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Figure 1. Northern Cultural Expressions Society Summer Cultural Program Participants.
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Figure 2. An Emerging Generation of White River First Nation Archaeologists – L to R: Blaine Chassé, Seth Sam, Tamika Johnny, Eddie Johnny.
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With the permission and support of the White River First Nation, archaeological and ethnographic research was undertaken under the direction of Norman Alexander Easton of Yukon College between 20th of May and 1st of September, 2014 at the Little John site (KdVo-6) and in the region about Beaver Creek, Yukon Territory.

Our archaeological work in 2014 was limited by a small core field crew, however major results of this fieldwork included:

- Training in archaeology and ethnography of three graduate students, and five local native youth.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Lobe</th>
<th>Unit - Quad</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
<th>Fauna</th>
<th>Profile / Feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>S02 W23 - All</td>
<td>Completion of Unit</td>
<td>B2 - 3 obsidian EMF, 3 Flakes (2 obsidian and 1 basalt), 1 CPA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S03 W21 - All</td>
<td>New Unit - completed</td>
<td>B2 - 14 Flakes (6 basalt, 4 obsidian, 2 black chert, 2 green chert)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S03 W22 - All</td>
<td>New Unit - completed</td>
<td>B2 - 1 brown chert Retouched Blade, 1 obsidian Flake, 3 basalt Flakes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S04 W22 - All</td>
<td>New Unit - completed</td>
<td>B2 – 1 obsidian, 2 basalt Flakes, 1 Hammerstone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apex</td>
<td>N02 E04 - NW</td>
<td>New Unit – 1 Quad by NCES</td>
<td>B2 - 3 EMF, 2 Flakes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N03 E03 - NE</td>
<td>New Unit – 1 Quad by NCES</td>
<td>B1 – Washer w/ Key</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N03 E05 - NW</td>
<td>New Unit – 1 Quad by NCES</td>
<td>B2 Low – EMF, on grey chert, 2 joining pieces</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N07 E05 - SE</td>
<td>New Unit – 1 Quad by NCES</td>
<td>B2 – Blade, 3 Flakes (one possible core tablet?), all on obsidian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N15 W12 - All</td>
<td>Continued Unit – to top of LbPC2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 bison tibia, 1 MM longbone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N15 W13 - All</td>
<td>New Unit – to top of LbPC2</td>
<td>PC2 - 1 basalt Flake</td>
<td>3 bison tibia, 1 LM scapula, 1 MM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N16 W12 - All</td>
<td>New Unit, slumped to East – to top of LbPC2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 articulating bison tibia frag. Fe2014-03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N16 W13 – E, W, S portions</td>
<td>New Unit, slumped to N and E – to LbPC2</td>
<td>PC2 – 1 Flake LbPC2 – 1 Flake</td>
<td>1 squirrel longbone, 3 LM rib</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N17 W12 - All</td>
<td>Continued Unit – SW Baulk</td>
<td>PC3 – 1 large Flake, no EM</td>
<td>1 bison metapodial, 1 caribou rib</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>N17 W13 – S baulk</td>
<td>Continued Unit – S Baulk</td>
<td>PC1 – BTF PC3-P4 – 3 basalt Flakes LbPC3 – 1 retouched split greenstone pebble, 1 basalt EMF, 4 basalt Flakes</td>
<td>1 bison longbone, 1 MM tooth, 1 MM, 3 SM postcranial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N19 W05 - W</td>
<td>New Unit – to LbPC1</td>
<td>LbPC1 – 2 Flakes, basalt and black chert</td>
<td>12 fox teeth and mandible Fe2014-02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N19 W06 - E</td>
<td>New Unit, slumped to W – to LbPC1</td>
<td>PC1 – 1 basalt Flake</td>
<td>5 fox cranial, 1 wapiti metacarpal Fe2014-02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N20 W06 - All</td>
<td>New Unit, W slumped – to LbPC1</td>
<td>P1-PaPC distal Biface fragment on basalt</td>
<td>5 mammal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N20 W07 - All</td>
<td>New Unit, see N20W08 fieldbook</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N20 W08 - All</td>
<td>New Unit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27 wapiti vertebra, 1 metacarpal, 1 rib Fe2014-01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Notes: EMF = Edge Modified Flake. CPA = Cobble/Pebble in Association. BTF = Biface Thinning Flake. M = Unidentified Mammal (Large / Medium / Small). Unless otherwise noted, all bone are element fragments.
- Excavation of 14 square meters of deposits in 19 designated Excavation Units: 4 meters in 4 units on the West Lobe, 1 meter in 4 units on the hilltop (Apex Lobe) in the vicinity of the cabin, and 9 meters in 11 units in the East Lobe; 15 of these were new units, while 4 continued excavations in Units begun in previous seasons.

- Eight of the Units were excavated to basal non-cultural deposits and backfilled; nine of the units were excavated to or through the culture-bearing paleosols and will be investigated further in 2015. Table 1 above summarizes the location of these units and associated artifacts, fauna, and features. The Figure below shows the location of these units in relation to previous excavations at the site. Unit Field Books and excavation summaries related to each Unit excavations are presented in the printed and digital appendices to this report.

Figure 5. Excavated Units, KdVo6, 2014.
Cataloguing of 70 additional artifacts from the Little John site, summarized in Tables 3 and 4 below; these were catalogued into 61 unique catalogue numbers (KdVo6:4325 through 4385 inclusive). Filemaker Files with and without photographs, and an Excel File providing provenience, metric, and qualitative data related to all recovered artifacts are presented in the Digital Appendix; an Excel table summary in the Print Appendix and a summary description of selected artifacts are presented below in this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Lithic Tools</th>
<th>% Total Lithics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biface</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMF</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>14.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCP-SP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Lithic Tools</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.85</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debitage</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>72.85</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>99.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Lithics</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>94.28</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.99</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Catalogued</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EMF = Edge Modified Flake, MCP = Modified Cobble-Pebble. Percentages are rounded up one decimal.

With the support of the Yukon College Research Fund, processing and return of an additional 11 AMS Radio Carbon dates. They are fully reported on in our discussion of dates at the site below.
• Recovery of 89 additional faunal elements summarized in the Table below. Full descriptions of recovered fauna are presented in Printed and Digital Appendices, while a summary discussion of selected fauna is presented below in this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level Common Name</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>L b PC1</th>
<th>PC2 - P3</th>
<th>PC3 - P4</th>
<th>L b PC</th>
<th>Species Total</th>
<th>Species Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mammal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bison</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Mammal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Large Mammals</strong></td>
<td><strong>(63)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(70)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Fox</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Mammal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Medium Mammals</strong></td>
<td><strong>(22)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(26)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squirrel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Mammal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Small Mammals</strong></td>
<td><strong>(4)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(4)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Totals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level Percent</strong></td>
<td><strong>8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>23%</strong></td>
<td><strong>7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>54%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Continued taphonomic analysis of the Little John fauna by Lauriane Bourgeon, David Yesner, Vance Hutchinson, and Easton, the results of which are discussed more fully below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature #</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>Unit/Quad</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Depth BD cm</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fe 2014-01</td>
<td>Wapiti Vertebrae</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>P2 (no PC)</td>
<td>88 - 94</td>
<td>26-28 July</td>
<td>Dated to c. 10.7 Cal BP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe 2014-02</td>
<td>Fox Cranial Elements</td>
<td>N19 W05/W06</td>
<td>P2 (no PC)</td>
<td>51 – 71</td>
<td>25 July</td>
<td>Reconstructed from fieldnotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe 2014-03</td>
<td>Bison Tibia frags</td>
<td>N16 W12 N15 W13</td>
<td>PC2-P3</td>
<td>81 - 83</td>
<td>22 July</td>
<td>Multiple rejoining frags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe 2014-04</td>
<td>Hearth pit</td>
<td>N17 W12</td>
<td>PC2-P3</td>
<td>71 – 80</td>
<td>23 July</td>
<td>Hearth feature found in units to N and NE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Identification and mapping of 4 archaeological features, summarized in the Table above. The three faunal features were all concentrations of bone of the same species
and gross element, presumably from the same animal. A description and discussion of these features is presented below in this report.

- Recovery of 6 potential radiocarbon samples, detailed in the Table below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RCS #</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Provenience</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-01</td>
<td>N17 W13</td>
<td>LbPC3</td>
<td>E16 N20 Z 96</td>
<td>Charred material</td>
<td>Artfact #s 4375 - 4380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-02a</td>
<td>N19 W05 SW</td>
<td>P1 - no PC</td>
<td>E22 N33 Z 51 bs</td>
<td>Carbon sample</td>
<td>assoc. w/ fauna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-02b</td>
<td>N20 W08 NW</td>
<td>P2 – no PC</td>
<td>Z c. 93 bs</td>
<td>Charcoal sample</td>
<td>Assoc. w/ Fe2014-01 wapiti vertebra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-03</td>
<td>N17 W12</td>
<td>PC2/P 3</td>
<td>Z 78 bsd</td>
<td>Carbon from baulk Fe2014-04</td>
<td>Hearth feature continuing from units to N and NE 23 July JH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-04</td>
<td>N16 W13 SW</td>
<td></td>
<td>E28 N22 E Z 96.5 bud</td>
<td>Carbon sample</td>
<td>JH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-05</td>
<td>N16 W13 SE</td>
<td></td>
<td>E04 N03 Z 71.5</td>
<td>Carbon sample</td>
<td>Rob</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Recovery of 14 sediment samples as detailed in the Table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geo #</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Provenience</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-01</td>
<td>N20 W06 SE</td>
<td>LbP1 a P2 no PC</td>
<td>E50 N21 Z 82 bsd</td>
<td>large chunk of calcium carbonate</td>
<td>23 July NVB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-02</td>
<td>N20 W08 NW</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Z 88 bd</td>
<td>matrix sample below Fa14-08</td>
<td>assoc. date on wapiti c. 10.7 Cal BP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-03</td>
<td>N16 W12 SW</td>
<td>PC2/P3</td>
<td>Z 83 bd</td>
<td>matrix adhering to Fa14-10-09</td>
<td>Bison tibia frag, 4 bagged samples removed in lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-04</td>
<td>N16 W13 NE</td>
<td>PC2/P3</td>
<td>E49-42 N63-70 Z 71-72 bd</td>
<td>Paleosol assoc w Fa14-08</td>
<td>Currently unidentified – poss. MM innominate or scapula frag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-05</td>
<td>N16 W13 NE</td>
<td>Lb PC2/P3</td>
<td>E49-42 N63-70 Z 73-74 bd</td>
<td>Loess assoc w Fa14-08</td>
<td>Currently unidentified – poss. M innominate or scapula frag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-06</td>
<td>N17 W12</td>
<td>PC2/P3</td>
<td>Z 71-80 bs</td>
<td>Bulk sample Fe2014-04</td>
<td>Hearth feature continuing from units to N and NE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Hosting for one week 7 Youth and 3 counselors engaged in the Northern Cultural Expressions Society’s summer cultural program for native youth at risk. We used a combination of field camp activities (excavation, artifact molding, cooking, camp maintenance, fishing, swimming, and taking in the spectacular view) a variety of art activities (beading, bark and wood working, painting, storytelling), and local Elder interaction as vectors of therapy for the children.
• Three conference presentations related to this project were delivered at the Society for American Archaeology meetings in April 2015. Hutchinson et al. (2015) reviewed the accumulated fauna and taphonomic analysis of the site, Grooms et al. (2015) discussed the ongoing geoarchaeological analyses of the site, while Easton et al. (2015) discussed the developing chronology of the site based on the radiocarbon dating record at Little John and other regional sites on the Yukon-Alaska borderlands. Work continued on three manuscripts for publication on the obsidian artifacts, PXRF analysis of basaltics, and a proposed chrono-stratigraphic interpretation of the Little John site.

• Jordan Handley completed her first year of a Masters program at the Department of Anthropology of the University of British Columbia under the supervision of Dr. David Pokotylo. Ms. Handley will be joining us for four to six weeks this summer to collect material related to her thesis topic, which will focus on a gendered analysis of the Little John site.

• Michael Grooms (PhD candidate, University of New Mexico, Dr. E. James Dixon, Supervisor) continued course work and training in geoarchaeology in support of his doctoral dissertation on the geomorphology of the Little John site. He currently preparing a National Science Foundation grant for analytical work this winter and will join us for three to four weeks this summer.

• Laurianne Bourgenon (PhD candidate, University of Montreal, Adriane Burke, Supervisor) contributed further to our taphonomic analyses of the Little John fauna collection and continues her dissertation work.

• Students in Yukon College’s Anthropology 103 and 221 participated in cataloguing and analysis of the 2014 lithic and fauna collection.

Plans for the 2015 field season include continued analytical work and additional limited excavations of unfinished units and several new ones as resources allow, along with additional geophysical data collection in collaboration with the Geological Technology Program at Yukon College.
REGIONAL CONTEXT OF THE AREA OF STUDY

GLACIAL HISTORY AND PALEOECOLOGY OF THE STUDY REGION

Pleistocene glacial advances in the Mirror Creek and adjacent Tanana valleys were thin piedmont glaciers extending from the Nutzotin – Wrangell – St. Elias Mountain chain, which rise about forty kilometers to the southwest of the site. The Little John site lies at the edge of the maximum extent of the Mirror Creek glacial advance (corresponding to the central Yukon’s Reid and North American Illinoian glacial events), variously dated to the Late Illinoian – MIS 6, c. 14,000 BP (Bostock 1965; Krinsley 1965) or the Early Wisconsin – MIS 4, c. 70,000 BP (Denton 1974; Hughes et al. 1989).

However the Late Wisconsin advance of glacial ice, identified locally as the McCauley glacial advance (corresponding to the central Yukon's McConnell and the North American Wisconsin glacial periods), ended at McCauley Ridge, some fifty kilometers to the southeast, and began a rapid recession at about 13500 BP; by 11000 BP the region was ice-free to at least the White River, some 150 kilometers to the southeast (Rampton 1971).

Thus, the Little John Site lies within the ice free lands of Beringia. Paleontological data compliments the geological evidence. This includes a dated fragment of ivory from a scatter of this material found eroding from the hillside across the highway from the Little John site, which has been AMS dated to 38160 +/- 310 RCYBP; presumably it is from *Mammuthus*, although we have not undertaken any DNA analysis to confirm this.

![Figure 6(a/b). Ivory Locality across the highway from Little John and detail of Recovered Fragments.](image)

However, combined with the recovery of additional Pleistocene fauna in the area representing specimens of *Bison*, *Equus*, *Mammuthus*, *Rangifer*, and possibly *Saiga*, including an *Equus lambei* specimen, recovered about two km from the site, which has been radiocarbon
dated to 20660 +/- 100 RCYBP (Beta 70102; MacIntosh 1997:84), these non-cultural fauna confirm that the area about the Little John site supported a range of mega-fauna during the mid to late Wisconsin glacial period from at least 38,000 years ago.

Figure 7. Pleistocene Fauna collected at Little Scottie Creek Bridge; *Equus lambei* dated to 20,660 rcybp (Greg Hare; Yukon Heritage Branch).

Several palaeo-ecological studies have been carried out in the region, which allow us to reconstruct the local post-glacial environmental history of the past 13,000 years or so. Rampton
(1971b) analyzed sediments from Antifreeze Pond, just south of Beaver Creek, while MacIntosh (1997) examined sediments from "Daylight Coming Out" Lake (Upper Tanana = Yikahh Männ’) just north of Beaver Creek and the uppermost lake on the Little Scottie Creek drainage, and "Island" Lake (Upper Tanana = Cha’atxaa Männ’), which lies just over the Alaska border and drains into Big Scottie Creek via Desper Creek. The results of these two studies were in general agreement, differing slightly in some aspects of dating and environmental indicators. In combination they present us with the following palaeo-environmental reconstruction:

**Herb-Tundra Steppe Zone**

The late glacial environment of between 13,500 to 11,000 years ago was dominated by grasses (*Gramineae*), sage (*Artemisia spp.*), willow (*Salix spp.*) and sedges (*Cyperaceae*), equivalent to that of the predominantly herbaceous tundra steppe zone proposed for much of eastern Beringia at the end of the Wisconsin glaciation.¹ MacIntosh estimates minimum July temperatures of five degrees Celsius.

**Birch Rise**

The period between 11,000 and 8,000 years ago is marked by a significant (up to seventy-five percent of the pollen record) increase in birch (*Betula spp.* - predominantly dwarf birch - *Betula pumila* var. *glandulifera*), with a slow decline in the levels of *Artemisia*. These data suggest a continuing warming climate to at least a minimum mean July temperature of nine degrees Celsius. A rise in aquatic plants and algae is also noticeable in the pollen record, suggesting increased moisture and precipitation, as well as a general reduction in erosion and accompanying stabilization of the landscape.

**Spruce Rise**

This is a relatively short period, which is marked by the first appearance of spruce (*Picea spp.*) in the region. It is also one which different localities present different time depths. Rampton’s estimates for Antifreeze Pond place the onset of spruce at about 8,700 years ago; MacIntosh’s data from *Yihkah Männ’* place it at between 7,400 and 8,400 years ago. Birch and willows retain the high values of the previous period however, while other taxa are greatly reduced. The presence of spruce suggests a minimum mean July temperature of thirteen degrees Celsius.

¹ There is not unanimous agreement on Wisconsin Beringian environments, but I follow the position set out by Guthrie (1990) on the matter, which argues for a productive "mammoth steppe".
Spruce Zone
After about 7,500 years ago, spruce becomes predominant within the pollen record in the region, with an accompanying dramatic decrease in the presence of birch and willow. Sphagnum pollen also rises noticeably, with a corresponding decrease in aquatic species. These data suggest at least maintenance of minimum mean July temperatures of thirteen degrees Celsius.

Alder Zone
A rise in alder (Alnus spp.) is found at about 5,400 years ago at Yihkah Männ’, and 5,600 at Antifreeze Pond; both suggest an increase in relative moisture in the region at about this time to about present levels. Both Rampton and MacIntosh interpret their data as indicating the onset of an environment generally similar to that of today, with the exception of a gradual rise in mean annual July temperatures to its contemporary level of about twelve degrees Celsius.

It was during this last period that the region experienced the ash fall from two major volcanic eruptions near Mounts Churchill / Bona, near the headwaters of the White River. The figure below shows the limits of the two ash falls.

Figure 9. Distribution of the White River Ash fall, c. 1,900 and 1,250 years ago.
(from Smith et al. 2004:28)

The first, smaller eruption occurred at about 1,900 years ago; the majority of ash was deposited northward from the eruption. The second, larger, eruption occurred at about 1,250
years ago; the ash fall from this eruption was carried eastward to beyond the Yukon - Northwest Territory border (Lerbekmo et al. 1975); more recent analysis of peat deposits has extended its distribution as far east as the shores of Great Slave Lake, 1300 km from the source. This expanded distribution encompasses about 540,00 km$^2$, representing a tephra volume of 27 km$^2$ (Robinson 2001). The effect of these ash falls must have been significant for both the environment and the humans living in the region (Workman 1974). Moodie and Catchpole (1992), and others (Derry 1975, Ives 1990, 2003, Matson and Magne 2007), suggest that this may have been the impetus for the migration of the Athapaskan speaking ancestors of the Navaho and Apachean peoples into the American southwest desert lands. Ives (2003:267) notes that

the clear recognition of two separate White River events enhances the tie between Athapaskan language history and volcanic history. The north lobe White River event (ca. 1900 B.P.) corresponds in time with the intermontane and coastal migrations of the Pacific Coast Athapaskans that Krauss and Golla (1981) felt took place before 1,500 B.P., while the east lobe event corresponds with the divergence of Canadian and Apachean Athapaskans after about 1,200 B.P. It seems unlikely that these two episodes of language divergence, in their correspondence with two volcanic events of stupendous ecological moment, would arise purely as a matter of coincidence.

Figure 10. Leek'ath Niik Village, Middle Scottie Creek.

Interestingly, Easton was told by several Upper Tanana Elders that the traditional village site of Leek'ath Niik / muddy water creek /, which lies on the eastern side of the middle Scottie
Creek valley, was the location to which their ancestors retreated at the time of the eruption and subsequent ash fall - a time referred to in their oral history as the year of two winters (Easton n.d.).

After the last eruption about 1,200 years ago the region's environment has been relatively stable, although fluvial erosion and redeposition of sediments, as well as localized mass wasting of hillsides, continued.

CONTEMPORARY ENVIRONMENTAL ECOLOGY OF THE STUDY REGION

From a contemporary perspective, Oswald and Senyk's (1977) categorization of the eco-regions of the Yukon place the southwest Yukon and the adjacent Upper Tanana valley within the eastern portion of their "Wellesley Lake Eco-Region" (pp. 42-45; see also Smith et al. 2004).

The surface of the valley floors are characterized by extensive meandering streams across boggy, largely permafrost muskeg. Though technically discontinuous, permafrost is extensive and can reach as deep as thirty meters (Rampton 1980). Frozen ground features include fen polygons, stone nets, felsenmeer, solifluction lobes and stripes, and rock rivers. Loess (wind blown) sediments and volcanic ash deposits, both of which can reach over 50 cm in depth, are also found throughout the region (Oswald and Senyk 1977).

Today the ground is covered with sphagnum mosses, sedges, blueberry, bearberry, Labrador tea, and is dotted with remnant oxbows and a plethora of small lakes ringed with willows. Black spruce bowers and scattered growth of dwarf birch, alder, and willow crowd any rise in the valley landscape, which are often elevated frost mounds, shading ground patches of cranberry and wild rose. The surrounding hillsides support alternating patches of white and black spruce, birch, alder, aspen, and poplar trees and a wide variety of shrubs, up to their low

---

2 All of these surficial features are directly related to permafrost conditions:

- Fen polygons are peatlands with slowly moving water above or below the surface, commonly supporting grasses, sedges, cottongrass, bulrushes, and reeds, on patterned ground, roughly polygonal in shape.
- Stone nets are characterized by fine-grained soils in the centre and coarse-grained, stony materials found on the rim of patterned ground intermediate between sorted circles and sorted polygons.
- Felsenmeers are chaotic assemblages of fractured rocks resulting from intensive frost shattering of jointed bedrock.
- Solifluction lobes and stripes are two forms of surficial sediment deposits which have resulted from the slow, gravitational downslope movement of saturated, unfrozen sediments moving as a viscous mass over a surface of frozen material (Oswald and Senyk 1977).
summits. Due to the near surface presence of permafrost, north-facing hillsides are predominantly black spruce. Many of these plants were and continue to be used by Dineh of the region (see Easton 2004b).

Despite the abundance of water in the region, the humidity is low. This is because the lowland bogs are more a function of the low relief and summer solar thaw of the fifty or so centimeters of soil above the permafrost than of precipitation, which averages only about 30cm per year. Seasonal variation in temperatures is extreme, ranging from -57 degrees Celsius or greater in the winter to the low 30s in the summer. The mean low temperature is -31 degrees Celsius in January, the mean high temperature is 12 degrees Celsius in July, and the annual mean temperature is -6 degrees Celsius. (The lowest recorded temperature for North America was recorded at nearby Snag, Yukon on 3 February 1947 of -62.8 degrees Celsius (-81 degrees Fahrenheit). Cloud coverage is relatively high, averaging overcast for 27% and broken for 30% of the year (Wahl et al. 1987).

The low mean temperatures combined with the low solar values associated with the high cloud cover, result in long winters with lakes and streams frozen from October to mid-May (Hosley 1981a). And while the depth of snow is never very deep, it can come as early as September and remain on the ground until May. As a result, the seasons of spring and fall are short, while the difference between winter and summer might best be summed up as frozen or wet.

In the present, the basin supports a wide range of fish species, large and small mammals, and is an important component of the interior western continental flyway; in Alaska the lower Chisana River basin is completely within the Tetlin National Wildlife Refuge, while the upper portion lies in Wrangell-St.Elias National Park and Preserve.

Dominant large mammals include moose (Alces alces), black and brown (grizzly) bear (Ursus americanus and Ursus arctos), mountain sheep (Ovis dalli), and caribou (Rangifer tarandus) of the Chisana and Forty-Mile Caribou Herds.

Furbearers include wolf (Canis lupus), lynx (Lynx canadensis), wolverine (Gulo gulo), beaver (Castor canadensis), muskrat (Ondatra zibethica), otter (Lontra canadensis), and the snowshoe hare (Lepus americanus).

Pre-eminent among the fish species are whitefish (Coregonus sp.), grayling (Thymallus arcticus), pike (Esox lucius), sucker (Catostomus spp.), and lingcod [burbot] (Lota lota). Salmon
is also available to the region from fishing localities on the White and Yukon Rivers, as well as through reciprocity with relatives living in the Copper River watershed and in the Dawson region (see Friend, et al. 2007, for a comprehensive survey of traditional and contemporary subsistence fishing in the upper Tanana River basin).

Like the plants, most all animals were integrated into Upper Tanana culture. All retain an important social and spiritual relationship to people - the Dineh culturally categorize animals as non-human persons with cognitive and moral purpose - and many were important components of the aboriginal technology and subsistence systems (see Nadasdy 2007; Easton 2008a).

**REGIONAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL SEQUENCES**

The ancient Beringian environment which prevailed in the Borderlands during the last glacial maximum, some 27,000 to 12,000 years ago during the late Pleistocene geological epoch, and the general environmental changes which occurred in the region over the past 11,000 years of the subsequent Holocene epoch was presented above. There is widespread agreement on the presence of human societies occupying eastern Beringia during the final millennia of the Pleistocene and the early Holocene Epochs. Currently there are two regional schemes that prevail in our understanding. The first is one that was developed to account for the prehistory of glaciated Yukon; the second is one that was developed to account for the prehistory of unglaciated eastern Beringia (central Alaska and western Yukon). In order to provide a larger context to the material recovered from the Little John site, I present first the northwestern Canadian (glaciated Yukon) archaeological sequence, followed by a presentation of the eastern Alaskan sequence, and then a comparative discussion of both archaeological sequences, which relates one to the other. Finally, I discuss specific archaeological sites within the local area of the Borderlands to contextualize the Little John site in a regional perspective.

From the pan-regional perspective of Northwestern North America, it is clear that there must be some technological and cultural relationship between the Alaskan and Yukon sequences.

---

3 I am leaving aside discussion of the proposed early (20,000 years + ) cultural tradition based on a bone tool technology proposed by Jaques Cinq-Mars, and Richard Morlan (Cinq-Mars and Morlan 1982) for unglaciated northeastern Beringia in the Old Crow River Basin of northern Yukon. The archaeological evidence for this early culture is equivocal at best and not generally accepted by the majority of archaeologists, including myself. The demonstrable late Pleistocene – early Holocene (circa 11,000 years ago) microblade and burin component of the Blue Fish Caves assemblage in the Old Crow basin is variously assigned to the Paleo-Arctic, Denali, Beringian, or Dyuktai archaeological traditions which are discussed below (c.f. Fagan 1987:122-127; Dixon 1999:58-61).
Indeed, the Little John site, along with others in the Borderlands area, are well placed geographically and chronologically to provide the archaeological data to link the two separate sequences, which to date have been geographically separated by hundreds of kilometers and nationalist driven definitions.4

The map below shows the general location of most western subarctic archaeological sites of the late Pleistocene and early Holocene (from as early as 14,000 years ago at the Swan Point [next to # 26, Broken Mammoth] and Little John sites to about 8,000 years ago), and includes the approximate location of the newly announced 13,000 + year old site at the mouth of Britannia Creek (Guzman 2014). Based on current knowledge, the archaeological sequence for the glaciated Yukon first proposed by Workman (1978) has been refined by the recognition of a non-microblade Northern Cordilleran Tradition in the early Holocene (Clark 1983), a mid-Holocene “Annie Lake” technological complex of small, deeply concave-based lanceolate points (Greer 1993), and the combining of Workman’s Aishihik and Bennett Lake phases into a Late Prehistoric period (Hare 1995). Each of these archaeological cultures is discussed in more detail below.

**The Northwestern Canadian (Central Glaciated Southwest Yukon) Archaeological Sequence**

**Northern Cordilleran Tradition**

Lasting from at least 10,000 years ago to about 7,000 years ago, this tradition is characterized by large straight and round-based lanceolate point forms, large blades and flakes, and transverse notched burins. Significantly the assemblage lacks microblade technology (Clark 1983). The climate at this time shifted from the colder and dryer climate associated with the terminal glacial period to increasing warming throughout (from a mean July temperature of 5.5 to 7.2 degrees Celsius to 7.2 to 9.9 degrees Celsius), while the vegetation seems to have been dominated by shrub tundra. Representative site components of this tradition include the basal levels of the Canyon (JfVg-1) and Annie Lake (JcUr-3) sites, and the Moosehide (LaVk-2) site.

---

4 Interestingly, Carlson (2007) goes even further, linking the early Borderlands archaeological culture with that of the early Northwest Coast.
As discussed by Hare (1995), two possible sources for this tradition have been proposed. The first, following Clark (1983, 1992) is derived from populations of the Cordillera geophysical region, themselves derivative from late Paleoindian Plano peoples of the northern prairies, which co-existed with microblade making populations entering the Yukon from the northwest. However, Hare (1995:131) suggests that,

“given the broad morphological similarities between blades from Annie Lake and those for the 11,000 BP Nenana Complex (discussed below and Goebel et al. 1991) and the apparent dissimilarities with the Early prehistoric period, Clovis-like blades of northern Alberta (see Le Blanc and Wright 1990), it is unlikely that the Northern Cordilleran
Tradition is derived from southern-based Plano influences. Instead, it is probable that the roots of Northern Cordilleran are to be found in the indigenous northwestern Paleoindian tradition” – which I take to mean the northern Brooks Range assemblages such as those found at Mesa (Kunz et al. 2003), Putu, Bedwell and Hilltop sites, and Spein Mountain in the lower Kuskokwim River basin (Ackerman 2001), collectively grouped within the Mesa complex (Kunz and Reanier 1994; see also Hoffecker 2011).

**Little Arm Phase or Northwest Microblade Tradition**

Lasting from about 7,000 to 8,000 years ago to about 4,500 to 5,000 years ago, this tradition is characterized by composite tool production using small blades or microblades, multiple gravers and burins, round-based projectile points, and a variety of end and side scrapers (Workman 1978). The Little Arm site (JiVs-1) on Kluane Lake is the type site of this regional phase and sites of this type and period are found everywhere throughout the southwest Yukon, many of which might also include some notched points (although Workman, 1978, would disagree with including such sites on that basis). The climate during this time continued to become warmer than today’s average temperatures, while the vegetation shifted from shrub tundra to a spruce forest ecosystem.

![Figure 12. Little Arm Phase Artifacts](from Workman 1978)

The Northwest Microblade Tradition (NWMt) as proposed by MacNeish (1964) included both wedge-shaped microblade cores and side notched points. It was seen by some as attempting
to embrace far too many regional phases over too great a geographic area (from the Mackenzie River basin to Fairbanks) to have any great utility. More recently, its use has been resurrected by some in the Canadian northwest as representative of a merging of microblade technology diffused from Alaskan (and ultimately east Asian) origins and combined with the developing indigenous Yukon-Northwest Territories-based Northern Cordilleran tradition (Wright 1995; Clark et al. 1999). Clark et al. (1999:175) suggests that:

The genesis of the Northwest Microblade Tradition, at least its microblade industry and possibly also its burins, lies in the spread of Denali culture to the Yukon about 7,000 or 8,000 years ago [after deglaciation] and its further, later, spread into the District of Mackenzie and adjacent areas of British Columbia and Alberta . . . [that] resulted in considerable heterogeneity. . . . The Northwest Microblade Tradition should be viewed as a frontier culture [in the Cordillera] vis-à-vis the Denali focal region.

**Annie Lake Complex**
Lasting from about 6,900 to about 2,900 years ago, this complex is characterized by projectile points - called Annie Lake Points - which are relatively small (3.5 to 4.25 cm), basally thinned (or "deeply concaved lanceolate" in Greer's (1993) morphological description), and additional lithics which are “characterized by thin, well made tools of high quality raw materials, with adebitage suggesting extensive curation and maintenance of tools (Hare 1995:132).

![Figure 13. Annie Lake Points](N. A. Easton)

To date these points have been exclusively located in the Southern Lakes region around Whitehorse, Yukon. The Annie Lake Complex is found stratigraphically above microblade-bearing horizons of the NWMt and below Taye Lake Phase or Northern Archaic Tradition horizons. Temporally, however, it lies astride both the preceding and following tradition, leading
Hare (1995:121-2) to suggest that it may represent “a small colonizing population . . . or, and perhaps more likely, the Annie Lake complex represents diffusion of early Northern Archaic traits into an indigenous microlithic tradition.”

**Taye Lake Phase or Northern Archaic Tradition or Middle Prehistoric Period**

Lasting from about 4,500 to 5,000 years ago to about 1,250 years ago, this archaeological culture is characterized by the introduction of a variety of side-notched and stemmed spear and atlatl points (Anderson 1968a, 1968b; Workman 1978), a range of scraper forms, net weights, and a notable increase in the recovery of bone artifacts of a variety of functions (although this last attribute may be a function of preservation, and the percentages of bone artifacts within the entire assemblage is less than that found in the subsequent Late Prehistoric period). At some sites microblades are found as well (c.f. Clark et al. 1999). A cooling and moister climate begins this period, with a neo-glacial period at about 2,600 years ago, followed by a drier climate at its terminus. Vegetation was similar to that of today.

![Figure 14. Taye Lake Phase Artifacts - Points, Bifaces, and Burins](from Workman (1978)
Both Anderson and Workman noted that the lithic artifacts at this time become increasingly crude in their workmanship, with little retouch flaking and dominated by poor, coarse-grained materials. This fact, combined with the general expansion in the size and diversity of the overall toolkit, is interpreted to represent a population that has adapted and expanded its comfortable adaptation to the boreal forest landscape to include a wider variety of subsistence technology and resources, perhaps with an increased emphasis on bone technology and a reduction in lithic technology.

**Aishihik Phase - Late Prehistoric Period**

Lasting from about 1,250 to about 200 years ago, this archaeological culture (Workman 1978) is essentially Northern Archaic, but differentiated from the Taye Lake phase by its presence above the White River Volcanic ash fall - Taye Lake material is below the ash. It is characterized by increased use (or perhaps only archaeological recovery) of bone and antler tools, native copper...
implements, and small-stemmed projectile points (Kavik or Klo-kut points\(^5\)). While initially cooling and moist, the climate became warmer at the end of this period and the vegetation was not significantly different from today.

![Figure 16. Aishihik Phase Artifacts. (from Workman 1978)](image)

Interestingly, recent dating of a large number of well-preserved atlatl darts and bow arrows found in melting ice patches in the southwest Yukon has revealed that the bow and arrow is exclusively an Aishihik Phase technology in the southwest Yukon (Farnell et al. 2005; Hare et al. 2004). Such a correlation between the second White River Volcanic ash fall and the introduction of the new bow and arrow technology replacing the longstanding atlatl is suggestive of a brief period of rapid population displacement and replacement, although undoubtedly of the same Athapaskan language family.

**Bennett Lake Phase - Late Prehistoric**

Lasting from about 200 years ago to this century, this archaeological culture (Workman 1978) is characterized by the introduction of European trade goods and their integration into aboriginal technology, and is prior to the full encapsulation and transformation of aboriginal technology into its modern form. Expedient lithic tools such as simple cobble scrapers (Upper Tanana = \textit{thi-}

\(^5\) These stemmed points may have tapered or shouldered bases; see Campbell 1968, Morlan 1972, Shinkwin 1978.
chos), choppers, bipolar flakes, scrapers made from bottle glass and strips of metal, fish-hooks made from nails, and bunting arrow points made from spent cartridges are common at sites such as those at Dawson-Tr’ochëk (Hammer 2001), Fort Selkirk (Easton and Gotthardt 1987, Gotthardt and Easton 1988), and the Scottie Creek valley (Easton 2002b).

**Discussion of Southwest Yukon Sequence**

![Technological Sequences for Southwest Yukon](image)

*Figure 17. Technological Sequences for Southwest Yukon (from Hare 1995)*

The figure above presents a summary of the technological sequence of the southwest Yukon discussed in the previous section. There is no doubt that there is direct historic continuity between the contemporary inhabitants of the southwest Yukon and the people of the Bennett Lake phase. Similarly there is a direct connection between the people of the Bennett Lake phase and the preceding Aishihik, since the only defining difference is the introduction of European
trade goods. This connection is reflected in contemporary archaeologists' movement away from
the use of these phase names towards a more regional and generalized Late Prehistoric
categorization with clear affiliations to modern Athapaskan groups (c.f. Greer 1983; Gotthardt

The relationship between the Late Prehistoric period and the preceding periods is
summed by Hare (1995:17):

As outlined by Workman, most researchers agree that the Northern Archaic and
Northwest Microblade traditions gradually evolved into the Late Prehistoric Athapaskan
Tradition and while there was considerable regional variability there is evidence for
continuity in terms of technology, settlement and subsistence patterns.

In years past, some archaeologists had suggested that the changes in technology between
the Microblade and Northern Archaic periods reflected the migration of new culture-bearing
people into the region (see especially Anderson 1968 and Workman 1978).

However, many archaeologists now favor models of population continuity in this period
as well and suggest the possibility that the principal factor in these changes has been necessary
adaptations to changes in the environment or the result of indigenous populations adapting
diffused technological elements of neighbouring cultures (see, for example, Clark and Morlan
1982; Morrison 1987; Clark 1992; Hare 1995:16-17). Furthermore, Hare and Hammer (1997)
have shown that the temporal range of microblades within the Yukon has more components
outside the proposed range of the Northwest Microblade tradition than within it (see also Clark et
al. 1999). Thus, for example, Morrison (1987) prefers the use of the term *Middle Prehistoric
period* over that of the *Northern Archaic Tradition* in the Mackenzie and eastern cordilleran
regions, while Clark and Morlan (1982:36) view the Northern Archaic as the later *phase* of the
Northwest Microblade Tradition.

In other words, it can be argued that the changes in material culture in the archaeological
record do not imply a physical replacement of the people in a region. Consider our own material
culture changes from the introduction of new technology - the archaeological remains of my
family or any of my neighbours 35 years ago would not have included a personal computer,
diskettes, cd-roms, or videotapes. Today they do. To suggest, based on material remains alone,
that the differences between the material remains of then and today reflects *the replacement of
one resident population with another* is clearly wrong in this instance. It could be wrong in
prehistory as well, and increasing numbers of archaeologists are considering this fact.
The notion of a Northern Cordilleran Tradition was first proposed by Clark (1983) in order to account for the presence of non-microblade archaeological components underlying microblade-bearing deposits throughout the Yukon. The application of this tradition is now generally accepted to account for early Holocene sites characterized by large straight and round-based lanceolate point forms, large blades and flakes, and transverse notched burins, but which lack microblades. However, even this tradition is increasingly regarded as having direct continuity with the subsequent Northwest Microblade Tradition (Wright 1995; Clark et al. 1999).

The Archaeological Sequence of Eastern Beringia (Unglaciated Central Alaska and Northwest Yukon)
For some years the archaeological sequence of F. H. West and his collaborators (West 1996c) dominated the prehistory of Alaska; this generally agreed with the Yukon sequence of technology but favors earlier dates, based on sites within unglaciated eastern Beringia, and a slightly different terminology. The principal exception to this generalization is that the earliest components are variously classified as belonging to the Chindadn / Nenana Complex, the Denali Complex, or the Eastern Beringian Tradition. More recently Holmes (2008) and Hoeffecker (2008) have proposed new complexes or phases for the late Pleistocene technologies of interior Alaska.

Figure 18. Chindadn ("Ancestor") points from Healy Lake. (from West 1996c)
Chindadn Complex / Nenana Complex and Swan Point Dyuktai

The relationship between the Chindadn and Nenana complexes is currently under debate. Many of the sites in this period share similar sedimentary contexts. Located on buried paleosols below wind-blown glacial silts (loess sediments), some of these sites have exceptional organic preservation of bone, antler, and mammoth ivory, the latter presumably scavenged from earlier Pleistocene deposits exposed along river banks, which has revealed in some detail the diet of these culture carriers (Dilley 1998). Besides the expected remains of larger game – bison, wapiti, and sheep - their diet clearly included significant proportions of small mammals, migratory waterfowl and their eggs, and fish (Yesner et al. 1992, Yesner 1996, Yesner et al. 2011).

Figure 19. Dry Creek, Component I, Nenana Complex

The Dry Creek, Walker Road, and Moose Creek sites in the Nenana valley provided the basis for the construction of the Nenana complex (Powers and Hoffecker 1989; Hoeffecker, et al. 1996a; Yesner et al. 1992; Yesner 1996; Yesner et al. 2011).
1993). Dated to between 13 and 13.6 thousand years ago in the Nenana valley, it is characterized by an emphasis on bifacial technology on blades and flakes, triangular and tear-dropped shaped (Chindadn) projectile points and / or knives (Cook 1969, 1996; Holmes 2001), straight and concave-based lanceolate projectile points, perforators (including bone needles), endscrapers and sidescrapers, but is lacking microblades.

The Nenana complex appellation was subsequently extended to include a series of site components along the Tanana River proper, including Healy Lake, Broken Mammoth, and Swan Point (Goebel and Slobodin 1999; Hamilton and Goebel 1999). In earlier reports on Little John, I and my collaborators have also designated the Western lobe loess stratum component at the Little John site, which includes Chindadn bifaces, straight-based lanceolate projectile points or knives, large ovate bifaces, bifacial blade and flake technology, endscrapers, and burins, but lacking microblade technology, as a Nenana assemblage (Easton 2007c; Easton and MacKay 2008).

Based on geographical, temporal, and technological differences, Holmes (2001) has for some time argued that we should recognize these late Pleistocene Nenana valley and Tanana valley components as separate complexes – the Nenana complex for the former and Chindadn complex for the latter. Geographically their separation is of enough distance to warrant this. Temporally the dated Chindadn complex components in the Tanana valley are all younger than those in the Nenana valley: Cultural Zone 3 at Broken Mammoth is dated to between 12.6 and 12 thousand calendar years ago (Yesner et al. 1992; Yesner 1996), Cultural Zone 3 at Swan Point is dated to between 12.5 and 11.5 thousand calendar years ago (Holmes et al. 1996; Holmes 2008, 2011), and the basal levels of Healy Lake are dated to between 9.1 and 13.3 thousand calendar years ago, with an average of c. 11 thousand calendar years ago (Cook 1969, 1996).

Technologically, all three assemblages of these Chindadn complex components at all three sites contain Chindadn bifaces along with some evidence of microblade technology: microblades are found in small numbers at Swan Point CZ3 (34) and 44 are reported for Broken Mammoth (Krasinski 2005:46); however no microblade cores have been recovered from CZ 3 at either site. The presence of microblades negates inclusion of the Broken Mammoth and Swan Point CZ 3 assemblages in the Nenana complex. . . .

---

6 Dry Creek, Component I is dated at 11,120 +/- 85 radiocarbon years – 13,025 +/- calibrated calendar years (Hoffecker et al. 1996). The Nenana component at Walker Road has several dates averaging 11,208 +/- 92 radiocarbon years – 13,100 calibrated calendar years (Goebel et al. 1996; Goebel 2008). The Nenana component at Moose Creek is dated between 11,730 +/- 250 radiocarbon years – 13,681 +/- 316 calibrated calendar years (Hoffecker 1996) - and 11,190 +/- 60 – 13,091 +/- 117 calibrated calendar years (Pearson 1999).
Assignment of CZ 3 to the Chindadn complex is a better fit and has precedence over the Nenana complex, especially in the Tanana Valley. I place this group of components (Healy Lake Chindadn, Broken Mammoth CZ 3, and Swan Point CZ 3) in the EBt [East Beringian tradition] Phase II, and it may be possible to include the Nenana complex as well (Holmes 2008:6).

Figure 20. Chindadn Bifaces of the Tanana Valley: Top - Healy Lake Chindadn, Middle - Swan Point CZ 3, Bottom - Broken Mammoth CZ 3

(Holmes 2008)

Holmes’ identification of a Phase II, which includes both Chindadn and Nenana complexes, within an “East Beringian tradition” is made in order to account for the earlier, distinct occupation at Swan Point at c. 14,000 calendar years ago, that is characterized by what he calls the Dyuktai microblade production technique, which “is based on preparing a biface (or less common, a blade or flake) preform, producing a platform by removing spalls from the lateral
edge, and then detaching microblades” (Holmes 2008:5). He sees this form of microblade production as directly derivative from the Dyuktai and Yubetsu traditions of eastern Siberia, northern China, northern Korea, and Northern Japan and distinctively different from the “Campus” or “Denali” microblade production technique.

The best way to distinguish between the two techniques is to compare the core platforms. Dyuktai core platforms were created and maintained by spall removal along the entire core length. Campus core platforms were created by extensive retouch followed by core tablet removal, and maintained by subsequent platform retouching necessary to detach another core tablet. The core tablets often hinged out so that some of the platform preparation trimming scars were retained. I see this as a significant difference between Beringian microblade technology, based on the Dyuktai technique, and the later Alaskan technologies of the American Paleoarctic tradition and Denali Complex, which may have been influenced by Dyuktai culture, but became an Alaskan prodigy (Holmes 2008:5).

In addition to the practice of Dyuktai microblade core preparation technique, Holmes’ notes that the 14 thousand year old Swan Point Cultural Zone 4 includes transverse and dihedral burins, hammer stones, possible anvil stones, utilized flakes, and, “as minor elements”, blades and blade-like flakes. No complete formed bifaces, other than those prepared for microblade production, have yet been recovered from Swan Point CZ 4, though several biface fragments and thinning flakes indicate “thin biface production . . . but the finished form of these . . . is unknown” (Holmes 2008:6). A summary of Holmes’ schema is presented in the figure below (see also Holmes 2011).

Based on these arguments and the evidence from Swan Point I am now inclined to agree with Holmes that the Upper Tanana valley components should be separated from the Nenana complex and designated as belonging to the separate Chindadn complex, which would include its
expression at Little John as well. Some implications of this shift in terminology is explored further in Easton et al. (2011).

![Figure 22. Late Pleistocene - Early Holocene Culture History of Interior Alaska Proposed by Holmes (2008)](from Holmes 2008)

**Denali Complex (American Paleo-Arctic Tradition / Beringian Tradition)**

This archaeological culture is found from about 11,000 years ago to about 9,500 years ago and is characterized by the presence of microblades, wedge-shaped microblade cores, and burins. The American Paleoarctic Tradition was originally defined by Anderson (1970a, 1970b) on the basis of excavations at the Akmak and Onion Portage sites of northwest Alaska near the Brooks Range. It has subsequently been applied to a great number of assemblages within a wide variety of environmental contexts (maritime, transitional, interior, montane, northern, central, and coastal Alaska and Yukon). West (1981, 1996) subsumes these assemblages into an even wider Beringian Tradition that extends geographically into eastern Siberia / western Beringia, and would include the Nenana complex assemblages as well, on the basis that the lack of microblades is explained by site function – they are not found where they are not used.
The presence of wedge-shaped microblade cores (one of a number of alternative core forms from which microblades can be struck) is the common element, which unifies the designation. Some archaeologists (e.g. Dixon 1999, and myself), find the inclusion of such a variety of assemblages to reduce the utility of both constructs to little more than some indication of relationship between them; a more useful construct for the Tanana River valley is West’s earlier defined Denali complex.
Figure 24. Bifaces from Component II (Denali Complex), Dry Creek site.  
(from West 1996c)

**Northern Archaic Tradition**

I have described the main features of this archaeological culture earlier. Esdale (2008) is the most recent comprehensive account of its expression in Alaska, noting that nearly 70% of dated Northern Archaic sites fall between 6,000 and 3,000 years ago in Alaska, but is expressed as recently as 500 years ago in some Late Holocene assemblages. Her review also reveals a close association between side notched and oblanceolate points, small end-scrapers, burins, and microblade technology during this period; interestingly, notched pebble net weights, commonly cited as a feature of the Northern Archaic, is found in only 4% of the examined assemblages.
Late Denali Complex

The presence of wedge-shaped “Denali” microblade cores at the Campus site, as well as other undated sites in the Tanana valley (Nelson 1935, 1937; West 1975), which have been subsequently radiocarbon dated to the late Holocene, led to the notion of a “Late Denali complex,” circa 3,500 to 1,500 years ago (West 1967, 1975; Moberly 1991). It is characterized by the presence (reappearance?) of microblades and burins, in components which otherwise are similar to the Northern Archaic (i.e., containing side-notched points, etc.).

The Campus site has been excavated on eight occasions between 1933 and 1995 (University of Alaska 1934, Rainey 1939, Moberly 1991, Pearson and Powers 2001). The initial recovery of wedge-shaped microblade cores at this site led Nels C. Nelson of the American Museum of Natural History, who examined the collection in 1935, to note: "the cores and the small endscrapers . . . are identical in several respects with . . . specimens found in the Gobi desert [and] furnish the first clear evidence we have of early migration to the American continent. . . . possibly 7,000 to 10,000 years ago" (Nelson 1935:356). Moberly’s (1991) analysis of the site concluded that the assemblage dated to c. 3,500 years ago, and represented a Late Denali complex. Pearson and Powers’ (2001) analysis of undisturbed strata provided them a date for the microblade component of c. 6,850 years ago, arguing that the site represents an early to mid-Holocene occupation of the Denali complex proper or early Northern Archaic that included microblade technology, rejecting the construct of a Late Denali complex as untenable. I am in agreement with them; there is no need for a Late Denali complex archaeological culture to account for continuity of microblade technology in the middle and late Holocene Northern Archaic.

Athapaskan Tradition

This archaeological culture is found from about 1,500 years ago to about 150 years ago and is characterized by a shift to the introduction of copper technology, stemmed projectile points, and the increased use of bone and antler arrowheads (although it is likely that this is largely a function of better preservation of more recent organic material).
Euroamerican Tradition
This archaeological culture began about 150 years ago and is characterized by the introduction of European manufactured goods and materials.

Comparative Discussion of the Interior Southeastern Beringian Archaeological Sequence

As can be seen, there are several direct correspondences to be made between the Alaskan and Yukon chronologies. For all intents and purposes the Euroamerican Tradition is equivalent to the Bennett Lake Phase and the Athapaskan Tradition is equivalent to the Aishihik Phase. In combination, these Alaskan traditions and Yukon phases fit within the Yukon’s Late Prehistoric Tradition. There is also a direct correspondence between the two regions' Northern Archaic Traditions.

I see no need for a “Late Denali Complex” within the time of the Northern Archaic. More recent analyses of the temporal range of microblade technology in the Yukon have suggested that in many local areas this method has persisted up until quite recent times (Hare and Hammer 1997; Clark et al. 1999), a fact subsequently demonstrated for Alaska as well (Esdale 2008). Grouping together both microblade and non-microblade sites with the more embracing Middle Prehistoric Period (Morrison 1987), or altering our definition of the Northern Archaic to include the presence of microblades (Esdale 2009), is called for.

The distinguishing feature between the Denali Complex (c. 11,000 to 9,500 years ago) and the Northwest Microblade Tradition (c. 7-8,000 to 4,500-5,000 years ago) is time. Yet most researchers agree that the latter represents the migration of this technology eastward over space through this time from Alaska into the Yukon and western Northwest Territories (MacNeish 1964, Clark, Gotthardt, and Hare 1999, Magne and Fedje 2008).

Finally, there does seem to be some correspondence between the Nenana and Chindadn complexes and Northern Cordilleran Tradition with their emphasis on bifacially worked tools, the presence of blades, and, in the case of the Nenana complex, the lack of microblades. However, we can also see distinctive differences including the
presence of Chindadn type and basally thinned points in the Alaskan complexes and, in the case of the Chindadn complex the presence of microblades, and the absence of these artifact types in the Northern Cordilleran Tradition.

Recent comparisons of the components associated with the Nenana and Denali Complexes has led some to suggest that these may all belong to a single over-arching tradition, which West has named the (Eastern) Beringian Tradition. West has put the case most strongly:

There is no unique Nenana artifact. Every Nenana artifact form can be duplicated in Denali. The absence of microblades surely has simpler explanations than . . . calling upon another culture - and one without antecedents at that. This certainly suggests that Nenana is, at best, a Denali variant (West 2000:4, quoted in Heffner 2002:26).

Resolution of this question may well hinge on archaeological evidence within the Borderlands region. Heffner's (2002) excavation and analysis of the KaVn-2 site, 55 kilometers southeast of the Little John site, brought to light an early component dated between 10,670 and 10,130 radiocarbon years before present (12,023 – 11,598 and 12,731 – 12,520 Cal YBP respectively), which was occupied within a few hundred years of deglaciation in the area. Heffner argues that the "assemblage can be seen as intermediary between the Nenana Complex or Northern Cordilleran Tradition and the Denali Complex or American Paleo-Arctic Tradition" (Heffner 2002:119). He goes on to argue that this fact lends support to the Eastern Beringian Tradition as the most appropriate cultural historical classification for early sites in interior northwestern North America. As noted earlier, the Eastern Beringian Tradition posits that the Nenana and Denali Complexes of Central Alaska, and by extension the Northern Cordilleran Tradition and American Paleo-Arctic Traditions as well, are technologically related and that assemblage differences in early archaeological sites can be better explained by site location, site function, and site seasonality (Heffner 2002:120).

At this point, based on the emergent evidence from the Little John and Swan Point sites, we take an alternative view which maintains the separation of the Denali and Nenana / Chindadn complexes along the lines proposed by Holmes (2008, 2011). Indeed, we have most recently proposed the separation of the Nenana and Chindadn complexes
themselves, based on geographical and chronological distance, suggesting that the former be restricted to sites within the Nenana valley while the latter be applied to the late Pleistocene of the Tanana valley proper with Chindadn Points and associated technology (Easton et al. 2011).

Several important new additions to the Late Pleistocene archaeology of the region have been recently published that bear on our work at Little John. The first is the publication of a multi-authored assessment and examination of the implications the hypothesized genealogical relationship between the Siberian Yeniseian language Family as represented by the Ket language and the Na-Dene language Phylum, which consists of the Athapaskan, Eyak, and Tlingit languages. The emergent consensus among linguists is that if not proven the hypothesis put forward by Edward Vayda (2010a and 2010b) is certainly robust and the best (perhaps only) evidence of a shared linguistic heritage between a New World and Old World population. The archaeological implications of this possibility is explored by Potter (2010) and critiqued by Dummond (2010).

The second is Potter, et al. (2001) and Potter (2014) who report on the recovery of cremated human remains of a single juvenile (c. 3-4 years of age) in a burial pit - hearth feature, overlying a second burial of two unburned interned infants (neo-natal – 6 months in age), within a house structure at the Upward Sun River site on the south bank of the Tanana River south of Big Delta Junction in Alaska. The human remains are dated to c. 11.5 thousand calendar years, just after the end of the Younger Dryas, and the house feature is evidenced by post holes around a semi-subterranean concavity feature. The lower burial includes grave goods in the form of bifaces and decorated antler rods. Besides its inherent importance in its own right, we can note the identification of concentrations of wood within the Pleistocene levels at Little John that may represent a similar occupational feature that full 3-dimensional mapping being undertaken by will clarify.

The third is the important discovery in 2013 within the White River First Nations Traditional Territory of 13,000 year plus cultural deposits at KfVi-3 on a terrace overlooking the confluence of Britannia Creek with the Yukon River about 110 kilometers East-North-East of the Little John site (Guzman 2014, Altimira Consulting 2014). We discuss its potential relationship with the Little John site later in this report.
Archaeological Sites within the Borderlands Region

Prior to the initiation of the Scottie Creek Culture History Project by Easton in the mid-1990s, the Borderlands area had received limited archaeological attention.

Frederick Johnson first conducted survey efforts in the area in 1944 and 1948, after the construction of the Alaska Highway, but he did not record any archaeological sites beyond Duke Meadow immediately south of the Duke River crossing north of Burwash Village and thus outside of our area of interest, broadly defined as west of the White River (Johnson 1946, Johnson and Raup 1964). A number of archaeological survey efforts passed through the area during environmental impact assessments for the Foothills natural gas pipeline project in the late 1970s and early 1980s and they are summarized in Damp and Van Dyke (1982). Only one site was recorded within our area of concern. Tests at KaVn-1, 3 kilometers southwest of the Little John site, recovered a small collection of debitage flakes. Walde (1991) conducted survey along the Alaska Highway right-of-way in 1991 from the border to the White River, returning to undertake mitigation excavation at Borden sites KaVn-2, KbVo-1, KbVo-2, and KdVo-3 (Walde 1994). Easton conducted some survey in the area of Beaver Creek in 1994 (Easton 2002a). In 1999, Ty Heffner revisited KaVn-2 to complete the excavation and analysis of this site, as well as survey a number of localities around Tchawsahmon Lake (Heffner 2000, 2002). Easton has conducted additional surveys of the middle reach of Scottie Creek in 2001 and 2002 (Easton 2002), and the northern Mirror Creek drainage in 2003, 2004, 2006, and 2007 (Easton 2007c, 2008b). In 2002 and 2003, Glen MacKay undertook additional excavations at the Nii-ii hunting lookout site (KdVo6) which formed the basis for his Master’s Thesis at the University of Victoria under Dr. Quentin Mackie (MacKay 2008). Just across the border in Alaska, a series of site surveys of historic native settlements and graveyards has been undertaken by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) on the upper Chisana and Nabesna Rivers. While several of these sites are presumed to hold additional evidence of prehistoric occupation, limited subsurface excavation undertaken in the course of the surveys did not uncover any artifacts and so do not bear directly on this current discussion (BIA 1993a, 1993b, 1995a, 1995b, 1996a, 1996b). William Sheppard undertook archaeological survey work at several localities in Alaska,
recovering middle and late Holocene components along lower Scottie Creek, Deadman Lake, and in the Tok Junction area (Sheppard 1999 and 2001, Sheppard et al. 1991)\(^7\). Bob Satler and Tom Gillespie of the Tanana Chiefs Conference, and Easton conducted limited archaeological survey of several sites in the area about Northway and Tok, Alaska in 2006; two sites were discovered near the border, one of which, at the mouth of Mirror Creek where it meets the Chisana River, bears a similar stratigraphic profile to that found at the Little John site and consequently may be related, although no artifacts were recovered in the single test pit excavated there (Gillespie 2006). In collaboration with Tanana Chiefs Conference and Northway Village Inc. and Northway Village Council, Easton undertook testing at a number of sites in the Northway region in 2009, identifying occupations along the shores of Hidden and Deadman Lakes; the latter included recovery of a complete projectile point in a Late Pleistocene stratigraphic context and bears further investigation and dating (Easton 2009).

Table 9, below, presents summary information on the principal archaeological sites recorded to date on the Canadian side of the border eastward to about the White River along the Highway corridor. With the exception of KaVn-2, these sites reveal a culture history pattern similar to that of the regional archaeological sequences to the east of our study area.

In addition to archaeological remains related to the prehistoric occupation of humans, the Mirror Creek, Little Scottie Creek, and Big Scottie Creek basins have been the location of the recovery of Pleistocene-age paleontological remains, including mammoth, bison, caribou, horse, saiga, and an unidentified feline spp. Several associated fragments of *Equus lambei* recovered during highway reconstruction in 1996 have been dated to 20,660 +/- 100 BP. Three juvenile mammoth tusks were found close to each other in the middle Little Scottie Creek basin (MacIntosh 1997, Easton et al. 2009). Both the horse and juvenile mammoth tusks were recovered less than two km from the Little John site.

Finally, we note the important discovery in 2013 within the White River First Nations Traditional Territory of 13,000 year plus cultural deposits at KfVi-3 on a terrace

\(^7\) Bill Sheppard passed on in 2006; several of his colleagues and I are currently working on analyzing the last of his collections held at Northern Land Use Planning, Fairbanks at the request of Ken Pratt.
overlooking the confluence of Britannia Creek with the Yukon River about 110 kilometers East-North-East of the Little John site (Guzman 2014, Altimira Consulting 2014). We look forward to a more detailed comparison with Little John when more details become available.

Table 8. Canadian Archaeological Sites of the Yukon - Alaska Borderlands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KaVn-1</td>
<td>S of Sanpete Creek and E of Ak. Hwy, S of a knob located between creek bottom and Horsecamp Hill. Original find was two dark silicified siltstone-like flakes on surface. Test pits yielded 53 blue-grey flakes of various sizes. As no prehistoric sites had been previously recorded in this region of S. Yukon, the site is considered inherently valuable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KaVn-2</td>
<td>Moose Lake. On a sand ridge on E side of Ak. Hwy at NW base of Horsecamp Hill overlooking Moose Lake. Archaeological site excavated during Alaska Highway realignment. The basal component is dated to be about 10,400 years RC’y BP, making this the third oldest known site in southwest Yukon (Walde 1991, 1994; Heffner 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KbVo-1</td>
<td>Km 1918.550, N side of Ak. Hwy on a knoll on the top of a ridge at the edge of the highway cutbank, overlooking Enger Lakes to SE. Scatter of lithic debitage, artifacts and burnt bone. Second excavation uncovered unformed tools projectile points, microblade core fragment, hide scrapers, hammerstone and eight pieces of copper. Dated at approx. 1800 years before present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KbVo-2</td>
<td>N side of Ak. Hwy, km 1918.5, on top of ridge at edge of the highway cutbank overlooking Enger Lake. Initial test pits included obsidian flakes, basalt flakes and burned bone fragments. 1993 investigation included lithics and faunal material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KbVo-3</td>
<td>About 320 m east of KbVo-2 on n side of Ak. Hwy. Large burnt mammal bones collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KcVo-1</td>
<td>TaatSan Tôʊh / Raven’s Nest - Red Hill. On W side of Ak. Hwy, N of Beaver Creek, km 1983. Historic lookout site of the WRFN. Five lithic scatters identified; subsurface testing recovered material related to Late Prehistoric, Northern Archaic, and microblades possibly related with Workman’s Little Arm phase / NWMt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KcVo-2</td>
<td>Owl’s Skull Lookout - hunting lookout northwest of middle Snag Creek. Late Prehistoric and Northern Archaic occupations indicated by debitage above the White River Ash and microblades within the B2 below the ash. Associated AMS radiocarbon date of 1770 +/- 40 BP (2 Sigma Cal BP 1810 – 1570; Beta 245517). The presence of blade technology suggests an earlier occupation as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KcVo-3</td>
<td>TaatSan - Raven village - Traditional village site on the upper reach of Snag Creek near the international border, containing Historic, Late Prehistoric / Archaic components, based on limited testing in 2006. A similar stratigraphy with that of KdVo-6 suggests that earlier components may be present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KdVo-1</td>
<td>Along Little Scottie Creek trail, ca. 1 km east of Ak. Hwy, on E side of Sourdough Hill. Prehistoric scatter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KdVo-2</td>
<td>East side of Ak. Hwy, km 1949.3, approx. 150 m east of highway on the north shore of a small lake. Probably a prehistoric campsite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KdVo-3</td>
<td>S side of Ak. Hwy, km 1950 at an YTG rock quarrying location. Near Mirror Creek. Prehistoric scatter of tools and bones. Dated at 810 +/- 80 BP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KdVo-5</td>
<td>Nii-ii / [to] Look Away From – Sourdough village - Hunting Lookout associated with nearby traditional village site. Late Prehistoric and Northern Archaic occupations reported by Easton (2002a) and MacKay (2004); RC date 920 +/- 40 – 2 Sigma Cal BP 930 – 740; Beta 231793.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KdVo-6</td>
<td>Large multi-component site containing stratified components of the Historic, Later Prehistoric, Northern Archaic, Denali / NWMt, and Nenana complexes. Strata sequence ranges from several cc to c 2 m across the site. Basal cultural date RC 12020 +/- 70 on butchered Bison vertebrae – 2 Sigma Cal BP14050 – 13720 and multiple other dates; see this Report below for extended discussion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KdVo-7 | Small multi-component hunting lookout on the Mirror Creek plain 2 km to the south of KdVo-6. Side-notched points of the Northern Archaic and round-based lanceolate point within loess similar to the Nenana stratum at KdVo-6 (Easton, et al. 2004).

KdVo-8 | *Thee Tsaa K'eeet* / Rock Cache Place - a hunting lookout and cache on the southeast point of Starvation Mountain, overlooking lower Big Scottie Creek. Limited test units recovered obsidian point fragment characteristic of the Northern Archaic culture.

KdVo-9 | *Ta'y Ch'i'u* / Little Point of Hill Village - on the southwest edge of Starvation Mountain. Historic features include cabins, foundations, gravesites, and assorted late 19th and 20th century detritus. Burial site of *Gaundimkilion*, maternal grandmother of Bessie John.


KeVo-1 | *Naagat Káiy* / Fox Den village. Traditional village site on middle reach of Scottie Creek containing Historic, Late Prehistoric, Archaic (RC date of 2010 +/- 40 -2 Sigma Cal BP 2050 – 1880; Beta 173826), and possibly an earlier occupation within buried paleosols located in test pits 80 cm + below surface dated to RC 6210 +/- 70 – 2 Sigma Cal BP 7270 – 6900; Beta 173827 (Easton 2002b).

KeVo-2 | Contemporary trapline cabin of Mr. Joseph Tommy Johnny and traditional campsite of his great-grandfather, *Tsay Suul*. Early Historic remains include musket balls and beads, and undiagnostic, presumably Late Prehistoric flakes and debitage (Easton 2002b).

KeVo-3 | *Ta’ ah* - Historic hunting lookout containing modified flakes, hammerstone, and flake core (Easton 2002b); associated AMS radiocarbon date of 2220 +/- 50 BP (2 Sigma Cal BP 2340 – 2120; Beta 245514).

KeVo-4 | Historic hunting lookout containing microblades and flakes (Easton 2002b).

KeVo-5 | *Rupe Sha’* / Rupe’s Cabin - location of William (Bill) Rupe’s cabin and trade post on upper Big Scottie Creek, on the west side of Paper Lake. The cabin remains can be seen from the air.

KeVo-6 | *Kelt’andun Mann*’ - Paper or Pepper Lake Village - large village on the east side of the lake by the same name; occupied into the middle of the 20th century. Untested for prehistoric remains.

Table data adapted, with modification and additions from additional fieldwork by Easton, from Dobrowolsky (1997).

Having set the larger archaeological context of the region, we now turn to a detailed discussion of our work at the Little John site in 2014.
2014 INVESTIGATIONS AT THE LITTLE JOHN SITE (KdVo-6)

Figure 25. General Location of the Little John Site, Yukon Territory, Canada

LOCATION OF THE LITTLE JOHN SITE

The Little John site is located just off the Alaska Highway, twelve kilometers north of the village of Beaver Creek, Yukon, about two kilometers due East from the international border with Alaska. It occupies most of the higher surface of a knoll overlooking the upper reach of Mirror Creek, known as Cheejil Niik / Grayling Creek / in the local Upper Tanana Athapaskan language. It overlooks the basin of the creek below from the north and lies within the most western extension of the Tanana River drainage; Snag Creek crosses the valley about seven kilometers east of the site, marking the watershed division between the Tanana and Yukon River drainage basins.
Figure 26. Aerial view of the Little John Site from the South. KdVo-6 on left, KdVo-7 on right. Mirror Creek can be seen in the foreground, the Alaska Highway running across the centre, and Little Scottie Creek valley behind.

Figure 27. Aerial view of the Little John site from the West.
HISTORY AND METHODS OF INVESTIGATIONS AT THE LITTLE JOHN SITE

Although the Little John site lies within the Alaska Highway corridor its archaeological deposits were not discovered until 2002, during regional survey efforts associated with Easton’s long term Scottie Creek Culture History Project. In that year, plans to work further up the Scottie Creek valley were delayed and several test pits were dug at the location on the recommendation of Upper Tanana Elder Joseph Tommy Johnny. The results of these tests indicated mid-holocene (Northern Archaic) to historic occupation of the site. In 2003, an additional 61 test pits were dug across the hillside and 22 m$^2$ of the site were excavated by natural levels by the Yukon College Field School in Subarctic Archaeology and Ethnography. Thirteen of these units were in the West lobe, four in the Rockfall lobe, one in the East lobe, and the remainder scattered along the periphery of the site. These efforts recovered Chindadin complex artifacts from the West lobe, underlying

---

8 Directed by Easton, crew members consisted of Glen MacKay, Ken Hermanson, Duncan Armitage, and Joseph Tommy Johnny.
9 Directed by Easton, crew members consisted of Glen MacKay, Ken Hermanson, Christopher Baker, Jolene Johnny, Terrance Sam, Peter Schnurr, Nicole Schiffart, Michael Nieman, Mellissa Winters, Eldred Johnny, and Vance Hutchinson.
a microblade bearing horizon, identified the presence of a paleosol containing fauna and artifacts in the East lobe, expanded the assemblage related to the mid-Holocene Northern Archaic, and identified a military presence on the site, likely during the building of the Alaska highway.

Figure 5 (above) show the location of excavation units on the site through 2014. Easton (2007a:14-18) provides details on test and excavation units prior to 2007. In 2004, nine m² were excavated contiguous to the first unit in the East lobe, while an additional six m² were excavated in the West lobe; a five meter trench was also begun in the Permafrost lobe of the site. In 2006, with support of the White River First Nation and the Tanana Chief’s Conference, 14 m² were excavated in the East lobe. In 2007, in collaboration with Dr. David Yesner and the Department of Anthropology of the University of Alaska-Anchorage forty-nine m² units were exposed; twenty-two of these remained to be fully excavated.

In 2008, again in collaboration with Yesner and the UA-Anchorage field school, nine of these units were completed to basal regolith and all were profiled and twenty-seven new units were excavated, including eight new 1 m units completed in the SW site quadrant, fourteen new 1 m units excavated to the Loess below Paleosol stratum in the NW site quadrant, and five new 1 m units completed in the NE and SE site quadrants. Due to the age and nature of the Loess below Paleosol stratum it was decided to stop excavation of the majority of units at this level in order to undertake wide area excavation in 2009. Finally, in 2008 an eight-meter trench was mechanically exposed in the Swale

---

10 Directed by Easton, crew members consisted of Glen MacKay, Arthur McMaster, Paul Nadasdy, Eldred Johnny, and Joseph Graham.
11 Directed by Easton, crew members consisted of Patricia Young, Camille Sanford, Glen MacKay, Eldred Johnny, Derrick Peters, David Johnny jr., Nicolas Sam, Peter Schnurr, Kathy Lowe, and Patrick Johnny.
12 Directed by Easton and David Yesner, participants included Patricia Young and Camille Sanford of Tetlin Village, Nicolas Sam of Northway, Jordan Vandermeer, Eldred Johnny, and Derrick Peters of White River First Nation, Arthur McMaster of Yukon College, Joseph Easton, and members of the University of Alaska Anchorage - Yukon College Field School in Archaeology: Dan Stone, Lorraine Alfen, Kris Crossen, Kay Toye, Katie Herrera, Jessica Jayne, Susan Savage, Kenzie Olman, Douglas Blevins, Jessie Petersen, Nicki Dwyer, Adriana Campany, Dio Glentis, Merideth Wismer, Adam Bathe, Sam Hutchinson, and Rita Eagle.
13 Directed by Easton and Yesner, crew members consisted of Patrick Daley, Christopher Baker, Polly Hyslop and Nicolas Sam of Northway Village, AK, Camille Sanford of Tetlin Village, AK, Eldred Johnny and Jordan Vandermeer of White River First Nation, Yukon, Vance Hutchinson, Katie Herrera, and Amanda Janssens, Joseph Easton and Gary Pflugradt, and members of the University of Alaska Anchorage - Yukon College Field School in Archaeology: Élith Lucas, Dan Stone, Lorraine Alfen, Mary Gladkowski, Brooke Nall, Joel Lennen, Brian Geyer, Caitlin Hanson, and Owen Marcotte.
lobe in the far NW of the site that exposed a buried two deeply buried Paleosols dating to the Wisconsin Interstadial, c. 44,000 years old (Easton et al. 2009). The exposed strata were profiled and column sampled for further detailed analysis (sediment, pollen, etc.) at a later date when resources permit; it is expected they will be included in Michael Grooms’ geoarchaeological analysis of the site currently in progress (Easton 2009a).

In 2009 sixteen units were excavated. Seven of these were in the West Lobe, two at the apex of the hill near the cabin, and seven in the East Lobe (Easton 2009b, 2010).\(^{14}\)

In 2010 thirty-two units were either fully or partially excavated. Fifteen of these were in the West Lobe, eight at the apex of the hill near the cabin, and nine in the East Lobe. Most of the East Lobe units were excavated to the loess deposits just below the main paleosol complex with a view towards undertaking an area excavation of these loess sediments in 2011 (Easton 2011).\(^{15}\)

In 2011 eight new one meter units were excavated on the West Lobe, as well as four on the hilltop to the east of the cabin. We continued excavation of thirteen units initiated previously in 2009 and 2010 in the East Lobe Pleistocene sediments. We also dug a series of 25 cm square tests in the Northwestern quadrant of the site that were profiled and sampled in support of Michael Grooms continued geomorphological studies of the site (Easton 2012a, 2012c, 2012d).\(^{16}\)

In 2012 twenty-three one meter units were worked: eight on the West Lobe, nine on the hilltop in the vicinity of the cabin, and six in the East Lobe; fourteen of these were

---

\(^{14}\) Directed by Easton, crew members consisted of Camille Sanford (Tetlin Village and University of Alaska Anchorage), Katie Hannigan Toye (Arizona), Emily Youatt (Reed College), Jessica Pepe (Tulane University), Ian MacDonald (Yukon College and Champagne Aishihik First Nation), Phillip Sabelli (Boston), Annalisa Heppner (U of Tennessee), Karen and Bob Rogers (Washington State), Joseph Easton (Burnaby, B.C.), Keith Jacob (Australia), Chelsea Johnny, Eddie Johnny, and Trudy Brown (Beaver Creek, Yukon), Margo MacKay, Kat Cronk, and Kate Menzel (Anchorage), Jim Guy (Victoria), Kate Crosmer (Lycoming College), and Dr. David Yesner and Danny Yesner.


\(^{16}\) Directed by Easton, crewmembers in 2011 included Julie Thomas, Katie Fittingoff, Ally Zeiger, Jordan Handley, Tia Marie Ray, Sarah Rickett, Pawel Wojtowicz, Michael Grooms, Nicolena Virga, Mark Young, Joseph Easton, Hillary Wong, Margo acKay, Nick Jarmain, Peter and Lucy Schnurr, Chelsea Johnny, Trudy Brown, Eldred Johnny, Eddie Johnny, Tamika Johnny, and David Yesner.
new units, while the remainder completed unexcavated sediments from previous seasons (Easton 2014a).¹⁷

In 2013, twenty-eight square meters were investigated: six on the West Lobe, eight on the hilltop in the vicinity of the cabin, and fourteen in the upper East Lobe. Twenty-three of these were new units, while the remainder continued excavations begun in previous seasons. Nineteen of the Units were excavated to basal non-cultural deposits and backfilled; nine of the units were excavated to or through the culture bearing paleosol complex levels and would be investigated further in 2014 (Easton 2014).¹⁸

In 2014, fourteen square meters were investigated: four meters in four units on the West Lobe, one meter in four units on the hilltop (Apex Lobe) in the vicinity of the cabin, and nine meters in eleven units in the East Lobe; fifteen of these were new units, while four continued excavations in Units begun in previous seasons.

All excavation units were excavated by trowel within unit quadrants by the natural layers identified in the site stratigraphy. Completed excavation units had at least one side profiled; many excavation units had two or more profiled (see Table in Summary above). Recovered artifacts and fauna were recorded by three-dimensional provenience to the surface datum of the unit, unless they were recovered in the excavation screen, in which case their provenience was recorded by natural level and unit quadrant. Unit Datums in turn were tied into the principal site Datum to facilitate a comprehensive site map of recovered finds. The Digital Appendices provide comprehensive catalogues of recovered artifacts and fauna, while this report provides a summary of their metrics, context, and description of selected samples. Photographs of representative strata, features, and artifacts in situ were regularly taken. A representative selection of these photographs is presented in this report and digital copies in large and

¹⁷ Directed by Easton, crewmembers in 2012 consisted of Kendra Vaughn, Alina Aquino, Geoffrey Homel, Keith Saunders, Rachelle Mathews, Michael Grooms, Nicolina Virga, Jordan Handley, Laurianne Bourgenon, Mark Young, Anne Marie Lapointe, Dianna Marion, White River First Nation Youth: Chelsea Johnny, Eldred Johnny, Eddie Johnny, Tamika Johnny, and cultural experts David and Ruth Johnny, Youth participants from the Northern Cultural Expressions Society led by Naomi Crey, and Dr. David Yesner.

¹⁸ Directed by Easton, crewmembers in 2013 consisted of Katherine Brown, Lisa Chatwin, Colin Christiansen, Sarah Elsworth, Thomas Gregston, Jonathan Lee, Jamie Pope, Kalista Sherbanuk, Josh Varkel, Pawel Wojtowich, Amanda Wong, Michael Grooms, Nicolina Virga Berry, Laurianne Bourgeon, Brittany Tuffs, Timothy Allen, Daniel Frim, Chelsea Johnny, DellaSas Sam, Eddie Johnny, Tamika Johnny, David Yesner, members of the Yukon Junior Rangers led by Norm Beebe, and participants of Northern Cultural Expressions Society summer culture program led by Naomi Crey.
small formats of all photos are provided in the Digital Appendix. Finally, representative sediment samples and potential radiocarbon samples were collected on a regular basis and archived for future analysis when resources permit; they are summarized in a set of Tables above.

Subsequent to field recovery, artifacts and faunal remains have been curated at the Faculty of Liberal Arts at Yukon College and catalogued by unique site numbers, along with recovery provenience and additional descriptive characteristics. Formed artifacts and modified flakes and other material have received metric and character (form, raw material, flake or modification location, among others) descriptions, using the categories established by the Yukon Heritage Branch artifact database forms which use the FileMaker computer program. All artifacts have been photographed and major formed artifacts are being drawn. Unmodified flakes and manuports have also been described more basically; smaller, unmodified flakes and fire altered rocks are often described by lot, for example. The Digital Appendices provide a full listing of these derived data, while summaries are provided in the artifact class descriptions below.

In addition to basic cataloguing, faunal material has been identified to genus and species to the extent possible through comparison with known skeletal remains held by a variety of sources, including Dr. David Yesner of the Department of Anthropology, University of Alaska - Anchorage, the Yukon Heritage Branch, standard published skeletal guides, and consultations with colleagues. Dr. Vance Hutchinson, a biological anthropologist in Whitehorse, has also undertaken microscopic examination of the faunal material with a view identifying cutmarks or other signs of cultural modification. Laurianne Bougeon carried out her own analysis of about 90% of the fauna collection in 2012, 2013, and 2014; her initial analysis was included in our 2013 Report Appendix and is integrated into our discussion of Fauna below. A Digital Appendix and Print Appendix provide a photographic catalogue of collected fauna in 2014; a major analytical paper on the entire faunal collection is in preparation.

Detailed distributional analysis of several representative units has been undertaken, while more limited distributional analysis of recovered artifacts has been

---

19 Over the years these colleagues have included Vance Hutchinson, David Yesner, Scott Gilbert, David Mossop, Greg Hare, Susan Crockford, Paul Mateus, Grant Zazula, and Lauriane Bourgeon.
undertaken across the site, based on recovered level, raw material, and artifact type. A first draft of an ARCVIEW GIS representation of the artifact and faunal distribution at the Little John site was begun in 2010 and is continuing under Michael Grooms and Easton. A detailed analysis of Obsidian Sources in the Little John collection through 2006 was undertaken by Natalia Slobodin and Jeff Speakman and presented in our 2007 report (Easton 2007a); additional analysis of subsequently collected obsidian has been undertaken by Jeff Rasic and will be summarized in an upcoming publication. The general trends identified in our 2007 report are sustained, i.e. 90% plus of obsidian at Little John are derived from the Wiki Peak source.


Jordan Handley completed her Undergraduate Honours Thesis at the Department of Archaeology at Simon Fraser University in 2013 examining pXRF characteristics of non-vitreous artifacts from Little John under the supervision of Dr. Rudy Reimer Yumks (Handley 2013). Ms. Handley has recently been accepted to the Master’s program at the University of British Columbia under the direction of Dr. David Pokotylo, an established scholar in lithic technology and analysis, with whom she will be developing an analytical thesis aimed at engendering the Little John site and collection. Michael Grooms has recently advanced to candidacy in the Doctoral program at the Department of Anthropology at the University of New Mexico under the supervision of Dr. E. James.
Dixon and continues analysis and research related to the geo-archaeological context of the Little John site. Lauriane Bourgeon of the Doctoral program at the University of Montreal continues to develop her dissertation focusing on the Blue Fish Caves fauna under the direction of Dr. Adrian Burke; following Dr. Burke’s suggestion and our enthusiastic support, Ms. Bourgeon has examined about 90% of the Little John fauna to provide her with a known culturally derived comparative collection.

Archaeological publications generated as a result of ongoing analyses include the journal *Current Research in the Pleistocene* (Easton, et al. 2007b, Easton et al. 2009), an invited contribution to a volume on projectile point sequences in the North American northwest edited by Roy Carlson and Martin Magne (Easton and MacKay 2008), and a new volume on lithic industries of Beringia edited by Ted Goebels and Ian Buvit (Easton, et al. 2011, Yesner et al. 2011). Several new papers for publication are anticipated in 2015.

Ethnographic publications arising from research on the borderland include an ethno-historical account of the government survey of the Yukon - Alaska border (Easton 2007b), an essay documenting contemporary hunter-gatherer values embedded in the *Dineh* Way (Easton 2007c), a multi-disciplinary study of the contemporary subsistence fishery in the Upper Tanana River Watershed (Friend, et al. 2007; Friend, Holton, and Easton 2007), and an examination of contemporary conflicts between *Dineh* and Game Management views of animals (Easton 2008a). Based on her fieldwork participation in 2009 and subsequent field interviews in January 2010, Emily Youatt and Easton presented a paper on contemporary Borderland *Dineh* Identity at the 2010 meetings of the Alaska Anthropology Association (Youatt and Easton 2010). Ms. Youatt also completed and successfully defended her Undergraduate Honours Thesis on the topic at Reed College, Oregon in May of 2011 (Youatt 2011). A large format public interpretation poster was prepared by Easton for the White River First Nation and the Beaver Creek Visitors Center in 2008 (Easton 2008c); additional interpretive posters are on display at Yukon College and the University of New Mexico.

The significance of the Little John site is now firmly entrenched within Beringian archaeology. A description of the site is included in the recent summaries and discussions of Beringian prehistory (Dixon 2013, Potter et al. 2013, Ives et al. 2013, Hoeffecker and
Collaborative field schools were held with the University of Alaska Anchorage and Yukon College in 2007 and 2008, and Dr. David Yesner of that institution has continued to collaborate with us in the excavation, analysis, and interpretation of the site.

Financial and In-Kind support of continued fieldwork and analysis of our Yukon Alaska borderlands research in 2014 was received from the White River First Nation, the School of Liberal Arts, Yukon College, and myself.

Research plans for 2015 include continued limited excavations at the Little John site and additional archaeological survey in the region as opportunity allows. Since we will not delivering an Undergraduate training program in 2015 we intend to concentrate our efforts on ensuring graduate student participants will obtain the data sets they require in order to complete their individual theses and contribute to a series of jointly authored scholarly publications. Funding is being sought by Easton and Joel Cubley and Mary Samolczyk of Yukon College’s Geological Technology program to collect electrical resistivity and sediment cores across the site to build a 3D model of the geological structure of the site. Easton is also collaborating with Dr. Julie Esdale of US Army Group – Fort Wainwright, the Tanana Chiefs Conference, and Native Village Councils of Tanacross and Tetlin in a week-long archaeological survey and public interpretation of the Tok Overlook site, as well as continuing to work with Bob Sattler of the Tanana Chiefs Conference and Native Village Council of Northway on exploration of the archaeology of Village lands around Deadman Lake.
GENERAL STRATIGRAPHY AT THE LITTLE JOHN SITE

In general terms the geological stratigraphy of the site consists of a basal regolith comprised of a volcanic dyke (Reger, pers. com 2009), overlaid with sparse glacial till representing a glacial maximum known locally as the Mirror Creek glacial advance, variously dated to the Late Illinoian - MIS 6, c. 140000 BP (Bostock, 1965; Krinsley, 1965) or the Early Wisconsin – MIS 4, c. 70000 BP (Denton 1974; Hughes et al., 1989). Above this are found loess sediments laid down during the post-glacial, principally during the Younger Dryas Climatic Event, circa 12.8 and 11.5 thousand years ago (Reger pers. com. 2009). These deposits vary in thickness from a few centimeters to a meter or more. Above this loess deposit are ten to twenty centimeters of Brunisols typical of the boreal forest in the region. In some areas this B horizon is intersected by a volcanic ash layer of up to several centimeters which radio-carbon dates suggest is a tephra deposit of the second White River volcanic eruption, c. 1200 BP (West and Donaldson 2002; Lerbekmo and Westgate, 1975). A thin (1 – 2 cm) O/A horizon caps the sequence.
The discontinuous depth of these strata is accounted for by the undulating topography of the site, which ranges from deep basins to eroding hillsides. Electrical resistivity measurements taken in the fall of 2013 by Dr. Joel Cubley and Mary Samolczyk of Yukon College indicate that the “Swale Lobe” may be capped by as much as 50 or 60 feet of sediment above bedrock. Discontinuous permafrost is also indicated in the three lines measured in 2013. We plan to collect additional data in 2015 in order to develop a more accurate 3-dimensional representation of sedimentary structures across the site. The stratigraphy is also complicated by the action of both ancient and contemporary permafrost, solifluction, and what seems to be a mass wasting event (probably a series of colluvial deposits originating from the higher ground to the North).
over a portion of the site (Reger pers. com. 2009). Because of this differentiation in depth and nature of strata we have divided the site into five zones or lobes (see Figure below).

The West Lobe, where the strata are most shallow, occupies the southwestern hillside on which deposits range from five to thirty centimeters. The Permafrost Lobe, where frozen ground is encountered mere centimeters from the surface, occupies the north-facing slope of the knoll. The Apex lobe consists of shallow (< 2cm) deposits at the highest point of the site with accumulating deposits to the north; large boulders and cobbles (which we have called the “rockfall lobe” in previous reports), representing frost cracked basal regolith, lie through the brunisol and loess deposits in this area. The East Lobe is a large basin that troughs east-west across the site, and contains the deep sedimentary deposits of one hundred centimeters and more and series of paleosol strata near the bottom of the sequence. Capped by forty to sixty centimeters of loess below the B horizon, this paleosol complex contains a well preserved, culturally deposited faunal
assemblage, in direct association with lithic artifacts. Test excavations in 2007 revealed that the basal bedrock dips sharply North of the East lobe into what I now designate as the Swale lobe; Unit N31W11 was excavated to a depth of nearly 5 meters through loess before it was abandoned due to safety concerns.

In 2008 a mechanical excavator run by Walter Dyke of Beaver Creek exposed a trench through this area, revealing massive loess deposition above organic paleosols subsequently dated to between 42,000 and greater than 46,000 years old, representing a depositional episode during the last Wisconsin Interstadial or perhaps earlier (Easton et al. 2008).

Figure 32. The Road Trench from the South and Detail of Wisconsin Interstadial Paleosol complex at the North end of the Road Trench

Figure 33. Detail of Wisconsin Interstadial paleosol below massive loess, north end of Road Trench.
Excavations in 2009 in the East Lobe revealed an apparent trend for greater separation of the paleosol complex into increasingly distinct strata as we exposed Units to the North and West of our previous excavations, a trend that has continued in our excavations since. This is well illustrated in the exposure of the West Wall of Unit N17W11, shown below. Previous AMS dates on bones within these strata have provided a series of dates between 10 to 12 thousand calendar years. A date on charcoal in contact with a Bison bone modified for use as a beamer or scraper returned a calibrated calendar date of 11,390 – 11,230 Cal BP at the 2 sigma level.

![Image](image.png)

Figure 34. Unit N17W11 SW showing separation of Paleosol Complex strata; associated Calendar date on carbon from beneath the bone = 11,390 – 11,230 at 2 sigma.

Similar to our work in 2008 and 2009, as we moved further North in our East Lobe area excavation in 2010 we encountered increasing macro-organic detritus in the lower Paleosol and Loess below Paleosol strata, characterized by wood flakes, fleks, and
slivers and chunks of carbonized wood. An example of this is seen in Unit N18W11, illustrated below. We suspect, although cannot demonstrate, this higher macro organic content is a function of the level’s proximity to the permafrost. In any event, samples of materials encountered were taken as potential AMS dating and identification of wood species when resources allowed.

Figure 35. Wood Fragments in N18 W11. L: SW Corner of Unit. R: Detail of Wood Fragments.

Figure 36. Wood feature, Unit N18W13, 92 cm Below Unit Datum, c. 12,840 Calendar Years.

Excavations in 2011 in the Eastern Lobe continued through lower paleosol complex levels and into the Loess below Paleosol stratum to a variety of depths in the 11 square meter area excavation we had been working down over the previous two field seasons. Within this Loess below Paleosol stratum we have identified at least two further paleosol strata of mercurial integrity tentatively labeled P5 and P6. In addition the P5 stratum holds a patchwork of additional decaying wood features, one of which was AMS radiocarbon dated to 10,840 +/- 50 which has a single intercept on the calibration curve at
12,840, with a 2 sigma probability between 12880 – 12810 Cal BP; significantly this date turns out to be very close to a date on a wapiti inominate from the same level in Unit N13 W02 (UCI-88769: RC age = 10,960 +/- 30 / Cal BP 12,905 – 11,715 at 2 sigma).

Excavations in 2012-2014 continued to expose paleosol strata containing organic wood remains, culturally modified bone, principally bison, concentrations of unmodified cobbles and pebbles that are being interpreted as cultural features distinct from clearly colluvially deposited sediments from the hillside north of the site, and a small but indisputable assemblage of culturally modified flakes, hammerstones, and formed tools. These features and remains are more fully described our 2012 permit report and below.

Figure 37. Feature 11-12, Bison Bone and Edge Modified Flake in situ, KdVo6 N18W13 SE, Bottom of Paleosol Complex – AMS Date on associated wood, 9560-9477 Cal BP (Beta 223239)

In the fall of 2013 Joel Cubley and Mary Samolczyk of Yukon College collected Electrical Resistivity measurements in order to determine the depth and nature of sedimentation over the basal bedrock of the knoll on which the site lies and pXRF data from the site in order to see if it is possible to recognize unique sedimentological signatures that may facilitate the linking of strata across the site. The latter will be combined with the work of Michael Grooms, who is examining the stratigraphy and chronology at the Little John site, Yukon Territory, in order to interpret depositional and environmental differences between the Late Pleistocene Chindadn (non-microblade) and
Denali (microblade) complexes, combined with sediment micromorphology, and OSL and AMS radiocarbon dating methods.

Figure 38. Measuring Electrical Resistivity and pXRF of KdVo-6 Sediments.

Initial electrical resistivity measurements along three transects have suggested that the East – Swale Lobe sections of the site may hold as much as 20 meters of sediment above the basal bedrock, intersected with two major permafrost facies; additional transects are planned to increase the resolution of this model. Dip and strike measurements and gross mineralogy confirms Dick Reger’s earlier field observation that the bedrock of the Little John site is a lithological contact feature distinct from the exposed bedrock to the north of the site across the Alaska highway. Additional analysis of this basal morphology and exploration of the overlying sedimentary structures will be undertaken through 2014-15. Exploration of the non-cultural Pleistocene deposits of the site will increase our understanding of the Quaternary history of the Mirror, Snag, and Beaver Creek basins, a poorly understood sedimentary basin which has been subject to only reconnaissance investigation by Rampton in the 1970s.
## RADIOCARBON DATES AT KDVO-6


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lab #</th>
<th>RCBP</th>
<th>Var</th>
<th>2σ CALBP</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>DBS CM</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Comments / Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beta 387618 KdVo6 N15W1 8-045</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1815-1615</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>N15 W01</td>
<td>c. 8</td>
<td>Charred material</td>
<td>Large B2 hearth feature and artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta 387614 KdVo6 Fa07-045</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8035-7960</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N18 W07</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Bone, swan</td>
<td>Fa08-045 long bone fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOC 0642 KdVo6 S11-16</td>
<td>8972</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10231-9923 2 intercepts</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>N19 W11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>wood sample 2011-16; bottom of PC Hearth Feature 2011-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta 387616 KdVo6 Fa10-019</td>
<td>9370</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10680-10515</td>
<td>PC3-P4</td>
<td>N16 W12</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>Bone, bison</td>
<td>Fa10-019 long bone fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOC 0645 KdVo6 Fa14-01/02</td>
<td>8974</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11083-10562 2 intercepts</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Bone, wapiti</td>
<td>Fa14-03-04-01/02, Wapiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOC 0644 KdVo6 Fa10-21</td>
<td>9502</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11085-10587 2 intercepts</td>
<td>Loess at base of PC</td>
<td>N16 W12</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Bone, caribou</td>
<td>Fa10-21 tibia fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta 406635 KdVo6 C14S 2014-01</td>
<td>9780</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11240-11185</td>
<td>Loess at base of PC3-P4</td>
<td>N17 W13</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Charred material</td>
<td>Artifact #s 4375 - 4380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOC 0643 KdVo6 Fa06-133</td>
<td>10831</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12793-12679</td>
<td>LbPC</td>
<td>N17 W04</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Bone, caribou</td>
<td>Fa06-133 innominate with acetabulum, ischilium, mature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta 387613 KdVo6 Fa07-017</td>
<td>11140</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13080-12970</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>N17 W07</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Bone, caribou astragulus</td>
<td>Fa07-017 astragulus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta 387617 KdVo6 Fa10-137</td>
<td>12400</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14715-14210</td>
<td>LbPC3-P4</td>
<td>N16 W12</td>
<td>105-115</td>
<td>Bone, bison</td>
<td>Fa10-137 phalanx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Dates from the Little John Site (2014-2015)

With generous support from the recently established Yukon College Research Fund, ten new radio-carbon dates were obtained over the past year that have contributed to the further refinement of the chronology of human occupation at the Little John site. The new dates range from 1,780 to 12,400 radiocarbon years (c. 1715 – 14,500 calibrated years before present). The new dates are summarized in the table above and their formal associated reports presented in the Print and Digital Appendices. Of the ten new dates,
one is Late Holocene in age (1815-1615 cal. bp), two are Early Holocene in age (ranging from 7960 to 10231 calibrated years before present), four are post-Younger Dryas Late Pleistocene in age (ranging from 10515 to 11185 calibrated years before present), one is Younger Dryas Late Pleistocene in age (12793 – 12679 cal. bp), and one is Older Dryas Late Pleistocene in age (14715 – 14210).

The entire suite of acceptable dates at the site now consists of 33 AMS measured dates ranging from the most recent past to the Wisconsin Interstadal (MIS 3) c. 42-44,000 years ago. The earliest date on a bison bone from within the Loess below the main Paleosol Complex at the site is dated the Older Dryas at c. 14,460 calibrated years before present, joining another date on bison from this stratum of c. 13,900 calibrated years before present at the onset of the Late Pleistocene Allerød Interstadal.

Placing the New Dates in Context
The Table below shows the 36 dates we have accumulated to date on material from the Little John site, along with nine other dates from nearby sites in Canada; for clarity the regional sites are highlighted in Blue font. The table also includes major climatic periods relevant to the dates.

Three of these dates we have rejected for a variety of reasons, and three are non-cultural dates of Wisconsin and Wisconsin Interstadal in age.

Of the rejected dates, one (Beta 1814885) is clearly of wood killed in the past 50 years. Another (Beta 245516) was on charred material from below what we have been interpreting as the White River tephra and too young to belong below the tephra – the
date of 100 +/- 40 radio-carbon years also has five intercepts on the calibration curve ranging from 240 to 0 calendar years before present.\(^{20}\) The third (Beta 245515) is similarly problematic. Retrieved from very shallow deposits on the southeast corner of the overlook in the southwest portion of the site, the sample returned a radio-carbon date of 250 +/- 40 years and four intercepts on the calibration curve ranging between 430 and 0 years before present and is impossible to relate with any confidence to the cultural materials from this level, which quite likely consist of mixed components.

Of the of the non-cultural Wisconsin dates we note that a fragment of ivory from a scatter of this material found eroding from the hillside across the highway from the Little John site produced a date of 38160 +/- 310 RCYBP (Beta 231794); we presume it is from *Mammuthus*. Combined with the recovery of additional Pleistocene fauna in the area representing specimens of *Bison, Equus, Mammuthus, Rangifer*, and possibly *Saiga*, including an *Equus lambei* specimen, recovered about two km from the site, which has been radiocarbon dated to 20660 +/- 100 RCYBP (Beta 70102; MacIntosh 1997:84), these fauna confirm that the area about the Little John site was supporting a range of mega-fauna during the mid to late Wisconsin glacial period from at least 38,000 years ago. Two Wisconsin Interglacial dates have also been obtained on two buried peats at **KdVo**-6 at c. 2.6 and 2.8 meters below surface in Unit N39 W09 of 42,000 and greater than 46,000 years radio-carbon years old, representing a depositional episode during the last Wisconsin Interglacial and perhaps earlier (Easton 2009a: 51-58; Easton et al. 2008). Subsequently, it is clear that this region holds considerable potential for the recovery of additional paleontological remains related to the Beringian prehistory of the Yukon.

Thus there are now thirty dates we consider applicable to the cultural occupation of the site, supporting human occupation of the site from the recent past to the terminal Pleistocene. A separate manuscript exploring the implications of these dates to our interpretation of the Little John site and relating them to other dates in the borderlands region and middle Tanana Valley is in development. The structure of this manuscript can be found in my discussions on radio-carbon dates in my permit report for 2013 and will not be repeated here.

\(^{20}\) Work is currently underway to examine thin-sections of the Little John tephra in an attempt to determine whether it represents the first or second ash-fall.
### Table 10. Radio Carbon Dates for Yukon Borderlands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lab #</th>
<th>RCBP</th>
<th>2 S CALBP</th>
<th>Intercept BP</th>
<th>1 S CALBP</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>DBS CM</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Comments / Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beta 181485</td>
<td>130.44 +/- 0.86 pMC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B2 - L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Rejected - Radiometric Result indicates material was living post 1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KdVo-6 2003-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KdVo-6 07-05</td>
<td>100 +/- 40</td>
<td>280 - 180 and 150 - 10, 0 - 0</td>
<td>240, 240, 60, 40, 0</td>
<td>260 - 220 and 140 - 20 and 0</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>S16W18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Charred material</td>
<td>AMS Rejected due to location below Ash - burned root?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KdVo-6 07-04</td>
<td>250 +/- 40</td>
<td>430 - 370 and 320 - 270, 180 - 150 and 10 – 0</td>
<td>436 – 350 [0.248423] &amp; 333 – 267 [0.447658] &amp; 215 – 145 [0.248423] &amp; 17 – 1 [0.045231]</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>S19W9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Charred material</td>
<td>AMS / Rejected - small foliate and basally thinned bifaces (Art #s 1345, 1386, 1485-86); note shallow deposit on deflationary surface and multiple intercepts include BP 1 - 17, may NOT date artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KdVo-3 Rock Quarry</td>
<td>810 +/- 80</td>
<td>732 – 694</td>
<td>729 - 704</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>associated with tools, bone, and flakes at km 1950 AH (Walde 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KdVo-5Snii-ii S70-01</td>
<td>920 +/- 40</td>
<td>930 – 740</td>
<td>920 - 780</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Unit B</td>
<td>c. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charred material</td>
<td>AMS from charcoal, anomalous with WRA above – root burn?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KdVo-6 2003-11</td>
<td>1740 +/- 40</td>
<td>1725 – 1545</td>
<td>1685, 1660, 1625</td>
<td>1705 – 1585</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>S10W17</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>Charred material</td>
<td>AMS – below ash date 2nd (c. 1200 BP) WR tephra on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owl’s Skull</td>
<td>1770 +/- 40</td>
<td>1810 – 1570</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Test Unit N2</td>
<td>17 - 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charred Material</td>
<td>AMS / blade core / biface (wedge?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KdVo-6 N15W1B2</td>
<td>1780 +/- 30</td>
<td>1815 – 1615 [1.0]</td>
<td>1780-200,</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>N15W1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charred Material</td>
<td>Large B2 hearth feature and artifacts (e.g. KdVo6:3706 Spokeshave /Graver)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 600 – 150 Little Ice Age Cooler

#### Second (East Lobe) White River Ash Fall – circa 1,250 years ago

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lab #</th>
<th>RCBP</th>
<th>2 S CALBP</th>
<th>Intercept BP</th>
<th>1 S CALBP</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>DBS CM</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Comments / Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beta 182799</td>
<td>1740 +/- 40</td>
<td>1725 – 1545</td>
<td>1685, 1660, 1625</td>
<td>1705 – 1585</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>S10W17</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>Charred material</td>
<td>AMS – below ash date 2nd (c. 1200 BP) WR tephra on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KdVo-6 2003-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KdVo-2 07-10</td>
<td>1770 +/- 40</td>
<td>1810 – 1570</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Test Unit N2</td>
<td>17 - 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charred Material</td>
<td>AMS / blade core / biface (wedge?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owl’s Skull</td>
<td>1780 +/- 30</td>
<td>1815 – 1615 [1.0]</td>
<td>1780-200,</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>N15W1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charred Material</td>
<td>Large B2 hearth feature and artifacts (e.g. KdVo6:3706 Spokeshave /Graver)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1,450 – 1,200 Medieval Neoglacial

#### First (North Lobe) White River Ash Fall - circa 1900 years ago

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lab #</th>
<th>RCBP</th>
<th>2 S CALBP</th>
<th>Intercept BP</th>
<th>1 S CALBP</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>DBS CM</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Comments / Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beta 245518</td>
<td>1950 +/- 40</td>
<td>1990 – 1820</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>N9W8</td>
<td>40 - 45</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charred material</td>
<td>AMS associated with medial biface fragment (Art # 2112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KdVo-6 07-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta 173826</td>
<td>2010 +/- 40</td>
<td>2050 – 1880</td>
<td>2010-200,</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>S7W20</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charred material</td>
<td>Standard date / basally thinned point and assoc. tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KeVo-1 Fox Den</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta 355049</td>
<td>KdVo-6 12-06</td>
<td>2169 +/-30</td>
<td>2300 - 2240 and 2180 - 2110 and 2080 – 2060</td>
<td>2308 – 2219 [0.501639] &amp; 2212 – 2105 [0.46917] &amp; 2083 – 2065 [0.029192]</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>2300 - 2270 and 2160 - 2120</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>N17 W16</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta 245514</td>
<td>KeVo-3-01 Ta‘ah Naakeeeg</td>
<td>2220 +/-50</td>
<td>2340 – 2120</td>
<td>2342 – 2124 [1.0]</td>
<td>2300, 2240 and 2180</td>
<td>2330 - 2150</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>TPG-6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta 75867</td>
<td>KaVn-2</td>
<td>4740 +/-60</td>
<td>5592 - 5322</td>
<td>5589 – 5439 [0.664269] &amp; 5419 – 5322</td>
<td>5582 - 5504</td>
<td>CZ 2 B2 Top</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>Top bracket date on CZ 2 B2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**8,500 – 8000** Younger Younger Dryas Cooler Mesoglacial - Glacial advances

| Beta 387614 | KdVo-6 Fa08-045 | 7200 +/-30 | 8035 -7960 [1.0] | | P | N18 W07 | 97 | Bone collagen, Swan | Fa08-045, long bone shaft fragments |
| Beta 68509 | KaVn-2 | 7810 +/-80 | 8979 - 8412 | 8973 – 8914 [0.042812] & 8897 – 8884 [0.008913] & 8865 – 8829 [0.030855] & 8791 – 8417 [0.917421] | 8659 - 8506 | CZ 2 B2 Bottom | 12 | Charcoal | Bottom bracket date on CZ 2 B2 |
| Beta 323239 | KdVo-6 | 8560 +/-40 | 9550 – 9490 | 9581 – 9574 [0.007768] & 9560 – 9477 [0.992232] | 9540 | 9540 - 9530 | LowerPC | N18 W13 | 75 | Wood | AMS associated with Fa11-79 and Fa11-80 (bison long bones, spiral fracture) and edge modified flake, Fe11-12 |
| Beta 355050 | KdVo6 12-09 | 8860 +/-40 | 10170 - 9760 and 9750 – 9750 | 10164 – 9774 [1.0] | 10110, 10100, 9920 | 10150 - 10060 and 10040 - 9990 and 9960 - 9900 | bottom of P2 | N17W16 | 65 | Charred material | AMS associated with medial biface fragment KdVo6:4057 N17W16 P2 2+53 |
| Beta 182798 | KdVo6 2003 Fa03-01 | 8890 +/-50 | 10190 – 9865 and 9855 – 9780 | 10190 – 9883 [0.92972] & 9878 – 9861 [0.014936] & 9849 – 9785 [0.055792] | 10130, 10060, 9945 | 10160 – 9910 | Lower Paleosol | N16 W01 (U20SE) | 67 | Bone collagen, caribou? | AMS / on long bone shaft fragment, Fa03-01 |
|---------|---------|-----------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|-----|---------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Beta 387616 | KdVo-6 Fa10-19 | 9370 +/- 30 | 10680 – 10515 [1.0] | PC3-P4 | N16 W12 | 82.5 | Bone collagen, bison | AMS long bone fragment Fa10-19 |
| UOC 0645 | KdVo-6 Fa14-03-04-01/02 | 9474 +/- 65 | 11083 – 10562 [1.0] | N20 W08 | N20 W08 | 90 | Bone collagen, Wapiti | AMS conjoining vertebra fragments Fa14-03-04-02/02 from Fe2014-01 |
| UOC 0644 | KdVo-6 Fa10-21 | 9502 +/- 59 | 11085 – 10587 [1.0] | L at base of PC | N16 W12 | 85 | Bone collagen, caribou | AMS on tibia fragment, Fa10-21 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10,000 – 9000</th>
<th>Milankovitch Thermal Maximum</th>
<th>Warmer, Moister</th>
<th>- Spread of forests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beta 217279</td>
<td>KdVo-6 06-04</td>
<td>9530 +/- 40</td>
<td>10930 – 10930 and 10880 – 10690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta 218235</td>
<td>KdVo-6 fa06-04</td>
<td>9550 +/- 50</td>
<td>11120 – 10690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta 241522</td>
<td>KdVo-6 fa07-17</td>
<td>9580 +/- 60</td>
<td>11170 – 10700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta 406635</td>
<td>KdVo-6 C14S 2014-01</td>
<td>9780 +/- 30</td>
<td>11240 – 11185 [1.0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta 355051</td>
<td>KdVo-6 13-12</td>
<td>9790 +/- 50</td>
<td>11260 – 11170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta 323238</td>
<td>KdVo-6 12-03</td>
<td>9860 +/- 40</td>
<td>11320 – 11210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta 323237</td>
<td>KdVo-6 12-02</td>
<td>9890 +/- 40</td>
<td>11390 - 11380 and 11350 – 11230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta 382328</td>
<td>KdVo-6 2014</td>
<td>9970 +/- 40</td>
<td>11610 – 11520 and 11510 – 11255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta 241525</td>
<td>KdVo-6 Fa07-30</td>
<td>10000 +/- 60</td>
<td>11760 to 11250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Coordinates</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta 382339</td>
<td>KdVo-6 12-04</td>
<td>N17 W04</td>
<td>1910 – 1910 and 11670 - 11645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta 75868</td>
<td>KaVo-2</td>
<td>11947-11874</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk-7841</td>
<td>KaVo-2</td>
<td>12694 – 12575</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOC 0643</td>
<td>Beta 6 Fa06-133</td>
<td>12679</td>
<td>LbPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta 303043</td>
<td>KdVo-6 11-01</td>
<td>12880-12810</td>
<td>PC - PC3?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCI 88769</td>
<td>KdVo-6 Fa06-41</td>
<td>12905 – 12715</td>
<td>LbP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta 387613</td>
<td>KdVo-6 Fa07-17</td>
<td>13080 – 12970</td>
<td>PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta 241523</td>
<td>KdVo-6 Fa07-20</td>
<td>14077 to 13730</td>
<td>LbP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta 387617</td>
<td>KdVo-6 Fa10-137</td>
<td>14715 – 14210</td>
<td>LbPC-P4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta 231794</td>
<td>KdVo-6 Ivory</td>
<td>42768 – 41894</td>
<td>surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta 246741</td>
<td>KdVo-6 08-02</td>
<td>47237 – 44434</td>
<td>Swale Paleosol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes:
1. Table Notes: Primary Dates are those provided by Beta Analytic or UOC in their report on results. Italicized Dates are those generated by the CALIB 7.02 calibration program which is based on IntCal13 (Reimer et al. 2013). The entire results of this calibration is reported in an accompanying appendix. Square [ ] brackets enclose the statistical probability for different calibrations based on multiple intercepts at the 2 sigma confidence level on the calibration curve.
2. Dates for KaVn-2 are from Heffner (2002), while those for KdVo-3 are from Walde (1994), recalibrated using the above source.
3. All other dates in the table are derived from samples submitted by Easton. Except where noted they were derived from the Accelerated Mass Spectrometric technique.

Figure 40. Bison Phalange, from LbPC3-P4, N16W12, KdVo6 Fa10-137 c. 14,715 – 14210 CAL BP.
SUMMARY OF RECOVERED FAUNA FROM THE LITTLE JOHN SITE, 2014

Recovered fauna from 2014 is detailed in the accompanying faunal databases in both Filemaker (with photographs) and Excel formats and summarized below. An analytical summary of recovered fauna through 2009 is presented in Yesner et al. (2011), while the entire faunal assemblage through 2011 has received an initial analysis in terms of its taphonomic distribution and demonstration of site integrity within a periglacial sedimentary context (Yesner et al. 2012). Laurianne Bourgeon, a PhD student in taphonomy at the University of Montreal undertook additional examination of the Little John fauna in the summers of 2012 and 2013; a summary of her initial results of analysis of fauna through to 2012 was presented in our 2013 report and in Bourgeon (2013) submitted with that report. Further faunal analysis continues in collaboration with Yesner, Hutchinson, and Bourgeon. The Table below provides a summary of the 89 fauna specimens recovered in 2014 by identified species or class and excavation level.

Table 11. Summary of Recovered Fauna by Level, KdVo6-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level Common Name</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>PC1 - P2</th>
<th>Lb PC</th>
<th>PC2 - P3</th>
<th>PC3 - P4</th>
<th>Lb PC</th>
<th>Species Total</th>
<th>Species Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mammal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bison</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Mammal</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Fox</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Mammal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squirrel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Mammal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Level Percent     | 7.7%| 22.2%    | 6.7%  | 55.5%    | 3.3%    | 4.4%  | 100%         |

Eighty-nine faunal elements and one wood fragment recovered in 2014 have been examined within 90 catalogue entries. Fauna from the Late Pleistocene Paleosol Complex and intersecting Loess strata made up the majority of recovered fauna in 2014 (n = 86 or
95.5%), while 4 Large Mammal elements were recovered from below the Paleosol Complex proper. No fauna was recovered from the upper Holocene levels in 2014.

As seen in the Table below, Vertebrae fragments made up a third (33.7%, n=30) of the faunal elements collected in 2014; all except 1 came from a single semi-articulated group in Unit N20 W08 representing a single individual Wapiti. At 22.5 percent (n=20), Limb fragments represent the second largest element count, but again 17 of the 20 fragments came from contiguous units (N15 W12/13, N16 W12, and N17W12/13), and eleven of these co-join to form the medial section of a single Bison tibia. The third highest skeletal element present in the 2014 collection, Identifiable Cranial and Dental elements at 18.0 percent (n=16) are similarly skewed towards a single individual Red Fox from Units N19 W05/06. Six Rib fragments from large mammals (6.7%), one Pelvic fragment from a small mammal, and sixteen unidentifiable Post-cranial fragments (18%) complete the inventory of skeletal elements recovered in 2014.

Table 12. Counts of Identified Faunal Elements by Species or Class, KdVo6-2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Cranial</th>
<th>Dentition</th>
<th>Post Cranial</th>
<th>Vertebrae</th>
<th>Thoracic</th>
<th>Pelvic</th>
<th>Limb</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Species %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prob Wapiti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Mammal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Mammal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Fox</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squirrel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Mammal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element %</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned above, a series of three specimens were found in close association with refitting elements that allow us to confidently assign them to the same individual of the same species; they have been cross-referenced as Features Fe 2014-01, Fe 2014-02, and Fe 2014-03.
KdVo6:Fe 2014-01 is comprised of 29 semi-articulated Wapiti Vertebrae fragments, one metacarpal, and one rib fragment recovered from Unit N20 W08 from within the Second Paleosol encountered in the unit at depths between 88 and 94 cm.
below Unit Datum. The paleosols in this area of the site are not compacted into multiple strata, but more ephemeral, thinner, and separated by several centimeters of loess, so it is difficult to correlate this second paleosol with the more defined Paleosol Complex proper to the west. Fortunately we were able to obtain an AMS radio-carbon date on one of the elements. KdVo-6 Fa14-03-04-01/02 is a thoracic vertebra that returned a date of 9,474 +/- 65 radio-carbon years in age (UOC-0645), which has two intercepts on the calibration curve and lies somewhere between 11,083 and 10,562 calendar years at the two sigma level of significance. This date correlates well with those of the Paleosol Complex proper and undoubtedly relates to this occupation.

Figure 42. KdVo6:Fe2014-01, Wapiti Vertebrae Fragments in situ, P2, N20W08.

KdVo6:Fe2014-02 is comprised of 13 Cranial (including 11 Dental fragments) and four Post-Cranial skeletal elements assigned to a Red Fox recovered from Units N19 W05 and N19 W06 also from within the Second Paleosol encountered in the unit at depths between 51 and 71 cm below Unit Datum. We are awaiting a radio-carbon date on this specimen, but we expect it to be similar in age to the Wapiti specimen above.
KdVo6:Fe2014-03 is comprised of 11 medial fragments of a Bison Tibia, most of which refit together, from Units N16 W12 and N15 W13 recovered from within Paleosol Complex level 2 (P3) at between 81 and 83 cm below Unit Datum.

A full listing of Provenience, Species, and Element assignment is presented in the Table below.
Table 13. Provenience and Skeletal Elements of Recovered Fauna, KdVo6 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Qu</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>DBD</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Gross Element</th>
<th>Specific Element</th>
<th>Element Section</th>
<th>Pieces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-01</td>
<td>N17 W12</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>PC3 - P4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>Thoracic</td>
<td>Rib</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-02</td>
<td>N17 W12</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>PC3 - P4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Bison</td>
<td>Limb</td>
<td>Metapodial</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-01</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Limb</td>
<td>Metacarpal</td>
<td>Distal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-03-01</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-03-02</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-03-03</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-03-04</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-04-01</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Thoracic</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-04-02</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Thoracic</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-05-01</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-05-02</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-06-01</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-06-02</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-06-03</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-07-01</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-08-01</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-08-02</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-08-03</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-08-04</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-09-01</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-09-02</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-09-03</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-10-01</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-10-02</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-11-01</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-11-02</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-11-03</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-12-01</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-12-02</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Thoracic</td>
<td>Rib</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-03-12-03</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Wapiti</td>
<td>Thoracic</td>
<td>Rib</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-04</td>
<td>N15 W13</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>PC1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Pelvic</td>
<td>Illium</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-05-01</td>
<td>N17 W13</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Pelvic</td>
<td>Illium</td>
<td>Proximal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-05-02</td>
<td>N17 W13</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Pelvic</td>
<td>Illium</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-06-01</td>
<td>N17 W13</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-06-02</td>
<td>N17 W13</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Dentition</td>
<td>PreMolar?</td>
<td>Buccal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-06-03</td>
<td>N17 W13</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-07-01</td>
<td>N16 W13</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Lb PC</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>Thoracic</td>
<td>Rib</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-07-02</td>
<td>N16 W13</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Lb PC</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>Thoracic</td>
<td>Rib</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-07-03</td>
<td>N16 W13</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Lb PC</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>Thoracic</td>
<td>Rib</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-08</td>
<td>N15 W13</td>
<td>Lb PC</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>Thoracic</td>
<td>Scapula</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-09-01</td>
<td>N15 W13</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>Bison</td>
<td>Limb</td>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-09-02</td>
<td>N15 W13</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>Bison</td>
<td>Limb</td>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-09-03</td>
<td>N15 W13</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>Bison</td>
<td>Limb</td>
<td>Long Bone</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-10-01</td>
<td>N16 W12</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Bison</td>
<td>Limb</td>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-10-02</td>
<td>N16 W12</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>PC2 - P3</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Bison</td>
<td>Limb</td>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-10-03</td>
<td>N16 W12 SW PC2 - P3 83</td>
<td>Bison Limb Tibia Medial 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-10-04</td>
<td>N16 W12 SW PC2 - P3 83</td>
<td>Bison Limb Tibia Medial 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-10-05</td>
<td>N15 W12 SW PC2 - P3 83</td>
<td>Bison Limb Tibia Medial 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-10-06</td>
<td>N16 W12 NW PC2 - P3 83</td>
<td>Bison Limb Tibia Medial 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-10-07</td>
<td>N16 W12 SW PC2 - P3 83</td>
<td>Bison Limb Tibia Medial 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-10-08</td>
<td>N16 W12 SW PC2 - P3 83</td>
<td>Bison Limb Tibia Medial 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-10-09</td>
<td>N16 W12 SW PC2 - P3 83</td>
<td>Bison Limb Tibia Medial 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-11</td>
<td>N16 W13 SE PC1 - P2 82</td>
<td>Squirrel Limb Calcaneus Distal 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-12</td>
<td>N15 W12 NW PC2 - P3 77.5 MM PC Indeterminate Medial 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-13</td>
<td>N17 W13 SW PC3 - P4 99</td>
<td>Bison Limb Long Bone Medial 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-14</td>
<td>N19 W06 SE PC1 - P2 69</td>
<td>Red Fox PC Indeterminate Medial 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-15</td>
<td>N19 W06 SE PC1 - P2 69</td>
<td>Red Fox PC Indeterminate Medial 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-15-01</td>
<td>N19 W05 SW PC1 - P2 51</td>
<td>Red Fox Dentition Molar Complete 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-15-02-01</td>
<td>N19 W05 NW PC1 - P2 51</td>
<td>Red Fox Dentition Maxillary Alveolar Complete 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-15-02-02</td>
<td>N19 W05 NW PC1 - P2 51</td>
<td>Red Fox Dentition P4/Carnissial Complete 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-15-02-03</td>
<td>N19 W05 NW PC1 - P2 51</td>
<td>Red Fox Dentition Carnissial Complete 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-15-02-04</td>
<td>N19 W05 NW PC1 - P2 51</td>
<td>Red Fox Dentition Incisor? Maxillary? Complete 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-15-02-05</td>
<td>N19 W05 NW PC1 - P2 51</td>
<td>Red Fox Dentition Carnissial enamel Medial 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-15-02-06</td>
<td>N19 W05 NW PC1 - P2 51</td>
<td>Red Fox Dentition Maxillary Complete 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-15-02-07</td>
<td>N19 W05 NW PC1 - P2 51</td>
<td>Red Fox Cranial Vomer? Complete 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-15-02-08</td>
<td>N19 W05 NW PC1 - P2 51</td>
<td>Red Fox PC Indeterminate Medial 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-15-02-09</td>
<td>N19 W05 NW PC1 - P2 51</td>
<td>Red Fox PC Indeterminate Medial 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-15-03</td>
<td>N19 W05 SW PC1 - P2 51</td>
<td>Red Fox Dentition Maxillary Complete 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-15-04</td>
<td>N19 W05 SE PC1 - P2 69</td>
<td>Red Fox Dentition Maxillary Alveolar Complete 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-15-05</td>
<td>N19 W06 SE PC1 - P2 69</td>
<td>Red Fox Dentition M1 Complete 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-15-06</td>
<td>N19 W06 SE PC1 - P2 71</td>
<td>Red Fox Dentition M2 Complete 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-15-07</td>
<td>N19 W06 SE PC1 - P2 69</td>
<td>Red Fox Cranial Indeterminate Medial 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-16</td>
<td>N19 W06 SE PC1 - P2 65</td>
<td>Wapiti Limb Metacarpal Distal 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-17</td>
<td>N20 W06 SE L b PC 80</td>
<td>M PC Indeterminate Medial 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-18-01</td>
<td>N20 W06 SE L b PC 80</td>
<td>M PC Indeterminate Medial 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-18-02</td>
<td>N20 W06 SE L b PC 80</td>
<td>M PC Indeterminate Medial 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-19-01</td>
<td>N20 W06 NE L b PC 80</td>
<td>M Cranial Mandible Medial 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-19-02</td>
<td>N20 W06 NE L b PC 80</td>
<td>M PC Indeterminate Medial 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-20-01</td>
<td>N16 W13 NE PC2 - P3 72</td>
<td>Wapiti? PC Pelvic? Medial 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-20-02</td>
<td>N16 W13 NE PC2 - P3 72</td>
<td>Wapiti? PC Pelvic? Medial 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa14-21</td>
<td>N16 W13 NE PC2</td>
<td>M PC Indeterminate Medial 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY OF FEATURES FROM THE LITTLE JOHN SITE, 2014

Table 14. Inventory of Recorded Features and Associations, KdVo6 – 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature #</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>Unit/Quad</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Depth BD cm</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fe 2014-01</td>
<td>Wapiti Vertebrae</td>
<td>N20 W08</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>88 - 94</td>
<td>26-28 July</td>
<td>Dated to c. 10.7 Cal BP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe 2014-02</td>
<td>Fox Cranial Elements</td>
<td>N19 W05/W06</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>51 – 71</td>
<td>25 July</td>
<td>Reconstructed from fieldnotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe 2014-03</td>
<td>Bison Tibia frags</td>
<td>N16 W12 N15 W13</td>
<td>PC2-P3</td>
<td>81 - 83</td>
<td>22 July</td>
<td>Multiple rejoining frags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe 2014-04</td>
<td>Hearth pit</td>
<td>N17 W12</td>
<td>PC2-P3</td>
<td>71 – 80</td>
<td>23 July</td>
<td>Hearth feature found in units to N and NE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four archaeological features were recorded in the course of excavations in 2014; they are summarized in the Table above. We discussed and provided illustrations of the first three features in the preceding section describing recovered fauna. Here we provide a description of the final feature.

KdVo6:2014-04 is a Hearth Pit encountered in Unit N17 W12 in the PC2-P3 stratum at a depth between 71 and 80 cm below Unit Datum. The feature is in fact a continuation of a large hearth feature, representing multiple episodes of use over several hundreds of years encountered in adjacent units to the north and east. It is shown in profile in the figure below, along with an in situ shot of an large (L=46.25, W=30.27, T=5.32 mm) Biface Thinning Flake (KdVo6:4381) found near the base of the stratum.

Figure 45. KdVo6:Fe2014-04, Hearth Feature in Profile with Edge Modified Flake in situ at base, Paleosol Complex 3/P4, N17 W12.
This section provides summary descriptions of a selection of the major formed artifacts recovered at the Little John site in 2014. A total of 70 artefacts were recovered in 2014 and ordered into 61 unique catalogue numbers (KdVo6:4325 through 4385 inclusive).

As shown in the Table above, the majority of the recovered artifacts represent prehistoric aboriginal technology; Historic artifacts were only 3% (n = 2) of the assemblage. Lithic Tools made up 24% (n = 17) of the total, while associated Debitage related to the creation or curation of these tools accounted for nearly 73% (n = 51) of the assemblage.

The Table below provides a summary of recovered artifacts by type and stratum. With supporting new dates from the East Lobe we are now able to assign more precise chronological distinctions to the material recovered there. As the Table illustrates, we can now include the Loess above Paleosols and the first P1 stringer to the middle Holocene and the Northern Archaic tradition, circa 2,000 to 8,000 years ago.

Late Prehistoric material (post 1200 ybp) make up 5.71% (n = 4) of the assemblage, while Middle Prehistoric / Northern Archaic materials represent the largest component accounting for 67.14% (n = 47) of the 2014 assemblage.

In the East Lobe, 12 artifacts (17% of the total assemblage) were recovered from the Late Pleistocene Paleosol Complex; all of them were Flakes and, with the exception of one chert flake, all were struck from a basaltic objective piece. Seven artifacts were
recovered from the Loess below Paleosol Complex stratum and consisted of 2 Edge Modified Flakes, 4 Flakes, 1 Hammerstone made on basaltic material, and 1 Split Pebble made on greenstone.

### Table 16. Summary of Recovered Artifacts by Type and Stratum, KdVo6 - 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Artifact Type</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>PC 1/ P2</th>
<th>Lb PC1</th>
<th>Lb PC2</th>
<th>PC2/ P3</th>
<th>PC3 - P4</th>
<th>Lb PC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB1</td>
<td>Biface</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Blade</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>EMF</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>MCP-HS</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>MCP-SP</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Flakes</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.71%</td>
<td>67.14%</td>
<td>5.71%</td>
<td>11.42%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Period - Date (see Radiocarbon Dating)</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Late Holocene c. 1,900 – 150</td>
<td>Middle Holocene c. 2,000 – 8,000</td>
<td>Early Holocene c. 9,400 – 10,100</td>
<td>Late Pleistocene Post Younger Dryas c. 10,700 – 11,700</td>
<td>Late Pleistocene + 12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numerical and Percentile distribution through Levels will generally reflect intensity of use through time within the excavated units. Using the Period / Date correlations with Levels presented in the Table above the highest intensity of use is the Middle Holocene period prior to the White River Ash fall c. 1,900 years ago (67%), followed by the Late Pleistocene post-Younger Dryas period (11%). Combined the Late Pleistocene strata account for about 21 percent of the recovered artifacts in 2014, the Early Holocene 6 percent, and the Later Holocene about 73 percent. However, we must bear in mind that recovery bias based on intra-site location can effect these numbers and will make more sense when integrated with the entire artifact database from previous field seasons.

**Raw Material Analysis - Visual Morphology of the 2014 Collection**

A variety of lithic raw materials were used in the manufacture of the recovered artifacts. The Table below provides the distribution of lithic raw material by major stratigraphic levels present at the site from which the artifacts were recovered.
Considering the data in the Table below, Balsaltic material make up just over 57% (n = 40) of the artifacts; based on Jordan Handley’s portable X-Ray Fluorescence analysis discussed in last year’s report (Handley 2013, Handley et al. n.d.), it seems likely that the majority of this material will prove to be within the Andesite class of Basalts. Cherts make up 14.3% (n = 10) of the assemblage, Obsidian 21.4% (n = 15), while one piece of Greenstone accounts for 1.4% of the assemblage. Two Cobble artifacts (2.8%) are probably basaltic and dolomitic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level / RM</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>Ash</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B2 L</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>PC1 /P2</th>
<th>Lb PC1 /P2</th>
<th>PC2 /P3</th>
<th>Lb PC2 /P3</th>
<th>PC3 /P4</th>
<th>Lb PC</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BaBl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BaGy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChBl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChBr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChGr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChGy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChRd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoBr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoGy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GrGr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObBl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObGyBd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| %          | 1.4| 2.9| 2.9 | 60 | 2.9 | 1.4| 1.4| 2.9  | 2.9 | 4.3 | 1.4 | 5.7 | 10     |       |

Raw Material Codes: Ba = Basalt / Ch = Chert / Co = Cobble / Gr = Greenstone / Ob = Obsidian


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RM / Type</th>
<th>BaBl</th>
<th>BaGy</th>
<th>ChBl</th>
<th>ChBr</th>
<th>ChGr</th>
<th>ChGy</th>
<th>ChRd</th>
<th>CoBr</th>
<th>CoGy</th>
<th>GrGr</th>
<th>ObBl</th>
<th>ObGyBd</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biface</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blade</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCP-SP</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCP-HS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of Balsaltic artifacts consisted of Debitage (n = 34 of 39 basaltic pieces). The remaining Basaltic assemblage consists of three Edge Modified Flakes and two Biface artifacts.

The Chert category accounts for 14.3% (n = 10) of the Total Lithics: five pieces of Flake debitage, four Edge Modified Flakes, and one Blade. The majority of the Chert material (n = 7), including the Blade, was located in the B2 stratum, while Edge Modified Flakes made on Grey Chert were recovered at the B2/Loess interfaced, and a single Black Chert Flake was found in the Loess between PC1/P2 and PC2/P3.

Fifteen of the recovered artifacts were of obsidian; 11 pieces were Debitage, 3 were Edge Modified Flakes, and 1 was a Blade from the B2 stratum, which contained a total of 13 obsidian artifacts. A single Edge Modified Flake made on Obsidian was recovered from the late Pleistocene loess of the West Lobe. The obsidian recovered in 2014 will be source analyzed by Jeff Rasic in 2015.

**Bifaces**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artefact Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>DBD cm</th>
<th>DBS cm</th>
<th>Sum Level</th>
<th>Sum RMC</th>
<th>Leng</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Thick</th>
<th>Wght</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4383</td>
<td>point</td>
<td>N20W06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P1 - Paleosol</td>
<td>BaGy</td>
<td>19.84</td>
<td>18.38</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4385</td>
<td>point</td>
<td>N25E04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>BaGy</td>
<td>39.71</td>
<td>20.42</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two formed Bifaces were recovered at Little John in 2014. Their location and metrics are summarized in the Table above, and photographs and general descriptions below.

Figure 46. KdVo6:4383, Biface, N20W06, P1 – Paleosol above Paleosol Complex.
KdVo6: 4383 is a small and extremely thin pentagonal-shaped biface made on dark grey basalt or andesite recovered from Unit N20 W06 from the first paleosol stringer designated P1 – Paleosol above the Paleosol Complex at a depth of. It bears multiple invasive flake scars on both sides. It seems eroded. Assignment is either a small chindadn-like biface or, more likely, the tip of a larger biface.

![Image of KdVo6:4385, Biface, N25E04 - Surface.]

KdVo6:4385 was found on the surface along the path between the major East Lobe excavations and the entrance to the site so the Unit designation of N25 E04 is approximate. This biface is truncated at one end (proximal?) along a single flake scar suggesting it was broken during late stage of manufacture. The shaping flake scars are covering and invasive, with a suggestion of pursuit of collateral technique. Both margins also bear extensive, regular, and straight retouch, although one margin is more deeply flaked, giving it a more serrated edge, suggesting that this might be the working edge of a cutting implement. Its surface provenience does not allow us to say much more at this point.

Large Blades

This class of artifacts consists of detached flakes struck from a prepared core in such a way as to produce roughly rectangular flakes with parallel or subparallel lateral edges and a length two times or more than its width, and with one or more roughly parallel arrises
running from the proximal end to the distal end along the ventral surface (Andrefsky 2005).

Two Blade artifacts were recovered at KdVo-6 in 2014; one was a proximal fragment while the other was complete. Their location and metrics are summarized in the Table below, followed by photographs and general descriptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artefact Number</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>DBD cm</th>
<th>DBS cm</th>
<th>Sum Level</th>
<th>Sum RMC</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Thick</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4326</td>
<td>blade</td>
<td>N07 E05</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>ObBl</td>
<td>20.01</td>
<td>14.24</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4370</td>
<td>blade</td>
<td>S03 W22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>ChBr</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 48. KdVo6:4326, Blade Fragment, N07E05, B2.**

**KdVo6:4326** is a complete Blade flake made on obsidian recovered from Unit N07 E05 from within the B2 stratum at a depth of 20 cm below the surface. It bears a single arris on its dorsal surface along with inconsistent patina. The presence of a step fracture at the distal end suggests it broke from the objective core while being struck. This is supported by the absence of any evidence of retouch or use along the margin.

**KdVo6:4370** is a larger Blade made on brown chert recovered from Unit S03 W22 in the West Lobe from within the B2 stratum at a depth of 8 cm below unit datum. It bears a single arris on its ventral surface with a feathered termination at the distal end, suggesting this is a complete blade. The ventral surface bears cortex along one entire facet and two, perhaps three steep flake scars at the distal end. It is also bears unifacial retouched along the left lateral edge of the ventral surface.
Edge Modified – Retouched – Utilized Flakes

Edge Modified Flakes usually consist of larger secondary waste flakes produced in the manufacture of more formal tools that have been subsequently utilized, producing characteristic irregular flake scars along one or more edges created during their expedient use as slicing, cutting, or scraping implements. Less often they exhibit deliberate secondary modification in the form of semi-regular to regular retouch along one or more edges to facilitate more specific use, although the two categories of edge modification cross-grade into each other making it sometimes difficult to determine whether the modification was the product of utilization or deliberate retouching (Andrefsky 2001).
This class of artifact is ubiquitous throughout the site through all levels. Nine specimens were collected in 2014: 6 came from the B2 (Mid Holocene), 1 from the B2/L (Early Holocene), 5 from the West Lobe Loess (Late Pleistocene), and 2 from the East Lobe Loess below the Paleosol Complex (Late Pleistocene – basal Little John). One specimen consists of two adjoining pieces, bringing the total count to ten. Comprising 59% of Total Lithic Tools (n=10/17) and 14.3% of Total Lithics including debitage (n=10/68), this artifact class is the highest among tool types and second highest among all lithics. Their location and metrics are summarized in the Table below, followed by photographs and general descriptions of a selection of this class of artifacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artefact Number</th>
<th>Sum Type</th>
<th>Seg</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>DBD cm</th>
<th>DBS cm</th>
<th>Sum Level</th>
<th>Sum RMC</th>
<th>L mm</th>
<th>W mm</th>
<th>T mm</th>
<th>Wt gm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4330 EMF C</td>
<td>N02 E04</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>33.24</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>BaGy</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4331 EMF C</td>
<td>N02 E04</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>ChGy</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4332 EMF C</td>
<td>N02 E04</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>24.86</td>
<td>10.62</td>
<td>ChRd</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4335 EMF B</td>
<td>N03 E05</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>B2 L</td>
<td>50.30</td>
<td>22.62</td>
<td>ChGy</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4348 EMF P</td>
<td>S02 W23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>ObGyBd</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4351 EMF C</td>
<td>S02 W23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>13.99</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>ObBl</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4352 EMF C</td>
<td>S02 W23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>17.38</td>
<td>13.94</td>
<td>ObBl</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4380 EMF C</td>
<td>N17 W13</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>L b PC</td>
<td>21.65</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>BaBl</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4384 EMF C</td>
<td>N18 W12</td>
<td>L b PC</td>
<td>BaGy</td>
<td>37.24</td>
<td>14.27</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seg=Segment C=Complete B=Broken P=Proximal. See Raw Material Distribution Table, above for RMC codes.

**KdVo6:4380 and 4384** are two complete Edge Modified Flakes recovered from the Loess below Paleosol Complex stratum in Units N17 W13 and N18 W12 respectively. Both were struck from basaltic material. KdVo6:4380 is modified along the left lateral margin while KdVo6:4384 is modified at the distal end. Beyond describing these two Late Pleistocene artifacts there is little more of interest to remark on the small sample of edge modified flakes collected in 2014.
Figure 51. Left: KdVo6:4380, EM Flake, Left Margin, Both Margins, N17W13; Right: KdVo6:4385, EM Flake, Distal Margins, N18W12 - both Loess below Paleosol Complex.

Figure 52. KdVo6:4335, EM Flake, Both Margins, N03E05-B2/Loess

Modified Pebble / Cobble Artifacts – Hammer Stones, Choppers, Split Pebbles, Anvils, Scraper Planes

Only three Modified Cobble or Pebble artifacts were recovered at the Little John site in 2014, consisting of two Hammerstones and one Split Pebble. The table below provides a summary of their provenience and metrics and they are more fully described below.

This class of artifact is generally ubiquitous across the Little John site, consisting of cortical pebbles and cobbles with battered or punctate surfaces, presumably used for shaping or flaking other stone and breaking bone for marrow extraction or producing bone slivers for further working into a variety of tools, split cobbles and pebbles for chopping wood and bone and other expedient cutting or scraping use, and flat-sided or split cobbles for use as a stable anvil base for preparing stone or breaking bone or planing wood and bone.
Hammer Stones are recognized on the basis of morphological characteristics of a crushed and / or punctate surface along the margin or one surface and a size and shape to be held comfortably in the hand; one is identified in the 2014 collection. Split Cobble Tools might be used as a Chopper or as a primary hide scraping tool (the Thii Cho); none were collected in 2014. Split Pebbles are generally produced by Bipolar Percussion, resulting in a sharp cutting edge along the circumference of the artifact and percussive crushing at either end; one was identified in 2014. Anvils are large dense cobbles with one flat surface that can be buried level with the ground surface and serve as a stable solid platform for percussive flaking of other stones. Scraper planes are large cobbles split to produce a flat surface at one end of which will be found steep unifacial retouch in order to provide a planning edge to flatten wood or bone. The strength of their designation as artifacts is further supported by their close association with unequivocal artifacts, flake debitage, spirally fractured bone, or other features (Andrefsky 2005, Kooymann 2000, Odell 2003).

These artifacts are common throughout all Paleolithic assemblages, but are generally found at higher rates within Late Prehistoric and mid-Holocene assemblages that are thought to have used higher percentages of bone projectiles within their tool kit (Workman 1978). They are often found in clusters that can be described as work station features. At the Little John site they are found through all levels.

Although only one Split Pebble was recovered this year, in general this class of artifact is well represented in the lower Late Pleistocene levels of the East Lobe. These strata in this area represent secondary processing and cooking of a variety of large and small mammal (as detailed in our earlier discussions on faunal remains from these levels in this report and elsewhere; c.f. Yesner, et al. 2001, Yesner et al. 2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A #</th>
<th>Sum Type</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Lev</th>
<th>Typ/Loc Mod</th>
<th>L mm</th>
<th>W mm</th>
<th>T mm</th>
<th>Wt gm</th>
<th>RM</th>
<th>% Cortex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4339</td>
<td>MCP-HS</td>
<td>S04W22</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>BP BE</td>
<td>34.99</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20.72</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>BaGy</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4349</td>
<td>MCP-HS</td>
<td>S02W23</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>BP BE</td>
<td>40.65</td>
<td>30.67</td>
<td>18.19</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>TnSd</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4379</td>
<td>MCP-SP</td>
<td>N17W13</td>
<td>LbPC</td>
<td>UnD C LM</td>
<td>14.73</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Gn</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MCP=Modified Cobble/Pebble HS=Hammerstone SP=Split Pebble EM=Edge Modified BP=Battered Punctated BE=Both Ends UnD=Unifacial Dorsal C=Convex LM= Left Margin TnSd=Tan Sandstone Gn=Greenstone
KdVo6:4379 is an Edge Modified Split Pebble recovered in Unit N17 W13 from the Loess below the main Paleosol Complex strata at 106 cm below unit datum. Made on what we are designating greenstone, this small split pebble bears fairly steep unifacial retouch on the dorsal surface on the left lateral margin along a convex edge. It joins a small assemblage of similar small retouched split pebble artifacts detailed in previous reports.

![Image of KdVo6:4379](image1.png)

Figure 53. KdVo6:4379, Edge Modified Split Pebble, N17W13 - LbPC.

The two artifacts designated as Hammer Stones recovered in 2014 were both from the B2 stratum in the West Lobe.

![Image of KdVo6:4339](image2.png)

Figure 54. KdVo6:4339, Hammer Stone, S04W22 – B2.

KdVo6:4339 is a small Hammer Stone of sandstone conglomerate recovered from Unit S04 W22 in the B2 stratum which is heavily battered at one end and punctated
around the remaining margins and surface. Association with biface thinning flakes and debitage supports its cultural designation.

**KdVo6:4349** is a larger Hammer Stone recovered from Unit S02 W23 from the B2 stratum at 39 cm below unit datum which bears a punctated surface on both sides of the artifact. Three edge modified flakes and 2 pieces of debitage were found in association in this unit as well, supporting its cultural designation.

![Figure 55. KdVo6:4349, Hammer Stone, S02W23 – B2.](image)

**Debitage**

This class of artifact contains all apparent lithic debris generated in the course of manufacture, use, and discard of formal and informal stone tools. In general they are usually the most prevalent lithic form found on Paleolithic sites; at KdVo6 debitage made up 75% of collected lithics in 2014 (n=51/68). Analysis of debitage type, raw material, and distribution can contribute to our understanding of site use, inter-site relationships, external procurement and trade relationships, and prehistoric technological organization (Andrefsky 2001, 2005). Here we provide only an initial summary of debitage collected in 2014; a fuller treatment awaits detailed future analysis.

The table below presents the distribution of 51 pieces of debitage collected in 2014 by Flake Type categories through stratigraphic levels at KdVo6. Debitage type generally reflects the stage of lithic manufacture being practiced; cortical flakes suggest
earlier stages, large complete flakes middle stages, and high levels of thinning and sharpening flakes suggest late stage of manufacture and artifact maintenance.

Biface Thinning and Sharpening Flakes account for 27.5 (n=14) and 15.7 (n=8) percent of debitage collected in 2014 respectively, or 43.2 percent (n=22) combined, and Complete Flakes account for another 53 percent (n=27). Of the total 51 pieces of debitage only 7.8 percent (n=4) bear Cortex.

Table 23. Debitage Distribution by Flake Type and Level, KdVo6 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Flake Type</th>
<th>Ash</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>PC1 - P2</th>
<th>L b PC 1</th>
<th>PC2 - P3</th>
<th>L b PC 2</th>
<th>PC3 - P4</th>
<th>L b PC</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Row %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>complete</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19 (1C)</td>
<td>2 (1C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biface thinning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 (1C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharpening</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>broken</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (1C)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Column %</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period - Appx. Date</td>
<td>Late Holocene c. 1,900 – 150 ybp</td>
<td>Middle Holocene c. 3,000 – 8,000 ybp</td>
<td>Early Holocene 9,400 – 10,100 ybp</td>
<td>Late Pleistocene 10,700 – 11,700 ybp</td>
<td>Late Pleistocene + 12,000 ybp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historic Remains

Only one artifact from the historic period was recovered at the Little John site in 2014, consisting of a small “MasterLock” key for a padlock connected to a washer by a metal fishing line leader. It was found at the top of the B1 stratum in Unit N03 E03 and may be associated with the remains of the locker trunk and related historic materials found in N07 E06 in 2013?
CONCLUDING REMARKS

The 2014 field excavations at the Little John site and associated analytical work over the past 18 months has further refined our understanding of this important site and simultaneously presented us with both new and continuing questions which we hope to address through subsequent field work and laboratory analysis.

In particular, new AMS radio-carbon dates obtained over the past year has resulted in an emergent pattern that suggests the chronological parameters of distinctive occupational periods at the Little John site. We discussed in detail these Cultural Chronozones in our 2013 report, suggesting four for the Late Pleistocene: one prior to the Younger Dryas during the Bolling-Allerod Interstadial, one at the onset of the Younger Dryas followed by abandonment of the site during the height of this cooling Stadial period, and a third beginning at the tail end of the Younger Dryas. The suggested fourth period of Late Pleistocene occupation might also simply be a continuation of the third, with their current separation a sampling artifact; our new dates seem to support this interpretation.

Within the Holocene proper we have suggestions of another four Cultural Chronozones. The oldest of these precedes the First White River Ash Fall of c. 1900 years ago, with new dates extending this period to about 8,000 years ago. The second begins immediately after the first eruption and lasts until just before the Second White
River Ash Fall of c. 1200 years ago. Our limited current dates relating to the Late Holocene are suggesting an 800 year period of abandonment of the site until the Late Prehistoric phase about 400 years ago, although I suspect that this hiatus is a sampling artifact. The final cultural period documented at the site is that of the Historic period of the last 150 years.

Six flakes (two edge modified) and an edge modified split pebble and four large mammal bones were recovered from the earliest Loess below Paleosol Complex strata, dated to between 13,000 and 14,400 years ago. Although the cultural materials from these early strata remain sparse they continue to grow with each subsequent year of excavation.

Work will continue at the Little John site in 2015 with a focus on detailed exploration of a small number of units in the East Lobe and extensive geophysical survey and analysis as we work to understand further the context and nature of one of the earliest camps of Canada’s First Peoples.
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