the official program change to "cultural resource management" was made, but it occurred when I was in the Washington Office, so it would be after 1980. Sometime in the '70s, Federal archaeologists began to use the term "cultural resource" more and more when they spoke of archaeology and, to some extent, history.

With the founding of ASCA – American Society for Conservation Archaeology – the term became pretty much standard across the country. ASCA formed following an interagency meeting in Denver, probably around 1974-1975. Because there was no official change in the Forest Service program, the use of cultural resources became more a fashion than a requirement. Official documents probably could be found showing a variety of usages, "cultural and
historical” being the most common. After I went to D.C., in the fall of 1980, there was an official change of the program title and the Manual chapter to “Cultural Resource Management,” but I am not certain of the exact date, probably by 1982 (Evan DeBloois, personal communication, 2003).

It is in a 1979 regulation from the USDA Office of Environmental Quality that the term “heritage resources” first came to the author’s attention. The regulation is intended to implement NHPA and appears to have been written by Janet Friedmen, the first cultural resource specialist in the Chief’s office. At section 3100.42, “Definitions,” it states that:

Cultural resources (heritage resources) are the remains or records of districts, sites, structures, buildings, networks, neighborhoods, objects and events from the past. ... Cultural resources are an irreplaceable and nonrenewable aspect of our national heritage (“Federal Register,” Vol. 44, No. 224, pp. 66181-2).

It was not until the 1990s, however, that “heritage resources” came into common usage in the Forest Service.

Legislative Context

Executive Order 11593

Management of archeological resources by the Forest Service was based mainly on a number of Federal and state laws as well as on the concern of professionals and interested citizens. The legal underpinning very much increased in the decade of the 1970s, perhaps most notably because of Executive Order 11593 (“Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment”) but also because of the regulations and guidelines that grew out of laws enacted in the 1960s. E.O. 11593 was issued on May 13, 1971, signed by President Richard Nixon. It directed Federal agencies to inventory all historic properties, to nominate all eligible properties to the National Register of Historic Places, and to give priority attention to Federal historic properties that were proposed for transfer or alteration. It also required that historic properties within the environmental effect of an undertaking, if determined eligible for the National Register, be treated the same as if they were listed properties (Murtagh 1975).

One perceived weakness of E.O. 11593 was that it set an accomplishment date of July 1, 1973. Thus, in 2 years the Forest Service was supposed to inventory the sites, buildings, etc. on its almost 200 million acres and nominate to the Secretary of the Interior all that might qualify for the National Register of Historic Places. That goal was patently unreachable (there were already 2,978 recorded sites as of June 26, 1973 with only a tiny fraction of Southwestern Region lands examined). So, Forest Service officers and other Federal land managers were forced to try to make what interpretations they could of this requirement more in line with their real world capabilities. One early assumption was that the “inventory” did not require a fresh, on-the-ground examination but rather an examination of files and of the memories of field officers. A second assumption was that the National Register was a kind of honor role, rather than an inventory, so that nominations would include only the best, most interesting sites. These assumptions are not explicit in the files but can be inferred from results. The assumptions were consistent with the experience of the Forest Service in its dealings with the National Historic Landmarks program.

In summing up the region’s efforts to implement E.O. 11593, in 1973 the regional forester wrote to the Chief:

Work on Executive Order 11593 is listed as a must do job, however, the forests must correlate this work with other priority work as identified by the regional forester. In addition, there are no funds to implement the Executive Order. Any funds to implement the program must be taken from the recreation appropriations or other funds...
The initial historic sites inventory is nearing completion for this region. As soon as the State Liaison Officers return the forms submitted to them, they will be sent to you..." (2360 letter dated July 12, 1973, written by Tom Roederer, from Regional Forester Wm. D. Hurst to the Chief).

Hurst's letter also noted that, "It is quite likely that until such time as the National Park Service and the profession establish criteria for significance for archeological sites, and considerable more study is done into the various cultures of the region, a very small percentage of the overall sites will be considered for nomination." National Register criteria were finally published in 1976 (36 CFR 60).

The Chief's office wrote to the regional foresters in 1974 to underline a requirement in the Forest Service Manual. It required that professional archeologists make "determinations as to whether or not cultural history values exist in project areas..." (2360 letter dated June 27, 1974 from Roy W. Feuchter, acting director of Recreation, to regional foresters). FSM 2361.12 required that archeologists conduct or supervise the surveys that lead to management decisions. Feuchter noted that Forest Service compliance with E.O. 11593 had been questioned based on allegations that decisions were being made without input from professionals. Knowing that there were not enough professional archeologists in the Forest Service, Feuchter advised that the regional foresters should "turn to contracting this professional direction from colleges, universities, scientific institutions and the private professional" (op cit.).

36 CFR 800

The first regulations for the National Historic Preservation Act, 36 CFR 800, "Procedures for the Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties", finally appeared in 1974, 8 years after the legislation had been signed. These regulations established the process by which Federal agencies would comply with the law. At the core of these regulations was the concept that a Federal agency had to document the fact that it was doing all it reasonably could to protect cultural resources from the consequences of its own actions. Further, the agency had to consult with designated out-service experts and document that as well. The life of the Forest Service archeologist had just become more complicated.

One year before the formal NHPA regulations were published, the Department of Agriculture had amended Chapter 16, Section 12, "Cultural History Management," of its Administrative Regulations. It emphasized E.O. 11593 and the responsibilities of Federal agencies under the Antiquities Act, Historic Sites Act, NHPA and NEPA. It repeated the language of the executive order that, until inventories, evaluations and nominations were complete, caution was to be exercised so that no property eligible for the National Register might be lost. Regarding agency programs, any action that might adversely affect any National Register property must be studied to "remove, or mitigate the adversity before proceeding with the program."

The transmittal letter from the Chief's office noted that the Forest Service Manual already included similar instructions at 2360 (2360 letter dated October 23, 1973 from F. L. Bond, director of Recreation, to regional foresters).

Nothing in the academic training of archeologists up to this time had prepared them to deal with 36 CFR 800. If anything, the training of an archeologist had stressed independence and original thinking. That sort of freedom would have to be tempered now as archeologists implementing NHPA learned to adjust to a very detailed compliance process and a considerable amount of oversight. The author recalls that it was about this time that Dee Green began his often heard complaint that the Forest Service had to manage sites but the SHPOs and Advisory Council "managed files." The implication was that it was much easier to think of rules for how things should be done than to actually do good things on the ground.

The regulations stressed definitions and procedures. Critical terms included "undertaking" (virtually anything done by an
agency). "effect" (just about anything that an agency does to a site) and "eligible property" (in practice, just about everything). The Forest Service and other land managing agencies were faced with a seemingly overwhelming task given the amount of funding and personnel available for compliance with these regulations. The Southwestern Region, aware of its large number of prehistoric ruins, was especially sensitive to the size of the workload. It was clear that something would have to change.

In 1976 R. K. Griswold, the assistant director for Recreation Management in the Washington Office, addressed an interagency meeting sponsored by the Advisory Council. After pointing out that the Forest Service was making progress in implementing the regulations, he stated:

There is no way that an agency like the Forest Service can get surveys completed for all of the projects on 187 million acres of working forests. So we've had to fight brush fires; we've had to work just ahead of the bulldozer. We've been stooped over killing rattlesnakes around our ankles, and haven't been able to stand up and conceptualize on cultural resources programs (Griswold 1977).

The Advisory Council regulations were revised in 1979 but the changes did not give Forest Service land managers much comfort. Consultation, mostly with the SHPO but also with the Advisory Council, remained the heart of the requirements. And "consultation" presumed sufficient professional consideration and reporting to form the basis of the consultation. If anything, the job of the archeologist was getting bigger because growing awareness of the law resulted in an increasing number of "undertakings" that clamored for professional attention. The "flag and avoid" approach to archeology was born as the Forest Service and its archeologists scrambled to keep up with timber sales and other activities on the ground. A staff white paper from Region 4 captured how many saw the problem: "Some aspects of cultural resource legislative and regulatory language are so broad that full compliance would all but immobilize the Forest Service and obviously goes beyond Congressional intent" (Anon. 1976).

In comments on the 1978 draft of the proposed revisions to 36 CFR 800, Apache-Sitgreaves Forest Archeologist Bruce Donaldson and Dee Green summed up their concerns:

It seems to us that the difficulties lie with two basic assumptions which underlie the regulations.

1. Assumption 1 is that Federal agencies lack programs to manage cultural resources.

2. Assumption 2 is that Federal agencies lack the expertise to manage cultural resources (Donaldson and Green 1979).

The authors stated that, while this was probably true in 1974 when the first regulations were published, by 1978 the situation had changed dramatically. They felt the regulations were being unnecessarily tightened and made more restrictive and complicated, a theme that would persist throughout the following years each time the regulations were revised. Donaldson and Green's proposed solution was for agencies to develop their own regulations, an option included in the proposed 36 CFR 800 revisions as "Counterpart Regulations" (36 CFR 800.11). In reality, very few agencies were successful in developing such regulations; however, another provision of the 1979 regulations, "Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement" (PMOA), eventually proved very useful to the Forest Service in streamlining some aspects of the 36 CFR 800 process.

American Indian Religious Freedom Act

In August of 1978 Congress passed the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA) (P.L. 95-341). Although the entire act fits on a single page, it was a very significant piece of legislation. AIRFA reflected a heightened awareness in Congress of American Indian issues and concerns and set the stage for a
The Arizona Snow Bowl

One of the first court cases involving AIRFA occurred in Region 3. In July 1977, the new owner of the Snow Bowl Ski Area on the San Francisco Peaks near Flagstaff, submitted to the Coconino National Forest a master plan for future development of the Snow Bowl. The proposal included additional parking, new ski lifts, and a new lodge facility. The forest went through the NEPA process, evaluating alternatives that ranged from elimination of existing structures to full development, as proposed by the permittee. There was strong tribal opposition to any new development on the peaks. In 1979 the forest supervisor made the decision to permit moderate development of the ski area. The regional forester overruled this decision and ordered maintenance of the status quo. The Chief subsequently reversed the regional forester’s decision and reinstated the forest supervisor’s decision.

The Navajo Medicinemen’s Association filed suit in District Court in the District of Columbia in 1981. The suit sought a halt to further development plus removal of existing ski facilities. This suit was consolidated with a similar suit brought by the Hopi Tribe. The complaints listed in the lawsuit included violation of the tribe’s First Amendment right to free exercise of religion, violation of AIRFA, and violation of NHPA. In May 1981, the District Court granted summary judgment to the Forest Service on all issues except NHPA. The Forest Service had determined that the proposal would have “no effect” on two nearby historic properties and that the San Francisco Peaks did not qualify for the National Register because their significance was religious in nature. But the forest had not documented consultation with the SHPO on these findings. The court directed the Forest Service to consult with the SHPO on these matters and report back to the court. The Forest Service consulted with the SHPO, who concurred on the “no effect” finding and concluded that the peaks did not qualify for the National Register because they were a natural feature, not a historic property. After the Forest Service reported back to the judge, he entered final judgment for the Forest Service on all issues.

The case was appealed to the Eleventh Circuit Court. On May 20, 1983, the Appeals Court affirmed the decision of the district court. In terms of AIRFA, after examining the law and its legislative history, the Appeals Court concluded:

It is clear from the reports, and from the statutory preamble, that AIRFA requires federal agencies to learn about, and to avoid unnecessary interference with traditional Indian religious practices. Agencies must evaluate their policies and procedures in light of the act’s purpose, and ordinarily should consult with Indian leaders before approving a project likely to affect religious practices. AIRFA does not, however, declare the protection of Indian religions to be an overriding Federal policy, or grant Indian religious practitioners a veto on agency action. “The clear intent of [AIRFA],” the Senate report states, “is to insure for traditional native religions the same rights of free exercise enjoyed by more powerful religions. However, it is in no way intended to provide Indian religions with a more favorable status than other religions, only to insure that the U.S. Government treats them equally (Federal Reporter 708 F.2d 735, 745-57 (D.C. Cir)).”

In a final legal action the case was appealed to the Supreme Court, but the Supreme Court declined to hear the case (denied cert) on October 31, 1983. The Snow Bowl decision remains an important decision in terms of how AIRFA is interpreted in the courts.

Figure 10. The San Francisco Peaks, near Flagstaff, AZ, are considered sacred by many Southwestern tribes.
series of related changes in laws, regulations, and policies throughout the remainder of the decade. With AIRFA, the Congress resolved:

That henceforth it shall be the policy of the United States to protect and preserve for American Indians their inherent right of freedom to believe, express, and exercise the traditional religions of the American Indian, Eskimo, Aleut, and Native Hawaiians, including but not limited to access to sites, use and possession of sacred objects, and the freedom to worship through ceremonials and traditional rites (loc. cit).

AIRFA required Federal agencies to evaluate their policies and procedures to identify appropriate changes needed to protect and preserve Native American religious cultural rights and practices. It also required agencies to report to Congress on the results of their evaluation and any changes that were made in administrative policies and procedures. AIRFA did not require project-by-project consultation, but it did give a clear signal that agencies were to be aware of Native American religious rights and concerns in carrying out their missions.

Archaeological Resources Protection Act

The Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) (P.L. 96-95) was signed into law on October 31, 1979. The legislation was introduced in the House by Rep. Morris Udall (D-Arizona) and in the Senate by Sen. Pete Domenici (R-New Mexico). A new law was needed to protect archeological sites because a court ruling in the Ninth Circuit had nullified the archeological protection section of the Antiquities Act, plus nationwide, more effective penalties were needed to combat pothunting activities. In ARPA's Findings and Purpose statement (Sec. 2), Congress declared that:

(1) archaeological resources on public lands and Indian lands are an accessible and irreplaceable part of the Nation's heritage;

(2) these resources are increasingly endangered because of their commercial attractiveness;

(3) existing Federal laws do not provide adequate protection to prevent the loss and destruction of these archaeological resources and sites resulting from uncontrolled excavations and pillage.

ARPA provided stiff criminal and civil penalties, not only for the excavation or removal of archaeological resources without a permit, but also for the sale, purchase, exchange, transport, or receipt of such resources excavated or removed from public lands or Indian lands in violation of the act.

Compliance

The Forest Service by now had direction from Congress, the President and the Secretary of Agriculture to protect cultural resources. All of this direction had been passed on by the Chief and incorporated into the Forest Service Manual. So, it is fair to ask how the Southwestern Region scored in compliance with all those instructions. Assuming that the number of undertakings remains fairly stable, and comparing the number of reports written in the 1970s to the reports from the 1990s, the compliance level was probably at about 20 percent in the early years of the cultural resource program.

Although both law and regulation (36 CFR 800) indicated that virtually every on-the-ground action by the Forest Service was defined as an undertaking, there was great reluctance to accept this interpretation. Digging post holes, cutting firewood and similar small projects were not activities considered by line officers to be subject to the law. Archeologists were too busy with timber sales and revegetation projects to take on the issue, and the Advisory Council and SHPO staffs apparently were struggling to keep up with larger and potentially more damaging activities. The entire Section 106 process was evolving during this time and all agencies were trying to define the workload and catch up.
In the early 1970s forest supervisors were asked to submit a list of projects annually to the regional office. They would indicate which were to be examined by archeologists under contract or on the staff and which would require assistance. The regional forester could direct that the zone archeologist provide help with some jobs or send someone from the regional office. Not every project that was identified could get the archeological attention it required. That did not mean that the project would not go ahead. The term "backlog" gave some respectability to these unexamined projects, but it did not put them into compliance.

A system evolved for documenting that a Forest Service undertaking was in compliance with the NHPA. Once a survey had been done, there would be a written report, usually brief, submitted for review by the regional archeologist. If it was found to be acceptable, the forest supervisor would be so advised. This gave the green light for the forest supervisor to "grant clearance," i.e. the project could be completed. Reports were not sent to the SHPO for review prior to the decision but in batches. Often a transmittal letter from the regional office to a SHPO would list a dozen reports and often the SHPO would make no response (e.g., 2360 letter dated April 29, 1977 from John T. Koen to Dorothy H. Hall, Arizona SHPO which transmitted 25 "archeological clearance investigation reports"). As forests hired forest archaeologists, compliance and report review responsibilities shifted more to the forests.

**Compliance on the Kaibab**

In the 1970s, on-the-ground compliance work consumed almost all of the forest archeologists' time. Tom Cartledge recalls his introduction to compliance on the Kaibab National Forest as the new forest archaeologist.

By the time Dennis Lund, the new Recreation staff officer and my supervisor, reported to work on the Kaibab, spring of 1977 was well underway and the field season was imminent. Together we determined that my main, if not my entire, focus should be to obtain archeological clearance for planned ground-disturbing projects. Then Dennis set about helping me determine how much clearance I had to get done in the coming field season.

Dennis helped me track down the list of proposed projects for the coming field season, plus those backlog projects that were not already too near completion to bother with archeological clearance. We totaled up the acreage included in clearly ground-

![Figure 11. Survey work on the Kaibab involved locating and protecting resources like this Cohonino site on the flanks of Sitgreaves Mountain. Tom Cartledge is pictured, 1977.](image-url)
disturbing projects. Then we divided this by a hypothetical figure of how much archeological survey a person could perform in a day. Being pretty much ignorant of the amount of survey a person could accomplish in a day's time, we used a figure of 50 acres per person per day. Through this process we determined that we were faced with 14 person years of survey work to be done in the coming field season.

As the following years of experience came to demonstrate, a survey figure of 20 acres per person per day is more realistic. So actually the true figure of survey to be accomplished that first season was closer to 35 person years of work. This figure is so astronomically high due to the fact that there was no effort in timber sales to delineate specific areas to be harvested. A given timber sale boundary might encompass as much as 20 to 30 square miles of territory, and the outfit having the timber harvest contract had license to go wherever they wanted within that large boundary to remove the marked trees. The concept of specific cutting units was some time in the future.

In any case, it was obvious that we had a big problem and I had to have some help. Dennis shook the money tree and came up with enough funding to hire a few seasonal helpers. Our strategy that first season was to be in the field every day with me personally leading the survey crew. We would get into the office early and get out to the field so that I would not get bogged down in office matters. We would arrive back at quitting time. This pattern of complete focus on survey with me personally leading the survey crew was to continue for a number of years until the ever increasing demands of administrative tasks came to force me to spend more and more time in the office (Tom Cartledge, personal communication, 2003).

How It Was Done on the Coconino

In 1978 Bill Holmes, Recreation staff officer on the Coconino National Forest, prepared a report on the archeology program on the Coconino, which had been underway for some time (Holmes 1978). The Coconino was unique in that, in addition to the forest archeologist, it had a cadre of archeologists (mostly work study, temporary, etc., totaling 12 people in 1977) in the forest supervisor's office that was termed the “archeology section.” Aside from that, the basic procedures that were followed by the archeology staff are fairly representative of most other forests and will be described at some length based on Holmes' report.

The rangers submitted a list and map annually showing what projects would need to be examined (surveyed) by archeologists. The forest archeologist and line officers would set priorities according to how much impact (potential site damage) a project would produce and how long the survey might take. For 1978 the archeology section had 5.6 person years available but there was a need to do 9.8 person years of work on high priority projects. Even with quite a large staff, more than other forests, there was a shortfall of 937 person days (op. cit., p. 13).

The first step in the inventory of land in a project area was to decide how intensively it should be surveyed. A 10 percent sample was considered sufficient for a timber sale, a figure that the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation was comfortable in supporting. If the project was a land exchange and the Federal government would lose control of the cultural resources, or if the project would cause a high degree of ground disturbance, then the survey might be conducted at up to the 100 percent level.

The Coconino used two sampling strategies. In one approach a crew would walk along a series of transects determined by randomly generated compass bearing. Alternately, a crew might walk along transects at right angles to existing roads, starting a new transect every quarter mile or so. The crew members would try to maintain a spacing of from 20 to 100 feet apart, a tricky problem if vegetation and topography restricted
Some Memorable Moments

While most archeologists in the 1970s spent long days in the field, there were rewards. Martin McAllister, then forest archeologist on the Tonto National Forest, recalls a special connection with one historic property:

"I wanted to relate an interesting aspect of the summer fieldwork that we did during the late 1970s. The fieldwork involved a number of large timber sale sample surveys as well as various other clearance survey projects. At that time, I had a crew of six temporary archeologists working for me as well as some work study students and at least one volunteer and we were spending a week in the field on a regular basis doing the survey work for these projects. Motel lodging for a crew of this size would have been cost prohibitive and trying to camp for these long periods of time also did not seem feasible. This lodging problem was solved by using the Haught Cabin that had been acquired from the Haught family by the Payson Ranger District in, I believe, the early 1970s.

This cabin began its life in the late 1800s as a classic log dog trot house with two log pens on either side of a breezeway and connected by a roof that served as a sleeping loft. It was constructed by Babe Haught on land he homesteaded just under the Mogollon Rim. Subsequently the original roof was removed and a second story consisting of four or five sleeping rooms was added. Babe Haught was a well-known bear and mountain lion hunter and became author Zane Grey's hunting guide when he came to Arizona in the 1920s or '30s. As a result, the Haught family and Haught Cabin became the characters and setting in several of Zane Grey's books, including "Under the Tonto Rim." Grey subsequently bought part of the Haught homestead and had the Haughts construct a cabin for him.

We had worked with the Payson Ranger District on a study of the Haught Cabin and obtained permission from Payson District Ranger Hugh Thompson to use the cabin for our summer field lodging. Facilities at the cabin consisted of, as I recall, pump water in the house, an outhouse, a propane range and a wood stove. We constructed a solar shower and I think we brought our food in coolers. We slept in our sleeping bags on various old beds and couches in the house or outside on the first or second story porches in warmer weather. These were not luxury accommodations, but were far better than camping out and what a thrill it was to be living in this historic environment while carrying out our archeological survey work.

We spent many weeks living at the Haught Cabin in the summers of the late 1970s and I think Scott Wood and I were still occasionally spending a night or two there in the early '80s. My fondest memory of the Haught Cabin was sitting on the porch one day after work reading Zane Grey's "Under the Tonto Rim" and knowing that the plot of the book was based on the Haughts and the cabin where I was reading the book. It was an experience I will never forget and I think all of my crew members from this period also have fond memories of living at the Haught Cabin (Martin McAllister, personal communication, 2003)."
lines of vision. The ground was closely observed and, when a site was found, it was plotted on both an aerial photograph and topographic map, photographed, and recorded on a site form. A representative collection of artifacts was saved (op. cit., p. 4). (Yes, there was a “non-collection” policy in the region, but field personnel often interpreted that rule rather loosely. It could be argued that identification of artifacts was too difficult in the field.)

Back in the office, the records were filed away on site cards and books as well as on acetate overlays. The project area was recorded on a set of half-inch-to-the-mile maps as a record of what parts of the forest had been surveyed. A report was written to describe the project, the survey, the findings and management recommendations. The report was intended to document compliance with the law and to give the forest supervisor enough information to make an informed decision about granting clearance for the project to proceed (op. cit., p. 5). Then, as now, the archeologist only recommended action to a line officer.

Another document that had to be prepared was the "clearance form." It gave a statistical summary of the archeological work and gave specific management recommendations. For example, the report might recommend that a proposed road be realigned at a certain point in order to avoid causing damage to a site. Copies of the report and clearance form had to be distributed widely, typically to the ranger, forest supervisor, SHPO and regional archeologist. Another copy was saved for the archeologist’s files and perhaps another for the staff that proposed the project.

Frustration with the Process
Dee Green expressed the frustration of many archeologists with the bureaucratic and somewhat negative tone of the 36 CFR 800 regulations.

The convolutions of the compliance procedures themselves; the notion that advisory councils and state officials are looking over one’s shoulder ready to pounce, and time and money spent preparing paperwork for others all contribute to negative feeling about the process (Green n.d.).

He proposed a solution for at least part of the problem. He noted that the kinds of “effect” (in the regulation) that an undertaking might have on a site were all negative (no effect, no adverse effect or adverse effect), no matter what useful outcome might result, such as data discovery or site protection. If managers could see that cultural resources were really a resource rather than a negative problem to be overcome then they would be more inclined to support the archeologists. Green proposed that “beneficial effect” should become another option (op. cit.) in 36 CFR 800. That idea was never accepted in the regulations, although it remains a choice on the current version of the Inventory Standards and Accounting clearance form used in the Southwestern Region.

Permits
One permit-related problem for the Forest Service both arose and disappeared in this decade. Collecting artifacts, and particularly arrowheads or potsherds, is a deeply rooted tradition in much of the nation. It was so pervasive in the Southwest that many people, including Forest Service officers, became convinced that it was allowed under the law and perhaps was even specifically authorized. When the author began work with the Forest Service in 1974 in Utah he was assured by more than a few line officers that arrowhead collection had always been allowed. This might be viewed as a sort of urban legend of archeology. The confusion went so far as to be enshrined in the Forest Service Manual (FSM 2708 of June 1970). The manual advised that the Antiquities Act did not apply to the casual collection of artifacts from the surface of lands owned by the United States. That faulty advice was soon reversed by Emergency Directive No. 6, FSM 2363.4 (2720 letter dated February 24, 1972 from E. W. Schultz, Deputy Chief, to regional foresters). Based on advice of the Office of the General Counsel, the gathering of artifacts on lands of
the United States by private individuals for their personal collection or use would not be allowed.

The manual was on firmer ground when it described Antiquities Act permit procedures. In the early 1970s the 2700 section of FSM spelled out 10 conditions that applied to the processing of archeological permits. One thing had not changed from the earliest Antiquities Act permits: the process still required that the applicant sign and submit six copies of the application. One must assume that a lack of inexpensive copy equipment was behind this requirement. The applications passed through the hands of the ranger, forest supervisor and regional forester, and each of these individuals added his or her recommendations. The Washington Office would seek approval from the Smithsonian and then start three copies of the signed permit back down the line until an original of the permit was given to the permittee by either the ranger or forest supervisor along with a copy of the uniform rules and regulations.

One improvement in the permit procedure won Dee Green an award. His idea, approved for service-wide use, called for stipulations to be used as amendments to antiquity permits. Selection from a list of standard stipulations somewhat eased the paperwork burden for the originating office and insured that all contingencies were covered. This made the permits more uniform ("Southwestern Region Administrative Bulletin," June 1978).

There was also a permit problem that arose between the Forest Service archeologists on one hand and archeologists for the Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration on the other. The controversy, centered on the Tonto National Forest, concerned jurisdiction and management control of cultural resources discovered in the right-of-way (ROW) of highway projects. The ADOT and FHWA position was that once they had been granted a ROW they controlled what happened within it. Thus, any artifacts discovered were disposed of at their discretion.

Dee Green and the Southwestern Region's special uses experts, Bob Bates and Art Maynard, all argued that the Forest Service retained fee title of the underlying land. Regardless of the ROW, Congress had dedicated the land to national forest use. Artifacts would remain under management control of the Forest Service, they said. There were other dimensions to the debate but the focus seemed to be on the artifacts.

Letters were exchanged and lawyers were consulted. The Office of General Counsel agreed with Green, Bates and Maynard. The regional forester sent more letters and finally a face-to-face meeting of all parties was held. ADOT and FHWA conceded the point and future archeological work within Forest Service ROWs had more oversight from Forest Service archeologists. Highways would become bones of contention again but the artifact issue was laid to rest (Art Maynard, personal communication, 2003).

**Contract Archeology**

Private enterprise sensed opportunity in the new cultural resource protection laws. The shortage of government professional archeologists had the consequence...
of delaying all kinds of projects that had the potential to damage a cultural resource. The projects that were proposed by out-Service sponsors also faced very long delays if they were to be surveyed by those government employees. For example, a proposed power line to be built, in part, across a national forest, might require intensive survey of hundreds of acres. Line officers probably preferred to spend their scarce survey talent in looking at timber sales or range projects ahead of a power line.

Into this manpower gap flowed a stream of archeologists employed by private firms as well as by divisions of universities and museums that were set up to deal with what was originally called "salvage archeology." By the end of the 1970s there were probably a couple of dozen firms, universities and museums offering their services throughout the Southwestern Region to any proponent with the money to fund their work and an urgent need to get the surveys done faster than the government could do it. In addition to working for out-Service customers, the contractors came to take on a share of survey work for Forest Service projects, often adding 10,000 acres to the accomplishment of a forest in one season. When working for external clients, all of these contractors had to operate under the authority of a permit. The permits were still issued through the special uses staff but archeologists came to play a large role in review and administration of the permits.

During the 1970s the acreage surveyed by contractors working under permit grew to be a significant percentage of all such work done in the region. That made it all the more important to ensure that the work was done to an acceptable standard. Reviewing contract reports became an important aspect of a Forest Service archeologist's job. This was done both in the regional office and on those national forests that had acquired a staff archeologist. In 1976, the Coconino became the first national forest in the Southwestern Region to receive authority to review permits' "archeological clearance investigations," rather than waiting for regional office approval. Dr. Raymond Thompson was advised of the change but reminded that reports for all other forests would continue to be reviewed for acceptance by the regional office (2360 letter dated January 7, 1976 from John T. Koen, director of Recreation, to Dr. Thompson).

Most of the work done by contractors was above reproach but there were enough problems to justify the time spent on quality control. The files contain a number of examples of contract reports drawing unfavorable notice. For example in a 1979 letter, the regional archeologist informed a contractor that his aerial photo site locations were not acceptable. When a site was discovered it was to be recorded on a site form, on a USGS map and on a Forest Service aerial photograph. It was generally agreed that the information on the photo was the most accurate record of the exact location of a site. In the case noted, one third of the marked sites could not be found again when Forest Service employees went to the survey area to do a quality control inspection.

Another notable example of field work problems that comes to mind was on a very large Forest

Figure 14. A pothurited site in the Mazatzal Wilderness, Tonto National Forest. illustrated the state of many prehistoric sites in Region 3. 1979.
Service contract project. The contract was terminated and reissued when it was discovered that sites were being located on maps based on poor compass technique. The land being surveyed was very difficult because of short sight lines. The field crew had been fixing their position by taking compass bearings on a rounded mountain top many miles away. The error built into that procedure was so great that no reliance could be placed on the reported site locations.

It should be noted that in most cases, contractors fixed any problems reported to them. It was very rare for a contractor to lose a permit or to be denied future permits.

Law Enforcement

The Southwestern Region began investigating and prosecuting pothunters (also called relic-hunters or looters) in the mid-1970s under authority of the Antiquities Act of 1906. The author knows of no earlier cases. There were certainly many sites that had been looted before, but no documentation survives in the regional office of investigations or actions taken.

In a 1977 article, Don Graybill reported: "Archaeological sites of the Mimbres phase of the Mogollon Culture are being illegally destroyed on Federal lands at a rapidly increasing rate. More than 60 percent of the pueblo architecture in one completely surveyed area of the Gila National Forest in New Mexico has been lost" (Graybill 1977). In addition:

The history of unprofessional excavation here is extensive. As early as the 1880s a noted explorer reported on this type of activity in the Mimbres Valley. By the early 1900s a number of people had spent time locating Mimbres ruins and several descriptions of items taken from them by local residents had been published. In 1967 an extensive survey of sites in the region provided data on 110 Mimbres phase sites. Less than 10 percent of these were undisturbed (loc. cit.)

On the Coconino National Forest the site called Nuvakwehtaqe by the Hopi (Chavez Pass) was heavily impacted. In 1977 Arizona State University began a salvage program there following an especially severe episode of looting. It was feared that nothing of value would be left at the site unless some professional archeological work was done quickly. At that time the site was littered with human remains that had been cast aside by pothunters (Pilles and Freeman 1981, p. 12).

In one 2-day period in 1977 there were six pothunter arrests at three different locations on the Cave Creek District of the Tonto National Forest. About one ton of artifacts were recovered. Forest Service officers were joined by Yavapai County Sheriff's officers in making the arrests. One notable feature of these cases is that they were reported at length, with photos, in the Region's in-house newsletter. Pothunting was being brought to the attention of all employees ("Southwestern Region Administrative Bulletin," January 1978).

Martin McAllister, forest archaeologist on the Tonto, described the events leading up to the arrests:

At 2 a.m. on the morning of December 22, I was awakened by a phone call bringing me news that pothunters had been arrested on our forest. As I excitedly called my assistants and we prepared to leave for the area, none of us could have predicted that by that evening the catch would be six pothunters working at three different sites in an area of several square miles. We certainly could not imagine that these events, which marked the beginning of the Jones, Jones and Gevara case, would not end until more than 2 years later. Nor did we imagine that it would involve a legal battle taken all the way to the Supreme Court or that it would result in radical legislative action by the U.S. Congress to better protect the Nation's archeological sites (McAllister, 1980).
In New Mexico there were several early prosecution successes starting in the 1970s. Defendants were convicted in the courts of John A. Darden (U.S. Magistrate) and Howard Bratton (U.S. District Judge). But there was a stunning setback in Arizona in 1974 when the Antiquities Act was declared fatally vague in United States v. Diaz (Federal Reporter 499 F.2d 113). This decision would thereafter be in force in Arizona and the rest of the Ninth Circuit, and it placed a cloud on the Antiquities Act nationwide, including New Mexico and the Tenth Circuit.

In spite of the Diaz decision, an important prosecution success occurred in New Mexico in 1976 when two Deming men, Mike J. Quarrell and Charles L. Quarrell, were charged with illegally excavating a site on the Gila National Forest. In the United States v. Quarrell the magistrate held that the 900-year-old artifacts were clearly "objects of antiquity" and protected by the 1906 act. U.S. Magistrate Darden found both defendants guilty of violating Title 16, USC, Section 433 (Green and Davis 1980 p. 83). Likewise, in 1978 the government won in the case of the United States v. Smyer and May in which the men were charged with looting Mimbres sites on the Gila National Forest (Collins 1980, Miscellaneous Paper No. 33).

The Antiquities Act had several flaws from the viewpoint of a Federal prosecutor. As mentioned above, the fact that it had been declared "unconstitutionally vague" in the Ninth Circuit made its effectiveness uncertain in other jurisdictions. On the other hand, the existence of the Antiquities Act and its focus on crimes against archeological property meant that some judges would not permit the use of more general statutes, such as the Theft of Government Property statute, in cases of antiquities theft. This was the case when District Judge William A. Copple dismissed the Jones, Jones, and Gevara indictment in 1978, saying there should be new legislation (enclosure 1 to 2360 letter dated August 29, 1985 from W. R. Snyder, acting deputy regional forester, to Robert Fink, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation). Third, the law only applied to excavators. It could not touch dealers, the people who provided a market and incentive for site looters. Another shortcoming was that the Antiquities Act’s penalties ($500 maximum) that may have been a deterrent in 1906 did not deter in the 1970s.

Dee Green cooperated with Assistant U.S. Attorney Robert Collins to argue for passage of new site protection legislation with sharper teeth (Collins and Green, "Science" 1978, vol. 202 pp. 1055-1059). The new law that resulted from their efforts and the work of many others, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA), was enacted in 1979. ARPA was a definite improvement in that it clearly defined concepts such as "archaeological resources" and provided much stiffer criminal and civil penalties for unauthorized excavation and removal of artifacts from Federal lands as well as for artifact trafficking.

The earliest training session known to feature the law enforcement aspects of cultural resource management took place in Albuquerque in March 1977. Robert Collins was invited to participate in a discussion of pothunting as part of a cultural resource seminar (2360 letter dated February 3, 1977 from John T. Koen to Victor Ortega, U.S. Attorney). That was followed by a longer training session in Tucson, Arizona in
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May 1978. The occasion was a national meeting hosted by the Coronado National Forest. Seven regional archeologists attended and exchanged information on a wide span of problems. Dee Green focused on law enforcement. His summary of the meeting noted the presentations made by Robert Collins, by Tonto National Forest personnel who were involved in three antiquities cases, and by Region 6 archeologist Janet Friedman describing a case in Hell's Canyon. There was also a general discussion session about the need for new legislation and a need for awareness training for law enforcement officers (2360 letter dated August 30, 1978 from John Koen to the Chief).

Region 3 began to offer specialized training in methods for dealing with pothunting in 1979. The purpose of the training was to familiarize cultural resource specialists with evidence collection and prosecution techniques used in antiquities law cases. At the same time, law enforcement specialists were learning the characteristics of sites and the value of the resource. Cooperation between the two kinds of specialists was fostered ("CR Update," January 1982). It should be explained that archeologists acted in a supporting role for law enforcement officers. Archeologists were not sworn officers and did not arrest pothunters, although some para-archeologists were law enforcement officers.

John Koen opened the 1979 law enforcement training session with reflection on the achievements and challenges of the 1970s. On the debit side, "There was an increase in the vandalism of cultural sites—it was more destructive and more extensive than in past years. There was a notable increase in the activity of the commercial pothunter." On the plus side Koen noted that the government had, "Increased and intensified our protection and law enforcement" for cultural resources ("Background for the Training" in regional office files 2360 Special Interest Areas, Antiquities Violation Training, December 3-7, 1979).

Enhancement

National Register Nominations

It was Executive Order 11593 that focused the attention of the Forest Service on the need to nominate historic properties to the National Register of Historic Places. Awareness of this requirement filtered down to the forest supervisors in the Southwest via a letter dated December 6, 1971 from John Tom Koen (2360 letter to all forest supervisors dated December 6, 1971). Koen briefly explained the requirement to locate all sites and complete the nominations by July 1, 1973. He said,

The procedure involves all agencies submitting possible nominations through the State Planning Agency liaison officers who will in turn submit the nominations to a Department of the Interior Committee for consideration for the National Register.

Figure 16. Palace Station, an 1870s stage stop on the Prescott National Forest, was listed on the National Register in 1976.
Included in the enclosures to Koen's letters were “appropriate inventory forms” and the criteria for evaluation. The forms were all state forms, so different versions went to the forest supervisors according to which state or states included their lands. There was no mention of a need to complete Form 10-33, the National Park Service form titled “National Register of Historic Places – Nomination Form” (which was created in July 1969). There was no suggestion that new field studies were required or that the Forest Service would do any paperwork for the nominations beyond completing the state forms.

Things had changed some when, more than a year later, Koen wrote to David King, the State Planning Officer for New Mexico, and outlined the procedures being followed for National Register nominations. The forests in New Mexico had completed the state’s “Form A” for each site and had sent them to the state’s Cultural Properties Committee for review. In June 1972 the committee provided the Forest Service a list of sites which were considered to be eligible for National Register status. The regional office then advised the forest supervisors to fill out NPS form 10-300 for each of those sites. Tom Roederer carried the completed 10-300 forms to Santa Fe to obtain the signature of the State Liaison Officer. This step was a newly imposed requirement (2360 letter dated April 13, 1973 from J. T. Koen to David W. King).

It is noteworthy that neither the correspondence cited nor the National Register forms found in the files, involved archeologists. A letter to the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) (2360 letter dated July 9, 1973 from J. T. Koen to Dorothy Hall) mentions that “Tonto Forest personnel” had made inquiries about the significance of certain sites. The Tonto had no archeologist in 1973. A nomination form was completed on the Carson National Forest for “El Camino Real” on February 26, 1973. The form was filled out by Manuel Dominguez, forestry tech., and signed by H. R. Nickless, the Penasco district ranger (regional office National Register files). The role of the regional office’s archeologist in the National Register process is nowhere evident. In fact, of the sites listed on the National Register in the 1970s (Table 1), only the Dragoon Springs Stage Station Site nomination was prepared by a Region 3 archeologist (Don Wood).

There is an interesting footnote to the Koen-Hall letter. In a note to be appended to copies of the letter sent to the Tonto it is explained why Sierra Ancha Cliff Dwellings was being returned rather than sent to SHPO. “We do not believe sites within wilderness should be nominated.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date Listed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cibola</td>
<td>Gallinas Springs Ruin</td>
<td>1970-09-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconino</td>
<td>Loy Butte Pueblo (Honanki)</td>
<td>1975-02-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clear Creek Pueblo and Caves</td>
<td>1975-02-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mayhew Lodge</td>
<td>1975-02-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sacred Mountain</td>
<td>1975-03-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nuvakwewtaqa</td>
<td>1977-08-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>Power's Cabin</td>
<td>1975-08-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Flag Post Office</td>
<td>1979-06-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dragoon Springs Stage Station Site</td>
<td>1979-05-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gila</td>
<td>Burro Springs Site</td>
<td>1974-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>Mexican Canyon Trestle</td>
<td>1979-05-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescott</td>
<td>Palace Station District</td>
<td>1976-04-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walker Charcoal Kiln</td>
<td>1976-10-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>San Juan Mesa Ruin, Seshukwa (AR-03-10-03-12,LA-303)</td>
<td>1970-07-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tsiniping</td>
<td>1970-09-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonto</td>
<td>Brazaletes Pueblo Site</td>
<td>1975-01-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verde River Sheep Bridge</td>
<td>1978-11-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
idea that wilderness lands were somehow different under the cultural resources laws may have been expressed here for the first time. The theme would recur.

Another interesting footnote, in light of a National Register site inspection requirement in the Save the Jemez lawsuit settlement agreement 10 years later, concerns NPS inspections. At the start of the National Historic Landmark program it was usual for NPS inspectors to make biennial visits to landmark sites so that they could report on their condition. As the Forest Service found in the next decade, regular inspection of these sites can be both difficult and expensive. In some cases it is the very isolation of a site that has preserved its special qualities. It was explained (H34 - SWR PSC letter dated January 6, 1976 from Joseph C. Rumburg, NPS Regional Director, Southwest Region, to William D. Hurst, regional forester) that, "in the immediate future all visits are to be curtailed so as to comply with the national effort to restrict government spending ..." The visits had been made before because the NPS was responsible for informing the Secretary of the Interior's Advisory Board regarding integrity of the sites. Apparently the site visits were found by NPS to be an activity it could no longer afford.

If a site owner did not actually complete the nomination forms, at least the owner should have been told that it was being nominated. That did not always happen when Federal lands were involved. The Cumbres and Toltec Scenic Railroad appeared in the Federal Register for February 19, 1974 as a new listing in the National Register of Historic Places. No Forest Service officer had participated in the nomination process (2360 letter dated March 11, 1974 from John Koen to the Carson forest supervisor).

The statement of program accomplishments prepared for the Chief by Tom Roderer in 1973 (2360 letter dated July 12, 1973 from Wm. D. Hurst to the Chief) apparently was in response to criticism of the region's National Register efforts. The letter states that 2,978 sites had been inventoried in the Southwestern Region and that, "The inventory will likely never be completed." Hurst lists major roadblocks that included a lack of resources (time and money), a lack of agreement by professionals about what is significant, and the vast supply of prehistoric sites in the region. He concluded that the region is, "actively pursuing compliance with Executive Order 11593."

The Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service (HCRS) was established in the Department of the Interior on January 25, 1978. HCRS was divided into a half dozen divisions including the National Register. An immediate result of this was that the regulations which had been published in Title 36, Chapter I, programs of the National Park Service, were redesignated as Title 36, Chapter XII. The content of the National Register regulations remained unchanged. HCRS became the primary contact for matters involved with National Register nominations, but not for long. HCRS was absorbed by the NPS in May 1981 with NPS again taking responsibility for the National Register, National Historic Landmarks

Figure 17. Tsipng, a large ancestral puebloan site in the Chama River valley, was listed on the National Register in 1970.
and National Historic Trails. Other functions of HCRS were found to duplicate programs already assigned to other agencies ("CR Update," April 1981).

**Interpretation and Public Outreach**

Instances of interpretation of cultural sites in the 1970s still were rare and usually consisted of little more than a sign. The Carson was still interested in El Camino Real. The Carson's 1974 "Management Plan for Protection of the Camino Real" cited a need for 8 interpretive signs to be made at a cost of $50 each (regional office National Register files). Notably ambitious was the making of a motion picture film of the excavations at Tijeras Pueblo on the Sandia Ranger District. The CRM staff also were involved in the erection of two displays, one each on the Cuba and Mormon Lake Ranger Districts (Anon. 1977).

Another means of interpretation used in the 1970s was the brochure, but only a few were produced. One, from the Santa Fe National Forest, was the 1977 "Archaeological Resources of the Cuba District." This described the prehistoric Gallina culture that made use of the area but it was not a guide to specific sites. Several sites were shown in photographs but there were no directions to their locations and the public was not encouraged to seek them out.

One measure of the amount of public attention devoted to cultural resources can be found in the region's in-house newsletter, the "Southwestern Region Administrative Bulletin." The number of stories related to cultural resources was very minor in the 1960s. Not every issue has survived in the files but, of those that do, it is rare to find a story about archeology. The few history stories deal only with the Forest Service itself, such as occasional "old timer" stories. In the 1970s, however, the number of stories about archeology, and the amount of page space devoted to them, begins to increase. Archeologists appeared in the "Mentioned in Dispatches" feature, and they were reported for having received awards. Excavations by permittees and contractors were reported. Also, space was devoted to what might

---

**"Thieves of Time"**

Of special note, in terms of public outreach in the 1970s, was the Forest Service’s participation in the production of a public television program on pothunting in Arizona, "Thieves of Time." In a letter to forest line officers and staff, Peter Pilles wrote:

> On Tuesday, February 28, at 7 p.m., a DAET television (Channel 9) will be showing "The Thieves of Time," a special program produced by KAET in conjunction with the Museum of Northern Arizona and the Coconino National Forest.

> The film will discuss the problem of pothunting in Arizona and includes interviews with Bob Gillies, Beaver Creek district ranger, and Peter Pilles, forest archeologist.

Scenes will be shown of Chavez Pass ruins, a National Register site on the Blue Ridge District, and the Sedona site being excavated for the Forest by the Verde Valley Archaeological Society. Members of that group will also be interviewed and their work for the forest presented as an alternative to pothunting (2360 letter to forest supervisor's staff and district rangers, dated January 16, 1978).

This was the first documentary on the looting of archeological sites that received wide distribution, not only in the Southwest but across the nation. It was used by many agencies to raise awareness of the accelerating loss of the nation's heritage at the hands of looters. The title inspired a well-known poster, "Thief of Time," produced by the Arizona Governor's Archaeology Task Force around 1980.

**Forest History Program**

A formal history program began in the Chief's office in 1971. One sign of its status as a "program" was that history was assigned its own file designator, 1680, which it retains to this day (“History Line,” Volume 1, Number 1, 1971). This program was completely separate from the cultural resource program in both personnel and staff affiliation. Cultural resources was a function of the Chief's National Forest System Recreation staff but history fell into the province of Public Affairs, which served Research and State and Private Forestry as well as the National Forest System. There was an attempt to foster regional history programs by requiring that each region identify a "history coordinator," a person who would funnel news about the program up and down the line. Every district, forest and station was directed to establish a history coordinator position (a collateral duty, not a full-time job).

The function of the history program was, "to be an agency-wide agenda of preserving Forest Service documents and artifacts. It also served to link personnel engaged in history activities into an agency-wide network" (1680/2360 letter dated April 12, 1991 from Susan Hess, director of Public Affairs, to regional foresters, etc.). This sounds so much like what Regional Forester Kennedy had assigned to Ed Tucker in 1964 that it is tempting to think that the Southwestern Region can claim a share of the credit for the Chief's history program.

If it was also hoped that this would stimulate the formation of vibrant programs at regional, forest and district levels of the organization, then that hope went unfulfilled. In most regions, forest history remained an idiosyncratic interest of individuals, sometimes supported by the leadership but often abandoned after a single project had been completed. If anything solid did result at the field levels it was the idea that each staff should have a “1680” folder in the files. This folder was to receive a copy of any correspondence that might have long-term significance and which would be of interest to historians in the future. Sadly, in most cases the idea was more honored in the breech than the observance.

At a more general level, some attention was given to history and historic sites in cultural resource awareness sessions and in training sessions for para-archeologists. The idea that both historic and prehistoric sites should be recorded during surveys was promoted and did take root. It was still uncommon in the mid-1970s to find any mention of historic cabins and roads in survey reports but it was not unknown. The regulations certainly promoted consideration of historic sites (e.g., 7 CFR Part 3100, dated November 19, 1979). There was no particular resistance to dealing with historic sites, it was just not an important part of the training that most archeologists had received. The appearance of the first monograph with a historical topic in 1975 (“Historical Firsts in the Forest Service,” Cultural Resources Report No. 26) was a good sign and it flagged the trail for many more such monographs in later decades.

As for the question of there being a "history program," the facts do not support a claim that there was such a thing in the Southwestern Region in the 1970s.

**Personnel**

In the 1970s much of the responsibility for fostering and strengthening the emerging cultural resource programs rested with the recreation program leaders in the regional office and forest supervisors' offices. Archeologists, as resource specialists, were not regular participants in line and staff officer meetings, so it was the region's Recreation director and the forest Recreation staff officers who championed and interpreted the program for the leadership. They also ran interference for the archeologists when problems arose and tried to assist them in becoming more integrated into the Forest Service organization. It was the Recreation staff officers who made the arguments to forest
supervisors and rangers for additional funding for cultural resources and who often scraped together additional dollars from other recreation programs to help meet critical cultural resource needs. John T. Koen was the Recreation director in the regional office throughout most of the 1970s.

Tom Roederer was not an archeologist but he performed some functions appropriate to a regional archeologist in the early 1970s. Tom was a branch chief in Recreation with responsibility for the archeology program. It was Tom Roederer, for example, who worked with the State Planning Office to finalize the region’s first round of National Register nominations (2360 letter dated April 13, 1973 from John T. Koen to David W. King, State Planning Officer). James E. Fitting started the National Register form for Burro Springs Site No. 2 nomination. In his transmittal letter to Roederer, Fitting noted that he had been forced to leave much of the form incomplete and requested that Roederer fill in the missing boundary/location data (letter dated August 27, 1973 from Fitting to Roederer).

Tom spent a great deal of time with the states’ historic preservation program staff attempting to determine where a Forest Service program should go and how to coordinate with them. He felt that this needed to be done since it was a budding program agency-wide. He was beginning to formulate where it should go with a future archeologist when he was reassigned to Washington, D.C. (Tom Roederer, personal communication, 2003).

Figure 19. Don Wood was hired in 1975 to serve as a Tucson-based zone archeologist to provide services to the national forests in Arizona that did not have their own archeologist.

Professional Staff

When President Nixon signed Executive Order 11593 in 1971, wheels were set in motion that began the large-scale hiring of archeologists in the Forest Service. The E.O. requirement in Section 2 (inventory) could become a very labor-intensive obligation. At least a few line officers read that and decided that it would be useful to have an archeologist around to advise on how to accomplish this new requirement. The National Historic Preservation Act regulations just made the need more clear.

Carl Johnson’s employment in the regional office ended in 1972. There is little in the files regarding his activities, probably because few 2360 records from the 1960s and early 1970s are preserved in the regional office. Many reports that predated the Cultural Resource Automated Information System (CRAIS) (see the “Data Management” section for a discussion of CRAIS) subsequently were entered into it by the forest archeologists. However, a search of the Inventory Standards and Accounting (IS&A) database turned up no reports with Johnson’s name. In part, this void may be because Johnson reported his work and recommendations in memoranda or in letters rather than reports. For example, he left a 5-page letter that described his visit to Tijeras Pueblo in 1969. He described his inspection of construction work at the site and recommended that the Museum of New Mexico be given a contract to do salvage excavations there. He cited FSM 2363 as authority for the Forest Service to prevent the loss of archeological information and FSM 6510.43a as authority to expend funds on the work (2360 letter dated August 7, 1969 from Carl B. Johnson to John T. Koen, assistant regional forester).

The region began to experiment with contracting and with hiring temporary professional archeological personnel in 1972. The regional forester reported to the Chief that,

... this summer we are trying a contract for general inventory work.

The Apache National Forest has
contracted the Prescott College Anthropology Department and obtained the services of two archeological students who will be working under a professional archeologist put under contract by the forest. ... If it is successful, we will institute this procedure on other forests in forthcoming years in order to step up the inventory (2360 letter dated July 12, 1973 from Wm. D. Hurst to the Chief).

In October 1973, Dee Green (Figure 9) was hired and reported for work as regional archeologist. Shortly thereafter the job was upgraded to one of the assistant directors in the Recreation staff (Robert Bates, personal communication, 2003). This gave the regional archeologist position more visibility and more opportunity to effect policy. Green had been working in Utah for the Manti-La Sal National Forest as a district archeologist. His hiring initiated a period of increased professionalism in the region's archeological program. Up until this time there never had been more than two archeologists at a time

First Day on the Job

Tom Cartledge, a new archeologist who had been recently appointed to the Kaibab, found an alien culture when he took the job. He recounts what it was like reporting for work in Williams, Arizona:

When I think back to my very early days on the Kaibab, the thing that comes foremost to my mind is that the Forest Service, or at least the Kaibab, was as unprepared for archeologists as the archeologists were for the Forest Service. Let's not forget that it was 10 years after passage of the National Historic Preservation Act when some, but not all, forests began to hire their first archeologists. When I started the job on the Kaibab in October 1976, I was fairly fresh from graduate school/academia and had little or no understanding of what the Forest Service did nor why they did whatever they did.

Although the Forest Service had previously had an intensive, multiweek orientation training program for new employees, for unknown reasons they had dropped the program. So I received zero orientation to the large complex organization for which I was to work for the next 25 years, even though I was entering the organization at a mid-level (GS 9/11) position.

I was so green that, when I drove into Williams, Arizona to report for work, I saw a Forest Service sign, walked into the office, and said, "Reporting for duty, sir!" The confused person at the desk said, "Who are you and what duty are you reporting for?" I told them I was their new forest archeologist, and was informed that I was in the Chalender District Office and where I needed to be was the S.O. Thus I went in search of the S.O., although I was not exactly sure what an S.O. was (the Supervisor's Office) or what it might look like. I never did find the actual S.O. because, as it turned out, the building housing the S.O. had burned several months prior to my arrival, and S.O. personnel were scattered around town in various buildings where there was space available.

I eventually found the personnel officer in a trailer parked not far off the main drag. After processing I was directed to report to Recreation staff officer Ben Wallingford, who would be my supervisor. I finally found the staff officers' space in a room upstairs above one of the local businesses only to learn that Ben, who was applying for another job, was out of town for a job interview or a house-hunting trip or something related. One of the staff officers told me that there was a desk for me in the once vacant beauty shop now occupied by a half dozen or so Forest Service substaff individuals.

Continued...
I found the beauty shop, went in, and introduced myself. One individual who seemed more aware of my presence than the others working there pointed out an empty desk and said, "There is your desk." Since this person seemed more concerned than the others, I asked him, "What am I supposed to be doing?" I did not realize that he was a "timber beast" and probably had no notion of what I was supposed to be doing. Although I am probably paraphrasing his answer after all these years, his answer was something to the effect of, "How would we know what you are supposed to do? We've never had an archeologist before. You're the one who will have to figure out what you're supposed to do!" There was one particularly abrasive engineer who, when I was introduced, may have summed up at least some people's feelings when he said, "Oh no! Another damned ologist!"

In any case I took possession of my new desk in a state of bewilderment, but, not being one who can remain idle very long, this condition lasted only briefly. I opened my brief case, scattered some papers around the desktop, and took on an appearance of being busy. Although I don't recall specifically what I was doing, I was probably reading and rereading my position description.

Ben Wallingford did end up getting the job for which he had applied, and he was available only intermittently and occasionally to give me some guidance over the next few weeks before he left permanently. Given the pace at which the Forest Service moves in filling vacant positions, it was to be a number of months before the Kaibab advertised the Recreation Staff position, evaluated the applicants, and selected someone to fill it. Following selection, the new person was given a reporting date a few months off in the future. Thus, although I reported to work as the forest archeologist in October of 1976, it was to be the late spring of 1977 before I came under direct supervision or received any real guidance as to my responsibilities.

I realize that there are many who would see this as a golden opportunity—to be in a relatively well-paid position on a beautiful national forest in the Arizona outback with no one particularly concerned as to how you spent your time. I, however, need a bit more structure than this, so as I recall I pretty much floundered around busily for a number of months trying to psych out what I should be doing. I did determine that my most critical task was to perform archeological clearance surveys on various ground-disturbing projects which the forest was undertaking. However, by the time I got my bearings, the northern Arizona winter was upon us, and the snow pretty much put me out of the survey business (Tom Cartledge, personal communication, 2003).
from Koen, Director of R-3 Recreation staff, to Dr. James Ayers, Arizona State Museum. Note that not every person on the list was employed in the GS-193 Archeology series. Those marked with an asterisk had other jobs and were not working in full-time professional archeologist positions. Later, they would be called cultural resource "coordinators."

Don Wood – Arizona Zone (multiforest)
Tom Cartledge – Kaibab NF
Robert Armstrong* – Cibola NF
Harlow Yaeger* – Prescott NF
Peter Pilles – Coconino NF
Martin McAllister – Tonto NF
Joseph Janes – Gila NF

Around 1978, David Gillio, zone archaeologist on the Fishlake National Forest in Region 4 but soon to become associate regional archaeologist in Region 3, compiled a listing of all professional forest and regional archeologists throughout the Forest Service. His lists were revised about semi-annually until the Chief's office took over the job. Region 3, with 9 archeologists, had the third largest staffing in the Forest Service, just behind Region 4 where there were 11 and Region 5 which had 13. These people served under a variety of appointment authorities and few were permanent full-time employees. Individuals who were named in 1978 for the Southwestern Region included the following archeologists:

Cartledge, Thomas, Ph.D.
Kaibab Forest Archeologist
Donaldson, Bruce
Apache-Sitgreaves Forest Archeologist
Green, Dee, Ph.D.
Regional Archeologist

Figure 22. Martin McAllister started working on the Tonto National Forest as a temporary in 1974 and became the forest archeologist soon after.

McAllister, Martin
Tonto Forest Archeologist
Janes, Joseph
Gila Forest Archeologist
Pilles, Peter
Coconino Forest Archeologist
Smith, Landon D.
Assistant Regional Archeologist (became Santa Fe Forest Archeologist on August 27, 1978)
Tainter, Joseph, Ph.D.
Cibola-Lincoln Forest Archeologist
Wood, Donald
Coronado Forest Archeologist

Dr. Pat Spoerl joined the Forest Service on the Lincoln National Forest at about this time, probably shortly after distribution of the above list. That left Joe Tainter with just the Cibola to worry about, which was enough since that national forest also administered national grasslands in two other states.

In a 1991 paper reflecting on the development of the cultural resource program in the Forest Service, Peter Pilles recalled what it was like during those early years:

In the early 1970s, as more forests began to hire forest archeologists, attitudes among forest personnel toward this new requirement in their programs ranged from

Figure 23. Peter Pilles became forest archaeologist on the Coconino National Forest in 1975.
curious, suspicious, to downright hostile. Archeology was seen as yet another red tape, paperwork hoop that stood in the way of their getting the job done. Many felt that archeology was not a proper function for the Forest Service. The archeology program existed solely to support "real" forest programs such as timber, range, and engineering. It certainly was not a resource to be managed in its own right. The costs for this new function were seen as being taken away from limited budget funds that should more properly be used for accomplishing required projects.

Archeologists in 1970 were primarily oriented toward an urban, liberal, academic or institutional job situation and, when they suddenly found themselves an unwanted stepchild of the forest family, experienced a severe dose of culture shock. But over the past 20 years, they have used their skills at dealing with alien cultures so that with the passage of time, cultural resource management is now a well-trenched, almost universally accepted function in the U.S. Forest Service (Pilles 1991).

A 1979 letter preserved in the regional office files provides a nice summary of the archeological staff at the end point of this decade. The archeologist in the Chief's office, Janet Friedman, decided that the Forest Service should get professional recognition for the cultural resource program. One way to do that would be to buy a listing in the American Anthropological Association's "Guide to Departments of Anthropology." Friedman made the arrangements to buy that listing and asked the regions to provide biographical information to the Chief. The Region 3 response was sent by the director of Recreation (2360 letter dated June 15, 1979 from J. T. Koen to the Chief). Copies of the biographical forms are attached to the file copy and show both most of the archeological staff of the region and also the various kinds of appointments.

The June 1979 staff included Dee Green and David Gillio, both permanent appointments, in the regional office. For national forests 14 other archeologists were listed, some with permanent appointments, some temporary and others with limited hours, work study or Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IGPA) appointments. Donald Wood was on the Coronado. Landon Smith was forest archeologist assisted on the Santa Fe National Forest by Julia Dougherty, Genevieve Sprinkle, William Neal and David Staley. David Abbott, a temporary appointment, was the sole archeologist on the Carson. Martin McAllister, forest archeologist for the Tonto, was assisted by Joel Johnstone, Dorothy Goddard, J. Scott Wood and Brent Woodward. The Cibola employed Joseph Tainter (IGPA) and Emily Garber. For
some reason, no other national forests were included in that letter but we know that Peter Pilles was still forest archeologist on the Coconino, with a cadre of assistants. Pat Spoerl was on the Lincoln, Bruce Donaldson was on the Apache-Sitgreaves, Joe Janes was on the Gila and Tom Cartledge was on the Kaibab.

Those who are familiar with the organization of the Forest Service will know that there is a line/staff organization. Line officers have the executive authority whereas staff officers have technical expertise and serve as advisors ("staff will propose and line will dispose"). The archeologists were hired into assistant staff positions so it was their lot, outside the narrow technical limits of their daily assignments, to recommend how things should be done. As a staff specialist, an archeologist would not directly promulgate policy nor make "determinations of effect" for projects or decisions about a prehistoric site. Rather, the archeologist would make recommendations to the appropriate line officer. Most archeologists usually worked alone and did not have supervisory functions, other than perhaps a seasonal crew, although this was somewhat variable. Some forest archeologists supervised several temporary employees working in the forest supervisor's office. But an archeologist assigned to a ranger district usually reported to the ranger and not to the forest archeologist.

Since a staff officer does not have the authority of a line officer, an archeologist in the regional office had no authority over an archeologist in a forest organization. Dee Green could not, on his own writ, direct a forest archeologist to go out and survey a particular project in a particular way. As a result, there was room for development of some idiosyncrasies in the methods and policies found in the region's archeological community. What made its way into the Forest Service Manual was supposed to be observed but there was often room to put a local interpretation on manual instructions. So long as an idea could be sold to the archeologist's line officer there was a good chance that it could be put into practice on at least that forest.

At the end of the 1970s the professional staff of archeologists in the Southwestern Region had increased nearly tenfold in 10 years. That is a rate of increase that would not be matched in coming decades, even as a result of the cultural resource lawsuit. Green had worked hard to sell the idea that every forest supervisor needed a professional archeologist. That goal was in sight.

Some note should be taken of "the rigors of field work." The first forest rangers worked long hours for short pay and probably spent more time with their horse than with their families. The first archeologists swapped the horse for a
pickup but still spent a lot of time in the field, often in remote locations. Someone with a zone position, like Don Wood, was particularly subject to having to be away from the permanent duty station. For example, Wood was borrowed by the Prescott’s Walnut Creek Ranger District when his help was needed for a 100-acre survey and for training (2360 letter dated June 2, 1977 from Donald Bolander to regional forester). In these days, when there can be a cell phone on every belt, it may be difficult to recall that the first archeologists were often on their own and far from home.

As the decade closed only the Prescott National Forest had declined to hire a professional archeologist. Even there it was mainly financial constraints that prevented the forest supervisor from joining the trend. The Prescott received some professional assistance from the regional office and from the Tonto National Forest archeologists. The Carson forest supervisor originally had felt that it was most desirable to contract with universities for archeological services and to supplement the contracts with additional para-archeologists (2360 letter dated February 4, 1977 from W. R. Snyder to regional forester). By 1979, although the Carson did not have a forest archeologist, it had employed a temporary archeologist to conduct archeological surveys. The Carson would continue to rely on temporary appointments for a few more years. Green would continue to urge that all forest supervisors budget for at least one full-time permanent position in archeology.

Paraprofessional Program

The use of personnel other than professional archeologists (para-archeologists, paraprofessionals, “paras,” or “cultural resource technicians” in some regions) to do archeological field work for the Forest Service is a concept that caused debate again and again both in-Service and with other interested parties. In a sense, the Forest Service had always made use of other personnel in archeology. Antiquities Act permits were administered for the first 60 years on the national forests by persons with no archeological training. The first use of archeological site inventory forms was primarily by rangers and others with no particular training in prehistory. So, when the first professionally trained archeologists arrived and saw that there were some 20 million acres in need of survey, it was natural to look for help.

When the author was first hired, in the Intermountain Region, he was the sole archeologist for six national forests with lands in three states. Within a year he had started to recruit interested range and timber employees for some basic training in archeological field methods. With a short course under their belts, they could accompany the archeologist and be extra eyes during the surveys so that more ground could be inspected each day. It was a bonus that these individuals already knew the country, its roads and access, so there was always an efficiency benefit in having them for company. It was no small comfort to have a second person along for emergencies, too.

In the mid-1970s Dee Green was exploring the use of paras in Region 3. The Chief’s office was supportive, and a para program was already getting underway in Region 5. Most forest supervisors embraced the idea because they could see no way to pay for enough professional services to meet their needs. Some wanted to have staff archeologists and others wanted to rely on contracting but all agreed that it would be prudent to have a cadre of para-archeologists, perhaps with some on every ranger district. By 1977 there was Forest Service Manual (FSM 2361.42) direction on how paras could be used...
Table 2. Forest Supervisors’ preferences for archeological service providers, 1976.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest</th>
<th>Sufficient Professional Expertise?</th>
<th>Para Preference</th>
<th>Who Trains?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-S</td>
<td>No, want forest archaeologist</td>
<td>Yes, 1/RD + 2 in SO</td>
<td>RO, SO, University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>University expert</td>
<td>Yes, Paras 2</td>
<td>RO train and supervise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cibola</td>
<td>No (too little work)</td>
<td>Yes, need 5 Paras</td>
<td>RO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconino</td>
<td>Yes, forest archaeologist</td>
<td>Yes (few only)</td>
<td>SO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>No, need forest archaeologist</td>
<td>Yes, Paras 2/RD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gila</td>
<td>Yes, forest archaeologist</td>
<td>Yes, Paras 9</td>
<td>RO train, SO supervise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, 2</td>
<td>RO and University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescott</td>
<td>No (need zone)</td>
<td>Yes, 2</td>
<td>RO or zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonto</td>
<td>Yes, forest archaeologist</td>
<td>Undecided, maybe 1/RD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and the region had begun some initial para training. In fact, there were already 26 qualified paras and another 20 people were in training (Anon. 1977). There were 10 paras on the Coronado National Forest alone (Holms 1978, p. 11). The high number of paras on the Coronado may have been because the Coronado National Forest was the duty station for Arizona Zone Archeologist Don Wood.

The Chief ordered a program review of cultural resources in 1976, the first ever. The report of that review noted that three regions (3, 4 and 5) used para-professionals to extend available professional expertise. It also noted that this approach created controversy both among the regions and within the archeological profession. The major issue among in-Service archeologists, it said, “is the degree of autonomy of the technician in the instance of negative findings in the field investigations” (Koskella 1976, p. 8).

In 1976 a questionnaire was sent to all R-3 forest supervisors to inquire if they would want paras trained for the national forests. It also asked if there was already a sufficient professional level of expertise available to conduct the cultural resource management program. If not, would it be most desirable to have that expertise at the level of the forest, the region or at a university? Would the forest want para-professionals trained in 1977 and how many (2380 letter dated October 22, 1976 from Deputy Regional Forester Gary E. Cargill to forest supervisors)?

In the frequently seen manner of surveys in the Forest Service, the questions were not always answered or were re-framed in the answer. Table 2 is a summary of the survey results and shows that pattern. The missing replies may be a quirk of the regional office’s file system or those forest supervisors may not have been interested in the questions (2360 files for 1976).

The responses from most of the forest supervisors have been preserved in the regional office 2360 files for fiscal year 1977. Only a few (those with a forest archeologist on staff) believed that they had the capability to manage the program. All but one, the Tonto supervisor, gave an unqualified “Yes” to the question of wanting paras. The Tonto said it was undecided on the issue but would probably get one for each ranger district. The Coconino thought only a few paras would be needed. The others suggested various numbers that work out to be about two paras per ranger district. Almost all requested that the regional office undertake the necessary training of the paras but half wanted to keep the responsibility for their supervision on the forest. Several forest supervisors that were definite about wanting paras were ambivalent about the need for a professional archeologist. The Cibola, for example, suggested that there was not enough work to keep a person busy full time.

If line officers liked the idea of paras, there were some people who did not. A degree of self-interest may have played a role in the
contrarian position, as did an honest and firm commitment to the idea of preservation of the resource. Some archeologists wanted to be able to compete for any archeological work that might be available. Many archeologists sincerely believed that someone trained in forestry or range management, for example, could not be trusted to give priority to saving a prehistoric site if there was a conflict with their primary resource. That was the concern about “instance of negative findings” noted above by Koskella.

Some professionals argued that a person could not be trained well enough in a few days as a para-archeologist to do the work that an archeologist had learned during years of graduate level university education. Others pointed out that paras were being asked to do only a small fraction of the work the archeologist had been trained to do; paras only had to recognize sites and bring them to the attention of an archeologist. They did not have to be able to analyze the data or write scholarly reports.

The State Historic Preservation Officers did not raise objections to reports based on field work by paras in the 1970s. Likewise, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation did not object. In 1977, the Archeological Society of New Mexico presented its Amateur Achievement Award to para-archeologist John Hayden of the Tijeras Ranger District (May 12, 1977 letter from James G. Bain, President, to regional forester).

One thing that needs to be made clear is that a para-archeologist was, for the most part, a volunteer from another resource area, like timber, lands, or wildlife. This may not always have been the case, and sometimes individuals were directed to become paras based on funding and workload considerations (David Johnson, personal communication, 2003). The intent, however, was to recruit individuals who were interested and willing because such individuals would have a strong commitment to the resource. Fortunately, there seemed to be a good supply of Forest Service employees who considered archeology to be interesting (even fun!) and who were willing to spend some time learning basic skills in that discipline. The para program continued during the 1970s, thanks to the interest of the individuals involved, and paras accomplished many surveys that otherwise would not have occurred at all.

There was another category of “assistant” in the cultural resource program, and individuals in this category may or may not have been paras. Inadvertent damage to cultural sites by project work (timber sales, road building, etc.) was known to be a problem. To mitigate that problem a new job and title, “cultural resources liaison officer” was created to describe the employees who would help ensure the survival of cultural resources during these projects. These individuals did not have to be trained to do surveys, but they were to be sensitized to the values of the resources and told how to protect those values.

Where the project is of sufficient magnitude that full-time liaison officers are appointed, these individuals must undergo a 2-day cultural resource awareness training session (2360 letter dated February 15, 1977 from John T. Koen to Forest Supervisor, Apache-Sitgreaves NFs).

Program Management

Building Professionalism

All of the early Forest Service archeologists were committed to building and maintaining a professional program. Then, as now, they were trained in a profession and they wanted to do quality work that would be respected both internally and externally. To that end archeologists continued to maintain memberships in state and national professional societies and took part in their meetings. Those meetings not only provided opportunities to keep abreast of new developments in the field, they also were a forum for meeting peers in other regions and in other agencies. Federal dollars were seldom available to send more than one or two representatives to distant meetings, but there were meetings in the Southwest, such as the annual Pecos Conference, that could be attended at modest cost.
Publication, both internal and external, was another outlet for professional contribution. A quick scan of the region’s publication list shows that many of the forest archeologists prepared papers that Dee Green used in the Region 3 publication series. Active cooperation with peers outside of the Federal government was another way to maintain skills and to become involved in aspects of archeology not readily available in-service.

**Building Program Support**

As the cultural resource program got underway, there was a need to make line and staff officers aware of the new responsibilities outlined in cultural resource laws and policy. The subject matter was new to most managers and outside their normal range of interests. The fact that there was a law, or even a manual requirement, did not mean much until it was brought to the attention of the individuals who had to make it work. Of course there were forest personnel who appreciated both the law and the values of the resource prior to the arrival of archeologists. The following story illustrates this.

This story relates to the suppression of the Battle Fire on the Prescott National Forest in 1972; many Amigos took part. John Hafterson was running GHQ. He was particularly concerned that we protect cabins on mining claims from the advancing fire. Seems that forest personnel were sensitive about the alleged use of “winter lightning” by the Forest Service to remove buildings on questionable claims, hence the need to avoid suspicion. One cabin was particularly vulnerable: we named it “Hafterson’s Shack” to avoid confusion in the event of need for protective action. The fire made at least two runs at the shack, requiring the diversion of air tankers from more important strategic targets to provide protection. The shack was saved as the fire moved on. As we demobilized from fire camp several days later, we passed by the shack. Unfortunately the shack had been constructed beneath the limb of a large oak tree. A wayward ember had ignited the limb, burning it off. The limb fell, breaking the back of and destroying Hafterson’s Shack. We were happy to “get out of Dodge” without having to inform John of the fate of his namesake (John Chambers in “Southwestern Forest Service Amigos Newsletter,” No 78, 2003).

The main mechanism used by archeologists to reach line and staff officers with the cultural resource message was to make presentations of the information. The main setting for this was the “awareness session” and it would be utilized by Dee Green and the forest archeologists many times in the 1970s (e.g., 2360 letter dated January 6, 1977 from John Koen to forest supervisors, Tonto and Kaibab). These might be brief talks given as part of a forest “family meeting” or a 1- or 2-day session devoted exclusively to the topic. Four of those 2-day sessions were given in 1977 (Anon. 1977). They were sometimes requested by a forest supervisor and at other times were offered by the regional office.

At the session planned in the letter cited above, there would be 2 days of talks given by Green. The first day started by introducing the goals and methods of “cultural history” and reviewing the laws. That was followed by a discussion of the goals and problems of management of the cultural resource. The intended audience was drawn mainly from one forest but the archeologists from adjacent forests were invited to attend and assess the value of the training for their forest.

“Tailgate” sessions were also used for training. Whenever a ranger or other line officer would go to the field with an archeologist there would be a predictable period of sitting on the tailgate of their pickup truck while rehashing the laws and trading information about the kinds of prehistoric sites in the area.

Yet another training opportunity came from excavations being conducted on a forest either
under permit or by contract. Visits were arranged to these projects to show other employees what archeology was all about. The Coronado’s archeologist staged a particularly ambitious “show-me” trip to some excavations that the Arizona State Museum was doing as part of the Anamax Land Exchange project. All 65 people in the supervisor's office were invited to visit sites being tested so that they could “become more aware of the forest Cultural Resource Program” (2360 letter dated July 19, 1979 from Don Wood to “All SO Personnel”). The invitation explained the kind of sites being tested and the field conditions.

Para-arheologist training was another opportunity to build support for the cultural resource program. Since the para candidates were generally volunteers, they represented a pool of sympathetic listeners. Once they were convinced that cultural resources were “real” resources and that they should be protected, paras became ambassadors to their co-workers.

Symposia
Another avenue for professional contributions was to host symposia and invite experts from around the country to address important management issues or research questions. Participation in the discussions and resulting papers should also provide opportunities for professional involvement for the Forest Service archeologists in attendance. A number of topics were readily available such as the allocation of sites (rather than total preservation) and how to use predictive modeling in planning. A number of these symposia did get arranged, although usually very few of the region’s archeologists were involved so the professional employee development payoff was low.

Some of the symposia that were sponsored by the Southwestern Region reflected immediate administrative interest. For example, the 1975 symposium “The Wilderness and Cultural Values” reflected a real concern. One part of the Forest Service believed that wilderness should not show the imprint of man. According to that school of thought, cultural resources had no place in a wilderness. The symposia proceedings, Archeological Report No. 7, discussed the various positions in this debate. Fortunately, there was no new push to “clean up” the wilderness and many important prehistoric ruins and historic sites remain there today.

Research Partnerships
When the cultural resource program was still embryonic, the need for relationships with museums and universities was at its greatest. But the need did not go away as larger staffs were built. University field schools provided excellent opportunities for the Forest Service to learn about a particular culture through site investigations. If those investigations could be accomplished under permit, with no cost to the government, all the better. Sometimes the Forest Service was able to offer at least seed money to

Figure 29. Excavations were underway at Tijeras Pueblo in the early 1970s, under the direction of the University of New Mexico's Maxwell Museum.
attract an institution to a particular area of interest. The results of some of this kind of collaboration can be seen in the region's publications. In the 1970s some well-known names in the profession contributed to our knowledge of the region from their universities including Jim Judge (1974), Linda Cordell (1975) and Herbert Dick (1976).

### Publications

The publication portion of the Southwestern Region’s cultural resource program began in the 1970s. Dee Green was intent on disseminating the professional contributions of Forest Service archeologists to a broader audience. At the time, no other region of the Forest Service had a publication program for cultural resource papers. An in-house publication series underscored the assertion that the program had come of age.

Green in his prefatory note for the first of the Southwestern Region’s archeological publications wrote,

*Under the Multiple Use Act the Forest Service is directed to insure that the resources on national forest lands are managed to the benefit of the American people (in Archeological Report No. 1).*

The publication series was a step toward taking some of the information about archeological sites on the forests out of file cabinets and making it available to the American people. Most Forest Service archaeologists had papers or reports published in the new publication series. Scott Wood, for example, had six papers published in the 1970s.

The regional office unveiled its first publication in 1974 (see Appendix D for a complete listing of the region’s cultural resource publications). It was a monograph by William Holiday that described excavations in the Cave Creek Drainage, Tonto National Forest. The format of Holiday’s book was followed throughout the life of what is now called the “old” report series. All of the books were printed by the offset process with screened illustrations on letter size paper. They were given a heavy brown, paper cover and bound by staples. The logo for this series was a
Dear Sir

We have just received from your office copies of Archeological Reports, Nos. 14 and 15, presenting the results of field work by Forest Service archeologists and other archeologists representing institutions working under Forest Service contracts or permits.

It is gratifying that the Forest Service is underwriting the publication of these reports which have great research value for archeologists throughout the Southwest. At times short individual papers may seem unimportant to publish, but they increase in value as more such papers accumulate and are referred to by researches interested in specific areas.

We greatly appreciate receiving the reports which now reside in our library where they are available to our staff and the general public, and we look forward to seeing additional reports in the future.

Sincerely

Stewart L. Peckham
Acting Director
Division of Anthropology
Museum of New Mexico
that could be thought of as “interpretation,” or making information available to the public, albeit a very limited public. It is doubtful that any lay person ever looked at any of the first couple of dozen titles.

The first title that appealed to a wider readership was Number 26, “Historical Firsts in the Forest Service” (Bates 1978), which included such topics as the first use of radios in the Forest Service, first Federal Aid Highway (Coronado Trail), and the first use of aircraft to move manpower in fire emergencies. By then (starting with Number 19 in 1978) the series title had changed to “Cultural Resources Reports.” In subsequent years, historical titles played an ever larger role in the publications list and they often reached quite a wide audience. The several books about railroad logging by Vern Glover were particularly popular and were reprinted by the New Mexico Historical Society.

**Cultural Resources Overviews**

The overview series had a different genesis than the reports series. These books were written to serve as an aid in the formulation of land use plans. A consequence of this is that the overviews were written in a way that would be interesting and understandable by a wider audience, including land managers. In the late 1970s it was recognized that project-specific archeological surveys and reports, the norm for archeologists then, did not give a “big picture” for the resource. Planners needed to get a handle on the wide sweep of prehistory in order to better understand how their proposed actions would impact the sites that remained on the ground. For most planning units there was a body of literature available from many years of field work and analysis. What was needed was a synthesis of the data, an overview that would not just speak to professional archeologists but also to the people who did most of the land management planning work.

Each study area was very large. All of New Mexico and Arizona were encompassed in just 18 “overview areas” (shown as Map 1 in Tainter and Gillio 1980). Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management lands are often adjoining in the Southwest and, in many cases, are even intermingled. Discussions with BLM counterparts confirmed the suspicion that the two agencies had similar data needs so it was decided that jointly-funded studies of some areas could result in overviews that would benefit both agencies. Thus, the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management executed an Interagency Agreement (IA No. NM-197) in the late 1970s. The agencies would divide up the work and share the costs toward the goal of publishing overviews for all lands of both states (8111 letter dated November 22, 1985 from Tom Allen, Acting State BLM Director, to Sotero Muniz, regional forester).

Once the agreements were written to formalize the relationship of the Forest Service and BLM, several contracts were awarded to researchers. This was a change from the region’s earlier books; some of the overviews were commissioned works, the authors receiving pay for their work. As BLM’s Marvin LeNoue and Forest Service’s Paul Weingart explained in their preface to the Mt. Taylor Overview, various approaches are being used to assemble knowledgeable authors for this series. Some areas will be described by professionals from the academic world who successfully bid for contracts; others result from the work of scholars who accept temporary employment under authority of the Intergovernmental Personnel Act. Unlike earlier overviews, this study was completed by members of the Forest Service family” (Tainter and Gillio 1980).

In addition to the Mt. Taylor Overview, overviews of two other areas were completed in the 1970s: the Middle Rio Grande Valley (Cordell 1979) and the Socorro Area (Berman 1979).
The Archeology Laboratory

Sometime in the late 1970s the regional office invested in some equipment and acquired space for a modest laboratory. It was difficult to conceive of archeology being done without at least a basic ability to analyze and describe artifacts. That was the mission of the lab facility. A lab was set up in borrowed space on the second floor of the old Federal Court House across 5th Street from the regional office. It was collocated with the Insect and Disease lab and easy to overlook. Being overlooked was of some importance because "research" was not an official function of the National Forest System. If any research was to be done, it was properly the function of the Research Stations.

That first regional office archeology laboratory was very modest. The assistant regional archeologist managed to spend some of his time there and Julia Daugherty functioned as a part-time lab assistant. There were washing facilities and drying racks for the potsherds and other artifacts that were collected on the national forests. The high-tech equipment was pretty much limited to a microscope and balance. There were some storage spaces and limited photographic capabilities. Only the Coconino among the national forests had laboratory facilities at this time.

One reason the laboratory facilities were so rare is that the official regional policy was one of "noncollection" so there should be little need for a lab in routine cultural resource survey work. The Advisory Council and others had expressed concern that sites were sometimes "collected out of existence." Due to similar concerns, the region did not sanction routine collection of artifacts during surveys. The few things that the forest archeologist might collect to make a reference collection would not require the attentions of a laboratory. But there were still some reasons to make collections and the artifacts began to accumulate. Test excavations produced artifacts and seizures from law enforcement investigations added to the analysis and storage needs.

Data Management

Data management was not a big problem for archeologists at first because the number of completed site forms and reports was not large. That changed as the Forest Service came to terms with the need to comply with cultural resource legislation. The inventory of sites grew to a point where it soon became unmanageable. The prospect for continued growth of the files spurred the regional office archeologists to action. The number of reports of surveys also grew along with a need to have statistical summaries more readily available for information requests from higher levels. That kind of information was basic to management of the resource as well as for budget considerations. The region, and especially the regional office, was about to drown in archeological paperwork.

Dee Green and Landon Smith, along with Joel Johnstone on the Tonto, became closely involved with the mechanics of data management. By 1976 the region had focused on a program called "Statistical Package for the Social Sciences" (SPSS) and knew that a region-wide system was needed (2360 letter dated November 4, 1976 from Landon Smith to Cathy Moore-Jansen). When the Chief reissued Chapter 2360 of the Forest Service Manual in 1979 it specified that "Each region should develop a system to be used for the storage and retrieval of site information collected as a result of inventory" (FSM 2360.23).

The region, with the help of the forests, had initiated a pilot study in 1976 to test the feasibility of an automated data system. On November 2, 1977, Dee Green transmitted to the director of Recreation a report by Landon Smith on the results of the pilot study. Green concluded, "My estimation of the project is that it is successful, and should be pursued despite a few problems and the current non-participation of the Coconino" (2360 letter dated November 2, 1977 from Dee Green to Director of Recreation).

Green's recommendation was accepted and the Cultural Resources Automated Information System (CRAIS) was born.
Once the region had accepted the concept of a computerized database for its archeological records there was still no suitable equipment within the Recreation staff unit. As did many other functions, Recreation would use the shared capabilities of the Forest Service computer located at Fort Collins, Colorado. Information from site forms was transformed into data by using a cardpunch machine. The operator manually entered information on a keyboard and then the machine punched holes in an IBM card with the hole patterns representing letters and numbers. One card held only 80 characters and it took three cards to represent one site form.

The contents of a site form had to be carefully considered, and codes were assigned to descriptive values, to keep costs and data file size within reason. A deck of data cards would be fed into a reader machine connected to the telephone lines. When it was time for the staff unit to transmit a batch of data the card reader would quickly run through a deck and the transmission would enter the files into a computer at Fort Collins Computer Center (FCCC).

By the end of 1977 the Southwestern Region had computerized information for approximately 1,500 archeological sites. There was an "interface package" that allowed analysis (SPSS) and a program that could generate reports (Qwick Qwery) (2360 letter dated August 29, 1977 from Dee Green to Donald Weaver, Arizona Archeological Council Newsletter editor). These 1,500 sites were about 15 percent of all recorded sites in Region 3 at that time. The backlog of data entry work would continue to be a problem for quite a while. Much of the initial data entry work had been done by clerks in the regional office working from copies of site forms sent from the forests. Even if there was interest at the forest level in doing this work, often there was not sufficient staff time available to learn the system and make the entries. Another way to get the work done was to contract, so contracts were issued to Arizona State University and to Adams State College (Smith 1977).

Serious problems remained even after a system was selected and a large subset of data had been entered. One was the lack of an online capability for data entry. The use of cards and batch processing was cumbersome and it made corrections of errors difficult. Perhaps most serious was the fact that not all forests participated in the new system. Every attempt to run reports using the data files would require footnotes explaining that the data were incomplete or needed an additional step of hand processing to integrate the data that was not in the computer (Smith 1977).

Given those limitations, it was still possible to be optimistic about the data management progress of the 1970s. The big gains were in the design of a workable regional site form (R3-2300-2, Archeological and Historical Inventory) and a "clearance" form to record the results of survey (R3-2300-4, Inventory Standards and Accounting, or IS&A). Finally, the coding guide was written and widely distributed. Initially this was a large notebook but it would appear in several editions as a pocket-sized, field-going booklet (e.g., Anon. 1979).

There was another computer capability available in the 1970s that had some utility for archeologists. It was called WESTFORNET (Western Forest Research Information Network), an information retrieval system operated by Rocky Mountain Station. It was a library service that promised research and document delivery services ("Southwestern Regional Administrative Bulletin," April 1978). In operation, it was focused on forestry and very little archeological material surfaced of its own accord. A literature search on archeological topics could be requested but results were spotty and most cultural resource specialists continued to use more familiar resources.
Accomplishments

Because annual reports did not exist in the 1970s, information on accomplishments is spotty. The files contain a chart showing that, by the end of 1973, inventory of 2,978 sites had been accomplished (Table 3).

By 1977, the number of inventoried sites had increased to over 7,000:

All forests have active inventory programs for cultural resources and the region is currently implementing a computer data file to control the very high volume of sites which we anticipate recording over the next several years. The current file contains 1,100 sites, with a backlog of approximately 6,000 sites needing entry (Green 1977).

In his summary of 1977 accomplishments, Green provided a comparison of cultural resource accomplishments in 1974 and in 1977. Table 4 is based on Green's data. Additional 1977 accomplishments included: four 2-day forest awareness training sessions; “a number of different activities designed to present cultural resources to the general public”; issuance of 21 cultural resource permits; and four law enforcement investigations. The report included printouts showing a breakdown of accomplishments generated by the region's new computerized data system.

Funding

Interest in archeological and historic sites can be seen among the earliest professional foresters in the Southwest, but they did not propose that the Forest Service have a separate program to manage these sites. It was not until passage of the National Historic Preservation Act in 1966 that there was a coalescence of interests and requirements such that both funding and positions could be allocated to cultural resources. By 1968, the Southwestern Region had funded an archaeologist in the regional office and one forest archeologist. By the end of the 1970s, staffing and cultural resource activities had increased significantly.

The costs of doing archeology involve something of a paradox. Some archeological projects could probably use every dollar available. If cost were no object, the excavation of a site, done “the right way,” would be enormous because the work is highly labor-intensive, specialized, and can require multiple iterations of expensive applications and tests, such as C14 or paleo-magnetic dating, ground penetrating radar, laser photography, etc. Collaboration with related specialists such as physical anthropologists and geomorphologists can further run up the bills. And once a site has been excavated and analyzed, there are still the

Table 3. Total inventoried sites in Region 3 as of June 26, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest</th>
<th>No. of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apache</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cibola</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconino</td>
<td>1,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gila</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaibab</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescott</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitgreaves</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonto</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,978</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Comparison of Region 3 FY 1974 and FY 1977 cultural resource accomplishments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accomplishment</th>
<th>1974</th>
<th>1977</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Publications</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of LUP's with input</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Sites on National Register</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Full-time Archeologists</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Reports</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of New Sites Recorded</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Acres Examined</td>
<td>18,780</td>
<td>114,662</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
costs of publishing the results and providing for the curation of artifacts and related records.

For all that (and here comes the paradox), most archeologists grew up in a profession accustomed to doing more with less, making do with castoff equipment, volunteered labor and less-than-satisfactory levels of laboratory analysis. That was good training for entering the Forest Service in the 1970s. To the extent that archeologists were considered in the budget it was primarily their salary that was covered. There would have to be very active scrounging to borrow vehicles and tools, to salvage file cabinets and office furniture, and to find funds to purchase cameras, books, and other supplies. The author sadly reports this from personal experience.

The details of the cultural resource budgets in the 1970s remain a mystery, since few records seem to have survived in the regional office and the WO (Judy Propper, personal communication, 2003). We do not even know when a separate cultural resource allocation appeared in the Forest Service budget, but it may have been in FY 1977. In his 1976 presentation on the Forest Service cultural resource program to a meeting of the Advisory Council, R. K. Griswold reported:

We have a budding archeological program: 2 and one half years ago, we had 4 archeologists; today, we now have 23 full-time professional archeologists. Even so, Fiscal Year 1977 is the first year that we've been able to weave the moneys to really do cultural resource inventory work into our budgetary process; however, those funds aren't available to use until October of this year. The money we've been using for our archeological program has basically been borrowed or pirated from other programs—this in a time when the budgets have not been going up as high as the inflationary pressure on the dollar (Griswold 1977).

During at least the latter part of the 1970s, the Forest Service used the “Advent” budget system which was based on preparation of very detailed project plans at the field level. We can only assume that cultural resource surveys were identified as a funding item in an increasing number of those project plans. Funds were also identified in the regional office and on the forests for archeologist salaries and for activities like travel, supplies, publications, data base development, etc. Dee Green reported that in 1974, the year after he was hired, $131,940 was spent on cultural resources in the region; he estimated that in 1977, that figure would be $787,000 “based on data through August 24, 1977 and projected to the end of September” (Green 1977 p. 4).

Many archeologists had to be brought into the budget side of their job somewhat reluctantly. After all, they had trained to become archeologists because they wanted to do research and field work. They didn't especially desire to spend time mastering the Forest Service budget system. They eventually learned that they had been ignoring a vital part of the job and that nobody was going to do it for them, at least not in the way they would like (Doug Smith, personal communication, 2003). The earliest archeologists had been spared the pangs of budgeting because they were junior personnel and someone over them had the responsibility. They soon noticed that there was never enough money and that few costs beyond salary had been anticipated.

After his first field season on the Kaibab National Forest, absent any input on the cultural resource budget, Forest Archeologist Tom Cartledge recalls a greater involvement in the budget in subsequent years:

The following year Dennis made sure that I participated directly in the budget process by reviewing all of the Advent spreadsheets and adding needed archeological support costs as appropriate. For the next few years, or however long the Advent system
survived, our aggregate figure for archeological support costs was in the hundreds of thousands of dollars. What we actually ended up with when the funds came down to the forest was a relatively small percentage of our funding request. It was usually enough to pay my salary, travel, and per diem, and to hire three or four seasonal archeologists, usually at a GS-4 level.

After a few years, Advent was abandoned and replaced by some murky system, that I never did fully grasp, in which funding was requested in different levels and different increments in the different functional areas. It was never clear to me how support costs figured into the system. Even though we did not receive anywhere near adequate funding under the Advent system, I always looked back on it fondly and longed for its clarity and simplicity in identifying what was really needed, especially as the next couple of decades saw the budget process completely reborn every few years into systems farther and farther removed from the work on the ground (Tom Cartledge, personal communication, 2003).

Some basic information was given to the Southwestern Region’s archeologists at the cultural resource seminar held in Phoenix in April 1978. Doug Smith, who looked after Recreation staff budgets in the regional office, made the presentation. He started by saying that complaints about a lack of funds for the current year were too late. Funding decisions were made with long lead times, a fact hard to grasp by someone newly employed.

Certain funds could be available for archeological work but they were not in a budget that any archeologist controlled. For instance, the Reservoir Salvage Act of 1960 (especially in its later amended form) authorized the expenditure of Federal funds to recover historic or archeological data when certain large construction projects were found to adversely affect those resources. As noted above, a Comptroller General of the U.S. decision in 1955 found that road construction budgets could also be tapped to pay for archeological salvage work. But for project inventory and evaluation work, the majority of Forest Service cultural resource work, funding in the 1970s was supposed to come from cultural resource dollars.

The Resource Planning Act required the Forest Service to gather some figures that began to reveal the potential size of the workload in cultural resources. In the 1970s, it was estimated that, nationally, there might be as many as 90,000 sites on national forest lands that could be nominated to the National Register of Historic Places. Since only 65 sites had been nominated by 1975, the rest were considered “backlog.” It was estimated that 470 person years would be required to complete the inventory and that another 500 person years would be needed to process the nominations. That added up to a need for over 20 million dollars (Smith 1978) which seemed an astronomical figure at that time.
The 1980s: Beyond Inventory – Starting to Manage

Introduction

The 1980s in some respects embodied both the best of times and the worst of times. The early part of the decade was characterized by a difficult struggle to stay ahead of an accelerating timber program, usually with woefully inadequate leadtime, staffing and funding. Consequences of this situation culminated, in 1984, in the Save the Jemez lawsuit that paralyzed many activities in the region, especially in New Mexico, for almost 2 years. The latter part of the decade, on the other hand, saw a dazzling rebound, with new national and regional funding initiatives that carried the program well into the 1990s.

Legislative Context

The decade of the 1980s was not a period of major new cultural resource legislation, but existing laws were amended and regulations continued to be developed and revised. In 1980, the National Historic Preservation Act was amended. A significant change was the addition of Section 110. This section directed Federal agencies to (1) implement a program to inventory, evaluate, and nominate eligible properties to the National Register of Historic Places and (2) to ensure that eligible historic properties are "managed and maintained in a way that considers the preservation of their historic, archaeological, architectural, and cultural value." Thus, Section 110 incorporated into law the concepts of E.O. 11593 (minus the inventory deadline). This addition to NHPA gave strong support to the expansion of Federal cultural resource management programs in order to address management of the resource beyond compliance with Section 106.

The Archaeological Resources Protection Act, passed in 1979, had its first impact in the 1980s. There was considerable confusion and discussion about how to proceed while the regulations were being developed (Green 1980). The concern centered on the fact that enforcement of parts of the law were dependent on the existence of regulations that spelled out procedures and definitions. The ARPA regulations (36 CFR 296) were finally issued in 1984.

Also in the 1980s the Washington Office and Region 3 issued their first detailed Forest Service Manual direction for cultural resources. The Region 3 "blue pages" provided local instructions that expanded on the Chief's direction.

Another revision of 36 CFR 800 occurred in 1986. Major changes included an attempt to reduce the paperwork burden. The definition of "undertaking" was changed to be less inclusive. The old definition had the effect that just about any Federal undertaking was covered. The new definition was specifically aimed at work "that can result in changes in the character or use of historic properties" ("CR Update," September/October 1986).

Compliance

In this decade the Southwestern Region's cultural resource specialists continued to provide basic inventory and site protection services to the Forest Service. They also provided advice regarding pending changes to laws and regulations and helped map strategies for compliance when they came into effect.

Above and beyond this work, they found themselves involved in events of larger scope than they had previously known, such as the Save the Jemez lawsuit and the largest land exchange project the region has ever attempted. Probably the archaeologists in every decade have thought that they had more work than could be completed and more laws to observe than they wanted; in this decade they truly had very full plates.

Interim Directive No. 6

Desperate times sometimes lead to desperate measures. The term "desperate measure" has a good fit with the short history of the Southwestern Region's experiment with Interim Directive No. 6 (ID No. 6). It seems certain that Dee Green knew that this attempt to find the
region a way out of a compliance sand trap was
doomed. The author's recollection of events is
that this was the case. Still, the region's cultural
resource program was in a nearly hopeless
situation and any attempt to get out seemed
better than doing nothing. In retrospect, that
was not so; it was probably one more straw on
the camel's back and contributed to the
situation that resulted in the famous cultural
resource lawsuit.

In this decade the pressure was building for
more and better archeological work to assure
compliance with Section 106 of NHPA and other
laws. At the same time there was reluctance
at the Chief's office to increase spending. In fact,
the entire administration's emphasis during the
early 1980s was on cutting government
spending, as summarized by former Assistant
Secretary of Agriculture John B. Crowell, Jr.:

> For the 4 years in which I was guiding
the Forest Service budget-making
process, I tried to implement four
precepts. First was to emphasize
existing revenue-producing activities of
the Forest Service. Second, was to
propose means by which new revenues
could be collected from the national
forests. Third, was to reduce costs of
overall national forest management,
and fourth was to reduce or even
eliminate some research and state and
private forestry programs.

I think the time has come when the
Forest Service should be mandated to
make a profit and when Congress's
annual process of setting Forest
Service budgets should be guided by
the desirability and need for the
national forests to operate profitably
(Crowell 1985).

A reduction in funding would have been hard
enough to live with, but then the budget advice
arrived for fiscal year 1983 with a new
bombshell.

The Chief's "budget advice" came to the region as
a series of sheets that listed a program and its
appropriation and function codes along with text
sections that briefly described the "Program
Objective" and "Program Guidelines." For
appropriation 302, function 074 (Cultural
Resource Management), the F.Y. 1983 Program
Guidelines gave the following direction:

> The Secretary of Agriculture, Office of
Management and Budget, and the
Congress have, through the budgetary
process, directed the FS to reduce the
intensity of cultural resource
management to only the minimum
necessary to meet legal requirements.
Therefore, undertake cultural resource
inventories only on areas expected to
have high cultural values or that are
controversial.

A copy of the budget advice was provided to the
New Mexico SHPO, at his request (2360 letter
dated May 31, 1983 from James C. Overbay,
deputy regional forester, to Thomas W. Merlin).
The SHPO responded that regulations (7 CFR
3100) of the Department of Agriculture required
the Forest Service to investigate an entire project
area, to the extent practical (Merlin's letter of
June 14, 1983). Overbay responded that "the
extent practical" was determined by the budget
(2360 letter dated June 16, 1983).

Interim Directive No. 6 modified, for F.Y. 1983
only and for the Southwestern Region only, the
2360 portion of the Forest Service Manual.
Whereas the basic FSM direction was to
complete cultural resources inventory in
compliance with law and regulation, the new ID
gave direction on how to proceed with
undertakings that could not be surveyed.

In brief, forest supervisors were to list all needed
cultural resource clearance work and assign
each project a priority number. The number
came from a matrix that combined an estimate
of a project's "potential effect severity" and
"resource sensitivity." Once numbers were
assigned, the list would be revised with an eye
for the likelihood of public concern and
management targets. Projects at the bottom of
the priority list and that lacked cultural resource
funding would proceed but with an "adverse
effect" report to the Advisory Council and SHPO. All of the unfunded work would be lumped together as a single undertaking for purposes of consultation. Under this scheme the region would be able to accomplish all of its undertakings and meet the requirement for consideration of the resource.

The problem with the ID was that it did not meet the requirements of the various laws, and the SHPOs were quick to point this out to the Forest Service. The effort was risible, they seemed to think. The response of the Texas SHPO was typical: “We believe that 'Interim Directive No. 6' will not adequately serve our goals or the Federal regulations involved” (letter dated May 19, 1983 from LaVerne Herrington, deputy SHPO, to James C. Overbay).

In the end, six of the national forests in the Southwestern Region reported to the regional forester that they would be able to accomplish all required surveys and be in compliance in the normal way. For them, ID No. 6 would not be an issue. The Cibola reported that its archeologist could do the first priority undertakings and that paras could do all of the rest using dollars that had been squeezed from other areas (2360 letter dated April 25, 1983 from Forest Supervisor Phil Smith to the regional forester). The Cibola's solution ended complaints about ID No. 6 from both the Texas and Oklahoma SHPOs.

When the Santa Fe National Forest submitted its report of proposed firewood sales that would lack survey, the New Mexico SHPO blocked them. He would not accept the report as the basis of consultation. Without SHPO concurrence the forest had little hope of completing the consultation process. So, in the end, the interim directive accomplished little more than angering an important Forest Service constituency.

The Cultural Resource Lawsuit

Probably no event had as much impact on Forest Service thinking about cultural resources as did the lawsuits filed in 1984 against the Southwestern Region. The lawsuits were the culmination of bad decisions and missed opportunities that the Forest Service could have used to build a stronger program. The Southwestern Region had a number of solid accomplishments in the 1970s and early 1980s in the cultural resource field. For example, it could point to a growing professional staff, an expanding site inventory, and a publication program. It had been a leader in combating pothunters and had completed the very large Elena Gallegos land exchange survey. But the ball had been dropped in one critical area. In the absence of sufficient cultural resource funding on some national forests, sites were being damaged by work either sponsored by or permitted by the Forest Service.

Figure 30. The Holiday Mesa mechanical site preparation project, implemented without an archeological survey, was one of the projects that sparked the cultural resource lawsuit. Santa Fe National Forest.
Staff archeologists were aware of the site destruction problem although the magnitude of it may have been underestimated (D. Green in "CR Update," number 27, 1983). It was known that there were flaws in the flag-and-avoid approach. First, surveys were not always accomplished in time or to a standard that ensured that most sites were found before a project started. In some cases a 10 percent sample survey was conducted and only the sites found in that sample were protected. Second, those who executed the projects on the ground were not always attuned to the goal of site protection. It was not unusual for equipment operators to overlook or ignore flag lines and push right through a site that should have been protected. Also, the boundaries of projects often were reconfigured after the archeologists had finished their survey. Any of these problems could have been corrected if there had been stronger leadership from line officers. And it should be noted that the region's archeologists were never sued; for the most part, they were credited by litigants with doing the best job they could with the funds they had.

A post-lawsuit briefing document summarized the factors that set up the region for the lawsuits (undated memo preserved in Recreation staff notebooks, "Cultural Resource Lawsuit, Book 2"). Part of the problem, the document concluded, was what can be summarized as the "Forest Service work ethic." The Forest Service had been justly proud of its "can do" spirit and willingness to find ways to do more with less. When this was combined with a "target" orientation, you had a formula for failure in nontarget areas. Targets are specific goals, usually set by Congress based on agency proposals, which specify how many outputs must be produced for the dollars appropriated. For example, a national forest might be expected to harvest a certain amount of timber in one year. Since line officers are annually graded on their performance with respect to those targets, it seems logical that when faced with insufficient funds, any resource with an attached target would be considered more critical than a nontarget resource.

Another ingrained belief among some employees of the Forest Service was the comfortable knowledge that there were numerous laws that were pretty much ignored and ignored with safety. Congress did not always provide funding for a new task. When that happened, the new job was either done with funds "stolen" from another program or it was given very little attention. Cultural resource management was in this category; it was a fairly new program with a seemingly endless hunger for funds and yet without additional appropriations. The wording of Executive Order 11593 probably supported this attitude. It called for complete survey of all Federal lands in 2 years (E.O. 11593, Sect. 2, para. (a)). There was no new money to do the job and it could not have been accomplished even with generous funding, so it could be shrugged off by some as yet another example of nice-to-do work. If it was really supposed to be done, then Congress would have funded it and there would have been realistic goals. This view was articulated by Robert Day when he wrote in the Journal of Forestry, "Claims by program proponents that multimillion dollar actions are mandated by laws that provide no funding are unconvincing. Even the Agriculture Department's Office of the General Counsel advises that the Forest Service has wide discretion in complying with existing statutes..." (Day 1978).

There was also an attitude held by some that decisions made in the field to reach targets should not be interfered with by senior line officers. If some risks were taken to reach targets, that was OK, even encouraged. This was especially true with respect to cultural resources, which were not traditional resources, like timber, water, etc., that the Forest Service had husbanded since the beginning. The author recalls an incident when a briefing was made to a deputy regional forester regarding the archeological site damage situation. It was recommended to him that certain corrective actions should be taken soon. The alternative, it was explained, was that the Forest Service was likely to become the defendant in a lawsuit. The deputy replied in words to the effect of, "Let them sue us, then." And that is what happened.
The Litigation

In August 1984, Save the Jemez, an environmental protection interest group, joined with the Pueblo of Jemez, All Indian Pueblo Council, New Mexico Archaeological Council, and Sierra Club to file suit (CIV 84-1150-HH) against the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief, the regional forester, and all 11 forest supervisors. At about the same time, the State of New Mexico filed a similar suit (CIV 84-1166 BB). The United States District Court consolidated the two suits. The allegations made by the plaintiffs ran to seven “counts.” The first count claimed that no program had been established to locate, inventory and nominate National Register eligible properties. This point, as well as most of the other counts, can be summarized as compliance-type violations regarding 36 CFR 800. It was also stated that there had been damage to cultural resources, a violation of the Forest Service responsibility to preserve historic properties under NHPA. It was also alleged that the Forest Service had failed to make records as required by 16 USC 470h-2(b).

The author recalls an interesting, but frustrating, incident related to the last point above. A public meeting was hosted (May 25, 1984) by the New Mexico Archeological Council, a party which joined Save the Jemez. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the possibility of bringing suit against the Forest Service. At one point there was a question from the floor. In effect, the question was asked, “Why sue the Forest Service when they are doing as well or better than the other agencies with lands in New Mexico?” The reported response was that the Forest Service had better records!

Records played a major role in subsequent legal maneuvers. The plaintiff’s attorneys requested numerous documents through the “discovery” process wherein one side is required by the court to provide to the opposing counsel any information thought to support the case. In the early days of the lawsuit, having to respond to discovery requests and other motions left the region’s archeologists with little time to attend to archæology.

Save the Jemez presented an extensive laundry list of requested documents to the U.S. Attorney. For example, they wanted all documents related to communications with the timber industry or any other person about CRM; all reports of damage to sites; bibliographies of any cultural resource documents; and all CRM documents related to the Elena Gallegos land exchange. Anyone who has worked in the Gallegos project can appreciate that even the last item alone involves thousands of sheets of paper. The “production of documents” request includes 13 such items.

The “Interrogatories” list, to be used in taking depositions, was also very broad. Some typical
questions included: “What was the total amount of money spent [for CRM] by each forest and by the regional office in the past 10 fiscal years”; “Identify all land disturbing undertakings in each national forest for Region 3...” and “Identify all archeologists employed by the Forest Service in Region 3...” There were 13 such items in the Save the Jemez list (“CR Update,” number 33, Sept./Oct. 1984).

Legal matters consumed nearly the full attention of the regional archeologist and much of the workday of the forest archeologists. Although the initial concern focused on New Mexico lands, almost every legal move by the plaintiffs generated new work for the Arizona staff as well. Toward the end of a year of legal maneuvering, it was estimated that $250,000 had been spent by the Forest Service on the lawsuit (briefing paper for the Chief, dated June 12, 1985, Item C-4 in “Cultural resource Lawsuit, Book 1”).

As Dave Johnson, then forest archeologist on the Lincoln National Forest, recalls:

I started on the Lincoln in the early fall of 1984 just after the lawsuit was filed. For the next several months, almost half my time was devoted to pulling documents together for the lawsuit. That wasn’t all that bad since my position started as a part-time position (3 days a week), and the lawsuit work filled in the gaps. As I recall, the lawsuit discovery period lasted close to a year. It was difficult to get out to the field during that time, and most of the fieldwork in 1984 and early 1985 was done exclusively by the para-archeologists. Although the lawsuit was not directed at the Forest Service archeologists, the lawsuit did strain our relationship with the New Mexico SHPO and New Mexico Archaeological Council for the next several years (Dave Johnson, personal communication, 2003).

Summing up the situation in the regional office, Regional Archeologist Judy Propper remembers:

I came to the region in the fall of 1985, when the parties were already beginning to talk about a settlement. At that time, Joe Tainter had been detailed into the regional office for over a year, working exclusively on the lawsuit. Patrick L. Jackson was also working on the litigation full time for the regional forester, coordinating with the U.S. Attorneys and Chief’s office. Clarice Sanchez, the cultural resource office assistant, spent most of her time keeping track of documents and maintaining the litigation file. And Jim Dick had been recruited from Timber to computerize much of the documentation related to compliance tracking. All of this was in addition to the time Dee Green and Dave Gillio had spent on the litigation.

There were boxes and boxes of documents, and several file drawers of legal correspondence and reports. An important thing to remember is that this lawsuit was filed in the days before lawsuits were an everyday occurrence, especially broad, far-reaching complaints that threatened to shut down on-the-ground activities. There was no question that this was a priority in the regional office (Judy Propper, personal communication, 2003).

The effects of the lawsuit were not all negative by any means. The lawsuit forced attention on the cultural resource program that quickly translated into stronger policies and more resources to get the job done. “Ron Henderson, Gila NF Recreation staff, has commented that this has been like having an activity review with all the benefits that can come from that” (“CR Update,” number 32, July/Aug. 1984).

The Chief’s office followed the progress of the Southwestern Region’s lawsuit closely and with
real interest. It was clear that any new standards for cultural resources work adopted as a result of the suit would become national standards very soon. This was spelled out in the June 12, 1985 briefing in Washington ("Cultural resource Lawsuit, Book 1, document C-4"). The increased annual cost of compliance with the various laws related to historic properties was estimated at $622,500 for the Southwestern Region and that was only the cost of doing business under the region's proposed settlement agreement. Under settlement terms proposed by the plaintiffs the costs would be much higher, estimated at over 5 million dollars.

The Chief was told that various corrective actions had already been taken by the region in anticipation of reaching a settlement agreement. These were:

1. All undertakings brought into compliance or suspended.
2. Steps taken to emphasize and strengthen the compliance process.
3. Compliance tracking system developed and implemented
4. Site restoration on the Borrego Timber Sale funded
5. A PMOA with the Arizona SHPO negotiated
6. A damage and restoration program being developed
7. New 2360 manual direction drafted
8. Standards and definitions of field work and reporting being refined

The following memo text indicates how seriously the forest supervisors took the lawsuit, especially in New Mexico:

A recent event has caused me some concern as to the understanding for this need to obtain archeological clearance from SHPO. In short, it is very simple, clearance is needed prior to turning any shovel of dirt, be it by hand or equipment, or by anyone on the national forest, national grassland, be it employee, contractor, or permittee. If you have questions, call Allan Hinds or Joe Tainter. ... If this is not clear, you better call me. We cannot afford to make any mistakes. (2360 letter dated January 25, 1985 from Cibola Forest Supervisor Phil Smith to district rangers and staff).

Arizona Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement

A PMOA, or Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement, with the State of Arizona, seemed possible during the early days of the lawsuit for several reasons. First, the State of Arizona had not been a party to the lawsuit. Arizona's State Historic Preservation Office still had a good relationship with the Forest Service and was willing to consider the development of more efficient procedures. Second, it was thought that Arizona did not have the compliance problems that were evident in New Mexico. The regional office later discovered that this was not entirely true, especially on one forest where the survey program was found to have serious deficiencies.

Another reason the Arizona SHPO favored the PMOA was that it would streamline the compliance process regarding the Forest Service by reducing the amount of paperwork exchanged. Perhaps most significant was the fact that the Arizona PMOA was based on a Bureau of Land Management model that had been accepted in New Mexico in the prior year. It was also similar to a draft PMOA which the regional archeologist had negotiated with the New Mexico SHPO just prior to the filing of the lawsuit (2360 letter dated August 29, 1985 cited above).

The PMOA approach was one encouraged by 36 CFR 800.13. It allowed an agency and a SHPO to agree in advance on how various kinds of undertakings would be treated. For example, a PMOA might state that a timber sale would
require certain survey intervals and a certain sample percentage. A PMOA might also state that certain kinds of undertakings, such as hand thinning, would require no survey at all.

The New Mexico SHPO opposed the proposed Arizona PMOA and wrote to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation urging that the Council reject it (SHPO letter cited in 2360 letter dated Aug 29, 1985 from W. R. Snyder, acting deputy regional forester to Robert Fink, Advisory Council). The Forest Service responded that the reasons given by New Mexico were either spurious or designed to enhance the litigation position of the State.

The Advisory Council was not inclined to become further enmeshed in the region’s lawsuit. Also, it may have felt that the region’s 2360 manual revision that was under review by the council largely obviated the need for what would be a stopgap PMOA. The Advisory Council did not sign the Arizona PMOA.

**Lawsuit Settlement Agreement**

The litigation continued through all of 1985 highlighted by depositions, requests for additional disclosure and negotiations aimed toward a settlement agreement. A prime goal of the Forest Service was to avoid an injunction order from the district court that would shut down projects until the lawsuit was resolved. Such an injunction had been the goal of plaintiff’s final “Request for Relief” in the lawsuit (Consolidated CIV 84-1166 BB, page 30). No injunction was ordered, although the lawsuit did essentially shut down most of the timber sale program in New Mexico for almost 2 years. The negotiations finally came to an end and resulted in a document that was acceptable to the Forest Service and the plaintiffs. It was signed by the regional forester on February 24, 1986. However, approval by the Justice Department was also required and took a while longer. It was 7 months later when the signatures of all parties were obtained and the settlement was filed with the U.S. District Court on September 9, 1986. When the final settlement agreement was reviewed by the Advisory Council, the council

---

**Looking Back**

Most archeologists viewed the lawsuit settlement as burdensome in some areas but, overall, a positive outcome. According to John Hanson:

I saw the lawsuit settlement as something of a pain, but I don’t think we (Kaibab National Forest) were heavily impacted by it one way or the other. Tom [Cartledge] had made people aware of heritage (then cultural) resources and issues surrounding them, it was not a hostile environment, so we were able to carry on pretty much as we had but with perhaps a little more caution and oversight. I think the lawsuit was a really positive thing from a number of perspectives. People in the FS who had never paid attention to CR had to. The issues that had brought the lawsuit about were absolutely unseemly in a region with the diversity of resources we have here (John Hanson, personal communication, 2003).

Dave Johnson concludes:

There were several important outcomes from the lawsuit. Following the settlement, the line officers and program managers finally understood the importance of complying with Section 106, and archeology took on a new level of recognition overall. There was more funding available for compliance as well as stabilization activities and National Register nominations, and more archeologists were hired to manage the program. It was almost as if cultural resources had gained a new level of respect within the agency, although there were still those who looked upon the program as a “stumbling block” and regarded enhancement projects as “nice to do” activities, but not necessary. The lawsuit was probably the single most important event that moved the heritage program forward, and the momentum lasted into the 1990s (Dave Johnson, personal communication, 2003).
staff was critical of the agreement and argued that it went too far in some areas. The following comments were not written until after the regional forester had already signed the agreement and the region had moved on.

Although the proposed settlement would correct what appear to be real flaws in the way Region 3 of the Forest Service has complied with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), it would do so by imposing on the region what we believe to be entirely excessive requirements, causing the Government to incur unnecessary costs and to devote unnecessary amounts of time to pointless activities. To the extent the settlement is looked upon as a model by other litigants, it could have profound and damaging implications far beyond Region 3 and the Forest Service (Memorandum dated April 3, 1986 from Thomas F. King, director of the Office of Cultural Resource Preservation of the Advisory Council to the acting Executive Director).

In September, 1986, the regional forester wrote to forest supervisors to announce that all signatures had been obtained on the settlement agreement and final court approval was expected. Full implementation of the agreement would happen on the first of October 1986. A summary was provided:

The basic content of the settlement agreement has not changed. This includes survey requirements, standards for paraprofessional training and supervision, site inspections, National Register nominations, site stabilization, etc. The most significant modification in the agreement is a reduction in the period of court jurisdiction from 5 years to a time not to exceed January 20, 1989. A section on agency discretion, based on changes in law, regulations, and executive branch directives, has also been added. The remaining revisions are fairly minor legal clarifications (2360 letter dated September 10, 1986 from Sotero Muniz to forest supervisors and staff directors.)

There were several key elements in the agreement that would result in closer compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act and better Forest Service stewardship of cultural resources. There were increased standards for inventory (100 percent survey, with some exceptions), site protection and monitoring. The agreement supported a larger professional staff and increased funding which showed up in the fiscal year 1986 budget. The site stabilization program got a big boost in that it went from an occasional afterthought to a firmly earmarked 5 percent of the cultural resource budget. National Register nominations were required, with a set goal of two per archeologist per year or one multiple-property nomination per forest per year. Cultural resource "planning assessments" were to be produced as part of forest planning. Finally, the Forest Service agreed to increased oversight by SHPO along with new documentation requirements that included tracking projects through the compliance process (2360 letter dated February 24, 1986 from David Jolly, deputy regional forester, to forest supervisors).

In transmitting a copy of the settlement agreement to the field, the deputy regional forester provided the following direction:

This agreement represents a reasonable compromise between the region and the plaintiffs on complex issues. Significant concessions were made by both sides. Although the terms reduce our flexibility in some areas, the agreement as a whole is workable, and highly preferable to the disruption, expense, and risk of going to trial.

We are committed to the complete implementation of this agreement, and to adherence to its terms. We are
also committed to rebuilding our working relationships with the New Mexico State Historic Preservation Officer and the other plaintiffs. Our ability to refine or improve the agreement in the future will depend on our record of compliance and good faith (2360 letter dated February 24, 1986 from Deputy Regional Forester David F. Jolly to forest supervisors and staff directors).

In 1987 the region revised its 2360 manual supplement, the blue pages, to incorporate many of the terms of the settlement agreement, thus internalizing many of the program changes. Life for the region's archeologists largely returned to normal and their attentions could shift from legalities back to historic and prehistoric resources. Their work days would be different from before, with more emphasis on documentation, but the end of litigation was welcomed. But not all who began this journey reached the end. Notably, Dee Green was a casualty of the lawsuit even though he had tried to warn the Forest Service of the site damage situation. In spite of his many accomplishments and the improvements he had made in the cultural resource program during the lawsuit, he saw the litigation as a personal failure, a rejection of what he had accomplished as regional archeologist. "I quit because I failed. I had tried for 4 years to get the Forest Service to change its attitude toward cultural resources, and I could see that it wasn't happening" (Dee Green, Albuquerque Tribune, May 2, 1989). He resigned from the Forest Service and left the field of archeology for other pursuits. In the fall of 1985, Dr. Judith Propper, the regional archeologist for Region 9, was hired to fill the regional archeologist position in the Southwestern Region. Dee Green later returned to the Forest Service and completed a very successful career in Region 5.

**Freedom of Information Act**

A different aspect of compliance that began to impact the cultural resource program in the 1980s involved the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) (5 U.S.C. 552). Enacted in 1966, FOIA was the first law to establish an effective legal right and mechanism for the public to obtain information from government agencies, underscoring the crucial need in a democracy for open access to government documents by citizens. Since then, citizens, scholars and reporters have used FOIA to obtain vital and valuable government information. The spirit of the act requires cooperation by any Federal agency whenever it is contacted by a citizen who desires information.

If the information requested does exist, it must be shared unless it falls within one or more of the exemptions provided by law. Some components of heritage site information are protected from disclosure by specific statutes and thus qualify for one or more FOIA exemptions. In the early years of the cultural resource program archeologists were innocent about FOIA and untroubled by its application. The author cannot recall an instance of FOIA being applied to archeological data before 1988.

A request for information that is identified by the sender as being a FOIA request receives expedited handling. The request is given a "control number" and a timeline is started. There is a very short turn-around time allowed for servicing these requests. The main justification for a complete denial of a FOIA request is that the information does not exist or the request was sent to the wrong agency. For example, the Forest Service cannot provide information about heritage sites administered by the Bureau of Land Management because it does not have access to that information.

The New Mexico Archeological Council reported in 1988 that the region was obstructing NMAC's FOIA requests (NEWSMAC, Number 1, 1989). NMAC wanted certain information related to the Save the Jemez lawsuit in order to monitor Forest Service compliance with the settlement agreement. The problem was that the requests were for information not contained in existing documents or the information was wanted in formats that the Forest Service did not have. FOIA does not require more of a Federal agency than that documents must be shared. NMAC
may have been confused about FOIA due to its involvement in the Save the Jemez lawsuit. The attorneys in that case were able to invoke discovery and interrogatory rules that apply only to court cases. Under such rules a party can be required to generate or prepare summaries of information that are beyond the scope of FOIA.

The region responded to the NMAC FOIA by providing readily available information and by explaining that the law relates only to existing documents. An agency is permitted, under the law, to charge a reasonable fee for making copies and could pass on the costs of extraordinary research. Since it would take much time and be very expensive for the Forest Service to search its records and then make the requested copies of reports, an alternative was offered. The region would, “permit you [NMAC] to do the search directly. If you are willing to do this, we would be willing to let you use our photocopying equipment at no charge ...” (6270 letter dated August 5, 1988 from Dale Fabian, director of Administrative Services, to New Mexico Archeological Council).

The region was the subject of several FOIAs during the 1980s. The author recalls one that appeared to be from a pothunter who hoped to easily get site location information. Of course, it was rejected and there were no other requests like it. But requests for cultural resource information continued to come either alone or as a small part of inquiries with a large scope. Organizations that objected to a Forest Service proposal often wanted to find out if there had been full compliance with all environmental regulations. The New Mexico Archeological Council request was not unique but it is a good illustration of the process.

Permits

Changes in permit procedures continued to accumulate in the 1980s. A significant change affecting personnel was the delegation, in 1986, of authority to forest supervisors to issue all cultural resource permits. The authorization appeared in 1986 as a supplement to Forest Service Manual 1230. This was the final stage in a shifting of responsibility “to the ground.” Remember that the first permits, under authority of the Antiquities Act, were signed by the Secretary of Agriculture. Delegation to lower levels of the organization reflected both a growing amount of work related to the permit process and a confidence that there was sufficient professional expertise available at the field level to ensure protection of the resource. Permits still were not issued by the staff archeologists. As before, it was the specialists uses personnel that did the paperwork on permits, work that included collecting fees and originating correspondence on such matters as reminding permittees about late reports.

There was a clear distinction between permits issued under the authority of ARPA and those issued in accordance with the 1906 Antiquities Act. In general, ARPA permits were used in place of the 1906 act permits. But ARPA defined its area of interest to be sites more than 100 years old. The 1906 act was still utilized to authorize investigations at any site less than 100 years old (2360/2720 letter dated August 13, 1986 from David Jolly, deputy for resources, to all forest supervisors).

There was no specialized application form for archeological permits. Those interested in creating a form could cite numerous advantages. They were countered by the government-wide interest in “paperwork reduction” which made it difficult to obtain approval for a form with limited use. As a result, application for a permit had to be made using Form 2700-3, a general purpose form which asked few of the questions of interest to someone evaluating an archeological permit request. The solution was to publish “Guidelines for Completing Cultural resource Applications,” a booklet that contained all of the specific information requirements authorized by the ARPA regulations (36 CFR 296). Yet more paperwork was generated by Forest Service Handbook 2709.11 where Chapter 50 listed all of the mandatory clauses that must be cited as part of the permit. The simple days of the 1-page 1906 act permit were well and truly dead.
The number of privately-owned archeological consulting companies had become impressive. These companies generated additional permit business for the Forest Service. The consultants worked under some restrictions caused by the fact that they were not "institutions" within the meaning of the 1906 Antiquities Act. ARPA did not exclude consultants, but they had to have signed agreements with a qualified institution that would agree to curate any artifacts discovered. It was a drawback for consultants that the guidelines used by the Forest Service did not envision issuing a permit unless an applicant requested one for a specific project.

At first blush, the project-by-project approach seems eminently logical. However, consultants found that it was a competitive disadvantage if they could not represent themselves to potential clients as being holders of valid permits. A solution was suggested to Steven Baker of Centuries Research after he raised the issue to Southwestern Region authorities. What was implemented was a "certification program," an idea borrowed from the Intermountain Region. Certified consultants were placed on a list that attested to the fact that their credentials had been reviewed and they were qualified to receive nondisturbing permits to conduct surveys and examinations. There was no fee to the consultant until an actual permit was signed (2720 letter dated January 19, 1981 from Paul Weingart, director of Recreation, to Steven Baker). This practice was discontinued when the provision for "blanket consulting permits" was added to national permit direction a few years later.

Law Enforcement

The publication of "Cultural Resources Law Enforcement: An Emerging Science" (Green and Davis 1980) demonstrated that the region was serious about solving the pothunter problem. Bringing together papers by a wide range of authors with experience in the field, this volume described various cases, summarized what had been learned about pothunters, and detailed some of the methods that had been effective in apprehending and prosecuting them. It came to be used as a textbook for many law enforcement classes and remained popular throughout the decade.

In December 1980, the Southwestern Region sponsored a 4-day course on cultural resource law enforcement. The following year, over 100 students, representing a variety of agencies from throughout the United States, attended the first 40-hour course offered in the nation focusing on the pothunter problem and law enforcement. A second edition of this course in 1982 reached approximately another 100 trainees from various Federal and state agencies. The employees who attended these courses were a mixture of law enforcement officers, land managers and archeologists (Enclosure 1 to 2360 letter dated August 29, 1985 from W. R. Snyder, acting deputy regional forester, to Robert Fink, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation).

The success of these Region 3 courses showed that there was a real demand for training regarding implementation of the Archaeological Resources Protection Act. Due to the growing demand from both...
archeologists and law enforcement officers, personnel from the region initiated and then cooperated with the presentation of a new ARPA course at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) in Glencoe, Georgia. For several years, regional special agents and archeologists supplemented the professional staff at FLETC to facilitate the training of law enforcement officers and archeologists from many Federal, state and tribal law enforcement agencies. By the mid-1980s the Southwestern Region was acknowledged as having the leading experts in ARPA investigation and training.

Only 5 days after ARPA was signed, the first pothunters to be charged with its violation were apprehended in Region 3. The defendants were accused of digging and removing artifacts from the Dix Creek area of the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests. The case went to trial in December of 1981, and three of the four defendants were convicted and received probation (“CR Update,” numbers 4, 5 and 6).

In a strange twist, one case in Region 3 resulted in an ARPA conviction for an event that occurred 2 years before ARPA came into existence. As discussed in the previous chapter, the case of Jones, Jones and Gevara began with a looting incident on the Tonto National Forest in 1977. Because of the 1974 Diaz decision, the trio was charged under the Theft of Government Property Act (18 USC 641) and the Destruction of Government Property Act (18 USC 1361) but the case did not come to trial. On April 12, 1978, Judge William Copple dismissed the case on grounds that the case could not be prosecuted under the theft and destruction statutes because a more specific statute, the 1906 Antiquities Act, existed (even though the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals had declared that act unusable). On appeal, Copple was overturned and the case was remanded for trial. In the words of Martin McAllister:

It was later that same day when we heard about ARPA being signed that word came that the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals had ruled in the Government’s favor. It had reversed Judge Copple’s decision and

remanded the defendants for trial. The ruling was based on the principle that when two Federal statutes prohibit the same act (e.g., artifact theft and destruction), the Government may prosecute under either unless there is specific congressional direction precluding prosecution under one or the other.

Our elation was short lived however, as the defendants’ attorneys immediately requested Supreme Court review of the Ninth Circuit decision. The long awaited beginning of the end came, nevertheless, in just a few months, when the Supreme Court denied this request and a new trial date was set for May 1980. Knowing that they had exhausted all available dismissal avenues and that the evidence presented against them in a trial would be overwhelming, the Jones brothers, Gevara, and their attorneys began the plea bargaining process. They apparently feared the maximum felony level, incarceration penalties of the theft and destruction statutes (10 years) and wished to plead under the more lenient jail term provisions of the Archaeological Resources Protection Act. Though not enacted when they committed their crimes, they were allowed to plead guilty under the new act by virtue of what is known as a “waive jurisdiction” agreement (McAllister 1980).

In 1980 Gevara and Kyle Jones pled guilty to misdemeanor violations of ARPA and each was sentenced to a year in jail. Thayde Jones, due to a prior conviction under Utah’s antiquities law, was not allowed to plead guilty to a misdemeanor. He pled guilty to a felony violation of ARPA and was sentenced to a term of 18 months. According to McAllister, “Though not the first convictions under the new act, these are the most severe penalties ever enacted in the effort to stop the looting of our Nation’s
cultural heritage." In reporting the sentences, a local radio station in Phoenix announced: "If you're thinking about digging up Indian ruins on Federal land, don't!" (loc. cit.).

The director of Recreation wrote to the Chief in 1987 to describe the region's actions under ARPA. He listed 13 cases that involved Forest Service sites and Department of Justice prosecution. There had been 20 convictions and a pretrial diversion. One suspect had been acquitted and another trial was pending. The cases had resulted in fines, imprisonment, restitution, probation and forfeitures. While a few convictions had resulted in jail time, probation, pretrial diversion and suspended sentences were the norm. No civil penalties were pursued in the courts through 1987. Weingart went on to explain that ARPA had helped but not solved the pothunting problem. In fact, it had confused some issues, such as the dollar amount of damage required to trigger ARPA's penalties and the exemption of artifacts less than 100 years old from the penalty provisions (2360 letter, undated, from Paul D. Weingart to Chief).

Operation STOP

Operation STOP was a proactive undercover investigation conducted by the region's special agents in the early 1980s. This initiative differed from most in that it focused on the ARPA provisions that provide criminal penalties for dealers in stolen prehistoric artifacts. Most early cases had targeted only the excavators but now the spotlight would be on the whole criminal chain from digging to retail selling. Operation STOP resulted in the conviction of 12 individuals and the recovery of artifacts valued at $44,000 (Pilles 1991). Governor Babbitt of Arizona wrote to the Forest Service to express appreciation for Operation STOP. He said that pothunting remained a big problem in Arizona that could only be solved by efforts like STOP. "It is hoped that the results of Operation STOP will eliminate the widespread pothunting activities in Arizona and throughout the Southwest. Your commitment to the preservation of Arizona's unique cultural heritage is to be commended"

Site Stewards

Another approach to the site protection challenge made use of volunteers. In the mid-1980s the State of Arizona, through the SHPO and cooperating agencies like the Forest Service and BLM, developed the Arizona Site Steward Program. The heart of the scheme was to have regular visits to vulnerable archeological sites by volunteers in the hope and expectation that a regular presence at a site would discourage looting. An additional benefit would be increased awareness among citizens of the value of the sites. The volunteers would not act as law enforcement personnel and would have no legal authority. Their mission was simply to be present as a deterrent and to promptly report any damage they might observe. The program was established in a Memorandum of Understanding in 1987 (2360 letter dated October 27, 1987 from Sotero Muniz to Dr. Shereen Lerner, SHPO). From an initial nucleus of 22 people in 1987, by the end of the decade, the program was well on its way to becoming an amazing success story and national model.

Elena Gallegos Land Exchange

The Elena Gallegos Land Exchange became the most labor-intensive undertaking to involve the Southwestern Region's cultural resource staff. In retrospect, it seems a little odd that the Forest Service was such an important player because the Federal lands that would be exchanged were mostly under the administrative supervision of the Bureau of Land Management. The Forest Service, however, would be the recipient of most of the Elena Gallegos tract. The story begins with political maneuvers that reached to the U.S.
Congress. For several years the City of Albuquerque had been interested in a large (about 8,000 acres) and valuable parcel of foothills land that was then owned by the Albuquerque Academy. The academy wanted to convert some of its land into cash, but the city fathers feared that a sale to private interests would result in yet another subdivision, and one that would impinge upon the Sandia Wilderness (Roger Ruvolo in Albuquerque Journal, July 15, 1981).

The Forest Service administers the Sandia Wilderness and was the nearest Federal landholder to the Elena Gallegos tract, but it lacked sufficient lands available for exchange ("base for exchange"). Congress had authorized the Forest Service to acquire the old Elena Gallegos Grant, but no funds were appropriated (Albuquerque Tribune, April 17, 1980). The intention was to exchange the Gallegos land directly for federal lands that the Albuquerque Academy could then sell as it wished. When attention turned to BLM lands, the formula became more complex when it was found that the lands offered by BLM were not of interest to Albuquerque Academy. In the end, the City of Albuquerque purchased most of the Elena Gallegos Grant outright. The city earmarked a portion of the lower elevation lands for a park and negotiated a trade with the Forest Service/BLM for the higher elevation lands adjacent to the wilderness.

To be in compliance with NHPA, it was necessary to complete a cultural resource survey and evaluation of the Federal lands proposed for exchange. A series of surveys resulted in the examination of a total of 32,823 acres, the largest intensive survey project the region had undertaken. A total of 537 sites were discovered, along with many isolated artifacts. Of those sites, 71 were tested and 10 were fully excavated. The number of excavated sites would have been much higher but for two conditions. First, some lands were dropped from consideration either because of the sites found or for other reasons. Second, some sites were transferred to the city with the proviso that they would be protected and not disposed of without further investigation (Joseph A. Tainter, 1997, "Archeology of the Farmington Sector of the Elena Gallegos Project").

As far as the region's cultural resource staff was concerned, this work requirement appeared suddenly on the horizon in 1981. It required some very fast hiring decisions and a shifting or
postponement of other priorities. Dee Green summarized his frustrations in a 1982 briefing paper. He regretted the adverse impact the Elena Gallegos project had on his time as well as on many others in the Recreation staff unit. He described the problems of keeping qualified staff people for what was essentially a limited job lacking security or future opportunity. He listed important jobs that could not be accomplished because resources had been redirected to the Elena Gallegos project (some of which might have helped to head off the coming lawsuits). He also listed four alternative ways to get supervisory staff for the Elena Gallegos job. His least-favored alternative, status quo, would be to hire an additional archeologist in the regional office (to replace Mike Elliott who was returning to the Santa Fe) and then muddle along with Green and Gillio giving what Elena Gallegos supervision they could fit in among other duties (Dee Green Briefing Paper, “Cultural Resources Situation Statement,” dated April 22, 1982). This became the de facto way work would proceed.

The region had never before needed so much archeological survey done in such a short time and there were nowhere near enough trained people available in the Forest Service. When possible, people were borrowed. Forest archeologists were detailed to take charge of surveys for as long as their home forest could spare them. They put together crews of paras, students and even, sometimes, office workers from the regional office.

Charles Haecker, a Gallegos crew chief, recalled that one day a secretary from the RO showed up for his crew wearing high heels. He didn’t think she would make it through the day but she did. He doesn’t recall how the shoes fared. He added that the lady did a very good job and was even better at spotting artifacts than an archeology student who was also with the crew that day (Charles Haecker, personal communication, 2003).

A lab crew was hired so that the artifacts brought back from the field could be cleaned and sorted. There were often four people working with artifacts and another person, Robert McMahon, in charge of the photo lab. Having an in-house photographer allowed a field crew to quickly see their film while there was time to re-shoot bad pictures. This sort of hiring and detailing still did not provide enough survey crews so some of the work was done by contract.

When the project moved into the testing and excavation phase, the laboratory facility at the regional office proved to be too small. The lab crew moved out to the Forest Service tree nursery property south of Albuquerque and remained there until the job was finished.

Securing funding to complete the analysis and reports for the Elena Gallegos project required a great deal of effort and reprogramming in the late 1980s and early 1990s. In the end, however, reports for all three sectors of the project were completed (Miller, Batcho and Swarthout 1989, Tainter 1995, 1997). According to terms of an interagency agreement, once the analysis was completed all artifacts were transferred to BLM for delivery to the Museum of New Mexico for curation.

Enhancement

National Register Nominations

The Southwestern Region entered the decade of the 1980s with 28 National Register sites on the books (2360 letter dated April 29, 1981 from Paul D. Weingart, director of Recreation, to Chief). Not all of them had been nominated through Forest Service efforts and not all would survive. The Mayhew Lodge was lost to fire in March 1980 and the Verde Sheep Bridge had to be demolished in the interest of public safety.

A memorandum of agreement (MOA) was signed with the Advisory Council in May of 1986 to end a controversy over the Sheep Bridge. The popular bridge had become a menace to public welfare because its wooden walkway was crumbling and the steel suspension wires were suspect. Hikers continued to use it in spite of the hazards until it was demolished. In the MOA, the Forest Service agreed to preserve certain
elements of the bridge for interpretation and to incorporate as much of the historic character of the old bridge as possible into the design of the replacement bridge.

The number of National Register nominations completed by the region's archeologists increased significantly as a result of the lawsuit. There was not full compliance with the new standard (two per year per archeologist or one multiple property per forest), but certainly more and larger nominations were undertaken. Concerning the requirement for National Register nominations, John Hanson recalls:

> It was seemingly overwhelming at first and then just a challenge. Teri [Cleeland] was a godsend. She had already prepared National Register nominations before and knew the ins and outs. It became a heady time on the Kaibab, one in which we (she) continually tried to outdo ourselves. No survey monuments on the register? Nominate Brow. You say linear features can't be done? How about we do the first nomination anywhere along the Mother Road (Route 66)? World class rock art? Nominate Snake Gulch. Teri, of course, capped her career in the mid '90s by nominating the Barney Flat Historic Railroad Logging Landscape, to our knowledge the first and only stump field listed on the register (John Hanson, personal communication, 2003).

The multiple property nomination became much more popular in the 1980s because one of those fulfilled the whole yearly obligation for a forest under the settlement agreement. They were also professionally appealing because this
kind of nomination provided an opportunity to develop an historic context for an entire class of sites. The first thematic multiple property nomination in the region, Large Pueblo Sites Near Jemez Springs, New Mexico (1984), included almost 40 sites and was prepared for the Santa Fe National Forest by Mike Elliott. One of the largest nomination projects the region has ever attempted, National Forest Fire Lookouts in the Southwestern Region (1988), was already in the works before the lawsuit settlement.

Gila Forest Archeologist Robert Schiowitz suggested that a thematic study of all of the region’s fire lookout towers and cabins would help solve certain administrative problems. The thematic approach would certainly be more economical than a piecemeal approach. The suggestion was considered and approved. Subsequently, a contract was let in 1986 to Cultural & Environmental Systems, Inc. for the task of preparing the nomination forms. The field work and much of the records search was done by Forest Service employees who turned their results over to the contractor. They were able to mine a rich seam of historic photographs, engineering drawings and other records.

The resulting nomination placed 31 towers and 53 associated structures on the National Register. Another 69 towers had been evaluated and were determined to be ineligible for listing for reasons of age, condition, etc. Details of the project and the nominations themselves were published as Report Number 8 of the Cultural Resources Management series (Steer et al. 1989). The efficiency of this nomination made an impression; it was followed by many more thematic nominations in the following years.

Table 5. Region 3 National Register properties listed in the 1980s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date Listed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Forests</td>
<td>National Forest Fire Lookouts in the Southwestern Region</td>
<td>1988-01-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Vehicular Bridges in Arizona</td>
<td>1988-09-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apache-Sitgreaves</td>
<td>Los Burros Ranger Station</td>
<td>1986-10-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>Navajo Refugee Pueblos</td>
<td>1987-01-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Ring Place</td>
<td>1988-07-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconino</td>
<td>Elden Pueblo</td>
<td>1986-10-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>Council Rocks Archaeological District</td>
<td>1987-01-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silver Peak Lookout Complex</td>
<td>1988-05-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marijilda Canyon Prehistoric Archeological District</td>
<td>1988-10-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaibab</td>
<td>Laws Spring</td>
<td>1984-07-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hull Cabin Historic District</td>
<td>1985-10-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacob Lake Ranger Station</td>
<td>1987-07-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brow Monument</td>
<td>1987-07-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historic US Route 66 in Arizona</td>
<td>1989-05-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>Mayhill Administrative Site</td>
<td>1989-06-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wizard’s Roost</td>
<td>1982-08-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescott</td>
<td>Taylor Cabin Line Camp</td>
<td>1985-07-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prehistoric Walled Hilltop Sites</td>
<td>1989-01-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walnut Creek Bridge</td>
<td>1989-03-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>Guaje Site</td>
<td>1982-12-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La Bajada Mesa Agricultural Site</td>
<td>1983-12-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large Pueblo Sites Near Jemez Springs</td>
<td>1984-05-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gallina Cultural Developments</td>
<td>1989-05-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonto</td>
<td>Houston Mesa Ruins (Shoofly Village)</td>
<td>1986-09-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bandelier’s Archaeological Survey of Tonto Basin</td>
<td>1989-04-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation and Public Outreach

Interest in interpretive opportunities grew in the 1980s and especially in the years after the end of the Save the Jemez lawsuit. This was largely a result of the new National Recreation Strategy.
especially its “Windows on the Past” component. During the early 1980s, however, funding and time for enhancement activities were almost nonexistent on many forests. According to Tom Cartledge:

The first decade of the archeology program on the Kaibab was heavily focused on clearance survey and site recording. We gave little thought to such activities as site interpretation, site stabilization, National Register nominations, or active participation in the program by the public. We did present occasional slide/lectures talks to schools and various civic organizations. For one semester (or was it two?) I taught a general Southwestern Archeology course at night in the local high school through an extension program of adult education sponsored by Yavapai Community College out of Prescott. Since we were gathering a considerable amount of archeological data through our survey efforts in an area where very little archeological work had been done previously, I felt that it was important to get the information out to others in the profession. There seemed to be no way to devote work time to such effort, so I spent many nights and weekends of my own time analyzing and summarizing our findings, writing them up as journal articles and submitting them to regional archeological journals such as “The Kiva” and “Plateau.” A couple of the articles I authored got published in this manner. Most of the forest archaeologists were involved in similar efforts (Tom Cartledge, personal communication, 2003).

In 1980 when Dee Green wrote his “Goals and Objectives” for the coming years, he listed an increase of public awareness of cultural resources as his second priority. He saw three components to this effort. First would be the use of brochures and second would be a continuation of the region’s monograph publication work. Finally, Green wanted to see some public interpretation on every Region 3 national forest by Fiscal Year 1981 (2360 letter dated May 20, 1980 from Green to director, Recreation staff unit).

Martin McAllister recalls one such interpretive project on the Tonto National Forest:

A 1984 interpretive project occurred when the Mesa Ranger District office was completely remodeled. Mesa District Ranger Don Van Driel asked me if we could install a permanent archeological display as the focal point

Figure 37. The cultural resource exhibit at the Mesa Ranger District office helped increase awareness among employees and the public.
of the new office's public reception area. He wanted a display chronicling the cultural history of the district, featuring artifacts from the district. This was the first time that a district ranger had expressed an interest in having an archeological display in the district office and I was very happy to develop this display for the new reception area. To house the display, Van Driel had a large lighted display case built into the reception area.

I don't recall all of the details of the display now, but it included several whole pots, probably Hohokam and Salado, that were part of the collection from the district (these were in Federal repository status at ASU before becoming part of the display), and also a U.S. belt plate (belt buckle) from the Camp Reno military site on the district that was found and turned in to us by a Tonto supervisor's office Engineering survey crew. I don't know whether or not this display still exists at the district office, but at the time it was very successful in helping to build acceptance and ownership for the forest's archeology program at the district level (Martin McAllister, personal communication, 2003).

Windows on the Past

In the late 1980s the Forest Service saw the beginning of an increased emphasis on recreation. It was heralded by the introduction of a new National Recreation Strategy that would focus on enhanced recreation opportunities for visitors to the national forests. Buoyed by the positive atmosphere created by this strategy, the national cultural resource team developed "Windows on the Past," a concept billed as "an exciting new part of the National Recreation Strategy" (Flyer enclosed with 2360 letter dated August 10, 1988 from F. Dale Robertson to regional foresters, station directors, area director and WO staff).

"Windows on the Past" provides visitors to a national forest, or Forest Service office, an opportunity to learn how national forests have been used and enjoyed for thousands of years. With "Windows on the Past," each forest is encouraged to develop at least one new window through which a part of its unique cultural heritage can be interpreted. History of place, such as a battlefield, a homestead or mining camp can be shared; an interpretive theme can be developed, such as prehistoric Indian land use, historic logging, or lookouts and firefighting. Windows on the Past can bring together both past and current management techniques (loc. cit.).

Windows on the Past nicely fit the goals Dee Green had outlined back in 1980 and was welcomed by most archeologists who were frustrated by seemingly endless and unrewarding compliance work. Efforts were underway in all regions to expand opportunities for the public to learn about and enjoy the...
cultural resources of their national forests. "Windows on the Past provided an umbrella for talking about and promoting those efforts both inside and outside the Forest Service.

**Region 3 Interpretive Action Plan**

Another factor that led to an increased emphasis on cultural resource interpretation in Region 3 was the Chief's 1986 general management review (GMR) of the region (Anon. 1986). The review team noted that the Southwestern Region had a vast array of cultural resources that "represent a scientific, historical, and religious treasure of incalculable value," yet the region did little to capitalize on that resource. In particular, the potential for visitor centers and other interpretation had been overlooked. The GMR Action Plan called upon the region to develop and implement a cultural resource interpretive plan (Item III.B.3.a).

In response to that requirement, in early 1988, the region developed "Serving People by Opening the Doors to the Past." This action plan provided a rationale and vision for a program of cultural

---

**Chavez Pass Interpretive Prospectus**

An early and particularly bold effort at enhancement was proposed by the Coconino National Forest around 1980. As noted above, the ruins at Chavez Pass (Nuvakwewtaqa) had been a popular target of looters for a long time. The site was also a particularly interesting one with remains going back to A.D. 600. During the period of excavations and survey by the Arizona State University archeologists there was a great deal of interest expressed by amateurs and others around the state. That interest was channeled into an interpretive program that provided participation opportunities for students and amateurs who worked under the supervision of the university archeologists. The success of that program led the Coconino to develop an interpretive prospectus for Chavez Pass (Pilles and Freeman 1981). It envisioned a long-term visitor participation program linked to development of a campground, museum, and laboratory.

The unique recreational experience we propose will be acquired through traditional interpretive techniques and by making use of innovative "hands on" activities in Participatory Archeology and Living Archeology programs. Under these programs, families and individuals would make advance registration and pay a fee to participate in 1- or 2-week long programs. They would have the opportunity to camp and participate in archeological field surveys, excavations, laboratory work and analysis of information. By participating in actual archeological work, the public would learn about archeological techniques and the importance of preserving archeological sites for future generations. They would also have the choice of living in a stabilized prehistoric ruin and learning the crafts and daily activities of prehistoric people—taught to them by the modern Hopi Indians, descendants of the people who lived in the ruins. By experiencing the technology and accomplishments of prehistoric people, visitors would better appreciate the values and contributions of early people to modern times. This also provides an excellent way to compare and contrast prehistoric land uses with modern multiple-use concepts to illustrate basic relationships between man and his environment (loc. cit.).

Interested partners included the Museum of Northern Arizona, Arizona State University, and the Hopi Tribe, which passed a tribal resolution in support of the Chavez Pass development on January 18, 1980. If implemented, the Chavez Pass plan would have been a unique and exciting program in the region and in the nation. The interpretive prospectus itself was ahead of its time in terms of its vision and scope. Sadly, no funds could be found to implement the plan.

---

*Figure 39. Chavez Pass offered opportunities for a unique interpretive development in the early 1980s. Coconino National Forest.*
Cold Springs Canyon Cliff Dwelling

Martin McAllister describes a challenging site stabilization project on the Tonto in the early 1980s.

In 1983, we learned that the Cold Springs Canyon Cliff Dwelling in the Sierra Ancha Wilderness of the Pleasant Valley Ranger District was in danger of collapse because a major roof support beam had rotted to the point of breaking. I believe this was reported to us by some Phoenix residents who liked to hike in the Sierra Anchas and were interested in this site. This cliff dwelling is not a typical one in that it is built in a crevice-like cave rather than the standard open rock shelter type cave. If this beam had rotted through completely, it is likely that the entire structure would have been severely damaged or destroyed. We took a Park Service ruins stabilization unit expert to visit the site and he recommended that we use floor jacks to lift the floor above the beam and then replace the prehistoric beam with a new one. We decided to carry out this strategy and I wrote an EA for the work and went through the consultation process with the SHPO, I believe for a no adverse effect determination.

The field crew for the project consisted of myself as the leader, ASM Archeologist Rich Lange, Archeologist John Hohman, who was then working either for ASM or ASU, Linda Hohman, Pleasant Valley Ranger District employee Dave Dockery, and two or three volunteers. Lange was involved because of his strong interest in the Sierra Ancha Cliff Dwellings. I'm not sure how Hohman became involved. I think the volunteers were the individuals who originally reported the beam situation to us.

We rented floor jacks in Phoenix and transported them by vehicle to the wilderness boundary where we established a camp. The crew members packed the jacks into the site on foot since no vehicles are allowed in the wilderness. We used the jacks to raise the floor above the beam. (This was a hazardous operation that today would require some sort of safety analysis.) We sawed the old beam into two pieces and removed it. Dockery rode a horse into the site area dragging a new beam of the approximate size we needed behind the horse. The crew carried the beam up to the site on our backs, traversing some relatively steep slopes (another hazardous operation). We cut and shaped the beam to fit and inserted it into the beam sockets for the original beam. We then lowered the jacks and the floor above back down onto the new beam and it successfully supported the floor.

After completing the work, we packed the jacks and our other equipment out of the wilderness and back to our camp and then returned to Phoenix. The work took 2 days to complete and the crew spent 2 nights in our camp at the wilderness boundary. Not only did this project succeed in stabilizing the ruin, but it also was a very successful volunteer project, giving the volunteers a real sense of ownership for the site as a result of their involvement and hard work. As far as I know, this beam is still in place and the site remains successfully stabilized as a result of this project (Martin McAllister, personal communication, 2003).
resource interpretation in Region 3. It identified issues and opportunities, set forth goals, and identified regional interpretive themes ("Living with the Land," "Somewhere in Time," etc.). It also described an interpretive strategy based on an integrated, three-tiered approach: "Gateway to the Past" visitor contact stations; unobtrusive on-site interpretation (the "discovery" concept); and associated visitor participation and outreach programs. Most importantly, the plan included a detailed 3-year action plan that was subsequently funded. According to Propper:

Region 3's 1988 Interpretive Action Plan helped inspire the national Windows on the Past program and was the major factor that made funds available in Region 3 for interpretive projects in the late 1980s and early 1990s. The lawsuit settlement agreement did not address interpretation at all, so it was this plan that made interpretation a funding priority in Region 3. (Judy Propper, personal communication, 2003).

Implementation of the Interpretive Action Plan got underway in 1989, using challenge cost-share funding. Through this initial funding, planning was begun on a number of interpretive projects that were implemented and completed over the next few years, including: the Zuni Mountains Historic Auto Tour (Cibola), Poshuouinge Interpretive Site (Santa Fe), Tijeras Pueblo Interpretation (Cibola), Sears Kay Ruin (Tonto), Cloudcroft Railroad Trestle Interpretive Trail (Lincoln), and Route 66 Mountain Bike Trail (Kaibab).

**Stabilization**

In spite of a lack of funds, site preservation efforts were underway on several forests by the early 1980s. In a summary of the Coconino’s archaeological activities prepared for the 1980 Pecos Conference at Mesa Verde, Peter Pilles reported several "enhancement projects," including: correction of major erosion problems and structural damage at Palatki using Young Adult Conservation Corps enrollees, supervised by Linda Farnsworth; experiments in removing graffiti from the pictographs at Honanki; and collection of tree ring cores from 26 cabins located on the forest (Pilles 1980). Pilles also mentioned an emerging project at Elden Pueblo:

For the third summer, the forest has continued to re-examine rooms excavated at this important Sinagua site by Jesse Walter Fewkes in 1926. Anne Baldwin supervised the excavation of nine rooms this year.... Although not finalized yet, it appears that at least five building episodes were involved in the construction of Elden Pueblo.

A pilot program involving local school children in an archaeology program was also conducted at the site in cooperation with the Museum of Northern Arizona. If this test study is successful, the museum will apply for an NEH grant to introduce an archaeology program focused around Elden Pueblo into the Flagstaff Public School System (loc. cit).

Figure 42. Stabilization of the Gallinas Springs Ruin required data recovery as well as installation of erosion control structures. This photographic of the site was made in 1989.
Site stabilization efforts increased in the latter part of the decade, largely as a result of the Save the Jemez lawsuit. The region's archeologists had a long standing concern for the adverse effects of time, weathering and vandals on sites, but there never seemed to be enough resources to tackle the problem. That changed because one of the conditions of the lawsuit settlement was that the Southwestern Region would allocate 5 percent of the annual CRM funding to pay for stabilization work. This mandate resulted in an almost immediate increase in the kind and number of projects. Examples included:

- Los Burros Ranger Station Stabilization (Apache-Sitgreaves)
- Ring Ranch Stabilization (Carson)
- Gallinas Springs Ruin Stabilization (Cibola)
- Clear Creek Ruin Stabilization (Coconino)
- Palatki Cliff Dwellings Stabilization (Coconino)
- Red Cave Gate Installation (Coronado)
- Repair of Four Pothunted Sites (Gila)
- Jacob Lake Ranger Station Stabilization (Kaibab)
- Jicarilla Schoolhouse Stabilization (Lincoln)
- Sycamore Canyon Cliff Dwelling Stabilization (Prescott)
- Nogales Cliff Dwelling Stabilization (Santa Fe)
- Haught Cabin Stabilization (Tonto)

Not all of the stabilization projects were high dollar projects. On the Coronado, for example, Archeologists Pat Spoerl and Mary Farrell used epoxy and fiberglass to seal a crack in a granitic boulder at the Council Rocks rock art site. This work slowed water seepage that threatened the red and orange pictographs ("Southwestern Region News," Dec. 1986-Jan. 1987).

Southwest Museum Collection

During the 1970s, while the museum collection was in storage in Flagstaff, the Coconino National Forest led an impressive effort to develop a new home for the collection at a proposed Southwestern Region visitor center and museum. Several possible locations were explored, including the Museum of Northern Arizona campus. In the end, the regional forester selected a location at the Ft. Valley Experimental Forest headquarters on U.S. 180. Funding for the project, however, did not materialize. In 1982, the collection was moved to the Sharlot Hall Museum in Prescott, under the terms of a memorandum of understanding, where for several years a portion of the collection was again exhibited for the public. By the end of the decade, however, Sharlot Hall no longer had space for the collection and moved it into commercial storage. The Forest Service and other partners in Prescott began efforts to secure funding for a new museum which could house several local collections, plus the Forest Service artifacts and archives.

Personnel

The region's Recreation program leaders continued to play an important role in the development of the cultural resource program in the 1980s. Some of the forest Recreation staff officers, like Dennis Lund (Kaibab), had been with the program almost from its beginning. Key players in the 1980s included Bill Moen (Carson), Don Freeman and Art Matthias (Coconino), Allan Hinds (Cibola), Jim Reid (Santa Fe), Bruce Lamb (Prescott), Vearl Haynes (Apache-Sitgreaves), Ron Henderson (Gila), Lee Redding (Tonto), Bill Leonard (Lincoln), and Lee Poague (Coronado). In the regional office, Paul Weingart was Recreation director for most of the 1980s, followed by Roger Deaver, who heralded the arrival of the National Recreation Strategy and increased emphasis on all recreation programs, including cultural resources.
Professional Staff

Joe Janes, who was the first Forest Service archeologist, scored another “first” in 1983. He became the first Forest Service archeologist to retire. His position was quickly filled by Robert Schiowitz and the trend toward larger numbers of archeologists continued.

During the 1980s Martin McAllister resigned to pursue a career in consulting work, and Scott Wood became the forest archeologist on the Tonto. Jon Young became the first forest archeologist on the Carson. Landon Smith took a position in the Information Resources Management staff in the regional office, and Tom Cartledge moved from the Kaibab to become forest archeologist on the Santa Fe. John Hanson transferred from BLM to take over the forest archeologist job on the Kaibab. Emily Garber became acting forest archeologist for the Cibola while Joe Tainter was detailed to the regional office to work on the Save the Jemez lawsuit and Elena Gallegos. Don Wood resigned in 1983, and Pat Spoerl moved from the Lincoln to become the forest archeologist on the Coronado. Dave Johnson was hired as the new Lincoln forest archeologist. Jim McKie became the first forest archeologist on the Prescott. Most of the archeologists gathered at Mesa Verde in 1988 (Fig. 51).

The good work of the forest archeologists was recognized both within the region and beyond. In 1984 the National Trust for Historic Preservation selected the Coconino National Forest for a National Figure 43. John Hanson, one of several new faces in the region, became forest archeologist on the Kaibab National Forest in 1986.
Trust Honor Award for its Elden Pueblo Archeological Project, and Peter Pilles received a Superior Service Honor Award from the Secretary of Agriculture John Block at a ceremony in Washington in 1985.

The employment procedures in the 1980s included a near roadblock regarding the hiring of people to fill temporary archeologist positions, such as for summer survey crews. Adding people for the summer was an important part of most forests’ strategy for keeping the timber sales and other projects in compliance with CRM laws. The problem (which has since been resolved) was nicely stated in a 1981 letter from the Coconino forest supervisor.

Figure 45. Don Freeman, Recreation staff officer on the Coconino, captured some of the participants at the Recreation-Cultural Resources meeting in Las Cruces in 1984. Pictured left to right, top row: Dave Gillio, Martin McAllister, Peter Pilles, Jon Young, Bruce Donaldson; middle row: unidentified participant, Joe Tainter, Ron Henderson, Dave Johnson; bottom: Tom Cartledge, Lee Poague, Dennis Lund.

A continuing topic of frustration is the difficulty of hiring temporary archaeologists, since archaeology is not recognized as a specific technician series in the OPM permanent technicians classification. Seasonal hiring application forms also make no allowance for archaeological positions or experience. In addition, even though archaeology is accepted in the professional GS-193 series, education and experience of archaeologists are not accepted for interdisciplinary jobs or the S STEP application. There is an urgent need to revise USFS and OPM standards to correct these problems (6140 letter dated August 27, 1981 from Neil R. Paulson to the regional forester).

A change in employment procedures in the 1980s makes it more difficult to track exact numbers and job titles of archaeologists for this study. Dee Green had played a role in the hiring of most of the first generation of forest archaeologists. In general, a certificate (or “cert”), was obtained by the hiring office with a variable number of candidates listed. All were certified to be qualified in accordance with Civil Service regulations. These people would probably all be qualified archaeologists, but they might lack specific Southwestern experience or other traits thought to be desirable. A forest supervisor without a staff archeologist would often welcome help from the regional office to sort through the candidates and make a hiring recommendation. On several occasions the author helped sort through a score or more candidates for a single job.

Once the forest supervisors had local expertise they usually preferred to make hiring decisions based on the advice of their forest archaeologists. That is especially true of jobs below the GS-11 pay grade. Thus, the records of the regional office, the primary source for this study, are silent on the comings and goings of many of the region’s archaeologists from the 1980s forward. This is particularly true regarding the hiring of archaeologists to work for district rangers. The newsletter, “CR Update” is a useful source for tracking changes in employment, but it seldom mentions seasonal or temporary employees by name. A partial list of each forest’s archaeologists is included in Appendix J.
At the top of Dee Green's 1980 "Goals and Objectives" was the need to shift program emphasis from a compliance mode to one of management of the cultural resource. An important step toward this goal would be to have one permanent full-time archeologist in every supervisor's office by F.Y. 82 (2360 letter dated May 20, 1980 from Green to director, Recreation staff unit). That goal was finally achieved in 1986 when the Prescott National Forest hired Jim McKie ("CR Update," October 1986). Green strongly supported the employment of archaeologists with doctorate degrees in archeology or anthropology. He was of the opinion that a doctorate degree represented an important qualification, especially for forest archeologists, and put the Forest Service in a better position when dealing with other agencies and out-Service professionals.

There was an obvious increase in the mobility of individual archeologists in the 1980s, perhaps because the greater number of positions for archeologists translated into more opportunity for career development and promotions. As for Region 3 totals, this summary figure is available from "CR Update" for May 1985: 12 PFT professionals, 144 paras, 40 others including students and temps. Another trend was for archeologists with temporary appointments to be moved to the regular Civil Service lists. Pat Spoerl converted from a TAPER (Temporary Appointment Pending Establishment of Register) status to regular Civil Service status in 1983. Bruce Donaldson and Joe Tainter went from IGPA appointments to permanent Civil Service. Not noted by name are the many people who were hired on a temporary basis to work on the Elena Gallegos Land Exchange. One issue of "CR Update" notes that "10 new (temporary) employees have been added" to the Gallegos excavation crew (July 1982). By the end of the decade the number of PFT archeologists had increased to around 35.

At the national level, the Chief reacted to the 1980 changes in regulations for the National Historic Preservation Act. It was now necessary for an agency to identify contact individuals for all matters pertaining to historic preservation and cultural resource management. The appointed person must be specifically trained and experienced in cultural resource management. Evan DeBloois, who became the archaeologist in the Chief's office in 1980, was given that designation. Each region was asked to designate a regional historic preservation officer and report that to the Chief (2360 letter dated December 17, 1981 from J. B. Hilmon, Associate Deputy Chief, to regional foresters). Dee Green got the job in the Southwestern Region and then was formally in charge of the review of National Register nominations as well as being the official contact person in Region 3 regarding NHPA implementation.

Para-professional Program
The 1980s were interesting times for the para-archeology concept. It was praised, berated, challenged and upheld. A newsletter was created for the benefit of paras, new regulations focused on their work and new training material was created for them. Paras were an essential part of the cultural resource team.

Forest Service performance awards were given to paras more and more often throughout the rest of the century. There were many stories of various kinds of recognition, published in both "CR Update" and in the regional newsletter that it is hard to pick out some for special mention here. However, Cathy VanCamp, from the Santa Fe, stands out for having done 40 percent of the cultural resource reports on the Espanola Ranger District ("CR Update," November/December 1986).

Para training for a number of years followed a format of 40 hours in a classroom where the paras watched demonstrations, heard lectures and viewed films. After the classroom sessions the paras would spend time with their own forest archeologist in the field to learn how the instruction applied to the on-the-ground situation. The classroom training took a lot of time out of the region's professional archeologists' schedules. The training sessions did teach the required skills, but this approach did not appear to be cost effective. The region needed to reinvent its para training and it did...
so in 1981. One of the many cultural resource “task forces” convened in the 1980s looked at the para training issue and recommended adoption of a proposed new course.

The new course was based on slide-tape modules. Each training module could be borrowed and used by that trainee at his or her convenience at the duty station. There was no further need for a week of per diem payments at another location and no need for having an archeologist present for all classroom training segments, although some forest archeologists preferred to use the modules with groups of trainees. Each training module included a written exam, and a lesson could be repeated, if needed. Each forest supervisor received a full set of the modules and other copies could be borrowed from the regional office. The RO copies were often borrowed by other agencies for their training needs (“CR Update,” January 1982).

A special certificate of completion was designed to give extra recognition of the effort that a para put into the training program. A competition was held to produce a suitable design and the winning submission, from Lloyd Powers, was printed in 1986. By 1989 there had been 143 certificates awarded by forest supervisors to their new paras.

The newsletter, “CR Update,” edited by Dave Gillio, primarily served the para-archeologist community. As a group, the paras had few common professional interactions. There was often but one on a ranger district. The newsletter became a communication medium addressed to the paras to serve several ends. It helped to further identify the paras as a valued group within the Forest Service. It helped dispel the feeling that they might have been trained and then forgotten (since many were called upon only at widely spaced intervals to assist in surveys). Finally, the newsletter was an economical way to pass on training tips, procedural changes and other news of interest to this special group of people. The first issue appeared in August 1980.

The everyday work of the paras in the CRM program is preserved in the CRAIS report database. Probably over a hundred clearance reports per year bear the names of paras. Their work also has left a mark with unusual finds and efforts. John Keenen was a para-archeologist working on the Carson National Forest when he discovered an artifact so rare that few professional archeologists have found its like. John recognized the importance of a prehistoric stone tool that he saw on the ground. It was a “Cody knife,” a lithic tool used by Paleo-Indians some 9,000 years ago. This find pushed the date of man’s use of the Carson back 2,000 years (“Southwestern Region News,” February 1988).

Some paras also attended the annual training and work sessions of the forest archeologists. There were usually a few representatives of the para community at each session, usually from the host forest for that year’s training. In a letter announcing the 1986 work session, the director of Recreation spelled out the desired

Figure 46. Bob Crostic, Jemez District recreation staff, was also a para-archeologist on the Santa Fe National Forest. He was photographed at Seshukwa in 1986.
participants. "In addition to archeologists, we hope to have at least one representative line officer, recreation staff officer, and para-archeologist at the session" (2360 letter dated Jan 8, 1986 from Paul D. Weingart to forest supervisors).

Survey reports from paras working for the Cibola National Forest had been submitted to the Oklahoma State Preservation Officer since about 1976. Those reports, over 90 of them, were accepted as the basis for project clearance. Then, in 1984, the SHPO rejected reports that had been written by long-time paras Phil Dano, Wanda McKean and Patsy Hamilton. The region was told that the Oklahoma SHPO policy was to accept reports only from fully-qualified professional archeologists ("CR Update," November 1984). The Advisory Council was asked to resolve the question of use of paras and review the "determination of effect" based on the paras' reports. The Council agreed that the use of paras for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act was appropriate so long as there was adequate training and supervision. The Forest Service program was said to meet those conditions and the reports were acceptable to the Council and it agreed to the "no effect" determinations (C.R. Update, January/February 1985).

On February 1, 1985, the Washington Office sent a letter to the regions transmitting the Advisory Council's advice. The letter noted:

Although the council accepts our use of these specially trained individuals, they also clearly spell out the conditions under which that acceptance is given. Each region should re-examine its program of utilizing para-professional skills to be certain that it meets FSM direction.

Suggestions made in the enclosed letter from the Advisory Council should also be considered. Para-professionals must be appropriately trained, adequately supervised, and there must be a professional assumption of responsibility for work done (2360 letter dated February 1, 1985 from J. B. Hilmon, Associate Deputy Chief, to regional foresters).

The Texas SHPO objected to the use of paras and review the "no effect" based on the paras' reports. The Texas SHPO objected to the use of para-archeologists in 1985, although it was only incidental to the SHPO's review of the region's draft supplement to FSM 2360 (letter dated August 2, 1985 from Lavern Herrington, Deputy Texas SHPO, to James C. Overbay, deputy regional forester). This objection had no effect since the region's settlement agreement became the guideline for the use of paras.

The Save the Jemez lawsuit did not directly challenge the region's use of paras. i.e., para-archeologists did not figure in the various "counts" included in the complaint. However, the use of paras came under scrutiny in the

Figure 47. This cartoon by Jeff Boyer, first printed in "CR Update" (November/December 1981) distorts the function of the para-archeologists but hints that they were appreciated.

"Thank God! Here come the para-archeologists."
settlement discussions. A document that summarized the position of the Forest Service vs. the plaintiffs listed several points of disagreement regarding paras. The plaintiffs wanted to allow the use of only 100 paras in the Southwestern Region. The Forest Service wanted to retain the 200 or so it had at the start of the lawsuit. The plaintiffs wanted to see an annual expenditure of $100,000 for training the 100 paras. Finally, plaintiffs wanted direct supervision of paras by a professional archeologist (“Cultural Resources Litigation – June 12, 1985,” Item C-4 in “Cultural resource Lawsuit, Book 1”).

Thomas King of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation was not supportive of the plaintiffs on the para issue. He wrote, in commenting on the Proposed Settlement Order and Agreement, that Section III.A of that agreement had proposed overly harsh restrictions. He did not agree that a professional archeologist could train no more than two paras at a time. Subsequent subsections of the agreement that posed “strict limitations” on what the paras could do in the field would leave a situation that “will eliminate a cost-effective option for the agency” (letter dated April 3, 1986 from Thomas King to acting Executive Director, Advisory Council).

The deputy regional forester announced the acceptance of a settlement agreement to end the Save the Jemez lawsuit in February 1986. In describing the “performance standards” agreed to, he began by saying that there would be no limit on the number of para-professionals in the region. There would be some conditions that changed some of the rules for training and use of paras. Under post-settlement rules a new para had to receive 72 hours of initial training (40 hours of classroom instruction and 32 hours in the field). Annual update training was also required, and this would take the form of surveys of nonproject areas under professional supervision. There would also be professional inspection of sites discovered by paras and inspection of a percentage of acres surveyed (2360 letter dated February 24, 1986 from David F. Jolly to forest supervisors and staff directors).

Program Management

Building Professionalism

Efforts continued in the 1980s to strengthen and maintain the professionalism of the cultural resource program. More detailed policies and standards were developed to guide the work of a growing number of archaeologists. By the end of the decade, training opportunities, both internal and external, had increased as cultural resource management programs in all agencies matured. Region 3 archaeologists continued their active involvement in professional societies, prepared professional papers and shared national forest accomplishments with the larger archaeological community.

Some Disagreements

The expansion of the CRM staff in the early 1980s was accompanied by a growth of differing opinions on policy and procedures, and sometimes it took the intervention of a line officer to settle an issue. A particularly rich year for controversy was 1982. These issues are mentioned primarily because they help explain why the regional forester called for a program.
assessment a few years later. In February the deputy regional forester addressed two issues. First, some forests decided that it was not efficient to write a survey report if no sites had been located. In lieu of a formal report some archeologists had developed a checklist form to be used with the Inventory Standards and Accounting form. Forest supervisors were directed to end that practice and to submit reports for all 1981-1982 projects (2360 letter dated February 12, 1982 from James Overbay to forest supervisors). The same letter addressed another area where practice had deviated from policy. Some forests had operated as if the burial (sometimes called “plating”) of a site was a routine matter that did not require consultation. Overbay reminded forest supervisors that site burial is a mitigation measure and that the Advisory Council has a consultation role under 36 CFR 800.

In September the deputy was again required to settle a professional disagreement regarding report standards. Some of the region’s archeologists had developed several reporting methods that they thought were superior to the requirements of FSM 2361.21 and FSM 2361.7. To simplify reports, they proposed the use of checklists and/or coded forms to replace written texts. There were alternatives suggested by the archeologists of the Apache-Sitgreaves, Coconino and Tonto National Forests. Overbay decided that the proposed savings resulting from this change was illusory and largely negated by the fact that computers allowed easy replication of any “boilerplate” language required in conventional reports. The manual provisions would be observed (2360 letter dated September 1, 1982 from Overbay to forest supervisors).

Finally, the deputy turned his attention to the fact that one national forest was not participating in the region’s automated cultural resource database. The Manual directed that sites should be recorded on form R3-2300-2 and that copies should be sent to the regional office to be entered into the computerized database. He directed that, in the future, all sites would be recorded on the region’s form and that a plan should be prepared for his review to ensure that all previously discovered sites would be entered into the computer (2360 letter dated September 7, 1982 from Overbay to forest supervisor, Coconino).

The director of Recreation stepped into another dispute between the archeologists in 1982. He wrote that the new requirement from the Chief for accomplishment reporting would be complicated if the region did not standardize how it recognized cultural resources. It was nearly universal practice for the Forest Service to speak of the presence or absence of isolated artifacts or sites. Areas lacking either sites or isolated artifacts are said to contain no cultural resources. Some archeologists had introduced the “non-site” concept, used to refer to what others would have described as area containing widely scattered, isolated artifacts. Weingart directed that the use of the “non-site” term should end and that permittees and contractors be reviewed for consistency with this policy (2360 letter dated August 3, 1982 from Paul Weingart to forest supervisors).

Tom Cartledge recalls the tensions between some of the forest archeologists and the regional office during the early 1980s:

In retrospect it seems we on the Kaibab kind of wanted to have our cake and eat it too. We wanted the regional folks to assure that we somehow had the resources and training necessary to have a good cultural resource program, but we did not want regional hands-on interference in what we were up to. This same outlook was common to some of the other forest archeologists, especially in Arizona. Thus, while I don’t recall many specifics of the actual topics of early regional meetings of the archeologists, I do recall that the meetings generally lacked the comfortable ambiance one might expect from a group of professionals grappling with common difficulties. It seems that these meetings were generally charged with a degree of tension and strain.
A kind of “them and us” atmosphere developed between two factions. One faction generally included the Arizona, and a couple of the New Mexico, forest archaeologists. The other faction was the regional office and some of the New Mexico forest archaeologists. Although I allied myself with the Arizona-based faction, I am not saying we were right and they were wrong. We just seem to have had different ideas as to the direction the program should be going.

In the final analysis the factionalism was generally counterproductive. While I can’t really identify the specific issues involved in the tense atmosphere, it seems that regional office interests differed considerably from those of a number of the forest archaeologists. Many of the forest archaeologists were greatly concerned with the practical aspects of getting clearances accomplished—a job which, at best, was totally overwhelming or, at worst, physically impossible. Forest archaeologists wanted regional help in expanding our level of funding; in understanding arcane budget processes; in streamlining personnel processes to be able to hire needed help without undue hassle; in getting specific kinds of training with direct application to on-the-ground efforts; in raising the level of awareness of archeological requirements among fellow employees; in how to participate meaningfully in the EA process; and in dealing with certain kinds of difficult “sites,” e.g. small, sparse lithic scatters or so called non-site scatters.

The regional office emphasis, on the other hand, was somewhat more academically focused on electronic databases, statistically valid sampling strategies, and predictive modeling (hot topics among university archaeologists at the time). The region sponsored and funded a series of “research” symposia which seemed generally to have only a tangential connection to on-the-ground efforts. The principal investigators in these endeavors generally seemed to be non-Forest Service colleagues of the regional archeologist.

The archeologists as a group had their own separate annual meetings, often with no Forest Service personnel in attendance other than archeologists. At these meetings the factionalism continued to the point that it eventually came to the awareness of the regional director of Recreation who brought the separate archeological meetings to an end and required the archeologists to join in with general all-inclusive recreation meetings. The archeologists were given a limited amount of time to meet separately within the context of the more inclusive meeting and to address issues specific to the archeology program. Generally one or more nonarcheologists would attend in order to facilitate these mini-meetings and keep the proceedings on track.

The main effect of all this disagreement was that the line officers of the Southwestern Region began to look upon the archeologists as a very contentious group. For the next few years all meetings of archeologists were to be attended by a staff or line officer to act as mediator or “minder.” That indignity continued until the issues raised by the Save the Jemez lawsuit submerged the old problems (Tom Cartledge, personal communication, 2003).

Building Program Support

Following the settlement of the cultural resource lawsuit, the region undertook a comprehensive training effort to bring archaeologists, staff officers, and line officers up to speed on the terms of the settlement agreement and what would be required to implement it. A guidebook was developed to communicate the terms of the
Presentations were made to the RO staff and the regional leadership team, and a training session was presented on each of the 11 national forests. Regional Forester Dave Jolly made a video, which was used to introduce the forest training sessions when he was not in attendance. In the video, Jolly affirmed his commitment to the principles in the settlement agreement:

The lawsuit had a tremendous impact on Region 3... Of all the regions in the Forest Service, ours probably has the most significant and extensive cultural resources ... It's a valuable resource that needs to be well managed and protected. The lawsuit was filed because some people and some groups in New Mexico were not happy with the way we were managing our cultural resources. And sadly, some of our own records indicated that this was true.

It's extremely important that we implement this agreement thoroughly and consistently throughout the region. We just can't believe that we'll succeed if we go on with business as usual. It's going to take good teamwork and it's going to mean that all of us are going to have to shoulder part of the responsibility for making it work.

I think the last thing for me to consider today is, "what have we learned from all this?" And I think we need to look at what's happened to us in this situation as positively as we know how. The important thing is that we do the kind of job of managing cultural resources that the public has a right to expect of us ... So I think we need to take a positive view of what's happened to us and perhaps apply this to some other things we do so we don't make the same mistakes ("Multiple Use Management: Cultural

Resource Responsibilities,” 1986, training video on file in Recreation.)

Forest Planning Assessments

Forest archeologists got an added task in 1987 that was an offshoot of the lawsuit settlement agreement. They were directed to produce, by April 1, 1988, for each national forest, a comprehensive document to be called a "Cultural Resources Planning Assessment."

The objectives of the Cultural Resources Planning Assessment are to provide a framework for active cultural resource management on each national forest in Region 3, to schedule specific management activities, and to implement and refine, if appropriate, the cultural resource elements of Forest Plans (Regional Guidelines, Enclosure to 2360 letter dated January 8, 1987 from David Jolly to forest supervisors).

The ten major information requirements followed the standards prescribed in 36 CFR 219.24 and the settlement agreement. They included:

- Overview of known data
- Areas needing more inventory
- Identification, classification and evaluation of known resources
- Plan for additions to the National Register of Historic Places
- Measures for the protection of the resource
- Priorities for stabilization, restoration and repair of damaged sites
- Needs for maintenance of National Register sites
- Interpretative opportunities
- Discussion of the interaction of cultural resources and other multiple uses
- Coordination with state and Federal agencies
Had that list been included in a question on a final exam for college archeology courses there would probably be fewer archeologists in the world today. The region’s archeologists rallied and managed to produce the required assessments on time. The Cibola National Forest noticed what a big job this was and made awards to Emily Garber and LuAnn Wandsnider for their additional duties and special contributions in completion of the Cultural Resources Planning Assessment (“CR Update,” January 1989).

The Kaibab National Forest planning assessment was a joint effort of four archeologists and a para-archeologist, Charles Nelson (Hanson et al. 1988). Their work was closely tied to the forest plan in that the management areas in that plan were used to organize the cultural resource data. They compiled information about the current status and management of the Kaibab’s cultural resources and identified priorities for future work. Primarily, their study provided a framework and goals for active cultural resource management over the next several years. This was a big advance over the archeology game plan of former years when the goal was mainly to react to every new undertaking and try to stay in compliance with all laws.

In addition to a statement of current knowledge and accomplishments, the planning assessments laid out a roadmap for future cultural resource work. “Study Evaluation Units,” identified topics for further study and a proposed due date. The Kaibab’s planning assessment listed the Overland Road for research in F.Y. 1988 with the anticipated outcome of public education and interpretation (op cit., p. 37). A brochure on the Overland Road was published in 1990.

In acknowledging receipt of the planning assessment documents for the New Mexico forests, the New Mexico SHPO provided the following comments:

I have completed the review of the cultural resource planning assessment documents submitted to my office by each of the forests in compliance with the Settlement Agreement dated September 9, 1986. I would like to commend the forests and their cultural resource staffs for preparing excellent planning assessments. You can be proud of the hard work and care put into these documents by your archaeologists” (letter dated June 24, 1988 from Thomas W. Merlan, State Historic Preservation Officer, to Regional Forester Sotero Muniz).

Looking back on the planning assessment experience, John Hanson acknowledges that the effort was worthwhile:

We still have ours on file under the title “Chain Gang,” which is what we all felt like while we were doing it. I review it now and then, because it was a SIGNIFICANT investment in time and effort, and am surprised by how well it’s held up (John Hanson, personal communication, 2003).
Many of the items in the planning assessments were incorporated directly or by reference into forest plans. A good example was the 1991 amendment to the Prescott National Forest Plan (1950 letter dated November 18, 1991 from Forest Supervisor Coy Jemmet to the public, transmitting Amendments 5 and 6 to the Forest Plan). The amendment listed the forest's study evaluation units and specifically identified the priorities and schedules for inventory, National Register nominations, stabilization, maintenance, and interpretation. Over the next few years, many of these projects were accomplished, including rock art surveys in the Juniper Mountains, nomination of hilltop sites, CCC administrative sites, Limestone Canyon railroads, and the Groom Creek School, routine inspections of National Register sites, stabilization and maintenance of Taylor Cabin, Palace Station, and Sycamore Canyon Cliff Dwelling, an interpretive trail at Lynx Creek Ruin, and brochures on Palace Station, historic mining, and a historic military road.

Training and Meetings

Acquiring new skills remained high on the archeologists' "want list" in the Southwestern Region. Unlike the 1970s, where the majority of training was in workshops dealing with law enforcement and administrative procedures, by the late 1980s, there was a trend toward learning how to do new things in the field. Cooperation with the Park Service resulted in a 1987 session in Santa Fe dealing with the stabilization of ruins. Students learned about the design, implementation and documentation of stabilization work. Instructors included Park managers, conservation specialists and contractors ("CR Update," March-June 1987). Damage assessment was the topic in Phoenix that same year. Most of the permanent cultural resource specialists in the region attended and learned about the complexities of fixing a dollar amount to "archaeological value" and the "cost of restoration and repair" under ARPA.

In 1988 a training session at the Carson’s Ring Ranch taught skills needed in the restoration of log structures. A national expert in log building stabilization, Harrison Goodall, was brought to the Carson to supervise the instruction along with Forest Service expert Joe Gallagher. The students learned how to use modern materials to repair damaged portions of logs as well as how to hew and notch raw materials and install replacement logs ("CR Update," July 1988). The skills learned at Ring Ranch were later put to work to stabilize other sites in the region including Hull Cabin on the Kaibab and Ranger Cabin and General Springs Cabin on the Coconino.

A Regions 3 and 8 cooperative effort resulted in an interpretive training session at the Park Service training facility at Harper’s Ferry, WV, in 1989. There Forest Service archeologists were able to learn some of the Park Service’s philosophies and techniques in interpretation including signs, waysides, museum displays and publications ("CR Update," August 1989).

Specialized classes were not available every year but the region continued to hold annual cultural resource meetings where archeologists could
Site: A location of purposeful prehistoric or historic human activity. An activity is considered to have been purposeful if it resulted in a deposit of cultural materials beyond the level of one or a few accidentally lost artifacts. Locations of human activity not classifiable as sites by this definition should be considered isolated finds.

A cultural resource qualifying as a site under this definition should exhibit at least one of the following:

a. One or more features.

b. One formal tool if associated with other cultural materials, or more than one formal tool.

c. An occurrence of cultural material (such as pottery sherds, chipped stone, or historic items) that contains one of the following:
   1. Three or more types of artifacts or raw material.
   2. Two types of artifacts or material in a density of at least 10 items per 100 square meters.
   3. A single type of artifact or material in a density of at least 25 items per 100 meters.

These criteria may be modified where appropriate, based on a professional cultural resource specialist’s judgment.

The boundary of a cultural resource site shall minimally include:

a. All features, formal tools, and identifiable activity areas.

b. All areas of artifactual debris exhibiting a density of 10 or more cultural items per 100 square meters.

- Region 3 Forest Service Handbook, FSH 2309.24 - Definition developed at 1986 cultural resource work session.

1986 Cultural Resource Work Session

A particularly important workshop was held in Albuquerque in January of 1986. In their 1985 meeting, the archeologists and Recreation staff officers had decided that, regardless of how the cultural resource lawsuit might turn out, a number of issues needed to be resolved in order to move the cultural resource program forward.

According to the notes of the 1985 meeting: “The encompassing understanding in the group was that there exists a perception that there is a serious shortage of standards and of direction to the SW Region’s CRM program” (Gillio 1985). The Albuquerque workshop, which included line officers, staff officers, and para-archeologists as well as archeologists, was organized to address some of those issues. This workshop was described in a report (Propper 1986) which is summarized below.

Work groups were assigned to work on three major topics: CRM Goals and Management Framework; Regional Standards; and Documentation (the R-3 Site Form, IS&A Form, and Compliance Tracking Form).

Products included a “Statement of Purpose” for the cultural resource program:

Therefore, the goal of this program is the active management of cultural resources to:

1. Serve as a source of information about our heritage and past environment;

2. Provide recreational opportunities to the public; and

3. Facilitate the management of other forest natural resources.
Judy Propper provides this account of another important gathering of archeologists on the eve of implementation of the National Recreation Strategy.

A memorable meeting of the 1980s was the Regions 2, 3, and 4 Windows on the Past workshop at Mesa Verde National Park in October of 1988. Elizabeth Estill, then assistant director for Recreation in the Washington Office, and Evan DeBloois, the WO historic preservation officer, gave opening remarks filled with optimism about cultural resource opportunities embedded in the new National Recreation Strategy and the newly unveiled Windows on the Past program.

Topics at the workshop were upbeat: "Lighting the Fuse," "Beyond Compliance," "New Horizons, Professional Growth." The workshop was packed with success stories from forests across the three regions, including Yankee Fork Gold Dredge (R-4), Fish Creek Falls Bridge project (R-2), and Elden Pueblo and Gallinas Springs Stabilization Project (R-3). There were also presentations on the "Tools to Manage the Past" symposium at Grand Canyon, training opportunities, and career development as well as ARPA news and initiatives. Budget was not even on the agenda, other than Challenge Cost-Share opportunities.

The workshop was sprinkled with intriguing events, like the moonlight tour of Balcony House, an Anasazi Feast where keynote speaker Jim Judge spoke on "Pushing the Past into the Future: Giving Direction to Modern Archeology," and special tours of Wetherill Mesa, Crow Canyon, and BLM’s Anasazi Heritage Center. Feedback on the workshop from Region 3 archeologists was very positive, with a few grumbles - "too much rah rah," "too many success stories." But, compared to the struggles and legal preoccupations that had dominated the cultural resource meetings of the earlier part of the decade, Mesa Verde represented a turning point in the program, and everyone was on board (Judy Propper, personal communication, 2003).
Examples were given of activities within each of these three areas.

Another product was the concept of the "Cultural Resources Action Plan," affectionately known as "CRAP." It was clear from settlement agreement discussions that cultural resource planning was probably going to be an element in the final settlement so the work session provided an opportunity to agree on what such a plan should contain. The goal of the CRAP was to provide a framework for "active cultural resource management in the forests of Region 3 ... and to implement the cultural resource elements of the forest plan." The elements in the CRAP, including development or update of overviews, identification of priorities for inventory, evaluation, stabilization, etc., and formulation of study evaluation units, were later transformed into regional guidance for the forest planning assessments required by the settlement agreement.

A final major accomplishment of the 1986 workshop was agreement on a "site" definition, a Herculean task given the diversity of archeological manifestations and opinions across the region. The notes of the prior year's meeting (op.cit.) had concluded: "The desire for standardization seems to be motivated by both professional instincts and a need to address line concern regarding differences in procedures between Forests with no apparent justification." In addition, "For the region, a lack of a firm definition means that many of our most basic statistics are not comparable between forests. It also means that differing levels of work are required on different forests. The archeologists seem to be ready to seek a more tightly phrased definition." The site definition that came out of the 1986 workshop represented a compromise, but one that stood the test of time and remained in effect beyond the 1990s. Definitions were also developed for "site boundary" and "(complete) survey." These concepts were subsequently incorporated into the Survey Standards Handbook (FSH 2309.24, Chapter 10), a task that had been taken on by Joe Tainter.

Regardless of these accomplishments, the one thing workshop participants probably recall about the 1986 Albuquerque work session was the explosion of the space shuttle Challenger which occurred during the meeting and added a shocking and somber note to the week's activities.

**Publications**

As the 1980s began Dee Green was growing dissatisfied with the publication series. He wanted a new look that could take advantage of the computer technology then being installed by the Forest Service. Over time, the original report series produced in the regional office was supplemented with several other categories (see Appendix D) including the "New Reports" series, overviews, and some nonserial publications. This last category included training manuals and procedural guides. A final category included books produced jointly with another agency or unit.

In addition to books, Green wanted a newsletter devoted to cultural resources. It would be used as a medium of instruction for paras as well as a way to keep forest archeologists informed of new developments. "CR Update" was launched in 1980 and persisted for more than a decade until David Gillio, its editor, was reassigned. Renamed "Heritage Update," the newsletter then continued on for four more issues with Rita Moots Skinner as editor until it was discontinued in 1999.

The new report series began with Fred Plog's "Managing Archeology" (Plog 1981). Its appearance (size, format, etc.) was closely followed by all subsequent titles. The printing was still done by the offset method but type was now set in two columns per page to make it easier to read. The binding was "perfect"—no staples and a wraparound cover was glued on. The title often was printed also on the spine.

Covers had a very different look compared to the old report series and featured a large photograph or drawing. More attention was given to layout and a smaller type font was used so that more material could fit in fewer pages. Authors were no longer asked to make their final manuscripts camera ready because the regional office staff did that work. Computers allowed the text to be
Tools to Manage the Past Symposium
Grand Canyon

In 1988 another very important symposium was jointly sponsored by Region 3 and Rocky Mountain Station. Propper provided the following summary of this event.

In the 1986 Washington Office general management review (GMR) of Region 3 and the Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, cultural resources figured prominently in the review team’s findings. One item in the report dealt with the need to increase the interpretation of cultural resources for the public. Another dealt with the need to assess research needs in the cultural resource management program:

Cultural resources are a major aspect of land management in Region 3. Plans and programs for cultural resource inventory, protection, restoration, and public interpretation are being developed. Forest Service research has historically not included programs on cultural resource research. Consequently little work has been done in identifying research needs in this area, if they exist. Programs in universities may be adequate, but it is likely they emphasize archaeological aspects of cultural resources not land management considerations (General Management Review, Southwestern Region and Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, August 20-29, 1986)

In the action plan developed for the review, Region 3 and the Rocky Mountain Station (RMS) agreed to analyze the need for a Forest Service cultural resource research program in the Southwest by sponsoring a symposium to address this topic. The symposium took place in May of 1988 at Albright Training Center, Grand Canyon National Park.

The symposium was attended by 57 participants representing academia, public sector archaeology, tribes, and state and Federal agencies. Following several invited presentations, work groups were asked to identify research needs related to three areas: providing quality on-the-ground management of cultural resources; facilitating management of other resources; and providing public opportunities and benefits. Over 50 topics were suggested. After much analysis these were consolidated into eight topical areas: management impacts; Native American heritage; protection and preservation; site discovery and definition; public interpretation and education; key prehistoric research; key historic research; and integrated research designs. The proceedings of the symposium were published in Rocky Mountain Station’s Technical Report Series. Joe Tainter, chief organizer of the symposium, summarized the results this way:

As the Southwestern Region develops a positive program of cultural resource management—emphasizing scientific, cultural, and recreational values—we are finding that we lack many of the tools necessary to evaluate sites, to protect them, even to determine their age. The research recommended at the conference reflects the combined efforts of leading cultural resource specialists. This research is essential if we are to understand, protect, and interpret the unique heritage of the Southwest (Tainter and Hamre 1988).

The symposium became the cornerstone of efforts by Region 3 and Rocky Mountain Station to establish a cultural resource research program in the Southwest. In December of 1988, RMS requested $500,000 in the 1990 budget for the research program, to be based in Albuquerque. Meanwhile, in 1989, Regional Forester Dave Jolly earmarked $100,000 in excess timber receipts funds for “administrative studies” in support of the research initiative. Two studies were funded: a Chronological Study of the Jemez Mountains (contract with the Museum of New Mexico) and a Study of Pothunting on Perry Mesa, Tonto National Forest (a contract jointly funded with BLM). As the new decade rolled around, the stage was set for making a coordinated effort to get the research program in the Southwest approved by the Forest Service, Department, OMB, and Congress.
justified, so this series had a more polished, professional appearance.

A final, minor series must be added to the already long list. In 1983 Green experimented with another format that was called the "Cultural Resources Document series. Only three of these were published and they created little interest. The subject matter of documents was exclusively archeology and the papers published were all very brief. They were letter size and bound with a melted plastic pillar system (Velo binder). No new manuscripts were accepted in 1984 or thereafter for this series, perhaps because the Save the Jemez lawsuit took attention away from publication work.

A book important to the region's history program was "Timeless Heritage" (Baker et al. 1988), a history of the Southwestern Region. It was not originated by the region but by the Chief's history program. The Chief funded a series of publications that would include a history of each region to be published in Washington. "Timeless Heritage" was one of the histories prepared under contract as a result of this effort. The contractor, Intaglio, Inc., made good use of records and people from the Southwest and the region supported Intaglio's research through reviews and by providing materials and facilities. For example, a group oral history session was arranged. The book was published in 1988 by the Chief's office.

Cultural Resource Overviews

The emphasis on producing cultural resource overviews continued in the 1980s. In New Mexico, an overview was completed for Central New Mexico (Tainter and Levine 1987). Overviews produced by Region 2 and by the BLM Colorado State Office were an added plus for the Cibola in that they covered the Cibola's national grasslands in New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas (Gunnerson 1987; Gunnerson and Gunnerson 1988). Arizona overviews included the Little Colorado Area (Plog 1981), Tonto (Macnider and Effland, Jr. 1989), Prescott (McNider, Effland, Jr. and Ford 1989) and the Kaibab (Altshul and Fairley 1989). The Tonto and Prescott overviews were somewhat different in that they were forest-specific, rather than joint Forest Service-BLM studies.

Symposia

Forest Service sponsored symposia continued to be one the region's most important professional accomplishments in the 1980s. Not only did the symposia address hot button topics of interest to a wide range of archeologists, they also generated professional papers that were published in the region's cultural resource series. Symposium topics included high altitude sites, predictive modeling, and site allocation.

The site allocation symposium started with an interesting premise. The National Forest Management Act directs the Forest Service to undertake planning for the management of its lands. Planned allocation to various uses is a basic concept in the planning process. If allocation works for other resources, then it should be applicable to the cultural resource (King and Plog in Green and Plog 1988).

The symposium concluded that the system then in place, which mainly classified archeological sites according to National Register status, did not support a useful management scheme. Rather, it was argued, a system was needed that provided for alternate uses of the resource. Some eight categories of use were proposed including "interpretation," "information-conservation research," and "adaptive reuse." The proposed development of Chavez Pass discussed earlier would have been an adaptive reuse of the site as well as interpretative use. The symposium resulted in a publication, Report Number 3 in the Cultural Resources Management series, but little other effect. What King (op. cit.) had called "the plethora of statutory authorities" left little room for this sort of innovation.

Research Partnerships

Research partnerships continued to be important in the 1980s, with several multiyear projects. Examples include:
In September of 1980 it was possible to take over some space on the fifth floor of the regional office, adjacent to the offices being used by the Recreation staff, for the archeology lab. Everything from the old lab across the street was moved in, although the space was a bit smaller. The new lab included additional storage shelves, desks and enough equipment to make a very credible photographic darkroom. A considerable number of reference books also shared space in the lab, amounting to perhaps 20 bookshelves.

This new lab allowed for a certain degree of scientific analysis and very much forwarded progress on the Elena Gallegos Land Exchange project. The tools were there to do the basic types of analysis required by Forest Service field projects. Curiously, it was still considered unwise to actually call this new facility a "laboratory." Rather, it was obliquely referred to as the "cultural resource evaluation center" ("CR Update," September 1980).

When the Elena Gallegos Land Exchange project moved to the test excavation phase there was a need for somewhat larger lab space due to the large number of artifacts being recovered. It was possible to expand a bit so that the lab now occupied the equivalent of two numbered rooms in the Federal Building. The Elena Gallegos work also required increased staffing. At one time there were about five temporary...
employees, including a full-time darkroom technician, plus a work-study person in the lab.

Before the Ellena Gallegos project ended, the lab was moved to the Albuquerque Tree Nursery, a Forest Service facility near the airport. The move provided even more space and access to additional equipment. The photographic facilities stayed in the regional office but the rest of the old space was converted to nonlab uses.

Activity Reviews

The use of the “activity review” process to inspect performance is provided for in the Forest Service Manual (FSM 1410). Reviews may be undertaken by the Chief of any regional office activities and by each subordinate level of the line organization. Thus, inspectors become inspected and quality control can be exercised from the top on down throughout the Forest Service. Reviews can be assigned or requested in any area and are often viewed as helpful, healthy exercises, even though there is always grumbling about the time they require. Typically, the review team leader negotiates a set of questions with the head of the inspected unit. A timetable is agreed and a list of contacts is established. The review often takes several days, involves travel to several subunits and results in a detailed written report that catalogues both deficiencies and commendable progress. The inspected unit then responds with an action plan that it will follow to correct deficiencies.

There seem to be both fits of enthusiasm and lethargy about activity reviews. Under some leadership there are high targets, such as completing an activity review of three national forests each year in a region. Alternately, another line officer may redirect staff resources with the result that no activity reviews occur at all for several years.

The first use of the activity review process to inspect performance in cultural resources was completed for the Prescott National Forest in the spring of 1982. The Prescott had been the “poor” forest in the region for a while. It was not a big timber producer and had a smaller budget than most forests. It had not been able to hire a staff archeologist (David Gillio came from the regional office to serve as professional adviser when needed and provided para-archeologist oversight). It would not have been much of a surprise if the Prescott had fared poorly in a review of how it cared for cultural sites.

In fact, the Prescott survived its cultural resource activity review with good marks. Harlow Yeager (Figure 28) had served as the cultural resource coordinator since the mid-1970s. That means that he was the person to see if you wanted a permit, if a ranger wanted to arrange for somebody to survey a project or if you needed any of the many administrative services usually provided by a forest archeologist. The Prescott was fortunate that Yeager was both interested in the resource and dedicated to doing a job right. He had set up a management system that ensured that records were in safe storage and in good order. He was aided by another nonarcheologist, Roger Templeton, who maintained the cultural resource atlas, a set of maps that shows all known sites and surveyed lands. The Prescott also had a cadre of para-archeologists who were good at what they did and who cared about the resource.

The results of the Prescott’s activity review included several commendations as well as caution that it needed to seek more funding so that it could consider enhancement projects, like site interpretation. It was commended for coordination of the region’s museum collection move from dead storage and into the Sharlot Hall Museum in 1982. The forest had commissioned an overview of its cultural resources as part of the land management planning (LMP) effort. It also was noted that the Prescott had done preservation work at the historic cabin at Palace Station (“CR Update” number18, 1982).

The Apache-Sitgreaves did not fare as well with its activity review in the following year (1410 letter dated November 30, 1983 from David Gillio, team leader, to deputy regional forester and the forest supervisor). Perhaps the most important finding was that the forest was not
doing surveys on some of its large undertakings and was reporting only about 10 to 15 projects per year (the R-3 average then being about 10 times more reports per Forest). Neither sites nor surveys had been entered into the region's database. The forest had funded the research and writing of an overview by Dr. Fred Plog and had contracted for the survey of large projects with good results. In other words, some good resource protection was happening but there was a lot of room for improvement. The action plan spelled out steps the forest would to take to correct weaknesses, including items related to training and use of para-archeologists, correcting field work and paperwork deficiencies and, in general, coming into better compliance with regulations.

Each forest in the Southwestern Region eventually received a cultural resource activity review in the coming years. There was a suspension of this work during the period of the Save the Jemez lawsuit. A well-done review honestly recounts the situation as observed by the review team; the good and the bad are frankly discussed with the goal of seeing improvements made. It would have been unwise for the Forest Service, during the lawsuit, to produce lists of its own problems and weak points, knowing that they would be cited in court records to bolster the plaintiff's case. Once the legal considerations were no longer a factor, the activity reviews resumed. Eventually, each forest saw its turn come around for a second time and it had the opportunity to demonstrate how it had improved.

As mentioned earlier, the Chief ordered a general management review (GMR) of Region 3 and the Rocky Mountain Station in 1986. This was to be a wide-ranging inquiry, covering all program areas, but it included some topics of interest to the cultural resource program. In particular, the review addressed the need for more cultural resource interpretation and an assessment of research needs in the Southwestern Region. The action plan that came out of this review significantly advanced progress in both of these areas.

Data Management

The region's archeologists entered the 1980s with the guide books and computer forms that had been developed by Landon Smith and the Tonto's Assistant Forest Archeologist Joel Johnstone. The use of punch cards to enter data into computers continued as well but not without problems. According to the terms of contracts with organizations that did key punch work, there could be an allowance of one percent for errors. The actual error rate ran higher than that, an understandable effect of poorly copied site forms coupled with the poor handwriting that notoriously afflicts forms filled out under field conditions. Forest archeologists were cautioned to compare printouts of site data with original forms and then correct the computer files ("CR Update," Nov./Dec. 1980).

At first the printouts of site data were not in a user-friendly form: only an archeologist could make sense of it and then only with difficulty. The data for a site would print as three lines of eighty characters, one line for each card. In 1982 a new program, or "runstream," was made available to the forest archeologists. This presented the site data with the headings that were on the site form, so it was much easier to read ("CR Update," Sept./Oct. 1982).

Archaeologists greatly benefited from improvements in cultural resource data management that came about as a result of the DG system in the mid-1980s. Some PCs (personal computers) were finding their way into Forest Service use at about the same time that the DGs were installed. Landon Smith advised forest archeologists that it would now be easier to download data from FCCC to a PC and then send a disk to other users rather than a tape. In what was probably the least comprehensible article every to appear in the "Update," the following advice was offered:

"...downloading data from FCCC directly to a PC ... works well. The PC used Smart Term 400 with a Data General emulator ... to make the switch... The PC can store the data on
a floppy disk and then the files are readable on any other computer that reads MS-DOS.” (“CR Update,” Jan./Feb. 1987)

WESTFORNET became more sophisticated and changed its name to FS INFO. By 1988 this FCCC service allowed users to search, on DG, the literature base it had constructed over the past 10 years. However, it remained a sort of entry-level search engine so far as archeological interests were concerned because the focus remained on forestry (“Southwestern Region News,” July 1988).

The Microfiche Project

One result of the growth of survey activity in the 1980s was a strain on the capability of the regional office to maintain files of all the survey reports. It was taken as a given at that time that the regional office should be a repository for reports. If copies of all reports were in one place it would facilitate research and accounting for accomplishment reports. There was a time when permittees, contractors and other agencies’ archeologists were frequent visitors to the RO as they researched the lands where they would work. When the reports began to overflow two whole bookcases it was decided to eliminate the paper copies by having them all copied in microfiche format. The BLM’s Socorro District contributed funds that largely paid to copy the pre-1981 reports because copies of Forest Service reports would be useful to their work (2360 letter dated June 29, 1982 from Paul Weingart to forest supervisors).

The microfiche project proved to be a very labor-intensive task because the copies of reports in the files were found to have many flaws, such as missing or poorly-reproduced pages. Nevertheless, all survey reports for the period through 1983 were completed and 1984 was almost ready to go to a contractor for filming in 1986 (“CR Update,” September/October 1986). In addition to having a microfiche set in the regional office, a copy was sent to every forest in the region and they

Archeology and Computers in the 1980s

Joel Johnstone provides this summary of the evolution of Forest Service computer capabilities and the CRAIS database during the 1980s.

Starting in 1980 the forests started working on their land management plans, a task that involved massive data management. To serve that need, forests began to hire their own computer specialists and got online/demand connections to FCCC. These early connections generally consisted of Digital Equipment Corporation LA-36 TTY terminals connected to a digital line via an acoustical coupler. With the card-data stored in flat-file format at FCCC, forests could start to use Quick Qwery to generate reports of their data in a format that looked like their input forms and they could start doing their own SPSS analysis.

The TTY equipment was quickly replaced with International Computers Ltd. (ICL) key-to-tape machines and a data entry program written in the Regal programming language provided the field a way to get the form data to FCCC locally. The ICL connected to FCCC via a shared dedicated line that went from the forest supervisor’s office to the regional office and then to FCCC. Each forest had a block of time each day to send their records up from the tape and later retrieve the resulting output reports. It became fashionable to be seen carrying big stacks of computer paper through the halls.

In 1982 the ICL was replaced in the Southwestern Region with a Harris Computer 1650 remote batch processing system. The forests had graduated from cards and tapes to cathode-ray tubes (CRTs) and disk files. Data entry applications had to be individually coded in the 1650’s programming language. Most forests only had three to five terminals for data entry that were generally used for LMP. The need for additional capabilities was growing by leaps and bounds and the Forest Service recognized a need to standardize computing and word processing equipment across the nation. Thus, the FLIPS (Forest Level Information Processing System) contract was conceived.

In the mid-1980s the region was acquiring much needed upgrades of its computational power. The OS-6 IBM machines that, for a few years, had been the latest thing in word processing would be replaced by Data General (DG) terminals. These were “dumb” monitors running off a central server, not self-

Continued...
contained personal computers, but they ushered in the
computer revolution to the non-specialist staff persons.
Not every person in a staff unit had a DG sitting on a desk
and it was a while before they were found beyond the
executive suites and director’s offices. Still, there were
enough terminals around so that everyone was soon
thinking “computer” instead of “typewriter.”

There were so many impacts of the new technology on the
cultural resource program that it is hard to single out a
few for comment here. Certainly the publications of the
program benefited from the Data General because editing
and proofing became easier. It also made it possible for
archeologists to reach their data with more ease now that
they could operate keyboards directly. Data entry used an
application developed by Al Lowen on the Mark Twain
National Forest called FES, or Form Entry System, so no
programming was needed. But perhaps the biggest payoff
was in easy, speedy communications because the Data
General introduced e-mail to the Forest Service. On the
downside, much good historical material that once would
have been preserved in letters was being sent in a much
more perishable electronic form. Another possible
downside was that the data actually resided at FCCC and
data transfers to outside the system was via magnetic tape,
a method that was not convenient.

In 1984 various word processors and data entry devices
started to be replaced by Data General MV series mini-
computers, the equipment that had been selected for the
FLIPS contract. There would be FLIPS terminals in every
SO by the middle of FY 1985 (“Southwestern Region
today may have wondered why some oldtimers say they
will “FLIP you the information.” It is just an anachronism,
not any sort of insult.

In 1985 it was possible to use the DG terminals to run
reports based on site forms and the inventory standards
form. There had been some downtime in the use of the
system because the old runstreams had to be revised to
match the new equipment. By August 1985 the regional
office could announce that the red handbook, “Cultural
Resources Automated Information System,” had been
revised and was being sent to the field. Now data could be
entered through a menu-driven program that utilized FES
and Present (a report generator). This change made it
easier to enter data and it also had an error-check feature
that refused some kinds of incorrect data (“CR Update,”
August 1985). Now data could be stored on the local DG
and various reports could be generated without having to
go to FCCC (Joel Johnstone, personal communication,
2003).

Accomplishments

When the Forest Service begins to
measure and report its accomplishments
in any area it is a sign that the program is
coming of age. No record has been found
of such cultural resource measurements
in the 1970s. The accomplishments
achieved in the program for the 1980
fiscal year were summarized by Dee Green
in an undated memo, “Cultural
Resources: Status Summary for R-3.” The
staff was enumerated at 10 forest
archeologists (2 part-time), 6 full-time
assistant forest archeologists and 2 full-
time archeologists in the regional office.
These were supplemented with
approximately 100 paras. Volunteers,
work-study and other categories also
contributed to the staff effort. It was
estimated that another 2 person years
came from this source.

Green cited 58,140 as the number of
acres surveyed in FY 1980 but cautioned
that some unstated percentage of that
figure had been performed as sampling.
The surveyors located and recorded 1,065
sites and there were 482 clearance
reports. These figures include work by
out-Service sources such as contractors
and permittees, but there was no
breakdown offered. At this time there was
no national reporting requirement so
Green reported what seemed important at
the time for regional purposes (Green, op
cit., filed in regional office 2360 files,
Special Interest Areas, National Cultural
A formal system for reporting accomplishments in the cultural resource program began in 1983 with the first report due in the Chief's office in August. Evan DeBloois, Washington Office archeologist, predicted that the information the regions reported about accomplishments and budgets would ultimately have an effect on funding. ("CR Update," number 26, July 1983).

Form FS 2300-8, first issued in 1983, was to be used by the field units to report accomplishments. The form listed "elements" such as "complete surveys (acres)" and "cultural resources evaluated." There were 36 of these categories and for each one a response was required for each of the major Forest Service "functions" such as Range or Fire. This would show how much "support" the archeologists were providing to each of those senior programs. In all, there were over 350 little boxes calling for data. Strong archeologists all but wept in despair when this new form arrived.

What became very clear at the outset was that it is not easy to quantify the inputs and outputs of the cultural resource program. It seemed that just about everything that could go wrong with attempts to count things would go wrong. First, four of the forests in the region had not made use of the inventory standards and accounting computerized data system (CRAIS), so it was not possible to easily retrieve information. Definitions were another problem area because numbers became hopelessly confused as individuals made interpretations of what should be included in various data categories. The Coconino National Forest alone sent four pages of questions when it submitted its data (2360 letter dated November 22, 1983 from Neil R. Paulson to the regional forester). Even so simple a question as whether a site was "historic" or "prehistoric" created difficulty. A significant share of the region's sites were listed as "unknown," presumably because there were many lithic scatters that could have originated in prehistoric or historic times ("CR Update," number 30, March/April 1984). Another continuing problem was disagreement about what constituted a "complete" survey.

Some of the numbers on the report for Fiscal Year 1983 are as follows. The region (not counting out-Service work) had surveyed 46,659 acres and found 1,009 new cultural resource sites at a cost of $288,284. The cumulative total number of acres surveyed stood at 938,210 or roughly 5 percent of the total land in the region. A copy of the form FS 2300-8 for 1983 is reproduced in Appendix E.

The FS 2300-8 was used for several more years. Those years span the immediate impacts of the Save the Jemez lawsuit and so the numbers reported reflect increased funding and outputs for the cultural resource program. Table 6 summarizes a few of the data groups for the years on that form.

The successor to the FS 2300-8 reports was a less structured report made to the National Park Service. It was titled "The Secretary of the Interior's Report to Congress on Federal Archeological Activities." The region reported on about 70 data categories with a breakdown by national forest. In addition, there were narrative questions and numerous data categories for which only regional totals were required. For example, "4" was the response to the question "Number of convictions under ARPA during FY 1987." There was no requirement to report accomplishments in each functional area. There was heavy emphasis on permits, law enforcement and costs (FY-1987 2360 Accomplishment folders).

Table 6. Key data elements in Region 3 accomplishment reports of the 1980s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>New Sites Found</th>
<th>Acres Cleared</th>
<th>Cost in Dollars</th>
<th>Surveys</th>
<th>Acres Surveyed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>116,679</td>
<td>288,284</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>46,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1,374</td>
<td>447,437</td>
<td>427,015</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>135,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>641,352</td>
<td>625,355</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>149,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>420,755</td>
<td>638,244</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>121,932</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(flagged in regional office, 2360 USDA Forest Service, Annual Accomplishment folders)
In 1987 the Southwestern Region reported that 106,718 acres had been surveyed and that 1,661 new sites were inventoried.

**Funding**

The reader will note that budget and budget issues become more complex in this decade and will seem even more complex in the 1990s. The faint of heart may wish to move along to the next chapter right now. However, the author must say that this is important, if arcane, stuff. It should also be said that most of this section, and almost all of the 1990s Budget section, would not be here if not for the contribution of Judy Propper. She seems to understand terms like "ET113" better than the average archeologist and she was able to consult with Bill Larsen and Jim Acree, regional office budget gurus with an inside track on budget records.

The 1980s saw dramatic growth in the size of the budget for cultural resources in Region 3. Inflation accounted for a part of the growth but there was also a change in the percentage of the Forest Service national budget that went to the Southwestern Region. The biggest factor in the latter increase was due to the effects of the Save the Jemez lawsuit. At first, changed procedures took effect only in the Southwestern Region but soon they were in force in all regions. The lawsuit mandated some expensive changes and the Chief realized that it was necessary to provide funding to facilitate those changes. The lawsuit, however, did not create a new pot of money so, for the first year of the settlement agreement, the existing dollars were just dealt out in a different proportion by the Washington Office. Region 3's gain was another region's loss. After the first year, Region 3 had to cover the increase, by reprogramming and by shifting more dollars into cultural resources in its out-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Dollars to R-3</th>
<th>R-3 Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>$576,000</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>$504,000</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>$771,000</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>$897,000</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>$1,347,000</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>$1,752,000</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>$2,023,000</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>$2,099,000</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: "Heritage Budget Field Allocations - FY 1982-2000")

The roughly half a million dollar budget of 1982 in the Southwestern Region would have had to increase to three quarters of a million by 1989 just to keep even with inflation. In fact, the budget roughly quadrupled to $2,099,000, so there was a real gain. Still, to actually quadruple in buying power, the budget would have had to increase to 3.5 million dollars (Statistical Abstract of the United States, 2001).

Prior to 1981 the regional office had kept a small "kitty" of cultural resource dollars, funds over and above those needed for projects on the plan of work. These dollars were doled out to the various forests in response to pleas for help in financing last minute jobs. It was a useful device but it was abolished in 1981 as part of a new emphasis on getting "dollars closer to the ground" ("CR Update," Number 11, 1981).

During the early 1980s the Forest Service abandoned the Advent system in favor of a budget proposal and allocation system linked to forest plan implementation. Cultural resource funds were identified separately, as Function 074 throughout most of the decade, then as NFRN(AC) beginning in 1988. Also in FY 1988, the Washington Office began identifying a portion of recreation funds as timber support (ET113). In Recreation, 75 percent of these funds were shown in cultural resources and 25 percent in recreation. The regional office did not display ET 113 separately in the forest allocations so this was not something that was tracked at the forest level. Forests only knew that timber support dollars, and other support dollars, were supposedly included in their...
cultural resource allocation. The budget output linked to cultural resource funding in the 1980s was “acres surveyed.”

Forests were usually asked to submit budget proposals for three or four funding levels (Levels 1-2-3, Starting Point-Partial-Full, etc.), the highest level being full forest plan implementation. Each forest was given a total forest dollar constraint for each budget level within which to plan, usually based on some percentage of the prior year’s total funding. Forest proposals were gathered and consolidated at the regional office and a regional proposal package was formulated and submitted to the Washington Office. The regional office made adjustments in the total funds requested by the forests based on various management priorities and budget strategies. The same thing happened at the WO, where the national funding proposals were formulated and submitted to the Department, thence to OMB where they were used to prepare the President’s budget package for Congress around the first of the year.

When the appropriation was finally approved by Congress, months later, the WO allocated the budget back to the field using a set of pro-ration “rules” based on the regions’ original proposals. For example, the region might get 92 percent of their Level 1 request in one program area and 68 percent of Level 2 in another program area. The region used a similar allocation formula for the forests. The dollar amount that came back in the final allocation was often quite different from what was submitted by a forest. For example, the timber program might be funded at a high level, but the cultural resource program, which had to pay for the timber sale clearance surveys, might be funded at a low level.

The role of forest and regional archeologists in the budget process of the 1980s was not easy. They had to try to convince their forest supervisor or the regional forester to request enough cultural resource funding in the low funding levels for both compliance and a bare bones cultural resource program and enough in the higher levels to accomplish some significant cultural resource enhancement projects. There was always hope that whatever sum was requested by the forests made it through the RO, WO, Department, OMB and Congress without being slashed. There were usually more disappointments than successes. Once the final budget was received, archeologists looked for opportunities to request adjustments, through processes like reprogramming and mid-year budget reviews.

Regarding the confusion of the budget process in the early 1980s, Tom Cartledge recalls:

As the budget process became less and less comprehensible to me, I spent less and less effort to actively participate. I figured that my time could better be spent in churning out acres of survey and recording sites. This was a major mistake. It eventually sunk in to me that the only way to have a viable program of archeological resources management was to continue to play an active role in securing adequate funding. By the time I reached this earth-shattering conclusion I had pretty much convinced those in power that I was not very interested in budget matters and that I was “content” to take whatever funds came down to me through the system. This strategy, of course, puts one’s financial fate in someone else’s hands. In retrospect, I could have better served the program in the long term by firmly interjecting myself into the budget process, or at least schmoozing more affirmatively with the budget power brokers. In the case of the Kaibab, the budget power players were in timber and engineering and, to some extent, administration. It would have been much better to have expended the energy necessary to understand the budget process and to have worked it to advantage of the program in whatever ways possible. Having opted out of the budget process to a certain degree, for the first decade we had a program focused on survey acreage and site recording.
accomplished mainly with seasonal employees, but we remained always way behind the power curve (Tom Cartledge, personal communication, 2003).

Because cultural resource funding was so low in the early 1980s, few dollars were available for site preservation, nonproject inventories and interpretive projects. This began to change in the latter part of the decade due to several factors:

1. The Save the Jemez settlement agreement that required specific accomplishments in terms of National Register nominations, site inspections, and stabilization.

2. The Southwestern Region 1988 Interpretive Action Plan that, for 3 years, provided off-the-top funding for a number of interpretive pilot projects.

3. The congressional approval of two national Forest Service initiatives, which made substantial additional funds available to the regions for recreation and cultural resource projects: the Challenge Cost-Share program (1988); and the Excess Timber Receipts program (1989-1990).


Nationally, this upturn in funding and possibilities, which was linked to the emerging National Recreation Strategy, helped spark the development in 1988 of Windows on the Past, the first formal articulation of the “proactive” side of the cultural resource program. By the end of the decade, the combination of these funding opportunities had resulted in the first specific budget allocations for a wide range of stabilization and interpretive projects on Region 3 forests.

Regional budget direction in the mid-1980s focused on compliance with the Save the Jemez lawsuit settlement agreement and getting ahead on timber sale surveys. By the end of the decade, budget direction had expanded to include projects focused on management of cultural resources, above and beyond project support, especially sharing cultural resource values with the American people.
The 1990s: Search for a Balanced Program

Introduction

The 1990s saw an increasing level of commitment to cultural resources within Forest Service recreation programs. The idea that cultural resource interpretation, public programs, and heritage tourism opportunities were in demand by recreation visitors took hold at all levels and helped make cultural resources a more integral part of the overall recreation program. National direction for the cultural resource program was updated to reflect this broader role. Throughout the decade, the emphasis was on achieving "a balanced program" where site preservation and interpretation were just as important as compliance.

A National Strategy

In 1992 the Chief's office formally rolled out the first national heritage strategy. The strategy grew out of a national recreation director/regional archeologist meeting in Alaska where participants redefined the cultural resource management program in light of the National Recreation Strategy, Windows on the Past, the new Passport in Time program, and other changes that had been taking place over the course of several years.

During the past decade, the cultural resource program has been moving steadily toward a balance of support to other resources and the public outreach parts of our job as spelled out in the law. The enclosed strategy is not the beginning of this move, it is an acknowledgement of it; a recognition of the growth of the program at a time when all programs are struggling to find their niche. It is not a new initiative. It is a framework within which to grow. We hope it will provide the latitude to rethink your priorities within the Heritage Program (2360 letter dated December 21, 1992 from F. Dale Robertson to regional foresters and station directors).

The 1992 Heritage Strategy stressed balance between project support and management of the resource, using a graphic of a fulcrum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>project inventory</td>
<td>nonproject inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation</td>
<td>evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mitigation</td>
<td>(ecosystem approach)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curation</td>
<td>interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The strategy listed benefits of a balanced heritage program, including: "Interpretation enhances recreation experiences;" "It contributes to economic development;" "It's fun;" "It ensures the protection of a unique, irreplaceable resource;" and "It is relevant to the resolution of contemporary natural resource and human issues." Washington Office action items were identified in the areas of clarifying direction, fostering internal and external support, increasing public opportunities, demonstrating that the past is relevant to contemporary issues, and expanding heritage workforce skills to reflect the broader mission of the program. For the remainder of the decade, the major heritage program goal was to achieve "program balance" or at least to move in that direction.

"Heritage – It’s About Time"

In 1998, in the wake of a whole series of new national initiatives, including the Chief's Natural Resource Agenda and a new Recreation Agenda, the 1992 Heritage Strategy was revisited and updated. This revised version of the strategy, "Heritage – It’s About Time" was the product of a national heritage team meeting in Galveston, Texas, and a followup session in St. Louis. The vision articulated in the new Heritage Strategy was simple. Tiering to the Forest Service mission statement, "Caring for the Land and Serving People," the heritage program vision began: "We open windows on the past, and thereby see both people and the land more clearly." The strategy identified three heritage program components: stewardship; public service; and providing a context for natural resource management. For each there
was a description of the current situation, a desired future, and number of action items. The strategy was written with an eye toward increasing internal awareness of what the heritage program was all about. Region 3 designed and produced the brochure version of the strategy, which featured Kaibab PIT volunteer Jocelyn Docherty on the cover.

The impact of the 1992/1998 Heritage Strategies was significant. Prior to this time, there was no official description of the program. The 2360 manual, by this point quite out of date, dealt mostly with laws and procedures, and did not adequately capture the diversity and richness of the program or the public's fascination with the past. With the Heritage Strategy, there was now a blueprint for what a forest heritage program should look like; PIT projects and interpretive sites were as much a part of the program as project surveys; and the potential contributions of the heritage program to understanding past and present ecosystems and living cultures had been put on the table.

**Program Name**

The WO cover letter transmitting the 1992 Heritage Strategy officially changed the name of the program:

> With this strategy, we change the name of Cultural Resource Management to the Heritage Program. We do this not because Cultural Resource Management is a bad title, but because it has come to be synonymous with only one part of our program—support to other resources (2360 letter dated December 21, 1992 from F. Dale Robertson to regional foresters and station directors).

---

**Figure 55.** The 1998 Heritage Strategy updated the framework and vision of the heritage program.
As 1992 came to a close the Region 3 newsletter, "CR Update," still proclaimed (on its mission-statement line) that it contained "Information of Cultural Resources Management," just as it had since 1980. The next issue altered that line to read "Heritage Management." At the same time the sponsoring staff in the regional office became the Recreation, Heritage, and Wilderness staff. The monograph series also was changed, with No. 14 in 1995, and became the "Heritage Resources Management" series but continued the numbering scheme used in the prior "Cultural Resources Management" series. The name change reflected the broader program emphasis articulated by the Chief:

We have traditionally focused our cultural resource program on support to other resources. This support must continue, but it must do so in a way that contributes to the understanding of our past and to the protection, interpretation and accessibility of that past for present and future publics. To do this, our strategy must be twofold: it must allow for increased efficiency in the National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 process and it must include public outreach. This strategy seeks to facilitate not an increase of responsibilities but a balance of responsibilities (Chief Robertson, quoted in "CR Update," March 1993).

Evan DeBloois recalls this about the change in the program name.

The program name change to "Heritage Resource Management" was intended to broaden the scope of the program to reflect more of the issues with which specialists were dealing. When people asked, "What do you mean by HRM?" one had the opportunity to lay out a whole range of subjects that were included. Although there were many who questioned the change, it brought a lot of attention to the program, particularly from Recreation program managers. It was effective in earning the program a place at a lot of other tables like tribal relations, forest history, and planning (Evan DeBloois, personal communication, 2003).

Legislative Context

NAGPRA

NAGPRA became one of the consuming issues for Region 3 in the decade of the 1990s. NAGPRA, Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (P.L. 101-601), was signed into law by President George H. W. Bush in 1990. This law was enacted to right a wrong by returning to Native Americans the remains of their ancestors along with many sacred objects and objects of cultural patrimony that had been removed from Federal lands.

As is the way of most laws, the act was a compromise, and early on, not all archaeologists or Native Americans were fully supportive of all of NAGPRA's procedures. Regardless of that, the Forest Service was confronted with yet another expensive task with ill-defined limits. It would require a substantial effort for the Southwestern Region to come into compliance with NAGPRA.

After the date of the act, Native American human remains and specified cultural items found on Forest Service lands would belong to the lineal descendants, to the tribe determined to have the closest cultural affiliation, or to the tribe upon whose legally recognized ancestral lands the remains were found. Such items in existing museum collections were to be located, inventoried, disclosed, and repatriated to the appropriate lineal descendants or culturally affiliated tribes upon request. The Forest Service, by law, had 5 years, until November 1995, to complete its inventory and the Southwestern Region intended to finish on time.

The National Park Service issued regulations (43 CFR Part 10.1-10.17) to implement the...
statute but not until 1995. Even without regulations it was clear that certain steps had to be taken. To complete the inventories, the Forest Service would have to contact museums thought to hold collections from national forest lands to obtain listings of human remains and other NAGPRA items. The agency would also have to research old permit records to identify early excavation projects and then follow up on the disposition of collections that might contain NAGPRA items. This would be a daunting task.

You will recall that institutions from all over the country had worked in the Southwest for nearly a century.

Through discussions with the forest archeologists, it was decided that a coordinated regional approach to the NAGPRA inventory work would be most efficient. In 1992 the region started its NAGPRA compliance by earmarking $150,000 of FY 1993 funds to help museums inventory their Forest Service collections. The region also decided to contract for the services of a NAGPRA coordinator to oversee this work. The coordinator position had been endorsed at a meeting of the forest archeologists. Given the choice of possibly being detailed to the regional office to do the work themselves or seeing a portion of forest heritage funds go for a contract, the idea of a regional contract was quickly and unanimously approved. This was one of the few instances of immediate consensus among the region's archeologists on an important question. Because of the long history of archeological research in the Southwest, it was clear to everyone that only a substantial effort, beyond the capabilities of in-house personnel, would bring the region into compliance with NAGPRA.

Dr. Frank Wozniak was awarded the NAGPRA coordinator contract in 1992 (contract 53-8371-3-01 dated October 1, 1992). This had been preceded by a short-term contract that began on July 1, 1992 to assess the scope of the region's NAGPRA task. Wozniak set about combing through the National Anthropological Archives at the Smithsonian to retrieve information about the region's oldest archeological excavation permits. He also established contact with every tribe and pueblo that might have an interest in artifacts or human remains from the Southwest. A similar contact was made with every museum or other institution that ever held a permit or was responsible for the curation of materials excavated from Forest Service lands by others. He soon had overflowing file cabinets and no forest archeologist regretted the choice to hire a contractor for this work.

Another dimension of the NAGPRA story was the execution of challenge cost-share agreements with major institutions that held collections from the Southwestern Region. Under these agreements the institutions inventoried all collections from the national forests and provided lists and descriptions of remains and objects. These lists, prepared at relatively minor expense to the government, then served as the basis for the required NAGPRA inventories and summaries as well as for repatriation discussions.

The region completed its NAGPRA inventories on November 16, 1995, but as the decade drew to a close, NAGPRA work was still far from over. Most of the remains and objects that potentially could be claimed by tribes had not yet been claimed, and new excavations and discoveries had to be dealt with. Frank Wozniak continued as the NAGPRA coordinator and was asked to serve in a similar role for the Chief's office. In terms of NAGPRA compliance, the region had met all of the law's deadlines. Inventories and summaries had been completed on time, and notices had been published in the Federal Register as required by the act. A very formalized notice was required, called a "Notice of Inventory Completion and Determination of Cultural Affiliation." The region sent 132 of these notices to NPS for publication in the "Federal Register" in 1995. NPS consolidated the notices and published, between 1996 and 1998, one notice for each national forest. Wozniak also coordinated preparation of a cultural affiliation assessment (Anon. 1996a) that summarized, for the Southwestern Region and BLM, the evidence regarding the cultural affiliation of prehistoric archeological remains with modern tribes.
The first repatriation under NAGPRA involved prayer sticks found on Mt. Taylor, Cibola National Forest. In 1994 the prayer sticks were turned over to Acoma Pueblo (2360 letter dated December 12, 1994 from Charles W. Cartwright, Jr. to Governor Reginald T. Pasqual, Acoma). This was a relatively simple repatriation involving little controversy and consultation with only a few tribes. It took 90 person hours and the cost to the Forest Service was estimated at $2,250 ("CR Update," October 1994).

There were several other repatriations in the 1990s. These were always preceded by a notice in the "Federal Register." For example the Acoma prayer stick repatriation was announced in "Notice of Intent to Repatriate Cultural Items" ("Federal Register" v. 59, no. 211, p. 54921, November 2, 1994). The fact that relatively few items (compared to the total inventory) had been repatriated by the end of the decade was due to the small number of claims that had been received. It was no surprise to archeologists that Southwestern tribes and pueblos did not want to handle repatriations in the same way as the Plains tribes that had been most vocal in arguing for the creation of NAGPRA. Rather than bringing ancestral remains back to their current pueblos and reservations, most tribes in the Southwest wanted human remains to be reburied at their place of original interment. The Forest Service had no policy to permit such reburials in the mid-1990s and there were many questions about the legal status of such reburials and the agency's ability to protect them. After several years of trying to get clarification and direction on this issue from the Chief's office, the region developed its own "reburial policy" (Interim Directive No. 2360-98-1). This policy gave forest supervisors the discretion to allow reburial of repatriated remains on national forest land in accordance with specific criteria and guidelines. This policy was incorporated into Region 3's blue pages and later became the model for national direction on reburial.

Figure 56. Repatriation of feather bundles found in the Sandia Mountains to Jemez Pueblo, May 4, 1995. Front row (L to R): Pat Tosa; Bill Whatley; Tom Cartledge. Back row: George Toya; Frank Fragua; Forest Supervisor Jeanine Derby; Rostudo Gauchupin; Michael Loretto; Vince Toya; Regional Forester Chip Cartright; Cynthia Benedict; Cristobal Loretto; Joe Sando; and Frank Woźniak.
It was generally acknowledged that the Southwestern Region was the leader in the Forest Service in terms of expertise in NAGPRA compliance. The region had no choice in the matter, given the large number of NAGPRA human remains and cultural items it had to address. The region’s inventories going into the year 2000 listed 5,325 human remains (many fragmentary) and 17,728 associated funerary objects. There had been 58 repatriations of human remains as the century came to a close (Report titled “Forest Service NAGPRA Compliance Status – FY 2000” located in R-3 NAGPRA files).

**Bulletin 38**

A National Park Service publication called “National Register Bulletin 38, Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties” (undated) created considerable stir among Forest Service archeologists and managers around 1991. The subject of this bulletin was “traditional cultural properties” (TCPs) and how to deal with them as potential National Register properties. “Traditional” in this context referred to the beliefs, customs and practices of a living community. Archeologists were accustomed to dealing with sites or districts with constructed features, artifacts, etc. Many were uncomfortable with “beliefs” as a National Register component. “Beliefs,” after all, seemed closely linked to religion, and at that time there was perhaps an over emphasis on the National Register consideration that states, “... properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes ... shall not be considered eligible for the National Register (FSM 2361.32d and 36 CFR 60.4 [codified July 1, 1983]).

It seemed that a new and expanding universe of places would have to be considered in the National Register context. It was clear that in many cases, standard field techniques would not be sufficient to identify and evaluate such properties. “Bulletin 38” warned that usual methods would not always bring to light a traditional cultural property and that “locations often can be ascertained only through interviews with knowledgeable users of the area” (“Bulletin 38,” p. 2).

There was enough concern about the implications of “Bulletin 38” that the Chief wrote to the field to provide some clarification. The letter explained that the bulletin was not new regulation or direction but only supplemental information offered by the NPS as technical guidance. “Bulletin 38 does not change the way we manage cultural resources. It does not alter our responsibilities under NEPA” (2360 letter dated September 6, 1991 from F. Dale Robertson to regional foresters).

The enclosure to the Chief’s letter reiterated the criteria of eligibility for National Register listing. For example, a property “must be tangible and discrete, as defined under 36 CFR 60.4” (op. cit., p. 3). Therefore, the Forest Service need not fear that suddenly large areas would be listed on the National Register based on little more than a few individuals’ claims that traditional values were present. In fact, the Forest Service had been dealing with sacred sites, shrines, etc. for many years. “Bulletin 38” had not created a new property type, but provided additional guidance on applying National Register criteria. In actuality, applying the guidance in “Bulletin 38” was not that simple, and Forest Service perspectives, tribal perspectives, and SHPO/Advisory Council perspectives were not always in sync. It took the remainder of the decade to develop a fairly comfortable understanding and pragmatic approach to TCPs that was effective for most projects and consultations. It was recognized, however, that there would always be controversial projects and decisions where it would not be possible to resolve traditional cultural property concerns to everyone’s satisfaction.

One of the early TCP issues dealt with the definition of “traditional cultural property.” Some tribes, for example, felt that all archaeological sites were traditional cultural properties. Another issue was the level of identification needed, e.g., the idea of “TCP surveys.” Compensation for consultation was another frequent topic. Most of these issues were resolved or set aside as all parties gained more
experience with the process and a better understanding and respect for each other’s concerns.

There were two controversial projects in the 1990s where TCP issues became the focus of court cases: Las Huertas Canyon and Mt. Graham. These are summarized here because they reflect the kinds of issues that dominated many Section 106 discussions in the 1990s. Almost every regional heritage meeting, for example, included an update on TCP developments.

1992 Amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act

In 1992, the National Historic Preservation Act was again amended. Perhaps the most significant change for land managing agencies was the clarification of the role of Indian tribes in the Section 106 process. Codifying some of the guidance contained in “Bulletin 38,” the amendments made it clear that properties of importance to tribes should be considered in the inventory and evaluation process:

(A) Properties of traditional religious and cultural importance to an Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization may be determined to be eligible for inclusion on the National Register.

(B) In carrying out its responsibilities under Section 106, a Federal agency shall consult with any Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization that attaches religious and cultural significance to properties described in subparagraph (A) (Section 101, 16 U.S.C. 470a).

The amendments also included provisions for tribes to strengthen their own historic preservation programs and, if qualified by the Secretary of the Interior, to establish “Tribal Historic Preservation Officers” (THPOs) to take over the role of SHPOs on tribal lands. Section 110 was also expanded to include additional guidance on what should be included in a Federal agency’s historic

Las Huertas Canyon

In July 1988, the Cibola National Forest released a draft EIS (DEIS) examining eight management alternatives for Las Huertas Canyon in the Sandia Mountains northeast of Albuquerque. A Sandia Pueblo representative was a member of the DEIS work group, and religious use of the canyon was mentioned in the DEIS. In August 1989, the forest supervisor selected an alternative that allowed for realignment and reconstruction of the existing road and additional improvements, including rehabilitation and expansion of several picnic areas. Sandia Pueblo and a coalition of environmental groups appealed the decision, and provided an affidavit by a Sandia Pueblo elder. The affidavit referred to various religious activities that occurred in the canyon, such as gathering evergreen boughs, gathering earth for ceremonies, etc., although no specific places were mentioned. This was well before “Bulletin 38” was issued. The forest supervisor’s decision was upheld.

In 1991, Sandia Pueblo, Sandoval Environmental Action Community, Sandia Mountain Wildlife & Conservation Association, Sierra Club, and Wildlife Rescue of New Mexico, Inc., filed a lawsuit alleging violation of NEPA, NFMA, and several other statutes, although not NHPA. Meanwhile, “Bulletin 38” had been published, and in 1992, the plaintiffs amended their complaint to add violation of NHPA because the Forest Service had not evaluated Las Huertas Canyon as a traditional cultural property. Accompanying the complaint was an affidavit by a cultural anthropologist which again provided information about religious activities in the canyon but did not mention specific locations.

In response to the lawsuit and “Bulletin 38,” in the summer of 1992, the forest sent letters to neighboring pueblos, the All Indian Pueblo Council (AIPC), the elder who had provided the appeal affidavit, and Hispanic users of the canyon. The letters explained Bulletin 38 and the New Mexico SHPO’s guidance on its application, requested information on locations of traditional cultural properties and offered to meet with anyone who preferred a meeting to a written response. One pueblo agreed to a meeting but stated at the outset that they would not provide any locational information; the AIPC requested that all work in the canyon stop until the NHPA amendments were passed; the pueblo elder requested a time extension, which was granted, but did not respond again and the forest did not follow up.

In September 1992, the forest sent a report to the SHPO, summarizing efforts to contact the pueblos and...
an elder known to be familiar with Sandia Pueblo TCPs. Based on the results of these contacts, the report concluded that efforts to contact the pueblos had “resulted in the disclosure of no information that would allow the forest supervisor to conclude that the Las Huertas Canyon area contains traditional cultural properties eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. While the consultations, and other information, have disclosed that parts of this area are of contemporary religious significance, there is no evidence that the area contains traditional cultural properties” (Report 1992-03-124, dated September 4, 1992). The report to SHPO, however, did not include the two affidavits, since these were considered to be court documents and they did not contain any information on sites, a mistake as it turned out. The SHPO suggested that one more attempt be made to obtain information by meeting with the All Indian Pueblo Council, which the forest did. No additional information was received. The forest submitted a supplemental report documenting the meeting with the AIPC and lack of response, and the SHPO concurred that no TCPs had been identified in the canyon. Meanwhile, the district court ruled in favor of the Forest Service.

The plaintiffs appealed the decision to the Tenth Circuit on the NHPA issue alone. In addition, the plaintiffs submitted copies of the affidavits regarding religious uses of the canyon to the SHPO. In a letter to the forest supervisor, the SHPO expressed concern that the Forest Service had not shared the affidavits, and stated that, based on the information contained in the affidavits, the Forest Service had not made a reasonable effort to obtain additional information and recommended that an ethnographic study be conducted. The Appeals Court took note of the SHPO’s letter and overruled the district court’s decision on the NHPA issue: “Because we conclude that the Forest Service did not make a reasonable and good faith effort in its evaluation of Las Huertas Canyon, we REVERSE the judgment of the district court and REMAND for further proceedings” (Federal Reporter 50 F.3d 856).

The Las Huertas case is often cited as an important case in helping clarify the point that standard attempts to contact tribes with letters, offers of meetings, and normal response timeframes may not be good enough, especially when there is a good indication that traditional cultural properties do exist in an area. It is important to remember that this case occurred before and just after “Bulletin 38” was issued, and there was no common understanding of what might be considered a “reasonable and good faith effort.”

Executive Orders

The emphasis on tribal participation and government-to-government relationships was reinforced through several executive orders signed by President Clinton in the 1990s. E.O. 13007, “Indian Sacred Sites,” signed May 24, 1996, directed Federal agencies to accommodate access to and use of Indian sacred sites and to avoid adversely affecting the physical integrity of such sites to the extent practicable, permitted by law, and not clearly inconsistent with essential agency functions. E.O. 13084, “Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments,” signed May 14, 1998, emphasized tribal self-government and sovereignty and directed Federal agencies to have regular and meaningful consultation and collaboration with Indian tribal governments in the development of regulatory policies that affect Indian
Mt. Graham

The Coronado National Forest's Mt. Graham telescopes project became one of the most widely known undertakings involving a TCP controversy. In 1984, the University of Arizona submitted a proposal for an astrophysical site on Mt. Graham (Pinaleno Mountains) near Safford. During the NEPA analysis, letters were sent to all of the Arizona tribes regarding the proposed project and a number of archaeological surveys were completed. Two artifact scatters and a rock cairn, considered to be possible prehistoric shrine sites, were identified and all tribes were contacted again. Responses were received from The Ak Chin Community, the Hopi Tribe, and the Pueblo of Zuni. Zuni representatives visited the sites, and although they could not determine if the sites were Zuni shrines, recommended protection or excavation. The sites were determined eligible for the National Register and provisions were made for the protection of two sites and for data recovery if necessary at the third. The SHPO concurred on a “no adverse effect” finding. No comments were received from other tribes. The DEIS identified cultural resources and possible Native American use as an issue, but stated that there was no information regarding contemporary use. The major issue regarding Mt. Graham at that time was the endangered Mt. Graham Red Squirrel.

Prior to the final EIS (FEIS) and agency Record of Decision, Congress intervened by including language in the Arizona-Idaho Conservation Act of 1988 (AICA) (P.L. 100-696) authorizing construction of three telescopes and associated support facilities on 8.6 acres, in accordance with one of the alternatives in the draft EIS. The law also deemed all requirements of NEPA to be satisfied. The Coronado completed the FEIS and the forest supervisor made his decision in accordance with the legislation on January 5, 1989. There were seven appeals, but none cited cultural resources or religious use issues. In 1990, the forest indirectly began to receive the first specific information on Apache interest and ties to the Pinalenos. Then on August 31, 1990, over a year and a half after the FEIS and Record of Decision, the San Carlos Apache Tribe sent a letter to the regional forester identifying Mt. Graham as a sacred mountain and stating that construction of the observatory threatened to destroy religious sites. Although additional information was requested, none was received. In June 1991, the regional forester received a second letter from the tribe requesting an immediate cessation of construction activity. Attached to the letter was a document prepared by a cultural anthropologist that concluded that the Forest Service had failed to follow NHPA as outlined in “Bulletin 38,” although “Bulletin 38” did not exist at the time the decision was made.

On August 19, 1991, a lawsuit was filed by The Apache Survival Coalition, a nonprofit corporation, and two San Carlos Apache tribal members charging violation of NHPA as well as raising constitutional issues regarding the AICA. The district court ruled in favor of the Government on all issues on April 10, 1992, finding that even if AICA had not been passed, the Forest Service had complied with NHPA. The case was appealed to the Ninth Circuit. On April 11, 1994, the Appeals Court ruled in favor of the Government on the basis that the suit should be barred by the doctrine of “laches,” finding that “the Coalition brought its NHPA claims with inexcusable delay” (Federal Reporter 21.F.3d 895 (9th Cir. 1994)).

Several other complaints were filed by the Apache Survival Coalition and others during the 1990s as construction of the telescopes proceeded, with the same result. A standard element in the complaints was that the Forest Service had not adequately considered the religious and cultural significance of Mt. Graham to traditional Western Apaches and had not evaluated it as a traditional cultural property. To resolve these issues for future projects on Mt. Graham, Pat Spoerl in 2000 undertook the task of preparing a National Register evaluation of Mt. Graham as a traditional cultural property of the Western Apache. This was a 6-month project that resulted in Mount Graham (Dzil Nchaa Si An) being determined eligible for the register. This was responsive to San Carlos Apache concerns as well as those of the White Mountain Apache Tribe and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. It took over a year for agreement to be reached on the property boundary. The boundary corresponds to the administrative boundary of the Pinaleno Mountains unit of the Safford Ranger District, consisting of over 198,000 acres. The Keeper of the National Register determined that Mt. Graham is eligible as a site.
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communities. This E.O. was replaced by E.O. 13175 (same title), signed November 6, 2000, which provided more specific guidance in these areas.

Compliance

Region 3
Programmatic Agreement

A programmatic agreement (PA) between the Forest Service, the Advisory Council and the Arizona, New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas SHPOs was signed by the final party on April 2, 1990, replacing the requirements of the Save the Jemez lawsuit settlement agreement which had officially expired on January 20, 1989. This new PA set the ground rules for the region's compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act for the rest of the decade.

In a number of ways, for the Forest Service, this agreement represented a significant improvement. For one thing, it standardized procedures with SHPOs. That was particularly useful for those national forest staffs that had to consult with more than one SHPO (the Cibola consults with New Mexico, Texas and Oklahoma SHPOs). Some of the restrictive procedures that were in place under the settlement agreement ended. There would be no more prescription of budget percentages for certain work. Many requirements were now expressed in terms of adherence to cited Forest Service Manual sections. For example, rather than spelling out a percentage of survey for every project the PA called for compliance with FSM 2361 and FSH 2309.24 and consultation with the SHPOs on survey designs when less than 100 percent surveys were proposed.

The use of paraprofessional archeologists was still authorized and with less binding verbiage. Again, reference was made to published Forest Service policy. The National Register nomination quotas were not incorporated into the PA. This was a good thing in that the targets set in the settlement agreement were expensive and difficult to meet. It was also a bad thing in that the amount of attention given to nominations gradually declined.

A couple of other procedural items in the programmatic agreement made life a bit easier for the Southwestern Region. Under the first regulations of the Advisory Council just about everything an agency might do was considered an undertaking and subject to the compliance process. Appendix A of the PA listed classes of activities that would normally be considered undertakings and would require consultation and other classes of activities that normally would not be considered undertakings. Timber sales and land exchanges were clearly undertakings. Maintenance of existing facilities (such as gates and fences) and projects that did not cause ground disturbance would not be treated as undertakings. Probably the most significant improvement from a land manager's standpoint was the provision that when no sites were present or when all sites could be avoided, once the report was approved by the forest archeologist, the forest supervisor could approve project clearance and proceed without having to wait 30 days for SHPO comment. About 85 percent of the region's projects fell into this category in any given year. For example, in FY 1997, 883 projects, 88 percent of the total, were either "no property" or "no effect" projects (Report attached to 2360 letter dated March 18, 1998 from acting deputy regional forester Gilbert Vigil to Don L. Klima).

When the PA was signed in 1990, Regional Archeologist Judy Propper predicted that consultation would proceed more quickly and smoothly. She also expected that turn-around time for cultural resource clearance would be much improved ("CR Update," May 1990). In 1993 the Arizona SHPO wrote to say that he was very comfortable with the track record of the forest archeologists' work under the PA. He also noted that the new procedures, such as batching of reports, "helps the process flow more efficiently" (James W. Garrison letter dated December 10, 1993 to Roger Deaver, director of Recreation).
A Shift in Focus

It should be noted that there was a fundamental shift in the primary focus of Forest Service NHPA compliance work in the 1990s. One reason for that shift was the widespread success of appellants and litigants in slowing down or blocking many traditional Forest Service operations. Most conspicuously, timber sales were very much restricted. In addition, partly as a result of the now erratic supply of trees, most sawmills closed so there was a reduced market for trees from national forest lands (Cravens 2003). In addition, Forest Service views about sustainable forests and timber harvest levels were changing. The result was a shift in the primary workload of archeologists away from timber sales and toward other activities, such as prescribed fire, range allotments, and ecosystem management.

Mike Bremer, who became Santa Fe forest archeologist in 1995, summed up how this change affected the work of the forest archeologist:

The loss of timber funding resulted in a decrease in large-scale surveys on the forest. A large percentage of survey and site documentation on the forest was accomplished during the timber years, and we have not approached that level of survey with the current emphasis on landscape-scale projects. There was also a shift from field survey to planning as a result of the landscape-scale projects. We also developed different methods of site treatment. For timber sales we were primarily in a flag-and-avoid mode but with larger projects that involved burning we developed strategies for treating sites but not necessarily avoiding them. Archeologists have also become integral members of ID teams with the changeover to landscape-scale projects (Mike Bremer, personal communication, 2003).

The new forest archeologist on the Lincoln National Forest, agreed:

I think ecosystem management got us involved in the NEPA process at a much higher level—made us become active participants. Also made us more aware of all facets of land management and their impact on cultural resources ... no longer project specific but a range of projects used together to accomplish one goal (Richard Newton, personal communication, 2003).

Timber sales on the Cibola National Forest tended to be a smaller part of its business compared to other forests in the Southwest. Still, the trend toward smaller and fewer operations can be seen in the Cibola’s reports. In 1999 there were only 442 acres surveyed for timber management activities. For the last 3 years of the decade the average was 1,866 acres. For the same 3 years of the 1980s the timber management surveys amounted to 29,622 acres, an average of 9,874 acres per year (Report 6: Accounting by Function, Cibola National Forest, computer report generated 5/14/2003). A similar pattern is found on the Coconino, where an average of 11,000 acres per
year was surveyed for timber activities during the period 1987-1989; 10 years later, during 1997-1999, the yearly average was 485 acres (Inventory Standards and Accounting database, Coconino National Forest). These figures are significant to the heritage program because timber projects traditionally occupied most of the time of the heritage workforce.

It also should be mentioned that timber sales provide an example of how forests sometimes tried to defer NHPA compliance in the NEPA process. A timber sale typically was quite large and the number of acres to be surveyed translated into a lengthy period of field work. Then, the reporting and coordination with SHPO and others added additional time to the process. In an attempt to get sales to market sooner some forest supervisors, both in the Southwestern Region and elsewhere, would sign decisions before all (or any) of the archeological field work and paperwork had been completed. It could be argued that this caused no harm since all sites would be found and would be marked for protection. That might be true but the timber sale that took that shortcut was not in compliance with NEPA or with 36 CFR 800. In response to a policy letter from the Chief, the deputy regional forester ordered that this practice end and that all sales to be offered in Fiscal Year 1994 would be in compliance (1950/2360 letter dated February 10, 1992 from R. Forrest Carpenter to forest supervisors). This direction prompted a special meeting of the regional and forest archeologists in Santa Fe to develop a plan for accomplishing this work.

As timber surveys declined in the region, the range project workload increased, again partly as a result of appeals and lawsuits. Grazing permits could no longer be renewed with minimal paperwork in the mid-1990s. Now, environmental studies were required and that included a heritage resource assessment. Range projects for the Cibola in 1999 amounted to 328,909 acres although only 201 acres were actually surveyed. The range work 10 years earlier on the Cibola amounted to 130 acres and 135 had been surveyed (op. cit.). The old figures reflect the fact that range projects at that time would have been defined as individual improvements like stock tanks, cattle guards and fences. Under the procedures of the mid-1990s the project or undertaking was defined as the entire allotment where grazing was to be permitted. These large areas were not surveyed because normally impacts were considered to be minimal and dispersed, but a synthesis of past surveys and the nature and distribution of heritage sites was prepared and the potential effects of the proposed grazing system on these sites was discussed. Field work still focused on authorized improvements, but also might include sites or areas of special concern identified by the forest archeologist, such as sites with standing walls, and inspection of any sites where grazing impacts had been noted on site forms. The big difference between the new and old range work was in the scale of the analysis and the paperwork, not the field work, although more attention was given to checking out potential site impacts (see Appendix I).

The 1990s also saw a general shift to larger planning areas. This included heritage input for ecosystem analysis units where a variety of projects might be proposed, large prescribed burn areas, and prescribed natural fire plans. Such projects required more involvement by archeologists in project planning as well as new strategies for inventory and compliance.

Still, progress was being made on the job of finishing a complete survey of Forest Service lands. The reader will recall that one of the charges of E.O. 11593 was to "locate inventory and nominate ... all sites, etc. ... that appear to qualify for listing on the National Register of Historic Places." The Southwestern Region contains over 20,000,000 acres, so this was no easy assignment. After some 30 years the region had accomplished the complete inventory of more than 10 percent of its lands (Questionnaire on Fiscal Year Activities, October 1, 1999 – September 30, 2000). That inventory figure, totaling 2,710,096 acres, is intended to represent the lands which have been examined with sufficient intensity that they need not be examined again for future undertakings.
Tribal Participation

It was not so long ago that tribes seldom took part in discussions about heritage resources. Back in 1978 Bill Holmes, Recreation staff officer on the Coconino, had noted that he had discussed the Stumpwood Sale with Hopi official Stan Honani. This, he reported, was the first time he had ever heard Native Americans “refer to archeological sites as any importance to them” (Holmes 1978, page 19). This probably was not true for the archaeologists, but tribal interactions in the course of routine Section 106 work were rare. As the 1990s progressed, with the addition of “Bulletin 38” and the 1992 NHPA amendments, the Forest Service began sending tribal officials letters that described a project and asked if there were any traditional cultural property concerns, but the tribes and pueblos would rarely respond. After a set comment period had elapsed the Forest Service would proceed. The pattern changed slowly but, by the end of the decade, procedures and relationships had matured to a point where tribes were becoming important consultation partners. In recognition of this kind of relationship, the Hopi Tribe honored Coconino Archaeologists Peter Pilless and Linda Farnsworth with the “First Annual Natwani Cultural Preservation Award” in 1998 (“CR Update,” November 1998). The region responded to the increased emphasis on tribal relations by creating a regional tribal relations program manager position in State and Private Forestry. Dorothy Firecloud accepted that position in 1998.

NAGPRA certainly provided a strong motivation for the tribes and the Forest Service to talk. If a tribe does not express interest in human remains after the Forest Service publishes an intent-to-repatriate notice then that tribe can lose the right to be consulted or to object to decisions about disposition of the remains. The Mount Graham court decision showed that the doctrine of “laches” can also limit legal options if a tribe does not make timely comments. On the other hand, the Las Huertas decision made it clear that the Forest Service needed to do more than just send letters, especially when potentially sensitive areas were involved.

In 1998 President Clinton signed Executive Order 13084 entitled “Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments” (“Federal Register,” May 19, 1998, Volume 63, Number 96). This E.O. directed agencies to establish an effective consultation process that would permit tribes to have meaningful input on matters that significantly affect their communities. This was advice that the Southwestern Region had already adopted. Early in 1998 the region had mailed a reminder to forest supervisors about the need to fully comply with the NEPA Process. The advice concludes, “Of special importance is the need for tribal consultation early in the planning process so that tribal concerns can be adequately addressed (2360/1950 letter dated February 11, 1998 from Gilbert Vigil, acting deputy regional forester, to forest supervisors).

A preferred way in which to effect meaningful consultation was by way of a national forest-tribal memorandum of understanding (MOU). The first national forest in the Southwestern Region to complete an MOU with a tribe for

Figure 60. Representatives of the Hopi Tribe visit the Coronado National Forest in December 2000 to inspect prehistoric sites and make management recommendations. L to R: Jim Tawyesva Sr., Clay Hamilton, Harold Polingyumptewa, and Wilton Koojahaema of the Hopi Tribe, and Bill Gillespie of the Coronado.
consultation purposes was the Kaibab. The MOU, "Memorandum of Understanding Between the USDA Forest Service Kaibab National Forest and the Hopi Tribe Hopi Cultural Preservation Office," was signed in 1999 and described mutually agreed-upon procedures for when and how consultation between the two governments would occur. The Kaibab-Hopi MOU became a model for others in the region.

Curation

Museums at universities and in private operation must be thanked for having cared for collections of archeological artifacts from national forest lands for many years. The artifacts came to them by various routes, including their own research projects, but in recent years largely as a result of work by heritage resource permittees or by arrangement with individual national forests. For many decades, museums accepted collections without charge. At some institutions the volume of the collections became very large, and, in some cases, collections were not completely accessioned and records were incomplete. The Forest Service was not unaware of the problems facing museums but did not have the resources to offer much assistance.

A new regulation was published in 1990 that identified guidelines for curation of collections. Entitled "Curation of Federally-owned and Administered Archeological Collections," 36 CFR 79 set standards and gave Federal agencies guidance on how to inspect repositories. Now the Forest Service had a specific mandate to ensure that artifacts from its lands were safely stored. Unfortunately, the regulations created no new funding to accomplish this job. Most of what the region came to

Plan 6

No discussion of the heritage program would be complete without at least a brief mention of Plan 6. Just as the Elena Gallegos Land Exchange had been the biggest archeological effort for the Southwestern Region in the 1980s, Plan 6 was the largest project that took place on a single forest in the 1990s. Over several decades, starting with the 1968 authorization of the Central Arizona Project by Congress, a huge investment has been made in Arizona's future water supplies by funding massive engineering works. The Plan 6 project grew out of a proposal to replace or modify several dams along the Salt, Verde and Agua Fria Rivers to provide improved flood control, water storage, and water distribution to communities in the Phoenix, Gila River, and Tucson basins. The name "Plan 6" derives from the environmental impact statement prepared for the project by the Bureau of Reclamation. The selected alternative, Alternative 6, included raising the height of the Theodore Roosevelt Dam in Tonto Basin, a National Historic Landmark.

Studies for Plan 6 covered thousands of acres in Tonto Basin, most of which is administered by the Tonto National Forest. Unlike the Elena Gallegos project, Plan 6 would not require a massive archeological field effort by the Forest Service staff, but permits for the work were administered by the Tonto, and Scott Wood and the forest's archeologists contributed to research designs, inspected field work, reviewed lengthy reports and participated in the synthesis of results. The project involved survey of some 8,000 acres and inventory of 78 historic and 693 prehistoric sites. Of those sites, 170 were tested or excavated over the 9-year life of the project.

The Bureau of Reclamation, in concert with a team of archeologists from the Tonto National Forest and Arizona SHPO, developed an innovative approach for fulfilling the Section 106 responsibilities for Plan 6. In developing the mitigation research design, the team looked at Tonto Basin as a

Figure 61. Water being released through the spillway gates at Roosevelt Dam in 1941. This was the first time since 1920 that the dam was filled to capacity. FS Photo 406486.
whole and developed several major research topics. These were then used to divide the overall mitigation program into several distinct contracted studies: the Roosevelt Platform Mound Study (Arizona State University), the Rural Sites Study (Statistical Research), and the Community Development Study (Center for Desert Archaeology). A fourth study involved the documentation of the historic dams, construction camps, distribution systems and associated historic sites (Dames & Moore). The Plan 6 mitigation program, which got underway in 1989, cost more than 10 million dollars, involved most of the major archeological contractors in Arizona, employed hundreds of archeologists over the course of a decade, and resulted in several linear feet of publications, plus numerous professional papers, dissertations, symposia, and conferences.

The Tonto National Forest, as well as many other agencies, universities, and the public, benefited from the survey, description and excavation of such a wide range of prehistoric and historic sites in Tonto Basin. In summarizing the contributions of the Plan 6 work, Arizona State University's Glen Rice noted:

The Roosevelt archaeology projects amassed data on a truly remarkable scale, and those data were used to test a number of hypotheses about prehistoric society. Many of the hypotheses formulated to guide the research were rejected, and the results led to unexpected views on how the populations in Tonto Basin were organized and how they related to the populations of the surrounding regions.... None of these hypotheses prepared us, however, for the finding that relationships among settlements were often highly competitive. People in Tonto Basin competed for agricultural land, trade contacts, and ultimately for occupancy of the basin itself (Rice 1998).

One component of the Plan 6 project was the construction of a visitor center at Roosevelt Lake which includes exhibits on the history and prehistory of Tonto Basin, enhanced by the project's findings.

Museums have become more aware of the costs they incur by curating a collection. As a result they have started to charge for such services. In the Southwest curation charges are generally billed once, at the time of accession. The Forest Service does little excavation itself but occasionally contracts for data recovery and allows excavation under permit. In permits it is the permittee that has to bear the cost of curation. In Forest Service contracts, curation costs are included in the cost of the project.

The quantity of stored artifacts (in cubic feet) is one of the categories in accomplishment reporting. Until 1994 the figures reported were just a very rough estimate. In 1995, Frank Wozniak went back through the information received from the museums for the NAGPRA summaries and made fresh estimates based on that information. The estimate is still rough since it was necessary to make assumptions about box sizes, etc. After that the region just added the cubic feet of new collections each year to the 1995 figure. In the year 2000 it was estimated that over 31,000 cubic feet of...
materials were curated in 36 museums and other repositories around the country. In addition to repositories in the Southwest, Region 3 collections are found in the Smithsonian Institution, the Peabody Museum, the American Museum of Natural History, and the Field Museum of Natural History (Judy Propper, personal communication, 2003).

Freedom of Information Act

In the 1990s the region's archeologists saw quite a few FOIA (Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S. Code 552) requests, and those requests often consumed a considerable amount of staff time. The FOIA requests were frequently used as preludes to appeals or lawsuits sparked by disagreement over an undertaking and its environmental impacts.

A letter that was sent to a FOIA petitioner in 1996 summarized the important FOIA exemptions that were invoked by the Forest Service to prevent the disclosure of certain site information. Some archeological site forms were entirely withheld because they contained, "information on the location and character of historic and archaeological resources protected by Section 304(a) of NHPA and Section 9(a) of ARPA." A letter to the requestor explained that "release of this information could lead to harm to the resources and could impede the use of traditional religious sites by practitioners" (6270 letter dated June 28, 1996 from regional forester to Steven C. Sugarman).

Also requested were reports of cultural resource surveys. Most of each report was provided but portions of those reports were redacted. Redaction was usually accomplished by using black ink to make some words illegible and then making a photocopy of the altered report. This was a time consuming job because the records had to be read closely to locate any exempt information protected by the confidentially provisions of Section 304(a) of NHPA and Section 9(a) of ARPA (op. cit.).

Permits

Permits for archaeological investigations continued to be issued throughout the 1990s. Work was still being performed for both academic reasons and for Section 106 compliance needed by special use permit applicants. The accomplishment report for fiscal year 1995 stated that there were 174 permits being administered that year with 91 new applications received. None of the permits had been denied or suspended (FY 1995 Accomplishments, in "Heritage Program Update," 1996b).

Law Enforcement

If anyone thought that more laws and significant penalties would force pothunters to cease their depredations of prehistoric sites, they have been disappointed. One of the most egregious cases of artifact theft happened on the Coconino National Forest in 1991. A prehistoric site, called "Tim's Cave," had been discovered by a helicopter tour group. The cave contained some unusually large and well-preserved pots and other artifacts attributed to the Sinagua culture. Forest Service archeologists were notified promptly of the find and began documenting the discovery. According to Peter Pilles, it was "an exciting and eerie feeling ... You get the feeling you've walked into somebody's kitchen and sort of expect that somebody to return at any minute." But in the next few days some of the artifacts, including one of the large pots, were stolen from the site. This was one case that had a better ending than most pothunting stories. Perhaps it was due to the pressure from law enforcement investigations, but something caused the thief to turn the artifacts over to the Yavapai Apache Tribe and the tribe returned the artifacts to the Forest Service ("CR Update," December 1992). An exhibit featuring the Tim's Cave artifacts was later opened at the Museum of Northern Arizona for all to enjoy.

Several fresh examples of site vandalism and looting were noted in "CR Update." The Cibola reported that pothunting continued to be a
problem in 1993. The staff archeologists worked with Jacquelyn Boaz, their law enforcement officer, to start a reward program. Posters to advertise the program were placed in ranger district offices and at some sites ("CR Update," May 1993). In 1995 there was a relatively easy ARPA conviction for the vandalism of a rock art site. An individual who had carved his name on a rock art panel located on the Jemez Ranger District was sentenced to a year of probation and 50 hours of community service. He was given the job of removing graffiti from areas on the national forest ("CR Update," March 1995).

In Arizona, the site stewards continued to help protect sites and a new and very active site steward program was getting underway on the Santa Fe National Forest. Peter Pilles noted that in 1997 there were over a hundred sites being protected by site stewards on the Coconino National Forest. In that year there were almost 400 site visits which represented over 200 person-days of volunteered work just on one forest ("Southwestern Region News," December 1998, p.23). Since 1987 the site stewards had made over 6,000 visits to protected sites on national forest lands in Arizona. In recognition of that assistance, the region agreed to provide $6,000 annually to help the Arizona SHPO support the program (2360 letter dated July 15, 1997 from John Kirkpatrick, deputy regional forester, to Joseph Holmwood, ASPB).

Despite increased law enforcement and public education efforts, the century came to an end with pothunters still looting sites. In February 2000, Forest Service Law Enforcement Officers Cathy VanCamp and Mike Skinner arrested three men at an illegal excavation on the Gila’s Wilderness Ranger District. The defendants, who admitted they were seeking Mimbres bowls, were charged with felony violations of ARPA. One defendant pled to a misdemeanor violation. In October a jury in Las Cruces convicted brothers James L. Quarrell and Michael Quarrell of felony ARPA violations ("Southwestern Region News," September 2000). Each was subsequently sentenced to a year in jail and a substantial fine.

Enhancement

National Register Nominations

As previously noted, the expiration of the Save the Jemez lawsuit settlement agreement released the region from the requirement to annually nominate two National Register sites per archeologist. Predictably, the number of nominations declined, especially in the late 1990s, but they did not dry up altogether. In fact, thanks to multiple property nominations, more individual sites were listed on the National Register in the 1990s than in the previous decade. Yet another new form was introduced in 1994 for use in the nomination of sites to the National Register. The Forest Service resisted immediate adoption of the new form because nationally there were hundreds of nominations in various stages of completion or pending approval on the previous form (no citation).

In Fiscal Year 1994 five nominations were submitted and these were for multiple properties. A typical multiple property, or thematic, nomination requires a substantial amount of research and documentation to develop a theme. Then individual properties are described and a demonstration is made that they illustrate and support the theme. The Lincoln National Forest chose to study “Public

Figure 63. Sycamore Canyon Cliff Dwelling, a small Honanki Phase (AD 1125-1300) Southern Sinagua cliff dwelling in Sycamore Canyon Wilderness, Prescott National Forest, was listed on the National Register in 1990.
Works of the CCC Era” and nominated sites constructed by CCC workers that contributed to that theme. In 1996 the region completed only four nominations including two with multiple properties. In the following year there was but one nomination, again a multiple property nomination (Annual Reports, in 2360 files). Nevertheless, as the century ended, more than 600 individual properties had been listed on the National Register in Region 3.

Table 8. Region 3 National Register properties listed in the 1990s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date Listed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Forests</td>
<td>Depression Era USDA FS Administrative Complexes in Arizona</td>
<td>1993-06-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apache-Sitgreaves</td>
<td>Butterfly Lodge</td>
<td>1992-06-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>Old Tres Piedras Administrative Site</td>
<td>1993-05-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconino</td>
<td>Childs-Irving Hydroelectric Facilities</td>
<td>1991-08-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ridge Ruin Archeological District</td>
<td>1992-04-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconino and Kaibab</td>
<td>Logging Railroad Resources of the Coconino and Kaibab National Forests</td>
<td>1995-02-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>Upper Davidson Canyon Archeological District</td>
<td>1992-01-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oak Draw Archeological District</td>
<td>1992-11-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sutherland Wash Rock Art District</td>
<td>1993-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kentucky Camp Historic District</td>
<td>1995-11-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rucker Canyon Archeological District</td>
<td>1995-03-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaibab</td>
<td>Fracas Lookout Tree</td>
<td>1991-01-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nine Lookout Trees on the Kaibab National Forest</td>
<td>1992-01-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Snake Gulch Rock Art</td>
<td>1992-11-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooper Ridge Lookout Tree</td>
<td>1992-11-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barney Flat Historic Railroad Logging Landscape</td>
<td>1995-02-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logging Railroad Resources of the Coconino and Kaibab National Forests</td>
<td>1995-02-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>Corona Phase Sites in the Jicarilla Mountains</td>
<td>1990-08-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lincoln Phase Sites in the Sierra Blanca Region</td>
<td>1990-10-22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the down side, the region also lost some National Register properties in the 1990s. The Haught Cabin was lost to the Dude Fire and the privately-owned Zane Grey Cabin burned in the same fire ("CR Update," 1990). In January of 1995 a fire destroyed the Mt. Union Lookout and an associated cabin, a listed property. The remains of a person thought to have started the fire was found in the cabin ("CR Update," March 1995).

---

**Table 8. Region 3 National Register properties listed in the 1990s (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date Listed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>Railroad Logging Sites of the Sacramento Mountains</td>
<td>1991-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Works of the CCC in the Lincoln NF</td>
<td>1993-12-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mining Sites in the Nogal Mining District, Lincoln</td>
<td>1995-08-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ring Midden Sites of the Guadalupe Mountains</td>
<td>1995-11-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homesteads on the Lincoln NF</td>
<td>1995-11-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rockshelter Sites of W Escarpment of Sacramento Mountains</td>
<td>1998-04-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescott</td>
<td>Sycamore Cliff Dwelling</td>
<td>1990-09-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groom Creek School</td>
<td>1992-11-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Fe, Prescott, and Phoenix RR, Limestone C District</td>
<td>1994-12-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>Jemez Cultural Developments in North Central New Mexico</td>
<td>1990-04-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Developments on the Pajarito Plateau</td>
<td>1990-11-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Railroad Logging Era Resources, Canon de SanDiego</td>
<td>1992-09-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rattlesnake Ridge Site</td>
<td>1992-10-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaic Sites of the NW Jemez Mountains</td>
<td>1993-12-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonto</td>
<td>Skeleton Cave Massacre Site</td>
<td>1991-02-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hierglyphic Canyon Site</td>
<td>1994-04-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Azatlan Archeological Site</td>
<td>1995-11-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rye Creek Ruin Platform Mound Complex District</td>
<td>1995-11-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sears-Kay Ruin</td>
<td>1995-11-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perry Mesa Archeological District (Boundary Incr.)</td>
<td>1996-11-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Figure 65. The Aldo Leopold House, designed and built by Aldo Leopold in 1912 for his bride-to-be, is one of several structures listed on the National Register in 1993 as part of the Old Tres Piedras Ranger Station, Carson National Forest.*

*Figure 66. Carson Forest Archaeologist Jon Young and Regional Office Exhibit Designer Jeff Klos discuss plans for the Ring Ranch Interpretive Trail in the Valle Vidal, 1990.*
Interpretation and Public Outreach

Site interpretation and public education projects figure prominently among the heritage program achievements reported in the 1990s. For FY 1994 the region reported: "Over 225 interpretive/educational projects were completed to expand opportunities for the public to visit, enjoy, and learn about the sites, history and prehistory..." of the region (FY 1994 Annual Report, attachment to 2360 letter dated Jun 15, 1995 from John R. Kirkpatrick, deputy regional forester, to Claudia Nissley). Among the 225 projects were products and events categorized as interpretive projects, outreach/educational projects and Passport in Time projects.

The wide variety of interpretive projects in FY 1994 shows a high degree of inventiveness at the forest and district levels. Projects included an interpretive auto tour, signs, and Table 9. Region 3 interpretive highlights of the 1990s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apache-Sitgreaves</td>
<td>Blue River Prehistory Tours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blue Crossing Rock Art Signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>Jicarilla Ranger Station Exhibit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ring Ranch Interpretive Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ghost Ranch Gateway to the Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cibola</td>
<td>Kiwanis Cabin Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tijeras Pueblo Interpretive Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Fe Trail Markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconino</td>
<td>Tim's Cave Cache Display</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Elden Pueblo&quot; Brochure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palatki Interpretive Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>Dragoon Stage Stop Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;CCC,&quot; &quot;Guns and Gold,&quot; and &quot;Who Named the Mountains?&quot; Brochures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Reef Interpretive Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gila</td>
<td>Pueblo Park CCC Camp Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lake Roberts Interpretive Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaibab</td>
<td>Route 66 Auto and Mountain Bike Tours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Snake Gulch Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Overland Trail,&quot; &quot;Beal Road&quot; Brochures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>Cloud Climbing Railroad Interpretive Signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nogal Rockshelter Interpretive Sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flickinger Center Photo Exhibits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescott</td>
<td>Lynx Creek Ruin Interpretive Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historic Mining Brochure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;The Old Military Trail&quot; Brochure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>Tshiping Interpretive Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seshukwa and Nogales Cliff House Posters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rattlesnake Ridge Interpretive Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Poshuouinge&quot; Brochure and Poster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Enduring Heritage&quot; Brochure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonto</td>
<td>Sears-Kay Ruin Interpretive Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shoofly Village Interpretive Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;11,000 Years on the Tonto National Forest&quot; Brochure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Office</td>
<td>&quot;Moments in Time&quot; Brochure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;In Search of America's Past&quot; Traveling Exhibit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Heritage-It's About Time&quot; edition of &quot;Southwestern Region News&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 67. Visitors explore Sears-Kay Ruin during the dedication of the new interpretive trail in 1998.
slide programs, traveling exhibits and new interpretive trails. Outreach included training for tour providers, Elderhostel sessions, school visits, and demonstrations at state archeology fairs. Passport in Time (PIT) put volunteers to work recording rock art, stabilizing ruins, sorting historic photographs and many other useful projects. In all, over 5,000 hours were contributed to the Forest Service in PIT work. And all of that was just the 1994 accomplishment summary.

Some of the personal satisfaction and excitement engendered by the Southwestern Region's enhancement projects is summarized by Kaibab Forest Archeologist John Hanson:

For me what stands out from the late 1980s and early 1990s was having solidified the staff here on the Kaibab with Teri, Larry, Marietta and later Neil and feeling as if anything was possible. I remember an after-hours get together the heritage team had at the Cleeland-Lesko's where refreshments were flowing. We were discussing what it would take to do the Snake Gulch video and were full of optimism. I told them at the time "this may be as good as it gets... these ARE the good old days." What a great core group of people! I realized, perhaps for the first time, what it was like to be part of a team that just really clicked. From there we did produce the video, I convinced the timber staff to allow us to do huge block surveys for salvage sales, more cost-effective despite the upfront costs, and we surveyed more than 100,000 acres intensively over a 2-year time period. We completed overviews of the north and south sides, including ethnographic, started doing PIT projects, had (it seemed) the money and time to accomplish whatever needed to be done. Wonderful stuff. Wonderful time to be an R3 heritage person (John Hanson, personal communication, 2003).

See Table 9 for a sample of interpretive projects completed in the 1990s.

Stabilization

Although the stabilization requirements of the Save the Jemez settlement agreement expired in 1989, challenge cost-share opportunities, PIT projects, and expanding heritage program funding enabled the region to sustain its funding for stabilizing important heritage sites. Stabilization projects completed in the 1990s include:

See Figure 69 for an example of stabilization projects during the 1990s.
• Bailey Ruin Backfilling (Apache-Sitgreaves)
• Bancos Canyon Site, Pot Creek Pueblo, and Borracho Cabin (Carson)
• Kiwanis Cabin, Wingate Sheep Lab, and Limekiln Canyon Site (Cibola)
• Ranger Cabin, Palatki Cliff Dwelling, General Springs Cabin, and Honanki Cliff Dwelling (Coconino)
• Camp Rucker and Kentucky Camp (Coronado)
• Tularosa Cabin, Hillsboro Lookout, and Sapillo Creek Cliff Dwelling (Gila)
• Hull Cabin and Jumpup Cabin (Kaibab)
• Monjeau Lookout and Sitting Bull Falls Campground Shelter (Lincoln)
• Sycamore Canyon Cliff Dwelling and Brown Springs Ruin (Prescott)
• Nogales Cliff Dwelling, Canada Ranger Station, and Tsiping (Santa Fe)
• Rye Creek Ruin Backfilling (Tonto)

Passport in Time

More needs to be said about Passport in Time (PIT), which has been a notable success nationwide and in Region 3. PIT was developed on the Superior National Forest in Region 9 in the late 1980s, inspired by a Canadian model. The program was so popular that soon other regions and the Washington Office wanted to make it a national program. The Forest Service joined in partnership with CEHP (Conservation, Environment and Historic Preservation, Inc.) to serve as a clearinghouse for the program in 1991. A curious individual could contact the Passport in Time Clearinghouse and find out about opportunities available to volunteers who wish to work with professionals on real heritage projects ("History Line," Summer 1991). The clearinghouse published a newsletter ("The Pit Traveler"), processed applications and tracked program accomplishments, relieving forest archeologists of these time-consuming tasks.
administrative tasks. SRI (Statistical Research, Inc.) based in Tucson won a competitive PIT procurement in FY 1996 and administered the PIT Clearinghouse throughout the remainder of the 1990s.

The Southwestern Region embraced the Passport in Time program and opened numerous opportunities to volunteers. Each national forest tried to sponsor at least one project each year that would provide interesting opportunities for volunteers and advance the goals of the heritage program. As a result, little known areas of national forests were surveyed, rock art was recorded and sites were documented, excavated and stabilized. All of this work was in addition to the normal “support” kinds of projects that archeologists worked on. Members of the public gladly responded and filled the available slots. Just to cite one of the dozens of projects, the Gila National Forest sponsored the Sapillo Cliff Dwelling PIT project inside the Gila Wilderness. Three archeologists supervised 11 volunteers. Work accomplished included the recording of Mogollon pictographs. The holes left by looters were investigated and repaired and ceramics were recovered. Standing walls were stabilized and then a fence was built to keep out cattle (“CR Update,” July 1994). Several PIT projects like Kentucky Camp on the Coronado, the Garcia Canyon and Gallina Culture

Kentucky Camp

In 1993, Mary Farrell described stabilization efforts underway at Kentucky Camp, a stabilization project that spanned the 1990s and beyond. This project exemplifies the creativity and the partnership-rich nature of many of the enhancement projects of the 1990s.

Once the scene of grandiose engineering schemes and optimistic mining activities, Kentucky Camp—a small gold mining camp in southeastern Arizona—had been abandoned for decades. But recently this locale on the Coronado National Forest has come alive again, thanks to “Passport in Time” volunteers, “Friends of Kentucky Camp,” and others. These partners are joining with the Forest Service to preserve the site for the future....

Kentucky Camp Today. Soon after acquiring the property the Coronado National Forest contracted with the Phoenix architectural firm of Ryden and Associates to prepare a historic building analysis. The basis of a site stabilization plan, the historic building analysis describes and ranks the steps needed to preserve the buildings and to restore them for future use.

The most critical was keeping rain out. The MGM-United Artists film company, which shot episodes of the television series "Young Riders" in the vicinity, contributed money for wooden shingles to match the original roof covering. The Nogales Ranger District fire crew reroofed the standing buildings....

In the spring of 1992, Forest Service archaeologists from all over the Southwest came to Kentucky Camp to learn adobe stabilization techniques, rebuilding walls, patching adobe, and repairing wood. Ruin walls were capped with "sacrificial" mud, which would bear the brunt of rain and wind while protecting the original adobe beneath....

Continued...
projects on the Santa Fe, the Pinal Townsite project on the Tonto, and the Cibola’s Lion Mountain project became multi-year projects with scores of volunteers and impressive accomplishments.

Passport in Time became a big success with participants. As one volunteer wrote to the Chief, after participating in a PIT project on the Cibola National Forest:

The week I spent working alongside Forest Service archaeologists and ancillary staff gave me a new perspective on this agency and its function. The dedication, enthusiasm and professionalism of Forest Service staff who participated in the project was most impressive. These were clearly individuals who feel a sense of mission in what they do, and that spirit is contagious.

Moreover, it is clear to me that projects such as this are a most effective tool in enhancing the appreciation of ordinary citizens for the wealth of historical resources which are present on public lands. PIT projects are in a position to teach, as no textbook or admonition ever could, the irreplaceable value of these artifacts. It would be wonderful if such an experience could be part of the education of every

In the spring of 1990, five volunteers in one of the Nation’s first Passport in Time projects helped document architectural and archaeological features at the site. One volunteer contributed not only his photographic expertise but also the use of his own large-format camera to help record the existing condition of the buildings and details of construction. Other volunteers sketched architectural features and drew room plans to aid in preservation efforts. With patience and care, scattered trash and fragments of lumber were transformed into clues about the doors, windows, porches, and other features that once graced the buildings.

At the second Passport in Time project at Kentucky Camp in June 1992, 21 volunteers contributed over 600 hours to help preserve the site. They mixed up batches of adobe mortar to patch walls and repoin foundations. Volunteers erected scaffolding to renail loose tongue-in-groove ceiling boards...

(Farrell 1993)

Farrell went on to describe a new “friends” group that had been formed to help preserve Kentucky Camp:

Friends of Kentucky Camp. Some of the Passport in Time volunteers and others interested in the preservation of Kentucky Camp came together to start a Friends of Kentucky Camp group. The Friends of Kentucky Camp will be able to do many things the government cannot do, like collect tax-deductible donations. The “Friends” will help coordinate special volunteer projects at Kentucky Camp, including preservation work, research, and interpretation. This winter they will join with the Coronado National Forest to build a barbed wire fence around Kentucky Camp to keep cattle a safer distance from the site. Currently cows make themselves at home in the cool buildings, to the detriment of the already stressed floorboards. The small founding board of the “Friends” will need a lot more help to accomplish their goals, and they welcome new members (loc cit).

From these modest beginnings, the activities at Kentucky Camp grew throughout the 1990s, with annual PIT projects, volunteer work days sponsored by the Friends of Kentucky Camp, a volunteer caretaker program, and even international partnerships with adobe preservation specialists from Mexico. Several buildings at Kentucky Camp were gradually transformed from ruins to restored structures, one of which became a Fee Demo rental cabin soon after the decade ended.
Many of the volunteers returned time and again for another project. In 1998 one couple had already worked on 6 PIT projects, a volunteer from Texas had participated in 17 projects and a Tucson man, Ken Harber, had taken part in at least 25 PIT projects (“Southwestern Region News,” November 1998). PIT continued to provide a lot of good copy for the region’s newsletter, as well as local newspapers. More than a dozen issues of the “Southwestern Region News” in the 1990s carried stories about PIT volunteers and their accomplishments. One such story was about the restoration work done at “Arnold Place Cabin” on the Verde Ranger District on the Prescott, the project that attracted Harber. The old mortar in the fort-like stone cabin was repointed to stabilize it and prevent further weather damage.

By the year 2000 there had been over 1,500 PIT participants. Volunteers had contributed over 80,000 volunteer hours to heritage projects and many of those projects would not even have been attempted if PIT volunteers had not been available. It was estimated that the value of their donated work amounted to almost $980,000 (Anon 2001).
by the Commission on the Arizona Environment and they received the Take Pride in America Award ("Southwestern Regional News," April 1991). And in 1997 the New Mexico National Forests received the New Mexico SHPO's Heritage Preservation Award in recognition of their commitment to public outreach and heritage education. These awards show that the Forest Service had come a long way since days of the Save the Jemez lawsuit.

**Fee Demonstration Program**

The Recreation Fee Demonstration (Fee Demo) pilot program offered new, exciting heritage opportunities. The Fee Demo concept originated in 1996 as part of the annual Appropriations Bill. It was conceived as a program to enhance recreation

---


A complete list of Windows on the Past awards for the 1990s is shown in Table 10.

There were other notable awards received by the region's heritage programs. The Arizona Historical Sites Review Committee (the group that must approve National Register nominations in Arizona) singled out the Coconino, Kaibab and Coronado National Forests for recognition in 1994. These units produced National Register nominations that were cited as the best nominations seen by the committee that year. Bill Gillespie and Mary Farrell cooperated to produce the Rucker Canyon Archeological District. Pat Stein wrote "Logging Railroads of the Coconino and Kaibab National Forests" ("CR Update," July 1994).

Also in Arizona, volunteers on the Prescott's Chino Ranger District took home a prize for their stabilization work at a Sinagua cliff dwelling. Richard Lord, Charles Steger, and Terry and Linda Porter assisted the district in the repair of vandalism damage. Their work was recognized

---

**Figure 76.** Peter Pilles, recipient of the 1991 Windows on the Past award, leads a tour of Elden Pueblo, just one of the many events and activities for children and adults in the Flagstaff area, Coconino National Forest.
opportunities in ways that could not be accomplished with the funds Congress provided for recreation projects. Fees could be charged at certain sites and a large percentage of the money that was collected could be kept at that unit for further improvements. The Coconino’s Verde Valley (Palatki) Fee Demo Project was the region’s and the Forest Service’s first foray into Fee Demo as an opportunity to enhance heritage site interpretation and protection.

Other Fee Demo projects included the Ghost Ranch Living Museum with its Gateway to the Past and Gila Cliff Dwellings, an NPS site managed by the Forest Service. Both of those sites were traditionally free to all visitors but the new fees allowed their managers to make improvements such as more onsite interpreters and new exhibits, enhancements that otherwise would not have been accomplished. A fourth Fee Demo project was the cabin rental program.

On some forests around the country, cabin rentals had been available for many years to employees but not to the public. As a fresh-caught archeologist, the author rented an old administrative cabin from the Fishlake National Forest to enjoy a weekend in the woods with his children. The cost was very modest and there was no extra charge for the mice. The Forest Service later decided that the cabins were too good not to share, and getting too expensive to maintain, and decided to let the public participate in these experiences. By the 1990s cabin rental programs were already underway in Regions 1, 4 and 6, using Granger-Thye permits. It took a while for the Southwestern Region to get on board but the Arizona forests were eager to give it a try. The national “Rooms with a View” Fee Demo project made cabin rentals more attractive because the receipts could be used not only to maintain the existing cabins, but to help bring other cabins on line. Four of the national forests in Arizona (Coconino, Coronado, Kaibab and Prescott) were offering cabin rental opportunities as the 1990s drew to a close.

Some cabins offer a rustic experience. Kentucky Camp provides a small adobe house with an outside sink and a Forest Service toilet but boasts a microwave oven. The Kaibab offers a 1917 Guard Station, Spring Valley Cabin, that appeals to hunters. Regardless of

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Awardee</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Judy Propper (RO)</td>
<td>Heritage Program Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Peter Pilles (Coconino NF)</td>
<td>Elden Pueblo Education Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Friends of Tijeras Pueblo (Cibola NF)</td>
<td>Heritage Volunteer Contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Ghost Ranch Living Museum (Carson NF) Jeff Klas, designer (RO)</td>
<td>Gateway to the Past Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Coronado NF</td>
<td>Rucker Canyon Archaeological District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>(no R-3 submission)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Coyote Ranger District (Santa Fe NF)</td>
<td>Tsipinowinge Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Friends of Kentucky Camp (Coronado NF)</td>
<td>Heritage Volunteer Contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Cibola NF</td>
<td>Kiwanis Cabin Stabilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Camino Real RD (Carson NF)</td>
<td>Pot Creek Cultural Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Sedona RD (Coconino NF)</td>
<td>Palatki Fec Demo Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Arizona Site Stewards</td>
<td>Site Monitoring and Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Lincoln NF</td>
<td>Last Chance Canyon Battle Site Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the fittings, all sites offer a connection to the history of national forests and have made friends for both the cabins and the Forest Service. Some renters have subsequently joined volunteer programs such as the Friends of Kentucky Camp ("Southwestern Region News," June-August 2000, pp. 12-13).

Partnerships

The region expanded its circle of friends by partnering with people interested in supporting particular archeological or historic sites. Among these groups are Friends of Tijeras Pueblo, Friends of Kentucky Camp and the Palatki Warriors. The “Warriors” are actually members of the Coconino’s Friends of the Forest volunteer group who have had training specific to the interpretation of Palatki-Red Cliffs. The “Warriors” lead tours, monitor site condition, document rock art and provide other valuable services ("Southwestern Region News," November 1997, p. 20).

The Friends of Kentucky Camp are the Coronado National Forest’s most stalwart partners in efforts to preserve this century-old mining camp. They sponsor work days, raise funds, and contribute thousands of volunteer hours to the site. The “Friends” group has repaired rock walls, replaced adobes, and restored doors and windows. The site is also protected by the Site Stewards program and has been an ongoing PIT project ("Southwestern Regional News," December 1998, pp. 48-49).

The Friends of Tijeras Pueblo volunteer group has donated thousands of hours to the interpretation of the pueblo ruin located at the Cibola’s Tijeras Ranger Station. This is the same site that Carl Johnson wrote about in the 1960s, saying that it had interpretive potential. In 1991 alone, 3,000 visitors and school children were given tours of the site. The volunteers produce a newsletter and brochures, provide educational programs, and offer archeological training ("CR Update," August 1992). As the decade drew to a close they were planning a new educational building for the site.

The Sierra Club contributed skilled labor for four seasons (1996-1999) to work at Gallina culture sites on the Santa Fe. Their earliest work was on trail stabilization projects. Then they aided in stabilization of sites on Rattlesnake Ridge ("Heritage Update," March 1999). The Sierra Club also made significant contributions to the heritage program on the Coconino National Forest. The Arizona Archeological Society, New Mexico Archeological Society and Taos Archeological Society all contributed many volunteer hours to heritage projects in Region 3. Earthwatch participants helped document cliff dwellings in the Sierra Anchas on the Tonto, and Elderhostel volunteers worked at Pot Creek Cultural Site and helped document aspen art on the Coconino.

Research Partnerships

Region 3 forests continued to host research projects and field schools that added to the knowledge and understanding of the region’s history and prehistory. Examples include:

- University of Arizona, Silver Creek Archaeological Project (Apache-Sitgreaves)
- Grinnell College, New Caves Field School (Coconino)
- SUNY, Black Range Field School (Gila)
- Western New Mexico, Lake Roberts (Gila)
Centennial Celebrations

The Forest Service celebrated 1991 as a centennial year because it marked the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the first Forest Reserve as authorized by the Act of March 3, 1891. The first Forest Reserve in the Southwestern Region was not proclaimed until the following year (the Pecos River Forest Reserve) but the region whole-heartedly joined in the celebrations. The centennial celebration was not a heritage program responsibility but there was a great deal of heritage program involvement in terms of goals and personnel.

A Forest Service publication, “100 Years of Federal Forestry,” was reprinted in 1991. It was supported by the Chief's office as were a series of regional histories. The interest in history sparked by the centennial led to many articles in the region's newsletters. Almost every issue of the “Southwestern Region News” in the 1990s carried at least one story about an aspect of the agency's history.

The Forest Service found multiple occasions for celebration of centennials in the 1990s. Aside from the establishment of the Forest Reserve system there were observances of the 100-year anniversary for several individual national forests. Besides the Pecos (Santa Fe), the century mark was reached by the Grand Canyon (Kaibab) in 1993, the Prescott and San Francisco Mountains (Coconino) in 1998 and the Gila River (Gila) in 1999. The Prescott celebration was typical in that its employees provided field trips to historic sites, presented interpretive programs to local groups and wrote articles on historic subjects for local newspapers (“Southwestern Regional News,” May 1998).

Southwestern Museum Collection

Sharlot Hall Museum eventually found more urgent uses for its storage space and asked the Forest Service to remove its museum collection, much of which was then in traveling exhibits or in storage at Lucky Seven Transfer and Storage (Mac R. Harris letter dated March 15, 1991 to regional forester). The Prescott forest supervisor had been designated the liaison with Sharlot Hall, so he took on the job of finding new storage space for the collection. A sturdy garage was found near the forest supervisor's office that could serve the purpose. It was not large enough to allow for displays, but it was possible to access documents and artifacts for study on a limited basis.

Dr. Ken Kimsey, recently retired director of the Sharlot Hall Museum, accepted a position in the forest supervisor's office. He was placed in charge of the Forest Service collection and began finding ways to put it to practical use. The collection grew during Kimsey’s tenure as retirees made donations. He designed a number of small displays that used selected artifacts to tell stories about Forest Service history. These displays were placed in ranger district offices and other places where the public could enjoy an interpretive experience.

As the decade closed the collection became largely unavailable to the public. Efforts to create a new multi-partner museum in Prescott were initiated in the 1990s but never got off the ground. The Prescott was relieved of its
responsibility for the collection soon after Dr. Kimsey retired. A new building being erected for the regional forester and his staff in Albuquerque was to have space reserved for museum storage. Unfortunately, the space available to the collection shrank by about 75 percent between planning and execution of the move. The collection, although secure, remains boxed and largely inaccessible in the basement of the regional office ("Southwest Forest Service Amigos," No. 71, January 2002).

Personnel

Most of the long-time forest Recreation staff officers had retired by the end of the 1990s, making way for a new group of recreation program leaders. In some cases, Recreation staff officers were not replaced, but their duties were incorporated into positions that managed a number of resource programs ("super staffs"). Recreation with Engineering was a popular combination, as was Recreation, Public Affairs and other "public service" programs. In a way this made it harder for the forest archaeologists to make their voices heard, but a lot depended on the local situation. Pat Spoerl solved the potential problem by becoming the Recreation staff officer on the Coronado in 1991. In the regional office, Roger Deaver retired and was followed by Joe Meade as director of Recreation, Heritage and Wilderness. Both of these individuals were strong advocates for heritage resources both within the region and at the national level.

Professional Staff

In the 1990s "CR Update" published more than 50 individual notes about archaeologists either being added to the region's roles or transferring between units, far too many to list here. We can look at the overall picture and see that every national forest in Region 3 now had some archaeologists on staff—and there were even some historical skills available. On the Kaibab, for example, Teri Cleeland was devoting a substantial part of her time to historical issues and had the title of forest historian. She prepared a National Register nomination for parts of historic Route 66 that were on the national forest and nominated a number of other historic properties including lookout trees and an early logging landscape. She also contributed to the historic lookouts study and a history of the forest, "People and Places of the Old Kaibab." The Prescott National Forest added historian Ken Kimsey to its staff in order to provide curatorial services for the region's history collection. David Gillio got a job description change in 1990 that created the part-time position of regional historian. Another job with historical duties was created when the Gateway to the Past Museum opened. In 1992 Anne Baldwin moved to the Carson and took on that job.

Larry Lesko, assistant forest archaeologist on the Kaibab, became the first Region 3 archaeologist to be given the additional title and duties of "Forest Tribal Liaison", followed some time later by Assistant Forest Archeologist Cynthia Benedict on the Cibola. In addition to Pat

Figure 79. Joe Meade, seen here with Navarro, became the Southwestern Region's director of the Recreation, Wilderness, and Heritage Program in 1998.
Spoerl, several archeologists branched out into other program areas. The Cibola’s Emily Garber became realty specialist on the Tonto in the early 1990s and Jim McDonald, Coronado forest archeologist moved into the assistant NEPA coordinator position on the forest and later became regional NEPA coordinator for Region 9. Joe Tainter became the project leader for Rocky Mountain Station’s new Heritage Resources Research Work Unit, and Carol Raish joined the work unit as a research scientist.

On most forests, the structure of the heritage organization changed significantly in the 1990s as additional SO, zone and district archaeologists were hired. According to Mike Bremer, “For the Santa Fe there was a radical change in the way work was conducted. The forest hired archeologists for the field units and shifted from an SO-based operation to a district-based field operation with SO oversight” (Mike Bremer, personal communication 2003).

With a growing workforce and the growing emphasis on large-scale ecosystem analyses, forest archeologists spent more time on program management, interdisciplinary planning teams, area overviews, and tribal consultation and less time in the field.

The complexity of the forest archeologist’s job was recognized through promotions. The jobs had been rated as GS-11 in the 1980s but they were reclassified as GS-12 positions in the 1990s (six of them by 1991). This allowed promotions in the ranks of assistant forest archeologists, district and zone archeologists. Another trend was the conversion of seasonal and part-time positions to full-time permanent appointments. Still, some locations made use of a considerable number of seasonal employees. The Jemez Ranger District, for example, at times had more archeologists than were in the whole Southwestern Region in the mid-1970s. Most of them were temporary or seasonal employees. The co-op student program offered an excellent opportunity to recruit and train graduate students for future employment in heritage programs.

The staffing picture now included an overall increase in the number of professional archeologists and a corresponding reduction in the number of para-archeologists although there were still more paras than professionals. Most forest supervisors continued to rely on seasonal employees and contractors for at least part of their cultural resource survey needs. In the regional office, a down-sizing (“right sizing”) effort saw the heritage program staff cut in half (i.e., one position was lost) so that after 1996, services were provided by the regional archeologist alone. According to Judy Propper,
this resulted in a dramatic decrease in service to the field in terms of the history program, publications, and support to the para-professional program (Judy Propper, personal communication 2003). On the plus side, there was a new contract archeologist in the regional office, the NAGPRA coordinator, who was shared with BLM, the Washington Office and other regions.

There was considerable movement in the ranks of the forest archaeologists in the 1990s. When Joe Tainter accepted the position in the Cultural Resources Research Work Unit, Tom Cartledge moved from the Santa Fe to become forest archeologist on the Cibola. Española District Archeologist Mike Bremer, previously on the Coconino, became forest archeologist on the Santa Fe. The Carson's Jon Young retired and Dave Johnson transferred from the Lincoln to become the Carson's forest archeologist. Richard Newton returned from Region 1 to take the forest archeologist job on the Lincoln. On the Gila, Bob Schiowitz moved to a zone position and Gail Firebaugh-Smith came from Region 5 to become forest archeologist in Silver City. When Pat Spoerl accepted the Recreation staff officer position on the Coronado, Jim McDonald moved down from Region 6 to become forest archaeologist. Bruce Donaldson moved to a zone position and Linda Martin returned to Region 3 from the Mark Twain to fill the forest archeologist position on the Apache-Sitgreaves. Peter Pilles, Scott Wood, John Hanson, and Jim McKie stayed put. By the end of the decade, the number of PFT archeologists was approaching 50.

The cultural resource program had always included a mix of men and women even in the 1970s when archeologists were thin on the ground. By the '90s there was a male-female mix that closely matched the production of graduates at the universities. The newsletter took notice of

Figure 81. Near the end of the decade, many of the region’s archeologists gathered for the 1999 heritage meeting at Gila Pueblo in Globe, Arizona. Sitting on sidewalk: Mike Bremer (Santa Fe); Anne Baldwin (Santa Fe); Sitting on curb: Larry Lesko (Kaibab); Jim McKie (Prescott); Kristin Martine (Santa Fe); Navarro (RO); Frank Wozniak (RO); Bob Lawrence (Carson); Rita Skinner (Santa Fe); Gloria Curry (Gila); Gail Firebaugh (Gila); Unidentified; Standing in front: Judy Propper (RO); Scott Wood (Tonto); Michael Sullivan (Tonto); Carrie Levin (Carson); Joe Meade (RO); Tom Cartledge (Cibola); Dave Johnson (Carson); Diane White (Lincoln); Chris Adams (Lincoln); Cynthia Benedict (Cibola); Connie Reid (Kaibab); Standing in middle: Denise Ryan (Tonto); Elaine Zamora (Prescott); Cliff Nicoll (Cibola); Martha Yates (Santa Fe); John Hanson (Kaibab); Bill Gillespie (Coronado); Standing in back: Rich Boston (Coconino); Tom Schley (Santa Fe); Steve Germick (Tonto); Brent Abel (Santa Fe); Bruce Nellans (Prescott); Linda Martin (Apache-Sitgreaves); and Bill Westbury (Carson).
promotions and the comings and goings of the region’s archeologists. A quick scan of the names reported shows a near parity of the sexes at this time. The heritage program may well have had a better balance in this regard that most other professions within the Forest Service. In addition, many of the top jobs (regional archeologist and forest archeologist) were held by women.

Para-professional Program
Para-archeologists continued to be an important part of the cultural resource team on most national forests in the 1990s. However, by 1999 the Carson, Lincoln and Santa Fe were not using paras. As the number of professionals increased, on some forests it was difficult to justify the para’s annual update training when they might be available to survey only a few acres per year. Other national forests maintained a small cadre of paras who mainly worked with professionals on special projects. Paras continued to play a very active role in routine compliance work on several forests, including the Tonto, Coronado, Prescott, Cibola, Apache-Sitgreaves, and Gila. As in prior years, there continued to be a small para presence at gatherings of the region’s professional archeologists. For example, Bruce Nellans, an archaeologist in a forestry technician position and a para-professional from the Bradshaw Ranger District, attended the 1999 session at Globe, Arizona. Bruce later accepted an archeologist position on the Prescott.

And, as in prior years, the paras continued to make interesting finds while doing their field work. Jim Tensfield and Lorri Ketterman separately found fragments of a clay effigy on the Carson’s Jicarilla Ranger District. The two pieces they had found fit together, revealing a female figurine. The piece is probably from Pueblo I times, or about a thousand years old (“CR Update,” October 1994). Those paras, plus Betty Jordan, branched out and worked on a stabilization project for the Carson. An arroyo threatened to destroy Gallina Culture villages. The paras worked with Forest Archeologist Jon Young to experiment with several different types of erosion control devices. When it was determined that these all worked well, they moved their work to a pithouse village and successfully stabilized it (“Heritage Update,” January 1998). In 1995 the site was the focus of a PIT project and the paras hosted volunteers who had come to the Carson from around the country (“CR Update,” February 1996).

A 1994 activity review on the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests revealed that the para-archeologists were still a valued part of the heritage program. The review report stated that the para-professional program was, “highly valued by both rangers and archaeologists. Paras are relied upon to conduct surveys of almost all small projects and, as one ranger said, we can’t operate without them” (Propper 1994).

A significant factor in the decision to phase out paras on some forests was the fact that paras had other professional obligations. Each para was a specialist in some other field, such as range, wildlife or timber, and they had heavy responsibilities there as well.
workloads in those areas. In some cases their availability for para work was very limited. Differences of opinion about the para program in general were less evident in the 1990s, as use of paras was specifically authorized in the Region 3 programmatic agreement. Training standards in the 2360 blue pages were updated in the mid-1990s to allow greater flexibility in annual update training.

Program Management

Building Program Support

By the mid-1990s, the high level of awareness regarding Section 106 compliance and project support had dimmed somewhat in the regional office and on many forests as personnel changed and the cultural resource lawsuit became a rather distant memory among both line officers and archeologists. As the heritage program grew during the late 1980s and early 1990s, approaches undoubtedly diverged and concerns were again voiced about lack of consistency and perceived inefficiencies, concerns that would catch the attention of the regional leadership team.

Activity Reviews

The pendulum started to swing again in 1993 toward emphasis on activity reviews. Regional Forester Larry Henson was a believer in reviews as a management tool. He directed the regional archeologist to review the cultural resource program of each Region 3 forest. This time, all reviews were to be completed in just 2 years. Six reviews were scheduled for completion in F.Y. 93 and the remaining national forests would be done in the next year ("CR Update," number 83, May 1993). All but two of these reviews were completed in the specified timeframe.

Heritage Research Work Unit

Some of the region's archeologists left the forests in 1992 to provide staffing for the newly established Cultural Heritage Research Work Unit, a part of Rocky Mountain Research Station. Strictly speaking, that unit is not a part of the history of the Southwestern Region, but it was formed largely through RMS and Region 3 efforts and is staffed in part by former Region 3 archeologists. Upon completion of the new Forest Service building in Albuquerque, the RMS offices moved into it so they are the closest Forest Service neighbors to the regional office.

The 1988 Grand Canyon symposium, "Tools to Manage the Past" set the stage for development of a Forest Service cultural resource research program in the Southwest. In the years following the symposium, Region 3 worked in partnership with Rocky Mountain Station to make such a program a reality. This involved developing proposals, presentations, and briefing papers and helping bring the idea of a heritage research program to the attention of the Research branch of the Forest Service, the Chief, the Society for American Archaeology, and the New Mexico congressional delegation. Ed Wicker (RMS) and Joe Tainter worked tirelessly for several years to build support for the proposal. Finally, in FY 1992, funding for a Cultural Resource Work Unit, based in Albuquerque, was added to the Forest Service appropriations bill by Senator Pete Domenici.

With this authorization and a small amount of seed money, the work unit was officially established. Joe Tainter was selected to be the project leader. One of his first jobs was to write the work unit description, including a statement of purpose, identification of major problem areas, and a 5-year plan. Three problem areas were identified: sustainable societies, the cultural dimension of ecosystem management, and management and enhancement of heritage resources. Carol Raish (Jemez District) and Richard Periman (Region 1) were offered and accepted the two newly-created research scientist positions, working under Tainter. The three scientists have produced an impressive bibliography and they collaborate in national and international research efforts. Examples of their research include: the economic importance of public lands to diverse cultural groups; the role of cultural and other differences in perceptions of land use, management, and sustainability; social and cultural dimensions of grazing in northern New Mexico; conflict between timber production and subsistence foraging in southeast Alaska; the

Continued...
human role in the development of North American ecosystems; environmental histories; spatial and spatial modeling of anthropogenic landscapes in the northern Rio Grande basin; historic and prehistoric use of fire; past human responses to rapid environmental change; ecological and social aspects of sustainability; complexity and environmental risk in the prehistoric Southwest; and global change in history and prehistory.

The Heritage Resources Work Unit is national in scope, not limited to the Southwest. Although much of the work takes place in the Southwest, research has been conducted in other regions, including Regions 1, 5, and 10. Their products have application nation-wide, such as Penman's work on reconstructing past landscapes and Raish's studies of cultural attitudes and values relative to Forest Service land management activities. Tainter focuses more on national and global heritage issues related to topics like global warming, environmental change, and sustainable ecosystems. Funding for the work unit comes through a separate line item in the Forest Service Research budget, not from national heritage program dollars, and most of the research is done in partnership with other scholars, universities, and institutions.

According to Regional Archeologist Judy Propper:

The Heritage Resources Research Work Unit responds to that critical part of the Heritage Strategy that deals with providing a historic and cultural context for natural resource management. For years the Forest Service has studied trees, insects, and fire. It only makes sense to study human beings, past and present, who have played and continue to play a major role in our changing environment (Judy Propper, personal communication 2003).

Figure 83. Richard Penman's stratigraphic trench in the Rio del Oso drainage revealed 24 distinct layers that provided environmental and cultural data going back 5,000 years.

Heritage Program Assessment

Regional Forester Larry Henson also directed that a special workshop be held to assess some aspects of the heritage program. Henson had visited many projects in the region and had heard concerns about the substantial costs of archeological clearance. He was also concerned that there seemed to be a broad range of variation in the application of policy, rules, regulations and procedures (2360/5100 letter dated August 26, 1993 from Larry Henson to forest supervisors). John Kirkpatrick, director of Fire and Aviation, was assigned to lead this effort and he convened the workshop in December 1993. His objectives were to review the region’s policy and procedures in heritage work and to see how they were coordinated with other resource programs.

In the beginning, most archeologists were unable to feel very positive about the Kirkpatrick workshop, warily referred to by some as “The Inquisition.” It was perceived as an example of mistrust, or at least misunderstanding, of the heritage program by line officers. There was also a feeling that this was another demonstration that heritage resources were still not considered mainstream resources, viewed instead as barriers to other work.

The geneses of the assessment grew out of activity reviews and from line officer conversations with the regional forester. In particular, a problem arose on the Carson National Forest that became known as “The Jeep Hood Incident.” A new seasonal archeologist doing a survey for a prescribed burn encountered some unidentifiable scraps of metal and wood and, to be on the safe side, flagged the area for avoidance. While burning a line around the site, project personnel discovered that they were protecting the remnants of an abandoned Jeep. Both Propper and Roger Deaver were called to the front office to explain this offense (Judy Propper, personal communication, 2003).
Propper summarized a number of concerns that were frequently heard during the activity review process. She noted that there was a perceived need for better communication and coordination between the supervisors' office and district levels and between heritage specialists and other resource areas. There was a need for periodic training to assure that project personnel had a clear understanding of requirements and procedures. There was also a need for the region's archeologists to take a look at consistency and cost effectiveness ("CR Update," September 1993).

In preparing for the Heritage Program Assessment workshop, all line officers in the region were asked to complete a questionnaire to determine their opinions about how the heritage program was working. A number of very positive comments were submitted. For example, 29 of the 34 respondents rated their archeologist as "a valuable team member." Also, there was strong support for increased emphasis on the "enhancement" aspect of the program through tours, site interpretation, etc. There were also some real concerns, such as the difficulty of scheduling archeological services, especially for projects with short turn-around times. In part, this was seen as a function of too much work and too few people, but there was also concern that it was due to a lack of common goals between archeologists and other functions. Another concern was that line officers were required to "overprotect" sites (Lee 1993) and there was a perception that areas were being surveyed again and again.

Commonly heard complaints at this time involved such issues as overly-large buffers around sites. Archeologists who had seen sites damaged, even after they had been marked for protection, sometimes were very generous in marking boundaries for site avoidance. On the other hand, managers of other resources were reluctant to see any more area than necessary excluded from a project. There was also some feeling that areas were being designated as sites that did not meet the regional standard.

The heritage assessment workshop brought together archeologists, line officers and staff from around the region. Not surprisingly, they found that one major problem was poor project planning. There often was not enough lead time to allow the archeologists to do their job. The active discussions generated in this workshop...
1997 Recreation–Heritage Meeting at Grand Canyon

One meeting highlight of the 1990s was the 1997 combined Recreation and Heritage meeting at Albright Training Center, a perennial favorite meeting spot of the heritage specialists. This was an upbeat meeting heralding the opportunities of the Fee Demonstration program and “Company’s Coming!,” Recreation Director Roger Deaver’s brain child designed to emphasize and energize the region’s Recreation, Heritage and Wilderness programs. Much attention was given to the Fee Demo pilot program and external funding sources (grants, rural tourism dollars, partners and Friends groups) as a way to leverage flat or shrinking recreation and heritage dollars. The “business” of recreation was a hot new topic, presented by Dick Paterson from Region 2. Evan DeBloois and Jill Osborn, WO heritage public outreach coordinator, shared their excitement about the new national heritage Fee Demo project: Heritage Expeditions.

Reminiscent of meetings in the early 1980s, participants met together for general topics and broke into separate sessions to address program-specific topics. The heritage portion of the meeting reflected the major areas of interest and concern in the late 1990s: budget, NAGPRA, traditional cultural properties, GIS, and wildfire, which first appeared as a major agenda topic at this meeting. Infrastructure, a new database system for recreation and engineering facilities, was a topic on the recreation specialists’ agenda, but not on the heritage agenda since the heritage component of Infrastructure had not yet been adopted at the national level. The 1997 Grand Canyon meeting provided a unique opportunity for recreation and heritage personnel from around the region to get better acquainted and to share ideas in the context of new opportunities to enhance the recreation experiences of the visiting public.
resulted in the development of four "Strategies" to improve program effectiveness:

1. More actively involve heritage specialists in all aspects of ecosystem management and the integrated resource management (IRM) process.

2. Improve the efficiency and consistency of the program.

3. Develop better methods (including a publication or video) to market the Heritage Program internally.


In retrospect, Propper (personal communication, June 2003) says that the results of the workshop and applications of the strategies were very positive. A lot of good ideas surfaced and most of the long list of action items were implemented. Perhaps the most positive thing to emerge from the workshop was greater recognition by line officers that the heritage workload was very heavy and complex. They acknowledged that their heritage personnel were doing a good job under difficult circumstances. The archeologists gained a better understanding of the concerns about consistency and efficiency and realized the importance of continuing to strengthen and communicate their efforts in these areas. A lot of misconceptions were cleared up on all sides.

Looking back on the Heritage Program Assessment experience, Kaibab Forest Archeologist John Hanson notes that the assessment had a very positive effect: "It was when the program finally began to get the attention at the regional level that it had always deserved, thanks in great part to John Kirkpatrick's work. He became a deputy regional forester and a strong advocate and ally" (John Hanson, personal communication, 2003).

**Training and Meetings**

This section is based on a summary of the heritage meetings and training sessions in this decade provided by Judy Propper. The 1990s saw a continuation of the annual heritage meetings and periodic training sessions. By the 1990s many more external training opportunities were available, provided by the Advisory Council, NPS, private consultants like the National Preservation Institute, and university programs like the University of Nevada-Reno's Heritage Resources Management Program. The FLETC (Federal Law Enforcement Training Center) ARPA training course waned a bit in the 1990s, but the vacuum was filled by Martin McAllister's Archeological Resource Investigations (ARI), which added an additional course on preparing damage assessments. Regional training during this decade included a historic structures training session, "Managing and Maintaining Historic Buildings" in Prescott (1991), that was jointly sponsored by Heritage and Engineering, an adobe structure stabilization training session at Kentucky Camp (1992), and a NAGPRA training session presented in conjunction with the 1998 regional meeting in Ruidoso, NM. The region also offered it's one and only "Recreation Figure 87. Field trips in the snow, like this 1990 hike to Tsiping on the Santa Fe National Forest, were a standard feature of annual heritage meetings in the 1990s.
University," where heritage offerings included a mock ARPA trial.

An especially memorable meeting during this decade was the joint Forest Service-BLM workshop in March of 1990 in Sedona, Arizona: "Partners in Caring for the Past: Cultural Resources Agenda for the 1990s." The workshop provided an excellent forum for sharing ideas and accomplishments. Topics included the full range of cultural resource activities, but with particular emphasis on partnerships, public outreach, and interpretation. Gordon Peters, from the Superior NF, gave an evening talk on his "Passport in Time" program which had just been adopted by the Forest Service as a national program. Forest Service Historic Preservation Officer Evan DeBloois shared information on the "Windows on the Past" program, and BLM Historic Preservation Officer John Douglas talked about the BLM's new initiative, "Adventures in the Past." For the first time, Native American Relationships, appeared as a major agenda topic, with BLM and Forest Service consultation examples.

Other emerging issues were on the agenda, like "CRM in Wilderness," "Inventory in Prescribed Burn Areas," and "Current Issues Affecting the Curation of Federal Archaeological Collections" which featured a panel composed of Raymond H. Thompson (Arizona State Museum), Curt Schaaäfsm (Museum of New Mexico), LouAnn Jacobson (NM BLM), and Frank McManamon (NPS, Washington D.C.). An afternoon work session brought neighboring BLM and Forest Service archaeologists together to brainstorm about possible cooperative projects. It was a unique gathering at a unique time in the development of both agencies' cultural resource management programs.

Publications

The publications portion of the heritage program slowed almost to a halt by the end of the 1990s. The frequency of new titles in the various publications series diminished and the newsletter pretty much went extinct. The total of all items published in all of the various heritage series amounted to just eight for this decade, the same number published in 1978 alone. This is partly attributable to the loss of the associate regional archeologist position in the regional office.


An especially bright spot in the late 1990s was a unique newsletter that resulted from the cooperation of the Heritage and Public Affairs staffs. A special edition of the "Southwestern Region News" came out in December 1998. It was printed in color, a first for the heritage titles. Although it was a typical regional newsletter in form and distribution pattern, it was entirely devoted to archeology, traditional cultures and history stories. This publication fulfilled one of the action items developed at the 1993 Heritage Program Assessment. It appears that most of the archeologists and historians in Region 3 contributed an article to this publication although not every article was signed.

By the end of the decade, "CR Update" had all but disappeared. With the loss of the Associate Regional Archeologist position, field efforts to sustain the newsletter were unsuccessful. Part of the niche once occupied by "CR Update" had been filled by the national heritage newsletter, "Heritage Times," which provided news items and feature articles from around the country. This newsletter, edited by Boise Forest Archeologist Will Reed, could be widely shared.
electronically. The local flavor of "CR Update," however, and the emphasis on maintaining a pararaeologist network was lost.

Data Management

A new kind of computer application was used on the Kaibab in 1992. An automated way of locating points on maps, expressed as Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) values, had become available. A program called LTP1us was used with a plotter table and a computer to find the values. It was much faster than the manual method and probably more accurate. The archeologists on the Kaibab applied the LTP1us method to all sites found on the south half of the forest that season. At the same time, they incorporated the locational information into their GIS site layer ("CR Update" February 1992).

Geographic Information System (GIS) became a hot topic in the early 1990s. Using this system all resources could be represented on digital maps with a separate “layer” for each. Thus there would be a layer for roads, another for recreational sites, and yet another for historic and prehistoric sites. A map could be generated on demand that had any combination of layers. The system selected for this GIS work was called MOSS and it was designed to be fully compatible with the next generation of computers to follow the DGs ("CR Update" May 1993).

Later in this decade several forces came together to generate a big improvement in the handling of geographic data. Technology and

Data Management on the Eve of the 21st Century

Joel Johnstone summarizes the decade's advances in data management:

By 1993 the Data General contract had expired but the equipment stayed on for several more years as the Forest Service migrated from the proprietary operating systems of the DG to the open system of UNIX provided by IBM's RISC Servers. The new contract, titled the 615 contract, was intended to provide GIS capabilities locally. Initially, the concept was to mimic the DG with dumb terminals accessing central servers, but that idea quickly became infeasible as more and more applications, needed by personnel to work cooperatively with other agencies, would run only on PCs. In 1997 the first PCs were added to the contract and they quickly replaced all the dumb terminals.

By 1999 the last of the DGs were being forced out the door because they were not 42K compliant. Joel Johnstone, now working as a computer systems analyst in the RO, developed a process to migrate the CRAIS cultural resource data from the DG so it could be stored on the IBM UNIX servers. Then he and Regional Archeologist Judith Propper worked with an outside contractor to convert the Data General data entry system CRAIS into a system that would run on the UNIX system's Oracle database. A program was developed to load the flat file data into the relational Oracle database and kick out records that were in error. What was found was that often as much as 50 percent of the data had errors as a result of typos, coding letters for numbers (e.g., "o" for "0") or from adding unique codes that could not be recognized by the program (Joel Johnstone, personal communication, May 2003). It took 2 more years to clean up the errors, migrate the rejected records to CRAIS and to make CRAIS a functional system again.

In the latter part of the 1990s, the Forest Service developed "Infrastructure," a new national corporate database for maintaining information on facilities, like roads, bridges and campgrounds, and eventually other kinds of activities. It was finally decided at the national level that there would also be a heritage component to the Infrastructure database, modeled on a prototype developed by Regions 2, 5, and 8. By the end of the decade, the region was awaiting the release of the first Heritage Infra module and wondering how to make the transition from CRAIS and other state and local heritage databases to a national system (Joel Johnstone, personal communication, 2003).
software improved, national GIS standards were developed by the Chief's office and, in the mid-1990s, heritage sites and heritage surveys were accepted as National Core Layers. In Region 3, the leadership team decided to invest in a coordinated regional approach to completing the required GIS layers. This became known as "The Core Layer Project." In the late 1990s most national forests were engaged in digitizing their sites and surveys. The Kaibab had an operational heritage GIS system by the end of the decade, linked to their CRAIS database, and the archeologists were using it in their daily work.

Another kind of technology was used to map the very large (2,000 rooms) ruin called Kwastiyukwa on the Santa Fe National Forest. The Global Positioning System, or GPS, receives radio signals from satellites orbiting the earth. Through computer processing of the signals simultaneously received from several satellites it is possible to fix a position on the ground very accurately. Using this technology at Kwastiyukwa solved several problems of cost and accuracy that had always obstructed archeologists who wanted maps of large ruins. By moving a receiver to key points among the ruins it was possible to quickly record data that otherwise would have been difficult to gather. Tom Cartledge, the forest archeologist, summed up the results of the experiment, "With this approach we will have a much, much better idea of what the overall site looked like when it was in use" ("Southwestern Region News," July 1990). Bill Whatley, director of the Kwastiyukwa project, later used the information for another useful product. He created a three dimensional model of the site and a detailed artist's reconstruction to share with the Pueblo of Jemez and the public.

Accomplishments

During the 1990s the decline in timber sale activity was reflected in the reduced number and acreage of cultural resource surveys (see Appendix F). At the same time the decade saw a great expansion in the amount of non-compliance work accomplished by heritage specialists. Overall, for the 1990s, having hosted over a hundred PIT projects was in itself a huge departure from the steady diet of compliance work in prior decades.

It appears that there was a sort of accomplishment reporting holiday in Fiscal Years 1991 and 1992. A 1994 letter from the Washington Office requested data for those 2 years, saying that the Department of the Interior had been negotiated down to only five data categories for the missing years (2360 letter dated February 24, 1994 from H. M. Montrey, Associate Deputy Chief, to Regional Foresters). Table 11 shows cultural resource accomplishments for FY-1991 and FY-1992 as reported to the Chief.

The Fiscal Year 1995 accomplishment report returned to the format of columns and rows of figures. From that we learn that the region spent almost 1.5 million dollars on field studies and discovered just over 2000 sites. The number of acres inventoried was just 89,278.

In addition to the national accomplishment report, Region 3 had a requirement to report accomplishments directly to the SHPOs and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. This
Table 11. Region 3 accomplishments reported to the Chief, FYs 1991 and 1992.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>FY 1991</th>
<th>FY 1992</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of field studies</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>1,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of acres inventoried</td>
<td>195,609</td>
<td>158,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of sites recorded</td>
<td>2,605</td>
<td>2,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Number of properties determined eligible</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of properties evaluated</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2360 letter dated March 15, 1994 from L. Roger Deaver to Chief)

Table 12. Region 3 accomplishments reported to the Advisory Council, Fiscal Years 1996-1999.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undertakings</td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>1,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres surveyed</td>
<td>93,941</td>
<td>60,515</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Sites</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>1,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Protected/Preserved</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>1,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive/Outreach Projects</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverse Effects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

was a requirement of the programmatic agreement executed in 1990 (Stipulation VIII.F). The first report submitted to the council was in 1994 and covered the years 1990 through 1993. This was not a formatted report so the text and charts tended to emphasize the positive. For example, in 1993, 23 sites were stabilized, 100 interpretive projects were completed and there were 15 Passport in Time projects (2360 letter dated April 14, 1994 from R. Forrest Carpenter, acting regional forester, to Claudia Nissley, Advisory Council). The Advisory Council commented that the region’s annual reports were too general and focused too much on enhancement work rather than compliance issues (Letter dated May 14, 1998, from Carol Gleichman to Eleanor S. Towns). As a result the reports for 1998-1999 are less informative. Table 12 includes a sample of accomplishments from the latter part of the decade.

For a sample of the kinds of accomplishments being reported at the end of the decade, see the list for FY 1997 in Appendix H. Two pages of various projects shows that a great deal was being accomplished under the leadership of the region’s heritage team. Appendix G summarizes key accomplishment categories for the entire decade. As the century drew to a close, Region 3 had surveyed over 2,700,000 acres and inventoried almost 58,000 heritage sites, more than any other region.

**Funding**

Although the 1990s started off extremely well, overall, the decade proved to be a disappointment insofar as budgets for heritage resources were concerned. There was a significant drop in the total national dollars specifically identified for heritage resources work, and the total available to the field shrank by nearly half between the start and end of the decade. This was theoretically offset by a shift in 1995 that required the “benefiting function” rather than heritage program dollars to pay for project support. According to Lincoln Forest Archaeologist Richard Newton (personal communication, 2003), this change had some benefits, “The redistributing of the support dollars to other functional areas is cumbersome but gave us more visibility to other resource areas.” But, in the view of many forest archeologists, the overall effect of this change on funding for the heritage program was negative. The Southwestern Region’s share of the pot stayed around 14 percent so forests had much less to spend as the pot decreased (see Table 13).

The increased visibility and growth of the cultural resource program in the late 1980s continued throughout the early 1990s, sustained by the Challenge Cost-Share Program, Excess Timber Receipts, and the now fully-developed Recreation Strategy. “America’s Great Outdoors
Initiative" (AGOI). For several years, the congressionally-funded AGOI initiative pumped additional dollars into the recreation and cultural resource programs for recreation improvements and cultural resource enhancement projects. This funding dovetailed nicely with the new national “Heritage Strategy” (1992) and the emerging “Passport in Time” program (1990). In the Region 3 FY 1990 budget allocation, for example, $671,000 in off-the-top funding was earmarked for special heritage projects. This included $119,000 for 3 challenge cost-share projects, $138,000 for 19 stabilization projects, $180,000 for 6 projects funded under the Cultural Resources Interpretive Action Plan, and $234,000 in excess timber receipts for 32 projects that included overviews, interpretive projects, stabilization assessments, oral history projects, and artifact analyses. This was in addition to regular program dollars.

The cultural resource fund code NFRN(AC) was replaced by NFCR in FY 1992, which was replaced by NFHR in FY 1996. Beginning in 1992, the “acres surveyed” cultural resource output was replaced by a number of Management Attainment Reporting (MAR) items, including inventory, evaluation, stabilization, interpretation, protection, and National Register nominations. The 1990s were a time of continuing budget system experimentation and change. In 1990, the Forest Service gave “the Big Bucket” approach a try, where forests could re-mix their dollars and were not restricted by line item designations. Overall, the heritage program in Region 3 fared pretty well under the Big Bucket, although results varied by forest. This approach was rather quickly abandoned due to congressional concerns about lack of accountability.

As the decade progressed, there was a shift away from off-the-top funding and earmarking specific projects in the budget allocation package. Instead, the regional office sent almost all of the money to the field and provided more general program direction about what should be emphasized and accomplished. Heritage budget direction in the early 1990s focused on expanding Windows on the Past activities and Passport in Time projects, continued emphasis on site stabilization and National Register nominations, and the addition of a new item, “NAGPRA.” In FY 1992, the region approved $40,000 of off-the-top funding for a NAGPRA coordinator contract, which continued throughout the 1990s in partnership with the WO. In the early 1990s, the RO also earmarked funds for Challenge Cost-Share agreements with 13 museums and repositories. This helped to pay for the preparation of inventories and summaries of NAGPRA human remains and cultural items. Region 3 heritage funding peaked in 1994 at 3.5 million dollars.

As stated previously, one difficulty in trying to understand Forest Service budgets is that the rules constantly change. FY 1995 provides an example of how changing rules can quickly and significantly affect program dollars. In FY 1995, the Washington Office had proposed to Congress that all costs of supporting a project (e.g., paying archeologists and wildlife biologists to do surveys so that a land exchange or construction project could proceed) should be paid directly by the benefiting function. To make that work, all of the money that previously went to the heritage program, for example, to take care of project support would have to be removed from the heritage budget.

Table 13. Region 3 heritage allocations in the 1990s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>to R-3</th>
<th>R-3 Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>$2,686</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>$3,453</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>$3,248</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>$3,961</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>$3,521</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>$1,837</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>$1,698</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>$1,783</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$1,893</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$1,813</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source “Heritage Budget Field Allocations – FY 1982-2000”)
and added to the budgets for timber, fire, wildlife, etc. Between the Initial and Final FY 1995 budget, Congress approved this concept and asked the Forest Service to submit a revised budget proposal incorporating this change.

All of the benefiting function staffs in the WO were quickly polled on the question of how many dollars would be needed to cover the heritage resource work for their projects. This was done without any heritage input. The resulting total was roughly 80 percent of the entire heritage budget. Nationally, the heritage program was left with only 4.7 million dollars in the revised budget that was submitted to Congress (compared to 28.2 million for the prior year). Once the WO recreation and heritage staffs realized what had happened, emergency meetings were held, and another revised budget was forwarded to Congress, in which enough of the redistributed money was recovered to bring cultural resource funding up to around 15.2 million dollars. Both houses of Congress had already acted on the FY 1995 budget, but in their conference deliberations they made a note that they expected the Forest Service to come in with a reprogramming request based on verification of the numbers in the last revised budget submission. The Forest Service did this and submitted a reprogramming proposal that increased the cultural resource line item to 14.7 million dollars, a little more than half of what it had been the prior year. This could not have come at a worse time for Region 3. In response to the 1993 Heritage Program Assessment strategy aimed at “funding a balanced heritage program,” the region had requested a substantial increase in heritage funding in its FY 1995 budget proposal (“current” level and above). Needless to say, this did not happen.

In the late 1990s, despite valiant efforts regionally and nationally to improve the heritage budget situation and recoup some of the funds lost in 1995, the heritage budget either declined or stayed more or less flat for the remainder of the decade. Heritage actually lost considerable ground if inflation is taken into account. Budget direction in the late 1990s stressed that allocations in NFHR were to be used exclusively for implementing the national Heritage Strategy and accomplishing heritage projects although this was hard to track. One problem that quickly surfaced was that on some forests, all associated costs for heritage personnel, such as office space, annual leave, vehicle costs, were charged to the heritage program, although perhaps 80 percent of a heritage specialists’ time might be spent providing support for other program areas. There were numerous reminders to distribute such costs based on percent of time charged to various programs. Tribal consultation is mentioned for the first time in the 1995 budget direction along with developing and maintaining heritage data. AGOI enhancement funding and separate challenge cost-share funding do not appear in the budget allocation after 1995.

In 1997, the national budget process took a major detour, away from the development of forest budget proposals aggregated up the line and toward a totally different criteria-based approach. In this system, forests and regions were less involved in the budget planning process, and whatever funds were appropriated by Congress were allocated to the regions, and thence to the forests, based on budget criteria. These criteria consisted primarily of quantitative factors such as acres of land managed, miles of roads maintained, number of grazing allotments managed, etc. For the heritage program, the criteria included: acres of land managed, number of inventoried heritage sites, number of SHPOs and tribes consulted, number of ARPA cases, number of interpreted heritage sites, etc. The budget criteria approach significantly reduced the ability of forests and forest archeologists to influence the budget or emphasize particular program needs. While Region 3 held its own nationally, the budget criteria process resulted in some fairly significant shifts in heritage funding among forests in Region 3. Heritage outputs in the late 1990s were measured both with traditional MAR items (for attainment reporting) and with budget criteria outputs (for budget allocation).

In the early 1990s, the role of archeologists in the budget process included, in addition to involvement in the preparation of forest budget
proposals, development of numerous proposals for competitive CCS and AGOI funding. Later, as these special off-the-top initiatives declined, efforts focused more on competing for dollars at the forest level. In the budget criteria process of the late 1990s, the way to influence the budget was through outputs, but with fewer dollars to work with, most forests could effect only minor changes in their allocations.

With the general drop in heritage funding in 1995 and the drying up of special initiatives and off-the-top funding, forest archeologists increased efforts to find partners and external funding sources. Some notable successes were the Coconino National Forest's "Save America's Treasures" grant for the stabilization and interpretation of Honanki and the Lincoln National Forest's National Park Service battlefield grants for work on Apache military battle sites. The strategy of "using other people's money" wherever possible was emphasized. This included taking advantage of opportunities to fund heritage interpretive projects with recreation funds, funding large-scale inventories, overviews, and GIS work with land management planning funds, and applying for special project funding in areas like environmental education, rural tourism, and international forestry. Projects and programs, like the Arizona Site Stewards, Kentucky Camp, Tijeras Pueblo, and Elden Pueblo continued to be highly successful due to the commitment and support of successful partners and "Friends" groups. Those accomplishments are even more impressive in light of the overall state of the heritage budgets.

One new special initiative of the decade did provide some unique heritage opportunities—the Recreation Fee Demonstration Program (Fee Demo) (1996). As mentioned earlier, the heritage program had some striking successes with the Fee Demo program. Still, overall, the late 1990s saw a decline in new, moderate-to-high-cost stabilization and interpretative projects. Accomplishments remained relatively high, however, as forests shifted efforts to less expensive projects. With a few exceptions, forests focused on maintaining existing investments, concentrating on less-costly projects, like site inspections, sustaining Passport in Time and other volunteer and partnership programs, often at a reduced level, and highlighting local public outreach and educational activities. Some of the successes of the early 1990s, like the Ghost Ranch Gateway to the Past and Pot Creek Cultural Site were closed to the public by the end of the decade due to insufficient operating funds.

The start of the 21st century saw another major change in the Forest Service budget system, one whose long-term effects on the heritage program are still unknown. In FY 2001, in an effort to reduce the complexity of its budget and accounting system, the Forest Service significantly reduced the number of budget line items. This resulted in the loss of a separate congressional line item for the heritage program, which was subsumed under NFRW, the Recreation, Heritage, and Wilderness budget line item. Without a separate fund code, there is no easy way to track actual heritage program expenditures at the regional or national levels.

This change accompanied the implementation of an entirely new budget system in FY 2002, the.
Figure 90. Already embarked on the journey into the new millennium, the heritage group gathers in Silver City for the 2002 regional heritage meeting. Front row (L to R): Cliff Nicoll (Cibola); Chris Adams (Lincoln); Bruce Nellans (Prescott); Anne Baldwin (Santa Fe); Judy Propper (RO); Second row: Cynthia Benedict (Cibola); Rebecca Stoneman (Cibola); Cheryl Harper (Santa Fe); Sharynn Valdez (Coconino); Jim McKee (Prescott); Bob Schoutz (Gila). Third row: Bill Gillespie (Coronado); Heather Cooper (Coconino); Linda Martin (Apache-Sitgreaves); Calla McNamee (Kaibab); Patricia Corral (Carson); Jennifer Berke (Tonto); Skip Miller (Carson); Fourth row: Mike Elliott (Santa Fe); Bruce Bouchy (Coconino); William Barfuss (Santa Fe); Mary Parrell (Coronado); Mary Robertson (Lincoln); Rachel Anderson (Carson); Angela Crossley (Coconino); Denise Ryan (Tonto); Dave Johnson (Carson). Fifth row: Jeremy Kulisheck (sunglasses, Santa Fe); Peter Pilles (Coconino); Gail Firebaugh-Smith (Gila); Patrick Haynal (Kaibab); Kathy Makansi (Coronado); Lisa Schub (Santa Fe). Sixth row: Brent Abel (Santa Fe); Chris Jenkins (Santa Fe); Mike Bremer (Santa Fe); Melissa Schroeder (Kaibab); Travis Bone (Kaibab); John Hanson (Kaibab); and Scott Wood (Tonto).

Budget Formulation and Execution System (BFES). BFES did away with budget criteria and replaced them with overall constraints and budget “capability curves.” Outputs were to be measured with a series of “Activities,” including one for heritage: “Heritage Resources Managed to Standard.” Regional budget direction in the early 2000s, focused on implementing the national Heritage Strategy, sustaining Passport in Time projects, populating the Heritage Infrastructure module, assessing and reporting deferred maintenance costs (a new task), and completing heritage site and survey GIS layers. As this report goes to press, there is news that BFES, too, is on the way out, and that yet another new budget system is being adopted.

Postscript

The history of the Region 3 heritage program, according to Regional Archaeologist Judy Propper (personal communication, 2004), is a story filled with twists and turns and many detours along the way. It has been shaped in part by the convictions and colorful personalities of the players, in part by the richness of the region’s heritage resources, in part by external factors like legislation, politics, and the national economy, and in part by accidents of timing (good and bad) and opportunity (seized and lost).

Overall, it’s a success story. In spite of all the ups and downs, highpoints and
setbacks, the program has moved steadily forward in terms of stewardship of the region’s irreplaceable heritage resources, sharing that heritage with the American people, and contributing to the broader goals and work of Region 3 national forests. Looking back, each decade had its challenges and its triumphs, a wealth of past experiences that can spark new ideas and perspectives for those who will carry the program forward.

There are some aspects of the program in the 1970s, for example, that deserve a second look with 21st century eyes, like the emphasis on scientific contributions and bringing folks together to synthesize what we’ve learned. The 1980s produced some excellent ideas on planning, priority setting, and the benefits of having a clear management framework to guide our work. The 1990s saw real breakthroughs in terms of products (interpretation, stabilization, etc.) and in terms of relationships (with the public, with partners, with tribes, and within the Forest Service). Hopefully this brief volume will encourage us to explore, preserve and learn from our own past, just as we encourage the public to discover and value the nation’s past. This is our historic context. And new archeologists coming on board need to know that they are not operating alone or in a vacuum, but that there is a rich history out there of which they are about to become a part (loc. cit.).

Looking Toward the Future

Some thoughts by John Hanson, Kaibab

Operating on a small forest for more than 18 years, I’ve had the opportunity (necessity really) to find alternative and more efficient ways of doing the heritage resources job. And while it’s true that there have been many fiscal and policy ups and downs as the program has developed, it is also true that the work has gotten steadily more complex and challenging. I see no real change in direction in either regard in the foreseeable future. The next generation of R3 archaeologists will face many challenges that, cast in the right light, become opportunities waiting to be exploited. You will almost inevitably be asked to do more work with less money. How can you do that without endangering the resources you are charged with protecting? How can you work smarter and not harder? There are several avenues that I can envision.

1. The use of digital data (GPS and GIS) will, I believe, increase exponentially. Learn how to use this to your advantage and don’t be afraid to share what you know with others.

2. Make time to work and develop trusting and mutually beneficial relationships with your tribal neighbors, not because you have to consult them but because you will be enriched. They’ve been here longer and know more about some things (not just heritage) than you do. Listen to and learn from them. Teach them the things you know that they might not.

3. Increasing amounts of compliance and decreasing amounts of “heritage” work available to you? Devise ways to make the compliance work make a difference in the heritage arena. Here’s another place the digital data becomes WAY useful. You often hear archaeologists talking about “playing” with the data. Here’s a chance to actually do it and it can be just as easily accomplished within the compliance arena (maybe even more so) than through a strict “heritage program” focus.

Continued…
4. Use some of that anthropology you learned in school in the office setting. By doing so you can become a “culture broker” within the Forest Service and between the Forest Service and the various publics, including tribes, which we serve. Good job security, that.

5. Never close your mind to learning from all those other folks who don’t do heritage for a living. It might be the volunteers on a PIT project or a fire ecologist or a heavy equipment operator or a tribal member who has a different take on how to manage natural resources. The possibilities are nearly endless if you avail yourself of them and go into it with an open mind.

6. Most importantly have lots of fun doing the job. And get out of the office as often as you can. Consider that heritage folks get paid pretty decent money for WALKING AROUND THE WOODS LOOKING FOR STUFF. How bad can that be ultimately?
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Appendix A. Federal Archeology Program 
Authorizations, Regulations and Guidelines


Antiquities Act: P.L. 59-209 approved June 8, all were amended [52 FR 47721]; additional amendments to these Uniform Regulations were proposed in 1991 (56 FR 46259). The Department of the Interior also has Supplemental Regulations to 43 CFR 7(7) [52 FR 9165: 1987] in response to ARPA Section 10(b).


Department of Transportation Act of 1976, 49 USC 1653(f), generally known as §4(f); codified at 49 USC 303 (1982).


36 CFR 60: National Register of Historic Places (48 FR 46306). NPS’s National Register of Historic Places regulations that include (Section 60.4) criteria for evaluating a property’s eligibility for the National Register: “significance” criteria. These criteria are not involved in ARPA protection of archeological resources, which themselves may or may not be Register-eligible.


36 CFR 79: Curation of Federally-Owned and Administered Archeological Collections (55 FR 37616). This rule, written by the National Park Service (NPS), Department of the Interior, was issued under the authority of Section 101(a)(7)(A) of the National Historic
Preservation Act and Section 5 of the Archaeological Resources Protection Act.

Secretary of the Interior Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation (48 FR 44716).

Guidelines for Federal Agency Responsibilities, Under Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act (53 FR 4727).


43 CFR 10: Native American Graves Protection Act Regulations

Appendix B. Permit for Examination, Excavation, and Gathering of Objects of Antiquity

Permit for Examination, Excavation, and Gathering of Objects of Antiquity.

In accordance with the Act for the Preservation of American Antiquities (Act of June 6, 1906), and the uniform rules and regulations thereunder approved December 28, 1906, permission is hereby given to the American Museum of Natural History, New York, New York, to examine, excavate and collect objects of antiquity from the ruin of Kotyiti within the Jemez National Forest, New Mexico. Said work to be done under the supervision of Dr. Clark Wissler, Curator; all objects gathered under this permit are to be deposited in the Museum of the American Museum of Natural History.

This permit shall be for a period of two years from date hereof unless sooner terminated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Given at Washington, D. C., this 8th day of August, 1912.

[Signature]
Secretary of Agriculture.

Flagging the Trail: One Hundred Years of Managing Cultural Resources
Appendix C. Forest Service Archeological Site Inventory Form (1969)

This reproduction of an archeological site form completed by Ranger Brunner must be one of the very first in Region 3 to use the new form, R-3 2300-2, approved 10-68. It shows, for one thing, use of the site numbering system that is still in use. The components of the site designation are as follows: “AR” simply means “archeological,” then the numbers, in order, are for Region 3, Forest 3 (Cibola), Ranger District 3 (Magdalena), and the sequence of recording. Therefore, this is the first site recorded on the Cibola’s Magdalena Ranger District.

USDA FOREST SERVICE
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>AR 03-03-03-01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Type of Site: Ruin

Forest: Cibola
Ranger District: Magdalena
State & County: Socorro
New Mexico

Cultural affiliation, if known: unknown

Other site designations: Gallinas Ruins

Map Reference: A Quadrangle 271

Location data:
Gallinas Canyon, approximately ¼ mile NE of the Council Rock Road.

Legal Description: E1/4 SE1/4 Sec. 27, T11S, R4W

Area of occupation: 8 acres

Site description, position, and surrounding terrain:
The site is on a bench on the south side of the Gallinas Canyon, and also on a hillside on the north side of Gallinas Canyon. There are crumbled mounds which are the remnants of the walls and roofs of dwellings. On the south bank, cut by Gallinas Canyon, there are exposed walls of rock and adobe. A few of the dwellings have been excavated, showing walls. There are one or two depressions which might have been Kivas. Scattered over the area are pottery shards, charcoal, and pieces of bones.

Present condition: Fair
Being eroded by Gallinas Creek, and pilfered by pot hunters.

Material observed: Shards of black and white, plain, corrugated and red pottery.

Depth and character of fill: Estimate 3 feet, mostly of crumbled walls and roofs.

Ceramic types:

Informants, if any:
Dr. Peckham, Museum of New Mexico

Recorded by:
District Ranger

Date: 12/31/69

R-3 2300-2 (10-68)
Appendix D. Publications Produced by the R-3 Heritage Program Since 1974

Old Report Series

The titles in this first group comprise the listing of cultural resources reports published between 1974 and 1979. They were the Southwestern Region’s first sally into publication of scientific papers in this field. These papers did not have peer review and were published in very limited press runs. At the time, no other region of the Forest Service had a publication program for cultural resources papers. They are presented here, in the order of publication. Note that the series title changes from “Archeological Reports” to “Cultural Resources Reports” after number 18. Numbers of the series continued unbroken despite the name change.


Cultural Resources Documents Series

This series was short-lived, published only in 1983. Dee Green edited the series and he intended to make available the results of minor excavations and symposiums.


Overview Series

The following titles were published to share information gathered for the planning process:

Cordell, Linda S. 1979. Cultural Resources Overview: Middle Rio Grande Valley, New Mexico

Berman, Mary Jane. 1979. Cultural Resources Overview: Socorro Area, New Mexico


Plog, Fred. 1981. Cultural Resources Overview: Little Colorado Area, Arizona

Tainter, Joseph A. and Frances Levine. 1987. Cultural Resources Overview: Central New Mexico
Non-Serial Overviews

These are similar to all other overviews but they were published jointly with another agency or unit.


Other Non-Serial Publications

Titles in this list reflect changing opportunities or contain subjects that diverged from the usual content of the established series.


Adams, Christopher, et al. 2000a. Last Chance Canyon 1869 Apache/Cavalry Battle Site: Lincoln National Forest, New Mexico. Published by the Lincoln National Forest, Alamogordo, NM.

2000b. Dark Canyon Rancheria Apache/Military Battle Site: Lincoln National Forest, New Mexico. Published by the Lincoln National Forest, Alamogordo, NM.

Anon. 1996. Cultural Affiliations: Prehistoric Cultural Affiliations of Southwestern Indian Tribes. Also available from NTIS: number PB 96-169008.
Titles in the New Cultural Resources Reports Series

In 1981 the format of the Southwestern Region's publications was changed to take advantage of newly available technology. The resulting publications were referred to as the "New Series" and numbering resumed with number 1.


Cordell, Linda S. and Dee F. Green (editors). 1984. Stage 1 Site Locational Modeling in the Southwestern Region, Report No. 5 (Two Papers):


2. Theory and Model Building: Refining Survey Strategies for Locating Prehistoric Heritage Resources.


Glover, Vernon J. 1989. Jemez Mountain Railroads, Santa Fe National Forest, Report No. 9. The Forest Service railroad books (Reports 4, 6 and 9) were also sold in a reprint edition by the New Mexico Historical Society.


### CULTURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT ACCOMPLISHMENT REPORT

**Region 3; FY 1983**

#### PART I - DATA BY ACTIVITY TYPES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>CRM</th>
<th>Furn.</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Meets</th>
<th>Permits</th>
<th>Freelance</th>
<th>Worksites</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>$H</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Non-Cy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey/Scanned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,655</td>
<td>10,804</td>
<td>2,854</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>2,198</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Survey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>89,438</td>
<td>13,654</td>
<td>2,712</td>
<td>1,551</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey with Cultural Resource Areas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Cultural Resource Located</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Costs</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(HALF OF THE REGION 3 FOREST DO NOT SEPARATE COSTS, SO ONLY TOTAL IS GIVEN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>288,284</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cultural</em></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resource Consultation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,244</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,216</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resource Engineer</td>
<td>3,093</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Costs</td>
<td>3,482</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,470</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,534</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project A - No Effect</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project B - No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resource - No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resource A - Adverse Effect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resource A - Adverse Effect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Recovery Project</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources with Data Recovered</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Recovery Costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resource Documentation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation Costs</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PART III - SUMMARY OF PART I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Projects FY 83</th>
<th>Current FY</th>
<th>Total FY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Acme Surveyed</td>
<td>NPR</td>
<td>48,659</td>
<td>938,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Efficienct</td>
<td>NPR</td>
<td>1,929</td>
<td>1,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CIRR</td>
<td>NPR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sites</td>
<td>NPR</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>7,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CIRR Evaluated</td>
<td>NPR</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Oil Exports</td>
<td>NPR</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Church Uses</td>
<td>NPR</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Oil Extracted</td>
<td>NPR</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Quasi-Radiomet</td>
<td>NPR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Geophysical</td>
<td>NPR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. National Monume</td>
<td>NPR</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Objects Exempted</td>
<td>NPR</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. CIRR Permit</td>
<td>NPR</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Churches</td>
<td>NPR</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Churches Completed</td>
<td>NPR</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Churches Updated</td>
<td>NPR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PART IV - COST RANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Range</th>
<th>CRM</th>
<th>Furn.</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Meets</th>
<th>Permits</th>
<th>Freelance</th>
<th>Worksites</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>$H</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Non-Cy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. &lt; $1M</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. $1M-$2M</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. $2M-$4M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. $4M-$6M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. $6M-$8M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. &gt; $8M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Line 1 asks for "survey", but lines 11, 13, and 15 deal with "Projects." There are more projects than surveys so totals do not match line 1.

Column N lists only work which does not fit definitions of columns B through I.
Apendix F. Undertakings in Region 3 — Section 106 Compliance, FYs 1990-1995

This graph shows the decline in the number of individual undertakings in the region related to reductions in the timber sale program and the shift to landscape-scale analyses that included multiple projects under one umbrella.
### Appendix G. Heritage Program
#### Accomplishments in the 1990s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Properties</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverse Effect</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Undertakings</td>
<td>1,752</td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>1,451</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>923</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Sites Invented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites Evaluated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites Eligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites Noneligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites Stabilized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites Inspected/Protected (S. 110)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation/Outreach Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIT Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIT Volunteer Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Volunteer Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Flagging the Trail: One Hundred Years of Managing Cultural Resources
Appendix H. FY 1997 Heritage Program Accomplishment Highlights

National Register Nominations
Rock Shelter Sites of the West Escarpment of the Sacramento Mountains (Lincoln)

Stabilization
A total of 31 sites stabilized. Examples include:
- Wingate Sheep Lab (Cibola)
- Bancos Site (Carson)
- AR 03-03-02-1378 (re-channeling arroyo) (Cibola)
- Navajo Logging Camp (Coconino)
- Van Deren Cabin (Coconino)
- Kentucky Camp (Coronado)
- Gila Cliff Dwellings (stabilization, ladder replacement) (Gila)
- Bear Wallow and Hillsboro Lookouts Rehabilitation (Gila)
- Jumpup Cabin (Kaibab)
- Sitting Bull Falls CCC Structures Rehabilitation (Lincoln)
- Monjeau Lookout Repairs (Lincoln)
- Brown Springs Ruin (Prescott)
- Row Mesa Rock Art Stabilization (Santa Fe)
- Old Caves Pueblo Cleanup (Coconino)

Protection
Over 500 sites were inspected and documented, unrelated to Section 106 compliance. There were 17 law enforcement investigations of ARPA and related violations.

Enhancement
Approximately 526 interpretive, educational, and volunteer projects were completed to expand opportunities for the public to visit, enjoy and learn about the sites, history, and prehistory of Region 3 national forests. Total volunteer contribution: 61,855 hours. Interpretive project examples follow.
- Sears Kay Ruin Interpretive Site (Tonto)
- Fish Creek Hill (Apache Trail) (Tonto)
- Historic Aspen Carvings Exhibit at Ghost Ranch Living Museum (Carson)
- “Experience Archaeology at Elden Pueblo” brochure (Coconino)
- “Marks of the Ancestors” video, with Museum of Northern Arizona (COD)
- Hunting Magic Exhibit, Chalender District Office (Kaibab)
- Photo Exhibit at Flickinger Center (Lincoln)
- Salt Mine Exhibit (Prescott)
- “Who’s Minding the Past” video (partnership) (Santa Fe)
- Jemez Obsidian Poster (Santa Fe)
- “Moments in Time” brochure (RO)

Public Outreach Examples
- Elden Pueblo (school programs, public archaeology days, teachers’ workshop) (Coconino)
- Gila Bird and Nature Festival Site Tours (Gila)
- Tijeras Pueblo (tours, school programs, evening programs) (Cibola)
- Santa Fe Trail Celebration (Cibola)
- Lakeside Ranger District Interpretive Tours (Apache-Sitgreaves)
- Romero Ruin Tours (Coronado)
- Lynx Creek Ruin Tour (Prescott)
- Shoofly Village Open House (Tonto)
- Flagstaff Festival of Science Exhibit (Kaibab)
- Cultural Heritage Day, Cloudcroft (Lincoln)
- Exhibits and demonstrations for Arizona Archaeology EXPO and NM Archaeology Fair
- Numerous tours and talks for Heritage Preservation Week and Arizona Archaeology Month
Passport in Time Projects

- Silver Creek Archaeological Project (Apache-Sitgreaves)
- Great Kivas on the Mogollon Rim (Apache-Sitgreaves)
- The Rock Art of Roundy Crossing (Apache-Sitgreaves)
- El Rito Historic Period Sites Documentation (Carson)
- Pot Creek Cultural Site (Carson)
- In Search of the Archaic, Rock Art Recording and Mills Canyon (Cibola)
- Preservation Maintenance of the Wingate Sheep Lab (Cibola)
- Caretaking Kentucky Camp (Coronado)
- Restoring Kentucky Camp (Coronado)
- Cameron Creek and Ft. Bayard Survey (Gila)
- Rain Tank Rock Art Recording (Kaibab)
- Last Chance Canyon Rockshelter Testing and Stabilization (Lincoln)
- Glorieta Mesa Rock Art Survey and Stabilization (Santa Fe)
- Flying V Ranch Archaeological Survey (Tonto)
- Pinal Townsite Mapping (Tonto)

Other Volunteer Project/Program Examples

- Pot Creek Cultural Site Elderhostel Projects (Carson)
- Philmont Scouts Maintenance of Ring Ranch (Carson)
- Sierra Club, Honanki Rock Art Recording (Coconino)
- American Ranch Ruin Site Complex Documentation and Evaluation (Tonto)
- Artifact Analysis for Sites in the Groom Creek Area (Prescott)
- Sierra Club Rattlesnake Ridge Stabilization (Santa Fe)
- Little Spring Rock Art Recording (Kaibab)
- Inspection of Sites Identified on Old USGS Maps as “Ruins” (Tonto)
- Deadman’s Wash Rock Art Recording, Arizona Archaeological Society (Coconino)
- Friends of Kentucky Camp Work Days (Coronado)
- Arizona Site Stewards Site Monitoring Trip to Snake Gulch (Kaibab)

Research

Over 20 research projects of various types were conducted, including partnership projects with universities, independent research projects, and research conducted by Rocky Mountain Station’s Heritage Resources Research Work Unit. Examples include:

- Silver Creek Archaeological Project, University of Arizona (Cibola)
- Wild Horse Mesa Archaeological Project, University of Texas-El Paso (Santa Fe)
- Verde Valley Prehistoric Fields Pollen Sampling (Coconino)
- McCollaum’s Pit Paleoenvironmental Project (Lincoln)
- Mammoth Site Investigations (Lincoln)
- Kotyiti Assessment, University of Pennsylvania (Santa Fe)
- Rio del Oso Prehistoric Cultural Landscapes, Rocky Mountain Station (Santa Fe)
- Glorieta Mesa Photogrammetric Project, Earth Views (Santa Fe)
- Hatalacva Dating Project, Archaeological Conservancy/Arizona Archaeological Society (Coconino)
- Upper Basin Archaeological Project, University of Cincinnati (Kaibab)
- Research in Site AR 03-0702-223, Museum of Northern Arizona (Kaibab)

Apendix I. Heritage Consideration
Checklist for Allotment Management Plans

Heritage Considerations in NEPA
Analysis for Grazing Authorizations

Assure consultation with Indian tribes:

- Early consultation to identify concerns
  (government-to-government).

- Assure that tribes are included in scoping
  letters as well as mailing lists to receive
  information, meeting notices, draft EAs, etc.
  (regardless of whether or not tribes respond
  initially).

Identify any specific heritage issues and
concerns in NEPA scoping.

Consider heritage resources as appropriate in
formulation of alternatives.

Address impacts on heritage resources in
analysis of alternatives:
- Likely impacts of grazing in general,
  compared to current situation.
- Impact on specific heritage sites, if any such
  impacts were identified.
- Impacts of proposed on-the-ground facilities
  on heritage sites.

Address any needed mitigation measures
(fencing, monitoring, etc.)

Document compliance with Section 106 of
NHPA.

Assure that NHPA compliance documentation is
incorporated into project record:
- Clearance report and completed IS&A form
documenting appropriate SHPO
  consultation.
- Documentation of consultation with tribes.

Compliance with
National Historic Preservation Act

Tribal Consultation

Assure that Indian tribes are consulted early in
the Section 106 process.

Followup to provide tribes a reasonable
opportunity to identify heritage concerns and
traditional cultural properties if present in the
area of potential effects.

Records Review and
Review of Proposed Action

Review existing inventory information to
identify:
- Sensitive sites where impacts due to grazing
  have been documented.
- Sensitive sites include ruins with free-standing walls, historic structures, rock
  art sites, and rock shelters.
- Any other sites or areas of special concern
  as identified by the forest or district
  archaeologist based on available
  information.

Review Proposed Action to determine if it
involves:
- Shift to a more intensive grazing system, e.g.
  holistic resource management or high
  intensity/short duration grazing
  management, where concentration of
  livestock in small areas with high stock
densities could cause a significant increase
in surface disturbance above previous
levels; or
- Introduction of grazing into previously
  ungrazed areas.

Identify proposed on-the-ground facilities
(fences, water developments, etc.) to be
authorized by the NEPA decision.
Field Work (may or may not be needed)

Field checks of any sensitive sites where grazing impacts were documented.

Field checks of other sites or areas if any concerns were identified by the forest or district archaeologist.

Inventory as appropriate of any areas where cattle will be concentrated under a high intensity grazing system or any new areas where grazing will be introduced.

Inventory of proposed on-the-ground facilities to be authorized by the NEPA decision (may or may not require survey per programmatic agreement).

Potential Impacts:

Grazing Impacts
- Existing site impacts, if identified (from site forms, discussions with district personnel).
- Results of followup inspections/field checks if any.
- Impacts of shift to a more intensive grazing system (inventory results, if this applies).
- Impacts of introducing grazing to new areas (inventory results, if this applies).

Impacts of Proposed On-the-Ground Facilities to be Authorized by Decision
- Inventory results (either report here or refer to other reports if clearances have already been completed).
- Statement that future improvements will be subject to Section 106 prior to decision, in accordance with Regional PA.

Recommendations:
- Determination of eligibility, if applicable.
- Determination of effect.
- Conditions of clearance—could involve fencing, monitoring, etc., of specific sites if impacts identified.

Inventory Standards and Accounting (IS&A) Form:

IS&A form documenting consultation with SHPO in accordance with Regional PA.
Appendix J. Partial List of Region 3 Heritage Specialists, 1966-2004

This list was compiled based on surviving records and the memories of current Region 3 heritage specialists, and does not represent a complete listing. Hopefully the list contains most of the permanent heritage specialists and the temporary/seasonal specialists who worked a year or more on national forests in Region 3. Earlier dates (1970s and 1980s) should be considered approximate.

Apache-Sitgreaves NFs

Forest Archaeologists
Bruce Donaldson (1977-1994)
Linda (Kelley) Martin (1994-2002)
Charlotte Hunter (2003-Present)

Assistant Forest Archeologists
Marty Tagg (1986-1988)

District, Zone, and SO Archeologists
Sandra (Leschin Boone) Schlesinger, Springerville Zone (1989-1998)
Bruce Donaldson, Lakeside Zone (1994-Present)
Gerald Bair, Springerville Zone (1999)
Jeremy Haines, Black Mesa Zone (2002-Present)
Brian Kenny, SO (1984-1985)
Kay Read, SO (Historian) (1990-1993)
Kathy Pitts, SO (Historian) (1995-1997)
David Mehallic, SO (2001-Present)

Carson National Forest

Forest Archaeologists
Jon Young (1983-1999)
David M. Johnson (1999-Present)

Assistant Forest Archaeologists
Bob Lawrence (1984-1992)
Bill Westbury (1999-Present)

District, Zone, and SO Archeologists
Patricia Corral, Camino Real District (1988-Present)
Mary Ann Elder, Tres Piedras District (1988-1999)
Bill Westbury, SO, Canjilon District (1989-1999)
Maria Garcia, El Rito District (1989-1992)
Bob Lawrence, El Rito District/Zone (1992-Present)
Anne Baldwin, Ghost Ranch (1992-1999)
Carrie Leven, Questa Zone (1993-Present)
Joe Farrugia, Tres Piedres Zone (2001)
Michael Kyte, Tres Piedres Zone (2002-Present)
Skip Miller, SO Fire (2001-2004)
Rachel Miller, Jicarilla District (2002-Present)
Mark Henderson, SO (1977)
David Abbott, SO (1979)
Jon Young, SO (1980-1983)
Eric Kleinschmidt, SO (1984-1986)
Cheryl Muceus, SO (1985-1989)
Del Dubois, SO (1988-1990)
Alfred Hobbs, SO (1989-1990)
Christine Ponco, Camino Real (1992-1993)
Marilyn Jesmain, Tres Piedres, SO (2002-present)
and many more who worked less than a year...
Cibola National Forest

Forest Archeologists
Emily Garber (Acting 1985-1989)
Tom Cartledge (1995-2001)
Cynthia Benedict (2001-Present)

Assistant Forest Archeologists
Emily Garber (1978-1983)
Lou Redmond (1989-1992)
Cynthia Benedict (1992-2001)
Cliff Nicoll (2001-Present)

District, Zone, and SO Archeologists
Linda Popelish, Mt. Taylor District (1987-Present)
Cliff Nicoll, Magdalena District (1991-2001)
Rebecca Stoneman, Mountainair District (2001-Present)
Rick Robinson, Magdalena District (2002-Present)
Emily Garber, SO (1989-1990)
Harding Polk, SO (1993-1995)
Aleta Lawrence, Mountainair (1996-1997)
Kelly Collman, Magdalena (1996-1997)
Bill Fortini, Mountainair (1999-2000)

Coconino National Forest

Forest Archaeologist
Peter Pilles (1975-Present)

Assistant Forest Archaeologist
Linda Farnsworth (1989-1993)

District, Zone, and SO Archeologists
Richard Boston, Sedona Zone (1995-2001)
Sharynn-Marie Blood, Sedona Zone (2001-Present)
Marietta Davenport, Sedona/Mormon Lake Zone (1992-1997)
Linda Farnsworth, Peaks District/Zone (1993-2001)
Lisa Hanson, Long Valley/Blue Ridge Zone (1993-1994)
Kristen Martine, Mogollon Rim District (2002-Present)
Heather Cooper-Provencio, Peaks Zone (2002-Present)
Anne R. Baldwin, SO (1979-1992)
Chris Barrett, SO (2002-Present)
Christine Beard, SO (1988-1993)
J. Michael Bremer, SO (1980-1992)
Phillip Condrey, SO (1976-1978)
Howard Cyr, SO/Peaks (1999-2003)
Angela Crossley, Peaks (1996-Present)
David Dechambre, SO (1976-1977)
Jerry DeYoung, SO (1992-1993)
Linda Farnsworth, SO (1977-1989)
Fred Frampton, SO (1977-1978)
Peggy Gaudy, SO (1977-1978)
David Gifford, Peaks (2003-Present)
Kathleen Gratz, SO (1977-1980)
Laura Heacock, SO (1984-1988)
Mark Hovezak, SO (1987-1988)
David Kuehn, SO (1976-1978)
Larry Lesko, SO (1972-1985)
Michael Lyndon, Peaks (2003-Present)
Allen Madril, Peaks (1996-1999)
Edward Maloney, Peaks (2000-2001)
Bruce Nellans, SO (1990-1993)
Thomas Parry, SO (1976-1978)
Rene Pepoy, SO (1976-1979)
Paige Pheifer, SO (1997-2001)
Judith Schwartz, SO (1984-1985)
Pat H. Stein, SO (1980-1987)
Chris Stevenson, SO (1984-1985)
Gregory Welden, SO (1976-1977)

Coronado National Forest

Forest Archaeologists
Don Wood (1975-1984)
Pat Spoerl (1984-1991)
Jim McDonald (1991-1999)
Mary Farrell (1999-Present)

Assistant Forest Archeologists
Mary Farrell (1986-1999)
Bill Gillespie (1999-Present)

District, Zone, and SO Archeologists
Bill Gillespie, Sierra Vista Zone (1989-1999)
Cynthia Benedict, SO (1985-1987)
Deni Seymour, SO (1990-1991)
Nicole Branton, SO (1999-2001)
Cathy Cameron, SO (1987-1989)
Kathy Makansi, SO (1990-Present)
Pete Taylor, SO (1999-Present)
Chris LeBlanc, SO (2001-Present)
Chris Schrager, SO (1987-Present)

Gila National Forest

Forest Archaeologists
Joe Janes (1966-1983)
Bob Schiowitz (1984-1996)
Gail Firebaugh-Smith (1998-Present)

Assistant Forest Archeologists
Linda Kelley (1988-1992)

District, Zone, and SO Archeologists
Richard Newton, Reserve District, Zone (1985-1991)
Tom Hensiak, Silver City, Glenwood District (1993-2001)
Bruce Ellis, Glenwood, Reserve District/Zone (1989-1995)
Bob Schiowitz, Silver City, Zone (1996-Present)
Cathy Dodt-Ellis, Luna, District (1989-1995)
Gloria Curry, Luna/Quemado District (1995-2001)
Joe Garrotto, Reserve, Zone (2001-Present)
Carol Telles, Black Range, Zone (2003-Present)
Kathleen Weidner, SO (1993)
Kristen Martine, Reserve (1996-1997)

Kaibab National Forest

Forest Archaeologists
Tom Cartledge (1976-1986)
John Hanson (1986-Present)
**Assistant Forest Archeologists**

John Autrey (1984-1987)
Teri Cleeland (1987-1992)
Larry Lesko (1992-2001)
Melissa Schroeder (2001-Present)

**District, Zone, and SO Archeologists**

Bob Schiowitz, North Kaibab District (1980-1984)
Neil Weintraub, SO (1990-1998); Williams/Chalender Zone (1998-Present)
Connie Reid, North Kaibab Zone (1997-Present)
Lisa Hanson, Tusayan District (1994-1996)
Jeanna Stephenson, SO (1980)
Kate McCraley, SO (1980-1983)
Helen Fairley, SO (1980), North Kaibab (1988)
Larry Lesko, SO (1986-1992)
Dan Sorrell, SO (1991-1996); Williams, (2000-Present)
Jonathon Till (1990-1992)
Hugh Robinson, Williams (1998-2000)
Dave Gifford, Williams (1998-1999)
Travis Bone, Williams, (2000-2002)
Calla MacNamee, Williams, (2000-Present)
Russ Snyder, North Kaibab (2002-Present)
Britt Hansen, North Kaibab (2002-Present)
Brian Culpeper, Tusayan (1997-1998)

**Lincoln National Forest**

**Forest Archeologists**

Joe Tainter (1976-1978) 50% Cibola and 50% Lincoln
Patricia Spoerl (1978-1984)
David M. Johnson (1984-1999)
Richard Newton (2000-Present)

**Assistant Forest Archeologists**

Howard Higgins (1986-1987)
Tommy Fulgham (1987-1988)
Marty Tagg (1988-1992)
Mike Baskerville (1996-1997)
Diane White (1995-2001)
Eric Dillingham (2002-Present)

**District, Zone, and SO Archeologists**

Kathy Reno, SO (1987)
Summer McKean, SO (1987-1990)
Lori Reed, SO (1987-1988)
Gail Bockley, SO (1988)
Jill Mayo, SO (1990-1991)
Lori Hawthorne, SO (1990-1991)
Rita Moots, SO (1992)
Christy Comer, SO (1991-1992)
Jean Fulton, SO (1993-1994)
Erica Young, SO (1993)
Sue Ruth, SO (1993)
Diane White, SO (1994-1995)
Mike Baskerville, Guadalupe (1994-1995)
Robert Abbott, SO (1994)
Jeff Fleisher, SO (1994)
Chris Adams, SO (1995-Present)
Erin Driskell, SO (1996)
Bill Crawford, SO (1997-1999)
Kim Lovett, SO (1997)
Erin Schiritzinger, SO (1998)
Rita Gentry, SO (1998)
Robert Fiske, SO (1998)
Brian Shanks, SO (1999-2000)
Mary Robertson, SO (2001-Present)
Ryan Powell, SO (2001-Present)
Hila Nelson, SO (2001-Present)
Shannon Gray, SO (2001)
Angie Whifield, SO (2001)
Esther Stuedli, SO (2001)
Aaron Hockman, SO (2002)
Amy Pommill, SO (2002)
Craig Williams, SO (2002-2003)
Meg Underwood, SO (2003)
Jennifer Thomas, SO (2003)
Also, many seasonals and temps who worked one season only.

Prescott National Forest

Forest Archeologists
Jim McKie (1986-Present)

District, Zone, and SO Archeologists
Denise Ryan, Chino Valley District (1988-1993)
Elaine Zamora, Chino Valley District (1993-Present)

Paige Phifer, SO (1994-2001)
Bruce Nellans, SO (2003-Present)

Santa Fe National Forest

Forest Archeologists
Landon Smith (1978-1985)
Mike Elliott, Acting (1985-1986)
Tommy Fuigham, Acting (1986)
Tom Cartledge (1986-1995)
Mike Bremer (1995-Present)

Assistant Forest Archeologists
Tommy Fulgham (1986-1987)
Sue Eininger (1988-1989)
Tom Baker (1996-1997)
Tom Schley (1997-1999)
Mike Elliott (2001-2003)
Melissa Powell (2003-Present)

District, Zone, and SO Archeologists
Mike Elliott, SO (1981-1985)
Tommy Fulgham, Cuba (1985-1986)
Bill Whatley, Cuba (1985-1988)
Brent Able, Pecos-Las Vegas District/Resource Area (1988-Present)
Dave Legare, Coyote District (1988-1993)
Carol Raish, Jemez District (1988-1994)
Janet Weeth, SO (1988-1990)
Bill Wyatt, Cuba District (1990-1996)
Mike Bremer, Espanola District (1992-1995)
Bill Fortini, Cuba District (1996-1999)
Rita (Moots) Skinner, Jemez/Cuba District/
Kristen Martine, Espanola (1997-2001)
Anne Baldwin, Coyote/Espanola Resource Area (2000-Present)
James Gachupin, Jemez (1989-Present)
Jeremy Kulishek, Pecos/Las Vegas (2002-Present)
Julia Dougherty, SO (1979-1980)
Brad Vierra, Zone (1980)
David Eck, Zone (1981)
Cheryl Muceus, Zone (1982-1984)
Bob Lawrence, Zone (1982-1984)
Ana Steffen, Jemez/Valles Caldera National Preserve (1994-Present)
William Barfuss, Pecos/Las Vegas (1997-Present)
Chris Jenkins, Jemez (2001-2003)
Rita Gentry, Pecos/Las Vegas (2002-Present)
Jennifer Boyd, Jemez (2003-Present)

Tonto National Forest

Forest Archaeologists
Martin McAllister (1974-1985)
Scott Wood (1985-Present)

Assistant Forest Archeologists
Scott Wood (1975-1985)
Michael Sullivan (1989-Present)

District, Zone, and SO Archeologists
David Abbott, SO (1976-1978)
Joel Johnstone, SO (1976-1980)
Lynn Rogler, SO (1976-1979)
Tim Sexton, SO (1976)
Rex Tjaden, SO (1977-1978)
Dorothy Goddard, SO (1977-1981)

Robert Buitron, SO (1977-1979)
Roberta Jewett, SO (1977-1978)
Michael Keller, SO (1980)
Shari Southard, SO (1980)
Linda (Hohman) Kelley, SO (1986-1988)
Noreen Fritz, SO (1989)
Esther Morgan, SO, Payson District (1990-1999)
Denise Ryan, SO, Payson District (1993-Present)
Travis Bone, SO (2002-Present)
Jennifer Berke SO, Ethnohistorian (2002-Present)

Regional Office

Regional Archeologists
Carl Johnson (1967-1972)
Dee F. Green (1973-1985)
Judith Propper (1985-Present)

Assistant/Associate Regional Archeologists
Landon Smith (1975-1978)
Joe Tainter, Special Projects, Detail (1985-1989)

Cultural Resource Assistants
Polly Davis, Cultural Resource Assistant (1977-1982)
Clarice Sanchez, Cultural Resource Assistant (1985-1989)
Angela Sandoval, Cultural Resource Assistant (1989-1996)
Ellena Gallegos Project

Albuquerque Sector
(Forest Service)

Project Directors: Dee Green, Joe Tainter
Field Supervisors: Joe Tainter, Charles Haecker

Farmington Sector
(Forest Service, Museum of Northern Arizona)

Project Directors: Dee Green, Joe Tainter
Field Supervisors: Peter Pilles, Fred Plog, Steven Dosh, Cheryl Taylor, Don Keller, Michael Elliott, Charles Haecker, Carol Raish, James Rancier
Field Crew: Richard Newton, Belinda McFerrin, Katherine Miles, Showell Osborne, Mark Sale, Trace Stuart, Skip Willes, Jenny Miller, Dotty Spaulding, Karen Doerr, Ricardo Unwin, David Millinan, Mike Miklochik, James Marrone, John Day, Robert Lawrence, Cheryl Muceus, David Staley, Bert Starr, Robert Dickerson, Pete Fieweger, Peter Morse, Wayne Oakes, Keith Oshins, David Hutchinson, Stephen Fischer, Bruce Freyburger, Richard Sullivan, Sandra Marshall, Steven Street, and Louanna Haecker.

Laboratory Analysis and Reports


Las Cruces Sector
(Forest Service, Museum of Northern Arizona, New Mexico State University, Batcho & Kauffman Associates)

Project Directors: Dee Green, Fred Plog
Field Supervisors: Martin McAllister, Fred Plog
Field Crew: (no information available in the Regional Office)

Cultural Heritage Resources Research Work Unit (Rocky Mountain Station)

Joe Tainter, Project Leader
Carol Raish, Research Scientist
Richard Periman, Research Scientist