

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN GUIDELINE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| ABOUT THE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN | 1 |
| What Is a Resources Management Plan? | 1 |
| Who Uses the Resources Management Plan and How Is it Used? | 2 |
| Who Is Responsible for the Resources Management Plan?..... | 3 |
| EXTERNAL PARTICIPATION IN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLANNING | 5 |
| How to Initiate the Resources Management Plan Process - Scoping | 5 |
| Suggestions for Conducting Resources Management Plan Scoping Sessions..... | 5 |
| External Participation in Resources Management Planning | 8 |
| The Benefits of External Participation..... | 8 |
| Extent and Type of External Participation..... | 8 |
| When to Conduct External Participation | 9 |
| Implications of the Federal Advisory Committee Act..... | 9 |
| RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN TIMETABLES | 10 |
| Review/Approval of Resources Management Plans..... | 10 |
| Annual Resources Management Plan Project Statement Update | 11 |
| PLAN REQUIREMENTS | 13 |
| Sample Resources Management Plan Table of Contents | 15 |
| WRITING THE INTRODUCTION TO THE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN | 16 |
| THE PRESENT RESOURCE STATUS SECTION OF THE RESOURCES | |
| MANAGEMENT PLAN | 17 |
| Natural Resources Baseline Information | 17 |
| Summary Table of Natural Resources Baseline Information | 18 |
| Natural Resources - Condition and Threats to the Resources..... | 19 |
| Cultural Resources Baseline Information | 20 |
| Cultural Resource Documentation Checklist..... | 21 |
| Cultural Resources..... | 24 |
| Cultural Contexts/Themes | 25 |
| Instructions and Definitions for Completing Archeological Sites Summary ChartCounting | |
| Instruction for Archeological Sites Chart | 27 |
| Instructions and Definitions for Completing Structures Summary ChartCounting | |
| Instructions for Structures Chart..... | 32 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Instructions and Definitions for Completing Objects Summary Chart ... Counting Instructions for Objects Chart | 39 |
| Instructions and Definitions for Completing Cultural Landscapes Summary Chart.....Counting Instructions for Cultural Landscapes Chart | 43 |
| Instructions and Definitions for Completing Ethnographic Resources Summary Chart Counting Instructions for Ethnographic Resources Chart | 50 |
| THE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM SECTION OF THE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN | 57 |
| The Overview of Current Program and Needs | 57 |
| Project Statements..... | 58 |

ABOUT THE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN

WHAT IS A RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN?

An essential document for each park, the National Park Service's (NPS) resources management plan serves as the foundation for park resources management programs. The resources management plan flows from the general management plan and statement for management. The resources management plan describes the park's natural and cultural resources; outlines the park's goals and objectives in managing these resources; identifies basic operational needs and specific deficiencies in resources inventory, monitoring, research, mitigation, protection, and interpretation; describes and evaluates current resources management activities; and prescribes an action program based on legislative and executive mandates, NPS management policies, guidelines (particularly NPS-28, the *Cultural Resource Management Guideline*, and NPS-77, the *Natural Resources Management Guideline*), management zoning, and provisions of related planning documents.

Consistent with relevant laws, NPS-77, and NPS-28, each resources management plan must:

- summarize the resource values and purposes of the park;
- describe the park's resources management program;
- analyze the significance of resources management needs and problems and rank them in importance;
- propose specific actions, including dollars and FTEs, for dealing with the most important and urgent needs and problems;
- present a multi-year program to achieve measurable progress in accomplishing the proposed actions;
- record accomplishments to define progress on priority actions;
- identify threats to the cultural and natural resources arising from sources inside or outside the park boundary, evaluate their affect on park resources, and describe mitigation actions;

- provide for the integration and coordination of cultural and natural resources programs as needed.
-

The resources management plan is the park's strategic plan for the long-range management of its resources and a tactical plan identifying short-term projects. This vision provides the context for setting priorities and implementing both ongoing programs and short-term projects. Constituting an agreement between the superintendent and the regional director, the resources management plan describes resource problems and data deficiencies, laying out a logical, long-term management course.


The resources management plan is a dynamic document used to measure and track progress toward long-term goals and to adjust resources management actions to keep pace with developing technologies and techniques. Long-range management goals may evolve slowly in response to accumulating knowledge and experience gained through the operation of current programs, operations evaluations, and the completion of short-term projects. In contrast, proposed projects are expected to change more rapidly to incorporate new data, scoping revisions, partially funded efforts, and so forth. Information in the resources management plan must be kept current and accurate to maximize its utility.

The resources management plan also serves as an important information source often used by parks, regional offices, and the Washington Office to satisfy information requests from a variety of governmental, public, and private interest groups; few plans serve so broad an audience and provide such diverse utility. No other plan integrates short- and long-term management strategies, cultural and natural resources, and issues inside and outside park boundaries.

WHO USES THE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN AND HOW IS IT USED?

The resources management plan is, first and foremost, a plan for the preservation, restoration, and management of park resources and provides a summary and analysis of a park's resource information and current situation. The resources management plan provides a tool for integrating divisional responsibilities to achieve resources preservation and management objectives. It is particularly important in clarifying the interface between natural and cultural resources management and applications of social sciences. The resources management plan serves as a reference and source of information for the entire park staff, and is a particularly important source of information for the non-resources management staff. Future resources management staff learn from the plan, providing important continuity to the resources management program. The resources management plan is used to coordinate actions of other park plans and as a springboard to develop detailed resources management action plans. The resources management plan is also used in developing cooperators and for developing public support. It facilitates transboundary cooperation to reduce the impacts of outside influences on park resources and facilitate cooperation with adjoining landowners in the management of ecosystems and cultural contexts.

The resources management plan provides a primary source for information about a park that is used to seek and acquire funding for the resources management program. Funding for resources



management activities begins with Congress and ends with the implementation of a resources management program, including one-time, cyclic, or recurring management actions. Along the continuum, the regional office evaluates project proposals and sets priorities for funding from a variety of sources for a limited number of park projects and base funding increases.

Regional offices also use information in the resources management plans to identify regional project needs, to support new and developing techniques in resources management, to coordinate multi-park projects, and to propose cost savings through park networking and shared research opportunities. Regional offices review park submissions, providing quality assurance, prior to compiling information for Washington Office requests.


The Washington Office uses resources management plan summary data to respond to a multitude of requests from the Government Accounting Office, Office of Inspector General, Congress, other government agencies, and private interest groups. Funding estimates summarized from the resources management plan are used to prepare budget briefings and Servicewide budget initiatives targeted at critical resources management needs. The allocation of some funds, including Natural Resources Preservation Program and water resources funds, is based on needs identified in the park resources management plan.

Resources management plans are read by a variety of audiences. In addition to the park and regional and Washington Office staffs, the audience includes researchers, concerned institutions, special interest groups, program managers, park neighbors, the general public, and state and Federal agencies. Due to the wide array of readers, the plan should be written so that a person with little specific knowledge of the park or familiarity with NPS jargon can understand the plan.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN?

Because the resources management plan is a park planning document, the park superintendent is responsible for its preparation. The development of the resources management plan is a major planning effort addressing both natural and cultural resources; because of its dynamic nature, resources management planning is a continuing management responsibility. Park managers should recognize that resources management planning responsibilities are fundamental to park missions and mandates, and will require a continuing staff commitment.

The resources management plan is one of the most complex management and operations documents that the park will produce. Although normally coordinated by the park's resources staff, the resources management plan is more than a division action plan. Rather, it is the parkwide road map for resource stewardship. Resources management projects routinely involve shared responsibilities and interdivisional cooperation for successful development and implementation. Resources management issues often transcend park boundaries, requiring the coordination of other state, Federal, tribal, and



local agencies as well as other parks, private interests, and landowners. Therefore, development of the resources management plan must be an interdivisional and interdisciplinary effort.

Regional resources management staff responsible to the regional director ensure that the plan is prepared according to this guideline and that its recommendations are valid and consistent with established resources management policies and guidelines.



EXTERNAL PARTICIPATION IN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLANNING

HOW TO INITIATE THE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN PROCESS - SCOPING

When writing or substantially revising a resources management plan, the park should initiate a scoping process to gather information from people knowledgeable of the natural, cultural, and social resources of the park; document the issues affecting park resources; develop alternative actions to address those issues, and the major components of each of those actions; identify possible sources of funding and ways of implementing the proposed actions; and identify potential partnerships.

Scoping should involve representatives from all divisions of the park staff, sister agencies, academicians, park neighbors and traditional users of park resources, the State Historic Preservation Office, and private interests. Various methods can be used to scope out resources management issues, ranging from informal interviews to formal meetings and conferences. Assistance from the regional office and elsewhere, including Washington Office specialists, should be sought as needed to obtain interdisciplinary expertise and advice on scoping techniques. The park must decide what level of scoping is appropriate and what techniques are most effective given the complexity of the park's resources management responsibilities and the sensitivity of its social, cultural, and political setting. The quality and utility of the final plan are directly related to the adequacy of the scoping process. Inadequate scoping undermines a comprehensive, interdisciplinary effort, resulting in a plan that lacks commitment by other park divisions and the understanding and support of park neighbors and potential cooperators. After the initial scoping process, all divisions in the park should actively assist in the in-house drafting and review of the plan.

Suggestions for Conducting Resources Management Plan Scoping Sessions

The following discussion outlines suggestions to parks on resources management plan scoping sessions. These suggestions are based on the experiences of the staff in the Midwest Region.

Persons that should be invited to each session.

- regional director or representative (often only needed at the kick off)
- regional cultural resources representative

- regional natural resources representative
 - superintendent
 - assistant superintendent (where applicable)
-

- chief ranger
- chief of resources management (where applicable)
- chief of cultural resources (where applicable)
- chief of maintenance
- chief of interpretation (where applicable)
- as many other staff members as possible
- outside experts
- staff (or their acting) that the region and park feel need to be present before a scoping can be conducted
- state historic preservation officer
- local government preservation board or staff (where applicable)

Materials that should be present at the session.

- copies (enough for every person present) of all legislation pertaining to the park
- copy of the NPS Organic Act
- pertinent copies of all other applicable laws (i.e., National Environmental Policy Act, Migratory Bird Treaty Act, Endangered Species Act, Coastal Barrier Systems Protection Act, National Historic Preservation Act, Antiquities Act, Archeological Resources Protection Act). See Appendix A of NPS-77, NPS Management Policies, Appendix B of NPS-28, etc.
- recovery plans for threatened and endangered species
- copy of the park's statement for management and general management plan
- copy of most recent resources management plan guidelines and subsequent guidance
- flip chart for writing down thoughts and major points
- laptop computer and a typist for recording thoughts and major points

Tasks to assign to personnel in preparation to a scoping session.

- Assign each scoping session participant the task of highlighting goals contained in the legislation pertaining to the park. (Keep in mind that enabling legislation is highly variable. A few of the earlier parks will have no real guidance; legislative history should be explored in this instance. Other parks will have multiple pieces of legislation with relatively specific guidance. Don't dwell on the inadequacies.)
- Assign members of the park staff the task of reviewing the NPS Organic Act, other applicable laws, policies, procedures, recovery plans, etc., to pick out pertinent goals for the park to bring up during the scoping session discussion.

Post and circulate the following rules of conduct for the meeting, adapted from the R-MAP process.

1. Participants are critical of ideas, not people.
2. Participants focus on reaching the best possible decision, not winning.
3. Participants listen to everyone's ideas, even if they do not agree.
4. Participants restate what someone has said if it is not clear.
5. Participants first bring out all the relevant information, and then try to put it together.
6. Participants, no matter what their status or grade, are encouraged to participate. The strength of the scoping process is the broad spectrum of persons that participate and their individual views and ideas.
7. Participants may change their mind when the evidence clearly indicates they should.

The following process could be used as an example of how a scoping session can be conducted.

The regional director, deputy regional director, or an associate regional director kicks off the session. Discussion leaders felt this was the single most important factor leading to successful scoping sessions. The regional director states the importance of resources management plans and his/her support of the scoping session process.

A regional natural or cultural resources representative describes resources management plans and discusses the most recent guidelines and their meaning.

Participants identify what they perceive as their highest resource priority in the park. This involves the staff in the discussion early and provides a benchmark for recapping the main issues and actions.

One person records the goals, issues, and actions on a computer. Goals taken from legislation, laws, policy, etc., are the foundation upon which issues related to these goals are developed. The final outcome of the scoping session is a list of alternative actions under each issue. Issues and actions become project statements.

Goals, issues, and actions are recorded on a flip chart. As more goals are listed the pages are taped around the room for reference when developing issues and actions.

One person leads the discussion. This person should be someone other than the superintendent or the assistant superintendent. The natural and cultural resources managers in the park or region usually work well. Those two persons can trade off when expanding on natural or

cultural issues and actions.

The park is left with a list of goals, issues, actions, and a timetable from which they can develop

a resources management plan.

Assigned personnel draft high priority project statements from the list developed at the scoping session. Model project statements can be requested from the regional resources management plan coordinator or from the Washington Office. Higher priority projects should be more detailed.

Project statements are circulated for review by peers both inside the National Park Service and outside. This should include personnel from the National Biological Survey, cooperative park study units, and the State Historic Preservation Office.

EXTERNAL PARTICIPATION IN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLANNING

Because the resources management plan provides critical analysis of a park's resources, it is of interest to concerned institutions, special interest groups, park neighbors, and the general public. Park superintendents ensure that opportunities are made available for the public to participate meaningfully in, and comment on, preparation and major revisions to resources management plans.

The Benefits of External Participation

Although the resources management plan is generally not the document through which environmental compliance is accomplished, the participation of other Federal, state, and local agencies, Native American authorities, and private landowners adjacent to the park in the development of resources management plans has many benefits. Involving others in the planning process can minimize the impacts of outside influences on park resources, reduce conflicts, and help accomplish resources management objectives. External participation also facilitates cooperation with adjoining landowners in management of ecosystems and cultural contexts, and serves as a vehicle to coordinate research, share data and expertise, and establish native wildlife corridors. External participation in the resources management plan development can also identify partnerships, interagency agreements, and other cooperative agreements that may be needed.

Extent and Type of External Participation

The extent and type of external involvement in resources management planning will vary according to park location and people involved, the type of planning effort (i.e., new resources management plan or a revision), and

the level of external interest. At a minimum, other Federal agencies, state and local governments (including the state historic preservation officer, Native Americans, and other indigenous populations in the area of the park) should be involved. Superintendents should also seek input from the National Biological Survey and universities to help resolve management concerns in the planning process and to identify areas where additional research is needed. The types of external

participation that can be conducted include requests for written comments, meetings, conferences, seminars, workshops, tours, open houses, the assignment of planning teams, and similar events designed to foster public reactions and suggestions.

When to Conduct External Participation

External participation is encouraged at each phase of resources management planning, but may be particularly useful during the scoping process. External participation in scoping allows parks to elicit the full range of resources management issues and concerns. External participation in the review of draft resources management plans or the review of an executive summary of the resources management plan may be beneficial in allowing parks to gauge support for the park's resources management program and activities. Since many resources management plans are lengthy, a park may prepare an executive summary for external review. The length of time provided for the review, whether the resources management plan or an Executive Summary is under review, should be set and the dates of review announced so that the public is aware of when the review is complete. The results of public participation should be documented.

Implications of the Federal Advisory Committee Act

A major consideration for park superintendents before seeking external participation in Federal decisionmaking is the applicability of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. While the Federal Advisory Committee Act applies to many external contacts it does not apply to all such interactions. The National Park Service may seek to obtain external participation in the following areas without implicating the Federal Advisory Committee Act. 1) A meeting between an individual and the National Park Service for the purpose of obtaining advice or recommendations. 2) Meetings with a group of individuals (i.e., roundtables, forums, or focus groups) for the purpose of obtaining advice of the individual and not for the purpose of utilizing the group to obtain consensus advice or recommendations. (The same is true for any meeting with a group for the sole purpose of exchanging facts or information.) 3) Public meetings open to all interested parties for the purpose of exchanging views and information. For regulatory guidance on the applicability of the Federal Advisory Committee Act consult the General Services Administration's regulations, 41 CFR 101-6.

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN TIMETABLES

This section of the Resources Management Plan Guideline addresses the resources management plan review/approval process and the Annual Resources Management Plan Project Statement Update. Because these processes are undergoing reengineering, this section of the guideline will be transmitted for inclusion when reengineering has been completed.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS

The resources management plan will be a typed document housed in one or more looseleaf binders to permit easy updating. The resources management plan must include the following parts in the prescribed formats.

I. COVER SHEET

The cover sheet bears the title of the document: Resources Management Plan: [Park Name]. Signature and date lines for the park superintendent and regional director as recommending and approving officials appear below.

II. TABLE OF CONTENTS

The table of contents includes all headings and subheadings identifying sections and subsections of the plan, and all project statement titles and appendices. (See the end of this section for a sample.)

III. INTRODUCTION

This portion of the resources management plan is not automated and should be written using the word processing software normally used by the park. See the following section entitled The Introduction to the Resources Management Plan for instructions on content.

IV. PRESENT RESOURCES STATUS

This portion of the resources management plan is not automated and should be written using the word processing software normally used by the park. See the following section entitled Present Resource Status for instructions on content.

V. RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Overview of Current Program and Needs

This portion of the resources management plan is not automated and should be written using the word processing software normally used by the park. See the following section entitled Overview of Current Program and Needs for instructions on content.

Project Status

This subsection of the resources management plan contains:

Table 1 - Personnel

Table 2 - Natural and Cultural Resources Funding

Programming Sheet 1 - Ongoing and Funded Activities

Programming Sheet 2 - Unfunded Activities

The tables and programming sheets are generated with the resources management plan software. Consult the *RMP Software Manual* in Part Two of this notebook for instruction in the use of the software.

Project Statements

The project statements are entered into the resources management plan software. The project statements generated with the resources management plan software are then joined with the Introduction, Present Resource Status, and Overview of Current Program and Needs sections to form the body of the resources management plan.

VI. APPENDICES

The following appendices will be maintained with the resources management plan: Cultural Resources Documentation Checklist, park cultural resource status summary charts, Annual Accomplishments Reports to reflect the actions completed over the recent past, list of related but separate action plans, and a bibliography of references cited.

VII. ADDENDA

The addenda is used at the park's discretion for related material too voluminous to include in the resources management plan. This may include miscellaneous items that add to the value of the document by serving as pieces of administrative history for the document. Lists of goals, issues, and actions developed through the scoping process may be included to add to the administrative history of the plan and provide continuity for park managers. Cited references or additional action plans which were referenced from park project statements could also be included. The resources management plan is meant to be a dynamic document.

SAMPLE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page Number

INTRODUCTION
 Resources Management Objectives

PRESENT RESOURCE STATUS

 Natural Resources Baseline Information

 Natural Resources - Condition and Threats to the Resources

 Cultural Resources Baseline Information

 Cultural Resources

 Cultural Context/Theme

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

 Overview of Current Program and Needs

 Table 1--Personnel

 Table 2--Natural and Cultural Resources Funding

 Programming Sheet 1--Ongoing and Funded Activities

 Programming Sheet 2--Unfunded Activities

 Project Statements

 Project Title #1

 Project Title #2

APPENDICES

 Cultural Resources Documentation Checklist

 Park Cultural Resource Status Summary Charts

 Annual Accomplishments Reports

 List of Related Action Plans

 Bibliography of References Cited in Resources Management Plan

ADDENDA - OPTIONAL

WRITING THE INTRODUCTION TO THE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Introduction to the resources management plan briefly states the purposes for which the park was established, describes the natural and cultural resources values and special designations for which the park is legally responsible, and summarizes the current resources related management objectives that supplement the broader management objectives presented in the park's statement for management and general management plan, providing more specific guidance for resources management. These responsibilities are derived from enabling legislation, executive orders, general environmental and preservation legislation, treaties, and other sources normally found in the statement for management and the general management plan.

The Introduction also explains the purpose of the resources management plan, in terms specific to the park in question and consistent with the section above, What is a Resources Management Plan. It describes the scoping process used by the park to identify the wide range of cultural and natural resources management issues as presented in the resources management plan. In the Introduction, the park briefly should define the approach, participants, and results of the scoping process and discuss how the resources management plan is used in implementing the resources management program. This section should describe park-associated groups and the park resources they have traditionally used.

After reading the Introduction, users should have a general sense of the variety and significance of park resources and the groups to whom they are traditionally significant, and be prepared to understand the following discussion of park conditions and priorities. Users should recognize that the park's resources management strategy flows directly from mandates and is implemented through an organized program which comprehensively addresses natural and cultural resources issues.

THE PRESENT RESOURCE STATUS SECTION OF THE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN

The purpose of the Present Resource Status section is to summarize comprehensive baseline information on the park's resources and their condition. Subsections for natural and cultural resources may be developed to facilitate presentation.

After reading the Present Resource Status section, users should be able to understand the basis for the management actions proposed elsewhere in the resources management plan. This section also should provide the context for assessing individual project statements.

NATURAL RESOURCES BASELINE INFORMATION

The Natural Resources Baseline Information subsection of the Present Resource Status section describes the park's baseline information and evaluates baseline information and long-term monitoring needs. Using the *Natural Resources Inventory and Monitoring Guideline* (NPS-75), the current status of baseline information available for the park's purposes and resource values, as delineated in the Introduction to the resources management plan, is assessed. Baseline information should be described as either meeting, exceeding, or not meeting the minimal level of baseline information as described in Appendix A of NPS-75. Table 1 should be completed and inserted into this subsection to provide a quick reference of the level of the park's natural resources baseline information. Additional categories should be added to the table to meet individual park needs. A brief narrative description of the natural resources baseline information available for the park should accompany the table to provide additional details as necessary. If baseline information does not meet the minimal level, a project statement(s) to meet this need should be included in the resources management plan. Needs for long-term monitoring should also be addressed briefly in the Natural Resources Baseline Information subsection and in a project statement(s), either in the same project statement(s) that addresses the park's baseline information needs or in a separate project statement(s). Information needs that are not addressed by the Servicewide Inventory and Monitoring Program should also be included.

SUMMARY TABLE OF NATURAL RESOURCES BASELINE INFORMATION

| SUMMARY TABLE OF NATURAL RESOURCES BASELINE INFORMATION | | | |
|--|-------|---------------|---------|
| Meets, does not meet, or exceeds the recommended minimal set of natural resources information in Appendix A of NPS-75, the <i>Natural Resources Inventory and Monitoring Guideline</i> | | | |
| INVENTORY COMPONENTS | MEETS | DOES NOT MEET | EXCEEDS |
| Historical Database | | | |
| Species Information | | | |
| Species List | | | |
| Biological Surveys (Species Field Inventories) | | | |
| Species Distribution | | | |
| Vegetation Maps | | | |
| Cartographic Maps | | | |
| Soils Map | | | |
| Geology Map | | | |
| Water Resources Inventory | | | |
| Water Quality Data | | | |
| Air Quality Stations | | | |
| Air Quality Data | | | |
| Precip./Meteorological Data | | | |
| <p align="center">**New inventory components not listed in NPS-75 should be added to the table as necessary to meet individual park needs.</p> <p align="center">For a description of the inventory components see NPS-75, Appendix A.</p> | | | |



NATURAL RESOURCES - CONDITION AND THREATS TO THE RESOURCES

Previous introductory sections describe the basic nature and extent of the park's natural resources. The Natural Resources subsection focuses on the **condition** of the natural resources and the threats to their preservation. In this subsection, summarize this information to generally describe the nature, severity, and source, both internal and external, of the major threats facing the park's resources and the status of current resources condition.

To the extent possible, use literature citations to document the threats to the resources. Speculation is a temporary substitute for technical documentation, but may be the only source available to identify resources threats. Critical information needs should be previously identified in the description of baseline information and may be cited themselves in this subsection as a causal threat if information gaps impede resources protection and preservation.



CULTURAL RESOURCES BASELINE INFORMATION

Using the Cultural Resource Documentation Checklist, indicate the status of documentation of the park's cultural resources.¹ Documents checked as "needed" should be provided for in a project statement. Documents contained in the Checklist under the heading Planning Documents pertain to both natural and cultural resources, and should be evaluated on how well they address **both** types of resources. Columns should be left blank if a particular document is not required by the park, with an explanation of why these documents are not needed, if the reason for leaving the column blank is not obvious. (A blank checklist begins on the following page).

2 The Cultural Resource Documentation Checklist is a standard computer report generated by the Cultural Resources Management Bibliography (CRBIB). This report can only provide information from the CRBIB, and will therefore not provide entries for all the documentation needed for the checklist.

CULTURAL RESOURCE DOCUMENTATION CHECKLIST

Place an X in the appropriate column. Leave columns blank if document is not required for the park. Remember that items in the first section, Planning Documents, may also apply to natural resources. See NPS-28, Chapter 2, for description of each inventory or study.

| TITLE | CURRENT AND APPROVED | INCOMPLETE; NEEDS REVISION OR UPDATING | NEEDED |
|--|----------------------|--|--------|
| PLANNING DOCUMENTS | | | |
| Preauthorization and Authorization | | | |
| Statement of Management (SFM) | | | |
| Outline of Planning Requirements (OPR) | | | |
| General Management Plan (GMP) | | | |
| Development Concept Plan (DCP) | | | |
| Resources Management Plan (RMP) | | | |
| Interpretive Prospectus (IP) | | | |
| SERVICEWIDE INVENTORIES, LISTS, CATALOGS AND REGISTERS | | | |
| Cultural Resources Management Bibliography (CRBIB) | | | |
| Cultural Sites Inventory (CSI) | | | |
| List of Classified Structures (LCS) | | | |
| National Catalog of Museum Objects | | | |
| Cultural Landscapes Inventory (CLI) | | | |
| National Register of Historic Places | | | |

CULTURAL RESOURCE DOCUMENTATION CHECKLIST CONT.

| TITLE | CURRENT AND APPROVED | INCOMPLETE; NEEDS REVISION OR UPDATING | NEEDED |
|--|----------------------|--|--------|
| BASIC CULTURAL RESOURCE DOCUMENTS | | | |
| Archeological Overview and Assessment | | | |
| Archeological Identification Studies | | | |
| Archeological Evaluation Studies | | | |
| <i>Rapid Ethnographic Assessment Procedures (REAP)</i> | | | |
| Cultural Affiliation Study | | | |
| Ethnographic Landscape Study | | | |
| Ethnographic Overview & Assessment | | | |
| Ethnographic Oral Histories & Life Histories | | | |
| Ethnographic Program | | | |
| Historic Resource Study | | | |
| Historical Base Map | | | |
| Park Administrative History | | | |
| Scope of Collection Statement | | | |
| SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDIES AND PLANS | | | |
| Archeological & Ethno. Collections Studies | | | |
| Archeological Data Recovery Studies | | | |
| Collection Management Plan | | | |
| Collection Storage Plan | | | |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Collection Condition Survey | | | |
| <i>Cultural Landscape Report (CLR)</i> | | | |

CULTURAL RESOURCE DOCUMENTATION CHECKLIST CONT.

| TITLE | CURRENT AND APPROVED | INCOMPLETE; NEEDS REVISION OR UPDATING | NEEDED |
|--|----------------------|--|--------|
| SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDIES AND PLANS CONT. | | | |
| <i>Ethnohistory</i> | | | |
| <i>Exhibit Plan</i> | | | |
| <i>Historic Furnishing Report</i> | | | |
| <i>Historic Structure Report (HSR)</i> | | | |
| <i>Inventory & Condition Assessment Program (ICAP)</i> | | | |
| <i>Social Impact Study</i> | | | |
| <i>Special History Study</i> | | | |
| <i>Traditional Use Study</i> | | | |
| <i>Other</i> | | | |

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Using NPS-28 as a guide to basic research, planning, and stewardship needs, the Cultural Resources subsection briefly **summarizes** the status of the cultural resources according to the major resources types: archeological sites, structures, objects and archival and manuscript collections, cultural landscapes, and ethnographic resources. Park cultural resource status summary charts must be included in the resources management plan appendix to support the narrative. (Instructions and examples of summary charts begin on page 27). These charts should be updated from the Cultural Sites Inventory, List of Classified Structures, Cultural Landscape Inventory, National Register documentation, and Annual Collections Management Report, Form 10-94.

The narrative in this subsection should indicate in summary fashion the significance of archeological sites, structures, and cultural landscapes (as evaluated using National Register criteria), and ethnographic resources; their condition; and levels and types of impacts. In the case of ethnographic resources, National Register documentation alone may be inadequate since significance is determined through research, observed use, and consultation with traditional user groups. National Register evaluations of properties that were found ineligible should be included in this discussion. This narrative should also indicate the percentage of the park that has been surveyed to identify resources. It should summarize the nature and scope of previous survey efforts **for each type of resource** in sufficient depth so that the park's needs for additional surveys are clear. Long-range and short-term needs to fill gaps in basic resources inventories, lists, catalogs, and National Register documentation should be outlined.

The narrative on ethnographic resources should discuss longstanding non-recreational use of both natural and cultural resources, and should identify contemporary groups with traditional ties to the park, their traditional uses of park resources, and the legislative or other formal bases of their authorized use. "Users" is meant broadly, including groups for whom park resources are critical for defining cultural identity. The narrative should specify which park resources traditional users consider to be significant, and, should indicate user preferences for proper treatment of resources when this is known. Any consultation between park managers and traditional users should be noted, as should the fact that some or all information learned is to be held confidential.

The narrative on archeological resources should provide summary information on the types, numbers (by type), and general condition of archeological resources known to be in the park. An estimate should be given of the types and numbers (by type) of other archeological resources projected to be in the park. The discussion should provide summary information about field surveys conducted to inventory archeological resources (e.g., date survey conducted, type and level of survey employed, percentage of lands covered, name of the principal investigator or organization that conducted the survey, numbers and types of resources located). The status of the park's archeological overview and assessment, base map of archeological sites, and other needed archeological studies should be

discussed. Archeological resources listed or determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places should be identified. The status of entering required data into the Archeological Sites Management Information System (ASMIS) database should be described.

The narrative on objects should discuss the approximate number of objects in each of the seven collection categories (archeology, ethnology, history, archives, biology, paleontology, geology), the general condition of the objects in each category (as defined in the Museum Handbook, Part II, pages 3-19), summary of the status of compliance with the standards of the NPS Checklist for the Preservation, Protection, and Documentation of Museum Property completed most recently by the park (as required by the Departmental Manual (411 DM, Chapter 3) and Special Directive 80-1), impacts to the objects, and the status of cataloging in each category. The narrative should also compare the rate of acquisition over the past three years with the rate of cataloging over the same three years, by category, to show whether there is a catalog backlog and whether it is growing.

After reading the Cultural Resources subsection, the resources management plan user should be able to turn to the overview and understand the major issues addressed by the actions being proposed, including the park's needs for cultural resources survey, evaluation, and documentation.

CULTURAL CONTEXTS/THEMES

A cultural context is the framework within which the significance of a resource can be evaluated as it relates to an ethnographic, historic, or prehistoric theme, a particular geographic area, and a specific time period (e.g. Cultural Context--fur trapping in the Mississippi Valley between 1763 and 1815; Property Types--portage routes, a trading post, and a collection of 19th century trapping gear. (See Standards I and II of the Secretary of the Interior's "Standards for Preservation Planning" and National Register Bulletins 16A and 16B for a more complete discussion of cultural/historic context.)

In the Cultural Contexts/Themes subsection, the relevant cultural contexts (themes) are briefly listed. The list includes not only those mentioned in the legislation, but also others represented by the park's resources. A list of property **types** in the park associated with each cultural context should also be prepared. (Individual resources are not listed.) Museum object collections under the appropriate cultural contexts should be included.

All contexts must correspond to the themes and subthemes in the *Revision of the National Park Service's Thematic Framework*. It will be necessary to refine these contexts into sub-categories pertinent to individual parks, similar to those in the revised thematic framework's predecessor, *History and Prehistory in the National Park System and the National Historic Landmarks Program, 1987*, which is no longer the prescribed framework. Contexts should be subdivided consistent with current scholarship and recognize variables of race, ethnicity, class, occupation,

culture, and gender, where pertinent. Contexts should be constructed in accord with the tenets of the new framework.

The following studies and inventories provide references to use in preparing this information. All applicable park cultural contexts and the property types they describe should be listed in the resources management plan.

- *Revision of the National Park Service's Thematic Framework*
- Historic resources studies
- Archeological overviews and assessments
- National Register documentation
- Ethnographic overviews and assessments, Rapid Ethnographic Assessment Procedures (REAP), traditional use, and cultural affiliation studies
- Cultural Landscapes Inventory
- List of Classified Structures
- State Historic Preservation Office and local government preservation planning documents, historic context documents, and survey project reports
- Other special studies

If contexts have not been developed, steps should be taken to do so by preparing a project statement calling for the appropriate study and then programming for it.



Instructions and Definitions for Completing Archeological Sites Summary Chart

Counting Instruction for Archeological Sites Chart

Definitions for completing the condition, impacts, and documentation sections of the Summary Chart for Archeological Sites are contained in the 1993 *Revised Functional and Data Requirements for the Archeological Sites Management Information System (ASMIS)*. Coordinate with the regional archeologist on the standards to follow to collect and enter information in the summary chart.

1. Significance

The National Register of Historic Places is the only acceptable source of information when indicating resource significance. If the park contains archeological sites which are believed to be significant but have not yet been formally evaluated through the National Register process, record them in the "Not Evaluated" Significance category. Do not place them in any of the other Significance categories until they have passed through the National Register review process.

Record the number of known archeological sites associated with each of the four significance levels, including archeological sites which contribute to a nationally significant district. Include only those resources which have been physically identified through direct observation, testing, or survey. Do not attempt to estimate the number of archeological sites that may exist in unsurveyed areas. Do not include any resources on the chart that have been evaluated as non-contributing.

When counting resources which contribute to a district or site, do not include structures. They should be counted on the Structures chart. If an archeological site has contemporary ethnographic significance, include it on both the Archeological Sites chart and the Ethnographic Resources chart.

2. Condition

Record the number of sites which are represented by each of the five condition categories. Note that the chart is organized by significance level and should be read horizontally.

3. Impacts

Record the number of sites which are represented by each of the four levels of impact severity. Note that the chart is organized by significance level and should be read horizontally.

4. **Documentation**

Record the number of sites which are represented by each of the three documentation levels. Note that the chart is organized by significance level and should be read horizontally.

SUMMARY CHART FOR ARCHEOLOGICAL SITES

| Significance | | Condition | | | | | Impacts | | | | Documentation | | |
|------------------|-------|-----------|------|------|-----------|---------|---------|----------|------|---------|---------------|------|------|
| | | Good | Fair | Poor | Destroyed | Unknown | Severe | Moderate | Low | Unknown | Good | Fair | Poor |
| National | 1297 | 783 | 135 | 195 | 6 | 178 | 26 | 93 | 851 | 327 | 512 | 325 | 460 |
| State & Regional | 4646 | 760 | 275 | 125 | 112 | 3374 | 559 | 482 | 417 | 3188 | 458 | 1508 | 2608 |
| Local | 2234 | 42 | 12 | 10 | 0 | 2170 | 12 | 20 | 32 | 2170 | 51 | 6 | 2177 |
| Not Evaluated | 2754 | 695 | 505 | 185 | 20 | 1349 | 302 | 562 | 597 | 1293 | 421 | 577 | 1756 |
| Totals | 10931 | 2280 | 927 | 515 | 138 | 7071 | 899 | 1157 | 1897 | 6978 | 1442 | 2416 | 7073 |

SUMMARY CHART FOR ARCHEOLOGICAL SITES

| Significance | | Condition | | | | | Impacts | | | | Documentation | | |
|------------------|--|-----------|------|------|-----------|---------|---------|----------|-----|---------|---------------|------|------|
| | | Good | Fair | Poor | Destroyed | Unknown | Severe | Moderate | Low | Unknown | Good | Fair | Poor |
| National | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| State & Regional | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Local | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Not Evaluated | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Totals | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Definitions for Archeological Sites Chart

Archeological (expanded Cultural Sites Inventory definition)

"An archeological site or resource is the locus of any surviving physical evidence of past human activity, including the record of the effect of the activity on the environment. Archeological resources may represent the prehistoric or historic time periods, or both, and may be terrestrial, whether submerged or on land, or extraterrestrial" (such as the moon landing site).

Instructions and Definitions for Completing Structures Summary Chart

Counting Instructions for Structures Chart

1. **Significance**

The National Register of Historic Places is the only acceptable source of information when indicating resource significance. If the park contains structures which are believed to be significant but have not yet been formally evaluated through the National Register process, record them in the "Not Evaluated" Significance category. Do not place them in any of the other Significance categories until they have passed through the National Register review process.

If the park List of Classified Structures is complete, the LCS database will print out this chart. If not, record the number of **known** structures associated with each of the four significance levels. Include only those structures which have been physically identified through direct observation, inventory, or survey. Do not attempt to estimate the number of structures that may exist in unsurveyed areas. Do not include non-contributing structures on the chart.

If a structure has contemporary ethnographic significance, include it on **both** the Structures and Ethnographic Resources charts. List known archeological features associated with a structure on the Archeological Sites chart.

2. **Condition**

Record the number of structures which are represented by each of the four condition categories. Note that the chart is organized by significance level and should be read horizontally.

3. **Impacts**

Record the number of structures which are represented by each of the four levels of impact severity. Note that the chart is organized by significance level and should be read horizontally.

4. **Documentation**

Record the number of structures which are represented by each of the three documentation levels. Note that the chart is organized by significance level and should be read horizontally.

SUMMARY CHART FOR STRUCTURES

| Significance | | Condition | | | | Impacts | | | | Documentation | | |
|-----------------|-------|-----------|------|------|---------|---------|----------|-----|---------|---------------|------|------|
| | | Good | Fair | Poor | Unknown | Severe | Moderate | Low | Unknown | Good | Fair | Poor |
| | Total | | | | | | | | | | | |
| National | 21 | 19 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 16 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 3 |
| Contributing | 94 | 63 | 16 | 15 | 0 | 15 | 13 | 66 | 0 | 17 | 41 | 36 |
| State | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local | 71 | 25 | 29 | 15 | 2 | 14 | 18 | 38 | 1 | 3 | 32 | 36 |
| Not Significant | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 1 |
| Not Evaluated | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Totals | 195 | 116 | 46 | 31 | 2 | 30 | 35 | 129 | 1 | 26 | | 76 |

SUMMARY CHART FOR STRUCTURES

| Significance | | Condition | | | | Impacts | | | | Documentation | | |
|-----------------|-------|-----------|------|------|---------|---------|----------|-----|---------|---------------|------|------|
| | Total | Good | Fair | Poor | Unknown | Severe | Moderate | Low | Unknown | Good | Fair | Poor |
| National | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Contributing | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| State | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Local | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Not Significant | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Not Evaluated | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Totals | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Definitions for Structures Chart

Historic Structure (NPS-28)

Structure: A constructed work, usually immovable by nature or design, consciously created to serve some human activity. Examples are buildings of various kinds, monuments, dams, roads, railroad tracks, canals, millraces, bridges, tunnels, locomotives, nautical vessels, stockades, forts and associated earthworks, Indian mounds, ruins, fences, and outdoor sculpture. In the National Register program “structure” is limited to functional constructions other than buildings.

Condition -- Structures³

Good

The structure and significant features are intact, structurally sound, and performing their intended purpose. There are no cosmetic imperfections. The structure and significant features need no repair or rehabilitation, and only routine or preventive maintenance.

Fair

The structure is in fair condition if either of the following conditions is present:

- there are early signs of wear, failure, or deterioration, though the structure and its features are generally structurally sound and performing their intended purpose; **or**,
- there is failure of a significant feature of the structure.

Poor

The structure is in poor condition if any of the following conditions is present:

- the significant features are no longer performing their intended purpose; **or**,
- significant features are missing; **or**,
- deterioration or damage affects more than 25% of the structure; **or**,
- the structure or significant features show signs of imminent failure or breakdown.

Unknown

Not enough information available to make an evaluation.

3 Ruins that have lost their integrity as structures are considered archeological resources and should be recorded on the Archeological Sites chart.

Level of Impact Severity -- Structures

An impact is a detectable result of an agent or series of agents having a negative effect on the significant characteristics or integrity of a resource, and for which some form of mitigation or preventative action is possible. The assessment should include only those impacts likely to affect the resource within the next five years.

Severe

For an impact to be considered severe, it must meet at least one of the following criteria:

- the resource(s) will be significantly damaged or irretrievably lost if action is not taken within 2 years;
- there is an immediate and severe threat to visitor or staff safety.

Moderate

For an impact to be considered moderate, it must meet at least one of the following criteria:

- the resource(s) will be significantly damaged or irretrievably lost if action is not taken within 5 years;
- the situation caused by the impact is potentially threatening to visitor or staff safety.

Low

For an impact to be considered low, it must meet at least one of the following criteria:

- the continuing effect of the impact is known, and will not result in significant damage to the resource(s);
- the impact and its effects are not a direct threat to visitor or staff safety.

Unknown

Not enough information available to make an evaluation.

Documentation Level -- Structures

Good

For a resource to have good documentation, **all three** of the following conditions must be met.

Identification -- Information is sufficient to associate the resource with a prehistoric or historic context and to give a general description of its current condition.

Evaluation -- Information exists which clearly documents that the resource possesses prehistoric or historic significance in accordance with the National Register criteria for evaluation.

Treatment -- Detailed information exists which analyzes the possible strategies for the proper treatment of the resource, and identifies the preferred method.

Fair

Documentation on the resource must meet the above standards for **Identification** and **Evaluation**, but documentation on **Treatment** may be lacking. In other words, the general significance of the resource is known, but detailed information on its condition or information potential is lacking.

Poor

Documentation on the resource does not meet the above standards for **Identification** and **Evaluation**. This category primarily describes those resources which are known to exist, but which have never been properly surveyed or researched.

Instructions and Definitions for Completing Objects Summary Chart

Counting Instructions for Objects Chart

1. Documentation

Record the number of objects in each collection represented by the five documentation categories. The data on documentation should be obtained from the park's annual Collection Management Report (Form 10-94).

2. Condition

Record the percentage of objects in each collection category represented by the five condition categories.

If a museum object has contemporary ethnographic significance, include it on both the Objects and Ethnographic charts.

SUMMARY CHART FOR OBJECTS

| <i>DOCUMENTATION Form 10-254 Submitted to National Catalog at Harpers Ferry</i> | <i>Archeology</i> | <i>Ethnology</i> | <i>History</i> | <i>Archives</i> | <i>Biology</i> | <i>Paleontology</i> | <i>Geology</i> | <i>TOTALS</i> |
|---|-------------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|---------------|
| <i>Registration Data Only</i> | 1288 | 59 | 2188 | 10 | 1087 | 0 | 0 | 4632 |
| <i>Registration & Catalog Data</i> | 150122 | 6050 | 92111 | 41 | 17474 | 1550 | 2685 | 270033 |
| <i>Total Items Cataloged</i> | 151410 | 6109 | 94299 | 51 | 18561 | 1550 | 2685 | 274665 |
| <i>Backlog to be Cataloged</i> | (101444 3) | (613) | (2081 14) | (38) | (26586) | (1169) | (502) | (240526 5) |
| <i>Total Collection Summary</i> | (116585 3) | (6722) | (3024 13) | (89) | (45147) | (2719) | (3187) | (267993 0) |

| <i>CONDITION</i> <i>The percentage of collection in the following categories:</i> | <i>Archeology</i> | <i>Ethnology</i> | <i>History</i> | <i>Archives</i> | <i>Biology</i> | <i>Paleontology</i> | <i>Geology</i> |
|--|-------------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| <i>Excellent</i> | 29 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Good</i> | 37 | 52 | 40 | 60 | 5 | 98 | 90 |
| <i>Fair</i> | 15 | 37 | 26 | 26 | 66 | 2 | 5 |
| <i>Poor</i> | 13 | 10 | 24 | 13 | 15 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Unknown</i> | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 5 |

SUMMARY CHART FOR OBJECTS

Note: Obtain data from annual Collection Management Report (Form 10-94)

| <i>DOCUMENTATION Form 10-254 Submitted to National Catalog at Harpers Ferry</i> | <i>Archeolog y</i> | <i>Ethnolog y</i> | <i>History</i> | <i>Archive s</i> | <i>Biology</i> | <i>Paleontolo gy</i> | <i>Geology</i> | <i>TOTALS</i> |
|---|------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| <i>Registration Data Only</i> | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Registration & Catalog Data</i> | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Total Items Cataloged</i> | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Backlog to be Cataloged</i> | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Total Collection Summary</i> | | | | | | | | |

| CONDITION The percentage of collection in the following categories: | <i>Archeology</i> | <i>Ethnology</i> | <i>History</i> | <i>Archives</i> | <i>Biology</i> | <i>Paleontology</i> | <i>Geology</i> |
|--|-------------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| <i>Excellent</i> | | | | | | | |
| <i>Good</i> | | | | | | | |
| <i>Fair</i> | | | | | | | |
| <i>Poor</i> | | | | | | | |
| <i>Unknown</i> | | | | | | | |

Definition for Objects Charts

Museum Object (NPS-28, Guideline, Appendix A.)

"Material thing possessing functional, aesthetic, cultural, symbolic, and/or scientific value. An object is usually movable by nature or design, such as a coin, a gun, a ceramic pot, a chair, a canoe, or an automobile. Museum objects include prehistoric and historic objects, artifacts, works of art, archival material, and natural history specimens that are part of a museum collection. Elements, fragments, and components of structures may be designated museum objects if they are no longer part of the original structure. Large or immovable properties, such as monumental statuary, trains, nautical vessels, cairns, and rock paintings, are considered to be either structures or features of sites. Museum objects in the custody of the National Park Service are usually housed in park museum collections or in archeological and historic preservation centers. Objects owned by the Service also may be on deposit in non-Federal repositories, e.g. museums and university collections."

Object Condition (Museum Handbook, Part II, pages 3-19)

Excellent -- No damage or deterioration.

Good -- Minor damage and no active deterioration.

Fair -- Some damage and/or slow but active deterioration.

Poor -- Significant damage and/or active deterioration.

Unknown -- Not enough information available to make an evaluation.

Instructions and Definitions for Completing Cultural Landscapes Summary Chart

Counting Instructions for Cultural Landscapes Chart

1. Significance

The National Register of Historic Places is the only acceptable source of information when indicating resource significance. If the park contains cultural landscapes which are believed to be significant but have not yet been formally evaluated through the National Register process, record them in the "Not Evaluated" Significance category. Do not place them in any of the other Significance categories until they have passed through the National Register review process.

Record the number of known cultural landscapes associated with each of the four significance levels. Include only those cultural landscapes which have been physically identified through direct observation, inventory, or survey. Do not attempt to estimate the number of cultural landscapes that may exist in unsurveyed areas. Do not include non-contributing landscapes on the chart.

If a cultural landscape has contemporary ethnographic significance, include it on both the Cultural Landscapes and Ethnographic Resources charts. List any significant structures associated with the landscape on the Structures chart, and any archeological sites on the Archeological Sites chart.

2. Condition

Record the number of cultural landscapes which are represented by each of the four condition categories. Note that the chart is organized by significance level and should be read horizontally.

3. Impacts

Record the number of cultural landscapes which are represented by each of the four levels of impact severity. Note that the chart is organized by significance level and should be read horizontally.

4. Documentation

Record the number of cultural landscapes which are represented by each of the three documentation levels. Note that the chart is organized by significance level and should be read horizontally.

SUMMARY CHART FOR CULTURAL LANDSCAPES

| Significance | | Condition | | | | Impacts | | | | Documentation | | |
|------------------|---|-----------|------|------|---------|---------|----------|-----|---------|---------------|------|------|
| | | Good | Fair | Poor | Unknown | Severe | Moderate | Low | Unknown | Good | Fair | Poor |
| National | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | 2 | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| State & Regional | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Local | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Not Evaluated | 3 | | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | | | | | 3 |
| Totals | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 | | 1 | 4 | | | 1 | 1 | 3 |

SUMMARY CHART FOR CULTURAL LANDSCAPES

| Significance | | Condition | | | | Impacts | | | | Documentation | | |
|------------------|--|-----------|------|------|---------|---------|----------|-----|---------|---------------|------|------|
| | | Good | Fair | Poor | Unknown | Severe | Moderate | Low | Unknown | Good | Fair | Poor |
| National | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| State & Regional | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Local | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Not Evaluated | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Totals | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Definitions for Cultural Landscapes Chart

Cultural Landscape (NPS-28)

A cultural landscape is a geographic area, including both natural and cultural resources, associated with a historic event, activity, or person, or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values. The National Park Service recognizes four cultural landscape categories: historic designed landscapes, historic vernacular landscapes, historic sites, and ethnographic landscapes. These categories are helpful in distinguishing the values that make landscapes cultural resources and in determining how they should be treated, managed, and interpreted.

Historic site: a landscape significant for its association with a historic event, activity, or person.

Historic designed landscape: a landscape significant as a design or work of art; was consciously designed and laid out either by a master gardener, landscape architect, architect, or horticulturist to a design principle, or by an owner or other amateur according to a recognized style or tradition; has a historical association with a significant person, trend, or movement in landscape gardening or architecture, or a significant relationship to the theory or practice of landscape architecture.

Historic vernacular landscape: a landscape whose use, construction, or physical layout reflects endemic traditions, customs, beliefs, or values; in which the expression of cultural values, social behavior, and individual actions over time is manifested in physical features and materials and their inter-relationships, including patterns of spatial organization, land use, circulation, vegetation, structures, and objects; in which the physical, biological, and cultural features reflect the customs and everyday lives of people.

Ethnographic landscape: areas containing a variety of natural and cultural resources that associated people define as heritage resources. Contemporary settlements are included as well as culturally important, massive geological structures, and ceremonial grounds.

The four cultural landscape categories are not mutually exclusive. A landscape may be associated with a significant event, include designed or vernacular characteristics, and be significant to a specific cultural group. For example, Gettysburg National Military Park is a historic site primarily significant as the scene of the 1863 Civil War battle. The park also includes historic vernacular farm complexes that existed at the time of the battle and a number of designed components added later to commemorate the event, including a national cemetery, roads, and numerous monuments.

The cultural landscape program focuses on landscapes listed in or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Landscapes primarily significant for their ethnographic value are under the purview of the ethnography program; however, professionals from both programs may be involved in their documentation and treatment.

Condition -- Cultural Landscapes

Condition of the Landscape - An indication of the current condition of the landscape.

Good - indicates the cultural landscape shows no clear evidence of major negative disturbance and deterioration by natural and/or human forces. The cultural landscape's historical and natural values are as well preserved as can be expected under the given environmental conditions. No immediate corrective action is required to maintain its current condition.

Fair - indicates the cultural landscape shows clear evidence of minor disturbances and deterioration by natural and/or human forces, and some degree of corrective action is needed within 3-5 years to prevent further harm to its historical and/or natural values. The cumulative effect of the deterioration of many of the character-defining features of the cultural landscape, if left to continue without the appropriate corrective action, will cause the landscape to degrade to a poor condition.

Poor - indicates the cultural landscape shows clear evidence of major disturbance and rapid deterioration by natural and/or human forces. Immediate corrective action is required to protect and preserve the remaining historical and natural areas.

Unknown - indicates that not enough information is available to make an evaluation.

Level of Impact Severity -- Cultural Landscapes

An impact is a detectable result of an agent or series of agents having a negative effect on the significant characteristics or integrity of a resource, and for which some form of mitigation or preventative action is possible. The assessment should include only those impacts likely to affect the resource within the next five years.

Severe

For an impact to be considered severe, it must meet at least one of the following criteria:

- the resource(s) will be significantly damaged or irretrievably lost if action is not taken within 2 years;
- there is an immediate and severe threat to visitor or staff safety.

Moderate

For an impact to be considered moderate, it must meet at least one of the following criteria:

- the resource(s) will be significantly damaged or irretrievably lost if action is not taken within 5 years;
- the situation caused by the impact is potentially threatening to visitor or staff safety.

Low

For an impact to be considered low, it must meet at least one of the following criteria:

- the continuing effect of the impact is known, and will not result in significant damage to the resource(s);
- the impact and its effects are not a direct threat to visitor or staff safety.

Unknown

Not enough information available to make an evaluation.

Documentation Level -- Cultural Landscapes

Good

For a resource to have good documentation, **all three** of the following conditions must be met:

Identification -- Information is sufficient to associate the resource with a prehistoric or historic context and to give a general description of its current condition.

Evaluation -- Information exists which clearly documents that the resource possesses prehistoric or historic significance in accordance with the National Register criteria for evaluation.

Treatment -- Detailed information exists which analyzes the possible strategies for the proper treatment of the resource, and identifies the preferred method.

Fair

Documentation on the resource must meet the above standards for **Identification** and **Evaluation**, but documentation on **Treatment** may be lacking. In other words, the general significance of the resource is known, but detailed information on its condition or information potential is lacking.

Poor

Documentation on the resource does not meet the above standards for **Identification** and **Evaluation**. This category primarily describes those resources which are known to exist, but which have never been properly surveyed or researched.

Instructions and Definitions for Completing Ethnographic Resources Summary Chart

At present there is no special software available for an Ethnographic Resources Summary Chart (see sample). Preparers of resources management plans can use WordPerfect tables to generate their own forms for the chart; using WordPerfect permits use of asterisks to refer to explanations of special cases below the chart and permits space to specify traditional user groups under each resource type.

Counting Instructions for Ethnographic Resources Chart

The summary chart for Ethnographic Resources should include both natural and cultural resources. It should include all those sites, objects, structures, flora and fauna, and landscapes (whether or not already classified as historic, natural, or archeological) which may be considered "ethnographic resources," because one or more contemporary groups identify the resource as traditionally associated with its lifeways and used for traditional religious, subsistence, medical, or other non-recreational purposes.

The chart should indicate the number, documentation level (poor, fair, good), authority for use (treaty, cooperative agreement, park enabling legislation), and type of traditional use (subsistence, commercial, medical, ceremonial, residential, spiritual) of identified ethnographic resources, and should indicate whether or not resources are eligible for the National Register or listed in the National Register.

Counting will be done as follows (adhering to procedures outlined in other summary charts).

- Archeological Sites - by number of prehistoric and historic archeological sites fitting definition of ethnographic resource (see pages 27 - 30);
- Structures note eligible - by number of known structures fitting definition of ethnographic resource; that ethnographic structures are **not** restricted to National Register structures;
- Objects ethnographic - by number of objects in each collection fitting category for resources (see pages 38 - 41);
- Ethnographic Landscapes of traditionally - by number of formally evaluated landscapes fitting definition of ethnographic resource (see pages 42 - 48) and by number of settlements associated peoples;
- Natural Resources - by number of species, mineral types, or bodies of water which have been identified as significant to a traditionally associated group; in the case of subsistence grounds, by number of acres;
- Other - count items in the "other" category only where quantifiable.

SUMMARY CHART FOR ETHNOGRAPHIC RESOURCES

| Resource Types | National Register | Authority | Non-recreational Use | Documentation Level |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Sites Hopi Apache | 4E 1L | TU | RC H | G G |
| Structures Navajo Mormon | 2E 1L | EL | RC O | G G |
| Objects Mormon Hopi Isleta | | 5 TU | O 25*** RC RC1 | F G F |
| Natural Resources Navajo Hopi Miners | 1*,1@ 1** | CA 2 acres# TU | MR C C | F F P |
| Ethnographic Landscapes Navajo Hopi Mormon | | | RS RS RS | F F F |
| Other | | | | |

* Refers to hot spring.

** Refers to turquoise mine.

@ Refers to viewshed including sacred mountain.
Refers to plant communities used for baskets.

*** Refers to tools used in traditional orchards.

SUMMARY CHART FOR ETHNOGRAPHIC RESOURCES

| Resource Types | National Register | Authority | Non-Recreational Use | Documentation Level |
|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Sites | | | | |
| Structures | | | | |
| Objects | | | | |
| Natural Resources | | | | |
| Ethnographic Landscapes | | | | |
| Other | | | | |

Definitions for Ethnographic Resources Chart

Ethnographic Resources

Ethnographic resources are those flora, fauna, minerals, natural features, and habitats, and cultural objects, sites, structures, places, and landscapes identified through interviews or observed use and research as being of traditional significance to contemporary peoples with longstanding ties to park resources.

These resources may be cross-listed in other NPS inventories. These resources include (but are not limited to): natural environmental features such as Native American hunting, trapping, and fishing grounds in Alaskan units; features of sacred geography such as Devils Tower or catlinite quarries at Pipestone NM; buildings such as the churches with ongoing parish use at San Antonio Missions; cultural landscapes such as the Timbisha Shoshone settlement at Death Valley; archeological sites in southwestern units that contemporary American Indians regard as sacred; and museum items such as pottery, weavings, and carvings that are assigned religious or legendary meaning by culturally affiliated peoples.

Traditionally Associated Group

A traditionally associated group is any ethnic group, family, or community with two or more generations of association with park resources. In the case of American Indians, Federal recognition is irrelevant to meeting the criteria for traditionally associated group.

Traditionally Associated Groups

In the category "Resource Types", under the specific type of resource (site, structure, object), write in the name of the traditionally associated group or groups. Examples of traditionally associated groups could include Jicarilla Apache, Mormons, descendants of Frederick Douglass, ranchers, members of the Stehekin, Washington, community, and commercial fishermen.

Resource Types

Sites: Archeological or historical places assigned significance by traditionally associated peoples as locales, for example, of their physical, cultural, or spiritual origins.

Structures: Built features to which traditionally associated peoples accord importance.

Objects: Portable materials in park collections, assigned traditional significance by park-associated peoples, including archives and photographic collections. Curators classify these materials and include them in counts for "historic," "archeologic," "natural," or "ethnologic" collections, but traditionally associated people classify them as ceremonial materials, adornment, spiritual entities, or other categories of ethnic heritage. Some collection materials classified as "ethnologic" may not be "ethnographic resources," because they do not continue to have traditional meaning assigned by park-associated peoples. Although other collection materials are not classed as "ethnologic," they may be considered "ethnographic resources," because these materials are significant to traditionally associated groups who are not Native American.

For example, the following objects are "ethnographic resources" because they are assigned traditional significance by associated groups: houseposts lent by the Tlingit people to Sitka NHP, Ellis Island material lent to the L. and A. Small Museum, Washington, D.C.

Natural

Resources This category includes flora and fauna, minerals, bodies of water, etc. Note whether Terrestrial (T) or Aquatic (A) or both (TA).

Ethnographic

Landscapes Areas containing a variety of natural and cultural resources that associated people define as heritage resources. Examples include contemporary settlements such as that at Martin Luther King, Jr. NHS, New Orleans neighborhoods, and massive geological structures such as Devils Tower.

Other

Any resource identified through consultation with a traditionally associated group which does not fit into one of the above categories.

Documentation Level -- Ethnographic Resources

Good

For a resource to have good documentation, **all three** of the following conditions must be met:

Identification -- one or more contemporary groups identify or identified a park resource as being traditionally associated with their lifeways over two or more generations; such identification is determined through consultation with the concerned group, ethnographic interviews, systematic observation, and analysis of documents.

Evaluation -- Information clearly documents the **continuing** significance attributed to a park resource by a contemporary group with traditional ties to park resources. The traditionally associated group **uses or would like to use** the resource under discussion for traditional religious, subsistence, or other cultural purposes; "use" includes a critical role in the definition of a group's cultural identity, such as Ellis Island for some U.S. immigrants or such as a place associated with an origins narrative for some Native Americans. The form and frequency of use have been established with a high degree of certainty.

Treatment -- Detailed information exists on a traditionally associated group's ranked preferences for proper treatment of ethnographic resources. For example, a Pueblo group may prefer that a certain kiva be filled in so that there is no risk of desecration by non-initiates.

Fair

Documentation on the resource must meet the above standards for **Identification** and **Evaluation**, but documentation for **Treatment** is lacking. The general ethnographic significance of the resource is known, but consultation is required to determine the treatment strategies preferred by the traditionally associated group.

Poor

Documentation on the significant park resource and on ties between it and the traditionally associated group does not meet above standards for **Identification**, **Evaluation**, and **Treatment**. Casual observation suggests that members of contemporary park-associated groups might ascribe cultural meaning to certain resources, but consultation and ethnographic research (interviews, observation, literature review) have not been conducted to confirm either ongoing significance or form and frequency of uses.

National Register

Note whether the resource is:

- E - eligible for listing on the National Register on the basis of ethnographic value;
- L - listed;
- X - has been considered for nomination by a traditionally associated group which has decided it does not support nomination;
- ID - documentation is inadequate to determine National Register status.

Authority

If the resource is currently actively used, note whether use is based on:

- EL - park enabling legislation;
- T - treaty;
- CA - cooperative agreement;
- O - other authority;
- TU - documented past traditional use.

Quarrying at Pipestone NM, for example, would be EL/TU.

Non-Recreational Use

Specify the type of non-recreational use. Note whether:

- S - use is consumptive and for subsistence;
- C - use is consumptive and for occasional commercial exchange;
- M/MR - use is consumptive and medical or medico-religious;
- RC - use is for religious ceremonial purposes;

Note if use is:

- R - for non-consumptive religious purposes such as spiritual training;
- RS - residential community;
- O - other cultural uses;
- U - casual observation suggests there are additional non-recreational uses aside from those noted by use of above abbreviations, but these uses cannot be determined without ethnographic research.

Ethnographic landscapes such as Martin Luther King, Jr. NHS or the Timbisha Shoshone community at Death Valley should be entered as RS, which implies multiple uses.

THE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM SECTION OF THE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN

THE OVERVIEW OF CURRENT PROGRAM AND NEEDS

The Overview of Current Program and Needs subsection of the Resources Management Program section contains the current and proposed resources management program for the park. The overview should logically build on the resource descriptions, conditions, and threats identified in the Introduction and Present Resource Status sections of the plan. It should also clarify the overall strategy behind the project statements that follow. This section describes the park's day-to-day resources management program, including interdivisional responsibilities in resources management, protection (e.g., enforcement, maintenance, and interpretive activities), and compliance processes. The scope of the park's current resources management capabilities should be discussed with reference to personnel and funding for the current fiscal year. The park's present organizational structure should be included, preferably displayed as an organizational chart. A concise statement of the responsibilities of each of the various park divisions with respect to managing the resources of the park should be included.

This subsection should also prescribe long-term strategies to address the park's most important resources problems. They may employ monitoring, survey and evaluation, research, mitigation, protection, and interpretation activities. These strategies should reflect the legislative mandates, relevant general management plan strategies, management objectives, and resource significance identified in the Introduction. Short-term actions being implemented and/or proposed should be logically ordered so they provide building blocks to achieve long-term goals.

Unfunded operational needs for ongoing program activities also should be presented. Staffing and skills needed to implement the resources management program contained in the resources management plan should be logically prioritized for future operational funding submissions. The Resources Management Assessment Program (R-MAP) provides an objective assessment of the base staffing and funding needed to implement a thorough natural resources management and research program in a park, and should be used as the basis for staffing needs, although other goals for FTEs may be included. The park's target natural resources organization should be described and an organizational chart included. Parks should include requests for increases to base funding, including funds to support follow-up activities resulting from project completion and ongoing management actions (e.g., monitoring).

Unmet needs will be reflected in the unfunded project statements. Priorities should be carefully assigned to these project statements to assure that high priority proposals reflect a commitment to

long-range goals for research, resources management, and resources preservation. The primary consideration in setting resources management plan priorities is the importance and urgency in protecting and maintaining natural systems, restoring natural conditions, and protecting and maintaining cultural resources. However, some extra consideration should be given to opportunities for cost sharing, cooperative projects, meeting health and safety objectives, and/or circumstances where a delay will result in significantly higher costs.

PROJECT STATEMENTS

This subsection defines current and proposed actions through project statements. Project statements should describe all current and anticipated resources management undertakings, including ongoing, day-to-day, base-funded operations as well as proposed projects. Include not only those issues or problems that may require development of separate action plans, but also the resources management tasks that occur on a regular or cyclic basis. For cultural resources research, project titles should correspond to NPS-28.

The various divisions' responsibilities should be identified in both the problem statement and the description of recommended activity. Other divisions (maintenance, interpretation, protection) should participate in completing project statements, describing the funded and unfunded resources management component of their division. Project statements should also integrate the management of natural and cultural resources. For example, cultural landscape reports and vegetation management plans should be coordinated whenever there are benefits to be gained by doing so. Cross-referencing related natural and cultural project statements is further recommended to maximize the integration of cultural and natural resources management.

Problem Statement: State the issue, problem, or need that will be addressed and discuss it at a level of detail commensurate with the nature of the problem and urgency. High priority projects that have numerous impacts or ramifications will be detailed and lengthy. Lower priority projects that are recently identified may have less detail initially but should receive more attention as staff time is addressed to researching or documenting the problem. It is a useful practice to state the crux of the problem and the needed action clearly in the first couple of sentences. That gives the rest of the narrative some context, and the real problem does not get lost.

The problem statement must clearly identify and describe the affected cultural and natural resources and the significance of the affected resources as they relate to the park's enabling legislation and relevant Federal preservation, Native American-related, and environmental laws, and must describe the relationship of the project to park management objectives. The project statement should include a description of the impact or threat to park resources, clearly describing the nature and extent of threats relating to the project, and identifying the source(s) of the threat, indicating whether the source(s) is internal, external, or a combination of both. The problem

statement must describe the

relationship of the project to park ecosystem management and cultural resources management, and the relationship of the problem to park mandates and objectives. It should also consider potential effects on all National Register-listed or Register-eligible properties whether such properties relate to park interpretive needs or not, and also consider potential effects on traditional user groups and ethnographic resources.

The problem statement narrative must discuss the condition of the affected resources, the extent of known impacts whether from within the park or outside it (including impacts on the health and safety of employees and visitors), related park activities that are affecting the resources, and ongoing activities to monitor the situation.

The narrative should also include the relationship between the resources and park-associated groups, local communities and other interested user groups, as well as the broad area of environmental and cultural resource concerns beyond the park's boundaries.

Description of the Recommended Project or Activity: List and describe each component to be completed by respective divisions in recommended order of accomplishment; explain how the actions will be incorporated or what feedback mechanism will be employed to ensure the results are to be put to use via management action to correct the problem and how their effectiveness will be monitored. Clearly describe the mitigative actions to address internal and external threats identified in the Problem Statement. The cost of administration of the project, related interpretive, protection, maintenance, monitoring, or research components should be explained.

The detail within the description of action narrative will be commensurate with the urgency and complexity of the issue. Lower priority projects will have less detail. The narrative should describe the resolution of the resource issue, relationship to effective management actions, (visitor use, access to sacred areas, protection, mitigation, etc.); and any benefits the project will have for programs of other parks. The project detail should include the relationship or timing with other projects, the cost effectiveness of the approach being proposed; estimated duration of work, methodology, responsibility, probable funding sources, adequacy of staff, necessary FTEs, grade levels, technical skills above that possessed by the staff, etc. If the park staff does not have the information or expertise to fully develop the proposed action, describe that uncertainty, where the park will go to resolve it, and present the objectives of the proposed action.

An initial investment in detailed project statements will enhance the quality of the plan for both park management and outside readers as well as the chances of the project competing for funding. Minor revisions, performed during annual reviews, will be simplified by updating existing narratives or adding detail to project statements that are lower in priority.

[Optional Section] Alternative Actions/Solutions and Impacts: Although optional, parks may wish to discuss alternatives to present the analysis process by which the recommended action was

chosen, record options that could be carried out if full funding is not received, and preserve information that may be needed for an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement. Parks may also use this section to document the expected results of taking no action.

Compliance: The need for and status of compliance with cultural resources and environmental protection regulatory requirements should be shown here. If regulatory requirements have been completed, reference the relevant compliance document and its date (EA/FONSI, EIS/ROD, Letter of Concurrence, Memorandum of Agreement or Programmatic Agreement, etc.); if regulatory requirements have not been met, indicate the compliance necessary.

Generally, the RMP is **not** the document through which compliance is accomplished. However, if sufficient information is available about cultural resources and potential effects on them it may be possible to conduct 106 consultation based on appropriate documentation. Even when the consultation process cannot be completed for individual projects at the time of resources management plan development, state historic preservation officers should have opportunities to advise on general directions and priorities in the resources management plan. Compliance (for both cultural and natural resource-related projects) will be accomplished on a case-by-case basis, as funding becomes likely.

Specific compliance requirements beyond those of the National Environmental Policy Act and National Historic Preservation Act should be identified, such as the following: Endangered Species Act, wetlands, floodplains, water quality, water rights, Section 404, Coastal Zone Management, state requirements such as air quality that are binding on the National Park Service, Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA), Archeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA), etc.

For more information on compliance, see NPS-28, the *Cultural Resources Management Guideline* and NPS-12, the *National Environmental Policy Act Guideline*, and the Section 106 regulations (36 CFR Part 800) and publications of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. Regional cultural resources specialists can answer questions about 106 processes.

