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## IN MEMORIAM

## JESSE D. JENNINGS

1909-1997


Jesse David Jennings, noted archaeologist and Fellow of the Utah Professional Archaeological Council and the State Historical Society, died at his home in Siletz, Oregon, on August 13, 1997. Jane Chase Jenuings, his wife and partner since their 1935 wedding, was at his side. His nearly forty years as professor of anthropology at the University of Utah profoundly influenced the practice of archaeology both locally and nationally and gained him numerous awards and honors.

The portzait of Jesse Jennings, by Alvin Gittins, hangs in the Utah Museum of Naural History. Photo courtesy of David Jennings.

Born July 7, 1909 in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, he moved with his family to Estancia, New Mexico at the age of ten. His father worked variously as a sharecropper and traveling salesman and was rarely with the family; Jennings, being the oldest child, began working at the age of twelve tending livestock, hoeing beans and cutting firewood, all while excelling at schoolwork - he skipped three grades and graduated from high school at age fifteen.

His mother, a devout Baptist who vowed that her son would enter the ministry, loaded the family into a covered wagon and made a seven-day trip to Hot Springs, New Mexico, to enroll Jesse in Montezuma College, a small Baptist college that had opened a few years earlier. He worked at various jobs while in college, played sports, led the debate team, and graduated second in his class. Immediately following college he went to Chicago with one of his professors, found a job as a laborer on the University of Chicago Campus, and in the fall was able to begin taking classes as a probationary graduate student. He became interested in anthropology and took classes or seminars from such notable scholars as Fay-Cooper Cole, Robert Redfield, Edward Sapir, Bronislaw Malinowski, Alfred Kroeber, and Alfred R. Radcliffe-Brown. While in graduate school, Jennings worked as a university policeman, and even shot a man, who later died from the resulting pneumonia.

After taking an archaeological feld school, enjoying it and doing well, he interrupted his graduate education when, in order to be closer to his ailing father, took a job teaching high school in New Mexico. He taught for two years, working with the field schools in the summers, and returned to graduate school following his father's death in 1933. He completed his classwork in 1936 and worked for the National Park Service in the southwest, and on numerous archaeological projects in the southeast and midwest. His work with A.V. Kidder at Kaminaljuyu, Guaternala, in 1938 formed the basis for his dissertation, which he completed in 1943. After serving as a naval officer in World War $\Pi$ he again worked for the Park Service, resigning in 1948 to accept a faculty position at the University of Utah. Jennings' career at the University of Utah lasted nearly 40 years, ending with his retirement in 1986. During that time he trained many students and conducted research throughout Utah, most notably in the Great Salt Lake Desert, the Glen Canyon of the Colorado, and in the Colorado Plateau. His work at Danger Cave near Wendover, published in 1957, was a remarkable piece of research that contributed greatly to our understanding of area prehistory and set a new standard for archaeological methods and reporting. The report, (Danger Cave, University of Utah Anthropological Papers 27) a classic in American archaeology, described in meticulous detail the complex stratigraphy, the artifacts, and the floral and faunal components of the site. Combining the results of the excavation with ethnographic information about regional cultures, Jennings developed a model for Great Basin human adaptation called the Desert Culture that continues to be a useful characterization. The Danger Cave research was also one of the first studies in the world to demonstrate the utility of the then new technique of radiocarbon dating.

When construction of the Glen Canyon dam threatened thousands of archaeological sites, Jennings led an eight-year salvage and research program that resulted in the recording of over 2,000 sites, excavation of dozens more, and over one hundred publications, including the synthetic and wide-ranging summary (Glen Canyon: A Summary, Anthropological Papers No. 81, University of Utah, 1966; recently reprinted, with a new introduction by Don Fowler as Glen Canyon: An Archaeological Summary, University of Utah Press, 1998). Other significant research projects conducted by Jennings include excavations at Cowboy Cave, Sudden Shelter, Bull Creek, and a multi-year project in Western Samoa.
In addition to teaching and research, Jennings' contributions to the field included a tireless effort to disseminate knowledge widely in the academic community through journals, synthetic works, and textbooks. He served as editor of American Antiquity (1950-1954), of the Plains Archeological Conference Newsletter (1947-1950), and of the University of Utah Anthropological Papers (1950-1953 and 1963-1985). His Prehistory of North America (McGrawHill, 1968, 1974, 1989) and two other introductory textbooks (with Robert F. Spencer and Edward Norbeck)
introduced generations of students to the field. He edited and contributed to Ancient Native Americans (1978), Ancient North Americans (1983) and Ancient South Americans (1983, all W.H. Freeman) compilations which have been widely used in both graduate and undergraduate courses.
He also served on the Executive Board of the American Anthropological Association (1953-1956), as President of the Society for American Archaeology (1959-1960), and as Vice-President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (1961). For these many and varied services to the field, Jennings was widely honored. Among his awards are included the Viking Medal in Archaeology (1958), Distinguished Professor, University of Utah (1974), and Doctor of Science, University of Utah (1980). He was elected to the National Academy of Sciences in 1977, was a Fulbright-Hayes Lecturer at the University of Auckland in 1979, and was awarded the Distinguished Service Award by the Society for American Archaeology in 1982.
Jesse Jennings was a tireless advocate for and promoter of archaeology. He and avocational archaeologist George Tripp were responsible for the passage of antiquities protection laws in Utah. He founded the Utah Museum of Natural History, and was a strong supporter of the College of Eastem Utah Prehistoric Museum during its early years. He was an eariy supporter of the Utah Statewide Archaeological Society and worked with George Tripp to help get it established.
As a researcher Jennings was thorough, diligent, insightful, and creative. He had a very strong conviction that it is an archaeologist's most important responsibility to publish the results of any research in a timely fashion. When a site is excavated, it is destroyed, and Jennings thought it an atrocity if detailed reports were not prepared. He took this responsibility seriously, and expected his students to do the same. He was very disciplined, and demanded discipline from his students. As a teacher he was always fair, although his intensity terrified many students (and colleagues). Most of his students will remember Jennings for his ability to be both gruff and humorous, for his great dedication to and deep love of archaeology, and for his incessant smoking. We often joked that Jennings thought the eraser trays on classroom chalkboards were there for him to use as an ashtray.
Jennings was a big man with a big personality and endless drive. Following his retirement from the University of Utah, Jennings and his wife Jane moved to \$iletz, Oregon. During this period of "semi-retirement," he remained active in the field, teaching and advising students at the University of Oregon, writing, and revising his textbook for a new edition. His well-written autobiography Accidental Archaeologist (University of Utah Press, 1994) is fascinating reading for anyone interested in archaeology, and it affords considerable insight into this intriguing man whose contributions to archaeology will continue to benefit the field for years to come.

Kevin T. Jones

# WINTER CATTAIL COLLECTING EXPERIMENTS 

David B. Madsen, Environmental Sciences Program, Utah Geological Survey, 1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah 84114<br>Lee EschJer, Salt Lake Chapter, Utah Statewide Archaeological Society, 1173 West 1850 South, Woods Cross, Utah 84087

Trevor Eschler, $4^{\text {th }}$ Grade, Woods Cross Elementary School, 1173 West 1850 South, Woods Cross, Utah 84087

Cattail (Typha latifolia) rhizomes and shoots were experimentally collected and processed during late winter (January through mid-March) to examine their uility as winter food resource. Shoots are readily collected from warm water springs, but are generally inaccessible where marshes are frozen. They produce return rates of $500-600 \mathrm{Cals} / \mathrm{hr}$., but are bulky and were most likely used as a dietary supplement. Cattail rhizomes were easily collected in fields by using a digging stick to pry off 6-12 inches of frozen soil above the rhizomes. The starch content of the rhizomes is at its highest from late fall until early spring when it begins to support new growh. Processing which employs simple mashing and boiling techniques produces return rates of $3000-4000 \mathrm{Cals} / \mathrm{hr}$. When combined with other experimental data, the return rate range for cattail rhizomes is $200-5000 \mathrm{Cals} / \mathrm{hr}$. Increasing experimental data indicate wide return rate ranges are a common characteristic of many food resources, suggesting the need for caution in applying diet breadth models in archaeological situations.

## INTRODUCTION

To examine the possible utility of cattails (Typha latifolia) as a winter staple, we conducted a series of collecting experiments throughout January, February and early March of 1997 . The tests were initiated as part of a science fair project initiated by one of us (Eschler 1997) indended to examine two simple questions: (A) Can cattails be collected and used as a food resource in the depths of winter? and (B) Is the return rate from collecting and processing these resources high enough to make them viable as a winter staple in lieu of other potential food sources? In answering these questions we were also able to address issues surrounding the role wild plants may have played in the establishment of sedentary village life, and methodological issues surrounding food collecting experiments. These tests are part of a continuing cost-benefit assessment of plant and animal resources commonly collected by Great Basin hunter-gatherers (e.g., Simms 1987; Jones 1981; Madsen and Kirknan 1988; Jones and Madsen 1991). We collected winter cattails for consumption in two ways: new shoots were collected from warm water springs where water temperatures prevent winter freezing and allow some growth during winter months, and rhizomes from cattails in frozen fields were collected with a digging stick.

## CATTAIL SHOOTS

The shoots are easily collected by simply pulling them from the water. The water in the spring fed pond where we made our collection was warm, and collecting the shoots on bright, sunny winter afternoons presented no hypothermic problems. Nearby ponds were frozen solid and neither shoots nor rhizomes were available (Figure 1). The shoots, almost withoat exception, broke-off from the rhizome when pulled, and came out relatively clean and in little need of washing. The white, starchy, base of the new shoot is the edible portion, and where growth is extensive, the green, chlorophyl enriched, upper leaves must be cut off prior to cooking and eating (Figure 2). These constitute the only processing costs associated with the consumption of cattail shoots. We used a serrated knife in cutting off these green ends to simulate an obsidian knife. Obsidian blades are considerably sharper than steel knives (Robert Elston, personal communication 1997), so this may have introduced some small bias in determining processing time. Since cutting away of the green part of the shoots constitutes the majority of overall handling costs, prehistoric retum rates were probably higher. Moreover, when the shoots are younger and first emerging, no cutting at all is necessary, as the entire new stock is edible.
The shoots resemble leeks and can be prepared in the same ways. Often, these new shoots, which "taste much like celery," were merely eaten raw (Fowler 1992:64). We tried them by baking them, boiling them in water and sauteing them in butter. When cooked, they become soft and translucent, much like onions, and lose much of their high water content. To determine their crude nutritional content, we submitted a sample collected January 22, 1997 to Wasatch Laboratories of Ogden, Utah for analysis. They report that basal cattail shoots are $95.13 \%$ water, $0.75 \%$ ash, $0.70 \%$ crude fiber, $.05 \%$ crude fat, $66 \%$ crude protein, and $2.78 \%$ carbohydrates. Using a formula in which 1 g of fat produces 9 calories, 1 g of protein produces 4 calories, and 1 g of carbohydrates produces 4 calories, the cattail shoots we tested contain about 142.1 calories per kilogram.'
We collected cattail shoots experimentally in an area of warm water springs along Beck Street road in Salt Lake City, Utah on three different days during the winter of 1996-1997. During this period (January lst to March 15th), daily high and low temperatures ranged from $10^{\circ}$ to $59^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$, with an average high of $42^{\circ}$ and an average low of $25^{\circ}$ (Figure 3). In our first experiment we pulled entire cattail plants from the mud, including old growth, thizomes, roots, and new shoots. Processing consisted of cleaning off mud clinging to the shoots and cutting off the white starchy portion of new growth. In subsequent experiments, we found it easier and faster to simply pull the new shoots from the water and little or no washing was necessary. Again, the white starchy portion of new growth was cut off for consumption. In all, five experiments were conducted (Table 1).
The average return rate of $575 \mathrm{Cals} / \mathrm{hr}$ places cattail shoots approximately in the middle of the range of experimentally derived return rates for Great Basin plant resources (e.g., Simms 1987; Jones and Madsen 1991). However, return rates for the collection and consumption of younger shoots, which require no cutting, is probably at least double this rate since our processing time constiates $57 \%$ of overall handling costs. Even so, this rate is much higher than that of other plant resources commonly collected during winter months. While this suggests cattail shoots may have been a favored resource of aboriginal foragers, two major problems with cattail shoots may have tempered this enthusiasm. First, cattail shoots probably had only limited availability during winter months. In areas away from warm water springs, cattails are covered by ice or frozen ground and shoots do not grow. Shoots can be collected from only a few areas where warm springs occur unless plant growth is initiated other marsh areas by a mid-winter thaw. Shoots are, however, one of the few plant resources available in early spring, and, as Fowler (1990: 64) notes, provide "some of [the Northern Paiute's] first fresh food of the season." Second, cattail shoots must be consumed in large quantities to provide any significant energetic gain. A person with a daily requirement of $2000 \mathrm{Cals} / \mathrm{day}$


Figure 1. View of cattail shoot collecting area (a) and adjacent frozen ponds (b) in the Warm Springs area north of Salt Lake City.


Figure 2. View of catail shoots collected during initial experiments (a) and white edible portion of the shoots prior to cleaning (b).


Figure 3. Daily minimum and maximum temperatuers at the Salt Lake airport from January 1 to March 5, 1997 (National Climatic Data Center 1997)
would have to consume more than 14 kg of raw cattail shoots to obtain that much energy. While cattails shoots are $-95 \%$ water and this bulk can be considerably reduced by cooking, a diet consisting solely of cattail shoots would still create a substantial intestinal mass. As a result, it is unlikely that cattail shoots were more than a dietary supplement, albeit an important one in early spring.

## CATTAIL RHIZOMES

The Northern Paiute commonly collected cattail thizomes in the spring and fall (Fowler 1992), although Wheat (1967: 8) implies they were collected from fall thtough spring whenever they were available, and that January and February were the critical months, when "ice formed on the marshes, sealing the fish and the cattail roots from their reach." When the marshes were frozen over, we think rhizomes may have been collected from areas of higher ground where possible, particularly during later winter months when stored resources were running out. According to Morton (1975:20) cattail "...rootstocks are best gathered in autumn and winter" (see also Colville 1897). To test the viability of rid-winter cattail collecting, we collected rhizomes from relatively dry fields away from areas of open water where warm temperatures could initiate early growth of cattail shoots or, conversely where thick layers of ice would preclude their collection. Collections were made in a snow covered field where the ground was frozen (Figure 4).

Table 1. Cattail Shoot Experimental Return Rates.

| Date of <br> Collection | Collector | Collecting <br> Time | Processing <br> Time | Product | Hourly Rate | Return Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 / 20 / 97$ | 50 yr old M | 10 min | 7.5 min | 886 g | $3.038 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{hr}$ | $432 \mathrm{CaI} / \mathrm{hr}$ |
| $1 / 22 / 97$ | 50 yr old M | 5 min | 5.0 min | 666 g | $3.996 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{hr}$ | $568 \mathrm{CaI} / \mathrm{hr}$ |
| $2 / 9 / 97$ | 51 yr old M | 5 min | 12.0 min | 1171 g | $4.133 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{hr}$ | $587 \mathrm{Ca} / \mathrm{hr}$ |
| $2 / 9 / 97$ | 30 yr old F | 5 min | 7.33 min | 639 g | $3.109 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{hr}$ | $442 \mathrm{Cal} / \mathrm{hr}$ |
| $2 / 9 / 97$ | 38 yr old M | 5 min | 7.2 min | 1211 g | $5.956 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{hr}$ | $846 \mathrm{Cal} / \mathrm{hr}$ |
|  |  | 6 min | 7.8 min | 915 g | $4.046 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{hr}$ | $575 \mathrm{Cal} / \mathrm{hr}$ |

Cattails begin to store starch in their rhizomes in the summer after primary growth has occurred, and storage accelerates in early fall after seed production is complete. Starch production and storage continues until frost finally kills the upper portion of the plant (Figure 5). In our neck of the woods this usually occurs sometime in November. In early spring (or where warm water springs permit), the starch in the rhizomes is used to support the growth of new shoots. As the shoots grow, the amount of starch in the rhizomes is gradually reduced until the rhizomes are little more than fibrous husks and the plant is getting its energy from chlorophyl production in the new leaves. In the area of the Great Salt Lake, new shoots generally begin to grow in late March after ice is off the ponds and the ground thaws out. As a result, cattail rhizomes are at their most fecund and have their highest utility as a food resource during the winter months from November through March. Where cattails are growing in warm water springs, however, growth can occur throughout the winter and rhizomes in these areas are less useful as a winter food resource. Simms (1987) reports an experiment conducted March 26, 1981 at Blue Lake, a warm water spring near Wendover, Utah, in which he collected "urusable" rhizomes, which had started to send out growing shoots, and which, as a result, "were thin, wrinkled, and contained nothing but coarse fiber when broken open." Unfortunately, no attempt was made to evaluate the food value of the shoots growing from these rhizomes.

Rhizomes can be prepared for consumption in a number of ways. The simplest is to merely peel and chew the rhizomes while raw, extract and swallow the starch, and spit out the wad of fiber (usually called the quid) which remains (Fowler 1992): Another simple procedure is to briefly mash the rhizome with a mano to expose the starch laden fibers within, and then boil the rhizome until the starch is dissolved. Peeling the outer covering from the rhizome is unnecessary. The fibrous remnants of the rhizome are then merely scooped from resulting "soup" with the finger tips and discarded. In our experiment, we mashed a rhizome with a mano for 10 seconds and boiled it for 5 minutes. This is a processing/cooking techuique commonly employed by the Northem Paiute and other Great Basin peoples for fibrous tubers, and, while not explicitly associated with cattails, was likely used in preparing them for consumption (Catherine Fowler, personal communication 1997). Starch around the fiber appeared to dissolve within less than one minute of boiling, and the remaining boiling time was only to insure that all starch was removed. Boiling is actually unnecessary, as is "squeezing" the rhizome in water to release the starch (Jones 1981, Jones and Madsen 1991). Both techniques merely accelerate a process that occurs with simple soaking. Schofield (1989)


Figure 4. View of rhizome collecting area and experiment in progress.


Figure 5. Close-up view of winter rhizome interior. Note the heavy accumulation of starch grains along the rhizome fibers.
recommends merely soaking mashed rhizomes in water, waiting for the "flour" to sette to the bottom, pouring off the water and letting the "flour" dry. Other, more labor intensive, preparation methods include scraping off the fiberous outer covering and baking the rhizomes in a fire (e.g., Simms 1987), and using a mano and metate to mash the rhizome and press out a starchy paste which can be dried and used as a flour. Specialized grinding stones found in the Great Salt Lake marshes may have been used for this purpose (see below).
Rhizones cara also be dried and stored, but require some processing. In our experiments, unprocessed rhizomes began to rot rapidly. The skin around the rhizome helps to retain much of the water it originally contained, leading, in turn, to the break down of the sugars in the starch and the onset of bacterial action. The Northem Paiute dried the rhizomes by splitting them into strips and roasting them on a greasewood fire to retain their "sweet flavor" (Fowler 1992: 65). Often these strips were merely dried without roasting, but there is no report that these strips were peeled prior to drying (Catherine Fowler, personal communication 1997). These stored pieces were later prepared by grinding them into a flour and making them into a mush or roasted cakes. We dried and stored rhizomes by simply breaking them open with a mano and spreading them out to dry, a method recommended by (White 1990). We kept these almost completely dehydrated rhizomes for more than a month (from $2 / 9 / 97$ to $3 / 20 / 97$ ) and then processed them
by using the boiling method described above (Figure 6). The dried starches on the exposed fibers went into solution almost as quickly as the fresh specimens. Drying the rhizomes also appears to be a more efficient way to produce cattail "flour" than does extracting a paste while moist. It also postpones a major component of processing costs to a time when it does not conflict with other collecting opportunities (e.g., Barlow and Metcalfe 1996). Although we did not conduct any tests to determine a possible return rate for producing flour from dried rhizomes, it should be relatively close to that reported here, as milling is not normally considered to be part of handling costs (e.g., Simms. 1987).


Figure 6. View of mashed cattail rhizome, dried and stored for 45 days. Note the heavy accumulation of starch virtually obscures the rhizome fibers on the flattened end.

The nutritive and energetic values of cattail rhizomes are highly dependent on the time of year they are collected and eaten. In experiments conducted by Jones in 1979 (Jones 1981, Jones and Madsen 1991), fresh rhizomes collected in mid-November contained $224 \mathrm{cal} / \mathrm{kg}$ (a figure derived by using the same simplified formula we use here), Since caloric values may vary from year to year and from one location to another, we repeated the experiment using cattail rhizomes collected January 22, 1997 from a field west of Woods Cross, Utah. One rhizome was selected for examination and cut into two equal halves of 22.8 g each. One half was left unprocessed and was submitted directly to Wasatch Laboratories to determine nutritive and caloric values. The other half was mashed with a mano for 10 seconds and boiled in water for 5 minutes. After drying overnight, the weight of the remaining fiber was 1.4 g (i.e., 21.4 g water and starch was converted to an edible "soup"). This cooked fiber was then also submitted to Wasatch Laboratories for identical tests (Figure 7). The nutritive and caloric content of rhizomes processed as "soup" was then easily determined by simply subtracting the caloric values of the two halves of the test rhizome. Results are shown in Table 2. Using the simplified fonnula described above, the cattail rhizome we tested contains about 656.2 available calories per kilogram of fresh rhizome (the 22.8 gram test specimens contained 14.962 net available calories converted to cattail "soupt" 18.217 Cals contained in the unprocessed half, minus 3.255 Cals in the mashed and boiled half.)
Our initial rhizome collecting experiment was conducted only to determine the caloric content of winter cattail rhizomes and to investigate possible processing techniques. No attempt was made to determine caloric return rates during this preliminary investigation On February 22,1997 we collected rhizomes from a spring-fed marsh area west of Woods Cross City and immediately east of the Farmington Bay marshes. Rhizomes were dug from dry ground about 2.3 m from a partially frozen spring channel containing some areas of open water. The area is boggy in spring and summer, but is relatively dry in winter. The rhizomes were actually easier to get from dry ground than from open water as the relatively dry and/or frozen earth fell easily away from roots. Rhizomes from open water were more difficult to process as the mud on them was heavy and clingy and more difficult to wash away. Perhaps more importantly, the extremely cold water temperatures made it almost impossible to muck out rhizomes for more than. a few seconds at a time. When digging in a dry field, dirt is "easy" to remove once the excavation is started and collecting goes rapidly. Shoots were just starting and were still under ground.
Our second rhizome collecting experiment took place in the same location on March 5, 1997. Our initial intention was to investigate minimum winter return rates by collecting from an area we thought would be difficult to work. Collections were made in a snow covered field where the upper ground surface was frozen to a depth of $\sim 10 \mathrm{~cm}$. A hardwood digging stick was used to pry up the frozen surface soil and loosen dirt around the rhizomes. Pursuit time included breaking up the frozen ground, loosening the rhizomes, pulling old stocks and rhizomes from the ground, and cutting the rhizomes from the old stocks. Digging was difficult (for an old guy) and this rate could probably not have continued for an entire hour. However, similar situations hold for many other resources measured for only a short time, so results should be comparable. Relatively little cutting was necessary (again a serrated knife was used) as most rhizomes broke-off from the base of the old stock while being removed. Our return rate for our initial collecting episode is somewhat lower because of the initial time required to break through frozen ground. Once a working face was created, it was possible to lever up pieces of frozen earth and get to the rhizome level relatively rapidly. Processing time included washing the thizomes and mashing them briefly with a mano as described above. However, our boiling experiments suggest mashing is not necessary, as virtually all starch can be removed simply by splitting the rhizomes as they are cooking while watching the pot boil/tending the fire. To be conservative, we include mashing costs here.
The average experimental energetic return rate from collecting and processing winter cattail rhizomes for "soup" is $3299 \mathrm{Cals} / \mathrm{hr}$, with a high of $3966 \mathrm{Cals} / \mathrm{hr}$ and a low of $2929 \mathrm{Cals} / \mathrm{hr}$ (Table 3). At first glance, this return rate seems astonishingly high given previously reported return rates for cattail rhizomes (Jones 1981; Simms 1987; Jones


Figure 7. View of the two hatves of a cattail rhizome tested to detemine energetic retums in cattail "soup." Unprocessed half (a); fibrous remnant after mashing and boiling to remove starch (b).

Table 2. Caloric Values for Two Halves of a Single Cattail Rhizome.

|  | Unboiled Half | Boiled Half |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Original Weight | 22.8 g | 22.8 g |
| Weight After Boiting | - | 1.4 g |
| Water | $75.22 \%$ | $9.01 \%$ |
| Ash | $.89 \%$ | $2.93 \%$ |
| Crude Fiber | $4.09 \%$ | $30.50 \%$ |
| Crude Fat | $.014 \%$ | $.52 \%$ |
| Ctude Protein | $2.47 \%$ | $6.74 \%$ |
| Carbohydrates | $17.19 \%$ | $50.22 \%$ |
| Caloric Value | 18.217 Cals. | 3.255 Cals. |

Table 3. Cattail Rhizome Experimental Return Rates.

| Date of <br> Collection | Collector | Collecting <br> Time | Washing <br> Time | Mashing <br> Time | Product | Hourly Rate | Return Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

and Madsen 1991). The difference is related to three principal factors: (1) A difference in season of collection and, hence, a difference in caloric values of $224 \mathrm{CaIs} / \mathrm{kg}$ verses $656 \mathrm{Cals} / \mathrm{kg}$ of raw cattail rhizome; (2) a difference in the location selected to collect the rhizomes; and (3) a difference in complex verses simple processing techniques. We are convinced the simple mashing process we employed is valid, particularly when it is possible to get 656 Cals $/ \mathrm{kg}$. of available energy into a soup when using that technique. Moreover, the technique we employed is functionally very little different from that used by Jones (1981), since both approaches simply get the rhizome starch into a water solution. We extracted $82 \%$ of the available calories from the rhizome we tested using this simple technique, and a more complex processing approach would only require more time and produce relatively little additional return. Since the common winter meal of the Northern Paiute was a "soup" prepared by dropping hot rocks into a watertight basket (Wheat 1967: 16), this simple soup processing technique is Fikely to be representative. Nevertheless, we applied the $.36 \mathrm{hr} / \mathrm{kg}$ processing time required for the technique suggested by Jones and Madsen (1991) to the winter rhizomes. we collected and found that the resulting average return rate of 1309 Cals/hr still is eight to ten times the 1.28 Cals/hr and 157 Cals/hr return rates they report.

In September, 1980, Simms conducted a similar rhizome collecting experiment along the eastern shore of the Great Salt Lake. By using a digging stick to excavate the rhizomes in large masses and roll them out like a mat, he was able to collect cleaned cattail rhizomes from a patch in wet ground (but with no standing water) at a rate of $9 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{hr}$ (Simms 1987; personal communication 1997). Using a more complex processing technique than that described here (a technique which included scraping off the fibrous outer covering), Simms' experiment produced a return rate of only 267 Cals/hr ( $374 \mathrm{Cals} / \mathrm{hr}$ without the scraping). Processing these same 9 kg of rhizomes in the manner suggested by Jones (1981; see also Jones and Madsen 1991) would produce a return rate somewhat above 475 Cals/hr, a rate nearly double that when using the skinning and baking technique. ${ }^{2}$. When the simple mashing and boiling technique we used is applied to the raw rhizomes Simms collected, the retum rate soars to $1680 \mathrm{Cals} / \mathrm{hr}$ (using our average mashing rate of $.755 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{min}$ and the 224 Cals $/ \mathrm{kg}$ "edible portion" rate derived by Jones for fall cattail rhizomes). At the higher $\mathrm{Cal} / \mathrm{kg}$ rate available later in the fall at the end of the storage cycle, a similar collecting rate would produce a return rate of $4920 \mathrm{Cals} / \mathrm{hr}$ (using our average mashing rate of $.755 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{min}$ and the $656 \mathrm{Cals} / \mathrm{kg}$ available in winter rhizomes). In short, the rehm rate for fall cattail rhizomes can vary significantly from 267 to 475 to 1680 to 4920 Cals/hr depending on when in the storage season they are collected and on the kind of processing technique that is used to prepare them for consumption.

The choice of the most appropriate patch from which to collect cattail rhizomes also has a tremendous impact on overall return rates. The experimental return rates for fall rhizomes produced by Simms (1987) and Jones and Madsen (1991) are not very comparable (contra Jones and Madsen 1991:71) because of differences in collecting locales. Simms, working in a moist field, collected cleaned rhizomes at a rate of 9 kg an hour, while a crew of volunteer foragers led by Jones averaged only 1 kg of unwashed rhizomes for each hour of work when digging thern from a hard-packed fjeld. Our collecting rate of 7 kg per hour when digging unwashed rhizomes from a frozen field was midway between these two extremes (Figure 8). Similarly, the time of collection can also have a dramatic impact on return rates as already noted, but they can be particularly different when the rhizomes are collected just before (as reported here) or just after (e.g., Simms 1987) they have produced shoots for the new growing season. These temporal and spatial differences are true for virtually all resources, and the choice of when and where to forage experimentally is critical when comparing the return rates of altemative resources (Simms 1987).

## CATTAILS AS A WINTER STAPLE

The central questions we examined are the ones originally posed by (Eschler, 1997): (A) Can cattails be collected and used as food resource in the depths of winter? and (B) Is the return rate from collecting and processing these resources high enough to make them viable as a winter staple in lieu of other potential food sources? We think the results of the experiments reported here clearly suggest that the answer to both question is yes. Dormant cattail rhizomes, containing a maximum amount of recoverable starch, are available throughout the winter months from November through March. These rhizomes can be economically collected and processed, even from frozen fields, at a return rate that exceeds, with a single exception, that of any other plant resource available at any time of the year! ${ }^{3}$ Moreover, rhizomes can be readily dried and stored for weeks, if not months, and can be prepared for consumption in the same simple fashion as are fresh rhizomes.


Figure 8. View of unprocessed rhizomes collected in one mid-winter experiment.

Simons (1987: 257) is correct in noting that cattail "...roots are similar to Scirpus roots in that they are generally not available year round." Rather, they are available only about half the year. Rhizomes appear to be viable as a moderately ranked plant resource from September through November when starch storage is only partially complete, and as a high ranked plant resource from November through March when they are at their maximum return rate. During the remaining five months of the year, however, other parts of the cattail plant provide alternative resources. Cattail shoots, while having only an average return rate in comparison to other plant types, are available during the early spring months of March, April, and May, when few other plant types are available. They were eagerly sought in March and April: "Spring was a good time [because] it meant that new shoots of the cattail would soon appear above the water. Impatient for fresh green food, naked women waded into the marshes, reaching arm-deep into the chiily water to search in the mud (Wheat 1967: 9)." Young spikes were eaten fresh by the Northern Paiute during late May and June (Fowler 1992), although they appear to have served only as a dietary supplement and no experimental return rates have been defined.

Cattail pollen, with the highest return rate of all experimentally tested plant resources (Simms 1987), is available during the early to mid-summer months of June and July. Pollen was commonly baked into cakes and consumed directly or stored for later use (Fowler 1992:65). Only during the late summer months of August and early September, must cattails take a back seat to other Great Basin plant resources. However, cattail seeds are available during this time period, and can be collected and processed at a retum rate that averages 260 Cals/hr (David Rhode, 1997 personal communication). While this retum rate is low relative to a number of other plant types available during this time period, it is still comparable to a wide range of plant types used aboriginally and can serve as a viable resource during years when plant types with higher retum rates are relatively rare. More likely, the seed heads were collected and stored, then processed during winter months (e.g., Wheat 1967:15). In short, cattails are available as a food resource in some form year-round, and can be economically collected and stored for winter use and/or can be collected directly during the winter months.

The dramatic increase in retumu rates when simply processing cattail rhizomes as soup raised a number of questions about prehistoric culinary utensils. The intensive use of the marshes around the Great Salt Lake is, in large measure, associated with pottery using groups (Fawcett and Simms 1993), and it is interesting to speculate that once a suitable boiling vessel was available, people moved into the marshes to exploit root crops there. However, twined and coiled baskets were used by a variety of Great Basin groups as cooking vessels, and pottery does not appear to be directly linked to the consumption of "soups." Among the Norther Paiute, for example, these vessels were "commonly coiled baskets, made to hold roughly two to three gallons of liquid.... Heated stones were placed in them along with the mush or soup to be cooked, and the liquid soon boiled vigorously....the more a boiler was used the more water tight it became, as particles of mush soon filled the interstices of the weave (Fowler 1992:135)." Yet there is a clear distinction between the basketry made by Numic-speaking peoples and that made by earlier Basin peoples, and it is unclear whether or not boiling baskets were a common feature of these earlier textile industries (e.g. Adovasio and Pedler 1994). It is perhaps possible that the dramatic increase in the use of both the Lahontan Basin and Bonneville Basin marshes, which occurred at roughly the same time (Raven and Elston, 1988; Kelly 1990) may be associated with the advent of a suitable boiling vessel; the boiling basket in the westem Basin and the ceramic jar in the eastern Basin. Though it seems likely that bailing vessels were in use before this time, it is perhaps a question worth investigating.

A unique mano form, common to the marshes of the Great Salt Lake but found rarely outside marsh settings, may also be associated with rhizome processing. These manos are usually small cobbles which are ground around their margins rather than on either of the opposing flat sides, although some battering is usually evident on virtually all surfaces (Fawcett and Simms [1993] refer to these tools as "V-edge cobbles"). The edge grinding is bifacial and the
outer margin of the mano is lens-shaped in cross-section (Figure 9, see also Fry and Daliey 1979: 78, Figure 57, g-h). This shape is produced by a rocking motion, as the margin of the mano is pressed on a resistant surface and pushed across the item being processed. Subjectively, this type of mano seems to be almost a perfect tool for processing cattail rhizomes, and we used one of these beaked forms to process the rhizomes we collected for our experiments. ${ }^{4}$ The technique we employed was to quickly pound and mash the rhizome in six or seven strokes, then push edge of the mano along the rhizome to flatten it out and expose all the fibers for boiling and/or drying. Manos much like these beaked forms occur in the marshes of Australia where they were used to process fiorous roots (H.J. Hall, 1997 personal communication). These may have included cattail rhizomes since they were a common aboriginal food resource (Irvine 1957; Morton 1975). It seems very possible that the manos of the Great Salt Lake served a similar purpose. The use of the Australian manos was identified by examining diagnostic starch grains clinging to the rough surface of the stone. Similar tests on the Great Salt Lake manos may confirm the use suggested here.


Figure 9. View of "beaked" or "v-edged" mono common at archaeological sites in the marshes of the Great Salt Lake.

## SUMMARY

Our experiments, together with others conducted previously, suggest that return rates for cattail rhizomes are highly variable, with differences due to the season and location of collection, and to the type of processing employed. When collected in the off-season, from difficult situations, and processed with more complex techniques, rhizomes produce retum rates of only $200 \mathrm{Cals} / \mathrm{hr}$ or lower. When collected at their productive peak, from easy collection locations and processed with simple techniques, their return rate may be as high as $5000 \mathrm{CaI} / \mathrm{hr}$. Rates anywhere between these two extremes depend on which particular combination of variables obtains at any one time and place. The average return rate for our experiments in collecting rhizomes from a frozen field in mid-winter was over 3000 Cals/hr. Such a high rate, much higher than pine nuts for example, suggests cattails rhizomes can be, and probably
were, a valuable winter staple, either consumed directly or stored for later use. Younger cattails shoots are also available during the winter months in favored locations and produce return rates of $500-600 \mathrm{Cals} / \mathrm{hr}$. During early spring months they were widely available and, due to limited competition from other resources, may have been a principal plant resource.
One of the more instructive aspect of these cattail experiments is that it reveals the extreme range of variation that may be associated with the collection of any one resource. Cattail rhizomes are yet another example of a number of resources which have retum rates with order of magnitude differences between the low and high ends of their return rate scale. While the cattail range of $200-5000 \mathrm{Cals} / \mathrm{hr}$ is modest compared to resources like crickets, which range from 600 to more than 33,000 Cals/hr (Jones and Madsen 1991), it still reflects how dramatically changes in processing methods, collecting techniques and procurement locations can alter return rates, and suggests that similar extreme ranges may exist for other plant resources. Bulrush (Scirpus spp.) seeds, for example, seem like another likely candidate. A limited number of experiments using a seed beater produced moderate return rates of 300-1700 Cals/hr (Simms 1987). However, a principal technique of the Northern Paiute was to gather bulrush seeds "...in considerable quantity during fall and early winter when the seed dropped from the plant into the water. It accumulated in windrows along the shore and could be scooped up into winnowing baskets and burden baskets and taken to camp (Fowler 1992:67)." Since pursuit time constitutes more than half of overall handing time for bulrush seeds, it is likely this windrow collecting technique produces dramatically higher over all return rates than does the seed beater technique.

These cattail experiments also illustrate the very preliminary nature of experimental results obtained to date. Resource collecting experiments are only in their infancy, and it is very inappropriate to draw any but the most general conclusions from them. Many resources have been tested in only one experiment, while return rates for others are based entirely on speculation. Even when multiple tests have been run, they often consist of only two or three tests conducted using the same techniques in similar situations. Yet despite these experimental limitations (and any number of cautionary notes about those limitations, e.g., Simms 1987; Jones and Madsen 1991), return rate data for Great Basin resources continues to be misused, as in "the return rate for plant X is Y ;" or "animal Z is high ranked." But plant $X$ does not have a retum rate, it has a return rate range, and, like cattail rhizomes, it may be an extended range. Whether or not animal $Z$ is high ranked depends on how its range over laps those of other resources and on the particular circumstances that determine which rates obtain within those ranges. As a result, the archaeological application of these return rates may be difficult unless these particular circumstances are known. In sum, return rate experiments, like those detailed here, continue to produce surprising results, and there is a clear need to conduct some initial tests on the many food resources, particularly faunal resources, that have yet to be examined. As our experiments show, however, an array of additional experiments on resources which have been tested in only a limited number of situations is equally necessary.
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## NOTES

${ }^{1}$ While a number of more accurate formulas are available in determining the nutritive and energetic content of various food types, the 9-4-4 formula is simple, relatively accurate, and has been widely used in other retum rate experiments [e.g.,Simms 1987; Jones 1981]. For comparative purposes we use the simple formula here.
${ }^{2}$ Time spent washing the rhizomes was included by Simms in his pursuit time, while Jones included it in his processing time. As a result, it is counted twice in these calculations. The processing technique employed by Simms approximates that used by the Northern Paiute in drying rhizomes for storage (Fowler 1992:65), although there is no report that they first removed the outer covering. Our drying experiments suggest the rhizome need only be split open.
${ }^{3}$ The exception, interestingly enough, is cattail pollen, which Simms (1987) collected experimentally in two tests at rates of 2811 and $8667 \mathrm{Cals} / \mathrm{hr}$. Experimental return rates for all other plants are typically below about $1500 \mathrm{Cals} / \mathrm{hr}$ (Jones and Madsen 1991)
${ }^{4}$ Fry and Dalley (1979: 59-60) suggest these stones were used to produce ground slate tools, but they do not have striations on the ground surface that would occur when grinding the edge of such hard stone, and they appear to have been used with softer materials
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# THE ESCALANTE GAME DRIVE SITE 

Alan D. Reed, Alpine Archaeological Consultants, Inc., P. O. Box 2075, Montrose, Colorado 81402


#### Abstract

The Escalante Game Drive site (5DT192) is along the Gumnison River valley in west-central Colorado. Investigations at the site by the Chipeta Chapter of the Colorado Archaeological Society have documented at least 27 cultural features thought to represent components of a game drive system, as well as a broad scatter of stone and Euroamerican artifacts. Chipeta Chapter members conducted limited excavations at the site to salvage two prehistoric hearths threatened by erosion, resulting in the identification of two Late Prehistoric period components. The association between the hearths and the game drive features is unclear. Game drive features include stacked rock and brush fences, as well as circular enclosures thought to represent blinds. Through consideration of the site's topographic setting and the distribution of game drive features, a model of prehistoric game driving at the site is constructed. Game drive systems have been reported in low frequencies in Utah and Colorado, primarily in areas characterized by relatively high game populations, considerable local relief, and low vegetation.


## INTRODUCTION

Between 1988 and 1992, members of the Chipeta (Montrose) Chapter of the Colorado Archaeological Society conducted investigations at the Escalante Game Drive site (SDT192) in west-central Colorado with the assistance of Alpine Archaeological Consultants, Inc. The site, administered by the Bureau of Land Management, covers approximately $240,500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ( 59.4 acres) and consists of numerous circular stone structures, thought to be hunting blinds; stone and brush fences, designed to direct game animals toward concealed hunters; several hearths; and a sparse scatter of historic and prehistoric artifacts. The objectives of the project included documenting a relatively rare site type, assessing the nature of surface artifacts, salvaging archaeological data from two hearths threatened by erosion, and furthering the training of Chipeta Chapter members in archaeological techniques.

## LOCATION AND SETTING

The Escalante Game Drive site is 18 km (11 miles) west of Delta, Colorado, on the canyon rim and benches north of the Gunsison River. US Highway 50, which extends between Delta and Grand Junction, is approximately 3 km (2 miles) to the northeast.
The site is situated approximately 200 m northeast of the Gunnison River. The Gumnison River is a major tributary to the Colorado River, into which it flows at Grand Junction, Colorado. In the site vicinity, the Gunnison River separates the Grand Mesa from the Uncompahgre Plateau, uplifted areas that rise to elevations over $3,000 \mathrm{~m}$ ( 10,000 feet). The river is locally entrenched in a narrow valley that is approximately 244 m ( 800 feet) deep. The northern
valley wall, where the site is situated, is especially steep, and is called the Dominguez Rim.
The western portion of the site is atop the Dominguez Rim. Cretaceous-age Dakota and Burro Canyon sandstone are exposed there, usually covered with a thin veneer of soil. From the canyon rim, the land slopes gently to the northeast, away from the river. The lowlands to the northeast are underlain by Cretaceous-age Mancos Shale. Below the Dominguez Rim, the Dakota sandstone and Mancos Shale have been eroded, exposing Jurassic-age Morrison formation sandstone and shale (Tweto 1979).

The site's elevation is $1,630 \mathrm{~m}$ ( 5,350 feet). Common vegetation includes saltbush, narrow-leaf yucca, snakeweed, prickly pear cactus, and grasses. Juniper are sparsely scattered along the canyon rim. The site is in an ecotone setting, where the Shrublands of the Saltdesert vegetation zone abuts the Woodlands of the Intermountains zone. The Shrublands of the Saltdesert cover the Mancos Shale lowlands that skirt the base of Grand Mesa, northeast of the site, Saltbushes and greasewood are common plant species. The Woodlands of the Intermountains zone is dominated by pinyon and juniper. This zone extends along the base of the Uncompahgre Plateau, which is across the Gunnison River to the southwest (Soil Conservation Service 1972). Fauna in the vicinity include pronghorn, mule deer, elk, mountain sheep, coyote, black bear, cougar, cottontail, jackrabbit, rodents, birds, and reptiles.

## INVESTIGATIONS

## Surface Artifacts

Stone artifacts were found widely scattered over the surface of the site and included debitage, utilized flakes, a Sudden Side-notched projectile point, a core, and two bifaces. Lithic surface artifacts were concentrated in the southeastern portion of the site, east of the Dominguez Rim, where evidence of at least three eroding hearths was found.

Historic artifacts were also found in the southeastem portion of the site, but are not believed to be associated with the stone artifacts (Reed et al. 1997). These include six hole-in-cap food cans; amber, light green, olive green, and purple glass bottle fragments; and seven cartridge cases. One amber glass bottle base was marked "FHGW," indicating manufacture by the Frederick Hampson Glass Works of Lancastershire, England, between 1880 and 1900 (Toulouse 1971:202). Three of the cartridge cases are $40-70$ cases. According to analyst Douglas Scout (citing Sellers 1982:339), this round was introduced by Sharps in 1876, designed for use in the Model 1874 Sharps rifles. One . 45 Colt cartridge case was found that was probably used in pistols, as evidenced by striations evincing rotation in a revolver cylinder. According to Douglas Scott, the case was probably fired in a gun such as the Colt revolver Model 1873. A single case was identified as a .44-40 case. This cartidge, lacking a headstamp, was introduced for use in the Winchester Model 1873 rifle (Madis 1985). Although this type of round was adopted for use by other firearms, Scott observed markings on the case consistent with those produced by Winchester rifles. A . 45 - 60 -caliber case was found; it was headstamped W.R.A.Co./45-60. According to Scott, this type was made by the Winchester Repeating Arms Company between 1880 and 1939 and retained evidence of use in a Model 1873 Winchester rifle. The cartridge cases indicate use of a Colt revolver, a Sharps rifle, and two different calibers of Winchester rifles at the Escalante Game Drive site. The fireams may or may not have been used contemporaneously.

The historic artifacts are concentrated along a small wash. The concentration is interpreted as a camp site, occupied sometime between 1880 and 1900. The campsite may be that of Art Brown, a commercial hunter hired to provide meat for construction crews building a narrow gauge railroad along the Gunnison River. A 1972 newspaper article
in the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel Colorado West supplement describes an apparent "bison trap and kill site" on a bench overlooking the Gunnison River, with a series of rock blinds from which prehistoric hunters sprang to kill driven animals, visited by Art Brown (Casebier 1972). The article states:

> Ralph Vemon, veteran outdoorsman and hunter, now in his 70s, was a mere lad when Charlie Brown, another hunter in his declining years, showed Ralph the blinds. The story goes that Charlie's brother, Art Brown, first discovered the game trail in 1882 when he was hired out to the railroad to furnish game for railroad crews building track through Western Colorado. It was in the migratory season, and this particular game trail yielded 37 deer on a single hurting trip when the going price was five cents a pound.

Years of hardship on the frontier had clouded the memory of Charlie Brown, however, he related one item of interest about his deceased brother finding a buffalo jump where he believed thousands of mountain buffalo had been run over by the Indians. The best Charlie could remember, Art had said the trap was on the Gunnison River [Casebier 1972].

That the Escalante Game Drive site is the site described in the newspaper article is suggested by the age of the historic artifacts, the historic description of the hunting blinds along the Gunnison River, and the dearth of similar game drive sites in the region. Of course, it is possible that Art Brown hunted, but did not camp, at the site.

## Excavations

Two hearths 5.5 m apart in the southeastern portion of the site, threatened by erosion, were excavated. A block of 11 excavation units, each consisting of 1 m by 1 m squares, was dug, resulting in the removal of $4.1 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$. One hearth (Feature 1) was partly lined and filled with sandstone. Additional fire-cracked rock was found in the excavated area northwest of the hearth, indicating repeated use of the feature, but little concern for cleaning of the hearth activity area. Charcoal from the hearth yielded a radiocarbon age of $1180 \pm 50 \mathrm{BP}$ (Beta-55978), which, when calibrated, indicates an occupation sometime between A.D. 687 and 980 . The other hearth contained less rock and was not dated.

Excavations resulted in the recovery of a Desert Side-notched projectile point, a mano fragment, and 11 flakes. The paucity of artifacts, in conjunction with the informal manner of waste disposal as indicated by fire-cracked rock distributions, suggests that the hearth area was utilized on a short-term, but repeated basis, and that lithic reduction was not an important activity. The small quantity of artifacts tentatively suggests that resource processing, rather than habitation, occurred in this portion of the site. At least two occupations are indicated in the excavation area. The radiocarbon assay from Feature 1 indicates an occupation between A.D. 687 and 980, a period contemporaneous with horticultural groups, such as represented by the Fremont tradition or, as Reed (1997) has argued for portions of westcentral Colorado and east-central Utah, the Gateway tradition. No evidence of horticulture or artifacts diagnostic of the Fremont or Gateway groups were found at the site, however. Although it is possible that the site was utilized by people that practiced horticulture during the period between A.D. 687 and 980 , it is also possible that the Escalante Game Drive site was used by a people fully engaged in a hunting and gathering lifeway. The discovery of a Desert Side-notched point indicates a later site occupation, dating sometime after A.D. 1000 (Reed 1994).

## Game Drive Features

Twenty-seven stone hunting blinds and several associated stone and brush fences were identified at the Escalante

Game Drive site (Figure 1). The blinds were constructed with unmodified sandstone slabs that were either stacked or set on end to form Iow walls (Figure 2). Some incorporate talus boulders. The walls vary in height; none presently exceed 1.0 m . The blinds are oval or round in plan view and range in size from $0.9 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ to $10.1 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$. Mean blind size is $4.1 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ (s.d. $=1.963$ ). Additionally, one stone circle consisting of four conjoined structures was present. It, too, probably served as a blind. The blinds are clustered along the Dominguez Rim and on a lower bench.

At least 10 stone alignments are present within the site area that appear to represent fence lines. Some fence segments are only a single stone high, but in other areas, sandstone boulders are stacked. Frequently, hatural boulders are incorporated in the fence lines. Remains of branches are evident in some of the fence lines, indicating that brush was incorporated (Figure 3). Branches are most evident in the major fence line that climbs the talus slope on the south edge of the site. Patination of the exposed surfaces of the rock gives an indication of the relative age of the alignments to each other and, in at least one instance on the northwest edge of the site, it appears that stone was taken from one fence and used in a more recent alignment.

Fence lines were primarily built along the top of cliff edges and on ridge crests at locations where the topography would have allowed animaks to escape. The broken topography of the game drive would have allowed some natural ridges and rock outcrops to have been used without modification as blinds or barriers. The extent and degree that these natural features were used is difficult to assess, but may have been considerable.

## Model of Game Drive System Use

The Escalante Game Drive site comprises a game drive system, composed of a combination of rock and brush fences and rock blinds strategically situated on the landscape. It has all of the key attributes of a game drive system, as identified by Benedict (1985;85), including 1) a collection area, where animals are first encountered; 2) an animal concentration area, formed by natural and architectural features; 3) a kill area, where the concentrated animals are dispatched; and 4) an overlook, where an observer can direct hunters and drivers about the progress of the hunt.

The system has been constructed at the base of a topographic feature shaped like an inverted triangle that restricts animal movements. The top of the triangle, oriented roughly east-west, is approximately 3 km north of the Escalante Game Drive site, It consists of a steep talus slope and cliffs on the northern side of Wells Gulch, a tributary to the Gunnison River. At the western end of the northem barrier, the cliffs and talus slopes along Wells Gulch intersect with the Gunnison River, making passage along the river bottom to the north difficult. The western edge of the triangle consists of the Gunnison River, and the eastern edge consists of the Dominguez Rim cliffs. The enclosed area, representing the systems collection area, comprises approximately 1,000 acres of valley bottom, with easy access to permanent water. Access to the bottom land is provided by Wells Gulch, which becomes progressively less entrenched to the east. The site is at the base of the inverted triangle, where the Gunnison River flows against the canyon wall to concentrate animals driven southward. The area south of the site is rugged talus and cliffs, with slopes often exceeding 60 percent grade. Travel along the river bottom or talus slope south of the site would be difficult.

It is believed that game animals entered the river bottom, perhaps from Wells Gulch, and were driven south toward the Escalante Game Drive site (Figure 4). The valley floor is primarily vegetated by desert shrubs, so human drivers could be easily seen from a distance, and animals could not hide until the drivers passed. The Dominguez Rim and the Gunnison River precluded an easy escape to the sides. The site is atop a bench above the river, and extends up a steep talus slope to include a relatively short segment where there is a break in the cliffs that form the Dominguez Rim. With respect to the area both notth and south of the site, the site area affords a comparatively easy means of egress from the valley bottom. As animals encountered the northwestern portion of the site, those traveling along the

Figure 1. The distribution of cultural features at the Escalante Game Drive site.


Figure 2. Blind 4, a relatively intact feature.


Figure 3. A segment of the primary fence on the talus slope in the southern portion of the site. Note the association of the branches with the rock aligument.


Figure 4. A model of the game drive system. Contour intervals are 200 feet ( 61 m ).
lower cliffs encountered fence lines and associated Blinds 16 and 18. Animals successfully passing these hazards continued to be bound by cliffs and fences to the west, so proceeded to the southwestern comer of the site where a series of blinds and fences were located. There, a major fence line oriented up the talus slope was encountered, forcing animals either upslope to the mesa top, or downslope toward more blinds and fences. Animals moving up the slope along the major fence line ultimateiy encountered an impassable cliff, so were forced several tens of meters northward to where the cliff disappears. Those continuing along the rim may have encountered a cluster of blinds in the vicinity of Blinds $1-5$, and those going eastward from the rim may have encountered Blind 11 , constructed along a drainage. Some animals may have elected to climb the talus slope before encountering the main fence up the slope, and may have chosen the cover offered by a small draw up the slope along which scattered juniper trees presently grow. The talus slope is, otherwise, devoid of trees. These animals would have directly encountered the cluster of blinds in the vicinity of Blinds $1-5$ at the top of the slope.
This model of game-driving does not account for the fence lines and blinds in the northeastern corner of the site, situated along the rim of the escarpment. It does, however, account for natural game movements; Southwell's research (1995) indicates that mule deer and bighorn sheep tend to flee upslope when threatened by predators. It is possible that animals sticcessfully escaping the hazards to the south could be predicted to travel north atop the canyon rim to the site's northeastern corner, where they would have encountered more hunters.
A less satisfactory model involves driving animals from the gently rolling and wide-open Mancos Shale lowlands to the east of the site toward the Dominguez Rim. This "reverse" model is undermined by problems associated with driving animals out of wide-open areas in a predictable manner without the aid of multiple topographic barriers. Such could be effected with the aid of fire or large numbers of human drivers, as has been described among historic Plains groups (Southwell 1995), but would have been considerably more "expensive" in terms of labor, energy, and resources. Both models imply primary use of the game drive system by communal hunting parties. It is likely, however, that individual hunters also exploited the natural concentration of game in the site area.
The animal species exploited at the site cannot be determined. The only bone collected at the site is attributed to the historic component. It is possible that pronghom, mule deer, elk, or bighorn sheep were prehistorically hunted at the site. All presently inhabit the project vicinity, though probably not in the same numbers as in the past. It seems less likely that bison were hunted at the site, partly because bison may never have been common in the region (see Meaney and Van Vuren 1993). Pronghorn may have been less apt to jump the rock and brush fences at the Escalante Game Drive site than the other species mentioned, so perhaps they were the exploited species.
The age of the gane drive features cannot be deternined. Southwell (1995:55) indicates that game drive system features such as cainns, stone walls, pits, blinds, and stone circles may have been used throughout prehistory. That the stone fence lines retain brush constituents indicates use during the Late Prehistoric period. It is entirely plausible, however, that the features are quite old, and have been repeatedly repaired and reused through time. Diagnostic artifacts and the radiocarbon data support the hypothesis that the site has been repeatedly occupied. A Sudden Sidenotched point found on the site surface suggests a Middle Archaic period occupation, between approximately 4400 and 2500 B.C. (Holmer 1986). The radiocarbon date obtained from excavated Feature 1 indicates an occupation sometime between A.D. 687 and 980, and the Desert Side-notched point found during excavations points to a postA.D. 1000 occupation. Whether these artifacts and features were associated with use of the game drive features cannot be positively determined.
Unlike most game drive systerns, the Escalante Game Drive site may have been the locus of on-site animal processing. This is suggested by the discovery of hearths in the southeastern portion of the site, such as Features 1 and 2 described above, and by the presence of utilized flakes and bifaces. The low quantity of surface artifacts found at the site also support the hypothesis that game processing occurred on-site, if only because use of the site for
habitation would have probably resulted in the discovery of greater quantities of artifacts, especially debitage.
As a game drive system, the site represents a type of site poorly represented in the regional archaeological record. A site file search conducted by the Utah Division of State History resulted in the identification of a single game drive in eastern Utah. The site, known as the Mountain Sheep Drive Site (42UN1796), is a game drive system comprised of linear and circular rock alignments in apparent association with a low-density artifact scatter. It is situated at 2,204 $\mathrm{m}(7,230$ feet) elevation in the Uinta Mountains in a transition zone between a pine forest and an extensive sagebrush park. Blaine Phillips (personal communication 1998) reports of another possible game drive site in Daggett County, Utah, near the Wyoming border. In her synthesis of Colorado game drive sites, Southwell (1995) identified 147 game drive or kill sites; of these, only 54 evidence an association of feature types sufficiently complex to merit classification as a game drive system. Of the previously recorded game drive systems in Colorado, most are in high elevation settings, often above timberline (e.g., Benedict 1985). Southwell's (1995) data indicate that 83 percent of game drive systems occur at elevations over $2,286 \mathrm{~m}(7,500 \mathrm{feet})$. Lower elevation game drive systems have been identified on the Plains and in western Colorado (e.g., 5DT771, 5RB160, and 5SM755), and, of course, at the Mountain Sheep Drive Site in northeastern Utah. The utility of game drive systems is especially great in areas characterized by are relatively abundant game animals and little vegetation cover to conceal hunters - attributes common to many lowland settings on the northem Colorado Plateau and in the adjacent mountains.
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# A COMPARISON OF HUMAN SKELETAL REMAINS FROM VIRGIN ANASAZI, KAYENTA ANASAZI, AND PAROWAN FREMONT ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES 

Heidi Roberts, HRA, Inc. 8544 Summer Vista Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada 89128


#### Abstract

Human skeletal remains from archaeological sites representing three prehistoric cultural traditions, the Virgin Anasazi, the Kayenta Anasazi, and the Parowan Fremont, were examined. The objective of the study was to determine the extent of differences in the skeletat remains of the 125 individuals studied. Statistical comparisons of stature, robusticity, and cranial measurements show no statistically significant differences in skeletal metric traits. Preliminary results of the comparison of nonmetric traits show that Virgin Anasazi cranial nonmetric traits are more similar to a Mogollon series studied by Birkby (1973) than to the Parowan Fremont series. Paleopathological conditions were also compared. While most individuals in the three series were healthy, the prevalence of periostitis, osteitis, and dental hypoplasia was found to be highest among the Virgin Anasazi individuals. Two other pathological conditions frequently associated with iron deficiency anemia - porotic hyperostosis and cribra orbitalia - were most comnon among the Kayenta individuals and the least prevalent among the Parowan Fremont.


## INTRODUCTION

Human skeletal remains can provide important clues to the health, diet, and biological relatedness of prehistoric people. Health stress can be evaluated through the identification of paleopathological conditions and biological relatedness can be assessed through comparisons of certain morphological traits known as nonmetric traits. This study of skeletal remains from Virgin Anasazi, Kayenta Anasazi, and Parowan Fremont sites in southwestern Utah and southem Nevada was conducted to answer two key questions: are Parowan Fremont individuals biologically different from the Anasazi individuals, and are patterns of health similar or different?

Biological relatedness was assessed by comparing metric and nonmetric skeletal traits. Using Jennings' (1978:155156) model of Parowan Ftemont origins and Aikens' (1966) observation that some kind of cultural barrier may have existed, I hypothesized that the Parowan Fremont should be different from the Virgin and Kayenta Anasazi. Metric traits (Bass 1987, Brothwell 1981, Olivier 1969) are variants concerned with the size and dimensions of the skeleton such a stature and robusticity. These traits are believed to be more sensitive to environmental influences including nutrition, cultural practices, and disease than are nonmetric traits. Nonmetric traits are minor morphological variations that are recorded as being present or absent in both the cranial and postcranial skeleton (Berry and Berry 1967, Finnegan n.d., Hauser and DeStefano 1989). Some of the more familiar of these traits are the Inca Bone, shovel shaped incisors, and Carabelli's cusp. Although the heritability of these traits is not fully understood, many physical anthropologist consider them to be superior to metric traits in determining biological relatedness (Hauser and DeStefano 1989, Saunders 1989).

Patterns of health were compared for the three skeletal series following a model developed during a 1982 Wenner Gren Symposium on human health before and after the Neolithic (Cohen and Armelagos 1984). Most participants in this world-wide conference noticed that skeletal indicators showed an increase in health stress following the adoption of agriculture. Subsequent research in the southwest has supported these findings (Akins 1986; Fink and Merbs 1991; Holland and O'Brien 1997; Roberts 1991, 1992; Stodder 1987). Heatth stress, which is the product of environmental constraints, cultural systems, and host resistance, can leave a series of indicators in bone and teeth.
Some examples of these health stress indicators are enamel hypoplasia, porotic hyperostosis, and caries. Enamel nypoplasia (Figure 1), a tooth enamel defect occurring during childhood, cart mark health stress associated with a wide variety of diseases and nutritional deficiencies. Anemia-related pathological conditions including porotic hyperostosis and cribra orbitalia are commonly found in individuals from agricultural and sedentary cultures. Dental pathological conditions including caries and rates of attrition can be the result of diet, eating, and food preparation habits. An increase in the rate of caries through time is often associated with a shift to high carbohydrate foods such as maize. Changes in the frequencies of other pathological conditions including dental attrition, osteoarthritis, and dental abscesses have been found to change following a shift in subsistence focus.

It is generally believed that the subsistence focus of the Parowan Fremont, Virgin Anasazi, and Kayenta Anasazi was agricultural and the settlement strategy sedentary (Jennings 1978; Marwitt 1970; Aikens 1966; Dalley and McFadden 1988; Myhrer 1986; Lyneis et al. 1989). Other studies have pointed out the dearth of data, particularly for Virgin Anasazi sites and the Coombs Site, and alternative settlement strategies have been suggested (Westall 1987; Altschul and Fairley 1989). While debate continues, for the purposes of this study, the fonmer opinion is taken. The hypothesis is, if settlement and subsistence pattem were similar for the three cultural groups, then skeletal patterns of health stress should also be similar.


Figure 1. Linear enamel hypoplasia lines on the incisors of a Virgin Anasazi juvenile (AHUR 515).

## METHODS

The collection of skeletal remains examined for this study consisted of 125 individuals; 51 came from Parowan Fremont sites, 42 from Virgin Anasazi sites, and 32 from the Coombs Site. The artifacts and architectural traits from the Coombs Site contain both Virgin Anasazi (Altschul and Fairley 1989) and Fremont characteristics (Lister and Lister 1961) yet it is generally considered to have been affiliated with the Kayenta Anasazi (Jennings 1978:125). All of the skeletal remains included in the study were either buried with artifacts that are culturally diagnostic or they were recovered from sites or components that are affiliated with these cultures. However, the reader is cautioned that these skeletal series represent a collection of individuals from a variety of archaeological sites that may or may not be representative of the burial population. Data on 95 of the skeletons were compiled by the author through direct observation and 30 were examined by other physical anthropologists (Roberts 1991).

The Parowan Fremont series is the largest collection and includes 51 individuals excavated from three sites in southwestern Utah (Figure 2). Evans Mound (Richard Thompson, personal communication 1990; Berry 1972), Paragonah (Coles 1956; Judd 1919) and Median Village (Dodd 1982; Pecotte 1982). The majority of the remains came from the Evans Mound Site which dates to A.D. 1050 to $\ddagger 200$. The other sites date from A.D. 900 to 1200 (Dodd 1982). The Virgin Anasazi series consists of skeletal remains representing 42 individuals. Twenty-two of the remains came from sites in southern Nevada (Figure 2) including Steve Perkins, Burial Hill, and Lost City, and the other 20 individuals were excavated from 14 small habitation sites in southem Utah. The dates of occupation for the Virgin Anasazi sites range from A.D. 800 to 1250 . All 32 Kayenta series individuals came from the Coombs Site in Boulder, Utah which dates from A.D. 1050 to 1160 (Jennings 1978:125) and perhaps as late as A.D. 1275.


Figure 2. Locations of the Virgin Anasazi, Kayenta Anasazi, and Parowan Fremont culture areas.

The demographic composition of the three series are similar except for the Virgin Anasazi series (Figure 3). For reasons that could not be determined, the Virgin series contains fewer infants, more javeniles between the ages of 6 to 20 years, and more older adults. Figure 3 shows that infant mortality was comparably high in the Coombs and Parowan Fremont series. When these rates are compared to other southwestern skeletat series they are slightly high (Akins 1986 ; El-Najiar 1986; Stodder 1987: Table 41). The sex composition of all three series was similar with half of the sexed individuals male and half female. Although roughly half of the individuals were male and half female at the Coombs site, it is interesting that no males were found in primary burial contexts. A simple calculation of the mean age at death for each of the series yielded the following means: Coombs 14.7 years, Parowan Fremont 18.7 years, and Virgin Anasazi 29.4.

For the analysis of metric traits, standard measurements from anthropometric landmarks were made on all individuals where possible. These measurement were compared to test the hypothesis that Virgin and Kayenta Anasazi skeletal measurements should be different than Parowan Fremont measurements. Two-tailed t-tests were used to determine the significance of the differences. The sample size was not large enough to use other statistical methods such as multivariate statistics. Multivariate statistics would have reduced the number of measurements further by subsampling the data, and there are no indications that it would have increased any statistical correlations.


Figure 3. Mortality curves of the three skeletal series sudied.

## BIOLOGICAL RELATEDNESS

The hypothesis that Parowan Fremont and Virgin Anasazi skeletal measurements and indices should be different was rejected by statistical tests. Interseries comparisons of Parowan Fremont and Virgin Anasazi cranial measurements and indices by means of two-tailed t-tests failed to find significant differences in the cranial or post cranial measurements at the 0.05 level of significance (Roberts 1991 ). It is also possible that no significant differences were found due to the large standard deviations and the small size of the series. The Coombs series could not be included because of the small number of measurements represented.

While interseries metric trait differences do not exist, in the Parowan Fremont series measurements related to sexual dimorphism were found to be significantly different. These differences were found between males and females in the ischio-pubic index and the clavicular index. This may indicate that sexual dimorphism was greater in this series (Figure 4). This finding of greater sexual dimorphism in the Parowan Fremont series was also evident in the stature estimations. Figure 4 demonstrates that stature was remarkably similar except for the Parowan males who were larger than Virgin Anasazi males.

Differences, although not statistically significant, recognized in the cranial indices probably reflect the types and degrees of cranial modification. The majority of the crania observed $(\mathbb{N}=46)$ for the three series were artificiatly modified ( $88-100$ percent), although the predominant style of modification varied. Coombs crania were modified occipitally (leaves the back of the head almost straight) causing the greatest breadth relative to the length of the skulis. Parowan Fremont crania were predominantly modified in the lambdoid style (flattening appited to the upper part of the occiput at an angle of 50 to 60 degrees), and this style does not shorten the length as much as the occipital style. The Virgin Anasazi series contained the largest percentage of unmodified crania resulting in a longer length of the crania. Modification styles were also more variable for the Virgin Anasazi crania.


Figure 4. Mean stature for the three skeletal series, males and females (cm).

Nonmetric traits were scored as present or absent in order to identify differences in trait frequencies (Table 1). Statistical tests could not be used due to the small sample size that was the result of incomplete skeletal materials and poor preservation. Table 1 shows that cranial metric trait frequencies are similar for the series. A comparison of cranial traits scored for the Virgin Anasazi, Parowan Fremont, and a Mogollon series scored by Birkby (1973) showed that the Virgin Anasazi cranial trait frequencies may be more similat to Mogollon scores than to the Parowan Fremont scores (Roberts 1991: Table 37). When Virgin Anasazi and Parowan Fremont cranial trait frequencies were compared to 23 traits scored by Birkby (1973), 15 Virgin Anasazi traits were within 10 percent of the Mogollon score as opposed to 10 Parowan Fremont traits. An expanded skeletal series and additional sudies are needed before meaningful conclusions can be drawn from this type of research.

## PATHOLOGICAL CONDITIONS

Cribra orbitalia and porotic hyperostosis are suspected to result from anemia. Cribra orbitalia (Figure 5) or lesions present on the superior surface of the eye orbits represents the earliest signs and porotic hyperostosis the more advanced (Klepinger 1992). Porotic hyperostosis, recognized by the appearance of surface porosity is a lesion occurring on the cranial vault and results from a widening of the spongy diploe and a corresponding thinning of the outer dense cortical bone. Until recently it was suggested that in the New World high rates of this condition may have been related to a maize dependant diet (El-Najjar et al. 1976). Maize and other vegetable foods are low in iron and, unlike animal iron from meat, it is difficult to absorb. It was suspected that chronic iron deficiency anemia resulted from a combination of factors including high maize/low meat diet, the low content of iron in maize, and the practice of alkali soaking. This process increased the calcium and phosphate content of maize but further reduced the availability of iron as the process promotes the binding of iron into insoluble complexes.

Parasite invoivement, infectious disease, and gastrointestinal disturbances can further inhibit the absorption of nutrients. It has been suggested that the high rate of anemia is indicative of a heavy pathogen load, particularly intestinal parasites (Stodder 1989:178; Stuart-Macadam 1992). Parasites found in the southwest among the Fremont, Sinagua, and Anasazi farming populations include the following: threadworm, whipworm, intestinal roundworm, thorny-headed worm, hairworm, tapeworm, and pinworm (Reinhard and Clary 1986:184). Stodder (1989), and Paikovich (1984), have demonstrated that high rates of parasitism are found where population densities are high, and particularly in canyon settings (Stodder 1989:182). Recently, Holland and O'Brien (1997) have developed a symbiotic model in which both diet and pathogens contribute to porotic hyperostosis. This model also stresses the diagnostic value of anemia conditions as a marker of early agriculture.

The lowest incidence of anemia related pathological conditions was found among the Parowan Fremont, and the highest at the Coombs Site (Figure 6). The incidence of cribra orbitalia and porotic hyperostosis in the Virgin Anasazi fell between the two (Figure 6). In the southwest, high rates of 50 percent or more, have been identified in Chaco Canyon (Akins 1986), Mesa Verde (Stodder 1987), and Canyon de Chelly (EI-Najar 1986). Although the Coombs series is too small to draw conclusions the prevalence at this site resembles frequencies at Anasazi sites in Canyon settings. The Virgin Anasazi rates may be considered on the low end, and the Parowan Fremont rates are atypically low for a southwestern series and resemble rates identified for populations in California and northern Nevada (Brooks. et al. 1988; Dickel et al. 1984; Stark 1983).

Periostitis and osteitis are both non specific infectious skeletal lesions. Periostitis is confined to the outer periostial surface of the bone and osteitis occurs when the reaction involves both the marrow and cortex. Figure 6 demonstrates

Table 1. Cranial nonmetric variation for Parowan Fremont, Virgin Anasazi, and Kayenta Anasazi skeletal remains.

| Trait | Parowan Fremont |  | Virgin Anasazi |  | Coombs Site |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Highest nuchal line | $3 / 18$ | 16.6 | 3/13 | 23 | $0 / 1$ | 0 |
| Ossicle at lambda | $5 / 17$ | 29.4 | 4/14 | 28.5 | $0 / 1$ | 0 |
| Lambdoid ossicle | 12/20 | 60 | $8 / 13$ | 61.5 | 1/2 | 50 |
| Parietal foramen-unilateral | $7 / 17$ | 41.1 | $8 / 12$ | 66.6 | $0 / 2$ | 0 |
| Parietal foramen-bilateral | $4 / 16$ | 25 | 1/12 | 8.3 | $0 / 2$ | 0 |
| Bregamatic bone | $0 / 18$ | 0 | $0 / 14$ | 0 | $0 / 3$ | 0 |
| Metopism | $0 / 21$ | 0 | 1/18 | 5.6 | $0 / 2$ | 0 |
| Coronal ossicle | 1/32 | 3.0 | 1/23 | 4.4 | $0 / 4$ | 0 |
| Epipteric bone | $5 / 31$ | 16.1 | $3 / 27$ | 11.1 | $0 / 4$ | 0 |
| Fronto-temporal articulation | $2 / 27$ | 7.4 | $0 / 24$ | 0 | $0 / 4$ | 0 |
| Parietal notch bone | $6 / 35$ | 17.1 | 1/24 | 4.2 | 0 | 0 |
| Ossicle at asterion | 17/39 | 43.6 | $4 / 23$ | 17.4 | $0 / 2$ | 0 |
| Auditory torus | $0 / 37$ | 0 | 1/28 | 3.6 | $0 / 4$ | 0 |
| Foramen of Huschke | 2/37 | 5.4 | 4/24 | 16.7 | $0 / 4$ | 0 |
| Mastoid foramen | 21/33 | 69.7 | $9 / 19$ | 47.4 | 0 | 0 |
| Mastoid foramen absent | 12/31 | 38.7 | $3 / 19$ | 15.8 | 0/2 | 0 |
| Posterior condylar canal patent | 21/25 | 84 | 9/18 | 50 | $2 / 2$ | 100 |
| Condylar facet double | $0 / 33$ | 0 | $0 / 9$ | 0 | 0/3 | 0 |
| Precondylar tubercle | $8 / 30$ | 26.7 | 3/18 | 16.7 | 2/2 | 100 |
| Anterior condylar canal double | 2/33 | 6.0 | 2/17 | 11.8 | $0 / 2$ | 0 |
| Foramen ovale incomplete | $2 / 33$ | 6.0 | $4 / 17$ | 23.5 | $0 / 2$ | 0 |
| Foramen spinosum open | $9 / 33$ | 27.3 | 4/15 | 26.7 | $2 / 2$ | 100 |
| Accessory lessor palatine foramen | $26 / 34$ | 76.8 | 10/16 | 62.5 | 1/2 | 100 |
| Palatine torus | 23/35 | 65.7 | $8 / 23$ | 34.8 | $0 / 4$ | 0 |
| Maxillary tons | 10/32 | 31.3 | $2 / 27$ | 7.4 | $0 / 4$ | 0 |
| Zygomatico-facial foramen | 37/37 | 100 | 14/18 | 77.8 | $3 / 4$ | 75 |
| Anterior ethmoid foramen exsutural | 13/18 | 72.2 | $2 / 14$ | 14.3 | 0 | 0 |
| Posterior ethmoid foramen absent | $10 / 19$ | 52.6 | $1 / 19$ | 5.6 | 0 | 0 |
| Accessory infraorbital foramen | $6 / 32$ | 18.6 | $8 / 18$ | 44.4 | $0 / 1$ | 0 |



Figure 5. Partially healed cribra orbitalia lesions in the superior surface of the eye orbit of a Virgin Anasazi juvenile (AHUR 515).
that the Virgin Anasazi series had the highest frequency of periostitis and osteitis. The most extensive case of periostitis was found in a 45 to 60 year old female excavated from the Bunker Hill Site, in the Moapa/Muddy River Valley. Both tibiae, fibulae, and the distal third of the right ulna were thickened circumferentially with periosteal reactive bone. Involvement was most severe on the distal half of the bones and except in the ulnae the epiphyses were not affected. The anterior, medial, and lateral surfaces of the tibiae were porous and spongy in appearance and the posterior surface was smooth. This pathological condition has been associated with treponemal infections such as yaws or venereal syphilis (Steinbock 1976; Steele and Bramblett 1988).
As in maty prehistoric skeletal series the rate of traumatic injuries is low (Figure 6), and the only type of trauma identified were healed or partially healed fractures. As can be seen in Figure 6, rates for the three series are almost exactiy the same. All but one of the fractures occurred in adults and they were more common in fermales ( $67 \%$ ) than males ( $33 \%$ ). The bones most often fractured were ulnae, femora, and crania.

Osteoarthritis, is recognized as pitting, porosities, or lipping along the edges of joint surfaces and was the most common pathological condition identified in adults. Forty percent of the Parowan Fremont adults and 50 percent of the Virgin Anasazi adults exhibited this condition in varying degrees. The Coombs series had the lowest incidence of this condition probably because older individuals were underrepresented. Schmorl's nodes, recognized as a depression on the vertebral body due to herniation, were observed in three Parowan Fremont males. Kennedy (1989) associated Schmorl's disk herniation with flexion and lateral bending characteristic of generalized physical stress among prehistoric hunter-forager and modern urban populations.

Dental hypoplasia, or a deficiency in the enamel thickness resulting from interruption in enamel formation during childhood, is caused by infectious disease, congenital defects, nutritional disturbances, neurological disturbances,

## Pathological Conditions



Figure 6. A comparison of the pathological conditions for the three skeletal series studied.
trauma, and intoxicants. This condition is commonly noted in southwestem skeletal series. High rates in a population are believed to be a marker of nutritional problems or infectious disease during childhood (Skinner and Goodman 1992). Figure 6 demonstrates that rates for this condition were significantly higher in the Virgin Anasazi series than in the Fremont and Kayenta series.

Other dental pathologies including the prevalence of caries, abscesses, and tooth loss were not different for the three series (Table 2). Note that the rate of caries, in terms of teeth observed, for all three series falls between 7 to 8 percent. Seven percent is between the mean Lukacs (1989) identified for cultures with a mixed economy ( $4.8 \%$ ) and that of an agricultural economy ( $10.4 \%$ ). The total number of individuals with caries ranged from 50 to 56 percent for the three populations. Patterns of dental attrition were slightly different in the Fremont series, as there were more individuals with severe attrition than in the other two series (Roberts 1991).
Patterns of dental attrition among the Virgin Anasazi and the Kayenta series were similar. Most individuals (Table 2) exhibited moderate attrition (cusps worn and dentin visible). Severe attrition (pulp visible), considered less common among people with an agricultural subsistence focus, was found in 23 percent of the Virgin Anasazi individuals and 12 percent of the Kayenta dentitions. The Parowan Fremont dental wear patterns were different; there were more individuals with severe and slight attrition than moderate attrition (Table 2). Overall the Parowan Fremont series was comparatively younger at death than the Virgin Anasazi series, and age at death can not be called upon to explain the observed differences in the atrition patterns.

Table 2. Dental pathological conditions, individual count (top) and tooth count (bottom).

| Series | Cavities |  | Abscesses |  | Hypoplasia |  | Anternortem Loss |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I/N* | \% | I/N* | \% | $\mathrm{I} / \mathrm{N}^{*}$ | \% | I/N* | \% |
| Parowan Fremont | 13/23 | 56 | 9/23 | 39 | 1/23 | 4 | 13/23 | 56.5 |
| Virgin Anasazi | $12 / 22$ | 55 | 9/22 | 41 | $5 / 22$ | 23 | 10/22 | 45.4 |
| Coombs Site | $4 / 8$ | 50 | 2/8 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 4/8 | 50 |


| Series | Cavities |  | Abscesses |  | Antemortem Loss |  | Average Exposed Root M1 (mm)$1 / \mathrm{N}^{*}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I/N* | \% | L/ $\mathrm{N}^{*}$ | \% | I/N* | \% |  |
| Parowan Fremont | 32/459 | 7 | 19/459 | 4 | 104/459 | 23 | 3.3 |
| Virgin Anasazi | 27/381 | 7.4 | 17/381 | 4.2 | 88/381 | 25 | 3.9 |
| Coombs Site | $9 / 105$ | 8.5 | 3/105 | 2.8 | 25/105 | 24 | 2.6 |

* Incidence / \# individuals observed


## SUMMARY

The objective of this study was to answer two key questions: are the Parowan Fremont skeletal remains biologically different from the Anasazi remains, and are pattems of health similar or different? Biological differences are measured by comparing metric and nonmetric skeletal traits. Metric trait comparisons indicate that the three series are not significantly different. Two-tailed t-tests failed to find significant differences in the cranial measurements at the 0.05 Ievel of significance (Roberts 1991). Post cranial indices show that Parowan Fremont individuals were slightly more robust than individuals in the Virgin Anasazi series, however, these differences were not statistically significant. It is possible that no significant differences were found due to the large standard deviations and the small size of the series.

While interseries measurements are not statistically different, robusticity indices and stature calculations show that sexual dimorphism was greater in the Parowan Fremont series than the Virgin Anasazi series. Two differences, significant at the 0.05 level, were found in the ischio-pubic index and the clavicular index between Parowan Fremont males and females. Significant differences were also found between Parowan Fremont females and Virgin Anasazi females in the humero-fernoral index. It has been suggested that "sexual dimorphism should be greatest in those populations under the least amount of stress, because males will be subject to less growth disruption" (Stodder 1989:184). Other factors such as genetic variation make interpretations of these data difficult without additional research.

Cranial and post cranial nonmetric trait frequencies for the Virgin Anasazi and Parowan Fremont series were compared to assess biological relatedness (Roberts 1991: Tables 36-38). Archaeologists have suggested that some form of cultural barrier may have existed between the Fremont and Anasazi, and if such was the case, then it is possible that nonmetric trait frequencies may differ significantly. The three skeletal series studied were not large enough to use biological distance statistics but a simple frequency comparison was conducted to identify trends. Despite the potential problems of inter-observer error it is notable that traits scored by Birkby (1973), for a Mogollon skeletal series from Arizona, show closer agreement to the Virgin Anasazi series than to the Parowan Fremont series.

Comparison of pathological conditions revealed that health stress patterns are different for the three skeletal series. If pathological conditions are used as indicators of relative health, then the individuals in the Virgin Anasazi series experienced the highest overall prevalence of health stressors and the Parowan Fremont the lowest. The Virgin Anasazi sertes has the highest rates of non-specific infectious lesions and enamel hypoplasia, and the Coombs and Virgin Anasazi series both have a greater prevalence of anemia related pathological conditions than the Parowan Fremont. I interpret these differences to be related to greater sedentarism among the Anasazi groups, combined with higher population density, and a heavier pathogen load. I suspect that the greater incidence of anemia at the Coombs Site and Virgin Anasazi sites is tied to sanitary conditions, crowding, and perhaps to increased disease transmission rates related to an emphasis on long distance trade (Lyneis 1995, Jennings 1978). Future studies may also show that dietary factors also play a role.

An accurate comparison of health patterns, before and after agriculoure, awaits the recovery and analysis of preagricultural skeletal series from the study area. Until such data are availabie it is difficutt to attribute the prevalence of pathological conditions to differences in settlement and subsistence strategies, as other factors including genetics and environment can influence the rates. One of the first of these studies has recently been completed by Edgar (1994) for a Basketmaker skeletal series from the Virgin Anasazi region. In this agriculturally transitional series, Edgar found that pathological conditions related to anemia and infectious disease were non-existent. Several hurdred years later the inhabitants of the Virgin Anasazi area experienced an increase in health stressors that leave markers on bone. It should be recognized, however, that skeletal evidence of disease often reflects a physiological response to chronic rather than acute infections, and therefore the skeletal lesions within a skeletal series must be interpreted with caution (Powell 1988).
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# STEWARD ALCOVE: A CASE OF SUPERPOSITION DATING OF BARRIER CANYON STYLE ROCK ART 

Nancy Coulam, Bureau of Reclamation, 125 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah 84138

Alan R. SchroedI, P-III Associates, Inc., 2759 South 300 West, Salt Lake City, Utah 84115


#### Abstract

Pinus edulis needles adhering to a Barrier Canyon Style anthropomorph in southeastern Utah produced a radiocarbon date with a two-sigma calibrated range of A.D. 1400-1655. Because the sample was superposed over the pictograph, the pictograph must have been created before this dare, perhaps as much as several hundred or even a thousand years earlier. The investigation of other cases of superposition could help shed light on the date range of the Barrier Canyon and other styles of rock art.


## INTRODUCTION

Since Polly Schaafsma (1971) defined Barrier Canyon Style rock art, the date range of the style has intrigued many researchers. Tipps (1995) summarizes this research and discusses the potential date range of Barrier Canyon Style rock art. She suggests it was created during a 2200 -year time span from about 1900 B.C. to A.D. 300 (Tipps 1995:168). The ending date is of particular interest since Schaafsma (1971) posits a transitional style between the earlier Barrier Canyon Style and the tater styles of Fremont and Anasazi rock art. Given the issue of transition of styles and cultures, it is important to attempt to date when Barrier Canyon Style fell out of use and new styles were developed.
In 1997, we were informed of a site that might shed light on the issue of the ending date for Barrier Canyon Style. The pictographs at this site had evidence of superposition that might help solve this problem. Superpositioning and superimpositioning are indirect or relative techniques for bracketing the date when a style falls out of use. The two terms are often used interchangeably, but they have different meanings. In the context of rock art studies, superimposition refers to the placement of one rock image over another, earlier image. As an example of superimposition, Schaafsma (1971:130) cites the case of a Fremont Style anthropornorph superimposed over Barrier Canyon Style figures at Temple Mountain. Tipps (1995:83) notes a case of superimposition of an Anasazi sprayed hand print over a Barrier Canyon Style anthropomorph at site 42SA20615. These and other examples of superimposition suggest that some time had passed between the creation of the Barrier Canyon Style and the creation of the later superimposed Fremont and Anasazi styles.

Superposition usually refers to the geomophological principle that overlaying strata (and the artifacts and features within them) are younger than underlying strata (Harris 1979). Superposition is not generally thought of in relation to rock ant, but it is applicable when deposits or strata cover rock art images. An exarmple of the use of the principle

[^0]of superpositioning in rock art research is the radiocarbon date obtained from a feature within a stratum that covered a Barrier Canyon Style anthropomorph at the Rochester Creek site in central Utah (Loendorf 1985). This radiocarbon date has a tree-ring calibrated one-sigma age range of 170 B.C.-A.D. 200, suggesting that the Barrier Canyon figure was created prior to the date.
In this paper, we describe another example of superposition dating of Barrier Canyon Style rock art at Steward Rockshelter. The site is named after its discoverer, David Steward, who recognized the importance of the site. In July, 1997, we visited the site and recorded it as 42SA23203. After discussing treatment plans and obtaining the necessary ARPA permit from Bruce Louthan of the Bureau of Land Managernent, we returned to the site and collected a small radiocarbon sample that was in the matrix adhering to one of the pictographs int the panel. We report the results of dating this sample and present the implications of this date in relation to dating Barrier Canyon Style rock art.

## SITE DESCRIPTION

Steward Rockshelter (42SA23203) is located in southeastern Utah, in a tributary canyon east of the Colorado River. The site consists of a rock art panel and associated lithic scatter in a south-facing alcove (Figure 1) overlooking an alluvial terrace just above a stream. The site measures 10 m north-south from the dripline to the rear wall of the alcove and 35 m east-west across the alcove mouth. This site is unusual because the western portion of the rock art panel had originally extended below the modern ground surface.
Six separate looter's pits (up to 40 cm deep) were dug into the floor of the alcove; one immediately in front of the rock art panel. One screened backdirt pile was also noted next to one of the pits. Artifacts recorded across the site surface included 2 tested Summerville Chalcedony cobbles and perhaps 20 bifacial thinning and pressure retouch flakes of Surnmerville Chalcedony in the backdirt pile. A few burned sandstone fragments were also noted in this pile. One modern rock-ringed firepit was also recorded in the rear of the alcove. No diagnostic artifacts or pottery were identified at the site.
Typical of other Barrier Canyon Style pictographs, the rock art panel is located in an exfoliating arc in the rear of the shelter. The panel, about 0.9 m high and 5.2 m long, includes both anthropomorphic and zoomophic elements. Unlike other Barrier Canyon Style pictographs, a portion of the panel had been partially buried by sediments. Although most of these sediments (and presumably cultural artifacts) had been dug away from the panel by looters, a small amount of sediment and pack rat midden still adhered to the rear wall, covering one of the anthropomorphs and thus allowing us to obtain organic material for a radiocarbon date.

## PANEL DESCRIPTION

While not all motifs at Steward Alcove can be classified as Barrier Canyon Style, the majority of the motifs within the panel fit Schaatsma's (1971:69) original definition of Barrier Canyon Style rock art. Since the pigment of all the elements or motifs appears to be the same, it is likely that the panel represents one painting episode.

Three anthropomorphs are located on the left side of the panel. The full torsos of the three left-most anthropomorphs at Steward Alcove are not visible due to salts and sediments that had previously covered this portion of the panel (Figure 2). However, if we project the angle from the exposed shoulders of these figures to the probable torso


Figure 1. Plan map of Steward Alcove showing the looter's pits, backdirt pile, and general location of the Barrier Canyon Style rock art panel along the rear wail.
terminus, the figures fall within the classic elongated proportions of Barrier Canyon Style anthropomorphs. Two of the anthropomorphs have short lines projecting from their heads in typical Barrier Canyon Style fashion and the leftmost anthropomorph, along with some possible anthropomorphs to the right, appear to have pecked-out "hearts," another characteristic Barrier Canyon trait.

Also present are nine or more small quadrupeds painted in a curved line reaching upward from below the present ground surface. These are badly weathered, but the individual quadrupeds and their arrangement in a curved line are classic Barrier Canyon Style (Schaafsma 1971:131). However, below these small animals is a faint anthropomorph in a stick-figure style uncharacteristic of Barrier Canyon Style.

Above the arc of quadrupeds and extending to the right are two parallel lines of red and white pigment. The uppermost line has 13 perpendicular red tick marks and where the tick marks end, a horizontal red and white parallel line begins. This right-most horizontal line is located an average of 53 cm above the present ground surface. Above this line are vertical linear motifs that appear abstract, but may, in fact, represent anthropomorphs. These motifs are simply too weathered and faded to determine their original shapes. Beneath the red and white parallel lines are a series of vertical parallel lines that might either be characteristic "rakes" (Schaafsma 1971:159; Manning's 1990:62-63 "rain clouds"), or possibly, lines of anthropomorphs with torsos depicted by parallel lines.

Until the recent looting, the lower portion of the western end of the panel was partially buried by natural sediments. It appears chat sediments covered at least the lower 20 cm of the panel in this area. Unfortunately, the fill covering this portion of the panel had been dug away by looters. Given the presence of a screened backdirt pile and a few surface artifacts, the sediments burying the rock art probably contained cultural deposits. Luckily, some of the matrix, including a few pack rat feces and pine needles, still adhered to the wall and overlay some of the pictographs (Figure $3)$.


Figure 2. Drawing of the rock art panel at Steward Alcove. Also shown is the location of the radiocarbon sample and the original ground surface (prior to looting).

## RADIOCARBON SAMPLE

Two Pinus edulis needles that were part of the cemented midden material overlying the westernmost anthropomorph were collected as a radiocarbon sample. The sample was submitted to Beta Analytic Inc. for an Accelerator Mass Spectrometry date. Since the sediment and pine needles were superposed on top of a Barrier Canyon Style anthropomorph, a radiocarbon date of the needies should represent a date some time after the pictograph was painted and used. The possibility does exist, however, that pine-needles older than or contemporary with the rock art were later incorporated into the adhering sediments. The sample's conventional radiocarbon age (comected for $\mathrm{C} 12 / \mathrm{Cl} 3$ fractionation) was $420 \pm 80 \mathrm{BP}$ (Beta-107403). The one-sigma tree-ring calibrated date was A.D. 1425-1520 and A.D. 1570-1630. The two-sigma caibrated date was A.D. 1400-1655.

## DISCUSSION

The ideal sample for superposition dating at this panel would have been dateable material that covered or overlapped the very bottom of the pictographs, since that would represent the time when the deposits started to accumulate after the rock art was originally created. Unfortunately, with the looting of the deposits, such a date could not be obtained from this site. Rather, the A.D. 1400-1655 date represents the end of the episode of deposition and accumulation of sand and sediment at the site that covered the pictograph. This clearly indicates the western side of the panel was created some time before A.D. 1400-1655, most likely hundreds of years earlier, depending on the rate of deposition in the alcove.


Figure 3. Close-up photograph of the westernmost anthropomorph showing the sediments adthering to the pictograph. The pine needles visible in this photograph were submitted for radiocarbon dating.

This radiocarbon date has several implications. First, the date does not contradict the date range Tipps (1995) posited for Barrier Canyon Style rock art. Second, the date challenges Manning's (1990) hypothesis that Barrier Canyon Style was created by Pueblo IV Hopi after A.D. 1300. If this were the case, 20 cm of deposition should not have covered the panel prior to A.D. 1400-1655. Third, the date also raises some questions about natural depositional events in overhangs and rockshelters in southeastern Utah. This date demonstrates the present ground surface in Steward Alcove (prior to recent looting) had been stable for several hundred years. If the pictographs were painted between 1900 B.C. and A.D. 300, then environmental conditions between their creation and A.D. 1400 were such that at least 20 cm of sediments were deposited, but these depositional processes within the alcove ceased sometime between A.D. 1400 and 1655. The deposition patterns at Steward Alcove reflected in this radiocarbon date may have been affected by two severe drought periods (A.D. 1385-1404 and A.D. 1622-1639) identified in the Canyonlands region by Schwartz (1994:64, 65).
While rock art researchers have long noted the importance of superimpositioning, we hope that by reporting this date, rock art enthusiasts will be alerted to the importance of superpositioning in rock art sudies. Whether the superposed stratum is a thin veneer of sediment as in the case of Steward Alcove, a mud flow, mud daub, or a dense deposit of pack rat midden, as long as there is organic matter in the superposed sediment or material, it is likely that a radiocarbon date can be obtained. Such superposed dates are especially important since they document when a particular panel or image fell out of use. If we can accumulate a database of such superposed dates for Barrier Canyon Style rock art, then we can finally begin to place the rock art in its cultural context, and learn about the social system that existed on the Colorado Plateau several thousand years ago.
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# ANTIQUITIES SECTION, UTAH DIVISION OF STATE HISTORY, LIST OF REPORTS WITH 1996 PROJECT NUMBERS ASSIGNED 

Evelyn Seelinger, Autiquities Section, Division of State History, 300 Rio Grande. Salt Lake City, Utab 84101

## INTRODUCTION

All organizations who conduct archaeological projects in the state are obliged to: (1) obtain a project number from the Antiquities Section, Division of State History and (2) submit a report on the work done.
The following is a list of project numbers assigned by the Antiquities Section for projects with 1996 project numbers.
ANTIQUITIES SECTION，UTAH DIVISION OF STATE HISTORY

| County | Activity | Organization | Field Supervisor | Project Name | Project Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 日E | Survey | Intersearch | B．Frark | Circle Four ROW Survey | U－96－IG－0040p |
| 㫙 | Survey | Intersearch | B．Frank | Beaver River Floud Channel | U－96－JG－0：78t |
| 日E | Survey | Intersearch | B．Frank | Ross Cenlurion Mines Powerline | U．96－1G－0343b |
| 日E | Survey | Imersearch | B．Frank | Capps BLM Survey | U－96－JG－0704b |
| BE | Survey | JBR | R．Crosland | South Milford Skyline Trunk for UP\＆L | U．96－JB－045Ib．p |
| BE | Survey | Senico－Phenix | J．Senulis | Beayer Block | U．96－SC－0007s |
| BE | Survey | USFS Fishlake | C．Mackelprang | Buck Pasture ATV Trail | U－96－FS－0032 |
| BE | Survey | USFS－Fishlake | C．Mackelprare | Crooked River Ranch Trail Rite | U－96－FS－003 11 |
| BE | Survey | USFS－Fishlake | M．Cartwright | Elk Meadows Water Line | U－96－FS－0625f |
| BE | Survey | USFS－Fishlake | R．Leonard | Upper Kents Lake Modification | U－96－FS－0728t |
| BE／PI | Survey | Abajo | W．Hurst | UDOT SR－153 | U－96－A5－050Mr， |
| BO | Survey | ARCON | G．Norman | SR－30 Repaving Gravel Pits（UDOT） | U－96－AK－0347p， |
| BO | Survey | BL－M－Salt Lake | D．Melton | Black Butte Guzzlers | U－96－BL－0028ib |
| BO | Survey | BLM－Salt Lake | D．Melton | Sparks Spring Fence | U－96－EL－0133b |
| BO | Survey | BLM－Salt Lake | D．Melton | West Locomotive Springs Boundary Fince | U－96－BL－0148b， 8 |
| BO | Survey | BLM－Salt Lake | D．Meiton | DWR Guzziers | U－96－BL－0149h |
| BO | Survey | BLM－Salt Lake | C．Eccles | Rosebud Commuñity Pit | U－96－BL－0324b |
| BO | Survey | BLM－Salt Lake | D．Melton | Black Pine Disposal Track | U－96－BL－0398b |
| BO | Survey | BLM－Salt Lake | D．Meiton | Cedar Hill Waterline Extensions | U－96－8L－0410b |
| BO | Survey | BLM－Satt Lake | D．Melton | Rozel Point Pipeline | U－96－8L－0590\％ |
| BO | Survey | BLM－Sals Lake | D．Melton | Newfoundland Trespass Access Road | U－96－EL－0619b．p |
| BO | Survey | Hill AFB | D．Weder | MSA Road | U－96－HL－0204m |
| BO | Survey | Hill AFB | D．Weder | Phoenix Firing Rauge Fire Break | U－96－HL－0509m |
| BO | Survey | Hill AFB | D．Weder | Bug Hill Observation Site | U－96－HL－0632m |
| BO | Survey | USFS Sawtooth | D．Santini | Johnson Creek Road Improvement | U－96－FS－0294f |
| BO | Survey | Utah State University | R．Lewelling | Lemuel＇s Garden | U－96－UJ－0327p |
| BO／WB | Monitor | Utah State University | S．Simms | BLM Monitoring | U－96－UJ－0577w |
| CA | Survey | UDOT | C．Lizotte | UDOT 1400 North in Logan | U－96－UT－0587p，s |
| CA／RI | Survey | USFS－Wasatch／Cache | C．Thompson | Old Canyon Basin Timber Sale | U－96－FS－0601 |
| CA／RI | Survey | USPS－Wasatch／Cache | C．Thompson | Logan Canyon Scenic Byway | U－96－FS－02997 |
| CB | Survey | AERC | G．Hadden | Winterquarters Canyon Drill Holes \＆Access Routes | 0．96－AF－0524I |

ANTIQUITIES SECTION, UTAH DIVISION OF STATE HISTORY

| County | Activity | Organizatiou | Field Supervisor | Project Name | Project Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CB | Survey | Baseline | A. Nielson | Two Compressor Stations for River Gas | U-96-BS-0711p |
| CB | Survey | Baseline | A. Nielson | River Gas Evaporation Ponds and Alternatives | U-96-BS-0113p,s |
| CB | Survey | Baseline | A. Nielson | River Gas Overburden Storage Site | U-96-BS-0156s |
| CB | Survey | Baseline | A. Nielson | River Gas Porphry Bench Wells, Roads, und Utility Lines | U-96-BS-0213p,s |
| CB | Survey | Baseline | A. Nielson | Two Evaporation Ponds for River Gas | U-96-BS-0558s |
| CB | Survey | Baseine | J. Allison | River Gas - Two Well Locations near Consumers Road | U.96-BS-0425p,s |
| CB | Survey | Baseline | J. Altison | River Gas 1996 Drilling Season | U.96-BS-0345p,s |
| CB | Survey | Baseline | J. Allison | River Gas Well D. 3 and Access | U-96-8S-0002s |
| CB | Survey | Baseline | J. Allison | River Gas Well Pad and Evaporaion Ponds | U.96-ES-0044s |
| CB | Survey | BLM-Price | B. Miller | Chrisien Ranch R\&PP | U-96-BL-004 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| CB | Survey | BLM-Price | B. Miller | Dry Canyon Road Repair | U-96-8i-0276b.p |
| CB | Survey | BLM-Price | C. Atwood | Miller Creek-Hays Wash Water Pipelines | U-96-BL-0588b |
| CB | Survey | BLM-Price | C. Atwood | East Carton Fire Complex Rehab | U-96-BL-0589b,p |
| CB | Survey | JBR | L. Billat | Helper Bridge | U-96-JB-0455is |
| CB | Survey | JBR | L. Billat | Price River Bridge in Carbonville | U-96-JB-0456s |
| CB | Survey | Monigomery | 5. Montgomery | Anadarko Warehouse Canyon and Cardinal Wash Drill Sites | U-96-MQ-0536b, p, s |
| CB | Survey | Montgomery | 1. Montgomery | Cyprus Plateau Willow Creek N, Drill Sites and Ats. Access | U-96-MQ-0238b |
| CB | Survey | Montgomery | J. Montgomery | Madsen-Hammond Drill Location | U-96-MQ-0578p |
| CB | Test/Etc. | Sagebrush | S. Ellis | Willow Creek Mine (42Cbl000) Test and Data Recovery | U-96-SJ-0232p(e) |
| CB | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Cyprus Waterline | U.96-SJ-0406s |
| CB | Survey | Senco-Phenix | J. Senulis | Dugour Creek Road Upgrade | U-96-SC-0102b |
| CB | Survey | Senco-Pbenix | J. Senulis | Dugout Creek Road Borrow/Slaging Area, 10 Acre Block | 10.96-SC-0103b |
| CB | Survey | Senco-Phenix | I. Senulis | Two Powerline Alternatives for the Willow Creek Mine | U-96-SC-0452b,p |
| CB | Survey | SWCA | K. Quick | Questar Lateral 102 | U-96-ST-0550p |
| CB/EM | Survey | Baseline | I. Allison | Emery Telephone Fiberoptic Line | U-96-BS-0186b, ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| CB/EM | Survey | Bascline | 1. Allison | River Gas CRM Inventory of 12 Welly and Roads | U-96-BS-05473.p |
| CB/UT | Survey | Sagebrush | S. Murray | Scofield Reservorr RMP Pluase II | U-96-SJ-0401s.w |
| DA | Survey | BLM-Vernal | E. Moncrief | Devils Hole Trail | U-96-BL-0038b |
| DA | Survey | BLM-Vernal | E. Moncrief | Lucky RC Placer Mine | U-96-BL-0192b |
| DA | Survey | BLM-Vernal | E. Moncriel | Dutch Jolin Mountain Rangeland Project | U-96-BL-0496b |
| DA | Survey | BLM-Vermal | E. Moncrief | Little Hole Fencing Project | U-96-BL-0723b |

ANTIQUITIES SECTION, UTAH DIVISION OF STATE HISTORY

| County | Activity | Organization | Field Supervisor | Projeci Name | Project Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\overline{\text { DA }}$ | Survey | USFS-Astrey | L Ingram | Greendale Canal | U-96-FS-0008f |
| DA | Survey | USFS-Ashley | A. Edwards | Antelope Flar Fence | U.96-FS-0212b, $\mathrm{f}, \mathrm{s}$ |
| DA | Survey | USFS-Ashley | 1. Ingram | Greendale Overlook Fuelwood | U-96-FS-0219f |
| DA | Survey | USES-Ashley | K. Malmstom | South Valley Pipeline and Trough | U-96-FS-0271f |
| DA | Survey | USFS-Ashley | K. Malmstrom | Cedar Springs Pinyon-Juniper Manipulation | U-96-FS-02978 |
| DA | Survey | USFS-Ashley | B. Loosic | Greendale PIT Survey | L-96-FS-036 |
| DA | Cleared | USFS-Asbley | K. Matrumrom | Catcer Road ATV Trail | U-96-FS -042if |
| DA | Survey | USFS-Adhley | K. Malmstrom | Spruce Creek Butn | U.96-FS-0436f |
| DA | Cleared | USFS-Astiley | K. Malmstrom | Sheop Creek Born | U.96-ES-04377 |
| DA | Survey | USFS-Asticy | L. Ingram | Hicks Tember Sale | U-96-FS-0531f |
| DA | Survey | USFS-Ashlicy | 1. Ingram | Deep Creek Timber Sale | U-96-FS-0532f |
| DA | Survey | USFS-Ashley | J. Berke | ${ }^{\text {Spruce Creek RX Burn }}$ | U-96-FS-05408 |
| DA | Survey | USFS-Ashley | J. Berke | Upper Buck Springs Watertine | (1-96-FS-054)f |
| DA | Survey | USES-Ashley | A. Haney | Lucerne Special Use Arca | U-96-FS-0599 |
| DA | Survey | USFS-Astiley | K. Mainstrom | Quarry Site Project | U.96-FS-065if |
| DA/SM | Survey | USFS-Ashley | K. Maimstrom | Round Park and L.ost Creek Timber Salvage | U-96-FS-0334t |
| DA/UN | Survey | USFS-Ashley | K. Malmstrom | Roadshed and Deep Creek Timber Silvage | U-96-FS -0315t |
| DA/UN | Survey | USFS-Ashley | B. Loosle | High Uintas Weyman Park Survey | U-96-FS-0462t |
| DC | Survey | AERC | R. Hauck | Balcron Wells 41-8-9-16 and 11-9-9-16-Welts Draw | U-96-AF-0066b |
| DC | Survey | AERC | R. Hauck | Brundage Canyon Wells/Roads for 15-16/16-18/5-20/15-23 | U.96-AF-0143i |
| DC | Survey | AERC | R. Hauck | Six. Wells and Access - Brundage and Sowers Canyons | U-96-AF-0179i |
| DC | Survey | AERC | R. Hauck | Tabiora Pipeline | U-96-AF-0196p |
| DC | Survey | AERC | G. Hadden | Four Wells with Roadi and Pipelines - Castle Peak Draw | U-96-AE-0235b |
| DC | Survey | AERC | R. Hauck | Pipeline Complex - Pariette Bench and Wells Draw | U-96-AF-0445b |
| DC | Survey | AERC | G. Hadden | Six Wells - Wells Draw | U-96-AF-0556b |
| DC | Survey | AERC | R. Hauck | Eight Wells - Wells Draw and Castle Peak Draw | U-96-AF-0623b |
| DC | Survey | AERC | R. Hauck | Ten Inland Wells-Castle Peak Draw | U-96-AF-0700b |
| DC | Survey | AIA | J. Truesdale | Petroglyph Well 04-03 | U-96-AY-0063i |
| DC | Survey | AIA | J. Truesdale | Seven Tribal Wells \& Pipeline/Road between 29-10 \& 29-15 | U-96-AY-0188i |
| DC | Survey | AIA | J. Truesdale | Block Survey of Section 4 in T5S, R3W | U-96-AY-0201i |
| DC | Survey | AIA | J. Truesdale | Petroglyph Sections 5 and 28 in TSS, R3W | U-96-AY-0207\% |

ANTIQUITIES SECTION, UTAH DIVISION OF STATE HISTORY 1996 PROIECT NUMBERS ASSIGNED

| County | Activity | Organization | Field Supervisor | Project Name | Project Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DC | Survey | AlA | J. Truesdale | Barrett Ute Tribal Well 5-26 | U-96-AY-0231i |
| DC | Survey | AlA | J. Truesdale | Coastal Pipeline | 0.96-AY-02571 |
| DC | Survey | AIA | J. Truesdale | Petroglyph Sections 8 and 29 in TSS. R3W | 11.96-AY-025Ri |
| DC | Survey | AIA | J. Truesdate | Four Barteil Wells | U-96-AY-0314i |
| DC | Survey | AIA | J. Truesdale | Coastal Oil and Gas Pipeline | U.96-AY-03351 |
| DC | Survey | AIA | 1. Triesdale | Petroglyph Ute Tribal Wells 17-12 and 03-12 | U-96-AY-03361 |
| DC | Survey | AIA | I. Truesdale | Petrogiyph Section 20 in 'TSS, R3W | U-96-AY-0337 |
| DC | Survey | A1A | 1. Truesdale | Petroglyph Section 21 in T5S, R3W | U.96-AY-03811 |
| DC | Survey | AIA | I Truesdale | Petroglyph Section 19 in T5S, R3W | U-96-AY-0383i |
| DC | Survey | AIA | 1. Truesdale | Petroglyph Section 30 in T5S, R3W | U-96-A Y-0384i |
| DC | Survey | AIA | J. Truesdale | Coastal Pipelines | U.96-AY-0418i |
| DC | Survey | AIA | J. Truesdale | Six Petroglyph Wells, Roads and Flowlines | U-96-AY-0419i |
| DC | Survey | AIA | J. Truescale | Coastal Oil and Gas Pipeline | U-96-AY-0424i |
| DC | Survey | AlA | 5. Truesdale | Coastal Pipeline Extension | U-96-AY-0491i |
| DC | Survey | AlA | 1. Truesdale | Petroglyph Section 16 in T5S, R3W | U-96-AY-0499i |
| DC | Survey | AIA | J. Truesdale | Petroglyph Section 18 in T5S, R3W | U-96-AY-05001 |
| DC | Survey | AIA | J. Truesdale | Petroglyph Section 9 in T5S, R3W | U. 96 -A Y-0501i |
| DC | Survey | AIA | J. Truesdale | Petroglyph Section 7 in TSS, R3W | U-96-AY-0502i |
| DC | Survey | AlA | J. Truesdale | Three l'etroglyph Wells | U.96.A Y-0503i |
| DC | Survey | AlA | J. Truestale | Petroglyph Section 3 in T5S, R3W | U-96-AY-0516i |
| DC | Survey | AIA | J. Truesdale | Coastal Pipeline in Sections 21, 22 and 23 in T1S, R1W | U-96-A Y-0517i |
| DC | Survey | AIA | J. Truesdale | Barrett Ute Tribal Well 9-19 | U-96-AY-0559i |
| DC | Survey | AIA | J. Truesdale | Barrett Ute Tribal Well 15-19 | U-96-AY-0560i |
| DC | Survey | AlA | J. Truesdale | Barren Ute Tribal Well 16-21 | U-96-AY-0561t |
| DC | Survey | AlA | J. Truesdale | Barret Ute Tribal Well 5-21 | U-96-A Y-0562i |
| DC | Survey | AIA | J. Truesdale | Barrett Ute Tribal Well 3-19 | U-96-AY-0563i |
| DC | Survey | AIA | J. Truesdale | Barrett Ute Tribal Well 3-25 | U.96-A Y-0564i |
| DC | Survey | AlA | J. Truesdale | Barterl Ute Tribal Well 1-2) | U-96-AY-0565i |
| DC | Survey | AIA | J. Truesdale | Barretr Ute Tribal Well 7-21 | U-96-AY-05661 |
| DC | Survey | AIA | J. Truesdale | Barrett Ute Tribal Well 5-22 | U-96-AY-0567i |
| DC | Survey | AlA | J. Truesdale | Barrett Ute Tribal Well 2-25 | U-96-AY-0568) |

ANTIQUITIES SECTION, UTAH DIVISION OF STATE HISTORY

| County | Activity | Organizaitum | Field Supervisur | Project Name | Project Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\overline{\mathrm{DC}}$ | Survey | Ala | J. Truesdale | Barren Ute Tribal Well 8-25 | U-96-AY-0569i |
| DC | Survey | AIA | 1. Truestale | Petroglyph Section 17 in T5S, R3W | U-96-AY-0635i |
| DC | Survey | AIA | d. Truestale | Petroglyph Section 10 in TSS, R3W | U-96-AY-0665i |
| DC | Survey | AIA | 1. Truesdale | Petroglyph SE $1 / 4$ or Sectien 6 in T5S. R3W | U-96-AY-0666i |
| DC | Survey | AIA | 1. Truestale | Barrett Pipeline | U-96-AY-0689i |
| DC | Survey | BIA | N. Crozier | UOIR Consolidated 18 | U-96-81-0706 |
| DC | Survey | BIA | N. Crozier | UOIR STP-L304(1) Arcaidia Roid | U-96-81-07094 |
| DC | Survey | BL.M-Price | B. Miller | Ninemile Canyon 1996 | U-90-BL-0730p |
| DC | Survey | Dames \& Moore | E. Fassen | Fort Duchesne Sewage Facility | U-96-DH-0479i |
| DC | Survey | Metcalf | D. Barclay | Coastal UteTribal Well 2-31C6 | U-96-MM-0246p |
| DC | Survey | Mercalf | D. Buarclay | Coxatil UteTribal Well 1-6D6 | U-96-MM-0405i |
| DC | Survey | Metcalf | M. Metcalf | Enserch Federal 13-15H and 1-15 | (1-96-MM-0385b |
| DC | Survey | Metcalf | M. Metcalf | Enserch Federal 31R-9H | U-96-MM-0386t |
| DC | Survey | Montgomery | K. Mantgomery | Sixteen Wells in Wells Draw for Equinble | U-96-MQ-0703b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | M. Polk | Souith Pleasant Valley Wells 9-19, 4-29 und 4-30 and Roads | U.96-SJ-0010b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Inland Resources Monument Butte Pipeline A | U-96-SJ.0011b,s |
| DC | Survey | Sagetruish | H. Weymmut | Inland Resources Mormment Butte Pipeline B | U-96-SJ-0012b,s |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Inland Resources Monument Butte Pipeline C | U-96-SJ-0013b,s |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | M. Polk | Inland Tar Sands Federal Wells 8-31, 9-31 and 15-31 | U-96-SJ-002 lb |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Inland Tar Sands Wells 4-31,5-31, 11-31 and 12-31 | U-96-SJ-0022b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Pipeline for Hanging Rock Federal Well 1-16 | U-96-5J-0023b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Monument Butte Fed. 13-27 and Travis Fed. 1-33 and Roads | U-96-SJ-0024b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | M. Polk | Intand OK Corral 4 -28 Well | U-96-5J-00475 |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Inland Pipetine Group 2! Segments iA-ID, 4 and 5 and Road | U-96-51-0074b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Intand Pipeline Group 2: Segment 2 | U-96-SJ-0075b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Intand Pipeline Group 2: Segment 3 | U-96-SJ-0076b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Gilsonite State Well 16-32 and Access Road | (t-96-SJ-0077s |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Boundary Federal Wells 15-2t and 16-21 | t-96-SL-0078b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Tar Sands Federal Welts 4-33 and 5-33 and Access Roads | U-96-SJ-60796 |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Sundance State Wells 1-32 and 3-32 and Access Roads | U-96-SJ-00808 |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Tar Sands Federal Wells 2-28, 3-28 und 4-28 | U-96-SJ-00815 |

ANTIQUITIES SECTION, UTAH DIVISION OF STATE HISTORY

| County | Activity | Organization | Field Supervisor | Project Name | Project Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Tar Sands Federal Well 1-3i and Access Road | U-96-SJ-0082b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Boundary Federal Wells 15-24 and 16-24 | U-96-SJ-0116b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Tar Sands Federal Wells 4-30 and 5-30 | U-96-SJ-0117b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Boundary Federal Well 13 -19 | U.96-SJ-01186 |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Ashley Federal Wells 9-23, 10-24R, 11-24 and 12-24R | U-96-SJ-0119b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | S. Ellis | Monument Butte Federal Wells 9-24, 10-24, 11-24 and 14-24 | U.96-SJ.0134b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | S. Ellis | Tar Sands Wells 12-30 and 13-30 and Addendum | U-96-SJ.0135b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | S. Ellis | Inland Pipeline Additions and Addeodum | U-96-5J-0157b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | M. Polk | Momument Butse NE Federal Wells 13.24, 4.25 and 5-25 | U.96-S5-0227b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | W. Simmons Johnson | Inland Pipeline Group 3: Segmend 1A | U-96-5).0250b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | W. Simmons Johnson | Inland Pipeline Group 3: Segmend 9 | U-96-SJ-0251b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | W. Stmmons Johnson | Inland Pipeline Group 3: Segments 2 thin 8 | U-96-SJ-0252b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | W. Simmons Johnson | Morument Butte Feteral Wells 2-34 and 4-34 | U-96-SJ-0253b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | W. Simmons Johnson | Monumemt Butte Federal Well 3A-35 and Access Road | U-96-SJ-0254b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | W. Simmons Johnson | Boundary Federal Wells 5-19, 6-19 and 12-19 und Road | U-96-SJ-0255b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | S. Murray Ellis | Morument Butte NE Federal Wells, Roads and Pipelines | U-96-SJ-0342b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Class II Survey at Siaryation Reservoir | U-96-SJ-03625 |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Tar Sands Federat Wells 3-30, 6-30, 11-30, 14-30 and 16-30 | U-96-SJ-0474b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Inland Resources Waterline | U-96-SJ-0475b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Tar Sands Federal Wells 5-28 and 6-28 | U-96-SJ-0476b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Tar Sands Federal Wells 1-29 and 8-29 and Roads | U-96-SJ-0477b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Tar Sands Federal Well 8-26 | U-96-SJ-0478b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | M. Polk | Wells Draw Federal Well 3-30 | U-96-SJ-0542b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | M. Polk | Soudh Pleasant Valley Federal Well 3-22 | O-96-SJ-0543b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | S. Ellis | South Pleasant Valley Federal Well 2-20 | U-96-SJ-0615b |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | S. Eltis | Idle Tribal Lands | (1-96-SJ-0620i |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | S. Ellis | Pipeline Between Wells 9-25 and 16-25 | U-96-SJ-064ib |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Rainbow Federal Wells 8 through 12 and Roads | U-96-SJ-0660t |
| DC | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Momument Butte NE Well 7-26 and Monum. Butte Well 16-23 | U-96-SJ-0674b |
| DC | Survey | USFS-Ashley | C. Cowan | Sowers Canyon Fence and Pipeline | U.96-FS-0225f |
| DC | Survey | USFS-Ashley | C. Todd | Timber Canyon Stooe Sale | U-96-FS-0240f |

ANTIQUITIES SECTION, UTAH DIVISION OF STATE HISTORY

ANTIQUITIES SECTION, UTAH DIVISION OF STATE HISTOR Y

| County | Activity | Organization | Field Supervisor | Project Name | Project Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EM | Survey | Monigomery | K. Montgomery | Texaco Grimes Wash Pipeline and Lateral A | U-96-MQ-02935 |
| EM | Survey | Montgomery | K. Montgomery | Lawrence Road Waste Disposal Area | U-96-MQ-0639p |
| EM | Survey | Montgomery | K. Montgomery | Texaco Grimes Wastr and Cottonwood Creek Pipelines | U-96-MQ-0697b,p,s |
| EM | Survey | Montgomery | K. Montgomery | Texaco State "U" 2-48 Well | U-96-MQ-0698s |
| EM | Survey | Sagebrush | M. Polk | Texaco Buzzard Bench Plicline | U-96-SJ-0009b.p |
| EM | Survey | Senco-Pherux | J. Senulis | Western Clay Gypaum Mine Block | U-96-SC-0466t |
| EM | Survey | SWCA | K. Quick | Questar Poison Springa Counpressor Station | U.96-ST 0591b |
| EM | Survey | UDOT | S. Miller | UDOT SR-31 MP 19.1 Culvert Extension | U-96-UT-0554s |
| EM | Survey | USFS-Manti/La Sal | B. Blackshear | Mills Plat Road tmprovenents | U.96-FS-0056\% |
| EM | Survey | USFS-Manti/La Sal | B. Blackshear | Huntington Catheguard Fence | U-96-FS-0057f |
| EM | Survey | USFS-Manti/La Sal | B. Blackshear | Joe's Valley Reservoir Campground/Waterline/Mannil | U-96-FS-022If |
| EM | Survey | USFS-Manti/La Sal | S. McDonald | Juicy Fruth Gravel Source Area | U-96-FS-0244t |
| EM/SV | Analysis/Rept. | Alpine | R. Greubel | UDOT Eleven Sites: 1-70/Castle Valley to Rattiesnake Bench | U.96-A1-0463b,5 |
| EM/SV | Survey | Montgomery | J. Montgomery | Eight Locations in Packet A for Texaco Exploration | U-96-MQ-0248b,p,s |
| GA | Survey | BLM-Kanab | D. McFadden | Boulder Town Land Disposal Tract 37 | U.96-BL-0061b |
| GA | Survey | BLM-Kanab | D. McFadden | McGath Point Rond Trespass | U-96-BL. 0062 b |
| GA | Survey | BLCM-Kanab | D. McFadden | Escalante Deseri Caichments | 11-96-BL-0070b |
| GA | Survey | BLM-Kanab | D. McFadden | Hiddale Vicinity Reservoin | U-96-BL-01636 |
| GA | Survey | BLM-Kanab | D. McFadden | Panguitch Community Clay Pit | U-96-BL-0164b |
| GA | Survey | BLM-Kanab | D. McFadden | Frank Pierce Rights of Way | (1-96-8L-0371b |
| GA | Survey | BLM-Kanab | D. McFadden | Call Creek Access Tumout | U.96-BL-0372b |
| GA | Survey | BL.M-Kanab | D. McFadden | Hawkins Creek Fence | U-96-BL-0373b |
| GA | Survey | BLM-Kanab | D. McFadden | Haws Trespass | U-96-BL-0375b |
| GA | Survey | BLM-Xanab | D. McFadden | Wide Hollow Fence | U-96-BL-0376b |
| GA | Survey | BL.M-Kanab | D. McFadden | Panguitch City Exchange | U-96-BL-0394b |
| GA | Survey | HLM Kanah | D. McFadden | Rock Canyou Division Fence | 19.96-BL-0427b |
| GA | Survey | BLM-Kanat | D. McFadden | BFD Inventory | U-96-BL-0681b |
| GA | Survey | BLM-Richfield | C. Harmon | Indian Spring Pipeline | U-96-Bl-00986 |
| GA | Survey | BLM-Richfield | C. Harmon | Arches Reservoir | U-96-BL-0099b |
| GA | Survey | BLM-Richfield | C. Harmon | Cedar Point Well | U-96-BL-0100b |
| GA | Survey | BLM-Richfield | C. Harmon | Kaihah Gold Mill Site | U-96-7IL-0712b |


| ANTIQUITIES SECTION, UTAH DIVISION OF STATE HISTORY 1996 PROJECT NUMBERS ASSIGNED |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| County | Activity | Organization | Field Supervisor | Project Name | Project Number |
| GA | Survey | BLM-Richfield | C. Harmon | Ticaboo Pipeline and Trough | [1-96-BL-0713b |
| GA | Survey | BYU-Museum | 1. Janeiski | Capitol Reef Year One - 1995 | U-96-BC-0214n |
| GA | Moniter | yNPS-Glen Canyon | N. Muller | 1996 DCL Monitor und Recon | 0-96-NA-0166m |
| GA | Survey | NPS-Gien Canyon | C. Goebie | 1996 Escalamte Rock Art Recording | U-96-NA-026) |
| GA | Survey | SWCA | F. Millet | UDOT Maintenance Shed in Panguitch | U-96-ST-0005s |
| GA | Saryey | SWCA | K. Quick | Ruby's fan to Red Canyon Fiberoptic | U-96-ST-0338b, p.s |
| GA | Survey | USFS-Dixie | M. Jacklin | Prescribed Burns D-3 | U.96-FS-00541 |
| GA | Survey | USFS-Dixie | M. Jacklin | Posy Lake Ovetiook Restoration | U-96-FS-0055f |
| GA | Survey | USFS-Dixie | M. Jucklin | Pine Lake Spawning Chanaei | U-96-FS-0305t |
| GA | Survey | USFS-Dixie | M. Jacklin | Single Rock Mistictoe | U-96-FS-0306t |
| GA | Survey | USFS-Dixie | M. Jncklin | East Siope Allomment Fence | U-96-FS-0308f |
| GA | Survey | USFS. Dixie | M. Jacklin | Horse Hollow Buru | U-96-FS-0309f |
| GA | Survey | USFS-Dixie | M. Jnckin | Barker Recreation Site Development | U-96-FS-0310f |
| GA | Survey | USFS-Dixie | M. Jacklin | Poison Creek Burn | U-96.FS-031L |
| GA | Survey | USFS-Dixic | M, Jackio | Garkane Land Exchange | (1-96-FS-0583f |
| GA | Survey | USFS-Dixie | M. Jacklin | Jones Corral Burn | U-96-FS-0584f |
| GAIN | Survey | USFS-Dixie | M. Jacklin | Blue Spring/Reeds Valley Salvage | U-96-FS-0325f |
| GA/KA | Survey | NPS-Glen Canyon | T. Burchett | Glen Canyon NRA Uplate Signs | U-96-NA-01403 |
| GA/PI | Survey | SWCA | K. Quick | Panguitch to Circleville Fiberoptic | 10-96-ST-0339\%, p, s |
| GR | Monitor | Abajo | K. Montgomery | UP\&L Monitor of Power Removal at 42G12029 | 0-96-AS-0270b |
| GR | Survey | Abajo | M. Bond | Space Chimp White Wesh Filming Location | U-96-AS-0634b |
| GR | Survey | Abajo | W. Davis | Grand County Capitol Reef Burr Trail Project | U-96-AS-07260is |
| GR | Survey | BLM-Grand | B. Louthan | Litule Grand Wash Reservoirs | 0.96-BL-0046b |
| GR | Survey | BLM-Grand | B. Louthan | Rim Tours Bike Trip Campsites | U.96-8L-0065b |
| GR | Survey | BLM-Grand | B. Louthan | FNAWS Floy \& Crescem Fences \& Reservain \& Addendum | 0-96-8L-0137b,s |
| GR | Survey | BLM-Grand | B. Louthan | Agate Wildife Water Catcliment | U.96-8L-0154b |
| GR | Survey | BLM-Grand | B. Louthan | Monument Wildife Water Carchment | 0.96 -8L-0155b |
| GR | Survey | BLM-Grand | B. Louthan | East Thompson Boundary Fence | U.96-8L-0222b |
| GR | Survey | BLM-Grand | B. Louthan | Archview Trall Ride Camps | U-96-BL-0607b |
| GR | Survey | BLM-Grand | B. Louthan | Colin Fryer Agrisultual Lease | U-96-BL-0609b |
| GR | Survey | BLM-Grand | B. Louthan | Dubinky Well Windmill Move | U-96-8L-0610b |

ANTIQUITIES SECTION, UTAH DIVISION OF STATE HISTORY

| County | Acivity | Otgantiation | Field Supervisor | Ptoject Name | Project Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GR | Survey | BLM-Grand | B. Louthan | Big Cur Wildife Fence | U-96-BL-0611b |
| GR | Survey | BL.M-Grand | B. Louthan | Kayenta Heighis Boulder Barrier | U.96-BL-0612h |
| GR | Survey | BLM-Grand | B. Louthan | Poison Spider Road and Parking | U-96-BL-0614b |
| GR | Survey | CASA | L. Hammack | Cellular Tower and Power Line NW of Crescent Junction | U-96-CH-0241b |
| GR | Survey | Desent West | K. Lupo | White Wash Fihning Location | U-96-WZ.0072b |
| GR | Survey | 4-Comers | C. DeFrancia | Deuel Federal Well No. 2 and Azcess. | U-96-FE-03895 |
| GR | Survey | 4-Comers | C. DeFrancia | Three Mineral Drith Sites in Sall Valley | U.96-FE-0507\% |
| GR | Survey | 4 Comers | C. DeFramia | GCRL Sersmosaur Federal Well No I | U.96-FE-0555b |
| GR | Survey | GRI | C. Comer | Cisco Seismic Lime | U.96-G8-0268b |
| GR | Survey | Powers Elevation | G. Newberry | Sute Land Parcel - Bullfrog | U. $96-\mathrm{PA}-0053 \mathrm{~s}$ |
| GR | Survey | USFS-Manti/La Sal | L. Hum | Piuhook Gravel Pit | U.96-FS-0234f |
| GR | Survey | USFS-Manti/La Sal | L. Hum | Miners Basin Trailhead | U.96-IFS-0593f |
| GR | Survey | Utah Trust Lands | K. Wintch | Cedar Camp Canyon Timber Sale | U-96.UM-0518s |
| GR | Survey/Test | Utah Staic Universily | W. FawcetI | Uuh State University Field School 1996 - Polar Mesa | U-96-UJ-0414b, $\mathrm{f}^{\text {f }}$ |
| GR/SA | Survey | GRI | C. Conner | Two Film Locations - Deiernization Tower \& Pyramid Butle | U-96-GB-0432b |
| GR/SA | Survey | USFS-Mantilla Sal | L. Hunt | Monticello Range MOU Compliance- 1996 | U-96-FS-0725t |
| IN | Survey | ARCON | G. Norman | Parowan Gap Project | U.96-AK-0413t |
| IN | Survey | BLM-Cedar City | G. Dalley | Woods Exchange | U-96-BL-0114b |
| IN | Survey | BLM.Cedar City | G. Dalley | Meadow Spring ROW | U-96-BL-0690b |
| IN | Survey | BL.M-Karub | D. McFadden | Sandy Creek Riparian Fence | U-96-BL-0374b |
| IN | Survey | Interscarch | B. Frank | Plait-Gibibert Development Sewer | U.96-1G.06766 |
| IN | Survey | JBR | R. Crosland | Cedar City 200 E 200 N ST. Bridge over Cout Creek | U-96-JB-0058 |
| IN | Survey | SWCA | F. Miller | UDOT 1-15 Fruniage Road Near Eranant Wast | U-96-ST-0003bes |
| IN | Survey | SWCA | F. Miller | Small Purcel Near Beryl | U-96-ST-0004p,s |
| 1 N | Survey | SWCA | K. Quick | LDS Church Survey | U.96-ST-0404p |
| 1 N | Survey | UDOT | S. Miller | UDOT SR-56 MP 42 to 43 | U-96-UT-0174b, fis |
| IN | Survey | UDOT | S. Miller | UDOT SR-56 MP 34.8 to 36.15 South Side Maintenance | U.96-UT-0490b,s |
| IN | Survey | USFS-Dizie | M. Jacklin | Rudd's Roost Road Update | U.96-FS-0369f |
| IN/WS | Survey | USES-Dixie | M. Jacklin | West Side Vegetation Project | U-96-FS-0585t |
| JB | Survey | Baseline | J. Allison | Ashgrove Cement Plant Pipeline under SR-132 (UDOT) | U-96-BS-0388s |
| JB | Survey | BLM-Eilimore | N. Shearin | Snale Creek Road Realignment | U-96-BL-0026b |

ANTIQUITIES SECTION, UTAH DIVISION OF STATE HISTORY

| County | Activily | Organization | Field Supervisor | Project Name | Project Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IB | Survey | BLM.F.Filmore | N, Shearin | Tom's Creek Chamel | U-96-8L-00596 |
| J $\mathrm{H}^{\text {d }}$ | Survey | BL.M-Filmore | N. Stearin | Fish Sprimgs Fence Extension in | U-96-BL-0180b |
| JB | Survey | BLM-Fillmore | N, Shearin | West Skunky Springi/South Pine Pipeline | U. 96 -BL-02156 |
| J | Survey | BLM-Pillmore | N. Shearin | Handcari Trek | U-96-BL-02836 |
| JB | Survey | BL.M-Filmore | N. Shearin | BYU Radar Tesi | (1-96-BL-03220 |
| JB | Survey | BLM-Fillmore | N. Shearin | South Gilson Fire | U-96-BL-04800 |
| נ8 | Survey | BLM-Filmore | N. Shearin | Black Mountan Fire | U-96-BL. 0481 b |
| J8 | Survey | BL.M-Fillinore | N. Sheariu | Eric Cire | U.96-BL-0482b |
| 18 | Survey | BLM-Fillimore | N. Shearin | Round Knoll Fire | U-96-BL-0484b |
| J8 | Survey | BLM-Fillinore | N , Shearin | Boulter Fire | U-96-HL-0485 |
| J8 | Survey | BLM-Filmore | N. Sbearim | Cherry Creek-Poll Eire | U.96-8L-0486 |
| נ8 | Survey | BLM-Fillmore | N , Sthearin | Leamington Fire | U.96-8L-0487b |
| 18 | Survey | BLM-Fillinore | N. Sthearin | Cherry Creak | U-96-8L-0488b |
| J8 | Survey | BLM-Fillinote | N. Shearin | Cane Springs Fence Enhancemient | U-96-BL-0683b |
| 18 | Survey | BLM-Fillmore | N. Shearin | Drum Mountain Drilling | U-96-BL -0684b |
| JB | Survey | BL.M.Filinore | N. Shearin | Quarry Spring Rock Sule | U-96-8L-0685b |
| JB | Survey | BLM-Richfield | C. Harmon | Radar Roof Guzzer | U-96-BL.-0128b |
| JB | Test, Etc. | JBR | S. Billat | Brush Wellman Survey and Collectiou/Test at 42.5b507 \& 509 | U-96-JB-0216b |
| JB | Survey | JBR | M. Manin-Moore | Brush Wellman Pipeline | U-96-JB-0522b |
| JB | Survey | Sagebrush | W. Simmons Johuson | Nephi Aiport Extension | U-96-SJ.02\% ${ }^{\text {p }}$ |
| JB/MD | Survey | BLM-Filmore | N. Shearin | Wild Horse Traps | U-96-BL-0110b |
| JB/MD | Survey | BLM-Fillmote | N. Shearin | Little Sahara Complex Fire | U-96-BL-04836 |
| jB/TO | Survey | BLM-Fillmore | N. Shearin | Death Creek Fire Fence Extension | 4-96-81-01815 |
| JB/UT | Survey | Baseline | A. Nielson | Cenual Uah Telephone Fiberoptic from Goshen to Eureka | U-96-BS-052 $\mathrm{Lb}, \mathrm{p}, \mathrm{s}$ |
| KA | Survey | BLM-Kanab | D. McFadden | Early Weed Bench Pipeline Extensiou | U-96-BL-006\% |
| KA | Survey | BLM.Kanab | D. McFadden | Paruoweap Canyon Comnutnity Trail Rides | U-96-BL-0132 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| KA | Survey | BLM/Kanals | D. McFanden | Mineral Gulch Telephone Line | U-96-BL-0161b |
| KA | Survey | BLM-Kanab | D. McFudden | Dry Lake Seeding | U-96-BL-0162b |
| KA | Survey | BLM-Kınab | D. McFadden | Park Wasit Gravel Pit | U-96-BL-0165b |
| KA | Survey | BLM-Kanab | Jackitio/McFadden | Trail Canyon Seeding | U-96-BL-0313b |
| KA | Survey | BLM-Kanab | D. McFadden | Long Canyon Gap Fence | U-96-BL-0328t |


| ANTIQUITIES SECTION, UTAH DIVISION OF STATE HISTORY 1996 PROIECT NUMBERS ASSIGNED |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| County | Activity | Organization | Field Supervisor | Project Name | Project Number |
| K^ | Survey | BLM-Kamb | D. McFadden | Lake Powell Communicalions Site | U-96-BL-0329 |
| KA | Survey | BLM-Kanab | D. McFadden | Sink Valley Staie Pit | 0.96-BL-0377 |
| KA | Survey | BLM-Kamab | D. McFadden | Spencer Fuelwood Saie | U-96-BL-0378b |
| KA | Survey | BLM-Kamb | D. McFadden | Schoppmin Exchange | U-96-BL-0402 |
| KA | Survey | BLM-Kanab | D. McFadden | Buckskin Widdile Guzzers | U-96-Bt-0426b |
| KA | Survay | BLMM Kanat | D. McFadden | Wygaret Access Road | U-96-8L-0534b |
| KA | Survey | BLM-Kanab | D. McFauden | Buckskin Gulch Frue Rehiob | U-96-8L-0535b |
| K/ | Survey | Intersearch | B. Frank | Hansen-State Mineral Lease Survey | U-96-16-01085 |
| KA | Survey | La Plata | S. Fuller | Conoco Reese Canyon Federal No. 1 Well | U-96-LA-0526b |
| KA | Survey | La Plata | S. Putler | Conoco Reese Canyon Federal No. 2 Well | U-96-LA-0527b |
| KA | Survey | La Pata | S. Fulter | Conoco Resse Canyon State No, 1 Well and Road | U-96-LA-0528s |
| KA | Survey | La Plata | S. Fuller | Conveo Rese Canyon State No. 2 Well and Road | 1-96-LA-05295 |
| KA | Survey | NPS-Glen Canyon | c. Goertie | 1996 Kaiparowicz. Plateau Recon | U-96-NA-0493m |
| KA | Survey | USFS-Dixie | M. Jacklin | Harris Flat Fence | U-96-FS-007) |
| KA | Survey | USFS-Dixie | M. Jacklin | Meadow Canyon Burn | U-96-FS-0304\% |
| KA | Survey | USFS-Dixie | M. Jacklin | Buti Rush Valley Road | U-96-FS-0307b |
| KA | Survey | USFS-Dixie | M. Jacklin | Muddy Creek NRCS Project | U-96-FS-0312b |
| KA | Survey | USFS-Disie | M. Jacklin | Under The Rim/Crawford Pass Trail | U-96-FS-0461\% |
| KA | Survey | USFS-Dixie | M. Jacklin | Virgin River Rinu Trail Rerouse | U-96-FS.06035 |
| KA | Survey | USFS-Dixie | M. Jacklin | Strawberry Road | U.96-FS-0604f |
| Ka/SA | Survey | SWCA | L. Neal | Lake Powell Archueological Survey | U.96-ST-03914 |
| KA/WS | Survey | NPS-Zion | M. Betenson | Historic Bridges in Need of Repair (Ka4264/Ws2899) | U.96-NA-0735n |
| MD | Survey | AERC | R. Hauck | Mamba Unuts 43-22 and 31-22-Snake Valley | U-96-AF-0302b |
| MD | Survey | BL.M-Fillimote | N. Shearin | Boyd Station Gravel Pit | U-96-8L-0025b |
| MD | Survey | BLM-Fillmore | N. Shearin | Antelope Spring Bat Gate | U-96-BL-0036b |
| MD | Survey | BLM-Filmmore | N. Shearin | Saegars Gravel Pid | U.96-BL-01Hib |
| MD | Survey | BL.M-Filmore | N. Shearin | Geodetic Monior Sites | U-96-BL-0160 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| MD | Survey | BL.M-Fillmore | N. Stearin | Nielson Placer Mine | U-96-8L-0226b |
| MD | Survey | BLM-Filmmore | N. Shearin | Red Canyon Rock Quarry | (1)96-BL-0291b |
| MD | Survey | BLM-Fillmore | N. Shearin/E. Kre | Continental Lime Amendments 1 and 2 | U-96-BL-0330b |
| MD | Survey | BLM-Fillmore | N. Shearin | Crown Drill Holes | (1)-96-BL-0422 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |

ANTIQUTIIES SECTION, UTAH DIVISION OF STATE HISTORY

| County | Activity | Organization | Field Supervisor | Project Name | Project Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MD | Survey | BLM-Fillmore | N. Shearin | Twin Peaks Fire | U-96-BL-0423b |
| MD | Survey | BLM-Fillmore | N. Shearin | Eightmile Fire | U-96-BL-0449b |
| MD | Survey | BLM-Fillmore | N. Shearin | Flowell Fire | U-96-BL-0450b |
| MD | Survey | BL-M-Fillmore | N. Shearin | Red Canyou Rock Quarry 2 | U-96-BL-0626b |
| MD | Suryey | BLM-Fillmore | N. Sheario | Centution Mines Notice Amendment | U-96-BL-0628b |
| MD | Suryey | BLM-Fillmore | N. Shearin | Monument Poini Community Pit | U-96-BL-0686b |
| MD | Survey | BLM-Fillmore | N Shearin | South Flnwell Fire Fence | U-96-BL-0687b |
| MD | Survey | BLM-Fillmore | N. Shearin | NOLS Cmp | U.96-BL-0702b |
| MD | Excavation | BLM-Filmore | N. Shearin | 1996 Excayation at Thurstay Site (42Md1053) | U-96-BL-0739b(c) |
| MD | Survey | BLM-Richfield | C. Harmon | Cove Fort Big Game Guzzler | U-96-BL-0092b |
| MD | Survey | BLM.Riclfield | C. Harmoo | Danish Reservoir Protection Fepar | U-96-BL-00936 |
| MD | Survey | BLM-Richfield | C. Hamman | Crickett Chukar Guzzlers | U.96-BL-0094b |
| MD | Survey | BLM-Richfield | C. Harmon | Georges Big Game Guzzler | U-96-BL-0095b |
| MD | Survey | BLM-Richfield | C. Harmon | Pavant Water Developments | U-96-BL-0096t |
| MD | Survey | BLM-Richfield | C. Hamon | Devij's Kitchen Big Game Guzzler | U-96-BL-0097b |
| MD | Survey | BL.M-Richfield | C. Harmon | Bluegrass Knoll Wildlife Waters | U-96-BL-0126b |
| MD | Survey | BL-M-Richfield | C. Harmon | Marjum Pass Wildife Waters | U-96-BL-0127b |
| MD | Survey | SWCA | J. Hirschi | Cox Rock Products Operation | U-96-ST-0189p |
| MD | Survey | UDOT | S. Miller | UDOT I-15 Burn Rehab No. 182 | U-96-UT-0553b,s |
| MD | Survey | WCRM | C. Wheeler | Cricket Mountain Quarry Expansion 1996 | U-96-WE-0519p, ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| MO/WB | Survey | JBR | S. Billat | Three Pipeline Segments for Ogden Valley Project | U-96-JB-01675 |
| MULTI | Survey | Dames \& Moore | E. Bassett | Three Coal Mines EM/GA/SV | U-96-DH-0050b, $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{p}} \mathrm{p}$ |
| MULTI | Survey | NW Archace, Assoc. | R. Barlow | WoridCom Fiberoptic from Seattle to SLC BO/DV/SL/WB | U-96-NR-0131b.p.s |
| MULTI | Survey | USFS-Manti/La Sal | S. McDonald | Addendum to Scenic Eyways Inventory EM/SP/UT | 0-96-FS-0281b, p, 5 |
| MULTI | Survey | USFS-Manti/La Sal | S. McDonald | Four Vehicle Waysides on SR-31 and SR-264 CB/EM/SP/UT | U-96-FS-0494p, ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| PI | Survey | BLM-Richfield | C. Harmon | Angle Bench | U-96-BL-0112 ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| Pl | Survey | USFS-Fishlake | R. Leonard | Liute Table Harrow and Eurn | U.96-FS-0428f |
| PI/SV | Survey | USFS-Fishlake | R. Tuttle | Monroe Eastside Burn | (1-96-PS-0718f |
| PI/WA | Survey | Dames \& Moore | E. Basselt | Bullion Abandoned Mines | (1-96-0H-0052f.p |
| RI | Survey | Baseline | J. Allison | Wheatgrass Fire Retab. | U-96-BS-0520b |
| RI | Survey | BLM-Salf Lake | D. Melton | Rich County Weather Stations | U.96-BL-03996 |


| ANTIQUITIES SECTION, UTAH DIVISION OF STATE HISTORY 1996 PROJECT NUMBERS ASSIGNED |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| County | Activity | Ofganization | Field Supervisor | Project Name | Project Number |
| RI | Survey | BL.M-Satt Lake | D. Meltoo | Old Canyon Waierline | U-96-BL-0409b |
| RI | Survey | BLM-Salt Lake | D. Melton | DWR Rich County Projects | U-96-BL-0467b,s |
| SA | Survey | Abajo | W. Davis | Culinary Water Improvement Project for Bluff | U-96-AS-0048b,p,s |
| SA | Survey | Abajo | K. Montgomery | Holliday Construction Blaff Bench Materials Pit | U-96-AS-0169s |
| SA | Survey | Abajo | K. Montgomery | UDOT Kane Springs Wash Bridge and Addilitonal Areas | U-96-AS-0243h, p |
| SA | Excavation | Abajo | W. Davis/W. Hurst | Excavation at 425 a 18245 | U-96-As-0326p(e) |
| SA | Collection | Abajo | D. Westfall | UDOT SR-163, Burial at 42Sa23122 | U-96-AS-0530p |
| SA | Excavation | Alpine | S. Chandler | Excayation/Rebunal of Remains from Mill Sine, Monncello | U-96-ㅅ-0688w(e) |
| SA | Survey | Arizona State University | N. Mahoney | Cotionweod Wash Survey 1996 | N-96-ZU-07416 |
| SA | Survey | BLM-Grand | B. Louthan | Sturnway Lisbon Limestone Mines | U-96-8L-0136b |
| SA | Survey | BLM-Grand | B. L.outhan | Charles Redd $\mathrm{Ag} /$ /⿴arn Lease | U-96-BL-0223b |
| SA | Survey | BLM-Grand | B. Louthan | Mike Wilcox Reservoit Access Road | U.96.BL-0224b |
| SA | Survey | BLM-Grand | B. Louthan | Bill Groff Boulder Sale | U-96. BL-06066 |
| SA | Survey | BLM-Grand | B. Louthan | Grand County Gravel Pit Lease Renewal | U-90-BL-060\%h |
| SA | Survey | BLM-Grand | B. Louthan | Cominental Minerals Uranium Drilling | U-96-BL-06136 |
| SA | Monitor | BLM-San Juan | E. Kreusch | 1996 Comb Wash Monitoring | U-96-BL-.0434b |
| SA | Survey | CASA | M. Erickson | The Kee Topahah/Louise Begay Humesite | U. $96-\mathrm{CH}-00141$ |
| SA | Survey | CASA | M. Erickson | Cave Canyon 13-3 Powerine | U-96.CH-0015b |
| SA | Survey | CASA | N. Hammack | Five Aneth Chapter Homesites | U-96.CH-0083i |
| SA | Survey | CASA | N. Hammack | Mobil Area Six Pipeline | U. $96 . \mathrm{CH}-00841$ |
| SA | Survey | CASA | N. Hammack | Mobil Area Two Pipeline | U.96-CH-0085 |
| SA | Survey | CASA | L. Hammack | Section 7 Pipeline for Mobir's McElme Creek Uni | U-96-CH-01301 |
| SA | Survey | CASA | L. Hammack | Mobil's Ratherford Unil Section 12 Surfice Flow Line | U.96-CH-015 11 |
| SA | Survey | CASA | L. Hammack | Four Red Mesa and Aneib Chapler Bomesites | U.96-CH-0152i |
| SA | Survey | CASA | L. Hammack | Westec Alkall Ridge Wells 8-29, 12-28 and 4-33 | U-96-CH-01536, ${ }^{\text {i }}$ |
| SA | Survey | CASA | L. Hammack | White Mesa Water Line | U-96-CH-0242b,i,p |
| SA | Survey | CASA | L. Hammack | Sections 12 and 13 and NE $1 / \mathrm{Sec} .24$ in Mobi/Ratherford | U-96-CH-0470i |
| SA | Survey | CASA | M. Errickson | Sixily Homesites and Waterline Exten-Shiprock (also AZ/NM) | U-96-CH-0492i |
| SA | Survey | CASA | L. Hammack | Mobil Plow Lines and Power Lines in Red Mesa | U-96-CH-0538i |
| SA | Survey | CASA | N. Hamumack | Mobil Block Survey in Seetion 21, Ratherford Unit | U-96-CH-0573i |
| SA | Survey | CASA | L. Hammack | Goulding's Alrport Expansion | U.96-CH-0575i |

ANTIQUITIES SECTION, UTAH DIVISION OF STATE HISTORY

| County | Activity | Organization | Field Supervisor | Projecl Name | Project Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SA | Survey | CASA | M. Errickoon | Six Sand Sources in Mobil's Ratherford Unit | U-96-CH-0592i |
| S 4 | Survey | CASA | N. Hammack | Nabls Fifty Honesites and 3.1 Miles of Wateritipe Extension | U. $96-\mathrm{CH}-0597 \mathrm{i}$ |
| SA | Survey | CASA | L. Hammack | The Begay/Ben/Ner. Powertine for UP\&L | U. $96 . \mathrm{CH}-0650$ |
| SA | Survey | CASA | D. Leetig | Sections 17 and 20 in Mobil Ratherford Unit | U-96-CH-0716i |
| SA | Survey | CASA | D. Loebiz | Mobit Sections 18 and 19 | U-96-CH-0717 |
| SA | Excavation | University of Colorado | M. Bond | Excavation at Bluff Great Home, 42Sa22674 | ( $0.96-\mathrm{Cl}-0284 \mathrm{p}$ (e) |
| \$A | Excavation | Eage of the Cedars | T. Prince | 1996. Hogan Excavation at Edge of the Cedars, 42 Sa 700 | (U-96-UD-0471s(e) |
| SA | Survey | 4 -Corners | E DeFrancia | Knockdfu Well pad mud Access | U.96-FE-00396 |
| SA | Survey | 4 - Corners | C. DeFrancia | Aulimore No.I Well | U.96-FE-0263b |
| SA | Survey | 4 Corners | C. DeFrancia | Knockando Well | U.96-FE-0264b |
| SA | Survey | 4 -Comers | C. DeFrancia | Knockdhu Federal No. 1 Pipeline | U-96-FE-0237b,p |
| SA | Survey | 4 -Comers | C. DeFrancia | Knockdhu No, 2 Well | U-96-FE-03906 |
| SA | Survey | 4 -Comers | C. DeFrancia | Spanish Valley Gravel Quarry | U-96-FE-0513n |
| SA | Survey | 4 -Corners | C. DeFrancia | Aultmore No. 1-24X Well | U-96-FE-0514b |
| SA | Survey | 4 -Comers | C DeFrancia | Mountain Gravel Spanich Valley 18-8 Macrials Site | U-96-FE.05338 |
| SA | Survey | 4-Corners | C. DeFrancia | Nos. 7 and 5 Knockdhy Units | U-96-FE-0677b, |
| SA | Survey | 4-Corners | C. DeFrancia | No, 4 Knockdhu Unit | U-96-FE-06786 |
| SA | Survey | La Plata | S. Fuller | Cherokee Federal 43-14 Well | U-96-LA-0208b |
| SA | Survey | Montgomery | J. Monigomery | Doward Productions Shafer Hauin Flum Location | U-96-MQ-04416 |
| SA | Survey | Montgomery | K. Montgomery | Key Construction Materials Pit | U-96-MQ.05448 |
| SA | Damage Assess | s Navajo Nation | N. Coulam | Looting at Site UT-C-41-115 (425a23208) | U-96-NK-0738i |
| SA | Survey | NPS-Canyonlands | N. Coulam | Murply Point Campsite, LSland-in-the-Sky District | U-96-NA-0637n |
| SA | Survey | NPS-Canyoulinds | N. Coulam | Cave Springs Barrier-Free Trail | U-96-NA. 6638 n |
| SA | Survey | UDOT | S. Miller | UDOT SR-95 Mantenance between MP [ [8 and 121 | U-96-UT-017 ${ }^{\text {d }}$, 3 |
| SA | Survey | UDOT | S. Miller | UDOT SR-46 Maintenance at Various Locations | U.96-UT-0172b, 5 |
| SA | Survey | UDOT | S. Miller | UDOT SR-19t MP 108.4, 108.7 and 109.8-110.11 Maint. | 0-96-UT-0498b,s |
| SA | Survey | USFS-Manti/La Sal | L. Hunt | King Edward Mine Rehabilitation | 0-96-FS-0029 |
| SA | Survey | USFS-Manti/La Sal | L. Hunt | Stumway Mining Claims in North Whiskers Draw | 0.96-Fs 0067 T |
| SA | Survey | USFS-Manti/La Sal | L. Humt | DOE Slope Stability Assessment vic. Dry Wash Reservoir | U-96-FS-0129 |
| SA | Monitor/Survey | yUSFS-Manti/La Sal | L. Hunt | Souith Elks Salvage Rond Improvements | 0-96-FS-0233\% |
| SA | Survey | USFS-Manti/La Sal | D. Harber | Tony Mine Shant Closure | U-96-FS-05948 |

ANTIQUITIES SECTION, UTAH DIVISION OF STATE HISTORY

| County | Activity | Organization | Field Supervisor | Project Name | Project Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SA | Survey | USFS-Manti/La Sal | G. Denton | Recreational Lakes Survey | U-96-FS-0595f |
| SA | Survey | USFS-Manti/La Sal | G. Denton | South Long Point Salvage Sale | U-96-FS-0596\% |
| SA | Survey | USFS-Manti/La Sal | L. Hum | Lewis Lodge Rim Survey | U-96-FS-0719 |
| SA | Survey | USFS-Manti/La Sal | D. Keller | Reconnaissance in Dark and Woodenshoe Canyons | U.96-FS-0720r |
| SA | Survey | Utah Trust Lands | K. Wiath | Harr's Point Road Work Evaluation | U-96-UM-06825 |
| SA | Test | Woods Canyon | 3. Felleroun | Testing at Site 42Sal 2603 (ML-956) - Cream Pots | U-96-WN-072 If |
| SL | Survey | Baseline | A. Nielson | UDOT Jordan River and E. Jordan Canal Bridges Replacement | U-96-BS-0089\% |
| SL | Survey | Baseline | A. Nielson | Jordan River Blvd. in Midvale (UDOT) | U-96-BS-0090p,s |
| SL | Test | Baselitie | 1. Allisan | Sall Lake Airport 1996-1997 Test Excavations | U-96-BS-0662s |
| SL | Survey | Dames \& Moore | E. Braseti | Jordan River Bike Path Phase II | [0-96-DH-01245 |
| SL | Survey | Dames \& Moore | E. Bassett | Midvale Pioneer Cemetery Delineation Study | U-96-DII-0446p |
| SL | Survey | Sagebrush | M. Potk | UDOT Bangerter Highway/Redwood Road Project | U-96-SJ-0380p, ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| SL | Survey | Sagebrush | M. Poik | UDOT Draper Bridge Survey | U-96-SJ-0435s |
| SL | Survey | Sagebrush | S. Ellis | UDOTF 1-15 Wetlands Mitigation | U-96-SJ-0438p |
| SL | Survey | Sugebrush | S. Ellis | Stiex 94th South Parcel, Sandy City | U-96-SJ-0693p |
| SL | Survey | Sagebrushr | S. Ellis | 138th South Frontage Roads (UDOT) | U-96-SJ-0694p, |
| SL | Survey | UDOT | R. Rood | UDOT Jordan River Bridge, East Jordan Camul | U-96-UT-0355s |
| SL | Survey | UDOT | R. Rood | UDOT SR-210 and Wasitch Bird | U-96-UT-0447s |
| SL | Survey | UDOT | R. Rood | UDOT Surplus Properties-Saltait and Sugarhouse | U-96-ET-0448s |
| SL | Survey | UDOT | R. Rood | UDOT 5600 West Proposed Wetlands | U-96-UT-0508s |
| SL | Survey | UDOT | R. Rood | UDOT 5300 South Land Site | U-96-UT-0537 |
| SL | Survey | USFS-Wasatch/Cache | C. Thompson | Brighton 5-Year Pian | U-96-FS-0297t |
| SL | Survey | USFS-Wasatch/Cache | C. Thompson | Snowbird 5-Year Plan | U-96-FS-0298f |
| SL | Survey | USFS-Ulinta | S. Nelson | Pacific Corp Pipeline | U-96-FS-934)If |
| SM | Survey | Baseline | A. Nielson | Oakley - Weber River Bridge (UDOT) | U-96-BS-0087s |
| SM | Survey | Baseline | A. Nielson | Union Pacific RR Bridge, Hencfer (UDOT) | U-96-BS-0088s |
| SM | Survey | BLM- Salt Lake | D. Melton | Transwasatch Roud Iniprovemem | U-96-BL-02455.p |
| SM | Survey | BYU-OPA | R. Talbot | BOR Rockport State Park Improvementy | U-96-BC-0346w |
| SM | Survey | Dames \& Moore | E. Bassett | Black Hawk Mining Site | U-96-DH-0458p |
| SM | Survey | UDOT | R. Rood | Weber River Bridge Replacement | U-96-UT-03535 |
| SM | Survey | UDOT | R. Rood | Weber River Bridge Area | U-96-UT-0407s |

ANTIQUITIES SECTION, UTAH DIVISION OF STATE HISTORY

| County | Activity | Organization | Field Supervisor | Project Name | Projeci Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SM | Survey | UDOT | R. Rood | Wasatch Remote Weather Station | U-96-UT-04685 |
| SM | Survey | UDOT | R. Rood | UDOT Henefer RR Bridge | U-96.UT-0695s |
| SM/WA | Survey | BYU-OPA | R. Tailon | Jordanelle Land Exchange | U-96-BC.0679w |
| SP | Survey | USFS-Manti/La Sal | R. Mathlies | Pauon Trailhead Development | U-96-FS-01628 |
| SP | Survey | USFS.Manti/La Sal | B. Buackshear | Willow Creek Gravel Pit | U-96-FS-0267t |
| SP | Survey | USFS-Manti/La Sal | B. Blackshear | Wales Fence Reconstruction Projeci | U-96.FS-0415f |
| SP | Survey | USFS-Manti/La Sal | B. Blackstiear | Ephraim Canyon Road Closures | U.96-FS-06574 |
| SPISV | Survey | USFS-Mantila Sal | S. McDonald | 1995 Annual Report for Sounh Mami Tinber Sale | U-96-FS 01688 |
| SV | Survey | AERC | R. Hauck/G, Hadden | Miniug Subsidence Zonc in Box Canyon | U-96-AF-0443r |
| SV | Survey | AERC | R. Hauck | Two Drill Locations in the Big Ridge Locality | U-96-AF-0549r |
| sy | Survey | Intersearch | B. Frank | Koosthirem-Kumz Land Survey | U-96-IG-0285i |
| SV | Survey | NPS-MWAC | K. Cannon | Evaluation of 42Sv2298 | U-96-NA-0413i |
| SV | Survey | Sence-Phenix | J. Senulis | Clear Creek Canyon Forty Acre Trust Lands Block | U-96-SC-04535 |
| SV | Survey | UDOT | S, Miller | UDOT Stockpile for the SR-50/SR-260 Junction | U-96-UT-0465b, s |
| SV | Survey | USFS-Fishlake | R. Leonard | The Gooseberry Chaining | U-96-FS-0266t |
| SV | Sutvey | USFS-Fishlake | T. Cartwright | Rock Springs Dixie Harrow | U-96-FS-03571 |
| sV | Survey | USFS-Fishlake | R. Leonard | Bell Rock Ridge Harrow | U-96-FS-04291 |
| SV | Survey | USFS-Fishlake | R. Leonard | Buffato Skull from Coal Mine Creek | U.96-FS-0525f |
| sV | Survey | USFS-Fishlake | R. Leonard | Sevier Creek Harrow Burn | U-96-FS-0727f |
| sV | Survey | USFS-Fishlake | R. Leonard | Salina Creek Dixie Hartow | U-96-FS-07298 |
| TO | Survey | Baseline | J. Allison | Access Road Alt. No, 4 near the Grassy Mountain Facility | U-96-BS-00016 |
| TO | Survey | BLM-Salt Lake | M. Brewster | Leppy Peak Material Pii Expansion | U-96-BL-0017b |
| то | Survey | BLM-Salt Lake | M. Brewster | National Guard Forward Aming and Refueling Point | U-96-8L-0018b |
| To | Survey | BLM-Satt Lake | M. Brewster | Cedar Mountain Widdife Guzders | U-96-BL-0020b |
| T0 | Survey | BLM-Saft Lake | D. Melton | Hidden Treasure If Drill Holes | U-96-BL-0145b |
| то | Survey | BLM-Salt Lake | D. Melton | BHP West Dip Project | U-96-8L-0146b |
| TO | Survey | BLM-Satt Lake | D. Melton | Twelve Mile Fence | U-96-BL-0147b |
| T0 | Survey | BLM-Salt Lake | D. Melton | Mercur West Dip Project | U-96-8L-0175b,p |
| то | Survey | BLM-Salt Lake | D. Meton | Dump Closures | U-96-HL-0183b |
| то | Survey | BLM-Salt Lake | D. Meton | Deep Creek Test Wells | U-96-BL-0184b |
| то | Survey | BLM-Salt Lake | D. Melton | FARP | U-96-BL-0185b |

ANTIQUITIES SECTION, UTAH DIVISION OF STATE HISTORY

| County | Activily | Organization | Field Supervisor | Project Name | Project Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TO | Survey | BLM-Sall Lake | R. Macpherson | Stunsbury island Survey | U-96-8L-0382b |
| то | Survey | BLM-Sall Lake | D. Metorn | Lower Sumshine Drill Hole | 0.96-BL-03926 |
| то | Survey | BL.M-Salt Lake | D. Melton | Watson Wild Horse Trap | U-96-BL-04006 |
| T0 | Survey | BLM-Salt Like | D. Melton | Dugway Mountains Driltiotes | U-96-BL-04316;p |
| T0 | Survey | BL.M.Salt Lake | D. Metion | BHP Tetzlaff Peak Project | U-96-BL-0442h |
| T0 | Survey | BL.M-Salt Lake | D. Melton | Silverado Canyon Drill Holes | U-96-BL-051 16 |
| To | Survey | BL.M-Salt Lake | D. Methon | Sheep Rock EFR | U-96-BL-05126 |
| T0 | Suryey | BLM-Salt Lake | D. Melton | The Timm Exchange | U. 96 -BL -05236 |
| To | Survey | BLM-Sah Lake | D. Metion | Davis Knoils EFR | U.96-BL-0640b |
| то | Survey | Dames \& Moore | E. Basseti | Dugway/Wig Mountain Survey | U-96-DH-0045m |
| T0 | Survey | Desert West | K. Carumbelas | Low Commumication Towers | U.96-WZ.0576b |
| T0 | Survey | Dugway PG | K. Callister | Fiberoptic Line from Wig Launch Site to CALCM Area | U-90-DU-0125m |
| T0 | Survey | Dugway PG | K. Callister | Proposed Firing Points Wesi of Granite Peak | U.96-DU-0170m |
| T0 | Survey | Dugway PG | K. Callister | Site Recordation at Black Point | U.96-Du-0194m |
| то | Survey | Dugway PG | K. Callister | Air Combat Comm Mini-Mutes Site Nos. 9, 4 \& \& | U-96-DU-0393m |
| то | Survey | Dugway PG | K. Callister | 1996 North Little Davis Mourtain Burn | U-96-DU-0622m |
| T0 | Excavation | Dugway PG | D. Madsen | Excavation at Camel's Back Cave, 42 To392 | U-96-DU-0737m(e) |
| то | Survey | Hill AFB | D. Weder | WSEP Piber Optic Line | U.96-HL-0123m |
| то | Survey | Hill AFB | D. Weder | JDAM Target | U-96-HL-0303m |
| ro | Survey | Hill AFB | D. Weder | Three GPS Jammers | U.96-HL-0440m |
| то | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Touele Army Depot 96 | U-96-5s-0395m |
| то | Survey | USFS-Uinta | M. Depietro | Larry's BLM/FS Pipeline and Trough | U-96-FS-02596, f |
| то | Survey | USFS-Uinta | M. Depietro | Litfe Valley Pipeline Extension and Riparian Exclosure | 15-96-FS-0260f |
| то | Survey | USFS-Uinta | C. Thompson | Dog Hollow Homestrad | U-96-FS-0319 |
| то | Survey | Weber State University | B. Arkush | Utah Test and Training Range 1996 | U-96-WC-0506m |
| roinv | Damage Assess | Weber State University | B. Arkush | Vandalism Assessment for Four Sites on the UTTR | U-96-WC-0138m |
| roinv | Test | Weber State University | B. Arkush | Test Excavation of Thuee Prebistoric Sites on the UTTR | U-96-WC-0734m |
| UN | Survey | AERC | R. Hauck | Gas Pipeline in the Evacuation Creek Locality | U-96-AF-0142b |
| UN | Survey | AERC | R. Hauck | Bonow Ares on Indian Bench | U-96-AF-0210p |
| UN | Survey | AERC | R. Hauck | Two Well Locations - Asphat Wash/Atchees Waht | U-96-AF-0236b |
| UN | Survey | AERC | R. Hauck | Federal Unit No. 17-6 in the Atchee Wash Locality | U-96-AF-0256b |

ANTIQUITIES SECTION, UTAH DIVISION OF STATE HISTORY

| County | Activity | Organization | Field Supervisor | Project Name | Project Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UN | Survey | AERC | R. Hauck/G. Hadden | Rockhouse Units 17 and 18 in the Saddletree Draw Locality | U-96-AF-0300b |
| UN | Survey | AERC | R. Hauck | Two Monument Federal Wells in the Eightmile Flat Locality | U-96-AF-0364b |
| UN | Survey | AERC | R. Hauck | Five Monumen Federal Wells in the Pariette Bench Locality | U-96-AF-0397b |
| UN | Survey | AERC | R. Hauck | Gravel Pit in the Buckskin Hills | U-96-AP-0412s |
| UN | Survey | AERC | R. Hauck | Three Wells in the Eightmite Flat-Pariette Draw Locality | U-96-AF-0444b |
| UN | Survey | AERC | R. Hauck | Nine Wells, Access and Pipelines in the White River Locillity | U-96-AF-0557 |
| UN | Survey | AERC | R. Hauck | Wells and Pipelines in the White River Locality | U.96-AF-0701i |
| UN | Survey | AlA | J. Truesdale | Del Rio Pipeline | U.96-AY-0649 |
| UN | Survey | BIA | N. Crozier | UOIR Consolidated 10 | U-96-81-07075 |
| UN | Survey | BIA | N. Crozier | UOIR Consolidated 20 | U-96-81-0708i |
| UN | Survey | BLM-Vernal | B. Phillips | Wild Rose Water Flood | U-96-8L-0158b |
| UN | Survey | BLM-Vernal | B. Phillips | Ulatah County Landfill Extension | U-96-8L-0197b |
| UN | Survey | BLM-Vernal | E. Moncrief | Big Erush Creek | U-96-8L-0247b |
| UN | Survey | BLM-Vernal | R. Fowler | Davis Canyon Corral | U-96-8L-0348b |
| UN | Survey | BLM-Vernal | B. Phillips | Barry Gale Sand Test Pits | U.96-BL 03496 |
| UN | Sutvey | BLM-Vernal | L. Moncrief | Gate Canyon Building Stone EA | U-96-BL-0464b |
| UN | Survey | BLM-Vernal | B. Phillips | Cheyron U,S.A. Red Wash Unit No. 261 | U-96-BL-0598b |
| UN | Survey | BYU-OPA | R. Talbot | Steinaker Plase 2 | U-96-BC-0580w |
| UN | Survey | Dames \& Moore | E. Bassett | Domestic Sewage Disposal Facility at Ft . Duchesne | U-96-DH-0579i |
| UN | Survey | GRI | C. Conner | No. 1 State Well and Retated Access | U.96-GB-0368s |
| UN | Survey | JBR | S. Billat | James Allen Power Line near Steitaker Reservoir | U.96-JB-0439b, p,w |
| UN | Survey | Metcalf | K. Pool | Water Injection Line Between Ute Wells 15-1 and 21-3B | U.96-MM-0019 |
| UN | Survey | Metcalf | D. Barclay | Chandler Glen Bench 8-19 Access and Pipeline | U-96-MM-0073b, 1 |
| UN | Survey | Metcalf | D. Barclay | Ute Tribal 22-4-1 Access Road | U-96-MM-0086i |
| UN | Survey | Metcalf | D. Barclay | Chandler Baser Wash Federal Well 10-18-7-22 | U-96-MM-0104b |
| UN | Survey | Metcalf | D. Barclay | Chandler Sage Grouse Federal Well 6-14-8-22 | U-96.MM-0105b |
| UN | Survey | Metcalf | D. Barclay | Chandler Larson Federal Well 12-3-8-23 | U-96-MM-0106b |
| UN | Survey | Metcalf | D. Barclay | Chandler Toll Station State 8-36-8-21 | 1-96-MM-0122b |
| UN | Survey | Metcalf | D. Barclay | Gerrity Oil and Gas Antelope Federal Well $20-3$ | U-96-MM-0150b |
| UN | Survey | Metcalf | J. Scott | Glen Bench 15-19-8-22 Well | U-96-MM-0193i |
| UN | Survey | Metcalf | J. Scott | Del-Rio Resources Orion 32-1A Project | U-96-MM-0194i |

ANTIQUITIES SECTION, UTAH DIVISION OF STATE HISTORY

| County | Activity | Organization | Field Supervisor | Project Name | Project Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UN | Survey | Metcalf | J, Scort | Chandler Gien Bench Unit 5-30-8-22 | (1-96-MM.0200 |
| UN | Survey | Metcalf | 1. Scott | Coastal Compressor Siue No, 3 | U.96-MM-0350b |
| UN | Survey | Metcaif | , Scott | Coastal Cotupressor Sites in Section 17, T95, R21E | U-96-MM-03511 |
| UN | Survey | Meicaif | ). Scoll | Coastal Compressor Site No. 5 | U.96-MM. 0352 b |
| UN | Survey | Meicall | M. Metcalf | Enserch Exploration 44-181 und 34,181 | U.96-MM-0387b |
| UN | Survey | Metealf | D. Barclay | Snyder Leland Bench Gathering System | U-96-MM-0469i |
| UN | Survey | Metcalf | C Graham | Chander Pipeline from Sage Grouse Federal Well 6-14-8-22 | U-96-MM-05396,s |
| UN | Survey | Metcalf | C. Graham | Chander Purdy Prospects 3-35-7-21 and 6-34-7-21 | U-96-MM-0545b |
| UN | Survey | Meicalf | C. Graliam | Chundter Tribal 4-30 Tie-In Pipeline | U-96-MM-0548) |
| UN | Survey | Meicalf | J. Scott | NBUU No. 4 to F8 $10^{*}$ Pipeline and CIGE 4* Gathering Line | U-96-MM-0571 |
| UN | Survey | Mectalf | J. Scott | CIGE 28 to CIGE 133 Pipeline | U-96-MM-0572s |
| UN | Survey | Metcalf | C. Spath | Snyder's Stirrup State No. 32-6 Well and Access | U-96-MM-0602s |
| UN | Survey | Metcaif | K. Pool/3. Scoti | Chandler Purdy Federal Well 6-34-7-21 | U.96-MM-0642b |
| UN | Survey | Metcalf | D. Barclay | Coastal NBU 236, 237.Alt. 1 and 238-Alf. I Wells | U-96-MM-0643b |
| UN | Survey | Meccalf | D. Barclay | Coastal NBU 239, 240 mud 242 Wells | U-96-MM-0644b |
| UN | Survey | Metcalf | J. Scott | Coastal NBU 243,244 and 245 Wells | U-96-MM-0645b |
| UN | Survey | Metcalf | K. Pool//. Scott | Coastal NBU 246, 247 and 249 Welh | U-96-MM-0646b,s |
| UN | Survey | Metcalf | D. Barchay | Coastal CIGE 189, 190 and 195 Wells | U-96-MM-0647s |
| UN | Survey | Metcalf | Barchay/Psol/Scout | Coastal CIGE 193, 194 and 196 Wells | U-96-MM-0648b |
| UN | Survey | Metcalf | Barclay/Scot/Pool | Coastal CIGE 197, 198, 199, 200, 201 and 202 Welis | U-96-MM-06521 |
| UN | Survey | Metcalf | D. Barchay | Coastal NBU 252, 254, 255 and 256 Wells and Access | U-96-MM-0653i |
| UN | Survey | Metcalf | D. Barchay/J. Scott | Coastal CIGE 204 and 205 Wells | U-96-M M-0654s |
| UN | Survey | Mercalf | D. Barclay/1. Scott | Coastal NBU 257,258, 259, 263 and 265 Wells | U-96-MM-0655s |
| UN | Survey | Metcalf | D. Barclay | Coastal NBU 206, 260, 262 and 264 Wells | U-96-MM-0656b |
| UN | Survey | Metcalf | D. Barclay | Eight Coastal Morgan State Wells: 6 through 13-36 | U-96-MM-0680s |
| UN | Survey | Metcalf | M. Metcalf | JPS AeroConsultanss Vernaf-Uinuh County Aiport | U-96-MM-0692b,s |
| UN | Survey | Metcalf | D. Barclay | Flying I Oil and Gas Gusher No. 12-24 Well | U-96-MM-0710b |
| UN | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Wild Rose Well 13-28 | U-96-SJ-0120h |
| UN | Monitor | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Monitor for Wild Rose Well 12-24 | U-96-SJ-0121b |
| UN | Survey | Sagebrush | M. Polk | Five Wells and Associated Access Roads and Pipelines | U-96-SJ-0228b |
| UN | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Flu Knolls Federal Well No. 23-3 and Access Road | U-96-Sj-0379b, |

ANTYQUITIES SECTION, UTAH DIVISION OF STATE HISTORY

| County | Aclivity | Organization | Field Supervisor |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UN | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Tar Sands Federal Welis 6-33 and 12-33, Pipelines and Roads | U-96-SJ-0659b |
| UN | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Inland Pipeline beiween Wells 1-25 and 9-25 | U.96-S5-0661b |
| UN | Survey | Senco-Pluenix | J. Senulis | Flowlinc in the Red Wash Oil and Gas Field | U-96-SC-01906 |
| UN | Survey | Senco-Plienix | J. Senulis | Breunan Basin Oil and Gas Field Expansion-USF\&W Lands | U-96-SC-0331w |
| UN | Survey | Senco-Phenix | J. Senulis | Breunan Basin Oill and Gas Field Expansion Phase 1-Part 2 | U-96-SC-0332b |
| UN | Survey | Senco-Phenix | J. Senulis | Leland Bench Seismic | U-96-sc-0454i,p |
| UN | Survey | Senco-Phenix | J. Senulis | Chevron Real Wash Utmts 250 and 260 and Accesy | U-96-SC.055 in |
| UN | Survey | Senco-Plenix | J. Senulis | Chevrou Red Wash Unit 207 Well Pad | U-96-SC-0552b |
| UN | Survey | Senco-Phenix | J. Senulis | Powerline for Red Wash 43/173/259/260/261/303 Wells | U-96-SC-0663b,s |
| UN | Survey | USFS-Astrey | K. Wikins | East Park Satvage Siles | U-96-F5-0229t |
| UN | Survey | USFS-Ashliey | B. Loosle | Key Scuires Pipeline for NRCS | U-96-FS-0230p |
| UN | Survey | USFS-Ashley | D. Wilson | Gravel Pit Salvage Sales | U-96-FS-0239f |
| UN | Survey | USFS-Asthey | K. Malmstrom | South Charleys Park Timber Sale | U-96-FS-02778 |
| UN | Survey | USFS-Ashley | K. Malmstrom | Dodds Hollow | U-96-FS-0279\% |
| UN | Survey | USFS-Ashley | K. Malmstrom | Pboneliae Pipeline | U-96-FS-0280\% |
| UN | Survey | USFS-Ashley | K. Malmstrom | Range Study Restrooms | U-96-FS-0286\% |
| UN | Survey | USFS-Ashley | K. Malmstrom | North and South Fork Road Improvement | 0-96-Fs-02888 |
| UN | Survey | USFS-Asibley | K. Malmstrom | Frenches/Alma Taylor Sales | U-96-FS-0289\% |
| UN | Survey | USFS-Asbley | K. Malmstrom | Dry Fork Flume | U-96-FS.0361 |
| UN | Survey | USFS-Ashley | K. Malmstrom | Big Lake Buri | U.96-FS-0420\% |
| UN | Survey | USFS-Ashley | B. Loosle | High Uinas Lightning Park PIT Survey | 0.96-FS-0430 |
| UT | Survey | Baseline | A. Nielson | Central Telephone - Slicep Creek to Thistle | 0-96-BS-0282b,p |
| UT | Survey | Baseline | J. Allison | Central Telephone - Clear Creek to Sheep Creek | 11-96-8S-03215 |
| UT | Survey | Baseline | A. Nielson | Five Historic Bridges and Surroundiag Ateas | U.96-BS-0333p,s |
| UT | Survey | Bascline | A. Nielson | Inventory of Mapletion Lateral | U-96-8S-0696w |
| UT | Survey | BLM-Salt Take | D. Melton | Clay Canyon Drill Holes | U.96-8L-0205 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| UT | Survey | BLM-Salt Lake | D. Mellon | Wiley Commumity Pit | 4.96-8L-0206b |
| UT | Survey | BL.M- Salt Lake | D. Melton | Clay Caryon 11 Drill Holes | U-96-81-0510b |
| UT | Survey | BYU-Museum | S. Baker | Murdock Canal Bridge Survey | U-96-BC-069 [ w |
| UT | Survey | BYU-OPA | S. Baker | Mapleton Casal Bridge Survey | O-96-BC-0195w |
| UT | Survey | BYU-OPA | R. Talbot | CUP Diamond Fork Pipeline for BOR | U-96-8C-020\% |

ANTIQUITIES SECTION, UTAH DIVISION OF STATE HISTORY 1996 PROJECT NUMBERS ASSIGNED

| County | Activity | Organization | Field Supervisor | Project Name | Project Nunber |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UT | Survey | Moutgomery | J. Montgomery | Hobble Creek Road in Springville | U-96-MQ-0433p,5 |
| UT | Suryey | UDOT | S. Miller | UDOT White River Bridge Replacement Addendum | U-96-UT-0262p, ${ }^{2}$ |
| UT | Survey | UDOT | R. Soper | UDOT Two Aridges in Spanish Forl Canyon | U-96-UT-0457s |
| UT | Survey | USFS-Manti/La Sal | B. Blackshear | Yellow Brush/Water Hollow Water Development Project | 1 0.96 -FS-0722f |
| UT | Survey | USFS-Uinta | S. Nelson | American Fork Parkway Trail | U-96-FS-0265f,0 |
| UT | Survey | USFS-Uinis | C. Thompson | Lone Peak Wilderness Mine Survey | U-96-FS-0296r |
| UT | Survey | USFS-Uinta | C. Thoupson | Camyor Rock | U-96-FS-0316\% |
| UT | Survey | USFS-Uinia | C. Thompson | Saptap̧uin Mines | L-96-FS-03170 |
| UT | Survey | USFS-Uinta | S. Neisom | Guy Wall Mine | U.96-FS-0318p |
| UT | Survey | USFS-Uinta | S. Nelsou | Camp Diamond Tesi Hole Wells | U-96-FS-0600f |
| UT | Survey | USFS-Uinta | 5. Nelsori | Pleasant Grove RD-Timpanogos Cave Exchange | U-96-FS-0616b |
| UT | Survey | USFS-Uinta | S. Nelson | North Fork Prescribed Burn | U-96-FS-0617 |
| UT | Survey | USFS-Uinta | S. Nelson | Forest Lake Survey | U-96-FS-06181 |
| WA | Survey | Dumes \& Moore | E. BassetI | Ridgetop Abandoned Mines | U-96-DH-0051f.p |
| WB | Survey | Sagebrush | M. Polk | UDOT 5600 South Ituersection in Roy | U-96-SJ-0416p |
| WB | Survey | Sagebrush | M. Polk | UDOT 6000 Soulh Detour in Ray | 11-96-S1-0417p |
| WB | Survey | Sagebrush | H. Weymouth | Defense Depot in Ogden | U-96-sj-0621m |
| WB | Survey | Sagebrush | M. Polk | 30th/31st Streets in Ogden (UDOT) | U-96-SJ-0724p,s |
| WB | Survey | USFS-Wasatch/Cache | T. Scont | Skyline Section of the Mount Ogden Trail | U-96-FS-0667f |
| WN | Survey | BL.M-Richfield | C. Hamon | Ken Garrett ROW | U-96-BL-0027) |
| WN | Survey | BLM-Richfield | C. Harmon | Wayne County Water Conservancy District Drilling | U-96-BL-0068t |
| WN | Survey | BL-M-Richfield | C. Harmon | Capitol Reef Riprap | U.96-BL-0091b |
| WN | Survey | BI.M-Richfield | C. Harmón | Torrey Drit Fence | U-96-BL-0714b |
| WN | Survey | BLM-Richfield | C. Hammon | Gruver Irrigation Amendmea! | U-96-BL-0715b |
| WN | Survey | CASA | M. Erickson | Rangeland Teasdale No. I Well | U-96-CH-0515b, 5 |
| WN | Survey | CASA | N. Hammack | Rangeland Pipeline | U.96-CH-0574b,p |
| WN | Survey | NPS-Captiol Reef | L. Kreutzer | Compurer Network Trench | U-96-NA-0042n |
| WN | Survey | NPS-Capitol Reef | L. Kreutzer | Renovation of the Cathedral Mine Cabin | U-96-NA- 0043 n |
| WN | Survey | NPS-Capitol Reef | L. Kreurzer | Upper South Desert Overlook Road Closure | U-96-NA-0049n |
| WN | Survey | NPS.Capitol Reef | L. Kreutzer | Scenic Drive Rehab | U-96-NA-0064n |
| WN | Survey | NPS.Capitol Reef | L. Kreutzer | Ackdand Springs and Archacological Site Fencing | U.96-NA-0159n |

ANTIQUITIES SECTION, UTAH DIVISION OF STATE HISTORY

| County | Activity | Orgauization | Field Supervisor | Project Name | Projeca Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WN | Survey | NPS-Capitol Reef | L. Kreutzer | Pleasam Creek Road to Sleeping Raintow Ranch | 1-96-NA.0699\% |
| WN | Damage Asses | NPS-Capitot Reef | N. Coulam | Looting Damage at 42WN2014 in Capitol Reef National Park | U-96-NA-0740n |
| WN | Survey | SWCA | K. Quick | Scuta Fibet Optic Line from toa to Bickneil | U-96-ST-0340b,s |
| WS | Excavation | Baseline | J. Allison/A. Nielson | Excavation at Site 42Ws3105 | U-96-BS-0060s(e) |
| ws | Survey | Baseline | A. Nielson | Washington City Water Pipeline | U-96-BS-0115p, |
| ws | Excavation | Baseline | J. Allison/A. Nielson | Excavation at Sites 42 W s2722 and 2743 | U-96-BS-0176p,s(e) |
| ws | Survey | Baseline | A. Nielson | UDOT SR-59 Apple Valley Egress | U-96-BS-0203p,s |
| ws | Survey | Baseline | A. Nielson | UDOT Kephart SR-9 Egress near Rockville | U-96-BS-0220p.s |
| WS | Survey | Baseline | J. Allison | UDOT SR-9 Noruh Side Egress West of Rockvilfe | U-96-BS-0320s |
| WS | Survey | Baseline | J. Allison | US West Fiberoptic Reroute along SR-59 | U-96-BS-0323s |
| WS | Survey | Baseline | A. Nielson | SR-9 Egress in Springtaia (UDOT) | U-96-BS-0658p,s |
| WS | Survey | BLM-Cedar City | G. Daliey | Roger": Rock Sale | U-96-BL-0664b |
| WS | Survey | BYU-OPA | R. Talbot | WCWCiP Andersor Junction Waterline | U-96-8C-0370 |
| WS | Survey | BYU-OPA | 1. Richens | Washington County LaVerkin Water Linc | U-96-BC-0472b,s |
| WS | Survey | BYU OPA | R. Talbot | Hartisburg/Quill Creek Land Acquisition | U-96-BC-0705b |
| WS | Excavation | DRI-Las Vegas | L. Perry/D. Valentine | Excavations at 42Wsil46 and 1148, White House Rums | U-96-DA-0187p(e) |
| WS | Survey | Intersearch | B. Frank | Alpha Engineeriog Dixie Dive Extension | U-96-1G-0037s |
| WS | Survey | Intersearch | B. Frank | Ross-Veyo Access Road | U-96-IG-0107b |
| WS | Survey | Intersearch | B. Frank | Ross-Staheli Pipeline Easement | U-96-IG-0177b |
| Ws | Survey | Intersearch | B. Frank | Welch-Veyo BLM Easement | U-96-IG-0344b |
| Ws | Survey | Intersearch | B. Frank | Ross-Washington Fields Powerine | U-96-IG-0675b |
| Ws | Survey | J8R | L. Billat | UPEL, Middeton Powerline Realiggment | U.96-JB-0016b |
| Ws | Survey | J8R | S. Billat | Dammeron - Sand Cove 69/34.5 KV Line near Veyo | U-96-JK-0202b |
| WS | Survey | Knight \& Leavitt | R. Leavitt | Two Parcels near Bloomington Hills for Trust Lands | U-96-KG-0581s |
| ws | Survey | NPS-Zion | B. Frank | Fenceline Survey South of Paradise Canyon Ranch | U-96-NA-0191n |
| ws | Survey | Senco-Pbenix | J. Senutis | Hurricane Block (NE/NW $1 / 4$ of Section 14 in T42S, R14W) | $\mathrm{U}-96-\mathrm{SC}-00065$ |
| ws | Excavation | Southern Utah University | B. Frank | 1996 SUU Field School Excavations at 42 W 53119 | U-96-SE-0736b(e) |
| ws | Survey | swed | K. Quick | Mt. Fuel Pipeline, St. George to Central | U-96-ST-0624b,p,s |
| Ws | Survey | UDOT | S. Miller | UDOT SR-18 MP 26 to 28 | U-96-UT-0173f,s |
| WS | Survey | UDOT | S. Miller | UDOT SR IS MP 29 to 30 Maintenance | U-96-UT-0497f,s |
| ws | Survey | USFS-Dixic | M. Jacklin | Pinto Road Reroute | U-96-FS-0459f |


| ANTIQUITIES SECTION, UTAH DIVISION OF STATE HISTORY 1996 PROJECT NUMBERS ASSIGNED |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| County | Activity | Organization | Field Supervisor | Project Name | Project Number |
| WS | Surycy | USFS-Dixie | M. Jacklin | Pine Valley Dump Station | U-96-FS-04601 |
| WS | Survey | USFS-Dixie | M. Jacklin | Commanche Springs Cabins | U-96-FS-0586f |
| WS | Survey | USFS-Dixie | M. Jacklin | Browse Guard Station Restoration | U-96-FS-0605f |
| WS | Survey | Utah Trust Lands | K. Wintch | Sunset Itills and Santia Clara Parcels | U-96-UM-0731s |
| WS | Survey | Utah Trust Lands | K. Wintch | Lower Atkinville Wash Parcel | U-96-UM-0732s |
| WS | Survey | Utah Trust Lands | K. Wintch | Red Hawk Parcel | U-96-UM-0733s |
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