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Management Summary

**Subject Property:** State and County Road Right of Way(s) within the towns of Irondale and Port Hadlock and nine privately owned property parcels (Tax Parcels 901112010, 901112002, 901112012, 901112041, 901023006, 901112001, 901023001, 901023005 and 901112004). Owners: Jefferson County and Private Property

**Acres:** Approximately 50 acres of sub-surface disturbance within a 1,290-acre project area

**Sections:** 1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 12  
**Township:** 29 North  
**Range:** 1 West

**Sections:** 34, 35  
**Township:** 30 North  
**Range:** 1 West

**Referenced Quad map:** Port Townsend South, WA (1981), 7.5-minute  
Nordland, WA (1973), 7.5-minute

**Smithsonian Trinomial for Archaeological sites within or adjacent to the project area (Section 4.1.1):**
- 45JE00027  
- 45JE00277  
- 45JE00285  
- 45JE00286  
- 45JE00289

**National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) Properties within or adjacent to the project area (Section 4.1.2):**
- Captain Peter Shibles House  
- Galster House  
- Hattie Williams House  
- Methodist Episcopal Church of Port Hadlock  
- Irondale Jail  
- Irondale Historic District

**Level of Effort/Survey Work Performed.** For this project photo documentation of all historic resources was completed where nearby ground disturbing activities would take place. Thirty-Five shovel test probes were dug in areas where the ground surface was accessible and intact soil horizons could be found. All portions of the project area were visually inspected to determine any adverse effects on archaeological materials, features or historic structures by the proposed project activities.

**No Historic Properties will be affected by this project; one archaeological site will be affected.**
No new historic properties were identified as a result of this investigation. Project work is strictly limited to existing road ROW’s and private property where significant disturbances in the form of quarry activities have already taken place. No structures will be visually or physically impacted as a result of the proposed project. One site (45JE00027) is found within a portion of the project area, due to the existing disturbances it is not likely that cultural materials will be found but it is recommended that an archaeological monitor be on hand during excavation activities within this site to monitor for cultural materials that may be present within the excavation trench.

**We recommend that the proposed sewer facility and forcemain project proceed as proposed.**
The Project Manager and the on-site inspectors for the project should be familiar with the attached unanticipated discoveries protocol (Appendix B) and should have a copy on site for the responsible Construction Superintendent to carry. This plan should be reviewed ahead of time and if the project managers need to address questions regarding the identification of cultural material or the process to follow, should any questionable material be encountered during construction then a Tetra Tech archaeologist should be contacted to address these concerns. The unanticipated discoveries protocol should be provided to contractors during the bid process so they are aware of the requirements when they develop their estimates.
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SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION

As part of its Growth Management Act (GMA) planning activities, Jefferson County (County) has designated the Port Hadlock and Irondale sewer service area as a potential center for County growth. Per the 1990 GMA, the County has pursued the designation of an Urban Growth Area (UGA) in the Port Hadlock/Irondale service area (Figure 1). As part of the requirements for establishing a UGA, the County contracted with Tetra Tech, Inc. (Tt) on December 5, 2005 to prepare a Sewer Facility Plan to study alternatives for developing a sewer system. The sewer planning boundary will coincide with the UGA boundary since urban services must be provided within an urban growth boundary and sanitary sewers are considered a key urban service.

The Irondale/Port Hadlock Urban Growth Area (IPHUGA) is an unincorporated area located approximately six miles south of the City of Port Townsend, Washington (Figure 1). The area of potential effect (APE) is located in Sections 1, 2, 3, 10, 11 and 12 of Township 29 North, Range 1 West, and Sections 34 and 35 of Township 30 North, Range 1 West. Currently, the PHUGA is served by public water, but no sewer facilities exist. On-site septic systems serve the existing dwellings and commercial establishments.

In order to facilitate planned growth in accordance with the County’s approved comprehensive plan, the County has undertaken an analysis of potential impacts that may occur as a result of the undertaking. This includes cultural resources that may be present within the APE. To determine the potential impacts on cultural resources, Tt conducted background research at the Washington Department of Archaeology and Historical Preservation (DAHP) Website, “Washington Information System for Architectural and Archaeological Records Data” (WISAARD) on October 9, 2010 and a survey of the APE on October 18-22, 2010.
Figure 1. Project Location
SECTION 2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 Project Activities

The County proposes to construct a water reclamation plant (wastewater treatment plant) and effluent reuse area as well as install a wastewater collection system consisting of gravity sewer lines, pump stations, and force mains within road ROWs (Figure 2). The purpose of the undertaking is to provide sanitary sewer service and replace existing septic systems as the means of wastewater disposal. A sewer system would be more effective in treating and managing the expected future wastewater from the planned residential and commercial expansion of the Irondale and Port Hadlock UGA. The current undertaking does not include private property (on-site) connections to the proposed sewer system, which will be the responsibility of future developers who undertake residential construction within the UGA.

The wastewater treatment plant will consist of a series of man-made ponds and mechanical systems that will treat the wastewater to Class A standards – the highest level of treatment required for reuse. The treated water will be beneficially reused by applying it to the ground within infiltration ponds at the reuse site. In addition to the facilities and equipment directly associated with treating and reusing the wastewater, a portion of the APE will be developed to hold an emergency generator, electrical room, lab/office, chemical storage and blowers. The depth of disturbances within the wastewater treatment plant site will extend eight to twelve feet below ground surface (bgs) and cover a 400 x 600 foot area. The depth of disturbances within the proposed effluent reuse site will extend to eight to twelve feet below ground surface (bgs) and cover a 500 x 500 foot area.

The proposed sewer lines will be placed within existing ROWs under County and State roads. According to the County Public Utility District (PUD), which currently provides domestic water service to the PHUGA, the minimum depth of soil disturbance is 32 inches to three feet in County ROWs and 3.5 feet in State ROWs. The proposed sewer lines will be placed at depths of 8 to 21 feet bgs. Horizontal disturbances will be within the existing ROW’s but will average approximately 4-6 feet wide.

2.2 Project Location

The proposed project’s APE includes all roads shown on Figure 2 and the Sewer Treatment Facility found near the southern end of the UGA, Figure 2. The sewer treatment facility and reuse field are the only
portions of the undertaking that take place outside of the previously disturbed areas within the road ROWs. The entire project covers 1,290 acres but sub surface disturbances are limited to approximately 50 acres.
Figure 2. Street Map of Project Area - All Streets shown are included in the APE and are a part of the UGA ROW.
The project area is bordered by Port Townsend Bay on the east, Elkins and Lopeman Roads on the south, Chimacum Creek on the north, and State Route (SR) 19 on the west. In addition to the UGA sewer service area boundary, the APE also includes three private property land parcels for the proposed wastewater treatment plant and reuse field. The proposed wastewater treatment plant will be located to the north Lopeman Road, between its western termination and Chimacum Road (Figure 2). The reuse area will be located to the south of Lopeman Road, south of the proposed wastewater treatment plant site.

2.3 Project Proponent, Property Owner, and Agency
The proposed project is funded and supported by the County who owns and is responsible for all lands where wastewater collection lines will be installed. The treatment facility and reuse area are located on private property, which the County is in the process of purchasing in support of this project.

2.4 Description of Survey Area
The overall study area for this undertaking encompasses the Irondale and Port Hadlock areas within Jefferson County, WA as defined by the UGA boundaries (Figure 2). This report will detail known cultural resources, including historic properties, and previous cultural resource surveys and studies throughout the entire 1,290-acre UGA. The area of disturbance, approximately 50 acres, is considerably less as project work is limited to linear excavations within ROWs and the treatment facility itself.

The sewer lines and force mains will be entirely located within existing Road ROW’s where the planned project work will excavate through the existing road surface and install lines under the existing road. The treatment facility will be located on former gravel pit operations where gravel operations have been terminated.
SECTION 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

3.1 Geography

Ground elevations in the Port Hadlock area range from zero to about 120 feet above sea level. The terrain gently slopes to the east across most of the UGA, with some areas near the coastline having slopes greater than 15 percent. Most of the study area is underlain by Quaternary Vashon Recessional Outwash, which generally consists of loose, clean, stratified sands and gravels (Franklin and Dyrness 1988).

Existing land uses are dominated by commercial development concentrated along the major highway corridors of SR 19 (Rhody Drive), SR 116 (Ness’ Corner Road), and Chimacum Road. Additional commercial development is found along Lower Hadlock Road in the historic location of the Washington Mill Company complex (discussed below). The remainder of the study area is residential and vacant lots.

3.2 Vegetation

The study area is found in the Puget Trough Province as defined by Franklin and Dyrness (1988). This trough covers the entire Puget Sound region, a glaciated area that is now partially submerged. The Puget Sound area is composed of prairie, oak woodland, and pine forests with upland areas dominated by Douglas fir. Bare ground as well as grasslands and riparian areas dominated by wetland shrub species and red alder are also common (Franklin and Dyrness 1988). The majority of the study area falls within an upland setting with residential neighborhoods nestled within a pine forest setting. The wastewater treatment plant and reuse site are in a lowland setting with wetlands in the vicinity.
SECTION 4.0 CULTURAL SETTING

The cultural setting of the APE has been determined through the identification of known cultural resources and written histories. In addition to this data, cultural resource surveys completed within one mile of the APE have been summarized to characterize the previous cultural resource work conducted in the area. This data is used to determine expected finds of the cultural resources survey.

4.1 Cultural Setting

4.1.1 Prehistoric and Ethnographic Background

The study area lies in the traditional Chemakum territory, which stretches from the mouth of the Hood Canal to Port Discovery Bay (Eels 1996). Elmendorf (1990) identifies Chemakum territory as encompassing the immediate area of Port Townsend Bay and Hadlock Bay. The Chemakum referred to themselves as the A-hwa-ki-lu; the meaning and origin of this word is unknown (Eels 1985, 1996). As the Chemakum were linguistically related to the Quileute rather than the local Salish speaking people, it is of interest to note that the Chemakum and Quileute tribes were geographically separated from one another (Eels 1985, 1996). The Quileute reside approximately 125 miles to the west of Chemakum territory on the Pacific coast, south of Cape Flattery. At the time of Euro-American contact, Makah and Clallam tribal territories separated Chemakum and Quileute territories (Eels 1985, 1996). The Chemakum language may have been more widespread in the Olympic Peninsula prehistorically (Elmendorf 1990).

The little that is known about the Chemakum is derived from accounts by European explorers. Vancouver's 1792 expedition was the first to officially document the Port Townsend Bay area. He found evidence of three abandoned native villages situated along the bay. Most likely, the occupants were in their summer resource procurement localities (Blukis-Onat 1975). Vancouver and his crew investigated the study area, stopping at the mouth of Chimakum Creek and travelling inland for approximately one to two miles in search of freshwater. They noted that waters at the mouth of the creek were too brackish to ingest. Vancouver reports no evidence of a native village at the mouth of Chimacum Creek (Gunther 1972).

The Chemakum were known to have at least one village in the Port Townsend Bay area. This large village, known as Tsets-i-biis, was a "capital for nearly all tribes on the Sound, where they occasionally collected" (Eels 1996:13). According to Eels (1985, 1996), Tsets-i-biis was located at the head of Port
Townsend Bay; however, Elmendorf (1990) states this village was located at the head of Hadlock Bay and was named *C'ic 'abus*, a variation of *Tsets-i-biisi*. Physical descriptions of the village describe it surrounded by a stockade (Elmendorf 1990). It is unclear from these accounts where the village was precisely situated on the bay.

There was a contact-era village associated with a shell midden located in what is today the town of Port Hadlock (Hansen and Stump 1974). Hansen and Stump (1974) describe this site as a permanent Chemakum village, the scene of large gatherings including potlatches and canoe war-games. However, this village may have been Clallam rather than Chemakum. Hansen and Stump (1974) state that Lahanim, or Prince of Wales, was a Clallam who lived at the village in Hadlock. Lahanim was the son of the great Clallam chief, Chetzemoka, or Duke of York. A native named Old Patsy, a Squaxin, was said to have held the last potlatch at the native village at Hadlock in 1891 (Hansen and Stump 1974).

The Chemakum were never known to have a large historic population. Gibbs (1877) reported that there were only 90 Chemakum in the area in the mid-1800s (Eels 1985). By the time of Eels’ census in 1887, only 10 Chemakum remained in the area, of which only one complete family of four individuals existed (Eels 1996). It is suggested that warfare, smallpox, and assimilation into other tribes led to the small population (Elmendorf 1990). The Chemakum are described as warlike; hostile episodes with the majority of the surrounding tribes are recorded including skirmishes with the Clallam, Makah, Suquamish, Twana, and Duwamish (Eels 1985, 1996). Both Eels (1985, 1996) and Elmendorf (1990) describe a devastating raid by the Suquamish on a stockaded Chemakum village around 1850.

It is of interest to note that in 1856, when the US Coast Survey mapped the Port Townsend and Admiralty Inlet in the Washington Territory (namely Port Townsend Bay and Hadlock Bay) the only native village recorded was located at the mouth of Chimacum Creek (mapped as Chimikim River). The map shows that the village was situated on a sand spit and depicts approximately three large rectangular structures accompanied by three (possibly seven) smaller circular structures. The village is clearly surrounded by some type of boundary suggestive of a stockade or fence-like structure. Taken with the approximate location of *Tsets-i-biis*, it is very possible that this village represents the Chemacum village attacked by the Suquamish and Clallam and noted as a centralized gathering locality for many tribes on the Sound. Additionally, Gibbs (1877) remarked that by 1854 there was one Chemacum village remaining on Port Townsend Bay that contained up to fifteen small structures.
Archaeologists working in the Port Townsend Bay have recorded approximately 14 prehistoric and ethnohistoric sites (Bukis-Onat 1975). Site 45JE27, the Hadlock Cultural Resource District, is within one mile of the APE. It includes the ethnohistoric village used for the large gatherings by Old Patsy and Prince of Wales. The village had a pond for harboring canoes, large plank structures including a longhouse (Eels 1985) and a shell midden deposit.

### 4.1.2 Historical Context

Port Hadlock, located 5.5 miles south from Port Townsend on US Highway 101, and was founded in 1870 by Samuel Hadlock, who owned several hundred acres of land at the head of Port Townsend Bay. In 1884, the Western Mill and Lumber Company built a large sawmill there. In 1886, the operation was sold to the Washington Mill Company of San Francisco, which liked the port because the docks could accommodate seven lumber ships at one time. The mill employed about 125 sawyers and 30 stevedores to load the ships. It produced most of the lumber used to build Fort Flagler, Fort Worden, and Fort Casey on Whidbey Island. In 1907 however, the bottom dropped out of the lumber market and the company closed the mill. In its abandoned state, a fire in 1913 destroyed all but the office and commissary (McClary 2005).

A large distillery was built at Port Hadlock in 1911, using a new method of distilling alcohol from softwood sawdust, but the business was unsuccessful and the plant closed in 1913 (McClary 2005).

Irondale is now a privately owned residential area with scattered houses on consolidated lots masking a very industrial history. Begun in 1879, the town of Irondale was consolidated by Samuel Hadlock, the same man responsible for establishing the town of Hadlock, then located about one mile to the south of Irondale. Irondale was established in order to build an iron smelter on the waterfront with the platted property lots set aside for employees of the iron plant. The iron smelting operation was named the Puget Sound Iron Company. The operation was to transport ore from iron bogs located in the nearby community of Chimacum. The ore would then be smelted in a huge 38-foot wide conical furnace constructed of large beach cobbles (Carlson 2003; Kirk and Alexander 1990). Limestone was imported from the San Juan Islands for the purification process.
By 1881, the Puget Sound Iron Company had earned enough profit to extend the procurement of iron ore to more distant areas such as Texada Island, British Columbia (Kirk and Alexander 1990). At this time, the company had 20 kilns operating and employed over 400 workers. Additionally, there was daily steam ship service exporting the high quality iron to San Francisco (Kirk and Alexander 1990). However, the iron heyday did not last at Irondale due to "crude machinery, inept management, high import duty on Canadian ore, labor costs, and the indifference of San Francisco stockholders" (Kirk and Alexander 1990). The Puget Sound Iron Company lasted a mere ten years, closing in 1891.

In 1903, the Puget Sound Iron Company reorganized into the Western Steel Company. The move to rebuild and change to steel production was successful and Irondale became productive once again. In the early 1900s, the steel manufactured at Irondale was shipped all over the Pacific coasts of California and Alaska. By 1909, Irondale was a boomtown that had "steam heat, electric lights, a newspaper, six stores, a contract for a hospital, and a signed agreement to import ore from Hankow, China" (Kirk and Alexander 1990). James A. Moore, creator of the Western Steel Company, re-platted the town in 1910 to house up to 20,000 people. At the time, Irondale had a census of over 1,000 people. However, in 1911 the Carnegie Trust suspended operations of the plant, forcing the Western Steel Company to file for bankruptcy. Aside from a small revitalization in 1919 after World War I, the Irondale steel factory was closed for good and dismantled.

In 1911, the closest county authority and jail were located in Port Townsend, the Jefferson County seat. Being a typical boomtown, Irondale had a number of saloons that were accompanied by general lawlessness. Separated from Port Townsend by a poor road, Irondale advertised for the design and construction of a jail. On April 4, 1911, William H. Merrick was the lowest bidder and was awarded the contract of constructing the new Irondale Jail, now recorded as Site 45JEI03. In the early 1980s, the rear
of the Irondale Jail was starting to rot and had fallen into general disrepair (Stalheim 1983c). Today, the Irondale Jail sits at the base of a sloping bluff that is approximately 25 feet in height at what was once the northern outskirts of the industrial and commercial portion of Irondale.

Also in 1911, the Hattie Williams House was constructed on Moore Street (Stalheim 1983c). Today the house is listed on the NRHP. Ms. Williams together with Otto E. Staack operated the “Williams & Staack” mercantile company also located on Moore Street.

Modern Irondale is primarily a residential community and any remnants of its iron and steel production history have been removed or grown over. Only four of the original Puget Sound Iron Company houses built for company officials remain.

### 4.1 Known Cultural Resources

It conducted a literature review of known cultural resources found within one mile of the proposed project area. The literature review was conducted through WISAARD.

#### 4.1.1 Archaeological Resources

That file search revealed that six archaeological sites have been identified within one mile of the APE, one of these resources have been identified within the APE (45JE00027).

**Site # JE00027:** This site is the location of several cultural resources that include a midden deposit, Chinese worker camp and mill, potlatch house, a channel and canoe pond, and a charcoal feature. The site is listed on the State Register. The northern portion of this site falls within the proposed project area.

**Site# JE00201:** This site is the remains of a three masted barkentine that was shipwrecked in December of 1864. The site has been determined ineligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

**Site# JE00277:** This site is the Chimacum Creek Village that was first discovered by Euro-Americans in 1856. The site has not been evaluated for the NRHP.

**Site# JE00285:** This site is a prehistoric lithic debitage scatter and historic refuse scatter. The site has not been evaluated for the NRHP.
Site# JE00286: This site is a prehistoric lithic debitage scatter that included a bone tool. The site has not been evaluated for the NRHP.

Site# JE00289: This site is the location of the Chimacum pilings alignment that was once part of the Commercial Dock once located in the area. The site is listed as potentially eligible for the NRHP, but it has not been formally evaluated.

4.1.2 Built Environment Resources

Research into the Port Hadlock/Irondale area has identified six historic-era buildings listed on or eligible for the NRHP that have been recorded within one mile of the project area.

Captain Peter Shibles House: Capt. Shibles was a Puget Sound navigator from 1882 until his death in 1939. The house was constructed circa 1895 by Capt. Peter Shibles, master mariner, captain of the steamer "Louise," and later, master of the Milwaukee Railroad's steel steam tug "Milwaukee." The "Louise" was a steamer built in 1884 by the Washington Mill Company when it was still located at Seabeck. Peter Shibles was a mate on the "Louise" in 1884. He was afterward mate on the steamers "Josephine" and "Richard Holyoke." Shibles then became master of the "St. Patrick" for two years before mastering the "Louise." After the Washington Mill Company closed the mill at Port Hadlock, Capt. Shibles became the master of the tug "Milwaukee," the Milwaukee spent most of her 42-year career operating in car barge service between Seattle and Port Townsend (Stalheim 1983a).

Galster House: The building was constructed circa 1890 by Samuel Hadlock, capitalist and founder of the Port Hadlock town site. Hadlock came to Port Townsend Bay in 1870 after building and being the superintendent of a Tacoma lumber mill. In 1886, the same year the Washington Mill Company moved to Port Hadlock, Samuel Hadlock laid off the town site. Local sources report that Samuel Hadlock lived in the second floor of this building. The historical usage of the building is best known after William Galster moved to Port Hadlock in 1906. Lena and William Galster arrived in Port Hadlock in 1906, purchased the Hadlock House from Humphrey Oldfield, and moved into the second floor. On the first floor was a saloon where Galster tended bar. The Galsters also purchased the adjacent building (Stalheim 1983b).

Hattie Williams House: It is believed that the Hattie Williams House was built in 1911, just prior to or during the downfall of the Western Steel Corporation's iron and steel works in Irondale. Hattie Williams, together with Otto E. Staack, operated a mercantile company, Williams & Staack. The business was
begun on May 6, 1910, and was located in Irondale's "downtown" at the foot of Moore Street. Williams & Staack declared bankruptcy in February of 1913. Hattie Williams sold the property in 1928 to George and Tora Shold (Stalheim 1983c).

**Methodist Episcopal Church of Port Hadlock:** Port Hadlock residents incorporated the Methodist Episcopal Church of Port Hadlock in 1905. The organizers were Herbert and Alice Gray, John D. Phillips, Mary Cotton Blake, and Lillian S. Delanty. Samuel Hadlock, capitalist and founder of Port Hadlock, donated $2,000 worth of land for the church. A circuit rider ministered the Port Hadlock church, which was in use until the 1950's when a new church was built between Hadlock and Chimacum (Stalheim 1983d).

**Irondale Jail:** The Irondale Jail was constructed in 1911 by Williams H. Merrick as an alternative to transporting Irondale’s lawbreakers to Port Townsend (Stalheim 1983e).

**Irondale Historic District:** The Irondale Historic District is significant because of the association and importance the iron and steel works at Irondale had in the development of the Pacific Coast iron and steel industry. Throughout the years of operation under various ownerships, the Irondale plant was a pivotal company in the industry. The second furnace on the Pacific Coast to produce pig iron was constructed at Irondale; the first being at Oswego, Oregon, in the late 1860's. When steel production was added in 1910, the company was the first complete plant west of Denver to produce both iron and steel. The works employed between 100 and 300 people and was responsible for the significant growth of the Irondale community. A fire in 1914 claimed most of Irondale's commercial section (Stalheim 1983f). Some remains of the smelting operation can be found in the nearby woods with the four remaining worker houses being the only standing remnants of Irondale during the period of significance identified during the Historic District nomination process.

### 4.2 Previous Cultural Resources Surveys

Tt conducted a literature review of previous cultural resource investigations found within one mile of the APE. The file search revealed that two archaeological surveys have been completed within the search radius (Table 1). Neither of these reports documented any new archaeological resources.
Cultural Resource Report #1346137 took place outside of the project area. This survey completed a 100% surface reconnaissance survey and three shovel test scraps over the proposed project area. No cultural materials were identified by this survey.

Cultural Resource Report #1346660 took place outside of the project area. This survey included a 100% surface survey, sixteen 1 meter by 1 meter excavation units and ten backhoe trenches to investigate the surface and subsurface presence of archaeological materials. As a result, cultural materials from both the pre-contact and post-contact periods were identified and are associated with known archaeological sites.

### 4.4 Expected Cultural Resources

The study area and APE cover an area where significant cultural history has been documented. The Chimacum group clearly occupied the area and utilized a number of resources. Euro-American settlement in the region has a well-documented history of timber procurement, shipbuilding, and iron processing. Artifacts and cultural features relating to any of these activities could be found in the region.

The APE also includes areas where severe disturbances have already occurred and intact cultural deposits are unlikely to be found. The majority of the undertaking is to take place within existing road ROWs where previous disturbances reach 32 – 42 inches below ground surface (BGS). Additionally the proposed wastewater treatment facility and reuse area will be located on former gravels pits where excavations ranged approximately 6 to 40 feet bgs.

Evidence of Euro-American industry or settlement is not likely to be found in these locations due to the types of disturbances that these areas have experienced. The existing road ROW’s have been excavated several feet down and had that soil replaced with a stable fill material appropriate for road construction.
The remaining areas are former gravels pits where all excavated materials that could hold evidence of human occupation and use have been distributed out in the form of top soil and gravel.

Evidence of Chemakum and earlier native groups use of the project area would only be found in a subsurface context due to the level of disturbances experienced by the surface of the projects area i.e. Port Hadlock and Irondale construction and maintenance activities. Shovel test probes will help identify subsurface archaeological materials in areas where significant disturbances have not occurred.

4.4.1 Prehistoric-Era Site Types
Pre-contact site types are unlikely to be identified due to the level of post contact activity over the APE. Significant disturbances, such as gravel excavation and road construction, have occurred that not only remove cultural materials from their depositional contexts, but from the area all together. Despite these disturbances, prehistoric materials can still be found considering the known occupation of the region by native peoples and the presence of significant archaeological sites in the area, including sites 45JE27 and 45JE277. Expected pre-contact site types include village remains, procurement activity locations, and shell midden deposits.

4.4.2 Historic-Era Site Types
Significant disturbances, such as gravel excavation and road construction, have occurred that not only remove cultural materials from their depositional contexts, but from the area all together. Despite these disturbances, Historic-Era materials can still be found considering the known occupation of the region by Euro-Americans and the known commercial and industrial development that has occurred in the last 150 years. Expected Euro-American site types include timber procurement, early 20th century industrial development, and features relating to the construction of residential houses found adjacent to the APE.

4.5 Present Conditions
JE00027 is listed on the State Register and covers a large area where significant contemporary development has already occurred. Presently the Northwest School of Boat Building, the Ajax Café (The Galster House) and Cottage Rentals occupy the north portion of the site that is accessible via Lower Hadlock Road. This northern portion of the site is the only area where project work will be completed. Photos 2 and 3 show the existing conditions and the portion of road that will be disturbed as a result of this project.
Photo 1. Facing north along the existing road within 45JE27

Photo 2. Facing south along the road within 45JE27
Site# JE00201: Has been determined ineligible for the NRHP. This site is found offshore and no remnants of the ship where observed. No part of the proposed project area will come close to the site.

Site# JE00277: This site is the Chimacum Creek Village that was first recorded by Euro-Americans in 1856 on a coastal survey map. Former archaeological surveys and site investigations have gathered information on this resource but it has not been evaluated for the NRHP. Significant surface disturbances have occurred over the site that was investigated under Cultural Resource Report # 1346660. According to the survey report sediments have been placed over the site and a protective bulkhead further protects the site. No evidence of the site was observed during a pedestrian survey of the location. No portion of the proposed project area will come in contact with 45JE00277.

Photo 3. View of 45JE277 facing north.
Site# JE00285: This site is a pre contact lithic debitage scatter and historic debris scatter. Information has been gathered on this resource but it has not been evaluated for the NRHP. No evidence of the site was observed during a pedestrian survey of the location. No portion of the proposed project area will come in contact with 45JE00285.

Photo 4. View of JE00285.
Site# JE00286: This site is a pre contact lithic debitage scatter that included a bone tool. Information has been gathered on this resource but it has not been evaluated for the NRHP. No evidence of the site was observed during a pedestrian survey of the location. No portion of the proposed project area will come in contact with 45JE00286.

Photo 5. View of JE00286, Facing west towards the site.
Site # JE00289: This site is the location of the Chimacum pilings alignment that was once part of the Historic Commercial Dock once located in the area. The site is listed as potentially eligible for the NRHP but it has not been evaluated for the NRHP. The pilings are still in place and can be seen in photo 6. No associated cultural materials were observed as a result of a pedestrian survey. No portion of the proposed project area will come in contact with 4SJE00289.
National Register of Historic Places Properties

Properties that reflect the prehistoric occupation and historical development of our nation, state, and local communities and are greater than 50 years in age can be eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) requires federal agencies to take into consideration the affect of their actions (including federally funded, permitted, or licensed projects) on properties listed in, or determined eligible for listing in, the National Register of Historic Places. Preservation of these resources is of great concern to the Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation who administers the NRHP list of properties in Washington State. It includes districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that have been identified and documented as being significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering or culture.

The Irondale and Port Hadlock Sewer Project will utilize federal resources and is therefore subject to review by the DAHP for possible adverse effects to properties listed on and/or eligible for listing on the NRHP.

Six properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places are found near to or adjacent to the proposed project area. None of these properties fall within the proposed project area and none will be disturbed or adversely affected by the proposed actions. The NRHP properties are described below to document their current condition and give insight to the existing historical context that is found near the project area.
Captain Peter Shibles House

The Shibles House has undergone renovations in the form of siding replacement and likely a new roof. The interior of the house was not observed at the time of survey. The proposed APE comes as close as 30 feet to the house. No effects to the house are expected from the proposed project work.
Galster House
Now known as the Ajax Café the structure is still in good condition. The proposed APE comes as close as 15 feet to the house. No effects to the structure are expected from the proposed project work.

Photo 8. View facing NW towards the Galster House
Hattie Williams House

The Hattie Williams House remains in good condition and is still used as a residence today. The proposed APE comes as close as 20 feet to the house. No effects to the structure are expected from the proposed project work.

Photo 9. Facing SW towards the Hattie Williams House
Methodist Episcopal Church of Port Hadlock
The Methodist Episcopal Church of Port Hadlock building still stands but appears to be a residence today. The proposed APE comes as close as 30 feet to the church. No effects to the structure are expected from the proposed project work.

Photo 10. Facing north towards the Methodist Episcopal Church of Port Hadlock
Irondale Jail

The Irondale jail has suffered greatly over time and no longer stands. Blackberry has overgrown the jail and the only remaining visible remains of the jail are is collapsed walls. No effects to the structure are expected from the proposed project work.

Photo 11. Facing north towards the remains of the Irondale Jail.
Irondale Historic District

Today the historic district is made up of four homes that were originally intended for use by company officials. Remains of the iron smelters were found along a path that leads off to the north of these houses, see photo 14. No effects to the structure are expected from the proposed project work.
Photo 13. Facing SW towards the western most structure within the Irondale Historic District.
SECTION 5.0 METHODOLOGY

Investigation of the cultural resources contained within and around the APE involved a literature search of the project area and a physical survey of the project lands. The literature search was accomplished by reviewing the records of the Washington DAHP, University of Washington Special Collections Department, and Jefferson County Historical Society, as well as by conducting interviews of long-time local residents.

Road building and quarry activities have disturbed a physical majority of the APE. The ROWs have been previously excavated a minimum of 32 inches bgs to accommodate road construction. Two areas in the north and south portions of the APE appear to be relatively untouched by soil excavations. These locations were shovel tested on a 50-foot (15-meter) grid down to sterile sub soil and designated as Shovel Test Probe (STP) Area 1, STP Area 2 and STP Area 3 (Figure 4).
Figure 4. STP Locations and plan view of the proposed wastewater and stormwater facility.

Remaining proposed disturbance areas of the APE are existing roads covered with asphalt and cannot reasonably be shovel tested. Given the existing disturbances from road construction and the known depth of prior excavations, the probability for any intact cultural materials to exist in these areas is extremely low.
SECTION 6.0 INVENTORY RESULTS
This section documents the results of the field survey conducted for this undertaking. No new cultural resources were identified.

6.1 OBSERVATIONS
Significant disturbances in the form of road excavations and quarry activities were noted during field activities within the APE. Known cultural resources in the study area were visited. Historic architectural resources are the only remaining documented cultural resources known to exist within the study area. Lithic scatters and village sites known to be close to the APE have undergone protection activities (Section 4.5 - 45JE277) or have been built over by post-contact development (Section 4.6 - 45JE27). The APE is found in an area where significant pre-contact and post-contact occupations have occurred and cultural materials would be expected when surveys are conducted in an undisturbed context. This undertaking however is limited to areas where severe disturbances have occurred and cultural materials are not expected to be found in situ or at all.

6.2 SHOVEL TEST PROBES
Thirty-five shovel test probes were dug in three locations of the IPHUGA APE, STP Areas 1, 2 and 3 (Figure 4). Field notes documenting observations of the STPs are included in Appendix A. STP’s were dug using a rounded shovel and soil was sifted through ¼” screen. Widths of the shovel test probes were no greater than 30 cm. Munsell soil color and texture descriptions were used to describe the soil found in the STP’s.
6.2.1 STP Area 1
A connection line between the infiltration ponds and the storage ponds and facility equipment area would be constructed in this portion of the APE. A dirt road exists along most of this corridor, which is used to access the gravel pit operation where the storage ponds and facility equipment area are to be located. Fifteen STPs were dug in this area (Appendix A). No cultural resources were found in any of the STPs.

Figure 5. Area 1 Shovel Test Probe Locations
6.2.2 STP Area 2

A connection line between the wastewater sewer collection system and wastewater treatment plant would be constructed in this portion of the APE. Eighteen STPs were dug in STP Area 2 (Appendix A). This location is a semi-mature forest with thick undergrowth. No obvious disturbances are present although the area has likely been logged in the past considering the even age of the trees and their relatively young age. No cultural materials were identified.

![Area 2 Shovel Test Probe Locations](image)

Figure 6. Area 2 Shovel Test Probe Locations
6.2.3 **STP Area 3**

STP Area 3 is limited to the immediate ground surface of a mature cottonwood tree that, according to the landowner, pre-dates the gravel pit operation. Hard packed gravel roads surround this area and only two STPs were dug (Appendix A). No cultural materials were identified in either STP. A child’s tree swing was found in the cottonwood tree and left in place.

![Photo 14.View of STP Area 3](image1)

6.3 **Potential Effects of the Undertaking**

No cultural resources were identified during the field survey; however, one archaeological site, State Register-listed 45JE00027, extends within the APE. Site 45JE00027 is listed on the State Register and covers a large area where significant contemporary development has already occurred. Presently the
Northwest School of Boat Building, the Ajax Café (The Galster House) and Cottage Rentals occupy the north portion of the site that is accessible via Lower Hadlock Road. This northern portion of the site is the only area where project work will be completed. Photos 2 and 3 show the existing conditions and the portion of road that will be disturbed as a result of this project.

Photo 15. Facing north along the existing road within 45JE27
None of the remaining resources are within the IPHUGA APE. Therefore, the undertaking will have no affect on the following properties found to be near or adjacent to the APE.

Site# JE00201: The remains of a sunken ship found in Port Townsend Bay. Project activities will not affect this site.

Site# JE00277: The site of the Chemakum Creek Village. The site has been buried by previous restoration efforts. The site falls outside of the project APE and will not be affected by project activities.

Site# JE00285: A pre contact lithic debitage scatter. The site has likely been buried by the same restoration activities that occurred over site#45JE0277, no components of this site were found during a field visit. The site falls outside of the project APE and will not be affected by project activities.
Site# JE00286: A pre contact lithic debitage scatter. The site has likely been buried by the same restoration activities that occurred over site#45JE0277, no components of this site were found during a field visit. The site falls outside of the project APE and will not be affected by project activities.

Site# JE00289: The Chemakum piling feature. The site is found on the beach near Port Townsend Bay and Chemakum Creek. The site falls outside of the project APE and will not be affected by project activities.

Captain Peter Shibles House: The house is found adjacent to the APE along a road that will be excavated and repaired during project activities. Project activities are expected to remain within the previously disturbed ROW and will not physically affect the structure, visual impacts will be limited to the period of excavation and construction.

Galster House: The house is found adjacent to the APE along a road that will be excavated and repaired during project activities. Project activities are expected to remain within the previously disturbed ROW and will not physically affect the structure, visual impacts will be limited to the period of excavation and construction.

Hattie Williams House: The house is found adjacent to the APE along a road that will be excavated and repaired during project activities. Project activities are expected to remain within the previously disturbed ROW and will not physically affect the structure, visual impacts will be limited to the period of excavation and construction.

Methodist Episcopal Church of Port Hadlock: The structure is found adjacent to the APE along a road that will be excavated and repaired during project activities. Project activities are expected to remain within the previously disturbed ROW and will not physically affect the structure, visual impacts will be limited to the period of excavation and construction.

Irondale Jail: The former jail is found approximately 100 meters from the closest project component where a road will be excavated and repaired during project activities. Project activities are expected to remain within the previously disturbed ROW and will not physically affect the structure.
Irondale Historic District: The District is found over the APE were roads that will be excavated and repaired during project activities. The district is composed of four historic homes (Photo 12 and 13) which are adjacent to the APE. The existing road that will be disturbed has been maintained and kept up to date and is not considered a historic feature since the road appears much younger than 50 years old. Project activities are expected to remain within the previously disturbed ROW and will not physically affect any of the structures, visual impacts will be limited to the period of excavation and construction. After project activities are completed, the historic district will have lost none of its historical identity or integrity.
SECTION 7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Excavation work near 45JE00027 should be monitored by an archaeologist to document any archaeological materials that may be present and to administer a stop dig order should an archaeological feature be found. If an archaeological feature is identified then the Inadvertent Discovery Plan found in Appendix B should be followed to ensure that proper agency protocols are followed.

Tt recommends that the construction project manager and excavation personnel be familiarized with the types of cultural resources found in the Irondale/Port Hadlock region. This can be done by completing a short training program by a Tt archaeologist to inform personnel of the cultural resources found in the areas that they are working so that if personnel do uncover any archaeological remains they can issue a stop order and follow the proper protocol as outlined in Appendix B.

Using the above recommendations and based on the results of the literature review and subsequent survey of the project area, Tt recommends that the undertaking be implemented as planned.

7.1 Unanticipated Discoveries

If artifacts or unusual amounts of bone or shell are uncovered during the construction activity, work will be stopped and a qualified archeologist will be contacted for on-site consultation. If said bone is found to be human then work should be halted in the vicinity of the find and local law enforcement officials should be contacted. If the local coroner determines that the human remains are archaeological in nature, a qualified archaeologist should inspect the find area and consultation with the WADAHP and local tribes should be initiated. Implementation of the Inadvertent Discovery Plan (Appendix B) will ensure no adverse effects to historic properties occur.
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Appendix A

Shovel Test Probe Notes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STP #</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Soil Description</th>
<th>STP Depth</th>
<th>Materials Found/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP AREA 1</td>
<td>Very dark brown sandy loam, moderate compaction (0-35 cm.) Grayish brown clayey sand (35-55 cm.)</td>
<td>55 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>STP AREA 1</td>
<td>Very dark brown sandy loam, moderate compaction (0-35 cm.) Grayish brown clayey sand (35-50 cm.)</td>
<td>50 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>STP AREA 1</td>
<td>Very dark brown sandy loam, moderate compaction (0-35 cm.) Grayish brown clayey sand (35-60 cm.)</td>
<td>60 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>STP AREA 1</td>
<td>Very dark brown sandy loam, moderate compaction (0-30 cm.) Grayish brown clayey sand (35-60 cm.)</td>
<td>60 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>STP AREA 1</td>
<td>Very dark brown sandy loam, moderate compaction (0-35 cm.) Grayish brown clayey sand (35-60 cm.)</td>
<td>60 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>STP AREA 1</td>
<td>Very dark brown sandy loam, moderate compaction (0-40 cm.) Grayish brown clayey sand (35-65 cm.)</td>
<td>65 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>STP AREA 1</td>
<td>Very dark brown sandy loam, moderate compaction (0-45 cm.) Grayish brown clayey sand (35-65 cm.)</td>
<td>65 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>STP AREA 1</td>
<td>Very dark brown sandy loam, moderate compaction (0-45 cm.) Grayish brown clayey sand (35-65 cm.)</td>
<td>65 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>STP AREA 1</td>
<td>Very dark brown sandy loam, moderate compaction (0-45 cm.) Grayish brown clayey sand (35-65 cm.)</td>
<td>65 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>STP AREA 1</td>
<td>Very dark brown sandy loam, moderate compaction (0-45 cm.) Grayish brown clayey sand (35-65 cm.)</td>
<td>65 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>STP AREA 1</td>
<td>Very dark brown sandy loam, moderate compaction (0-45 cm.) Grayish brown clayey sand (35-65 cm.)</td>
<td>65 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>STP AREA 1</td>
<td>Very dark brown sandy loam, moderate compaction (0-45 cm.) Grayish brown clayey sand (35-65 cm.)</td>
<td>65 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>STP AREA 1</td>
<td>Very dark brown sandy loam, moderate compaction (0-45 cm.) Grayish brown clayey sand (35-65 cm.)</td>
<td>65 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>STP AREA 1</td>
<td>Very dark brown sandy loam, moderate compaction (0-45 cm.) Grayish brown clayey sand (35-65 cm.)</td>
<td>65 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>STP AREA 1</td>
<td>Very dark brown sandy loam, moderate compaction (0-45 cm.) Grayish brown clayey sand (35-65 cm.)</td>
<td>65 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>STP AREA 2</td>
<td>Very dark brown loam (0-60 cm.) Grayish Brown clayey sand (60-70 cm.)</td>
<td>70 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>STP AREA 2</td>
<td>Very dark brown loam (0-60 cm.) Grayish Brown clayey sand (60-80 cm.)</td>
<td>80 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>STP AREA 2</td>
<td>Very dark brown loam (0-55 cm.) Grayish Brown clayey sand (55-70 cm.)</td>
<td>70 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>STP AREA 2</td>
<td>Very dark brown loam (0-60 cm.) Grayish Brown clayey sand (60-70 cm.)</td>
<td>70 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>STP AREA 2</td>
<td>Very dark brown loam (0-55 cm.) Grayish Brown clayey sand (55-70 cm.)</td>
<td>70 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>STP AREA 2</td>
<td>Very dark brown loam (0-60 cm.) Grayish Brown clayey sand (60-70 cm.)</td>
<td>70 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>STP AREA 2</td>
<td>Very dark brown loam (0-60 cm.) Grayish Brown clayey sand (60-70 cm.)</td>
<td>70 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP #</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Soil Description</td>
<td>STP Depth</td>
<td>Materials Found/Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>STP AREA 2</td>
<td>Very dark brown loam (0-60 cm.) Grayish Brown clayey sand (60-70 cm.)</td>
<td>70 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>STP AREA 2</td>
<td>Very dark brown loam (0-60 cm.) Grayish Brown clayey sand (60-70 cm.)</td>
<td>70 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>STP AREA 2</td>
<td>Very dark brown loam (0-60 cm.) Grayish Brown clayey sand (60-70 cm.)</td>
<td>70 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>STP AREA 2</td>
<td>Very dark brown loam (0-60 cm.) Grayish Brown clayey sand (60-70 cm.)</td>
<td>70 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>STP AREA 2</td>
<td>Very dark brown loam (0-60 cm.) Grayish Brown clayey sand (60-70 cm.)</td>
<td>70 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>STP AREA 2</td>
<td>Very dark brown loam (0-60 cm.) Grayish Brown clayey sand (60-70 cm.)</td>
<td>70 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>STP AREA 2</td>
<td>Very dark brown loam (0-60 cm.) Grayish Brown clayey sand (60-70 cm.)</td>
<td>70 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>STP AREA 2</td>
<td>Very dark brown loam (0-60 cm.) Grayish Brown clayey sand (60-70 cm.)</td>
<td>70 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>STP AREA 2</td>
<td>Very dark brown loam (0-60 cm.) Grayish Brown clayey sand (60-70 cm.)</td>
<td>70 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>STP AREA 2</td>
<td>Very dark brown loam (0-60 cm.) Grayish Brown clayey sand (60-70 cm.)</td>
<td>70 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>STP AREA 2</td>
<td>Very dark brown loam (0-50 cm.) Grayish Brown clayey sand (50-00 cm.)</td>
<td>70 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>STP AREA 3</td>
<td>Compacted Brown clayey sand with 50% subangular gravels (0-30 cm.) Grayish brown sandy clay (30-50 cm.)</td>
<td>50 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>STP AREA 3</td>
<td>Compacted Brown clayey sand with 50% subangular gravels (0-30 cm.) Grayish brown sandy clay (30-50 cm.)</td>
<td>50 cm.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Inadvertent Discovery Plan
PLAN AND PROCEDURES FOR THE UNANTICIPATED DISCOVERY OF CULTURAL RESOURCES AND HUMAN SKELETAL REMAINS

IRONDALE AND PORT HADLOCK SEWER PROJECT, JEFFERSON COUNTY WASHINGTON

1. INTRODUCTION

The following Unanticipated Discovery Plan (UDP) outlines procedures to follow, in accordance with state and federal laws, if archaeological materials or human remains are discovered.

2. RECOGNIZING CULTURAL RESOURCES

A cultural resource discovery could be prehistoric or historic. Examples include:

- An accumulation of shell, burned rocks, or other food related materials
- Bones or small pieces of bone,
- An area of charcoal or very dark stained soil with artifacts,
- Stone tools or waste flakes (i.e. an arrowhead, or stone chips),
- Clusters of tin cans or bottles, logging or agricultural equipment that appears to be older than 50 years,
- Buried railroad tracks, decking, or other industrial materials.

When in doubt, assume the material is a cultural resource.

3. ON-SITE RESPONSIBILITIES

STEP 1: STOP WORK. If any employee, contractor or subcontractor believes that he or she has uncovered a cultural resource at any point in the project, all work adjacent to the discovery must stop. The discovery location should be secured at all times.

STEP 2: NOTIFY MONITOR. If there is an archaeological monitor for the project, notify that person. If there is a monitoring plan in place, the monitor will follow its provisions.

STEP 3: NOTIFY PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND QUALIFIED ARCHAEOLOGIST. Contact the Construction Project Manager and the Qualified Archaeologist responsible for cultural resources oversight.
Assigned Qualified Archaeologist:
Name: Frank Stipe
Number: 425-482-7821
Email: frank.stipe@tetratech.com

The Project Manager or the Cultural Resources Program will make all other calls and notifications.

If human remains are encountered, treat them with dignity and respect at all times. Cover the remains with a tarp or other materials (not soil or rocks) for temporary protection in place and to shield them from being photographed. Do not call 911 or speak with the media.
4. FURTHER CONTACTS AND CONSULTATION

A. Project Manager’s Responsibilities:

- **Protect Find:** The Project Manager is responsible for taking appropriate steps to protect the discovery site. All work will stop in an area adequate to provide for the total security, protection, and integrity of the resource. Vehicles, equipment, and unauthorized personnel will not be permitted to traverse the discovery site. Work in the immediate area will not resume until treatment of the discovery has been completed following provisions for treating archaeological/cultural material as set forth in this document.

- **Direct Construction Elsewhere On-site:** The Project Manager may direct construction away from cultural resources to work in other areas prior to contacting the concerned parties.

- **Contact CR Manager:** If the CR Program Manager has not yet been contacted, the Project Manager will do so.

B. CR Program Manager’s Responsibilities:

- **Identify Find:** The CR Program Manager (or a CR Specialist if so delegated), will ensure that a qualified professional archaeologist examines the find to determine if it is archaeological.
  
  - If it is determined not archaeological, work may proceed with no further delay.
  
  - If it is determined to be archaeological, the CR Manager or CR Specialist will continue with notification.
  
  - If the find may be human remains or funerary objects, the CR Manager or CR Specialist will ensure that a qualified physical anthropologist examines the find. If it is determined to be human remains, the procedure described in Section 5 will be followed.

- **Notify DAHP:** The CR Program Manager (or a CR Specialist if so delegated) will contact the involved federal agencies (if any) and the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP).

- **Notify Tribes:** If the discovery may relate to Native American interests, the Manager or Specialist will also contact the project’s Tribal Liaison, or, if the project is not assigned a Liaison, the Executive Tribal Liaison.
The Tribal Liaison, or CR Program Manager or Specialist, will contact the interested and affected Tribes.

Tribes consulted on this project are:

C. Further Activities

- Archaeological discoveries will be documented as described in Section 6.
- Construction in the discovery area may resume as described in Section 7.
5. SPECIAL PROCEDURES FOR THE DISCOVERY OF HUMAN SKELETAL MATERIAL

Any human skeletal remains, regardless of antiquity or ethnic origin, will at all times be treated with dignity and respect. Should suspected human remains be discovered:

A. Notify Law Enforcement Agency or Coroner’s Office:

In addition to the actions described in Sections 3 and 4, the Project Manager will immediately notify the local law enforcement agency or coroner’s office.

The coroner (with assistance of law enforcement personnel) will determine if the remains are human, whether the discovery site constitutes a crime scene, and will notify DAHP.

B. Participate in Consultation:

Per RCW 27.53.030, RCW 68.50, and RCW 68.60, DAHP will have jurisdiction over non-forensic human remains.

Further Activities:

- Documentation of human skeletal remains and funerary objects will be agreed upon through the consultation process described in RCW 27.53.030, RCW 68.50, and RCW 68.60.

- When consultation and documentation activities are complete, construction in the discovery area may resume as described in Section 7.

6. DOCUMENTATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL MATERIALS

Archaeological deposits discovered during construction will be assumed eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion D.

Cultural Resources staff will ensure the proper documentation and assessment of any discovered cultural resources in cooperation with the federal agencies (if any), DAHP, affected tribes, and a contracted consultant (if any).

All prehistoric and historic cultural material discovered during project construction will be recorded by a professional archaeologist on State of Washington cultural resource site or isolate form using standard techniques. Site overviews, features, and artifacts will be photographed; stratigraphic profiles and soil/sediment descriptions will be prepared for subsurface exposures. Discovery locations will be documented on scaled site plans and site location maps.

Cultural features, horizons and artifacts detected in buried sediments may require further evaluation using hand-dug test units. Units may be dug in controlled fashion to expose features, collect samples from undisturbed contexts, or interpret complex stratigraphy. A test excavation unit or small trench might also be used to determine if an intact occupation
surface is present. Test units will be used only when necessary to gather information on the nature, extent, and integrity of subsurface cultural deposits to evaluate the site’s significance. Excavations will be conducted using state-of-the-art techniques for controlling provenience.

Spatial information, depth of excavation levels, natural and cultural stratigraphy, presence or absence of cultural material, and depth to sterile soil, regolith, or bedrock will be recorded for each probe on a standard form. Test excavation units will be recorded on unit-level forms, which include plan maps for each excavated level, and material type, number, and vertical provenience (depth below surface and stratum association where applicable) for all artifacts recovered from the level. A stratigraphic profile will be drawn for at least one wall of each test excavation unit.

Sediments excavated for purposes of cultural resources investigation will be screened through 1/8-inch mesh, unless soil conditions warrant ¼-inch mesh.

All prehistoric and historic artifacts collected from the surface and from probes and excavation units will be analyzed, catalogued, and temporarily curated. Ultimate disposition of cultural materials will be determined in consultation with the federal agencies (if any), DAHP, and the affected tribes.

Within 90 days of concluding fieldwork, a technical report describing any and all monitoring and resultant archaeological excavations will be provided to the Project Manager, who will forward the report to WA DAHP, and the affected tribe(s).

If assessment activity exposes human remains (burials, isolated teeth, or bones), the process described in Section 5 above will be followed.

**7. PROCEEDING WITH CONSTRUCTION**

Project construction outside the discovery location may continue while documentation and assessment of the cultural resources proceed. A cultural resource specialist must determine the boundaries of the discovery location. In consultation with DAHP and affected tribes, Project Manager and Cultural Resources staff will determine the appropriate level of documentation and treatment of the resource. If federal agencies are involved, the agencies will make the final determinations about treatment and documentation.

Construction may continue at the discovery location only after the process outlined in this plan is followed including approval by WA DAHP and the concerned tribes who determine that compliance with state and federal laws is complete.