

MINNESOTA DEEP TEST PROTOCOL PROJECT



**Mn/DOT Agreement No. 85878
OSA License No. 04-030**

Authorized and Sponsored by:

**MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION**

Prepared by

**COMMONWEALTH CULTURAL RESOURCES GROUP, INC.
2530 SPRING ARBOR ROAD
JACKSON, MICHIGAN 49203**

**G. William Monaghan, Ph.D., Principal Geoarchaeologist
Kathryn C. Egan-Bruhy, Ph.D., Co-Principal Investigator
Michael J. Hambacher, Ph.D., Co-Principal Investigator
Daniel R. Hayes, Project Geoarchaeologist
Michael F. Kolb, Ph.D., Project Geoarchaeologist
Steve R. Kuehn, Ph.D., Faunal Analyst
Staffan Peterson, Principal Geophysicist
James A. Robertson, Ph.D., Project Manager
Nelson R. Shaffer, Ph.D., Project Geophysicist**

March 2006

WR-0200

ABSTRACT

Commonwealth Cultural Resource Group, Inc. was contracted by the Minnesota Department of Transportation Cultural Resources Unit (CRU) to develop a deep testing protocol to discover buried archaeological sites. Three primary methods were evaluated for their efficacy in finding buried sites and included 1) geophysical survey methods (resistivity, magnetometry, and ground penetrating radar), 2) a combined coring and augering procedure, and 3) backhoe trenching. These methods were applied to six different geological and archaeological settings by separate and independent field teams. Reports of each method's findings were independently prepared without knowledge of the results of other methods. Based on an evaluation of success in discovering buried archaeological resources and the relative costs for implementation, each method was then subjected to cost/benefit analysis.

The proposed protocol employs backhoe trenching as the primary means of finding buried archaeological sites and is explicitly multi-disciplinary in its geoarchaeological approach to landscape reconstruction. The protocol ensures that multiple, independent lines of evidence can explain the presence or absence of archaeological sites. The protocol also advances recommendations for evaluating the National Register eligibility of buried archaeological sites. As with site identification, the approach advocated for site evaluation is geoarchaeological, involving methodologies of both earth and archaeological sciences. A two-step evaluation process is proposed. The first step aims to reconstruct in detail the geoarchaeological setting of the site. The second step uses the data collected in step one to develop and execute an archaeological research strategy to gather sufficient and appropriate information to fully evaluate the site's significance and integrity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	ii
List of Figures.....	viii
List of Tables.....	xiii
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
1.1 Project Background.....	1-1
1.2 Project Design and Goals.....	1-3
1.3 Deep Testing Protocol and Archaeological Significance.....	1-5
1.4 Deep Testing Protocol and a Multidisciplinary Framework.....	1-6
2.0 GEOLOGICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND.....	2-1
2.1 Geological Background and Buried Archaeological Site Formation Processes.....	2-1
2.1.1 Geological Background.....	2-1
2.1.2 Buried Archaeological Site Formation Processes.....	2-5
2.2 Archaeological Background.....	2-10
2.2.1 Prairie Region, Red River (of the North) Valley, Western Minnesota (Hoff Deep Test Locale).....	2-10
2.2.2 Prairie Lakes Region, Minnesota River Valley, South-Central Minnesota (Fritsche Creek II and City Property Test Locales).....	2-13
2.2.3 Driftless Area of the Southeast Riverine Region, Root River and Mississippi Valley, Southeastern Minnesota (Root River Test Locale).....	2-17
2.2.4 Central Lakes Deciduous Forest Region, Upper Mississippi Valley and Anoka Sand Plain, Central Minnesota (Clement and Anderson Test Locales).....	2-20
3.0 DEEP TEST METHODS, RESEARCH DESIGN, AND TEST LOCALE DESCRIPTIONS.....	3-1
3.1 Deep Test Methods.....	3-1
3.1.1 Introduction.....	3-1
3.1.2 Deep Test Methods Used in Minnesota.....	3-1
3.1.3 Remote Sensing Methods for Deep Testing.....	3-4
3.1.4 Coring and Augering Methods for Deep Testing.....	3-9
3.1.5 Backhoe Trenching Methods for Deep Testing.....	3-12
3.2 Research Design and Test Locale Selection.....	3-13
3.3 Test Locale Descriptions.....	3-16
3.3.1 Valley Margin and Valley-Tributary Junction Landform Settings: Sites in the Minnesota River and Red River of the North Valleys.....	3-16
3.3.2 Floodplain and Dune Settings: Sites in the Mississippi River Valley.....	3-24

4.0 DEEP TEST METHODS AND TECHNIQUES.....	4-1
4.1 Introduction.....	4-1
4.2 Geophysical Survey Method and Techniques.....	4-1
4.2.1 Introduction.....	4-1
4.2.2 Magnetism.....	4-2
4.2.3 Resistivity	4-2
4.2.4 Ground Penetrating Radar.....	4-5
4.3 Coring/Augering Methods and Techniques.....	4-5
4.4 Trenching Methods and Techniques.....	4-7
4.5 Archaeological Field Methods.....	4-9
4.6 Archaeological Laboratory Methods	4-13
4.6.1 Prehistoric Period Artifacts.....	4-13
4.6.2 Historic Period Artifacts	4-14
4.6.3 Faunal Remains.....	4-15
5.0 HOFF DEEP TEST LOCALE.....	5-1
5.1 Introduction and Background	5-1
5.2 Results of Geophysics Survey	5-3
5.2.1 Magnetism.....	5-3
5.2.2 Resistivity	5-3
5.2.3 Ground Penetrating Radar.....	5-3
5.2.4 Discussion of Geoarchaeological Significance from Geophysical Survey	5-6
5.3 Results of Coring Survey.....	5-7
5.3.1 Deposits and Soils.....	5-7
5.3.2 Stratigraphy.....	5-7
5.3.3 Discussion of Geoarchaeological Significance from Coring.....	5-11
5.4 Results of Trenching Survey.....	5-12
5.4.1 Stratigraphy of Soils and Sediments.....	5-12
5.4.2 Discussion of Geoarchaeological Significance from Trenching	5-21
5.5 Results of Archaeological Testing.....	5-23
5.5.1 Previous Investigations at Hoff Deep Test Locale	5-23
5.5.2 Current Investigations at Hoff Deep Test Locale	5-23
5.5.3 Artifact Assemblage.....	5-30
5.5.4 Discussion of Archaeological Significance	5-33
5.6 Synthesis and Integration.....	5-34
6.0 FRITSCHER CREEK II TEST LOCALE.....	6-1
6.1 Introduction and Background	6-1
6.2 Results of Geophysics Survey	6-3
6.2.1 Magnetism.....	6-3
6.2.2 Resistivity	6-3
6.2.3 Ground Penetrating Radar.....	6-3
6.2.4 Discussion of Geoarchaeological Significance from Geophysical Survey	6-6

6.3	Results of Coring Survey	6-6
6.3.1	Deposits and Soils.....	6-6
6.3.2	Stratigraphy.....	6-10
6.3.3	Discussion of Geoarchaeological Significance from Coring.....	6-11
6.4	Results of Trenching Survey.....	6-12
6.4.1	Stratigraphy of Soils and Sediments.....	6-12
6.4.2	Discussion of Geoarchaeological Significance from Trenching.....	6-19
6.5	Results of Archaeological Testing.....	6-20
6.5.1	Previous Investigations.....	6-20
6.5.2	Current Investigations.....	6-20
6.5.3	Artifact Assemblage.....	6-24
6.5.4	Discussion of Archaeological Significance.....	6-27
6.6	Synthesis and Integration.....	6-28
7.0	CITY PROPERTY TEST LOCALE	7-1
7.1	Introduction and Background	7-1
7.2	Results of Geophysical Survey	7-1
7.2.1	Magnetics.....	7-1
7.2.2	Resistivity	7-4
7.2.3	Ground Penetrating Radar.....	7-4
7.2.4	Discussion of Geoarchaeological Significance of the Geophysical Survey	7-6
7.3	Results of Coring Survey.....	7-6
7.3.1	Deposits and Soils.....	7-6
7.3.2	Stratigraphy.....	7-9
7.3.3	Discussion of Geoarchaeological Significance from Coring.....	7-9
7.4	Results of Trenching Survey.....	7-9
7.4.1	Stratigraphy of Soils and Sediments.....	7-9
7.4.2	Discussion of Geoarchaeological Significance from Trenching.....	7-14
7.5	Results of Archaeological Testing.....	7-14
7.5.1	Previous Investigations.....	7-14
7.5.2	Current Investigations.....	7-16
7.6	Synthesis and Integration of Geophysical Survey, Coring, and Trenching.....	7-16
8.0	CLEMENT TEST LOCALE	8-1
8.1	Introduction and Background	8-1
8.2	Results of Geophysics Survey	8-3
8.2.1	Magnetics.....	8-3
8.2.2	Resistivity	8-5
8.2.3	Ground Penetrating Radar.....	8-5
8.2.4	Discussion of Geoarchaeological Significance from Geophysical Survey	8-5
8.3	Results of Coring Survey.....	8-7
8.3.1	Deposits and Soils.....	8-7
8.3.2	Stratigraphy.....	8-10
8.3.3	Discussion of Geoarchaeological Significance from Coring.....	8-10

8.4	Results of Trenching Survey.....	8-11
8.4.1	Stratigraphy of Soils and Sediments	8-11
8.4.2	Discussion of Geoarchaeological Significance of Trenching.....	8-18
8.5	Results of Archaeological Testing.....	8-19
8.5.1	Previous Investigations	8-19
8.5.2	Current Investigations.....	8-19
8.5.3	Artifact Assemblage.....	8-22
8.5.4	Discussion of Archaeological Significance	8-22
8.6	Synthesis and Integration.....	8-23
9.0	ROOT RIVER TEST LOCALE	9-1
9.1	Introduction and Background	9-1
9.2	Results of Geophysics Survey	9-3
9.2.1	Magnetics.....	9-3
9.2.2	Resistivity	9-3
9.2.3	Ground Penetrating Radar.....	9-6
9.2.4	Discussion of Geological Significance of the Geophysical Survey.....	9-6
9.3	Results of Coring Survey.....	9-6
9.3.1	Deposits and Soils.....	9-6
9.3.2	Stratigraphy.....	9-6
9.3.3	Discussion of Geoarchaeological Significance from Coring.....	9-12
9.4	Results of Trenching Survey.....	9-12
9.4.1	Stratigraphy of Soils and Sediments.....	9-12
9.4.2	Discussion of Geoarchaeological Significance of Trenching.....	9-19
9.5	Results of Archaeological Testing.....	9-19
9.5.1	Previous Investigations	9-19
9.5.2	Current Investigations.....	9-20
9.5.3	Discussion of Archaeological Significance	9-20
9.6	Synthesis and Integration.....	9-20
10.0	ANDERSON TEST LOCALE	10-1
10.1	Introduction and Background	10-1
10.2	Results of Geophysics Survey	10-3
10.2.1	Magnetics.....	10-3
10.2.2	Resistivity	10-3
10.2.3	Ground Penetrating Radar.....	10-5
10.2.4	Discussion of Geoarchaeological Significance from Geophysical Survey	10-5
10.3	Results of Coring Survey.....	10-7
10.3.1	Deposits and Soils.....	10-7
10.3.2	Stratigraphy.....	10-8
10.3.3	Discussion of Geoarchaeological Significance from Coring.....	10-8
10.4	Results of Trenching Survey.....	10-10
10.4.1	Stratigraphy of Soils and Sediments.....	10-10
10.4.2	Discussion of Geoarchaeological Significance from Trenching	10-17

10.5	Results of Archaeological Investigation	10-19
10.5.1	Previous Investigations at the Anderson Site.....	10-19
10.5.2	Current Investigations at the Anderson Site	10-19
10.5.3	Artifact Assemblage.....	10-25
10.5.4	Discussion of Archaeological Significance	10-34
10.6	Synthesis and Integration.....	10-35
11.0	COMPARISON OF OUTCOMES AND COSTS OF METHODS:	
	FOUNDATIONS FOR A DEEP TEST PROTOCOL.....	11-1
11.1	Introduction.....	11-1
11.2	Evaluation of Results: Methodological Outcomes	11-2
11.2.1	Geophysical Survey	11-2
11.2.2	Coring/Augering Survey.....	11-6
11.2.3	Trenching Survey.....	11-8
11.3	Cost/Benefit Analysis	11-11
11.3.1	Cost Analysis	11-11
11.3.2	Summary	11-19
11.4	Evaluating the Effectiveness of Alternative Deep Test Methods	11-20
12.0	MINNESOTA DEEP TEST PROTOCOL: A STAGED APPROACH TO SITE	
	DISCOVERY AND EVALUATION.....	12-1
12.1	Introduction and Overview	12-1
12.2	Deep Test Protocol.....	12-2
12.2.1	Preferred Deep Test Methods	12-2
12.2.2	Phase I Deep Testing Site Discovery.....	12-5
12.2.3	Phase II National Register Evaluation of Deeply Buried Archaeological Sites	12-11
12.2.4	Deep Testing for Buried Sites in Urban Settings.....	12-15
13.0	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	13-1
13.1	Project Overview and Design	13-1
13.2	Project Results at Test Locales	13-3
13.3	Project Results: Costs and Benefits	13-7
13.4	Deep Test Protocol: A Staged Approach.....	13-9
13.5	Conclusions.....	13-14
14.0	REFERENCES CITED.....	14-1
Appendix A.	Geophysics Survey Data	
Appendix B.	Core Descriptions	
Appendix C.	Deep Test Trench Descriptions	
Appendix D.	Radiocarbon Dates	
Appendix E.	Artifact Inventory	
Appendix F.	Faunal Inventory	
Appendix G.	Glossary	

ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure 2.1.1-1	Minnesota Surficial Bedrock Geology (adapted from Hobbs and Goebel 1982, 1985).....	2-2
Figure 2.1.2-1	Buried Archaeological Site Formation Processes at the Converse Site (20KT2) in Michigan (after Monaghan and Hayes 2002)	2-7
Figure 2.1.2-2	Flooding, Soil Formation, and Idealized Floodplain Stratigraphy through Time in the Upper Great Lakes Region (after Monaghan and Lovis 2005)	2-9
Figure 3.2-1	Location of Test Locales and Archaeological Sites.....	3-14
Figure 3.3.1-1	Location of the Fritsche Creek Test Locale	3-18
Figure 3.3.1-2	Location of the City Property Test Locale.....	3-20
Figure 3.3.1-3	Location of Hoff Deep Test Locale	3-23
Figure 3.3.2-1	Location of Clement Test Locale.....	3-26
Figure 3.3.2-2	Location of the Root River Test Locale.....	3-28
Figure 3.3.2-3	Location of the Anderson Test Locale.....	3-31
Figure 4.2.1-1	Geophysical Survey Field Methods	4-3
Figure 4.3-1	Coring Survey Field Methods.....	4-6
Figure 4.4-1	Trenching Survey Field Methods.....	4-8
Figure 4.4-2	Trenching Survey Field Methods.....	4-10
Figure 5.1-1	Hoff Deep Test Locale Overviews: (A) Testing Grid; (B) Red River; (C) Eroded Valley Margin	5-2
Figure 5.2.1-1	Magnetometry and Resistivity Data Plots, Hoff Deep Test Locale.....	5-4
Figure 5.2.3-1	GPR Data Plots, Hoff Deep Test Locale	5-5
Figure 5.3.2-1	Hoff Deep Test Locale, Core Locations, and LfSAs	5-8
Figure 5.3.2-2	Hoff Deep Test Locale, East-West Stratigraphic Cross-Section	5-9

Figure 5.3.2-3	Hoff Deep Test Locale, North-South Stratigraphic Cross-Section.....	5-10
Figure 5.4.1-1	Trench Locations at the Hoff Deep Test Locale.....	5-13
Figure 5.4.1-2	Cross Section through the Hoff Deep Test Locale	5-14
Figure 5.4.1-3	Trenches at the Hoff Deep Test Locale: (A) Trench 1; (B) Trench 2; (C) Trench 4.....	5-16
Figure 5.4.1-4	Soils and Sediments within the Upper Part of (A) Trench 1 and (B) Trench 2, Hoff Deep Test Locale	5-17
Figure 5.4.1-5	Trench 3 at the Hoff Deep Test Locale: (A) West Wall; (B) East Wall; (C) Junction of Trenches 3 and 3x.....	5-19
Figure 5.5.1-1a	Comparative Trench/Test Unit Profiles, Hoff Deep Test Locale	5-25
Figure 5.5.1-1b	Comparative Trench/Test Unit Profiles, Hoff Deep Test Locale	5-26
Figure 5.5.1-1c	Comparative Trench/Test Unit Profiles, Hoff Deep Test Locale	5-27
Figure 5.5.1-1d	Comparative Trench/Test Unit Profiles, Hoff Deep Test Locale	5-28
Figure 5.5.2-1	Probable Axe or Celt Preform from the Hoff Deep Test Locale	5-32
Figure 6.1-1	Fritsche Creek II Test Locale Overviews: (A) Testing Grid; B) Testing Grid from Minnesota Valley Margin; (C) Bone Bed.....	6-2
Figure 6.2.1-1	Magnetometry and Resistivity Data Plots, Fritsche Creek II Test Locale.....	6-4
Figure 6.2.3-1	GPR Data Plots, Fritsche Creek II Test Locale	6-5
Figure 6.3.1-1	Core Locations and LfSAs, Fritsche Creek II Test Locale.....	6-7
Figure 6.3.1-2	North-South Stratigraphic Cross-Section, Fritsche Creek II Test Locale.....	6-8
Figure 6.3.1-3	East-West Stratigraphic Cross-Section (LfSA 2), Fritsche Creek II Test Locale.....	6-9
Figure 6.4.1-1	Trench Locations at Fritsche Creek II Test Locale.....	6-13
Figure 6.4.1-2	Cross Section through the Fritsche Creek II Test Locale	6-14
Figure 6.4.1-3	Trenches at the Fritsche Creek II Test Locale: (A) Trench 2; (B) Trench 3; (C) Trench 4	6-15

Figure 6.4.1-4	Soils and Sediments within the Upper Part of (A) Trench 2 and (B) Trench 3, Fritsche Creek II Test Locale	6-17
Figure 6.5.2-1a	Comparative Trench/Test Unit Profiles, Fritsche Creek II Test Locale	6-22
Figure 6.5.2-1b	Comparative Trench/Test Unit Profiles, Fritsche Creek II Test Locale	6-23
Figure 6.5.3-1	Chipped Stone Tools and Bipolar Core from the Fritsche Creek II Test Locale.....	6-25
Figure 6.5.3-2	Possible Digging Tool from the Fritsche Creek II Test Locale	6-25
Figure 7.1-1	City Property Test Locale Overviews: (A) Testing Grid; (B) Test Locale Vicinity	7-2
Figure 7.2.1-1	Magnetometry and Resistivity Data Plots, City Property Test Locale	7-3
Figure 7.2.3-1	GPR Data Plots, City Property Test Locale.....	7-5
Figure 7.3.1-1	North-South Stratigraphic Cross-Section, City Property Test Locale	7-7
Figure 7.3.1-2	East-West Stratigraphic Cross-Section, City Property Test Locale.....	7-8
Figure 7.4.1-1	Trench Locations at the City Property Test Locale	7-10
Figure 7.4.1-2	Cross Section through the City Property Test Locale.....	7-11
Figure 7.4.1-3	Trenches at the City Property Test Locale: (A) Trench 1 Sand and Gravel; (B) Trench 2, Cumulative Soil Sequences; (C) Trench 6, 640 BP Soil Sequence.....	7-12
Figure 7.4.1-4	Soils and Sediments within Trench 6 at the City Property Test Locale	7-15
Figure 8.1-1	Clement Test Locale Overviews: (A) Testing Grid; (B) Mississippi River; (C) First Site.....	8-2
Figure 8.2.1-1	Magnetometry and Resistivity Data Plots, Clement Test Locale	8-4
Figure 8.2.3-1	GPR Data Plots, Clement Test Locale	8-6
Figure 8.3.1-1	East-West Stratigraphic Cross-Section, Clement Test Locale.....	8-8
Figure 8.3.1-2	North-South Stratigraphic Cross-Section, Clement Test Locale	8-9
Figure 8.4.1-1	Trench Locations at the Clement Test Locale	8-12

Figure 8.4.1-2	Cross Section through the Clement Test Locale.....	8-13
Figure 8.4.1-3	Clement Test Local Trenches: (A) Trench 1; (B) Trench 5; (C) Trench 7l.....	8-14
Figure 8.4.1-4	Soils and Sediments within the Upper Part of Trench 1, Clement Test Locale.....	8-15
Figure 8.5.1-1a	Comparative Trench/Test Unit Profiles, Clement Test Locale.....	8-20
Figure 8.5.1-1b	Comparative Trench/Test Unit Profiles, Clement Test Locale.....	8-21
Figure 9.1-1	Root River Test Locale Overviews: (A) Testing Grid; (B) Root River; (C) Active Erosion of Riverbank	9-2
Figure 9.2.1-1	Magnetometry and Resistivity Data Plots, Root River Test Locale	9-4
Figure 9.2.3-1	GPR Data Plots, Root River Test Locale.....	9-5
Figure 9.3.2-1	Root River Test Locale, Core Locations, and LSA	9-7
Figure 9.3.2-2	Root River Test Locale, North-South Stratigraphic Cross-Section.....	9-8
Figure 9.3.2-3	Root River Test Locale, East-West Stratigraphic Cross-Section 60N/40W to 60N/0W	9-9
Figure 9.3.2-4	Root River Test Locale, East-West Stratigraphic Cross-Section 0N/40W to 0N/0W	9-10
Figure 9.4.1-1	Trench Locations at the Root River Test Locale	9-14
Figure 9.4.1-2	Cross Section through the Root River Test Locale.....	9-15
Figure 9.4.1-3	Root River Test Locale Trench Profiles: (A) Trench 1; (B) Trench 3; (C) Trench 5; (D) Trench 4.....	9-16
Figure 9.4.1-4	Soils and Sediments in Trench 3, Root River Test Locale	9-18
Figure 9.5.2-1a	Comparative Trench/Test Unit Profiles, Root River Test Locale.....	9-21
Figure 9.5.2-1b	Comparative Trench/Test Unit Profiles, Root River Test Locale.....	9-22
Figure 10.1-1	Anderson Test Locale Overview and Trenches: (A) Testing Grid; (B) Trench 1; (C) Trench 2 with Soil Lamella and Possible Cultural Feature	10-2

Figure 10.2.1-1	Magnetometry and Resistivity Data Plots, Anderson Test Locale	10-4
Figure 10.2.3-1	GPR Data Plots, Anderson Test Locale.....	10-6
Figure 10.3.1-1	Stratigraphic Cross-Section, Anderson Test Locale	10-9
Figure 10.4.1-1	Trench Locations at Anderson Test Locale	10-11
Figure 10.4.1-2	Cross Section through the Anderson Test Locale.....	10-12
Figure 10.4.1-3	Soils and Sediments in the Upper Part of (A) Trench 2 and (B) Trench 5, Anderson Test Locale.....	10-14
Figure 10.4.1-4	Anderson Test Locale: (A) Trench 6 In-filled Burrows; (B) Trench 5 In-filled Burrows; (C) Gopher Holes	10-16
Figure 10.5.2-1a	Comparative Trench/Test Unit Profiles, Anderson Test Locale.....	10-21
Figure 10.5.2-1b	Comparative Trench/Test Unit Profiles, Anderson Test Locale.....	10-23
Figure 10.5.2-1c	Trench 1/Feature 2004-1 Profile, Anderson Test Locale.....	10-24
Figure 10.5.3-1	Diagnostic Ceramic Rim, Decorated, and Body Sherds from the Anderson Test Locale	10-26
Figure 10.5.3-2	Chipped Stone Tools from the Anderson Test Locale.....	10-30
Figure 10.5.3-3	Cobble Core from the Anderson Test Locale	10-32
Figure 12.2.1-1	Flow Chart of Phase I Deep Test/Site Identification Process	12-3
Figure 12.2.1-2	Flow Chart of Phase II Buried Site Evaluation Process	12-4

TABLES

Table 10.5.3-1	Prehistoric Artifact Assemblage from Anderson Site (21AN0008)	10-25
Table 11.1-1	Summary of Outcomes of Deep Testing Survey Methods for the Test Locales	11-1
Table 11.3.1-1	Costs for the Geophysical Survey	11-12
Table 11.3.1-2	Costs for the Coring/Augering Survey	11-13
Table 11.3.1-3	Costs for the Trenching Survey	11-14
Table 11.3.2-1	Summary Costs for Deep Test Methods	11-19
Table 11.4-1	Projected Time and Cost for Augering and Screening Three Vertical Meters of Sediment	11-21
Table 11.4.-2	Projected Cost Estimates for Hand Bucket Auger and Test Unit Excavations	11-22