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PROJECT SUMMARY

Drayton Archaeology was contracted to conduct the present archaeological investigation at the request of Paul Pittman, of Element Solutions to satisfy compliance with Skagit County SEPA for the proposed mining activities at the Marblemount Quarry near the town of Marblemount, Skagit County, Washington.

Drayton’s cultural resources assessment consisted of background review, field investigation, and production of this report. Background review determined that the project area is located in an area of low probability for cultural materials. Most of the project area is on a steep talus slope, and rock face unsuitable for human occupation. The lower flat area located in the western portion of the project is suitable for human occupation, but is still about a half a mile to the shores of the Skagit River.

During the course of the present work no archaeological materials of historic or precontact association were observed aside from a few old growth stumps associated with early logging activity in the area. Given the terrain and condition of the area geology, it seems most unlikely that archaeological materials, let alone, intact deposits will be encountered based upon the scope and location of the proposed work. Based upon the result of this review, Drayton Archaeology recommends that the project proceed without further archaeological oversight.

REGULATORY CONTEXT

The regulatory environment for the present project is compliance with State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) procedures. Through the SEPA process the project has been reviewed by the Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) and the present review was mandated. DAHP cultural resource management laws and regulations are defined under the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 27.53 Archaeological Sites and Resources; RCW 27.44 Indian Graves and Records; and RCW 68.50.645 Skeletal Human Remains—Duty to Notify. The latter regulation provides a strict process for notification of law enforcement and other interested parties in the event of the discovery of any human remains, regardless of inferred cultural affiliation. The cultural resources report should be reviewed by the Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) and all pertinent tribal agencies.
PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION

The Proposed Project includes boundary line adjustments, site clearing, site grading road building, quarry operations, and reclamation of a bedrock quarry on Rockport Cascade Road approximately one mile south of Marblemount, Skagit County, Washington, in Section 24, Township 35 North, Range 10 East, of the Willamette Meridian (Figure 1). The Proposed Project will involve development activities on parcels P45543, P128574, P120304, P45550, and parts of P45548 and P45541 (Figure 2). A majority of the mining would take place on P45543, which has been used as a small-scale quarry (under 3 acres) over the past several decades. The overall project limit footprint at full buildout is approximately 120 acres. At full buildout, the proposed mining footprint would encompass approximately 30 acres (20 acres proposed for Phase I); quarry operations—including roads, stockpile areas, stormwater management, and operations areas—would encompass approximately 60 acres; and approximately 30 acres would be retained vegetation areas.

Currently, stands of second-growth timber cover a majority of the site and an approximately 800-foot-high rock face dominates P45543. This rock face consists of Shuksan greenschist, which is the desired quarry stone source. The proposed project would occur in four steps:

1. Boundary Line Adjustment, Clearing and Building Access Road for Forest Practice Conversion;
2. Mining within the MRO Overlay Area;
3. Possible quarry expansion contingent on MRO boundary change, and
4. Quarry Reclamation.

**Step 1 – Boundary Line Adjustment, Site Clearing, Preparation and Building Access Road for Forest Practice Conversion** would include acquiring and performing boundary line adjustments on P128574. The property line would be adjusted to encompass approximately 10.2 acres of P45541. Additionally, an approximately 20.2-acre portion of P45548 would also be boundary line adjusted to P128574. Step 1 also includes clearing, removing stumps, and site grading, and road construction on Parcels P45543, P45550, P120304, P128574, and parts of P45548 and P45541. Marketable timber will be removed from the site. An approximately 6,700-foot gravel access road would be built to access the top and eastern portions of the project site. Wood mulch and top soil would be stockpiled on site for future reclamation. Access to the site would include building two new access driveways on Rockport Cascade Road and decommissioning the two existing access points. Grading and roadways for quarry operations and stormwater management will be constructed on the western portion of the project limits. The road to access the eastern portion of the site would be designed to meet or exceed Skagit County standards, Washington Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Forest Practice and Mining standards, and any other standards appropriate for its use. Following site clearing and preparation, the road would be used to access the top of the quarry and for hauling rocks to the bottom for processing.
**Step 2 – Mining Activities.** The quarry would be established on P45543 within the current MRO boundary per the Mining Site Plan. Step 2 would also include constructing mining operation areas and support facilities, including an armor stone staging area in the western portion of P45543. This step would also involve constructing portable offices/storage structures, truck loadout scale, a heavy equipment and employee parking area, a fueling station, maintenance shops, and storage facilities for blasting equipment. An undersized rock stockpile area would be established within the existing MRO area on P128574 and a potential future phase undersized rock stockpile area has been designated if the MRO boundary is successfully expanded (see Step 3). Rock mining would be conducted using a “top down” approach such that rock would not be cast off the cliff face. Instead, rock would be transported to the stockpile or staging areas by truck. The land use to the south, east, and west is secondary and industrial forestry and the land use to the north is rural residential. A minimum 100-foot setback would be maintained along adjacent property lines or bordering quarry activities. A 50-foot vegetative buffer would be maintained on Rockport Cascade Road.

**Step 3 – Expanded Mining Area** would include quarry and undersized rock stockpile area expansion. Step 3 is dependent upon an expansion of the MRO through the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan Amendment process. Once the MRO overlay is expanded, the quarry area would expand approximately 10 acres into P45541 and the undersized rock stockpile area described in Step 2 would expand to the south (approximately 20 acres) onto P45548 to accommodate the additional undersized rocks from the expanded quarry. The mining activities of Step 3 would be the same as those in Step 2.

**Step 4 – Quarry Reclamation:** would include full reclamation of all the affected parcels following decommissioning of the quarry, roads and supporting mining operations. The full lifespan of the quarry would be up to 100 years or whenever the source of rock is exhausted. The Mining Reclamation Plan is consistent with DNR surface quarry reclamation regulations. The land will be restored to forestry land use following reclamation.
Figure 1. A portion of the Rockport, Washington (1982) USGS 7.5-minute quad map illustrating the approximate project location.
Figure 2. A Google Earth aerial image illustrating the project location (adapted by Drayton).
Figure 3. The project area provided by Element Solutions.
BACKGROUND REVIEW

Determining the probability for cultural materials and archaeological sites within the project area was based largely upon review and analysis of past environmental and cultural contexts and previous cultural resources studies and sites recorded within about one-half mile of the project area. Consulted sources included reviewing local geologic data to better understand the depositional environment; archaeological, historic and ethnographic records on file on the Washington Information System for Architectural and Archaeological Records Data (WISAARD) database; and selected published local historic records.

**Environmental Context**

The project area is located just south of the Skagit River near Marblemount, Skagit County, Washington. The Skagit River is part of the Skagit River drainage basin, the largest drainage basin in the Puget Sound Basin. The Skagit, Cascade, Sauk-Suiattle, and Baker rivers are the major tributaries that drain 3,100 square miles into the Puget Sound from British Columbia to the mouth at La Conner and Conway. The delta was largely formed following a mid-Holocene lahar, which infiltrated the river basin with sediment and caused the shoreline to prograde west (Collins et al 2003).

**Geology**

The Skagit River drainage basin is located in the Puget Lowland physiographic province (Franklin and Dyrness 1973) that was shaped by at least four periods of extensive glaciation during the Pleistocene (Easterbrook 2003; Lasmanis 1991). The bedrock here was depressed and deeply scoured by glaciers, and sediments were deposited and often reworked as the glaciers advanced and retreated. A thick mantle of glacial drift and outwash deposits were left across much of Whatcom and Skagit Counties at the end of the last of these glacial periods, the Fraser Glaciation (Easterbrook 2003).

Large segments of the project corridor lie within geologic deposits associated with the Vashon Stade of the Fraser Glaciation and the Everson Marine Drift deposits it left behind. The Vashon Stade began around 18,000 BP with an advance of the Cordilleran ice sheet into the lowlands (Porter and Swanson 1998). The Puget Lobe of the ice sheet flowed down into the Puget Lowland and reached its terminus just south of Olympia between 14,500–14,000 BP (Clague and James 2002; Easterbrook 2003; Waitt and Thorson 1983). The Puget Lobe was thicker towards the north and thinned towards its terminus near Olympia. The depth of the ice near the project area is estimated to have been about 1,600–1,800 meters (m) (Easterbrook 2003). Shortly after reaching its terminus, the Puget Lobe began to retreat. Marine waters entered the lowlands that had been carved out by glaciers and filled Puget Sound. The remaining ice was floated and wasted away rapidly, depositing Everson glaciomarine drift dating to between 12,500–11,500 BP on the sea floor across the northern and central Puget Lowland (Easterbrook 2003).
The surficial geology within the Skagit River Valley consists of Quaternary and Holocene alluvium on the floodplain adjacent to the river, and glacial outwash deposits from the Vashon Stade of the Fraser Glaciation on downriver terraces above the floodplain (WDGER 2005). The slopes on both sides of the valley are made up of a group of low-grade metamorphic rocks, mostly phyllite and schist that formed during the Jurassic period and were thrust onto the continent during subduction (Dragovich et al. 1999; WDGER 2005).

Soils

The University of California Davis Agriculture and Natural Resources, in conjunction with the United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resource Conservation District (USDA-NRCS) developed an interactive soil survey application. According the UCDavis SoilWeb data, the project area contains two soil units: Andic Xerochrepts, warm-rock outcrop complex, (65-90 percent slopes and Barnestone very cobbly sandy loam, (0-8 percent slopes).

Barnestone soils are located on kames, eskers, moraines, glacial outwash plains and glacial drift plains. They are deep and well drained, formed in ash and loess over glacial outwash material. A typical pedon is as follows: an Oi soil horizon of slightly decomposed needles and twigs from 0-3 cm, followed by an A horizon (3 to 8cm) of black gravelly ashy loam, followed by a Bw1 layer (8 to 15cm) of reddish brown very gravelly ashy loam, followed by a Bw2 layer (15-48cm) of brown very gravelly ashy loam, followed by a 2C layer of extremely gravelly sand from 48-152 cm. (UCDavis SoilWeb n.d.).

Flora

The project area is located within the Tsuga Heterophylla vegetation zone (Franklin and Dyrness 1973:44-5). The natural environmental setting consists of an overstory dominated by Western hemlock, Douglas fir, western red cedar, and big leaf maple. Large areas would have differed from the broader regional pattern, however, with areas of prairie, oak woodland, and pine forest being distributed throughout the southern Puget Sound basin (Franklin and Dyrness 1973:88).

Native vegetation in the area would have included, but not have been limited to, Douglas fir (Pseudotsuga menziesii), western red cedar (Thuja plicata), western hemlock (Tsuga heterophylla), salal (Gaultheria shallon) and vine maple (Acer circinatum). Other locally important and available vegetative species would have included bracken fern (Pteridium aquilinum), blackcap (Rubus occidentalis), currants (Ribes spp.), deer fern (Blechnum spicant), gooseberries (Ribes spp.), huckleberries (Vaccinium spp.), Indian plum (Oemleria cerasiformis), oceanspray (Holodiscus discolor), red elderberry (Sambucus racemosa), snowberry (Symphoricarpos albus), sword fern (Polystichum munitum), and trailing blackberry (Rubus ursinus) (Pojar and MacKinnon 1994).
Fauna

Although the project area is located upriver on the Skagit, fish, especially salmon, were a staple. All five species of salmon and steelhead have been noted in the region, with runs of sockeye locally available (Suttles and Lane 1990:489). From the saltwater herring (*Clupea pallasii*), smelt or eulachon (*Thaleichthys pacificus*), halibut (*Hippoglossus stenolepis*), flatfish and rockfish would have also been abundant in the area. Shellfish including littleneck clams (*Protothaca staminea*), butter clams (*Saxidomus giganteus*), horse clams (*Tresus capax*), bay mussels (*Mytilus edulis*), cockles (*Clinocardium nuttallii*), and native oysters (*Ostrea lurida*) would have been harvested as well as crab (*Crustacea*). Sampson describes “millions of ducks” along the waterfronts and forests that teemed with game such as black tailed deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*), elk (*Cervus canadensis*), black bear (*Ursus americanus*), grouse (*Tetraoninae*), and mountain goats (*Oreamnos americanus*) (1972:7).

Cultural Context

In any investigation of the history of an area, a discussion of the past inhabitants is necessary to appreciate the full spectrum of possible occupational remnants. It is also important to broadly discuss the history of land use in the area along the Northwest Coast and the immediate area surrounding the project location. It is also important to note that many of the names applied to past inhabitants, especially during the contact and early historic period, are those given by European explorers, Euro-American settlers, and others compiling information for treaty purposes. Many names were derived from geographical place names and applied to people who were thought to be more static and less fluid by those applying names and creating geographical boundaries.

Precontact

Human occupation of the Puget Lowland has been well documented in a number of archaeological, ethnographic, and oral historic records (e.g., Suttles 1951; Greengo and Houston 1970; Nelson 1990; Larson and Lewarch 1995; Ames and Maschner 1999). In general, Puget Lowland archaeology can be subdivided into three time periods: the early (10,500 to 5,000 years BP), middle (5,000 to 1,000 BP) and late periods (1,000 to 250 BP). The early period is characterized by an emphasis on the use of flaked stone tools including fluted projectile points, leaf-shaped points and cobble-derived tools. In the regional area, these artifacts are often attributed to the “Olcott” phase, named after the site near Arlington and Granite Falls (Kidd 1964; Mattson 1985; Baldwin et al. 2014). Olcott sites are generally found some distance from modern shorelines and on terraces of major river valleys. Besides the lithic assemblage, little faunal or organic evidence remains date to this period. While the paucity of evidence beyond a lithic assemblage suggests a specialization of generalized terrestrial hunting, it is likely that littoral evidence from this time period is not as extensive and does not preclude some exploitation of marine resources. During this phase, camps were frequently established along river terraces or outwash channels.
The middle period coincides with a stabilization of the environment to something similar to today (Nelson 1990; Larson and Lewarch 1995). The broad cultural patterns include a larger suite of specialized tools including smaller notched points and groundstone, and bone or antler implements used for working with wood. Although lithic manufacture of stemmed bifaces and cobble tools is maintained in this period, ground stone tools are less common. Shell midden sites first appear during this period indicating a transition to a more maritime-based subsistence pattern. Although structural elements such as post molds have been identified, habitation structures have not yet been excavated. The middle period is noted for its increased artifact and trait diversity including a full woodworking toolkit, art and ornamental objects, status differentiation in burials, and extremely specialized fishing and sea-mammal hunting technologies.

The late period is dominated by a settlement pattern along the coastline and along streams and rivers (Nelson 1990; Larson and Lewarch 1995). Trade goods also appear indicating extensive trade networks up and down the coast as well as with inland Plateau peoples. Salmon became a primary food source at this time as sea levels had risen and riparian environments supported large runs of salmon and provided plentiful food for native populations. Toolkit diversity increases in the late period as groups utilized more microenvironments (Thompson 1978). Warfare is also argued to intensify, as defensive sites become more common on the landscape.

**Ethnographic**

The Sauk-Suiattle Tribe and the Upper Skagit Tribe historically inhabited the land between present-day Mount Vernon and Newhalem in northwest Washington. It should be noted that reducing the many individual groups of Native people who lived in the upper reaches of the Skagit River valley into two federally recognized entities is a gross oversimplification. There are abundant sources that elucidate the rich past and various people who are now recognized under the larger tribal designations. A much more thorough presentation of this issue is offered in Blukis-Onat et al. (1980:33-44), Bruseth (1977), Lane (1973), and Sampson (1972). The present quarry project is located within the traditional tribal boundaries, and more specifically, within the overlapping use areas of the Sba-le-och, Mis-skai-whwa, and Sah-ku-meh-hu groups, a few of the eleven aboriginal groups now recognized as the Upper Skagit peoples (Sampson 1972). The Sba-le-och once occupied the stretch of the Skagit River from Birdview to Illabot Creek, the Baker River Valley, and Baker Lake area. Mis-skai-whwa lived on the land from Illabot Creek to the headwaters of the Skagit and Cascade Rivers, and the Sah-ku-meh-hu, or Sauk, inhabited the drainage areas of the Sauk and Suiattle Rivers (Sampson 1972).

The major affiliation of the Upper Skagit peoples is with the Northwest Coast culture (Kroeber 1939), but individuals further up-river were beginning to show more and more influence from the neighboring Plateau people from the north/northeast, across the Cascade divide (Blukis-Onat et al. 1980:33). Northwest Coast culture is noted for its complexity and reliance on maritime resources for sustenance, while the Plateau Culture area has a less complex social system with
more emphasis on hunting and other terrestrial activities (Mierendorf et al. 1998). Upper Skagit peoples, being located at a hub between the coast and plains, were exposed to many other native groups in their seasonal activities, and unlike their closer Northwest Coast relatives, Upper Skagit people excelled at hunting and woodworking (Sampson 1972; Collins 1980).

The set of environmental factors that characterize the project area offers a unique landscape in western Washington that favored precontact people with a hunting, gathering, and fishing economy. Few places can be found with the variety of plants and animals within a day’s walking radius (Mierendorf et al. 1998). The Upper Skagit people obtained food by fishing, hunting, and collecting wild plants. Of these food sources, fish is considered to be the most important (Collins 1980).

None of the Upper Skagit villages were located on salt water; most were strategically located on the riverbanks to yield high seasonal salmon catches that would last them through the winter (Collins 1980). The Upper Skagit had three major permutations for dwelling structures: the wooden house (semi-portable), the mat house (portable), and the sweathouse or lodge (usually stationary). Wooden houses were used in the winter for dance rituals and dwelling locations and in the summer for fishing and processing activities, while the portable mat houses gave hunting and trading parties year-round mobile shelter. Unlike other Northwest Coast peoples, Upper Skagit people did not build pithouses (semi-subterranean dwellings).

Smallpox appears to have contacted the Upper Skagit groups prior to actual contact with white settlers, as it had with most other native populations (Boyd 1990). Chief Martin J. Sampson of the Swinomish recalls, “The first white settlers never saw the Indians at their full numbers at the peak of their culture. What they found was the broken remnant of a once powerful people, reduced to this state by disease, the white man’s first gift to the Indians” (1972:1). During Henry Custer’s 1859 land survey of the Skagit River Valley, he recognized that there had been a vast network of hunting trails in the area that had fallen into disuse. Custer also notes abandoned mat structures. He discounted the observations he made and, like many anthropologists of the recent past, underestimated the ability of people to thrive in the Cascade Range (Bush 1997).

**Historic**

Euro-American settlement along the Skagit River began to influx with the removal of a natural logjam at Mt. Vernon in 1876 (Dwelley 1953). Previously the upper Skagit River was only accessible by canoe or foot, and few had dared the journey. Removal of the logjam allowed steamer ships to make their way up the Skagit River bringing settlers and industry such as logging, mining, farming, packers and guides. In 1889 the railroad began moving not only north to the Canadian border, but up the reaches of the Skagit River to what is now known as Rockport (Dwelley 1953) which lies to the south of the project area. Railroads allowed increased settlement and the boom of many upriver towns.
Henry A. Martin made his way up the Skagit River in 1889 by canoe before settling on Illabot Creek. The following year he brought his wife, Katharine, and the first four of his nine children. He quickly began clearing his 160-acre homestead and in 1903 completed construction of the ten-room house (Kinney 1951). Henry Martin and L.A. Stafford constructed the schoolhouse three miles east of Illabot Creek. The Martin family established a Catholic Mission near Concrete and the family held Catholic worship at their homestead whenever possible (Kinney 1951). The Martins had 9 children, 21 grandchildren, and 19 great-grandchildren. Fred Jerome Martin, son of Henry and Katharine Martin, spent over 25 years as a State Representative, State Senator, State Director of Agriculture, State Director of General administration, and other various posts (Warinsky 1979). He resided at the Martin family homestead, which had grown into a 400-acre ranch, with his son Doug Martin until sold to Ken Perrigoue in approximately the 1980’s.

**Previous Cultural Resource Studies and Archaeological Sites**

The Washington Information System for Architectural & Archaeological Records Data (WISAARD) is operated by the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP). This database catalogs cultural resource surveys conducted in Washington State since 1995, and contains information regarding previously recorded archaeological sites, historic properties, National Register Properties, Traditional Cultural Places, cemetery sites, and the Washington State Heritage Barn Register. In addition to this database, a number of previously conducted cultural resources surveys, academic resources, and ethnographic resources were referenced to determine the probability for cultural resources to be present within the project area.

No archaeological studies had been conducted in the Skagit River Valley prior to work undertaken in 1970 by the National Park Service (NPS) for the then-proposed High Ross Dam and Reservoir. The explanation for the lack of professional archaeological research in this area is twofold. First, previous hydroelectric reservoirs (Gorge Dam 1923, Diablo Dam 1927, and Ross Dam 1949) and the clearing of a large logjam (1878) inundated much of the land in the immediate vicinity upriver of the constructed dam, effectively obscuring the locations where native peoples might have left cultural deposits. Secondly, much of the archaeological research in western Washington has been biased toward an emphasis on lowland sites. Previous academic studies of the area traditionally focused on coastal margins, viewing mountain terrain in the Cascades area as a marginal resource use and settlement area, having a low potential for archaeological resources (Mierendorf 1993; Bush 1997; Mierendorf et al. 1998; Smart, et al. 2011).

The first professional archaeological studies in the area were conducted by boat in 1970 when the NPS surveyed the area around the Ross Dam reservoir in North Cascades National Park (NCNP) for precontact sites (Mierendorf et al. 1998). In 1977, a joint archaeological investigation of the Ross Lake area by Western Washington University (WWU) and the NPS
yielded a number of artifacts culturally and chronologically different than others found in the area (Mierendorf 1989). The assumption of archaeologists prior to the 1977 work had been that upper river and the inland montane areas were special-use or highly selective resource acquisition areas. However, after the results of the Ross Lake work were added to local professional knowledge, the area began to be viewed as more than marginal (Mierendorf and Thomson 1986). Two precontact sites were identified during the 1977 investigations; 45WH50, located at the mouth of Big Beaver Creek contained a possible pithouse, and 45WH79, located on the Hozomeen campground, contained a large diagnostic lithic scatter (Grabert and Pint 1978). Between 1984 and 1986, Park Archaeologist Robert Mierendorf of the NCNP conducted a number of additional surveys in the Ross lake area. Capitalizing on the assumption that much of the physical prehistory of the area had been inundated by hydroelectric power generation activity, he conducted reconnaissance and survey of the area during the times when reservoirs were at low levels. During the survey, 13 new sites were identified, demonstrating that there was indeed a ‘lowland bias’ of the area and that the complexity of the prehistory of the area had not yet been fully realized by scientists (Mierendorf 1993; Bush 1997; Mierendorf et al. 1998).

The early to mid-1970s brought the publication of two large ethnographic studies produced in the Skagit area. Collins completed her detailed ethnography in 1974, which was followed by Roberts 1975 doctoral dissertation focusing on those living within the Skagit Region and changes into the modern era within a tribal council. Both authors provide village locations and place names throughout the area (Collins 1980: Map 2:17; Roberts 1975: Map VI:48). Near Rockport Collins describes an extended village site, ʔiłayucid, which included one small winter house, ʔijq̓̕əd, meaning “foot of the mountain stuck in the river”, at the town of Sauk (west of Rockport). One large winter house was located east of Rockport, and another was located to the west, both referred to as ʔaytalúshay (Collins 1980:18). Three winter houses, sqíxwucid, púk̓̕walicu, and saxíp̓̕pop, were spread across both sides of the Skagit River near Rockport and Rocky Creek created the larger village of sk’ax̣axúcid (Collins 1980:18). Roberts reports bəs[ʔ]ililucid at the mouth of the Sauk River on the Skagit, and čagʷəlq̓, a village stretching from Van Horn to roughly three miles above Rockport along the Skagit almost to the mouth of the Suiattle River (1975:74). The closest village site listed by either author is sákw̓bixʷ, “people of digging roots”. The village contains at least four winter houses located along the Sauk River up to its confluence with the Skagit. The largest house is located on the south bank of the Skagit at the mouth of the Sauk (Collins 1980:19).

According to WISAARD, no cultural resource surveys have been conducted within a one-mile search radius of the project area. A single site emerged from this search parameter, however. 45SK135, located nearly a mile to the west, was documented in 1980 as a precontact lithic scatter. The site record is minimal but states that lithic material was observed in “overturned stumps along the former riverbank” (Onat 1980). The area had been logged but appeared to be
otherwise undisturbed and appeared “quite large”. In addition to flakes, choppers and a projectile were found as well as “signs of fire hearths, and minute bit of shellfish and bone.”

ERCI conducted the closest cultural resource review to the current project in 2014 (Bush and North), at just over a mile to the northeast. The roughly 10-acre feasibility study resulted in the discovery of lithic material considered to be part of previously documented site 45SK139, initially recorded by Onat in 1997. The sizeable lithic scatter documented cobble tools and flakes in addition to concentrations of fire-cracked-rock, charcoal, and burned earth.

**CULTURAL RESOURCE EXPECTATIONS**

Based on review of the project scope, the environmental and cultural contexts, the project area was considered to be located in an area of lower probability for locating precontact and/or historic archaeological sites. As presented, precontact inhabitants to Euro-American settlers have left a record of adaptation and exploitation of their environment across the area. All types of cultural resources were considered during work. Remnants of precontact activities related to lithic resource acquisition and testing (cobble tool scatters), fire modified rock (suggestive of processing/camping activities), temporary camps or resource processing locations that could represent a range of ephemeral hunting, fishing, gathering and/or ceremonial activities were considered possible in the area. Knowing that talus would be encountered also opens the door for the potential of finding rock feature sites such as: hunting blinds, shelters, rock art, grinding slabs, quarrying sites, etc. Historic cultural resources thought possible included trash scatters or artifacts associated with logging, farming or residential settlement, and railroads and associated features.

**FIELD INVESTIGATION**

Field investigation consisted of pedestrian survey, visual reconnaissance, and subsurface inspection. Pedestrian survey and visual reconnaissance consisted of walking and viewing all accessible areas of the proposed project footprint to investigate the potential for any buried and / or aboveground cultural resources to be present. Pedestrian survey and visual reconnaissance are also employed to obtain an overall sense of the project area and determine whether appropriate areas for subsurface investigation exist.

Subsurface inspection consisted of excavating shovel probes (SP / SPs) to confirm soil types and to identify whether buried archaeological materials and / or deposits were present. SPs consist of cylindrical pits averaging 40 - 50 centimeters (cm) in diameter and were excavated to a depth determined by the conditions present in each SP. Excavated sediment from each SP was then screened through quarter-inch hardware mesh. Details regarding the location, depth, sediments encountered, and general setting were recorded for each probe and their location. Finally, each SP was backfilled and their locations marked with a handheld global positioning system (GPS) in order to create a site sketch map.
Drayton archaeologists Paul Howard, Oliver Patsch and Jeff Hillstrom conducted the present field investigation on November 28, 2018 and on December 21, 2018. Weather conditions were cloudy and misty with periodic light rains. The majority of the project area consists of a steep talus slope with boulders the size of cars or even small homes (Photo 1). The western portion of the project area is flat and heavily vegetated in areas not disturbed by roads or borrow pits (Photos 2 - 3).

Photo 1. Example of large boulders present on the lower talus; view south.
Photo 2. Thick vegetation in the lower flatlands.

Photo 3. Borrow pit.
The field review began with a pedestrian survey of the walkable portions of the project – the lower talus slope and western flats. Surveying the talus proved challenging given the large, wet, boulders, downed trees and voids covered in forest litter and moss (Photo 4). Since artifacts were considered to be unlikely in this terrain, efforts were placed on looking for rock features such as hunting blinds, cairns, shelters, walls, rock art, quarrying debris, etc. It was soon obvious that the rock type was not good toolstone material and would make a poor canvas for rock art. Many shelter sized recesses were found (Photos 5 and 6), but none had sign of human occupation (fire blackened walls or ceilings, rock walls or buttressing, midden floors, grinding slicks, etc). The survey only identified the ubiquitous sign of early logging – old tree stumps, some containing spring board notches (Photo 7). Surveying the lower flatlands was easier going aside from areas of thick vegetation (including blackberry thickets). Ground surface visibility was very poor overall.

Photo 4. Sample of lower talus showing large, mossy, boulders and forest debris.
Photo 5. A sample void, large enough to stand in.

Photo 6. Another investigated cavity with Paul inside.
The survey was continued on December 21, 2018 due to a plan update. The southern and eastern sections of the project area were extended. New locations for culverts, and the proposed quarry and stormwater pond were surveyed further (Photos 8 - 9). Survey followed an old logging road (Photo 10) where three of the future culvert locations were identified (Photo 11). Once the culverts, proposed quarry extension, and logging road was surveyed the stormwater pond location was surveyed, but was found to be heavily disturbed due to modern trash and dumping (Photo 12). Five shovel probes were excavated near or within these locations to identify any cultural material.
Photo 8. Kevin Ashenfelter’s property and proposed culvert location.

Photo 9. Proposed culvert location on stream.
Photo 10. One of the existing logging roads.

Photo 11. Flagging marking a proposed culvert location.
A total of four shovel probes were excavated throughout the survey of the project area. Four probes on November 28, 2018 were subsequently dug near the toe of the slope where, presumably, most of the ground disturbing activities would take place (Figure 4). On December 21, 2018 five probes were excavated. Two probes were excavated to the east section of the project area one near the logging road and another on a crest to the north within the proposed quarry area.

Three were subsequently dug in the southern area of the project. The probes were dug to sample the soil structure and judge the utility of conducting a comprehensive regiment of subsurface testing across all accessible areas. Locations were limited to areas that contained actual soil or sediment, in areas not impacted or filled with gravel, rock or brush piles.

Most of the nine probes shortly terminated at rocky impasses (Photos 14 - 15). The deepest probe (SP4) terminated at 60 cm. Sediment profiles varied slightly but encountered layers of sand and cobbles which are consistent with the Barnestone very cobbly sandy loam series previously discussed. The shallowest probe was only 2 cm due to the water encountered from sheet wash from the river (Photo 16). Shovel probe eight was dug near one of the future culverts, like shovel probe two, five impasses were encountered (Photo 17). Shovel probe nine hit glacial material (Photo 18). No cultural material was observed. A full description of soils observed in the project area during subsurface testing can be viewed in Appendix A.
Figure 4. An adapted Google Earth image illustrating the shovel probe locations.
Photo 13. A rocky impasse quickly encountered at SP2.

Photo 14. A rocky impasse quickly encountered at SP5.
Photo 15. A rocky impasse quickly encountered at SP7.

Photo 16. A rocky impasse quickly encountered at SP8.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Drayton Archaeology cultural resources assessment consisted of background review, field investigation, and production of this report. Background review determined that the project area is located in an area of low probability for cultural materials. Most of the project area is on a steep talus slope and rock face, unsuitable for human occupation. The lower, western flats, are suitable for human occupation but are also about one half mile from the Skagit River.

During the course of the present work no significant archaeological observations were made, only the ubiquitous sign of past logging activity. Several boulder crevices were inspected for human shelter, but none contained any sign of occupation. Given the scope of the project and probability for cultural materials it appears highly unlikely that intact deposits will be encountered. Based upon the result of this review, Drayton Archaeology recommends that the project proceed without further archaeological oversight.

It should be recognized that Washington State law provides for the protection of all archaeological resources under RCW Chapter 27.53, Archaeological Sites and Resources, which prohibits the unauthorized removal, theft, and/or destruction of archaeological resources and sites. This statute also provides for prosecution and financial penalties covering consultation and the recovery of archaeological resources. Additional legal oversight is provided for Indian burials and grave offerings under RCW Chapter 27.44, Indian Graves and Records. RCW 27.44 states that the willful removal, mutilation, defacing, and/or destruction of Indian burials constitute a Class C felony. Further, Washington legal code, RCW 68.50.645, Notification,
provides a strict process for the notification of law enforcement and other interested parties in the event of the discovery of any human remains regardless of perceived patrimony. The assessment of the property has been conducted by a professional archaeologist and meets or exceeds the criteria set forth in RCW: 27.53 for professional archaeological reporting and assessment.

**INADVERTANT DISCOVERY PROTOCOLS**

**Archaeological Resources**

In the event that archaeological materials (e.g. shell midden, faunal remains (bones), stone tools, historic glass, metal, or other concentrations) are encountered during the development of the property, an archaeologist should immediately be notified and work halted in the vicinity of the find until the materials can be inspected and assessed. The project archaeologist should be contacted immediately to review the find and contact the relevant parties. An assessment of the discovery and consultation with government and tribal cultural resources staff is a requirement of law. Once the situation has been assessed steps to proceed can be determined.

**Human Burials, Remains, or Unidentified Bone(s)**

In the event of inadvertently discovered human remains or indeterminate bones, pursuant to RCW 68.50.645, all work must stop immediately and law enforcement should be contacted. Any remains should be covered and secured against further disturbance, and communication should be immediately established with the Skagit County Sheriff’s office and the State Physical Anthropologist at DAHP for coordination with interested Native Tribe(s).

The area surrounding the discovery should be secured and of adequate size to protect the discovery from further disturbance until the State provides a notice to proceed. The discovery of any human skeletal remains must be reported to law enforcement immediately. The county medical examiner/coroner will assume jurisdiction over the human skeletal remains to decide whether those remains are forensic or non-forensic. If the county medical examiner/coroner determines the remains are non-forensic, then the State Physical Anthropologist at DAHP assumes the jurisdiction over the remains. The DAHP will notify any appropriate cemeteries and all affected tribes of the find. The State Physical Anthropologist will determine whether the remains are Native or Non-Native origin and report that finding to any appropriate cemeteries and the affected tribes. The DAHP will then handle all consultation with the affected parties as to the future preservation, excavation, and disposition of the remains. DAHP will also authorize when work may proceed.
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APPENDIX A: SHOVEL PROBE TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPTH BELOW SURFACE (CM)</th>
<th>SEDIMENT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-36</td>
<td>Reddish brown sand grading to a yellow brown sand with depth</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-42</td>
<td>Compacted layer of sandy gravel and rock</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td>Terminated at rock impasse. Large root in west wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>Brown sandy loam with a high gravel content</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td>Terminated at rock impasse.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-34</td>
<td>Reddish brown silt loam</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-38</td>
<td>Very compact, rounded gravels and rock</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>Grayish brown clay loam with high gravel content</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-60</td>
<td>Reddish brown clayey silt loam with high gravel content</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>Shovel probe excavated on a mid-slope. Silty sand with gravel. Leaf</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>litter, with colluvium. Edge of logging road. Impasse at base, large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rock.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-30</td>
<td>Shovel probe excavated on crest. Silty sand, sub-angled rocks, sticks</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leaves, bioturbation. Moss. Large rock at base.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>Water table hit a 2 cm. East of river culvert.</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-21</td>
<td>Shovel probe dug on terrace. Rock impasse at base.</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>Dark brown silt loam, roots, rocks and organic matter</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>Reddish brown clayey silt</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-50</td>
<td>Grey sand with gravel inclusions</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>