APPENDIX J

ARCHAEOLOGICAL CLEARANCE
ARC AEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF THE MARANA REGIONAL LANDFILL PROJECT NEAR MARANA, PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA

Submitted to:

DKL Holdings, Inc.
1222 E Coconino Drive
Chandler, AZ 85249

Submitted by

Professional Archaeological Services of Tucson
5036 Golder Ranch Rd.
Tucson, AZ 85739-4265

Prepared by

David V.M. Stephen Ph.D.
Principal Investigator
State Antiquities Permit No. 2009-57bl

P.A.S.T. Cultural Resources Report No. 091955

10/30/2009
REPORT TITLE: Archaeological Survey Of The Marana Regional Landfill Project
Near Marana, Pima County, Arizona

REPORT DATE: 10/30/2009

INSTITUTION/CONSULTANT: Professional Archaeological Services of Tucson (PAST)
with David V. M. Stephen, Ph.D. as principal investigator

AGENCY/LAND OWNERSHIP: Private

PERMIT NUMBER: ASM 2009-57bl

PROJECT TITLE: Marana Regional Landfill Archaeological Survey, PAST No. 091955

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Systematic survey to determine the extent of cultural resources on lands that had either not undergone a complete, intensive archaeological survey or sufficient time had passed since an earlier study suggesting cultural resources may now be exposed that would not have been documented by the initial field work

PROJECT LOCATION: Except NW4 of NW4 study area is within Section 1 T12S 10E G & SRB & M near Marana, AZ

DATES OF FIELDWORK/PERSON-DAYS EXPENDED: 13 person-field days
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**SUMMARY.** An on-foot cultural resources survey of private property (591 acres) near Marana in Pima county relocated cultural resource AZ AA:11:28(ASM) and 131 isolated artifacts. The quantity of artifacts within the study area and data about known sites in the study area and on adjacent lands suggests important cultural resources may be impacted by the proposed undertaking unless they can be avoided. The information potential of the cultural resources encountered has not been exhausted through activities completed in association with this study. Based on the fieldwork and archival documentation, further cultural resource studies may be warranted on the property.

### INTRODUCTION

**Archaeological Survey Of The Marana Regional Landfill Project**

Near Marana, Pima County, AZ  

**Agency Name:**  

**ASM Permit No.:** 2009-57bl  

**Project Description:** The land is slated for commercial development.  

**Agency Reference:** DKL Holdings, Inc.

### PROJECT LOCATION INFORMATION (see also attached copy of USGS map)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AZ QUAD</th>
<th>USGS MAP NAME</th>
<th>MAP SCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA:11 NE</td>
<td>West of Marana</td>
<td>7.5’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SURVEY INFORMATION

- **Type:** Non-collection on-foot survey with systematic 20m transects or equal  
- **Person-days:** 13  
- **591 acres AND/OR 0 miles long BY 0 foot wide right-of-way**  
- **Percent surveyed:** 100%  
- **Land Ownership:** Private  
- **Field Crew:** D. Stephen, J. Stephen & M. Stephen  
- **Project Director:** David Stephen  
- **Field Work Dates:** September 14 - October 18, 2009  
- **Ground visibility was effected minimally**  
- **Additional Survey Records Submitted:** None  
- **Artifact Collections Submitted to ASM:** None

### CULTURAL RESOURCES WITHIN PROJECT AREA (see report narrative for additional information)

- **Archives Researched:** ASM/AZSITE  
- **Numbers of eligible sites:** AZAA:11:28(ASM)  
- **Previously recorded sites:** AZAA:11:28(ASM)  
- **Artifact scatters:** NONE  
- **Sites within 150 meters:** NONE  
- **Ref. No. of Prior Surveys:** 1983-153.asm covered about 10 acres in NEC of parcel, 4 other linear surveys (2001-582, 2000-621, 185-167 & 1983-153, all ASM) are located within 400 meters of the parcel on State Trust Lands

### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER WORK (see also comments below)

- **FURTHER WORK RECOMMENDED:** None  
- **MUNICIPALITY/AGENCY CONSULTATION**  
- **SITE RECORDING**  
- **MONITORING**  
- **SUB-SURFACE TESTING**  
- **DATA RECOVERY**

### COMMENTS (see report narrative additional information)

The quantity of artifacts within the study area and data about known sites suggests the undertaking will impact cultural resources. Based on the fieldwork and archival documentation, unless the cultural resources can be avoided completely, further cultural resource studies should be undertaken on the subject property prior to the start of ground disturbing activities. These would involve the development of an appropriate treatment plan for the resource that includes a suitable scope of work and research design approved by the appropriate agency official.
Archaeological Survey Of The
Marana Regional LandfillProject
Near Marana, Pima County, Arizona
PAST No. 091955

Introduction.
Personnel from P.A.S.T. conducted a 13 person-day, survey of the Marana Regional Landfill project between September 14 and October 18, 2009, located in Pima County near Marana in anticipation of commercial development. The purpose of the project was to determine whether any significant cultural resources that might be adversely impacted by construction were present. The project sponsor (DKL Holdings, Inc.) initiated this study in accordance with municipal requirements. P.A.S.T. holds permit 2009-57bl issued under the Arizona Antiquities Act through the Arizona State Museum.

Project Location and Ownership.
The approximately 591-acre project area is located in the western portion of the Tucson Basin (Figure 1). The project area is located on the West of Marana United States Geological Survey 7.5' map. The location with respect to the Public Land Survey is within the Except NW4 of NW4 of Section 1 T12S R10E G&SRB&M. The UTM values for selected boundary points are shown on the map to provide the dimensions of the parcel. The boundary shown on the map is reasonably accurate given the limitations of a 1:24,000 scale map. It is based on data and maps provided by the client as well as field observations but it is not intended to represent the precise legal extent of the parcel. Unless otherwise noted, land ownership coincides with the parcel and survey boundary shown in Figure 1. The fieldwork was conducted on private lands.

Maps Included In Report
Figure 1 is a copy of a portion of the U.S.G.S. West of Marana 7.5-minute topographic map that shows the project boundaries, archaeological sites within the project area, and all isolated artifacts and features found during the survey. Projects extending across multiple maps are so noted on page ii and in the lower left of Figure 1. Figure 2 are 3 are maps of archaeological site AZAA:11:28(ASM).

BACKGROUND TO STUDY AREA:
Effective Environment.
The study area is within the Basin and Range physiographic province at an approximate elevation of 1,971 feet. Project area vegetation is typical of the Arizona Upland subdivision of the Sonoran Desertscrub biotic province (Turner and Brown 1982) predominantly comprised of mesquite with exotic annual grasses also present and desert broom in some areas. Because most of the study area, except about 15 acres in the northeast corner, is retired farm fields native vegetation is sparse.
NOTE: Due to the sensitivity of site locations, only sites within the project area are depicted on the map. Site locations as well as their geometric representation and extent are approximate. + = isolate
Records Review.
A review of the records of the Arizona State Museum (ASM), in anticipation of the survey revealed that the subject parcel had not undergone a complete archaeological survey or sufficient time has passed since an earlier study suggesting heretofore undiscovered cultural resources may have been subsequently exposed that would not have been documented by the initial field work. The ASM records, as well as the other archives indicated on the associated project form, revealed recorded cultural resources [AZAA:11:28(ASM)] on the inspected parcel record by Richard Lange (1983). GLO surveyor’s maps (Thorn 1922) showed the Silver Bell to Tucson road for T12S 10E G&SRB&M in the vicinity of Section 1 but not within the study area. Previously recorded cultural resources within a 150-meter perimeter around the project boundary are noted since such resources could be impacted by the project and may account for the presence of isolated non-site cultural entities found on the parcel. Recorded cultural resources within a 1.6-kilometer radius of the center of the project area are listed in Table A-2 and on the project summary form.

Culture History.
The antiquity laws apply to human cultural remains in excess of 50 years of age and require them to be assessed as to their potential for yielding important information. Consequently, sites and artifacts dating from the mid twentieth century and earlier must be evaluated. The historical period that commenced in roughly 1700 is comprised of the Spanish, Mexican and Anglo occupations with some researchers recognizing the protohistoric as a transitional culture from the earlier prehistoric occupations. The prehistoric peoples who lived in this region include the Hohokam, Archaic and Paleoindian cultures.

The Hohokam (A.D. 450 - 1450). The Hohokam were a sedentary, agriculture-based people who produced both plain and decorated pottery, along with numerous other crafts of shell, stone and clay. They were skillful agriculturists who lived in houses built in shallow pits and constructed extensive irrigation canal systems. In some of the larger villages, they built ballcourts that probably served as focal points for ceremonial or recreational activities. Whether the Hohokam migrated into the region from Mexico or developed from indigenous Archaic populations is still hotly debated. The Hohokam cultural sequence was established in the 1930s based on the decorated pottery types unearthed at the Snaketown Site in the Phoenix Basin. Shortly thereafter, Isabel Kelly modified this chronology to fit the Tucson Basin sequence after her excavations at the Hodges Ruin in Tucson. Since that time, the continual acquisition of new archaeological data has brought about many refinements in the chronology.

Archaic Era (7500 B.C. - A.D. 450). The Archaic era has traditionally been characterized by assemblages of chipped stone artifacts along with ground stone tools for processing plant materials, and a lack of ceramics. Recent research in the Tucson Basin and elsewhere has demonstrated the presence of pit house villages, agriculture and some ceramics in the Late Archaic. The shift from a hunting-based economy to a reliance on plant foraging and small-game hunting that characterized the Archaic sites was caused by the extinction of Pleistocene mammals favored by the Paleoindians.

Paleo-Indian Era (ca. 10,000 - 7500 B.C.). Eleven thousand years ago, the climate in the Southwestern United States was considerably wetter and cooler than it is today, and
much of the terrain consisted of lush grasslands that supported herds of mammoth, bison and other large grazing animals. Many of the earliest occupants of the area, known as Paleoindians, were hunters who subsisted on these large, late Pleistocene mammals. The belief that many of the Paleoindians were primarily big-game hunters is supported by the fact that most of the Paleo-Indian sites that have been excavated have been kill and butchering sites. The artifact assemblages from these sites are made up of projectile points and other stone tools suitable for skinning animals and cutting meat and bone. The earliest Paleo-Indian artifacts found in southern Arizona belong to the Clovis complex (9500-9000 B.C.), which is characterized by long, lanceolate, fluted Clovis points, along with other stone implements and bone artifacts.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY:

Survey Expectations.
This project's study area was located in a portion of southern Arizona that is conducive to prehistoric and/or historical settlement. Therefore, it was considered a reasonable likelihood that prehistoric or historical sites would be found during the survey.

Arizona State Museum Site Definition Standard (ASM 1993).
The determination of what constitutes an archaeological site is, to a certain extent, a matter of professional judgment. However, if certain minimal archaeological discoveries (listed below) are encountered, then an ASM site card must be completed and submitted. In other words, if the archaeological discoveries exceed the minimum criteria listed below, a site card must be filled out. Sites that do not meet the minimum standards, but which the archaeologist deems worthy of site status, may also be assigned ASM numbers.

Most archaeologists define sites based on consideration of age of remains as well as density and diversity of artifacts and features and the spatial arrangements of these remains within the area under consideration. The following guidelines should be used to define archaeological sites:

All sites should contain:
1. physical remains of past human activity that are at least 50 years old.

Additionally, sites should consist of at least one of the following:
2. 30+ artifacts of a single class (i.e., 30 sherds, 30 lithics, 30 tin cans) within an area 15 meters (50 feet) in diameter, except when all pieces appear to originate from a single source (i.e., one ceramic pot, one core, one glass bottle).
3. 20+ artifacts which include at least 2 classes of artifact types (i.e., sherds, groundstone, nails, glass) within an area 15 meters (50 feet) in diameter,
4. one or more archaeological features in temporal association with any number of artifacts.
5. two or more temporally associated archaeological features without artifacts.

Non-linear, isolated features without associated artifacts may be recorded. An "isolated feature" is defined as a feature that does not have any other features within a 100 meter (325 feet) diameter. This might include isolated rock piles, mine shafts, prospecting pits or unidentified depressions without artifact associations.
Methods.
The fieldwork consisted of intensive on-foot coverage of the property by our staff in order to identify and locate any cultural resources, historic or prehistoric, within the study area boundaries. Field personnel (D. Stephen, J. Stephen & M. Stephen) were spaced approximately 20 meters apart and crossed the subject property in a series of contiguous corridors with any areas of extreme slope covered less intensively. Survey transects paralleled the longest dimension of the property except when prevented by the landform, vegetation density or hydrological features. Unless noted otherwise, the transect count is the quotient of the transect extent and parcel width. General conditions were excellent for conducting the fieldwork. Ground visibility was minimally affected by the presence of trees, shrubs, semi-shrubs, succulents and grasses. The original landform was severely disturbed by modern alterations to the ground surface.

Survey Results.
As indicated below, the fieldwork revealed surface indications of archaeological resources within the study area that meet the Arizona State Museum minimum standard for recording as an archaeological site and may be eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. This site has been recorded at the Arizona State Museum with the archaeological site number designated below. A brief discussion of the resource is offered below.

**AZ AA:11:28(ASM).** Site AZ AA:11:28(ASM) was located initially during a Arizona Trust Lands survey by Richard Lange of ASM in 1983 that are adjacent to the current study area. He reported that the site extends approximate 300 meters along a northwest trending axis with a width of roughly 75 meters with 2 separate loci noted (see Figure 3) at the ends of the site. In AZSITE the loci are connected into a single site boundary (see Figure 3). In general the site today corresponds to Lange’s 1983 description in which he characterized the assemblage as a “scatter of fine grained black basalt debitage, utilized flakes, and tools such as scrapers and knives”. He also noted the presence of hammerstones, cores, core fragments and quartzite flakes. The ends of the site, where the 2 loci identified by Lange are located, fall on State Trust Lands, outside of current study area, but the middle of the site straddles the northeast comer of the study area within the private land holdings. The site boundary is based on the 1983 site card and the observed dispersal of the artifacts during the current fieldwork. Because only a small portion of the site falls with the current study an updating the map of the entire site was not undertaken. No features were noted and the artifact assemblage of roughly 200 artifacts is predominately lithics (90%) but some plainware sherds were observed that were not noted in 1983. The portion of the site outside of study area on State Trust land was visited d but not resurveyed. No temporally diagnostic artifacts were noted at the site. The depth of the site was not apparent but no soil staining was observed. Lange observed that the site “appears to be shallowly buried.” The site is situated along a small ridge and into the wash flood plain to the southwest. Vegetation includes creosote, grasses and semi-shrubs on the ridge and riparian vegetation dominated by mesquite trees in the floodplain The likelihood of human remains in this type of a site is not high but the possibility cannot be ruled out. Dirt roads, barbed wire fencing and a line of utility poles impact the site. Erosion continues to deflate the surface of the site. To the southwest of the site a large earthen berm or levee is present that parallels the adjacent Los Robles Wash.
Isolates. The occurrence of isolated artifacts and non-site features below the threshold required for formal recording as a cultural resource are documented below, in Figure 1 or in Table A-1 as appropriate. These included a total of 131 isolated artifacts or non-site features. More recent cultural manifestations identified during the survey include dirt tracks, informal trails, agricultural infrastructure, perimeter wire fencing, earthen berms, irrigation ditches and occasional isolated trash. All appear to be modern in origin with the possible exception of the cement lined irrigation ditches.

Cement irrigation canals and ditches have been used in central and southern Arizona for close to a century. Many have been superimposed on earlier dirt ditches. Cement lined irrigation systems varied somewhat in their construction methods over time and between farming areas. The earliest ditches used puddled cement construction, followed by separate forming of the sides and bottom resulting in “cold” seams along the bottom. Later ditch linings were cast with a single cement pour resulting in no horizontal seams being present at the base. This slipform method was also known as a Fullerform (for which Fuller [1951] was awarded patents beginning in 1951). The slipform construction methods appear to have begun in the 1940s and carried through the late 1990s (Houser 2009) with the more recent larger cement ditch linings having flat rather than curved top edges (Beaugureu 2009). Both slipform and other methods of form construction are still being used (USDA 2007). Unfortunately, precise temporal associations based on construction methods is tenuous because as newer forming methods were devised they were not adopted simultaneously in all areas and earlier methods continued in use by individual contractors and farmers after the slipform method was introduced.

The most extensive irrigation systems are associated with irrigation districts such as the Salt River Project and locally the Cortaro-Marana Irrigation District (CMID). Canals and laterals associated with the CMID are documented by Barnes and Wright (2001) and were assigned ASM site number AZ AA:12:870. Irrigation districts played an important role in agricultural development and the canals and laterals can extends hundreds of linear miles. The irrigation features associated with the current study area are outside of the CMID and are not part of a broader interconnected system but rather were constructed to serve individual farms. As such, the smaller farms often pumped water directly from a well into a carry ditch where the water was dispersed into individual fields using irrigation ditches, resulting in a configuration that technically lacked laterals.

The irrigation features within the study area are an example of this later configuration. The construction attributes of the cement ditch linings indicate the more recent slip form method was employed. This suggests the construction of cement lining in the ditches occurred after the 1950s. The irrigation ditches shown on the 1959 USGS map indicate that the original dirt ditches may date to over 50 years ago. Current ASM practice is to treat such features as isolates and not assign site numbers to them (Karl 2009). Unlike the SRP and CMID, individual irrigation systems such as this one do not appear to be associated with important historical period construction activities such as the C.C.C. or the W.P.A. It would appear that in most cases documenting such irrigation ditches as isolated features would not cause an irretrievable loss of knowledge concerning significant events or important historical period information.
Evaluation of Cultural Resources.
Although archaeological and historical sites may qualify for formal recording under state standards, they generally are not considered significant unless they are eligible for listing in the Arizona or National Register of Historic Places. According to the current standards a property must possess sufficient integrity, significance and antiquity to be listed in the Register. In addition to being at least 50 years of age a resource must meet the criteria set forth below:

The quality of significance in American or Arizona history, architecture, archaeology, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

A) that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
B) that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
C) that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
D) that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history (National Park Service 1986)

Evaluation of Eligibility.
Site AZ AA:11:28(ASM) contains archaeological materials that could yield information important in prehistory so is significant and therefore register eligible under Criterion D listed above. None of the isolates appear to have any further information potential.

Evaluation Of Effects Of The Proposed Project.
In light of the information compiled for this study, development of the inspected parcel will have an effect on significant cultural resources unless the resource, AZ AA:11:28(ASM), can be completely avoided and an acceptable and approved long-term preservation plan implemented.

Recommendations.
Based on the archival information, field methods and the observable surface indications further archaeological studies on this parcel appear to be warranted unless archaeological site AZ AA:11:28(ASM) can be avoided completely. Effective resource avoidance would include developing and implementing an approved long-term preservation plan.

If the site cannot be avoided and assured long-term preservation, PAST recommends that a site-specific treatment plan be formulated and implemented to determine the nature and extent of the site as well as to aid in documenting the National Register eligibility status of the site. The initial phase of the treatment plan could include field and research strategies such as subsurface testing of the site, instrument mapping,
systematic collection of the artifacts, as well as their analysis, and a report synthesizing
the known information about the site and others in the vicinity.

If important sub-surface materials are unearthed while executing the treatment plan for
AZ AA:11:28(ASM), there is the strong likelihood of the site containing important
archaeological information beyond what is currently known about this resource. In that
case, additional studies for the site as outlined in the treatment plan should be
implemented prior to the start of development related ground disturbing activities.

There remains the possibility that ground disturbing activities could reveal the presence
of heretofore undiscovered cultural resources. If such materials are discovered
construction activities should stop. Consultation should be initiated with the
appropriate agency archaeologist or official, and if applicable under ARS §41-841 et
seq. the Arizona State Museum, to assess the potential significance of any materials
unearthed. Under State law (ARS 41-§865 & §41-844) if human skeletal remains or
funerary objects are discovered on either public or private lands the Arizona State
Museum should be contacted immediately.
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NOTE FOR A.D.O.T. INVOLVED PROJECTS: If previously unidentified cultural resources are encountered during activity related to the use of this source, the contractor shall stop work immediately at that location and shall take all reasonable steps to secure the preservation of those resources. The Engineer will contact the A.D.O.T. Environmental Planning Group, Historic Preservation Team at 602.712.7767 and make arrangements for the proper treatment of those resources.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE NOTICE: P.A.S.T. is a holder of an Arizona Antiquity Permit and a signatory to the “ASM Archaeological Records Use Agreement”. As such, in compliance with the associated conditions and regulations of these documents, P.A.S.T. is bound “not to distribute or disclose specific site location information in a public document or make this information available to unauthorized individuals”. P.A.S.T. reports are often initiated through third parties, who are not authorized to access this information. Consequently such information is presented herein in a manner deemed appropriate not to compromise site location or divulge potentially identifying site attribute information. P.A.S.T. reports are further structured to restrict the dissemination of such information through the removal of Appendix "A" as well as any maps of archaeological sites included in the document prior to wider distribution of the report.

P.A.S.T. will readily provide further or more specific site location, eligibility or site attribute information to a qualified individual when that person makes a request in writing or via email directly to P.A.S.T. That request must be supported with written concurrence from the agency lead archaeologist and either the SHPO, Director of the Arizona State Museum or their authorized designee(s) if the requestor does not hold a valid Arizona Antiquity Permit or has not executed the aforementioned ASM records use agreement.
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## APPENDIX A - REPORT TABLES

### Table A-1. Isolates Provenience (all UTM Zone 12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Kind</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>474,075</td>
<td>3,585,670</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>1 sherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474,038</td>
<td>3,585,598</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>2 sherds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473,957</td>
<td>3,586,138</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>1 sherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473,700</td>
<td>3,586,449</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>2 sherds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473,657</td>
<td>3,587,066</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>4 sherds,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473,321</td>
<td>3,585,936</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>1 sherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474,452</td>
<td>3,586,848</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>1 sherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474,597</td>
<td>3,586,747</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1 chert flake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474,103</td>
<td>3,586,386</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>1 sherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474,306</td>
<td>3,586,362</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1 flake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473,458</td>
<td>3,587,010</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>1 sherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473,300</td>
<td>3,586,587</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>50 or so dump of modem cans and glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473,239</td>
<td>3,586,568</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>3 sherds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473,155</td>
<td>3,586,471</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>28 sherd pot break in 7m area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473,644</td>
<td>3,586,174</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>3 sherds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473,620</td>
<td>3,586,265</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>7 sherds in 6m area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473,610</td>
<td>3,586,226</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>8 sherds in 5m area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473,579</td>
<td>3,586,291</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>1 sherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473,565</td>
<td>3,586,301</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>2 sherds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473,542</td>
<td>3,586,357</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>5 sherds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473,542</td>
<td>3,586,242</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>2 sherds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473,527</td>
<td>3,586,312</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>4 sherds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473,523</td>
<td>3,586,357</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>1 sherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473,481</td>
<td>3,586,418</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>1 sherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473,484</td>
<td>3,586,464</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>1 sherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473,301</td>
<td>3,586,383</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>6 sherds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473,141</td>
<td>3,586,239</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1 gray basalt flake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473,081</td>
<td>3,586,428</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>1 sherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474,175</td>
<td>3,586,026</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>1 sherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474,389</td>
<td>3,586,036</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>1 sherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474,583</td>
<td>3,586,058</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>1 metate fragment, 8 by 15cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474,185</td>
<td>3,586,094</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>1 sherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474,423</td>
<td>3,586,117</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>1 sherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474,471</td>
<td>3,586,098</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>1 sherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474,638</td>
<td>3,586,118</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>1 sherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474,640</td>
<td>3,586,097</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>3 sherds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASM Quad</td>
<td>Site Numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA:11</td>
<td>28, 43, 44 45 46 47 60 (all ASM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table A-3. Site Management Summary Table** (all G & SRB&M)  
(only completed when greater than 3 sites are located)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASM #</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>T/R/Section</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Content/Age</th>
<th>Eligible?</th>
<th>Additional Work Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA:11:28</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>125/10E/1</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Hohokam</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Avoid or Test followed by data recovery if needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2. ASM SITE CARD MAP SHOWING AZ AA:11:28 (ASM)

Figure 3. AZSITE MAP SHOWING LOCATION OF AZ AA:11:28 (ASM)