

3.6 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

An archaeological study of the La Center Interchange Site was conducted on November 20-21, 2003, by Heritage Resources Associates, Inc. (HRA) (DEIS Vol. II, **Appendix Q**). This study included a records search and intensive field survey of the site. The HRA study, *Archaeological Survey and Discovery Probing of the Cowlitz Indian Tribe Property, Clark County, Washington*, was submitted to the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) (also known as the State Historic Preservation Office [SHPO]) for review. On December 10, 2003, the DAHP concurred with the professional recommendations and finding of *No Historic Properties Affected* for the La Center Interchange Site (DEIS Vol. II, **Appendix Q**).

In 2007, Analytical Environmental Services (AES) conducted an architectural analysis and National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) evaluation of the properties within the La Center Interchange and Ridgefield Interchange sites. The architectural reports, *La Center Road Interchange Site Historic Architectural Evaluations* and *Ridgefield Interchange Site Historic Architectural Evaluations*, were submitted to OAHP for review. Additionally, at the request of OAHP, AES conducted further research and sub-surface testing at the La Center Interchange Site for archaeological resources. The results were documented within an archeological addendum report and submitted to OAHP for review. The purpose of these studies was to identify and evaluate potential historic and prehistoric resources on the alternative project sites. All cultural resources work was performed in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 (as amended through 2004), and its implementing regulations found at 36 CFR Part 800. On March 3, 2008, the DAHP provided a letter to the BIA concurring with the professional recommendations and finding of *No Historic Properties Affected* for the project at the La Center Interchange Site. The architectural reports, archeological addendum, and SHPO concurrence letter for the La Center Interchange Site are included within **Appendix J** of the FEIS.

The information provided below is partially derived from the reports described above.

3.6.1 SETTING – LA CENTER INTERCHANGE AND RIDGEFIELD INTERCHANGE SITES

PREHISTORY

The general analytic framework used by researchers for the interpretation of Northwestern United States prehistory is divided into three broad periods: the Paleo-Indian Period, the Archaic Period and the Emergent Period. This framework uses sociopolitical complexity, trade networks, population and the introduction and variations of artifact types to differentiate between cultural units.

The Paleo-Indian Period (12,000-8,000 Before Present [BP]) was characterized by small, highly mobile groups occupying broad geographic areas. During the Archaic Period, consisting of the

Lower Archaic Period (8,000-5,000 BP), Middle Archaic Period (5,000-3,000 BP) and Upper Archaic Period (3,000 BP-A.D. 500), geographic mobility may have continued, although groups began to establish longer-term base camps in localities from which a more diverse range of resources could be exploited. The addition of milling tools and obsidian and chert concave-base points and the occurrence of sites in a wider range of environments, suggest that the economic base was more diverse. By the Upper Archaic, mobility was being replaced by a more sedentary adaptation in the development of numerous small villages, and the beginnings of a more complex society and economy emerged. During the Emergent Period (A.D. 500 to historic contact), social complexity developed toward the ethnographic pattern of large, central villages where political leaders resided, with associated hamlets and specialized activity sites. Artifacts associated with the period include the bow and arrow, small corner-notched points, mortars and pestles and a diversity of beads and ornaments.

ETHNOGRAPHY

Most of the tribes in the area defined by the Cascade Mountains from the Columbia River northward to near the 50th parallel in Canada shared a common root language—Salishan. Collectively, these groups are referred to as the Southwestern Coast Salish and represent four linguistic groups that comprise the Tsamosan division of the Salishan language family (**Figure 3.6-1**). The Quinault, which is comprised of the Queets, Copalis and Quinault; the Lower Chehalis, which is comprised of the Humptulips, Wynoochee, Chehalis and Shoalwater Bay; Upper Chehalis, which is comprised of the Satsop and Kwaiailk; and Cowlitz, which is comprised solely of the Cowlitz (Pritzker, 2000).

Other groups not related to the Salishan language that lived in Southwestern Washington are the Chinook on the Columbian River; the Willapa at the head of the Chehalis River and on the upper course of the Willapa River; the Quilliute on the ocean coast at the mouth of the Quillayute River and the linguistically related Chimakum on the Strait of Juan de Fuca; the Makah at Cape Flattery and Nootkan tribes on the West Coast of Vancouver Island in British Columbia (Curtis, 1913). Away from the coastal area, the large group of Salishan speakers extends beyond the 52nd parallel in British Columbia and a large part of eastern Washington State, northern Idaho and western Montana.

By the early 19th century the Cowlitz were organized into four geographically separate tribes: 1) The Lower Cowlitz occupied the middle and lower courses of the Cowlitz River, its tributaries (such as the Toutle River) and adjacent lands; 2) The Mountain Cowlitz lived on the upper reaches of the Chehalis River and eventually combined with the Kwalhioquas, who ended up adopting the Cowlitz language; 3) The Upper Cowlitz, who lived on the upper Cowlitz River and below Mt. Rainer, inter-married with Shahaptian speaking Klickitats and eventually assumed the Klickitat language. This group traveled widely for mountain game and grazed horses in the meadows. 4) The last group, the Lewis Cowlitz, lived along the Lewis River and adopted the Klickitat language (Ruby and Brown, 1992). The villages near the mouth of the Cowlitz River were jointly inhabited by Cowlitz and Chinookans (Adamson, 1934:x-xi). A transitional Cowlitz group lived in villages on the South Fork of the Chehalis (Adamson, 1934:x-xi) while those villages farthest upstream on the Chehalis were

Figure 3.6-1

shared with the Taitnapam (Curtis, 1913). Intermarriage was common between the Cowlitz, Klickitats, and the Chehalises (Ruby and Brown, 1992:70).

The origin for the tribal name Cowlitz means *capturing the medicine spirit* because they visited small prairies on the Cowlitz River (a Columbia River tributary in southwestern Washington State) to commune with the spirit world and receive *medicine power* (Ruby and Brown, 1992).

Some Washington tribes were linguistically separate from one another, others shared a common root language, but there were many common similarities in the utilization of the environment and daily lifeways and these groups often interacted with each other through trade, marriage and warfare (Curtis, 1913; Hajda, 1978). In particular, the Cowlitz often intermarried with the Chinookan and, as such, were heavily influenced by their culture (Curtis, 1913:4).

During their expeditions on the Columbia River in 1805-1806, Lewis and Clark passed through the territory of the Lower Chehalises tribes. The Astorians of the Pacific Fur Company were the first Euro-Americans to enter the Cowlitz territory when they ventured up the Cowlitz River in 1812. In 1833, the Hudson Bay Company established Fort Nisqually on Pudget Sound, reached via the Cowlitz Trail, which ran through Cowlitz and Upper Chehalis territory. In 1839, the company established Cowlitz Farm on Cowlitz Prairie at the southern tip of the trail. This had the effect of opening up the inland Indian territories to more traders, eliminated the need for Chinookan (Lower Chehalises) middlemen and increased Euro-American traders' influence over the trade negotiations with the natives (Bagley, 1915-1916).

Both the Cowlitz and their close neighbors used the rivers and trails to each other's villages for purposes of trade on most occasions and of war on others. Early accounts of trade indicated that the tribes rarely conducted a straight exchange between durable goods and food and raw materials. Instead, dentalium shells were used as a form of money to acquire these goods (Hajda, 1978). Trade goods included slaves, horses, dried camas and wapato roots, dried berries and meats, hides, and furs, including the highly valued mountain goat hair that was woven into blankets. Much prized were the Cowlitz women's watertight baskets. Due to their continuous contact with the Klickitats, the Upper and Lewis River Cowlitz learned or improved certain basket making techniques that set them apart from the other Cowlitz tribes. In addition to trade, the Cowlitz exchanged goods through games such as bone gambling, horse racing, and competitive gatherings. Gambling games were an important and ancient social institution, a trial of opportunity as well as an investment opportunity (Cowlitz Indian Tribe, 2005a). Warfare was limited to individual villages and did not involve whole tribes. Usually, it was settled by payment of valuables or marriage between the warring parties (Olson, 1936:116-117). To the south, slaves were not taken in conflicts between related groups and warfare was more orderly than in the north (Hajda, 1978).

Salmon played an important role in the native economy and there were many ways of catching fish, including using platforms and dip nets. Preserving the fish by drying enabled these traders to

exchange surplus catch for useful goods. The Cowlitz caught enough salmon, sturgeon and candlefish, and harvested enough roots, berries and other plants to produce surplus for trading. Cedar log canoes were used in fishing. Some measured 40 to 50 feet long and could carry up to 30 people. One of the most important means of transportation along the rivers was the blunt-nosed canoe, which was designed to traverse rapids.

The Pacific Northwest Indians grouped themselves more by family networks and villages than tribes. They settled in large, permanent villages about which were distributed seasonal camps and task-specific sites. Primary village sites were occupied continually throughout the year and other sites were visited in order to procure particular resources that were abundant or available only during certain seasons (Curtis, 1913). Sites were often situated near sources of fresh water and in ecotones where plant and animal life was diverse and abundant. The common winter longhouse was built out of cedar-wood, was gabled-roofed and windowless. Anywhere from 2 to 15 families would share a lodge. Houses were oriented east-west, in a row along the river with a doorway at each end. The windowless lodges had roof slots to let smoke escape. Temporary summer dwellings consisted of cedar-bark slabs or of pole frames covered with mats or boughs (Hajda, 1978). An example of this type of housing can be seen at the large village of Cathlapotle, which contains the remnants of 14 plank longhouses (Cathlapotle Plankhouse Project, 2005).

Diseases brought by Euro-American traders drastically reduced aboriginal populations in the Columbia and Willamette River valleys. Within 100 years of the first recorded contact in 1775, epidemics carried away more than 80% of the region's native people. By the time Lewis and Clark came down the river in 1805, as much as one-half of the native population had died from smallpox. Waves of malaria, measles and influenza during the 19th century emptied many villages along the Columbia River and its tributaries.

In the 1830s, a malaria epidemic struck the Lower Columbia River Valley and adjoining regions, altering the ethnographic territories and composition of various tribes. The Lower Cowlitz moved in to possess the environments at the mouth of the Cowlitz River, replacing the Chinnokan speakers. At the mouth of the Cowlitz River, villages that had been Cathlamet became Cowlitz (Gibbs 1855:428), while some villages contained Chinnokan people married to Cowlitz (Curtis, 1913:5, 172-173). The Suwal division of the Kwalhioqua was absorbed by the Upper Chehalis and Cowlitz. The Taitnapam (a Klikitat subgroup), already intermarried with neighboring Cowlitz villages, moved into Cowlitz Prairie and by 1841 were being called Cowlitz.

In 1853, the ethnologist Gibbs inferred that the total population of the Cowlitz tribe was around 4,000 (including Cowlitz and Upper Chehalis) (Curtis, 1913:5). However, when this observation was formulated, the Cowlitz population was already in a steady decline due to a series of deadly diseases (*c.f.* Curtis, 1913; Ruby and Brown, 1992, 1998). One of the survivors of an earlier plague gave an estimate of more than 6,000 prior to 1830, 4,000 of which were believed to have lived on the Cowlitz

River (Curtis, 1913:5). However, this number also included villages that were mixed with Chinookan people who had married into the Cowlitz villages. Around 1800, there were perhaps 2,500 Quinault and Lower Chehalis and about 8,000 Kwaiailks (Squaiatl) and (mostly) Lower Cowlitz. In 1990, there were roughly 2,000 Southwestern Coast Salish Indians living on reservations and at least half as many living in local cities (Pritzker, 2000:203).

Tribal Historical Information

From the time of first Euro-American contact through the late 1800s, the Cowlitz Indian Tribe occupied an area in what is now western Washington (ICC, 1969, 1971; NIGC, 2005). Their territory included much of the Cowlitz River drainages and tributaries and extended to the south to include the Toutle River drainage (ICC, 1969:145). By the mid nineteenth century, the Cowlitz intermittently co-inhabited portions of the East Fork Lewis River drainage near the Columbia River. This portion of the drainage was previously occupied by a Chinookan band (until disease wiped them out) and a Klikitat band (ICC, 1969; NIGC, 2005). The Tribe's historic presence in the Cowlitz River region is documented in the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) technical reports prepared in conjunction with its Final Determination acknowledging the Cowlitz Indian Tribe, and in the decision documents and related exhibits and testimony from the Indian Claims Commission (ICC) litigation involving the Tribe's successful claim for compensation for Cowlitz lands taken by the United States (ICC 1969: 143, 146, 148, 154, 155, 171; 1971; NIGC, 2005:10-15) as well as other sources (*e.g.* Curtis, 1913; Hajda, 1978; Beckham, 2002).

In February and March 1855, the Cowlitz attended the Chehalis River Treaty Council with Superintendent of Indians Affairs and Washington Territorial Governor Isaac Stevens but walked away without signing the treaty. The Cowlitz refused to move to a shared reservation with the Quinault, a tribe with which the Cowlitz had a long-standing hostile relationship. As a result, no land cession treaty with the Cowlitz was ever executed. With dismay and anger over the refusal by the federal government to grant them a reservation in their own homeland, the Upper Cowlitz, along with most of the other mountain tribes, fought against the U.S. in the 1855-56 Indian Wars. While those groups were engaging federal troops, many of the remaining Lewis River Cowlitz were eventually rounded up and relocated to Fort Vancouver while other Cowlitz tribes were relocated to a temporary reservation elsewhere in the territory (Ruby and Brown, 1992:70). Later in 1855, the Quinault and Quileute signed the Treaty of Olympia, by which they kept a large reservation on the mouth of the Quinault River. In March of 1863, a presidential proclamation put up for sale the Cowlitz Tribal lands without the Tribe's consent. Subsequent to the tribe losing their lands, the federal government ceased recognizing the Cowlitz Tribe as a governmental entity. The Cowlitz defied government wishes that they remove themselves to the newly established Chehalis Reservation, which had been established in July of 1864 for the Chehalis, Cowlitz and some southern coastal people, between the Chehalis and Black rivers (Pritzker, 2000). The government later expropriated most of this reservation; the remaining lands were homesteaded by 36 Indians and set aside for school purposes. In 1866, the Shoalwater Bay Tribe and the Georgetown Reservation were created in Pacific County,

Washington. The tribe was comprised mainly of Chehalis and Chinook families living on Shoalwater Bay. By 1879, these Indians all spoke the Lower Chehalis dialect (Pritzker, 2000). Over the next 20 years, the Cowlitz refused all government overtures to entice them to relocate to the Chehalis reservation. By 1893, the 127 Cowlitz remaining were either scattered onto small farms or were absorbed by the Euro-American community (Ruby and Brown, 1992:69).

The Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation, the Quinault Indian Nation, and the Shoalwater Bay Tribe are all federally recognized tribal entities. In the 1980s, the Quinault Indian Nation was composed of seven affiliated tribes: Quinault, Quileute, Chinook, Hoh, Chehalis, Queets and Cowlitz, with the first four comprising most of the enrollment. Most people in these different tribes trace descendants to more than one “tribal” group.

In the early 1900s, the Tribe reorganized, elected a governing body, and initiated a series of efforts to seek compensation and lands to replace the aboriginal territory that had been taken from it. In 1931 the U.S. Supreme Court, in *Halbert v. U.S.*, ruled that the Cowlitz were entitled to take allotments on the Quinault Reservation and that the Cowlitz tribe was recognized and protected by the 1855 Treaty of Olympia. Although numerous bills were introduced in Congress that would have given the Court of Claims jurisdiction over the Tribe’s claims, none became law until the ICC Act was enacted in 1946, providing a forum for the Cowlitz Indian Tribe to pursue its claims. In 1969, the ICC determined that the Cowlitz Indian Tribe historically had exclusive use and occupation of an extensive area extending from near Mt. Rainier to the mouth of the Kalama River, which lies about 14 miles to the north of the La Center Interchange Site (ICC, 1969). Eventually, in 1971 the ICC [Docket 218] held that “the United States had exercised sufficient domination and control over the lands of the Cowlitz tribe so as to deprive the plaintiff of its aboriginal Indian title without its consent and without payment of any consideration therefore” (ICC, 1971:461). Two years later, the tribe entered into a compromise settlement with the federal government for a cash settlement of \$1,550,000 with the ICC. Two hundred and eighty members voted for the settlement and 40 against, wanting land instead of money. The ICC dockets also documented the Tribe’s historical connections to the area in which the alternative project sites are located, but denied the Tribe compensation for this area because other tribes also used this area.

Passage of the settlement legislation needed to implement the Cowlitz ICC settlement award was delayed for decades, primarily because the Department of the Interior opposed the Tribe’s demands that a portion of the settlement funds be set aside to acquire replacement land. Ironically, the Interior’s opposition was based on its view that the Cowlitz Indian Tribe was not formally recognized and, therefore, was ineligible to hold trust lands, although the Tribe’s unrecognized status resulted largely from its landless condition, which in turn was a direct consequence of the Federal government’s confiscation of the Tribe’s aboriginal lands over a century before.

The Cowlitz Indian Tribe finally gained Federal recognition through the BIA's administrative Federal Acknowledgement Process on January 4, 2002, and applied to have the lands comprising the La Center Interchange Site taken into trust the same day (NIGC, 2005). Two years later, the Tribe agreed to settlement legislation entitled the *Cowlitz Indian Tribe Distribution of Judgment Funds Act* (2004 Settlement Act) that finally implemented a distribution plan for the Tribe's 1973 ICC land claim award, including funds set aside for land acquisition.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Regional History

In 1775, Spanish navigator Bruno de Hezeta became the first European to discover the Columbia River. However, he was not able to enter it. He thought it might be an estuary for an inland bay or "the mouth of some great river or some passage to another sea" (Clark County, 2005b). In search of ways to expand the fur trade, the American Captain Robert Gray navigated the bar in May of 1792 and discovered the river he would name for his ship, the *Columbia Rediva*. Not about to let the Americans claim the area, the British quickly dispatched two ships to the Columbia River five months later – the *Discover*, commanded by Captain George Vancouver, and the *Chatham*, commanded by Lt. William Broughton. Since Captain Vancouver was unable to get his larger ship past the bar, Lt. Broughton took the *Chatham* some 100 miles upstream to Washougal and claimed the area in the name of England. The lieutenant named the area near present-day Vancouver after his captain. After the Lewis and Clark Expedition concluded in 1806, the Hudson's Bay Company started actively trading fur with the Indians and soon thereafter, the Americans and English developed an intense rivalry with each other over the fur trade. In 1825, Dr. John McLoughlin of the Hudson's Bay Company established Fort Vancouver. A nearby clearing, which was used as the Army's polo grounds, would eventually become an airfield. It is the oldest operating airfield in the United States (U.S.), dating from 1905 (Clark County, 2006). The fort was built with a double purpose – to serve as a trading post for the fur traders but also to establish Great Britain's claim on the Northwest Territory.

By the 1840s, Fort Vancouver was the most important settlement and largest population center on the West Coast of North America. Its ethnically diverse population (French-Canadians, Iroquois, Scots, English, Americans, Orkney Islanders, local natives, and Hawaiians) spoke "Chinook Jargon" a pidgin trade language that enabled cross-communication among many different people (Vancouver, City of, 2006). For many years, Fort Vancouver was the center of all fur trading in the Pacific Northwest and served as the seat of British power in the Pacific Northwest until June 15, 1846, when the U.S. Senate approved the present boundary between the United States and Canada at the 49th Parallel. After the arrival of the U.S. Army in 1849, the neighboring settlement was called the City of Columbia. Increasing pressure on land in the West by American settlers and declining returns from trapping soured the relations between the Army and the Hudson's Bay Company in the latter half of the 1850s. By 1857, the City of Vancouver was incorporated. In June of 1860, The Hudson's Bay Company withdrew its operations to Ft. Victoria, British Columbia leaving the Fort in the hands of

the U.S. Army (NPS, 2006). Through the rest of the century, Vancouver steadily developed and increased in population. In 1908, the first rail line east through the Washington side of the Columbia River Gorge reached Vancouver. In 1910, a railroad bridge was opened south across the Columbia River. In 1917, the Interstate Bridge was completed. During World War I, the site later named Pearson Field was the location of the world's largest spruce cut-up mill. It cut raw timber into the lumber used to build the planes that helped win the war in Europe. During World War II, Vancouver's Kaiser Shipyard built a variety of craft that contributed greatly to America's war effort (Vancouver, City of, 2006).

County History

In 1845, a year after creating the Vancouver District, which included modern day Clark County, the Oregon provisional government changed its name to Vancouver County. It included all the land north of the Columbia River, west of the Rocky Mountains and south of Alaska. Two years later, on August 13, 1848, President Polk signed an act creating the entire region as the Oregon Territory. The Oregon Territorial Legislature became the first official United States government in the Pacific Northwest. On September 3, 1849, the legislature modified the territory's borders again and changed its name to Clark County in honor of William Clark of the Lewis and Clark Expedition. For a short time, Clark County included all of present-day Washington. A year later Congress also established Columbia (later renamed Vancouver) barracks as the largest military base in the West. The soldiers' mission was to pacify the Indians. In 1853, a clerk accidentally added an "e" to the end of Clark and Clarke County was born. It wouldn't be until 1925 that the "e" was officially dropped (Clark County, 2006).

Clark County is the oldest county in Washington State and is home to one of the oldest settlements in the Vancouver, Washington area. Early pioneers came from countries around the world and Clark County came alive with immigrants speaking Chinese, French, Russian, Hawaiian and other languages. They established farms, built businesses, founded churches, developed schools, and established towns that serve as the core of Clark County today (Vancouver, City of, 2006). Currently the City of Vancouver is the county seat of Clark County.

La Center Regional History

The earliest settlers in the La Center region were John H. Timmen and Aurlius Wilkins in 1852. G.W. Wier and Mr. Seeley established the first general store in the La Center region in 1872. In 1874, Timmen laid out the town of Timmen's Landing (later La Center, located approximately 4 miles to the northeast of Timmen's Landing), which was added to in 1884 by Mary Brazee Fairhurst. By 1885, with the continued support of the steamboats and its advantageous position near major forests, Timmen's Landing had developed into a prosperous town that contained several businesses, hotels, a Methodist church, sawmills, a gristmill, a brickyard, and a post of the Grand American Army of the Republic (Clark County, 2006). The first steamboat arrived in the area now known as La Center on the East Fork of the Lewis River in north Clark County in 1854. Steamboats would

continue to bring both passengers and freight up the Lewis River from the Columbia for more than 60 years, reaching as far as the current Daybreak Park located 6 miles upriver from La Center. Local mills produced thousands of railroad ties, plus tons of cordwood that were transported from La Center to Portland. Timmen's Landing was renamed La Center when it was incorporated in 1909 because it had become "the center" of shipping and travel on the Lewis River (Vancouver, City of, 2006). With the arrival of railroads and highways, La Center lost importance and lapsed into a small village serving the surrounding farming district. Its population in 1940 was 192. The population was 1,654 at the 2000 census.

3.6.2 FINDINGS – LA CENTER INTERCHANGE SITE

RECORDS AND LITERATURE SEARCH

HRA (2003) conducted a records search at the DAHP in Olympia, Washington, the agency that houses the official archaeological site records for the State of Washington. The records search indicated that no archaeological sites have been recorded in, or in the near vicinity of, the La Center Interchange Site. Two archaeological sites have been recorded at a distance of 1 mile from the site, and one historic site has been recorded within 0.5 miles.

A small number of Archaeological Predetermination and Cultural Resources Surveys have been conducted in the vicinity of the La Center Interchange Site. Most of the surveys did not result in the discovery of archaeological materials (HRA, 2003). However, a pedestrian survey in 1986 of the proposed Carlson Landfill resulted in the discovery of a single chert biface (HRA, 2003). The site records indicate that archaeological sites are most likely to be encountered on terraces or benches along streams and on the floodplain of the Lewis River in this portion of Clark County.

FIELD SURVEY

The pedestrian survey of the property was carried out by two HRA archaeologists (Robert R. Musil and Chris Young) walking 20-meter transects (HRA, 2003). The La Center Interchange Site consists primarily of open grass fields. Trees and brambles occur along a seasonal drainage that marks the northern boundary. A small stand of trees also occurs in a low wet area in the southwest corner. Two farms, one abandoned, are located within the project site. Ground visibility across the project site was minimal, with only occasional rodent backdirt mounds and cattle paths providing small exposures of mineral soil for examination.

Due to minimal ground visibility in the grass fields, all of the rodent backdirt mounds that were observed were examined closely. Two pieces of lithic flaking debris were encountered in two separate rodent mounds. No other artifacts were observed on the ground surface during the survey.

The discovery of the two flakes near a seasonal drainage prompted the placement of a line of subsurface shovel probes (SP) along the edge of the tree line south of the drainage. Eight shovel

probes were placed at 50-meter intervals in the area of the finds. The shovel probes consisted of 30-centimeter (cm) diameter cylindrical probes that were excavated to depths of 50 cm. The fill removed from each shovel probe was screened using 3-millimeter (mm) (1/8-inch) wire mesh. All of the probes were backfilled upon completion.

The shovel probes encountered very wet dark reddish to dark gray-brown silt loam sediments in the upper 20-30 cm. Underlying the sediments was a gray clay loam with distinct reddish-brown mottling. No cultural materials were observed in SPs 1 through 7. SP 8 was placed within 1 meter of one of the chert flake finds. A chert flake and a basalt flake were recovered from level 2 (10-20 cm) in SP 8. Because of this discovery, SPs 9 and 10 were placed at 10-meter intervals on either side of SP 8. SP 11 was placed 30 meters west of SP 8 and where the second flake was found on the ground surface. None of the three shovel probes yielded any artifacts.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONCLUSIONS

The pedestrian survey and discovery probing conducted by HRA uncovered four flakes in a level terrace area above a seasonal drainage on the property. HRA concluded that these flakes suggest a relatively small and diffuse scatter of lithic material occurs along the creek terrace. They recommended that if development occurs in this area, then additional subsurface testing occur in order to determine the depth, nature, extent and significance of the subsurface deposits in the area.

ARCHITECTURAL ANALYSIS

AES conducted historic architectural evaluations of the standing structures on the La Center Interchange Site in November of 2006. The study was conducted as part of the Cowlitz Indian Tribe Trust Acquisition and Casino Project. The purposes of this study, in accordance with Section 106 of the NHPA, were to (1) identify and record historic architectural resources on the project site, (2) make evaluations based on such resources' significance according to the criteria of the NHPA, and (3) recommend procedures for avoidance or mitigation of adverse effects to resources potentially eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

Subsequent to identifying elements of the built environment within the project sites, each structure was closely examined and photographed in order to establish the individual architectural styles represented. After the styles were identified, a build date was established for each building by consulting the Clark County Assessor's Office records. Similar property types in Washington State were researched via the Washington Information System for Architectural and Archaeological Records Data (WISAARD) database to give each property a historical context in which to evaluate them. Existing historic documents were researched in order to try to establish the history of the properties. Only four properties had structures on them and none had any NRHP recommended buildings. **Table 3.6-1** and **Table 3.6-2** summarize the results of the evaluation.

TABLE 3.6-1
ARCHITECTURAL STYLES

| PROPERTY | APN | ARCHITECTURAL STYLE |
|---|------------|-------------------------------------|
| Farmhouse | 210122-000 | Gable Front and Wing Folk Victorian |
| <i>Outbuildings:</i> Barn, Shed | | |
| House | 211002-000 | Split-level Ranch |
| <i>Outbuildings:</i> Sheds 1 & 2, Animal stall | | Vernacular/Agriculture |
| Barn | | Midwest/Western/Prairie Style |
| House | 211006-000 | Ranch – Minimal Traditional |
| <i>Outbuildings:</i> Shack | | Vernacular |
| Shack | 211003-000 | Vernacular |

Source: AES, 2006; Clark County Department of Assessment and GIS, 2006

TABLE 3.6-2
NRHP RECOMMENDATIONS

| PROPERTY | APN | NRHP RECOMMENDATION |
|---|------------|---------------------|
| Farmhouse | 210122-000 | Ineligible |
| <i>Outbuildings:</i> Barn, Shed | | |
| House | 211002-000 | Ineligible |
| <i>Outbuildings:</i> Sheds 1 & 2, Animal stall, Barn | | |
| Shack | 211006-000 | Ineligible |
| House | | |
| Shack | 211003-000 | Ineligible |

Source: AES, 2006; Clark County Department of Assessment and GIS, 2006

HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL CONCLUSIONS

Four of the eight parcels that make up the La Center project site contain structures. The farmhouse complex located on parcel 210122-000 includes one house constructed circa 1875 and two outbuildings (one barn and one shed). The farm complex located on parcel 211002-000 includes one house constructed circa 1900 and four associated outbuildings (one barn, two sheds and one large animal stall). Parcel 211006-000 contains a house and shack. The house has a build date of 1956. Parcel 211003-000 contains one shack of unknown use or origin. All structures within the APE are recommended not eligible to the NRHP. Of the parcels immediately bordering the APE, none are older than 1973 and thus do not qualify for NRHP evaluation.

3.6.3 FINDINGS – RIDGEFIELD INTERCHANGE SITE

RECORDS AND LITERATURE SEARCH

A review of historic United States Geologic Survey (USGS) topographic quadrangles from 1947 and 1954 indicate that the Ridgefield Interchange Site had no structures on it in 1947, but by 1954 there were three structures grouped together in the center of the property. Gary Arnold, AES Staff Archaeologist, conducted a records search at the DAHP in Olympia, Washington on March 9, 2005. The records search indicated that no archaeological sites have been recorded in, or in the immediate vicinity of, the Ridgefield Interchange Site. Two cultural resources studies have been conducted adjacent to the site (Archaeological Investigations Northwest, Inc., Report #1310 [2004a] and Archaeological Investigations Northwest, Inc., Report #1323 [2004b]). Report #1323 reported the presence of one historic structure, the Kapus Farm granary, recommended to be eligible for listing in the NRHP. The Kapus Farm granary is located across N 65th Avenue and approximately 200 feet from the westernmost project site boundary.

FIELD SURVEY

A field survey of the Ridgefield Interchange Site was conducted by AES archaeologists Kelly Heidecker and Gary S. Arnold on March 10 and 11, 2005. The site consisted almost exclusively of rolling grassland prairie, with moderate to poor visibility throughout. The northern portion of the site contained riparian woodland. Rodent disturbance was evident throughout much of the site, including mounds resulting from small burrowing rodents as well as collapsed and intact rabbit hutches.

The site was walked in 25-meter transects, with particular emphasis placed on bioperturbations, cutbanks and variations in topography, vegetation and soil consistency. No archaeological site indicators were encountered during the course of the survey of the Ridgefield Interchange Site. A single-family residence with multiple barns, shacks and sheds of various age and usage were recorded and evaluated for NRHP eligibility. The farm complex was recommended ineligible for NRHP listing.

RIDGEFIELD INTERCHANGE SITE CONCLUSIONS

No archaeological sites were discovered during the survey and a single historic-era property was recorded and evaluated for NRHP listing. The property was recommended ineligible for NRHP listing.

3.6.4 REGULATORY BACKGROUND***NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES***

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (as amended through 2004) authorizes the RHP, a program for the preservation of historic properties (“cultural resources”) throughout the nation. The eligibility of a resource for listing in the NRHP is determined by evaluating the resource using criteria defined in 36 CFR 60.4 as follows:

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, association, and

- a) *that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;*
- b) *that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;*
- c) *that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or*
- d) *that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important to prehistory or history.*

Sites younger than 50 years, unless of exceptional importance, are not eligible for listing in the NRHP.

All properties change over time. Therefore, it is not necessary for a property to retain all of its historic physical features or characteristics in order to be eligible for listing on the NRHP. The property must, however, retain enough integrity to enable it to convey its historic identity; in other words, to be recognizable to a historical contemporary. The National Register recognizes seven aspects or qualities that, in various combinations, define integrity (NPS, 1990). These seven qualities are listed below:

1. **Location** – the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.
2. **Design** – the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.
3. **Setting** – the physical environment of a historic property.

4. **Materials** – the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.
5. **Workmanship** – the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory.
6. **Feeling** – a property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.
7. **Association** – the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.

To retain historic integrity a property will always possess some, and usually most, of these aspects. In order to properly assess integrity, however, significance (why, where, and when a property is important) must first be fully established. Therefore, the issues of significance and integrity must always be considered together when evaluating a historic property.

NATIVE AMERICAN GRAVES PROTECTION AND REPATRIATION ACT

The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), 25 USC 3001 *et seq.*, provides a process for museums and Federal agencies to return Native American cultural items – human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony – to lineal descendants, and culturally affiliated Indian tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations. NAGPRA includes provisions for unclaimed and culturally unidentifiable Native American cultural items, intentional and inadvertent discovery of Native American cultural items on Federal and Tribal lands, and penalties for noncompliance and illegal trafficking.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES PROTECTION ACT OF 1979

The Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (ARPA) (PL 96-95; 16 U.S.C. 470aa-mm), provides for the protection of archaeological resources and sites which are on public and Indian lands, and fosters increased cooperation and exchange of information between governmental authorities, the professional archaeological community, and private individuals having collections of archaeological resources and data which were obtained before October 31, 1979. ARPA also provides for penalties for noncompliance and illegal trafficking.

3.6.5 NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION

In accordance with Section 106 of the NHPA, a letter was sent to the Washington Governor’s Office of Indian Affairs (GOIA) on July 25, 2005, to request information on Native American tribal contacts to complete the consultation process. Subsequent telephone conversations with staff at the GOIA on November 22, 2005, and Robert Whitlam at DAHP on July 25, 2005, identified three potentially interested parties in addition to the Cowlitz Indian Tribe: the Chehalis Confederated Tribes, the Yakima Nation, and the Shoalwater Bay Tribe. Consultation letters were sent to each of these three tribes on November 22, 2005 (DEIS Vol. II, **Appendix R**). To-date, no responses have been received from the Chehalis Confederated Tribes, the Yakima Nation, or the Shoalwater Bay Tribe. On

December 18, 2006 a consultation letter was sent to the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde Community of Oregon per their request to be involved in the Native American consultation process (DEIS Vol. II, **Appendix R**). Responses from the Grand Ronde Tribe are included within **Appendix J** of the FEIS.

On November 29th, 2005, AES received a letter from the Cowlitz Indian Tribe indicating that there are no traditional, cultural, or sacred sites on either of the alternative project sites and that there are no known sites that would be impacted by development of the property (DEIS Vol. II, **Appendices Q** and **R**).

3.6.6 PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

INTRODUCTION

Paleontological resources are defined as the traces or remains of prehistoric plants and animals. Such remains often appear as fossilized or petrified skeletal matter, imprints, or endocasts, and reside in sedimentary rock layers. Paleontological resources are considered important for their scientific and educational value. Fossil remains of vertebrates are considered significant. Invertebrate fossils are considered significant if they function as index fossils. Index fossils are those that appear in the fossil record for a relatively short and known period of time, allowing geologists to interpret the age range of the geological formations in which they are found.

This section presents documentation on reported paleontological deposits on the alternative project sites and surrounding region, as well as an analysis on the potential for unreported paleontological resources to be present on the La Center Interchange and Ridgefield Interchange Sites.

SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

Significance for paleontological resources is reflected in terms of compliance with the Antiquities Act of 1906 (PL 59-209; 16 U.S.C. 431 *et seq.*; 34 Stat. 225), which calls for the protection of historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest on lands owned or controlled by the Government of the United States. Additional provisions appear in the Archaeological and Historic Data Preservation Act of 1974, as amended, for the survey, recovery, and preservation of significant scientific, prehistoric, historic, archaeological, or paleontological data, in such cases wherein this type of data might be otherwise destroyed or irrecoverably lost as a result of Federal projects.

SITE AND REGIONAL GEOLOGY

The geological characteristics of the La Center Interchange and Ridgefield Interchange Sites are detailed in **Section 3.2**, Geology and Soils. The sites lie within the northern region of the Portland Basin within the Puget-Willamette Lowland. Surficial deposits consist of cataclysmic flood deposits and fine-grained facies (Quaternary deposits) from the Pleistocene period (USGS, 2004a). These

alluvial deposits are not typically associated with conditions favorable to the preservation or fossilization of paleontological resources.

DATABASE SEARCH

An online records search of the University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMP) revealed one unmapped locality in Clark County, containing an unspecified paleontological specimen. No paleontological resources have been reported within the La Center Interchange or the Ridgefield Interchange Sites. Specimens are specified in the UCMP database if they are considered significant for either paleontological or geological purposes.

CONCLUSIONS

No paleontological site indicators were reported in the HRA cultural resources survey of the La Center Interchange Site, or identified during the AES cultural resources survey of the Ridgefield Interchange Site. In addition, the geological age and composition of the ground at both the La Center Interchange and Ridgefield Interchange Sites are not typically associated with the presence of paleontological resources. The UCMP database searches reported only one paleontological locality within Clark County, which is not classified as significant.