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FOREWORD
William H. Doelle, President and CEO
Archaeology Southwest

The San Pedro Valley is a little off the beaten path, which is one reason why archaeology is generally well preserved there. From Benson north to Winkelman, the valley is served by two-lane roads, and for nearly half of that distance, the roads are unpaved. High mountains to the east and west clearly define the valley, and cottonwoods or dense stands of mesquite reveal places where the river’s waters flow above and below ground. This valley truly is a special place—for visitors and archaeologists alike.

When I arrived in Tucson in 1972, to attend graduate school at the University of Arizona, I met fellow students who were studying artifacts from San Pedro Valley excavations. However, my first field trip to the San Pedro only occurred a dozen years later, and my field notebook indicates it was another five years before I fully engaged with the valley. I made three visits in the final two months of 1989, and I will never forget New Year’s Day, 1990, when Henry Wallace and I departed for the valley at sunrise.

Since then, I have visited the San Pedro Valley more than 100 times—sometimes alone, but more often, with others. On the first Saturday in February of 1990, 10 volunteers initiated the Center for Desert Archaeology’s Lower San Pedro Survey, which covered 75 miles along the river over the ensuing four-and-a-half years. Volunteer crews did all of that work. Diverse goals—surveying, mapping, training site stewards, visiting landowners, leading tours—motivated my subsequent visits. With each visit, I learn more, my sense of connection to the San Pedro deepens, and, over the course of day-long tours, I see the compelling effect this special place has on visitors. I am not surprised it played a formative role in the development of two archaeological institutions, the Amerind Foundation and Archaeology Southwest (formerly the Center for Desert Archaeology).

The Amerind Foundation is located along the eastern boundary of the San Pedro watershed. William Shirley Fulton, Amerind’s founder, conducted the institution’s very first excavations in the 1930s, on its own property. These excavations drew the new institution into a debate over the nature and extent of the newly defined Mogollon culture, and led to work at the sites of Tres Alomos, north of Benson, and Babocomari Village, west of Fairbank. Building on that work, Charles Di Peso formulated a larger research agenda that used what he called “archaeohistory” to pursue the linkage between early contact populations and the archaeological manifestations of the 1400s. Work at multiple sites around Fairbank in the early 1950s was followed by work at Reeve Ruin and Davis Ranch in the mid-1950s.

Findings at these two sites raised the issue of migration into the valley, though Amerind did not pursue the topic through further research. The institution thrived as it built on this San Pedro Valley base of experience, ultimately pursuing larger-scale excavations at Paquimé, a unique regional center in Chihuahua, Mexico. Today, Amerind is a museum open to researchers and the public, and it hosts a variety of advanced seminars to synthesize and publish archaeological and anthropological scholarship. An important partner in the present research, the Amerind Foundation retains its institutional connection with the San Pedro Valley.

In many ways, the Center for Desert Archaeology’s survey followed the overall goals of Amerind’s original archaeohistory program. In 1990, migration was not our primary research focus, but as the survey progressed and we assessed the results, migration drew more of our attention. Changes in population size and distribution and the role of migrants in local history were principal questions for the mapping and limited excavation program we initiated in 1999. The results reported in this volume led us to the Safford, Tonto Basin, Phoenix, and Perry Mesa areas, and then on to the upper Gila. Partnerships involving graduate students funded by the Center’s Preservation Fellowship program contributed to this research trajectory as our institution matured. Now in our 31st year, our roots in the San Pedro Valley still inspire the research we pursue as Archaeology Southwest, our new institutional name.

Our work on the San Pedro brought Preservation Archaeology into focus. It is now central to Archaeology Southwest. The San Pedro Valley is where we first engaged our big-picture research questions about precontact regional migration and population collapse in the southern Southwest. Working with dispersed valley communities prompted us to expand our public programs. Looming threats accentuated the need for active site protection in the valley. Our first conservation easement developed there. Today, our site protection program has full-time staff, and the number of sites under our protection is growing. Six of these are in the San Pedro.
I have witnessed how the stories of this special place significantly affect those who experience it directly. The final stop on the day-long tour I have given to many people is the Davis Ranch ruin. Over the course of the day, we visit several platform mounds, walk through extensive nonriverine fields of rock terraces and rock piles, see 1,000-year-old pithouses, and ponder the subtle ovals of embedded stones that mark Sobaipuri dwellings Father Kino might have passed by in 1697. Although we experience some places lost to the destructive forces of vandalism, erosion, or development, our experience of the many places still preserved is a much stronger one. By the time we reach Davis Ranch, even first-time visitors have gained a sense of this dynamic landscape and the complex history etched into it.

At Davis Ranch, we observe a surprisingly deep hole that is actually a kiva constructed by Kayenta migrants around A.D. 1300. Subtle remnants of the first 10 rooms these migrants built after their arrival are also visible. As we gaze across the river, we see the steep cliffs that helped to protect another migrant settlement, today called Reeve Ruin, only 400 yards away. It is easy to imagine a village dog barking on a quiet morning, awakening the residents of both settlements. Although today’s river is usually dry, visitors can distinguish a rock outcrop that would have pushed groundwater to the surface just a scant half-mile to the south. We easily picture canals tapping that water and nurturing lush fields where, today, we see green pastures and grazing cattle. As we look westward, toward the Reeve Ruin, we make out the low pass between the Rincon and Catalina mountain ranges. Redington Pass reminds us that a very different landscape inhabited by nearly a million people lies just 20 miles away, in the Tucson Basin.

The San Pedro Valley has significantly affected all of us who have worked there. We have come to know many landowners, some of whom have given us permission to survey or excavate on private land. Many of these ranching families have been on the front line of preservation, protecting these important places for generations. How fortunate we have been to research ancient communities, work with modern residents, and explore the complex ways in which nature and culture interacted to create this remarkable landscape.

Publishing the results of our San Pedro Valley research is a source of great satisfaction. Our work continues, but now, the details of these efforts are available for others to review and assess. Just as we built on important work by the Amerind Foundation and others, we hope that new researchers with new questions find answers in this special place.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Archaeology Southwest (formerly the Center for Desert Archaeology) has spent more than 20 years investigating and protecting the cultural resources of the Lower San Pedro Valley. The region has become the keystone of our research program and the showcase of our preservation efforts. Our initial interest in the region was fueled by the informal explorations of Henry Wallace and James Holmlund during the 1980s. Wallace, then an employee of the Arizona Division of the Institute for American Research, brought the rich archaeological record of the region to the attention of William Doelle, the Division Director of the Institute, and subsequently, president of Desert Archaeology, Inc. Doelle initiated a more formal investigation of the region in 1990, as part of the Center for Desert Archaeology’s Lower San Pedro Survey. This volunteer survey was conducted during non-summer weekends by a varied cast of supervisors and volunteers until 1995.

The survey results and the abrupt destruction of a platform mound site prompted more thorough examination of late precontact ruins in the valley. Funded by a private foundation with additional financial support from the Amerind Foundation, the test excavation component of the San Pedro Preservation program sampled many of these ruins on temperate weekends from 1999 through 2001.

Neither project would have been feasible without the spirited efforts of a veritable army of volunteers. These included avocationalists from diverse professional and cultural backgrounds, student interns, and professional archaeologists. The first table in the volume (see Table 1.1) is an exhaustive attempt to thank everyone who volunteered for the survey, excavation, and postfield analyses over this 20-year period. Some people on this list were one-timers; however, many were repeat weekenders who participated in both survey and excavation. A few truly dedicated souls helped with the postfield analysis. Individual contributions are impossible to list in detail, but we extend a special thanks to that indefatigable cadre who were with us throughout much of our “San Pedro decades.” On the other hand, memories fade over 20 years, and the directors changed from the survey through the test excavations and analysis. As a result, a nagging feeling remains that some deserving names are missing in Table 1.1. To those hopefully few individuals, we extend a heartfelt thanks and an apology for the omission.

The test excavations would also not have been possible without the permission of a plethora of government and private landowners who owned or managed late precontact sites in the Lower San Pedro Valley at the turn of the millennium. The former included the Bureau of Land Management, the Arizona State Land Department, Pima County, and the City of Tucson. Large private landowners included ASARCO, BHP Copper, The Nature Conservancy, the Smallhouse (Carlink Ranch) and Ronquillo ranching families, and the C-Spear Ranch owned by the late Hope Jones. Residential landowners with sites literally in their backyards include Harold and Mignon Elliott, Vera Hill, Sam Rhodes, Eileen Hollowell, Lonnie Hicks, and Christine Curtis. The Elliotts established a conservation easement on the important sites on their property shortly after the excavations. Thanks to Sam Rhodes and Vera Hill, Lost Mound will never again be misplaced by archaeologists. The Smallhouses have been friends of archaeology since the first recorded excavations in the region by William Duffen in the mid-1930s.

As in most projects, the analyses, writing, editing, and revisions were much more onerous than the fieldwork. Many archaeological endeavors start with the best intentions, but ultimately languish in various incomplete stages of postfield purgatory. Although it has taken more than a decade, we have finally emerged from this limbo with a sense of closure and satisfaction. During the first decade of the new millennium, other work often pulled us away from completing this volume; however, the San Pedro Valley was always close to our hearts and never far back in our minds. We drew inspiration from the tireless efforts of our volunteers, several who have since passed away. In addition, a new cast of characters emerged to help us cross the finish line after the digging stopped. Paramount among these was the staff of the Production Department at Desert Archaeology, Inc., led by Emilee Mead, whose favorite line is “We can do that.” In particular, we would like to thank Andrea Mathews for her devotion in exorcising all those “little devils hiding in the details” and an unwavering commitment to excellence.

When the prose becomes a little too dense or detailed, the reader can always gaze at pictures and ponder maps. No effort was spared in creating aesthetically pleasing graphics in this volume. We took full advantage of Adriel Heisey’s talents, using aerial photographs he shot from precarious positions above the San Pedro Valley in a hand-built “airplane” that is the embodiment of minimalism and that still manages to defy gravity. Although her name does not appear on her creations, Catherine Gilman’s tasteful touch can be found on many of
Acknowledgments

the maps and illustrations. Catherine brings simple elegance to the most complicated maps while making the most mundane artifact scatters appear intriguing. In addition to his role as an author, J. Brett Hill was the project GIS wizard and a number of Catherine’s figures are artistic renditions of Brett’s algorithmic alchemy.

Sites in Chapter 3 that received what we call the deluxe cartographic treatment were generated by Robert Scott of Western Mapping, Inc., headed by James Holmlund, who is also a consummate perfectionist. These detailed and informative maps are seamless fusions of stereoscopic aerial photographs and architectural maps made with a total station. Specific credit for ceramic photographs in Chapter 4 (Figures 4.2-4.4, 4.6, 4.25, and 4.27) is given to Jack Ramsey. The original illustration for Figure 3.20 was produced by Susan Hall and for Figure 4.28 by Marina Sergeyeva; both subsequently revised by Catherine Gilman.

The National Science Foundation (Award No. SBR-990332) funded the development of a petrographic model of the San Pedro Valley. This model allowed us to determine where many of the ceramics recovered from the test excavations, especially Roosevelt Red Ware, were produced, an important research goal. We are also greatly indebted to the Amerind Foundation and the Arizona State Museum for granting us virtual carte blanche in reproducing and adapting unpublished and previously published maps and illustrations. Finally, we thank the Salus Mundi Foundation for awarding Archaeology Southwest a grant to print the volume that you hold in your hands.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword ................................................................................................................................. iii
Acknowledgments ...................................................................................................................... v
List of Figures ............................................................................................................................ xi
List of Tables ............................................................................................................................ xxiii

1. **THE RIVER, THE RESEARCH, AND THE REPORT, Jeffery J. Clark, Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh, and J. Brett Hill** ......................................................................................... 1
   - The River ......................................................................................................................... 3
     - Lower San Pedro Valley ................................................................................................. 6
   - Previous Research ........................................................................................................... 8
     - Go Ask Alice .................................................................................................................. 10
     - The Amerind Dynasty .................................................................................................... 13
     - The Unfinished Highway ............................................................................................... 18
     - Central Arizona College: The Trowel is Mightier than the Pen .................................... 23
     - Rediscovering Lost Mound, AZ BB:2:3 (ASM), and Lost Knowledge ............................ 25
   - This Report ....................................................................................................................... 26

2. **LOWER SAN PEDRO SURVEY RESULTS AND RESEARCH DESIGN FOR TEST EXCAVATIONS, William H. Doelle, Henry D. Wallace, and Jeffery J. Clark** ................................................................ 29
   - The Lower San Pedro Survey ......................................................................................... 29
     - Standard Survey Methods and Overview of Results ..................................................... 30
     - Survey Ceramic Analyses and Results ......................................................................... 31
     - Prelude to Classic Period Migration ............................................................................ 34
     - Evidence for Protohistoric Period Sites ....................................................................... 37
     - Protohistoric Period Documentary Background .......................................................... 40
     - Protohistoric Period Population and Settlement Size .................................................. 42
     - Documentary Insights Regarding Projectile Points ....................................................... 44
     - Protohistoric Period Summary ...................................................................................... 44
     - Survey Data Quality Assessments .................................................................................. 45
   - Research Design ............................................................................................................... 47
     - Management Issues ...................................................................................................... 48
     - Other San Pedro Preservation Projects Related to the Test Excavation Project ............. 49
     - Settlement Summary .................................................................................................... 49
     - Classic Period Subsistence Communities ....................................................................... 50
     - Lower San Pedro Districts ............................................................................................. 60
     - Sampling Strategy and Site Types .................................................................................. 61
     - Research Topics and Analysis ....................................................................................... 62
     - Conclusion ....................................................................................................................... 64

3. **HOW, WHERE, AND WHAT WE EXCAVATED, Jeffery J. Clark and Patrick D. Lyons** ................................................................................................................................. 67
   - How We Excavated ......................................................................................................... 67
   - Where and What We Excavated ..................................................................................... 72
     - Tested Pre-Classic Period Sites: Learning from Our "Past" Mistakes ................................ 73
     - Tested Soza Phase Sites .................................................................................................. 84
     - Aravaipa, Redfield, and Romero Phase Summaries ....................................................... 104
     - Tested Aravaipa, Redfield, and/or Romero Phase Sites in the Aravaipa District .......... 109
     - Tested Aravaipa, Redfield, and Romero Phase Sites in the San Manuel District ............ 130
## Table of Contents

Tested Aravaipa, Redfield, and Romero Phase Sites in the Cascabel District ........................................ 153  
Tested Aravaipa, Redfield, and Romero Phase Sites in the Dudleyville District ........................................ 176  
Recommendations for Future Fieldwork ................................................................................................. 202  

### 4. CERAMIC TYPOLOGY, CHRONOLOGY, PRODUCTION, AND CIRCULATION,  
*Patrick D. Lyons* ................................................................................................................................. 211  

Methods .................................................................................................................................................. 211  
Ware and Type Descriptions .................................................................................................................... 213  
  - Roosevelt Red Ware ......................................................................................................................... 213  
  - San Carlos Red-on-brown ................................................................................................................. 218  
  - Red-on-brown Variants ..................................................................................................................... 223  
  - The Maverick Mountain Series ....................................................................................................... 224  
  - Tucson Basin Brown Ware .............................................................................................................. 228  
  - Middle Gila Buff Ware ..................................................................................................................... 231  
  - Dragoon Series or San Simon Series .............................................................................................. 231  
  - Cibola White Ware .......................................................................................................................... 232  
  - Red-on-buff Variants ....................................................................................................................... 232  
  - Indeterminate Decorated .................................................................................................................. 233  
  - White Mountain Red Ware ............................................................................................................ 233  
  - San Simon Series ............................................................................................................................. 233  
  - Dragoon Series ............................................................................................................................... 234  
  - Indeterminate White Ware .............................................................................................................. 235  
  - Chihuahuan Polychromes ................................................................................................................. 235  
  - Matsaksi Buff Ware .......................................................................................................................... 237  
  - Trincheras Series ............................................................................................................................. 237  
  - Plain Brown Ware ............................................................................................................................ 237  
  - Red Ware ........................................................................................................................................ 248  
  - Brown Corrugated ............................................................................................................................ 250  
  - Mogollon Brown Ware ..................................................................................................................... 257  

Temporal Patterns ..................................................................................................................................... 259  
  - Ceramic Phase Markers ................................................................................................................... 260  
  - Cliff Polychrome in the Lower San Pedro River Valley .................................................................... 260  
  - Intrasite Chronology ......................................................................................................................... 263  

Ceramic Production and Circulation .......................................................................................................... 271  
  - The Origin of Roosevelt Red Ware ................................................................................................. 274  
  - Roosevelt Red Ware Sourcing ......................................................................................................... 275  
  - The Provenance Analysis .................................................................................................................. 276  
  - Petrofacies and Districts ................................................................................................................... 276  
  - Gross Provenance Data .................................................................................................................... 281  
  - Interdistrict Ceramic Production and Circulation Patterns ................................................................ 282  
  - Summary of the Production and Circulation Data .......................................................................... 306  

Summary and Conclusion ......................................................................................................................... 308  

### 5. PLANT AND ANIMAL UTILIZATION, Jeffery J. Clark, Michael W. Diehl, 
Jennifer A. Waters, J. Brett Hill, and Jenny L. Adams ............................................................................ 309  

Agricultural Land Use and Potential ....................................................................................................... 309  
  - Rock Piles Galore ............................................................................................................................ 310  
  - Modeling Agricultural Production in the Floodplain ....................................................................... 316  
  - Nearly Nada from the Bajada ............................................................................................................ 318  

Environmental Sample Analyses ............................................................................................................. 318  
  - Pollen Analysis ............................................................................................................................... 318  
  - Paleobotanical Analyses .................................................................................................................. 320  
  - Faunal Analyses ............................................................................................................................... 328  
  - Plant-processing Tools ..................................................................................................................... 338  

Food Preparation and Storage Features .................................................................................................... 341
Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Granaries</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roasting Pits and Hornos</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary and Conclusions</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. OF MIGRANTS AND MOUNDS, Jeffery J. Clark, J. Brett Hill, Patrick D. Lyons, and Stacey N. Lengyel</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisiting the Research Design</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A New Chronology for the Classic Period</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence Communities and Districts</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Classic Prelude</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten Thousand Years in Two Pages</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration Round 1: Phoenix Rising</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disenchantment and Dispersion</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Classic Tale</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soza Phase: Are We Really in the Classic Period?</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aravaipa Phase: Migrants and Mounds</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redfield Phase: Post-migration Continuity and Change</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romero Phase: A New Identity Emerges as Settlement Declines</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epilogue: Inward, Upward, and Onward</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salado and Sobaipuri: 200 Years and Six Degrees of Separation?</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Gila and Back</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concluding Remarks</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. X-RAY FLOURESCENCE SOURCING OF OBSIDIAN, SAN PEDRO PRESERVATION PROJECT, Steven M. Shackley and Samantha Gallop</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. CERAMIC WARE AND TYPE COUNTS, BY DISTRICT, SAN PEDRO PRESERVATION PROJECT, Patrick D. Lyons</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. INTRUSIVE TYPES AND WARES FROM EARLY FIELDWORK, LOWER SAN PEDRO VALLEY, Patrick D. Lyons</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. MODIFIED SHERDS, SAN PEDRO PRESERVATION PROJECT, Mathew Devitt and Patrick D. Lyons</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. TYPE DESCRIPTION OF SAN CARLOS RED-ON-BROWN: ARAVAIPA VARIETY, Patrick D. Lyons</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. TEMPORAL ASSIGNMENT OF EXCAVATED CONTEXTS, SAN PEDRO PRESERVATION PROJECT, Jeffery J. Clark and Patrick D. Lyons</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCES CITED</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF FIGURES

1.1. The San Pedro Valley in southeastern Arizona, showing selected sites and modern settlements ................................................................. 4

1.2. The Lower San Pedro Valley, showing locations of tested Classic period sites ................................................................. 5

1.3. Previously excavated sites in the Lower San Pedro Valley ................................................................................................. 11

1.4. Alice Hubbard Carpenter scrutinizing an artifact late in her career ........................................................................... 12

1.5. William Shirley Fulton with his wife Rose and daughter Elizabeth ................................................................................ 13

1.6. Carr Tuthill, William Shirley Fulton, and guests taking a break from work around the time of the Tres Alamos, AZ BB:15:1 (ASM), excavations .................................................................................. 14

1.7. Charles Di Peso leaning against the Amerind field vehicle around the time of the Reeve Ruin, AZ BB:11:26 (ASM), excavations .................................................................................. 15

1.8. Rex Gerald and Emil Haury sorting pottery at Point of Pines, AZ W:10:50 (ASM), before the Davis Ranch, AZ BB:11:36 (ASM), excavations ........................................................................... 17

1.9. John Ware, current director of the Amerind Foundation ................................................................................................. 18

1.10. Larry Hammack “cracking the whip” while directing the excavations at Second Canyon Compound, AZ BB:11:20 (ASM) ................................................................................... 19

1.11. Hayward Franklin and Charles Sternberg recording a room at Second Canyon Compound, AZ BB:11:20 (ASM) ................................................................................... 19


1.15. Bruce Masse conducting a tour of Central Arizona College’s excavations at Big Ditch, AZ BB:2:2 (ASM) ................................................................................................................... 25

2.1. All ceramics from the Lower San Pedro Survey ............................................................................................................. 31

2.2. Pre-Classic Tucson Basin Brown Ware distribution from the Lower San Pedro Survey .................................................................................. 32

2.3. Middle Gila Buff Ware distribution from the Lower San Pedro Survey .................................................................................. 32

2.4. Middle Gila Buff Ware, Aravaipa Variety, distribution from the Lower San Pedro Survey .................................................................................. 32

2.5. Dragoon/San Simon Series distribution from the Lower San Pedro Survey .................................................................................. 33

2.6. Corrugated Ware distribution from the Lower San Pedro Survey .................................................................................. 33
List of Figures

2.7. Cibola White Ware distribution from the Lower San Pedro Survey ...................................................... 34
2.8. White Mountain Red Ware distribution from the Lower San Pedro Survey ........................................ 34
2.9. Gila and Cliff Polychrome distribution from the Lower San Pedro Survey ......................................... 34
2.10. Peppersauce Red Ware distribution from the Lower San Pedro Survey ............................................... 35
2.11. The distribution of pre-Classic ballcourts and large villages that may have once had ballcourts ....................................................................................................................................... 36
2.12. Survey sites with Protohistoric period or possible Protohistoric period evidence, displayed with the approximate locations of places noted in 1690s documents ....................................................................................................................................... 38
2.13. Protohistoric period projectile points and possible Protohistoric period bifaces from the Lower San Pedro Survey ....................................................................................................................................... 39
2.14. Possible Protohistoric period unifaces from the Lower San Pedro Survey ............................................ ....................................................................................................................................... 40
2.15. Map of a portion of AZ BB:6:67 (ASM), a nonriverine agricultural field system ................................. ....................................................................................................................................... 46
2.16. Fergoliths recovered from nonriverine agricultural fields near Cascabel by a local resident ....................................................................................................................................... 47
2.17. A cluster of agave plants growing at an elevation of approximately 850 m within AZ BB:6:67 (ASM), a large nonriverine agricultural field near San Manuel ....................................................................................................................................... 48
2.18. Gila Junction and Dudleyville communities ............................................................................................. 52
2.19. Aravaipa community cluster ..................................................................................................................... 53
2.20. Leaverton Mesa-Camp Village community cluster .................................................................................... 54
2.21. Three communities, Big Bell, 111 Ranch, and High Mesa ........................................................................ 55
2.22. Three communities, Second Canyon, Bayless, and Reeve Ruin-Davis Ranch ........................................ 57
2.23. Cascabel community, in relation to Reeve Ruin-Davis Ranch and Palomas Wash isolate ....................................................................................................................................... 59
3.1. Classic period sites tested by the Center for Desert Archaeology in the Lower San Pedro Valley ....................................................................................................................................... 68
3.2. Sites with substantial tested pre-Classic deposits ...................................................................................... 76
3.3. Map of the northwestern portion of Tres Alamos, AZ BB:15:1 (ASM), showing architectural features excavated by the Amerind Foundation in 1940 and Center for Desert Archaeology test units ....................................................................................................................................... 78
3.4. Aerial view of the northwestern portion of Tres Alamos, AZ BB:15:1 (ASM), oriented east, in December 1940, showing Amerind Foundation excavations and trench pattern ....................................................................................................................................... 79
3.5. Crew excavating Unit 6 at Tres Alamos, AZ BB:15:1 (ASM) ........................................................................ 80
3.6. Map of the eastern portion of the Green Lantern site, AZ BB:2:12 (ASM), showing Center for Desert Archaeology test units and modern landmarks ....................................................................................................................................... 83
3.7. Photograph of the eastern portion of the Green Lantern site, AZ BB:2:12 (ASM), facing northwest from the site datum .......................................................... 84

3.8. Sites with substantial tested deposits that date to the Soza phase .......................................................... 85

3.9. Contour map of José Solas Ruin, AZ BB:11:91 (ASM), showing architecture, Center for Desert Archaeology test units, and room excavated by the Amerind Foundation in the early 1950s .......................................................... 87

3.10. Fall 2000 photograph of room investigated by the Amerind Foundation at José Solas Ruin, AZ BB:11:91 (ASM), in the early 1950s, facing south .......................................................... 89

3.11. Photograph of southeastern wall, Unit 1, Feature 1, José Solas Ruin, AZ BB:11:91 (ASM), facing northwest ............... .......................................................... 90

3.12. Room outline of Feature 2, José Solas Ruin, AZ BB:11:91 (ASM), facing northwest .......................................................... 91

3.13. Photograph of Unit 5, José Solas Ruin, AZ BB:11:91 (ASM), depicting a rock-filled pit, Feature 5, at the bottom, a small pit, Feature 7, left of Feature 5, and a possible pithouse, Feature 8, at the top .......................................................... 92

3.14. Southern and western profiles of Unit 3 at José Solas Ruin, AZ BB:11:91 (ASM) .......................................................... 93

3.15. Alice Carpenter Christmas card with Rincon Red-on-brown jar, the “Big Pot” from AZ BB:2:18 (ASM) .......................................................... 94

3.16. Map of Big Pot, AZ BB:2:18 (ASM), site area showing the location of the Center for Desert Archaeology test units and selected architectural and extramural features .......................................................... 96

3.17. Photograph of Unit 2, Big Pot, AZ BB:2:18 (ASM), facing west, in the narrow space between the rock-reinforced adobe walls of two separate masonry and adobe rooms .......................................................... 97

3.18. Photograph of Unit 3, Big Pot, AZ BB:2:18 (ASM), facing south, with rock-reinforced adobe wall of Feature 2 in the background .......................................................... 98


3.20. Sites recorded by Dudley Meade and Central Arizona College in the early 1970s .......................................................... 101

3.21. Map of Twin Hawks, AZ BB:6:20 (ASM), showing architecture, Central Arizona College’s excavations in the early 1970s, and fall 2000 Center for Desert Archaeology test units .......................................................... 103

3.22. Known, tested, and/or excavated sites with Aravaipa phase components .......................................................... 105

3.23. Known, tested, and/or excavated sites with Redfield phase components .......................................................... 107

3.24. Tested sites with Romero phase components .......................................................... 108

3.25. Contour map of Lost Mound, AZ BB:2:3 (ASM), showing architecture, modern buildings, and Center for Desert Archaeology test units .......................................................... 110
3.26. Fewkes' 1908 sketch map of the "Ruin opposite Old Fort Grant," Lost Mound, AZ BB:2:3 (ASM) ................................................................. 111

3.27. Contour map of Buzan, AZ BB:2:10 (ASM), showing architecture and Center for Desert Archaeology test units........................................ 114

3.28. Map of the Wright site, AZ BB:2:51 (ASM), showing major architectural features, excavation units, ridgeline, and State Route 77 .................. 117

3.29. Detailed contour detail map of Locus 1, the Wright site, AZ BB:2:51 (ASM), showing wall alignments and Center for Desert Archaeology test units ........................................ 118

3.30. Contour map of Flieger Ruin, AZ BB:2:7 (ASM), showing loci 1, 2, and 3, including visible architecture, the 1977-1979 Central Arizona College excavations, and spring 1999 Center for Desert Archaeology test units ........................................ 121


3.32. Map of Flieger Ruin, AZ BB:2:7 (ASM), showing loci 1, 2, and 3 .......................... 125

3.33. Contour map of Flieger Ruin, AZ BB:2:7 (ASM), mound settlement, showing architecture, Center for Desert Archaeology test units, and bulldozer damage ......................................................... 126

3.34. Northern profile of Unit 2 at Flieger Ruin, AZ BB:2:7 (ASM) .................................. 128

3.35. Photograph of Unit 2 at Flieger Ruin, AZ BB:2:7 (ASM), facing south .................... 129

3.36. Map of Leaverton Mesa, AZ BB:6:11 (ASM), showing architecture, Center for Desert Archaeology test units, and approximate ridgeline .... 131

3.37. Fewkes' 1908 sketch map of "Ruin Opposite Monmouth," Leaverton Mesa, AZ BB:6:11 (ASM) ................................................................. 132

3.38. Map of Camp Village, AZ BB:6:5 (ASM), showing architecture, Center for Desert Archaeology test units, and extent of erosion into Mammoth Wash ............................................... 134

3.39. Photograph of Feature 2, large granary pedestal, and Feature 3, small granary pedestal or puddling pit intruding into the west side of Feature 2, Camp Village, AZ BB:6:5 (ASM), facing north ................................................................. 136

3.40. Map of surviving portion of the Big Bell, AZ BB:6:2 (ASM), site area, showing architecture, Center for Desert Archaeology test units, and the extent of disturbance ......................................................... 138

3.41. Photograph of the copper bell recovered by Scott Ramsey at the Big Bell site, AZ BB:6:2 (ASM), alongside average-sized precontact copper bells ........................................................................... 139

3.42. Photograph of disturbed adobe floor and possible postholes in Unit 3 at the Big Bell site, AZ BB:6:2 (ASM), facing southwest ................................................................. 140

3.43. Photograph of the San Pedro River floodplain, facing northeast from 111 Ranch, AZ BB:6:73 (ASM) ................................................................. 141

3.44. Map of 111 Ranch, AZ BB:6:73 (ASM), showing compound wall, platform mounds, ridgeline, and excavation units ......................................................... 142

3.45. Southern profile of Feature 2, Unit 3 at 111 Ranch, AZ BB:6:73 (ASM) .................... 144
3.46. Plot of corrugated pottery percentage in the ceramic collection, by stratum and level, within Feature 2, Unit 3 at 111 Ranch, AZ BB:6.73 (ASM) ................................................................. 145
3.47. Aerial photograph of High Mesa, AZ BB:7.5 (ASM), facing southwest ........................................... 146
3.48. Photograph of a wall alignment restricting access to High Mesa, AZ BB:7.5 (ASM), from the terrace to the east ................................................................. 147
3.49. Contour map of High Mesa, AZ BB:7.5 (ASM), showing visible architectural alignments and excavation units ................................................................. 148
3.50. Fewkes' 1908 sketch map of "Fifteen Mile Ruin," High Mesa, AZ BB:7.5 (ASM) ........................................... 149
3.51. Adaptation of 1934 sketch map of "Kilberg Mesa Pueblo," High Mesa, AZ BB:7.5 (ASM) ................................................................. 150
3.52. Photograph of helicopter transporting equipment to High Mesa, AZ BB:7.5 (ASM), during Center for Desert Archaeology test excavations ........................................... 151
3.53. Aerial photograph of Reeve Ruin, AZ BB:11:26 (ASM), facing south ................................................................. 154
3.54. Map of Reeve Ruin, AZ BB:11:26 (ASM), modified from Di Peso (1958a), showing construction episodes, wall construction techniques, and Center for Desert Archaeology excavation units ................................................................. 155
3.55. Map of Davis Ranch, AZ BB:11:36 (ASM), Locus 1 and Locus 2, showing Gerald's Reeve phase architectural features ................................................................. 160
3.56. Map of Davis Ranch, AZ B:11:36 (ASM), Locus 1, showing Gerald's (1975) Davis, Sosa, Reeve, and Embudo phase components, and Center for Desert Archaeology excavation units ................................................................. 161
3.57. Contour map of Bayless Ranch Ruin, AZ BB:11:2 (ASM), showing visible wall alignments, Center for Desert Archaeology test units, and Bruce Bradley's 1979 excavations ................................................................. 165
3.58. Contour map of the Elliott site, AZ BB:11:27 (ASM), showing visible wall alignments and Center for Desert Archaeology test units ................................................................. 171
3.59. Sharon Urban's sketch map of AZ BB:11:28 (ASM), 150 m to the southeast of the Elliott site, AZ BB:11:27 (ASM) ................................................................. 172
3.60. Photograph of wall foundation of Feature 4 in Unit 1, Locus 1, at the Elliott site, AZ BB:11:27 (ASM), facing west ................................................................. 173
3.61. Photograph of Unit 5 and Feature 3 at Locus 2, the Elliott site, AZ BB:11:27 (ASM), facing west ................................................................. 173
3.62. Photograph of Unit 6 and rock-reinforced adobe wall foundation and collapse at Locus 2, the Elliott site, AZ BB:11:27 (ASM), facing north ................................................................. 174
3.63. Map of the Curtis site, AZ BB:11:100 (ASM), showing Center for Desert Archaeology test units, visible wall alignments, and approximate ridgeline ................................................................. 175
3.64. Detailed contour map of the Bajada/Ring site, AZ BB:1:6 (ASM), Locus 1 and Locus 2, showing wall alignments and Center for Desert Archaeology test units ................................................................. 178
3.65. Aerial photograph of the Bajada/Ring site, AZ BB:1:6 (ASM), facing west ........................................ 179
3.66. Walls at the Bajada/Ring site, AZ BB:1:6 (ASM), Locus 1, with possible adobe bricks .................................................. 180
3.67. Detailed contour map of Swingle's Sample, AZ BB:1:22 (ASM), showing Center for Desert Archaeology test excavation units ........................................ 184
3.68. Profiles of Unit 3 in Feature 1 at Swingle's Sample, AZ BB:1:22 (ASM) .............................................. 185
3.69. Map of Adobe Hill, AZ BB:1:32 (ASM), showing excavation units, walls, and approximate ridgeline ........................................ 187
3.70. Photograph of Unit 1, facing northwest, at Adobe Hill, AZ BB:1:32 (ASM), showing adobe walls and the northwestern corner of Feature 2 and the northeastern corner of Feature 1 ........................................ 188
3.71. Eastern profile of Unit 2, showing northern wall of Feature 3, looter pit, and three floors at Adobe Hill, AZ BB:1:32 (ASM) ........................................ 189
3.72. Photograph of upright cobbles at the base of the northern wall of Feature 3 in Unit 2 at Adobe Hill, AZ BB:1:32 (ASM) ........................................ 190
3.73. Map of the Dudleyville site, AZ BB:2:83 (ASM), showing Center for Desert Archaeology excavation units, visible wall alignments, and possible platform mound ........................................ 192
3.74. Photograph of Unit 2 at the Dudleyville site, AZ BB:2:83 (ASM), facing south ........................................ 193
3.75. Map of Piper Springs, AZ BB:1:34 (ASM), showing Center for Desert Archaeology test units, visible wall alignments, possible pithouse depressions, and trash concentrations ........................................ 195
3.76. Map of Flagged Bush, AZ BB:1:63 (ASM), showing artifact scatter and Center for Desert Archaeology test units ........................................ 196
3.77. Map of Artifact Hill, AZ BB:1:55 (ASM), showing Center for Desert Archaeology test units, visible wall alignments, and trash concentrations ........................................ 198
3.78. Map of Roach Wash, AZ BB:1:33 (ASM), showing Center for Desert Archaeology test units and visible wall alignments ........................................ 201
3.79. Photograph of Unit 2, facing south at Roach Wash, AZ BB:1:33 (ASM), with a possible pit feature along the southern wall ........................................ 202
3.80. Classic period sites not tested by the Center for Desert Archaeology that have substantial research potential ........................................ 203
3.81. Aerial photograph of Indian Hill, AZ BB:2:142 (ASM), facing southeast ........................................ 206
3.82. Photograph of oval compound wall associated with Bingham Cienega, AZ BB:11:21 (ASM) ........................................ 207
4.1. Vessel subform profiles adapted from Stark (1995:Figures 10.1-10.2) ........................................ 212
4.2. Pinto Polychrome bowl rim sherd from Flieger Ruin, AZ BB:2:7 (ASM) ........................................ 213
4.3. Gila Polychrome bowl rim sherd from the Wright site, AZ BB:2:51 (ASM) ........................................ 214
4.4. Tonto Polychrome jar rim and neck from Flieger Ruin, AZ BB:2:7 (ASM) ........................................ 214
4.5. Landmarks of ancestral Hopi pottery layouts: the banding line, the line break, the framing line, and the primary design field ......................................................... 215
4.6. Cliff Polychrome bowl fragment recovered from the Adobe Hill site, AZ BB:1:32 (ASM) ............... 216
4.7. Rio Grande Glaze C sherd recovered from the surface of Flieger Ruin, AZ BB:2:7 (ASM) ............... 217
4.8. Roosevelt Red Ware effigy vessel fragment from Swingle’s Sample, AZ BB:1:22 (ASM) ................ 220
4.9. San Carlos Red-on-brown from Davis Ranch, AZ BB:11:36 (ASM); from the Wright site, AZ BB:2:51 (ASM); and from Buzan, AZ BB:2:10 (ASM) .............................. 221
4.10. San Carlos Red-on-brown human effigy vessel fragments from Swingle’s Sample, AZ BB:1:22 (ASM) ................................................................. 223
4.11. Jar neck sherd with incised decoration recovered from José Solas Ruin, AZ BB:11:91 (ASM) ....... 223
4.12. Maverick Mountain Black-on-red from Reeve Ruin, AZ BB:11:26 (ASM); from Davis Ranch, AZ BB:11:36 (ASM); and from High Mesa, AZ BB:7:5 (ASM) ................. 224
4.13. Maverick Mountain Polychrome from Reeve Ruin, AZ BB:11:26 (ASM) ........................................ 225
4.15. Tucson Black-on-red from Davis Ranch, AZ BB:11:36 (ASM) ....................................................... 225
4.16. Tucson Polychrome from Flieger Ruin, AZ BB:2:7 (ASM); from Lost Mound, AZ BB:2:3 (ASM); and from Reeve Ruin, AZ BB:11:26 (ASM) ............................................. 226
4.17. Maverick Mountain Series bowl with hatched exterior decoration and red-slipped interior from Bayless Ranch Ruin, AZ BB:11:2 (ASM) ................................................. 227
4.18. Maverick Mountain Polychrome bowl with St. Johns Polychrome-style exterior decoration, recovered from Flieger Ruin, AZ BB:2:7 (ASM) ............................................. 227
4.20. Misfired Maverick Mountain Series vessel fragment from High Mesa, AZ BB:7:5 (ASM) ......... 229
4.21. Tucson Polychrome pinch pot from Davis Ranch, AZ BB:11:26 (ASM) ........................................ 229
4.22. Tanque Verde Red-on-brown produced in the Lower San Pedro Valley from Flieger Ruin, AZ BB:2:7 (ASM); and from Lost Mound, AZ BB:2:3 (ASM) ................................. 230
4.23. Cibola White Ware: fragment of a miniature jar recovered from the Wright site, AZ BB:2:51 (ASM) and effigy vessel fragment found at Lost Mound, AZ BB:2:3 (ASM) ................................................................. 232
4.24. Red-on-buff variant effigy vessel fragment found at Lost Mound, AZ BB:2:3 (ASM) ................................................................. 233
4.25. Locally produced Chihuahuan Polychrome human effigy fragment recovered from the Elliott site, AZ BB:11:27 (ASM) ................................................................. 236
4.27. Perforated plate recovered from a looter pit at Flieger Ruin, AZ BB:2:7 (ASM) ................................................................. 243
4.28. Map of portions of Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, and Colorado, showing the known distribution of sites having yielded perforated plates ................................................................. 245
4.29. Brown ware lug handles from Buzan, AZ BB:2:10 (ASM); and from Lost Mound, AZ BB:2:3 (ASM) ................................................................. 246
4.30. Possible “heavy-walled vessel” from Lost Mound, AZ BB:2:3 (ASM) ................................................................. 246
4.31. Figurines and figurine fragments from Lost Mound, AZ BB:2:3 (ASM); from Bayless Ranch Ruin, AZ BB:11:2 (ASM); and from Reeve Ruin, AZ BB:11:26 (ASM) ................................................................. 247
4.32. Brown ware specimens exhibiting unusual surface treatments: fingernail-indent ed from Lost Mound, AZ BB:2:3 (ASM) and tool-incised from Lost Mound and from Leaverton Mesa, AZ BB:6:11 (ASM) ................................................................. 248
4.33. Modeled spindle whorl recovered from Lost Mound, AZ BB:2:3 (ASM) ................................................................. 249
4.34. Red ware effigy ear from Lost Mound, AZ BB:2:3 (ASM) ................................................................. 257
4.35. Histogram based on data presented in Tables 4.32 and 4.33 ................................................................. 263
4.36. Petrofacies, archaeological districts, and tested sites in the Lower San Pedro River Valley ................................................................. 281
5.1. Rock-pile sites identified during the Lower San Pedro Valley Survey ................................................................. 311
5.2. Rock-pile site areas, ordered by size ................................................................. 312
5.3. Box-and-whiskers plots of rock-pile site areas identified during the Lower San Pedro Survey ................................................................. 313
5.4. Distribution of rock-pile site areas, by zone ................................................................. 314
5.5. Ceramic data from rock-pile sites ................................................................. 315
5.6. Phase and period assignments of rock-pile sites with diagnostic ceramics ................................................................. 316
5.7. Classic period plant food ubiquities ................................................................. 323
5.8. Classic period plant food ubiquities, by phase ................................................................. 323
5.9. Aravaipa/Redfield phase plant food ubiquities, by district ................................................................. 324
5.10. Classic period plant construction and fuel ubiquities ................................................................. 325
5.11. Classic period plant construction and fuel ubiquities of selected species, by phase .................. 326
5.12. Aravaipa/Redfield phase plant construction and fuel ubiquities, by district .............................. 327
5.13. Counts of ground stone manufacturing and plant-processing tools recovered from Center for Desert Archaeology test excavations ................................................. 340
6.1. Pre-Classic and Classic period sites in the Lower San Pedro Valley mentioned in this chapter .... 346
6.2. Provisional late precontact chronology for the Lower San Pedro Valley ................................. 347
6.3. Known late pre-Classic settlements and ballcourts in the Lower San Pedro Valley ................. 351
6.4. Aerial photograph of large ballcourt at Redington Ruin, AZ BB:11:1 (ASM) ......................... 352
6.5. Typical Hohokam “house-in-a-pit,” after discovery in backhoe trench and subsequent excavation ............................................................................................................................... 353
6.6. “Mogollon” pithouse adapted from Anyon and LeBlanc (1984:Figure 4.11) ......................... 354
6.7. Distribution of known ballcourts in the Southwest ................................................................. 355
6.9. Contour map of Lower San Pedro Valley population density during the Soza phase .......... 362
6.10. Contour map of corrugated pottery density in eastern Arizona during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries at 10-percent intervals ................................................................. 364
6.11. Black Mountain residual tree-ring chronology from the Upper Gila drainage .................... 365
6.12. Contour map of corrugated pottery density from Center for Desert Archaeology test units in the Lower San Pedro Valley at 10-percent intervals ................................................. 366
6.13. Contour map of corrugated pottery density at the late pithouse component from Second Canyon Compound, AZ BB:11:20 (ASM), at 5-percent intervals ................................................. 369
6.14. Contour map of corrugated pottery density at the compound component from Second Canyon Compound, AZ BB:11:20 (ASM), at 1-percent intervals ............................................ 370
6.15. Contour map of Lower San Pedro Valley population density during the Aravaipa phase ...... 372
6.16. Ancestral Puebloan migration routes from northeastern Arizona into eastern, central, and southern Arizona ........................................................................................................ 374
6.17. Illustration of typical Kayenta entrybox ........................................................................... 375
6.18. Standardized perforated plate counts from post-Soza phase contexts tested by the Center for Desert Archaeology ................................................................. 376
6.19. Rectangular kiva excavated at Davis Ranch, AZ BB:11:36 (ASM) ......................................... 378
List of Figures

6.20. Reconstruction of Reeve Ruin, AZ BB:11:26 (ASM) .................................................. 379

6.21. Plan view of the Meddler Point, AZ V:5:4 (ASM), platform mound in the Tonto Basin, showing retaining walls, mound cell structure, and rooms on top .................................. 381

6.22. Distribution of known platform mounds in southern and central Arizona ................ 382

6.23. Massive compound wall at Leaverton Mesa, AZ BB:6:11 (ASM) ............................ 383

6.24. Contour map of Lower San Pedro Valley population density during the early Redfield phase .......................................................... 385

6.25. Contour map of Lower San Pedro Valley population density during the late Redfield/early Romero phase .............................................. 387

6.26. Distribution of Gila Polychrome in the Greater Southwest, with respect to traditional archaeological culture areas ....................................................... 388

6.27. Major known obsidian sources in the Greater Southwest ........................................ 390

6.28. X-ray fluorescence sourcing results of the obsidian assemblage recovered during the Center for Desert Archaeology test excavations ...................... 393

6.29. Contour map of Lower San Pedro Valley population density during the late Romero phase .......................................................... 400

6.30. Photograph of a Sobaipuri structure at Alder Wash Ruin, AZ BB:6:9 (ASM) .............. 403

A.1. Rubidium, strontium, and zirconium three-dimensional plot of obsidian XRF data, San Pedro Preservation Project .................................................. 422

A.2. Rubidium versus barium biplot of obsidian XRF data, San Pedro Preservation Project .......................................................... 423

A.3. Rubidium versus strontium biplot of obsidian XRF data, San Pedro Preservation Project .......................................................... 424

A.4. The eastern Arizona/western New Mexico region and sources of archaeological obsidian and the center of the 111 Ranch Formation ....................................... 428

A.5. Distribution of obsidian source provenance for all sites, San Pedro Preservation Project .......................................................... 428

D.1. Sherd disks from Ash Terrace, AZ BB:2:19 (ASM); High Mesa, AZ BB:7:5 (ASM); and Lost Mound, AZ BB:2:3 (ASM) ............................................. 448

D.2. Perforated sherd disks from 111 Ranch, AZ BB:6:73 (ASM); Lost Mound, AZ BB:2:3 (ASM); and Buzan, AZ BB:2:10 (ASM) ............................................. 448

D.3. Partially drilled sherd disk from Buzan, AZ BB:2:10 (ASM) ............................................. 448

D.4. Possible jar lid from Lost Mound, AZ BB:2:3 (ASM) ............................................. 448

D.5. Potrest from Davis Ranch, AZ BB:11:36 (ASM) ............................................. 450
D.6. Possible pendant from Adobe Hill, AZ BB:1:32 (ASM) ............................................................... 451

D.7. Mendhole examples from the Elliott site, AZ BB:11:27 (ASM), and Lost Mound, AZ BB:2:3 (ASM) ................................................................................................................... 451
LIST OF TABLES

1.1. Volunteers, student interns, and supervisors/staff who participated in the field and analysis efforts associated with the Center for Desert Archaeology San Pedro Preservation Project survey and test excavations .................................................................................................2

2.1. Ceramics recovered from the Lower San Pedro Survey, by ware ........................................................................................................31

2.2. Roosevelt Red Ware, by type, from the Lower San Pedro Survey ...........................................................................................................34

2.3. Summary of sites with possible Protohistoric period material from the Lower San Pedro Survey .................................................................................................37

2.4. Population estimates for the Lower San Pedro project area: Sobaipuri in 1695 and 1697 ........................................................................................................43

2.5. Classic period sites, by site type and time period .................................................................................................................................51

2.6. Sites proposed for testing ...............................................................................................................................................61

3.1. Inventory of tested sites, with land ownership status at time of excavation and level of effort ......................................................................69

3.2. Sherd density categories ........................................................................................................................................71

3.3. Concordance of tested sites with Arizona State Museum site numbers and previous designations .................................................................................................74

3.4. Untested terminal Soza phase sites in the Lower San Pedro Valley .................................................................................................208

4.1. Size classes used in the ceramic analysis .................................................................................................................................213

4.2. Variables recorded in the ceramic analysis .................................................................................................................................213

4.3. Vessel form frequency, by ware or series .................................................................................................................................219

4.4. Vessel subforms exhibited by Roosevelt Red Ware specimens recovered from the San Pedro River Valley .................................................................................................220

4.5. Vessel subforms exhibited by San Carlos Red-on-brown specimens recovered from the San Pedro River Valley .................................................................................................222

4.6. Bowl subforms exhibited by Maverick Mountain Series specimens recovered from the San Pedro River Valley .................................................................................................228

4.7. Dates associated with Tucson Basin Brown Ware types and compound typological categories .................................................................................................229

4.8. Dates associated with Middle Gila Buff Ware types and compound typological categories .................................................................................................231

4.9. Dates associated with Cibola White Ware types and compound typological categories .................................................................................................232
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>Spatial distribution of phyllite-tempered brown ware as a percentage of the total brown ware assemblage from each site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>Brown ware vessel forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>Brown ware bowl:jar ratios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>Spatial distribution of polished brown ware bowls as a percentage of the total ceramic assemblage from each site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>Brown ware bowl subforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>Brown ware jar subforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>Frequency of smudging on brown ware types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>Frequency of smudging on brown ware bowls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>Spatial distribution of perforated plates in the excavated assemblage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>Red ware vessel forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>Frequency of smudging on red ware sherds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>Frequency of smudging on red ware bowls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>Distribution of red ware as a percentage of the total ceramic assemblage from each site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>Distribution of Aravaipa Red as a percentage of the red ware assemblage at each site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>Distribution of San Carlos Red as a percentage of the red ware assemblage at each site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>Distribution of Belford Red as a percentage of the red ware assemblage at each site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>Spatial distribution of unpolished red ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>Distribution of corrugated pottery as a percentage of total assemblage from each site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>Corrugated vessel forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>Frequency of smudging on corrugated pottery, by vessel form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>Frequency of smudging on corrugated pottery, by type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>Proportion of Roosevelt Red Ware as a percentage of the decorated assemblage recovered from each site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>Frequency of Cliff Polychrome in excavated samples from San Pedro Valley Classic period sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>Mean percentage of Cliff Polychrome, by district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>Types in the José Solas Ruin, AZ BB:11:91 (ASM), assemblage, by unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>High Mesa, AZ BB:7:5 (ASM), wares, as percentages of the total assemblage, by locus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>Types in the High Mesa, AZ BB:7:5 (ASM), assemblage, by locus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>Bayless Ranch Ruin, AZ BB:11:2 (ASM), wares, as percentages of the total assemblage, by unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>Types in the Bayless Ranch Ruin, AZ BB:11:2 (ASM), assemblage, by unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>Ceramic types in the Big Bell, AZ BB:6:2 (ASM), assemblage, by unit and level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>Camp Village, AZ BB:6:5 (ASM), wares, by unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>111 Ranch, AZ BB:6:73 (ASM), wares, as percentage of total assemblage, by unit, stratum, and level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>The petrographic sample, by ware or series, type, and recovery context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>San Pedro Valley archaeological districts, associated petrofacies, and the number of petrographic samples assigned to each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>Gross provenance results, by ware or series and recovery context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>Raw provenance data, by ware or series, production district, and destination district, for specimens assigned to San Pedro Valley petrofacies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>Transformed provenance data, by ware or series and production district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>Transformed provenance data (projected percentages), by ware or series, production district, and destination district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>Raw provenance data, by production district, type, and destination district, for brown ware specimens assigned to San Pedro Valley petrofacies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>Raw provenance data for perforated plates assigned to San Pedro Valley petrofacies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>Raw provenance data, by production district, type, and destination district, for red ware specimens assigned to San Pedro Valley petrofacies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>Spatial distribution of Roosevelt Red Ware, as a percentage of the total assemblage at each site and as a percentage of the decorated assemblage at each site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>Raw provenance data, by production district, type, and destination district, for Roosevelt Red Ware specimens assigned to San Pedro Valley petrofacies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>Raw provenance data, by production district, type, and destination district, for Cliff Polychrome specimens assigned to San Pedro Valley petrofacies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>Transformed provenance data for Cliff Polychrome, by production district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>Transformed provenance data for Cliff Polychrome, by production district and destination district</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.56. Spatial distribution of San Carlos brown ware, as a percentage of the total assemblage at each site and as a percentage of the decorated assemblage at each site ................................................... 304

4.57. Spatial distribution of Maverick Mountain Series, as a percentage of the total assemblage at each site and as a percentage of the decorated assemblage at each site ...................................................... 305

4.58. Raw provenance data, by production district, type, and destination district, for Maverick Mountain Series specimens assigned to San Pedro Valley petrofacies .......................................................... 307

5.1. Summary data from rock-pile sites, by zone, in the Lower San Pedro Valley ................................................... 312

5.2. Standardized counts of faunal remains from the Lower San Pedro Valley test excavations, by site ................................................... 331

5.3. Standardized counts of faunal remains from the Lower San Pedro Valley test excavations, by period or phase ................................................... 332

5.4. Faunal indices from the Lower San Pedro Valley test excavations and other selected projects, by period/phase ................................................... 333

5.5. Standardized counts of raptor avifauna from Lower San Pedro Valley Soza and Aravaipa/Redfield phase contexts, by site ................................................... 337

5.6. Standardized counts of tabular tools recovered from the Lower San Pedro Valley, Arizona State Museum, and Center for Desert Archaeology test excavations and the Tonto Creek Archaeological Project, by period ................................................... 339

6.1. Corrugated pottery percentages in utilitarian assemblages from Lower San Pedro Valley Soza phase site components, ordered from north to south ................................................... 367

6.2. Standardized counts of obsidian from the Center for Desert Archaeology test excavations, by site, phase, and district ................................................... 392

6.3. Standardized counts of marine shell from the Center for Desert Archaeology test excavations, by site, phase, and district ................................................... 394

A.1. X-ray fluorescence concentrations for selected trace elements RGM-1, San Pedro Preservation Project ................................................... 410

A.2. Elemental concentrations for the archaeological samples, San Pedro Preservation Project ................................................... 411

A.3. Cross-tabulation of sites, by obsidian source provenance, San Pedro Preservation Project ................................................... 425

B.1. Ware, series, and type frequencies, by district, San Pedro Preservation Project ................................................... 431

C.1. Intrusive types and wares previously recovered from San Pedro Valley sites ................................................... 439

D.1. Modified sherds, by district, site, and category, San Pedro Preservation project ................................................... 446

D.2. Modified sherds, by ware and type, San Pedro Preservation project ................................................... 447

D.3. Modified sherds, by vessel form, San Pedro Preservation project ................................................... 448
D.4. Modified sherds, by vessel part, San Pedro Preservation project ............................................. 448
D.5. Sherd disks, by ware and type, San Pedro Preservation project ................................................... 449
D.6. Perforated sherd disks, by ware and type, San Pedro Preservation project .................................. 450
D.7. Sherd disks, by vessel part, San Pedro Preservation project .......................................................... 450
D.8. Sherd disks, by vessel form, San Pedro Preservation project .......................................................... 450
D.9. Mendholes, by ware and type, San Pedro Preservation project ...................................................... 452
D.10. Modified sherds, by category and archaeological district, San Pedro Preservation project ............ 452
D.11. Modified sherds, by category and archaeological district, and adjusted for time, San Pedro Preservation project .................................................. 453
D.12. Counts and standardized counts of sherd disks, by district, San Pedro Preservation project ........... 453
D.13. Counts and standardized counts of sherd disks, by district and adjusted for time, San Pedro Preservation project .......................................................... 453
D.14. Counts and standardized counts of perforated sherd disks, by district, San Pedro Preservation project .......................................................... 453
D.15. Counts and standardized counts of perforated sherd disks, by district and adjusted for time, San Pedro Preservation project .......................................................... 453
D.16. Counts and standardized counts of mendholes, by district, San Pedro Preservation project ............ 454
D.17. Mendhole ware and type percentages, by district, San Pedro Preservation project ......................... 454
D.18. Modified sherd ware and type percentages, by district, San Pedro Preservation project ................. 455
D.19. Modified sherd vessel form percentages, by district, San Pedro Preservation project .................... 456
D.20. Modified sherd bowl to jar ratios, by district, San Pedro Preservation project .................................. 456
D.21. Modified sherd vessel part percentages, by district, San Pedro Preservation project ..................... 456
F.1. Period/phase assignments for excavated sites and contexts, San Pedro Preservation project ............... 466