CULTURAL RESOURCES REPORT COVER SHEET

Author: Lara C. Rooke, RPA

Title of Report: Cultural Resources Assessment of the Jefferson Transit Center Project

Date of Report: November 14, 2011

County(ies): Jefferson Section: 33 Township: 30 Range: 1W
Quad: Port Townsend South Acres: 10

PDF of report submitted (REQUIRED) ☑ Yes

Historic Property Inventory Forms to be Approved Online? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Archaeological Site(s)/Isolate(s) Found or Amended? ☐ Yes ☑ No

TCP(s) found? ☐ Yes ☑ No

Replace a draft? ☐ Yes ☑ No

Satisfy a DAHP Archaeological Excavation Permit requirement? ☐ Yes ☑ No

DAHP Archaeological Site #:

- Submission of PDFs is required.
- Please be sure that any PDF submitted to DAHP has its cover sheet, figures, graphics, appendices, attachments, correspondence, etc., compiled into one single PDF file.
- Please check that the PDF displays correctly when opened.
November 15, 2011
1-915-17279-0

Jefferson Transit Authority
1615 W. Sims Way
Port Townsend, WA 98368

Attention: Rachel Katz

Subject: Cultural Resources Assessment of the Jefferson Transit Center Project, Jefferson County, Washington
DAHP Log No.: 031810-19-FTA

Dear Ms. Katz:

AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc. (AMEC), conducted a cultural resources assessment for the Jefferson Transit Center Project in Jefferson County, Washington. Jefferson Transit Authority hired AMEC to conduct an archaeological assessment for the project to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. For this report, AMEC conducted a record search and literature review for cultural resources located within or adjacent to the Project’s Area of Potential Effects (APE), a pedestrian and subsurface survey of the APE, and historic building inventory. Our research indicates that no previously recorded archaeological sites are located within or directly adjacent to the APE. Based on our fieldwork, AMEC finds that there are no known significant cultural resources within the APE and that No Historic Properties are Subject to Effect. If you have any questions about the results presented below, please contact Lara Rook at (425) 368-0964, or by email at lara.rooke@amec.com.

Sincerely,

AMEC Environment & Infrastructure

[Signature]

Lara C. Rook, RPA
Senior Archaeologist
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Jefferson Transit Authority proposes to construct a new transit center that would house an administration and vehicle maintenance facility. The proposed facility would be located on a 10-acre site that Transit purchased in 2007 at the northeast corner of Four Corners Road at State Highway 20, near Port Townsend, Washington.

Jefferson Transit contracted with AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc. (AMEC), to conduct a cultural resources investigation of the project site in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. AMEC conducted archival research to develop an historic context for the project site, completed a surface survey and subsurface testing investigation, coordinated Section 106 consultation, and inventoried historic buildings within the Project’s Area of Potential Effects (APE).

No archaeological resources were recorded during this investigation. Two historic buildings were inventoried and evaluated for listing in the National Register of Historic Places; neither met the criteria of eligibility. As a result, AMEC finds No Historic Properties are Subject to Effect within the Project’s APE. AMEC determines that no further cultural resource investigations or monitoring of earth-disturbing activities is required, prior to, or during the commencement of project construction.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

Jefferson Transit Authority (Jefferson Transit) proposes to construct a new transit center that would house an administration and vehicle maintenance facility. The proposed facility would be located on a 10-acre site that Transit purchased in 2007 at the northeast corner of Four Corners Road at State Highway 20, near Port Townsend, Washington (Figure 1). The project site is located in Section 33, Township 30 North, Range 1 West, of the Willamette Meridian.

Jefferson Transit contracted with AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc. (AMEC), to conduct a cultural resources investigation of the project site in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended. AMEC conducted archival research to develop an historic context for the project site, completed a pedestrian survey and intensive subsurface testing investigation, and documented two historic buildings. This report documents the findings of this effort.

2.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND

2.1 AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS

The proposed archaeological Area of Potential Effects (APE) includes the footprint of the property and encompasses the horizontal and vertical extent of the project (Figure 2). For historic resources, the APE is proposed as the project parcel itself and all adjacent tax parcels.

2.2 REGULATORY CONTEXT

This project is funded in part by federal and state grant funds administered by the Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT). As a federal undertaking the project is subject to the provisions of Section 106 of the NHPA and associated regulations 36 CFR 800 regarding the protection of cultural and historic resources. Section 106 of NHPA requires that federal agencies take into account the effects of their undertakings on significant, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-eligible, historic properties and afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) an opportunity to comment on these actions. Within the state of Washington, the NRHP program is administered by the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) under the direction of the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is the lead federal agency on this project.
For federal projects, cultural resource significance is evaluated in terms of eligibility for listing in the NRHP. The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects of state and local importance that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. In addition, they must meet one of the following criteria:

a) are associated with events that have made a contribution to the broad pattern of our history;

b) are associated with the lives of people significant in our past;

c) embody the distinct characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, represent the work of a master, possess high artistic values, or represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

d) have yielded, or are likely to yield, information important for understanding prehistory or history (36 CFR 60.4).

2.3 CONSULTATION WITH DAHP, TRIBES, AND OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES

Jefferson Transit has initiated consultation, on behalf of FTA, with the affected Native American tribes in compliance with Section 106 of NHPA. A project description letter, including a vicinity map, was sent to the Port Gamble and Jamestown S'Klallam Tribes, Suquamish Tribe and the Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe requesting any information they would like to share with the project team (Appendix A). A copy of this technical report will be submitted to the interested parties for review and comments. Any information gathered during that review will be incorporated in the final version of this report.

3.0 ENVIRONMENT AND CULTURAL SETTING

Contextual information on the environmental and cultural setting of the Project’s APE provides a framework in which to evaluate cultural resources. Understanding the geologic history within the APE provides insight toward the depositional context. This information, in conjunction with the cultural context is used to develop a research design and field methods for the investigation.

3.1 ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT

This section describes the environmental context of the APE. Elements of the environmental context include geology, soils, plants and animal habitats. Knowledge of the geologic processes associated with the landforms in this area can assist in locating archaeological resources. Geographic features such as shorelines, rivers, lakes, and terraces are often correlated with the archaeological record. Throughout prehistory, these locations provided an abundance of plant resources and fish and often attracted terrestrial animals as well. As a result, sites tend to be found at locations along shorelines, within active floodplains or along associated terraces. The depth of soils and potential for buried
deposits can be derived from soil surveys and geomorphologic descriptions of the project vicinity. Understanding the extent of native plant and ecological habitats provides a context for interpreting archaeological sites and activity locations.

3.1.1 Geology
The proposed project lies within the Puget Lowland physiographic province of western Washington State. The geomorphology of this landscape was shaped during the late Pleistocene by glacial activity and during the Holocene by fluvial erosion and eustatic sea level rise. During the Vashon Stade of the Fraser glaciation, the last glacial advance of the Pleistocene epoch, the Puget Lowland was completely scoured by the Puget Lobe of the Cordilleran ice sheet. At its maximum extent, approximately 19,000 years ago, the Puget Lobe advanced southward from British Columbia and extended across the Puget Lowland from the Cascade Mountain range in the east to the Olympic Mountains in the west (Booth 1987; Thorson 1980). As this large glacier retreated, drainage of glacial meltwater through the Strait of Juan de Fuca was blocked by the ice sheet. Subsequently, the immense troughs formed by the glacier were occupied by southward-draining proglacial lakes. Lacustrine (lake) sediments that accumulated in these beds have depths of almost 50 meters (164 feet) in some areas of the Puget basin (Thorson 1980). As the glacier eventually ablated and the northward-flowing drainage through the Strait of Juan de Fuca was reestablished, marine sediments flowed into the basin, forming the current Puget Sound, and meltwater carved many of the major river channels and lakes seen today.

The project area is located on the Quimper Peninsula, where Quaternary deposits may exceed 610 meters (2,000 feet) in depth. Local topography and soils were formed by glacial deposits during the Vashon Stade of the Fraser glaciation in the late Pleistocene. As the ice sheet retreated, meltwater streams deposited outwash gravels and sands and created ice-dammed lakes in front of the glacier which drained southward and westward. The project area is located between two upland terraces in a valley formed by a glacial meltwater channel. Both glacio-lacustrine and recessional outwash deposits have been documented in this area (Figure 3).

3.1.2 Soils
The predominant surface soils within the APE are characterized by the Soil Conservation Service as an Agnew Silt Loam (AgB) part of the Agnew series. This series consists of somewhat poorly drained soils that formed in Glacial Lake or marine deposits and is usually found on terraces, canyon slopes, and ocean bluffs (McCreary 1975). The Agnew Silt Loam is characterized by a 3 inch (7.5 cm) organic, dark brown silt loam which overlies a grayish brown, faintly mottled silt loam with a finer grained silty clay loam strata below (McCreary 1975). This series generally extends up to 60 inches (153 cm) in depth and is underlain by a grayish-brown to gray silty clay loam parent material with 10 to 50 percent rounded glacial pebble inclusions (McCreary 1975).
3.1.3 Natural Resources

Climatic changes since the end of the Pleistocene and the retreat of the Cordilleran glaciers are documented in the pollen records of regional lakes. Because changes in vegetation are influenced by climate, particularly temperature and precipitation, analyses of pollen records are useful indicators for understanding the timing and nature of these events. The pollen sequence from Lake Washington shows that during the early post-glacial period of 13,400 to 11,000 before present (BP), temperatures increased appreciably (Leopold et al. 1982). Sedge and grass that initially colonized the landscape as the ice receded were quickly replaced by forests of Douglas fir and true fir. This flora indicates conditions that were still relatively cool and moist. From 11,000 to 7,000 BP, Douglas fir, alder, and bracken fern dominated the local flora, indicating drier and perhaps warmer conditions than exist in the area today. After 7,000 BP, Douglas fir, western red cedar, and western hemlock dominated the landscape under conditions much like those of the present day (Brubaker 1991; Leopold et al. 1982; Mathewes and Heusser 1981; Suttles 1990a).

The project area is located within the Tsuga heterophylla or Western Hemlock zone of the Forest Province (Franklin and Dyrness 1973). The vegetation of the area is now primarily agricultural; however, historically dense stands of the following species provided canopy for the understory plants: Douglas fir, western hemlock, western red cedar, big-leaf maple, red alder, willow, and vine maple. Ferns, mosses, salal, Oregon grape, ocean spray, snowberry, wild rose, red huckleberry, blackberry, and salmonberry grew abundantly under heavy forest canopy (Franklin and Dyrness 1973).

3.2 Cultural Context

This section describes the cultural context of the APE, which will inform the evaluation of findings from the field investigations performed as part of this assessment. Elements of the cultural context include cultural chronologies developed for the prehistoric occupation through archaeological research, information derived from oral histories and Native American recollections, and historic events and land use patterns. Reviewing archival archaeological, historical and ethnographic documents provide insight towards developing hypotheses and a research design.
3.2.1 Prehistory

The first human occupation of Washington State may date back about 13,800 years to the Manis Mastodon site at Sequim, where a bone point and the spirally fractured bones of a mastodon indicate human hunting and butchering (Gustafson et al. 1979; Waters et al. 2011). Artifacts of the Clovis culture, which has been dated to between 13,000 and 13,500 years ago elsewhere in North America, have been found in isolated locales in southern and central Puget Sound, but no campsite of this culture has yet been found in Washington. The Richey Roberts site is the sole in situ discovery of Clovis archaeology in Washington (Gramly 1991; Mehringer 1985). Several similar early sites that are coeval in time and possibly predating Clovis in the region are presented in recent literature (Huckeberry et. al. 2003; Lenz 2006). This early culture is generally believed to have relied heavily on big game for subsistence, although there is evidence they also relied on plants and smaller animals (Cannon and Meltzer 2004).

The post-Clovis prehistory of Western Washington has been divided into three periods designated simply Early, Middle, and Late. The Early Period, which lasted from approximately 12,000 to 7,000 years ago, includes the Proto-Western and Old Cordilleran traditions (Matson and Coupland 1995). Sites left by these traditions typically occur on high marine and river terraces, sometimes at significant distances from modern water courses; they consist of concentrations of cobbles, flakes, large, ovate knives, and broad-stemmed and leaf-shaped projectile points (Wessen 1990). People are thought to have relied more on inland hunting than on fishing and shellfish procurement for subsistence, although finds along the British Columbia coast indicate aquatic resources were sometimes important (Blukis-Onat 1987). Regionally, sites of this period are referred to as Olcott sites (Thomson 1961; Kidd 1964). Olcott sites are common in the vicinity of the project area (e.g. Stilson and Chatters 1981; Blukis-Onat et al. 2001). Few of these sites have been dated, so the chronology of Olcott remains one of the key mysteries of Western Washington archaeology (cf. Chatters et al. 2010).

The Middle Period, lasting from 7,000 to 3,500 years ago, incorporates a continuation of the Old Cordilleran Tradition until around 4,500 years ago, but few sites can be attributed to this time interval (Morgan 1999; Blukis-Onat et al. 2001). Sites dating after 4,500 years ago are more common, technologically more complex, and more diverse. They often include tools and ornaments of bone and antler, along with chipped stone (although preservation may be a major factor in the difference). On the basis of work at West Point, one of the few well-studied sites of this era just north of downtown Seattle, the lifestyle is interpreted as highly mobile and oriented to foraging for seasonally available foods, with little emphasis on mass harvesting or food storage (Larson and Lewarch 1995). The focus of subsistence activity seems to have changed from terrestrial to marine resources; most sites appear along the coasts or major river systems. The oldest shell midden sites in the region date to this period.
Human lifeways changed radically in the Late Period (3,500 to 150 years ago), as people focused even more strongly on aquatic resources; the number and diversity of sites increased markedly. People maintained permanent villages on the coast and along the lower reaches of inland rivers. They used these as home bases and storage warehouses for fish, shellfish, game, and plant foods systematically amassed during the warm seasons. Huge shell middens built up in saltwater settings. Cemeteries and petroglyph sites are often associated with villages, midden sites, and fishing camps; petroglyphs also occur occasionally in higher montane settings. Blazed cedars, stripped of bark for basketry or with planks removed from their living trunks, can still be found throughout the lowlands. Small open camps—left by hunters, fishers, plant gatherers, and traders—have been found from the lowlands well into the subalpine zone of the mountains, but they usually remain close to larger, permanent sources of water. These camps typically are concentrated along trade routes that linked communities living east and west of the Cascades. People usually strayed from larger streams and lakes only in the larger prairies of the lowlands, such as those around Sequim (Morgan 1999), in the huckleberry fields of the uplands, and near natural outcroppings of favored tool stone. Open, temporary camps, manifested as lithic scatters, are common in these settings.

### 3.2.2 Ethnohistory

The project location lies within the traditional lands of the Chemakum, a small tribe that was later absorbed by the Klallam (Elmendorf 1990). The Chemakum occupied the shores of the Strait of Juan de Fuca and Puget Sound near the present day towns of Port Townsend, Port Hadlock, Port Ludlow, Discovery Bay and Chimacum (Ruby and Brown 1993). Native Americans inhabiting the study area may have collected and processed edible roots and berries from the marshes, prairies, and forests that once occupied the river valley (Suttles and Lane 1990). The Puget Sound and the protected bays along the coast line of the Salish Sea provided numerous resources including fish and shellfish, attracting other animals who grazed along the shores. Deer and elk may have been hunted in the forests, open clearings, and marsh edges around these waterways or nearby Lake Anderson (Suttles and Lane 1990). Stone tools were manufactured from locally available raw material sources into a variety of implements used for hunting and processing food. Archaeological deposits in the study area would reflect these activities and would consist of shell midden deposits, fire hearths, roasting pits, seasonal campsites, fish weirs, berry drying features, and lithic scatters.

The tribe's yearly patterns were similar to that found throughout the Puget Sound and western Washington. They lived in permanent, communal, cedar-plank houses through the winter and left those residences in spring to camp and hunt seasonally at various sites in the mountains, on the salt water shore, and on lowland prairies where food, medicines, and materials could be accumulated and where social contact with people from other villages could be made (Suttles and Lane 1990). They knew and used the entire landscape, netting salmon and hooking bottom fish in the open water of Puget Sound, and building weirs and traps in smaller creeks and tributaries. They used ground stone
for fishing weights and also for anchoring their canoes (Suttles and Lane 1990). They dug littleneck clams, cockles, geoducks, and horse clams and gathered mussels, snails, and crabs. They collected acorns, fern roots, wapato, and camas bulbs and picked salmon berries, salal berries, strawberries, and huckleberries. They peeled bark from red cedars for baskets, cut cattails and tules for mats, and twisted nettle fiber into strong twine (Suttles and Lane 1990). They hunted deer, elk, ducks, and geese and gathered eggs. They quarried and traded for stone from which they manufactured weapons and other domestic implements. And they fashioned an array of implements from bone that were used for fishing, hunting, and spiritual ceremonies.

Near the project area several locations have been identified as areas of importance for Native Americans. Identified through oral histories, many of these locations are described in historic documents in the form of toponyms, or place names. These locations are associated with Coast Salish tradition, settlements, and subsistence. Two Chemakum villages include Tebq̲ə, located near Irondale, and Cec-l-boo, a stockaded village reportedly located about 8 miles south of Port Townsend near the present-day town of Hadlock at the head of Hadlock Bay (Elmendorf 1990). After the Chemakum left the area, the Clallum continued to occupy these villages in addition to others established in the vicinity of Clallum Point, Discovery Bay, and Port Townsend.

3.2.3 History and Land Use
The project site is located in Jefferson County between the historic communities of Port Townsend, Irondale, Port Hadlock and Discovery Bay. Supported by the lumber industry many of these towns grew rapidly, as lumber companies established saw mills and developed infrastructure to support the industry. As the communities grew, business men from Port Hadlock created a steel plant in Irondale, forming the Puget Sound Iron Company. Although the company closed after 10 years, it reopened soon after under new ownership as the Western Steel Company, providing steel for the shipping and railroad industries.

By 1910 the lumber and steel industries came to an end; however growth in the Port Townsend community continued as the possibility of transcontinental railroad connection spurred development. Although the transcontinental railroad did not arrive, city leaders began to build an independent connection that would extend south to Portland, the Port Townsend Southern Railway (PTSR). After establishing lines from Port Townsend to Quilcene, the company fell into bankruptcy before reaching Oregon.

An historic 1890 map indicates that one branch of the Port Townsend Railway crossed through the project area, connecting Discovery Bay with the communities of Irondale and Port Hadlock (Whitney 1890). In addition, this map also shows that a military road extended across the project area connecting Fort Townsend with Discovery Bay.
The first land owners, Henry and Fannie Brown, purchased the land within the project site in the early 1920s, likely from one of the mill companies, however the original deed could not be located.

Henry Brown, born in Princeton, Maine, was employed in the logging industry (Port Townsend Leader 1934). He married Frances (Fannie) Gilson in 1902, a teacher in the school at Brinnon, and raised two sons. After passing in 1934, the land transferred to Francis and remained in her estate until her death in 1957 (Port Townsend Leader 1957).

After the death of Fannie Brown the land was purchased by Ronald Minaker, then transferred to his son, Henry Minaker in 1957 (Jefferson County Assessors Records). In 1986, Elizabeth Ely purchased the land, selling three years later to Alain and Judith Dechantal. The Dechantal family owned the property for four years, until 1993 when it was purchased by Mrs. Pepper and her husband, Richard Birkeland (Jefferson County Assessors Records).

The project property was purchased by Jefferson Transit in 2006 from Pamela Pepper. It is currently a vacant, forested lot with open grassy areas and blackberry thickets. Based on the County Records and Metsker’s Maps, the property transferred ownership five times, however archival research at the County records department did not indicate that the property had ever been developed or homesteaded.

4.0 RECORD SEARCH AND LITERATURE REVIEW

On September 26, 2011, Lara Rooke conducted a literature and record search review for this project by consulting the DAHP Washington Information System for Architectural and Archaeological Records Data (WISAARD) and by reviewing historic records, maps, and aerial photographs. The results of that research are outlined in Tables 1 and 2 below.

There have been only two cultural resource investigations conducted within two miles of the Project APE (Table 1). No significant historic or precontact cultural materials were identified during either of these projects. There are no known archaeological sites within four miles of the Project APE (Table 2). The nearest site to the Project is 45JE277, a precontact village/ lithic material site on Chimacum Creek which was initially documented by the 1856 U.S. Coast Survey (Kent 2004). With the exception of 45JE87, which is located near the shore of Lake Anderson, all of the precontact sites are located along the shoreline near the communities of Port Hadlock and Irondale. Several historic sites have also been documented that are associated with military, steel production, and logging activities. These include a shipwreck, and features associated with Fort Townsend and the Irondale Steel Plant.
Table 1  Previous Cultural Resources Surveys Conducted in or near the APE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>NADB</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Distance from Project APE</th>
<th>Relevant Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bush, K. R.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1348005</td>
<td>Archaeological Investigation Report: Jefferson County International Airport Improvement Project</td>
<td>1.25 miles</td>
<td>No cultural resources found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill, M.</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1349276</td>
<td>Archaeological Assessment for the Olympic Mobile Village and Quimper Water System Project, Jefferson County, Washington</td>
<td>&lt;1 mile</td>
<td>No cultural resources found</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2  Previously Recorded Archaeological Sites Located near the APE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Distance from Project APE</th>
<th>Relevant Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45JE26</td>
<td>Fort Townsend (1856-1895) artifact concentrations and remnant building foundations</td>
<td>4.5 miles</td>
<td>Artifacts and features associated with the military encampment of Fort Townsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45JE87</td>
<td>Tamanous Rock - spiritually significant place of the Chimacum Indians.</td>
<td>5 miles</td>
<td>Precontact rock alignment and associated artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45JE202</td>
<td>“Warhawk” 1883 shipwreck</td>
<td>5.5 miles</td>
<td>Shipwreck occurred during time of occupation of Fort Townsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45JE277</td>
<td>Chimacum Creek Precontact Village Site</td>
<td>4.5 miles</td>
<td>FMR concentrations identified within area of dredge spoils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45JE285</td>
<td>Precontact Lithic Material Isolate</td>
<td>5 miles</td>
<td>5 pieces of lithic debitage and 1 glass fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45JE286</td>
<td>Precontact Lithic Material/ Bone tool fragment Isolate</td>
<td>5 miles</td>
<td>1 piece of lithic debitage and 1 fragment of toggling harpoon valve (bone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45JE289</td>
<td>Chimacum Pilings Alignment</td>
<td>5 miles</td>
<td>Log pilings to unknown early 20th century building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45JE358</td>
<td>Irondale Iron and Steel Plant (1880-1919)</td>
<td>5.25 miles</td>
<td>Six foundations from buildings, 69 associated features, and historic artifact concentrations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.0 RESEARCH DESIGN

This section describes objectives of the study and the study methods used to accomplish these objectives.

5.1 OBJECTIVES

The objective of this cultural resource survey is to satisfy the requirements of Section 106 of the NHPA, as amended. The investigation seeks to identify whether archaeological sites, traditional cultural properties, and historic buildings or structures are present within the project APE, and assess and evaluate those resources. Any sites found within the APE will be documented and evaluated, so that potential impacts to those resources can be assessed and mitigated. These objectives will be accomplished through archival research and pedestrian and subsurface surveys.

5.2 FIELD METHODS

This section describes the field and documentation methods used for the cultural resource survey. Field studies involved three levels of investigation: pedestrian survey, subsurface testing, and historic building documentation. Ms. Rooke was the Principal Investigator on this project. Her qualifications meet and exceed the standards established by the Secretary of the Interior for archaeology.

5.2.1 Archaeological Survey

AMEC’s archaeologists systematically inspected the Project’s APE for surface and subsurface artifacts October 4 through 6, 2011. During the surface inspection the archaeologists walked along north/south transects spaced approximately 30 meters (100 feet) apart, focusing their attention on any soil exposures. Subsurface testing consisted of excavating shovel test probes (STPs) at 30–meter (100-feet) intervals across the APE. STPs were excavated approximately 40 centimeters (15 inches) in diameter and varied in depth up to 100 centimeters (33.5 inches) depending on the sediment. All excavated soils were screened though a 0.25-inch screen onto a drop cloth. After completion, the excavated soil was placed back into the probe. STP locations were recorded using a handheld GPS unit. The results from our subsurface exploration efforts are described below and presented in detail in Appendix B. Notes and photographs are on file in the AMEC office in Bothell, Washington.

5.2.2 Built Environment Survey

Prior to the historic buildings field survey, AMEC reviewed the assessors records for Jefferson County to identify which buildings within the Project’s APE were 50 years or older. As a result of this research, AMEC compiled a list of historic buildings that met the age requirement for listing in the NRHP. These buildings were documented and evaluated during the field survey.
The historic property survey was conducted on October 4, 2011. As part of this investigation, we assessed the architectural conditions and looked for alterations and changes in the building or its historic setting. In order for a building to be considered eligible for listing in the NRHP, it must meet one of the criteria of eligibility and retain most of the seven aspects of integrity, including integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association (36 CFR 60.4). Each building was considered for integrity as an individual building and as a contributing element of a larger district.

6.0 INVENTORY RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

This section describes the results of the cultural resource survey and presents a description and evaluation of all cultural resources observed during the survey.

6.1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY RESULTS

AMEC’s archaeologists, Lara Rooker, RPA, Tim Gerrish, Emily Scott, and Tyler McWilliams, systematically inspected the Project’s APE for surface and subsurface artifacts. The ground surface within the APE was densely covered with vegetation. The landscape was hummocky and covered with brambles, Western Cedar, Salal, Oregon grape, and grasses which limited the effectiveness of the pedestrian survey. No cultural resources were identified, however several former geotrench locations were observed.

To evaluate the project site for buried cultural resources subsurface testing was employed. Sixty-two STPs were excavated within the APE. The locations of these subsurface probes is described in Appendix B and illustrated in Figure 4. All STPs exhibited a similar soil profile to that described by the Jefferson County Soil Survey (McCready 1975). Soils characterized as an Agnew Silt Loam were present – an organic dark brown silt loam overlaid a lighter brown silt/silt clay loam. Along the eastern portion of the APE, within the transmission line corridor, the sediments appeared to be disturbed, and high concentrations of surrounded gravels were present. Very little deposition has occurred since the last glacial episode. The upper organic layer varied in thickness, ranging between 5 and 18 centimeters (2 and 7 inches) thick. The sediments below were extremely compact, fine-grained silts that were likely deposited by glacio-lacustrine processes. Excavation of these sediments was difficult due to the degree of compactness and few STPs extended below this deposit. In areas where the sediments were less compact, coarse grained sand and gravels were encountered. None of the subsurface explorations contained cultural materials.
As the historic research indicated that a portion of the Port Townsend Southern Railroad and a military road were present in 1890, AMEC attempted to locate evidence of each. Elevated grades or linear swales associated with these historic transportation features were anticipated at these locations. Neither was observed. To further investigate the potential presence of these features, AMEC used geographic software to overlay the historic maps with current maps and employed a metal detector along the footprint of each. No evidence of either feature was found.

6.2 Built Environment Survey

During the historic building inventory, all historic buildings (50 years or older) within the APE were photographed and their physical features documented on standard historic building inventory forms. Each building was evaluated for its architectural integrity and assessed for NRHP listing under criterion C (36 CFR 60.4). There will be no direct impacts in the form of demolition of buildings or property takes; however indirect impacts may occur due to viewshed changes to the settings of the buildings.

Two residences were recorded and evaluated. These were located at 40 Four Corners Road and 191 Four Corners Road (Figure 5). Neither of these was found to be eligible for listing in the NRHP. Data collected for each historic building has been entered into the Washington State Historic Property Inventory (HPI) database, and the HPI forms are provided in Appendix C.

6.2.1 Bircher Residence, 40 Four Corners Road

The house located at 40 Four Corners Road was constructed in 1925 and is currently owned by Norma Bircher. It is a one-story, L-shape plan, vernacular style house build on a post and pier foundation. It features a cross-gabled, low-pitched, metal roof with projecting eaves and closed rafters. It is clad with vertical channel board, wood siding. The main window styles are paired sliding metal framed windows with wood surrounds. Other windows include a fixed picture window which is located on the east elevation. The front entry is located on the north elevation. It has a decorative wood door that is located centrally above a concrete stoop. The house has undergone slight alterations since its construction, including an addition and an attached carport located on the east elevation. A stand alone garage is located on the west side of the property. It features a lean-to on the north elevation, a front-gabled metal roof and wood vertical channel board siding.
6.2.1.1 Statement of Significance and Eligibility
The property is located next to a Shell Service station in a mixed residential and commercial rural neighborhood. The house faces the Project’s APE which is currently an undeveloped forested lot. This property is not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under criteria C. The roof has been replaced since its original construction and additions have altered the massing. The house no longer exhibits integrity of design, workmanship, or materials; and does not embody the characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction.

6.2.2 Cameron Residence, 191 Four Corners Road
The house located at 191 Four Corners Road was constructed in 1950 and is currently owned by Colleen Cameron. It is a one-story, T-shape plan, vernacular style house built on a poured concrete foundation. It features a cross-gabled, low-pitched, metal roof with projecting eaves and closed rafters. It is clad with clapboard wood siding. The main window styles are paired sliding vinyl framed windows with false shutters. Other windows feature paired sliding metal sashes and double-hung vinyl sashes. The main entry is located on the east elevation. It has a metal door with 1-light that is located centrally under an open gabled porch. Secondary entrances include a set of French metal and glass sliding doors that are located on the east elevation above a wood deck. An external brick chimney is located on the west elevation. Also on this elevation, a shed roof extends out from the main house over an open carport. It sits in a nicely landscaped lot with two outbuildings located on the north and west portions of the property.

6.2.2.1 Statement of Significance and Eligibility
The property is located in a mixed residential and commercial rural neighborhood. The house is located near the southwest corner of the Project’s APE, to the west of the transmission line corridor. This property is not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under criteria C. Although the house retains the seven aspects of integrity necessary for inclusion in the NRHP, it does not embody the characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction.

7.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
This report documents the results for the Cultural Resources Assessment of the Jefferson Transit Center Project, Jefferson County, Washington. The results are the outcome of background review of archival documents and maps, a record search of the DAHP WISAARD and field investigations within the APE. No archaeological resources were recorded during this investigation. Two historic buildings were inventoried and evaluated for listing in the NRHP; neither met the criteria of eligibility. As a result, AMEC finds No Historic Properties are Subject to Effect within the project’s APE.
AMEC determines that no further cultural resource investigations or monitoring of earth-disturbing activities is required for this project. This determination only pertains to the APE and project impacts described above. If any changes are made to the project design that impact areas outside of the APE, an additional assessment may be required.

If cultural resources (e.g., artifacts such as stone tools, bottles, ceramics, bone, or shell) are discovered during the excavation work all work in the vicinity should stop. The County should work with a professional archaeologist and the Washington State DAHP to evaluate the significance of the find. State statues RCW 27.44.055, 68.60.055, and 68.50.645 require any individual discovering human remains to report them to county law enforcement.
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APPENDIX A

Consultation Letters
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September 27, 2011

Dr. Allyson Brooks  
State Historic Preservation Officer  
Washington State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation  
PO Box 48343  
Olympia, WA 98504-8343

RE: Jefferson Transit Authority, Transit Facility  
SHPO Log Number: 031810-19-FTA  
Request for Concurrence on Area of Potential Effect

Dear Dr. Brooks;

As described in the February 22, 2010 and July 13, 2011 Federal Transit Administration (FTA) letters to your office, Jefferson Transit Authority (Jefferson Transit) proposes to construct a new transit center which would house an administration and vehicle maintenance facility. This letter is to seek approval of a proposed Area of Potential Effects (APE) for the proposed Transit Facility project. The project will be a federal undertaking and is subject to the provisions of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended, and associated regulations 36 CFR 800 regarding the protection of cultural and historic resources.

Jefferson Transit retained AMEC Earth & Environmental, Inc. (AMEC) to provide a Cultural Resources Survey of the project site. The proposed archaeological APE includes the footprint of the property which encompasses the horizontal and vertical extent of the project (enclosure). For historic resources, the APE is proposed as the project parcel itself and all tax parcels directly adjacent to the project parcel.

Based on this information provided, FTA proposes that the above described APE will be sufficient for the Jefferson Transit Facility Project and, therefore, seeks your concurrence with this finding.
Please contact Erin Green at (206) 220-7963 or at erin.green@dot.gov if you have any questions. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Linda Gehrke
Deputy Regional Administrator

cc: Rachel Katz, Jefferson Transit

Enclosure: Area of Potential Effects Map
APPENDIX B

Shovel Test Probe Results
This page intentionally left blank.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STP #</th>
<th>Easting NAD83</th>
<th>Northing NAD83</th>
<th>Excavated Depth (cm)</th>
<th>Levels (cm)</th>
<th>Cultural Materials (cm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I1</td>
<td>513454</td>
<td>5321807</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0-13 (10YR 3/4) dark yellowish brown silt w/ 10% subangular gravels, 13-30 (10YR 5/1) gray mottled w/ (10YR 6/3) pale brown very compact sandy silt w/ 5% subangular gravel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2</td>
<td>513455</td>
<td>5321837</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0-15 dark yellowish brown fine silt w/ roots, 15-75 gray mottled w/ pale brown silty sand and 5% subangular gravels</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I3</td>
<td>513458</td>
<td>5321856</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0-12 (10YR 5/3) brown silt w/ roots, 12-34 brown silt w/ sand and 5% subangular gravels w/ roots</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I4</td>
<td>513456</td>
<td>5321878</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0-8 yellowish brown silt w/ roots, 8-40 gray mottled w/ pale brown and oxidation very compact sandy silt w/ roots</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I5</td>
<td>513465</td>
<td>5321909</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0-12 yellowish brown silt w/ roots, 12-42 gray mottled w/ pale brown very compact sandy silt</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I6</td>
<td>513458</td>
<td>5321944</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0-18 yellowish brown silt w/ woody debris and roots, 18-24 (10YR 4/1) dark gray compact silt w/ charred roots, 24-48 yellowish brown very compact sandy silt</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I7</td>
<td>513461</td>
<td>5321966</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0-10 yellowish brown silt w/ roots, 10-44 gray mottled w/ pale brown very compact sandy silt</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I8</td>
<td>513461</td>
<td>5322001</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0-23 yellowish brown sandy silt and 10% subround gravel and cobbles and roots, 23-67 gray mottled w/ pale brown very compact sandy silt</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1</td>
<td>513486</td>
<td>5321802</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0-13 dark yellowish brown silt w/ 10% subangular gravels and roots, 13-30 gray mottled w/ pale brown very compact sandy silt w/ 5% subangular gravel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2</td>
<td>513476</td>
<td>5321837</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0-10 brown silty sand w/ roots, 10-30 pale brown compact sand w/ 10% gravel, 30-40 pale brown very compact sand w/ 10% gravel, 40-80 pale brown compact sand w/ 15% gravel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3</td>
<td>513488</td>
<td>5321857</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0-18 brown sandy silt, 18-38 pale brown very compact fine sandy silt w/ 10% subround gravel, 38-80 gray compact fine sand w/ 10% subround gravel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J4</td>
<td>513487</td>
<td>5321893</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0-8 brown compact silty sand w/ charcoal flecking, 8-40 gray compact silty sand</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J5</td>
<td>513492</td>
<td>5321929</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0-8 brown silty fine sand, 8-70 gray compact fine silty sand, 70-80 brown sand w/ 30% medium gravel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J6</td>
<td>513492</td>
<td>5321967</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0-12 brown compact silty sand w/ organics, 12-40 gray very compact silty sand w/ wood chunks and charcoal flecking, 40-70 gray (augered) very compact silty sand w/ 5% gravel, 90-105 pale brown (augered) sand, 105-117 brown medium coarse grain sand, 117-122 brown medium coarse grain sand w/ 5% gravel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J7</td>
<td>513499</td>
<td>5321986</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0-6 brown very compact silty sand, 6-40 gray brown</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP #</td>
<td>Easting NAD83</td>
<td>Northing NAD83</td>
<td>Excavated Depth (cm)</td>
<td>Levels (cm)</td>
<td>Cultural Materials (cm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J8</td>
<td>513484</td>
<td>5322010</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0-5 brown very compact silty sand w/ roots, 5-35 gray very compact silty sand</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>513516</td>
<td>5321799</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0-20 very compact silty fill w/ 70% angular gravel and large root</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>513512</td>
<td>5321831</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0-14 pale brown moderate compact silty sand, 14-55 gray very compact fine silty sand, 55-80 pale brown compact sand w/ 20% subround gravel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K3</td>
<td>513524</td>
<td>5321854</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0-6 yellowish brown silt w/ roots and 5% subround gravel, 6-25 gray tan compact silt w/ 5% subround gravels, 25-55 gray mottled w/ pale brown very compact silt</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4</td>
<td>513522</td>
<td>5321878</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0-7 yellowish brown silt w/roots, 7-35 gray mottled w/ pale brown very compact silt</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K5</td>
<td>513520</td>
<td>5321905</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0-8 yellowish brown silt w/ roots, 8-13 yellowish brown mottled w/ gray silt, 13-40 gray mottled w/ pale brown very compact silt</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K6</td>
<td>513522</td>
<td>5321937</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0-6 yellowish brown silt w/ roots, 6-35 light grey very compact silt</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K7</td>
<td>513517</td>
<td>5321969</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0-13 yellowish brown silt w/ roots and 5% subround gravels, 13-40 gray mottled w/ pale brown very compact silt</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K8</td>
<td>513522</td>
<td>5322010</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0-10 yellowish brown silt w/ roots and 5% subround gravels, 10-35 gray w/ oxidation compact silt, 35-65 gray very compact silt</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>513552</td>
<td>5321791</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0-3 very compact gravel, Driveway parking area</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>513551</td>
<td>5321823</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0-12 brown compact fine sandy silt, 12-49 gray compact fine sandy silt, 49-60 brown compact w/ oxidation silty sand</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>513553</td>
<td>5321852</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0-3 yellowish brown silt w/ roots, 3-10 gray fine sandy silt, 10-35 gray compact fine sandy silt w/ 5% subround gravels, 35-65 pale brown compact fine sand to medium sand w/ 5% subround gravels</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>513552</td>
<td>5321884</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0-4 brown fine sandy silt, 4-72 gray fine sandy silt w/ charcoal flecking, 72-100 pale brown compact fine sand w/ 10% subround pebbles, 100-120 pale brown compact sand w/ 20% small subround pebbles</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>513548</td>
<td>5321919</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0-5 brown fine sandy silt, 5-35 gray compact sandy silt w/ 5% pebbles</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>513552</td>
<td>5321955</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0-6 very compact brown sandy silt, 6-50 gray silt w/ fine grain sand</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7</td>
<td>513567</td>
<td>5321968</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0-8 brown very compact sandy silt, 8-50 gray brown silt w/ 5% subround gravel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP #</td>
<td>Easting NAD83</td>
<td>Northing NAD83</td>
<td>Excavated Depth (cm)</td>
<td>Levels (cm)</td>
<td>Cultural Materials (cm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8</td>
<td>513553</td>
<td>5322005</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0-5 brown fine sandy silt, 5-63 gray very compact sandy silt</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>513580</td>
<td>5321790</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0-19 yellowish brown silt w/ 50% angular road gravels, 10-32 gray mottled w/ pale brown silt and sand w/ 50% angular gravels and pebbles, 32-45 gray very compact silt and sand w/ 30% angular to subround gravels and cobbles</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>513589</td>
<td>5321820</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0-19 yellowish brown very compact fine silty sand w/ charcoal, 19-48 gray brown compact fine sandy silt, 48-55 brown w/ oxidation very compact fine sandy silt</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>513589</td>
<td>5321851</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0-19 yellowish brown silt, 10-50 pale brown very compact silt</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>513593</td>
<td>5321875</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0-19 yellowish brown silt, 10-30 pale brown compact silt, 30-50 yellowish brown compact clay</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>513592</td>
<td>5321908</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0-20 yellowish brown compact silt loam w/ 10% subround gravel, 20-30 pale brown compact silt w/ 30% subround gravel, 30-50 yellowish brown compact clay loam</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>513589</td>
<td>5321939</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0-5 yellowish brown silt, 5-25 pale brown compact silt, 25-50 yellowish brown compact clay loam w/ 5% subround gravel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7</td>
<td>513590</td>
<td>5321966</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0-5 yellowish brown silt, 5-20 pale brown very compact silt, 20-50 yellowish brown compact clay loam</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8</td>
<td>513590</td>
<td>5321995</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0-5 yellowish brown silt, 5-15 pale brown compact silt w/ charcoal, 15-40 yellowish brown compact clay loam</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N4</td>
<td>513605</td>
<td>5321886</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0-5 yellowish brown silt loam w/ roots, 5-30 pale brown very compact silt mottled w/ (10YR 6/4) light yellowish brown and some roots</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N5</td>
<td>513611</td>
<td>5321913</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0-5 yellowish brown silt, 5-35 pale brown very silt mottled w/ 10% light yellowish brown very compact</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N6</td>
<td>513612</td>
<td>5321937</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0-5 yellowish brown silt w/ 5% subround gravel, 5-30 pale brown w/ 10% subround gravel and 10% light yellowish brown motting, 30-60 yellowish brown coarse sand w/ 20% subround pea gravel to large gravel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N7</td>
<td>513602</td>
<td>5321967</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0-5 yellowish brown silt, 5-25 pale brown very compact silt, 25-60 yellowish brown compact clay loam</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N8</td>
<td>513610</td>
<td>5321999</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0-5 yellowish brown silt, 5-25 pale brown compact silt, 25-50 yellowish brown very compact clay loam</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O4</td>
<td>513645</td>
<td>5321878</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0-10 yellowish brown loam, 10-30 pale brown very compact silt, 30-40 pale brown (augered) very compact silt, 40-55 pale brown coarse sand w/ 30% granules to small cobbles</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O5</td>
<td>513640</td>
<td>5321911</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0-20 light yellowish brown silty loam w/10% subround gravel moderately compact, 20-80 light yellowish brown subround gravel to granules loosely compact</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP #</td>
<td>Easting NAD83</td>
<td>Northing NAD83</td>
<td>Excavated Depth (cm)</td>
<td>Levels (cm)</td>
<td>Cultural Materials (cm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O6</td>
<td>513640</td>
<td>5321940</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0-20 yellowish brown compact silt loam w/ 10% subround gravel, 20-30 pale brown compact silt w/ 30% subround gravel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O7</td>
<td>513643</td>
<td>5321974</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0-10 yellowish brown silty loam, 10-50 pale brown very compact silt</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O8</td>
<td>513640</td>
<td>5322002</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0-10 yellowish brown silty loam, 10-40 pale brown very compact silt, 40-50 yellowish brown clay loam</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>513671</td>
<td>5321894</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0-8 brown sandy silt w/ roots, 8-18 gray silty fine sand w/ 10% pebbles, 18-26 gray compact silty sand, 26-40 brown silty sand w/ 50% gravels and cobbles, 26-40 brown very compact sand with 30% small to medium pebbles</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>513667</td>
<td>5321924</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0-9 brown sandy silt, 9-30 gray silty sand w/ 25% small to medium subround pebbles, 30-36 light grey find sandy silt w/ &lt;5% pebbles</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>513664</td>
<td>5321945</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0-5 brown sandy silt w/roots, 5-20 light brown silty sand w/ 50% pebbles, 18-75 light brown coarse silty sand w/ 70% pebbles and gravels</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>513667</td>
<td>5321969</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0-15 brown fine sandy silt, 15-28 gray fine sand silt, 28-50 gray very compact fine sandy silt</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>513669</td>
<td>5321997</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0-3 brown very compact silty sand, 3-45 gray brown fine sandy silt w/ roots</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>513695</td>
<td>5321882</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0-9 yellowish brown silt and roots w/ 50% small subround gravel, 9-87 lbrown silt and sand loose matrix w/ 75% subround gravels and cobbles</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>513695</td>
<td>5321910</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0-9 yellowish brown silt w/ roots, 9-11 yellowish brown silt w/ charcoal stain, 11-55 brown compact fine sandy silt w/ 90% subround gravels and cobbles</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>513698</td>
<td>5321942</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0-6 yellowish brown silt w/ roots, 6-26 yellowish brown very compact silt and sand w/ 90% subround gravel, pebbles and cobbles possible fill</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>513699</td>
<td>5321969</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0-6 yellowish brown silt w/ roots, 6-23 yellowish brown compact silt w/ 50% subround small gravel, 23-35 yellowish brown very compact silt w/ 50% gravel and pebbles</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>513700</td>
<td>5321999</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0-9 yellowish brown silt w/ roots, 9-45 gray mottled with pale brown very compact silt</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Historic Inventory Report

Location
Field Site No. DAHP No.
Historic Name: Bircher Residence
Common Name: Bircher Residence
Property Address: 40 Four Corners Rd, Port Townsend, WA 98368
Comments:
Tax No./Parcel No. 001333030
Plat/Block/Lot
Acreage
Supplemental Map(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township/Range/EW</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>1/4 Sec</th>
<th>1/4 1/4 Sec</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Quadrangle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T30R01W</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>PORT TOWNSEND SOUTH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coordinate Reference
Easting: 1073260
Northing: 998776
Projection: Washington State Plane South
Datum: HARN (feet)

Identification
Survey Name: Jefferson Transit
Field Recorder: Lara Rooke
Owner's Name: Norma K. Bircher
Owner Address: 40 Four Corners Road
City: Port Townsend
State: Washington
Classification: Building
Resource Status: Survey/Inventory
Comments:
Within a District? No
Contributing? No
National Register:
Local District:
National Register District/Thematic Nomination Name:
Eligibility Status: Not Determined - SHPO
Determination Date: 1/1/0001
Determination Comments:

Date Recorded: 10/04/2011
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Historic Inventory Report

Description

Historic Use: 
Current Use: Domestic - Single Family House
Plan: L-Shape
Structural System: Braced Frame
Stories: 1
Changes to Interior: Unknown
Changes to Plan: Moderate
Changes to Original Cladding: Intact
Changes to Windows: Slight
Changes to Other: Moderate
Other (specify): roof replacement

Style: 
Vernacular
Cladding: 
Wood - Plywood
Foundation: 
Form/Type:
Post & Pier 
Single Family
Roof Type: 
Gable - Cross Gable
Roof Material: 
Metal

Narrative

Study Unit
Date of Construction: 1925 Built Date
Other
Builder:
Engineer:
Architect:

Property appears to meet criteria for the National Register of Historic Places: No
Property is located in a potential historic district (National and/or local): No
Property potentially contributes to a historic district (National and/or local): No

Statement of Significance: The property is located next to a Shell Service station in a mixed residential and commercial rural neighborhood. The house faces the project APE which is currently an undeveloped forested lot. This property is not eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) under criteria C. The roof has been replaced since its original construction and additions have altered the massing. The house no longer exhibits integrity of design, workmanship, or materials; and does not embody the characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction.

Description of Physical Appearance: The house located at 40 Four Corners Road was constructed in 1925 and is currently owned by Norma Bircher. It is a one-story, L-shaped plan, vernacular style house built on a post and pier foundation. It features a cross-gabled, low-pitched, metal roof with projecting eaves and closed rafters. It is clad with vertical channel board, wood siding. The main window styles are paired sliding metal framed windows with wood surrounds. Other windows include a fixed picture window which is located on the east elevation. The front entry is located on the north elevation. It has a decorative wood door that is located centrally above a concrete stoop. The house has undergone slight alterations since its construction, including an addition and an attached carport located on the east elevation. A stand alone garage is located on the west side of the property. It features a lean-to on the north elevation, a front-gabled metal roof and wood vertical channel board siding.
Rooke, L.
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2011

East elevation
2011

West elevation
2011
Historic Inventory Report

Location
Field Site No. DAHP No.
Historic Name:
Common Name: Cameron Residence
Property Address: 191 Four Corners Rd, Port Townsend, WA 98368
Comments:
Tax No./Parcel No. 001333026
Plat/Block/Lot
Acreage
Supplemental Map(s)

Township/Range/EW Section 1/4 Sec 1/4 1/4 Sec County Quadrangle
T30R01W 33 Jefferson PORT TOWNSEND SOUTH

Coordinate Reference
Easting: 1073969
Northing: 998809
Projection: Washington State Plane South
Datum: HARN (feet)

Identification
Survey Name: Jefferson Transit Date Recorded: 10/04/2011
Field Recorder: Lara Rooke
Owner’s Name: Coleen Cameron
Owner Address: 191 Four Corners Road
City: Port Townsend State: Washington Zip: 98368
Classification: Building
Resource Status: Comments:
Survey/Inventory
Within a District? No
Contributing? No
National Register:
Local District:
National Register District/Thematic Nomination Name:
Eligibility Status: Not Determined - SHPO
Determination Date: 1/1/0001
Determination Comments:
Description

Historic Use: Current Use: Domestic - Single Family House
Plan: T-Shape Stories: 1 Structural System: Braced Frame
Changes to Plan: Intact Changes to Interior: Unknown
Changes to Original Cladding: Intact Changes to Windows: Slight
Changes to Other:
Other (specify):
Style: Vernacular Roof Type: Gable - Cross Gable
CDC clad 
Foundation: Form/Type: Single Family
Concrete - Poured

Narrative

Study Unit: Other
Date of Construction: 1950 Built Date Builder:
Property appears to meet criteria for the National Register of Historic Places: No
Property is located in a potential historic district (National and/or local): No
Property potentially contributes to a historic district (National and/or local): No

Statement of Significance: The property is located in a mixed residential and commercial rural neighborhood. The house is located near the southwest corner of the project APF, to the west of the transmission line corridor. This property is not eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) under criteria C. Although the house retains the seven aspects of integrity necessary for inclusion on the National Register, it does not embody the characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction.

Description of Physical Appearance: The house located at 191 Four Corners Road was constructed in 1950 and is currently owned by Coleen Cameron. It is a 1-story, T-shape plan, vernacular style house built on a poured concrete foundation. It features a cross-gabled, low-pitched, metal roof with projecting eaves and closed rafters. It is clad with clapboard wood siding. The main window styles are paired sliding vinyl framed windows with false shutters. Other windows feature paired sliding metal sashes and double-hung vinyl sashes. The main entry is located on the east elevation. It has a metal door with 1-light that is located centrally under an open gabled porch. Secondary entrances include a set of French metal and glass sliding doors that are located on the east elevation above a wood deck. An external brick chimney is located on the west elevation. Also on this elevation, a shed roof extends out from the main house over an open carport. It sits in a nicely landscaped lot with two outbuildings located on the north and west portions of the property.
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