Cover: Detail from the Hazen Map of 1856 (National Archives)
“The Fort occupied the sloping top of a great hill which, standing at the gateway of the Grand Ronde valley, was naturally adapted for military occupation. The crest of the hill made a semi-circular sweep on the east and south, the ground falling away abruptly from its clear-cut rim to the winding course of the Yamhill river, far below. On the east, too, a phalanx of firs, scaling the rugged heights, wave their green plumes over the row of neat white cottages occupied by the officers and threw morning shadows across the smooth plateau of the parade ground. The other buildings of the post, soldiers’ quarters, mess-room, hospital, commissary, guard-room etc., occupied the remaining sides of the quadrangle, all marvelously white in their constantly refreshed coats of white wall with fine oaks flanking it on the north, stood the regulation blockhouse, strong, dark, and menacing. A stately flagstaff, supported by two gleaming field pieces, stood in the center of the parade ground.”

An excerpt from Sam Simpson’s, Maya, The Medicine Girl 1898

Fort site circa 1940’s.
Source: Salem Public Library Photo Collection
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PLAN SUMMARY

The Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD) has worked in a cooperative effort with the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde (CTGR) to develop a master plan for the Fort Yamhill State Heritage Area. During the past two years (December 2001-October 2003), OPRD and the CTGR have been examining potential options to eventually open the Fort and surrounding properties to the general public. As a result of this master planning process, OPRD and CTGR have developed a strategy to provide appropriate educational and recreational facilities on the site by 2006, the 150th anniversary of the Fort’s establishment.

The general planning area is owned by three parties: The Oregon Parks and Recreation Department acquired the 54.65 acre historic Fort site in 1988; The CTGR owns approximately 139.5 acres that was acquired in 2000; and Polk County owns a 2.72 acre parcel.

The Fort Yamhill State Heritage Area is in northern Polk County, about 1/2 mile north of Valley Junction. Although, Oregon State Parks has owned the property since 1988, development of a park here has not yet occurred. At the advent of this master planning process, CTGR acquired a key parcel (139 acres) associated with the historic Fort site. This acquisition set the stage for future facility development, public access and a long-term partnership between State Parks and the Tribes. This report outlines the shared vision for the future development and management of the 55-acre Fort Yamhill State Heritage Area.

Vision Statement for Fort Yamhill

To protect and interpret the cultural resources of Fort Yamhill and schedule the development of appropriate educational and recreational facilities by 2006, 150 years after the Fort was first opened.

The Oregon Parks and Recreation Department in partnership with the CTGR, has embarked upon an ambitious vision for the Fort Yamhill State Heritage Area having recognized that the Fort represents a significant part of Oregon’s history. Thousands of people on their way to the Oregon Coast travel through the Highway 18/22 corridor. Most of them unknowingly drive by one of Oregon’s more interesting historic places, an unassuming saddle between two hills perched above the South Yamhill River. The Oregon State Park’s property is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Future park visitors will better understand the importance of the Fort Yamhill site and its rich history if the vision for this park is implemented. Fort Yamhill’s history is intertwined with the history and culture of the Grand Ronde people and their relationship to a military fort located on the edge of their reservation. The developed Fort Yamhill State Heritage Area will provide a glimpse into the military life of the 1850s. Visitors will leave the park with a better understanding of the events that led up to the Fort’s closure and abandonment and an appreciation of the cultural history of the Grand Ronde people.

This master plan outlines a vision for OPRD’s property as well as access to it via Grand Ronde property.
The target date of 2006 was set early in the planning process. This date recognizes the 150th anniversary of the establishment of the Grand Ronde Reservation and the establishment of Fort Yamhill in 1856. It also conveniently corresponds with the events and planned celebrations associated with the Lewis and Clark Bicentennial. The Tribes will host the National Park Services Traveling Museum, Corps II commemorating the Lewis and Clark expedition in March 2006.

A Shared Vision
This plan was developed through a partnership between OPRD and the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde and reflects the mission and vision statements for each of these two entities.

OPRD’s Mission

“Provide and protect outstanding natural, scenic, cultural, historic and recreational sites for the enjoyment and education of present and future generations.”

The Fort Yamhill Plan is part of OPRD’s mission to preserve Oregon’s rich cultural heritage and broaden the public’s understanding of Oregon’s historic places and events. OPRD will follow principles of good cultural resource management of this historic site and provide for an enhanced visitor experience through the delivery of interpretive programs.

Confederated Tribes’ of Grand Ronde Vision

CTGR’s vision is to be a tribal community known as a caring people, dedicated to the principles of honesty and integrity, building community, individual responsibility and self-sufficiency through personal empowerment, and responsible stewardship of human and natural resources; a community willing to act with courage in preserving tribal cultures and traditions for all future generations.

Fort Yamhill offers an opportunity to connect to the history, culture and traditions so important to the CTGR community while preserving these same values for future generations.
Fort Yamhill: A Look Back

The site has a long, interesting history. The Yamhill band of the Kalapuyas lived in the Yamhill River Valley, long before European settlers arrived. In 1856 the Army moved the native Indian peoples of the Willamette Valley and the southern Oregon Coast to the Coast Indian Reservation. Fort Yamhill was one of three “reservation forts” established in Oregon after the Grand Ronde Reservation was created; the other two were Fort Hoskins and Fort Umpqua (see figure 2). These Forts, plus the Siletz Blockhouse outpost, served as a kind of buffer zone between the settlers and Native American people, protecting both populations and controlling traffic between them.

OPRD conducted a cultural assessment and field survey in 1991. The assessment revealed the location of major buildings that once occupied the site — at least 24. The Fort included a sentry box, officers’ quarters, barracks, carpenter’s shop, blacksmith shop, hospital, cookhouses, stables, barn, sutler’s store, laundress quarters and more. Famed Civil War General Philip H. Sheridan, then a 2nd Lieutenant, supervised the construction of some buildings at Fort Yamhill. The noteworthy wooden blockhouse was subsequently used much of the time as a jail, both on the post and in later years. In 1911 it was moved to the town of Dayton, where it still stands.

Perhaps the most fascinating and enigmatic structure at the site is an abandoned house, reported to have been the home of Lt. Philip Sheridan. Sheridan was an officer at Fort Yamhill but the use of the house by Sheridan has not been verified. What is certain is that the house encases relocated remains of one of the Fort’s officers’ quarters.

At the start of the Civil War, troops of the 4th California Infantry were quartered at Fort Yamhill, enduring a rather dull existence while the “regular army” was fighting the sporadic battles that characterized the western Civil War. The Fort was abandoned and disassembled in 1866, and its buildings auctioned off to the public. The government did not fare well in the proceedings: buildings that cost $36,053 to build were sold for $1,260 in 1866. The blockhouse itself sold for $2.50. For the next 121 years, the land was farmed, and it remained in private hands until it was acquired by State Parks.

Future Development at Fort Yamhill State Heritage Area

The Master Plan outlines a vision for the partial restoration of the Fort site. Under this scenario important landscape elements would be reconstructed to provide visitors with an understanding of the scale and layout of the Fort. Old Fort Road would be restored for pedestrian use. A 50-space parking lot would be located at the terminus of the primary access road. Adjacent to the parking area are interpretive panels overlooking the valley below with Spirit Mountain in the background. The park’s restroom would be located close to the parking area.

From the parking lot and interpretive area visitors will follow a path, across Old Fort Road to a picket fence encircling the parade ground. They would enter through the gate in the fence. Their eyes would focus on the reconstructed blockhouse overlooking the parade ground that would be demarcated by the white picket fence, and accentuated by large Oregon white oaks. A tall flagpole will identify the center of this sloping parade ground. At the blockhouse visitors would learn about the Fort from interpretive panels, and take in the view to Spirit Mountain, an important cultural icon for the Grand Ronde people, and the Grand Ronde Valley below.

The restored white washed officers’ quarters on the crest of the hill will draw visitors to the eastern edge of the Fort. A trail will bring the visitors through the Fort. Boulders, or other
means, will mark the corners of the known 24 buildings. Additional trails would lead visitors to strategic viewpoints overlooking the South Yamhill Valley and other important vistas.

The Fort restoration includes the relocation of the Bonneville Power Administration’s transmission lines to the south perimeter of the OPRD property. The realignment will cross private lands and require additional easements or land purchases prior to construction.

A new entrance road is proposed to the north of Old Fort Road through Tribal lands. Currently access to the properties is located on Old Fort Road, the historic route prior to the construction of Hebo Road along Cosper Creek. At the recommendation of the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), the new entrance road is sited further to the north to allow safe access by providing adequate sight distance. This section of road has sufficient length to see oncoming traffic. The proposed primary entrance road will cross Cosper Creek requiring the construction of a new bridge. The proposed alignment follows the slope providing access to all of the planned uses including a potential campground on Tribal lands and the Fort, as well as access to the Tribes’ timber management areas. A knoll provides a visual barrier between the Fort and future developable land on Tribes’ property. This road will be developed in partnership with OPRD and CTGR.
CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION

This plan was developed with guidance from the Grand Ronde Tribal Council with much work and dedication from Tribal staff, State Park staff and a community of interested citizens who worked together to develop the concepts outlined in this plan. Much work is still needed to make this plan a reality by 2006, OPRD’s target date for opening. This master plan also outlines a strategy and defines critical implementation steps to be undertaken by OPRD.

Useful Products of this Master Planning Process

- Creates the basis for a valuable planning partnership between the Tribes, Polk County, OPRD and the neighboring communities.
- Develops a unified vision for the State’s property that all parties and the community can work toward.
- Provides a forum for discussing important issues and identifying potential solutions.
- Compiles past research and information into one document including a GIS database, Planning Atlas and summary documents to help aid future efforts. OPRD and the Tribes jointly developed this research that provides the background information used to formulate this plan.
- Creates an opportunity for public involvement and understanding of project constraints.
- Provides a strategy for future planning efforts and development timelines.
- Defines next steps as related to additional historic and archaeological research needed.
- Defines natural resource management in the context of the cultural landscape.

The Planning Process

Partnership Development

The Fort Yamhill planning effort began in June 2000 shortly after the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde purchased a 139-acre parcel adjacent to Fort Yamhill State Historic Site, a 55-acre parcel of the land owned by the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department. The property purchased by the Tribes was considered a critical piece needed for appropriate facility development and access as identified in the OPRD “Fort Yamhill Feasibility Study” completed in 1991, shortly after OPRD acquired the Fort site.

In the spring of 2000, soon after the Tribes’ acquisition of the adjacent property, OPRD staff met with tribal staff to explore partnership opportunities. Michael Carrier, OPRD’s Director, made a presentation to Tribal Council in July 2001 inquiring about a future partnership between OPRD and the Tribes. At the conclusion of this meeting the Tribal Council recommended that partnership and development opportunities be further explored. Tribal staff and OPRD staff worked together, establishing timelines, identifying issues and setting up a public involvement strategy.

Following the Tribal Council meeting in August 2001, OPRD made a presentation to the Polk County Commission asking for their support. Polk County owned a 2.72-acre triangular shaped property, wedged between OPRD and CTGR properties. Polk County acquired this property through tax default. The Polk County Commission supported the partnership effort and encouraged OPRD and CTGR to develop a master plan for the site.

In August 2003, the Tribal Council signed a resolution authorizing the commitment to
provide a road access easement to the State’s property.

In September 2003, OPRD staff met with the Polk County Commission to present the draft plan concepts. The Commission supported the plan and offered to work with OPRD on the transfer of their property to State Parks. They requested that OPRD seek ways to capitalize on their donation by potentially using it as match for future grant projects. In April 2004, Polk County deeded the property to OPRD.

Coordinating Committee
A core group of dedicated staff, representing both the Tribes and OPRD, met regularly for over two years guiding the development of this master plan. This working group provided the motivation to complete this plan.

- June Olson, CTGR Cultural Resources Manager, Key contact for CTGR
- Ed Hansen, Spirit Mountain Casino
- Mike Wilson, CTGR Lands Manager
- Kim Rogers, CTGR Planning Manager
- Eric Scott, CTGR Development Manager
- Merle Holmes, Tribal Elder
- Josh Levy, CTGR GIS Coordinator, prepared planning atlas
- Kathy Schutt, OPRD Planning Manager
- Kristen Stallman, OPRD Master Planning Coordinator, Key contact for OPRD
- Eric Timmons, Willamette Mission State Park Manager
- Jack Wiles, OPRD Area Manager
- Dennis Wiley, Champoeg State Heritage Area Manager
- Dave Wright, Resource Management and Planning Manager

Studies
OPRD and the Tribes completed several joint studies which provided the background research critical to the development of this plan. These studies included a cultural resource analysis, natural resource inventory, architectural investigation of the officers’ quarters, a forestry assessment, and a GIS and visual landscape analysis.

Steering Committee
A steering committee of people who have experience or knowledge of Fort Yamhill convened four times during the development of the master plan with the Fort Yamhill Coordinating Committee. The steering committee helped to identify issues and provide insight into cultural resource management and possible development options. This group was advisory to the coordinating committee. This group represented a wide array of interests and included the following:

- Dr. David Brauner, OSU Anthropology Department
- Gene Clemens, Polk County Economic Development
- Dennis Creel and David Hampton, Hampton Affiliates
- John DeTar, Oregon Department of Transportation
- David Primozich, Yamhill County Parks Department
- Dennis Werth, neighbor
- April Wooden, Willamina Historical Society
- Tribal representatives from the coordinating committee

Public Involvement
OPRD and the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde held an informational public meeting in March 2002. Property owners adjacent to the Fort Yamhill State Heritage Area were notified. Approximately 20 people attended this information-sharing meeting. The public helped prioritize and identify issues related to the site. A follow-up newsletter was sent out to the Fort Yamhill mailing list in June. OPRD presented the draft plan to approximately 15 attendees at an
informational public meeting in October 2003. The purpose of this meeting was to solicit comments on the draft plan concepts. A final public meeting to review the draft master plan was held in early 2004.

**The Planning Context**

**Prehistory**  

The cultures of the Willamette Valley did not change dramatically over the last few thousand years of prehistory. Deer, elk, and other game were abundant. Social and political organization in the valley remained simple, as it was at the time of Euro-American contact. All the evidence suggests that the Willamette Valley people had achieved a remarkably stable equilibrium with their environment. At the time of contact, these people spoke dialects of Kalyapuyan, Molalla, and the Clackamas Chinook languages. The ancestors of these people may very well have been the first settlers in the valley.

Some Nehalem, Tillamook, Nestucca, and Salmon River people of the Oregon coast moved to the Grand Ronde Reservation. The prehistory of these Salish-speaking people is distinct from that of the Willamette Valley peoples just discussed. By 2,500 years ago, Salish speakers were settled just south of the mouth of the Columbia with a fully developed Northwest Coast fishing culture similar to that of their kin on the Washington Coast and in the Puget Sound region.

The prehistory of the peoples of the mountain valleys southward from the Willamette Valley is not well known. Hunting people occupied the valley possibly 4,000 to 6,000 years ago. The culture of the earliest occupants seems to have had affinities with the Great Basin cultures across the mountains in the southeastern Oregon and Nevada. Over time, people entered this tangle of mountains and valleys from all directions and found refuge in their isolated pockets.

The ancestors of the Umpqua, Cow Creek and Rogue River people must have had a remarkable prehistory. A little over a thousand years ago, they would have been with their sub-Artic Dene-speaking kin in northern Canada and Alaska. At some time after that, groups of Dene moved south. Their exact routes are not known. By the time Europeans arrived in the Northwest, some Dene had reached southwestern Oregon and northwestern California. Two isolated groups, no longer in existence, lived in the heavily forested hill country just north and south of the Lower Columbia. There are various hypotheses as to how the Pacific Dene reached their homes. Since most of them lived in isolated forests, mountainous country, it is possible that they were skilled upland hunters who infiltrated their Oregon homelands by moving from southwestern Washington down along the Coast Range in country little used by other Indian groups.

Shasta-speaking people from the Rogue River were among the first Indians settled on the Grand Ronde Reservation. The Rogue River Shasta were northern representatives of the Hokan linguistic group whose members occupied much of northeastern California, a portion of the coast north of San Francisco, most of central California, and desert lands around the lower Colorado.

There is much we do not know about prehistory in western Oregon. The available data reveal tantalizing glimpses of fascinating events and mysteries. In the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde, there are descendants of people who have lived in the Willamette Valley for over 8,000 years. The ancestors of others may have arrived only about a thousand years ago. Whether of more ancient
or more recent origin, all the Indians ancestral to the present day Grand Ronde people were established in western Oregon well before the arrival of the first white visitors and explorers.

**Fort Development**

As early as 1848, with the discovery of gold in southwestern Oregon and the subsequent influx of miners, frequent outbreaks of hostilities occurred between miners and the Native Indians. Passage of the Oregon Donation Land Law set the stage for further conflict. Unlike the earlier generation of traders who maintained a generally peaceful relationship with the Indians, the new settlers focused on agriculture and resource exploitation which threatened Indian ways of life. Beginning in 1852, major outbreaks annually beset the Rogue River region. The Table Rock Treaty and reservation were created in an attempt to curb the conflicts. However, in 1855, in part due to failures in treaty policy, conflicts ultimately erupted into the Rogue River Indian Wars.

The resolution of the Indian-white conflicts fell upon Joel Palmer, Superintendent of Indian Affairs in Oregon. Palmer outlined a policy for Indian relocation, rehabilitation and protection, as well as a reservation territory. Abandoning his earlier policy of establishing small reservations, Palmer concluded to move all the Indians of western Oregon onto one large reservation. The Coast Reservation was to reach for nearly 125 miles along the coast from Cape Lookout on the north to the mouth of the Umpqua River on the south and reach inland to the crest of the Coast Range to include over a million acres. The Coast Reservation was created by Executive Order on November 8, 1855. Subsequently an additional 60,000 contiguous acres in Polk and Yamhill counties were set aside as the Grand Ronde Reservation.

On April 11, 1856, Palmer wrote to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs:

“The threatening attitude of the community led me to apprehend a general and combined attack upon the camp of friendly Indians, located at the Grand Ronde, and the slaughtering or driving into hostile position all who might be residing in the valley. I accordingly deemed it necessary to organize a force of armed citizens and place them on the eastern line of the reservation, cutting off all communication between settlements and the Indians. And whilst engaged in this line, to construct a fence from mountain to mountain, as line of demarcation, across which no one could pass. This I have attempted putting into operation and will have good reason to believe will be successful. It will require a force of about sixty men, and to remain until relieved by the promised Company of United States Troops.”

Throughout the winter of 1855-56 the federal government began the large-scale relocation of western Oregon Indians to the reservation. With the creation of the reservation came the necessity of providing police protection for the Indians and agency employees who would live there. In 1856, Fort Yamhill was the first post to be established, followed by Fort Umpqua at the mouth of the Umpqua River in Douglas County; Fort Hoskins at Kings Valley in Benton County; and, the Siletz Blockhouse at Siletz in Lincoln County (See Figure 2).
The primary purpose of the posts as Joel Palmer envisioned them was to protect Indians on the reservation. In his view the displacement of Indians was deemed necessary to ensure their safety and well being. Joel Palmer wrote to General Wool at Fort Vancouver on December 1, 1855:

“The existence of a war of extermination by our citizens against all Indians in southern Oregon, which by acts appear to evince a determination to carry it out in violation of all treaty stipulations, and the common usage of all civilized nations, has induced me to take steps to remove the friendly bands of Indians now assembled at Fort Lane and upon Umpqua reservation to an encampment on the headwaters of the Yamhill River. This place has been adopted with a view of saving the lives of such of those Indians as has given just and reasonable assurances of friendship.”

It was also the view of some officers that the Indians would need to be protected against exploitation by settlers, agents, traders, lumbermen, miners and fishermen.

Figure 2 – Map of the Coast Indian Reservation.
Selecting the Location for the Fort
In 1855, Lieutenants Sheridan, Hazen and Bonnycastle each conducted a survey in the Grand Ronde territory to choose a suitable location for Fort Yamhill. Transportation of supplies from Portland was regarded as an essential factor in determining the location and feasibility of the Fort site. Access to water, pasture and timber was also a consideration. Most importantly however, the ultimate location for Fort Yamhill was based on its position at the boundary of the reservation along one of the only routes into the northern portion, thereby enabling it to restrict and control access into the Reservation. This site was also in close proximity to the Grand Ronde Indian Agency, the seat of supervision for the Indians of the Reservation for which it was meant to protect.

Indian Encampments
The Molalla Indian Encampment and a store were located on or near Cosper Creek. A second Native American encampment, identified as the “Klamoths (sic) Village appears on a map on the west side of Cosper Creek.

In a 1856 letter from Capt Smith
“The Post is located just within the Ind reservation on the road from the settlements at the only point of ingress & egress on this portion of the reservation for teams and horsemen.”

The U.S. Army Garrisons the Fort
In 1855, Lt. William Hazen established camp at the site and immediately began supervising the erection of the quarters and barracks of the Fort. Because the bulk of the construction was completed during Lt. Philip Sheridan’s tenure, credit was given to Lt. Sheridan for bringing the work at the post to an early completion. Sheridan used Indians as laborers and hired up to 38 civilian carpenters, masons and painters to expedite construction.

While the regular army was garrisoned, four officers including an assistant surgeon with the rank of captain, and about 80 enlisted men usually manned Fort Yamhill. Excitement of any kind was unusual in the lives of these frontier soldiers. Day to day life at the Fort consisted primarily of mundane chores. Local citizens provided services as physicians, sutlers (civilian provisioners), blacksmiths, wheelwrights, forage master and herders. The Fort in turn relied upon Valley communities, Willamina and Salem in particular, for certain goods, communication with the world at large, church services and social life.
Reservation Life
The removal of Indians from their native lands to the Reservation had been a “Trail of Tears”. Many of them were moved during the winter snows. Dozens of bands and tribes were brought together on the reservation to be subjected to “a program of fostering civilization.” When they could, Indians slipped away by twos and threes to return to their familiar homelands. The soldiers of the Fort complained that chasing after Indians was no part of soldier’s duty. The captives who failed to escape often suffered more than the fugitives, for the “trail of tears” was a death march to some whose entire families were wiped out within a few years by crowding, disease, starvation, and homesickness.

Volunteers Garrison the Fort
With the onset of the Civil War in the east, the Army had to decide what to do with Fort Yamhill and other posts on the Reservation. The initial decision was to close the forts. Unlike Fort Stevens, which guarded the mouth of the Columbia River from possible Confederate invasion, these forts had no military purpose in the main context of the Civil War. However, because Oregon was strongly sympathetic towards the South the U.S. Army felt a Union presence in Oregon was prudent. Also, white settlers near the reservation opposed closure of the Fort, fearing a repeat of hostilities with the Indians. So in the fall of 1861, the regular Army was replaced with volunteer citizen soldiers from California, Oregon and Washington. These men had enlisted for a great cause but never had the opportunity to fight for it. They spent much of their time waiting for something to happen. Though they were far from the battlefields, their battles on these isolated posts were no less real. The volunteers fought rain, hunger, daily routine, military restriction, ignorant officers, monotony and isolation. Desertions were common but life outside was not always easy, and many deserters gave themselves up to return to duty.

“Indian issues: Amount to a few “Spuds” and a little Wheat issued every Monday to each head of family. Just now, and for some time (sic.) to come, the Agent will answer a supplication for “Muck-a-muck” [food] after this style, “Nika halo Muck-a-Muck [I have no food].” Poor Indians, this is your reward for trusting the “Boston man.”

Royal Bensell
All Quiet on the Yamhill
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The Fort's Last Days

On August 13, 1866, the Oregon Statesman Newspaper of Salem carried a detailed advertisement announcing the sale of the property of Fort Yamhill. A public auction was held on August 27 and the buildings of the Fort were sold to area residents for a total of $1,260. The blockhouse was so little desired by the practical farmers that the auctioneer purchased it for $2.50 and left it on site. After some years it was moved to the Grand Ronde Agency where it was used as a jail and storehouse for nearly 40 years. Upon seeing its deteriorating condition, the citizens of Dayton lobbied to rescue the blockhouse and place it in the Dayton City Park as a memorial to Joel Palmer, their most prominent citizen. The blockhouse was moved to Dayton on June 9, 1911 by horse drawn wagons and re-erected during the next year by Dayton's citizens. The blockhouse still stands in Dayton today.
The Cultural Landscape
Setting and Views

Fort Yamhill was strategically located on a prominence at the eastern boundary of the Coast Indian Reservation. The Fort was located along the main passage into the northern portion of the reservation. Situated on the gentle western slope of the hill, the upper reaches of the Fort site offered a magnificent view of both the Grand Ronde Valley to the northwest and the Yamhill River Valley to the south and east. The Grand Ronde Indian Agency was located only a few miles to the northwest of the site. This view is an integral aspect of the story of Fort Yamhill.

Roads and Paths
Old Killimuck Trail generally follows the topography from the South Yamhill River bottom over the saddle in the hill towards the Oregon Coast. Early Native Americans used this trail as a major travel route between the Willamette Valley and the Oregon Coast.

Fort Yamhill’s ultimate location was selected along the “Road to Tillmook” which was “the only point of ingress and egress on this portion of the reservation”. This route generally follows the route of the Old Killimuck Trail.

This road established the northern boundary of the Fort’s parade ground. The remnants of this original road are the most visible remaining feature of the Fort setting. Off of this main road an additional road encircled the parade ground area.

An archaeological investigation of the Tribal property discusses a possible segment of a north branch road. Map analysis suggests that the road, or a branch of a road, might have turned north after it passed the west side of the Fort, and crossed Cosper Creek some distance upstream from the current crossing. If the road jogged to the north, as suggested by the historical maps, it would have descended a much gentler slope before crossing the creek. Old Fort Road may follow the original route at its eastern end, but the western end, including the Cosper Creek crossing, likely represents a re-route to the south of the original road alignment. Roads such as this one, were often rerouted based on weather conditions.
Buildings
The post contained at its completion 24 separate structures. With the exception of the blockhouse, the buildings of the post were described as being whitewashed, in the “cottage” style with vertical board and batten siding, and peaked roofs with overhanging eaves. Foundations were made of stones, and chimneys were made with locally made bricks. In contrast to the whitewashed buildings of the Fort, the blockhouse was constructed of dark, heavy hand hewn timbers. The structure is 2-stories and 20 feet by 20 feet square with the second story turned at a true diagonal to the first with a hipped roof above and small hipped roof on the lower part. The Davison Map of 1864 provides dimensions of these buildings and shows interior layouts of rooms and placement of doors and windows. Similar to the military sites, buildings were clustered and arranged by function.

Buildings Associated with Fort Yamhill as per the 1864 Davison Map
- Officers’ Quarters (4)
- Unfinished Houses (2)
- Blockhouse
- Adjutant’s Office
- Guard House
- Commissary & Quarter Master Storehouse
- Company Quarters
- Mess Room
- Kitchen
- Hospital
- Houses of Laundresses (4)
- Bake House
- Stable
- Blacksmith Shop
- Carpenter’s Shop
- Sutler’s Store

Landscape view from 1940’s (Source: Salem Public Library)
Landscape Structures
As was common of the majority of forts on the Oregon frontier, a stockade fence did not enclose Fort Yamhill as per map and literature descriptions. However, two different versions of fencing are referred to in the historic documentation; perhaps each existing at separate times. Both the Smith Map of 1856 and the Gardener map of 1858 show a zigzag line along the eastern boundary of the Fort. Reference is made to this line in Kroeker’s book on Wm. B Hazen: “Hazen established a line of sturdy fence, eight to nine rails high was also built, with a constantly guarded entrance gate.” The Davison map of 1864 shows a fence enclosing the parade ground with the dimensions of 546 feet by 1177 feet. The fence shows numerous gate openings as well as stiles, which indicate it to be around four feet in height. This fence is referred to as a white picket fence in Simpson’s accounts of Fort Yamhill.

A stately flagpole stood in the center of the parade ground. It is perhaps romantically described in a historical account by Simpson as being “about 200 feet high and hewn six square” and in Bensell’s journal as “supported by two gleaming brass field pieces”.

A sentry box and gate which crossed the main road, were located at the northeast corner of the Fort’s fence, establishing the official entrance to the Fort. A fire pond is located in this area today located on the Hampton Affiliates property.

A Changing Landscape
When the Fort was first established in the 1850’s the area was mostly open oak savannah. The oak savannah ecotype, now almost extirpated from the Willamette Valley, consisted of widely scattered Oregon white oaks with grassland prairie in between. Also present was an oak woodland type, which was characterized by groves of oak and scattered large Douglas fir in the overstory with the understory composed of open, park-like grassland along with a few shrubs.

The indigenous people frequently burned these open woodlands, in order to make for better hunting and traveling. The fir tended to be located near ridges, hilltops or in riparian margins, away and protected from these frequent burns. The oaks, which are more fire resistant than the firs, were commonly found on both the drier and wetter sites, which included the riparian areas along streams and rivers. Associated with the oaks on the wetter sites was Oregon ash and alder.

The frequent fires also kept most of the young thinned-barked firs from invading the oak woodlands. After the decline of the native culture, most of the burning ceased and after a century and a half, the savannahs and open woodlands slowly became dominated by Douglas fir and Big leaf Maple. On some of the wetter sites, white fir and Western Hemlock are now making inroads into the stands.
February 14, 1864. Clear. Sunday, and from the top of the Block house I watched the Indian game “Coho” played by a large number of “Siwashes.” Very interesting.

Royal Bensell, All Quiet on the Yamhill

The nature of the landscape at the time of military occupation afforded clear views to the northwest and southeast, a requirement for a military outpost. Many of these historic views have become restricted over time by the growth of trees and other vegetation. The planning atlas contains scenic overlay maps that analyze viewsheds from key viewing areas within the Fort site without factoring in existing vegetative screening. This analysis helped determine the forest management plan and facility siting.

The Advent of Fort Yamhill State Heritage Area
OPRD purchased the historic Fort Yamhill State Heritage Area property in 1988. Oregon Parks and Recreation Department had an interest in the property dating back to the 1960s when a report was prepared for the State Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee recommending acquisition. In 1966 an acquisition evaluation of the site was prepared. In 1969 OPRD staff met with Dr. Preston Onstad to discuss the suitability of Fort Yamhill and Fort Hoskins for development as historical parks. Dr. Onstad was a former military historian with the English department at Oregon State University. He wrote articles and books concerning Fort Hoskins and was writing a book on Fort Yamhill in 1969.

The 1969 report ranked Fort Yamhill and Fort Hoskins in importance behind Fort Dalles, Fort Stevens, and Fort Klamath. The report did not advocate reconstruction of the post structures; however, the report did mention that a replica of the blockhouse could be constructed.

At the time of the report, the Scotts, an elderly couple, owned the Fort Yamhill property. The report recommended acquisition of Fort Yamhill over Fort Hoskins for several reasons, including accessibility, acquisition costs, available models for reconstruction, and general condition of terrain. The site was also more attractive because of its proximity to Dayton (the blockhouse) and other sites and communities of the lower Willamette Valley.

Fort Yamhill was listed with the National Register of Historic Places in 1971 by OPRD.

Fort Yamhill remained in private hands until it was acquired by OPRD in 1988. A feasibility study for the site completed by OPRD in 1991 advocated the purchase of additional properties required for access, and development of accessory facilities such as roads and parking lots.
CHAPTER TWO - EXISTING FACILITIES

Location
Target Planning Area
For planning purposes, CTGR’s 139.5 acres, OPRD’s 55 acres and Polk County’s 2.72 acres are referred to as the “Target Area”. The Target Area acreage totals 196.87.

Historic Core Area
The historic core area refers to the Fort site that is located primarily on OPRD’s 55 acres. Polk County’s 2.72 acre parcel (deeded to OPRD April, 2004), the area encompassing the homestead site and the wetland are all located on a small portion of the Tribes’ 139 acres which are included in the general vicinity of the Molalla encampment. The core represents a concentration of the cultural and historic resources associated with the Fort.

Figure 4 – Fort Yamhill State Heritage Area General Vicinity Ownership Map 2003
Environmental Setting
The project area is located within the uplands immediately north of the South Yamhill River. The south and north Forks of the Yamhill River begin in the Coast Range physiographic province, before combining and terminating to the east at the confluence of the Yamhill and Willamette Rivers, within the Willamette valley physiographic province (Franklin and Dryness 1973). Although the Target Area is situated in the eastern foothills of the Coast Range, the historic vegetation regimes were probably more similar to those of the Willamette Valley province and should be classed as the “interior valley vegetation zone”.

General Description
Neighborhood
The Target Area is located in the Coast Range of northern Polk County (Township 6 South, Range 7 West, Sections 5 and 8). The Fort was situated on the northwest-facing slope of the distinctive prominence known as Fort Hill. The hill looms over the South Yamhill River, located to its south. Cosper Creek forms the western boundary for a portion of the site. The site is located one half mile from Valley Junction, which is the crossroads of two major coastal routes, Highway 18 and Highway 22. Nearby towns include the communities of Grand Ronde, Willamina and Sheridan. The surrounding area is rural with farm complexes, forested hillsides, timber management lands, and single-family houses. The Spirit Mountain Casino is located less than two miles away along Highway 18.

Existing Facilities
House
A farmhouse located on the OPRD property was known in the 1930’s as the Harrington House. This building has been changed repeatedly in the twentieth century and a major change occurred in 1915. OPRD has conducted an architectural investigation and determined that initially this structure was an original Fort structure: an officers’ quarter, which had undergone major alterations during the twentieth century.

This structure was moved to its current location before 1915, the year identified as “about 1874” by James Wooden, the son of the attributed joiner, James Wooden. In 1915 all siding and exterior boards from the military period were removed.

An extensive historic architectural investigation conducted during the summer of 2003 provides a better understanding of the construction and design of the original structure and recommendations for stabilization and restoration.

Guest House
A small guesthouse is located on the property adjacent to the farmhouse. Because it is not reflected on a 1936 aerial photo of the property, we know the guesthouse was constructed after 1936. According to Dennis Werth, Reinholdt Werth constructed the guesthouse after his marriage to Edna Harrington.

Utilities
Public utilities existing on the site include phone and electric service. The Grand Ronde Water District supplies the water. The host site is using the septic system developed for the house. The property includes a water right to Cosper Creek for the amount of
1.36 c.f./second or approximately 600 gallons per minute. However, it is of limited value since the creek nearly runs dry in the summertime and is superseded by downstream water rights.

**Abandoned Quarry**
An abandoned quarry is located along the southwest property line of the OPRD property. The quarry contains vertical drops and represents a potential attractive nuisance and safety hazard for the public. The quarry is generally out of the way of expected visitor circulation. Any future trail layout in this vicinity should avoid calling attention to the quarry.

**Power Line Easement**
BPA maintains a 100 ft wide power line easement through the OPRD property. The power line corridor is cleared with an access road constructed underneath. The line consists of four wooden H pole structures that are located on the OPRD property.

**Host Site**
An OPRD RV host site is located on the property. The park host is a park volunteer caretaker, responsible for general security of the site and basic maintenance.

**General Landscape Character**
This site is located on westward facing slopes. The Fort itself was perched near the top with views to the south over the South Yamhill River Valley. From the blockhouse, which was located in the center of the Fort complex, views were open to the north and the west towards the Agency. The landscape has changed since the Fort era: trees have grown up, and established farmhouses, structures and new roads have been built.

**Access**
The Fort Yamhill site is located near the junction of two primary coast access highways, Hwy. 18 and 22. Existing vehicular access to the site is limited to an unimproved gravel drive off of Hebo Road (Hwy. 22), one half mile north of Valley Junction. This gravel drive runs roughly along the northern boundary of the Fort site, Polk County’s Old Fort Road. Because of the curving nature of Hebo Road as it parallels Cosper Creek, existing sight distance at the intersection is extremely limited.

A review of early survey maps as part of the 1991 feasibility study found that the county never officially vacated Old Fort Road, meaning that the County has a legal claim on the old roadway. With no width specified, the right of way width would automatically default to 60 feet.

**Zoning Requirements**
Polk County governs development of park uses and facilities within OPRD’s property under the provisions of the County’s Comprehensive Land Use Plan and Land Development Ordinance. The Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) acknowledge the County’s comprehensive plan and ordinance pursuant to the statewide land use laws. OPRD’s and the Polk County property are zoned farm/forest. Parks would be considered a conditional use upon approval of a state parks master plan.

The County Planning Director has suggested that the property would be considered a timber resource and that a Conditional Use Application was required for adoption.
CHAPTER THREE- RESOURCE ASSESSMENT

Past Studies
OPRD purchased the Fort property in 1988 and soon thereafter conducted several background studies for a “Park Feasibility” plan which was released in 1991.

National Register Listing
Fort Yamhill was nominated to and listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1971 (Elizabeth, Walton 1971).

Overview of 1991 Planning Process
In 1991 OPRD undertook an extensive feasibility study of OPRD’s Fort Yamhill property. The foremost purpose was to identify and evaluate the historic resources of the site for interpretive potential. Another aim of the study was to evaluate additional site resources to determine the feasibility and opportunities for development, and the most appropriate visitor uses and facilities.

The study process included the following components:
- An aerial photogrammetric survey
- A cultural resource investigation
- A resource and advisory committee
- An analysis of natural resource features, site conditions, and recreation needs
- A land suitability plan and summary analysis
- Access and development alternatives
- A development concept with accompanying recommendations that address resource protection, design, management, and interpretation. The development concept allows for a range of development intensity that could be phased over time. The development feasibility rested on the acquisition of the north parcel that the Tribes eventually purchased.

The Adams Report
As part of the feasibility study, OPRD contracted for a cultural resource investigation that included extensive background research and fieldwork to identify the location of the Fort structures. The results of the investigation were presented in 1991 in a volume edited by William Hampton Adams (Adams ed., 1991). The Adams Report remains the best source of information on the Fort, and includes extensive data concerning the Fort’s history, physical development, and structures. It also includes a set of historic context statements for interpreting the Fort and a number of specific recommendations to protect cultural resources at the site and to begin to interpret them for the public.
2003 Master Planning Studies
Several reports and studies were developed for this master plan. Findings of the following studies are summarized into a planning atlas, which contains various maps that display historic, cultural, and natural resources within the Target Area. This section provides a summary of the resource inventories and assessments that were used to complete the master plan. Detailed mapping of these resources contributed to the completion of the Composite Resource Suitability Map, which is addressed in the next chapter. Detailed maps and background information may be viewed at the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department’s headquarters in Salem.

Vegetation/Plant Community Inventory
A plant association inventory of the Fort Yamhill Historic Site was completed as part of an overall Master Plan Assessment for Threatened and Endangered Species, Wetlands and Plant Communities in the spring and summer of 2002. The inventory and mapping effort involved detailed surveys and vegetation descriptions. Polygons mapped on aerial photographs provided by OPRD were classified according to the Oregon Natural Heritage Program’s vegetation classification, which is now part of the National Vegetation Classification System (NVCS). Field surveys for the Fort Yamhill Historic Site were conducted on the following dates: April 21, July 2, 10-11; August 1-2 and 13.

Wetlands and Riparian Areas
Several seasonal wetlands were found at this site, and riparian forest and shrub communities were found adjacent to Cosper Creek. The tall fescue bottomland grassland owned by the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde is seasonally flooded and supports several intermittent streams. An Oregon ash / camas - Dewey’s sedge community is also located on CTGR land, bisecting the Douglas-fir plantation on the northern portion of the surveyed area. Another riparian forest area is located adjacent to an intermittent stream on the eastern portion of the Grand Ronde land. All of these wetland types are described in the consultant’s report.

CTGR completed a wetlands determination prior to the purchase of its property. Findings from this determination are included on the attached map and planning atlas.

Protected Species
One sensitive plant species was found in the CTGR property, along the ditch in the wet (non-native bottomland) grassland habitat. A total of eight individuals of meadow sidalcea (Sidalcea campestris) was found in this area. It is a sensitive species, included as a Candidate for listing under the Oregon ESA by the Oregon Department of Agriculture. It is on the ORNHP Watch List (List 4), due to the fact that there are over 50 known occurrences in the Willamette Valley. However, the number of occurrences has been declining, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, as well as other local botanists, have suggested that this species should be ranked higher. In addition, the occurrence on the Grand Ronde site, while small, is a particularly unusual example. The habitat is more typical of habitat for the federally listed Nelson’s checker mallow (Sidalcea nelsoniana), and the plants found have the typically pink flowers of Nelson’s; however, due to the large size of the plants and leaves, Dr. Richard Halse at the OSU herbarium, the local expert on these species, determined the plants to be meadow sidalcea. Regardless of the taxa present in this bottomland area, they are of conservation concern, and should be protected at the site.
No other protected or sensitive species were found. Following restoration, the upland prairie habitats could provide excellent habitat for the federally listed *Lupinus sulfureus* ssp. *kincaidii* (Kincaid’s lupine) and its associated federally listed butterfly, Fender’s blue butterfly (*Icaricia icarioides fenderi*), as well as the List 1 Willamette Valley species: *Aster curtus*, *Horkelia congesta* ssp. *congesta*, and *Erigeron decumbens* ssp. *decumbens*.

**Forest Condition Assessment**

OPRD’s Foresters conducted a Forest Condition Assessment for the park property. It is summarized below.

Overall, the stands present at Fort Yamhill are in good forest health condition. There were no observable insect or disease problems. There is mechanical damage to a few of the trees scattered throughout the park including some basal scars from previous logging/farming operations, tops out due to wind storms, and trees with forked tops. Some of the Oregon white oaks in the interior of the denser stands have died due to overtopping by the firs. Other white oaks along the edges and in small clearings have fared better and are in good condition, but encroached upon.

A forest management prescription to restore the native landscape would include the protection of Cosper Creek, a large fish-bearing creek, so any harvest within 100 feet of the stream must leave at least 170 to 230 square feet of basal area per 1000 feet of stream on each side. The other waterway found in the park is too small and seasonal to be considered fish bearing, so management would consist of minimizing erosion and protecting the drainage.

OPRD foresters observed a herd of Roosevelt elk using the meadow for grazing and the forested area for cover. The foresters also observed a pair of wild turkeys.

**Cultural Resources Assessment**

*(An excerpt from Cultural Resource Study for the Proposed Fort Yamhill State Park, Polk County, Oregon By Applied Archaeological Research (AAR), Portland Oregon, December 20, 2002)*

This project included a cultural resource reconnaissance survey of land totaling 168.92 acres that are located adjacent to and near the site of historic Fort Yamhill. This total acreage amount includes a 139.5 acre parcel owned by the CTGR, a 2.72 acre parcel owned by Polk County, and a 26.7 acre parcel owned by Hampton Resources. The lands were surveyed to identify cultural resources exposed at the ground surface, and to assess their potential to contain historical and prehistoric archaeological resources. The ca. 57 acre state owned parcel that contains the Fort Yamhill site was not formally surveyed as part this project; however, AAR examined much of that parcel to relocate previously identified historical features related to Fort Yamhill.

This project continues the planning phase of the Fort Yamhill study initiated by Adams in 1991 for the development of Fort Yamhill and adjoining lands. AAR’s study included two primary components. The first included analysis of historical and modern maps, photographs, documents, and literature pertaining to Fort Yamhill and the surrounding area. The second component included the survey of the Tribal lands, the county parcel, and the Hampton Lumber property. The Fort grounds were also examined to relocate and provide coordinates for previously identified historical features.
Architectural Investigation of the Officers’ Quarters

In the spring of 2003, OPRD contracted with Gregg Olson, historic architect, and Professor Philip Dole of the University of Oregon to conduct an architectural investigation of the Officer’s Quarters. The objectives of this project were to determine through the use of architectural and structural investigation, review of archival materials, analysis of site conditions, and knowledge of building materials and methods for the 1850’s, the significance of the structure and its relation to Fort Yamhill. OPRD asked the consultants to determine remaining historic architectural elements, the condition and integrity of those elements, and their remaining integrity through invasive removal of contemporary features hiding the historic structure. In addition, they were asked to interpret how the structure’s missing elements would have been displayed by using their professional judgment and knowledge of the architectural elements not existent on the structure and the knowledge gained from prior experience with such period structures and construction methods and materials. Their report contains a written preservation strategy that provides guidance, and outlines future phases and cost estimates needed to complete the restoration of the structure.

This work was undertaken with the understanding that any 20th century changes were not significant historically, either architecturally or by association with the owners or craftsmen related to these changes based on information provided by local experts in the history of the area.
CHAPTER FOUR – SUITABILITY ANALYSIS

Resource Inventories and Assessments
OPRD prepares resource inventories and assessments for its master plans. Detailed mapping of the key resources contribute to the creation of a composite “Suitability Map”, which is provided in the master plan document. Detailed resource maps, inventories and background information are not included in the document, but are available for viewing at the OPRD headquarters office. The following list describes the resource inventories that were completed for the Fort Yamhill Heritage Area Master Plan.

Cultural Resources
Cultural resources were considered the most important element in determining significance on this site. This assessment was a separate process from the Cultural Probability Zone mapping found in Chapter 9.

- Protect - Value 1 - All known features identified on site related to cultural resources values associated with the project site from the Fort era or earlier. Includes the historic Fort site as well as identified archaeological sites, and older trees, in particular, Oregon white oaks and large Doug firs.
- High - Value 2 - Areas that were clearly mapped and whose approximate locations can be generally located. Includes such resources as the Molalla encampment and historic road alignment.
- Medium - Value 3 - Areas likely to be attributed to some type of development within the Fort.
- Low/NoValue 4 – No known resources. Not likely to yield additional information.

Future cultural resource studies and assessments are required to further determine the presence and significance of the cultural resources on this site.

Plant Communities
Based on the Oregon Natural Heritage Program community names. Names include reference to dominant tree, shrub or herbal plant species completed by consultant for OPRD.

Wetlands
Based on a wetlands determination prepared for the Tribes.

Water/Hazards
The 100-year flood plain and a 75-foot buffer from Cosper Creek were identified as a resource.

Protected Species (plant and animal)
Meadow sidalcea (Sidalcea campestris) was found in low-lying wet areas on the Tribes’ property based on a consultant study completed for OPRD.

Scenic Resources
Important views and vantage points were analyzed and the view corridors were mapped as a resource by the Tribal GIS staff with OPRD staff input.
Suitability Assessment

Methodology

A suitability analysis was prepared for the entire Target Area and is described below.

Existing and future recreational uses should coexist and complement natural, scenic and cultural resources within the project boundaries. To this end, the property has been assessed to identify discrete areas of different levels of suitability for recreational use or development, given the natural and cultural resources found there. The result is identifying those areas of the site that could be developed extensively without harming important cultural or natural resources.

This assessment recognized four resource suitability levels ranging from Protection (1) to Major Development (4). The resources assessed included cultural resources, viewsheds, vegetation, protected species (both plant and animal), and water features, which includes wetland areas and flood zones. Each level is defined by the presence or absence of certain criteria such as: sensitivity, rareness, condition, freedom from disturbance, native species occurrence and the extent of existing development and intrusions. Areas with resources that are very sensitive, rare, unique, and are in good condition, have very low tolerance for intensive, public, recreational use and facility development. These areas are typically assigned a low suitability level (Protection (1) or Low Intensity Use (2)). Areas with resources that are very tolerant to development, are in a developed condition, are typically assigned a high suitability level (3 or 4).

Once the suitability levels and areas for each resource category are identified, the resource categories are overlaid and the most restrictive resource suitability level determines the composite suitability level. The four composite resource suitability levels are discussed in the following chart with respect to each level’s criteria (Table 1).

The site has an approximate 400-foot elevation change making topography an important factor in siting facilities. An overlay slope map was created that identified areas with plus 20% slope, areas with 15-20% or areas with 10-15% slopes. When overlaid with the composite suitability map, developable areas were easily identified.
### Suitability Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Protection/Low Intensity Use Levels 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>Management/Moderate Development Level 3</th>
<th>Major Development Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Value 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Communities and Wildlife</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>All Known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare/Protected Species</td>
<td>All Known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geologic &amp; Water Features</td>
<td>Outstanding/Severe</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic Assessment</td>
<td>Views and Vantage points from the Fort</td>
<td>Overlay</td>
<td>Overlay</td>
<td>Overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slopes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overlay</td>
<td>Overlay</td>
<td>Overlay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1 - Suitability Matrix*
Legend

- Target Area
- Protection
- Low intensity use
- Management/Moderate Development
- Suitable for Development
- Fort Structures
- Current Structures

Fort Yamhill Historic Area
Development Suitability

Township 6 S, Range 7 W
Sections 8 & 5
Polk County, OR

1 inch equals 400 feet
Areas of Concern
In addition to Resource and Composite Suitability assessments, OPRD completes “Endowment” and “Area of Concern” assessments. Certain areas, currently owned by OPRD, may not meet OPRD needs for resource protection or recreational use and may be designated as “Endowment”. This classification allows OPRD to sell or trade the parcel or implement non-traditional uses on it. For this master plan no “Endowment” properties have been identified.

Certain adjacent lands are identified that are needed for recreational use or for the protection of important resources; and may be designated as “Areas of Concern”. These areas may be protected by OPRD acquisition from willing sellers, by zoning, joint agreements, granted easements or other means. The following list represents the properties OPRD recognizes as “Areas of Concern” in relationship to the Fort Yamhill State Heritage Area.

Tribal Property – 139 Acres
This property is important because of its historic relationship with the Fort. This property is located within the viewshed of the Fort property and is important in the retention of the cultural landscape. OPRD shall continue to partner with the Tribes to ensure mutually compatible development on this site.

Kissing Rock – less than 1 acre
This pull off on Hebo Road once contained a monument erected by the Daughters of the American Revolution in 1926. A small plaque was affixed to a large boulder. That monument recognized the Fort Yamhill site. The plaque was stolen and the boulder removed. A new boulder replaces the old boulder. It has been a popular local stopping point for many years and affords views to Cosper Creek and waterfalls from Highway 22.

Hampton Lumber Property – 27 acres
This property is critical because a portion of the historic Fort is within the property. This site also provides strategic viewpoints over the South Yamhill River valley. Acquisition of this property is required for the relocation of the BPA power lines. An appraisal for this property was recently completed. As a condition of sale Hampton Lumber will require an easement to their fire pond or construction of a new pond. This issue is currently being investigated and will need to be resolved prior to acquisition. A portion of this property adjacent to OPRD lands has been identified as an area with a strong likelihood to yield additional Fort-related archaeological resources. (OPRD acquired May, 2004)

Gill Property
An easement or acquisition of this property is required for the relocation of the BPA power line corridor. The Tribes are currently investigating acquisition opportunities for this site.

Johnson Property/Cosper Creek frontage
This property is located to the north of Old Fort Road near its intersection with Hebo Road. This property is in private ownership and is culturally important due to its location along the Fort Road (probable location of bridge crossing), relationship to Cosper Creek and proximity to the Molalla Indian encampment. OPRD will work with owners towards developing a protection strategy for this important property.

Rhodes Property
This property is located along Cosper Creek within the viewshed from the Fort property. According to historic mapping, this may have been the location of the Molalla encampment during the Fort period. OPRD should work towards developing a protection strategy for this important property. (This property may also provide a suitable location for a maintenance yard/shop.)
Werth Property
This property is located on the west and south side of OPRD’s property. The property contains a mature stand of fir trees that provides an excellent backdrop to the Fort setting. OPRD should work with owners towards developing a protection strategy for this important property to preserve the mature stand of Douglas firs. One strategy may include a scenic easement. This site may also have Fort-related archaeological resources.
CHAPTER FIVE – RECREATIONAL NEEDS AND OPPORTUNITIES

Recreational Demand
The primary recreation activity that Fort Yamhill could provide is interpretation of the history of the Fort and its context. Other activities that are compatible with or supporting the primary recreation activity include walking for pleasure on trails, bird watching, nature/wildlife observation, sightseeing/driving for pleasure, bicycling, outdoor photography, picnicking, visiting cultural/historical sites and day hiking.

The Oregon Outdoor Recreation Survey was conducted over a one-year period from February 2001 to January 2002 by Oregon State University's College of Forestry as part of the 2003-2007 Oregon Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP). Estimates for annual recreation use, by activity, are made for each of the 11 SCORP planning regions and statewide. Recreation participation estimates for individual recreation activities were measured in "User Occasions". A user occasion is defined as each time an individual participates in a single outdoor recreation activity.

Table 2 (at right) shows 2002 annual participation estimates for SCORP Planning Region 2 (including Columbia, Washington, Multnomah, Hood River, Yamhill, Clackamas, Polk and Marion Counties) for those activities compatible with interpretation of the history of the Fort. An interpretive center or associated interpretation related to the Fort site would be consistent with the growing demand for visiting cultural/historical sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation Activity</th>
<th>2002 User Occasions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking For Pleasure On Trails</td>
<td>7,453,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird watching</td>
<td>6,446,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature/Wildlife Observation</td>
<td>6,200,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightseeing/Driving For Pleasure</td>
<td>4,745,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling</td>
<td>3,526,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Photography</td>
<td>1,825,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking</td>
<td>1,782,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Cultural/Historical Sites</td>
<td>1,385,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Hiking</td>
<td>1,281,218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Combined Area Including SCORP Planning Regions 2 & 3
The most popular activities are walking for pleasure on trails, bird watching and nature/wildlife observation. A facility such as a nature trail could accommodate a number of these most popular outdoor recreation activities (walking for pleasure on trails, bird watching, nature/wildlife observation, outdoor photography and day hiking).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation Activity</th>
<th>2002 User Occasions</th>
<th>1987 User Occasions</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature/Wildlife Observation</td>
<td>8,573,512</td>
<td>2,422,761</td>
<td>+254%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightseeing/Driving For Pleasure</td>
<td>6,107,192</td>
<td>3,621,994</td>
<td>+69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Photography</td>
<td>2,452,490</td>
<td>1,520,137</td>
<td>+61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Hiking</td>
<td>2,023,615</td>
<td>1,676,404</td>
<td>+21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another method of identifying facility need is to make comparisons of how recreation participation for a comparable set of activities changes over time. For the SCORP analysis, 2002 recreation participation estimates from the Oregon Outdoor Recreation Survey were compared to participation estimates from the 1986-1987 Pacific Northwest Outdoor Recreation Survey. Many of the 76 outdoor recreation activities from the 2002 study were not directly comparable to 1987 activities.

Again, a facility such as a nature trail could accommodate an increasing demand for three of the top four growth activities in this area of the state (nature/wildlife observation, outdoor photography, and day hiking). In addition, a visit to Fort Yamhill should be tied to other nearby destinations to satisfy the demand for an increasing number of people who are on a driving tour through the area.
Relationship to Other Regional Heritage Tourism Opportunities

The Fort Yamhill Heritage Area is strategically located for future tourism due to its proximity to: Oregon’s population centers, ideal location off of Highway 18, a popular route to the coast, and relationship to the Spirit Mountain Casino, Oregon’s #1 tourist attraction. The site also provides the opportunity to link with other heritage sites within the area capturing future opportunities for cultural tourism. These sites include:

- Block House, Dayton Oregon
- Joseph Palmer House, Dayton Oregon
- Fort Hoskins, Kings Valley, Benton County
- Fort Umpqua, Douglas County
- Fort Vancouver, Vancouver Washington
- Willamette Mission State Park
- Champoeg State Heritage Area
- Mission Mill, Salem
- End of the Oregon Trail Interpretive Center

Recreational development would include passive recreation opportunities such as trails and some picnic facilities and interpretive signage and other features that would benefit the local communities of Grand Ronde, Sheridan and Willamina.

Opportunities for Cultural Tourism

The following statistics were taken from the most recent SCORP and from the Oregon Tourism Commission and relate to the proposed development at the Fort Yamhill State Heritage Area. The Oregon Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan is a federally funded, statistical and issue-related recreation analysis that is conducted by OPRD on a statewide, regional and community-based scale.

- According to the recently completed 2003 SCORP, most visits to parks involve increasingly shorter trips. Individuals and families have less leisure time than they did in the past. Potential project sites are close to Oregon’s population centers and near the Spirit Mountain Casino, Oregon’s most visited attraction.
- Half of the visitors to cultural or heritage sites in Oregon were doing so in the northern Willamette Valley. (Source: OPRD)
- Weekend travel is more popular than ever. Grand Ronde is ideally situated for weekend travel to the coast from the major urban areas. (Source: Oregon Tourism Commission)
- Twenty percent of all trips in the US include children under the age of 18. Popular activities include shopping (36%), outdoor activities (22%), historical places/museums, (15%). (Source: Oregon Tourism Commission)
- More than 50 million adults said they visited a museum or historical site in the past year. Cultural and historic travelers spend more, stay in hotels more often, and visit more destinations. (Source: Oregon Tourism Commission).
- Sight-seeing and driving for pleasure are two of Oregon’s significant participation growth activities. They have increased 21% since 1987. (Source: OPRD)
- People are looking for opportunities to recreate, camp and visit cultural sites closer to home more than ever. (Source: OPRD)
- Running/walking for exercise or pleasure are number one use activities for state residents. Sites could be designed with trails and park facilities that would benefit the local community. (Source: OPRD)
CHAPTER SIX - ISSUES

OPRD held a Steering Committee and a public meeting to solicit comments on the Fort Yamhill Heritage Area Master Plan. These meetings were held in March of 2002. OPRD field and planning staff have also identified issues pertaining to the master plan. The list below represents a summary of the comments gathered during the issue scoping phase of this plan.

Cultural Resource Protection
Aside from the setting itself, the primary resource of the site is its likelihood to yield additional information about the past uses of the land from the archaeological remains. Protection of this resource should be considered a priority for management, maintenance and interpretive development. Another component of cultural resource protection is the restoration of the cultural landscape and the preservation of visual resources.

Understanding the Resources
Cultural protection is the major issue associated with this park property and its future management. In order to protect the cultural resources, a better understanding of the resources, their extent and location are necessary. Future studies are critical to this understanding. These studies should include further archival research and archaeological investigations and documentation of this work to ensure that the resources are adequately protected for future generations. Committed funding for these purposes should be reflected in staffing and the phasing of development.

Understanding of the Site’s Historical Context
A Tribal Perspective
OPRD should continue to work in partnership with the Tribes to strengthen the ties between the Fort and the history of the Tribes and to ensure that the site is interpreted within the larger context of the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde and other ancestral Native Americans.

Other Reservation Posts
Interpretation of Fort Yamhill should seek to show its relationship to the other military posts that were established in conjunction with the Grand Ronde Reservation. These sites most notably include Fort Hoskins and Fort Umpqua. OPRD should work with other partners associated with the Fort to develop cohesive interpretive themes, story lines, and coordination of events.

Sorting Through the Layers of History
Interpretation of the site and its features should show the layers of history and how the Fort and its surrounding lands evolved over time. Interpretive themes should describe life prior to the Fort and the reservation as well as life after the Fort. These themes should investigate prehistory, allotments, and the settlement era as well as the development of the State Heritage Area. Methods for telling the story will be explored further.
Very Little Remains from the Historic Period
No Known Visual Images of the Fort Survive
After the Fort was abandoned and disassembled in 1866, the buildings were auctioned off to the public. No pictures or detailed building plans remain from the Fort period, making reconstruction impossible. Only two known buildings remain from the Fort period: the blockhouse, now in Dayton; and, the officers’ quarters, located on the Fort property. A challenging component of future interpretation will be how to demarcate the former locations of the 24 buildings associated with the Fort. The 1991 “Feasibility Plan” proposed using boulders to mark the foundations. Future development should investigate the use of ghost structures, a form of metal framing representing the building mass and shape, or other means of marking the foundations.

The Changing Landscape
The area once included within the Fort boundaries and surrounding the Fort was farmed or managed for timber for over 100 years after the Fort’s abandonment. Over this time, the landscape changed as fir trees crowded out the large oaks and the large open expanses of prairie filled in with forest blocking key vantage points required for a military post. Roads were realigned as travel patterns shifted. Restoration of original elements of this landscape will be an important preservation strategy.

Power Line Corridor
A power line easement traverses the site of the parade ground. The power lines are a dominant landscape feature detracting from the historic setting. Relocation of this corridor would greatly enhance the historic setting once associated with the Fort and should be further investigated.

Getting Visitors to and from the Site
Vehicular Access from Hebo Road
The 1991 “Feasibility Plan” determined that access was one of the major hurdles to facility development at the site. Existing access at Old Fort Road is difficult due to the dangerous intersection and limited site visibility at its intersection with Hebo Road. A new safe access to the site will be required prior to any new facility development and will need to meet ODOT requirements, along with a traffic study.

Dangerous Intersection with Highway 18/22
Another access concern is access from Highway 22 (Hebo Road) eastbound onto Highway 18. During peak traffic periods this is a difficult intersection for eastbound traffic exiting from Hebo Road. Highway 18, being a popular route to the coast, is often at capacity during summer weekends, which would conflict with peak traffic generated by the park.

Access for Visitors
Fort Yamhill was located on a sloping hillside to take advantage of views to the southeast and to the northwest. Today this proves a development challenge to siting parking lots, trails and visitor support facilities that provide access for those with disabilities. All future visitors should be able to experience and learn about Fort Yamhill regardless of their physical or mental abilities. Due to challenging terrain and sensitivity to the cultural resources, the development plans may need to consider alternative access or creative solutions in order to provide a positive experience for physically and/or mentally challenged visitors and guests.
Relations with Adjacent Property Owners
Work with Park Neighbors to Identify Potential Opportunities and Issues
Often with new park development, neighbors are concerned with trespass issues, levels of use and traffic. OPRD will work with the neighbors to establish relationships and to open the lines of communication between the neighbors to promote a “good neighbor” policy. Property boundaries should be clearly marked so the public knows exactly where the public property ends to discourage trespassing. OPRD should seek opportunities for either future acquisition or protection measures such as conservation easements of key parcels identified in this plan as “Areas of Concern”.

Maintain Working Partnership with the Tribes
The long-term success of this project relies on the continued partnership between OPRD and the CTGR. The Tribes are not only an important neighbor but also integral to the appropriate interpretation of the site.

Continued Coordination with Polk County
The County maintains ownership of a key 2.72 parcel of land adjacent to the state heritage area. OPRD has met with the County Commission who indicated they would be willing to transfer the property to OPRD in conjunction with future park development (deeded to OPRD in April, 2004). OPRD will continue to work closely with the county throughout this process. The master plan will request land use review and approval by the County prior to finalization of the master plan.

Timing of the Park Opening
2006 was set as a target goal for opening the park early in the planning process. This date represents the 150th year anniversary of the Fort and corresponds with the Tribes’ planned celebration of the Lewis and Clark Expedition. In March of 2006 the Tribes will be hosting the National Park Services’ Traveling Expedition, Corps II. This exhibit should draw thousands of potential park visitors to Grand Ronde. The timing and implementation of key projects will be critical to ensure the success of this goal.

Implementation and Development
The funding and timing of studies and subsequent development need to maintain a tight schedule in order to maintain the goal of opening the park by 2006. OPRD should seek adequate funding and future partnerships to appropriately develop the park.

Vegetation Management
Restoring portions of the Fort and parade ground from a forested area into a meadow will be an ongoing maintenance issue within the park. The required maintenance treatments should not impact the cultural resources within the site. Issues with weed control, stump removal and ongoing maintenance are considered primary issues related to the proposed cultural landscape restoration.

National Register Compliance
Fort Yamhill is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and as a result all proposed actions must comply with the National Register’s “Procedures for the Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties”. Prior to a decision to implement any of the proposals involving terrain alteration, an archaeological survey, subsurface testing and evaluation of any cultural resources must be completed. Update National Register form to include officers’ quarters findings.

Staffing and Ongoing Maintenance
Park development will require adequate staffing and maintenance. Future staff should have an understanding and appreciation of the Fort site. Due to its location, the site will require its own maintenance facility and residence. OPRD should locate opportunities in close proximity to the park site and not develop these administrative facilities within the historic core.
CHAPTER SEVEN - GOALS

OPRD established a series of master planning goals for guiding appropriate management and use of Fort Yamhill State Heritage Area. These goals are based on the suitability and recreation needs assessments. Steering Committee and public comments are considered in deciding the most appropriate goals to guide future development of the state park.

**Goal 1: Protect important cultural resource sites**
- Protecting important cultural resources (historic and prehistoric), cultural landscapes, views, and vantage points is the number one goal for future management of the Fort Yamhill State Heritage Area. Enhancement of selected aspects of these resources is also an important goal. Proposed development and public use will be located and designed to avoid significant impacts on these important resources.

- In order to adequately protect important cultural resources at Fort Yamhill OPRD must first gain a better understanding of the significance of the resource, and its location. Additional research and future studies to better understand the resource shall be considered a critical step to this understanding and an important component of future park development.

- This goal relates to OPRD’s 2014 goal to preserve Oregon’s rich cultural heritage and broaden the public’s understanding of Oregon’s historic places and events.

- Establish partnerships with University of Oregon and Oregon State to host Archaeological and Historic Preservation Field Schools

**Goal 2: Provide appropriate educational and recreational facilities**
- The overriding objective of this master plan will be to interpret and develop the site in a manner that will place Fort Yamhill within the larger context of the history of the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde and other ancestral Native Americans. Interpretive themes will explain to future visitors the stories and experiences of the Tribes before and after they arrived at the Reservation.

- The interpretation of the Fort should also consider the greater context of the Fort as it related to settlement of the west. OPRD should work closely with the surrounding cultural resource/heritage tourism sites to promote this interrelated history. Opportunities to coordinate with Benton County’s Fort Hoskins Park will be especially useful.

- Interpretive themes should also investigate life before and after the Fort. It will be important to future visitors to understand the prehistory of the site as well as how the site evolved and how the land use patterns changed with development.
over time. Another interesting theme to explore would be the development of the State Heritage Area.

- Enlist the help of archaeological and historic preservation field schools to better understand the site’s components, and open this work interpretation in process.

- The park could be considered a host site for special events and reenactments drawing people to the site.

**Goal 3: Restore appropriate site elements with historical accuracy**

- Reconstruction of the Fort’s structure should be based on historic accuracy. Only two structures are extant for the Fort Era. The blockhouse in Dayton could be reasonably reconstructed based on the 1936 Historic Documentation (HABS - HAER) drawings and the existing structure. Using the recently completed architectural investigation of the officers’ quarters, a comprehensive understanding of the building’s construction can be determined and aid in relocation and restoration.

- Several landscape elements have not survived; however, their design and structure may be construed based on written descriptions and typical designs for the period in military history. These elements include the fence surrounding the parade ground and the Fort’s flagpole.

- OPRD should attempt to restore important views and vantage points through selective vegetation management. In addition, a larger project will include the restoration of the cultural landscape associated with the Fort especially within the parade ground.

- Manage the forest resources to maintain the integrity of the historic, cultural, and scenic resources of the site. This goal can be achieved by recreating the historical viewsheds, controlling the encroachment of Douglas fir and other tree species into Oregon white oak communities, controlling the invasion of introduced exotic vegetation, and the re-establishment of native vegetative communities.

- OPRD has been coordinating with the Bonneville Power Administration to determine a new alignment for the power line corridor. This realignment is necessary to diminish the impact the line has on the historic landscape’s character. A new alignment has been identified. A major component of the realignment is the renegotiation of the 100 ft wide corridor easement.

The powerline relocation requires installation of approximately 5 new structures on a new right-of-way and access road to be acquired and constructed by OPRD. This acquisition may include two properties currently in private ownership, and OPRD is investigating the acquisition of or easements over these privately owned properties. As a federal agency, Bonneville must consider the potential
environmental impact of its decisions under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). In order for Bonneville to file a NEPA action on this project, Bonneville must perform the necessary environmental analysis to determine the impact of the Salem – Grand Ronde No. 1 115 kV line relocation.

**Goal 4: Establish good park access and orientation**
- Our goals include using good design to place park access roads and visitor support facilities. This placement should avoid disturbing significant resources, while providing access to the site’s attractions. We will also develop safe access off Hebo Road through the Tribal lands to OPRD. The new access road would be gravel but built to a standard conducive to paving at a later date. Recycled asphalt grindings could potentially be used as a top-coat to control dust. Coordinate with ODOT on new access requirements and work with CTGR to partner on a needed traffic impact study.
- Coordinate with ODOT regarding the Highway 22 and Highway 18 intersection improvements.
- Provide a parking lot and visitor service facilities that are centrally located to the Fort’s attractions.
- Any new facilities would be constructed to provide access for those with disabilities as required by law, in accordance with the setting and the opportunities. In addition, any new development should take into account the growing percentage of the recreating public who suffer temporary or “unofficial” disabilities or hindrances such as casts, parents with strollers, and elderly visitors who have limited endurance for walking and/or standing, poor eye sight, hearing loss and mental challenges.

**Goal 5: Encourage implementation and investment partnerships**
- OPRD shall seek management and development partners including youth crews, prison crews, hosts, and volunteer work groups, to assist in the implementation of the goals and development concepts outlined in the master plan.
- OPRD should continue to pursue partnership opportunities with the Tribes for future development of compatible uses and capitalization of facility and infrastructure development.
- OPRD should coordinate with Spirit Mountain Casino to provide opportunities for Casino patrons to visit the Fort Yamhill site.
• Neighboring properties owners should be considered partners in development. OPRD should work towards establishing a “good neighbor” policy and quickly address any neighbors’ issues as they arise.

• OPRD should seek to acquire important properties through acquisition, easement or voluntary protection strategies.

• Work with Tribes to develop maintenance shop and onsite caretaker’s/staff/office.

• Look to outside resources for fundraising opportunities or to leverage OPRD investments.

• Explore partnership with CTGR Natural Resources Department to help maintain vegetation and other potential forest and natural resource management.

• Work closely with CTGR on compatible development of adjacent tribal lands with significant cultural resources or opportunities for recreation use.

**Goal 6: Provide needed operational support**

• Work with CTGR to provide needed maintenance & office facilities.

• Consider imposing a day use fee for access and parking at the state property as per OAR 736-010-0120.
CHAPTER EIGHT – DEVELOPMENT CONCEPTS

Conceptual designs are prepared for OPRD master plans to show the appropriate location, layout, size and type of the proposed facilities. This chapter describes and illustrates those facility development concepts. The codes on the map correspond to codes on the chapter matrix where each project’s facility type and size are described. The matrix also shows for each project, design standards for implementation as well as phasing.

OPRD is dedicated to proposing facilities which are both needed to support outdoor recreation and appropriate to the Department’s role as a recreation provider in Oregon. Park development proposal locations are chosen so that important resources are not significantly harmed by the development or related recreational use. They are also selected to fit well into the neighborhood of surrounding uses. Each of the concepts is intended to fit within the goals and suitability assessments in the master plan, and with the land use goals of Oregon, but is to be flexible within those limits. Final designs may change somewhat as plans are implemented; however, OPRD will review preliminary and final plans with all applicable jurisdictions, as required, to ensure compliance with local codes and conditions.

Design Parameters
Below is a listing of what the OPRD planners have considered in designing the proposed concepts for Fort Yamhill State Heritage Area Master Plan.

- Provide good access and circulation for vehicles and non-motorized travel within the park;
- Place facilities, roads and trails in a manner that is understandable by the public in navigating through the park;
- Avoid significant impacts on important natural or cultural resources in or adjacent to the park;
- Present an appearance that is harmonious with the setting of the park and the region of the state;
- Provide choices for park visitors who may have varying desires for park amenities and settings;
- Take advantage of scenic views;
- Respond to public input and the Fort Yamhill Steering Committee input;
- Utilize previous studies;
- Follow principles of sustainability; and,
- Follow principles of universal access in making facilities and programs accessible to persons with disabilities.
## Development Proposal Matrix

**Fort Yamhill State Heritage Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID #</th>
<th>Development Description</th>
<th>Design and Operational Standards</th>
<th>Phasing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Access easement required from</strong></td>
<td>Phase 1 – Gravel Road construction 2005 for March 2006 park opening (Pave as funding allows or pave area adjacent to neighbors to the north – Christmas tree farm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CTGR/BIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>OPRD to construct phase 1 of the road up to $385,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Traffic impact study required by ODOT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Monitoring for cultural resources required</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CTGR completed design – 2003</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Work with adjacent property owners to minimize impacts on Christmas tree farm by clearly delineating the property line with signs, fence and tree plantings.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Explore use of recycled asphalt pavement grindings for dust control.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Conduct necessary archaeological work prior to construction.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Proposed Access Road</td>
<td>Phase 1 – Gravel Road construction 2005 for March 2006 park opening (Pave as funding allows or pave area adjacent to neighbors to the north – Christmas tree farm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Phase 2 – Pave road completely</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Property transfer from Polk County required prior to construction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Restroom development will require a sanitary feasibility study prior to development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Monitoring for cultural resources required</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 space parking lot</td>
<td><strong>Phase 1 – Construction 2005 for March 2006 park opening</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restroom</td>
<td><strong>Phase 1 – Construction 2005 for March 2006 park opening</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>At or near parking area</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2-3 panel kiosk with plaza and trail from parking lot to Fort</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Orientation Kiosk</td>
<td>Phase 1 – Construction 2005 for March 2006 park opening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To provide map and general orientation to the site</td>
<td><strong>Phase 1 – Construction 2005 for March 2006 park opening</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Phase 1 – Construction 2005 for March 2006 park opening</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Full RV hook ups required</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Site to avoid visual impacts with the parking area, historic site and neighbors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>RV Host Sites (2)</td>
<td>Phase 1 – Construction 2005 for March 2006 park opening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Phase 3 – 2006 +</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Conduct necessary archaeological work prior to construction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Visitor Center/Sutler Store</td>
<td>Phase 3 – 2006 +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct visitor services center in the area of the sutler store</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Borrow design concepts from written descriptions of sutler store</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6. | **Officers’ Quarter’s Stabilization**  
- **At current location** |   |
|   | Building may include collections, visitor services, interpretation, and gift shop.  
- **Not to exceed 1500 s.f.** | Protect resource from environmental deterioration or vandalism  
Phase 1: Cover building and stabilize sill structure, columns and top plate (2004)  
Phase 2: Restore military siding (2005) |
| 7. | **Power Line Corridor Access Service Road**  
- **Use portion as trail and interpretive access** | Align road to minimize impacts to cultural resource  
Follow proper cultural resource management protocols during construction  
Phase 1 – Construction in 2004 |
| 8. | **Blockhouse Reconstruction** | Construct based on Historic Documentation Drawings (HABS-HAER) records and blockhouse in Dayton  
Archaeological investigation to determine approximate location on the ground  
Investigate log structures from OPRD forest management activities or partners  
Phase 2 (2006+) |
| 9. | **Flagpole Reconstruction** | Conduct design study  
Archaeological investigation to determine approximate location on the ground  
Phase 1 – Construction 2005 for March 2006 park opening |
| 10. | **Picket Fence & Parade Ground Reconstruction** | Conduct design study  
Archaeological investigation to determine approximate location on the ground  
Phase 1 – Construction 2005 for March 2006 park opening |
| 11. | **Foundation markers**  
- Options include boulders (cut stone similar to original building foundations, fencing, ghost structures, etc.) | Archaeological investigation to determine locations on the ground  
Select appropriate demarcation methods  
Phase 1 – Construction 2005 for March 2006 park opening |
| 12. | **Trails** | Follow proper cultural resource management protocol according to construction methods used.  
Phase 1 and 2 as funding allows |
| 13. | **Sentry Reconstruction** | Conduct necessary archaeological work prior to construction or relocate firepond.  
Phase 3 – 2006+ |
| 14. | **Officers’ Quarters Relocation** | Prepare original site archaeologically  
Prepare access road to site archaeologically  
Phase 1: Move and enclose structure (2006+)  
Phase 2: Finish project exterior  
Phase 3: Finish project interior |
| 15.  | Old Fort Road Restoration | - Maintain as historic resource. Open areas closed in by vegetation growth  
- Maintain as trail use and limited service access | Phase 2 – Use for management purposes only. |
| 16.  | Power Line Relocation Corridor | - Agreement with BPA for NEPA review  
- Subsurface archaeological work at pole sites  
- Clear vegetation from power corridor – BPA forester review to limit hazard trees potential  
- Easements or acquisitions required prior to realignment | Phase 1 – Construction 2004  
(NEPA work, forest clearing, obtain necessary property acquisitions or easements)  
Phase 2 – Pole relocation Summer 2005 |
| 17.  | Relocation of the Fire Pond * | - Conduct necessary archaeological work prior to construction | Phase 3 – 2006+ |
|       | If OPRD acquires Hampton property seek to relocate Fire Pond  
|       | Restore site | | |
| 18.  | Interpretive Signing* | - Must be consistent with Interpretive Plan | Phase 1 - Initial installation in time for 2006 opening  
Phase 2 - More detailed installation to follow park opening |
| 19.  | Cultural Landscape Management* | - Vegetation management to establish the fort site and visual landscape | |
| 20.  | Maintenance Yard/Shop | - Identify appropriate location off site  
- Coordinate with CTGR or neighboring properties for appropriate location  
- Consider acquisition or long term lease options | |

* Not mapped on Development Concept Map
CHAPTER NINE- CULTURAL & NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES

Cultural resources are considered the primary resource for this site and they play a key role in the placement of proposed facilities. Facility development and maintenance practices within different zones of the target area require different cultural resource management prescriptions depending on their archaeological potential. In an effort to address this need, a Cultural Probability Zone Map was developed with an accompanying list of cultural management guidelines within the designated zones.

The Cultural Probability Map was based on an analysis prepared as part of the Cultural Resource Study for Fort Yamhill State Heritage Area. This study identified the archaeological potential for significant historic eras including the prehistoric era, early historic era, Fort Yamhill era, and post Fort historic era. Background research, including the analysis of historical maps and literature on regional prehistory and ethnography, combined with information collected during the field survey, provide a basis for assessing the likelihood of the Target Area to contain historic era and prehistoric archaeological resources. Areas were identified based on their likelihood to yield additional information. This analysis identified areas with high and medium probability to yield additional information for each of the eras.

Overlaying these four maps from the different historic eras, created one composite map, the Cultural Probability Zones Map. In addition to the “High” and “Medium” probability designations, the Cultural Probability Map included a “Protect” zone, which encompasses the entire historic Fort site. The “Protect” area includes the general location of all known building locations associated with the Fort identified in the Adams Report. Facility development and management except for described reconstructions and relocations will be most prescriptive within this area. A cultural resource protocol matrix follows the Cultural Probability Zone Map (Table 5).
## Cultural Resource Management Protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Management Prescription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Protect |     | - Vegetation growing on the parade ground which will primarily include blackberries, scotch broom, young fir and other brush species will be carefully removed without disturbing the ground and buried artifacts.  
|         |     | - Hand and light machine (light tractors with rubber tires) removal of encroaching young firs and brush. Mature Savanna oaks will remain with openings created in the understory to facilitate views.  
|         |     | - During dry season only.  
|         |     | - Inform crews to be on the lookout for historic and prehistoric materials and to follow proper protocol if resource is located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for clearance).  
|         |     | - Conduct archaeological reconnaissance to identify any visible artifacts/sites after ground-disturbing activities.  
| Medium  |     | - Conduct archaeological reconnaissance to identify any visible artifacts/sites after ground-disturbing activities.  
|         |     | - During dry season only.  
|         |     | - Inform crews to be on the lookout for historic and prehistoric materials and to follow proper protocol if resource is located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for clearance).  
| Low     |     | - Conduct archaeological reconnaissance to identify any visible artifacts/sites after ground-disturbing activities.  
|         |     | - Inform crews to be on the lookout for historic and prehistoric materials and to follow proper protocol if resource is located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for clearance).  

---
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### Cultural Resource Management Protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Management Prescription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timber removal</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td>- Timber removal shall be based on an archaeological probability plan that will identify appropriate staging, road locations, and direction of tree fall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- There is a large stand of mature Douglas fir trees growing within the parade grounds that dramatically disturbs the character of the site as it was maintained during the military period. Cutting them flush with the ground and leaving the roots in place will remove these conifers. Excavation of the roots and stumps would do serious harm to the archaeological resources. The tree roots are displacing artifacts as they grow. As roots and stumps decay, soil will be brought in to level the site. Selected cutting and use of herbicides is recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Conduct work during the dry season.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Have park staff periodically monitor work for cultural resources. Staff should follow proper protocol. If resources are located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for appropriate clearance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Techniques that reduce dragging of logs across the ground are recommended i.e., shovel logging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Inform crews to be on the lookout for historic and prehistoric materials and to follow proper protocol if resource is located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for clearance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Conduct archaeological reconnaissance to identify any visible artifacts/sites after ground-disturbing activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Tree Removal</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>- Conduct work during the dry season.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Have park staff periodically monitor work for cultural resources, and to follow proper protocol if resources are located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for appropriate clearance). In areas with significant vantage points or views, park staff should be on site to monitor for cultural resources. These area have a high probability for historic use and should be closely monitored for cultural resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Techniques that reduce dragging of logs across the ground are recommended i.e., shovel logging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Inform crews to be on the lookout for historic and prehistoric materials and to follow proper protocol if resource is located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for clearance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Conduct archaeological reconnaissance to identify any visible artifacts/sites after ground-disturbing activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Tree Removal</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>- Conduct archaeological reconnaissance to identify any visible artifacts/sites after ground disturbing activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Inform crews to be on the lookout for historic and prehistoric materials and to follow proper protocol if resource is located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for clearance).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 - Cultural Resource Management Protocol Cont.

### Cultural Resource Management Protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Management Prescription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>• Inform crews to be on the lookout for historic and prehistoric materials and to follow proper protocol if resource is located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for clearance).&lt;br&gt;• Conduct archaeological reconnaissance to identify any visible artifacts/sites after ground disturbing activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>• Base trail locations on archaeological probability plan and interpretive plan findings.&lt;br&gt;• Heavy foot traffic will be confined to well-defined trails to lessen soil compaction. Surface materials to consider include soil cement and gravel.&lt;br&gt;• Preparation of the site including brush, tree removal, seeding and fence post hole digging must be done with the guidance of an archaeologist to protect the cultural resources. Obtain necessary SHPO permits.&lt;br&gt;• Have park staff monitor work for cultural resources and follow proper protocol if resources are located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for appropriate clearance).&lt;br&gt;• Inform crews to be on the lookout for historic and prehistoric materials and to follow proper protocol if resource is located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for clearance).&lt;br&gt;• Conduct archaeological reconnaissance to identify any visible artifacts/sites after ground disturbing activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 - Cultural Resource Management Protocol Cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Management Prescription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ground Disturbing Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>• Refer to recommendations outlined in archaeological probability plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Obtain necessary SHPO clearance forms prior to work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Inform crews to be on the lookout for historic and prehistoric materials and to follow proper protocol if resource is located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for clearance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>• Obtain necessary SHPO clearance forms prior to work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Inform crews to be on the lookout for historic and prehistoric materials and to follow proper protocol if resource is located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for clearance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>• Obtain necessary SHPO clearance forms prior to work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Inform crews to be on the lookout for historic and prehistoric materials and to follow proper protocol if resource is located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for clearance).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cultural Resource Management Protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Management Prescription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ground Disturbing Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>• Refer to recommendations outlined in archaeological probability plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Obtain necessary SHPO clearance forms prior to work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Inform crews to be on the lookout for historic and prehistoric materials and to follow proper protocol if resource is located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for clearance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>• Obtain necessary SHPO clearance forms prior to work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Inform crews to be on the lookout for historic and prehistoric materials and to follow proper protocol if resource is located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for clearance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>• Obtain necessary SHPO clearance forms prior to work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Inform crews to be on the lookout for historic and prehistoric materials and to follow proper protocol if resource is located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for clearance).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cultural Resource Management Protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Management Prescription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park Access Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>• Stake road and conduct subsurface probing within impact area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Have park staff periodically monitor work for cultural resources and follow proper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>protocol if resources are located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>appropriate clearance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Inform crews to be on the lookout for historic and prehistoric materials and to follow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>proper protocol if resource is located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>clearance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>• Have park staff periodically monitor work for cultural resources and follow proper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>protocol if resources are located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>appropriate clearance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Inform crews to be on the lookout for historic and prehistoric materials and to follow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>proper protocol if resource is located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>clearance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>• Inform crews to be on the lookout for historic and prehistoric materials and to follow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>proper protocol if resource is located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>clearance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Avoid alignments within the protection zone or close to Fort structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPA Access Road Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>• Stake road and conduct subsurface probing within impact area where grading is to occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Build in conjunction with logging of power line corridor. Use as an access road for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>timber management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>• Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>• Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cultural Resource Management Protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Management Prescription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Events and Reenactments</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td>• Limit vehicle use. No subsurface disturbance allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Inform crews to be on the lookout for historic and prehistoric materials and to follow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>proper protocol if resource is located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for clearance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>• Inform crews to be on the lookout for historic and prehistoric materials and to follow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>proper protocol if resource is located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for clearance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>• Inform crews to be on the lookout for historic and prehistoric materials and to follow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>proper protocol if resource is located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for clearance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>• Inform crews/groups to be on the look out for historic materials and to follow proper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>protocol if resource is located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for clearance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slash Piles / Burning</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td>• Limit vehicle use within the protect zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>• Document fire locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Limit vehicle use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Limit ground disturbing activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building / Structure Relocation</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td>• During dry season only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Use existing powerline or existing roads as reasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Limit ground disturbing activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Do complete archaeological testing prior to move.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>• Stake out planting areas prior to work. Review with SHPO, obtain necessary permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Plant primarily grasses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Have park staff periodically monitor work for cultural resources and follow proper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>protocol if resources are located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>appropriate clearance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Inform crews to be on the lookout for historic and prehistoric materials and to follow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>proper protocol if resource is located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>clearance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Zone</td>
<td>Management Prescription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Medium   |      | - Stake out planting areas prior to work. Review with SHPO, obtain necessary permits.  
|          |      | - Have park staff periodically monitor work for cultural resources and follow proper protocol if resources are located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for appropriate clearance).  
|          |      | - Inform crews to be on the lookout for historic and prehistoric materials and to follow proper protocol if resource is located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for clearance). |
| Low      |      | - Inform crews to be on the lookout for historic and prehistoric materials and to follow proper protocol if resource is located (stop work, contact manager, contact SHPO for clearance). |
Restoration of the Cultural Landscape by Vegetation Management

Most of the habitats at Fort Yamhill are not particularly high quality habitats. The forests are dominated by native species, but most are not mature. They also represent forest types that were not present when the first soldiers were stationed at the site. Many areas at the site are dominated by non-native species and invasive species and are targeted for control work. Some are rather degraded. However, the site does have some interesting native species in some areas, and has the potential to support historically relevant native plant communities.

To support the reintroduction of these historic plant communities, several management techniques are suggested. The Native Americans in the area used fired as an important management tool to maintain native grassland and oak savanna habitats. The conifer forests that have encroached upon the site in the last 150 years owe their existence, in part, to the absence of periodic burning. Although historically Douglas-firs did exist on the southwestern portion of the surveyed site, they were co-dominant with Oregon white oak. It is recommended that the majority of these conifers be removed, with care taken to not damage the Oregon oaks currently growing in the understory. Fire should also be used to control the Scots broom and Himalayan blackberry that are actively invading much of the site, although repeated burns and herbicides may be necessary to accomplish this. Benton County’s work in restoring the oak savanna at Fort Hoskins will also be a useful guide to Fort Yamhill.

Native seeds are available to assist in the restoration of the prairie habitats; however, methods to control the European pasture grasses are not well formulated. Mark Wilson at Oregon State University, Tom Kaye at the Institute for Applied Ecology, and Ed Alverson of The Nature Conservancy have the most experience in restoring these habitats, mostly in conjunction with the Oregon State Office of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Their work related to grassland restoration in the Willamette Valley may be applied to Fort Yamhill.

It is important to note that several very large conifers were probably located on the site during the time that the Fort was in existence. The location of these conifers has been recorded with a GPS unit, and their coordinates have been noted on the vegetation map (located in master plan atlas). Most of these conifers occur in the southwestern portion of the surveyed area, an area that was historically Douglas-fir-Oregon white oak woodland. Because of the age and size of these trees, a prescribed burn would probably not damage them, but clearing out the understory first would prevent a crown fire and encourage a more woodland-type habitat.

There are also several large Oregon white oaks that were probably located on the site at the time of Fort operation. Two are located on the northern edge of the Grand Ronde grassland and one is located near the edge of the Oregon Parks and Recreation grassland on the south side of the property. The location of these oaks also has been recorded with the GPS, and their coordinates have been noted on the map (located in master plan atlas).
These woodland habitats support non-natives such as Himalayan and evergreen blackberry, which should be mechanically or chemically removed if they resprout after a controlled burn. The removal of these species should be sufficient to encourage the growth of native woodland understory species. No seeding of native species should be needed in these areas.

Much of the surveyed area was historically prairie. The management prescription is to remove trees and shrubs with the exception of the historic white oaks. The conifers should be mechanically removed and a controlled burn may be a good grassland management tool. A concerted effort to remove non-natives such as Himalayan and evergreen blackberry should be undertaken periodically after the controlled burn. Seeding of native grasses and forbs in areas with removed trees, non-natives or bare ground is recommended.

**Ethnobotany and Cultural Sensitive Vegetation**

Elaine LaBonte of the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde prepared a list of culturally important plants. The amount of usage and cultural importance of each plant species was not noted for the Fort Yamhill project, although the Tribes plan to work on developing themes and recommendations for specific plants as the Fort Yamhill Project progresses. Accordingly, more recommendations for species protection or restoration for cultural purposes will be suggested at a later date.

It is important to note that the recommendations for restoration and/or hands off management for plant communities on the site would foster plant communities that were historically present on the site and/or contain many of the species noted as being culturally important. For example, restoration of the upland grasslands would provide more habitats for the following native and culturally important plants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forbs</th>
<th>Shrubs</th>
<th>Trees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yarrow Hooker onion</td>
<td>Cow parsnip</td>
<td>Oregon white oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common camas Blue leaf strawberry</td>
<td>Tall Oregon grape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self heal Bracken fern</td>
<td>Wild cucumber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western goldenrod Cow parsley</td>
<td>Sedge and rush species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 - Native and culturally important plants

Restoration of the Douglas fir, Oregon white oak woodland and non-active management (except the removal of non-native species) of the various wetland areas would also provide habitat for many of the shrubs and trees that appear on this list.

Elaine LaBonte also noted the following: “The absence of any notations on species from the Poaceae family or of wild flowers is not indicative of their lack of cultural relevance. Certain grasses and wild flowers had a minor role in traditional lifestyles as compared to the shrubs and trees that had a much longer life cycle, and which consequently were more significant. Once the native plant communities are restored, those species that are a natural part of that community will establish themselves and regardless of their actual cultural significance (as far as usage goes), our native philosophy certainly considers them to be culturally relevant as one component of an interrelated plant community that our ancestors relied upon.”
Timber Management within Cultural Resource Sensitive Areas

If an area is slated for tree removal or when developing an area that is not compatible with maintenance of forest tree cover according to forest practices legislation, there must be a plan to reforest the area with appropriate tree species. As part of the cultural landscape management in establishing the parade ground and Fort site, OPRD may have to get approval from the State Forester to not reforest the site (Forest Practice Rule 629-610-0090). Oregon Parks and Recreation Department will also have to get the necessary permits from local jurisdictions for tree removal, if any, and will have to file a plan with the Oregon Department of Forestry preceding any harvest activities.

Any harvest activities will need to consider the impact on any cultural resources and should be done in a manner to protect them. To maintain the health of the remaining oaks, the encroaching conifers should be cleared away so as not to compete with the oaks. In areas where all the trees may have to be clear-cut to provide views or to recreate a historic landscape, replanting should be done with Oregon white oaks, native grasses and forbs. Fringe areas that are stocked with conifers should be cleared of the trees in order to maintain the meadow. Invasive plants such as Scot’s broom, Himalayan blackberry, and holly should be removed. Areas that will be thinned or cut may see an increase in some invasive species and there should be a plan to minimize or eliminate them as much as possible. Plans should include provisions for periodic tree and invasive plant maintenance.

According to Bonneville Power Administration specifications relocation of the power lines that bisect the meadow area will require a new 100 foot wide right of way clearing. Depending on its location, it may require the cutting of an area of two or more acres. If this is done, the edges should be feathered in a way to eliminate the “tunnel” effect. It may also be desirable or feasible to expand the R/W clearing to create larger openings where more native white oaks could be planted. All Oregon white oaks have been identified within the Fort site.

All harvest activities for the entire area should also happen during the dry months to minimize soil compaction and disturbance. Heavy equipment should be used as little as practically possible or confined to predetermined areas deemed to have minimal impact on cultural or other park resources. Some areas could be harvested using rubber-tired skidders or caterpillars utilizing pre-existing skid roads, thereby minimizing ground disturbance. Logs could be also winched to designated skid roads by caterpillar or other log yarding machines.

Shovel logging and/or horse logging may reduce some impacts, but a feller/buncher machine with rubber cleats may also be used. The advantage of a feller/buncher is that trees may be cut and then laid down in any direction. Helicopter logging is not a consideration due to its expense and impact to the ground (through the felling and yarding operations); a helicopter would also need a large log landing area. Skid roads should use existing roads or remnants of previous management roads, and be located away from known sensitive archaeological sites. Any accidental unearthing of significant artifacts will be reported to the proper authorities immediately and operations in the area will be suspended until the issue is resolved.

Removal of the tree overstory and the resulting ground disturbance will most likely cause a resurgence of brush species. Of particular concern will be the release of dormant Scott’s broom seed and Himalayan blackberry vines. Parks should be prepared for this by developing and using an aggressive weed management plan that includes timely mechanical and chemical treatment.
Prescribed fire, with careful planning and application, may also be used in this regard and may have an additional benefit of stimulating native plant reproduction.

Areas that are logged and not replanted with coniferous trees should be reseeded with native grasses (Roemers Fescus) and forbs as much as possible.
CHAPTER TEN - INTERPRETIVE MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES

OPRD’s Interpretive Mission
The “Interpretive and Educational” mission for OPRD is to provide interpretive and educational services that can involve visitors in activities, which connect them with the natural, and cultural heritage opportunities found on OPRD parks and properties.

A comprehensive interpretive plan should be developed for Fort Yamhill State Heritage Area. This park is considered level of service five under the Oregon State Parks Interpretive Plan. This is the highest designation for interpretation in the State Parks System, meaning level five parks can include a visitor facility of some kind or may include only a small visitor contact building. These parks could also contain outside interpretive structures to serve as a base for outreach and education programming. They offer staffing and interpretive access year round and seven-day week and have multiple interpretive sites within the park with staff guided and self guided trails. They offer staff run programs and tours and have staff members who are dedicated to interpretive duties on a year round basis. These level five parks also have additional dedicated interpretive staff for the summer season.

This Master Plan includes the future development of an interpretive center. This facility could be adapted to look and be interpreted as the Sutler Store. The building could also include archival storage and office space for staff.

Interpretive Design Approach
- To interpret as the primary topic, the story of how and why Fort Yamhill was created, the role it played in the history of the Grand Ronde people and Oregon’s settlement, and its significance to the history of Oregon and the settlement of the West.

- To interpret as a secondary topic, the daily life at Fort Yamhill: the frustrations and hardships endured by the soldiers of both the regular and volunteer army at this isolated post; how the lives of the Native Americans who were confined to the Reservation were impacted; and, the effect the Fort had on the daily lives of the civilians residing in the general areas.

- To convey the challenge of the times and to draw connections and lessons from this chapter of history that are applicable today, by acknowledging for example, the cultural diversity and reinstatement of the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde, or by discussing similar forces today that impact our environment and culture and the challenge of balancing these forces.
CHAPTER ELEVEN - IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

During the past two years (December 2001-September 2003), OPRD and the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde (CTGR) have been examining potential options to eventually open Fort Yamhill and surrounding properties to the general public. 2006 was set as a target date early in the planning process. This date recognizes the 150th anniversary of the establishment of the Grand Ronde Reservation and the establishment of the Fort Yamhill in 1856. It also conveniently corresponds well with the events and planned celebrations associated with the Lewis and Clark Bicentennial. In March 2006, the Tribes will host the National Parks Service’s Lewis and Clark Traveling Museum on its adjacent property.

In time for the 2006 celebration, elements of the new state park will include an access road through CTGR lands, 50-space parking lot, restrooms, interpretive kiosks and interpretive trails, reconstruction of the picket fence surrounding the parade ground, and a flagpole. Prior to 2006, OPRD intends to conduct an archaeological field school and further stabilization of the 1850s Officer’s Quarters. The Fort restoration includes the relocation of the BPA power lines. The realignment will require additional easements or land purchases. Both agency and tribal staff are presently investigating acquisition opportunities.

Table 7 - Target 2006 Implementation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target 2006</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Enter into Agreement with BPA to complete necessary environmental and</td>
<td>ASAP – June 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>archaeological work within the power line corridor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Stabilize Officers’ Quarters – Phase 1- Stabilize Sill and Protect</td>
<td>ASAP – June 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Seek to acquire Hampton Property</td>
<td>ASAP (Acquired May, 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Flagpole and Fence Design</td>
<td>Winter 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Master Plan Adoption - Land Use Application to Polk County</td>
<td>Spring 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Transfer County Property or obtain agreement for timber removal to</td>
<td>Spring 2004 (Acquired April, 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepare site for construction of parking lot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Timber Sale #1 – Power line Corridor, County land and Cosper Creek</td>
<td>May – July 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frontage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Vegetation Management</td>
<td>Spring/Summer 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Archaeological Field School</td>
<td>June 04 –June 05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field work (Late June – Mid August 2004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Traffic Impact Study and other permitting</td>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Site Development and Operations Plan</td>
<td>Fall – Winter 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Park wide Interpretation Plan</td>
<td>Winter 2004/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Road Construction and Intersection Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Timber Sale #2 – Parade ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Construct Parking Lot and needed utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Reconstruct picket fence and flag pole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Archaeological Field School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Install interpretation infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Relocate power lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Vegetation Management/Restoration of parade ground</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Projects Beyond 2006

#### Potential Future Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Investigation of possible mill site along Cosper Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Assessment of Kissing Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Additional Archaeological Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Additional Research and Archaeological work related to the Molalla Encampment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Additional Research and Archaeological work related to the Fort Garden and Firing Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Ongoing Archaeological and Historic Preservation Field Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Additional Archaeological work related to the location of the Fort Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Potential Future Reconstruction Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Block house reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Relocation of Officer’s Quarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Construction of Visitor Center/Sutler Store</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER TWELVE – LAND USE APPROVAL

Zoning Requirements
Polk County governs development of park uses and facilities under the provisions of the County’s Comprehensive Land Use Plan and Land Development Ordinance. The Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) acknowledges the County’s comprehensive plan and ordinance pursuant to the statewide land use laws and goals, statutes and related administrative rules. OPRD’s and the Polk County property are zoned farm/forest. Parks would be considered a conditional use upon approval of a state parks master plan.

Land Use Authorities
Development of park uses and facilities by OPRD at Fort Yamhill State Heritage Area is governed by Polk County under the provisions of the County’s comprehensive plan. The Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) acknowledge the County’s comprehensive plan pursuant to the statewide land use goals, statutes and related administrative rules. Development on or through tribal lands is exempt from compliance with local land use laws.

The master plan for Fort Yamhill State Heritage Area has been formulated through the master planning process described under OAR 736 Division 18 and OAR 660 Division 34. The master planning process includes procedures for coordinating with affected local governments to obtain local approval of the master plan. A separate document of the master plan, entitled, “Land Use Findings for Fort Yamhill State Heritage Area” contains the land use findings required for the County’s approval of the master plan. The findings in that document address the compliance of the master plan with the applicable statewide land use goals and local land use policies. The appendix of this master plan contains the documentation formalizing the approval of the master plan by the County.

County Permits for Project Development
Except where specifically noted in the master plan, all of the projects described in the master plan are granted conceptual land use approval by Polk County upon the County’s approval of the master plan, as provided in OAR 660-034-0030(2); however, development permits are still required for most of the projects. Prior to beginning construction, the project manager is responsible for consulting with the County and obtaining the necessary permits. The specific requirements for obtaining development permits for a project and the kind of local permitting process required, may vary from one project to another. The time required for completing development permitting processes may also vary substantially; therefore, the project manager should consult with the County early enough to assure that the permitting process is completed prior to the target date for beginning construction. The County has requested that the Master Plan be adopted through a Conditional Use Application process.

Prior to issuance of development permits for a project, Polk County will conduct the necessary review of the project plans and specifications to assure that the project proposed for construction is consistent with the conceptual design and description of the project in the adopted master plan and with any development standards outlined in the master plan for that project. The County may also review the project for consistency with any applicable standards in the County’s ordinances; however, any such standards must be clear and objective, as required by OAR 660-034-0030(2)(c). Because the master
planned projects are conceptually approved with the approval of the master plan, the development review process for a project cannot result in denial of the project, provided the project is consistent with the master plan and any applicable development standards.

**Variations from the Master Plan**

Under the provisions of OAR 736-018-0040, OPRD may pursue construction of a park use that varies from an adopted master plan without first amending the master plan provided the variation is minor, unless the master plan language specifically precludes such variation. Any specific project design elements that cannot be changed by applying the “Minor Variation” rule are indicated with the project descriptions in the master plan.

The OPRD Director must determine that a proposed variation from a master plan is “minor” using the criteria set forth in OAR 736-018-0040. A minor variation for a master plan which is approved by the Director, is considered to be consistent with the master plan, contingent upon Polk County’s concurrence.

---

**Rehabilitation of Existing Park Facilities**

State law allows OPRD to continue any state park use or facility that existed on July 25, 1997. (See ORS 195.125 and OAR 660-034-0030(8).) The law allows the repair and renovation of facilities, the replacement of facilities including minor location changes, and the minor expansion of uses and facilities. Such projects are allowed whether or not they are described in an adopted state park master plan. Any development permits normally required for such projects are still required.

Prior to applying for development permits for a project involving a minor location change of an existing facility or a minor expansion of an existing use or facility, the OPRD Director must determine that the location change or expansion is “minor” using the criteria in OAR 736-018-0043. The Director’s determination is subject to the concurrence of the affected local government. OPRD can limit or disallow the “location changes” or “minor expansions” otherwise allowed by OAR 736-018-0043 by so stating in the master plan.
OPRD Master Plan Adoption Process

Figure 9. Master Plan Adoption Process