

Selective Reconnaissance-Level Survey of  
Historic Architectural Resources Along  
Proponent-Proposed Routes for the Uinta  
Basin Railway Project in Utah, Carbon,  
Duchesne, and Uintah Counties, Utah

FINAL

FEBRUARY 2020

PREPARED FOR  
**HDR Engineering, Inc.**

PREPARED BY  
**SWCA Environmental Consultants**



**SELECTIVE RECONNAISSANCE-LEVEL SURVEY OF  
HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES ALONG  
PROPONENT-PROPOSED ROUTES FOR THE UINTA BASIN  
RAILWAY PROJECT IN UTAH, CARBON, DUCHESNE, AND  
UINTAH COUNTIES, UTAH  
FINAL**

*Creation dates of proposed routes (based on GIS data provided by HDR):*  
Indian Canyon Proposed Route: 11/22/2019 (final data received 11/26/19)  
Whitmore Park Proposed Route: 2/12/2020 (final data received 2/12/2020)  
Wells Draw Proposed Route: 11/22/2019 (final data received 11/26/19)  
Craig Proposed Route: 5/22/2019

Prepared for

**HDR Engineering, Inc.**  
2825 East Cottonwood, Suite 200  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84121

Prepared by

Kate Hovanes, M.S., and Megan Daniels, M.P.S.

Principal Investigator

Anne Oliver, M.S.

**SWCA Environmental Consultants**

257 E 200 S, Suite 200  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111  
(801) 322-4307  
[www.swca.com](http://www.swca.com)

SWCA Project No. 53323.02  
SWCA Cultural Resources Report No. 19-594

February 2020



## **ABSTRACT**

The Seven County Infrastructure Coalition (Coalition) proposes to construct and operate an approximately 80-mile rail line between two terminus points in the Uinta Basin and the interstate railway network. The Uinta Basin Railway Project (Project) would be constructed and operated under the authority of the Surface Transportation Board (STB) and has the potential to result in significant environmental impacts. For this reason, an environmental impact statement (EIS) is being prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The Project is located in Utah, Carbon, Duchesne, and Uintah Counties, Utah. Land ownership includes private ownership, Tribal land, and public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) (Vernal, Price, and Salt Lake Field Offices); the State of Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA); and the U.S. Forest Service (USFS). The Project proposes a No Build option and three proponent-proposed routes (proposed routes), which are subject to environmental analysis:

- The Indian Canyon Proposed Route is 80.6 miles long (based on centerline alignment dated 11/22/2019) and runs from a connection to the national railway network near Kyune, Utah, to a terminus near Myton, Utah, in the Uinta Basin.
- The Whitmore Park Proposed Route is 87.7 miles long (based on centerline alignment dated 2/12/2020) and runs from a connection to the national railway network near Kyune, Utah, to a terminus near Myton, Utah, in the Uinta Basin. It coincides with the Indian Canyon Route Alternative for much of its length.
- The Wells Draw Proposed Route is 103.3 miles long (based on centerline alignment dated 11/22/2019) and runs from a connection to the national railway network near Kyune, Utah, to a terminus near Myton, Utah.

A fourth route, the Craig Proposed Route, which is approximately 185 miles long and extends from a connection to the national railway network near Axial, Colorado, to a terminus near Myton, Utah, was initially proposed by the Coalition. Upon further examination, the Coalition determined that the Craig Proposed Route does not meet the purpose and need for the project, in that it fails to provide a cost-effective transportation alternative. Because the Craig route cannot meet the project purpose and need, it will not be carried forward in detailed evaluation during EIS preparation because the Coalition does not feel it is a viable project alternative. In the following report, the term “proponent-proposed route” refers to the potential construction area (referred to as the “route corridor”) plus a 1,000 foot buffer in most areas. Detailed definitions are provided in the body of the report. Survey included areas within a 1 mile buffer of the original proponent-proposed route (referred to as the “survey area”).

The Coalition contracted HDR Engineering Inc. (HDR) to provide environmental consulting services in support of the Project. In December 2018, HDR subcontracted SWCA Environmental Consultants (SWCA) to conduct a reconnaissance-level survey (RLS) of historic architectural resources to support environmental analysis under NEPA and to assist the STB, as the lead federal agency, in its responsibilities under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and its governing regulations (36 Code of Federal Regulations 800), which require federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties prior to the expenditure of any federal funds.

The initial study methodologies submitted to the Surface Transportation Board’s Office of Environmental Analysis (OEA) in the spring of 2019 identified a 2,000-foot study area width. When field survey work began in the late spring of 2019 for all resources, the Coalition’s consultant (and OEA’s third-party consultant) observed that the actual conditions along the alignments, including steep slopes, ridgelines, and other topographical constraints, were constraining field surveys within the 2,000-foot-wide corridor. In fact, in some areas, the corridor extended from the centerline located in one canyon up and over the

ridgeline into a different canyon. In response to the consultants’ field observations and ongoing coordination with OEA during weekly project update calls, an approximately 1,000-foot study area width was considered practical and feasible in most areas; however, in some areas, the width ranges up to 2,000 feet—for example, where the design team anticipates that a wider earthwork footprint might be needed to traverse the steep slopes with the restrictive railway grades. The study area also ranges up to 2,000 feet wide in areas where cultural resources had already been identified and surveyed prior to the reduction to a 1,000-foot-wide corridor. Per the reporting requirements of the land management agencies, information on these resources was retained in the report after the corridor width was reduced.

The purpose of the RLS summarized in this report is to document the locations of properties with historic-age architectural resources along the three proposed routes and to provide recommendations of resources’ eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The total study area acreage and the acreage surveyed for each alignment is presented in Table A-1. Historic-age resources were defined as older than 43 years (dating to 1976 or earlier). Resources along the Craig Proposed Route in Utah were also surveyed and results are included here as well.<sup>1</sup> In all, 106 historic architectural resources were recorded and evaluated according the Utah Division of State History (UDSH) standards and NRHP criteria. The number of recorded properties and an overview of eligibility recommendations for each proposed route is presented in Table A-2. The total number of all resources and eligible resources for each route and their location within the route corridor or the survey area (but outside of the route corridor) is presented in Table A-3. The route corridor varies in width based on the planned construction, as indicated in maps included in the appendices (Appendix A through Appendix D). The buffer extends approximately 1,000 feet beyond the APE on either side. Tribal land is excluded for all routes.

**Table A-1. Total Acreage Surveyed by Alignment\***

Proponent-Proposed Route	Total Study Area (Acres) (as of 2/12/2020)	Field Surveyed (Acres)	Desktop Review Only (Acres)	No Property Access Permission (Acres)
Indian Canyon	9,810	6,572	N/A	3,238
Whitmore Park	10,609	7,402	38	3,170
Wells Draw	13,193	11,417	N/A	1,776
Craig (Utah) <sup>†</sup>	9,823	8,820	N/A	1,003

\* These acreages were calculated using the State Plane Coordinate System. Mapping and GIS calculations for this report used UTM NAD 83 Zone 12, which is preferred by land managing agencies for cultural resources survey and reporting, thus acreages may vary by +/- 5 acres.

<sup>†</sup> Only data for the Utah portion of the Craig Proposed Route is included.

Additionally, SWCA has included a discussion of district and landscape level considerations for potential NRHP-eligible historic districts and historic vernacular landscapes. Taken as whole, the RLS provides important information regarding the numbers, locations, and nature of NRHP eligible or potentially eligible properties in the survey area.

<sup>1</sup> The Colorado portion of the Craig Alternative was partially surveyed prior to notification that the route will not be carried forward for detailed evaluation in the EIS. Survey results for Colorado will be reported separately.

**Table A-2. Number of Recorded Properties by Proponent-Proposed Route**

Proponent-Proposed Route	Number of Recorded Properties	Number Recommended Eligible/Significant (ES)	Number Recommended Eligible/Contributing (EC)	Number Recommended Not Eligible/Non-Contributing (NC)	Undetermined
Indian Canyon	38	3	11	22	2
Whitmore Park	48	4	13	27	4
Wells Draw	41	1	10	28	2
Craig (Utah)*	49	1	9	35	4

\* Only data for the Utah portion of the Craig Proposed Route is included.

**Table A-3. Location of Recorded Properties by Proponent-Proposed Route**

Proponent-Proposed Route	Number of Recorded Properties in Proponent-Proposed Route	Number of Recorded Properties in Survey Area Buffer	Number of Eligible Properties (EC and ES) in Proponent-Proposed Route	Number of Eligible Properties (EC and ES) in Survey Area Buffer
Indian Canyon	18	20	5	9
Whitmore Park	19	29	6	11
Wells Draw	19	22	4	7
Craig Utah*	14	35	5	5

\* Only data for the Utah portion of the Craig Proposed Route is included.

Historic architectural resources in the survey area range in construction date from ca. 1890 to ca. 1975 and in type from cairns to residences. Of the 106 properties with resources of historic age that were surveyed for this project, seven date to the Early Euro-American Settlement, Reservation Establishment, and Resource Development Period (ca. 1850–1904). Sixty-one date to the Permanent Settlement, Growth, and Development Period (1905–1948). Thirty-eight date to the Farming, Ranching, and Resource Extraction Period (1949–present). Primary uses of properties are residential (single-family dwelling and other) (56 percent), agricultural (26 percent), transportation-related (6 percent), other (6 percent), industrial or mining-related (3 percent), monument/marker (1 percent), outdoor recreation (1 percent), and unknown (1 percent).

Based on background research, the survey area has the potential for NRHP-eligible districts to be present at the landscape level relating to the themes of mining, agriculture, and settlement. Based on observations during the survey, however, no area has the potential to qualify as a rural historic district under the themes of mining and settlement. Argyle Canyon (primarily within the Wells Draw Proposed Route) may qualify as a rural historic district under the theme of agriculture, but additional research will be required to concretely identify, assess, and create boundaries for such a district. The potential for ethnographic landscapes may also be present but this requires further research and documentation in collaboration with ethnographic groups in the Uinta Basin, particularly Ute tribal members.

*This page intentionally left blank.*



## CONTENTS

<b>Abstract</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Survey Objective .....	2
Survey Area Boundaries.....	3
Indian Canyon Proposed Route .....	9
Whitmore Park Proposed Route.....	13
Wells Draw Proposed Route.....	17
Craig Proposed Route .....	21
Survey Methodology .....	25
<b>Outline History</b> .....	<b>28</b>
Exploration and Early History, 1776–ca. 1850 .....	29
Early Euro-American Settlement, Reservation Establishment, and Resource Development, ca. 1850–1904.....	30
Permanent Settlement, Growth, and Development, 1905–1948 .....	33
Farming, Ranching, and Resource Extraction, 1949–present .....	37
<b>Survey Results</b> .....	<b>38</b>
Indian Canyon Proposed Route.....	89
Whitmore Park Proposed Route .....	92
Wells Draw Proposed Route .....	95
Craig Proposed Route.....	98
Landscape Level and District Considerations .....	103
<b>Summary</b> .....	<b>105</b>
<b>References Cited</b> .....	<b>108</b>

## Appendices

- Appendix A. Maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route
- Appendix B. Maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route
- Appendix C. Maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route
- Appendix D. Maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route

## Figures

Figure 1. Survey overview map. ....	5
Figure 2. Overview of Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route. ....	11
Figure 3. Overview of Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route.....	15
Figure 4. Overview of Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route.....	19
Figure 5. Overview of Craig Proponent-Proposed Route. ....	23

## Tables

Table 1. Total Acreage Surveyed by Alignment*.....	2
Table 2. Summarized Comparison of the Proponent-Proposed Route.....	7
Table 3. U.S. Geological Survey 7.5-Minute Quadrangles Encompassing the Survey Area .....	8
Table 4. U.S. Geological Survey 7.5-Minute Quadrangles Encompassing the Indian Canyon Proposed Route .....	9
Table 5. U.S. Geological Survey 7.5-Minute Quadrangles Encompassing the Whitmore Park Proposed Route .....	14
Table 6. U.S. Geological Survey 7.5-Minute Quadrangles Encompassing the Wells Draw Proposed Route.....	17
Table 7. U.S. Geological Survey 7.5-Minute Quadrangles Encompassing the Craig Proposed Route .....	21
Table 8. Buildings and Structures of Historic Age in the Survey Area (constructed before 1976) .....	39
Table 9. Summary of Architectural Resources of Historic Age in the Survey Area .....	47
Table 10. Previously Documented Historic Architectural Resources in the Survey Area and Summary of Eligibility .....	88
Table 11. Summary of Architectural Resources of Historic Age in the Indian Canyon Proposed Route Survey Area.....	89
Table 12. Classification of Single Residences by Type, 1905–1948, in the Indian Canyon Proposed Route Survey Area.....	90
Table 13. Classification of Single Residences by Style, 1905–1948, in the Indian Canyon Proposed Route Survey Area.....	91
Table 14. Classification of Single Residences by Type, 1948–Present, in the Indian Canyon Proposed Route Survey Area .....	91
Table 15. Classification of Single Residences by Style, 1948–Present, in the Indian Canyon Proposed Route Survey Area .....	92
Table 16. Summary of Architectural Resources of Historic Age in the Whitmore Park Proposed Route Survey Area.....	92
Table 17. Classification of Single Residences by Type, 1905–1948, in the Whitmore Park Proposed Route Survey Area.....	94
Table 18. Classification of Single Residences by Style, 1905–1948, in the Whitmore Park Proposed Route Survey Area.....	94
Table 19. Classification of Single Residences by Type, 1948–present, in the Whitmore Park Proposed Route Survey Area .....	95
Table 20. Classification of Single Residences by Style, 1948–present, in the Whitmore Park Proposed Route Survey Area .....	95
Table 21. Summary of Architectural Resources of Historic Age in the Wells Draw Proposed Route Survey Area .....	95
Table 22. Classification of Single Residences by Type, 1905–1948, in the Wells Draw Proposed Route Survey Area.....	97
Table 23. Classification of Single Residences by Style, 1905–1948, in the Wells Draw Proposed Route Survey Area.....	98
Table 24. Classification of Single Residences by Type, 1948–present, in the Wells Draw Proposed Route Survey Area.....	98
Table 25. Classification of Single Residences by Style, 1948–present, in the Wells Draw Proposed Route Survey Area.....	98
Table 26. Summary of Architectural Resources of Historic Age in the Craig Proposed Route Survey Area.....	99

Table 27. Classification of Single Residences by Type, 1905–1948, in the Craig Proposed Route Survey Area .....	101
Table 28. Classification of Single Residences by Style, 1905–1948, in the Craig Proposed Route Survey Area .....	101
Table 29. Classification of Single Residences by Type, 1948–Present, in the Craig Proposed Route Survey Area .....	101
Table 30. Classification of Single Residences by Style, 1948–Present, in the Craig Proposed Route Survey Area .....	102
Table 31. Number of Recorded Properties by Proponent-Proposed Route.....	105
Table 32. Eligible Properties in the Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route .....	105
Table 33. Eligible Properties in the Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route .....	106
Table 34. Eligible Properties in the Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route .....	106
Table 35. Eligible Properties in the Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Utah) .....	107

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Seven County Infrastructure Coalition (Coalition) proposes to construct and operate an approximately 80-mile rail line between two terminus points in the Uinta Basin and the interstate railway network. The Uinta Basin Railway Project (Project) would be constructed and operated under the authority of the Surface Transportation Board (STB) and has the potential to result in significant environmental impacts. For this reason, an environmental impact statement (EIS) is being prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The Project is located in Utah, Carbon, Duchesne, and Uintah Counties, Utah. Land ownership includes private ownership, Tribal land, and public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) (Vernal, Price, and Salt Lake Field Offices); the State of Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA); and the U.S. Forest Service (USFS). The Project proposes a No Build option and three proponent-proposed routes (proposed routes), which are subject to environmental analysis:

- The Indian Canyon Proposed Route is 80.6 miles long (based on centerline alignment dated 11/22/2019) and runs from a connection to the national railway network near Kyune, Utah, to a terminus near Myton, Utah, in the Uinta Basin.
- The Whitmore Park Proposed Route is 87.7 miles long (based on centerline alignment dated 2/12/2020) and runs from a connection to the national railway network near Kyune, Utah, to a terminus near Myton, Utah, in the Uinta Basin. It coincides with the Indian Canyon Route Alternative for much of its length.
- The Wells Draw Proposed Route is 103.3 miles long (based on centerline alignment dated 11/22/2019) and runs from a connection to the national railway network near Kyune, Utah, to a terminus near Myton, Utah.

A fourth route, the Craig Proposed Route, which is approximately 185 miles long and extends from a connection to the national railway network near Axial, Colorado, to a terminus near Myton, Utah, was initially proposed by the Coalition. Upon further examination, the Coalition determined that the Craig Proposed Route does not meet the purpose and need for the project, in that it fails to provide a cost-effective transportation alternative. Because the Craig route cannot meet the project purpose and need, it will not be carried forward in detailed evaluation during EIS preparation because the Coalition does not feel it is a viable project alternative.

The Coalition contracted HDR Engineering Inc. (HDR) to provide environmental consulting services in support of the Project. In December 2018, HDR subcontracted SWCA Environmental Consultants (SWCA) to conduct a reconnaissance-level survey (RLS) of historic architectural resources to support environmental analysis under NEPA and to assist the STB, as the lead federal agency, in its responsibilities under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (Section 106) and its governing regulations (36 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 800), which require federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties prior to the expenditure of any federal funds, or issuance of federal permit or land transfer.

The initial study methodologies submitted to the Surface Transportation Board's Office of Environmental Analysis (OEA) in the spring of 2019 identified a 2,000-foot study corridor width. When field survey work began in the late spring of 2019 for all resources, including archaeological and architectural, the Coalition's consultant (and OEA's third-party consultant) observed that the actual conditions along the alignments, including steep slopes, ridgelines, and other topographical constraints, were constraining field surveys within the 2,000-foot corridor. In fact, in some areas, the corridor extended from the centerline located in one canyon up and over the ridgeline into a different canyon. In response to the consultants' field observations and ongoing coordination with OEA during weekly project update calls, an

approximately 1,000-foot study area width was considered practical and feasible in most areas. However, in some areas, it ranges up to 2,000 feet—for example, where the design team anticipates that a wider earthwork footprint might be needed to traverse the steep slopes with the restrictive railway grades.

This report summarizes the results of a selective RLS of 106 properties with architectural resources of historic age in Utah, Carbon, Duchesne, and Uintah Counties, Utah (Figure 1). The survey was done in support of the Project, which is examining the potential impacts of proposed routes for a railroad that may facilitate transportation of commodities out of the Uinta Basin. HDR requested that SWCA identify and evaluate properties with buildings and structures of historic age for their National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility in the survey area for all proposed routes. The total study area acreage and the acreage surveyed for each alignment is presented in Table 1.

**Table 1. Total Acreage Surveyed by Alignment\***

<b>Proponent-Proposed Route</b>	<b>Total Study Area (Acres) (as of 2/12/2020)</b>	<b>Field Surveyed (Acres)</b>	<b>Desktop Review Only (Acres)</b>	<b>No Property Access Permission (Acres)</b>
Indian Canyon	9,810	6,572	N/A	3,238
Whitmore Park	10,609	7,402	38	3,170
Wells Draw	13,193	11,417	N/A	1,776
Craig (Utah) <sup>†</sup>	9,823	8,820	N/A	1,003

\* These acreages were calculated using the State Plane Coordinate System. Mapping and GIS calculations for this report used UTM NAD 83 Zone 12, which is preferred by land managing agencies for cultural resources survey and reporting, thus acreages may vary by +/- 5 acres.

<sup>†</sup> Only data for the Utah portion of the Craig Proposed Route is included.

To facilitate the evaluation of the proposed routes and the consideration of effects of any undertaking under Section 106 after a proposed route is selected, the survey results have been broken out by proposed route in the Survey Results section. In some cases separate proposed routes partially overlap in terms of the geographic area they encompass. As a result of this, some resources fall within multiple proposed routes. In those cases, the resources are listed in each alternative even when this results in repetition in order to provide complete information about every route. Additionally, SWCA has included a discussion of district- and landscape-level considerations for potential NRHP-eligible historic districts and historic vernacular landscapes. Taken as whole, the RLS provides important information regarding the numbers, locations, and nature of NRHP-eligible or potentially eligible properties.

The proponent-proposed routes discussed in this report are based on GIS data provided by HDR with the following creation dates:

- Indian Canyon Proposed Route: 11/22/2019 (final data received 11/26/19)
- Whitmore Park Proposed Route: 2/12/2020 (final data received 2/12/2020)
- Wells Draw Proposed Route: 11/22/2019 (final data received 11/26/19)
- Craig Proposed Route: 5/22/2019 (final data received 7/25/19)

## **Survey Objective**

The objective of the survey was to identify properties with architectural resources of historic age located within the proposed routes for the Project that are recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP. The survey was intended to support the evaluation of all proposed routes for the EIS while also providing all the data necessary to consider the effects of any undertaking under Section 106 after a proposed route is selected.

## **Survey Area Boundaries**

The survey area encompasses four proposed routes, of which three will most likely be carried forward for detailed evaluation in the EIS. The survey area boundary selection process, landownership, and areas excluded from survey will first be addressed, after which the specific boundaries of each proposed route will be discussed separately. A summarized comparison of the proposed routes is provided in Table 2.

The area of potential effects (APE) is defined as an area that includes staging areas, access roads, communication tower locations, and all areas of cut/fill. This area was set by the engineers to include temporary and permanent impacts. For the Indian Canyon, Whitmore Park, and Wells Draw Proposed Routes, the “proponent-proposed route” refers to the potential construction area that is defined as the APE plus a 1,000-foot buffer in most areas and parts of the APE that go outside the buffer. For the Craig Proposed Route, which does not have an APE, the proponent-proposed route refers to a 1,000-foot buffer around the route centerline (extending 500 feet on either side). The route corridor varies in width based on the planned construction, as indicated in maps included in the appendices (Appendix A through Appendix D). The buffer extends approximately 1,000 feet beyond the route corridor on either side for most of the proposed routes; areas with exceptions to this buffer are explained in the introduction above. The buffer is designed to take into account the potential for both direct and indirect effects on architectural resources; it encompasses the entirety of the updated route corridor. All maps in the appendices show the route corridor (labeled “Proponent-Proposed Route”) and the area in which survey occurred, including the proponent-proposed route and a 1 mile buffer of the original proponent-proposed route (labeled “Survey Area”). When only a part of a parcel fell within the proponent-proposed route, the entire parcel was included for survey. During analysis, some parcels fell within the proponent-proposed route but the architectural resource fell outside of it; when this was the case, the parcel was still included in the results due to the potential for indirect or cumulative impacts to architectural resources even when outside the APE.

Much of the survey area comprises rural or undeveloped land, although the Indian Canyon Proposed Route passes close to the towns of Myton and Duchesne. Within the counties of Utah, Carbon, Duchesne, and Uintah, the survey area is on the following lands:

- Private land
- Tribal land
- Public land regulated by the BLM
- Public land regulated by the USFS
- State land regulated by SITLA

The survey area spans 30 U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute quadrangles, which will also be discussed separately for each alternative (Table 3).

*This page intentionally left blank.*






Figure 1. Survey overview map.

*This page intentionally left blank.*

**Table 2. Summarized Comparison of the Proponent-Proposed Route**

<b>Proponent-Proposed Route Features</b>	<b>Indian Canyon Proposed Route</b>	<b>Whitmore Park Proposed Route</b>	<b>Wells Draw Proposed Route</b>	<b>Craig Proposed Route</b>
Length (miles)	80.6	87.7	103.3	185 <sup>*</sup>
Passes through Tribal land?	Yes	Yes	No <sup>†</sup>	No <sup>†</sup>
Other proposed routes intersected	Whitmore Park, Wells Draw, Craig	Indian Canyon, Wells Draw, Craig	Indian Canyon, Whitmore Park, Craig	Indian Canyon, Whitmore Park, Wells Draw
Total number of surveyed properties in route corridor and buffer	38	48	41	49
Number of recommended eligible/significant (ES) properties	3	4	1	1
Number of recommended eligible/contributing (EC) properties	11	13	10	9
Total number of potentially National Register of Historic Places–eligible properties in route	14	17	11	10

<sup>\*</sup> This distance includes both Utah and Colorado portions.

<sup>†</sup> Due to the buffer, the survey area encompasses Tribal land, but the proposed route does not pass through Tribal lands.

**Table 3. U.S. Geological Survey 7.5-Minute Quadrangles Encompassing the Survey Area**

Quadrangle Name	
Anthro Mountain	Lance Canyon
Bridgeland	Matts Summit
Buck Knoll	Minnie Maud Creek West
Cliff Ridge	Myton
Cowboy Bench	Myton SE
Currant Canyon	Myton SW
Duchesne	Pariette Draw SW
Duchesne NE	Randlett
Duchesne SE	Rasmussen Hollow
Duchesne SW	Roosevelt
Fort Duchesne	Snake John Reef
Gilsonite Draw	Vernal SE
Jensen	Vernal SW
Jones Hollow	Windy Ridge
Kyune	Wood Canyon

Although Ute Tribal land is present within the survey area for two alternatives, it was not surveyed at the request of the Tribe. Methods for identifying properties of cultural or religious significance to Tribes are being developed independently with the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation and with other Tribes who may choose to consult regarding the Project. STB is initiating government-to-government consultation with the following potentially affected Tribes:

- Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, Utah
- Apache Tribe of Oklahoma
- Eastern Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation, Wyoming
- Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation, Nevada and Utah
- Fort Belknap Indian Community of the Fort Belknap Reservation of Montana
- Hopi Tribe of Arizona
- Navajo Nation, Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah
- Northwestern Band of the Shoshone Nation, Utah
- Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah (Cedar Band of Paiutes, Kanosh Band of Paiutes, Koosharem Band of Paiutes, Indian Peaks Band of Paiutes, and Shivwits Band of Paiutes)
- Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho
- Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians
- White Mesa/Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, Utah and Colorado

Additional interested Tribes may be identified during the scoping process.

## **Indian Canyon Proposed Route**

From west to east, the Indian Canyon Proposed Route begins north of Price in Utah County in Kyune, Utah, near U.S. Route 6 (US 6). It then trends northeast across Duchesne County, paralleling U.S. Route 191 (US 191) through Indian Canyon. South of Duchesne, Utah, it begins to trend east, running parallel with (but south of) U.S. Route 40 (US 40). It terminates southeast of Myton, Utah (Figure 2 and Appendix A, Figures A1–A31). For areas where the Indian Canyon Proposed Route overlaps with other routes, see Figure 1.

The Indian Canyon Proposed Route passes through four counties: Utah, Carbon, Duchesne, and Uintah. Within those four counties, the route corridor is on the following lands:

- Private land
- Tribal land
- Public land regulated by the BLM
- Public land regulated by the USFS
- State land regulated by SITLA

The Indian Canyon Proposed Route spans 15 USGS 7.5-minute quadrangles (Table 4).

**Table 4. U.S. Geological Survey 7.5-Minute Quadrangles Encompassing the Indian Canyon Proposed Route**

---

<b>Quadrangle Name</b>	
Bridgeland	Lance Canyon
Buck Knoll	Matts Summit
Duchesne	Minnie Maud Creek West
Duchesne NE	Myton
Duchesne SE	Myton SW
Duchesne SW	Randlett
Jones Hollow	Windy Ridge
Kyune	

---

*This page intentionally left blank.*




Figure 2. Overview of Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route.

*This page intentionally left blank.*



## **Whitmore Park Proposed Route**

From west to east, the Whitmore Park Proposed Route begins north of Price in Utah County in Kyune Utah, near US 6. It then trends east to a point approximately 9 miles northeast of Castle Gate, Utah, at which point it trends northeast across Duchesne County, paralleling US 191 through Indian Canyon. South of Duchesne, Utah, it begins to trend east, running parallel, to the south, with US 40. It terminates southeast of Myton, Utah (Figure 3 and Appendix B, Figures B1–B33). For areas where the Whitmore Park Proposed Route overlaps with other routes, see Figure 1.

The Whitmore Park Proposed Route incorporates engineering changes intended to address challenging areas along the Indian Canyon Proposed Route (the Coalition’s preferred alignment) identified during the scoping period. The Whitmore Park Proposed Route is similar to the Indian Canyon Proposed Route, with three significant changes:

- Emma Park Road: in an effort to reduce impacts on Indian Head Ranch (based on property owner comments), the alignment has been shifted to run along the Emma Park Road corridor, a pre-existing and previously impacted roadway.
- Whitmore Park: based on geotechnical survey and property owner feedback, the alignment was changed to bypass 19 property owners and a slide area by introducing a 1-mile-long tunnel. These alterations also resulted in a better crossing over U.S. Highway 191, requiring less fill and resulting in a bridge height closer to standard.
- Duchesne Mini-Ranches: based on property owner feedback, the alignment was shifted south to bypass all current homes in the subdivision by at least 1,000 feet. This shift allows for similar railroad operation and results in less impact to property owners and fewer at-grade road crossings.

The Whitmore Park Proposed Route overlaps with the Wells Draw Proposed Route at its west and east ends. On the west end, it overlaps with the Wells Draw Proposed Route from its beginning until approximately 5.5 miles northeast of Castle Gate, Utah, when the routes diverge. It also intersects with the Wells Draw Proposed Route at three points on the east end of the corridor, although the two routes do not coincide for a significant distance on that end. The Whitmore Park Proposed Route also intersects with the Craig Proposed Route at three points near the eastern terminus of the corridor, although the two routes do not coincide for a significant distance.

The Whitmore Park Proposed Route passes through four counties: Utah, Carbon, Duchesne, and Uintah. Within those four counties, the route corridor is on the following lands:

- Private land
- Tribal land
- Public land regulated by the BLM
- Public land regulated by the USFS
- State land regulated by the SITLA

The Whitmore Park Proposed Route spans 10 USGS 7.5-minute quadrangles (Table 5).

**Table 5. U.S. Geological Survey 7.5-Minute Quadrangles Encompassing the Whitmore Park Proposed Route**

---

<b>Quadrangle Name</b>	
Bridgeland	Minnie Maud Creek West
Jones Hollow	Myton
Kyune	Myton SW
Lance Canyon	Randlett
Matts Summit	Windy Ridge

---




Figure 3. Overview of Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route.

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## **Wells Draw Proposed Route**

From west to east, the Wells Draw Proposed Route begins north of Price in Utah County, in Kyune, Utah, near US 6. It then trends northeast before running east, starting at a point approximately 12 miles northeast of Castle Gate, Utah, and roughly parallels Nine Mile Canyon Road before running north, north of Argyle Canyon at a point approximately 24 miles northeast of Sunnyside, Utah (which would be accessed by tunneling through the West Tavaputs Plateau). It terminates southeast of Myton, Utah (Figure 4 and Appendix C, Figures C1-C31). For areas where the Wells Draw Proposed Route overlaps with other routes, see Figure 1.

The Wells Draw Proposed Route passes through four counties: Utah, Carbon, Duchesne, and Uintah. Within those four counties, the route corridor is on the following lands:

- Private land
- Public land regulated by the BLM
- State land regulated by SITLA

The Wells Draw Proposed Route spans 17 USGS 7.5-minute quadrangles (Table 6).

**Table 6. U.S. Geological Survey 7.5-Minute Quadrangles Encompassing the Wells Draw Proposed Route**

<b>Quadrangle Name</b>		
Anthro Mountain	Kyune	Myton SW
Bridgeland	Lance Canyon	Pariette Draw SW
Cowboy Bench	Matts Summit	Randlett
Currant Canyon	Minnie Maud Creek West	Windy Ridge
Gilsonite Draw	Myton	Wood Canyon
Jones Hollow	Myton SE	

*This page intentionally left blank.*




Figure 4. Overview of Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route.

*This page intentionally left blank.*



## **Craig Proposed Route**

The Craig Proposed Route begins approximately 3.5 miles southwest of Myton, Utah, and then trends east across Uintah County before reaching the Utah-Colorado border approximately 3 miles northwest of Dinosaur, Colorado (Figure 5 and Appendix D, Figures D1-D26). The Colorado portion of the Craig Proposed Route was partially surveyed. Once the Coalition determined that Craig Proposed Route did not meet the project purpose and need, survey activities along the Craig Proposed Route ceased. Survey results for the Colorado portion of the Craig Proposed Route will be reported separately. For areas where the Craig Proposed Route overlaps with other routes, see Figure 1.

The Craig Proposed Route passes through two counties: Duchesne and Uintah. The route corridor is on the following lands:

- Private land
- Public land regulated by the BLM
- State land regulated by SITLA

The Craig Route Alternative spans 15 USGS 7.5-minute quadrangles (Table 7).

**Table 7. U.S. Geological Survey 7.5-Minute Quadrangles Encompassing the Craig Proposed Route**

<b>Quadrangle Name</b>	
Bridgeland	Snake John Reef
Cliff Ridge	Randlett
Fort Duchesne	Rasmussen Hollow
Jensen	Roosevelt
Myton	Windy Ridge
Myton SE	Vernal SE
Myton SW	Vernal SW
Pariette Draw SW	

*This page intentionally left blank.*




Figure 5. Overview of Craig Proponent-Proposed Route.

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## Survey Methodology

The survey and evaluation of architectural resources followed the Utah State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) *Reconnaissance Level Survey Standard Operating Procedures (for Section 106 Purposes Only)* (rev. May 2012), and *Reconnaissance Level Survey Standard Operating Procedures* (rev. March 2015). To account for the extended duration of the Project, buildings, substantive outbuildings, and structures built at least 43 years ago (before 1976) were documented and evaluated.

The principal investigator and project manager for the RLS was Anne Oliver, SWCA Cultural Resources Program Director and Historic Architecture Team Lead. Fieldwork for the RLS was conducted by SWCA Architectural Historian and Field Manager Kate Hovanes, assisted by Architectural Historian Megan Daniels and Field Technician Ben Zumkeller. Ms. Oliver, Ms. Hovanes, and Ms. Daniels meet the professional qualifications for architectural historians, defined in 36 CFR 61, Appendix A.

The project area in Utah was composed almost entirely of rural and undeveloped land. It was anticipated that historic architectural resources would be identified but that they would be few and widely scattered. Therefore, a selective RLS of historic architectural resources, including buildings, structures, objects, sites, and potential districts (including rural historic landscapes) that were of historic age for the entire length of the four proposed routes (the survey area) was conducted, excluding only Tribal lands. A selective RLS of Indian Canyon was conducted in 2014 during a Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) study for a previous version of the Project; this report incorporates and updates the data provided by that previous survey.

Because of the rural nature of the survey area, property boundaries were anticipated to be difficult to delineate in the field, as would the association of principal buildings with outbuildings and outlying agricultural complexes. Thus, before fieldwork, parcel boundary data for all four counties that were available from the Utah Automated Geographic Reference Center were layered over aerial imagery to create field survey maps, and these boundaries were used to delineate individual properties.

A literature review was conducted prior to field work to identify potential historic resources within the survey area. A preliminary search of the Utah Division of State History (UDSH) PreservationPro database indicated that ten properties in the survey area had been previously recorded and assessed as to their NRHP eligibility.<sup>2</sup> PreservationPro search results indicated that no previous architectural surveys had been conducted in the survey area, although a UDOT study had been conducted for a previous version of the Project in 2014 (Lechert and Oliver 2014). Much of the Indian Canyon route proposed for the current Project follows the route evaluated during this previous study. Although UDOT's study was shelved prior to publication of an EIS, data from the cultural resources reconnaissance efforts were submitted to SHPO and were consulted for this project. The results were not formally reviewed by that office or any of the involved federal or state agencies.

Prior to fieldwork, historical General Land Office (GLO) maps and historical USGS topographic maps encompassing the survey area were also reviewed. Nineteen resources were identified on historical GLO maps and five resources were identified on historical topographic maps. Previously documented buildings and potential historic resources (such as buildings, corrals, and ranger stations) were marked on field survey maps. A desktop analysis of aerial imagery was used to determine high probability locations of additional architectural resources in rural and undeveloped areas.

---

<sup>2</sup> A total of 15 properties appeared in the PreservationPro search results. Of these, four were determined to have incorrect location data and actually fall outside the survey area (Property Record 28078, 25282, 85300, and 82515). Additionally, one property in the PreservationPro data was determined not to be of historic age (Property Record 96903). The remaining 10 properties were included in the survey results.

Prior to fieldwork, SWCA also consulted digital county assessor data for the four counties in an effort to identify legal parcels with historic-age resources as recorded with each county. However, the Utah County Real Property Information search supplies parcel numbers, owners, and recent tax data, but does not include construction dates. The Carbon County geographic information system (GIS) provides an online property map system that supplies parcel numbers, owners, and recent tax data, but does not include construction dates. Similarly, the Uintah County GIS also provides a parcel data GIS layer but does not include construction dates. And, although the Duchesne County Assessor's Office previously provided an online property parcel viewer that included construction dates, due to changes to the online viewer system this data was not available for the 2019 RLS.

Due to minor shifts in the route corridor, 38 acres fell within the final proponent-proposed route for Whitmore Park Proposed Route that were not included during field survey. SWCA conducted a desktop analysis of these 38 acres that included a file search and a thorough investigation of modern and historic aerial imagery for the area. No potential historic buildings were identified through desktop analysis within those 38 acres. Field work was conducted in three sessions: May 29 to June 5, June 12 to 13, and September 16, 2019. The fieldwork had two purposes: 1) to evaluate if the eligibility status of the previously surveyed resources had changed and 2) to document and evaluate the eligibility of unsurveyed resources. The survey was conducted by a combination of driving and walking the survey area and recording architectural resources deemed to be of historic age.

Each property with historic architectural resources was photographed using a digital camera set to at least 300-dpi resolution, and notes about the architectural attributes of the principal building or structure and associated outbuildings or structures were taken. The location of each resource was also recorded using a handheld global positioning system (GPS) unit and/or noted on parcel maps of the survey area. Properties were documented at a reconnaissance level using SWCA field forms that are designed to include the information contained in SHPO's RLS form.

During field survey, SWCA documented all properties with historic-age architectural resources that were identified in the literature review and desktop analysis. SWCA also drove all major and secondary roads in the survey area to locate and document any additional resources that, based on professional opinion, were of historic age based on architectural type, style, and materials. If a landowner had not granted access to private property or access could not be coordinated in a timely way, SWCA documented any resources of historic age visible from the public right-of-way and noted all access limitations in the survey report.

In accordance with UDSH guidelines, documentation comprised examination of the exteriors of the resources on each property, notation on architectural type and style, documentation of additions and alterations that would affect the eligibility of the resources and property for the NRHP, and photographic documentation. Construction dates for each resource and any additions or alterations were based on literature review results when available, but more often on professional opinion, derived from an observation of building type, style, material, and construction method. Finally, SWCA also evaluated properties for their eligibility as part of a larger historic district and as rural historic landscapes in accordance with National Park Service (NPS) guidance.

Due to the large survey area, the dispersed nature of architectural resources, land access issues, discontinuous or unnavigable roads, and weather conditions, the RLS could not be conducted in a linear progression. SWCA made every effort to survey the entire survey area, but several issues were encountered. Locked gates on several roads in rural areas prevented complete coverage. Other areas were not accessible by road, which also prevented complete coverage. All areas that could not be accessed were examined as well as possible in the field using binoculars and aerial imagery was reviewed in the office in an attempt to ensure that no historic architectural resources were missed. A limited number of additional resources were identified using these alternate methods, and the potential for additional

undocumented resources within the survey area is considered low. Areas are indicated on the detailed results maps for each route as surveyed (green) or unsurveyed (red) based on access and the ability to conduct visual survey in the field. Because these areas fall within the survey area, regardless of whether they were able to be accessed, both surveyed and unsurveyed areas have been included in all results maps. Identified potential resources located in unsurveyed areas are included in results maps. Although Ute Tribal land is present within the survey area for all proposed routes, it was not surveyed at the request of the Tribe; it is indicated on survey maps in places where it intersects with the survey area.<sup>3</sup> Methods for identifying properties of cultural or religious significance to Tribes are being developed independently with the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation and with other Tribes who may choose to consult regarding the Project.

Presented below are the evaluation criteria used to assess the eligibility of all architectural resources documented in the survey area that were built before 1976. As per the mandates of 36 CFR 60, all cultural resources of historic age, including buildings, must be evaluated for their eligibility for the NRHP under four criteria and with consideration for seven aspects of integrity. A resource may be considered eligible for the NRHP if it

- is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history (Criterion A); or
- is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past (Criterion B); or
- embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction (Criterion C); or
- yields, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history (Criterion D).

Resources considered eligible under one or more of these criteria must also be evaluated for integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. To be eligible for the NRHP, a resource must possess integrity of those elements directly related to the criterion or criteria under which it would be determined eligible. That is, the key aspects of integrity that contribute to the eligibility of a property must be identified. NPS guidelines provide direction on how to assess integrity (NPS 1997:44).

In Utah, all architectural resources documented at a reconnaissance level are evaluated using a rating system established by the UDSH Preservation program. This rating system allows for the assignment of one of four ratings to buildings and structures based on the degree to which they retain historical and architectural integrity:

- Eligible/Significant (ES): Built during the historic period and retains integrity; excellent example of a style or type; unaltered or only minor alterations or additions.
- Eligible (EC): Built during the historic period and retains integrity; good example of a style or type, but not as well preserved or well executed as ES buildings; more substantial alterations or additions than ES buildings, though overall integrity is retained.
- Ineligible (NC): Built during the historic period but has had major alterations or additions; no longer retains integrity.
- Ineligible/Out-of-period (OP): Built after the historic period.
- Undetermined (U): Not evaluated for NRHP eligibility.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> The route corridor passes through Tribal land for only the Indian Canyon and Whitmore Park proposed routes. Due to the buffers applied to all proposed route corridors to determine the survey area, the survey areas for all routes encompass Tribal land.

<sup>4</sup> This rating is often due to a resource not being visible from the public right of way or otherwise not adequately visible for evaluation.

At the reconnaissance level, this rating system only considers age and physical integrity, and does not directly evaluate NRHP eligibility for reasons of historical association with persons and events. That is, the history of the property is not researched or evaluated in any detail. The interaction between the UDSH ratings system and the eligibility criteria of the NRHP focuses on NRHP Criteria A and C and UDSH ratings ES and EC. The UDSH rating system does not effectively take into account properties that may be eligible for the NRHP under Criteria B and D. The UDSH rating system does, however, consider the seven aspects of integrity defined in 36 CFR 60 as they relate to historical buildings and structures.

The UDSH rating system, because it primarily evaluates resource integrity, generally correlates with the eligibility of buildings or structures under Criterion C of the NRHP. For RLSs in Utah, the UDSH has generally considered that eligibility for the NRHP under Criterion C is based primarily on integrity of location, design, materials, and workmanship. Similarly, the UDSH has generally considered that eligibility for the NRHP under Criterion A is essentially the sum of the elements of integrity. That is, buildings or structures with adequate integrity of location, design, materials, and workmanship retain the ability to convey the sense and feeling of the historic period—its temporal and social context—during which the important event occurred. In summary, when assessing NRHP eligibility of buildings and structures documented at the reconnaissance level, the key aspects of integrity are location, design, materials, and workmanship.

Several additional considerations were used during recordation and data processing. Isolated corrals that were not physically associated with a larger farm or ranch were a common resource type throughout much of the survey area. Larger corrals were generally considered eligible if they retained integrity and if they appeared to be collection points for a wider geographic area and therefore potentially of community-wide importance, while smaller isolated corrals were generally considered eligible.

Additionally, ranches and farms generally incorporate elements of both agricultural and residential use. Due to the nature of small-scale agriculture common in rural Utah, however, the line between a residence and an agricultural operation can be difficult to establish. For this survey, if no historic-age agriculture-related resources were observed on a property with a residence, its use was considered to be only residential. If a property's principal residential building was of historic age and historic-age agricultural outbuildings were observed, its primary use was considered to be residential and its secondary use was considered to be agricultural. If the principal dwelling on a property was not of historic age but it had historic-age outbuildings, its primary use was considered to be agriculture and its secondary use was considered to be residential. If a property only had agricultural buildings with no principal dwelling present, its primary use was considered to be agricultural. If a property was an isolated log cabin without temporally related agricultural outbuildings, it was considered to be of residential use only.

## **OUTLINE HISTORY**

The following history was written as a general context of the survey area. The survey area encompasses land in four counties: Utah, Carbon, Duchesne, and Uintah. Only small portions of Utah and Carbon Counties are included in the survey area; the majority of the survey area falls in Duchesne and Uintah Counties. Because of this, the history will focus primarily on events in the Uinta Basin, with a limited amount of information about Utah and Carbon Counties, focusing specifically on the areas in those counties that the survey area passes through.



## **Exploration and Early History, 1776–ca. 1850**

The Ute Indian Tribe (the Ute) was the dominant Native American group in the Uinta Basin when the Dominguez-Escalante expedition of 1776 became the first documented European group to visit northeastern Utah. Many other Euro-American groups soon followed, using the same route out of Santa Fe, New Mexico, in subsequent years. In particular, the Green River became a heavily traveled corridor in the Uinta Basin. Trade relationships were established with some of the local Native American groups in the Uinta Basin, and possibly the northern Colorado Plateau, whereby these groups provided other Native Americans in support of the Spanish slave trade in return for horses, weapons, and other new technologies and food (Spangler 2002).

After the first Spanish explorers traveled through the region, other countries became increasingly interested in the natural resources of the Uinta Basin and northern Colorado Plateau. The importance of the fur trade to the global economy in the early 1800s brought an influx of Euro-Americans trappers and traders to the region, which led to the establishment of several trading posts along waterways in the Uinta Basin (Barton 1998; Burton 1996; Spangler 2002). The trading posts became important centers for Euro-American trappers, traders, and overland travelers as well as for Native Americans. Some Native American groups, such as the Ute inhabiting northwestern Colorado and northeastern Utah, became involved with the fur trade and actively trapped and traded hides for Euro-American goods (Burton 1996; Spangler 2002). However, relations between the Euro-Americans and the Ute were not always cordial, and they became more stressed over time with the increasing numbers of whites entering the region (Barton 1998). Euro-Americans often treated the Ute poorly by cheating them on the price of furs, charging them inflated prices on goods, and kidnapping Ute women for slavery or prostitution. These actions led the Ute to retaliate, often by violent means (Barton 1998).

By the early to mid-1840s, the fur trade in North America had declined significantly for two reasons: 1) changes in fashion, and 2) the high degree of exploitation of regions, leaving them nearly devoid of the animals sought by the fur trade. Trading posts were abandoned between 1828 and 1844. The fur trade slowly ended in the Uinta Basin and northern Colorado Plateau, and many Euro-American fur trappers and traders became guides for government explorers and immigrants, whereas many Native Americans who had become dependent on the fur trade became increasingly destitute (Burton 1996; Spangler 2002).

Following closely behind the collapse of the fur trade in the 1840s and the widely available accounts of the West by trappers and traders, the United States began looking west with the desire to expand the nation's territorial holdings (Spangler 2002). Numerous scientific expeditions were created and sent to the western United States to gather data on the geology, fauna, and floral resources as well as the Native American populations inhabiting the region. In 1844, John C. Fremont became the first government explorer in the Uinta Basin, and he returned to the region in 1845 (Burton 1996; Spangler 2002). Some of these surveys were also in support of mapping expeditions to determine the feasibility of building a transcontinental railroad (Spangler 2002). In addition to pedestrian surveys across the region, explorers also traveled the region by river. John Wesley Powell was an important explorer who navigated the Green River, though he was neither the first nor the last explorer (Spangler 2002). These expedition reports and descriptions available to the public caused increased interest in the region for settlement beginning in the mid-1850s.

Additionally, just a few years after the functional end of the fur trade in the Uinta Basin, a new group of Euro-Americans came to Utah: members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Church of Jesus Christ or Church). The first group of Latter-day Saints, led by Brigham Young, arrived in the Salt Lake Valley in 1847 and quickly founded Salt Lake City. Extensive Church settlement of the Great Basin and the adjacent regions occurred over the following decades. These settlements were usually founded by Latter-day Saint members called upon by Church of Jesus Christ leaders to colonize outlying areas.

## **Early Euro-American Settlement, Reservation Establishment, and Resource Development, ca. 1850–1904**

Permanent Euro-American settlement in the Uinta Basin and the northern Colorado Plateau began as early as the 1850s, although the historical record suggests that the Uinta Basin was not heavily settled until after ca. 1870 (Barton 1998; Spangler 2002; Watt 1997). Ranching, especially cattle ranching, became the first important economy in the region, with large cattle companies arriving in the Uinta Basin as early as the late 1860s. Ranching in the Uinta Basin and Colorado Plateau was often dangerous. Conflicts arose between ranchers as to who controlled the grazing rights to a particular plot of land, and large cattle companies often tried to force smaller operations into selling their cattle and land rights. The large cattle companies also competed against one another for prime grazing locations and a monopoly on the region. Due to the remoteness of the region, outlaws also arrived in the area (Spangler 2002). Occasionally, conflicts arose between the outlaws and the more settled and law-abiding population. These conflicts sometimes ended in violence and murder, though by ca. 1898, most outlaw activity had ended.

Between the 1850s and 1870s, relations between Euro-American settlers and Native American groups remained in flux. The practices of settlement and agriculture that the Latter-day Saints followed made conflict with Native Americans almost inevitable, since Euro-American agricultural practices deeply disrupted traditional Native American ways of life (Smaby 1975:41). The result was increasing tensions between Euro-American settlers and Native Americans. With resources depleted by the increase in population and movements restricted by settlement and agriculture, the Native Americans of the area were forced to curtail their hunting and gathering activities and subsist by other means. At a Manti town meeting between the Ute and Euro-Americans, John Lowery accused one Tribal member of stealing his horse and proceeded to beat the man severely (Bishop 1997:70; Hittman 2013:74–75). This act set off a series of raids, skirmishes, and chases that were termed the Black Hawk War, which lasted from 1865 to 1872.

In 1850, the Utah Territory was established, with Church leader and president Brigham Young acting as territorial governor. In 1852 and again in 1861, Young sent survey parties to the Uinta Basin region to determine if agricultural activities could be supported (Burton 1996; Spangler 2002). But after an exploring party declared it “one vast contiguity of waste, and measurably valueless, excepting for nomadic purposes, hunting grounds for Indians and to hold the world together,” plans were abandoned (*Deseret News* 1861). Although the Church of Jesus Christ’s plans to create a settlement in the Uinta Basin fell through, non-members of the Church in Utah, particularly the federal Indian Agent Henry Martin, were concerned about the potential expansion of Latter-day Saint hegemony into the region. As a result, in an effort to block potential Church influence with the Ute in the area, the federal government established the Uintah Indian Reservation, which included most of the Uinta Basin, in 1861 (Burton 1996:83).<sup>5</sup>

As early as the 1850s, Church leadership had begun to consider the relocation of the Ute (Cornia 1998:8). Prior to the creation of the Uintah Indian Reservation, many of the Ute lived at unofficial reservations established in Sanpete and Spanish Fork, where the Latter-day Saints had run what were known as “Indian farms” since the 1850s. These Indian farms were intended to teach Euro-American-style agricultural practices but were not very successful. Other Native Americans continued to live in the Uinta Basin and practice traditional lifeways (Burton 1996:84). In 1863, efforts began to move the Ute from their existing homes to the reservation. By 1870, several bands of Ute had been forcefully relocated there (UDSH 2019).

---

<sup>5</sup> This first reservation was known as the Uintah Valley Reservation. A separate reservation, the Uncompahgre Reservation, was established in 1882 and largely functioned as an extension of the Uintah Valley Reservation. The two reservations were consolidated as the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in 1886 (Utah American Indian Digital Archive 2008). Because of the short time during which two reservations operated and their close administrative connection during that period, this history will generally only refer to “reservation” in the singular unless both of the reservations are being specifically referenced during the period from 1882 to 1886.

Culturally and socially, this forced relocation was disastrous for the Ute. For those already practicing Euro-American-style agriculture, it required them to uproot their lives and their families and move to a still-remote area of the territory. For Ute still practicing a traditional nomadic lifestyle, the creation of the reservation and confinement to it meant decreased hunting grounds and being forced into a more sedentary way of life (UDSH 2019). The Ute resistance to the changes being imposed upon them was ultimately strong enough that federal Indian Agents shifted their own goal toward encouraging the Ute to practice ranching as an intermediate step towards a full agrarian lifestyle (Cornia 1998:24).

Federal involvement also extended to land use and ownership on reservation lands. For much of this period, Tribal lands were communally owned and used. In 1887, however, Congress adopted the Dawes Act (also known as the General Allotment Act), which formally authorized the Executive Branch to survey and divide land on Indian reservations into allotments. These allotments would then be granted to individual Tribal members and privately owned, as part of what was known as the “allotment system.” The policy was implemented piecemeal on numerous reservations across the nation over the next several decades. The intention behind the act was to break up the Indian reservations by encouraging Native Americans, including the Ute of the Uinta Basin, to adopt Euro-American lifeways and values, particularly agricultural practices and privatized landownership. The act was intended to lift Native Americans from poverty, eliminate the paternalistic role of the federal government, and assimilate Native Americans into American society at large, but the result was intensely detrimental to Native Americans. The loss of communal lands and the required shift to private allotments resulted in the widespread destruction of traditional subsistence practices and caused substantial loss of Tribal culture. The allotments granted were held in trust by the federal government for 25 years before the allotment holder could gain title. Worst of all, though, lands that were deemed surplus to the needs of the Tribes under the allotment system were put up for sale by the government, resulting in a tremendous loss of land. Over 90 percent of reservation lands was lost by the Ute between 1882 and 1933 through a combination of illegal encroachment and development by non-Native American settlers, and then through the allotment system (Nebraska Studies 2019; Utah American Indian Digital Archive 2008).

The introduction of the Dawes Act, while not implemented on Tribal lands in the Uinta Basin until 1904, continued the worsening of the situation. Just like the Ute, many Euro-American trespassers (particularly ranchers) anticipated that the federal government would soon take Ute lands (Cornia 1998:30). Utah’s newspapers, citizens, and congressional delegation all worked together to persuade Congress and President Theodore Roosevelt to enact legislation to allow allotment as prescribed under the Dawes Act (Cornia 1998:37). This legislation was necessary because the Ute challenged the right of Congress to allot the land, which (per an 1898 act) required the consent of a majority of adult males on the reservation in order to allot. Despite the Ute resistance, Congress proceeded with allotment by passing several laws between 1902 and 1903 that made their consent unnecessary (Duncan 2000). Ultimately, the issue was decided with the formal introduction of the allotment system to the reservation, which entirely altered landownership in the Uinta Basin.

As a corollary to federal involvement in the Uinta Basin, Fort Duchesne was established by Major Frederick William Benteen on August 20, 1886, on a site selected by General George Crook (Burton 1996; Schirer 2019). “President Grover Cleveland officially designated the six square miles that comprised the fort reservation on 1 September 1887” (Schirer 2019). In September 1912, the last remaining cavalry unit at the reservation left for Fort Boise, Idaho. After the military abandoned Fort Duchesne the Indian Service consolidated its Uintah and Ouray operations there (Schirer 2019).

The first permanent Euro-American settlement in the region began in association with the reservation. Located at what is now known as Whiterocks (although it was known as Uintah Valley until 1895, when the U.S. Postal Service changed the name), a Euro-American settlement was established in 1869 in association with the headquarters of the Indian Agency, which remained there until 1912 (Burton

1996:85). In 1873, a former Indian Agent began ranching at Ashley Valley; this would eventually grow to become the town known as Ashley, near present-day Vernal. As Burton points out, in many respects this early Euro-American settlement in the Uinta Basin did not follow the patterns common in Utah at the time. The first settlers were not Latter-day Saints but instead were single Euro-American men associated with the Indian Agency or men who had previously worked as ranchers or cowboys, or who were criminals. The first Euro-American woman did not permanently settle in the Uinta Basin until 1874 (Burton 1996:85–86). The high quality of the region's agricultural lands quickly began to attract more settlers, including Church members who settled on the Ashley Valley's best agricultural land in the late 1870s and 1880s. Settlers and ranchers increasingly, and illegally, began diverting water from the local waterways on the reservation that had been reserved for use by the Ute (Barton 1998). These early Euro-American settlers, far from being satisfied with the available land outside the reservation, began to eye Ute land as well (Cornia 1998:12).

The establishment of the reservation and the lack of arable lands hampered additional settlement of the region by pioneers at first, but ultimately failed to halt the influx of settlers, especially after the creation of several roads in and out of the Uinta Basin. These wagon roads were constructed primarily in support of the transportation needs of the U.S. Army. The first wagon road, known as the Carter Road, was built in 1882 to Fort Thornburg; it extended over the Uinta Mountains to Carter, Wyoming (Barton 1998). The road proved to be treacherous in the winter, and the army looked for alternative routes that could stay open longer than the Carter Road. One such route was an early military freight road down Indian Canyon that became briefly popular after the construction of the Denver and Rio Grande Railroad through Carbon County in 1883 (Barton 1998; Watt 1997). This route later became US 191. Several additional routes were constructed that initially were used to haul supplies to several military forts in the Uinta Basin. These were later used to support mining activities and were used by homesteaders in the Uinta Basin as well as communities outside of the region. An early military supply route crossing Duchesne County followed the Daniels Canyon-Strawberry Valley route, which was first used by early settlers as a cattle trail through the Uinta Basin; it would later become the Victory Highway and is now US 40. The Nine Mile Canyon Road, connecting Fort Duchesne in the Uinta Basin with Price in Carbon County, served as an important freight road and opened profitable relationships with businesses and residents in the Uinta Basin and the northern Colorado Plateau (Watt 1997).

The southern portion of the current survey area, located on the northern Colorado Plateau around the Book Cliffs and what is now Price and Helper, Utah, was settled somewhat differently than the Uinta Basin during the mid-1850s. Although the fur trade did influence some settlement in this area, it did not impact the region to the same degree as the Uinta Basin. Homesteaders arrived and settled in the region, focusing on the hospitable valleys favorable to farming and for grazing cattle and sheep (Watt 1997). The earliest homesteaders to the region settled along the Price River and along other waterways providing regular water. However, the yearly fluctuations of water required farmers to build ditches and canals to water their crops and to locate additional fields further from the natural waterways as new settlers arrived and established farms (Watt 1997). Farming and ranching ventures increased and became more lucrative in the region with the arrival and expansion of railroads, and several communities were established along railway routes.

The expansion of white settlement into the Uinta Basin and the northern Colorado Plateau is also linked with the development of hydrocarbons such as coal, Gilsonite, natural gas, and oil, which began in the 1880s and continues today (Spangler 2002). The Gilsonite industry began in the late 1880s and was centered near Bonanza in the Uinta Basin, south of the Craig Proposed Route (Burton 1996). The coal industry began in 1877 and was most prevalent in the northern Colorado Plateau region near the southwestern end of the current survey area, although some coal extraction occurred in the Uinta Basin (Watt 1997). Natural gas and oil industries did not begin in earnest until the late 1940s but oil extraction remains an important industry today (Spangler 2002). In addition to the mining of hydrocarbons, hard

rock mining played a role in the economic development of the Uinta Basin and northern Colorado Plateau, although it was minor in comparison. Mining for copper ore and associated silver and gold, dredging for gold in the river at Jensen, extraction of carbon dioxide and helium from sandstone, extraction of oil-shale and asphalt, and mining for phosphate also occurred in the Uinta Basin (Burton 1996; Spangler 2002).

The administrative history of the Uinta Basin was also influenced by patterns of white settlement. As Euro-American communities like those in the Ashley Valley of the Uinta Basin grew, it became increasingly clear that the Uinta Basin needed its own administrative center. Initially the Uinta Basin formed a part of Wasatch County, which placed the county seat in Heber City, approximately 100 miles away from present-day Vernal, Utah. The difficulty residents in the eastern parts of the county had in reaching the county seat, as well as the growth of communities in the Ashley Valley, encouraged the creation of Uintah County in 1880. This new county encompassed the area that now forms Uintah County, as well as the area to the north (now Daggett County). In 1900, the population of Uintah County was 6,458, whereas Wasatch County had a population of 4,736 (Forstall 1995).

## **Permanent Settlement, Growth, and Development, 1905–1948**

By the late 1870s, settlers had established multiple small communities in the Uinta Basin, with new settlers arriving every year following the construction of multiple complex systems of irrigation ditches, canals, and reservoirs used to irrigate previously arid lands and render them available for farming (Spangler 2002). As the population of settlers grew in the region, so did the demand for arable lands and irrigation water. Settlers and ranchers increasingly, and illegally, began diverting water from the local waterways on the reservation that had been reserved for use by the Ute (Barton 1998). In 1905, under pressure from settlers and ranchers in the region as well as the state government, the federal government passed several acts and agreements that reduced the size of the reservation and permitted the land to be obtained by white settlers (Barton 1998; Burton 1996; Duncan 2000). A steady flow of homesteaders entered the Uinta Basin, and in 1907 that the flow increased dramatically as irrigation water became available and towns were surveyed.

In addition to reducing the size of the reservations, U.S. Congress authorized the Uintah Indian Irrigation Project in 1906. This project appropriated funds for the development of canals in the Uinta Basin primarily for use by the Ute, though it also authorized use of these canals by white settlers and allowed these settlers right-of-way access through Ute Tribal lands (Spangler 2002). As part of this, access to water became a large point of contention between the Ute and white settlers. Between 1906 and 1920, hundreds of white homesteaders in the region abandoned their claims under the Homestead Act largely due to their inability to obtain irrigation water combined with a persistent drought (Spangler 2002). Homesteaders in Carbon County were more successful and better off than their counterparts in the Uinta Basin in terms of obtaining regular supplies of water, though farms did fail. This region had more access to water and several dams, reservoirs, and canals were constructed as early as 1880; additional features were constructed as late as the 1940s (Watt 1997).

By 1910, several newly surveyed towns were established and settled, with individuals performing a variety of jobs, though farming made up most of the work in the region (Barton 1998). As town populations grew, so did the need for carpenters, merchants, laborers, teachers, and teamsters, just to name a few. Slowly and steadily the small communities in the Uinta Basin and northern Colorado Plateau grew in size and offered more services to inhabitants of the region. The economy also diversified beyond ranching and agriculture to include timber extraction from the Uinta Mountains, mining of a number of resources, and freighting goods, people, and equipment to and from the region (Burton 1996).

Because of the various extractive industries in the Uinta Basin and the northern Colorado Plateau, infrastructure and workers to support these industries were needed. The Uintah Railway, a narrow-gauge railroad, was constructed in 1904 to haul Gilsonite from the Uinta Basin to Colorado (Burton 1996; Spangler 2000). Although the Uintah Railway did access the Uinta Basin and provide transportation for commercial products like dinosaur fossils and Gilsonite, it was hardly a convenient travel route. Any products to be transported by rail had to be carried across the Green River and transported via wagon to Dragon, Utah, from which the narrow gauge line carried them to Mack, Colorado. The grade of the railroad was so steep that special engines were required for the rail line. The Uintah Railway operated until 1939 (Carr 1972:64–65; NPS 2018).

Gilsonite continued to play an important role in the economic development of the Uinta Basin because roughly 95 percent of the Gilsonite in the world is in the Uinta Basin (Burton 1996). Dozens of products are made today from the material, including paints, varnishes, inks, electrical insulation, pipeline insulation, high-test gasoline, and metallurgical coke (Burton 1996). The completion of the railroad in the early 1900s also brought about the establishment of communities and additional infrastructure such as roads to support the railroad and associated facilities. The railroads, in turn, also supported other industries as discussed further below.

The northern Colorado Plateau near Price and Helper, Utah, experienced a much greater economic benefit from the construction of the first railroad, which was built to support the growing coal mining industry and the growing population (Watt 1997). Several railway companies built rail lines in Carbon County; some of the smaller companies were later bought out and consolidated by larger companies. The relationship between the coal mining industry and the railroads was mutually beneficial. Coal was transported out of the region using the railroads, at a profit to both coal and railroad companies (Holzapfel 1999; Watt 1997). Railroad companies expanded operations of their rail lines as well as encouraged coal companies to establish new mines that could then be connected to the rail system (Watt 1997). None of these railroads connected to the Uinta Basin, instead routing south of the Uinta Basin through Spanish Fork Canyon to connect to the Wasatch Front.

The oil and natural gas industry played the largest role in the development of the Uinta Basin and to a much lesser degree in the development of the northern Colorado Plateau. Oil was first discovered near the Utah-Wyoming border in 1847 and the first oil well was drilled in the Uinta Basin in 1900 (Spangler 2002). Between 1900 and 1948, more than 40 oil wells were drilled in the Uinta Basin, but most of these wells produced little oil or oil too viscous to be pumped (Spangler 2002). It was not until after World War II that the oil and natural gas industry and exploration boomed in the Uinta Basin.

The natural gas industry that began in the Uinta Basin in ca. 1925 was part of a larger regional industry that included natural gas fields nearby in Wyoming and Colorado (Spangler 2002). To support the industry, pipes were laid in 1928 to deliver natural gas from the Uinta Basin to Vernal for public use and by 1929 to deliver natural gas from the gas fields in Wyoming and Colorado to Ogden and Salt Lake City markets (Spangler 2002).

Many communities grew concurrently with the development of industry in the Uinta Basin. The towns closest to the survey area are Roosevelt, Myton, and Duchesne. All of these towns quickly grew with farms and ranches, commercial establishments, mercantile companies, dance halls, and even baseball teams. Duchesne County was created out of Wasatch County in 1914, when it had nearly 4,000 residents. Initially, these towns began in support of the local farmers and ranchers, though as time progressed, they grew in size to offer a wider variety of services to support the increasing population and the increasing diversity of commerce in the region (Barton 1998; Watt 1997). In addition to new businesses, local governments, school districts, financial institutions, and religious institutions were established. Residents in the region also began demanding better facilities, including 1) improved roads to support not only traffic between communities but also to support the various markets in the region and 2) improved

irrigation systems to support farm production. As technology improved, the demand for electricity, telephone and telegraph lines, infrastructure for drinking and waste water in communities, and automobiles in the region grew (Barton 1998; Watt 1997). The arrival of these new technologies and additional improvements to the region's infrastructure—some of which were brought about by various federal programs under New Deal legislation during the Great Depression—improved the lives of residents as well as eased some of the workload for commercial enterprises and businesses.

Roosevelt, Utah, was founded in early 1906 when Ed Harmston turned his homestead claim into a townsite and laid out plots (Barton 2012a). The town was named for President Theodore Roosevelt by Harmston's wife Mary, who felt the town needed a respectable name (Barton 1998:168; 2012a). "From 1906 to 1914, Roosevelt was in Wasatch County, but in 1914, Duchesne County was formed from part of Wasatch County" (Barton 2012a). Today, Roosevelt is home to approximately 6,750 people but serves as the business center for the populations of many small towns and farming areas that surround the town, including those in the survey area (Barton 2012a; U.S. Bureau of the Census 2019). Roosevelt's current economy is based on agriculture and oil and gas industry activities.

Myton was founded as a trading post, originally known as "the Bridge," by William Henderson in the mid-1880s near one of the natural fords along the Duchesne River (Barton 1998:154). It became a named town after 1905 in an effort to establish a post office. Myton was named for Howell Myton, an Indian Agent for the Uintah and Ouray Indian Agency (Barton 1998:155–156). Myton continued to grow due to trading activities and allotment settlement, as well as a government-funded bridge that was constructed across the Duchesne River to improve trade routes (Barton 1998:154–160). Myton began to decline after a series of devastating town fires in 1915, 1925, and 1930; the suspension of banking activities at the Myton State Bank; and with the growth of Roosevelt, Utah (Barton 1998:160–161). The fires destroyed multiple businesses, and the timing of the Great Depression prevented those businesses from recovering (Barton 1998:164). Although Myton's population has decreased since its height in the 1910s, the town has remained an important stop for the large volume of oil and gas traffic in the Uinta Basin.

Located at the mouth of Indian Canyon, Duchesne was founded as a trading post in 1905 when the U.S. Government opened the region to homesteading under the Allotment Act (Barton 2012b). Duchesne was originally named "Dora," after town founder A.M. Murdock's daughter and later changed to "Theodore" after President Theodore Roosevelt (Barton 2012b). The town was renamed "Duchesne" in 1911 to prevent mail delivery confusion with nearby Roosevelt, also named for the President (Barton 1998:182, 2012b). Duchesne was chartered as a town in 1913, and incorporated in 1917 (Barton 1998:182). The town experienced some decline when the Bank of Duchesne failed in 1921 (Barton 1998:184). Duchesne's early growth and commercial activities were fueled by mining and agricultural activities (Barton 1998:183). Duchesne's economic base currently is farming and the oil and gas industry (Barton 2012b).

Indian Canyon has been used as a transportation route since early settlement in the region (Barton 1998:116). Initial improvements to the road through the canyon to the railroad at Castle Gate were finished by 1919 and allowed farmers to transport their crops to the railroad faster (Barton 1998:221). The improvements eliminated dangerous portions of road and shaved off several miles (Barton 1998:221). A state road was built through Indian Canyon after World War II, but it was not until the 1970s when the Indian Canyon road was "completely reworked [and] widened, and at places the old route was abandoned in favor of better grades and less turns" (Barton 1998:280).

Little information exists about the history of Whitmore Park. It is named after J. M. Whitmore, who established a grazing claim on public lands in the area ca. 1900. The land was later granted to the Denver & Rio Grande Railroad in ca. 1908 (Strack 2019; Van Cott 1990:397).

Wells Draw was originally known as Gamma Grass Canyon. It was renamed in 1891 after Owen Smith established a well and stage stop at what would become known as "Smith Wells." Significant commercial traffic passed along Nine Mile Road past the location of Smith Wells in what is now Wells Draw. Smith

Wells served as a waystation for travelers on the road, as well as an overnight stage stop. By 1905 commerce began to drop off from Nine Mile Road due to several causes: the construction of the Uintah Railway to Dragon, Utah, in 1904; the abandonment of Fort Duchesne by the army in 1912; and the construction of improved roads into the Uinta Basin starting in 1915. By 1922 Smith Wells was largely abandoned (Jenson 1993).

In 1914, the first ocean-to-ocean scenic highway, which would cross Utah, went into the planning stages (Burton 1996:208). Part of the “planning” was to use established routes across the American West for the transcontinental highway system. Given this, Salt Lake City became a north-south, east-west hub for highway connections. The old wagon routes across the Uinta Basin that connected Heber City, Utah, and Dinosaur, Colorado, including Vernal’s Main Street (which had been paved in 1899), were chosen to become part of this highway system. The result was the Victory Highway, since designated US 40, which was the first all-weather, direct transcontinental route across the United States. It began in Atlantic City, New Jersey, and ended in San Francisco, California, and was approximately 3,022 miles long. Dedicated to World War I veterans, the Victory Highway follows portions of the historical Dominguez and Escalante Trail in eastern Utah (Mead & Hunt, Inc. 2011:10) and the Midland Trail in western Colorado. With the completion of the Victory Highway through the Uinta Basin, it became part of the highway system in 1926, and by the late 1930s, the Victory Highway was paved from Vernal east and connected to the paved portion of the Victory Highway in Colorado (Burton 1996). It has been continuously improved since then. Unlike the National Road and the Lincoln Highway (two other famous highways in Utah), the Victory Highway has not lost its original designation as “Route 40” as far west as Park City, Utah (Brusca 2019).

The Great Depression significantly affected the region. Farmers, once able to grow successful crops like alfalfa or collect honey from bee colonies used to pollinate alfalfa fields, were initially hit hard by infestations of grasshoppers in the early 1920s. In addition, competition abroad and from growers in the Midwestern United States, persistent drought conditions from 1925 to 1936, and the degradation of the quality of alfalfa seeds by weeds and parasites also impacted local farmers (Barton 1998; Watt 1997). Cattle and sheep ranchers were affected by drought conditions that reduced the acreage of good grazing lands, and also by the poor economic conditions of the livestock industry during the Great Depression. Nearly all of the agricultural or ranching economies in the region were affected by the drought, the overproduction of goods, and poor market prices. Several relief and assistance programs were created by the federal government and supported by state and county governments across the United States. These programs were designed to assist farmers and ranchers and to correct the agricultural marketing and production structure of the nation (Barton 1998; Burton 1996; Watt 1997).

Other New Deal federal programs provided employment for the numerous people out of work due to the collapse of the agricultural and ranching industry. These programs hired men to work civic improvement jobs for the county or other government entities; jobs included road construction and repairs on streets in towns or farm and larger transportation routes, laying concrete sidewalks in towns, improving town parks, and improving drinking water supplies in towns and drinking water needs in rural areas (Barton 1998; Burton 1996; Watt 1997). Large water reclamation and land rehabilitation projects were also implemented and accomplished by the Civilian Conservation Corps, which hired some local men to work on the projects and supported communities by purchasing the supplies and equipment locally to be used on these projects (Burton 1996).

World War II was an important period of change for Uinta Basin agriculture. “World War II ushered in another round of agricultural consolidation. . . . With tractors and other machinery, those who stayed on the land became more productive and enlarged their holdings.” In many cases, this meant a decreased number of farms and farmers but greater prosperity overall, and in the Uinta Basin agriculture remained a key part of the economy (Johnson 1998:186).



The increase in agricultural prices and, correspondingly, increased production meant that in many ways the patterns of World War I were repeating themselves for Utah's farmers. But many had learned a valuable lesson.

Today with a defense program which indicates greatly increased buying power for the consumer because of increased employment, and war markets through our exportation of foodstuffs and materials to Britain, our livestock men are faced with the possibility, but not the probability, of having these cycles of 'boom days' and ensuing slumps. Armed with the knowledge of the effects of the last war our stock growers are preparing to do their part, but their plans are to reduce their indebtedness and make needed replacements on their outfits with their greater profits. (Willison n.d. [1940]:67)

This wariness of repeating the errors of the previous decades extended to the use of rangelands. Ranchers were fully aware of the dangers of overstocking and were determined not to increase stock production "at the expense of the range" (Willison n.d. [1940]:67). Instead, they worked to stock the range at its highest carrying capacity and then "supplemented with the finishing and supplementary feeds raised on the farm-ranches" (Willison n.d. [1940]:67).

Because of the personnel needs of the war, farm labor shortages were a problem in the Uinta Basin. In order to adapt, some farms adopted modern machinery such as tractors, which were financed through increased prices for farm products (Johnson 1998:185). In other cases, outside sources of labor provided relief. For example, the 1940s saw the introduction of Mexican sheep-shearing crews by "big outfits"; the crews often served multiple ranches (Burton 1996:111).

## **Farming, Ranching, and Resource Extraction, 1949–present**

Shortly after the war, the region saw a time of economic stability and increase. The total number of farms declined and the overall size of the farms increased (Barton 1998). Agricultural productivity increased with the use of mechanized farm equipment. Raising cattle and dairy cows was also an important industry after the war. With the oil boom, the economy surrounding agriculture and ranching began to shift in the late 1950s. Farmers and ranchers often leased part of their land for oil drilling and pumping, which greatly increased their incomes and allowed them to purchase more land (Barton 1998). However, land prices and interest rates increased in the 1970s, and some farmers with smaller holdings sought to consolidate. Ultimately, the inflated and fluctuating prices of land, equipment, and goods reduced the number of farms in the Uinta Basin as well as changed the type of crops produced. Agricultural activities moved away from food crops to crops grown to support livestock and associated industries (Barton 1998).

The oil industry in the Uinta Basin boomed shortly after World War II with the discovery of major oil reserves near Roosevelt in 1949 (Burton 1996; Spangler 2002). Due to this find and the extensive nature of the reserve, oil companies gathered in the Uinta Basin and established other oil fields. To support the oil industry, pipelines were built to transport petroleum from the oil fields to Salt Lake City refineries as early as 1939 (Spangler 2002). The first oil refinery was built in the Uinta Basin in 1941 in the town of Jensen but closed after 1948 (Spangler 2002). Additional businesses were founded to support the oil and natural gas industry, including construction, tool, pipeline, and oil hauling companies (Barton 1998).

The Uinta Basin has seen several boom and bust cycles in relation to economic development and the oil and natural gas industry. In the 1950s, exploration for these two resources was at a high, with a slowdown and a crash in the 1960s, then another boom in the 1970s (Burton 1996; Spangler 2002). In the modern day the oil industry is still subject to peaks and slumps, although the advent of new technology and the ability to extract oil from sources previously thought to be too difficult has offered some longer-term support to the industry.

The coal mining industry in the northern Colorado Plateau continued to slow production due to a reduction in coal prices and the national movement toward oil and natural gas (Watt 1997). Mining companies reduced the number of miners they hired after the Great Depression, though some mines were revived for very short periods of time after the Depression, such as during World War II or during the 1970s, before closing again in the 1980s (Watt 1997). As mines closed and mining companies moved out the region, local communities and economies declined as well. In addition, other industries also experienced declines, such as some of the railroad companies that worked with the mining companies to transport coal.

During the early years of the Cold War, Duchesne County temporarily became an important area for the prospecting and mining of uranium (Barton 1998). Several mining claims were opened and operated for a short time before larger deposits were discovered in regions out of the county.

Starting in the 1970s the population in the Uinta Basin significantly increased with the oil and natural gas industry as well as the Central Utah Project, an aspect of the Colorado River Storage Project for which several massive reclamation projects including reservoirs, dams, and irrigation projects were constructed along the upper Colorado River (Barton 1998; Burton 1996). As part of the increase in local populations, towns quickly upgraded public services by modernizing water and sewer systems, increasing law enforcement and health department personnel, and expanding and adding new schools. The region also saw an increase in housing. Road systems grew and improved to support the economic activities and the increasing population, which in turn brought additional development and diversity to the Uinta Basin and northern Colorado Plateau to improve the lives of the residents.

## **SURVEY RESULTS**

In all, 106 properties with historic-age architectural resources were surveyed within the current buffer (Table 8).<sup>6</sup> A description and one or more photographs of the principal building or structure on each property are presented in Table 9, along with a description of significant alterations that may affect each property's integrity and recommendation regarding its NRHP eligibility. In this table, properties listed as Eligible Significant are recommended eligible under NRHP Criteria A and C, while properties listed as Eligible Contributing are recommended eligible under NRHP Criterion A only. Previously evaluated properties are discussed in further detail in Table 10.

---

<sup>6</sup> An additional two properties, 00-0009-4593 and 00-0009-5442, fell within the original survey area but no longer fall within 1 mile of the proponent-proposed route; these properties were therefore excluded from the survey report.

**Table 8. Buildings and Structures of Historic Age in the Survey Area (constructed before 1976)**

Current Parcel Number	Property Address	City	County	Landownership	Results Map Numbers
330610001	? 22572 South Beaver Creek Road	Castle Gate (vicinity)	Utah	Private	Indian Canyon Map 2 Whitmore Park Map 2 Wells Draw Map 2
330700016	? 31368 East Emma Park Road	Castle Gate (vicinity)	Utah	Private	Indian Canyon Map 2 Whitmore Park Map 2 Wells Draw Map 2
330840001	? Emma Park Road	Castle Gate (vicinity)	Utah	Private	Indian Canyon Map 2 Whitmore Park Map 2 Wells Draw Map 2
330970001	? Emma Park Road	Castle Gate (vicinity)	Utah	Private	Indian Canyon Map 3 Whitmore Park Map 3 Wells Draw Map 3
330970002	? Emma Park Road	Castle Gate (vicinity)	Utah	Private	Indian Canyon Map 3 Whitmore Park Map 3 Wells Draw Map 3
2A-0312-005F	? US Highway 6	Castle Gate (vicinity)	Carbon	BLM	Indian Canyon Map 2 Whitmore Park Map 2 Wells Draw Map 2
330970015	? Horse Creek Road	Castle Gate (vicinity)	Utah	Private	Indian Canyon Map 3 Whitmore Park Map 3 Wells Draw Map 3
2A-0313-0000	? Emma Park Road	Castle Gate (vicinity)	Carbon	Private	Indian Canyon Map 4 Whitmore Park Map 4 Wells Draw Map 4
2A-0312-0001	? Emma Park Road	Castle Gate (vicinity)	Carbon	Private	Indian Canyon Map 4 Whitmore Park Map 4 Wells Draw Map 4
2A-0344-0000	? Quarry Road	Castle Gate (vicinity)	Carbon	Private	Indian Canyon Map 4 Whitmore Park Map 4 Wells Draw Map 4
00-0028-1745	? Argyle Canyon Road	Castle Gate (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 9 Whitmore Park Map 9 Wells Draw Map 8
00-0011-0373	22881 South US 191	Duchesne (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 13 Whitmore Park Map 15

*Selective Reconnaissance-Level Survey of Historic Architectural Resources Along Proponent-Proposed Routes for the Uinta Basin Railway Project in Utah, Carbon, Duchesne, and Uintah Counties, Utah*

<b>Current Parcel Number</b>	<b>Property Address</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Landownership</b>	<b>Results Map Numbers</b>
00-0011-0340	? US Highway 191	Duchesne (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 13 Whitmore Park Map 15
No Parcel No. (USFS) UDSH ID: 42465	? Forest Route 153	Duchesne (vicinity)	Duchesne	USFS	Indian Canyon Map 8 Whitmore Park Map 8
00-0010-8088	? Right Fork Indian Canyon Road	Duchesne (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 16 Whitmore Park Map 18
00-0009-9329	? US Highway 191	Duchesne (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 15 Whitmore Park Map 17
00-0009-9287	? US Highway 191	Duchesne (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 15 Whitmore Park Map 17
00-0009-9154	? US Highway 191	Duchesne (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 19 Whitmore Park Map 21
00-0031-5370	? 28265 West Right Fork Indian Canyon Road	Duchesne (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 16 Whitmore Park Map 18
00-0010-7882	? US Highway 191	Duchesne (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 16 Whitmore Park Map 18
00-0010-7965	? 16251 South US Highway 191	Duchesne (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 15 Whitmore Park Map 17
00-0009-7562	? Sowers Canyon Road	Bridgeland (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 23 Whitmore Park Map 25
00-0009-7539	? Sowers Canyon Road	Bridgeland (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 23 Whitmore Park Map 25
00-0009-7521	? 13079 South Antelope Canyon Road	Bridgeland (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 22 Whitmore Park Map 24
00-0009-7505	?13025 W Shearing Corral Cutoff Road	Bridgeland (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 22 Whitmore Park Map 24
00-0009-5731	6001 West 11350 South	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 24 Whitmore Park Map 26 Wells Draw Map 19 Craig Map 3
00-0028-9888	5751 West 11350 South	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 27 Whitmore Park Map 29 Wells Draw Map 24 Craig Map 3

*Selective Reconnaissance-Level Survey of Historic Architectural Resources Along Proponent-Proposed Routes for the Uinta Basin Railway Project in Utah, Carbon, Duchesne, and Uintah Counties, Utah*

<b>Current Parcel Number</b>	<b>Property Address</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Landownership</b>	<b>Results Map Numbers</b>
00-0009-5632	? 5670 West 11350 South	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 27 Whitmore Park Map 29 Wells Draw Map 24 Craig Map 3
00-0009-5640	5660 West 11350 South	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 27 Whitmore Park Map 29 Wells Draw Map 24 Craig Map 3
00-0009-5608	? 5269 West 11050 South	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 27 Whitmore Park Map 29 Wells Draw Map 24 Craig Map 3
00-0009-4924	? 9640 S Pariette Road	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Craig Map 3
00-0033-8493	? 11594 South Pariette Road	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 27 Whitmore Park Map 29 Craig Map 4
00-0009-5590	?4981 West 11050 South	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 27 Whitmore Park Map 29 Wells Draw Map 24 Craig Map 3
00-0901-3552	? South 4500 West	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 26 Whitmore Park Map 28
00-0034-0737	? 9811 South 4500 West	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 26 Whitmore Park Map 28
00-0009-5335	? 4365 West 10000 South	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 26 Whitmore Park Map 28
00-0009-4684	? 4238 West 10000 South	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 26 Whitmore Park Map 28
00-0030-8217	? 3728 West 10000 South	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 26 Whitmore Park Map 28
00-0035-1072	? 9938 South 3000 West	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 26 Whitmore Park Map 28
00-0009-5418	? South 3000 West	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 27 Whitmore Park Map 29
00-0009-3876	? 10791 South 3000 West	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 27 Whitmore Park Map 29

*Selective Reconnaissance-Level Survey of Historic Architectural Resources Along Proponent-Proposed Routes for the Uinta Basin Railway Project in Utah, Carbon, Duchesne, and Uintah Counties, Utah*

<b>Current Parcel Number</b>	<b>Property Address</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Landownership</b>	<b>Results Map Numbers</b>
170700002	? 1428 East 8250 South	Myton (vicinity)	Uintah	Private	Wells Draw Map 27 Craig Map 6
170700001	? 1403 East 8250 South	Myton (vicinity)	Uintah	Private	Wells Draw Map 27 Craig Map 6
170710009	? 2301 East 8250 South	Myton (vicinity)	Uintah	Private	Wells Draw Map 27 Craig Map 6
170720004	? 8656 South 3500 East	Myton (vicinity)	Uintah	Private	Indian Canyon Map 28 Whitmore Park Map 30 Wells Draw Map 27 Craig Map 6
150310001 Resource A	? 8251 South 3500 East	Myton (vicinity)	Uintah	Private	Indian Canyon Map 28 Whitmore Park Map 30 Wells Draw Map 27 Craig Map 6
150310001 Resource B	? At the intersection of South 3500 East and Myton Townsite Canal Road	Myton (vicinity)	Uintah	Private	Indian Canyon Map 28 Whitmore Park Map 30 Wells Draw Map 27 Craig Map 6
150300004	3809 East 8000 South	Myton (vicinity)	Uintah	Private	Wells Draw Map 27 Craig Map 5
150310019	? 4026 East 8000 South	Myton (vicinity)	Uintah	Private	Wells Draw Map 27 Craig Map 10
150310018	? 4124 East 8000 South	Myton (vicinity)	Uintah	Private	Wells Draw Map 30 Craig Map 10
00-0009-4049	? County Road 41	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Indian Canyon Map 29 Whitmore Park Map 31 Wells Draw Map 28 Craig Map 6
00-0011-3799	? Argyle Canyon Road	Castle Gate (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Wells Draw Map 8
No Parcel No. 1 (SITLA)	? Argyle Canyon Road	Castle Gate (vicinity)	Duchesne	SITLA	Wells Draw Map 8
No Parcel No. 2 (SITLA)	? Argyle Canyon Road	Castle Gate (vicinity)	Duchesne	SITLA	Wells Draw Map 8
00-0035-0193	? Argyle Canyon Road	Castle Gate (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Wells Draw Map 10
00-0011-5208	? Argyle Canyon Road	Castle Gate (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Wells Draw Map 10
00-0032-2860	? Argyle Canyon Road	Castle Gate (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Wells Draw Map 10

*Selective Reconnaissance-Level Survey of Historic Architectural Resources Along Proponent-Proposed Routes for the Uinta Basin Railway Project in Utah, Carbon, Duchesne, and Uintah Counties, Utah*

<b>Current Parcel Number</b>	<b>Property Address</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Landownership</b>	<b>Results Map Numbers</b>
00-0011-5257	? 30259 West Argyle Canyon Road	Castle Gate (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Wells Draw Map 10
No Parcel No. 3 (BLM)	? Rye Patch Road	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	BLM	Wells Draw Map 14
No Parcel No. 4 (BLM)	? Cedar Road	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	BLM	Wells Draw Map 16
No Parcel No. 5 (BLM)	? Five Mile Draw Road	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	BLM	Wells Draw Map 15
No Parcel No. 6 (BLM)	? Horner Knoll	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	BLM	Wells Draw Map 20
No Parcel No. 7 (BLM)	? Horner Knoll	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	BLM	Wells Draw Map 21
No Parcel No. UDSH ID: 28063	? Wells Draw Road	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	BLM	Wells Draw Map 22
No Parcel No. 8 (BLM)	? Horner Knoll	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	BLM	Wells Draw Map 22
00-0009-6168	? South 3000 West	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Craig Map 4
00-0034-1071	12778 S Pleasant Valley Road	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Wells Draw Map 29 Craig Map 7
00-0009-4437	868 West Pleasant Valley Road	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Wells Draw Map 29 Craig Map 7
00-0009-4429	13018 South 500 West	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Wells Draw Map 28 Craig Map 7
00-0011-0605	? West 13500 South	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Wells Draw Map 29 Craig Map 7
00-0011-0589	?13523 South 1000 West	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Wells Draw Map 29 Craig Map 7
00-0011-0571	? South 500 West	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Wells Draw Map 29 Craig Map 7
00-0028-0929	? Pleasant Valley Road	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Wells Draw Map 28 Craig Map 7
00-0009-4452	? Pleasant Valley Road	Myton (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Wells Draw Map 29 Craig Map 7
150090016	? 5737 East 4000 South	Fort Duchesne (vicinity)	Uintah	Private	Craig Map 9
150090012	5784 East 4000 South	Fort Duchesne (vicinity)	Uintah	Private	Craig Map 9

*Selective Reconnaissance-Level Survey of Historic Architectural Resources Along Proponent-Proposed Routes for the Uinta Basin Railway Project in Utah, Carbon, Duchesne, and Uintah Counties, Utah*

<b>Current Parcel Number</b>	<b>Property Address</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Landownership</b>	<b>Results Map Numbers</b>
150090019	5885 East 4000 South	Fort Duchesne (vicinity)	Uintah	Private	Craig Map 9
150090001	6134 East 4000 South	Fort Duchesne (vicinity)	Uintah	Private	Craig Map 9
150090006	? 4600 South 6500 East	Fort Duchesne (vicinity)	Uintah	Private	Craig Map 9
150100008	6975 East 4750 South	Fort Duchesne (vicinity)	Uintah	Private	Craig Map 9
150100006	? 7018 East 4750 South	Fort Duchesne (vicinity)	Uintah	Private	Craig Map 9
No Parcel No. 9 (BLM)	? Halfway Hollow Road	Vernal (vicinity)	Uintah	BLM	Craig Map 17
060630030	? 6277 South Alhandra Ferry Road	Jensen (vicinity)	Uintah	Private	Craig Map 18
060790007	? South 7100 East	Jensen (vicinity)	Uintah	Private	Craig Map 20
060790008	? 8171 South 7100 East	Jensen (vicinity)	Uintah	Private	Craig Map 20
060790004	? 8510 South 6950 East	Jensen (vicinity)	Uintah	Private	Craig Map 20
070370003	? 8501 South 6500 East (Goose Ranch Road)	Jensen (vicinity)	Uintah	Private	Craig Map 21
070450011	?11401 South Red Wash Road	Jensen (vicinity)	Uintah	Private	Craig Map 23
070450019	10268 South Red Wash Road	Jensen (vicinity)	Uintah	Private	Craig Map 21
070470011	? 10502 South Red Wash Road	Jensen (vicinity)	Uintah	Private	Craig Map 21
070440006	? 10802 South Red Wash Road	Jensen (vicinity)	Uintah	Private	Craig Map 21
070450009	? 9120 South Red Wash Road	Jensen (vicinity)	Uintah	Private	Craig Map 23
070530006	? 9491 South Red Wash Road	Jensen (vicinity)	Uintah	Private	Craig Map 23
No Parcel No. 10 (BLM)	? Cow Wash Road	Jensen (vicinity)	Uintah	BLM	Craig Map 24
No Parcel No. 11 (BLM)	? Old Bonanza Highway	Jensen (vicinity)	Uintah	BLM	Craig Map 25
No Parcel No. 12 (BLM)	? K Creek Road	Jensen (vicinity)	Uintah	BLM	Craig Map 26
2A-0357-0000 Resource A	? US Highway 191	Castle Gate (vicinity)	Carbon	Private	Whitmore Park Map 7
2A-0357-0000 Resource B UDSH ID: 37458	? US Highway 191	Castle Gate (vicinity)	Carbon	Private	Whitmore Park Map 7






*Selective Reconnaissance-Level Survey of Historic Architectural Resources Along Proponent-Proposed Routes for the Uinta Basin Railway Project in Utah, Carbon, Duchesne, and Uintah Counties, Utah*





<b>Current Parcel Number</b>	<b>Property Address</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Landownership</b>	<b>Results Map Numbers</b>
2A-0357-0000 Resource C	? US Highway 191	Castle Gate (vicinity)	Carbon	Private	Whitmore Park Map 7
2A-0357-0000 Resource D	? US Highway 191	Castle Gate (vicinity)	Carbon	Private	Whitmore Park Map 7
2A-0357-0000 Resource E	? Little Boulder Dam Rd	Castle Gate (vicinity)	Carbon	Private	Whitmore Park Map 7
2A-0338-0000	? Jack Canyon Road	Castle Gate (vicinity)	Carbon	Private	Whitmore Park Map 7
2A-0425-0000	? Whitmore Park Road	Castle Gate (vicinity)	Carbon	Private	Whitmore Park Map 11
2A-0427-0000	? Whitmore Park Road	Castle Gate (vicinity)	Carbon	Private	Whitmore Park Map 11
2A-0428-0000	? Whitmore Park Road	Castle Gate (vicinity)	Carbon	Private	Whitmore Park Map 11
00-0034-6840	? County Road 29	Duchesne (vicinity)	Duchesne	Private	Whitmore Park Map 23



? indicates an estimated address.




*This page intentionally left blank.*



**Table 9. Summary of Architectural Resources of Historic Age in the Survey Area**


Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
330610001 (Utah)	? 22572 South Beaver Creek Road Approximately 1 mile south of U.S. Highway 6 (US 6) between Mile Post (MP) 219 and 220 Approximately 16 miles north of Helper, Utah	ca. 1930	One-story building with hipped roof clad in corrugated metal. The building is located at a gravel quarry or material extraction site. However, access to the property was restricted at the time of survey, and visibility was poor from the right-of-way. For these reasons, the use, type, and style could not be determined.  One contributing resource was observed.	Undetermined Unknown		Whitmore Park
330700016 (Utah)	? 31368 East Emma Park Road At the intersection Emma Park Road and US 6 Near Helper, Utah	ca. 1960	The outdoor recreation area (and/or pull-off) consists of a circular gravel drive. Historical topographic maps indicate this was the site of a picnic area, although no structures or signs were extant to verify this use. Alterations likely include changes to site configuration. No buildings or structures were observed.	NC Not eligible		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park Wells Draw
330840001 (Utah)	? Emma Park Road Approximately 0.75 mile east of the intersection with US 6 Near Helper, Utah	ca. 1950	The animal facility is a small corral constructed of railroad tie posts and board rails; it is located on open range land near Emma Park Road. Alterations include metal gates replacing original. This is an isolated agricultural resource and not visibly associated with a principal dwelling or a larger farm or ranch.	NC Not eligible		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park Wells Draw

Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
330970001 (Utah)	? Emma Park Road Approximately 2.25 miles east of the intersection with US 6 Near Helper, Utah	ca. 1930	The road transportation related structure is a timber stringer bridge. Abutments are constructed of formed concrete and coursed rough stone which support the timber stringers. The stringers have collapsed, and most decking is missing. Alterations include a change in the road alignment. No visibly associated buildings or structures were observed.	NC Not eligible		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park Wells Draw
330970002 (Utah)	? Emma Park Road Approximately 2.5 miles east of the intersection with US 6 Near Helper, Utah	ca. 1930	The road transportation related structure is a timber stringer bridge. Abutments are constructed of coursed stone which support timber stringers and plank decking. The bridge is mostly collapsed and the road alignment changed. Additional alterations include replacement stringers and decking. No visibly associated buildings or structures were observed.	NC Not eligible		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park Wells Draw
2A-0312-005F (Carbon)	? US 6 Approximately 1 mile south of Emma Park Road between MP 222 and 223 on US 6 Near Helper, Utah	ca. 1920	The railroad transportation related structure includes two tunnels exhibiting the Neoclassical style. The tunnels are excavated through bedrock and the entrances constructed of formed concrete.	EC NRHP Criterion A		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park Wells Draw
330970015 (Utah)	? Horse Creek Road Approximately 0.5 mile north of Emma Park Road 4 miles east of the intersection with US 6 Near Helper, Utah	ca. 1940	One-story agricultural (general) building with side-gable roof covered with corrugated metal. Access to the property was restricted at the time of survey, and visibility was poor from the right-of-way. For these reasons, the use, type, and style could not be determined. One non-contributing outbuilding and two contributing outbuildings of similar historic age were observed. These appear to be isolated agricultural resources and not visibly associated with a principal dwelling or a larger farm or ranch.	Undetermined Unknown		Whitmore Park



Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
2A-0313-0000 (Carbon)	? Emma Park Road Approximately 4.5 miles southeast of the intersection with US 6 Near Helper, Utah	ca. 1900	The principal structure on this agricultural property is a large corral constructed of railroad tie posts and board rails. Alterations include metal gate replacements. There are two contributing resources: a one-story, single-family, single-cell log cabin exhibiting Vernacular style (Early Twentieth Century: Other) dating to ca. 1900 and transmission line utility poles dating to ca. 1940. One contributing corral was observed in the vicinity on the adjacent Parcel 2A-0312-0001.	EC NRHP Criterion A		Indian Canyon Wells Draw
2A-0312-0001 (Carbon)	? Emma Park Road Approximately 4.75 miles southeast of the intersection with US 6 Near Helper, Utah	ca. 1900	The animal facility is a small corral constructed of vertical wood posts with barbed wire. Alterations include removed fencing material and deterioration. The corral may be contributing to the adjacent cabin located on Parcel 2A-0313-0000.	NC Not eligible		Indian Canyon Wells Draw



Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
2A-0344-0000 (Carbon)	? Quarry Road Approximately 0.5 mile north of Emma Park Road, 2.75 miles west of the intersection with U.S. Highway 191 (US 191) Near Helper, Utah	ca. 1900	One-story, single-family, single-cell log cabin exhibiting the Vernacular style (Early Twentieth Century: Other). The exterior walls are constructed of stacked logs. The front-gable roof is covered in wood planks. Besides overall deterioration, no alterations were observed. No outbuildings were observed.	EC NRHP Criterion A		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park Wells Draw
00-0028-1745 (Duchesne)	? Argyle Canyon Road Approximately 1.25 miles east of US 191 between MP 266 and 267 Approximately 30 miles south of Duchesne, Utah	ca. 1940	One-story, single-family dwelling exhibiting Vernacular style (Early Twentieth Century: Other). The residence is set on wood post piers with weatherboard and stacked log walls. The front-gable roof is covered in sheet metal. Additions have been made to the side of the building and alterations include replacement windows. Two contributing outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park Wells Draw
00-0011-0373 (Duchesne)	22881 South US 191 Near Duchesne, Utah	1924†	One-story, single-family, single-cell dwelling exhibiting National Folk style (Early Twentieth Century: Other). The residence rests on a mortared stone foundation with walls clad in wood drop-siding. The side-gable roof is covered in corrugated metal. One contributing building was observed that is a secondary residence with hipped roof. Two non-contributing outbuildings were observed.	EC NRHP Criterion A		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park
00-0011-0340 (Duchesne)	? US 191 Near MP 276 Near Jones Hollow Southwest of Duchesne, Utah	ca. 1910	The principal building on this agricultural property is a one-story, single-family dwelling exhibiting National Folk style (Early Twentieth Century: Other). The residence rests on a mortared stone foundation. Exterior cladding includes weatherboard walls and plywood under the gable ends. The front-gable roof is covered in corrugated metal. Alterations include replacement of exterior cladding. Three contributing outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park



Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
No Parcel No. (USFS) UDSH ID: 42465+ (Duchesne)	? Forest Route 153 East of US 191 at MP 272 in Duchesne Ranger District, Ashley National Forest Approximately 25 miles south of Duchesne, Utah	1914	The Indian Canyon Ranger Station is a one-story, institutional residence constructed for the USFS. The foundation is fieldstone and mortar. The building is clad in sawed-log siding with shingles in the gable ends. The side-gable roof is covered in wood shingles. The 1999 NRHP nomination notes three contributing and two non-contributing outbuildings; however, none were observed during the survey.	ES NRHP Listed under Criteria A and C		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park
00-0010-8088 (Duchesne)	? Right Fork Indian Canyon Road Approximately 1.75 miles west of MP 285, US 191 Southwest of Duchesne, Utah	ca. 1910	One-story, single-family, single-cell log cabin exhibiting Vernacular style (Early Twentieth Century: Other). The walls are constructed of logs joined with square notching. The roof was originally front-gable although all roofing material has been lost. No alterations observed. No outbuildings observed.	EC NRHP Criterion A		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park


Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
00-0009-9329 (Duchesne)	? US 191 Near MP 288 Southwest of Duchesne, Utah	ca. 1910	The principal building on this agricultural property is a one-story, single-family, single-cell log cabin exhibiting Vernacular style (Early Twentieth Century: Other). The walls are of saddle-notched, round logs with wood shingles in the gable ends. The side-gable roof is covered in wood shingles. Brick chimneys rise from either end of the roof slope. Doors and windows are missing although the openings remain. Six contributing outbuildings were observed.	ES NRHP Criteria A and C		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park




Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
00-0009-9287 (Duchesne)	? US 191 Near MP 289 Southwest of Duchesne, Utah	ca. 1911 <sup>†</sup>	<p>The principal building on this agricultural property is a one-story, single-family, single-cell log cabin exhibiting Vernacular style (Early Twentieth Century: Other). The walls are of saddle-notched, round logs. The side-gable roof is covered with wood shingles.</p> <p>The original door and window openings remain, but the windows and doors are no longer present.</p> <p>Five contributing resources are located 0.10 mile east including a barn constructed of square notched, hewn logs. One non-contributing outbuilding is located 0.5 mile southwest on the same parcel.</p>	ES NRHP Criteria A and C	 <p>The first photograph shows a close-up of a log cabin with a gabled roof made of wood shingles. The second photograph shows a wider view of the cabin and other structures in a valley. The third photograph shows a different view of the cabin and surrounding terrain.</p>	Indian Canyon Whitmore Park
00-0009-9154 (Duchesne)	? US 191 Near MP 290 Southwest of Duchesne, Utah	ca. 1910	<p>The road transportation structure is a log-stringer bridge with multiple layers of wood board decking laid perpendicularly.</p> <p>Portions of the wood decking are no longer intact. Alterations include realignment of the road and installation of a modern culvert.</p>	NC Not eligible	 <p>The photograph shows a log-stringer bridge crossing a stream. The bridge has multiple layers of wood decking. The surrounding area is a valley with green vegetation and a hillside in the background.</p>	Indian Canyon Whitmore Park

Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
00-0031-5370 (Duchesne)	? 28265 West Right Fork Indian Canyon Road Near MP 285 US 191 Southwest of Duchesne, Utah	ca. 1975	The principal building on this agricultural property is a one-story, single-family, single-wide mobile home exhibiting characteristic stylistic elements of a Late Twentieth Century Mobile Home (General). The exterior is clad with corrugated metal and the flat roof with metal. Alterations include replacement of windows. One contributing outbuilding and one non-contributing outbuilding were observed.	NC Not eligible		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park
00-0010-7882 (Duchesne)	? US 191 Near MP 285 Southwest of Duchesne, Utah	ca. 1950	The principal building is a loafing shed with an associated corral. The shed is constructed of vertical board walls with a shed roof covered in corrugated metal. Alterations include replacement plywood gates/stall doors. The corral was the one contributing outbuilding observed. These are isolated agricultural resources and not visibly associated with a principal dwelling or a larger farm or ranch.	NC Not eligible		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park

Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
00-0010-7965 (Duchesne)	? 16251 South US 191 Near MP 285 Southwest of Duchesne, Utah	ca. 1905	<p>The principal building on this agricultural property is a one-and-one-half story, single-family dwelling exhibiting National Folk style (Early Twentieth Century: Other). The exterior walls are of saddle-notched, stacked logs. The front-gable roof is covered in corrugated metal.</p> <p>The primary residence may have been altered with an additional half story on the rear of the house, a front porch, and new windows and doors.</p> <p>A secondary residence was observed which may be a basement house/hope house. One non-contributing outbuilding and nine contributing outbuildings were also observed.</p>	EC NRHP Criterion A		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park
00-0009-7562 (Duchesne)	? Sowers Canyon Road Approximately 5.25 miles south of the intersection of Antelope Canyon Road and U.S. Highway 40 (US 40) between MP 96 and 97 South of Bridgeland, Utah	ca. 1910	<p>One-story, single-family, double-cell log cabin exhibiting Vernacular style (Early Twentieth Century: Other). Walls are constructed of square-notched, round logs. The roof rafters of the front gable roof extend to cover a deep porch.</p> <p>Windows and doors are no longer present, although the openings remain intact. Nearly all the wood plank roofing material is missing.</p> <p>No outbuildings were observed.</p>	EC NRHP Criterion A		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park

Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
00-0009-7539 (Duchesne)	? Sowers Canyon Road Approximately 4.5 miles south of the intersection of Antelope Canyon Road and US 40 between MP 96 and 97 South of Bridgeland, Utah	ca. 1930	The principal building on this agricultural property is a one-story, single-family, rectangular block dwelling exhibiting Minimal Traditional style. The foundation is constructed of formed concrete, the walls clad in stucco, and the side-gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. The residence is part of an agricultural property. Alterations include new door, windows, exterior cladding, and roofing. Eight contributing outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible	 <p>The photographs show a one-story, single-family, rectangular block dwelling with a side-gable roof, situated on a rural property. The building is surrounded by a dirt area and some vegetation. The sky is blue with scattered white clouds.</p>	Indian Canyon Whitmore Park

Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
00-0009-7521 (Duchesne)	? 13079 South Antelope Canyon Road Approximately 3.5 miles south of the intersection of Antelope Canyon Road and US 40 between MP 96 and 97 South of Bridgeland, Utah	ca. 1905	<p>The principal building on this agricultural property is a one-story, single-family manufactured home which post-dates the outbuildings. The dwelling exhibits stylistic elements of the Late Twentieth Century Manufactured Home style, dating to ca. 1990. It rests on a formed concrete foundation. The exterior cladding is vinyl siding. The side-gable roof is covered with composite shingles.</p> <p>Three earlier residences are located on the property including a two-story, single-family World War II (WWII)-Era Cottage type residence exhibiting Late Twentieth Century: Other style with board and batten exterior walls and a standing seam metal side-gable roof; a one-story, single-family, single-cell log cabin with saddle-notched, round log walls and a front-gable roof clad in corrugated metal; and a one-story, single-family, single-cell residence clad in stucco with a side-gable roof.</p> <p>Twenty-nine contributing outbuildings and one non-contributing outbuilding are present.</p>	NC Not eligible		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park

Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
00-0009-7505 (Duchesne)	? 13025 West Shearing Corral Cutoff Road Approximately 3.5 miles south of the intersection of Antelope Canyon Road and US 40 between MP 96 and 97 South of Bridgeland, Utah	ca. 1940	The primary building is an agricultural (general) type building. There is no foundation; posts for the wall framing are driven into the ground. The exterior cladding and roofing material appears to be corrugated metal. The building is largely collapsed. No other discernable alterations were observed. Three contributing outbuildings and one non-contributing outbuilding were observed. These are isolated agricultural resources and not visibly associated with a principal dwelling or a larger farm or ranch.	NC Not eligible		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park
00-0009-5731 (Duchesne)	6001 West 11350 South South of Myton, Utah	ca. 1940	One-story, single-family dwelling. Type, style, materials, and alterations not discernable due to restricted access and limited visibility from the right-of-way.	Undetermined Unknown		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park Craig
00-0028-9888 (Duchesne)	5751 West 11350 South South of Myton, Utah	ca. 1970	One-story, single-family Ranch type house exhibiting elements Late Twentieth Century: Other style. Exterior cladding is aluminum siding. The side-gable roof is covered with corrugated metal. Alterations include new windows, doors, door surround, removed porch or awning, and possibly new siding. Five contributing outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park Craig




Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
00-0009-5632 (Duchesne)	? 5670 West 11350 South South of Myton, Utah	ca. 1970	One-story, single-family, single-wide Mobile Home (General) single-family dwelling exhibiting characteristic elements of Late Twentieth Century Mobile Home style. Exterior cladding and roof cladding are corrugated metal. Alterations include new door, the gable-roofed structure built over the original, and added porch with concrete pad. One non-contributing outbuilding was observed.	NC Not eligible		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park Wells Draw Craig
00-0009-5640 (Duchesne)	5660 West 11350 South South of Myton, Utah	ca. 1975	Two-story, single-family, Split Entry with Garage type dwelling exhibiting Ranch/Rambler (General) style. The foundation is constructed of formed concrete. The exterior is clad in brick on the lower half-story and aluminum siding on the upper story. The side-gable roof is clad in composite shingles. Alterations include new doors and windows. No outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park Craig
00-0009-5608 (Duchesne)	? 5269 West 11050 South South of Myton, Utah	ca. 1905	The principal building on this agricultural property postdates the associated outbuildings. It is a one-story, single-family dwelling exhibiting Late Twentieth Century: Other style dating to ca. 1990. The exterior is clad in stucco and the side-gable roof in corrugated metal. Four contributing outbuildings and one non-contributing outbuilding were observed.	NC Not eligible		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park Wells Draw Craig
00-0009-4924 (Duchesne)	? 9640 South Pariette Road South of Myton, Utah	ca. 1960	One-story, single-family Ranch with Garage type dwelling exhibiting elements of Neo-Spanish-Mediterranean style. Exterior cladding is slump block with weatherboard in the gable ends. The side-gable roof is clad in composite shingles. Alterations include new windows and construction of outbuildings. Four non-contributing outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible		Craig


Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
00-0033-8493 (Duchesne)	? 11594 South Pariette Road South of Myton, Utah	ca. 1960	One-story, single-family Ranch with Garage type dwelling exhibiting Ranch (General) style. The foundation is constructed of formed concrete. The exterior cladding is brick veneer, and the side-gable roof is covered with composite shingles. Alterations include some new windows and likely a new garage door. Two non-contributing outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible		Craig
00-0009-5590 (Duchesne)	? 4981 West 11050 South South of Myton, Utah	ca. 1950	This agricultural property includes resources on either side of the road. The principal building is a one-story, single-family Ranch (General) type dwelling exhibiting elements of the Ranch (General) style. Exterior cladding is red brick with vinyl siding in the gable ends. The side-gable roof is clad in composite shingles. An attached garage was added to the residence. Alterations include new windows and vinyl siding. Adjacent to the house, one contributing and three non-contributing were observed. Across the street, seven contributing outbuildings were observed including a one-story, agricultural (general) type building with walls of concrete block and horizontal board in the gable ends. The side-gable roof is covered with corrugated metal.	NC Not eligible	 	Indian Canyon Whitmore Park Craig
00-0901-3552 (Duchesne)	Myton Pumping Station ? South 4500 West Northwest of the intersection of South 4500 West and West 10000 South Approximately 3 miles south of Myton, Utah	ca. 1950	One-story energy facility exhibiting elements of Brutalist style. Exterior cladding is concrete panel wall with a flat roof. Three contributing buildings and eight non-contributing buildings were observed.	EC NRHP Criterion A		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park






Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
00-0034-0737 (Duchesne)	? 9811 South 4500 West Northeast of the intersection of South 4500 West and West 10000 South Approximately 3 miles south of Myton, Utah	ca. 1920 ca. 1960	One-story, single-family, Ranch type residence exhibiting elements of the Ranch (General) style. The foundation is constructed of formed concrete. Exterior cladding is red brick veneer with vinyl siding in the gable ends. The side-gable roof is clad with corrugated metal. Alterations include new windows and doors. Two additions have been made to the house, including an attached garage. One non-contributing outbuilding and seven contributing outbuildings were observed including the original ca. 1920 front-gable house. It is clad in stucco with a wood shingle roof.	NC Not eligible		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park
00-0009-5335 (Duchesne)	? 4365 West 10000 South East of the intersection of South 4500 West and West 10000 South Approximately 3 miles south of Myton, Utah	ca. 1975	Two-story, single-family, Split Entry with Garage type dwelling exhibiting Split Entry (General) style. Foundation is constructed of formed concrete, and the exterior cladding is tan brick veneer and vertical wood board. The low-pitch side-gable roof is clad with composite shingles. No discernable alterations observed, although the windows may be new. One non-contributing outbuilding was observed.	EC NRHP Criterion A		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park





Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
00-0009-4684 (Duchesne)	? 4238 West 10000 South East of the intersection of South 4500 West and West 10000 South Approximately 3 miles south of Myton, Utah	ca. 1930	One-story, single-family dwelling with a side-gable roof that is clad in metal. Type, style, materials, and alterations were not able to be determined due to restricted access and limited visibility from the right-of-way. No outbuildings were observed.	Undetermined Unknown		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park
00-0030-8217 (Duchesne)	? 3728 West 10000 South East of the intersection of South 4500 West and West 10000 South Approximately 3 miles south of Myton, Utah	ca. 1960	One-story, single-family, single-wide Mobile Home (General) single-family dwelling exhibiting elements of Mobile Home (general) style. The dwelling rests on a concrete block foundation. Exterior cladding is corrugated metal. Flat metal covers the side-gable roof. Alterations include new doors and windows. A south addition has been removed. One contributing outbuilding was observed.	NC Not eligible		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park
00-0035-1072 (Duchesne)	? 9938 South 3000 West Northeast of the intersection of West 10000 South and South 3000 West Approximately 3 miles south of Myton, Utah	ca. 1955	One-story, single-family Box Ranch type dwelling exhibiting Post-War Box Ranch style. Exterior cladding is red brick with log veneer (Shevlin-type) siding in the gable ends. The side-gable roof is covered with composite shingles. Alterations include new windows and doors. Three contributing outbuildings and two non-contributing outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible	 	Indian Canyon Whitmore Park



Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
00-0009-5418 (Duchesne)	? South 3000 West Approximately 1 mile south of West 10000 South and South 3000 West Approximately 5 miles south of Myton, Utah	ca. 1950	One-story, agricultural shed type outbuilding with sheet metal exterior cladding. The front-gable roof is covered in corrugated metal. No discernable alterations were observed. Two contributing outbuildings were observed. These are isolated agricultural resources and not visibly associated with a principal dwelling or a larger farm or ranch.	NC Not eligible		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park
00-0009-3876 (Duchesne)	? 10791 South 3000 West Approximately 1 mile south of West 10000 South and South 3000 West Approximately 5 miles south Myton, Utah	ca. 1950	One-story, single-family WWII-Era Cottage type dwelling exhibiting Minimal Traditional style. Exterior cladding is red brick with vertical board siding in the gable ends. The side-gable roof is covered in corrugated metal. Alterations include new windows and roof. One contributing outbuilding observed.	EC NRHP Criterion A		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park
170700002 (Uintah)	? 1428 East 8250 South Approximately 2 miles east of intersection with South 1000 West Approximately 6 miles east of Myton, Utah	ca. 1970	The principal building on this agricultural property is a one-story, single-family dwelling was observed with a gable roof clad in corrugated metal. Visibility was limited from the right-of-way. For this reason, type, style, materials, and alterations could not be determined. Two contributing buildings and one non-contributing building were observed.	Undetermined Unknown		Wells Draw Craig

Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
170700001 (Uintah)	? 1403 East 8250 South Approximately 2 miles east of intersection with South 1000 West Approximately 6 miles east of Myton, Utah	ca. 1975	One-story, single-family Late Twentieth Century type dwelling devoid of stylistic elements. Foundation is constructed of formed concrete piers and the structure is wood framed. The cladding has been removed from the exterior walls and the low-pitch, front-gable roof. A front porch and rear addition have been added to the residence. One contributing outbuilding observed.	NC Not eligible		Craig
170710009 (Uintah)	? 2301 East 8250 South Approximately 2.25 miles east of intersection with South 1000 West Approximately 6 miles east of Myton, Utah	ca. 1910	One-story, single-family, single-cell log cabin exhibiting Vernacular style (Early Twentieth Century; Other). The exterior is constructed of round logs joined with round notching. The front-gable roof is covered with wood planks. No alterations observed. One contributing outbuilding was observed.	EC NRHP Criterion A		Wells Draw Craig
170720004 (Uintah)	? 8656 South 3500 East Approximately 4.25 miles east of intersection with South 1000 West Approximately 7 miles east of Myton, Utah	ca. 1910	One-story, single-family, double-cell log cabin exhibiting Vernacular style (Early Twentieth Century; Other). The foundation is a wood sill and exterior walls are constructed of square notched round logs in the west cell and half-square notched logs in the east crib. The side-gable roof is collapsed. The east crib is a later addition. No outbuildings were observed.	EC NRHP Criterion A		Indian Canyon Whitmore Park Wells Draw Craig





Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
150310001 Resource A (Uintah)	? 8251 South 3500 East Approximately 4.25 miles east of intersection with South 1000 West Approximately 7 miles east of Myton, Utah	ca. 1940	One-story animal facility, livestock shed (miscellaneous) type building. The foundation and structural framing are constructed of formed concrete. The exterior walls are concrete block with plywood and battens in the gable ends. The side-gable roof is clad with corrugated metal.  An addition has been added to the south end of the building. Alterations may include replacement of windows with vents and blocking in a large garage opening on the street-facing elevation.  One non-contributing outbuilding was observed.	NC Not eligible		Wells Draw Craig
150310001 Resource B (Uintah)	? At the intersection of South 3500 East and Myton Townsite Canal Road Approximately 4.25 miles east of intersection with South 1000 West Approximately 7 miles east of Myton, Utah	ca. 1905†	One-story, single-cell type, single-family log cabin exhibiting Vernacular style (Early Twentieth Century: Other). Exterior walls are constructed of saddle-notched, round logs and horizontal wood siding in the gable ends. The side-gable roof is covered with wood shingles.  The original doors and windows are missing although the openings remain. No other discernable alterations observed.  No outbuildings observed.	ES NRHP Criteria A and C		Wells Draw Craig
150300004 (Uintah)	3809 East 8000 South Approximately 7 miles east of Myton, Utah	ca. 1940†	One-story, single-family, Cape Cod type dwelling exhibiting Minimal Traditional style. Exterior cladding is wood shingle siding and corrugated metal covering the side-gable roof.  A shed-roof volume has been added to the east end of the building.  Three contributing and two non-contributing outbuildings were observed.	EC NRHP Criterion A		Wells Draw Craig




Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
150310019 (Uintah)	? 4026 East 8000 South Approximately 7 miles east of Myton, Utah	ca. 1950	One-story, agricultural (general) outbuilding framed with wood and structural steel framing and sheet metal cladding. The building is largely collapsed with only two exterior walls partially extant. No outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible		Wells Draw Craig
150310018 (Uintah)	? 4124 East 8000 South Approximately 7 miles east of Myton, Utah	ca. 1975	One-story, single-family, Ranch type dwelling exhibiting elements of the Ranch (General) style. The foundation is constructed of formed concrete. Exterior cladding is vinyl siding. The side-gable roof material is composite shingling. No alterations were observed. Two contributing outbuildings and two non-contributing outbuildings were observed.	EC NRHP Criterion A	 	Wells Draw Craig
00-0009-4049 (Duchesne)	? County Road 41 Approximately 5 miles east of South 3000 West Approximately 8 miles southeast of Myton, Utah	ca. 1920	The animal facility is a small corral constructed of wood posts and rail. This is an isolated agricultural resource located on open range land and not visibly associated with a principal dwelling or a larger farm or ranch.	NC Not eligible		Wells Draw Craig

Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
00-0011-3799 (Duchesne)	? Argyle Canyon Road Approximately 3 miles east of US 191 between MP 266 and 267 Approximately 30 miles south of Duchesne, Utah	ca. 1950	One-story, single-family dwelling. Exterior cladding is sawed log siding and the gable roof cladding is corrugated metal. Type, style, and alterations not discernable due to limited visibility from the right-of-way. Two non-contributing outbuildings were observed.	Undetermined Unknown		Wells Draw
No Parcel No. 1 (SITLA)† (Duchesne)	? Argyle Canyon Road Approximately 5 miles east of US 191 between MP 266 and 267 Approximately 30 miles south of Duchesne, Utah	ca. 1920	The animal facility is a small corral constructed of vertical wood and railroad tie posts with log, sawed log, and metal rails. Alterations include new metal rails. No outbuildings were observed. This is an isolated agricultural resource and not visibly associated with a principal dwelling or a larger farm or ranch.	NC Not eligible		Wells Draw
No Parcel No. 2 (SITLA)† (Duchesne)	? Argyle Canyon Road Approximately 6 miles east of US 191 between MP 266 and 267 Approximately 30 miles south of Duchesne, Utah	ca. 1900	One-story, single-family, single-cell type log cabin dwelling. Exterior walls constructed of saddle-notched, round logs. The roof is collapsed. The building is significantly deteriorated. No other discernable alterations were observed. No outbuildings observed.	NC Not eligible		Wells Draw
00-0035-0193 (Duchesne)	? Argyle Canyon Road Approximately 7.25 miles east of US 191 between MP 266 and 267 Approximately 30 miles south of Duchesne, Utah	ca. 1900	One-story, single-family, single-cell type log cabin. The foundation is a log sill and the exterior walls are constructed of saddle-notched, round logs. The roof has collapsed and the building is significantly deteriorated. No other discernable alterations were observed. No outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible		Wells Draw


Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
00-0011-5208 (Duchesne)	? Argyle Canyon Road Approximately 7.5 miles east of US 191 between MP 266 and 267 Approximately 30 miles south of Duchesne, Utah	ca. 1920	The principal building on this agricultural property is a one-story, camp/seasonal-housing, single cell type dwelling exhibiting Vernacular (Early Twentieth Century: Other) style. Exterior is clad in vertical log siding. The front-gable roof is clad in wood planks. A small addition was adjoined to the rear of the building. Two contributing outbuildings observed.	EC NRHP Criterion A	 <p>The first photograph shows a wide view of a log cabin with a gabled roof, situated in a grassy field with tall evergreen trees in the background. The second photograph is a close-up of the log cabin's exterior, showing the vertical log siding and a large tree trunk in the foreground. The third photograph shows a smaller, weathered outbuilding with a gabled roof, also in a grassy field with trees.</p>	Wells Draw
00-0032-2860 (Duchesne)	? Argyle Canyon Road Approximately 9.25 miles east of US 191 between MP 266 and 267 Approximately 30 miles south of Duchesne, Utah	ca. 1910	One-story, single-family, single-cell type log cabin exhibiting Vernacular (Early Twentieth Century: Other) style. The exterior is constructed of saddle-notched, round logs with a side-gable roof clad in wood planks. The building is significantly deteriorated and collapsed. No discernable alterations were observed. No outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible	 <p>The photograph shows a log cabin that has collapsed and is partially buried in a wooded area. The structure is made of saddle-notched logs and has a side-gable roof. The surrounding area is filled with tall evergreen trees.</p>	Wells Draw





Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
00-0011-5257 (Duchesne)	? 30259 West Argyle Canyon Road Approximately 11 miles east of US 191 between MP 266 and 267 Approximately 30 miles south of Duchesne, Utah	1933 <sup>†</sup>	The two principal buildings on the agricultural property are one-story, single-family, single-cell type log cabins exhibiting Vernacular (Early Twentieth Century: Other) style. Both are constructed of saddle-notched, round logs; one has a front-gable roof (on left in photograph) clad with corrugated metal and milled lumber; one has a side-gable roof (right) clad with asphalt shingles. Alterations include replaced roof material. Three contributing outbuildings and four non-contributing outbuildings were observed.	EC NRHP Criterion A		Wells Draw
No Parcel No. 3 (BLM) † (Duchesne)	? Rye Patch Road Southwest of Myton, Utah	ca. 1910	The agricultural (general) resource is a cairn constructed of dry-laid, stacked stone. It may be associated with the history of sheep herding in the region. No discernable alterations were observed. No visibly associated buildings or structures were observed.	NC Not eligible		Wells Draw
No Parcel No. 4 (BLM) † (Duchesne)	? Cedar Road Southwest of Myton, Utah	ca. 1910	The animal facility is a small corral constructed of wood (unprocessed) posts and rails. No alterations were discernable. No outbuildings were observed. This is an isolated agricultural resource and not visibly associated with a principal dwelling or a larger farm or ranch.	NC Not eligible		Wells Draw
No Parcel No. 5 (BLM) † (Duchesne)	? Five Mile Draw Road Southwest of Myton, Utah	ca. 1950	The animal facility is a corral constructed of vertical wood and railroad tie posts, wood rails, chain-link fencing, and sheet metal. Alterations include the addition of chain-link fencing and sheet metal. No outbuildings were observed. This is an isolated agricultural resource and not visibly associated with a principal dwelling or a larger farm or ranch.	NC Not eligible		Wells Draw




Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
No Parcel No. 6 (BLM) † (Duchesne)	? Horner Knoll, South of Myton, Utah	ca. 1910	The agricultural (general) resource is a cairn constructed of dry-laid, stacked stone. It may be associated with the history of sheep herding in the region. No discernable alterations were observed. No visibly associated buildings or structures were observed.	NC Not eligible		Wells Draw
No Parcel No. 7 (BLM) † (Duchesne)	? Horner Knoll, South of Myton, Utah	ca. 1910	The agricultural resource is a cairn constructed of dry-laid, stacked stone. It may be associated with the history of sheep herding in the region. No discernable alterations were observed. No outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible		Wells Draw
No Parcel No. UDSH ID: 28063† (Duchesne)	? Wells Draw Road South of Myton, Utah	ca. 1890	The property includes two resources of partial walls constructed of dry-laid, stacked stone. This property has been previously surveyed and documented as Smith's Well. Much of the exterior walls and roofs are no longer extant. For this reason, the resource use, type, and style are not able to be interpreted or readily known. No outbuildings were observed.	EC NRHP Criterion A		Wells Draw

Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
No Parcel No. 8 (BLM) † (Duchesne)	? Horner Knoll South of Myton, Utah	ca. 1950	The animal facility is a small corral (or fenced pasture) constructed of vertical wood and metal posts with wire fencing and barbed wire. Alterations include replacement of posts with modern metal posts. No outbuildings were observed. This is an isolated agricultural resource and not visibly associated with a principal dwelling or a larger farm or ranch.	NC Not eligible		Wells Draw
00-0009-6168 (Duchesne)	? South 3000 West South of Myton, Utah	ca. 1940	One-story, single-family Cape Cod type dwelling exhibiting Minimal Traditional style. Exterior walls are constructed of concrete block. The side-gable roof is covered in corrugated metal. Alterations include new doors and windows. Five contributing outbuildings and two non-contributing outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible		Craig

Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
00-0034-1071 (Duchesne)	12778 South Pleasant Valley Road Southeast of Myton, Utah	ca. 1950	One-story, single-family, single-wide Mobile Home (General) single-family dwelling exhibiting elements of Mobile Home (General) style. The exterior is clad in corrugated metal and has a flat roof. Alterations include new windows and inoperable shutters. Four contributing outbuildings were observed including a large one-story, agricultural (general) shed (miscellaneous) type building. It stands on a wood sill and is clad in corrugated metal.	NC Not eligible		Wells Draw Craig

Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
00-0009-4437 (Duchesne)	868 West Pleasant Valley Road Southeast of Myton, Utah	ca. 1960	The principal building on this agricultural property is a one-story, single-family Box Ranch type dwelling exhibiting Ranch (General) style. The foundation is concrete block and the exterior cladding is vinyl siding. The side-gable roof is covered with standing seam metal. Alterations include a front porch addition and new windows. Five contributing outbuildings and six non-contributing outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible		Wells Draw Craig
00-0009-4429 (Duchesne)	13018 South 500 West Southeast of Myton, Utah	ca. 1975	One-story, single-family, double-wide Mobile Home (General) single-family dwelling exhibiting elements of Mobile Home (General) style. The exterior cladding is corrugated metal. The side-gable roof is covered with composite shingles. A shed roof porch has been added to the east elevation. Six contributing and two non-contributing outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible		Wells Draw Craig




Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
00-0011-0605 (Duchesne)	? West 13500 South Southeast of Myton, Utah	ca. 1920	One-story, agricultural (general) shed type building with vertical log veneer (Shevlin-type) and wood board siding. The front-gable roof is covered in corrugated metal. Alterations include the new metal roof and an addition to the rear elevation. Two contributing outbuildings were observed. These are isolated agricultural resources and not visibly associated with a principal dwelling or a larger farm or ranch.	NC Not eligible		Wells Draw Craig
00-0011-0589 (Duchesne)	? 13523 South 1000 West Southeast of Myton, Utah	ca. 1970	One-story, single-family, single-wide Mobile home (general) exhibiting elements of Mobile Home (General) style. The residence sits on a formed concrete foundation and has wood sheet T1-11-type siding. The side-gable roof is covered in corrugated metal. Additions include a deck on the north elevation. Two non-contributing outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible		Craig
00-0011-0571 (Duchesne)	? South 500 West Approximately 9 miles southeast of Myton, Utah	ca. 1950	One-story, agricultural (general), Quonset type building constructed of ribbed metal. The Quonset hut is of recent construction (ca. 1980), but other associated outbuildings are likely of historic age (ca. 1950). No alterations were observed. Four contributing outbuildings observed. These are isolated agricultural resources and not visibly associated with a principal dwelling or a larger farm or ranch.	NC Not eligible		Wells Draw Craig
00-0028-0929 (Duchesne)	? Pleasant Valley Road Approximately 9 miles southeast of Myton, Utah	ca. 1940	One-story, single-family Cape Cod type dwelling exhibiting Minimal Traditional style. The foundation is constructed of formed concrete. Exterior cladding is wood shingles. The side-gable roof is covered with standing seam metal on the house and wood shingles on the garage. Alterations include some new windows and door and new roofing material. Two contributing outbuildings and one non-contributing outbuilding were observed.	NC Not eligible		Wells Draw Craig




Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
00-0009-4452 (Duchesne)	? Pleasant Valley Road Approximately 9 miles southeast of Myton, Utah	ca. 1920 ca. 1960	The property has two principal dwellings. One-story, single-family, hall-parlor type dwelling exhibiting National Folk style (Early Twentieth Century: Other). Exterior cladding is stucco with wood drop siding in the gable ends. The side-gable roof is covered with composite shingles. A shed-roof garage was added to the east elevation. One-story, single-family Late Twentieth Century Ranch type dwelling. Exterior wall cladding is aluminum siding and composite shingles cover the side-gable roof. No contributing outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible	 	Wells Draw Craig
150090016 (Uintah)	? 5737 East 4000 South Approximately 2.5 miles west of the intersection with South 7500 East Approximately 4.75 miles of US 40 between MP 121 and 122 South of Fort Duchesne, Utah	ca. 1920	One-story, single-family dwelling exhibiting Early Twentieth Century: Other style. The exterior cladding consists of loge veneer (Shevlin-type), board and batten, wood: other/undefined siding, and brick: other/undefined (structural terra cotta block). The front-gable roof is covered in corrugated metal. Alterations include replacement windows and cladding. A garage door opening may have been closed in with wood. Five contributing and one non-contributing outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible		Craig

Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
150090012 (Uintah)	5784 East 4000 South Approximately 2.5 miles west of the intersection with South 7500 East Approximately 4.75 miles of US 40 between MP 121 and 122 South of Fort Duchesne, Utah	ca. 1940	The principal building on this agricultural property is one-story, single-family manufactured home which postdates the outbuildings. The ca. 1990 dwelling exhibits elements of Late Twentieth Century Other style. The foundation is concrete, and cladding is vinyl siding. The roof is side-gable with a small front-facing cross-gable over the entrance and is covered in corrugated metal sheeting. Two contributing outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible		Craig
150090019 (Uintah)	5885 East 4000 South Approximately 2.5 miles west of the intersection with South 7500 East Approximately 4.75 miles of US 40 between MP 121 and 122 South of Fort Duchesne, Utah	ca. 1910	The principal building on this agricultural property is a two-story dwelling. Exterior wall cladding is wood and corrugated metal. The gable, salt-box-like roof is clad in plywood and standing-seam metal. Style and alterations not discernable due to restricted access and limited visibility from the right-of-way. Six contributing and two non-contributing outbuildings were observed.	Undetermined Unknown		Craig









Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
150090001 (Uintah)	6134 East 4000 South Approximately 2.5 miles west of the intersection with South 7500 East Approximately 4.75 miles of US 40 between MP 121 and 122 South of Fort Duchesne, Utah	ca. 1920	The animal facility is a one-story loafing shed with diagonal board siding and shed roof. Roof material is missing. No other alterations were observed. Six contributing outbuildings were observed. These are isolated agricultural resources and not visibly associated with a principal dwelling or a larger farm or ranch.	NC Not eligible		Craig





Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
150090006 (Uintah)	? 4600 South 6500 East West of the intersection with South 7500 East Approximately 4.75 miles of US 40 between MP 121 and 122 South of Fort Duchesne, Utah	ca. 1910	A one-story agricultural (general) shed (miscellaneous) type building exhibiting Vernacular style (Early Twentieth Century Other). The walls consist of square-notched, round logs. The front-gable roof is covered in wood planks.  Alterations may include the large, double door entrance in the gable end wall, although this appears to be a historic-period alteration.  One contributing corral and one non-contributing outbuilding were observed.  These are isolated agricultural resources and not visibly associated with a principal dwelling or a larger farm or ranch.	EC NRHP Criterion A		Craig
150100008 (Uintah)	6975 East 4750 South West of the intersection with South 7500 East Approximately 4.75 miles of US 40 between MP 121 and 122 South of Fort Duchesne, Utah	ca. 1960	One-story, single-family, L-shaped dwelling exhibiting National Folk style (Late Twentieth Century: Other). Exterior cladding consists of stone veneer, brick veneer, and stucco. A front-gable roof with rear hip-roofed additions is covered in composite shingles.  Alterations include replacement cladding, windows, doors, and roofing. Front-gable addition to the main block.  Four contributing and one non-contributing outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible		Craig
150100006 (Uintah)	? 7018 East 4750 South West of the intersection with South 7500 East Approximately 4.75 miles of US 40 between MP 121 and 122 South of Fort Duchesne, Utah	ca. 1950	One-story, single-family Cape Cod type dwelling exhibiting characteristics of Minimal Traditional style. Exterior cladding is aluminum siding. The side-gable roof is covered with corrugated metal.  Alterations include replacement windows and siding. A shed roof volume has been added to one side.  Two non-contributing outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible		Craig


Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
No Parcel No. 9 (BLM) † (Uintah)	? Halfway Hollow Road Northeast of the intersection with US 40 between MP 132 and 133 Approximately 12 miles southwest of Vernal, Utah	ca. 1938	The animal facility is a corral constructed of wood posts and wood rails. BLM survey datum was observed identifying the agricultural property as "Twelve Mile Corral." No alterations were observed. No outbuildings were observed. This is an isolated agricultural resource and not visibly associated with a principal dwelling or a larger farm or ranch	EC NRHP Criterion A		Craig
060630030 (Uintah)	? 6277 South Alhandra Ferry Road Approximately 0.5 mile southeast of State Route 45 between MP 36 and 37 Southwest of Jensen, Utah	ca. 1975	One-story, single-family, double-wide manufactured home exhibiting elements of Late Twentieth Century: Other style. The foundation is concrete. The exterior cladding consists of brick veneer and wood sheet T1-11-type siding. The side-gable roof is covered with composite shingles. One contributing outbuilding and three non-contributing outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible		Craig
060790007 (Uintah)	? South 7100 East Approximately 4 miles south of US 40 near MP 154 Southwest of Jensen, Utah	ca. 1960	The animal facility is a small corral and loafing shed constructed of metal pipe posts and wire mesh. No alterations were observed. No outbuildings were observed. This is an isolated agricultural resource and not visibly associated with a principal dwelling or a larger farm or ranch.	NC Not eligible		Craig

Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
060790008 (Uintah)	? 8171 South 7100 East Approximately 4 miles south of US 40 near MP 154 Southwest of Jensen, Utah	ca. 1930	Dugout built into earthen mound with concrete block walls, formed concrete roof, and wood door. Alterations appear to include new concrete block walls and the concrete roof. No outbuildings were observed. This resource may be related to the ranch nearby on Parcel No. 060790004.	NC Not eligible		Craig
060790004 (Uintah)	? 8510 South 6950 East, Approximately 4 miles south of US 40 near MP 154 Southwest of Jensen, Utah	ca. 1890	The principal building on this agricultural property is a two-story, single-family dwelling exhibiting Late Twentieth Century: Other style. Exterior cladding consists of brick veneer, with aluminum siding on the upper story. The front-gable roof of the two-story volume is covered in ribbed metal and the hip-roofed rear wing is covered in corrugated metal. Although the house is not of historic age, the contributing outbuildings likely date to ca. 1890. Alterations include new roof cladding and replacement windows. One addition, either a story or additional volume, has been added to an older residence, although it is unclear which part of the building is the addition. Five contributing and four non-contributing outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible	 	Craig
070370003 (Uintah)	? 8501 South 6500 East (Goose Ranch Road) Approximately 4 miles south of US 40 near MP 154 Southwest of Jensen, Utah	ca. 1910	One-story, single-family dwelling. The walls are stacked round logs and the side-gable roof is covered in composite shingles. Access and visibility were limited. One non-contributing outbuilding was observed.	Undetermined Unknown		Craig




Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
070450011 (Uintah)	? 11401 South Red Wash Road Approximately 5 miles south of the intersection with US 40 between MP 157 and 158 Near Jensen, Utah	ca. 1950	The property is a historic-age ranch. The principal building is a one-story, single-family Late Twentieth Century Ranch type dwelling (ca. 1990). Exterior cladding is vinyl siding. The roof is side-gable. Although the house is not of historic age, the contributing outbuildings likely date to ca. 1950. Alterations to the property include replacement of the original residence. Five contributing outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible		Craig
070450019 (Uintah)	10268 South Red Wash Road Approximately 5 miles south of the intersection with US 40 between MP 57 and 158 Near Jensen Utah	ca. 1975	One-story, single-family, double-wide manufactured home. The exterior is clad with metal skirting and corrugated metal siding. The side-gable roof is covered with standing seam metal. Alterations include new roofing and replacement of the door and some windows. A shed-roofed porch has been added at the entrance. One non-contributing outbuilding was observed.	NC Not eligible		Craig
070470011 (Uintah)	? 10502 South Red Wash Road Approximately 6 miles south of the intersection with US 40 between MP 157 and 158 Near Jensen, Utah	ca. 1910	One-story, single-family, single-cell type dwelling exhibiting Vernacular style (Early Twentieth Century: Other). It stands on a log sill, which supports walls made of saddle-notched, round logs. The side-gable roof was covered with wood boards, a few of which are extant. Alterations consist of a wide opening cut into one side of the building to allow use as a livestock shelter. No outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible		Craig
070440006 (Uintah)	? 10802 South Red Wash Road Approximately 6.25 miles south of intersection with US 40 between MP 157 and 158 Near Jensen, Utah	ca. 1940	The animal facility is a corral constructed of wood posts and wood rails; located on open rangeland near the Green River. No significant alterations or additions were visible. This is an isolated agricultural resource and not visibly associated with a principal dwelling or a larger farm or ranch.	EC NRHP Criterion A		Craig



Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
070450009 (Uintah)	? 9120 South Red Wash Road Approximately 4 miles south of intersection with US 40 between MP 157 and 158 Near Jensen, Utah	ca. 1950	The principal building on this agricultural property is a one-story, single-family Early Ranch type dwelling. The foundation is concrete, the exterior is brick, and the roof is covered with composite shingles. Additions include a deck/porch. Two contributing and two non-contributing outbuildings were observed.	EC NRHP Criterion A		Craig
070530006 (Uintah)	? 9491 South Red Wash Road Approximately 4 miles south of intersection with US 40 between MP 157 and 158 Near Jensen, Utah	ca. 1950	The principal building on this agricultural property is a later-period one-story, single-family Late Twentieth Century Ranch type dwelling (ca. 1990). The house sits on a concrete foundation and is clad in log veneer siding. The roof is side-gable and covered in composite shingles. Although the house is not of historic age, the contributing outbuildings likely date to ca. 1950. Alterations to the property include construction of the modern dwelling and a large modern pole building. Five outbuildings were observed of which three are contributing and two are non-contributing.	NC Not eligible		Craig

Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
No Parcel No. 10 (BLM) ‡ (Uintah)	? Cow Wash Road Approximately 1.75 miles southwest of the intersection with US 40 between MP 165 and 166 Near Jensen, Utah	ca. 1910	Mine shaft with modern fencing and sign. No outbuildings were observed. This is an isolated mine shaft and not visibly associated with any buildings.	NC Not eligible		Craig
No Parcel No. 11 (BLM) ‡ (Uintah)	? Old Bonanza Highway Approximately 0.5 mile south of the intersection with US 40 between MP 168 and 169 Near Jensen, Utah	ca. 1910	The animal facility is a corral constructed of wood posts and barbed wire. No alterations were observed. No outbuildings were observed. This is an isolated agricultural resource and not visibly associated with a principal dwelling or a larger farm or ranch.	EC NRHP Criterion A		Craig
No Parcel No. 12 (BLM) ‡ (Uintah)	? K Creek Road Approximately 1.5 miles northeast of the intersection with US 40 between MP 169 and 170 Near Jensen, Utah	ca. 1950	Storage tank with formed concrete foundation and bolted sheet metal drum. The tank is disconnected from its original supply source. No outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible		Craig
2A-0357-0000 Resource A (Carbon)	? US 191 Northwest of the intersection with Emma Park Road near MP 259 Northeast of Castle Gate, Utah	ca. 1920	Stone bridge abutment used for the original alignment of US 191. Abutment is dressed and mortared ashlar masonry. The original road grade has stone rubble and earth overburden. Significant alterations include the removal of the original bridge and a change in the road alignment. No outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible		Whitmore Park

Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
2A-0357-0000B (Carbon) UDSH ID: 37458	? US 191 Northwest of the intersection with Emma Park Road near MP 259 Northeast of Castle Gate, Utah	1918	Monument dedicated to Governor Simon Bamberger. Erected by inmates of the Utah State Penitentiary. Monument stands on a slab of poured concrete (a later addition). The monument is made of stone from quarries near Kyune, Utah. It is carved with a beehive, the inscription "UTAH 1918/GOVERNOR BAMBERGER" and a flower; the base is inscribed with A. BARGAEHR/3159 SO. SATE. SALT LAK [sic]. It is surrounded by a chain link fence (a later addition).	ES NRHP Criteria A and C (Criteria Consideration F)		Whitmore Park
2A-0357-0000 Resource C (Carbon)	? US 191 Approximately 0.25 mile north of the intersection with Emma Park Road near MP 259 Northeast of Castle Gate, Utah	ca. 1930	The animal facility is a corral constructed of wood boards with railroad tie posts, juniper-pinyon posts, and wire fencing. Significant alterations consist of the addition of metal gates. No outbuildings were observed. This is an isolated agricultural resource and not visibly associated with a principal dwelling or a larger farm or ranch.	NC Not eligible		Whitmore Park
2A-0357-0000 Resource D (Carbon)	? US 191 West side of the road approximately 0.25 mile north of the intersection with Emma Park Road near MP 259 Northeast of Castle Gate, Utah	ca. 1920	Stone bridge abutment serving US 191. Abutment is dressed and mortared ashlar masonry. The road grade has stone rubble and earth overburden. Significant alterations include the removal of the original bridge and the installation of a metal pipe culvert in its place. No outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible		Whitmore Park
2A-0357-0000 Resource E (Carbon)	? Little Boulder Dam Rd West of the road approximately 0.25 mile north of intersection with Emma Park Road near MP 259 Northeast of Castle Gate, Utah	ca. 1930	Earthen berm dam, likely serving as a check dam based on design and size. No alterations were observed. No outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible		Whitmore Park



Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
2A-0338-0000 (Carbon)	? Jack Canyon Road North of Whitmore Park Road Approximately 1.75 miles east of intersection with US 191 near MP 260 Northeast of Castle Gate, Utah	ca. 1910	One-story, single-family, single-cell type log cabin exhibiting Vernacular (Early Twentieth Century: Other) style. The exterior is constructed of half-square notched, round logs with a side-gable roof clad with wood planks.  The building is somewhat deteriorated, with the east wall beginning to collapse. No discernable alterations were observed.  No outbuildings were observed.	EC NRHP Criterion A		Whitmore Park
2A-0425-0000 (Carbon)	? Whitmore Park Road Northeast of Whitmore Park Road Approximately 3.25 miles east of intersection with US 191 near MP 260 Northeast of Castle Gate, Utah	ca. 1905	One-story, single-family dwelling exhibiting Vernacular (Early Twentieth Century: Other) style. The exterior walls are clad with wood boards, and the front-gable roof is covered with asphalt roll roofing.  Alterations include the application of plastic sheeting over windows and the replacement of the original roofing.  Three contributing outbuildings and one non-contributing outbuilding were observed.	EC NRHP Criterion A		Whitmore Park
2A-0427-0000 (Carbon)	? Whitmore Park Road West of Whitmore Park Road Approximately 4 miles east of intersection with US 191 near MP 260 Northeast of Castle Gate, Utah	ca. 1920	The animal facility is a small corral constructed of wood posts and wood pole rails. The livestock chute is made of railroad ties and wood boards.  Alterations consist of the addition of metal gates; the livestock chute may also be a later addition.  No outbuildings were observed.  This is an isolated agricultural resource and not visibly associated with a principal dwelling or a larger farm or ranch.	NC Not eligible		Whitmore Park

Current Parcel Number (County)	Street Address*	Year Built	Property Description	Recommended UDSH Rating and NRHP Eligibility	Photograph	Within Proposed Routes
2A-0428-0000 (Carbon)	? Whitmore Park Road Approximately 0.5 mile west of Whitmore Park Road 3.75 miles east of intersection with US 191 near MP 260 Northeast of Castle Gate, Utah	ca. 1910	One-story, single-family, single-cell type log cabin exhibiting Vernacular (Early Twentieth Century: Other) style. The exterior is constructed of stacked logs with a front-gable roof. The building is deteriorated, with a collapsed roof. No discernable alterations were observed. No outbuildings were observed.	EC NRHP Criterion A		Whitmore Park
00-0034-6840 (Duchesne)	? County Road 29 Approximately 4 miles south of US 40 Southeast of Duchesne, Utah	ca. 1950	Oil well with a metal wellhead, polish rod, and motor. The wellhead is accessed via set of metal stairs. Significant alteration consists of the removal of the pumping unit. Two non-contributing outbuildings were observed.	NC Not eligible		Whitmore Park

Note: BLM = Bureau of Land Management, EC = eligible/contributing, ES = eligible/significant, NC = ineligible/non-contributing, NRHP = National Register of Historic Places; SITLA = State of Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration; UDSH = Utah Division of State History.

\* ? indicates an estimated address.

† Date estimate based on Lechert and Oliver (2014).

‡ For parcels under federal or state agency ownership, parcel data is not available. Those parcels that have been previously surveyed are labeled by UDSH Record ID. Newly surveyed parcels are in numeric order with the agency of ownership indicated in parentheses by BLM, SITLA, or USFS.

Preliminary review of the UDSH PreservationPro database identified 10 previously recorded properties with historic architectural resources (see Table 10). Of these, nine had been evaluated for NRHP eligibility including the Indian Canyon Ranger Station, which was listed in the NRHP in 1999. One property, Smith's Well, had no previous eligibility determination. It is currently recommended EC as it may be associated with historic events in the region; however, due to its lack of architectural integrity, the property may be more appropriately recorded as an archaeological site. Two properties previously determined ES (Record IDs 80452 and 79508) are now recommended NC due to a loss of integrity. Two previously recorded properties were not resurveyed due to lack of property access and lack of visibility from the right-of-way; because they were not recorded during the RLS these properties were not included in the results section of this report or in any of the following resource counts.

Of the 106 properties with resources of historic age that were surveyed for this project, five are recommended eligible/significant (ES); one of these, the Indian Canyon Ranger Station, is listed on the NRHP. Of the remaining properties, 25 are recommended eligible/contributing (EC), 68 are recommended ineligible/non-contributing (NC), and eight are of undetermined status (see Table 8).

Of the 106 surveyed properties, seven date to the Early Euro-American Settlement, Reservation Establishment, and Resource Development Period (ca. 1850–1904). Sixty-one date to the Permanent Settlement, Growth, and Development Period (1905–1948). Thirty-eight date to the Farming, Ranching, and Resource Extraction Period (1949–present).<sup>7</sup> An in-depth discussion of the classification of surveyed properties by use and style is provided separately for each alternative.

---

<sup>7</sup> Two properties falling within this period had principal buildings dating to ca. 1990. However, all properties also had outbuildings dating to before ca. 1950 and were therefore considered historic and still fall within this period.

**Table 10. Previously Documented Historic Architectural Resources in the Survey Area and Summary of Eligibility**

PreservationPro Property Record ID	Street Address	City	Property Name	Current Status	UDSH Rating/NRHP Eligibility per Previous Documentation	Notes	2019 Recommendation	Proposed Route
37458	U.S. Highway 191	Castle Gate, Utah	Bamberger Monument	Present	ES	N/A	ES	Whitmore Park
96905 <sup>*</sup>	8510 South 6950 East	Jensen, Utah	N/A	Present	NC		NC	Craig
80452 <sup>*</sup>	8516 South 6950 East	Jensen, Utah	N/A	Present	ES	Single Cell, Round Logs	EC	Craig
79508 <sup>*</sup>	8514 South 6950 East	Jensen, Utah	N/A	Present	ES	Crosswing, Round Logs	N/A	Craig
87804	N/A	Gusher, Utah	N/A	No access to property; resource not visible from right-of-way	OOP		N/A	Craig
78968	5650 East 5910 South	Jensen, Utah	cistern	No access to property; resource not visible from right-of-way	ES		N/A	Craig
42465	State Highway 33 and Forest Route 153	Duchesne Ranger District, Ashley National Forest	Indian Canyon Ranger Station	Present	ES	Listed in the NRHP	ES	Indian Canyon, Whitmore Park
28063	Wells Draw Road	Duchesne County, Utah	Smith's Well	Present	Undetermined		EC	Wells Draw
24191	U.S. Highway 191	Duchesne County, Utah	N/A	Present	EC		EC	Indian Canyon, Whitmore Park
125757	? 2301 East 8250 South	Myton, Utah	Andrle, Louis P. House	Present	EC	Did not appear in final SHPO data cut	EC	Wells Draw, Craig

Note: EC = eligible/contributing, ES = eligible/significant, N/A = not applicable, NC = ineligible/non-contributing, NRHP = National Register of Historic Places, OOP = ineligible/out of period, UDSH = Utah Division of State History.

<sup>\*</sup> Combined into a single property based on proximity, ownership information, and parcel boundaries. PreservationPro data provided to SHPO reflects this combination.

## Indian Canyon Proposed Route

In total, 38 properties with historic-age architectural resources were documented in the Indian Canyon Proposed Route survey area (Table 11; see Appendix A Figures A32–A62).

**Table 11. Summary of Architectural Resources of Historic Age in the Indian Canyon Proposed Route Survey Area**

Current Parcel Number	UDSH Rating	NRHP Eligibility	Within Proponent-Proposed Route or Survey Area Buffer
330700016	NC	Not eligible	Route
330840001	NC	Not eligible	Route
330970001	NC	Not eligible	Route
330970002	NC	Not eligible	Route
2A-0312-005F	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer
2A-0313-0000	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Route
2A-0312-0001	NC	Not eligible	Route
2A-0344-0000	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer
00-0028-1745	NC	Not eligible	Route
00-0011-0373	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Route
00-0011-0340	NC	Not eligible	Route
42465	ES	Eligible (Criteria A and C), Listed	Buffer
00-0010-8088	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer
00-0009-9329	ES	Eligible (Criteria A and C)	Route
00-0009-9287	ES	Eligible (Criteria A and C)	Route
00-0009-9154	NC	Not eligible	Route
00-0031-5370	NC	Not eligible	Route
00-0010-7882	NC	Not eligible	Route
00-0010-7965	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Route
00-0009-7562	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer
00-0009-7539	NC	Not eligible	Route
00-0009-7521	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0009-7505	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0009-5731	Undetermined	Unknown	Buffer
00-0028-9888	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0009-5632	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0009-5640	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0009-5608	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0009-5590	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0901-3552	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer
00-0034-0737	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0009-5335	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer

Current Parcel Number	UDSH Rating	NRHP Eligibility	Within Proponent-Proposed Route or Survey Area Buffer
00-0009-4684	Undetermined	Unknown	Buffer
00-0030-8217	NC	Not eligible	Route
00-0035-1072	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0009-5418	NC	Not eligible	Route
00-0009-3876	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer
170720004	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer

Note: EC = eligible/contributing, ES = eligible/significant, NC = ineligible/non-contributing, NRHP = National Register of Historic Places, UDSH = Utah Division of State History.

Preliminary review of the PreservationPro database identified two previously recorded properties with historic architectural resources within this proposed route (see Table 9). Of these, both had been evaluated for NRHP eligibility. One, the Indian Canyon Ranger Station (Parcel Number 42465), is considered ES and is listed on the NRHP; the other is considered EC (Parcel Number 00-0009-9329).

Of the 38 properties with resources of historic age that were surveyed for the Indian Canyon Proposed Route, three are recommended ES. Of the remaining properties, 11 are recommended EC, 22 are recommended NC, and two are of undetermined status. Of the 14 eligible properties, five are within the proposed route corridor and nine are within the 1 mile survey area buffer (see Table 11).

Of the 38 surveyed properties, three (8 percent) date to the Early Euro-American Settlement, Reservation Establishment, and Resource Development Period (ca. 1850–1904). Twenty-one (55 percent) date to the Permanent Settlement, Growth, and Development Period (1905–1948). Fourteen (37 percent) date to the Farming, Ranching, and Resource Extraction Period (1949–present).<sup>8</sup>

The primary uses of the three properties dating to before 1905 were agricultural and residential. The properties consist of one corral, one corral with an associated single dwelling (a single-cell vernacular log homestead cabin), and one single dwelling (also a single cell vernacular log homestead cabin).

Properties dating from between 1905 and 1948 encompass a wide variety of uses. The primary uses are residential (single dwelling or other) (76 percent), transportation-related (19 percent), and agricultural (5 percent). Fifteen single residences date to this period. Of the single residences, eight were also associated with agricultural uses of the property (such as farming or ranching). The building types and styles of the residences are further classified in Tables 12 and 13. Agricultural resources for the one property primarily used for agriculture consist of a miscellaneous agricultural shed. Other property types include the Indian Canyon Ranger Station, one railroad tunnel and three bridges (two constructed of logs and one of concrete).

**Table 12. Classification of Single Residences by Type, 1905–1948, in the Indian Canyon Proposed Route Survey Area**

Type	Number	Percent of Single Residences*
Other Residential Type	5	33
Single Cell	3	20
Rectangular Block	2	13

<sup>8</sup> Two properties falling within this period had principal buildings dating to outside of the historic era. However, both properties also had outbuildings dating to ca. 1950 and were therefore considered historic and still fall within this period.

Type	Number	Percent of Single Residences*
Double Cell	2	13
Hall-Parlor	1	7
Ranch/Rambler	1	7
Other Late Twentieth Century Type	1	7

\* Percent rounded to nearest whole number.

**Table 13. Classification of Single Residences by Style, 1905–1948, in the Indian Canyon Proposed Route Survey Area**

Style	Number	Percent of Single Residences*
Early Twentieth Century: Other	8	53
Other/Unclear Style	3	20
Manufactured Home (General)	1	7
Late Twentieth Century: Other	1	7
Ranch/Rambler (General)	1	7
Minimal Traditional	1	7

\* Percent rounded to nearest whole number.

Properties dating from 1948 to the present also encompass a wide variety of uses. The primary uses are residential (65 percent), agricultural (21 percent), industrial related (7 percent), and outdoor recreation (7 percent). Of the total, two were animal facilities (one was a corral, the other a loafing shed), and one was an agricultural shed. One building was an energy facility (the Myton pumping station), one was outdoor recreation related (a picnic area), and 9 were single residences. The building types and styles of the residences are further classified in Tables 14 and 15. Two of the residences were also associated with agricultural uses.

**Table 14. Classification of Single Residences by Type, 1948–Present, in the Indian Canyon Proposed Route Survey Area**

Type	Number	Percent of Single Residences*
Mobile Home	3	33
WWII-Era Cottage	1	11
Ranch/Rambler	2	22
Split Entry with Garage	2	22
Box Ranch	1	11

\* Percent rounded to nearest whole number.

**Table 15. Classification of Single Residences by Style, 1948–Present, in the Indian Canyon Proposed Route Survey Area**

Style	Number	Percent of Single Residences*
Mobile Home (Gen.)	3	33
Ranch/Rambler (Gen.)	1	11
Minimal Traditional	1	11
Split Entry (Gen.)	2	22
Box Ranch	1	11
Late 20 <sup>th</sup> Century: Other	1	11

\* Percent rounded to nearest whole number.

## Whitmore Park Proposed Route

In all, 48 properties with historic-age architectural resources were documented in the Whitmore Park Proposed Route survey area (Table 16; see Appendix B, Figures B34–B66).

**Table 16. Summary of Architectural Resources of Historic Age in the Whitmore Park Proposed Route Survey Area**

Current Parcel Number	UDSH Rating	NRHP Eligibility	Within Proponent-Proposed Route or Survey Area Buffer
330610001	Undetermined	Unknown	Buffer
330700016	NC	Not eligible	Route
330840001	NC	Not eligible	Route
330970001	NC	Not eligible	Route
330970002	NC	Not eligible	Route
2A-0312-005F	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer
330970015	Undetermined	Unknown	Route
2A-0344-0000	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Route
00-0028-1745	NC	Not eligible	Route
00-0011-0373	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Route
00-0011-0340	NC	Not eligible	Route
42465	ES	Eligible (Criteria A and C), Listed	Buffer
00-0010-8088	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer
00-0009-9329	ES	Eligible (Criteria A and C)	Route
00-0009-9287	ES	Eligible (Criteria A and C)	Route
00-0009-9154	NC	Not eligible	Route
00-0031-5370	NC	Not eligible	Route
00-0010-7882	NC	Not eligible	Route
00-0010-7965	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Route
00-0009-7562	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer
00-0009-7539	NC	Not eligible	Route
00-0009-7521	NC	Not eligible	Buffer



*Selective Reconnaissance-Level Survey of Historic Architectural Resources Along Proponent-Proposed Routes for the Uinta Basin Railway Project in Utah, Carbon, Duchesne, and Uintah Counties, Utah*

<b>Current Parcel Number</b>	<b>UDSH Rating</b>	<b>NRHP Eligibility</b>	<b>Within Proponent-Proposed Route or Survey Area Buffer</b>
00-0009-7505	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0009-5731	Undetermined	Unknown	Buffer
00-0028-9888	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0009-5632	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0009-5640	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0009-5608	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0009-5590	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0901-3552	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer
00-0034-0737	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0009-5335	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer
00-0009-4684	Undetermined	Unknown	Buffer
00-0030-8217	NC	Not eligible	Route
00-0035-1072	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0009-5418	NC	Not eligible	Route
00-0009-3876	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer
170720004	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer
2A-0357-0000A	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
2A-0357-0000B	ES	Eligible (Criteria A and C; Criteria Consideration F)	Buffer
2A-0357-0000C	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
2A-0357-0000D	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
2A-0357-0000E	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
2A-0338-0000	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer
2A-0425-0000	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Route
2A-0427-0000	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
2A-0428-0000	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer
00-0034-6840	NC	Not eligible	Buffer

Note: EC = eligible/contributing, ES = eligible/significant, NC = ineligible/non-contributing, NRHP = National Register of Historic Places, UDSH = Utah Division of State History.

Preliminary review of the PreservationPro database identified three previously recorded properties with historic architectural resources within this proposed route (see Table 8). Of these, all had been evaluated for NRHP eligibility. Two, the Indian Canyon Ranger Station (Parcel Number 42465) and Bamberger Monument (Parcel Number 2A-0357-0000B), are considered ES; the Indian Canyon Ranger Station is listed on the NRHP. The third (Parcel Number 00-0009-9329) is considered EC.

Of the 48 properties with resources of historic age that were surveyed for the Whitmore Park Proposed Route, four are recommended ES. Of the remaining properties, 13 are recommended EC, 27 are recommended NC, and four are of undetermined status. Of the 17 eligible properties, six are within the proposed route corridor and 11 are within the 1 mile survey area buffer (see Table 16).

Of the 48 surveyed properties, one (2 percent) dates to the Early Euro-American Settlement, Reservation Establishment, and Resource Development Period (ca. 1850–1904). Thirty-two (67 percent) date to the Permanent Settlement, Growth, and Development Period (1905–1948). Fifteen (31 percent) date to the Farming, Ranching, and Resource Extraction Period (1949–present).<sup>9</sup>

The primary uses of the one property dating to before 1905 was residential. The property is a single dwelling (a single cell vernacular log homestead cabin, Early Twentieth Century: Other style).

Properties dating from between 1905 and 1948 encompass a wide variety of uses. The primary uses are residential (single residences or other) (59 percent), agricultural (13 percent), transportation-related (19 percent), monument/marker (3 percent), other (3 percent), and unknown (3 percent). Agricultural property uses included one ranch, one individual agricultural building, and two corrals. One dam and one monument were also present. Other property uses include a USFS ranger station, one railroad tunnel, and five bridges (two log bridges, one concrete bridge, and two stone bridges), and one building of unknown use. Additionally, 18 single residences were observed, of which nine were also associated with agricultural uses. The building types and styles of the residences are further classified in Tables 17 and 18.

**Table 17. Classification of Single Residences by Type, 1905–1948, in the Whitmore Park Proposed Route Survey Area**

Type	Number	Percent of Single Residences*
Single Cell	6	33
Other Residential Type	5	28
Rectangular Block	2	11
Double Cell	2	11
Ranch/Rambler	1	6
Other Late Twentieth Century Type	1	6
Hall-Parlor	1	6

\* Percent rounded to nearest whole number.

**Table 18. Classification of Single Residences by Style, 1905–1948, in the Whitmore Park Proposed Route Survey Area**

Style	Number	Percent of Single Residences*
Early Twentieth Century: Other	9	50
Other/Unclear Style	5	28
Manufactured Home (General)	1	6
Late Twentieth Century: Other	1	6
Ranch/Rambler (General)	1	6
Minimal Traditional	1	6

\* Percent rounded to nearest whole number.

---

<sup>9</sup> Two properties falling within this period had principal buildings dating to outside of the historic era. However, both properties also had outbuildings dating to ca. 1950 and were therefore considered historic and still fall within this period.

Properties dating from 1948 to the present also encompass a wide variety of uses. The primary uses are residential (60 percent), agricultural (20 percent), industry and mining-related (13 percent), outdoor recreation (7 percent). Agricultural properties include a corral, a loafing shed, and a miscellaneous shed. One property was a mine, one was an energy facility (in Brutalist style), and one was an outdoor recreation property (a picnic area). Nine single residences also date to this period, two of which were also associated with agriculture. The building types and styles of the residences are further classified in Tables 19 and 20.

**Table 19. Classification of Single Residences by Type, 1948–present, in the Whitmore Park Proposed Route Survey Area**

Type	Number	Percent of Single Residences*
Mobile Home	3	33
Ranch/Rambler	2	22
Split Entry with Garage	2	22
World War II-Era Cottage	1	11
Box Ranch	1	11

\* Percent rounded to nearest whole number.

**Table 20. Classification of Single Residences by Style, 1948–present, in the Whitmore Park Proposed Route Survey Area**

Style	Number	Percent of Single Residences*
Mobile Home (General)	3	33
Ranch/Rambler (General)	1	11
Split Entry (General)	2	22
Minimal Traditional	1	11
Late Twentieth Century: Other	1	11
Box Ranch	1	11

\* Percent rounded to nearest whole number.

## Wells Draw Proposed Route

In all, 41 properties with historic-age architectural resources were documented in the Wells Draw Proposed Route survey area (Table 21; see Appendix C, Figures C32–C62).

**Table 21. Summary of Architectural Resources of Historic Age in the Wells Draw Proposed Route Survey Area**

Current Parcel Number	UDSH Rating	NRHP Eligibility	Within Proponent-Proposed Route or Survey Area Buffer
330700016	NC	Not eligible	Route
330840001	NC	Not eligible	Route
330970001	NC	Not eligible	Route
330970002	NC	Not eligible	Route

*Selective Reconnaissance-Level Survey of Historic Architectural Resources Along Proponent-Proposed Routes for the Uinta Basin Railway Project in Utah, Carbon, Duchesne, and Uintah Counties, Utah*

<b>Current Parcel Number</b>	<b>UDSH Rating</b>	<b>NRHP Eligibility</b>	<b>Within Proponent-Proposed Route or Survey Area Buffer</b>
2A-0312-005F	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer
2A-0313-0000	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Route
2A-0312-0001	NC	Not eligible	Route
2A-0344-0000	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer
00-0028-1745	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0009-5632	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0009-5608	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
170700002	Undetermined	Unknown	Buffer
170710009	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer
170720004	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Route
150310001A	NC	Not eligible	Route
150310001B	ES	Eligible (Criteria A and C)	Route
150300004	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer
150310019	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
150310018	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer
00-0009-4049	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0011-3799	Undetermined	Unknown	Buffer
No Parcel No. 1 (SITLA)	NC	Not eligible	Route
No Parcel No. 2 (SITLA)	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0035-0193	NC	Not eligible	Route
00-0011-5208	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Route
00-0032-2860	NC	Not eligible	Route
00-0011-5257	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer
No Parcel No. 3 (BLM)	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
No Parcel No. 4 (BLM)	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
No Parcel No. 5 (BLM)	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
No Parcel No. 6 (BLM)	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
No Parcel No. 7 (BLM)	NC	Not eligible	Route
28063	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer
No Parcel No. 8 (BLM)	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0034-1071	NC	Not eligible	Route
00-0009-4437	NC	Not eligible	Route
00-0009-4429	NC	Not eligible	Route
00-0011-0605	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0011-0571	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0028-0929	NC	Not eligible	Route
00-0009-4452	NC	Not eligible	Route

Note: BLM = Bureau of Land Management, EC = eligible/contributing, ES = eligible/significant, NC = ineligible/non-contributing, NRHP = National Register of Historic Places; SITLA = State of Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration; UDSH = Utah Division of State History.

Preliminary review of the PreservationPro database identified two previously recorded properties with historic architectural resources within this proposed route (see Table 8). One property, Smith’s Wells (Parcel Number 28063), has not been previously evaluated for NRHP eligibility. The other property (PreservationPro Record ID 125757) is considered EC.

Of the 41 properties with resources of historic age that were surveyed for the Wells Draw Proposed Route, one is recommended ES. Of the remaining properties, 10 are recommended EC, 28 are recommended NC, and two are of undetermined status. Of the 11 eligible properties, four are within the proposed route corridor and seven are within the 1-mile survey area buffer (see Table 20).

Of the 41 surveyed properties, six (14 percent) date to the Early Euro-American Settlement, Reservation Establishment, and Resource Development Period (ca. 1850–1904). Twenty-two (54 percent) date to the Permanent Settlement, Growth, and Development Period (1905–1948). Thirteen (32 percent) date to the Farming, Ranching, and Resource Extraction Period (1949–present).<sup>10</sup>

The primary uses of properties dating to before 1905 were residential (50 percent), agricultural (33 percent), and transportation (17 percent). These properties consist of one corral, one corral with an associated single dwelling (a single-cell vernacular log homestead cabin, three single residences (all single-cell log cabins, and one road transportation-related resource, Smith’s Wells.

Properties dating from between 1905 and 1948 encompass a wide variety of uses. The primary uses are residential (single or other) (50 percent), agricultural (22 percent), transportation-related (14 percent), and other (14 percent). These include agricultural properties including two miscellaneous sheds and three corrals. Three cairns were also identified. One railroad tunnel and two bridges were identified. Additionally, 10 single residences were observed, of which two were also associated with agricultural uses. The building types and styles of the residences are further classified in Tables 22 and 23.

**Table 22. Classification of Single Residences by Type, 1905–1948, in the Wells Draw Proposed Route Survey Area**

Type	Number	Percent of Single Residences*
Single Cell	4	40
Cape Cod	2	20
Other Residential Type	1	10
Other Late Twentieth Century Type	1	10
Double Cell	1	10
Hall-Parlor	1	10

\* Percent rounded to nearest whole number.

<sup>10</sup> One property falling within this period had principal buildings dating to outside of the historic era. However, the property also had outbuildings dating to ca. 1950 and was therefore considered historic and still falls within this period.

**Table 23. Classification of Single Residences by Style, 1905–1948, in the Wells Draw Proposed Route Survey Area**

Style	Number	Percent of Single Residences*
Early Twentieth Century: Other	4	40
Other/Unclear Style	3	30
Late Twentieth Century: Other	1	10
Minimal Traditional	1	10
Post–World War II: Other	1	10

\* Percent rounded to nearest whole number.

Properties dating from 1948 to the present also encompass a wide variety of uses. The primary uses are residential (54 percent), agricultural (38 percent), and outdoor recreation (8 percent). Agricultural properties include one miscellaneous shed, one Quonset hut, and three corrals. One outdoor recreation property (a picnic area) was also present. Additionally, 7 residential properties were also identified, of which two were also associated with agricultural uses. The building types and styles of the residences are further classified in Tables 24 and 25.

**Table 24. Classification of Single Residences by Type, 1948–present, in the Wells Draw Proposed Route Survey Area**

Type	Number	Percent of Single Residences*
Mobile Home	3	43
Ranch/Rambler	1	14
Other/Undefined	2	29
Box Ranch	1	14

\* Percent rounded to nearest whole number.

**Table 25. Classification of Single Residences by Style, 1948–present, in the Wells Draw Proposed Route Survey Area**

Style	Number	Percent of Single Residences*
Mobile Home (General )	3	43
Ranch/Rambler (General)	2	29
Other/Unclear Style	2	29

\* Percent rounded to nearest whole number.

## Craig Proposed Route

In all, 49 properties with historic-age architectural resources were documented in the Craig Proposed Route survey area (Table 26; see Appendix D, Figures D27–D52).

**Table 26. Summary of Architectural Resources of Historic Age in the Craig Proposed Route Survey Area**

Current Parcel Number	UDSH Rating	NRHP Eligibility	Within Proponent-Proposed Route or Survey Area Buffer
00-0009-5731	Undetermined	Unknown	Buffer
00-0028-9888	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0009-5632	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0009-5640	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0009-5608	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0009-4924	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0033-8493	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0009-5590	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
170700002	Undetermined	Unknown	Buffer
170700001	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
170710009	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer
170720004	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Route
150310001A	NC	Not eligible	Route
150310001B	ES	Eligible (Criteria A and C)	Route
150300004	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Route
150310019	NC	Not eligible	Route
150310018	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Route
00-0009-4049	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0009-6168	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0034-1071	NC	Not eligible	Route
00-0009-4437	NC	Not eligible	Route
00-0009-4429	NC	Not eligible	Route
00-0011-0605	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0011-0589	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0011-0571	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
00-0028-0929	NC	Not eligible	Route
00-0009-4452	NC	Not eligible	Route
150090016	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
150090012	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
150090019	Undetermined	Unknown	Buffer
150090001	NC	Not eligible	Route
150090006	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Route
150100008	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
150100006	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
No Parcel No. 9 (BLM)	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer
060630030	NC	Not eligible	Buffer

*Selective Reconnaissance-Level Survey of Historic Architectural Resources Along Proponent-Proposed Routes for the Uinta Basin Railway Project in Utah, Carbon, Duchesne, and Uintah Counties, Utah*

<b>Current Parcel Number</b>	<b>UDSH Rating</b>	<b>NRHP Eligibility</b>	<b>Within Proponent-Proposed Route or Survey Area Buffer</b>
060790007	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
060790008	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
060790004	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
070370003	Undetermined	Unknown	Buffer
070450011	NC	Not eligible	Route
070450019	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
070470011	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
070440006	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer
070450009	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer
070530006	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
No Parcel No. 10 (BLM)	NC	Not eligible	Buffer
No Parcel No. 11 (BLM)	EC	Eligible (Criterion A)	Buffer
No Parcel No. 12 (BLM)	NC	Not eligible	Buffer

Note: BLM = Bureau of Land Management, EC = eligible/contributing, ES = eligible/significant, NC = ineligible/non-contributing, NRHP = National Register of Historic Places, UDSH = Utah Division of State History.

Preliminary review of the PreservationPro database identified six previously recorded properties with historic architectural resources within this proposed route (see Table 8). Of these, all had been evaluated for NRHP eligibility. Three of the properties are considered ES (PreservationPro Record ID 78968 and two that fall on Parcel Number 060790004); one (PreservationPro Record ID 125757) is considered EC; one is considered NC (Parcel Number 060790004), and one is considered out of period (OOP) (PreservationPro Record ID 87804). As noted earlier, three of these previously recorded properties (SHPO Record IDs 96905, 80452, and 79508) are located on the same parcel and appear to be related; they therefore have been considered as a single property (Parcel Number 060790004) in the counts presented below.

Of the 49 properties with resources of historic age that were surveyed for the Craig Proposed Route, one is recommended ES. Of the remaining properties, nine are recommended EC, 35 are recommended NC, and four are of undetermined status. Of the 10 eligible properties, 5 are within the proposed route corridor and 5 are within the 1 mile survey area buffer (see Table 26).

Of the 49 surveyed properties, one (2 percent) dates to the Early Euro-American Settlement, Reservation Establishment, and Resource Development Period (ca. 1850–1904). Twenty-four (49 percent) date to the Permanent Settlement, Growth, and Development Period (1905–1948). Twenty-four (49 percent) date to the Farming, Ranching, and Resource Extraction Period (1949–present).<sup>11</sup>

Only one property dates to before 1905, a single-family residence with associated agricultural uses.

Properties dating from between 1905 and 1948 encompass a wide variety of uses. Agriculture was the primary use of 42 percent of properties, 50 percent of properties were primarily residential, 4 percent of properties were used for mining, and 4 percent of properties were used for other purposes. Agricultural properties included four general agricultural properties (three of which are ranches with multiple contributing non-residential buildings), four corrals, and one miscellaneous shed. One dugout was also

<sup>11</sup> One property falling within this period had principal buildings dating to outside of the historic era. However, the property also had outbuildings dating to ca. 1950 and was therefore considered historic and still falls within this period.



observed, and one property used for mining. Additionally, 12 single residences were observed, of which one was also associated with agricultural uses. The building types and styles of the residences are further classified in Tables 27 and 28.

**Table 27. Classification of Single Residences by Type, 1905–1948, in the Craig Proposed Route Survey Area**

Type	Number	Percent of Single Residences*
Single Cell	3	25
Other Residential Type	2	17
Cape Cod	2	17
World War II–Era Cottage	1	8
Other Late Twentieth Century Type	1	8
Double Cell	1	8
Hall-Parlor	1	8
Other/Undefined	1	8

\* Percent rounded to nearest whole number.

**Table 28. Classification of Single Residences by Style, 1905–1948, in the Craig Proposed Route Survey Area**

Style	Number	Percent of Single Residences*
Other/Unclear Style	5	42
Early Twentieth Century: Other	3	25
Minimal Traditional	2	17
Late Twentieth Century: Other	1	8
Post–World War II: Other	1	8

\* Percent rounded to nearest whole number.

Properties dating from 1948 to the present are primarily agricultural and residential. Agricultural uses composed 21 percent of primary uses for properties, residential composed 75 percent, and other uses composed 4 percent of primary uses. Agricultural properties include two ranches with multiple contributing non-residential buildings, one miscellaneous shed, one general agricultural property, and one corral. One storage tank dates to this period. Additionally, 18 single residences were observed, of which four were also associated with agricultural uses. The building types and styles of the residences are further classified in Tables 29 and 30.

**Table 29. Classification of Single Residences by Type, 1948–Present, in the Craig Proposed Route Survey Area**

Type	Number	Percent of Single Residences*
Ranch/Rambler	4	22
Mobile Home	4	22
Ranch with Garage	2	11
Manufactured Home	2	11

Type	Number	Percent of Single Residences*
Cape Cod	1	6
Split Entry with Garage	1	6
Box Ranch	1	6
Other Late Twentieth Century Type	1	6
Other/Undefined	1	6
Crosswing	1	6

\* Percent rounded to nearest whole number.

**Table 30. Classification of Single Residences by Style, 1948–Present, in the Craig Proposed Route Survey Area**

Style	Number	Percent of Single Residences*
Ranch/Rambler (General)	5	28
Mobile Home (General)	4	22
Manufactured Home (General)	2	11
Late Twentieth Century: Other	2	11
Split Entry (General)	1	6
Neo-Spanish/Mediterranean	1	6
Other/Unclear Style	2	11
Minimal Traditional	1	6

\* Percent rounded to nearest whole number.

## Landscape Level and District Considerations

Architectural resources are often part of broader cultural landscapes, which exist at multiple levels ranging in size and scope from the region as a whole to a townsite to a single farmstead. The Secretary of the Interior defines four types of cultural landscapes: historic designed landscapes, historic vernacular landscapes, historic sites, and ethnographic landscapes. Many of the Uinta Basin's architectural resources of historic age, particularly those historically used for agriculture, can be considered part of one or more interlinked vernacular landscapes. As defined by the National Park Service, a historic vernacular landscape is

a landscape that evolved through use by the people whose activities or occupancy shaped that landscape. Through social or cultural attitudes of an individual, family or a community, the landscape reflects the physical, biological, and cultural character of those everyday lives. Function plays a significant role in vernacular landscapes. They can be a single property such as a farm or a collection of properties such as a district of historic farms along a river valley. Examples include rural villages, industrial complexes, and agricultural landscapes. (Birnbaum 1994:1)

In the Uinta Basin, the vernacular landscape (which includes both farming and ranching) can best be viewed as a series of features organized from top to bottom—from the most general to the most specific. Thus, we begin by looking at the land itself, from which can be identified parts of the region suitable for agricultural production, ranching, or potentially even for mining. A second level of organization places the Uinta Basin within the context of the regional economy, which depended on markets found mainly to the west in Salt Lake City, south in Carbon County, and east in Colorado; this level also includes consideration of proximity to transportation routes associated with access to those distant markets. Next are the principal kinds of permanent or transitory settlement, a landscape category that includes towns and villages. The Uinta Basin is unique within Utah for its patterns of settlement. Some early permanent settlements in the region were established by members of the Ute, often in association with the Bureau of Indian Affairs; Euro-American settlement in the region was also unusual in Utah both for its late start (generally after ca. 1905) and for the mix of Church members and non-Latter-day Saint settlers. These cultural differences, however, occur mostly at the level of community organization and fade considerably at the final level of the actual buildings and features, particularly those associated with agricultural practice.

Rural historic districts are those areas within the larger vernacular landscape that retain sufficient integrity to convey the significance of important historic themes and therefore may be eligible for listing on the NRHP. A rural historic district is defined as “a geographic area that historically has been used by people, or shaped or modified by human activity, occupancy, or intervention, and that possesses a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of areas of land use, vegetation, buildings and structures, roads and waterways, and natural features” (NPS 1999:3). Based on RLS results, there is potential for rural historic districts to be present within the larger vernacular landscape of the survey area. Key themes when considering potential rural districts in the survey area reflect the history of the region and include mining, agriculture, and settlement.

Mining, an important industry in much of the Uinta Basin, represents a potential theme under which a rural historic district might be significant. While such districts and landscapes likely exist in the Uinta Basin as a whole, few mining-related resources were observed within the survey area. As a result, no part of the survey area has the potential to qualify as a rural historic district under this theme.

Vernacular landscapes with the potential to qualify as rural historic districts related to agriculture do exist within the survey area. Indian Canyon, which is well defined geographically and has a relatively high

concentration of NRHP-listed or potentially eligible agricultural properties, is one such potential district but it lacks integrity due to modern intrusions such as numerous new roads and well pads associated with the oil and gas industry. Other parts of the survey area, such as in the vicinity of Myton and Argyle Canyon (on the Wells Draw route), also have a comparatively high proportion of potentially NRHP-eligible agricultural properties. The Myton area does not retain sufficient integrity to convey the theme of agriculture, also because of oil and gas industry intrusions, but Argyle Canyon likely retains sufficient integrity to convey this theme and may be eligible for the NRHP as a rural historic district; although recreational development has occurred on the slopes of the canyon, this development has largely occurred in areas outside the boundaries of where agriculture historically occurred and therefore has not reduced its integrity.

The areas around Indian Canyon and Argyle Canyon also reflect historic patterns of exploration and settlement and have significance in the area of exploration and settlement. However, Indian Canyon does not retain sufficient integrity to convey this theme because of modern oil and gas industry infrastructure and the presence of modern US 191. Argyle Canyon also lacks integrity because of later-period recreation development in the form of numerous cabins and small lodges. Therefore neither area is recommended eligible for the NRHP as a rural historic district under the theme of exploration and settlement.

Additional research will be required to concretely identify, assess, and create boundaries for areas of the survey area that are potentially NRHP eligible as rural historic districts under the theme of agriculture. In summary, however, based on RLS results, the potential for these landscape-level districts does exist within the survey area. The potential for ethnographic landscapes may also be present but this requires further research and documentation in collaboration with ethnographic groups in the Uinta Basin, particularly Ute Tribal members.

## SUMMARY

In total, 106 historic architectural resources were recorded and evaluated using UDSH standards and NRHP criteria as part of the survey. Historic architectural resources in the survey area range in construction date from ca. 1890 to ca. 1975 and in type from cairns to residences. Of the 106 properties with resources of historic age that were surveyed for this project, seven date to the Early Euro-American Settlement, Reservation Establishment, and Resource Development Period (ca. 1850–1904). Sixty-one date to the Permanent Settlement, Growth, and Development Period (1905–1948). Thirty-eight date to the Farming, Ranching, and Resource Extraction Period (1949–present). Primary uses of properties are residential (single-family dwelling and other) (56 percent), agricultural (26 percent), transportation-related (6 percent), other (6 percent), industrial or mining-related (3 percent), monument/marker (1 percent), outdoor recreation (1 percent), and unknown (1 percent).

The number of recorded properties and an overview of eligibility recommendations for each proposed route is presented in Table 31. Information about the location of the eligible properties for each proposed route is provided in Tables 32 through 35.

**Table 31. Number of Recorded Properties by Proponent-Proposed Route**

Proponent-Proposed Route	Number of Recorded Properties	Number Recommended Eligible/Significant (ES)	Number Recommended Eligible/Contributing (EC)	Number Recommended Not Eligible/Non-Contributing (NC)	Undetermined
Indian Canyon	38	3	11	22	2
Whitmore Park	48	4	13	27	4
Wells Draw	41	1	10	28	2
Craig (Utah)	49	1	9	35	4

**Table 32. Eligible Properties in the Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route**

Parcel Number	Address	Proponent-Proposed Route or Survey Area Buffer
2A-0312-005F	? US Highway 6	Buffer
2A-0313-0000	? Emma Park Road	Buffer
2A-0344-0000	? Quarry Road	Buffer
00-0011-0373	22881 South US 191	Route
42465	? Forest Route 153	Buffer
00-0010-8088	? Right Fork Indian Canyon Road	Buffer
00-0009-9329	? US Highway 191	Route
00-0009-9287	? US Highway 191	Route
00-0010-7965	? 16251 South US Highway 191	Route
00-0009-7562	? Sowers Canyon Road	Buffer
00-0901-3552	? South 4500 West	Buffer
00-0009-5335	? 4365 West 10000 South	Buffer
00-0009-3876	? 10791 South 3000 West	Buffer
170720004	? 8656 South 3500 East	Buffer

**Table 33. Eligible Properties in the Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route**

Parcel Number	Address	Proponent-Proposed Route or Survey Area Buffer
2A-0312-005F	? US Highway 6	Buffer
2A-0344-0000	? Quarry Road	Route
00-0011-0373	22881 South US 191	Route
42465	? Forest Route 153	Buffer
00-0010-8088	? Right Fork Indian Canyon Road	Buffer
00-0009-9329	? US Highway 191	Route
00-0009-9287	? US Highway 191	Route
00-0010-7965	? 16251 South US Highway 191	Route
00-0009-7562	? Sowers Canyon Road	Buffer
00-0901-3552	? South 4500 West	Buffer
00-0009-5335	? 4365 West 10000 South	Buffer
00-0009-3876	? 10791 South 3000 West	Buffer
170720004	? 8656 South 3500 East	Buffer
2A-0357-0000B	? US Highway 191	Buffer
2A-0338-0000	? Jack Canyon Road	Buffer
2A-0425-0000	? Whitmore Park Road	Route
2A-0428-0000	? Whitmore Park Road	Buffer

**Table 34. Eligible Properties in the Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route**

Parcel Number	Address	Proponent-Proposed Route or Survey Area Buffer
2A-0312-005F	? US Highway 6	Buffer
2A-0313-0000	? Emma Park Road	Route
2A-0344-0000	? Quarry Road	Buffer
170710009	? 2301 East 8250 South	Buffer
170720004	? 8656 South 3500 East	Route
150310001B	? At the intersection of South 3500 East and Myton Townsite Canal Road	Route
150300004	3809 East 8000 South	Buffer
150310018	? 4124 East 8000 South	Buffer
00-0011-5208	? Argyle Canyon Road	Route
00-0011-5257	? 30259 West Argyle Canyon Road	Buffer
28063	? Wells Draw Road	Buffer

**Table 35. Eligible Properties in the Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Utah)**

Parcel Number	Address	Proponent-Proposed Route or Survey Area Buffer
170710009	? 2301 East 8250 South	Buffer
170720004	? 8656 South 3500 East	Route
150310001B	? At the intersection of South 3500 East and Myton Townsite Canal Road	Route
150300004	3809 East 8000 South	Route
150310018	? 4124 East 8000 South	Route
150090006	? 4600 South 6500 East	Route
No Parcel No. 9 (BLM)	? Halfway Hollow Road	Buffer
070440006	? 10802 South Red Wash Road	Buffer
070450009	? 9120 South Red Wash Road	Buffer
No Parcel No. 11 (BLM)	? Old Bonanza Highway	Buffer

Based on background research, the survey area has the potential for NRHP-eligible districts to be present at the landscape level relating to the themes of mining, agriculture, and settlement. Based on observations during the survey, however, no area has the potential to qualify as a rural historic district under the themes of mining and settlement. Argyle Canyon may qualify as a rural historic district under the theme of agriculture, but additional research will be required to concretely identify, assess, and create boundaries for such a district. The potential for ethnographic landscapes may also be present but this requires further research and documentation in collaboration with ethnographic groups in the Uinta Basin, particularly Ute Tribal members.

## REFERENCES CITED

Barton, John D.

- 1998 *A History of Duchesne County*. Utah State Historical Society, Salt Lake City.
- 2012a Roosevelt. Available at: [https://www.uen.org/utah\\_history\\_encyclopedia/r/ROOSEVELT.shtml](https://www.uen.org/utah_history_encyclopedia/r/ROOSEVELT.shtml). Accessed June 24, 2019.
- 2012b Duchesne. Available at: [https://www.uen.org/utah\\_history\\_encyclopedia/d/DUSCHENE.shtml](https://www.uen.org/utah_history_encyclopedia/d/DUSCHENE.shtml). Accessed June 24, 2019.

Birnbaum, Charles A.

- 1994 *Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment and Management of Historic Landscapes*. Preservation Brief 36. National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services, Washington, D.C.

Bishop, M. Guy

- 1997 *History of Sevier County*. Utah State Historical Society, Salt Lake City.

Brusca, Frank

- 2019 History of the National Road and U.S. Route 40. Available at: <http://www.route40.net>. Accessed October 7, 2019.

Burton, Doris Karren

- 1996 *A History of Uintah County: Scratching the Surface*. Utah Centennial County History Series. Utah State Historical Society, Salt Lake City.

Carr, Stephen

- 1972 *The Historical Guide to Utah Ghost Towns*. Western Epics, Salt Lake City.

Cornia, Reed W.

- 1998 Land Conflict in the Uintah Basin: The Anglo and Native American Struggle for Control of the Uintah-Ouray Reservation's Natural Resources. M.S. thesis, Department of History, Utah State University.

Deseret News

- 1861 Uinta Not What Was Represented. *Deseret News*. 25 September:11(22). Salt Lake City, Utah.

Duncan, Clifford

- 2000 The Northern Utes of Utah. Excerpted from A History of Utah's American Indians. Available at: <https://muse.jhu.edu/book/9400>. Accessed June 24, 2019.



Forstall, Richard L.

- 1995 Utah: Population of Counties by Decennial Census: 1900 to 1990. Population Division, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C. Available at: <https://www.census.gov/population/cencounts/ut190090.txt>. Accessed October 7, 2019.

Hittman, Michael

- 2013 *Great Basin Indians: An Encyclopedic History*. University of Nevada Press, Reno.

Holzapfel, Richard Neitzel

- 1999 *A History of Utah County*. Utah Centennial County History Series. Utah State Historical Society, Utah County Commission, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Jenson, H. Bert

- 1993 Smith Wells, Stagecoach Inn on the Nine Mile Road. *Utah Historical Quarterly* 61(2):182–97.

Johnson, Michael W.

- 1998 *A History of Daggett County: A Modern Frontier*. Utah State Historical Society, Salt Lake City.

Lechert, Stephanie, and Anne Oliver

- 2014 *Selective Reconnaissance-Level Survey of Historic Properties Along Proposed Railroad Alignments for the Uinta Basin Railroad Study in Uintah, Duchesne, Carbon, and Utah Counties, Utah*. DRAFT. Prepared for HDR Engineering, Inc. SWCA Environmental Consultants.

Mead & Hunt, Inc.

- 2011 *Utah Historic Bridge Inventory: Historic Bridge Context, Statehood–1965*, Vol. 1. Prepared for Utah Department of Transportation. Mead & Hunt, Inc.

National Park Service (NPS)

- 1997 *National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service. Washington, D.C.
- 1999 *National Register Bulletin: Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes*. Revised ed. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service. Washington, D.C.
- 2018 The Uintah Railway. Available at: <https://www.nps.gov/dino/learn/historyculture/the-uintah-railway.htm>. Accessed September 19, 2019.

Nebraska Studies

- 2019 The Dawes Act, 1887. Available at: <http://www.nebraskastudies.org/1875-1899/the-dawes-act/>. Accessed October 7, 2019.

Schirer, David L.

- 2019 Fort Duchesne. Available at: [https://www.uen.org/utah\\_history\\_encyclopedia/f/FORT\\_DUCHESNE.shtml](https://www.uen.org/utah_history_encyclopedia/f/FORT_DUCHESNE.shtml). Accessed October 7, 2019.

Smaby, Beverly P.

- 1975 The Mormons and the Indians: Conflicting Ecological Systems in the Great Basin. *American Studies* 16(1):35–48.

Spangler, Jerry D.

- 2002 *Paradigms and Perspectives Revisited: A Class I Overview of Cultural Resources in the Uinta Basin and Tavaputs Plateau*. Prepared for Bureau of Land Management, Vernal Field Office. Uinta Research, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Strack, Don

- 2019 Rio Grande in Utah, 1908 to 1988. Available at: <http://utahrails.net/drgw/rg-in-ut-1908-1988.php>. Accessed September 19, 2019.

U.S. Bureau of the Census

- 2019 Roosevelt City, Utah: QuickFacts from the US Census Bureau. Available at: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/rooseveltcityutah>. Accessed October 7, 2019.

Utah American Indian Digital Archive

- 2008 History: The Northern Utes. Available at: <https://utahindians.org/archives/ute/history.html>. Accessed October 7, 2019.

Utah Division of State History (UDSH)

- 2019 1861 and Beyond: Uintah Reservation. Available at: [http://ilovehistory.utah.gov/time/stories/uintah\\_reservation.html](http://ilovehistory.utah.gov/time/stories/uintah_reservation.html). Accessed October 7, 2019.

Watt, Ronald G.

- 1997 *A History of Carbon County*. Utah Centennial County History Series. Utah State Historical Society, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Willison, George F., editor

- n.d. [1940] History of Grazing in Utah. Chapter V: Growing Crisis on the Range. Mss B 100, Box 1, Folder 7. Manuscript on file at Utah State Historical Society, Salt Lake City.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route**






Figure A1. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 1 of 31).




Figure A2. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 2 of 31).




Figure A3. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 3 of 31).




Figure A4. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 4 of 31).






Figure A5. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 5 of 31).




Figure A6. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 6 of 31).




Figure A7. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 7 of 31).




Figure A8. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 8 of 31).




Figure A9. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 9 of 31).




Figure A10. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 10 of 31).




Figure A11. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 11 of 31).




Figure A12. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 12 of 31).






Figure A13. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 13 of 31).




Figure A14. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 14 of 31).




Figure A15. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 15 of 31).




Figure A16. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 16 of 31).




Figure A17. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 17 of 31).




Figure A18. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 18 of 31).




Figure A19. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 19 of 31).




Figure A20. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 20 of 31).






Figure A21. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 21 of 31).




Figure A22. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 22 of 31).




Figure A23. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 23 of 31).




Figure A24. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 24 of 31).




Figure A25. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 25 of 31).




Figure A26. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 26 of 31).




Figure A27. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 27 of 31).




Figure A28. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 28 of 31).






Figure A29. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 29 of 31).




Figure A30. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 30 of 31).




Figure A31. Detailed project location maps for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 31 of 31).




Figure A32. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 1 of 31).




Figure A33. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 2 of 31).




Figure A34. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 3 of 31).




Figure A35. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 4 of 31).




Figure A36. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 5 of 31).






Figure A37. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 6 of 31).




Figure A38. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 7 of 31).




Figure A39. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 8 of 31).




Figure A40. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 9 of 31).




Figure A41. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 10 of 31).



Figure A42. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 11 of 31).



Figure A43. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 12 of 31).



Figure A44. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 13 of 31).






Figure A45. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 14 of 31).




Figure A46. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 15 of 31).




Figure A47. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 16 of 31).



Figure A48. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 17 of 31).




Figure A49. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 18 of 31).




Figure A50. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 19 of 31).




Figure A51. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 20 of 31).




Figure A52. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 21 of 31).






Figure A53. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 22 of 31).




Figure A54. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 23 of 31).




Figure A55. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 24 of 31).




Figure A56. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 25 of 31).




Figure A57. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 26 of 31).




Figure A58. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 27 of 31).




Figure A59. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 28 of 31).




Figure A60. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 29 of 31).






Figure A61. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 30 of 31).




Figure A62. Detailed results map for Indian Canyon Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 31 of 31).

## **APPENDIX B**

### **Maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route**






Figure B1. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 1 of 33).




Figure B2. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 2 of 33).




Figure B3. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 3 of 33).




Figure B4. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 4 of 33).






Figure B5. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 5 of 33).




Figure B6. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 6 of 33).




Figure B7. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 7 of 33).




Figure B8. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 8 of 33).




Figure B9. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 9 of 33).




Figure B10. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 10 of 33).




Figure B11. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 11 of 33).




Figure B12. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 12 of 33).






Figure B13. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 13 of 33).




Figure B14. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 14 of 33).




Figure B15. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 15 of 33).




Figure B16. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 16 of 33).




Figure B17. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 17 of 33).




Figure B18. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 18 of 33).




Figure B19. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 19 of 33).




Figure B20. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 20 of 33).






Figure B21. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 21 of 33).




Figure B22. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 22 of 33).




Figure B23. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 23 of 33).




Figure B24. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 24 of 33).




Figure B25. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 25 of 33).




Figure B26. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 26 of 33).




Figure B27. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 27 of 33).




Figure B28. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 28 of 33).






Figure B29. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 29 of 33).




Figure B30. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 30 of 33).




Figure B31. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 31 of 33).




Figure B32. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 32 of 33).




Figure B33. Detailed project location maps for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 33 of 33).




Figure B34. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 1 of 33).




Figure B35. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 2 of 33).




Figure B36. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 3 of 33).






Figure B37. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 4 of 33).




Figure B38. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 5 of 33).




Figure B39. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 6 of 33).




Figure B40. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 7 of 33).



Figure B41. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 8 of 33).




Figure B42. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 9 of 33).




Figure B43. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 10 of 33).




Figure B44. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 11 of 33).





Figure B45. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 12 of 33).



Figure B46. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 13 of 33).



Figure B47. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 14 of 33).



Figure B48. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 15 of 33).




Figure B49. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 16 of 33).




Figure B50. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 17 of 33).




Figure B51. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 18 of 33).



Figure B52. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 19 of 33).






Figure B53. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 20 of 33).




Figure B54. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 21 of 33).




Figure B55. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 22 of 33).




Figure B56. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 23 of 33).




Figure B57. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 24 of 33).




Figure B58. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 25 of 33).




Figure B59. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 26 of 33).




Figure B60. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 27 of 33).






Figure B61. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 28 of 33).




Figure B62. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 29 of 33).




Figure B63. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 30 of 33).




Figure B64. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 31 of 33).




Figure B65. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 32 of 33).




Figure B66. Detailed results map for Whitmore Park Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 33 of 33).

## **APPENDIX C**

### **Maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route**








Figure C1. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 1 of 31).




Figure C2. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 2 of 31).




Figure C3. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 3 of 31).




Figure C4. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 4 of 31).




Figure C5. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 5 of 31).




Figure C6. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 6 of 31).




Figure C7. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 7 of 31).




Figure C8. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 8 of 31).






Figure C9. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 9 of 31).




Figure C10. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 10 of 31).




Figure C11. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 11 of 31).




Figure C12. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 12 of 31).




Figure C13. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 13 of 31).




Figure C14. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 14 of 31).




Figure C15. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 15 of 31).




Figure C16. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 16 of 31).






Figure C17. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 17 of 31).




Figure C18. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 18 of 31).




Figure C19. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 19 of 31).




Figure C20. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 20 of 31).




Figure C21. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 21 of 31).




Figure C22. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 22 of 31).




Figure C23. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 23 of 31).




Figure C24. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 24 of 31).






Figure C25. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 25 of 31).




Figure C26. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 26 of 31).




Figure C27. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 27 of 31).




Figure C28. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 28 of 31).




Figure C29. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 29 of 31).




Figure C30. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 30 of 31).




Figure C31. Detailed project location maps for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 31 of 31).




Figure C32. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 1 of 31).






Figure C33. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 2 of 31).




Figure C34. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 3 of 31).




Figure C35. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 4 of 31).




Figure C36. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 5 of 31).




Figure C37. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 6 of 31).




Figure C38. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 7 of 31).




Figure C39. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 8 of 31).




Figure C40. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 9 of 31).





Figure C41. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 10 of 31).




Figure C42. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 11 of 31).



Figure C43. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 12 of 31).




Figure C44. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 13 of 31).




Figure C45. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 14 of 31).



Figure C46. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 15 of 31).




Figure C47. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 16 of 31).




Figure C48. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 17 of 31).






Figure C49. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 18 of 31).




Figure C50. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 19 of 31).




Figure C51. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 20 of 31).




Figure C52. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 21 of 31).




Figure C53. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 22 of 31).



Figure C54. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 23 of 31).




Figure C55. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 24 of 31).




Figure C56. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 25 of 31).





Figure C57. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 26 of 31).




Figure C58. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 27 of 31).




Figure C59. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 28 of 31).




Figure C60. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 29 of 31).




Figure C61. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 30 of 31).




Figure C62. Detailed results map for Wells Draw Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 31 of 31).

## **APPENDIX D**

### **Maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route**








Figure D1. Detailed project location maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 1 of 26).




Figure D2. Detailed project location maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 2 of 26).




Figure D3. Detailed project location maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 3 of 26).




Figure D4. Detailed project location maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 4 of 26).




Figure D5. Detailed project location maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 5 of 26).




Figure D6. Detailed project location maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 6 of 26).




Figure D7. Detailed project location maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 7 of 26).




Figure D8. Detailed project location maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 8 of 26).






Figure D9. Detailed project location maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 9 of 26).




Figure D10. Detailed project location maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 10 of 26).




Figure D11. Detailed project location maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 11 of 26).




Figure D12. Detailed project location maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 12 of 26).




Figure D13. Detailed project location maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 13 of 26).



Figure D14. Detailed project location maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 14 of 26).




Figure D15. Detailed project location maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 15 of 26).




Figure D16. Detailed project location maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 16 of 26).






Figure D17. Detailed project location maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 17 of 26).




Figure D18. Detailed project location maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 18 of 26).




Figure D19. Detailed project location maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 19 of 26).




Figure D20. Detailed project location maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 20 of 26).





Figure D21. Detailed project location maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 21 of 26).



FigureD22. Detailed project location maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 22 of 26).




Figure D23. Detailed project location maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 23 of 26).




Figure D24. Detailed project location maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 24 of 26).






Figure D25. Detailed project location maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 25 of 26).




Figure D26. Detailed project location maps for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (USGS quadrangle maps) (Map 26 of 26).




Figure D27. Detailed results map for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 1 of 26).




Figure D28. Detailed results map for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 2 of 26).




Figure D29. Detailed results map for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 3 of 26).




Figure D30. Detailed results map for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 4 of 26).




Figure D31. Detailed results map for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 5 of 26).




Figure D32. Detailed results map for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 6 of 26).






Figure D33. Detailed results map for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 7 of 26).



Figure D34. Detailed results map for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 8 of 26).




Figure D35. Detailed results map for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 9 of 26).




Figure D36. Detailed results map for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 10 of 26).




Figure D37. Detailed results map for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 11 of 26).




Figure D38. Detailed results map for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 12 of 26).




Figure D39. Detailed results map for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 13 of 26).



Figure D40. Detailed results map for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 14 of 26).






Figure D41. Detailed results map for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 15 of 26).




Figure D42. Detailed results map for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 16 of 26).




Figure D43. Detailed results map for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 17 of 26).




Figure D44. Detailed results map for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 18 of 26).




Figure D45. Detailed results map for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 19 of 26).




Figure D46. Detailed results map for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 20 of 26).




Figure D47. Detailed results map for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 21 of 26).




Figure D48. Detailed results map for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 22 of 26).






Figure D49. Detailed results map for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 23 of 26).




Figure D50. Detailed results map for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 24 of 26).




Figure D51. Detailed results map for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 25 of 26).




Figure D52. Detailed results map for Craig Proponent-Proposed Route (Map 26 of 26).