



Heritage Management in the U.S. Forest Service: A Mount Hood National Forest Case Study

GRACE A. WANG

School of Forest Resources
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania, USA

DOROTHY H. ANDERSON

Department of Forest Resources
University of Minnesota
St. Paul, Minnesota, USA

PAMELA J. JAKES

USDA Forest Service
North Central Forest Experiment Station
St. Paul, Minnesota, USA

Simultaneous to the advent of ecosystem management in the United States, heritage management has occurred. Heritage resources are broadly defined as those resources that describe the past. Within the U.S. Forest Service, heritage management includes using knowledge and skills from diverse cultures in resource decision making. A case study from the Mount Hood National Forest in Oregon is presented. The case study illustrates an integration of ecosystem management and heritage management, especially in regard to American Indians. Four fundamental principles of ecosystem management to guide the heritage management process are using an ecological perspective, forming partnerships, promoting grass-roots participation, and using scientific knowledge.

Keywords ecosystem management, heritage management, U.S. Forest Service, Warm Springs Indians

Prior literature has addressed the role of cultural resource management (CRM) within the U.S. Forest Service (Wang et al. 1996). With the agency's movement toward ecosystem management, subsequent changes in CRM have ensued. The Forest Service manages over 191 million acres of federal land. These lands include both natural and cultural resources. For many years, the Forest Service's CRM program focused on artifact collection and preservation. As the agency moved to an ecosystem-based management paradigm in recent years, it recognized the need to

Received 30 May 2000; accepted 21 March 2001.

Address correspondence to Grace A. Wang, Assistant Professor of Natural Resource Policy, School of Forest Resources, Pennsylvania State University, 208 Ferguson Building, University Park, PA 16802, USA. E-mail: gaw5@psu.edu

move beyond artifact management to include knowledge and skills from diverse cultures in resource decision making. The Forest Service calls this approach *heritage resource management*, or simply *heritage management*. Heritage resources are broadly defined as those resources that describe the past. Presently, the Forest Service is grappling with ways in which heritage management might best fit within the ecosystem management paradigm, which in part directs the Forest Service to include humans as a part of the ecosystem, rather than apart from it. This article explores the intersection of ecosystem management and heritage management using a case study from the Mount Hood National Forest in Oregon.

The Forest Service considers heritage management as part of a larger issue concerned with the human dimensions of ecosystem management. The Forest Service has a responsibility to manage the public lands using an ecosystem management toolbox. Human dimensions–related research seeks to understand human demands on, values and perceptions of, and interactions with ecosystems. This understanding must then be integrated into policy, programs, and management. Heritage resources serve as a medium for improving our understanding of the role of natural resources in human society, as they are often the focus of religious, spiritual, and aesthetic values. An additional focus of the human dimension is that increased knowledge about heritage resources can facilitate communication and public participation between public agencies and traditional user groups. Examining the human dimensions of ecosystem management puts social and cultural values on par with biophysical resources.

The primary focus of this article is to describe how heritage management can be linked to ecosystem management. Specifically, the Sherar Burn area of the Mount Hood National Forest is addressed within its heritage and ecosystem management contexts. The outcome of this article is a set of recommendations that should be useful to the Forest Service as it tries to implement heritage management service-wide.

Managers at the Mount Hood National Forest face several questions with respect to developing and implementing plans for management of the Sherar Burn area. Fundamental to their planning and management of the area are concerns about the amount and type of information they need regarding past uses, the kinds of landscape changes resulting from past uses, and the appropriate rules, regulations, legislation, and/or mechanisms to use in deciding about future uses.

The Sherar Burn area is located in the Salmon–Huckleberry Wilderness Area of the Mount Hood National Forest. The Sherar Burn area encompasses approximately 5120 acres, although to this date, boundaries have yet to be officially established. Much of the Sherar Burn is on a southerly slope, ranging between 3200 and 4400 feet in elevation. The Sherar Burn has a rich human history; it is believed that landscape patterns evident today are a direct result of past human use and management of the area's natural attributes. The area has long been recognized as one of the "usual and accustomed areas"¹ for members of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation, and is subject to certain treaty rights.

Forest Service Legislative Basis and Direction

The Forest Service, an agency within the Department of Agriculture, is vested with authority and responsibility for managing the multiple natural resources of our national forests. The Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act of 1960 lists these resources as "outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, wildlife and fisheries." The agency

is also vested with authority and responsibility to manage cultural resources. Several federal statutes provide for the management of significant cultural resources on federal lands. These include the Antiquities Act of 1906, the Wilderness Act of 1964, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (NFMA), and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979. Of these, the NHPA is most relevant to this study.

From its onset, the driving force behind cultural resources management (CRM) in the Forest Service was the NHPA and its subsequent regulations (Tainter 1987). Prior to 1994, the Forest Service defined heritage management as CRM. The CRM program was traditionally viewed as a support function; Forest Service managers provided services to assure that cultural resources were not affected by and did not interfere with other Forest Service activities. This process of clearance was central to CRM—clearance meant that the forest supervisor confirmed that a project was in compliance with cultural resource requirements and that it could proceed. Forest Service procedures required that cultural resources affected by a federally funded project be located and evaluated for their archaeological significance. Detractors from CRM often viewed this compliance-driven approach as an obstacle to other agency multiple-use activities. However, legislation such as the NFMA requires that Forest Service managers reconcile cultural values occurring on large land areas with other management responsibilities.

Amendments in 1992 to the NHPA provide that properties of traditional religious and cultural importance to either an American Indian tribe or a native Hawaiian organization can be deemed eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places.² The NHPA directs the Secretary of Interior to establish criteria for including properties in the National Register of Historic Places. For the most part, NHPA regulations establish procedures that detail the steps that federal and state agencies must follow when nominating properties to the National Register.

Ecosystem Management and Heritage Management

In the late 1980s, the Forest Service, along with many other federal agencies, began to propose ecosystem management as a new working paradigm. Specific to the Forest Service, a feature of the ecosystem management paradigm is the assumption of economic, ecological, and social interactions as a precondition for management. In the past, natural resource specialists from outside Indian culture have not been sensitive to Indian beliefs and practices, based in part on a lack of knowledge of traditional land uses in the region. Information about those past land uses accomplishes two things: first, a better understanding by Forest Service managers of historic land uses and their contemporary results; and second, improved conditions for cultural sustainability within surrounding communities.

Humans impact ecological systems and are integral elements of sustainable solutions. Human presence in the Mount Hood region has far outdated the administrative presence there. Accepting that humans have influenced landscapes (even “managed”) for thousands of years directs the Forest Service to appreciate the role of humans in that sense. Sustaining cultures, operating over broader scales, and appreciating humans as ecosystem components are just a few elements of ecosystem management that transcend to heritage management.

The Forest Service views ecosystem management as a holistic approach to natural resource management, recognizing that plant and animal communities are interdependent, interacting with their physical environment to form distinct

ecological units called ecosystems that span federal and nonfederal lands. The Forest Service also extends the definition of ecosystem management to include “using an ecological approach to achieve the management of national forests and grasslands by blending the needs of people and environmental values in such a way that national forests and grasslands represent diverse, healthy, productive, and sustainable ecosystems.”

Recognizing heritage resources as a component in ecosystems also reflects management in a more holistic framework. Understanding heritage data enables forest managers to chart historic land uses. The ecosystem approach to natural resource management directs land managers to focus on the broader landscape and that landscape’s position in time and space. Ecosystem processes operate over a wide range of spatial and temporal scales. Ecosystem management requires management oriented to ecological boundaries that span traditional administrative, political, and ownership boundaries. Demarcations on a map may indicate “ownership,” but natural processes occur regardless of these boundaries. One example is the growth on the Mount Hood National Forest of huckleberry patches, which often shift over time as forest conditions change. Ecosystem management recognizes these dynamic forces, and the Forest Service must adjust accordingly.

The Forest Service in 1994 produced a national framework of ecosystem management guidelines, which declared that the four fundamental principles guiding the implementation of ecosystem management are:

1. Using an ecological approach to meet the objectives of the Forest Service, and in assisting state and private landowners to meet their objectives.
2. Forming partnerships that require cooperation among varied public interests, land managers, land users, and communities to achieve shared goals.
3. Promoting grass-roots participation to close the gap between people and government, reduce conflict, and develop shared expectations for the lands of the National Forest Service.
4. Using scientific knowledge to help the Forest Service better understand the range of choices for action and the consequences of those decisions.

These ecosystem management principles integrate all resources on a regional landscape level, and are compatible with the Forest Service approach to the management of both cultural and natural resources.

Archaeologists have long been employed by the Forest Service to lead implementation of cultural resources management. Generally, archaeology can contribute to ecosystem management because it provides time depth to our understanding of how cultural, biological, and physical components of the ecosystem interact. It is primarily through the Forest Service archaeologists that heritage management interacts with ecosystem management. Archaeology introduces a temporal and historic framework to resource management. The success of ecosystem management ultimately depends on the ability of resource and land managers to obtain wide public support—the evaluation of heritage resources helps build this support.

The Heritage Program of the Forest Service is designed to protect the historic and cultural heritage of America’s national forests, and to share historical, cultural, and biological information with people for their enjoyment and education (USDA 1995). Unlike CRM, which was seen as a support role to other Forest Service programs, the Heritage Program introduced a broader level of public participation. It is beyond the scope of this study to adequately describe the public participation process in natural resource management. However, public participation can be

generally thought of as an inclusive process, using collaborative planning with interested groups to aid in planning decision making.

Cosgrove (1984, 13) states that “landscape is not merely the world we see, it is a construction, a composition of that world . . . a way of seeing the world.” In an ecosystem, Cosgrove’s “what we see” is a result of modified cultural practices. For example, prehistoric and historical burning of forest patches within the Mount Hood National Forest resulted in more open areas. Open areas are conducive to huckleberry growth. Without burning, a closed canopy results, and the result is an entirely different landscape context. Understanding these historic processes that led to the current state of the landscape is critical for both heritage management and ecosystem management to reduce conflicts between groups.

Creation of the Mount Hood National Forest

The Cascade Range Forest Reserve, like most of the forest reserves created in the West between 1891 and 1897, was set up at the request of local interests. The chief recreation organization in the region, the Oregon Alpine Club, had long wanted Mount Hood reserved as a park. At the time the reserve was established in September 1893, it was the largest of any in the West. In 1908 the Forest Service divided the Cascade Range Forest Reserve into the Oregon, Cascade, Umpqua, Crater, and Deschutes Forests. Mount Hood National Forest was created from the Oregon National Forest in 1924.

Indian Relations With the Forest

During the time when human presence was first established in what is now Oregon, climatic changes in North America led to changes in environmental adaptation. In the Middle Columbia River region of north central Oregon, humans developed an adaptation in which uplands were exploited for game during hunting seasons and roots were gathered at appropriate times of the year. However, the main focus of human habitation was along the banks of the Columbia River and its tributaries. The seasonal salmon runs became a major economic focus, and they provided support for many settlements within the region. Hunting and gathering forays into the upland regions also provided an additional source of food and religious importance. Archaeological evidence has shown that the native cultures of the Northwest have arisen from a shared basis in the Paleo-Indian hunter-gatherer culture of late glacial times. From that common beginning they continued to diversify and adapt to their distinctive environmental zones in the Pacific Northwest.

The Warm Springs and Wasco Indians were traditionally a Plateau culture and survived on the abundant resources that extended from the high mountains to the Columbia River.³ Over the centuries, the Warm Springs and the Wasco tribes developed an extensive economic network along the Columbia. The Wascos were principally fishers and traders who remained at their village sites along the Columbia River; the Warm Springs bands moved between winter and summer villages. Plateau Indians were village people in that they had customary winter village sites occupied each year typically by the same groups of families. People traveled a great deal, partly to gather food but also to trade and to socialize.

In contrast to the Warm Springs and Wasco tribes, the lifestyle of the Paiutes was considerably different. They are classified as belonging to the Great Basin culture, which can be characterized by small groups of families who spent the winters

together in encampments, with food collection done primarily by a single family or a few families. In 1878, Paiute bands of Oregon rose in revolt against white encroachment and the relocation to reservations. As a result, many Paiutes became prisoners of the Bannock War and were sent to Fort Simcoe in the state of Washington. Upon their release in 1878, they made their way toward their homeland. Encountering the Warm Springs Reservation, they were granted permission to settle there (Buan and Lewis 1991).

The Treaty of 1855 officially established the Warm Springs Reservation. The community now functions legally as the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Indians, given responsibility for the management of their own affairs. They are called the Confederated Tribes because the reservation is home to the three distinct peoples: Warm Springs, Wasco, and Paiutes. Each of these three tribes has an elected chief, who serves for life. An elected tribal council is the governing body of the Confederated Tribes. The council has the power to negotiate with federal, state, and local governments on behalf of the tribes, to employ legal counsel to protect tribal interests, and to manage the economic affairs of the Confederated Tribes. This includes disposition of tribal lands and other assets, and enforcement of law and order on the reservation in cases outside the federal (French and French 1955).

The issue of continued traditional use on the Mount Hood National Forest is probably greatest among residents of the Warm Springs Reservation. The Mount Hood region has been a vital part of the history of the area. Current Forest Service lands were once used for gathering food plants, collecting raw materials for physical objects such as tools, and hunting and fishing activities. There were also several important trails across forestlands that were vital to historical travel routes between the Columbia River and the Willamette Valley. Many remnants of these trails remain.

Of these various uses, the most important traditional use that continues into the present day is the gathering of huckleberries. The Mount Hood National Forest provides an important source of huckleberries for residents of the Warm Springs Reservations, as well as other Indian individuals and groups. Huckleberries contribute to both the subsistence and spiritual well-being of the native culture.

The Sherar Burn area presents itself as an opportunity to showcase management recommendations specific to huckleberry picking in the Zigzag Ranger District of the Mount Hood National Forest, using a variety of heritage management information. The example is offered because it is a recognized important cultural and social issue to the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Indians. The following management recommendations are derived from the ecosystem management guidelines discussed earlier.

Heritage management, most simply explained, uses information about the past. An expanded interpretation of heritage management includes considering information collected from current cultural groups with knowledge about the past. In the case of the Mount Hood National Forest, the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Indians have much to offer. Three explicit management recommendations are: (1) nomination of the Sherar Burn area as a National Register site; (2) setting aside huckleberry tracts for the exclusive use of American Indians; and (3) control of vegetation via prescribed fire, or thinning of competing vegetation.

Parker and King (1990) first introduced the concept of *traditional cultural properties* to the National Register lexicon. As defined by them, traditional cultural properties could be made eligible to the National Register because of their association with cultural practices and beliefs of a living community that are rooted in

that community's history and are important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the community. Under those criteria, the Sherar Burn area of the Mount Hood National Forest meets the criteria for nomination to and inclusion on the National Register.

Directly north of the Mount Hood National Forest, the Gifford Pinchot National Forest (the "GP") in Washington faces related forest issues. The forest ecosystems are similar and the associated cultural groups are related. On the Gifford Pinchot National Forest, huckleberries are a valuable forest product—the native culture closely aligned with the forest is the Yakama Indians, another group of American Indians classified as Plateau culture.

Through a historical quirk, what distinguishes the "GP" from the Mount Hood National Forest is the huckleberry management. Forest managers clearly mandate an affirmative reference in the forest plan to accommodate American Indians. In 1932, on what was then the Columbia National Forest, rangers set aside nearly 2500 acres of the forest for exclusive use by the Yakama Indians. In what was known as the "handshake agreement" between the Yakama Indians and Forest Service personnel, the Yakama Indians were guaranteed continued access to huckleberry fields and a measure of privacy to carry on their cultural traditions.

To this day, visitors to the Gifford Pinchot National Forest see signs that clearly post "This side of the road reserved for Indian picking." With a 65-year established history and effective notices, conflict is minimal. A similar public awareness program instituted at the Mount Hood National Forest would alleviate many concerns of the Warm Springs Tribal members who seek respect and privacy to pick huckleberries. Education of the general (non-American Indian) public should be a management priority on the Mount Hood National Forest. Currently, huckleberry pickers do not need permits, and introducing a non-fee permit system would enable forest managers to monitor and educate the general public about the spiritual nature of huckleberry picking, as enjoyed by the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Indians.

Current research is being performed on huckleberry productivity. There is discussion of manipulating vegetation, specifically huckleberries, by use of prescribed fires or thinning of competing vegetation. As stated earlier, a bumper crop of huckleberries in 1994 was the possible result of a Forest Service-administered timber harvest. Further ecological research must be conducted to ascertain methods that might be effective in maintaining or increasing huckleberry production to maintain viable quantities for humans (both Indian and non-Indian) and wildlife.

Linking Ecosystem Management with Heritage Management

Following is a suggested process to use ecosystem management guidelines as a framework for Forest Service decision making with heritage information as the cornerstone. One can ascertain that the language of the four fundamental principles of ecosystem management parallels that of heritage management. The ecosystem approach to land and resource management is moving the agency's focus away from traditional management and toward a focus on ecosystem sustainability and health. One important component of ecosystem sustainability and health is cultural sustainability, which includes a culture's ability to maintain traditional lifeways. Forest Service managers are increasingly recognizing that aspect, and understanding that the history, both natural and cultural, of a landscape increases their understanding of inputs shaping the current "look and feel" of a given area. Honoring legal

commitments such as treaties, laws, and regulations maintains cultural commitments. To guide management that links heritage management to ecosystem management on the Mount Hood National Forest, managers should revisit the four fundamental principles guiding the implementation of ecosystem management.

1. Use an ecological approach. Just as using an ecological approach requires us to look beyond administrative boundaries to manage forest resources such as timber, wildlife, water, and recreation, it requires us to look beyond administrative boundaries when practicing heritage management. For example, the Sherar Burn area, approximately 5120 acres, falls within a “usual and accustomed” area for fishing, hunting, or gathering activities. These activities predate administration of the Mount Hood National Forest. Part of the Sherar Burn area also falls within boundaries of the Salmon–Huckleberry Wilderness Area, which introduces yet another management unit in the forest. Recognizing that landscapes cross over these boundaries is one element of using an ecological approach.

Operationally, this means that Forest Service managers must accept that forest ecosystems are landscapes, just as they must consider heritage resources as landscapes. The ecosystem does not stop at the edge of the Mount Hood National Forest boundary, nor do ecological processes distinguish themselves among different administrative units. Appreciating these ecological relationships between various land ownership parcels in Oregon is one outcome of using an ecological approach.

For example, ecological boundaries may not coincide with administratively drawn boundaries of the reservation of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Indians and the Mount Hood National Forest. Certainly, natural processes such as fire and floods occur over wide ecosystems. Similarly, the biotas of a region do not recognize boundaries. Respecting those natural processes and biota over a broad spatial scale is important to understanding ecosystems.

2. Form partnerships. Just as ecosystem management necessitates forming partnerships to effectively manage forest resources such as timber, wildlife, water, and recreation, it necessitates forming partnerships when practicing heritage management. Both holistic ecological and heritage approaches to land management can be addressed, in part, by forming partnerships among the various interested parties. Varied public interests have different needs and values relating to resources. Cooperation among these interests and land managers necessitates periodic meetings. The Mount Hood National Forest and the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Indians have begun to draft a Memorandum of Understanding to coordinate huckleberry accessibility and enhancement.

By forming partnerships with the Tribe, as well as educating the public about the spiritual and cultural values of traditional resources such as huckleberries, increased appreciation and decreased user conflict will occur. Partnerships must occur not only between the tribal members and forest managers, but among other interested parties such as recreation users as well.

Partnerships have already been established. For example, in 1986, Congress passed the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, which includes a 90-mile stretch of the Columbia River. The act has two overriding purposes: (1) to protect and enhance the scenic, natural, recreational, and cultural resources; and (2) to promote economic development consistent with the first objective, primarily within the urban areas of the Gorge (Rogers 1993). Consequently, the states of Oregon and Washington adopted a bistate compact called the Columbia River Gorge Commission, which is mandated to work with four tribal governments to

ensure the protection of treaty rights and to protect and to enhance cultural and natural resources.

3. Promote grass-roots participation. Grass-roots participation is involvement at the local level, as distinguished by policy formed from the centers of political leadership. Rather than having managers impose decisions on citizens, they work in concert with each other to promote cooperation. One way this can be accomplished is by forest managers encouraging and attending community meetings, and by managers keeping the public informed about decision making as it occurs. Public meetings are often held, but outreach is sometimes difficult to obtain, other than by posting notices. Increased presence and visibility in the community would promote feelings of “goodwill.” Another outcome of promoting grass-roots participation is communication of shared expectations about resources and people.

Like the archaeological record, public participation is key to heritage management. Native groups of people are often overlooked in resource decision making. In an attempt to make better judgments regarding land and resource use, the Forest Service is including native people in the decision making process. Neglecting native groups in the past has caused, among other things, a sense of mistrust among some American Indians toward the federal government, a loss of native lands associated with loss of Indian values, and the desecration of spiritual sites used for worship.

Heritage management addresses these shortcomings and avoids future deficiencies by seeking input from native people about their desired future land uses. Native peoples’ insights into past conditions prove helpful in revealing possible desired future conditions and uses. Asking native people their perceptions about a desired future condition for a given tract of land, they often share information about past land uses and cultural practices. What is accomplished by bringing the agency and native people together is an increased level of knowledge and information from those most affected by resource decisions.

4. Use scientific knowledge. Lastly, just as using scientific knowledge in ecosystem management decisions leads to a better understanding of the range of choices for action, scientific knowledge in different forms can aid in heritage management and the consequences of those decisions. In the case of the Sherar Burn area, the use of social scientific knowledge was a core part of the study. Social science offers information about the human dimensions of ecosystems. As discussed earlier, human dimensions-related research seeks to understand human demands on, values and perceptions of, and interactions with ecosystems. It can be argued that scholarly ways of knowing and understanding include “nonscientific” disciplines or interests such as folklore and ethnohistory. These may be considered subfields of the myriad disciplines addressing culture—cultural geography, cultural anthropology, ethnography, and environmental psychology, among others.

The use of scientific information from heritage resources also bolsters social scientific knowledge. In the future, management actions must include the use of historic data and other types of heritage information to increase scientific knowledge. At a minimum, introducing that information to forest managers increased their knowledge base, and can very well translate into management plans that take history into account.

Historic information complements other types of scientific data, and it has been demonstrated that broad landscapes require a variety of academic disciplines in decision making. Research biologists, ecologists, economists, foresters, and social

scientists, among others, working in concert with each other increase the agency's knowledge base about ecosystems. Determining factors of cultural and legal dimensions in forest management fall under the aegis of biophysical constraints, wherein scientific knowledge can assist greatly.

Conclusions

The outcome of the heritage program in the Forest Service is a mix of products including the interpretation of heritage resources in a variety of media, public involvement, and education in different venues. Applying those different products will greatly enhance knowledge about ecosystems, which could lead to a greater awareness of different cultures in the United States. Cultural differences and cultural borrowings, particularly as they pertain to the most basic resource management tools and concepts, must be considered because resource management is a function of social and political institutions.

The varying definitions of ecosystem management result in a varying acceptance of heritage management. Disparate approaches are important because the Forest Service is comprised of personnel from numerous disciplines, although the most obvious and dominant training comes from natural resource management such as forestry, ecology, and fish and wildlife management. People educated and trained in the traditional natural sciences may not see people as important in ecosystems. Yet many social science scholars view humans as a critical component of ecosystems.

Former Forest Service Chief Jack Ward Thomas, a wildlife ecologist, was instrumental in relating ecosystem management to the agency. However, implementation at the district level, where decision making is most critical, could be greatly constrained by disciplinary biases present at that level. At the district level in the National Forest System, there are few social scientists diffusing the broader concepts of ecosystem management. Rather, trained natural scientists in forestry and other natural resources are the primary decision makers. The result has been an inconsistency (at best) and a lack of knowledge (at worst) on how to proceed with heritage management, and in the understanding of overall cultures within an ecosystem management framework.

Making heritage management relevant to ecological stewardship means reaching beyond the standard conduct of heritage programs. Heritage management can be accomplished first by compliance to the laws addressing forest management, and then through systematic stewardship and study of the resources. The resources provide attendant data, which contributes to understanding human–ecosystem relationships through time.

Notes

1. *Usual and accustomed areas* is a treaty term describing lands where a tribe or tribes frequented for the purpose of fishing, hunting, or other food or medicine gathering activities. As this term applies specifically to Region Six, where the Mount Hood National Forest is located, these areas are all outside reservation boundaries. Various federal courts have either referred to or defined the term when deciding lawsuits regarding the extent of a tribe's off-reservation treaty rights. It is possible for usual and accustomed areas to extend beyond a treaty area, and to overlap a large area of a neighboring tribe, based on specific treaty language.

2. The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, in its introductory section, establishes that “the historical and cultural foundations of the Nation should be preserved as a living part of our community life in order to give a sense of orientation to the American people.” One

output of the NHPA has been the National Register of Historic Places, which contains a wide range of historic property types, reflecting the diversity of the nation's history and culture. Property types included in the register are *buildings, structures, and sites*; groups of buildings, structures or sites forming *historic districts; landscapes*; and individual *objects*. To be included in the register, the property must meet the criteria specified in the National Register's *Criteria for Evaluation*, located in the Code of Federal Regulations at 36 C.F.R. 60.4.

3. Warm Spring Indians are also referred to in anthropological literature as Tenino Indians.

References

- Buan, C. M., and R. Lewis, eds. 1991. *The first Oregonians*. Portland: Oregon Council for the Humanities.
- Cosgrove, D. E. 1984. *Social formation and symbolic landscape*. Totowa, NJ: Barnes & Noble.
- French, K., and French, D. 1955. The Warm Springs Indian community: Will it be destroyed? *Am. Indian* 7:3–17.
- Parker, P., and King, T. 1990. *Guidelines for evaluating and documenting traditional cultural properties*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Rogers, K. O. 1993. Native American collaboration in cultural resource protection in the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. *Vermont Law Rev.* 17:741–800.
- Tainter, J. A. 1987. Cultural resources management in the Forest Service. In *Cultural resources management*, ed. R. W. Johnson and M. G. Schene, 49–71. Malabar, FL: Robert E. Krieger.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 1995. *Heritage program vision statement*. Washington, DC. Unpublished paper.
- Wang, G. A., D. H. Anderson, and P. J. Jakes. 1996. Legislating the past: Cultural resource management in the U.S. Forest Service. *Society Nat. Resources* 9(1):3–18.