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The Kitsap County Department of Public Works (the County) has identified a need to modify the intersection of Banner Road SE and Olalla Valley Road SE. The County has developed three alternatives and is currently conducting an alternatives analysis. The analysis includes a cultural resources overview, which is a preliminary desktop study intended to facilitate selection of a preferred project alternative; it includes no cultural resources fieldwork. This memorandum documents the results of the cultural resources overview.

PROJECT LOCATION AND ALTERNATIVES

The proposed Banner Road Improvement Project is located in the unincorporated community of Olalla in southeast Kitsap County. The three proposed alternatives are located north of Olalla Bay and bounded by Banner Road SE, Olalla Valley Road SE, and SE Culver Street. The three alternatives are described below and depicted on Figure 1. The naming conventions are derived from 11 alternatives originally contemplated as part of the early design analysis and include:

- Alternative 1 – Reconstruct and widen existing Banner Road SE
- Alternative 6C – Extend SE Culver Street north and west to Olalla Valley Road and close Banner Road SE
- Alternative 10 – New roadway from Banner Road SE to Olalla Valley Road SE and close Banner Road SE
Each of these alternatives will involve some ground-disturbing work. None would involve demolition or modification of existing structures.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND CULTURAL CONTEXT

The Kitsap Peninsula landscape is characterized by gentle rolling, low hills dissected by numerous rivers and streams. Soils of Kitsap County formed mainly in glacial drift deposited by the most recent of several glacial ice sheets. Most of the topography was formed between 13,000 and 15,000 years ago (USDA 1980:2).

The project is within a geographic province known as the Puget Lowland, a valley system that extends from the Puget Sound south through the Willamette Valley, and which separates the Olympic Mountains from the Western Cascades. Soils in the project area are typically shallow and moderately well drained, formed in glacially deposited sediments (USDA 1980). Native vegetation in the area consists of forests of the *Tsuga heterophylla* zone, which is characterized by western hemlock, western red cedar, and Douglas fir, with a dense shrub and herbaceous understory including sword fern, salal, Oregon grape, ocean spray, blackberry, red huckleberry, and red elderberry (Franklin and Dyrness 1973).

Prior to modern urbanization, small and large mammals would have been present in the area, as well as various bird species. Nearby riparian areas would have hosted such culturally important plants as wapato, nettles, reeds, and cranberries (Weinmann et al. 1984). Salmon, flounder, smelt, herring, rockfish, and sole would have been available in the waters of Puget Sound (Kruckeberg 1991:88).

The Manis mastodon site on the Olympic Peninsula near Sequim, which has been radiocarbon dated to about 12,000 BP (Gustafson and Manis 1984), may be the earliest evidence for prehistoric human occupation in Western Washington. There are few other sites that date before about 5000 BP. Numerous sites have been identified across the region dating to the period after 5000 BP, when larger populations began to organize in more complex ways to exploit a wide range of resources, including salmon and shellfish, land mammals, and plant resources such as berries, roots, and bulbs (Matson and Coupland 1995:97).
Over time, populations accumulated in large semi-sedentary cedar plank house villages located at river mouths and confluences and on protected shorelines. The artifact tool kits became increasingly complex and specialized, allowing for large takes of resources, which were processed and stored for year-long consumption (Ames and Maschner 1999). By the ethnographic period, the inhabitants of the project area were the Southern Coast Salish who spoke the Southern Lushootseed language (Suttles and Lane 1990:485). The project area is in the traditional territory of the Suquamish Tribe, just north and west of the traditional territory of the Puyallup Tribe.

Southern Coast Salish villages were occupied part of the year, largely in winter, and residents made seasonal journeys to camps near resource gathering areas. Coastal villages relied on fish (Suttles and Lane 1990), which they caught with various weirs and traps, as well as shellfish and sea mammals (Smith 1940; Ruby and Brown 1986). These food sources were supplemented by various berries, roots, and bulbs (Suttles and Lane 1990; Ruby and Brown 1986:166). More than 12,000 Lushootseed speakers occupied the Puget Sound region prior to European contact; however, epidemics introduced by the newcomers reduced this population to only 5,000 by the 1850s (Suttles and Lane 1990:501).

Captain George Vancouver’s 1792 exploration of Puget Sound marked the first Euroamerican intrusion in the region (Kirk and Alexander 1990:271). However, Euroamerican settlement in the region was not established until 1832; the earliest instance was at Fort Nisqually at the southern end of Puget Sound. The Wilkes Expedition of 1841 used the fort as a base for explorations in southern Puget Sound, which included mapping in proximity to the project area (Kirk and Alexander 1990:308).

Lumber was Puget Sound’s major export for much of its early history; in fact, Washington was the number one lumber-producing state in 1910 with 63 percent of the state’s wageworkers dependent upon the forest products industry for jobs (Schwantes 1996:215). Many of the Puget Sound mill towns were established after the devastating San Francisco fires of 1852. Virgin timber stands and natural deepwater anchorages provided ships refuge from the Pacific storms. Soon, inlets up and down Puget Sound were exporting timber down the coast (Schwantes 1996:217).
At the time of Euroamerican contact, the shoreline in the project area looked much like it does today. Among the earliest detailed maps is the 1857 General Land Office Map (USSG 1884), which shows no development in the project area (Figure 2). Development in the project area since the 1857 map includes mostly residences and roadways. The historic Olalla Pioneer Cemetery was established in 1901 along Olalla Valley Road SE.

**PREVIOUS RESEARCH**

There are no recorded archaeological sites or historic structures in the project area. The nearest archaeological sites surround Burley Lagoon, approximately 4 miles southwest of the project area. The nearest structure that has been determined to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) is the Charles F. Nelson House. The house is at the corner of Nelson Road and Crescent Valley Road, across Olalla Creek from the project area (Figure 3).

There is one recorded historic cemetery, the Olalla Pioneer Cemetery, in the project area (Figure 3). The cemetery is very near, possibly within, the alignment of Alternative 10. According to records on file at the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP), the cemetery occupies approximately 1.43 acres and contains burials dated from 1901 to 1933. The cemetery is not maintained and many headstones are gone or in poor condition. However, some graves are staked with rebar.

There are no Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) on file at DAHP in the project area. However, tribes may have knowledge of TCPs in the area.

There has been one cultural resources survey conducted within 1 mile of the project area. It was conducted for a boat launch facility just west of the intersection of Banner Road SE and Olalla Valley Road SE (Berger 2009). The survey included pedestrian reconnaissance and subsurface testing. It revealed that surface sediments at the boat launch area are primarily engineered fill, with possible native sediments at 75 to 155 centimeters (2.5 to 5 feet) below the ground surface. No archaeological materials were encountered.

**CULTURAL RESOURCES POTENTIAL**

DAHP has developed a state-wide predictive model for archaeological potential based on environmental factors. Model results for the three alternatives are as follows:
- **Alternative 10** begins at Olalla Valley Road SE. It traverses very high or high risk areas for about 350 meters (1,150 feet). The remainder of the alignment is in moderate or moderately low risk areas.

- **Alternative 6C** traverses a high risk area from its origin at Olalla Valley Road SE westward for about 320 meters (1,050 feet). The remainder of the alignment is in moderate risk areas.

- **Alternative 1** is almost entirely within a high risk area, except for about 30 meters (100 feet) of a moderate risk area.

The predictive model would seem to indicate that Alternative 1 has the highest risk for impacting archaeological resources and Alternative 6C has the lowest; however, the model does not include modern land use. Alternative 1 follows the existing Banner Road alignment, whereas the other two alternatives both include some new roadway. The existing Banner Road is cut into the steep hillside as it ascends to the east, then continues along the bluff top. Archaeological potential has likely been lowered by road and residential construction activities along the road.

Historic structures are unlikely to be affected by any of the alternatives. None of the alternatives involve the modification or demolition of existing structures. Possible effects, therefore, would only include potential direct effects of noise and vibration during construction, or potential indirect effects to setting along new roadway segments.

There may be NRHP-eligible structures along the existing roadway segments for all three alternatives. Direct effects from construction are possible, but these can likely be avoided with appropriate planning.

Only Alternatives 10 and 6C involve new roadway construction, mostly on undeveloped land screened from existing structures by forest. For Alternative 10, one parcel with a structure would be near the new roadway, on parcel #1024967. The Kitsap County Assessor’s online database lists the structure as constructed in 1988. For Alternative 6C, one structure would be near the new roadway, on parcel #1025105. The database lists the structure as constructed in 1978. Therefore, all alternatives seem to have little to no potential to cause indirect effects to the setting of historic structures.
RESULTS

Of the three alternatives, only one will possibly impact a known cultural resource. Alternative 10 might impact the Olalla Pioneer Cemetery. Because the cemetery is unmaintained and many graves are unmarked, the marked boundaries must be considered approximate. Even if Alternative 10 avoids the marked boundaries of the cemetery, there is clearly elevated potential to encounter graves during construction.

Alternatives 1 and 6C will not impact known cultural resources. Of the two, Alternative 6C is probably more likely to impact unrecorded cultural resources because it involves more disturbance in previously undisturbed areas.

Each of the alternatives, if chosen, would require a cultural resources survey in compliance with applicable state and federal laws.
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LEGEND:
- Orange: Alternative 10
- Green: Alternative 6C
- Pink: Alternative 1

SOURCE: Drawing prepared from electronic files provided by KPFF Consulting Engineers dated 7/2011.
HORIZONTAL DATUM: Washington State Plane North, NAD83.