

**A COMPARISON OF FAUNAL USE AT RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURES AT TWO FREMONT SITES IN  
UTAH VALLEY**

**Abstract:** Excavations conducted by Brigham Young University's Field Schools from 2010-2015, have uncovered several examples of Fremont residential architecture at two sites around Utah Lake. At least five residential structures have been excavated at Wolf Village (42UT273), a site dating to AD 900 – 1208. One residential pithouse was uncovered at the Hinckley Mounds site (42UT111), dating to AD 1100. Recent research at these sites has focused on architecture and the use of space, particularly in regards to communal architecture. This paper seeks to add to these investigations by comparing the faunal assemblages and other artifact types from residential structures at both sites and how each was utilizing local lake, marshland, and mountain resources.

Spencer F. Lambert and Joseph A. Bryce  
Brigham Young University  
Provo, Utah  
84602

PLEASE DO NOT CITE WITHOUT THE PERMISSION OF THE AUTHORS

To be presented at the Utah Professional Archaeological Council Annual Meeting,  
Salt Lake City, Utah  
4 March 2016

[**SLIDE 1**] Excavations conducted by Brigham Young University's Field Schools from 2010-2015, have uncovered several examples of Fremont residential architecture at two sites around Utah Lake. [**SLIDE 2**] At least five residential structures have been excavated at Wolf Village (42UT273), a site dating to AD 900 – 1208. One residential pithouse was uncovered at the Hinckley Mounds site (42UT111), dating to AD 1100. Recent research on Wolf Village has focused on architecture and the use of space, particularly in regards to communal architecture (Johansson et al. 2014). This paper seeks to add to these investigations by comparing the faunal assemblages and other artifact types from residential structures at both sites and how each was utilizing local lake, marshland, and mountain resources. We will briefly describe site information and discuss the previous and current research at these sites. Since our data is currently unpublished, this paper will be primarily descriptive, with a brief discussion of our findings and upcoming research goals.

Before we began our analysis of residential structures at Wolf Village and the Hinckley Mounds, we expected our findings would show a greater abundance of lake resources at the Hinckley Mounds due to their close proximity to Utah Lake. We also expected that Wolf Village residential units would show evidence of a greater use of mammals, especially small artiodactyls.

### **Site Information and Previous Research**

[**SLIDE 3**] Wolf Village is located north of the mouth of Goshen Canyon, on private property owned by the Wolf family. The site is located on the side and top of a hill, on land that the Wolf family uses for cattle grazing. A reconnaissance survey of Goshen Valley was conducted by Leland Gilson in 1966, as part of his master's thesis. He documented thirteen

structures at Wolf Village. These structures were visible from artifact concentrations and decaying walls (Gilsen 1968: 28).

Archaeological excavations began at Wolf Village in 2009 under the direction of Joel C. Janetski. James R. Allison directed the excavations from 2010-2013, with Michael Searcy co-directing in 2012. During these five years of excavations, nine structures were excavated, including seven pit structures and two surface structures. The structures at Wolf Village date from AD 900-1208, although radiocarbon dating suggests two periods of occupation with an extramural pit on the site dating to the AD 600s or 700s. Previous research has been conducted on the architectural variation at Wolf Village, focusing especially on communal architecture (Johansson et al. 2014). Our objective is to add to the discussion of Fremont architecture by analyzing the faunal bones, hereafter bones, and other artifacts from residential structures at this site and comparing them with one excavated at the Hinckley Mounds.

**[SLIDE 4]** The second site in our discussion is one of the Provo Mounds. Excavations were conducted in 2015 at sites on the Hinckley family farmland as a collaboration between Brigham Young University and Utah Valley University. While other mounds on the property had been leveled for agricultural purposes, John Hinckley has done an excellent job of preserving these two sites. Michael Searcy and David Yoder co-directed this field school, and they will be presenting some of their finding in the following paper.

### **Analysis of Faunal Data**

**[SLIDE 5]** All associated faunal specimens were analyzed from Structures 3, 5, and 7 at Wolf Village, with a sample analyzed at Structure 4 at Wolf Village and Structure 1 at the Hinckley Mounds. Since part of our project involves the research of residential structures at

Wolf Village, Structures 1, 8, and 9 are worth investigating in future reports, but we were unable to include them in our current paper due to limitations on time. Johansson et al. (2014) has described Structures 1 and 9 as being residential, and Structure 8 as potentially being communal based on its estimated size. Faunal and artifact analysis from Structure 8 may provide clues as to its possible functions. Structure 1 is a multi-room surface structure which Johansson et al. (2014: 47) state may have been the residential home of someone with an elevated status in the community. If this assumption is true, comparing Structure 1 with residential pithouses could shed light on social organization at the site and potentially in the region. Structures 8 and 9 are currently only partially excavated; therefore, their faunal data will be analyzed in the upcoming months.

**[SLIDE 6]** Structure 3 at Wolf Village is shallow pithouse with a well-preserved floor. Structure 3 is only a few centimeters below modern ground surface, so much of southern edge of structure has eroded over time (Johansson et al. 2014: 39-40). Since Structure 3 was significantly eroded, there were only 39 bone fragments recovered. Based on this limited sample, people living at Structure 3 seemed to have enjoyed a diet primarily consisting of large, small, and medium mammals, including bighorn sheep and desert cottontail (Table 1). Mammals made up the vast majority of the faunal data from Structure 3, with fish being non-existent (Table 2).

**[SLIDE 7]** Structure 5 is a sub-rectangular pithouse, and like Structure 3, is only a few centimeters below the modern ground surface. Therefore, much of the southern edge of the structure has eroded away. Johansson et al. (2014: 41) state that Structure 5 dates to AD 1040-1207 and was likely used for domestic activities such as food preparation, cooking and storing items. Structure 5 appears more eroded than even Structure 3, and contained 24 faunal specimens. According to the data, small mammals and small artiodactyls made up the majority of

their animal resources (Tables 3 and 4). A comparison between faunal and ceramic data recovered from Structures 3, 4, 5, and 7 show that there were less bones in Structures 3 and 5 even before erosion. There is a 1:10 ratio between bone and ceramics in Structure 3, and a 4:100 ratio between bone and ceramics in Structure 5. These ratios are significantly less than at Structures 4 and 7, where the bone to ceramic ratios are much higher; 6:10 at Structure 4 and 5:10 at Structure 7 (Table 5). While erosion does not select for artifact types, preservation does. It may be that the faunal bones did not preserve as well at Structures 3 and 5, or it may be likely that the animal bones were cleaned out of the structures prior to abandonment. The second possibility is evident from less specimens being recovered from the floorzone and subfloor features than in the fill of Structures 3 and 5 (Table 6). In any case, we simply have too little data to make any real inferences about faunal use at Structures 3 and 5, although the ratio differences between structures is interesting.

**[SLIDE 8]** Structure 4 is a sub-rectangular pithouse with a ventilation shaft. This structure is located only 9 meters west of Structure 3. Johansson et al. (2014: 40-41) explain that there is remodeling on the ventilation tunnel and a high number of postholes and post sockets. They argue that this may mean that Structure 4 was used for a relatively long period of time. A sample of faunal data was analyzed for Structure 4 at Wolf Village, with most of the animal diet consisting of small and large mammals, including small artiodactyls (Tables 7 and 8). 43 of the specimens from Structure 4 were identified to species, mostly from muskrat and desert cottontail. The minimum number of individuals from Structure 4 are evidence of the diversity of Fremont diet at the site and in this structure. In addition to muskrat and desert cottontail, there was mallard, pronghorn, white-tailed jackrabbit, Uinta ground squirrel, Utah sucker, and Utah chub (Table 9).

**[SLIDE 9]** Structure 7 is a semi-subterranean pithouse. It rests on a south facing slope; therefore, the eastern and southern edges of the structure have eroded away. Johansson et al. (2014) argue that Structure 7 is different from the other structures for having been occupied only a short period of time and lacking a central hearth. They believe that for most of Structure 7's use, was as a storage structure, and that the central pit was turned into a hearth late in the structure's life (Johansson et al. 2014: 41-42). Structure 7 may not have been originally constructed as a residential structure, it was included in our research since it was modified to be one later in its use.

**[SLIDE 10]** The faunal data from Structure 7 was as diverse as in Structure 4, although Structure 7 contained a higher minimum number of individuals. All 519 specimens associated with Structure 7 were analyzed, showing that former occupants of this structure enjoyed a diet rich in fish, specifically Utah chub and Utah sucker (Table 10). There was a minimum of 21 individuals at this structure, including 11 Utah chubs and 3 Utah suckers (Table 11). Of all identified bones recovered from Structure 7, 69 percent originated from fish (Table 12).

**[SLIDE 11]** Structure 1 at the Hinckley Mounds was excavated at the 2015 field school, and contained a clay-lined central hearth and several subfloor storage pits. Analysis of this structure and its site is still ongoing. A sample of the faunal data from this structure has been analyzed. 2,931 faunal bone specimens were analyzed, with a high presence of fish and small mammals, although small birds were also represented (Table 13). 44 percent of all identified specimens were fish, and 31 percent were small mammals (Table 14). **[SLIDE 12]** Like Structure 7 at Wolf Village there was a diversity of animals associated with Structure 1 at the Hinckley Mounds. There was a minimum of 29 individuals at this structure, including three Utah

suckers, five Utah chubs, and two mallards (Table 15). Clearly the people of the Hinckley Mounds were utilizing their nearby lake resource.

## **Discussion and Conclusions**

The noted structures were all determined to be residential due to their presence of central hearths, storage pits, and internal structural supports. The residential structures at Wolf Village chosen were chosen to compare with the one residential structure at the Hinckley Mounds since they all contained a central hearth, storage pits, and in the case of Structure 4, a ventilation shaft. Structures 3 and 5 were analyzed despite their severe impact by erosion, and their data will be compared to the other structures in our study. There was a minimum number of one small artiodactyl present at all analyzed structures at the two sites, except in the case of Structure 4 which had two (Table 16). Small mammals were also present at each structure. Fish was only present at Structures 4 and 7 at Wolf Village and Structure 1 at the Hinckley Mounds, although the lack of fish at Structures 3 and 5 may be to either poor preservation or erosion.

[SLIDE 13] While analyzing these structures we assumed that residential structures at Wolf Village would have more small artiodactyls than at the Hinckley Mounds, and that the Hinckley Mounds would utilize more fish resources than at Wolf Village. The faunal data from our analysis did not reflect this, especially when comparing Structures 4 and 7 at Wolf Village to Structure 1 at the Hinckley Mounds. Of the identifiable bones from Structure 7, 69 percent were fish. Of the animal bones from Structure 1 at the Hinckley Mounds, 44 percent were fish. Artiodactyl percentages were similar at the Hinckley Mounds' Structure 1 and Wolf Village's Structure 7 (Table 17). We realize that this does not necessarily mean that they were eating more

fish at Wolf Village than at the Hinckley Mounds, but is noteworthy since it means that the inhabitants at Wolf Village were eating more fish than we initially expected.

Scott Billat (1985) analyzed faunal material at the Smoking Pipe Site in western Provo, Utah to deduce subsistence patterns and provide a basis for comparison with other sites in Utah (Billat 1985: 4). Billat's analysis resulted in 66 percent of identifiable faunal specimens, and concludes that, like Structure 1 at the Hinckley Mounds, fish was the predominant faunal class exploited at Smoking Pipe. Billat also points out that Fremont sites closer to Utah Lake generally have less quantities of fish remains, although he attributes this discrepancy to poor recovery techniques (Billat 1985: 128-129).

The formation of villages is a time of tremendous social change where integration and social organization can be studied by analyzing architecture and their associated artifacts (Adler and Wilshusen 1990: 143). Johansson et al. (2014) argue in their paper that architecture is a medium in which community integration and social organization can be studied. Variation in house forms at Wolf Village could indicate social differentiation and hierarchy within Fremont communities. Johansson et al. point out that identifying social differentiation and hierarchy at Wolf Village and other Fremont sites requires a thorough study of the artifacts and activities that are associated with each structure (Johansson et al. 2014: 52). Bryan Hockett (1998) used faunal data to determine sociopolitical meaning at Baker Village. He argues that spatial patterning of faunal remains could help identify social inequalities, mobility, and feasting ceremonies (Hockett 1998: 291). We seek to study the spatial patterning of faunal remains at Fremont sites, especially at Wolf Village and the Hinckley Mounds.

**[SLIDE 14]** We will further our research of residential structures by analyzing the data from Structures 1, 8, and 9 at Wolf Village. Comparing all residential units at Wolf Village can



help us to understand the intra-site variation of structures. Structure 1 at Wolf Village is a surface structure with multiple storage rooms. The structure likely belonged to an individual with some degree of prestige, and will be helpful to compare data with other residential structures in order to understand possible social change occurring at the site. Structures 8 and 9 remain partially excavated, but will be excavated fully this upcoming summer. Their faunal data is already significantly higher with over 5,000 faunal bone specimens in Structure 8 and over 3,000 specimens in Structure 9. They do not appear to have been as affected by erosion as other residential structures at Wolf Village so their data will be important in understanding animal use at Wolf Village in comparison with the Hinckley Mounds.

**[SLIDE 15]** By analyzing residential structures at two sites in Utah Valley, we were able to compare and contrast how the former residents of each site utilized animal resources. Faunal data from Wolf Village and the Hinckley Mounds shows how the people at both sites were utilizing lake, marshland, and mountain resources. Diets at both sites are similar, with data from Structures 4 and 7 at Wolf Village and Structure 1 at the Hinckley Mounds suggesting that the inhabitants at both sites consumed a variety of animal resources including a fair amount of fish and waterfowl. Structures 3 and 5 were also included in our study, but they were too eroded to provide us with clear data. These results are preliminary, but with more complete data we expect to learn more about the Fremont inhabitants of the Utah Valley and their use of residential structures.

## Tables

Table 1. Number of Identifiable Specimens Present (NISP) and Unidentifiable Bones Recovered from Structure 3 at Wolf Village.

Taxa	NISP
<i>Ovis canadensis</i> (bighorn sheep)	1
<i>Sylvilagus audubonii</i> (desert cottontail)	1
<i>Ondatra zibethicus</i> (muskrat)	1
NISP Totals	3
Bird (medium)	1
Bird (small)	1
Mammal (large)	7
Mammal (medium)	4
Mammal (small)	8
Artiodactyl (large)	1
Artiodactyl (small)	7
Unidentifiable fragments	5
Total Bone Specimens	39

Table 2. Percentages and Quantities of Identifiable Bones found in Structure 3 at Wolf Village, Showing the High Concentration of Mammals to Birds.

Category	Quantity	% Category
Bird (medium)	1	3
Bird (small)	1	3
Mammal (large)	7	23
Mammal (medium)	4	13
Mammal (small)	10	32
Artiodactyl (large)	1	3
Artiodactyl (small)	7	23
Total	31	100

Table 3. Number of Identifiable Specimens Present (NISP) and Unidentifiable Bones Recovered from Structure 5 at Wolf Village.

Taxa	NISP
<i>Microtus</i> (vole)	3
NISP Totals	3
Bird (medium)	1
Mammal (large)	3
Artiodactyl (small)	3

Unidentifiable fragments	14
Total Bone Specimens	24

Table 4. Percentages and Quantities of Identifiable Bones found in Structure 5 at Wolf Village, Showing the High Concentration of Mammals to Birds.

Category	Quantity	% Category
Bird (medium)	1	10
Mammal (large)	3	30
Mammal (small)	3	30
Artiodactyl (small)	3	30
Total	10	100

Table 5. Comparison of Faunal Bone vs Ceramics Recovered from Structures 3, 4, 5, and 7 at Wolf Village, showing the Ratio between Bone and Ceramic from each Structure.

Location	Faunal Bone	Ceramics	Bone/Ceramic Ratio
Structure 3	39	383	0.101827676
Structure 4	1125	1908	0.589622642
Structure 5	24	557	0.041594454
Structure 7	519	1091	0.475710357

Table 6. Location of Bone Specimens by Structure at Wolf Village (WV) and the Hinckley Mounds (HM)

Location	Fill	Roof fall	Floor Zone	Ventilation Shaft	Hearth	Subfloor	Total
WV Structure 3	37		2				39
WV Structure 4	140	277	244	130	1	23	815
WV Structure 5	9		8		5	2	24
WV Structure 7	3		38			519	560
WV Total	189	277	292	130	6	544	1438
HM Structure 1	2311	170		353	28	30	2892
Total	2500	447	292	483	34	1864	4330

Table 7. Number of Identifiable Specimens Present (NISP) and Unidentifiable Bones Recovered from Structure 4 at Wolf Village.

Taxa	NISP
<i>Anas platyrhynchos</i> (mallard)	1
<i>Antilocapra americana</i> (pronghorn)	1

<i>Ondatra zibethicus</i> (muskrat)	13
<i>Sylvilagus audubonii</i> (desert cottontail)	14
<i>Lepus townsendi</i> (white-tailed jackrabbit)	2
<i>Spermophilus armatus</i> (Uinta ground squirrel)	1
<i>Catostomidae ardens</i> (Utah sucker)	2
<i>Gila atraria</i> (Utah chub)	4
Leporidae	5
NISP Totals	43
Bird (large)	5
Bird (medium)	1
Bird (small)	14
Unidentifiable bird	13
Mammal (large)	112
Mammal (medium)	67
Mammal (small)	264
Artiodactyl (small)	110
Fish	12
Unidentifiable fragments	174
Total Bone Specimens	815

Table 8. Percentages and Quantities of Identifiable Bones found in Structure 4 at Wolf Village, Showing the High Concentration of Small Mammals to Other Categories.

Category	Quantity	% Category
Bird (large)	5	<1
Bird (medium)	2	<1
Bird (small)	14	2
Mammal (large)	112	18
Mammal (medium)	67	11
Mammal (small)	299	47
Artiodactyl (small)	111	18
Fish	18	3
Total	628	100

Table 9. Minimum Number of Individuals (MNI) and Numbers of Identified Specimens (NISP) at Structure 4 at Wolf Village.

Taxa	NISP	MNI
<i>Anas platyrhynchos</i> (mallard)	1	1
<i>Antilocapra americana</i> (pronghorn)	1	1
<i>Ondatra zibethicus</i> (muskrat)	13	2
<i>Sylvilagus audubonii</i> (desert cottontail)	14	1

<i>Lepus townsendi</i> (white-tailed jackrabbit)	2	1
<i>Spermophilus armatus</i> (Uinta ground squirrel)	1	1
<i>Catostomidae ardens</i> (Utah sucker)	2	1
<i>Gila atraria</i> (Utah chub)	4	1
Leporidae	5	1
Total	43	10

Table 10. Number of Identifiable Specimens Present (NISP) and Unidentifiable Bones Recovered from Structure 7 at Wolf Village.

Taxa	NISP
<i>Ondatra zibethicus</i> (muskrat)	1
<i>Sylvilagus audubonii</i> (desert cottontail)	1
<i>Catostomidae ardens</i> (Utah sucker)	23
<i>Gila atraria</i> (Utah chub)	95
<i>Zenaida macroura</i> (mourning dove)	5
Leporidae	4
Canidae	1
Squirrel	2
NISP Totals	132
Bird (large)	1
Bird (medium)	2
Bird (small)	6
Unidentifiable bird	3
Mammal (large)	6
Mammal (medium)	2
Mammal (small)	92
Artiodactyl (small)	29
Fish	226
Unidentifiable fragments	20
Total Bone Specimens	519

Table 11. Minimum Number of Individuals (MNI) and Numbers of Identified Specimens (NISP) at Structure 7 at Wolf Village.

Taxa	NISP	MNI
<i>Ondatra zibethicus</i> (muskrat)	1	1
<i>Sylvilagus audubonii</i> (desert cottontail)	1	1
<i>Catostomidae ardens</i> (Utah sucker)	23	3
<i>Gila atraria</i> (Utah chub)	95	11
<i>Zenaida macroura</i> (mourning dove)	5	2
Leporidae	4	1

Canidae	1	1
Squirrel	2	1
Total	132	21

Table 12. Percentages and Quantities of Identifiable Bones found in Structure 7 at Wolf Village, Showing the High Concentration of Fish to Other Categories.

Category	Quantity	% Category
Bird (large)	1	<1
Bird (medium)	2	<1
Bird (small)	11	2
Mammal (large)	6	<1
Mammal (medium)	3	<1
Mammal (small)	100	20
Artiodactyl (small)	29	6
Fish	344	69
Total	496	100

Table 13. Number of Identifiable Specimens Present (NISP) and Unidentifiable Bones Recovered from Structure 1 at the Hinckley Mounds.

Taxa	NISP
<i>Anas platyrhynchos</i> (mallard)	24
<i>Zenaida macroura</i> (mourning dove)	3
<i>Anas crecca</i> (common teal)	1
<i>Bombycilla cedrorum</i> (cedar waxwing)	4
<i>Corvus brachyrhynchos</i> (American crow)	7
<i>Recurvirostra americana</i> (American avocet)	1
<i>Gallinago gallinago</i> (common snipe)	3
<i>Turdus migratorius</i> (American robin)	8
<i>Odocoileus hemionus</i> (mule deer)	1
<i>Bos taurus</i> (domestic cattle)	2
<i>Ondatra zibethicus</i> (muskrat)	26
<i>Neotoma cinerea</i> (bushy-tailed woodrat)	3
<i>Microtus</i> (vole)	1
<i>Thomomys bottae</i> (Botta's pocket gopher)	1
<i>Mus musculus</i> (house mouse)	1
<i>Lepus townsendi</i> (white-tailed jackrabbit)	4
<i>Catostomidae ardens</i> (Utah sucker)	31
<i>Gila atraria</i> (Utah chub)	35
Ranidae (Frog)	2
Leporidae	1
NISP Totals	159

Bird (large)	6
Bird (medium)	49
Bird (small)	134
Unidentifiable bird	8
Mammal (large)	63
Mammal (medium)	77
Mammal (small)	470
Artiodactyl (small)	33
Fish	663
Unidentifiable fragments	1269
<b>Total Bone Specimens</b>	<b>2931</b>

Table 14. Percentages and Quantities of Identifiable Bones found in Structure 1 at the Hinckley Mounds, Showing the High Concentration of Fish.

Category	Quantity	% Category
Bird (large)	6	<1
Bird (medium)	50	3
Bird (small)	184	11
Mammal (large)	63	4
Mammal (medium)	77	5
Mammal (small)	507	31
Artiodactyl (small)	34	2
Fish	729	44
<b>Total</b>	<b>1650</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 15. Minimum Number of Individuals (MNI) and Numbers of Identified Specimens (NISP) at Structure 1 at the Hinckley Mounds.

Taxa	NISP	MNI
<i>Anas platyrhynchos</i> (mallard)	24	2
<i>Zenaida macroura</i> (mourning dove)	3	1
<i>Anas crecca</i> (common teal)	1	1
<i>Bombycilla cedrorum</i> (cedar waxwing)	4	1
<i>Corvus brachyrhynchos</i> (American crow)	7	1
<i>Recurvirostra americana</i> (American avocet)	1	1
<i>Gallinago gallinago</i> (common snipe)	3	1
<i>Turdus migratorius</i> (American robin)	8	2
<i>Odocoileus hemionus</i> (mule deer)	1	1
<i>Bos taurus</i> (domestic cattle)	2	1
<i>Ondatra zibethicus</i> (muskrat)	26	2
<i>Neotoma cinerea</i> (bushy-tailed woodrat)	3	1

<i>Microtus</i> (vole)	1	1
<i>Thomomys bottae</i> (Botta's pocket gopher)	1	1
<i>Mus musculus</i> (house mouse)	1	1
<i>Lepus townsendi</i> (white-tailed jackrabbit)	4	1
<i>Catostomidae ardens</i> (Utah sucker)	31	3
<i>Gila atraria</i> (Utah chub)	35	5
Ranidae (Frog)	2	1
Leporidae	1	1
Total	159	29

Table 16. Minimum Number of Individuals (MNI) Compared by Structures at Wolf Village (WV) and the Hinckley Mounds (HM). Identified and Unidentified Animal Types are Combined Together.

Location	Small Artiodactyls	Small Mammals	Medium Mammals	Fish	Birds	Amphibian
WV Structure 3	1	2				
WV Structure 4	2	5	1	2	2	
WV Structure 5	1	1				
WV Structure 7	1	4	1	14	2	
Total from WV Sample	5	12	2	16	4	0
HM Structure 1	1	5		9	9	1

Table 17. Comparison of Percentages of Identifiable Bones from Structures 4 and 7 at Wolf Village and Structure 1 at the Hinckley Mounds.

Category	Str 4 Quantity	Str 4 % Category	Str 7 Quantity	Str 7 % Category	Str 1 Quantity	Str 1 % Category
Bird (large)	5	<1	1	<1	6	<1
Bird (medium)	2	<1	2	<1	50	3
Bird (small)	14	2	11	2	184	11
Mammal (large)	112	18	6	<1	63	4
Mammal (medium)	67	11	3	<1	77	5
Mammal (small)	299	47	100	20	507	31
Artiodactyl (small)	111	18	29	6	34	2
Fish	18	3	344	69	729	44



Table 18. Burned vs. Unburned Bone by Structure at Wolf Village (WV) and the Hinckley Mounds (HM).

Location	Burned	Unburned	Total	Ratio	%
WV Structure 3	11	28	39	0.0016	0.1572
WV Structure 4	226	606	815	0.3729	0.2773
WV Structure 5	17	7	24	2.4286	70.8333
WV Structure 7	19	568	519	0.0336	0.0366
HM Structure 1	45	2887	2931	0.0156	1.5348

**References Cited:**

Adler, Michael A. and Richard H. Wilshusen

1990 Large-scale Integrative Facilities in Tribal Societies: Cross-cultural and Southwestern US Examples. *World Archaeology* 22(2):133–146.

Billat, Scott E.

1985 A Study of Fremont Subsistence at the Smoking Pipe Site. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Brigham Young University, Provo.

Gilsen, Leland

1968 An Archaeological Survey of Goshen Valley, Utah County, Central Utah. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Brigham Young University, Provo.

Hockett, Bryan Scott

1998 Sociopolitical Meaning of Faunal remains from Baker Village. *American Antiquity* 63(2):289-302.

Johansson, Lindsay, Katie K. Richards, and James R. Allison

2014 Wolf Village (42UT273): A Case Study in Fremont Architectural Variability. *Utah Archaeology* 27(1):33-56.