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INTRODUCTION

PaleoWest Archaeology (PaleoWest) was retained by Snell & Wilmer on behalf of Highmark School Development to conduct a Class I archaeological records review for two privately owned parcels (304-61-017B and 304-61-017D) in Queen Creek, Maricopa County, Arizona. Site and project records at the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Arizona State University (ASU), the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), and General Land Office (GLO) records housed by the Bureau of Land Management were examined by PaleoWest archaeologists. The purpose of the records search was to determine the presence and location of any previously recorded cultural resource sites, cultural resource inventories, and historic properties within the surrounding the parcels.

Information resulting from PaleoWest’s site-file and records search for the two parcels revealed the presence of 10 cultural resource sites, one of them, the large prehistoric Hohokam village site known as the Southwest Germann Site, is within the project area. Those sites were discovered and documented by 23 archaeological projects that have taken place in the project area and the one-half mile buffer.

PaleoWest recommends that if the project area is developed that a treatment plan be developed for testing and potential data recovery of intact cultural features. The Southwest Germann Site is eligible to the National Register of Historic Places and the potential for prehistoric human remains to be present on both of the subject properties is high. Human remains are protected on private land in Arizona under A.R.S. 41-865.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project area is located on the Queen Creek delta south of the Salt River and north of the Gila River in the eastern Salt River Valley near the town of Queen Creek, Arizona. The region is in the Basin and Range Physiographic Province, which contains linear mountain ranges oriented north-south or northwest-southeast, with shallow basins in between (Chronic 1983). The Superstition Mountains are northeast of the project area, and the Santan Mountains are located to the south. The elevation in the project area is an average of approximately 1,350 ft above sea level.

The project area is located in the Lower Colorado River subdivision of the Sonoran Desertsctrub biotic community (Brown 1994). This area of the eastern Salt River Valley is largely developed but retains some rural characteristics with some areas of open, undeveloped desert. Natural vegetation in the area includes creosotebush, mesquite, acacia, paloverde, desert broom, saguaro, and other cacti.
CULTURE HISTORY

There is little evidence for a Paleoindian (10,500?–9200 B.C.) occupation of the Queen Creek area. Other parts of southern Arizona, however, have been important to the study of Paleoindian occupation in the Southwest (Mabry 1998). Well-known Paleoindian sites are located west of Sulphur Springs Valley at Naco (Haury 1953), at the Lehner Ranch (Haury et al. 1959), and at Murray Springs, in the San Pedro Valley (Haynes 2002; Reid and Whittlesey 1997). Isolated Paleoindian projectile points have been reported for the Phoenix Basin, including several Clovis points (North et al. 2005). Two Clovis points were reportedly found in the vicinity of the project area (Agenbroad 1967; Foster et al. 1995). Current evidence suggests that Paleoindian groups were small and that they hunted big game, including mammoth, and gathered other subsistence resources. The most distinctive Paleoindian artifacts are the large fluted projectile points, such as Clovis and Folsom, which would have been hafted to hand-held spears (Slaughter 1992). Archaeologists believe that Paleoindian groups were highly mobile and that they selected high-quality lithic material for tool production (North et al. 2005:297).

The Archaic period (9200 B.C.–A.D. 150) was characterized by the collecting of a broad spectrum of wild plant and animal resources. The large Pleistocene animals hunted in the previous period had become extinct by the start of the Archaic period. It appears that the climate and environment during the Archaic were much like they are today. The Archaic in southern Arizona is known as the Cochise Culture. Distinctive Cochise artifacts include projectile points, which would have been mounted on spears or atlatl darts, and a variety of ground stone tools (Slaughter 1992). The Early Archaic period is not well documented in southern Arizona (Huckell 1984:137).

The Middle Archaic is better represented, especially in the Tucson area. Middle Archaic sites have been found in the bajada zone surrounding Tucson and in floodplain areas. Sites dating to this time period have been excavated along the Santa Cruz River (Gregory 1999), in northeastern Tucson (Dart 1984, 1986; Douglas and Craig 1986), and in the northern Tucson Basin (Roth 1989). Diagnostic artifacts for the period consist mainly of Chiricahua, San Jose/Pinto, and Cortaro-style projectile points (Roth and Huckell 1992). Features from Middle Archaic sites include basin-shaped hearths, roasting pits, ground stone caches, rock alignments, domestic living surfaces, flexed and extended inhumations, cairn burials, and rock art (Freeman 1999; Huckell 1996:342).

The Late Archaic, often referred to as the Early Agricultural period in southern Arizona because of the growing evidence for the practice of sedentary agriculture, dates from 1500 B.C. to A.D. 150. The Late Archaic/Early Agricultural period is divided into the San Pedro phase and the Cienega phase. During the period, the inhabitants of the region began planting corn, building pit structures, and using pits to store subsistence goods (Huckell 1990). Pit structures were usually circular with large subfloor storage pits. A radiocarbon date of 3145 ± 50 B.P. was obtained from a maize kernel fragment recovered from the Valley Farms site (Roth and Ahlstrom 2000).
The best-documented and most widespread archaeological remains found in the Phoenix Basin are attributed to the Hohokam, the prehistoric desert farmers who occupied much of central and southern Arizona (e.g., Bayman 2001; Crown and Judge 1991, Fish 1989; Gumerman 1991; Haury 1976). Although not necessarily recognizable as Hohokam, the earliest archaeological manifestation that probably gave rise to the Hohokam cultural tradition is assigned to the Red Mountain phase (A.D. 1–500) of the Pioneer Period (A.D. 1–750 [Cable and Doyel 1987; Dean 1991; Hackbarth 1992, 2001; Morris 1969]). Evidence from Red Mountain phase sites indicates people subsisted on a mix of wild resources and agricultural products. Corn was the dominant crop grown along with beans, squash, and cotton. It is also during this time, A.D. 400, that the first evidence for canal irrigation is reported along the Salt River, indicating agriculture was being practiced (Ackerly and Henderson 1989). House forms identified include small circular and “bean-shaped” pit houses (Mabry 2000).

The period from A.D. 500–650 is defined as the Vahki phase. By this time, irrigation appears to have been well established. Vahki phase canals have been identified at Snaketown (Haury 1976), as well as along the edges of the Salt River floodplain (Ackerly and Henderson 1989). Domestic architecture is characterized by square and rectangular pit houses of various sizes (Ciolek-Torrello et al. 2000; Crary and Craig 2001).

The late Pioneer period, A.D. 650–750, saw the appearance of decorated pottery in southern Arizona. Hohokam decorated pottery is characterized by red-painted designs on a light-colored buff or brown background (Abbott 2001; Haury 1976). The earliest decorated pottery types include Estrella, Sweetwater, and Snaketown Red-on-buff (Wallace 2001). House types associated with the late Pioneer period vary greatly. Small, domed field houses made from bent poles and covered with brush served as temporary shelters at agricultural fields or at resource procurement and processing sites. Few artifacts are associated with the remains of these structures. Late Pioneer period habitation sites, on the other hand, contained moderate-size pit structures with square or rectangular floor plans and formal, plastered hearths. These were far more substantial than the field houses and were occupied for extended periods.

Late Pioneer period subsistence was based on a mixture of wild resources and agricultural produce. The use of irrigation expanded from the floodplains to include lands on terraces above rivers (Ackerly and Henderson 1989).

The Gila Butte and Santa Cruz phases make up the Colonial period (A.D. 750–950). This was a time of expansion and elaboration of the Hohokam culture. There were more sites and their distribution across the landscape increased considerably. Colonial period Hohokam artifacts have been found as far north as Prescott in north-central Arizona, south into northern Mexico, to the west of Gila Bend in southwestern Arizona, and east into New Mexico (Haury 1976). Abbott (1994, 2001) argues that the center for most of the decorated buffware vessels produced during this time was in the area of the middle Gila River valley. Not only did the Hohokam expand their territory, their contact with their neighbors increased. Intrusive ceramics from the north, east, and west have been found in Hohokam sites dating to this time. It is argued that Colonial period Hohokam social organization was tied to the exchange of ritual and subsistence goods (Doyel 1985). Across Arizona, interaction spheres dominated the social landscape and facilitated exchange across the region. It is during this time that the Hohokam
achieved their highest level in the production of arts and crafts. Ceramics were well made and elaborately decorated, as was shell jewelry.

The large, square, communal structures found in earlier times ceased to be built during the Colonial period. Instead ballcourts, which were probably first built in the early A.D. 800s, became the dominant form of public architecture (Wallace 2001). Their appearance in southern Arizona is thought to mark the appearance of a regional system with religious, economic, and political links that crosscut geographical boundaries (Abbott 2001; Wilcox and Shenk 1977). Subsistence during the Colonial period was based on a mixture of wild resources and agricultural crops. Some wild species (e.g., little barley) were so intensively exploited that they appear to have become as important as some domesticated species (Bohrer 1987). The use of irrigation expanded significantly throughout the Salt and Gila River valleys, with the construction and maintenance of canals having a significant impact on Hohokam social and political organization (e.g., Abbott 2000; Hunt et al., 2005).

With the onset of the Sedentary period (Sacaton phase—A.D. 950–1150), there was a decline in the quality of Hohokam material culture, especially in the production of ceramics and shell ornaments. Ballcourts were still the dominant form of public architecture in the early Sedentary period, however, by its end, few were being built. As the construction of ballcourts diminished, the construction of capped mounds or platform mounds became more common. Platform mounds were built near village centers around plazas surrounded by domestic features. House types exhibited significant variability, and were aggregated within courtyard groups or village segments (Wilcox et al. 1981). One of the largest Sacaton phase occupations in the region was at the Grewe site. Grewe is part of the Casa Grande site complex, and it was the pre-Classical antecedent of the Classic period Casa Grande village (Craig 2001).

Subsistence during the Sedentary period continued to be based on agriculture, although there was some emphasis on the collection of certain wild plant species such as cholla. The production of cotton (its fiber for use in the weaving of textiles and its seeds as food) was also of major importance.

By the end of the Sedentary period, a major reorganization of Hohokam society occurred. After a period of intensive growth and expansion, many villages and areas were abandoned. Populations tended to begin to concentrate in larger villages along the Salt River. These changes in the social and political environment were reflected in public architecture, along with the changes in ceramic and shell production.

The Sedentary period was followed by the Classic period, which is divided into the Soho (A.D. 1150–1300) and the Civano phases (A.D. 1300–1450). Differences in ceramic decoration and architectural styles separate these two phases. Although they occur in lower frequencies, red-on-buff ceramics continued to be produced during the Soho phase. Redwares become increasingly common and the introduction of long-necked jars marks a clear contrast with the earlier ceramic styles.

Structures with post-reinforced adobe walls and surface structures are common during the Soho phase. However, during the Civano phase, adobe compounds, often containing small
plazas, and adobe structures were built and used to the near exclusion of semi-subterranean structures. Puddled and coursed adobe construction generally replaced the use of structures with pole-reinforced walls. The number of rooms within compounds increased, as did their proximity to each other.

Public architecture also underwent a change in the early Classic period. There was a significant increase in the construction and use of platform mounds (Gregory et al. 1988). At the same time, the construction of ballcourts declined to its lowest point. According to Gregory (1987), more new sites with platform mounds were established along the Salt River than along the Gila River.

The apex of Hohokam public architecture was achieved in the Civano phase with the building of “big houses.” The only remaining example of a big house is found today at Casa Grande Ruins on the outskirts of Coolidge. These structures likely served multiple functions. It is argued that they were clear symbols of elite status within Hohokam society (Wilcox and Shenk 1977). Big houses often co-occurred with platform mounds, with the two being separated by a site’s central plaza. The appearance of the big house is as mysterious as its disappearance. Their construction and use may have been the result of changes within Hohokam society, and their abandonment may have been tied to attacks from outsiders (e.g., Teague 1989).

Redwares and the disappearance of buffwares mark the Civano phase, although plainwares continue to dominate the total ceramic assemblage. Polychrome pottery (Gila and Tonto polychromes in particular) and local imitations are present after A.D. 1320 (Reid and Whittlesey 1992).

Canal irrigation continued to be very important during the Civano phase. The Civano phase Hohokam depended greatly upon corn, beans, and squash as the mainstays of their diet, although agave and cholla were significant components of the diet. Corn was certainly the most common domesticate, and the abundance of agave at many sites indicates it too was extremely important. At some sites, during the late Classic period, the use of agave became increasingly important and the availability of agricultural produce declined (e.g., Miller 1994).

Hohokam social organization during the Civano phase was clearly different from what preceded it and from what was to follow. Population size and density at many of the large sites in the Phoenix Basin reached never-before-seen levels. Although the level of social and political organization actually achieved by the Hohokam is open to much debate, some increase in social complexity was undoubtedly necessary to manage the higher population densities that developed. This may be expressed in the construction and use of platform mounds and big houses.

The post-Classic period (A.D. 1450–1540) in the Phoenix Basin, referred to by some as the Polvorón phase, is somewhat of a hazy gap between the late Classic period Hohokam and the arrival of the first Europeans (e.g., Bayman 2001; Chenault 2000; Henderson and Hackbarth 2000). Nevertheless, the traits used to identify the Polvorón phase include jacal structures, polychrome ceramics, and an abundance of obsidian. Many argue that these characteristics are not sufficient to distinguish the Polvorón phase from the late Civano phase. Additionally,
available chronological dates make it difficult to distinguish Civano and Polvorón phase sites from one another (Dean 1991:87).

By the late Civano phase the success the Hohokam enjoyed had vanished. High population densities, depletion of food resources, decline in agricultural productivity, disease and malnutrition, flooding, drought, and the collapse of many irrigation systems are cited for the collapse of the Hohokam (e.g., Bayman 2001; Van Gerven and Sheridan 1994). Nevertheless, Bayman (2001) points out that the Hohokam may have persisted until the early 1500s and that the debate over the cause or causes for the decline and disappearance of the Hohokam is far from resolved. Some have even argued that Hohokam and Salado peoples may have been directly encountered by the Spanish (Reff 1992).

Following the collapse of the Hohokam regional system, Akimel O’Odham (Pima) and Tohono O’Odham (Papago) groups lived in the Middle Gila River Valley. For unknown reasons, the Salt River Valley including the Queen Creek delta was either used sparingly or abandoned following the Hohokam collapse. Akimel O’Odham and Tohono O’Odham groups lived in small rancherias subsisting on agricultural products, wild plant foods, and game. The Pee Posh (Maricopa), migrants from the Gulf of California area, formed an alliance with the Pima in the early 1800s and have lived in the Salt-Gila Basin ever since. All these groups continue to occupy the area on several reservations.

Spanish, Mexican, and Anglo factions began to arrive in appreciable numbers in the 18th century. The ensuing period of historic exploitation was marked by mining, ranching, and homesteading interests. These historic pursuits included the construction of new canals as well as re-utilization of prehistoric ones.

**PREVIOUS RESEARCH**

Examination of relevant site-file and project records showed that 23 previous cultural resource projects took place within the project area and a one-half mile buffer herein referred to as the study area (Figure 1, Table 1). These projects include fiber optic and utility lines, and the Rittenhouse drain paralleling Rittenhouse Road and the railroad. These utilities are primarily located in the railroad right-of-way. Block surveys range from less than 5 ac parcels to the large Ash Creek residential development and the Power Ranch Marketplace and associated commercial developments on the east side of Power Road south of Rittenhouse developed by Sunbelt Holdings, Inc. Significant archaeological excavations were undertaken on the Sunbelt Holdings commercial development properties adjacent to the subject parcels.
Figure 1. Previous surveys and previously recorded sites within a one-half mile radius of the subject parcels.
Table 1. Previous Projects in the Study Radius.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>In Project Area?</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964-4</td>
<td>Survey of Maricopa County</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ayres 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-222</td>
<td>Fiber Optic Line Survey</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>O’Brien and others 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-331</td>
<td>Survey and Testing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Greenwald and others 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-301</td>
<td>Damage Assessment</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Haynes-Peterson 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-27</td>
<td>Rittenhouse Drain Survey</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Rodgers 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-134</td>
<td>Rittenhouse Drain Survey</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Rodgers 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-587</td>
<td>Fiber Optic Cable Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Doak 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-545</td>
<td>Rittenhouse Tower Site Survey</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lindley 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-564</td>
<td>Survey for Residential</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lindley and Ryden 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-723</td>
<td>AT&amp;T Fiber Optic Cable Survey</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Kearns and others 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-82</td>
<td>Survey for Residential</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Foster 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-469</td>
<td>Survey for Residential</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lindly 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-705</td>
<td>Survey for Proposed School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lundin 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-114</td>
<td>Survey for Development</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ryden and Lundin 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-516</td>
<td>Natural Gas Pipeline Survey</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lindly and others 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-910</td>
<td>Fiber Optics Line Survey</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Rally and others 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-646</td>
<td>Not Listed in AZSite</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2493 SHPO</td>
<td>Not Listed in AZSite</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2508 SHPO</td>
<td>Not Listed in AZSite</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-014 ASU</td>
<td>Not Listed in AZSite</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2413 SHPO</td>
<td>Ash Creek Residential</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Wenker 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 SSI</td>
<td>SW Germann Site</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leonard and Others 2007a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sunbelt Holdings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 SSI</td>
<td>SW Germann Site – Mesa Parcel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leonard and Others 2007b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site-file and records search performed by PaleoWest revealed that 10 previously recorded sites are located within the study area. Those sites are listed in Table 2 and also are shown on Figure 1. Those sites range from small artifact scatters to large prehistoric villages and include one of the largest prehistoric village site in the Queen Creek delta, the Southwest Germann Site.

Testing and data recovery by Soil Systems, Inc. for Sunbelt Holdings, Inc. (Leonard and others 2007a and b) on private parcels adjacent to and immediately to the west of the two subject parcels involved the excavation and documentation of 427 backhoe trenches, for a linear total of approximately 5,000 m of trench. Approximately 48 ac of the Sunbelt Holdings, Inc. project area were within the revised site boundaries of AZ U:10:2 (ASM). Within this area, data recovery involved mechanical stripping of culturally sterile overburden in areas identified as having subsurface cultural deposits, and the excavation of individual features encountered as a result. Stripping was done in 18 main areas, which together covered approximately 8.3 ac, or 6.1 percent of the area. Over 1,100 prehistoric subsurface features were encountered, including...
pithouses, adobe compounds, burials, and a wide variety of nonburial pit features. Most features were found in and around the mounds that were encountered during survey, but other features occurred in clusters associated with roasting areas or surface artifact concentrations. Thus, archaeological remains were concentrated in a few localized areas, separated by larger areas without subsurface remains, and no data recovery was required in almost 94 percent of the project area.

The features encountered in the project area included the full range of types that would be expected at a Hohokam habitation site, with the exception of irrigation-related features and community-level features such as ballcourts or platform mounds. Habitation structures included pithouses, stand-alone surface structures, ramadas, and adobe compounds. Burial features included both human and animal inhumations, as well as the full range of Hohokam cremation burial types. Nonburial extramural features included hornos, with some very large examples, other thermal feature types of various sizes and shapes, adobe mixing pits and borrow pits related to construction, apparent storage pits, and a large number of unburned pits without obvious function. An unusual subrectangular reservoir was even present.

However, the features were distributed in spatially discrete clusters separated by large areas that lacked significant prehistoric cultural remains, and the clusters varied in the numbers and types of features present. For example, mortuary features were only encountered in four of the feature clusters, whereas thermal features were encountered in almost all of the feature clusters, and structural features were limited to somewhat fewer than half of the feature clusters. The feature clusters associated with the three mounds had the largest number and variety of features and were evidently associated with more intensive residential occupations, while many of the other feature clusters lacked both structural and mortuary features and therefore probably
were the remains of limited or specialized activities rather than residential occupation, although these activities may have been carried out by the occupants of nearby residential loci.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The two subject parcels (parcels (304-61-017B and 304-61-017D) are within the revised site boundaries of the large prehistoric village site known as the Southwest Germann Site. This site has been documented numerous times by linear and block projects associated with the railroad right-of-way and residential and commercial development. The most extensive archaeological investigation was undertaken by Soil Systems, Inc. (SSI) on private parcels located to the west and north of the two subject parcels for commercial development undertaken by Sunbelt Holdings, Inc. between 2004 and 2007 (Leonard and others 2007a and b). Thousands of intact prehistoric features including human remains were recovered from the adjacent Sunbelt properties. However, SSI reported that these features were distributed in spatially discrete clusters separated by areas that lacked significant features and remains. SSI did not report any features adjacent to the subject parcels in the southeast corner of the Sunbelt properties adjacent to the western subject parcel and north of Germann Road.

The potential for intact prehistoric features and possibly human remains on the two subject parcels is high; however, it is doubtful that the prehistoric features cover both parcels in their entirety. Therefore, it is recommended that prior to any development of the two parcels that archaeological testing in the form of systematic backhoe trenches be conducted. This will allow for the identification of areas that do contain intact cultural features, deposits, and potentially human remains, and also to identify those areas within the two parcels that are clear of any cultural remains.
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