

**From:** [BrownScott, Jennifer](#)  
**To:** [Raymond, Anan](#)  
**Subject:** Protection Island Survey & DNWR CR Survey  
**Date:** Thursday, February 22, 2018 9:23:45 AM  
**Attachments:** [Dungeness Tidelands Survey Report Final Jan2017.pdf](#)  
[Dungeness Project Drawings Dec28-2017.docx](#)

---

We heard that you have been knocked down by the flu and hope you are feeling better.

I am checking in to see where we are at with the cultural resource survey of the construction APE on Protection Island. Has the SOW been given to CGS? How soon should we expect a contract to be completed and work to begin?

I also wanted to pass along Jamestown S'Klallam's Cultural Resource Survey of the proposed aquaculture area on Dungeness NWR tidelands. They have submitted their application for County Shoreline Permitting.

Hope you are enjoying the snow!

-jennifer

---

Jennifer Brown-Scott  
Refuge Manager  
Washington Maritime NWRC  
715 Holgerson Rd  
Sequim, WA 98382  
office: (360) 457-8451 ext.22  
fax: (360) 457-9778

~~Dungeness NWR~Protection Island NWR~San Juan Islands NWR~~  
~~Copalis NWR~Flattery Rocks NWR~Quillayute Needles NWR~~

# CULTURAL RESOURCES REPORT COVER SHEET

Author: Gary C. Wessen

Title of Report: An Archaeological Survey of the Jamestown S’Klallam  
Dungeness Bay Project Area, Clallam County, Washington

Date of Report: January 2017

County: Clallam    Section: 23    Township: 31 N    Range: 4 W  
Quad: Dungeness    Acres: ~35

PDF of report submitted (REQUIRED) Yes

Historic Property Inventory Forms to be Approved Online? No

Archaeological Site(s)/Isolate(s) Found or Amended? No

TCP(s) found? No

Replace a draft? No

Satisfy a DAHP Archaeological Excavation Permit requirement? No

Were Human Remains Found? No


DAHP Archaeological Site #:

- Submission of PDFs is required.
- Please be sure that any PDF submitted to DAHP has its cover sheet, figures, graphics, appendices, attachments, correspondence, etc., compiled into one single PDF file.
- Please check that the PDF displays correctly when opened.

# AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF THE JAMESTOWN S'KLALLAM DUNGENESS BAY PROJECT AREA, CLALLAM COUNTY, WASHINGTON

by

GARY C. WESSEN, Ph.D.



prepared for

the Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe  
1033 Old Blyn Highway  
Sequim, Washington 98382

by

Wessen & Associates, Inc.  
905 56<sup>th</sup> Street  
Port Townsend, Washington 98368

January 2017

## MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

The Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe has proposed to develop an oyster farm on an intertidal surface in the northwestern part of Dungeness Bay, on the northeastern Olympic Peninsula. U. S. Army Corp of Engineers reviewers have requested an assessment of the archaeological potential of this location and, to this end, the Tribe arranged for Wessen & Associates, Inc. to conduct the study.

This survey of the Jamestown S’Klallam Dungeness Bay Project Area has found no evidence of the presence of either potentially intact archaeological deposits or re-deposited cultural materials other than those of recent origin. While the surface inspection conducted at this time did not address the possibility of buried cultural deposits associated with older sea level stands, I think that such deposits - - if present - - are likely to be buried beneath the more recent marine sediments in this area. It is not possible to predict whether such deposits are, in fact, present and, if so, at what depth they might occur, but I can note that the extensive shellfish harvesting which has occurred in this area for decades has not exposed evidence of such deposits. Therefore, I believe that the presence of such deposits within the uppermost 18 inches of sediment in this project area is very unlikely.

I recommend that the Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe be allowed to proceed with their plan to conduct shellfish aquaculture activities in this project area. Additional archaeological research actions do not appear to be warranted at this time and monitoring of the proposed aquaculture activities is not necessary.

The cover picture is view of a portion of Dungeness Spit and surrounding waters. The lower half of this image is a portion of the Jamestown S’Klallam Dungeness Bay Project Area in Dungeness Bay. View is to the northwest.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	MANAGEMENT SUMMARY	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	ii
1	INTRODUCTION	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1
2	BACKGROUND	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1
2.1	Project Area	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1
2.2	Environmental Setting	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1
2.3	Cultural Setting	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	3
2.3.1	Native American Occupation	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	4
2.3.2	Euro-American Occupation	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	7
2.4	Archaeological Setting	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	8
2.4.1	Olympic Peninsula Archaeology	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	8
2.4.2	Dungeness Bay Archaeology	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	9
3	RESEARCH DESIGN	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	11
3.1	Research Goals	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	11
3.2	Research Methods	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	12
3.3	Practical Expectations	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	12
4	FIELD ACTIVITIES AND FINDINGS	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	13
5	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	14
6	BIBLIOGRAPHY	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	14

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe has proposed to develop an oyster farm on an intertidal surface in the northwestern part of Dungeness Bay, on the northeastern Olympic Peninsula. U.S. Army Corp of Engineers reviewers have requested an assessment of the archaeological potential of this location and, to this end, the Tribe arranged for Wessen & Associates, Inc. to conduct the study. The field work associated with this effort was undertaken by Gary Wessen from Wessen & Associates, Inc., Ralph Riccio, Chris Burns, Casey Allen, and David Brownell from the Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe, and Tori Cantelow from the Point-No-Point Treaty Council on 16 November 2016.

This report describes the background, goals, methods, fieldwork, findings, conclusions, and recommendations of our study of the Jamestown S’Klallam Dungeness Bay Project Area. Field notes and photographs taken during the study are on file with Wessen & Associates, Inc.

## 2 BACKGROUND

The background for this study includes consideration of the project area, and its environmental, cultural, and archaeological settings.

### 2.1 Project Area

The Jamestown S’Klallam Dungeness Bay Project Area is an approximately 35 acre rectangular parcel located in the intertidal zone of northwestern Dungeness Bay in Clallam County (see Figure 1). Specifically, it is located near the center of Section 23, Township 31 North, Range 4 West. It is Department of Natural Resources Lease: 20-A013012. There is no street address nor does it have a Clallam County Tax Parcel number

The project area has a long history of commercial shellfish aquaculture and the Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe proposes to continue this activity. The past activity has extensively disturbed the sediment in the project area to a depth of approximately 18 inches and no action proposed at this time is expected to exceed this depth.

### 2.2 Environmental Setting

The Jamestown S’Klallam Dungeness Bay Project Area is a very gently sloping intertidal surface on an extensive tide flat in the northwestern part of Dungeness Bay. The unit’s long axis is oriented northeast-southwest; the shoreward margin of the area lies at approximately +3 feet and it extends to the southeast until an elevation of approximately -2.5 feet MLLW is reached. The closest terrestrial surface - - a portion of the western arc of Dungeness Spit - - is located approximately 200 feet to the northwest. Dungeness Spit is a 5.5 mile long curving sand spit which extends into the Strait of Juan de Fuca from a point approximately 2 miles west of the mouth of the Dungeness River. Waters protected within this arc are referred to as: *Dungeness Bay*. The bay itself is split into two major bodies by two smaller sand spits. The larger of these is a locally-prominent north-south oriented limb of Dungeness Spit known as: *Graveyard Spit*. This landform extends southward almost to the southern shore of the bay. Just to the west is a smaller cusped foreland extending northward from the southern shore known as: *Cline Spit*. The portion of the bay to the west of these landforms is quite shallow and drains to the east in a circuitous channel







Figure 3 Typical conditions in the Jamestown S’Klallam Dungeness Bay Project Area, Clallam County, Washington. View is to the west.

illeran Ice Sheet during the Late Pleistocene, but the Dungeness Bay area was probably ice free by ca. 12,000 to 14,000 years ago (Porter and Swanson 1998). A recent reconstruction of Late Pleistocene and Holocene sea level history for the eastern Strait of Juan de Fuca suggests that relative sea levels were as much as 400 feet higher ca. 14,000 years ago, but they fell rapidly after this time and were significantly below the modern level from approximately 11,000 to 5,000 years ago (Gowan 2007). The modern sea level has probably been in place for approximately the last 3,000 to 5,000 years. Thus, the project area was probably significantly further below sea level at the end of the Late Pleistocene, but may have been a near shore terrestrial surface for much of the Holocene. This changing sea level history has had a profound effect on the landscape here. All of these spits have formed as a result of wave energy pushing sediments at an angle to the shoreline (i.e., longshore drift cells) and the location of this process is strongly influenced by local sea level conditions. Thus, Dungeness Spit, Deadman Spit, and Cline Spit - - as they appear today - - are all associated with modern sea level; none of these landforms can therefore be more than 3,000 to 5,000 years old. Finally, it is worth adding that Dungeness Spit and its vicinity has been relatively less impacted by historic events than many other parts of coastal western Washington (Todd et al. 2006).

### 2.3 Cultural Setting

The cultural setting of the Jamestown S’Klallam Dungeness Bay Project Area includes both the early historic and late prehistoric Native American occupants and the early historic and more recent Euro-American occupants of the vicinity of Dungeness Bay. Each of these groups is briefly considered below.



### 2.3.1 Native American Occupation

The native occupants of the Dungeness Bay area are members of a broad group of peoples referred to as the Coast Salish. Coast Salish peoples are widespread in western Washington and southwestern British Columbia and are divisible into a number of smaller regional groups. The people of the northern Olympic Peninsula are considered to be members of a regional group generally called the Central Coast Salish (Suttles 1990). They are distinguishable from their neighbors by the language they speak, Lkungen, as opposed to Lushootseed and other local Salishan languages spoken in central and southern Puget Sound. Within each of these regional groups, a number of still smaller units may be discerned. Within the Central Coast Salish group, the people of the northern Olympic Peninsula are referred to as the S'Klallam or Klallam<sup>1</sup>. Ethnographic and early historic descriptions of the S'Klallam people have been provided by Gibbs (1855), Eells (1889), Curtis (1913), and Gunther (1927).

The traditional territory of the S'Klallam people includes much of the southern shore of the Strait of Juan de Fuca. Smaller groups of S'Klallam people may also have occasionally occupied nearby areas including: portions of northern Hood Canal, the western shore of Whidbey Island, the southern San Juan Islands, and Vancouver Island in the vicinity of Beecher Bay. During the historic period, S'Klallam people from throughout this area slowly became concentrated into three modern Klallam communities. These are the Lower Elwha Klallam, Jamestown S'Klallam, and Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribes. The modern Jamestown S'Klallam community includes descend-ants of the people who formerly occupied the vicinity of Dungeness Bay.

The S'Klallam had economic and subsistence strategies much like those of most of their Salish neighbors. They were skilled fishermen, hunters, and plant material gatherers who possessed great knowledge about the resources available in their environment. They followed a subsistence pattern characterized by a series of seasonal movements determined by the availability of different seasonal resources. A typical annual cycle of movements included a substantial winter village and a number of smaller camps which supported such activities as plant or shellfish collecting, hunting, and fishing. Winter villages were marked by the presence of large plank longhouses; residential structures in the seasonal camps were usually relatively small pole frame lodges covered with brush or woven mats. The bulk of their economic activities were oriented towards marine and riverine environments; while not ignored, upland settings were probably of decidedly secondary importance. Salmon, taken in both marine and riverine settings, was probably the major element of the S'Klallam resource base. Other important resources for them included marine fish, marine mammals, shellfish, terrestrial large game, birds, and plant foods such as berries, roots, and shoots.

The material culture of the S'Klallam people was very similar to that of their other Salishan neighbors. They were skilled craftsmen and technicians who produced a wide range of goods from plant, bone, and stone materials. Like all southern Northwest Coast peoples, they were particularly noted for their skill with wood and other plant fibers. They worked extensively with Western Red Cedar, using the wood to make large plank longhouses, canoes, boxes, and many smaller utilitarian items. Cedar bark and other plant fibers were used to make a wide variety of basketry, cordage, nets, clothing, and other woven objects. Bone and stone artifacts represent a smaller, but important portion of the material culture as most cutting tools and ornaments were made of these materials. To a limited extent, shell materials were also utilized

---

<sup>1</sup> The term "Clallam" is another variation of this group name.

to manufacture cutting tools and ornaments.

The social and ceremonial life of the S'Klallam people had much in common with that of the other Northwest Coast peoples. As noted above, most types of economic, political and social affiliation appear to have focused on local lineal groups (extended families) which were based in individual winter villages. Family control of resource collection localities and ownership of the rights to ceremonial properties such as dances, songs, titles, and masks was the rule. Three broad categories of social standing existed within S'Klallam society: nobles or upper class freemen, commoners or lower class freemen, and slaves (usually captives taken from other groups). Individual family groups existed at all three levels and there seems to have been only limited potential to move between them. Marriage patterns tended toward local group exogamy, with wives generally taking up residence in their husband's village. Similarly, descent patterns tended toward the father's group. Actual marriage patterns seem to have been variable, with the above noted norms being most important among the upper-class families. These relations created a broad network of social ties between families and villages which supported a significant amount of economic and ceremonial exchange. Historic S'Klallam social ties appear to have been most developed with the other Central Coast Salish groups located to their east and north.

Within the context of the present study, it is important to consider the specific character of the S'Klallam presence in the general vicinity of Dungeness Bay. A number of historic and ethnographic sources report the presence of S'Klallam settlements in the area, but few details are available and some accounts may be confused or otherwise incorrect. For example, Gibbs' (1855:37) list of S'Klallam villages includes a "*Tinnis, or Dungeness*". No other source gives this name for a S'Klallam settlement at Dungeness and this may actually be a reference to the village of "*I'ē'nis*" at the eastern end of Port Angeles Harbor. Curtis (1913:174) reports three S'Klallam villages in the vicinity of Dungeness Bay and Gunther (1927:178) follows the latter account. The three villages noted by Curtis are: "*Tsi'skat*" - - at or near the site of the early historic Euro-American settlement of Dungeness (see Section 2.3.2) - - "*Tsūq*" - - at or near the mouth of the Dungeness River - - and "*Sttītlūm*" at the site of Jamestown. Unfortunately, very little information is available for the first two. The community at Jamestown is much better documented however, and we know that this is an early historic S'Klallam settlement established in the 1870s (Strauss 2002:143-145). While Gunther's (1927:174) map is not precise, it clearly places all of these communities along the southern margin of the bay. The westernmost of them - - "*Tsi'skat*" (Gunther gives this name as: "*Tsē'esqat*") - - is of most direct relevance to the present Dungeness Bay Project Area. The indicated location of this community is on Cline Spit, approximately 1 mile southeast of the southern end of the project area. I am aware of no details regarding this settlement beyond the observation that Curtis (ibid) described it simply as "*small*". When S'Klallam people ended their occupation on Cline Spit is uncertain, but it is worth noting that an 1855 hydrographic map of New Dungeness prepared by Lt. James Alden shows the village of "*Tsūq*" - - near the mouth of the Dungeness River - - but no native settlement on Cline Spit (see Figure 3).




Figure 3 Detail of a portion of the 1855 hydrographic map of New Dungeness prepared by Lt. James Alden. Note the 'Indian Village' on the bluff, on the south side of the river and the absence of a second community on the low spit to its northwest.

Beyond the village locations, there can be no doubt that S'Klallam people engaged in a variety of seasonal economic activities on the lower Dungeness River and at various locations on and near Dungeness Bay. In this regard, Gunther (1927:195-206) makes passing references to features such as duck nets on Dungeness Spit and a wide range of other hunting, fishing, and collecting activities in the area. Thus, it is likely that small seasonal camps were present at multiple locations in the vicinity.

Yet another dimension of the traditional use of the area concerns cemeteries. It is likely that every S'Klallam village had one or more cemeteries associated with it. Eells (in Castile 1985:346) said that "*in nearly every case, their old cemeteries were near the beach*". Gunther (1927:192) said that cemeteries were "*preferably out on a sand spit*". In fact, Smith (1907) reports the presence of burial features at several locations in the Dungeness area and at least one archaeological site here is known to contain human remains. Of particular note in this regard is an event which occurred in the area in 1868; an attack on Tsimshian Indian people camped on a portion of Dungeness Spit by local S'Klallam people (Lambert 1961 and Harper 1969). Eighteen people are reported to have been killed and the area where the attack is thought to have occurred has come to be known as "*Graveyard Spit*". While later designated as an archaeological site (see Section 2.4.2), considerable uncertainties remain regarding precisely where the attack occurred and what might be present there. Lambert (1961:3), for example, says that the victim's bodies were deposited in offshore waters and - - if accurate - - this would mean that

there are no graves representing these individuals on Graveyard Spit. This uncertainty notwithstanding, there could be unrelated prehistoric and/or early historic graves on this landform. With the exception of Graveyard Spit, there do not appear to be reports of traditional cemeteries at, or elsewhere close to, the project area. As noted earlier, the northern end of the project area is approximately 0.5 mile west of Graveyard Spit and this distance increases toward the south.

In sum then, the Jamestown S’Klallam Dungeness Bay Project Area is located within the traditional territory of the S’Klallam Indian people. While there do not appear to be clear detailed accounts of S’Klallam people in - - or close to - - the project area itself, there are clear indications of their presence in the Dungeness area. A few specific settlement locations have been identified, the closest of which - - “*Tsi’skat*” at Cline Spit - - is approximately 1 mile southeast of the southern end of the project area. As an intertidal surface in the bay, however, it is unlikely that settlements of any kind would have been located here. Alternatively, it is likely that some S’Klallam people regularly visited the project area to fish, hunt, and collect shellfish and/or other marine resources.

### 2.3.2 Euro-American Occupation

While earlier visits by Europeans such as Juan de Fuca remain a possibility, the first white explorers to clearly have entered the Strait of Juan de Fuca began to arrive in the last decades of the 18<sup>th</sup> Century (Wagner 1933 and Whitebrook 1959). The first explorer to have actually landed near Dungeness Bay was Manuel Quimper. He spent several days here in early July of 1790. Quimper collected fresh water from the nearby Dungeness River, traded with S’Klallam Indians he encountered, and formally claimed the area for Spain. He called the bay: “*Puerto de Quimper*”. The Dungeness area was briefly visited by George Vancouver two years later. Vancouver anchored in the bay on the night of April 30, 1792 and named the large spit here: “*New Dungeness*”. There is no record that he actually came ashore here. A few additional explorers past by the Dungeness area during the following decades (e.g. Charles Wilkes in May of 1841), but there doesn’t appear to have been any additional Euro-American presence on the ground here until the first arrival of settlers in the early 1850s.

The earliest records for historic settlement in the vicinity are very incomplete, but we do know that several individuals established themselves here between 1851 and 1855 (Keeting 1976). These early settlers included: Capt. Thomas Abernathy, John Thorton, Charles Bradshaw, Elijah H. McAlmond, and Elliot Henry Cline. Most of these individuals established themselves on the uplands south of Dungeness Bay on the west side of the Dungeness River. Additional settlers arrived and a community began to develop on the bluff along the bay’s southern shoreline, approximately 1 mile to the west of the river mouth. This community was called: “*New Dungeness*”. It fronted onto that portion of Dungeness Bay to the west of Cline and Graveyard Spits, the latter area now being known as: “*New Dungeness Harbor*”. New Dungeness was an important early administrative center for Clallam County. By the 1870s, it included the County Courthouse, a jail, a hotel, a store, at least two saloons, and a number of homes. Almost all of this infrastructure was built atop the bluff above the active beach. The principal exception to this pattern was the community’s dock at Cline Spit. The dock was located approximately 1 mile south of the southern end of the project area. The only other mid-19<sup>th</sup> Century built feature in the vicinity was the New Dungeness Lighthouse located near the northeastern end of Dungeness Spit. First lit in 1857, it was the first lighthouse to operate on the southern side of the Strait of Juan de Fuca (Ayres 1972). It was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1993. The New Dungeness Lighthouse is located approximately 2 miles northeast of the project area.

Things progressed well for New Dungeness for a while, but the continued silting in of the passage between Cline and Graveyard Spits made it difficult for ships to reach the community and it began to fail in the late 1880s. By 1891, the County's administrative offices had been moved to Port Angeles and most of the commercial interests had moved to a new location just to the east of the river mouth. This shift was associated with a number of place name changes which offer some potential for confusion. The new community to the east of the Dungeness River mouth was called: "*Dungeness*". The old community formerly known as: "*New Dungeness*" now came to be known as: "*Old Dungeness*" or "*Old Town*". Old Dungeness faded quickly after the early 1890s. It is essentially a rural residential area today. In contrast, a large dock built at the new town site allowed Dungeness to compete as a port for a while, but it fell on hard times when it was bypassed by development of a railroad line across eastern Clallam County in 1915. A large fire also damaged much of the town at about this time. The dock was purchased by the Port of Port Angeles in 1925 and was used until 1941. A few businesses still operate in Dungeness today, but it is now a small rural community.

Against this general backdrop, only limited information is available about the specific land use history of the Jamestown S'Klallam Dungeness Bay Project Area. Documents on file with the Tribe provide few details prior to a tideland lease issued in 1953. In fact, Tribal officials are confident that oyster cultivation was occurring here prior to this time. The 1953 lease was for an oyster farm which grew pacific oysters. In 1964, the operation was sold and shellfish aquaculture activity here then continued under the name D. C. Oyster Farms. The latter group operated here until 1988. The Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe purchased the assets of former oyster farm in 1990 and resumed production here at that time. Water quality issues in the bay led to closures of the oyster cultivation intermittently during the late 1990s and early 2000s, and the Tribe's seafood business closed in 2005 due to these water quality closures. However, the Tribe continued to cultivate a low number of oysters and lease the 50 acre parcel on the main Dungeness Spit while the Tribe contributed their efforts to improve water quality in Dungeness Bay. Improvements in water quality in recent years has, however, now caused an interest in renewing oyster cultivation here.

## 2.4 Archaeological Setting

Appreciation of the archaeological context of the present study requires both a brief review of the history of archaeology on the Olympic Peninsula and a discussion of the work conducted in the vicinity of Dungeness Bay.

### 2.4.1 Olympic Peninsula Archaeology

While the first accounts of archaeological resources on the Olympic Peninsula were written more than a century ago, most archaeological research has been relatively recent. The first reference to archaeological sites here is probably Myron Eells' (1877) mention of two shell middens on the Hood Canal shoreline. Harlan Smith (1907) reported the presence of a number of shell midden sites along the eastern portion of the Strait of Juan de Fuca and, shortly afterwards, Albert Reagan (1917) also reported shell midden sites along the western and northern margins of the area. While none of the latter offer many details, both Smith and Reagan clearly investigated some of these sites and they each offered brief accounts of their contents and structures. No further archaeological efforts were conducted here for the next 40 years.

The era of modern archaeological fieldwork began with a few relatively large scale site survey efforts focused upon the peninsula's outer coastal zone. The first of these was in 1947 when Richard Daugherty undertook a systematic survey of the entire outer coast of Washington; Daugherty (1948) recorded several dozen sites during this study. At about the same time, Fred Pennoyer began to record sites along the Strait of Juan de Fuca. In 1956, Bruce Stallard and Clayton Denman surveyed the Olympic Coast between the Queets River and the Ozette River. While also primarily of coastal focus, Stallard and Denman were taken to three 'upriver' localities by local informants and they recorded the western Olympic Peninsula's first interior sites (Stallard and Denman 1956).

Most subsequent archaeological survey and site recording activities on the Olympic Peninsula have occurred within the context of much smaller efforts. Many have been associated with relatively recent culture resource management (CRM) studies and have confined their focus to small project areas. Most have focused upon coastal or near coastal settings. The first systematic attempt to investigate the archaeological potential of the river valleys of the Olympic Peninsula was undertaken by Gary Wessen in 1977. This survey was specifically focused upon ethnographic settlements reported to have been present along the Quinault, Queets, Hoh, and Quilleute River systems. Attention to interior areas began to grow in the early 1980s. The Olympic National Park began to undertake studies of upland areas (notably Bergland 1984 and Schalk 1988). The Olympic National Forest has also made archaeological surveys a more regular part of the preparation of timber sales in recent years.

Starting later than the site survey activities, the excavation of prehistoric sites on the Olympic Peninsula began in 1958 when Thomas S. Newman undertook test excavations at 45JE9 - - the Toleak Point Site - - on the coast south of La Push. Most subsequent work has focused strongly on coastal sites; most of which are located along the peninsula's northern and western margins. To date, more than 35 prehistoric sites have been sampled by excavation, but in most cases these have been small testing efforts. Only a few large projects have been undertaken, the largest of which has been the work at 45CA24 - - the Ozette Village Site - - (Samuels 1991 and 1994). Other large efforts have been conducted at 45CA21 and 45CA213 - - the Hoko River Site Complex - - (Croes 1995 and 2005) and at 45CA426 near Sequim (Morgan 1999). Still another large effort has been conducted recently at 45CA523 - - the Tse-whit-zen Village Site - - in Port Angeles (Larson 2006). While most of the latter have addressed shell midden deposits representing occupation during the last few thousand years, 45CA426 is a multi-component lithic site which contains significantly older cultural materials.

#### 2.4.2 Dungeness Bay Archaeology

In a broad sense, archaeological research activities in the vicinity of Dungeness Bay have paralleled those of the Olympic Peninsula as a whole. While some very early reports of archaeological sites exist, very little systematic work has occurred here until quite recently and the total body of research in this area remains quite small.

Harlan Smith (1907) was the first person to make specific written reference to archaeological sites in the immediate vicinity of Dungeness Bay. Operating as a part of the Jessup North Pacific Expedition, Smith made a wide ranging reconnaissance of much of maritime western Washington around the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. Smith (1907:386-387) makes passing reference to at least six shell middens and/or grave sites on or near Dungeness Bay. Little, if any, real investigation was conducted at any of these places. Unfortunately, individual site descriptions are very brief and it is difficult to unequivocally associate any of the places noted by Smith with



any currently documented archaeological site. Nevertheless, deposits representing the S'Klallam villages of “*Tsiskat*” and “*Tsūq*” were probably reported. Also of note, Smith specifically describes what he considered to be historic Native American burial features on the southern end of Graveyard Spit.

A second early account of archaeological sites in portions of western Washington was published by Albert Reagan in 1917. It is unlikely that Reagan spent much time investigating sites in eastern Clallam County, but his account of shell midden sites along the northern margin of the Olympic Peninsula includes two sites at Dungeness Bay. The Reagan and Smith reports are sometimes difficult to compare, but it appears likely that both of the sites noted by Reagan are also noted in Smith's list. Indeed, it is likely that Reagan was aware of the earlier Smith effort. Both of the sites noted by Reagan are located along the bay's southern margin; one near Cline Spit and one near the base of Dungeness Spit.

After Reagan, nothing else of significance happens with respect to the area's archaeological resources until the late 1960s. In 1969, I. C. Harper prepared an application to the National Register of Historic Places for Graveyard Spit and the property identified in this submittal was assigned the Smithsonian Trinomial Number: 45CA238H. While the *Statement of Significance* in the application focuses exclusively on the 1868 attack on Tsimshian people (see Section 2.3.1), it is important to stress that Harper was a historian, not an archaeologist, and there is no evidence that an archaeological study of Graveyard Spit was conducted prior to drafting this document. Thus, the application does not specifically identify: (1) where within the described property the attack occurred or (2) whether human remains are likely to be present here. In the latter regard, Harper did not note Smith's 1907 report of historic Native American burial features on the southern end of Graveyard Spit. It is additionally important to stress that the above-described National Register application is the only document which describes 45CA238H. An Archaeological Site Inventory Form was never prepared for it. The formal boundaries of 45CA238H - - as described in the application - - are a large rectangle encompassing the entire Graveyard Spit landform and a significant amount of the surrounding waters. More than half of the included area consists of intertidal and shallow subtidal surfaces in the adjacent bay. The closest terrestrial portions of 45CA238H are located approximately 0.5 mile east of the project area.

The Graveyard Spit property identified by Harper was not approved for listing with the National Register of Historic Places and it was subsequently added to the Washington Heritage Register in 1971.

Richard H. McClure, Jr. recorded a shell midden site at Cline Spit in 1980. It was assigned the Smithsonian Trinomial Number: 45CA239. No survey report accompanies the Archaeological Site Inventory Form and so the circumstances of this effort are unclear. In any event, McClure described cultural deposits extending across an area of approximately 125 by 55 yards and attributed them to the traditional S'Klallam village of “*Tsiskat*”. No estimate of the depth of the deposits was offered nor does it appear that he collected any materials there. A second account of the 45CA239 site area was prepared in an updated Archaeological Site Inventory Form prepared by Guideon Cauffman in 2014. Again, no survey report accompanies the updated Archaeological Site Inventory Form and so the circumstances of this effort are also unclear. Of some note, the site dimensions reported by Cauffman - - 7.3 by 5.5 meters - - are dramatically smaller than those given earlier by McClure. In this regard, Cauffman's account offers no evidence that subsurface testing was conducted in order to establish these much smaller boundaries and it remains possible that a significantly larger area of cultural deposits is still present here. The 45CA239 site area (as described by McClure) is located approximately 0.8

mile from the project area. The 45CA239 site area (as described by Cauffman) is located approximately 1 mile from the project area.

In sum, there have been no studies of shell midden deposits at any of the sites near Dungeness Bay and so we have no direct information about their ages or contents. Nevertheless, some data is available for shell midden sites in the nearby Sequim Bay area just to the southeast. In particular, data is available from 45CA227 at Washington Harbor (Onat and Larson 1984) and from 45CA214 at Pitship Point (Kennedy and Thomas 1977 and Wessen 1984). The latter sites offer evidence of a variety of economic activities related to the collection and use of maritime resources during the last ca. 2,000 years, and it is likely that at least some of the shell midden sites near Dungeness Bay contain additional such evidence of similar antiquity. At least broadly similar deposits are known from most coastal areas in western Washington.

Somewhat further away, recent excavations at 45CA426 - - approximately 6 miles to the south - - near Sequim (Morgan 1999), has provided evidence of much older Early to Middle Holocene cultural activities. While the latter is not well dated, it could be as much as 7,000 to 9,000 years old. Much less is known with confidence regarding these earlier cultures, but we do know that - - though less common - - sites with similar ancient stone tool assemblages have been found elsewhere on the Olympic Peninsula (e.g., at Slab Camp [Gallison 1994], Quilcene [Larsen 1971], Lake Cushman [Wessen 1990], and Lake Ozette [Conca 2000]). As such, it would not be unusual if similar materials were found on older surfaces in the vicinity of Dungeness Bay.

### 3 RESEARCH DESIGN

The activities described in this report represent a limited program of site survey designed to determine whether potentially significant archaeological resources are present within the Jamestown S'Klallam Dungeness Bay Project Area. The research design of the study included both a clear statement of goals and an identified set of appropriate methods.

#### 3.1 Research Goals

The goals of this effort were to identify any potentially significant archaeological resources which might be present in the project area, to document them, and to offer an assessment and recommendations regarding possible impacts to them during the proposed shellfish aquaculture activities. Such resources could include shell midden deposits similar to those present elsewhere in the Dungeness Bay area, deposits and/or features associated with early historic or more recent Euro-American occupation, and/or any other archaeological materials which might be present. To this end, the investigation reviewed the entire project area and considered adjoining areas. The effort was descriptive and documentary in nature. As such, the articulation of study findings within any particular proposed regional cultural framework was not a high priority. Similarly, the study results cannot be considered to be a test of any particular model of prehistoric settlement and subsistence patterns or other cultural process dynamics.

### 3.2 Research Methods

The work plan for this study relied upon standardized archaeological techniques established for an earlier assessment of an intertidal area in Sequim Bay selected for similar shellfish aquaculture activities (Wessen 2010). That effort consisted of background research and a ground surface inspection. The U. S. Army Corp of Engineers reviewers for the earlier proposed project specifically requested a visual “*walk over*” survey with no digging and our effort was designed to meet this standard. Essentially the same procedures were used at this time. I felt that they were equally appropriate in this situation as the current project area has already been in use for this purpose since the 1970s. Background information collected as a part of the effort indicates that this area was regularly disturbed to a depth of approximately 18 inches during this period and the Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe’s proposal is to continue to engage in similar disturbance. Given these conditions, I felt that materials exposed on the surface were likely to be a useful indicator of what this already disturbed deposit contains.

Background research for the study included the review of relevant documents on file with the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, the Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe, in the author’s possession, and other sources available on the internet.

The survey was essentially a reconnaissance-level examination of the surface of the project area. While straightforward in concept, the effort was complicated in that the only deep minus low tides available to us were during nighttime hours. As such, special plans were developed to conduct the survey in the dark. The inspection was made by a field crew of five individuals walking parallel transects at intervals of approximately 4 to 5 meters (13 to 16.5 feet). Each individual carried a strong light and swept the lane in front of them as the group moved as a single unit. Hand-held GPS receivers were used to keep the crew oriented correctly and to ensure that our coverage was complete. As was the case with the earlier 2010 survey, the possibility of including subsurface testing was initially considered during planning for this effort. The idea was again rejected, however, since it was felt that digging into the intertidal sediments could prove to be logistically complicated and that it would require more time than the brief exposure during the low tide would allow. I concluded that, if areas warranting subsurface testing were identified, they could be recorded with the GPS receivers and plans to attempt such action could be made for a later time.

If archaeological resources were identified, I planned to collect sufficient descriptive information to formally record them with the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation. Diagnostic artifacts, if encountered, would be photographed, but no cultural materials would be collected.

### 3.3 Practical Expectations

The background review and prior experience at Dungeness Bay and elsewhere along the marine shorelines of the northeastern Olympic Peninsula, suggested that the potential for archaeological resources being encountered in the Jamestown S’Klallam Dungeness Bay Project Area was low. The most likely type of archaeological feature to be seen here was considered to be an intertidal fish trap. Both wooden stake alignments representing weirs and stone wall traps have been reported on the southern Northwest Coast, and I considered that either type of structure could be present. I also considered that either late prehistoric or early historic cultural materials could be encountered on the tide flat’s surface, but such objects would be far likelier to

be re-deposited from nearby terrestrial areas than to represent potentially *in situ* cultural deposits exposed in the project area. The range of possible objects which could be encountered was understood to include human remains, although I felt that the likelihood of encountering such material was low. Finally, I did not dismiss the possibility that much older prehistoric cultural materials or deposits - - associated with older sea level stands - - could be present here, but, if so, I would expect them to be deeply buried beneath the more recent marine sediments. Such materials - - if present - - would not be visible during a “*walk over*” inspection and are very unlikely to be encountered within the depths that the planned shellfish aquaculture activities will affect.

#### 4 FIELD ACTIVITIES AND FINDINGS

Fieldwork activities conducted at the Jamestown S’Klallam Dungeness Bay Project Area occurred on the evening of 16 November 2016. The inspection was scheduled to take advantage of a -2.2 foot low tide. The crew included: Gary Wessen from Wessen & Associates, Inc., Ralph Riccio, Chris Burns, Casey Allen, and David Brownell from the Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe, and Tori Cantelow from the Point-No-Point Treaty Council. The weather was cool and overcast, but no rain fell.

The crew used for this survey was made up of shellfish technicians and other individuals without prior archaeological experience. As such, I gave them specific instructions regarding what we would be looking for. Crew members were to advise me if they encountered any broken - - or otherwise modified - - rock greater than 2 inches in length, any bone, or any historic object likely to be older than 50 years (i.e., pre-1965). We arrived in the project area almost 3 hours prior to the low tide and began examining northeast-southwest oriented lanes at its northwest (i.e., upper) margin. This approach allowed us to cover the uppermost portion of area first and then shift to lower portions of it as they become exposed by the dropping water level. In fact, the tide did not drop far enough to completely expose the entire unit and its southeastern (i.e., lower) margin had to be examined while it was still covered by from 2 to 4 inches of water. The water in this area was quite clear however and our lights effectively illuminated the exposed surface despite this presence. I do not believe that it significantly degraded our ability to detect the types of materials we were looking for.

We encountered some variation in conditions while examining the project area. While most of it consists of broad exposed surfaces of sand and/or finer sediments - - offering very good survey conditions - - more difficult locations are also present. The latter are mostly places in the southeastern part of the unit where eel grass or other aquatic vegetation effectively obscures the surface. Field mapping of the eel grass areas indicates that they account for approximately 15-20% of the surface here. These areas were examined, and I acknowledge that our efforts in them were less effective than on the adjacent bare surfaces.

Examples of cultural material are uncommon in the project area and most objects we did observe appeared to be quite recent and are probably related to earlier shellfish aquaculture activities here. These include fragments of plastic mesh bags, small diameter PVC pipes, rope, and small diameter hoses. No potentially prehistoric or early historic objects were observed. Localized low density accumulations of marine shell dominated by fragments representing Japanese oyster and basket cockle were encountered in a few places, but these appeared to be related to fluvial processes on the tide flat rather than cultural activity.

## 5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This survey and assessment of the Jamestown S’Klallam Dungeness Bay Project Area has found no evidence of the presence of either potentially intact archaeological deposits or re-deposited cultural materials other than those of relatively recent origin. While the surface inspection conducted at this time did not address the possibility of buried cultural deposits associated with older sea level stands, I think that such deposits - - if present - - are likely to be buried beneath the more recent marine sediments in this area. It is not possible to predict whether such deposits are, in fact, present and, if so, at what depth they might occur, but I can note that the extensive shellfish harvesting which has occurred in this area in recent years has not exposed evidence of such deposits. As such, I believe that the presence of such deposits within the uppermost 30 inches of sediment in this project area is very unlikely.

I recommend that the Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe be allowed to proceed with their plan to conduct shellfish aquaculture activities in this project area. Additional archaeological research actions do not appear to be warranted at this time and monitoring of the proposed aquaculture activities is not necessary.

## 6 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bergland, Eric

1984 *Summary Prehistory and Ethnography of the Olympic National Park, Washington.*

A report prepared by the National Park Service Pacific Northwest Region, Cultural Resource Division. Seattle.

Blumenthal, Richard W.

2009 *Charles Wilkes and the Exploration of Inland Washington Waters.* McFarland & Company, Inc. Jefferson.

Chambers, Craig, Paul Martin, Lee Porterfield, and June Robinson

2003 *A History of Clallam County, Washington.* Clallam County Historical Society. Port Angeles.

Croes, Dale R.

1995 *The Hoko River Archaeological Site Complex: the Wet/Dry Site (45CA213), 3,000 – 1,700 B.P.* Washington State University Press. Pullman.

2005 *The Hoko River Archaeological Site Complex: the Rockshelter (45CA21), 1,000 – 100 B.P.* Washington State University Press. Pullman.

Conca, David J.

2000 *Archaeological Investigations at Site 45CA432: Re-Evaluating Mid-Holocene Land Use on the Olympic Peninsula, Washington.* A Master’s Thesis in Anthropology, Western Washington University. Bellingham.

Daugherty, Richard D.

1948 Survey of the Washington Coast from Cape Flattery to Cape Disappointment. Manuscript in the author’s possession.

Eells, Myron

1889 The Twana, Chemakum, and Klallam Indians of Washington Territory. *Smithsonian Institute Annual Report for 1887*, pp.605-681. Washington D.C.

Fish, Harriet U.

1983 *Tracks, Trails, and Tales in Clallam County, State of Washington*. Published by the author.

Gallison, James Daniel

1994 *Slab Camp: An Early to Middle Holocene Olcott Complex in the Eastern Olympic Mountains of Washington*. A Doctoral Dissertation in Anthropology, Washington State University. Pullman.

Gibbs, George

1877 Tribes of Western Washington and Northwestern Oregon. *Contributions to North American Ethnology* 1(2): 157-361.

Gorsline, Jerry (editor)

1992 *Shadows of Our Ancestors*. Empty Bowl. Port Townsend.

Gowan, Evan James

2007 *Glacio-Isostatic Adjustment Modeling of Improved Relative Sea-Level Observations in Southwestern British Columbia, Canada*. A Masters Thesis prepared for the School of Earth and Ocean Sciences, University of Victoria. Victoria.

Hallion, Louis

1987 *Soil Survey of Clallam County Area, Washington*. Soil Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture. Washington D.C.

Keeting, Virginia (editor)

1976 *Dungeness: the Lure of a River*. Sequim Bicentennial Committee. Sequim.

Kennedy, Hal and Robert S. Thomas

1977 Archaeological Testing of a Disturbed Site on Sequim Bay, Clallam Bay, Washington. Office of Public Archaeology, Institute of Environmental Studies, University of Washington. Seattle.

Lambert, Mary Ann

1961 *Dungeness Massacre and Other Regional Tales*. Published by the author.

Larsen, Curtis

1971 Unpublished draft preliminary report of excavations at the Quilcene Site (45JE14), Jefferson County, Washington. Report on file with the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation. Olympia.



Larson, Lynn

- 2006 Data Recovery Excavation and Archaeological Monitoring at the Tse-Whit-Zen Site (45CA523), Clallam County, Washington. Larson Anthropological/Archaeological Services. Gig Harbor.

Lotzgesell, George

- 1993 Pioneer Days at Old Dungeness. *Washington Historical Quarterly* 24(4):264-270.

Meany, Edmond S.

- 1957 *Vancouver's Discovery of Puget Sound*. Binford & Mort. Portland.

Morgan, Vera E. (editor)

- 1999 The SR-101 Sequim Bypass Archaeological Project: Mid- to Late-Holocene Occupations on the Northern Olympic Peninsula, Clallam County, Washington. *Eastern Washington University Reports in Archaeology and History* 100-108. Cheney.

Onat, Astrida R. Blukis and Lynn Larson

- 1984 Report of Testing of 45CA227, Washington Harbor and Cultural Resources Overview at the Battelle Marine Research Laboratories, Sequim, Washington. A report prepared for Battelle's Pacific Northwest Laboratories by Blukis Onat Applied Sciences, Inc. Seattle.

Porter, Stephen and Terry W. Swanson

- 1998 Radiocarbon Age Constraints on Rates of Advance and Retreat of the Puget Lobe of the Cordilleran Ice Sheet during the Last Glaciation. *Quaternary Research* 50:205-213.

Reagan, Albert

- 1917 Archaeological Notes on Western Washington and Adjacent British Columbia. *Proceedings of the California Academy of Sciences, Fourth Series*, 7(1):1-37.

Samuels, Stephan R. (editor)

- 1991 Ozette Archaeological Project Research Reports, Volume I, House Structure and Floor Midden. *Reports of Investigation* No. 63, Department of Anthropology, Washington State University. Pullman.
- 1994 Ozette Archaeological Project Research Reports, Volume II, Fauna. *Reports of Investigation* No. 66, Department of Anthropology, Washington State University. Pullman.

Smith, Harlan I.

- 1907 Archaeology of the Gulf of Georgia and Puget Sound. *Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition* Volume II, Part VI. American Museum of Natural History. New York.

Stallard, Bruce and Clayton Denman

- 1955 Archaeological Site Survey of the Olympic Coast between the Queets and Ozette Rivers. Report on file with the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation. Olympia.

Stauss, Joseph H.

- 2002 *The Jamestown S’Klallam Story - Rebuilding a Northwest Coast Indian Tribe*.  
Jamestown S’Klallam. Sequim.

Suttles, Wayne

- 1990 Central Coast Salish. In: *Northwest Coast*, edited by Wayne Suttles. Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 7, William Sturtevant, general editor, Smithsonian Institute. Washington, D.C.

Todd, Steve, Nick Fitzpatrick, Alan Carter-Mortimer, and Chris Weller

- 2006 Historical Changes to Estuaries, Spits, and Associated Tidal Wetland Habitats in the Hood Canal and Strait of Juan de Fuca Regions of Washington State. *Point No Point Treaty Council Technical Report* 06-1. Kingston.

Wessen, Gary C.

- 1978 Archaeological Reconnaissance of River Valleys on the Western Olympic Peninsula, Washington. *Project Report* No. 69, Washington Archaeological Research Center. Pullman.
- 1984 Archaeological Activities at the Sequim Bay Marina Site, Pitship Point, Clallam County, Washington. A report prepared for the Port of Port Angeles by Wessen & Associates, Inc. Burien.
- 1990a The Prehistory of the Ocean Coast of Washington. In: *Northwest Coast*, edited by Wayne Suttles. Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 7. William Sturtevant, general editor, Smithsonian Institute. Washington, D.C.
- 1990b A Report of Limited Survey and Evaluation at 45CA407, A Prehistoric Archaeological Site near Dungeness, Washington. A report prepared for the Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe by Wessen & Associates, Inc. Burien.
- 2004a An Assessment of Possible Prehistoric Shell Midden Deposits Near the Mouth of Dean Creek, Blyn, Washington. A report prepared for the Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe by Wessen & Associates, Inc. Burien.
- 2004b An Archaeological Assessment of a Portion of a Proposed New RV Park near Jimmy-Come-Lately Creek, Blyn, Washington. A report prepared for the Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe by Wessen & Associates, Inc. Burien.
- 2005 An Archaeological Assessment of a Portion of the Jimmy-Come-Lately Creek ‘Delta Cone’, Blyn, Washington. A report prepared for the Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe by Wessen & Associates, Inc. Burien.

Whitlock, Cathy

- 1992 Vegetation and Climatic History of the Pacific Northwest during the Last 20,000 Years: Implications for Understanding Present-Day Biodiversity. *The Northwest Environmental Journal* 8:5-28.

REFERENCE: NWS- 2007-1213

LOCATION: Dungeness Spit  
Parcel No. 20-A013012

PROPOSED PROJECT:  
Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe Dungeness Bay  
Oyster Farm

APPLICANT: Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe

LAT/LONG: 48.02465N 123.004031W


IN: Dungeness Bay  
NEAR/AT: Sequim  
COUNTY: Clallam  
STATE: WA

ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNERS:

1. DNR
2. USFWS

PAGE # \_\_ OF # 5    DATE: 12/28/2017

## Project Drawings for Shellfish Aquaculture Location and Methods in Dungeness Bay



REFERENCE: NWS- 2007-1213

LOCATION: Dungeness Spit  
Parcel No. 20-A013012

PROPOSED PROJECT:  
Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe Dungeness Bay  
Oyster Farm

APPLICANT: Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe


LAT/LONG: 48.02465N 123.004031W

IN: Dungeness Bay  
NEAR/AT: Sequim  
COUNTY: Clallam  
STATE: WA

ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNERS:

1. DNR
2. USFWS

PAGE # \_\_ OF # 5    DATE: 12/28/2017



REFERENCE: NWS- 2007-1213

APPLICANT: Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe

ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNERS:

1. DNR
2. USFWS


LOCATION: Dungeness Spit  
Parcel No. 20-A013012

LAT/LONG: 48.02465N 123.004031W

PAGE # \_\_ OF # 5 DATE: 12/28/2017

PROPOSED PROJECT:  
Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe Dungeness Bay  
Oyster Farm

IN: Dungeness Bay  
NEAR/AT: Sequim  
COUNTY: Clallam  
STATE: WA



REFERENCE: NWS- 2007-1213

APPLICANT: Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe

ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNERS:

1. DNR
2. USFWS


LOCATION: Dungeness Spit  
Parcel No. 20-A013012

LAT/LONG: 48.02465N 123.004031W

PAGE # \_\_ OF # 5 DATE: 12/28/2017

PROPOSED PROJECT:  
Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe Dungeness Bay  
Oyster Farm

IN: Dungeness Bay  
NEAR/AT: Sequim  
COUNTY: Clallam  
STATE: WA





REFERENCE: NWS- 2007-1213

LOCATION: Dungeness Spit  
Parcel No. 20-A013012

PROPOSED PROJECT:  
Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe Dungeness Bay  
Oyster Farm

APPLICANT: Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe

LAT/LONG: 48.02465N 123.004031W

IN: Dungeness Bay  
NEAR/AT: Sequim  
COUNTY: Clallam  
STATE: WA

ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNERS:

1. DNR
2. USFWS

PAGE # \_\_ OF # 5    DATE: 12/28/2017

