

**Keystone Pipeline Project:
Testing 32RM160 and 32RMx89
in Ransom County, North Dakota**

Prepared for:
ENSR Corporation
Fort Collins, Colorado

Principal Investigator:
Amy Bleier

Authors:
Amy Bleier and Ed Stine
Metcalf Archaeological Consultants, Inc.
Bismarck, North Dakota

February 2007

MANUSCRIPT DATA RECORD FORM

1. Manuscript Number:
2. SHPO Reference #: 06-0088
3. Author(s): Amy Bleier and Ed Stine
4. Title: Keystone Pipeline Project: Testing 32RM160 and 32RMx89 in Ransom County, North Dakota
5. Report Date: February 2007
6. Number of Pages: 69
7. Type: Testing
8. Acres:
9. Legal Location(s):

<u>County</u>	<u>TWP</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>SEC</u>	<u>SU</u>
Ransom	136	58	12	SH

Abstract

TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, LP (TransCanada) intends to construct and operate a new pipeline (Mainline) approximately 1,845 miles long, originating in Hardisty, Alberta, Canada and terminating in Patoka, Illinois, United States. The crude oil pipeline will run through eastern North Dakota, from the Canada/Cavalier County border approximately 216.9 miles south to the Sargent County/South Dakota border. The proposed pipeline route runs through the western half of Ransom County, North Dakota. For the proposed undertaking, the lead Federal agency is the Department of State and the lead state agency is the Public Service Commission.

ENSR Corporation, a subcontractor of TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, LP, contracted Metcalf Archaeological Consultants, Inc. to conduct evaluative testing of one archaeological site and one archaeological site lead, recorded during the preceding Class III cultural resource inventory along the proposed pipeline route in Ransom County. Site 32RM160 and site lead 32RMx89 are located on either side of the crossing of the proposed pipeline route and the Sheyenne River.

Site 32RM160 is a sparse to moderately dense archaeological cultural material scatter on the east side of the Sheyenne River. The majority of cultural materials were recovered from the plowzone. No features were found. Additional investigation is not likely to broaden the knowledge of the prehistory of the area. Site 32RM160 does not meet the criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. On the basis of evaluative testing, the site is recommended as not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and avoidance of the site is not recommended.

Site lead 32RMx89 is a very sparse archaeological and historic cultural material scatter. All of the cultural materials were recovered from within the plowzone. No features were found. Additional investigation is not likely to yield significant information about the prehistory of the area. The results of evaluative testing at 32RMx89 reveal that the site does not meet the criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. On the basis of evaluative testing, it is recommended as not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and avoidance is not recommended.

A finding of *no historic properties affected* is recommended for the proposed undertaking within the survey corridor as tested at 32RM160 and 32RMx89, mapped, and described herein.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Chapter 1: Comprehensive Introduction	1
Introduction	1
Project Description	1
Project Locations	1
Environment	3
Drift Prairie	3
Cultural History	3
Paleoindian Tradition (11,500 - 7,500 Years B.P.)	4
Plains Archaic Tradition (7,500 - 2,400 Years B.P.)	5
Plains Woodland Tradition (2,400 Years B.P. - A.D. 1000)	5
Plains Village Period (A.D. 1000 - 1780)	6
Equestrian Period (A.D. 1780 - 1880)	7
Euro-American/Settlement	8
Background Research	9
Research Goals	10
Chapter 2: Comprehensive Methodology	11
Testing Field Methods	11
Testing Personnel	12
Laboratory Methodology	12
Laboratory Personnel	12
Chipped Stone Tool Analysis	12
Chipped Stone Flaking Debris Analysis	12
Swan River Chert	13
Knife River Flint	13
Tongue River Silicified Sediment	13
Petrified Wood	13
Chert	13
Chalcedony	14
Faunal Analysis	14
Ceramic Analysis	14
Fire-Cracked Rock	14
Chapter 3: Results	15
32RM160	15
Shovel Test Probes	17
Soils	19
Test Unit 1	19
Test Unit 2	22
Test Unit 3	24
Site Ceramics Analysis	25

32RMx89	27
Shovel Test Probes	29
Site Ceramic Analysis	29
Test Unit 1	30
Soils	30
Chapter 4: Summary and Recommendations	32
Unanticipated Discoveries Plan	32
Chapter 5: References Cited	35
Appendix A	A-1
Appendix B	B-1
Appendix C	C-1
Appendix D	D-1

List of Figures

Figure 1. Locations of 32RM160 and 32RMx89 depicted on the USGS 7.5' Fort Ransom (1967) quadrangle map.	2
Figure 2. Sketch map of 32RM160.	16
Figure 3. 32RM160, Test Unit 1, south wall profile sketch.	21
Figure 4. 32RM160, Test Unit 1, south wall profile (Image 263).	21
Figure 5. 32RM160, Test Unit 2, east wall profile sketch.	23
Figure 6. 32RM160, Test Unit 2, east wall profile (Image 246).	23
Figure 7. 32RM160, Test Unit 3, west wall profile (Image 252).	26
Figure 8. 32RM160, Test Unit 3, west wall profile sketch.	26
Figure 9. Sketch map of 32RMx89.	28
Figure 10. 32RMx89, Test Unit 1, east wall profile sketch.	31
Figure 11. 32RMx89, Test Unit 1, east wall profile (Image 234).	31

List of Tables

Table 1. Results of Files Search for 32RM160 and 32RMx89	9
Table 2. 32RM160—Collected Materials from Shovel Test Probes	17
Table 3. 32RM160—Collected Materials from Test Unit 1	19
Table 4. 32RM160—Collected Materials from Test Unit 2	22
Table 5. 32RM160—Collected Materials from Test Unit 3	24
Table 6. Cultural Materials from Testing at 32RMx89	29

Confidential Information removed from document