ARCHAEOLOGICAL DATA RECOVERY
OF A TRAIL FEATURE
WITHIN THE FAGA VILLAGE SITE (AS11-1)
TA‘U ISLAND, MANU‘A ISLAND GROUP,
AMERICAN SAMOA

Prepared By:
Leann McGerty, B.A.,
and
Robert L. Spear, Ph.D.
SCS/CRMS, Inc.,
711 Kapiolani Blvd., Suite 1475
Honolulu, HI 96813

and

Paul L. Cleghorn, Ph.D.
and
William A. Shapiro, M.A.
Pacific Legacy, Inc.
332 Uhunui Street
Kailua, HI 96734
September 2002

Prepared for:
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers,
Honolulu District, Building 252,
Fort Shafter, Hawaii 96858-5440

FINAL REPORT
Delivery Order No. 0040
ABSTRACT

Scientific Consultant Services/Cultural Resource Management Services (SCS/CRMS), Inc. and Pacific Legacy, Inc., under contract with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Pacific Ocean Division (COE-POD) (DACA83-95-D-004; D.O. 40), conducted Archaeological Data Recovery at an archaeological trail feature in the vicinity of Avmalee Cove on Ta’u Island, in the Manu’a Island Group, American Samoa. This trail, designated Feature U, was previously recorded as part of the Pagh Village Site (AS-11-1), which is potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The western portion of the trail feature lies within a proposed quarry area that is planned to be used during construction of the Faleasao Harbor improvements.

Data recovery investigations consisted of:

- a detailed record of the trail feature by mapping, photographing, and describing construction details
- informant interviews
- excavation of five test units
- appropriate laboratory analyses (midden, artifact, and radiocarbon samples)

The trail extends for at least 40 m from east to west, paralleling the coast, and ranges in width from 1.2 to 2.5 m. The trail was constructed of stacked and piled basalt boulders and cobbles, with the down-slope retaining wall being considerable higher than the up-slope wall. The down-slope wall measures about 0.7 m high and the up-slope wall measures approximately 0.2 m high. The surface of the trail is roughly paved with basalt boulders and cobbles.

Radiocarbon dates from nearby the trail feature, combined with informant information, suggest that the trail may have been used as early as the later part of the 19th century and into the 20th century.

Two human burials were discovered in the test excavations. These remains were partially exposed in order to determine whether they were indeed human remains; once they were determined to be human, they were then reburied.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

Scientific Consultant Services/Cultural Resource Management Services (SCS/CRMS), Inc. and Pacific Legacy, Inc., under contract to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Pacific Ocean Division (COE-POD) (DACA83-95-D-004; D.O. 40), conducted archaeological Data Recovery services at an archaeological trail feature in the vicinity of Avatele Cove on Ta'u Island, in the Mau Ila Island Group, American Samoa (Figure 1). This trail, designated Feature U, was previously recorded as part of the Fagā Village Site (AS-11-1), which is potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP, see Figure 2). The western portion of the trail feature lies within a proposed quarry area that is planned for use during the construction of the Faleasao Harbor improvements.

The archaeological investigations were conducted under the authority of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended. Previously, a Data Recovery Plan (Cleghorn and Spear 1996) was submitted to the American Samoa Historic Preservation Office (ASIPO) in partial fulfillment of the 1990 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the American Samoa Department of Public Works and American Samoa Historic Preservation Officer.

The scope of work for this project consisted of four tasks:
1. recording the trail feature by mapping, photographing, and describing construction details
2. interviewing informants
3. excavating five test units
4. laboratory analysis (i.e., midden, artifacts, radiocarbon samples)

The archaeological field investigations were directed by William A. Shapiro from Pacific Legacy, Inc. with assistance from Leann McGerty and Randy Ogg from SCS/CRMS. Local support was provided by Galuva Tuifua and Anaetela Petulo from Faleasao Village on Ta'u. Fieldwork was conducted from October 21-28, 1998.

The product of the fieldwork was a document of the trail feature created through describing, mapping, and photographing the feature. Informant information was obtained that provided details about the use and maintenance of the trail in historic times. Finally, four test excavations were conducted in an attempt to find any cultural deposits that may have been associated with this trail feature.

SCS/CRMS is providing the necessary curation services for this project. Artifacts are curated so as to allow ready access and display for local residents, as well as qualified researchers. After laboratory analysis, SCS/CRMS will arrange to temporarily curate all recovered cultural remains with the American Samoa Government's Jean P. Haydon Museum in Fagatogo. Final curation of these materials shall be determined through consultation between the various government agencies at a future date. Field notes, maps, and other field data are the property of the U.S. Government and at the conclusion of the project will be transmitted to the U.S. Army Engineer District in Honolulu.
Figure 2: The Faga' Village Site AS-11-1 (From Cleghorn et al. 1997).
1.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The island of Taʻu is a steep sided volcanic cone that has a narrow, flat coastline interrupted by numerous large colluvial fans of basalt boulder and cobble talus. Taʻu, along with the islands of Ofu and Olosega make up the mutually invisible island group of Manuʻa, which is separated from the larger island of Tutuila by approximately 100 km of ocean.

The land area of Taʻu measures 28.5 km², with a coastline of 32.5 km. The highest point of the island, Mt. Lata, is 966 m above sea level making it the highest mountain in American Samoa. In 1980, Taʻu supported a population of 1,146 people (Hunt and Kirch 1987, see Table 1).

Taʻu is a shield volcano of the Pliocene and Pleistocene age. The summit of the volcanic peak collapsed to the south, exposing the caldera and creating a semicircular cliff area backed by Lata Mountain. Late Pleistocene and Holocene volcanic activity created the lava bench at Fitiuta and the pyroclastic formations at Faleasao (Stice and McCoy 1968).

The project area is made up of three soil units: “Ngedebus Variant extremely cobbly sand, 0 to 5 percent slopes”; “Pavaiai stony clay loam, 6 to 12 percent slopes”; and “Pavaiai stony clay loam, 12 to 25 percent slope” (Nakamura 1984:Plate 5).

The Ngedebus Variant extremely cobbly sand is a deep excessively drained coastal soil formed of sand and cobbles made from coral and marine shells. Typically, the surface layer is an extensively cobbly sand that is about 38 cm thick and black in color due to its high organic content (Nakamura 1984:15).

The Pavaiai stony clay loam (both the 6 to 12-percent and the 12 to 25-percent slopes) is a moderately deep, well drained soil that was formed in volcanic ash and is underlain by basalt bedrock at about 50 to 100 cm below surface. The surface layer is typically a very dark greyish brown stony clay loam approximately 118 cm thick, underlain by a very dark greyish brown clay loam about 13 cm thick. Between this second layer and bedrock is an approximate 65 cm thick dark brown, very cobbly sandy loam. Permeability is moderately rapid, runoff is slow to medium, water erosion hazard is slight to moderate (Nakamura 1984:19-20).

The project area is not currently being used, although it was likely used for gardening activities in the past. The present biota includes banana, breadfruit, feral taro, vines, and a variety of ferns.

1.2 PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGY

The first archaeological investigations that incorporated the project area were conducted by Dr. William Kikuchi as part of his Masters Thesis research. Kikuchi recorded an archaeological village site at Fagā as follows:

The oldest village in all of the Samoan Islands, traditionally and mythologically, was that of Fagā, Ta-4, located about three miles west of the present village of Fitiuta. Tradition states that when Fagā had a war in
Which the Tui-Manu`a was killed by invaders, the blood spilled by the Tui-Manu`a desecrated the area so the village had to be abandoned [1963:44].

The site at Fagā (originally designated Ta-4, and then assigned the ASHPO number AS-11-1) was later re-investigated by Terry Hunt (Hunt 1987; Hunt and Kirch 1988), who surveyed eight ocean-inland transects within the site area. Recorded features included round-ended house foundations, terraces with house floors, terraces without habitation structures, pavings, wall enclosures, burial monuments, mounds, platforms, and stone alignments.

Jeff Clark, as part of his overall survey of the entire Ta`u Highway road corridor states that local residents informed him that some of the features were built by “parents and grandparents of some Filiuta residents,” while others were older than history has recorded (1990:18). Clark thought that some of the surface structures dated to prehistoric times (Clark 1990). Clark excavated a 1 by 2 m unit at the Fagā site and recorded the stratigraphy in a previously excavated pit associated with the construction of a modern house (Clark 1990:17-34). The controlled excavation unit exposed eight strata extending approximately 2 m below present ground surface. The previously excavated pit revealed 12 strata extending 2.3 m below surface. A few artifacts, consisting of basalt flakes were recovered from the excavations and numerous pit features, postholes, and pavements were recorded in profile. A charcoal sample from Layer VII in the controlled excavation unit yielded a calibrated date of A.D. 960-1270 at two sigma (Clark 1990:33, see Table 2).

In 1995, a surface survey was conducted between Avatele Cove and Lepula (Cleghorn et al. 1997). Abundant surface remains were found on the Fagā Coastal Flat. Twenty feature complexes composed of over 76 substantial features (34 fale or house platforms and 42 burial monuments) were recorded; this total does not include other feature types such as terraces, enclosures, walls, etc. The surface features within the survey corridor were delineated; however, numerous features extended beyond the project area. The Fagā Site (AS-11-1) appeared to occupy the entire coastal flat, which measured approximately 1,200 m in length by 50 to over 200 m wide. Informant information collected during the course of fieldwork indicated that many of the structures were built and used in relatively recent times.

The trail was recorded as Feature U in Site AS-11-1. Feature U is described as follows (see Figure 3):

Feature Complex U is located at the west end of the Fagā coastal flat and consists of an abandoned dirt road (see Figures 2 and 3). It extends west of Power Pole 1 on the Ta`u Road and continues eastward to where it is no longer discernible at an intermittent drainage between and south of Power Poles 7 and 8 (see Figure 2). The road varies in width but averages 3.0 to 3.6 m. The road is at the southern edge of the Fagā coastal flat where the edge of the flat meets the steep talus slope to the south. It is inland or lutsa and south of the Ta`u road 24 to 44 m, averaging 33 m south of the existing road. The proposed road centerline in between Feature 4 and the Ta`u Road, but comes within a few
meters of Feature U in the vicinity of Power Poles 5 and 6. Vegetation along the road consists of dense tropical jungle (including *fa'au*, vines and ferns) with scattered plantations of bananas, coconut palms, *ʻulu*, and papaya (Figure 4).

This feature lies within the lands of Paopao on the west end (between Power Poles 1 and 3) and Fautanu property on the east end (from Power Poles 3 to 8). The only artifact noted was an old tire rim below the road grade. Portions of the road have been supported by sections of stacked basalt cobble and boulder rock retaining walls (Figure 5). No aluminum feature complex identification tag was left at this feature complex and no plan map was drawn. This feature has a transportation function.

Our local informant, Misa said that this road is not continuous the whole length of Fagā. It apparently goes inland near power pole 1 then come back out to the Ta’u road after a short while. It similarly goes inland then back out again near Power Pole 31, although we did not see clear evidence for it in this vicinity. Misa did not know when the road was built, but recognized it as being “old” [Cleghorn et al. 1997].

In 1997, personnel from SCS/CRMS and Pacific Legacy returned to the Fagā Village site to conduct Data Recovery investigations (Cleghorn et al. 1998). Thirteen controlled excavation units and 17 shovel test pits were excavated within the boundaries of Site AS-11-1. Areas investigated included interiors of *fa'ale, fa'ale paepae*, areas adjacent to *fa'ale*, and areas not associated with
Figure 4: Trail Feature at Fagā. View to East.

Figure 5: Feature U Facing at Fagā. View to East.
structural features. It appears that the Fagā Coastal Flat was initially occupied sometime between 800 to 1300 years ago in the 7th to 11th centuries A.D. Occupation of the coastal flat continued up into historic times, and some of the dwellings were abandoned within current memories.

The traditional importance of this site, along with its size, complexity, integrity, and long period of occupation has led the American Samoa Historic Preservation Office to begin the process of nominating the site to the National Register of Historic Places.
2.0 RESEARCH DESIGN

The primary objective of the Data Recovery investigations was to thoroughly document Feature U of Site AS-11-1, a stone paved trail that parallels the coast at the western edge of the Faga Village site. This level of investigation does not adhere to any particular theoretical orientation, nor are explicit hypotheses necessarily warranted. However, several basic questions guided the field investigations:

(1) What is the size and extent of the trail?
(2) What materials and techniques were used to construct the trail?
(3) Are there any surface structures or subsurface deposits possibly associated with the trail?
(4) What is the antiquity of the feature?

Data to address these questions was collected during pedestrian survey, feature documentation, and test excavations.

Initial documentation of the trail was provided by Cleghorn et al. (1997), who previously recorded the feature (see Section 1.2). Mapping and recording of the feature consisted of preparing detailed plan view and profile maps, locating surface artifacts, collecting verbal descriptions, and detailed photography. Surface artifacts were accurately located on plan view maps and their provenience was described. The discernable extent of the trail was determined and its orientation was plotted on the appropriate project maps.

Once the extent of the trail was determined, locations were selected for subsurface excavations. The purpose of the subsurface excavations was to:

(1) determine the presence or absence of cultural deposits associated with the trail
(2) obtain dating samples to determine cultural stratigraphic sequences
(3) quantitatively sample and characterize in situ cultural deposits
(4) determine the character and extent of cultural deposits

Deciphering the chronology of cultural deposits associated with this trail was an important component in the interpretation of this feature. Every effort was expended to obtain charcoal for radiocarbon dating of associated deposits. Three dating samples were sent to Beta Analytic for radiocarbon dating. Additionally, information regarding the history and use of this trail was elicited from knowledgeable members of the island community.

Completion of the stated objectives resulted in the recording and documentation of all readily accessible data associated with this historic resource. This work will be used to mitigate any adverse effects the proposed construction might have on this feature.
3.0 METHODOLOGY

3.1 FIELD METHODS
The primary purpose of the surface survey portion of the proposed investigations was to determine the physical extent of the trail. In addition, any spatially associated archaeological resources not previously identified were to be recorded. Intensity of individual site mapping and descriptions was determined by the extent of the site, the amount of cultural material present, and time and logistical constraints. The time and logistical constraints influencing the project were the shortness of the field phase—seven days—and the distance between the project area and field crew quarters. Physiographic factors such as local topography, major changes in vegetative communities, sedimentary changes, etc., were located, noted, and recorded.

The physical extent of the trail was clearly marked with surveyor's flagging tape and located on available project and USGS quad maps (Figure 6). Plan view maps, locations of surface artifacts, verbal descriptions, and a complete photographic record was compiled. McConnell Dowell (1988) mapped the proposed quarry and the extent of Feature U, from its west end to Power Pole 3, with a surveyor’s transit and stadia rod. East of Power Pole 3, the trail feature was difficult to delineate and was incorrectly shown on the McConnell Dowell map as merging with the current Ta’u Road near Power Pole 4 (Figure 7). Excavation units and plan views were mapped with the use of a tape and compass.

Subsurface excavations were used in order to determine the presence or absence of cultural deposits, to obtain dating samples, to determine cultural stratigraphic sequence, to quantitatively sample and characterize in situ cultural deposits, and to determine the extent and character of cultural deposits within the site. Excavations were dug by hand using trowels, brushes, and small mattocks. All excavated material was screened through 1/8-inch wire mesh, except for portions of TU-17 and TU-18 where soils became too muddy or consisted of cinder gravels and necessitated the use of 1/4-inch mesh screens.

All cultural material (i.e., artifacts, midden, charcoal, and other faunal and floral material) was bagged by stratigraphic provenience. The exception was those artifacts in direct association with two burials in TUs 15 and 16. At least one wall of each excavation unit was stratigraphically profiled and described in conformance with U.S. Soil Conservation Service and Munsell Color Notation. Plan view maps were drawn of major excavations layers. All excavation units were photographed.

Human remains were expected to be encountered during the Data Recovery program in the Faga Village site. A strict protocol was developed, mandating that if remains were encountered during the Data Recovery excavations, all work at the location was to halt and government representatives would be immediately notified. Recovery of any human remains or burials was contingent upon direction from the COE-POD Archaeology Manager (Mr. Charles F. Streck, Jr.) to SCS/CRMS and Pacific Legacy. When a possible burial feature was encountered, the local
Figure 6: Feature U and Test Unit (TU) Locations at Fagā.
Figure 7: Proposed Borrow Pit Site for the Faleasao Harbor Project Showing the Western Portion of Feature U within the Area of Potential Effect (Map by McConnell Dowell 1998).
Samoa informant was notified. Exposure of the feature continued only until an accurate determination could be made as to whether or not the bones were human. If human, excavation within the unit stopped and the appropriate people were contacted. The remains would then be reburied according to the wishes of the local Samoan representatives.

3.2 LABORATORY ANALYSES
All retrieved artifact and midden samples were thoroughly cleaned in the laboratory. Artifacts were photographed, sketched, and identified. All metric measurements and descriptions were recorded and the data are presented in Section 5. Midden samples were identified, weighed, and tabulated. Bertell D. Davis, Ph.D., Laboratory Director for SCS/CRMS, conducted these analyses. Dr. Davis has over 25 years of experience in Pacific Basin archaeology.

Charcoal dating samples were prepared in the laboratory and submitted to Beta Analytic Laboratory in Florida for analysis. Because the charcoal samples were so small, Accelerator-Mass-Spectrometry (AMS) techniques were used to date these samples. The AMS dates included the Carbon-13/12 isotope correction.
4.0 RESULTS OF FIELD INVESTIGATIONS OF FEATURE U AT FAGĀ

Specific information concerning the trail feature was obtained from a local informant, Mr. Tala Fautanu, who has a plantation in the western portion of Fagā, where the trail is located. A pedestrian survey was conducted along the observable length of the trail, and attempts were made to find remnants of the feature where it was reported to have been located. The trail was mapped and profiled with the use of a metric tape and compass. Four test units were excavated in the vicinity of the trail feature. An additional unit was excavated in the inland portion of the Fagā site in order to compare the trail with similar terrain.

4.1 INFORMANT INFORMATION

Mr. Tala Fautanu, a resident of Fitiuta and the principal of Manu’a High School at Ta’u, maintains a plantation on the western portion of the Fagā coastal flat. He provided the following information regarding the trail (Feature U) and the location of archaeological material in the western area of Fagā.

Mr. Fautanu stated that the trail was the original path through Fagā and was used prior to the Ta’u Road being constructed around 1966. He remembered walking the trail when he was younger to go to school and stated that vehicles never drove on the trail. He believes that a wheel found below the trail feature was taken from Ta’u Road to be used to support the fragile plantation crops of modern-day. The entire village of Fitiuta would work on repairing the trail as needed, by filling in the rough spots with small rocks and pebbles and constructing stacked-rock crossings at the drainages. The east end of the trail feature merged with the existing Ta’u Road in the vicinity of Power Pole 13 near the western well road. However, west of Power Poles 8 and 9 the trail is difficult, and nearly impossible, to demarcate due to subsequent plantation and hurricane disturbances. The trail gradually got closer to the Ta’u Road east of Power Pole 8 until they merged near the existing well road. The west end of the trail apparently connected to the Ta’u Road just west of the stream within the proposed quarry area.

Mr. Fautanu mentioned that he has found a couple of “stone adze relics” when planting his crops on the east side of the drainage between Power Poles 7 and 8 and inland of the trail feature (in the vicinity of Test Unit 16). He also stated that below the trail from the drainage eastward to near Power Pole 4, he had uncovered smooth rocks among rougher angular boulders and cobbles, which he believes are probably burial areas. Mr. Fautanu said that fale and burial features at Fagā do not extend west of Power Pole 4. West of Power Pole 4 the terrain becomes steeper and rockier, probably delimiting the edge of the Fagā Village flat.

Mr. Fautanu and other local informants have stated that during times of war it was not a common practice to bury the warriors who were killed, but they were often just left where they died in battle. As a result, it is not unusual to find unmarked graves at relatively shallow depths below surface.
4.2 SURVEY RESULTS
The observable length of the trail feature was mapped in relation to the present Ta’u Road to a point just east of the drainage near Power Pole 8. East of this area, the trail is impossible to delineate due to recent vegetation growth, plantation activities, and past hurricane disturbance. The discernable length of this trail is about 40 m. Two profiles were drawn of Feature U, where rock retention is most obvious, showing the relationship to the slope and Ta’u Road (Figures 8, 9, 10, and 11). At these points, the width of the trail ranges from 1.2 to 2.5 m.

The trail was constructed of stacked and piled basalt boulders and cobbles, with the down-slope retaining wall being considerable higher than the up-slope wall. The down-slope wall measures approximately 0.7 m high and the up-slope wall measures approximately 0.2 m high. The surface of the trail is roughly paved with basalt boulders and cobbles.

*Ma’a tui ave* or *ave* grinding rock, was identified within the facing of the trail near Cross Section 2 during the clearing of the trail prior to drawing the profile (Figure 12). The wheel originally identified during the 1977 surface survey and initially believed to be associated with the trail feature was relocated (Figure 13).

Four test units (TUs 14-16, 18) were excavated in the vicinity of Feature U and one test unit (TU-17) was excavated inland of Feature P at the edge of the talus slope. TU 17 was excavated for comparative purposes so that a sample of the central portion of the site would be tested in terrain similar to where the trail feature is located.

4.4 STRATIGRAPHIC DESCRIPTIONS
Test Unit 14
Test Unit 14 was located to the south (inland and upslope) of Feature U near its western end (see Figures 6 and 14). Immediately to the west was a small drainage area that was referred to as the 'old quarry.' Feature U could not be detected beyond this point.

A 1 by 2 m unit was excavated to 0.60 mbs (Figure 15). Two stratigraphic layers were exposed.

**Layer I**  
0-30 cmbs  
Very dark grayish brown (10YR 3/2) silty loam. A high percentage of cobbles and pebbles were present. Cultural materials included charcoal flecks and one basalt flake.

**Layer II**  
30-60 cmbs  
Very dark grayish brown (10YR 3/2) cinder. This layer consisted entirely of pebble and cobble sized pieces of volcanic cinder material. No cultural material was identified.

No subsurface features were encountered. A piece of a weathered Turbinidae shell, a basalt flake, and charcoal flecks were found between 0-20 cmbs.
Figure 8: Cross Section 1: Feature U Profile at Datum F (see Figure 6 for Location of Profile).

Figure 9 Cross Section 2: Feature U Profile at Datum L (see Figure 6 for Location of Profile).
Figure 10: Feature U Cross-Section 1. View to East.

Figure 11: Feature U Cross-Section 2. View to East.
Figure 12: Maa Tui Ava in Feature U Retaining Wall. View to South.

Figure 13: Metal Wheel Downslope from Feature U. View to North.
Figure 14: Test Unit 14 at Feature U. View to West.

Figure 15: South Wall Profile of TU-14 at Feature U.
Test Unit 15
Test Unit 15 was located at the eastern end of Feature U between the present Ta`u road and Feature U (see Figures 6 and 16). A 1 by 1 m test unit was excavated to 60/70 cmbs. Two stratigraphic layers were encountered.

Layer I
0-50 cmbs
Black (10YR 2/1) silty clay loam. Layer I contained abundant pebble and cobble sized basalt cinder rocks. Small pieces of waterworn coral and Turbinidae shell were mixed in with the cinders. Cultural materials included two basalt flakes (identified between 0 and 30 cmbs) and a small concentration of charcoal in the southwestern section of the test unit at 46 cmbs. Pebbles representing an `ili`ili pavement were identified at approximately 45 cmbs.

Layer II
50-70 cmbs
Very dark brown (10YR 2/2) silty clay loam. Layer II contained basalt and coral `ili`ili pebbles. Cultural materials included some Turbo shells, charcoal, three basalt flakes (one with polish) and human bone (Feature 1) appearing at 60 cmbs.

Feature 1 was a human burial associated with an `ili`ili pavement, located at 60 cmbs. Feature 1 was an adult with bones in poor condition. The burial was in a partially flexed position, with the unexcavated head area turned toward the south. The strict protocol concerning burials mandates that upon discovery, all work should cease in the immediate vicinity and government representatives should be notified immediately. No human bones were recovered unless directed by COE-POD. Photographs were taken and a plan view was drawn (Figure 17 and 18). This burial is not shown in profile (Figure 19) because it was not present in the east wall profile.

Cultural materials found above the burial included four basalt flakes—two with polish, Turbinidae shell midden, and two concentrations of charcoal identified at 46 and 50 cmbs that were collected for radiocarbon dating. The soil associated with the burial was screened through 1/8-inch mesh. Three basalt flakes, one with polish, were recovered and then reinterred with the human remains.

Galuenga Tuft removed the long bones, washed and wrapped them in cloth, then placed them into a box. The bottom of the unit was lined with plastic and the box with the long bones was placed atop the plastic. A sheet of metal roofing was placed over the box. Tuft said prayers before the unit was backfilled.
Figure 16: Photograph of TU-15 Location During Excavation. View to South.

Figure 17: Photograph of TU-15 Base of Excavation. View to South.
Figure 18: Planview Illustration of TU-15, Feature 1.

Figure 19: East Wall Profile of TU-15 at Feature U.
Test Unit 16
Test Unit 16 was located above the trail feature near its eastern end and was situated to the west of the drainage area. This area was chosen for the unit location since it was the area that Mr. Fautanu discovered some "stone aile relicts" while planting his plantation crops. A 1 by 1 m test unit was excavated to 60 cm (Figure 20). Two stratigraphic layers were encountered.

Layer I
0-35 cm
Black (10YR 2/1) silt loam. Layer I contained abundant cobbles and pebbles.

Layer II
35-60 cm
Very dark gray (10YR 3/1) loam. Layer II contained charcoal, seven basalt flakes and human bone appearing at 40 cm.

Feature 1, a human burial, was encountered at 40 cm. The burial appeared to be that of an adult, with bones in very poor condition. The position of the burial could not be determined based on the few bones that were uncovered. Cultural materials included a piece of marine shell, seven basalt flakes, and two pieces of carbonized material were recovered from the soil associated with the burial. Charcoal was collected for radiocarbon dating. The artifacts were photographed and then reinterred with the human remains (Figure 23).

Galupea Tuifii washed the recovered bones then placed them with the remaining bones, flakes, and soil in a plastic bag. The bottom of the unit was lined with rocks with a piece of metal was placed atop the stones. The bag of bones, soil and flakes was placed atop the sheet of metal and another sheet of metal roofing was then placed on top of the bag. Prayers were said by Tuifii and the unit was backfilled.

Test Unit 17
Test Unit 17 was located upslope from the Feature Complex P, in terrain similar to that surrounding the western portion of Feature U (see Figures 2, 24, and 25). A 1 by 1 m test unit was excavated to 1.10 m. Two stratigraphic layers were encountered.

Layer I
0-30 cm
Black (10YR 2/1) silt loam. Layer I contained charcoal, 'ili ili, coral, and basalt flakes.

Layer II
30-110 cm
Dark brown (10YR 3/3) loam consisting of mainly cinders and decomposing rock. One piece of volcanic glass, Turboidea shell, charcoal, and basalt flakes were identified in this layer.

Cultural materials included charcoal, one piece of coral, several 'ili ili, and basalt flakes (some with polish).
Figure 20: East Wall Profile with Feature 1 in TU-16.

Figure 21: Photograph of Feature 1 in TU-16 Base of Excavation. View to East.
Figure 22: Illustration of TU-16 Base of Excavation (BOE).

Figure 23: Artifacts from TU-16 Feature 1.
**Figure 24:** Photograph of TU-17 Base of Excavation (BOE).

**Figure 25:** South Wall Profile of TU-17.
Test Unit 18
Test Unit 18 was located in a plantation area south (upslope) of the Taʻu Road and north (downslope) of the trail feature (see Figures 6, 26, 27). This plantation area represents the western most active plantation of the Fagā Coastal Flat. West of this area, the terrain becomes very rocky and steep, and the local informants do not think that materials associated with the “old village” will be encountered west of this area. A 1 by 1 m test unit was excavated to 0.93 cmbs. One stratigraphic layer was identified.

Layer 1
0-93 cmbs
Very dark brown (10YR 2/2) loamy sand resulting from decomposing cinders

Cultural materials included basalt flakes, and some pieces of Turbinidae shell. Charcoal was identified but not collected as it was concentrated in the first 20 cmbs and therefore associated with present day plantation activities. The cinder and rock content increased with depth.
Figure 26: Photograph of TU-18 at Base of Excavation (BOE).

Figure 27: West Wall Profile TU-18.
5.0 RESULTS OF LABORATORY ANALYSES

5.1 ARTIFACTS
A small assemblage of basalt flakes was recovered from the excavations. The flakes have been
categorized in the following rubric:

- Flake with Polish: These flakes have one, two, or more polished facets.
- Diagnostic Flakes:
  1) Primary Flake: These flakes have more than 90 percent of their dorsal
     surface covered with cortex.
  2) Secondary Flake: These flakes have cortex on their dorsal surface, but
     less than 90 percent.
  3) Interior Flake: These flakes have no cortex on their dorsal surface.
- Flake Fragment: This category includes nondiagnostic pieces including shatter
  and small angular waste.

The distribution of these flakes by provenience is presented in Table 1, and the assemblage is
described below.

A single basalt flake with polish, measuring 5.80 cm by 3.16 cm by 1.31 cm, was recovered from
TU-14, Layer I/2 (10-20 cmbs).

One flake with polish was recovered from TU-15, Layer I (0-30 cmbs). It measures 5.80 cm by
3.16 cm and is 1.31 cm in thickness. It weighs 29.2 g. In addition, one flake fragment was
collected from 30 cmbs.

Seven basalt flakes associated with the burial found in TU-16 were recorded. These flakes were
recovered with the burial.

Four interior flakes, one secondary flake, six flake fragments, and two flakes with polish were
identified in Layer I of TU-17. One flake with polish measured 2.07 cm by 3.79 cm by 0.77 cm
and the other measured 1.12 cm by 1.70 cm by 0.24 cm. Layer I contained one primary flake,
one secondary flake, one interior flake, and ten flake fragments.

One interior flake was recovered from TU-18, Layer I/3 (20-30 cmbs). Layer I/6 (50-60 cmbs)
contained two interior flakes and one flake fragment.

5.2 MIDDEN
An extremely small midden collection was recovered from the excavations. The distribution and
identification of the midden is presented in Table 2. All of the midden was restricted to four shell
species that total 48.3 grams. Of these, Turbinidae was the dominant species. In addition to the
Turbinidae shell recovered from TU-15, Layer II, seven opercula were recovered which provide a
Minimum Number of Individuals (MNI) for this species.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>Unit #</th>
<th>Layer / Level</th>
<th>Lot #</th>
<th>Art. #</th>
<th>Artifact Type</th>
<th>Bag #</th>
<th>Length cm</th>
<th>Width cm</th>
<th>Thickness cm</th>
<th>Weight gm</th>
<th>Lot Count</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS-11-1</td>
<td>TU-14</td>
<td>I/2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Basalt Flake</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-11-1</td>
<td>TU-15</td>
<td>I/1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FWP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-11-1</td>
<td>TU-15</td>
<td>I/1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Basalt Flake</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-11-1</td>
<td>TU-17</td>
<td>I/1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Basalt Flake</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-11-1</td>
<td>TU-17</td>
<td>I/2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Basalt Flake</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-11-1</td>
<td>TU-17</td>
<td>I/2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>FWP</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2-IF, 3-FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-11-1</td>
<td>TU-17</td>
<td>I/3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Basalt Flake</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-SF, 1-IF, 2-FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-11-1</td>
<td>TU-17</td>
<td>I/3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>FWP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-11-1</td>
<td>TU-17</td>
<td>I/3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Basalt Flake</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2-FF, 1-FF, 4-FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-11-1</td>
<td>TU-17</td>
<td>I/3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Basalt Flake</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-SF, 4-FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-11-1</td>
<td>TU-17</td>
<td>I/3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Basalt Flake</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-11-1</td>
<td>TU-18</td>
<td>I/3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Basalt Flake</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-11-1</td>
<td>TU-18</td>
<td>I/6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Basalt Flake</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2-IF, 1-FF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- SF: Secondary Flake
- IF: Interior Flake
- PF: Primary Flake
- FF: Flake Fragment
- FWP: Flake with Polish
- EAF: Edge Altered Flake
Table 2: Project Area Midden

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TU-14</th>
<th>TU-15</th>
<th>TU-16</th>
<th>TU-17</th>
<th>TU-18</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbinidae</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. rucus</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melampus castanas</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapizidae</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified shell</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SHELL</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MIDDEN</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 RADIOCARBON DATING

Three radiocarbon dates were obtained from this project. Table 3 presents the results of these analyses. One charcoal sample (SCSRC-142) from TU-15 appears to date deposits that were spatially associated with the trail feature. This sample produced two intercepts at the 95.4 percent level of probability. These are A.D. 1640-1890 and A.D. 1910-present.

The other two samples (SCSRC-140 and -141) are from TU-17 which was located at the inland-most portion of the Fagā Coastal Flat. These two samples were internally consistent and slightly overlapping at A.D. 1280-1470 and A.D. 1450-1650.

Table 3: Radiocarbon Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCSR No.</th>
<th>BETA Sample No.</th>
<th>Provenience</th>
<th>Measured C(^{14}) Age (BP)</th>
<th>C(^{14})/C(^{12}) Ratio</th>
<th>Conventional C(^{14}) Age (BP)</th>
<th>Calibrated Age - 2 sigma - (95.4% probability)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>124503</td>
<td>TU-17 Layer 1 (Level 3 20-30 cmbs)</td>
<td>300 ± 50</td>
<td>-22.0 o/oo</td>
<td>350 ± 50</td>
<td>A.D. 1450-1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>124604</td>
<td>TU-17 Level 1 (Level 4 40-50 cmbs)</td>
<td>400 ± 60</td>
<td>-17.8 o/oo</td>
<td>520 ± 60</td>
<td>A.D. 1280-1470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>124605</td>
<td>TU-15 Layer 1 (Level 5 50 cmbs)</td>
<td>120 ± 50</td>
<td>-20.8 o/oo</td>
<td>190 ± 50</td>
<td>A.D. 1640-1850 A.D. 1910-present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6.0 SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The archaeological investigations reported on in the present report have provided information on the construction, relative age, and function of the trail feature (Site AS-11-1, Feature U). This information was obtained during surface survey and recording, informant interviews, and controlled excavations. These investigations have recorded and documented this archaeological feature, serving to mitigate any adverse effects that quarry operations in this area might have on this resource.

Surface survey has shown that this trail feature was built across the natural sloping terrain, roughly parallel to the coast. The trail was constructed by stacking and piling basalt boulders and cobbles across the slope to create a level surface. This surface was roughly paved with boulders and cobbles. The construction resulted in creating a higher retaining wall on the downslope side of the feature and a lower wall on the upslope side.

The present investigations verified that the trail continued east of Power Pole 3 to the drainage between Power Poles 7 and 8, as determined during the original survey (Cleghorn et al. 1997:79). Remnants of the trail were observed to the east of this drainage area for about 40 m, after which point it was no longer detectable.

Informant information indicated that this trail was the primary foot path that connected Fitiuta Village with the Ta'u Village. It appears that this trail predates the existing Ta'u Road and that it was never used for vehicular traffic. This trail apparently intersected with the existing Ta'u Road alignment to the north and the south. Periodic repair of the trail was a community activity.

Five test units (four 1 by 1 m squares, and one 1 by 2 m trench) were excavated so that the age, function, and activities associated with the trail could be determined. These excavations produced small samples of artifacts and midden. In addition, three radiocarbon dates were produced. No excavations were conducted on the trail feature itself because the research objectives could be achieved by the surface survey and excavations in associated areas. In general, this assumption proved valid as information was obtained on the methods of construction and the function of the feature. No absolute dates were determined for the feature, although a date could have possibly been obtained from charcoal recovered from the feature itself. However, radiocarbon dates obtained from nearby gave an indication of the antiquity of the feature.

The small artifact collection consists of a total of 43 basalt flakes. The majority of these (N=39) are waste flakes resulting from the manufacture of stone tools, most likely stone adzes. The remaining four flakes exhibit polish on their dorsal surfaces. These flakes were probably broken from basalt adzes while the adzes were being used for wood working. Two activities are thus inferred from this small artifact assemblage—stone tool manufacture and woodworking.

The small midden collection is only represented by four species of shellfish totaling 48.3 grams;
no bone material was recovered. A total of seven Turbinidae opercula were recovered, which provide a MNI for this shellfish species. All of the shellfish species were available in the near shore waters of Fagā.

Three radiocarbon dates were obtained from the excavations. One radiocarbon date was obtained from TU-15 (SCSRC-142) that may have been associated with the trail feature. This sample produced two age determinations at the 95.4 percent confidence level—A.D. 1640-1890 and A.D. 1910-present. While this date is from a charcoal sample found approximately 30 m downslope from the trail feature, it seems likely that the trail may date to about this time. It seems highly plausible that the trail may have been in use as early as the later part of the 19th century and into the 20th century. Informant information supports the late use of this trail.

The remaining two radiocarbon dates are from TU-17, located in the inland-most area of settlement on the Fagā Coastal Flat. These two dates are internally consistent and indicate that this area was first occupied in the 13th century A.D. with occupation extending into the 17th century.

Two burials were uncovered in the Fagā Village site in TU-15 and TU-16. Neither of these burials were marked with any kind of surface grave marker. Once the remains were identified as human, all work at the location was suspended and government representatives were notified. Every effort was made to avoid the excavation of human remains. As these burials were not located in an area to be directly impacted from any construction activities, they remained in situ and were reburied according to the wishes of the Samoan Community.

When the trail was first recorded as Feature U of Site AS-11-1 (Cleghorn et al. 1997:79), it was interpreted as an abandoned dirt road. Part of the reason for this interpretation was the presence of a vehicle wheel found on the surface immediately downslope of the feature. The width of the feature, averaging 3.0 to 3.6 m, supported the idea that the feature was used for vehicular traffic. The only ethnographic information obtained in 1977 was that the feature was "old" (Cleghorn et al. 1997). Current investigations have shown that this feature is not a modern road, but rather a traditional footpath of some antiquity. Current ethnographic information indicates that this was the traditional path that connected the villages of Fitiuta and Ta’u. Archaeological information suggests that this trail was in use from the late 19th century into the early 20th century.

The results of the current investigations, combined with previous results indicate that human remains are extremely common on the Fagā Coastal Flat. To date, 18 test units have been excavated at Fagā (Clark 1990 = 1; Cleghorn et al. 1998 = 13; and the current investigations = 5). Of these, 22 percent (N=4) of the units have contained human remains (TU-2 and 13 Cleghorn et al. 1997; and TU-15 and 16 current investigations). One of these sets of human remains was inside a fa’ate (TU-13) and the rest had no surface markings (Cleghorn et al. 1997).

The presence of these burials is interesting, especially in light of the ethnographic information recorded by Kikuchi in 1963, which indicated that there was a battle at Fagā where the Tui-
Manu’a was killed. The death of the Tui-Manu’a desecrated the area and the village of Fagā had to be abandoned. Ethnographic information obtained during the current investigations indicated that during battles, it was a common practice not to bury the corpses of dead warriors. The bodies were simply left on the surface to decompose and to be buried by natural sedimentary means. Turner, writing in the late 1800s indicated that:

The headless bodies of the slain, scattered about the bush after a battle, if known were buried, if unknown were left to the dogs [Turner 1884:194].

Based on this information we would expect to find unmarked sets of human remains at relatively shallow depths.

Two of the burials (from TUs 13 and 15) appear to be associated with coral pebbles, possibly pavements. Again, Turners comments are instructive: “. . . white stones or shell were intermixed with the top layer” above a chiefly burial (Turner 1884:148). It seems possible that high status individuals are represented by these burials.

The other two burials have been found between 40 and 97 cm below surface. These archaeological data support the postulation that Fagā may contain the remains of warriors killed during battle. Furthermore, it seems likely that other sets of remains may be found at Fagā at relatively shallow depths. This likelihood is of great importance when considering any land altering activities in the area.
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APPENDIX A
Memorandum of Agreement
September 24, 1998

Mr. John Enright
Historic Preservation Officer
Executive Offices of the Governor
American Samoa Historic Preservation Office
American Samoa Government
Pago Pago, American Samoa 96799

Dear Mr. Enright,

Transmitted for your review and comment is a copy of an archaeological data recovery plan (DRP) for the historic trail recorded as Feature U of Site AS-11-1, the Faga Village Site. Archival investigations of Site AS-11-1 were previously undertaken for the Tala Road Construction Project. The site is considered eligible for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. The DRP was prepared and compiled by Drs. Paul Clagheron and Robert Spear from SCS/CRMS, Inc. The trail is located in the area of the Old Quarry Site at Amatole Cove, Faga, Ta'u Island. The Old Quarry Site is being planned for use to provide rock materials for the proposed Tala Road Construction and Faleasao Harbor Construction projects. Quarrying activities from these projects have the potential to adversely impact the trail. It is anticipated that this potential adverse impact would be mitigated through a program of archaeological data recovery. The enclosed DRP was compiled to guide of the data recovery program.

This action is being undertaken in accordance with the 1991 Memorandum of Agreement executed with your office and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) to mitigate historic preservation concerns for the Tala Road Construction Project. The present data recovery program is anticipated to begin by the middle of next month and your timely comments, addressed to Mr. Charles Steck of my environmental staff [telephone number (808) 438-6934/- 3792 and facsimile number (808) 438-7801], shall be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

James L. Beresford, P.E.
Chief, Engineering Division

Enclosure

Copy Furnished:
Ms. Majoric Eagle Novick
Western Office of Planning and Review
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
12136 West Bayaud Avenue, Suite 330
Lakewood, CO 80228.
September 25, 1998

Mr. James L. Bersson, P.E.
Department of the Army
U.S. Army Engineer District
Honolulu
Fort Shafter, Hawaii 96858-5440

Attention: Mr. Charles Streek

Dear Mr. Bersson,

Thank you for your letter of September 24, 1998 concerning the archaeological data recovery plan (DRP) for the historic trail recorded as Feature U of Site AS-11-1, the Faga Village site. Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the report. We have used the 1991 Memorandum of Agreement Stipulation 1 as the standard for our review of the DRP.

We have reviewed the report and in general we find it to be a very well written and professions DRP. However, we have a few comments and offer them as follows:

1) In the Research Design section of the report on page 8 it is stated that

"Once the total extent of the trail/road is determined, selected locations for subsurface excavations will be selected."

While we agree with this course of action nowhere in the DRP does it state some minimum number of excavation units (or their size) that will be excavated. We recommend that some minimum number of units or a way to calculate them (such as one every 50m) be stipulated so there are no misunderstandings concerning the DRP to which we are agreeing.

We suggest the minimum number of units be either 7 1 x 2m units, or one 1 x 2 m unit every 50 meters. We believe this is a reasonable number to meet the research goals set out in the DRP. If it turns out that this number of excavations is not possible due to the nature of the topography a smaller numbers can be approved with in-the-field consultation with ASHPO.

2) There are no proposed methods for disseminating results of the work to the interested public. Please include such methods in the DRP.
3) There are no proposed methods by which interested groups will be kept informed of the work and afforded the opportunity to participate. Please include such methods in the DRP.

4) There is no proposed schedule for the submission of progress reports to the Department of Public Works, SHPO, the American Samoa Historic Commission or the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. Please include such a schedule in the DRP.

5) The DRP proposes (on page 11) that any cultural remains found be temporarily curated with the American Samoa Historic Preservation Office until final curation facility is agreed upon. As much as we would like to accommodate the ACE in this matter, curation of artifacts is not an allowable cost under our grant regulations (National Register Programs Guideline NPS-49 Chapter 13-D). We suggest that the DRP state the artifacts be temporarily stored at the American Samoa Government’s Jean P. Haydon Museum in Fagatogo until a final curation facility is agreed upon.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

John Enright
Historic Preservation Officer

cc: Ms. Marjorie Ingle Nowick
Western Office of Planning and Review
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
12136 West Bayaud Avenue, Suite 330
Lakewood, CO 80226
Document Separator
TO:  American Samoa
    Historic Preservation Office

From:  U.S. Army Engineer District, Honolulu
        Bldg. 252, ATTN: CEPOH-ED-ES
        Fort Shafter, Hawaii  96856-5440

Subject of Material Transmitted:
    Faga Quarry DRP

Name:  Dave Herdrich
Telephone:  684-633-2384
FAX Number:  684-633-2357

Name:  CHUCK STRECK
Telephone:  (808) 438-6934
FAX Number:  (808) 438-7801

Date:  Mon, Sep 28, 1998

Total Nr. of Pages (including this pg)  1

Remarks:

Dave- Thank you for your quick response to the DRP we sent you. I have a few responses to your comments (I'll be sending this same message to SCS/CRMS and Pacific Legacy). Nothing major...just a few clarifications.

#1: We can put in what is essentially an arbitrary number of proposed excavation units at this time. We already know that major portions are essentially solid rock (from the previous work at Faga). No problem.

#2: The dissemination of the work results is not a contractor concern. That is the agency's responsibility (in this case the Corps and Trans.). We normally send all final reports to library's and repositories. This reminds me...do you have a mailing address for the College library? Thanx.

#3: Again, the contractor is not tasked with public notification. As we went through before, the NHPA, unlike NEPA, does not have public meeting provisions. I can recommend to the contractor to include measures/provisions for local notification. This has to be done anyway through notification to property owners and mental concerned with Faga.

#4: Again, the contractor does not and is not authorized to submit reports to all those agencies. That is our responsibility. The contractor submits reports to us as to the scope of work milestones and then we, as the Federal agent, submit the reports under our letterhead to the other parties in the MOA. Therefore, all the contractor can state is that the reports shall be submitted to us per the SO.

#5: Thank you for the direction on curation. Can you assist us with contacting folks at the museum so that temporary curation can be achieved? The contractor shall take care of all the necessary paperwork regarding artifacts/samples.

Anyhow, thank you for your quick response. Both Kanai and I shall be down in American Samoa, probably during October. See you then.................Chuck

DI Form 24-R
1 Sep 90
Document Separator
October 2, 1998

Charles Streck
Department of the Army
U.S. Army Engineer District
Honolulu
Fort Shafter, Hawaii 96858-5440

Dear Mr. Streck,

Thank you for your FAX memo of September 28, 1998 concerning our review of the DRP entitled, An Archaeological Data Recovery Plan For the “Old Quarry Site” at Avatele Cove, Faga, Ta'u Island, Manu'a, American Samoa. I believe that there is a slight misunderstanding with regard to our comments in our earlier letter dated September 25, 1998. I will respond to your points using Stipulation 1 of the Ta'u Road MOA as the standard.

1. Thank you for agreeing to give us some idea of how many units will be part of the DRP. In a personal communication from Kanalei Sunn of your office we were told that the minimum number would be four 1 x 2 meter units. We concur that this number should provide us with an adequate amount of information concerning the site.

2. With regard to the dissemination of reports, Stipulation 1 states that information regarding the dissemination of reports should be provided in the DRP. From our point of view it is irrelevant if the contractor or the Corps actually carries out the dissemination; what we would like to see in the DRP is some indication ensuring that it will be carried out, and how it will be carried out. There could simply be a sentence or two stating that the Army Corps will disseminate the reports to x number of libraries and repositories. This is all that we are after.

With regard to your request for the College library address, it follows:

American Samoa Community College Library, P.O. Box 2609, Pago Pago, AS 96799

For your information the College Librarian is Dr. Stephen Lin, he can be reached at 011-684-699-4673.
3. With regard to public notification, as above, we are not saying that the contractor should be or is responsible for public notification. But we would like to see public notification discussed in the DRP as per Stipulation 1. Again we are looking for a brief paragraph stating what actions the Army Corps will take to ensure that the public is duly notified.

Also, our earlier letter to you did not necessarily ask that public meetings be held; we are aware of NHPA requirements as opposed to NEPA’s. Nonetheless, let me take this opportunity to point out to you something that the Advisory Council has recently written to us on this issue,

"How this [public notification] is done is left up to the agency, with encouragement to use its NEPA procedures for public participation and with acknowledgment of the varying requirements of the Federal agencies regarding public input."  

We also encourage you to integrate Section 106 compliance and public notification into the NEPA process whenever it is possible and whenever it will make the process more efficient for the Army Corps and more informative for the public.

In any event, we concur with your plan as stated in your FAX.

4. With regard to the submission of reports, again, we are not asking for the contractor to be responsible for submitting reports to the Agencies specified in the DRP; what we want is a statement in the DRP that it will be done, in this case by the Army Corps, as per Stipulation 1.

5. With regard to curation, we will be happy to assist you in making arrangements to have the artifacts temporarily curated at the Jean P. Haydon museum. Also, note that we would have no objection to the artifacts being temporarily stored with the archaeological contractor, until a permanent facility is found, if that is more convenient.

If you have any questions with regard to this correspondence please contact me by phone at 011-684-633-2384 or by email at herdich@samostelco.com

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David J. Herdich
Deputy Historic Preservation Officer

cc: Ms. Marjorie Ingle Nowick
Western Office of Planning and Review
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
12136 West Bayaud Avenue, Suite 330
Lakewood, CO 80226
12 October 1999

Mr. Charles Streek
Environmental/DOD Support Branch
Programs & Project Management Division
Department of the Army
Pacific Ocean Division, Corps of Engineers
Fort Shafter, Hawaii 96858-5440

Dear Mr. Streek,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the draft report *Archaeological Data Recovery of a Trail Feature Within the Faga Village Site (AS-11-1), Ta' u Island, Manu'a, American Samoa*. The report has been reviewed using the *American Samoa Historic Preservation Cultural Resource Investigations-Report Guidelines* (enclosed), the Section 106 implementing regulations "Protecting Historic Properties" (36 CFR Part 800) and "An Archaeological Data Recovery Plan For The "Old Quarry Site" at Avatele Cove, Faga, Ta' u Island, Manu'a, American Samoa". In general we find the report to be of good quality. Nonetheless the report does not meet all of our report guidelines nor does it implement all of the proposals found in the data recovery plan. Our detailed concerns and comments follow:

I. COVER PAGE. The cover page does not have the detailed information about the organizational affiliations of the authors, (i.e. addresses and phone numbers for Pacific Legacy.) Please provide them.

II. TITLE PAGE. There is no title page as required by our guidelines. Please provide a title page.

III. ABSTRACT. There is no abstract as required by our guidelines, please add one.

IV. TABLE OF CONTENTS. The table of contents is fine as it stands though there may be some adjustments to it based on comments below.

V. INTRODUCTION.

A. Project Background.
   The report meets this guideline.
B. Provide dates and names personnel.
The report meets this guideline.

C. Describe APE.
The report meets the guideline.

D. Describe purpose.
The report meets the guideline.

E. Describe Scope of work.
The report does not meet this guideline. Please provide a summary of the scope of work/data recovery plan in the report.

F. Summarize results.
The report does not meet this guideline. Please provide a summary of the results of excavations in the report.

G. Disposition of records and artifacts.
The discussion of the disposition of field notes, artifacts, and associated documents should be in the Introduction, not the Methods section. Note that the deposition of field notes and other documents should also be discussed, not simply the curation of cultural materials.

On page 14 of the report it is stated any cultural remains found will be temporarily curated with the American Samoa Historic Preservation Office until a final curation facility is agreed upon. As much as we would like to accommodate the Army Corps of Engineers in this matter, curation of artifacts is not an allowable cost under our grant regulations (National Register Programs Guideline NPS-49 Chapter 13_D). We suggest that the report state that the artifacts be temporarily stored at the American Samoa Government's Jean P. Haydon Museum in Fagatogo until a final curation facility is agreed upon.

VI. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING.

A. Describe local Pleistocene and Holocene.
The report meets this guideline.

B. Describe current environmental setting.
The report partially meets this guideline. Please describe the local biota.

C. Past and Present Land Use.
The report does not meet this guideline. Please discuss past and present land use.

VII. HISTORICAL AND PREHISTORIC BACKGROUND.
The report meets the guidelines of this section.

VIII. RESEARCH DESIGN. The report contains little in terms of research design and therefore does not meet this ASHPO minimal requirement.

A. There is no reference to the relevance of the research design to section 106 issues.

B. There are no references to broader Territorial and regional research goals that other scholars have been pursuing (for example, see Clark and Miclojic 1996, Kirch and Hunt 1993, and Green and Davidson 1974) and the relevance of this study to those goals.
C. There is no discussion of theoretical orientation.

D. No explicit hypothesis is mentioned.

E. There is no justification of the research strategy.

All of these points need to be added to the report.

IX. METHODS. Your section 1.4 Methods meets some but not all of the minimum ASHPO guidelines.

A. Describe and justify all field methods.
   This criteria is met.

B. Describe and justify all laboratory methods and special analysis.
   This criteria is not met. This section should include the name and qualifications of the individuals conducting the analysis.

C. Describe and justify data collection and management procedures.
   This criteria is met.

D. Describe in detail all constraints on the investigation.
   This criteria is partially met; there is a brief mention of “logistical constraints” on the project. Please elaborate as to the nature of these “logistical constraints” and any other constraints encountered during the project.

E. Assess the adequacy of the methods employed in terms of the research objectives.
   This criteria is not met. Adequacy of methods is not discussed. Please provide such a discussion.

X. FINDINGS.

The Findings or Results section meets the report guidelines though there are a few problems that require comment. Please note, however, that the final analysis presented in the Discussion section does not meet the research goals of the Data Recovery plan. We will first discuss the Results section itself and then comment on the Discussion section separately.

A. Describe verbally and cartographically all historic properties identified.
   The criteria is not met.

On page 20, Figure 15, there is no descriptive key with which to interpret the figure. Please provide one.

On page 22, Figure 17 (TU-15), there is a descriptive key, but rocks, roots, sand/gravel are not distinguished in the key. In the verbal description there is mention of ‘iliili pebbles, but there is no ‘iliili on the key. Please make the descriptive key descriptive.

In addition, it is stated that a burial was found in Unit 15. Please provide a plan view of the unit showing the location of the burial. Also with regard to the burial, was no other information gathered about the nature of the burial, such as its condition, did it appear to be an adult, was it an extended burial, was it flexed, did it seem to be entirely intact, was it photographed or drawn in any way, etc.? If such information was not collected please explain why. If it was collected please present it in the report. Furthermore, in the verbal
description of TU 15 a Feature 1 is described, yet there is no Feature 1 shown in the profile of figure 17. Please indicate where Feature 1 is for this profile.

On page 24, Figure 19 (TU-16), there is no descriptive key with which to interpret the figure. Please provide one. In addition, it is stated that a burial was found in the Unit 16. Please provide a plan view of the unit showing the location of the burial. Also with regard to the burial, was there any other information gathered about the nature of the burial, such as its condition, did it appear to be an adult, was it extended, was it flexed, did it seem to be entirely intact, was it photographed or drawn in any way, etc.? If no such information was not collected please explain why. If it was collected please present it in the report.

On page 25, Figure 21 (TU-17), there is no descriptive key with which to interpret the figure. Please provide one. In addition, it appears that rocks are present in layer 1 of the profile, yet in the verbal description on page 23 there is no indication that rocks are present. Please provide a complete description of each layer for this unit and include a description of rocks if present.

On page 27, Figure 23, there is no descriptive key with which to interpret the figure. Please provide one.

D. Describe the results of each investigative and analytical method categorized by site, feature, and investigative unit.
   1. An inventory of all recovered materials including drawings and photographs.
      This criteria has not been met. The report states that various artifacts had been photographed and there are references to various drawings in the report. Please provide copies of the photograph logs and an inventory of all drawings in an appendix.

C. Include complete, updated American Samoa Site/Feature Survey Forms
   This criteria has not been met. Please submit a site/feature form for this feature.

XI. CONCLUSION. (DISCUSSION SECTION)

Guideline A. calls for an evaluation of the effectiveness of the investigation in terms of the scope of work and local and regional research objectives. This guideline is not met.

In particular, why were there no test units placed in the trail feature itself when one conclusion claims to “provide information on the construction, age, and function of the trail feature?” How is this possible when the test units are twenty to thirty meters from the feature in question? Please explain this strategy in the report.

In addition, it is claimed that the radiocarbon date from TU 15 “may have been associated with the trail feature” and that,

"It seems quite likely from this that the trail may have been in use as early as the later part of the 19th century and into the 20th century."

Yet the charcoal for the radiocarbon date was 50cm below the surface at the base of Layer 1 in a test unit (TU 15) approximately 30 meters away and downslope from the trail feature. Please explain how it is “likely” that such a date is related to the trail feature. It seems to us that it would be very difficult to make such a claim given that there were no test units in the
trail feature and there is therefore no indication as to whether the base of Layer 1 in TU 15 has any common relationship with the base of the trail feature.

We have some concerns with regard to your interpretations of the burials. It is noted that “Ethnographic information obtained during the current investigations indicated that during battles, it was common practice not to bury the corpses of dead warriors. The bodies were simply left on the surface to decompose and to be buried by natural sedimentary means. Based on this information we would expect to find unmarked sets of human remains at relatively shallow depths. The three unmarked sets of human remains that have been found at Faga have been found between 40 and 97 cm below surface. These archaeological data support the current ethnographic information.”

Our concerns with this section are as follows;

Firstly, the “current ethnographic information” on Samoan warfare and the treatment of fallen warriors is derived from informant testimony that is second hand in that none of the informants (though they are Samoan) participated in Samoan warfare which ceased at the turn of this century.

Given that current informant testimony is second hand it is important to consult ethno-historical sources. When one does so one finds that they provide an importantly different picture. Consider the following from Turner’s Samoan: A Hundred Years Ago and Long Before (1884:194).

“The headless bodies of the slain, scattered about in the bush after a battle, if known were buried, if unknown were left to the dogs.”

This raises a number of points,

A. We need a better description of the burial remains. If they were indeed victims of Samoan warfare it is likely that they would be headless.

B. If the burials are missing the heads, the rest of the body is still intact, and, say, laid out in an extended position, then it would seem unlikely that they were simply left on the ground as the dogs would have scattered and gnawed on the bones. Again, a better description of the burial remains is needed to assess your interpretation.

Secondly, the additional argument that the burials were relatively shallow (between 40 and 97 cm below the surface) and therefore this indicates that they the individuals were not buried seems problematic because Turner (1884:147) tells us that under normal circumstances a Samoan grave is “about four feet deep” or about 122 cm. This in itself is not too far off from one of the depths noted and under the stress of war it seems likely that victims would be buried hastily and that the graves could be even shallower. In addition, the human burial in TU 15 (which is on a hillside) is said to associated with a coral ‘iditi’ pavement, since it is unlikely that a coral ‘iditi’ pavement would have come from the eroding hillside, it is possible that the coral ‘iditi’ was brought in and used as part of the burial preparation. And, again, Turner (1884:148) provides support for this in noting that “white stones or shell were intermixed with the top layer” of a chiefly burial.

Thirdly, with regard the burial in TU 16 if the human remains in layer II were covered by natural sedimentary processes one would need to explain why there is a discontinuity between the layer II which contains the human remains, charcoal basalt flakes in very dark gray (10YR 3/1) loam and layer I which is only made up of black (10YR 2/1) silty loam.
and abundant cobbles and pebbles. It would seem, based on the evidence provided, that one could argue that the discontinuity is the result of human burial activity and that layer one is then the result of natural sedimentary processes. Please provide an explanation for the differences in the depositional layers evidenced in your profile.

Guideline B. The report meets this guideline which calls for a summary and interpretation of the findings.

Guideline C. calling for an evaluation of the property is not applicable because the property has already been evaluated.

Guideline D. The report does not meet this guideline. Please state whether additional mitigation is necessary.

XII References Cited. The report meets this guideline.

XIII Appendices

A. Project correspondence. The report does not meet this guideline. Please provide project correspondence.

B. ASHPO Site/feature survey record forms. The report does not meet this guideline. Please update feature survey record forms for this feature.

C. Transcripts of all informant interviews. The report does not meet this guideline. Please provide transcripts or note of all informant interviews cited in the text.

Thank you for your time and attention. I hope you find these comments useful and constructive. If you have any questions please call David J. Herdich at (684) 633-2384.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Joan Emrich
Historic Preservation Officer

cc: Ms. Marjorie Ingle Nowick
Western Office of Planning and Review
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
12136 West Bayaud Avenue, Suite 330
Lakewood, CO 80226
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Te'o J. Fauvai  
Director of Public Works  
American Samoa Government  
Pago Pago, American Samoa 96799

REF: Memorandum of Agreement regarding the T.E.R.P. 30 Ta‘u Road Improvement

Dear Mr. Fauvai:

The enclosed Memorandum of Agreement regarding the T.E.R.P. 30 Ta‘u Road Improvement has been accepted by the Council. This action constitutes the comments of the Council required by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the Council’s regulations. Enclosed are two original documents as per your request. Please send copies of this Agreement to the American Samoa State Historic Preservation Officer.

The Council appreciates your cooperation in reaching a satisfactory resolution of this matter.

Sincerely,

Claudia Mislisley  
Director, Western Office of Project Review

Enclosure
CC:
SHPO:AS
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WOPR: CNissley: ncd: 1/14/91
FILE: AmSA/TERP 30 Ta' u Road/FHWA/Improvement

Disk #Kathy, CODE: ASTERP.kp
January 14, 1991

Te'o J. Fau vai
Director of Public Works
American Samoa Government
Pago Pago, American Samoa 96799

REF: Memorandum of Agreement regarding the T.E.R.P. 30 Ta'u Road Improvement

Dear Mr. Fau vai:

The enclosed Memorandum of Agreement regarding the T.E.R.P. 30 Ta'u Road Improvement has been accepted by the Council. This action constitutes the comments of the Council required by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the Council's regulations. Enclosed are two original documents as per your request. Please send copies of this Agreement to the American Samoa State Historic Preservation Officer.

The Council appreciates your cooperation in reaching a satisfactory resolution of this matter.

Sincerely,

Claudia Nissley
Director, Western Office of Project Review
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ABSTRACT

This MOA is unique in that it is the first time American Samoa has requested our comments apart from the PA that Tom King had initiated several years ago. While there was no adverse effect notification, the MOA is concisely and clearly written and follows PAD format. It calls for monitoring of some portions of the construction, development of a research design and data recovery plan, preservation of some archaeological sites when possible, discovery and dispute clauses. Both the HPO and Council will review the DRP and Preservation Plan when they are developed.

Accompanying Graphics/Illustrations:

[___X___] no
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MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT


WHEREAS, the American Samoa Historical Commission (ASHC) participated in the consultation and has been invited to concur into his Memorandum of Agreement; and

NOW, THEREFORE, the DPW, the ASHC, and the American Samoa SHPO agree that the undertaking shall be implemented in accordance with the following stipulations in order to take into account the effect of the undertaking on historic properties.

Stipulations

The DPW shall ensure the following:

1. Prior to any construction, excavation, grading or quarrying activities for the T.E.R.P. 36 and TAU ROAD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT the DPW shall ensure that a data recovery/preservation plan is developed in consultation with the SHPO for the recovery of archaeological data and preservation of archaeological sites for those properties affected by T.E.R.P. 36 and TAU ROAD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT. The plan shall be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Archaeological Documentation (43 FR 44789-44797) and take into account the Council’s publication, Treatment of Archaeological Properties (Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, draft 1980), subject to any pertinent revisions the Council may make in the publication prior to completion of the data recovery/preservation plan, and relevant SHPO or other guidance. It shall specify, at a minimum:
a coherent Research Design including the research questions to be addressed through the data recovery, with an explanation of their relevance and importance:

- the property, properties, or portions of properties where data recovery is to be carried out;

- site forms and maps of any property, properties, or portions of properties that will be destroyed or altered without data recovery;

- the methods to be used for data recovery, with an explanation of their relevance to the research questions;

- the methods to be used in analysis, data management and dissemination of data, including a schedule;

- the proposed disposition of recovered materials and records;

- proposed methods for disseminating results of the work to the interested public;

- proposed methods by which interested groups will be kept informed of the work and afforded the opportunity to participate;

- a proposed schedule for submission of progress reports to the AHPW, SHPO, ASHC and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Council);

- proposed plans for an intensive archaeological survey within areas directly impacted by quarry activities, equipment placement, and equipment turn-around areas necessary for the project.

A plan to preserve as many properties in place as is practicable is developed in consultation with the SHPO and submitted to the SHPO for review. It shall specify at a minimum:

- the property, properties, or portions of properties to be preserved;

- the methods to be used, with an explanation of how they are to be implemented.
The data recovery preservation plan (DRP), as prepared by the Contractor, shall be submitted by DPW to the SHPO, the ASHC, and the Council for 30 days review. Unless the SHPO, ASHC, or the Council objects within 30 days after receipt of the plan, the DPW shall assume that the plan is satisfactory and ensure that the Contractor implements the plan.

Until the DRP is finalized and approved, construction recovery plan operations shall be conducted in accordance with the draft.

2. DPW shall ensure that any human remains and grave-associated artifacts excavated during the data recovery at the TA’U ROAD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT are reburied consistent with the following principles:

- Human remains and grave goods should not be disinterred unless required in advance of some kind of disturbance.
- Disinterment when necessary should be done carefully, respectfully, and completely, in accordance with proper archaeological methods.
- In general, human remains, and grave goods should be reburied, in consultation with the descendants of the dead.

- Scientific studies and reburial should occur according to a definite agreed-upon schedule; and
- Where scientific study is offensive to the descendants of the dead, and the need for such study does not outweigh the need to respect the concerns of such descendants, reburial should occur without prior study. Conversely, where descendants have no objections and where the scientific research value of human remains or grave goods outweighs the need for immediate reburial, the human remains, remains or grave goods need not be reburied, but can be retained in perpetuity for study, in consultation with the descendants of the dead and the SHPO.

3. After completion of the field work component of the data recovery program provided for in special condition No. 1 above, DPW will ensure that the grading of the permit area for the TA’U ROAD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT is monitored by an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards (48 CFR 44736-0).
In the event that previously unidentified archaeological properties, features, or other cultural materials are discovered, the applicant shall halt all activities that could adversely affect these properties until the discovery can be evaluated in consultation with the SHPO and the ASHC. The DPW shall respond to notification of inadvertent discoveries in a timely manner so as not to cause undue delay, and such discoveries are determined to be eligible for inclusion in the National Register, all activities that could adversely affect them shall be held in abeyance until measures are developed and implemented to avoid, minimize, or mitigate the adverse effects.

4. DPW shall ensure that all final archaeological reports resulting from actions pursuant to this agreement will be provided to the SHPO, ASHC, National Park Service for possible peer review and submission to the National Technical Information Service. DPW shall ensure that all such reports are responsive to contemporary professional standards, and to the Department of Interior's Final Report of Data Recovery Projects (42 FR 5377-79). Precise locations data may be provided only in a separate appendix if it appears that its release could jeopardize archaeological sites.

5. Should a dispute arise during the course of implementation of this Agreement, the DPW shall forward all pertinent documentation relevant to the dispute to the Council.

6. This Memorandum of Agreement may be executed in counterparts.

7. Execution of this Memorandum of Agreement by the American Samoa Department of Public Works and the American Samoa SHPO, its subsequent acceptance by the Council, and implementation of its terms, evidence that the American Samoa Department of Public Works has afforded the Council an opportunity to comment on the T.E.A.P. 30 and TA’U ROAD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT and its effects on historic properties, and that the American Samoa Department of Public Works has taken into account the effects of the undertaking on historic properties.
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

By: [Signature]
Date: Feb. 22, 1990

Director of Public Works

(AMERICAN SAMOA) STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER

By: [Signature]
Date: Oct. 22, 1990

By: [Signature]
Date: 11/4/90

Concur:

American Samoa Historical Commission

By: [Signature]
Date: 11/4/90

Chairman, ASHC

ACCEPTED for the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

By: [Signature]
Date: 1/3/91

Robert D. Bush
Executive Director
Document Separator
March 1, 2002

Mr. John Enright
Historic Preservation Officer
Executive Offices of the Governor
Government of American Samoa
Pago Pago, AS 96799

Re: National Historic Landmark: Government House, Togo Togo Ridge, Pago Pago, AS 96799

Dear Mr. Enright:

At the request of David Herdick of your office, representatives of the National Park Service (NPS), Pacific Great Basin Support Office (PGSO) made a site visit to assess the preservation issues of Government House. On December 14, 1990, Government House was designated a National Historic Landmark, the highest designation for a historic resource. The NPS is charged with providing technical assistance to NHL stewards.

The NPS team made the site visit February 26-28, 2002 and was composed of Michael Crowe, NHL Program Coordinator and architectural historian, and Joseph Balachowski, historical architect. They were joined by Alun Coleman, a local contractor, a former resident of the house, and John Vieni, a local pest management contractor. The site visit report is attached. They verified the conditions and recommendations of the Condition Assessment Report (CAR) that had been completed in 1993 by Spencer Mason Architects under the auspices of the NPS. A copy of this report is attached.

It should be noted that the NPS has previously acknowledged the deterioration of the building in its most recent Report to Congress. This federally mandated report is provided to Congress to describe the status of NHLs, whether they are threatened and endangered and the nature of the threat or danger. Government House is noted on page 12 as being threatened by deterioration. A copy of this report is attached.

The team verified the findings, conditions, recommendations, and cost analysis of the CAR. It appears that the building has deteriorated noticeably from the conditions documented in the CAR. For this reason the priority levels noted in the CAR should be changed as follows: what was noted as critical is now crucial, what was serious is now essential, what was minor is now necessary. The NPS report details the maintenance steps that should be taken immediately to ensure that the building will maintain its integrity.

The present level of maintenance is no longer adequate to protect the building. Just as an automobile is maintained by oil changes and servicing, a historic resource of this importance should be regularly serviced by inspections and maintenance procedures. It should be noted that the original cost estimates in the CAR should be adjusted for inflation and the deferred maintenance. We tentatively estimate this new figure to be $500-600,000.

NPS does not intend these comments to be interpreted to mean that the building is in danger of imminent failure and should be subject to drastic measures. Rather, what is outlined in all of these reports and
findings are conditions that can be remedied and carried out by professionals knowledgeable in historic buildings.

NPS encourages you to consider applying for a Save America's Treasures grant. We would be pleased to work with you in developing an application and reviewing any plans, drawings or treatment proposals. We suggest that you include in the application the cost for the development of a Historic Structures Report. This type of report, which differs from the CAR, will provide you with important historical information that can be extremely helpful in making decisions about the programmatic use of the building, outlining priorities and project phasing. In addition, a Historic Landscape Report should also be prepared. As noted in the CAR there are also issues with the landscaping that are effecting the house. The historic landscape features, such as the plant materials, steps, railings, and planting boxes are important to the setting of the house. These elements need to be evaluated for preservation and stabilization treatments.

There are other NPS resources and programs which could benefit Government House. The NPS National Center for Preservation Technology and Training has been involved in developing treatments for the termites which were found in Government House. The Historic American Building Survey program could also provide important documentation which would assist in the Historic Structures Report and the understanding of the history of the building. NPS would also be pleased to assist in researching and developing other grant sources such as the Getty Preservation Institute.

NPS would like to thank you for the opportunity to address the preservation issues for this important historic resource. In addition, we would like to thank for your assistance in obtaining the travel funding and the crucial technical assistance provided by your staff in the preparation of this report. Should there be any questions or you need additional information, please feel free to contact either Mr. Crowe or Mr. Balachowski.

Sincerely,

Michael F. Crowe
NHL Program Coordinator
Government House Recommendations: Phased project in four phases.

Phase 1. Emergency repairs, stabilization recommended for immediate action.

Grade level:

- Remove all materials from the crawl space beneath the house, that provide either a direct food source for termites or contribute to water retention in the soil or materials. These include, but are not limited to organic matter such as coconut husks, roots, branches, plant cuttings, discarded building materials, broken furniture, toys, containers and all metal, paper and plastic products.
- Rake the soil to remove as much of the above types of materials as possible that has fragmented.
- Remove roots and other plant materials that have grown up around foundation piers, whether dead or still living, ensuring that the roots have been removed from below grade. All four sides of each concrete pier must be inspected and cleared.
- Remove soil from the planting beds, esp. on the harbor side of the house, in order to eliminate contact between siding and soil. Grade the planting beds so that water drains away from the house.
- Attach extension pipes to down spouts at or near grade to eliminate dripping and splashing onto foundation piers, wood posts, siding and other wooden house elements.
- Remove all traces of insects, including wings, larva, eggs, and other debris.
- Remove vegetation that is causing damage to exterior hardscape elements such as steps and walkways.

Openings:

- All windows must be protected by screens to prevent entry by flying insects such as swarming termites, wasps, etc. The flagpole window in the attic must receive all framing, glazing and screening elements immediately.
- Veranda screens must be examined for tears and unfastened edges and repaired or replaced if necessary.
- Any interior doors showing termite damage must be removed from the premises and either be treated and repaired or replicated with termite-resistant materials [see double doors between ground floor enclosed porch and grand stair hall.]
- All soffit vents must be protected by screens to prevent entry by flying insects such as swarming termites, wasps, etc.

Missing and damaged elements:

- Other openings such as missing siding [below balcony on harbor side] and missing windows [attic on the harbor side] must be patched/covered to prevent insect infestation and rain penetration.
- While the roof overall is in good condition, several holes must be patched immediately to prevent insect infestation and water penetration.
- Ensure that all gutters are cleaned out, properly attached and sloped toward down spouts. Down spouts must be properly secured and any leaks fixed.
- Repair any systems leaks that continually wet siding, decking [see the AC unit on the harbor side balcony, laundry room, water pipe in crawl space under enclosed porch.]
- Ensure that the water tanks in the attic do not leak. The rectangular pan under one tank is currently damaged; one lip is bent out. If the tank leaks, the pan will not contain the water.
- Remove all protruding extraneous fasteners, patch holes.
- Remove any items with signs of insect infestation from the premises and treat, repair or replace as necessary. This will include, but is not limited to pictures, furniture, art objects and items such as the kava branches in the pantry, loose wood and other construction materials in the attic, any other household or personal items showing signs of insect and/or water damage.
Phase II. Termite Remediation

Treatment of the entire building and immediately adjacent landscape area will be based on the condition evaluation and recommendations of a qualified termite abatement specialist. Because active termite activity was documented during this site visit, treatment must be undertaken as soon as possible. This treatment may include, but not be limited to the following:

- Tenting and fumigation of the entire house.
- Spot treatments of certain areas or building elements.
- Treatment of the soil underneath the building.
- Treatment of the soil adjacent to the house.
- Installing bait traps around the house, including in lawns, planters and drilled into concrete walks and driveways.

Phase III. Historic Structures Report

Developing new program for Government House or keeping current one

Phase IV. Implementation of Existing Report and Supplemental Recommendations

Structural and Architectural Work

- Remove, repair and replace deteriorated first floor beams.
- Repair all deteriorated interior and exterior wall elements.
- Repair all deteriorated interior and exterior doors, windows and architectural elements.
- Design and construct new details as necessary for waterproofing/removal systems such as "curtain" system on second floor screened porch, edge of second floor deck.
- In addition to implementing the 1993 report recommendations on rewiring and re-plumbing, all abandoned utilities must be removed to the greatest extent possible. Holes in exterior and interior surfaces must be patched with appropriate materials.
- All replacement products must include materials that resist moisture deterioration and insect activity to the maximum extent possible, such as galvanized fasteners and connectors, treated lumber, etc.

Ventilation: moisture (humidity) generated by household activities migrates into all structural spaces; it contributes to deterioration of materials and mold growth and increases the vulnerability of the building to termites. Moisture removal is critical to preserving the structure, architectural elements, finishes and furnishings in Government House. This can be accomplished by reestablishing and creating new systems and strategies that promote fresh air circulation and the natural movement of warm air from downstairs to the attic.

- Install fans in each bathroom and the kitchen. This is critical to removing moisture generated by showers, dish washing, etc.
- Ensure that all attic fans are operational.
- Consider construction of a small "lantern"-like structure at the center of the highest roof ridge. This element can serve as a mechanism to draw heat from the house, reducing the need to seal the building and use air conditioning.
- Replace the attic access door with a louvered door to promote vertical air circulation.

Landscape/landscape:

- Redesign the fence rail infill to comply with life safety codes, and so that it does not contribute to the deterioration of the original metal rail. [The existing infill traps moisture under the metal rail, causing it to rust.]

[Image not visible]
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ATTACHMENT D

CULTURAL RESOURCE INVESTIGATIONS - REPORT GUIDELINES

INTRODUCTION

The following is intended to serve as a guide for structuring survey, evaluation, and mitigation reports of cultural resource investigations conducted in American Samoa in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended. Though all elements of the outline must be included in every report, the level of detail in particular sections may vary with the level of the investigation.

REPORT OUTLINE

I. Cover Page
   A. Title of report including name and location of area(s) of potential effect(s).
   B. Author(s)/Principal Investigator(s), organizational affiliation, address, and phone number.

II. Title Page
   A. Title of report including name and location of area(s) of potential effect(s).
   B. Author(s)/Principal Investigator(s), organizational affiliation, address, and phone number.
   C. Name, address, and phone number of client.

D. Lead Federal/ASG agency and contract/permit numbers.
E. Date of Report.

III. Abstract
   A. Summarize the investigation's background and purpose
   B. Summarize the methods employed
   C. Summarize the results of the investigation
   D. Summarize the recommendations

IV. Table of Contents

V. Introduction
   A. Give project background.
   B. Identify the dates of the investigation and identify the principal investigator and supervisory personnel and give their qualifications.
   C. Describe the area of potential effect (project area) including a depiction of the area on an appropriate USGS quad.
   D. Describe the purpose of investigation (compliance with Section 106)
   E. Describe the scope of work.
   F. Summarize the results of the investigation.
   G. Identify the disposition of field notes, artifacts, and other associated documents.

VI. Environmental Setting

Present a detailed environmental description of the project area focusing on its resource utilization potential and factors affecting the preservation of archaeological sites. Environmental reconstructions should include a discussion of how the ecological methods and techniques and data generated by prior studies were or may be used to model past environments.

A. Describe what is known of local and regional Pleistocene and Holocene
environments and environmental processes.

B. Describe the current environmental setting including: topography, soils, hydrology, geomorphology, geology, and biota.

C. Assess the past and present land use and resource potential of the project area.

VII Historical and Prehistoric Background
Summarize what is known of the history and prehistory of the project area and its vicinity by reference to all relevant prior studies, available records, and informant interviews. The background should be of adequate scope to provide a context within which the historic properties previously documented and newly identified in the area of potential effect can be considered and the prior investigations evaluated.

A. Describe what is known of the prehistory of the project area.

B. Describe what is known of the history of the project area.

C. Describe all previously documented historic properties within one kilometer of the boundaries of the area of potential effect.

D. Discuss the distribution and temporal affilition of previously identified historic properties.

E. Discuss past and present land use in the project area.

F. Assess the cultural resource potential of the project area.

VIII Research Design
A. Describe the purpose of the investigation with reference to compliance with Section 106.

B. Describe the relevance of the investigation in terms of Territorial and regional research goals.

C. Describe and justify the theoretical orientation of the investigation.

D. Discuss the hypotheses and implications tested.

E. Describe and justify the research strategy.

F. Assess the strengths and limitations of the investigation.

IX Methods
Present a detailed description and evaluation of the field and laboratory methods and analytical procedures used in the investigation in terms of the research design. Discuss problems encountered in implementing the research strategy and their resolution. Describe and justify any modifications to the research design. Include samples of field and laboratory forms, photographs of work in progress, maps of areas investigated by various methods.

A. Describe and justify all field methods.
   Include scaled location maps of all investigative units.

B. Describe and justify all laboratory methods and special analyses.

C. Describe and justify data collection and management procedures.

D. Describe in detail all constraints on the investigation, e.g., limited access and poor visibility.

E. Assess the adequacy of the methods employed in terms of the research objectives.

X Findings
Present a detailed description of the information collected and the data derived during the investigation.

A. Describe verbally and cartographically all historic properties identified in the area of investigation. Present, at a minimum, the following information for each property and each component feature in the body of the report:
   1. Site/feature number;
   2. Horizontal and vertical dimensions;
   3. A measured plan of each site and component feature - include locations of all investigative units, disturbance, topography, vegetation, soils, geological features, and section and elevation drawings, where appropriate;
   4. Site/feature setting, e.g., soils, topography, vegetation -
   5. Present site condition and integrity;
6. Formal site type, and
7. Functional and temporal interpretation and cultural affiliation.

B. Describe the results of each investigative and analytical method categorized by site, feature, and investigative unit. Include, at a minimum:
1. An inventory of all recovered material - include drawings and photographs when appropriate; and
2. The results of the analyses of each class of recovered material and data categorized by analytical method and investigative unit;

C. Include complete, updated American Samoa Site/Feature Survey Forms for all historic properties in the project area as an unattached appendix. These forms must incorporate the results of the reported investigation. No report will be accepted for review by the ASHPO unless these forms, including maps and drawings, are submitted with the report.

XI Conclusion
A. Evaluate the effectiveness of the investigation in terms of the scope of work and local and regional research objectives.
B. Summarize and interpret the findings.
C. Evaluate each historic property with reference to eligibility criteria for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. (Other evaluation criteria may be employed to assess the significance of each property but not at the exclusion of National Register criteria.)
D. Make recommendations for any necessary additional investigations or mitigative measures at each property based on National Register eligibility and proposed project effects.

XII References Cited,
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MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT


WHEREAS, the American Samoa Government Department of Public Works (DPW) has determined that the T.E.R.P. 30 and TA'U ROAD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT will have an effect upon archaeological sites AS-11-15, AS-11-51, AS-11-59, AS-11-60, AS-11-61, AS-11-63, AS-11-65, AS-11-72, AS-11-88, AS-11-97, AS-11-98, AS-11-i, AS-11-i, AS-11-i, and AS-11-i. (as described in the Ta'u Road Archaeological Project: Phase I Survey and Test Excavation Report (TRAP)) eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places, and has consulted the Preservation Officer (SHPO) pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800, regulations implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470f); and

WHEREAS, the American Samoa Historical Commission (ASHC) participated in the consultation and has been invited to concur into his Memorandum of Agreement; and

NOW, THEREFORE, the DPW, the ASHC, and the American Samoa SHPO agree that the undertaking shall be implemented in accordance with the following stipulations in order to take into account the effect of the undertaking on historic properties.

Stipulations

The DPW shall ensure the following:

1. Prior to any construction, excavation, grading or quarrying activities for the T.E.R.P. 30 and TA'U ROAD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT the DPW shall ensure that a data recovery/preservation plan is developed in consultation with the SHPO for the recovery of archaeological data and preservation of archaeological sites for those properties affected by T.E.R.P. 30 and TA'U ROAD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT. The plan shall be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeological Documentation (48 FR 4473-57) and take into account the Council's publication, Treatment of Archaeological Properties (Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, draft) 1980, subject to any pertinent revisions the Council may make in the publication prior to completion of the data recovery/preservation plan, and relevant SHPO or other guidance. It shall specify, at a minimum:
be addressed through the data recovery, with an explanation of their relevance and importance.

the property, properties or portions of properties where data recovery is to be carried out:

site forms and maps of any property, properties or portions of properties that will be destroyed or altered without data recovery:

the methods to be used for data recovery, with an explanation of their relevance to the research questions:

the methods to be used in analysis, data management and dissemination of data, including a schedule:

the proposed disposition of recovered materials and records:

proposed methods for disseminating results of the work to the interested public:

proposed methods by which interested groups will be kept informed of the work and afforded the opportunity to participate:

a proposed schedule for submission of progress reports to the DPW, SHPO, ASHC and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Council):

proposed plan for an intensive archaeological survey within areas directly impacted by quarry activities, equipment placement, and equipment turn around areas necessary for the project.

A plan to preserve as many properties in place as is practicable is developed in consultation with the SHPO and submitted to the SHPO for review. It shall specify at a minimum:

the property, properties, or portions of properties to be preserved:

the methods to be used, with an explanation of how they are to be implemented.
The data recovery preservation plan (DRP) as prepared by the Contractor shall be submitted by DPW to the SHPO, the ASHC, and the Council for 30 days review. Unless the SHPO, ASHC, or the Council objects within 30 days after receipt of the plan, the DPW shall assume that the plan is satisfactory and ensure that the Contractor implements the plan.

Until the DRP is finalized and approved, construction operations shall be conducted in accordance with the draft recovery plan.

2. DPW shall ensure that any human remains and grave-associated artifacts excavated during the data recovery at the TAU ROAD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT are reburied consistent with the following principles:

- Human remains and grave goods should not be disinterred unless required in advance of some kind of disturbance.
- Disinterment, when necessary, should be done carefully, respectfully, and completely, in accordance with proper archaeological methods.
- In general, human remains and grave goods should be reburied in consultation with the descendants of the dead.
- Scientific studies and reburial should occur according to a definite agreed-upon schedule; and

where scientific study is offensive to the descendants of the dead, and the need for such study does not outweigh the need to respect the concerns of such descendants, reburial should occur without prior study. Conversely, where descendants have no objections and where the scientific research value of human remains or grave goods outweighs the need for immediate reburial, the human remains remains or grave goods need not be reburied, but can be retained in perpetuity for study, in consultation with the descendants of the dead and the SHPO.

3. After completion of the field work component of the data recovery program provided for in special condition No. 1 above, DPW will ensure that the grading of the permit area for the TAU ROAD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT is monitored by an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards (48 CFR 4473.09).
In the event that previously unidentified archaeological properties, features, or other cultural materials are discovered, the applicant shall halt all activities that could adversely affect these properties until the discovery can be evaluated in consultation with the SHPO and the ASHC. The SHPO shall respond to notification of inadvertent discoveries in a timely manner so as not to cause undue delay, and provide guidance and recommendations for further work. If such discoveries are determined to be eligible for inclusion in the National Register, all activities that could adversely affect them shall be held in abeyance until measures are developed and implemented to avoid, minimize, or mitigate the adverse effects.

4. DPW shall ensure that all final archaeological reports resulting from actions pursuant to this agreement will be provided to the SHPO, ASHC Council, and to the National Park Service for possible peer review and submission to the National Technical Information Service. DPW shall ensure that all such reports are responsive to contemporary professional standards, and to the Department of Interior's Format Standards for Final Reports of Data Recovery Program (42 FR 35977-78). Precise locations data may be provided only in a separate appendix if it appears that its release could jeopardize archaeological sites.

5. Should a dispute arise during the course of implementation of this Agreement, the DPW shall forward all pertinent documentation relevant to the dispute to the Council.

6. This Memorandum of Agreement may be executed in counterparts.

7. Execution of this Memorandum of Agreement by the American Samoa Department of Public Works and the American Samoa SHPO, its subsequent acceptance by the Council, and implementation of its terms, evidence that the American Samoa Department of Public Works has afforded the Council an opportunity to comment on the T.E.R.P. To and TA’U ROAD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT and its effects on historic properties, and that the American Samoa Department of Public Works has taken into account the effects of the undertaking on historic properties.
(DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS)

By: J. Samuel
Date: Oct. 22, 1990

TE'O J. SUAVALI
Director of Public Works

(AMERICAN SAMOA) STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER

By: Stan Sorensen
Date: Oct. 22, 1990

STAN SORENSEN
SHPO

Concur:

American Samoa Historical Commission

By: John E. Smith
Date: Nov. 1, 1990

JOHN E. SMITH
Chairman, ASHC

ACCEPTED for the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

By: Robert D. Bush
Date: 1/3/91

ROBERT D. BUSH
Executive Director
MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION

Reference: AmSa/TERP 30 Ta'u Road/PHWA/Improvement

Signature Recommendation:

[ ] Chairman
[ X ] Executive Director

Staff Member: Nissley

Date Action Required: 1/10/91

Approved by Director: 12/19/90

Claudia Nissley

(date)

Attached Briefing Statement:  [ ]
Attached Abstract:  [ X  ]

ABSTRACT

This MOA is unique in that it is the first time American Samoa has requested our comments apart from the PA that Tom King had initiated several years ago. While there was no adverse effect notification, the MOA is concisely and clearly written and follows PAD format. It calls for monitoring of some portions of the construction, development of a research design and data recovery plan, preservation of some archaeological sites when possible, discovery and dispute clauses. Both the HPO and Council will review the DRP and Preservation Plan when they are developed.

Accompanying Graphics/Illustrations:
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APPENDIX B
Radiocarbon Data
DATE SCSRC141 : 520±60BP

85.2% confidence
1317AD (0.29) 1345AD
1390AD (0.71) 1441AD
95.4% confidence
1292AD (1.03) 1462AD
DATE SCSRC142 : 190±50BP

68.2% confidence
1651AD (0.27) 1889AD
1732AD (0.62) 1810AD
1926AD (0.11) ...

95.4% confidence
1641AD (0.69) 1888AD
1911AD (0.01) ...
APPENDIX C
Project Correspondence
Executive Offices of the Governor
American Samoa Historic Preservation Office
American Samoa Government
Pago Pago, American Samoa 96799

Tausaga F.E. Sunia
Governor

Togiola L.A. Tufafo
M. Governor

September 25, 1998

Mr. James L. Berston, P.E.
Department of the Army
U.S. Army Engineer District
Honolulu
Fort Shafter, Hawaii 96858-5440

Attention: Mr. Charles Streek

Dear Mr. Berston,

Thank you for your letter of September 24, 1998 concerning the archaeological data recovery plan (DRP) for the historic trail recorded as Feature U of Site AS-11-1, the Faga Village site. Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the report. We have used the 1991 Memorandum of Agreement Stipulation 1 as the standard for our review of the DRP.

We have reviewed the report and in general we find it to be a very well written and professions DRP. However, we have a few comments and offer them as follows:

1) In the Research Design section of the report on page 8 it is stated that:

"Once the total extent of the trail/road is determined, selected locations for subsurface excavations will be selected."

While we agree with this course of action nowhere in the DRP does it state some minimum number of excavation units (or their size) that will be excavated. We recommend that some minimum number of units or a way to calculate them (such as one every 50m) be stipulated so there are no misunderstandings concerning the DRP to which we are agreeing.

We suggest the minimum number of units be either 7 1 x 2m units, or one 1 x 2 m unit every 50 meters. We believe this is a reasonable number to meet the research goals set out in the DRP. If it turns out that this number of excavations is not feasible due to the nature of the topography a smaller numbers can be agreed with in-the-field consultation with ASHPO.

2) There are no proposed methods for disseminating results of the work to the interested public. Please include such methods in the DRP.
# FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL

**US Army Corps of Engineers**  
**Hawaii Engineer District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO: (Organization, Office Symbol, &amp; Location)</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Telephone:</th>
<th>FAX Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa Historic Preservation Office</td>
<td>Dave Herdrich</td>
<td>664-833-2384</td>
<td>664-633-2387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From: (Organization, Office Symbol &amp; Location)</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Telephone:</th>
<th>FAX Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Engineer District, Honolulu Bldg. 232, ATTN: CEPOH-EO-ES Fort Shafter, Hawaii 96852-5440</td>
<td>Chuck Streck</td>
<td>(808) 438-6934</td>
<td>(808) 438-7801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of Material Transmitted:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Total Nr. of Pages (Including this pg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faga Quarry DRP</td>
<td>Mon. Sep 28, 1998</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks:**

Dave—Thank you for your quick response to the DRP we sent you. I have a few responses to your comments (I'll be sending this same message to SCS/CRMS and Pacific Legacy). Nothing major...just a few clarifications.

1. We can put in what is essentially an arbitrary number of proposed excavation units at this time. We already know that major portions are essentially solid rock (from the previous work at Faga). No problem.

2. The dissemination of the work results is not a contractor concern. That is the agency's responsibility (in this case the Corps and Trans.). We normally send all final reports to library's and repositories. This reminds me...do you have a mailing address for the College library? Then-

3. Again, the contractor is not tasked with public notification. As we went through before, NHPA, unlike NEPA, does not have public meeting provisions. I can recommend to the contractor to include measures/provisions for local notification. This has to be done anyway through notification to property owners and malu concerned with Faga.

4. Again, the contractor does not and is not authorized to submit reports to all these agencies. That is our responsibility. The contractor submits reports to us as to the scope of work milestones and then we, as the Federal agent, submit the reports under our letterhead to the other parties in the MOA. Therefore, all the contractor can state is that the reports shall be submitted to us per the SOW.

5. Thank you for the direction on curation. Can you assist me with contacting folks at the museum so that temporary curation can be achieved? The contractor shall take care of all the necessary paperwork regarding artifacts/samples.

Anyhow, thank for your quick response. Both Kanei and I shall be down in American Samoa, probably during October. See you then.-----------------Chuck.
APPENDIX D
ASHPO Site/Feature Form
AMERICAN SAMOA HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE
SITE/FEATURE FORM (SFF)

I. IDENTIFICATION

SITE DESIGNATION: 60-11-1
Previous Designation: AS-11-1
FEATURE DESIGNATION: Feature Complex U
ASHPO Project Number: 
Site Name: Faga Village
County Name: Ta'u
Village Name: Titiuta
Landowner: Faatana and Faapao
Address: Titiuta Post Office, Ta'u Manu'a, American Samoa 96799

II. LOCATIONAL DATA

UTM Easting: 666820 m
UTM Northing: 8427480 m
AS Coord./Easting: 692300 ft.
AS Coord./Northing: 329300 ft.
Verbal Locational Description: The site of Faga encompasses the entire coastal flat, which measures approximately 1500 meters east-west by 300 meters north-south, on the north central portion of the Island of Ta'u. It is located c. 400 to 1580 meters east of Avatele Cove and c. 1750 to 3300 meters west of the western portion (also known as Mala) of Titiuta Village. The UTM (Zone 2) and American Samoa Coordinate System coordinates provided above are for the approximate central point of the site. Due to the site's large size, six additional coordinate points are provided below which represent the approximate site limit boundaries and include the northeast corner (NE), the southeast corner (SE), the north-central point (NC), the south-central point (SC), the northwest corner (NW), and the southwest corner (SW).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UTM Easting</th>
<th>UTM Northing</th>
<th>AS Easting</th>
<th>AS Northing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. NE</td>
<td>667410</td>
<td>8427570</td>
<td>698290</td>
<td>329600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SE</td>
<td>667450</td>
<td>8427470</td>
<td>695450</td>
<td>329230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. NC</td>
<td>666860</td>
<td>8427670</td>
<td>693450</td>
<td>329950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SC</td>
<td>666820</td>
<td>8427370</td>
<td>693350</td>
<td>328800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. NW</td>
<td>666910</td>
<td>8427490</td>
<td>696500</td>
<td>329300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. SW</td>
<td>666950</td>
<td>8427360</td>
<td>696500</td>
<td>328850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. ENVIRONMENTAL DATA

Lowest Elevation: 12 m
Highest Elevation: 20 m
Distance to Sea: 50-75 m
Distance to Potable Water: 50 m
Direction to Sea: 360 deg
Direction to Potable Water: 75 deg
Minimum Slope: 0 deg
Maximum Slope: 15 deg

SCS Soil Type: Ngendeus Variant extremely cobbly sand & Pavajai stony clay loam
Geology: Alluvium, talus and stream deposits derived from volcanic deposits of Vitric Crystal Ash, Lapilli Tuff, and Olivine Basalt. Beach is composed of unconsolidated fragments of marine organisms.
Geomorphology: Coastal flat
Vegetation: Subsistence gardens (banana, uthu, coconut, taro) and tropical rain forest regrowth.

IV. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

Formal Site/Feature Type: Dirt road.
Formal Site/Feature Description: Feature Complex U is located at the west end of the Faga coastal flat and consists of a dirt road. It extends west of power poles 7 and 8, for a length of approximately 350 meters. The road varies in width but averages 3.0 to 3.6 m wide. The road is at the southern edge of the Faga coastal flat where the edge of the flat meets the steep talus slope to the south. It is inland (gnath) and south of the Ta'u road 24 to 44 m, averaging 33 m south of the existing road. Vegetation
along the road consists of dense tropical jungle (including fan, vines and ferns) with scattered plantations of bananas, coconut palms, uku, and papaya.

This feature lies within the lands of Paopao on the west end (between power poles 1 and 3) and Fautana properly on the east end (from power poles 3 to 8). The only artifact noted was an old tire rim below the road grade. Portions of the road have been supported by sections of stacked basalt cobble and boulder rock retaining walls. No aluminum feature complex identification tag was left at this feature complex. This feature has a transportation function.

Our local informant, Misa, said that this road is not continuous the whole length of Faga. It apparently goes inland near power pole 1 then come back out to the Ta‘u Road after a short while. It similarly goes inland then back out again near power pole 3t, although we did not see clear evidence for it in this vicinity. Misa did not know when the road was built, but recognized it as being “old.”

Number of Features: 1
Portable Remains: An old tire rim was noted below the road.

Absolute Date: N/A Lab Number: N/A
Dating Method: N/A

Area: 1260+ m² Max. Length: 350+ m Max. Width: 3.0-3.6 m
Max depth: unknown Max Height: N/A

How was depth determined (if dives?): N/A

V. INTERPRETATIONS

Functional Site/Feature Type: Transportation
Functional Site/Feature Interpretation: Level dirt grade representative of old road alignment (associated remains and informant data)
Temporal Interpretation: Prehistoric and historic periods; cultural constituents and local informants.
Cultural Affiliation: Manu‘a / Samoan

VI. REFERENCES


Evaluation Report: ___________
Mitigation Report: ___________

VII. STATUS

Condition: Good, some surface disturbance from recent hurricane and plantation activity.
National Register Eligibility: NRHP Eligible under criteria “a” and “d”

Recommendations: Preservation and avoidance if at all possible. Any disturbances or developments other than traditional plantation activities should require archaeological testing and mitigation measures.

VIII. RECORDER INFORMATION

Address: 332 Ulumuu Street, Kailua, Hawaii 96734
Project Name: Ta‘u Road Survey Date Recorded: 3-29-95
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Informant Interview Notes
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GAUVA MAP: TITLE
Mapping notes - continued

CHUCK: Shook came over yesterday afternoon and possibly left on the morning of July 1. He discussed strategy for remaining fieldwork.

- Dig quick shot units at end of road/trail (area #4364).
- Mark Feature Complex A.
- If we hit cultural deposits, we will set up adjacent control units.

- RAN on road/trail at 0.5 km From F.
- Mark Feature Complex B.
- Dig quick shot units at end of road/trail.
- Take photos of possible cross-section data.
- Mark Feature Complex C.
- Dig quick shot units at end of trail.
- Take photos of possible cross-section data.
- Mark Feature Complex D.
- Dig quick shot units at end of trail.
- Take photos of possible cross-section data.

Next high school principal -
Mr. Tala Faunani (677-3550, home; 677-3173, school office).
He was a wealth of information regarding the old trail/road and how it was used to walk it. When he was younger, it was the main road to the new road being built in 1966. He said that Feature #2 - road/road was the original one - through, even though, Eelga and predicates the quarry.
Mr. Tala Fantam owns the plantation property just west of driveway (between power poles 7 & 8) to the 1991 stone power pole 4. He said the current road was built in 1966 and prior to that Feature U (Trail Road) was the main road - meeting up with existing road near the western well road intersection at Powerpole #13.

No foaiga. Manga mauni property from driveway (between power poles 7 and 8), towards Ekitiwa. Fantamu said there was a fall in vicinity of current tapioca plantations above powerpole #9. He said that above where the road crosses the drainage on this lands (west side of driveway), he has collected a couple of "stone adze relics" when putting in his plantation crops. Fantamu also said that below Feature U - few about power pole 4 to the driveway - he has uncovered smooth rocks among the rougher boulder/cobbles which he believes are probably burial areas. The bounds and fields at Foga do not extend west of this property (power pole #4) - which probably means the end of the prehistoric flat of Foga.

The fall within the tapioca grove which Mr. Fantam points out is part of Feature Complex T -

The fall being the one that Misa built before Tusi destroyed it in 1987.

The old trail/road (Feature U) blends into the existing Ta'au road at powerpole #13 within sou Feature Complex R. Beyond Powerpole 8 the road is difficult to delineate due to recent planting activity and past hurricanes.

Mr. Fantam said that from our last recovery point along the trail/road at datum 5 (above powerpole 8) that the trail/road gradually got closer and closer to the existing trail road until it matched with the present Ta'au road at about the western well road intersection. Family and I walked out the section from the well road back to datum 5 on Feature U, but couldn't find any evidence for the trail/road in that area.

In T5-15 got a few pieces of shell midden (mostly A. a. a.) and collected a charcoal sample at 46 cm - shell at 54. Started to have a lighter/brown soil and hit a concentration of bones at 60 cm along southern edge of unit. Exposed the bones in situ to determine what it was. After cleaning off the feature area, we...
APPENDIX F
Inventory of Recovered Materials
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PHOTO DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>LOOKING</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PHOTOGRAPHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>TU-14: Surface</td>
<td></td>
<td>23 NO</td>
<td>LMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>TU-14</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>TU-14</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>TU-14 BDE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>24 NO</td>
<td>LMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>TU-14 South Wall profile</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>From B toward quarry along road - Tufi</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>24 NO</td>
<td>LMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>From AB along road</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>From AC along road</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>From 30 m SW of AD along road</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>From AD along road</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>From AE along road</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>From AF along road</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>From AG along road</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>From AH along road</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>From AI along road</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>AT AI: The nem. continues</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER</td>
<td>PHOTO DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>LOOKING</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PHOTOGRAPHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>ROAD AT ΔF - FACING ON GA'I'TA SIDE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>12-06-78</td>
<td>LMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ROAD AT ΔF</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ROAD AT ΔF - FACING ON GA'I'TA SIDE</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ROAD AT ΔF</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ROAD AT ΔF</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ROAD AT ΔJ</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>GRINDING/WHEATSTONE AT ΔL - CLOSEUP</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>FACING ON N SIDE OF ROAD AT ΔL</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ROAD AT ΔL</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ROAD AT ΔL</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ROAD AT ΔL</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>TARO PATCH ON N FACING SLOPE NEAR ΔL</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ROAD AT ΔQ</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ROAD TOWARD ΔS</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ROAD 10 M SW OF ΔS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ROAD 10 M SW OF ΔS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>TU-15 SURFACE</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>TU-15 FE-1 BURIAL</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>27-07-78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER</td>
<td>PHOTO DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>LOOKING</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PHOTOGRAPHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PK-11-1 TV K 15 Fe-1 burial</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25 Oct</td>
<td>RMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 from Ta'u Rd to Old Rd Shewing TV 15 Tufi</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6 from Old Rd to Ta'u Rd w/ TV 15 Tufi</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TV-16 Fe-1 burial: Buwani + E wall</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>27 Oct</td>
<td>RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TV-16 E wall profile</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>TV-16 Fe-1 BOE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fe-1 Closeup</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fe-1 Closeup</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Basalt flakes on photo BO</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Close-up</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>28 Oct</td>
<td>LMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>TV-17 Layer 1/4 10 cm BGS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>TV-17 Layer 1/2 20 cm BGS + stick</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>20-30 cm BGS</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>TV-17 Crew shot: Tufi, Lea + Leann</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>+ Will SW</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>TV-17 Layer 1/14 60 cm BGS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Tufi</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>TV-17 Layer 1/2 50 cm BGS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>#4 + #7 are not Basalt rather carbonized material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER</td>
<td>PHOTO DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>LOOKING</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PHOTOGRAPHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LE'IA DIGGING TU-17</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TU-17, LAYER II/5, 80 CM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; LAYER III/6, 70 CM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TU-17, LAYER IV/7, 12 CM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bag #</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Layer/Level</td>
<td>Contents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT:** D-1710

**LOCATION:** AS-11-1

**DATE:** 20-20

**FIELD REC.**

- 20-20
- 30-50
- 50-100

**SCOPE:**

- 10-20g
- 20-30g
- 30-50g
- 50-100g