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Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve was established by an act of Congress in 1978 in order "to preserve and protect a rural community which provides an unbroken historic record from nineteenth century exploration and settlement of Puget Sound up to the present time . . ." (Public Law 95-625, November 10, 1978). Patterns of settlement beginning with the first Donation Land claims and the subsequent historic development of the area are visible today in the physical landscape. Pioneer homes and landscape remnants reveal a continuous history of man's interaction with the immediate environment, a dynamic and long-lasting process that gives physical expression to the everyday workings of the community.

There are various reasons that account for continuity in Ebey's Landing. One very important one is the land. Of the 17,400 acres that make up the reserve, 5,500 acres or approximately 42 percent is agricultural land. Most of that is concentrated in three natural prairies including Smith, Crockett and Ebey's Prairie, the latter containing some of the island's most productive farmland. Other natural land features also influenced original and subsequent settlement. For example, the three major ridges on the reserve are densely wooded and greatly restricted access to farmable land -- a primary need for early settlers. In addition, these ridges physically channelled development into the open lands, shaping broad patterns of settlement and transportation.

Another important reason for the continuity in the reserve is the people. In our historically mobile society, it is rather remarkable to consider that of the nine original white settlers on Ebey's Prairie in the 1850s, eight were still living there in 1870. Even more remarkable, some of their descendents still make the reserve their home today.

The area has special designation -- national historical reserve -- because this kind of visible continuity through time is rare in any contemporary community. Most often change erases traces of the past. We build and add to our environments in a constant effort to renew and replace the old. Preserving the past often means setting something aside and protecting it from change. The reserve is different. It is a community of people that continually reshape their surroundings. They live and work in a place that has been minimally impacted by urban growth pressures and still continues to evolve as a vital living system.
No living system remains static. In nature, seasonal changes are visible. Trees leaf-out in spring and lose their leaves in fall. Old plants die and are replaced by new ones. In cultures and societies, the goals and values of one generation are not the same for another.

Architectural styles, farming practices, and transportation systems all change, reflecting different human needs and purposes. The land itself is a dynamic system that reflects those changes as it is shaped and reshaped over time. In Ebey's Landing, the way settlers farmed and the kinds of crops they grew in 1880 are different than the farming techniques and crops of today. What is of national significance is that after one hundred years, most of that same early pattern of land use -- the mix of farm, forest, village and shoreline -- still remains. There is a strong sense of the past in the present cultural landscape.

This report is an attempt to describe and document the continuing presence of the past in Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve. It consists of two volumes, this one and a second containing individual inventory cards for every building built within the reserve before World War II, as well as individual cards describing each half-section of land within this rural historic district. Residents seeking to understand the reserve and its historical and landscape evolution will find this a useful, if brief, introduction. For the members of the Trust Board and local governments, this report and the cards will assist in communicating to all the residents of the reserve the past traditions of land use and building styles that they are mandated to help maintain.

One short note about methodology may be appropriate. During the summer of 1983, a team of three historians and two landscape architects photographed and described every pre-World War II building and the entire landscape of the reserve. Those efforts took the form of inventory cards, included in Volume II of this report. During 1984, the National Park Service will complete an amendment to the National Register nomination for Ebey's Landing, adding to the nineteenth century buildings included in the original
nominated, the twentieth century buildings that also contribute to the historic integrity of the district. Designation of these contributing buildings may be found on the inventory cards. This report, "The Land, the People, and the Place" is a summary of what that summer team learned about Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve, about a community of people who came early and stayed, people who lived long and rather gently on the land, shaping a cultural landscape and creating a special sense of place.
"Come look from this eminence of bluff, now in the soft hour before daybreak... the island's farm fields are leather and corduroy, rich even panels between black-furred stands of forest. Tan grass... whisks soundlessly against a four-wire fence line. Yes; rural America of the last century..."

Ivan Doig, Winter Brothers, 1980
[Overlooking Ebey's Landing]

The dramatic times and slow times that create lands and shape environments worked once to carve the island communities of Puget Sound in Washington State. Huge masses of ice, once covering all the land south to Olympia, began receding 13,000 years ago, leaving behind a variety of island forms. In the northern portion of this grouping is Whidbey Island, a long irregular mosaic of forests, inland waters, natural prairies and coastal bluffs. The face of the island is gently rolling, with most upland areas under 300 feet in elevation. East of the island, the silhouette of the Cascade mountains forms the horizon and west across Admiralty Inlet, the Olympics push the eye up from the deep water foreground.

In the central portion of Whidbey Island is Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve, 17,400 acres of land and water that exhibit the past and present fabric of a strong rural community. The landscape of Ebey's Landing, its farms, fields, forests, and shorelines, have a subtle and quiet kind of beauty. It is not grand on the scale of the Olympics or the Cascades, but it can be just as breathtaking. It is a beauty that seems to lie in the harmony between natural and man-made elements and in the experience of generations shaping the environment into a community. Scattered groups of farm buildings seem a part of the land, not intrusive elements placed on it. Villages cluster around long-used transportation points while the pattern of forest and field follows natural contours on that same land. This gentle beauty, this balance between the built and natural environment, is a dynamic yet harmonious ensemble as each generation adds a layer of use and meaning on the land.

While we all recognize that landscapes change, not every landscape carries the tangible reminders of times past (both on the land and in the lives of those who live and work it). It is this physical evidence of the past that allows a visual understanding of the slow process of change. Fortunately, the physical landscape of the reserve is suffused with such remnants. Old fence lines and hedgerows, old farm complexes, orchards, and Victorian houses in Coupeville all mix with the contemporary everyday workings of the reserve. It is this visible mixture of new and old that creates a cultural landscape, a place where generations have lived harmoniously with the land.

While the reserve may be viewed as a single landscape there are many areas within it that have an individual character or feeling because of physical features, visual boundaries or land uses. These areas create the larger landscape and are like the pieces of a large mosaic. They may be viewed individually as small segments of colored glass, but when
viewed together in the context of the whole, they yield a single, composite picture. While the formal boundaries of the reserve follow the original Donation Land claims of the first settlers, these boundaries also encompass a rich mixture of physical features. There are ten basic land areas that characterize the reserve and as a way of picturing the whole landscape it is helpful to look at them individually.

Since Whidbey is an island, no place is far from the sight and sound of water. The reserve is outlined by two distinct water edges. The western shore and boundary of the reserve stretches eight miles along Admiralty Inlet. It is a dramatic margin of narrow sand and stone beaches that give way to windswept bluffs rising over 200 feet. Foot trails along portions of the crest reveal magnificent views to the inland waters, Port Townsend and the Olympics.

On the east side of the reserve, Penn Cove, a 4,300 acre bay that cuts deeply into the island, carves a more sheltered but equally rich beach character with small cottages, boathouses and lagoons which support various wildlife habitats.

Inland, the reserve is sculpted by wooded ridges and large natural prairies. Bordering the coastal strip in the southern part of the reserve are the Fort Casey Uplands, which consist of elevated woodlands and natural grasslands overlooking agricultural prairies. The area is sparsely settled and man's reshaping of the landscape is not obvious. What seems natural, however, has indeed been altered. The forests have all been logged once or twice and the meadows are full of introduced plants.

To the north lies Ebey's Prairie, the physical and symbolic center of the reserve. A gently sloping bowl of agricultural land, it cradles some of the island's most productive farmland. Perhaps because of this, Ebey's Prairie has undergone little change over time. Indeed many old fence lines, hedgerows and field patterns have remained the same for over a century.

Forming the northeast boundary of the prairie are the West Woodlands. Primarily a large ridgeline that levels and fills out into dense second and third growth forests, the area is rich in geologic history. Several glacial kettles are scattered throughout the woodlands leaving large areas of land relatively remote and undeveloped. One such depression is filled with water and forms Lake Pondilla.
Ebey's Prairie looking toward the West Woodlands.

along the north edge of the area in Fort Ebey State Park.

Forming the northern-most boundary of the reserve are the San de Fuca Uplands, an undulating patchwork of croplands, pastures, and residential development. The land extends east-west on a plateau and slowly rolls down to the shores of Penn Cove. A few old farm complexes and isolated homes punctuate an area rapidly changing in character as new subdivisions begin reshaping the landscape.

Following the shore of Penn Cove around to the southern edge is the town of Coupeville. Nestled on a natural low point, Coupeville is the commercial center of the reserve. It is here also, that one finds the highest visible concentration of alteration by man in structures, roads and the landscape. Here also is a strong sense of continuity as many original buildings and land patterns remain from its nineteenth century beginnings. Ornate Victorian homes, false front commercial buildings, a variety of bungalows, remnant orchards, wharf and waterfront all contribute to a sense of time and history.

Front Street in Coupeville.
East of Coupeville is another densely wooded ridge, the East Woodlands. They contain a large amount of second and third growth forest with rhododendron understory. The area remains largely undeveloped though there are signs of change as new roads are punched into the forest ending at a new home or clearing for a subdivision.

On the eastern edge of the reserve is Smith Prairie, a large open tract of land bisected by the reserve boundary. The prairie is framed by woodlands and dotted with a few scattered farm dwellings. Because the soil is rocky and difficult to farm, it is used primarily for grazing and feed crops.

Finally, with Crockett Prairie, we have toured the entire reserve. The prairie envelops Crockett Lake, a shallow brackish lake separated from Admiralty Bay by Keystone Spit. The wetlands surrounding the lake provide excellent wildlife habitats. North of the lake, agricultural prairie funnels between the tree covered ridges of the Fort Casey Uplands and East Woodlands. Several farms dating from original Donation Land claims remain viable working complexes, lending to the prairie not only scenic value but layers of landscape history.

These ten individual areas, when viewed in the context of the whole reserve, give us a composite picture of a landscape rich in physical and historical integrity. It is a landscape shaped by the people who came and the generations after them, reshaping the same land slowly and purposefully. The physical evidence of their experience on the land in the remaining structures and landscape remnants gives us a sense of history, but those alone cannot tell the whole story of the reserve. The glue that holds the pieces of this mosaic together is the history of the people who shaped the land. What is this history and how did their cumulative experience become what is today a community?
"My dear brother -

"I scarcely know how I shall write or what I shall write ... The great desire of heart is, and has been, to get my own and father's family to this country. I think it would be a great move. I have always thought so . . .

To the north down along Admiralty Inlet . . . the cultivating land is generally found confined to the valleys of streams with the exception of Whidbey's Island . . . which is almost a paradise of nature. Good land for cultivation is abundant on this island.

I have taken my claim on it and am now living on the same in order to avail myself of the provisions of the Donation Law. If Rebecca, the children, and you all were here, I think I could live and die here content."

Colonel Ebey's letter to his brother, W.S. Ebey
Olympia, Oregon
April 25, 1851

The first white settlers to set foot on central Whidbey Island encountered not a harsh wilderness but a tempered land already altered by human use. As early as 1300, the Skagit Indian tribe had permanent settlements along the shores of Penn Cove at what is now called Monroe's Landing, Snakelum Point and Long Point just east of present-day Coupeville. The Indians found on the island, abundant natural resources to sustain their community. They routinely cultivated their land by selectively burning to clear prairie areas and by transplanting foodstuffs such as bracken fern and camas.

As European exploration of the Puget Sound area increased, these tribes had more contact with whites, which ultimately lead to their demise. The native population succumbed to diseases such as smallpox and of the 1,500 Indians recorded in the area in 1790, the number tragically diminished to three families in Coupeville by 1904.
White exploration of the Puget Sound area began in the late 1700s. Early reports describing open meadows and natural prairies, abundant timber and dark rich soils did much to advertise the island's natural amenities and soon more white settlers were heading north into the area.

The Donation Land Claim Law of 1850 was instrumental in bringing settlers to central Whidbey. The law offered free land to those willing to homestead and cultivate land for a period of years. One of the first to take advantage of the new law was Isaac Ebey who claimed 640 acres of prairie land in the center of Whidbey Island in October, 1850. Others soon followed, many of them farmers who recognized the value of the land and knew how to work it. Within three years, all of the prairie lands on central Whidbey were claimed and several small farm homes dotted the landscape. Located along ridges near water or property lines, these simple buildings eventually were replaced by more substantial homes as the settlers themselves felt more permanent. Some of these later structures remain today and are provocative reminders of early settlement on the prairies of central Whidbey.

Farmland was not the only feature that drew settlers to the area. While farms were being carved out of the prairies, a number of sea captains and merchants, mainly from New England, were taking advantage of the island's other valuable resource, timber. Drawn to both the scenic beauty of Penn Cove and its value as a natural harbor, many took donation claims to the forest lands around the cove. Captain Barstow filed a claim on the west end of the cove and soon established a trading post, stocked with goods from San Francisco. Near Barstow's trading post was Dr. R.H. Lansdale's claim of 320 acres. This area came to be known as Coveland, a townsite Dr. Landsdale platted but never filed. In addition to a trading post, Coveland had a post office and the first county courthouse built in 1855, which still stands today.

During these early years, Island County comprised all of the Puget Sound area north of Olympia, and by virtue of its position as County Seat, central Whidbey played an important role in the politics of Washington Territory. Isaac N. Ebey, the first permanent settler, was active in politics and served as collector of customs for Puget Sound and as district attorney.
As transportation networks began to evolve, the first overland route in the area was, quite naturally, a road from Ebey's Landing north to Coveland on the opposite side of the island. Travelers from Port Townsend arrived at the landing and often stopped at the Ferry House which served at various times as an inn, tavern, mail station and freight depot. From there, travelers continued to Coveland and made connections to other island communities via Penn Cove. Not until ferry service from Port Townsend was redirected south to Admiralty Head did Ebey's Landing diminish in importance as the primary access point to central Whidbey.

Slowly, over the years, the population increased and the early scattered settlement of central Whidbey began to take shape and become a recognizable community. One of the first claims on the south side of Penn Cove was filed by Thomas Coupe in 1852. The house still stands today and is the oldest structure (1854) on the reserve. Although patterns of settlement first developed on the prairies and a few miles north along the cove, the two groups, farmers and town merchants, were inextricably tied together both socially and economically. In response to the needs and demands of both groups, the town of Coupeville developed along the south shore of Penn Cove on Thomas Coupe's claim. As early as 1870, commercial enterprises existed in Coupeville, providing various goods and services to the growing population. It was this slow and steady growth that began to lace the landscape and people of central Whidbey together as a visible community.
The years between 1880 and 1900 saw the interactions of merchants and farmers develop an economically stable community. Roads were constructed along property lines and between family farms, increasing access and facilitating the movement of goods. General services improved to meet the needs of a growing community and agricultural activities continued as farmers experimented in their search for a stable cash crop. They shifted from grain and potato farming to sheep ranching and eventually returned to grains and potatoes, selling to markets in Seattle and further south.

The growing prosperity of the farmers is evident in the more elaborate homes they built. Technological advances not only made some aspects of farm practice easier, new technology in machine-milled lumber allowed carpenters to construct buildings more intricate in plan and with decorative embellishments. This trend occurred not only in the prairies, it is also evident in the large homes of the merchants being built in Coupeville, in the 1870s.

Coupeville's dominance was assured when Coveland surrendered the County Seat in 1881. Thomas Cranney (Thomas Coupe's son-in-law) platted Coupe's claim in 1883 for a townsite, giving deeds to individuals who had purchased tracts from Coupe. By the time the plat was officially recorded, Coupeville had two hardware stores, a drugstore, three hotels, two saloons, a blacksmith shop, a courthouse, a post office, school houses, a church, and numerous other
buildings. Features like orchards, fences, stonewalls and other elements added a dimension of stability to the physical fabric of the growing community.

One temporary diversion from the slowly accumulating everyday activities of central Whidbey did occur in the late 1880s. Land speculators, anticipating the arrival of a railroad, quickly platted three townsites. One at San de Fuca on Penn Cove, and two along Keystone Spit: Brooklyn and New Chicago. These "boom towns" reached different degrees of development in a flurry of activity that saw roads, houses, hotels and commercial buildings constructed almost overnight. But the dreams of great profits dissipated with the realization that no railroad would be built, that planned populations of 50,000 would never be reached. Evidence of these "boom towns" on the present landscape is scarce. Only in San de Fuca, where a few vacant commercial buildings mingle with small homes, is there any indication that a sizeable community once briefly flourished.

Any excitement generated from this speculation was, for the most part, ignored by the agrarian community. Logging, shipping and farming continued to keep the local economy stable. Central Whidbey farmers enjoyed profits from exporting their crops to California and other points south.

As the twentieth century approached, agriculture remained the primary activity on central Whidbey with very few original donation claims divided into smaller farms. Steamships made daily trips to and from Seattle bringing mail and supplies to Coupeville, San de Fuca and Monroe's Landing, providing residents a steady supply of goods and wares. This system continued into the twentieth century when another force, the military, added another layer of history, reshaping the landscape and life on central Whidbey.

The need for a military post on Whidbey Island was clear. Bordering the Strait of Juan de Fuca, central Whidbey formed the gateway to all of Puget Sound and in the era of Naval fortifications it had great strategic importance. Fort Casey Military Reservation was built in the central portion of the island on Admiralty Head as part of a three fort defense system designed to protect the entrance to Puget Sound. The military began acquiring land for defense as

San de Fuca in its heyday.
In 1900, the first contingent of troops arrived on central Whidbey, and by 1910, the number of troops stationed at the fort reached 400. This large influx had a significant impact on the social and economic climate of the existing community. While the military supplied many of its own internal services, the raw materials and human resources needed in creating and maintaining the fort reached beyond early as 1850. This land, with an additional 150 acres on and around Admiralty Head, became the construction site of the fort beginning in 1897. Materials, received at the fort's wharf and dock on Keystone Spit, travelled overland by wagon and mule (and later a small railroad) to various locations. As part of a growing community, additional roads, sidewalks, streetlights along Keystone Spit and many other elements were added to the rural landscape. Large amounts of timber were cut between the years 1900-1917 in order to provide the raw materials for barracks, bunkers, residential quarters, storehouses, officer quarters and various other support structures. Many of these structures remain in the landscape around Admiralty Head.
the boundaries of the military reserve. In many ways, the
fort itself became a social center for central Whidbey.
Townspeople attended ballgames, dances, movies, and other
social events held on the expansive parade grounds. Over
the years, many local young women married soldiers stationed
at the fort and they often settled permanently on the
island. Around this time Prairie Center developed as a new
commercial center between Coupeville and the fort, catering
primarily to the military. Pat's Place, located in the
heart of Prairie Center, was built in 1905 by a retired
military soldier and continues to serve the community today
in much the same capacity, even without the military
presence.

During World War I, military activity increased at the fort
with the construction of map rooms and gun escarpments.
Though never fired in anger, these guns were among the
largest on the West Coast. After World War II, the
reservation fluctuated between being an active training post
and being on caretaker status. By 1954, the property was
declared surplus, divided, and sold to various public and
private interests. The State of Washington acquired much of
the military reservation and operates a state park there
today. Admiralty Head lighthouse houses an exhibit
interpreting the history of the Fort Casey military
operation. Seattle Pacific University acquired title to
adjacent property in 1956 and now uses the former military
residences, storehouses, gymnasium and other support
structures for their year-round educational and recreational
activities.

The early twentieth century also marked the beginning of a
tourist industry in the central Whidbey area that still
continues today. Most of the attention first focused on
Penn Cove because of its recreation potential and scenic

Pat's Place in Prairie Center, now known as the Tyee
Motel and Cafe.
views. In 1901, Lester Still, a local lawyer, judge (first one in the area), and entrepreneur, purchased property near Coveland and began a resort development. The property, a densely wooded point projecting from the cove’s south shore, came to be known as Still’s Park. By 1907, small wood frame cabins existed in conjunction with a larger structure, the Whid-Isle Inn. Constructed of logs and overlooking the cove, this rustic hostelry welcomed both locals and visitors from Seattle and elsewhere. Arriving by steamer at the Inn’s landing, guests enjoyed a quasi-wilderness experience which included boating, fishing and relaxation. Before long, the Whid-Isle gained a solid reputation for good meals and hospitality, eventually drawing more than seasonal guests. While the automobile replaced the steamship and contemporary seasonal and permanent homes replaced Judge Still's cabins, the picturesque inn continues to attract guests year round.

To the east of Still’s Park along Penn Cove, a small beach resort catering to the "recreation-minded" developed at Good Beach. For many years, the Smith family owned nearly all of Good Beach and its tidelands. In the 1910s - 20s, they built several small cabins with the intention of renting them out to fishermen. Lining the beach, tourists could spend the night in these cabins for a few dollars. Adjacent to the cabins, Frank Pratt, Jr., a wealthy local property owner, had two small boathouses built to protect and store his valuable hand-made teak sailboats. Over time, the attraction of the cabins diminished and the Smiths sold off parcels of Good Beach. The cabins were moved back from the shoreline to make way for larger homes, or torn down. Two cabins stand today nestled into the trees that define the boundary of Good Beach. The two boathouses also remain intact, appearing much the same as the day they were built.

Across the way from Still's Park, Kennedy's Lagoon opened in the 1920s catering to tourists and locals. Gil Kennedy, a former sheriff, believed his property was an ideal spot for swimming and fishing. He built small cabins and had a supply store and gas station as well. For a daily or seasonal fee, swimmers could use the lagoon and Kennedy's diving platform. In the 1950s, the land around the lagoon was subdivided and a few year-round residents replaced most of the small cabins, but retained the character and scenic
quality of the lagoon.

Following the sailing ships of the nineteenth century, steamship and ferry travel remained the only means of access to Whidbey Island during the early twentieth century. The steamer "Fairhaven" connected Coupeville, San de Fuca and Monroe's Landing to the north directly with Seattle on a daily basis. In the 1920s, ferry service linked Whidbey Island with the mainland at the south end of the island. As the automobile became a household item, Whidbey Island residents sought the construction of a bridge to the mainland at Deception Pass to the north. The Deception Pass Bridge Association lobbied strongly until 1935, when the bridge was completed. Years of isolation ended with a ribbon-cutting ceremony atop the bridge that spanned a treacherous but beautiful water passage.

Despite the publicity this major event generated, activity in the central Whidbey area was already slowing down. The far-reaching effects of the Great Depression were felt strongly in the prairies and in Coupeville, and small subsistence farms started up in town where room allowed. A limited amount of new building occurred during the 1930s, but more often structures were moved and re-used, and older structures were rehabilitated. The beach along the strait proved to be an excellent source of wood for additions, barns and sheds. Another source of building materials was Fort Casey, then on "caretaker" status. The military held a public auction in which entire structures as well as building materials were sold and removed from the post. Many local individuals took advantage of items such as roofing slate and incorporated these materials into their buildings.

By the close of the 1930s, economic conditions began to improve and tourists again began to visit the area. By the late 1940s, Seattle and other "mainland" residents rediscovered Penn Cove and began building vacation homes. Much of the beachfront along the cove was subdivided in the early 1950s. Homes were built along the bluffs overlooking the water and down at Snakelum Point. Much larger than the rustic cabins of the 1910s and 1920s, these homes were carefully sited to protect the natural character of the shoreline. An appreciation of the environment was also evident in the selection of building materials which often blended with the woodlands or beach front.

with the construction of the naval air station at Oak Harbor in the 1940s, other lands in central Whidbey were subdivided in order to provide year round residences for the increasing numbers of retired military personnel. The subdivisions, typical of the times, developed most often in agricultural lands, establishing neighborhoods or districts distinct from their surroundings. This trend continues to the present and development pressures continue to influence the culture and landscape fabric of central Whidbey including the reserve. The people also continue. They still build, work, trade, play and live in a community shaped by the familiar ways and feelings of this historical landscape.
"... I realize that I bring myself back and back to this bluff because here scenes still fit onto each other despite their distances of time. Becoming rarer in the West, constancy of this sort. What I am looking out over in this fresh dawn is little enough changed from the past that Swan in a Makah canoe, coming or going on the Port Townsend Neah Bay route, can be readily imagined across there, the sailing gulls slide through his line of sight as they do mine. Resonance of this rare sort, the reliable echo from the eye inward, I think we had better learn to prize like breath."

Ivan Doig, Winter Brothers, 1980
Overlooking Ebey's Landing

Every landscape is historic in a certain sense. This is true of both natural and man-made environments. In natural landscapes, patterns of succession define not only the physical patterns of vegetation and other life systems, but to the trained observer, tell the ecological history of a particular parcel of land.

The same is basically true of a cultural landscape like Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve. Successive generations shaped and reshaped the same land, slowly shifting its physical character. Old places are continually put to new uses or abandoned altogether. Over time, what remains may be no more than fragments or suggestions of a way of life and kind of living with the land. Sometimes a few important pieces of the past are easily recognized and maintained, like artifacts in a museum; dramatic reminders of a past culture. In other cases, many of the suggestions of the past are neither as obvious nor as easily protected. They are so closely laced into the present landscape fabric that their meaning and value is in the whole feeling of the place. Such is the case in Ebey's Landing. The structures, fences, gardens, and fields; the smell of cut hay or the cry of gulls; the foggy cliffs or the village seaport, all call to mind a familiar feeling and connection to the spirit of the place both past and present. The generations of people who lived on the land seem to have recognized the important pieces of this landscape without isolating them. These pieces, all part of the complete mosaic, formed a part of their everyday living. That is perhaps the essence and significance of this national reserve; it is a blending of land, people and time that together weave a sense of place and community.

This report, together with the building and landscape inventory cards that make up Volume II, is an attempt to document this sense of place, this collection of building and landscape pieces that together maintain a sense of integrity, a complete mosaic of past and present. The future of Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve is purposefully left unaddressed. Whether or not the future of the reserve will continue to maintain the sense of place established and maintained by past generations will be the decision of those who now live -- or will in the future live -- on these lands. This is as it has always been. It is a part of the long and remarkable continuity of human interaction with the land that creates this very special place.
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Archeological Resources
And Ethnographic Summary

Virginia A. Harris

I. NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Introduction

Whidbey Island is located in northern Puget Sound, western Washington. The island extends for a distance of about forty miles, north to south, and varies between 1-10 miles in width (Ness et. al. 1958:3). Admiralty Inlet, the Strait of Juan de Fuca, and the Olympic Peninsula lie to the west of Whidbey Island. Camano Island lies to the east of Whidbey Island. Together, Camano and Whidbey Island lie adjacent to the mainland just off the coast from Skagit and Snohomish counties, Washington. North of Whidbey Island are the San Juan Islands, Vancouver Island, the Gulf Islands, and the Georgia Strait. The Skagit and Stillaguamish rivers drain from the Cascade mountains, cross the Puget Lowland, and enter northern Puget Sound along the coast to the east of Whidbey and Camano islands.

Physiography, Soils and Vegetation

The island's relief is best described as gently rolling. Physiographic characteristics are largely derived from the effects of the advance and retreat of the Puget Lobe of the Fraser glaciation during the late Pleistocene. A separate geology section below discusses the island's Pleistocene glacial history.

Uplands on the island mostly range in elevation from between 100 to 300 feet (Ness et. al. 1958:3). The higher upland areas are located outside the project area in the southern
portion of the island and at the extreme northern tip of the island. Uplands in the project area include the Fort Casey Uplands with elevations of about 180 feet, and the San de Fuca Uplands and the West Woodlands with elevations of about 250 feet. Prior to lumbering activities, the vegetation on the uplands was characterized by the Douglas fir-hemlock forest cover typical of western Washington (White 1980, Franklin and Dryness 1973, Ness et. al. 1958).

The forested upland areas are broken by natural prairies in the central portion of the island. Ebey's Prairie and a portion of Smith and Crockett Prairie are located in the project area. These prairies are edaphic and they are thought to have developed on areas that had once been glacial lakes, sloughs, marine areas, or glacial channels which had emptied into the heads of small inlets (Ness et. al. 1958:15-17,18). Prairie vegetation at contact is expected to have included bulbous plants such as camas, native grasses, and shrubs (Ness et. al. 1958:5, Thompson 1978:26).

Geology

The surface features of Whidbey Island are derived from the most recent Pleistocene glacial advance of the area: the Puget Lobe of the Vashon Stade of the Fraser glaciation (Ness et. al. 1958, Easterbrook 1969, Huntting et. al. 1961). During the Vashon advance, Puget Sound and the surrounding lowlying areas were covered with continental ice to about fifteen miles south of Olympia (Armstrong et. al. 1965:323,327, Thorson 1980:307, Easterbrook 1968:4).

On Whidbey Island, this advance left proglacial outwash sands at the lowest Vashon levels of Whidbey Island. These sands are overlain by Vashon till deposited during the time the Vashon ice occupied the Puget Lowlands. Finally, with the retreat of the ice from the area, glacial-marine drift and post depositional gravels were deposited on the island (Easterbrook 1962, 1968, 1969).

Radiocarbon dates from different Vashon depositional units date the retreat of the Vashon ice from the island at about 12,500 to 13,000 B.P. (Easterbrook 1968:27). The implication for the archeological record is that land would not have been available for human occupation on Whidbey Island until an ice-free time after about 12,500 to 13,000 B.P. Occupation may have been much later due to apparently high relative sea levels immediately following the retreat of the Vashon ice as indicated by glacial-marine sediments at the highest levels of the island.

It is expected that the surface area of the island has changed during the Holocene with changing relative sea levels. The immediate worldwide Holocene trend following the retreat of the continental glaciers at the end of the Pleistocene was: 1) rising eustatic sea levels, and; 2) isostatic rebound (Flint 1971).

Easterbrook (1962, 1966, 1969), Bierdman (1967), Larsen (1971, 1972), Huesser (1960), and Mathews et. al. (1972) have presented different sequences for sea level oscillations during the Holocene for the Pacific Northwest. There is disagreement among Northwest researchers about the sequence and duration of periods of emergence and submergence for the Holocene. Some of these studies have been of local areas; other studies have used information from different areas of the Northwest to present a general sequence of sea level change for a broad area of the Pacific Northwest. Some variation is expected since differences such as local density and thickness of the Vashon ice, local geologic structure, and tectonic movement have affected the
local rate of isostatic adjustment and hence relative sea-level changes in different areas (Flint 1971, Easterbrook 1962, Thorsen 1980).

Studies which would provide information about a local sequence of Holocene sea level changes for central Whidbey Island have not been conducted. It is, however, possible to assess the effects that changing relative sea levels would have on the archeological record of the island. Simply put, sites may have been elevated or submerged since the original time of their deposition during the Holocene. As a result, certain types of sites for certain periods may be missing from the island's archeological record due to submergence (see discussion in Grebniak 1983, Thompson 1978, Fladmark 1975, Graebert and Larsen 1973).

II. ETHNOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Puget Sound Area Native American Subsistence Activities

The Pacific Northwest Coast has a large ethnographic literature describing the native groups that were encountered at contact. Subsistence activities have been documented for native groups of the Puget Sound area by authors such as Barnett (1955), Collins (1971), Haeberlin and Gunther (1930), Snyder (1964), Smith (1940), Stern (1934), and Suttles (1951).

The general subsistence pattern for the area can best be described as an extractive food producing economy. Resources of the area, and the Pacific Northwest as a whole, are abundant and varied, but widely scattered and available only during certain seasons of the year. The seasonal pattern was one in which families would disperse into small groups following a winter of common residence at a village site. The families would establish food producing camps for the spring, summer, and fall in loci of seasonally available foods. Camps would be located to gather berries, roots, shell-fish, and to fish. Food surpluses which were generated during the spring, summer, and fall supported life in the winter villages when families were reunited for the winter season. In spring another cycle of annual dispersal would begin again.

In discussing the Lower Skagit, Snyder (1964:72) points out that solitary work and small work parties were limited to certain resources and techniques. Berry picking, for example, could be done alone or as a cooperative venture. Other activities such as salmon fishing were always conducted by groups of families. Snyder also discusses the importance of Skagit society leaders for their role in directing the family groups to different resources, and in prioritizing resource collection to insure adequate collection if two or more resources were available at the same time (Snyder 1964:72-74).

Bennett (1972), Snyder (1964), and Collins (1974) provide useful summaries of Skagit society and may be consulted for further information about the Skagit.

Campbell (1981) and Thompson (1978) warn against the uncritical use of ethnographic data to model prehistoric settlement patterns. Thompson (1978:41-42) notes that the ethnographic information available to us about Northwest groups was recorded at least 150 years after the most recent time the native life way could have been practiced unaltered. Alterations came long before face-to-face contact and the first written Anglo accounts of native
groups. The most devastating of these changes was the loss of population through contact with diseases of European origin. Other changes came with the adoption of metal tools and new foods of European origin (Thompson 1978:42).

At best, the ethnographic record is an account of traditional systems during a period of collapse or adjustment. As such, it may not be a good model for interpreting prehistoric settlement patterns and land use. Ethnographic information may, however, provide the archeologist with information about the range of possible kinds of prehistoric land use (Campbell 1981:58-59).

Central Whidbey Island Native Groups

Ethnographic and historical references show that the Klallam and Lower Skagit used or occupied portions of central Whidbey Island included in the project area.

The Klallam are reported to have occupied the south side of the Strait of Juan de Fuca between Port Discovery and the Hoko river. Later they expanded into the territory of the Chemakum in the Port Townsend area and to southern Vancouver Island (Swanton 1952:419, Gunther 1927:177). Gunther (1927:177) cites an earlier reference of Curtis (1913:9) which reports Klallam settlements on the upper west coast of Whidbey Island, and Klallam use of southern Shaw and Orcas islands in the San Juan Islands. Gunther states that none of her informants spoke of settlement or use of these areas, but does admit that there may have been seasonal use of Whidbey Island by the Klallam (Gunther 1927:177). White (1980:15) cites early historical references (Olympia Pioneer Democrat 1853, Farrar 1916, 1917, and Kane 1925) as reporting historic period use of central Whidbey Island by the Klallam. White (1980:15) summarizes these sources and reports that the Klallam seized part of Ebey's Prairie to grow potatoes and that they had built a fort in the vicinity of the prairie.

Early references show that the territory of the Skagit included the mouth of the Skagit River and central Whidbey Island (Gibbs 1855:433, Upchurch 1936:284). Gibbs (1855:433) lists Penn Cove as a major habitation site for the Skagit. When the Swinomish are listed as a subgroup of the Skagit then the Skagit territory can be listed as also including northern Whidbey Island, eastern Fidalgo Island, and the mainland around Swinomish slough (Gibbs 1877:180, Eells 1887:8, Haeberlin and Gunther 1930:6, Fig. 1). Snyder (1964:63) lists Camano Island as part of the Lower Skagit territory. Curtis (1913:174), however, shows the Snohomish as occupying lower Camano Island.

In some later ethnographies, the Skagit are divided into Upper and Lower groups based on their distribution in space. Collins (1974:5) uses Upper and Lower Skagit to distinguish between mainland and Whidbey Island Skagits. Snyder (1964) describes the Lower Skagit as the group which occupied or used the mouth of the Skagit River and portions of the islands to the west in Puget Sound. She uses Upper Skagit to describe Skagit groups which lived upriver from the Skagit Delta tributaries (Snyder 1964:65). This paper follows Snyder's use of the terms, but also uses Lower Skagit and Skagit interchangeably.

Early Historical References to Native Use and Occupation of Central Whidbey Island

Bryan (1955), Bennett (1972), and White (1980) provide good
compilations of historical references about Native American use and occupation on central Whidbey Island. This section provides a summary of this information.

British Captain George Vancouver visited western Washington and the Puget Sound area in 1782 during his exploration of the West Coast and the North Pacific. After visiting Dungeness and southern Puget Sound he arrived in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. He had Joseph Whidbey take a longboat out to explore the Whidbey and Camano Island area. Whidbey's report of native inhabitation at Penn Cove is reported by Vancouver as follows: "On each point of the harbour . . . was a deserted village; in one of which were found several sepulchres formed exactly like a sentry box . . . (Vancouver 1801:167)." Vancouver goes on to describe the burials. He also estimates that the number of inhabitants at Penn Cove probably exceeded ". . . the total of all the natives we had before seen; the other parts of the Sound did not appear, by any means, so populous, . . . (Vancouver 1801:167)."

Much later, in 1840, Catholic Missionary Father Blanchet arrived on western Whidbey Island. He met with Skagit Chief Snatelum at Penn Cove and reported on the presence of Skagit gardens of European introduced potatoes (White 1980:33, Bryan 1955:17).

It was in the following year that Charles Wilkes of the U.S. Exploring Expedition arrived in Puget Sound (Wilkes 1845). Like Vancouver before him, Wilkes describes Penn Cove as having more native inhabitants than other areas he had visited in the Sound (Wilkes 1845:481).

Wilkes describes a palisade around the village at Penn Cove. Its purpose is said to have been a defense against northern groups who came to raid for slaves. Wilkes also notes the construction of a church at the village and a 3-4 acre enclosure of potatoes and beans (Wilkes 1845:481).

The first Anglo-American settlers; the Ebeys, Crocketts and others came to the prairies of central Whidbey Island in the early 1850s. Early settler and period accounts summarized in White (1980), Bryan (1955), Collins (1974), and Bennett (1972) show the settlement period as punctuated by Native-Anglo land use disputes, land use disputes between Klallam and Skagit, and finally Anglo displacement of Native groups from the area.

III. HISTORY OF ARCHEOLOGY FOR THE PROJECT AREA

Introduction

Previous archeological work in the project area and on Whidbey Island as a whole has been limited. At the beginning of the century, Smith (1907) reported the location of shell middens in the project area in the vicinity of Penn Cove. At about this time, cairn sites were reported in the project area by Smith and Fowke (1901), as part of the Jesup North archeological and ethnographic expedition to the Pacific Northwest Coast. This early field work was followed by an approximately fifty year period during which no archeological field work was conducted on central Whidbey Island.

In the early 1950's, Alan Bryan, University of Washington, conducted a shoreline archeological survey of Island, Skagit, and Snohomish counties (Bryan 1955, 1963).

Finally, to the north outside the project area, Astrida Onat, Seattle Central Community College, has recently completed archeological excavations at a shell midden site, Oak Harbor (Onat, personal communication).

Published reports, unpublished manuscripts, and records on file at the State Historic Preservation Office, Olympia, the Office of Public Archaeology, Seattle, and the Washington Archaeological Research Center, Pullman, have been used as sources of information about sites discussed in this section. Thirty-five sites are currently recorded for the reserve area. A table which lists these sites and their topographic situation and location has been prepared as part of this report. This confidential document is on file with the National Park Service, Northwest Regional Office, Seattle.

Early Archeological Fieldwork

Smith (1907:378) reports on sites he visited in the Gulf of Georgia and the Puget Sound region. He describes three shell middens located in the Penn Cove area of Whidbey Island. Smith and Fowke (1901) visited cairn sites in the Puget Sound area and adjacent areas of British Columbia. A map is included in their report which shows two shell midden and two cairn sites in the Penn Cove area. The text describes ten Whidbey Island cairn sites, but there are no site locations given in the description. One of these sites (Smith and Fowke 1901:58) appears to be the same as the third site listed above by Smith (1907:378).

Bryan's 1950's Survey and Test Excavations

During the early 1950's, Bryan (1955, 1963) conducted a shoreline survey of Island, Skagit, and Snohomish counties. During this survey, ninety-three sites were recorded for Island County. Thirty-five of the thirty-four recorded sites for the Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve were generated during this survey. The thirty-fifth site, IS-97, is discussed below. All but one of the thirty-four reserve area sites that Bryan recorded are located in the Penn Cove area. The site Bryan recorded outside the Penn Cove area is a shell midden located on Ebey's Prairie (Table 1). Interestingly, all but two sites recorded by Bryan are described as characterized by the presence of shell. These sites may also include associated features such as depressions, burials and cairns. The two sites that are not associated with shell are described as cairns (IS-59, IS-70).

Bryan (1955, 1963) conducted test excavations at nine sites that were located during his shoreline survey. Three former village sites were tested at Penn Cove. Ethnographic information shows that one site, IS-50, was the Skagit village of Caukwala which is reported to have been occupied until 1850 (Bryan 1963:40). Bryan (1963:44) correlated another site, (IS-77), with a Skagit village mapped by Charles Wilkes (nd:90) as having been inhabited in 1841. The third site, (IS-13), is reported to have been the main historic period Lower Skagit village site (Bryan 1963:47).

In the absence of explicitly stated research goals, Bryan appears to have undertaken his early 1950s shoreline survey in order to locate suitable sites for excavation. Sites were probably selected because they stratified and exhibited potential for artifact recovery. With his admittedly meager test excavation results (Bryan 1963:81,89), formulates a
chronological sequence consisting of: 1) Coastal Land Hunting culture, 2) an Intermediate (land and maritime culture), and 3) a Late/Recent/Historic sequence showing culture shift from a maritime culture to a re-emphasis of land resources (Bryan 1963:89). Bryan goes on to correlate this sequence with King's (1950) sequence for the San Juan Islands and Borden's (1951) for the Frazer River Delta (Bryan 1963:89).

Bryan's ordering should not be confused with the ordering of sites created by a frequency distribution of stylistic types in time. Instead, Bryan has used an assortment of traits such as the presence or absence of ground stone and flaked lithic artifacts, and the relative frequency of unmodified bone and shell in a component to make inferences about prehistoric adaptations.

Recent Fieldwork

In 1977, the Office of Public Archeology, University of Washington, was contracted to conduct a field investigation and a literature search for sites in an area of proposed marina development at Penn Cove (Jermann 1977a, 1977b). Three previously recorded sites, IS-58, IS-60 and IS-61, were reported in the project area, and one previously unrecorded site was located during field investigations (Jermann 1977b:2). While the topographic situation of the new site is described, the site itself is not.

Robinson (1980, 1981) reports on archeological fieldwork conducted in 1980 prior to proposed highway construction along State Route 20 between Libby Road and Madrona Way and along State Route 20 between Madrona Way and Penn Cove Road (Scenic Heights Road). Due to the reported presence of cairns located north of Libby Road (no reference or site number is given), infra-red and natural color aerial photographs were taken of areas adjacent to the proposed construction (Robinson 1977b:unpaginated). Soil samples were then taken in areas of enigmatic patterning. High priority test sites were then selected on the basis of soil sample analysis. The test excavation results are reported to have been negative; however, Robinson does report a light scattering of shell for several of the test units (Robinson 1981:unpaginated).

The thirty-fifth and only site (IS-97) that has been recorded for the reserve area since Bryan's mid-1950's survey is located in the Libby Road vicinity near State Route 20. It is a shell scatter and appears to have been located before or during the highway construction described by Robinson (1980, 1981). It was recorded in 1982 by E. Chesmore and H. Jackson.

Discussion

With the exception of site IS-97, all of the previously recorded sites for the area of central Whidbey Island now included in the Ebey's Landing National Reserve were located about 30 years ago by Bryan during his three county shoreline survey (Bryan 1955, 1963). Because of the survey's shoreline nature, most of our information about the distribution of sites for central Whidbey Island is limited to a knowledge of sites which, for the most part, are located in a littoral environment at Penn Cove. We have little information about the distribution of sites on the uplands and prairies of central Whidbey Island. We do know that most of the sites Bryan located at Penn Cove are high density artifact clusters represented by large accumulations
of unmodified shell artifacts. It would be of interest to sample the prairies and uplands to determine what other types of sites are represented on central Whidbey Island. The presently available information on recorded sites for the reserve area shows that five sites are located outside a littoral environment at Penn Cove (IS-54, IS-77, IS-59, IS-88, IS-97). Four are sites reported to be located on prairies in the Penn Cove area; the fifth site is located on Ebey's Prairie. While a sample size of five is small, the distribution of these sites may represent a different land use from the sites located on Penn Cove. Like the sites on Penn Cove, the prairie sites are described as shell mounds, shell scatters, and cairns. Since no formal comparisons have been made among the sites, it is not possible to assess the relationships among the sites at this point.

Because information about variability in the range of site types and their distribution in space is not available for central Whidbey Island, it is not possible to identify settlement patterns and prehistoric land use for the area. If the research interest is in examining changing prehistoric adaptations through time, as represented in changing land use and settlement patterns, then a regional scale analysis would be appropriate. In this approach, the region would be sampled and the resulting distribution of sites could be correlated with environmental variables and analyzed for intersite functional variability. Temporal control such as the analysis of stylistic types and the use of radiocarbon dates would be necessary to articulate contemporary but functionally distinct sites in a system of contemporaneous prehistoric land use.

It is useful to note here that the sites recorded for central Whidbey Island may be part of an adaptation that may have extended beyond Whidbey Island. Other settlement types in a contemporaneous system might be expected to be located on the mainland, on other islands, and in areas of Whidbey Island outside the project area. Thompson (1978) has analyzed prehistoric settlement patterns in neighboring Skagit county. This analysis may prove useful in developing a research design for a study of settlement patterns on central Whidbey Island.

Previously published and unpublished reports do show that good potential exists for identifying sites on the prairie areas of central Whidbey Island. In discussing lithic artifacts from the area, Bryan speaks of a number of projectile points in private collections. These are said to have come from the "plowed ground on the natural prairies in the Penn Cove area (Bryan 1963:54)."

Two unpublished manuscripts on file with the Office of Public Archeology, University of Washington (Kidd 1961, Holmes and Kidd 1961), also describe lithic artifacts such as projectile points from private collections of central Whidbey Island residents. Artifacts in these collections come from "the prairies around Penn Cove", "Ebey's Prairie" and "Crockett Lake." Other references give site locations in reference to named private residences (Kidd 1961:unpaginated, Holmes and Kidd 1961:unpaginated).
REFERENCES CITED

Armstrong, J.E., D.R. Crandell, D.J. Easterbrook, and J.R. Noble


Barnett, H.G.


Bennett, Lee Ann


Bierdman, D.D.


Borden, C.E.


Bryan, A.L.


1963 An Archaeological Survey of Northern Puget Sound. Occasional Papers of the Idaho State University Museum No. II.

Campbell, Sarah K.


Collins, June M.


Curtis, Edward


Eells, Myron

Easterbrook, D.J.


Farrar, Victor, (editor)


Fladmark, K.R.


Flint, Richard F.


Franklin, J.F. and C.T. Dryness


Gibbs, George

1855 Report of Mr. George Gibbs to Captain McClellen, on the Indian Tribes of the Territory of Washington. Pacific Railroad Reports. United States War Department, Washington D.C.


Grabert, G.F. and C.E. Larsen

Grebmeier, Jaqueline

Gunther, Erna

Haeberlin, H. and Erna Gunther

Holmes, Brian and R.S. Kidd

Huesser, C.J.

Hunting, M.T., W.A.G. Bennet, V.E. Livingstone, Jr., and W.S. Muen

Jermann, Jerry

Kane, Paul

Kidd, R.S.
King, A.R.

Larsen, C.E.

Mathews, R.W., C.E. Borden, and G.E. Roose

Ness, A.O., C.G. Richins, and R.C. Roberts

Onat, Astrida
1983 Personal Communication, September.

Robinson, Joan

Smith, H.I.

Smith, H.I. and G. Fowke

Smith, Marian W.
1940 The Puyallup-Nisqually. Columbia University Contributions to Anthropology, Volume 43.

Snyder, Sally
Stern, B.J.

Suttles, W.

Swanton, John

Thompson, Gail

Thorson, Robert

Upchurch, O.C.

Vancouver, George

Wilkes, Charles
1845 Narrative of the United States Expedition, Vol. IX. Lea and Blanchard, Philadelphia.

White, Richard
Notes On The Inventory: Survey Methodology
NOTES ON THE INVENTORY: SURVEY METHODOLOGY

For fourteen weeks during the summer of 1983, the Pacific Northwest Regional Office of the National Park Service had a project team working at Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve. The team consisted of five individuals with backgrounds in historic preservation and landscape architecture. Project goals included a complete inventory of all pre-1940 structures, and a record of all natural and manmade landscape features that are located within the 17,400 acre reserve.

From the beginning, the two parts of the inventory -- buildings and landscape -- were viewed as two distinct but interrelated elements that together create a composite picture of the reserve. This is the foundation of a cultural landscape inventory. For both the historians and landscape architects, this presented many interesting and innovative approaches to the actual survey. What follows is a brief description of the survey methods developed by the team and used to document the cultural landscape of Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve.

LANDSCAPE INVENTORY

Introduction: Process

The landscape portion of the inventory documents the reserve's natural and manmade elements. The first week of the project was spent canvassing all 17,400 acres on Ebey's Landing. This helped the team form both physical and mental images of the whole reserve. From that information, the team divided the reserve into ten basic and distinct character areas based on natural land features such as ridges and woodlands, and cultural patterns such as roads and political boundaries. These divisions provided a conceptual framework for the inventory as a whole.
The second phase was the heart of the landscape inventory and involved the actual field work. The goal was to document existing landscape components within the reserve and record the information on 8 1/2 x 11 inventory cards. One of the project tasks involved design of the cards themselves. While architectural inventories had been conducted by the National Park Service and others, this was the first landscape inventory to be documented using an 8 1/2 x 11 format.

Using criteria for identifying and naming various landscape components explored by Robert Melnick, Professor of Landscape Architecture at the University of Oregon, and
adapted to Ebey's Landing, the card was developed over a two week test period. It was designed to accommodate a variety of scales and information, maps, diagrams, and photographs used in cataloguing a single unit of land.

In this study a unit of land was one half of a USGS section; an area measuring one mile by one half mile or 310 acres.

This unit was chosen for two reasons. First, a parcel this size could be seen from one place if there were no visual barriers and could be thoroughly explored by car and on foot in a two to three hour period. Second, the information that required mapping could be read and rendered clearly at this scale.

To facilitate the field work, each inventory card had to stand alone as an individual piece of the larger reserve. Altogether, there were 66 cards describing the various components and related landscape qualities of Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve.

Field Techniques: Documentation

Before going out into the field, the landscape architects gathered as much information as possible from existing
sources including USGS maps, historic photographs and aerial photographs. The task was to record specific landscape elements in a consistent and objective manner. The first step was to locate the site. Every half section was first identified by a standard USGS map number and quad name. For example, locates this particular half-section in the south half of USGS section number in Township 32, Range 1 West in the Coupeville Quadrangle. The sources which support the information on the card are indicated, as well as the date and names of the team members who completed the documentation.

The next step was to write a brief description locating the specific half-section in the context of the entire reserve. For consistency, the description always located the unit in reference to the character areas of the reserve, primary access routes and general spatial patterns. This description addressed the broad relationships between material components and predominant landforms.

Those patterns were then explored in more depth according to general land use categories such as agriculture, ranching, natural vegetation, and so on. There are six categories in all and usually more than one use within a single unit of land. The team calculated the approximate percentage of each current land use within every half-section. The percentages added together give broad and general land use patterns for the entire reserve.

In order to express land use categories in more detail, those general patterns were next broken down into specific land use activities. For example, if the general land use was agriculture, the more specific use was cropland of some kind. In this inventory, rather than name individual crops, the team indicated whether the crop was rotating like a corn
or wheat field, or permanent like an orchard or berry field. Other categories were treated in a similar fashion.

Kancning was refined to indicate whether animals grazed in open pastures or were contained in holding areas associated with dairy complexes. Areas of natural vegetation were designated either forest, grassland or wetland. Residential uses were either multiple, as part of a subdivision, or single individual homes. Commercial land uses were broken down into three specific areas: towns, like Coupeville, single buildings outside the city limits and commercial groups which indicate working farm complexes. In every case, these land uses and patterns were defined by a variety of elements referred to as boundaries.

The inventory names both natural and manmade boundaries at a variety of scales. For example, topographic boundaries include ridges, bluffs, ravines and shorelines. Vegetative boundaries include large forest areas as well as hedgerows. Cultural boundaries such as roads, fences and political lines (like city limits) were also noted.

Any significant features and historical information is included as a note on the front of the card. Photographs supporting the verbal descriptions of the landscape were
added showing surrounding land uses, significant buildings and overall site character.

The back of the card included the USGS map at 1:8000 with all components diagramed and keyed, and a small location map which locates the particular half section in the reserve. A cross section was drawn to show primary and significant relationships among landscape components. A photographic panorama added a dimension to the map giving another overall character image for that particular section. Finally, the landscape cards are cross-referenced to the architecture cards listing every pre-1940 building in that half-section.

BUILDING INVENTORY

Introduction: Process

The building inventory of all pre-1940 residential and commercial structures located in the reserve was conducted by three historians with backgrounds in historic preservation. In order to complete an inventory card for each site or structure, it was necessary to first collect background information relating to various aspects of the
reserve. Using primary and secondary sources, research was conducted at the Island County Historical Society, the University of Washington, the State and Federal Archives, and the State Library in Olympia. Local newspapers, historic photographs and oral histories also proved to be valuable resources.

The second phase of the building inventory was to conduct field work at each pre-1940 site. Before that could occur it was necessary for the team to get an approximate count of all pre-1940 sites. The historians conducted a windshield survey, driving all roads within the reserve, and plotted suspected pre-1940 sites on a USGS map.

Next, the Island County Assessor Records were searched to help confirm dates on every site. In some cases buildings were added to the inventory because they were not originally identified in the windsheid survey due to major alterations to the older structure. In other cases, buildings were eliminated from the inventory because the assessor records showed a post-1940 construction date.

During this time building inventory cards were designed, adapted from a previous card format. The intent was to have the cards tie both graphically and thematically to the
landscape cards while providing all the necessary sections for thoroughly documenting a building. Basic information included the building/site's historic and common name; address; date of construction; past and present use; architectural description; location map; photographs of the site; and references. The building cards also were cross-referenced to a landscape card, setting a context for the site.

Field Techniques: Documentation

The field work provided nearly all the information needed to complete an inventory card for a site. Documentation of the building or site consisted of three components: writing an architectural description of the main building; taking photographs of the site; and recording historic information relevant to the site.

To help the team complete architectural descriptions at each site a field checklist was developed. This list allowed the team to quickly note the major features of a building. For example, the style of the building, its shape, height, roof, type and exterior material could be noted quickly while the window types and decorative features needed time to describe. Notable landscape features were also recorded. These included elements such as outbuildings, orchards, fences, gates and stone walls.

When possible, an attempt was made to characterize a building by an architectural style. The decorative elements of a structure and its massing determined the style, and many different styles are found in the reserve. The more prominent ones include the Saltbox; Vernacular Farmhouse; Queen Anne; Italianate and Second Empire styles; and the Bungalow. When a structure lacked architectural ornamentation, it was usually referred to as a Vernacular Residence.
The second component of the field work involved photographing the site. The main building had both a frontal and 3/4 view taken, with close-up photos taken of interesting architectural details like a porch or bay window. Outbuildings such as barns and sheds were also photographed. Finally, a wide-angle view of the building or complex was taken to show the relationship of the building to the surrounding landscape. This view was particularly important when using the landscape inventory for understanding the physical locale of a site.

The third component of the field work involved gathering historic information from property owners, residents or neighbors. Construction dates, exterior changes in the building, the names of builders or carpenters and the names of past owners were all included in building histories when known.

Once the field work was completed and recorded on the cards, a determination was made as to whether the site contributed to the reserve on some level of significance according to the criteria set by the National Register. The following criteria was used for this decision process:

A building/site contributed to the reserve if:
1. it represented a broad pattern of development in the reserve, and/or
2. it related to a person important to the history of the reserve, and/or
3. it illustrated a type or period of construction significant to the overall history of the area.

If a building/site met one of these criteria and retained integrity of design, materials, workmanship, and location, it was considered to be a contributing site.

Owners of properties determined to contribute to the significance of the reserve will be eligible to take advantage of grants and tax incentives available for rehabilitating National Register properties.

As a whole, the Building and Landscape Inventory will be used to expand the existing National Register of Historic Places' nomination. It will reflect not only the historical development of the area during the nineteenth century but will also include the first half of the twentieth century, as mandated in the legislation that established the reserve. The document will also serve as a tool for the Citizen's Trust Board to use in managing the reserve's resources and making informed decisions regarding its future.
Major Building Styles Of The Reserve
Saltbox 1850-1880

More a building shape than a building style, the Saltbox takes its name from a sloping gable roof that as a whole, is reminiscent of an early colonial saltbox. It is formed by a 1-story addition across the rear of a 1 1/2 or 2-story building. Initially an easy method of enlarging a house, it eventually became an accepted building form, particularly in New England. A prominent center chimney or a pair of end chimneys helped relieve an otherwise symmetrical box-like structure. Materials were simple and utilized in a functional manner. A center entrance with a transom above and 4/4 or 6/6 double-hung windows are common features.

VernacularFarmhouse 1860-1910

Severe simplicity, functionality, and a straightforward appearance are the characteristics of this style. Typically, 1 1/2-stories with a gable roof, the structure may be an "L" or "T" in plan. Corbelled center or end chimneys and 6/6 double-hung windows are common. Unembellished frieze boards and corner boards often serve as the sole ornamentation.
Queen Anne 1880-1905

The Queen Anne style takes its name from the reign of an eighteenth century English Queen. It is a varied and rich style in its ornamentation and form. Queen Anne style houses, generally, are not one simple volume but are composed of a number of parts, including towers, dormers, bay windows, and corbelled chimneys. Wall surfaces such as coursed shingles, clapboards, and inset panels of sawn wooden ornament are combined with irregular roof lines and decorative wrap-around porches. Windows may include small square or diamond panes, and the more typically 2/2 double-hung sash.

Queen Anne Farmhouse 1880-1910

The basic form and simplicity of the Vernacular Farmhouse is evident in the Queen Anne Farmhouse style, with the addition of Queen Anne elements for exterior variety. Typically 1 1/2-stories, this style utilizes Queen Anne ornamentation in an understated and less complex manner. Decorative woodwork is not as elaborate and used less frequently, but includes a combination of shingles and clapboards on wall surfaces, and sawn or turned woodwork on porches.
Italianate 1870-1900

Inspired by the "Romantic" villas of Italy, the Italianate style was widely used in both commercial and residential buildings. Whether single story in height or more, a building in this style is distinguished by the use of single or paired decorative brackets set under wide cornices. Other common features include flat or hip roofs, bay windows with inset wooden panels, corner boards, and 2/2 double-hung windows, often with molded window caps.

False Front 1880-1905

The vertical extension of the front of a building beyond the roofline creates the False Front style. Virtually always used for commercial purposes, false front buildings gave an air of dignity to a quickly growing town by providing visual continuity along the street. These buildings in their ornamentation usually echoed the architectural styles of the day, and the Italianate style was one of the most popular. A bracketed cornice will brand the building Italianate.
Bungalow 1910-1930

With new attitudes toward comfort, convenience and low cost housing, the Bungalow became a popular residential structure in the early twentieth century. The Bungalow is typically a 1-story house with one or more low-pitched overhanging gables. Exposed beams and projecting brackets help to emphasize structural form and exude a "craft" esthetic, a characteristic of the style. There is a deliberate use of natural materials like wooden shingles and clapboards, cobblestones and rough-faced brick for exterior walls, porch columns and chimneys. Porches extend across the front of the house and are supported by wide squat or battered columns. Windows are usually casement or double-hung with many small single panes combined with larger single panes. "Bungaloid" is used to describe small homes with bungalow traits.
Major Landforms Of The Reserve
COASTAL STRIP

The west shore of the reserve, along Admiralty Inlet, is an eight-mile strip of narrow sand and stone beaches that give way to dramatic bluffs and ravines. Elevations range from sea level to just over 200 feet. Many of the bluffs are sparsely vegetated, relatively unstable, and in a constant state of erosion and accretion. Access to the fragile bluffs is limited to a State Park trail along the crest and the beach itself.

PRAIRIES

Three large natural prairies cover over 5,000 acres or 42 percent of the reserve. All three are defined by major ridges which funnel the land into gentle sweeps of rich farmland. The prairie soils are a particularly valuable resource and approximately one-third of the prairie lands are in market crops such as squash, corn and various seed crops. The remainder is a mix of wetlands, pasturelands, woodlands and farm complexes that together constitute not only a cohesive scenic area but an area rich in the resources (fencelines, hedgerows, field patterns, buildings, etc.) that explain man's presence and relationship to the land over a long period of time.
WOODLANDS

Two large and densely wooded areas on the reserve cover just over 4,500 acres. The forests are primarily second and third growth Douglas fir-Western red cedar with alder, salal, and rhododendron understory. The interior portions of these woodlands are quite remote and isolated. Large glacial kettles created depressions in excess of 200 feet in some places, punctuating an area rich in geologic history. With the exception of Fort Ebey State Park and Rhododendron Park, the woodlands on the reserve remain relatively unaccessible and undeveloped, providing a valuable natural resource in the composite cultural landscape system.

UPLANDS

The upland areas of the reserve are undulating and gently rolling hills that sweep up from the shorelines on either side of the island. Primarily pasturelands and croplands carved out of woodland stands, these areas are sparsely settled with scattered farms and residences. The patchwork fabric of the land and limited development adds to the scenic quality and pastoral character of these areas.
PENN COVE

A more sheltered but equally rich beach character, Penn Cove covers over 4,000 surface acres. The shoreline varies between low beach front at Monroe's Landing, to uplifted banks near Coupeville. Along the west edge of the cove, the low lands fill out into lagoons providing habitats for various waterfowl and migratory birds. Small cottages enhance the quiet nature of the cove at Good Beach and Snakelum Point where permanent and seasonal residents enjoy the scenic and recreational resources of the inland waters.

COUPEVILLE

The town of Coupeville is the commercial center of the reserve occupying 740 acres of land stretching from Penn Cove across Highway 20 into Ebey's Prairie. Front Street along the waterfront was the original center of the town and contains the oldest commercial buildings in Coupeville. The neighborhoods surrounding the commercial core also contain a significant number of older residences (including the oldest house on the reserve), many of which retain qualities from original site designs including large, undivided lots, remnant orchards, gates, walls and walks, and grounds that denote early patterns and development trends.
The inventory of Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve encompasses two distinct and interrelated components: a landscape inventory that documents the natural and manmade elements of the Reserve, and an architectural inventory of all pre-1940 buildings within the Reserve. While the two components are organized separately in this document, the intent (of the work) is that it be viewed as a composite environmental picture of a cultural landscape.

The landscape component of this inventory documents the Reserve's natural and manmade elements. The first phase of that process was to break the 17,400 acres of the Reserve into ten distinct character areas according to both natural land patterns such as ridges and woodlands, and cultural patterns such as roads and political boundaries. These patterns provide a conceptual framework for the inventory as a whole.

The second phase is the heart of the landscape inventory and involves documenting the material landscape of the Reserve. Each card is a description of one unit of land. A unit of land in this study is half a USGS section; an area measuring one mile by one-half mile. The card identifies a site as occupying either a north half of a section or a south half of a section, and indicates in what quad the site is located. For example, S.Sec. 3, T32, R 1W (Coupeville) reads as the south half of section 3 in township 32, Range 1 west in the Coupeville quadrangle.

A brief description locates the half section in the Reserve according to the ten character areas, primary access routes, and general spatial patterns. Those patterns are then explored in more depth according to land use categories such as agriculture, ranching, and residential use, and more specific land use activities such as types of crops, pastures, and densities.

The inventory also names both natural and manmade boundaries at a variety of scales. For example, a ridge may be a topographic boundary, and a hedgerow in a field may be a smaller-scale vegetative boundary. Roads, water, fences, and other political lines constitute other types of boundary demarcations. All information is mapped on a USGS map at 1:8000 scale, with selected photos keyed to the front of the card, and a panorama on the back. A simple section is drawn in order to show primary relationships among elements. Finally, the landscape cards are cross-referenced with the architectural cards to include all pre-1940 structures located in that half section.

The architectural component of this inventory documents all pre-1940 structures within the Reserve. The first phase of this process, a "windshield survey" of the Reserve, consisted of driving and plotting suspected pre-1940 sites. A USGS/1:24000 scale map was used initially to identify these structures. After a search of local assessment records, it became apparent that many pre-1940 structures had been overlooked in the windshield survey due to major alterations which had rendered the original structures unrecognizable. It was decided to group farm complexes as one site, and to include a few buildings that lie outside the Reserve, as well as a few post-1940 structures which are architecturally unique.

To assist the inventory team during the next
phase of field work, a checklist of major structural features was devised. Once in the field, team members sought out property owners to confirm construction dates, alterations; in many cases, owners provided valuable background information regarding the history of the site and the surrounding area. The photographic documentation of each site includes a frontal shot of the main structure, a 3/4 shot to illustrate the structures massing, and a contextual shot representative of the environment surrounding the particular site. These contextual shots provide visual integration of each site with the landscape cards. Outstanding natural or manmade landscape features such as fences, orchards, and outbuildings are also recorded on the cards.

To complement the field work, research was conducted at local and regional institutions including the Island County Historical Society, Washington State Library, University of Washington Northwest Collection, Federal Archives in Seattle and the Regional Archives in Bellingham. Old photographs, local history texts, newspaper holdings, and personal interviews were the primary sources used in this phase of the research.

In the course of this research, four distinct periods in the history of the reserve became evident and provided a framework for determining the significance of each building in the broader history of the reserve. These periods are 1850-1880, a period of early settlement; 1881-1900, a period of community growth and stability; 1901-1920, a period of military influence and economic diversification; 1921-1940, a period of economic slowdown and later recreational development. The status of each building as contributing or non-contributing to the reserve was determined by asking such questions as: is it most representative of a style within a period? is it representative of an historic phase and/or development? is it associated with a prominent individual important to the history of the reserve? The architectural cards are arranged by the ten character areas, each with a USGS map section number, and then numerically within each area. The cards are also cross-referenced with the landscape cards. This information will be used to expand the existing National Register of Historic Places' statement of significance for the Central Whidbey Island Historic District/Eby's Landing National Historical Reserve. It reflects the historical development of the area during the first half of the twentieth century, as mandated in the legislation that established the reserve. Owners of properties determined to contribute to the significance of the district under this expanded definition will be eligible to take advantage of grants and tax incentives available for National Register properties. Furthermore, the document provides an important tool for public officials and private citizens to use in managing the reserve's resources and making informed decisions regarding the future of the special place in which they live.

The following represents a sample of the 3 volume inventory completed during the summer of 1983. The sample includes several building and landscape cards from only one of the ten character areas (Area 7, Ebey's Prairie). These were selected to illustrate the kind of information the team recorded.
1. San De Fuca Uplands
2. West Woodlands
3. Coupeville
4. East Woodlands
5. Smith Prairie
6. Penn Cove
7. Ebeys Prairie
8. Fort Casey Uplands
9. Crockett Prairie
10. Coastal Strip
**EBEY'S LANDING NATIONAL HISTORICAL RESERVE**

**NAME(S) OF STRUCTURE**
Elisha Rockwell House

**SITE ADDRESS (STREET & NO.)**
144 South Fort Casey Road

**CITY/VICINITY**
Coupeville

**COUNTY**
Island

**STATE**
Washington

**OWNER/ADMIN ADDRESS**
Robert E. Engle
144 South Fort Casey Road
Coupeville, Washington 98239

**DATE OF CONSTRUCTION**
1890

**ADDITION(S)**

**SITEMARKED INVENTORY**

**SCALE**
1:24000

**QUAD NAME**
Coupeville

**UTM ZONE EASTING NORTHING**
105242105338880

**CROSS REFERENCE**
LA43

**CONTRIBUTING & NON-CONTRIBUTING**

**DANGER OF DEMOLITION?**
No

**SIGNIFICANCE**
This building represents a period of community growth and stability characterized by an increased awareness and application of architectural details and ornamentation in private residences and public buildings. It retains integrity of design, materials, workmanship and location. This building is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.
Continued: addition as a room for his mother. In 1946, Robert E. Engle, the current owner, purchased the property. He enclosed the back porch in 1947 and added a bath on the rear of the house in 1948.
NAME(S) OF STRUCTURE
Cawsey House/Perkins House

SITE ADDRESS (STREET & NO.)
140 S. Ebey's Landing Road

DATE OF CONSTRUCTION
1890

DATE OF ADDITION(S)

SITE ID. NO.

SCALE
1:24000

QUAD NAME
Coupeville

UTM ZONE
12N

EASTING
834772

NORTHING
433517

CROSS REFERENCE
LA 41

DANGER OF DEMOLITION?
\(\) YES
\(\) NO
\(\) UNKNOWN

DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND HISTORY INCLUDING CONSTRUCTION DATE(S), PHYSICAL DIMENSIONS, MATERIALS, MAJOR ALTERATIONS, IMPORTANT BUILDERS, ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS, ETC.

Vernacular Farmhouse. Wood frame set on concrete block foundation; irregular (34' x 28'); 3 bays wide; 1½-stories; wood shingle siding; asphalt-shingled gable roof; off-center entrance on east facade; interior end chimney on north facade. Exterior features include multi-pane fixed and metal sliding sash, all with stickwork shutters; plain frieze board; decorative fascia boards; west facade addition.

This house was built in 1890, but the earliest known resident was Thursa Cawsey, who lived here in the mid-1940's. Edwin Sherman rented land from her. Roberta Smith owned it next, and she extensively remodelled the house in the 1950's. Windows were replaced, doors were relocated, and only the decorative fascia board suggests the appearance of the 1890 house. The Perkin's have owned the property since 1972.
PHOTOGRAPHS AND SKETCH MAP OF LOCATION

NEGATIVE NO. C9-5,6,8,9
HABS/HAER QUALITY • NO

REFERENCES Perkins, Mrs. E. Personal Interview. 2 August 1982.

INVENTORIED BY Luxenberg/Castellano/Lein
AFFILIATION National Park Service
DATE Summer, 1983
**NAME(S) OF STRUCTURE**
Glazier/Herrett House

**SITE ADDRESS (STREET & NO.)**
82 South Ebey Road

**CITY/VICINITY**
Island

**COUNTY**
Island

**STATE**
Washington

**OWNER/ADMIN ADDRESS**
Edenholm

**DATE OF CONSTRUCTION**
c. 1892

**ADDITION(S)**
c. 1948

**SCALE**
1:24000

**UTM ZONE**
10

**EASTING**
52290

**NORTHING**
33920

**CROSS REFERENCE**
LA1

**CONTRIBUTING**

**NON-CONTRIBUTING**

**DANGER OF DEMOLITION?**
No

**CURRENT USE**
Residence

**ORIGINAL USE**
Residence

**DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND HISTORY INCLUDING CONSTRUCTION DATE(S), PHYSICAL DIMENSIONS, MATERIALS, MAJOR ALTERATIONS, IMPORTANT BUILDERS, ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS, ETC.**

Vernacular Residence with Italianate elements. Wood frame set on stone foundation; rectangle (24' x 28') with 1-story hip roof addition on north facade; 3 bays wide; 1-story; asbestos shingle siding; asphalt-shingled hip roof with 1-story, gabled-roof projection on south facade; pedimented center entrance supported by knee braces with Italianate-style door and transom; corbelled, interior off-set chimney on west facade. Exterior features include 1/1 double-hung sash with plain surrounds; 3-sided, mansard-roofed bay window with multi-pane/1 double-hung sash in center; skylight on west facade and top; molded, boxed cornice with returns on projection; plain frieze board; corner boards; lattice skirting; original cresting removed, molded base remains.

This small residence may have been built by W.S. Glazier around 1892, on land sold off from the T.S. Davis Donation Claim (filed 3/16/1868). The abstract on the property shows Alvira Glazier selling to H.R. James (10/4/1901) and N.H. James to Gilbert Isaac Herrett (4/28/1910). The local newspaper had reference to "A.J. Morrill and family of Ebey's Prairie" in 1920, but it is unclear whether they rented or owned the place. It is not known when the Morrill's moved but Herrett sold to Edwin Sherman, who occupied the place from 1937 until 1949. Sherman then exchanged homes with Burwell Bantz, who lived in the old Comstock Place (N.W. corner of Cook and Ebey's Landing Road). Since Bantz, the house has had several owners, the most recent transaction being 1983. An addition was built onto the north facade, and more recently, skylights

**PUBLIC ACCESSIBILITY**
Yes, Limited

**EXISTING SURVEYS**
NR

**CONDITION**
Excellent

**SIGNIFICANCE**
This building represents a period of community growth and stability characterized by an increased awareness and application of architectural details and ornamentation in private residences and public buildings. It retains integrity of design, materials, workmanship and location.
PHOTOGRAPHS AND SKETCH MAP OF LOCATION

FROM E

FROM N

FROM NE

NEGATIVE NO. C9-16,17; L3-31-33; L7-23

REFERENCES
Sherman, Wilbur. Interview. 30 August 1983.
Island County Times. 20 February 1920.

Continued: were added.

INVENTORIED BY Luxenberg/Castellano/Lein
AFFILIATION National Park Service
DATE Summer, 1983
**EBEY'S LANDING**

**HISTORICAL RESERVE**

**NAME(S) OF STRUCTURE**

Francis A. LeSourd House

**SITE ADDRESS (STREET & NO.)**

209 So. Ebey's Landing Rd.

**CITY/VICINITY**

Coupeville

**COUNTY**

Island

**STATE**

Washington

**OWNER/ADMIN ADDRESS**

Jasper J. Walker, D. Stern

209 So. Ebey's Landing Rd.

Coupeville, Washington 98239

**DATE OF CONSTRUCTION**

1892

**ADDITION(S)**

Queen Anne Farmhouse. Wood frame set on stone foundation; irregular (24'x44') with addition on south facade; 4 bays wide; 2½-stories; shiplap siding with decorative diamond and round-cut shingles under gables; wood-shingled hip roof with projecting gables on north, south and east facades; off-center entrance on west facade with ornate glass and panelled door with molded cornice; corbelled center chimney. Exterior features include 1/1 double-hung sash with molded cornice; multi-pane/1 double-hung sash; half-round sash on north gable; pedimented hip-roofed porch on west facade with sunburst, turned posts, carved brackets, turned spindlework screen, and turned post railing; 2-story bay window with clipped corners, drop pendants, date plaque, fan detail flanking bottom of west gable window, and spindlework screen; fascia board; carved vergeboard; plain frieze board; corner boards; decorative sill board.

Notable landscape features include 2 wood frame gable-roofed outbuildings.

In 1892, Francis Asbury LeSourd contracted Howard B. Lovejoy to build this home on Ebey's Prairie. LeSourd himself served as a prominent citizen of Whidbey Island acting as County Commissioner and State Legislator. The home was left to his son John LeSourd in 1940. The John LeSourd Family never lived in the house, opting to use it for rental property. John in turn gave the home to his son Edward, who attempted to modernize the

**PUBLIC ACCESSIBILITY**

X YES, LIMITED

N NO

**EXISTING SURVEYS**

□ NR

□ NHL

□ LCS

□ STATE

□ LOCAL

□ OTHER

**LOCATED IN AN HISTORIC DISTRICT?**

X YES

N NO

**NAME**


**CONDITION**

□ EXCELLENT

□ FAIR

□ GOOD

□ DETERIORATED

□ RUINS

**SIGNIFICANCE**

This building represents a period of community growth and stability characterized by an increased awareness and application of architectural details and ornamentation. This building is attributed to the Lovejoy Family, local craftsmen/builders. It retains integrity of design, materials, workmanship and location. This building is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.
CONTINUED: Home inside and out. He replaced all the windows and remodelled the interior. A succession of owners followed Edward until c. 1971 when Jasper Walker and D. Stern bought the home. They are current owners and are responsible for the restoration of the home. They have returned the windows back to their original appearance.
**NAME(S) OF STRUCTURE**
Jacob Ebey House and Blockhouse

**SITE ADDRESS (STREET & NO.)**
West end of Cemetery Road

**CITY/VICINITY**
Ebey's Prairie

**COUNTY**
Island

**STATE**
Washington

**OWNER/ADMIN ADDRESS**
Robert Y. Pratt
2540 29th West
Seattle, WA 98199

**DATE OF CONSTRUCTION**
1855

**ADDITION(S)**

**SCALE**
1:24000

**UTM ZONE EASTING NORTHING**

**CROSS REFERENCE**
LA40

**DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND HISTORY INCLUDING CONSTRUCTION DATE(S), PHYSICAL DIMENSIONS, MATERIALS, MAJOR ALTERATIONS, IMPORTANT BUILDERS, ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS, ETC.**

Saltbox Residence. Wood frame set on wood post/concrete block foundation; rectangle (20' x 32'); 5-bays wide; 2½-stories; shiplap siding; wood-shingled saltbox roof; wood panel and glass center entrance with 4-pane transom on south facade; corbelled exterior end chimney on west facade; corbelled interior end chimney on east facade. Exterior features include 4/4 double-hung sash with plain surrounds; 4-pane fixed sash at gable ends; boxed cornice; plain frieze board; corner boards. Notable landscape features include intact 2-story square blockhouse of log construction with off-center entrance on north facade, 4-pane fixed sash on 2nd story; wood frame, gable-roofed sheep barn west of house with shed-roofed extensions on east and west facades; power-generating windmill north of house; property near ridgeline overlooking Ebey's Prairie.

This house was built in 1855 by Jacob Ebey, father of Isaac (first white settler in area), on his Donation Claim, which he filed in 1850. The blockhouse dates from 1856 and was built for defense purposes. Later on it was used as a law office for a son, Winfield. Frank Pratt acquired the property some time in the 20th century. Fred Krueger built the sheep barn in the 1930's, and it hasn't been used since 1952. A son of Pratt owns the property today and uses it as a rental.

**PUBLIC ACCESSIBILITY**
YES, LIMITED

**EXISTING SURVEYS**
NR

**CONDITION**
FAIR

**SIGNIFICANCE**
This building represents a period of early settlement characterized by simple, unadorned, functional structures. It retains integrity of design, materials, workmanship and location.

This building is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.
**REFERENCES**

Heath, Albert. Personal Interview. 8 September 1983.

**INVENTORIED BY** Luxenberg/Castellano/Lein

**AFFILIATION** National Park Service

**DATE** Summer, 1983
**EBEY’S LANDING NATIONAL HISTORICAL RESERVE**

**NAME(S) OF STRUCTURE**
Ferry House

**SITE ADDRESS (STREET & NO.)**
Ebey’s Landing Rd.

**CITY/VICINITY**
Coupeville
**COUNTY**
Island
**STATE**
Washington

**OWNER/ADMIN ADDRESS**
Robert Y. Pratt
2540 29th West
Seattle, Washington 98199

**DATE OF CONSTRUCTION**
c. 1860

**ADDITION(S)**

**SITE ID. NO.**

**SCALE**
1:24000

**UTM ZONE EASTING NORTHING**
10 522030 533725

**CROSS REFERENCE**
LA 49

**DANGER OF DEMOLITION?**
UNKNOWN

**PUBLIC ACCESSIBILITY**
YES, LIMITED

**EXISTING SURVEYS**
NR

**SIGNIFICANCE**
This building represents a period of early settlement characterized by simple, unadorned, functional structures. It retains integrity of design, materials, workmanship and location. This building is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

**DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND HISTORY INCLUDING CONSTRUCTION DATE(S), PHYSICAL DIMENSIONS, MATERIALS, MAJOR ALTERATIONS, IMPORTANT BUILDERS, ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS, ETC.**

Vernacular Residence with Greek Revival elements. Wood frame set on post and block foundation; T-shape (28’x36’); 5 bays wide; 1½-stories; clapboard siding; wood-shingled gable roof with gable-roofed dormer on north facade; off-center, wood-panelled entrance with transom and sidelights on north facade; corbelled interior end chimney on east facade. Exterior features include 6/6 double-hung sash with plain surrounds; 1-story, 3-sided bay window with 2/2 double-hung sash with transom above; 6-pane hinged sash with plain surrounds on south section; 1/1 double-hung sash; boxed cornice; plain frieze board; corner boards; wood sill; panelled side entrance on west facade; shed-roofed addition and porch on south facade. Notable landscape features include wood frame, gable-roofed barn with hay hood and shed-roofed addition on north facade, east of house; wood frame, gable-roofed shed south of house; 2 wood frame outbuildings.

Built c. 1860, this 2-story house served as a trading post, tavern, hotel and mail station. It served ferry traffic which landed at the Ebey’s Landing site until water traffic was re-routed to Fort Casey at the turn of the century. Some of the owners and tenants include Mary Ebey, Ivor Powell, Jasper Boyer and Frank Pratt, Jr. It is currently owned by Frank’s son, Robert. The structure is in a bad state of repair, and the balcony and front porch have been removed. Outlines of these features are still visible on the exterior. The building has not been altered since its construction.

**CURRENT USE**
Residence

**ORIGINAL USE**
Inn/Tavern
PHOTOGRAPHS AND SKETCH MAP OF LOCATION

The Ferry House built in 1660. Photograph courtesy Library of Congress.

NEGATIVE NO. C19-33; C6-25-36; T.S-7-11, 17
HABS/HAER QUALITY □ YES □ NO

REFERENCES
Cook. Penn's Cove. p. 73, 74.

INVENTORIED BY Luxenberg/Castellano/Lein
AFFILIATION National Park Service
DATE Summer 1983
DESCRIPTION
This half section is on the boundary between the West Woodlands and Ebeys Prairie. Primary access is along a footpath which follows the coastal bluff above Admiralty Inlet. A ridge runs NE across the section, dividing land use, with large tracts of cropland in the prairie to the SE and dense woodlands to the north on the crest of the ridge.

LANDUSE CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANDUSE ACTIVITY</th>
<th>BOUNDARY DEMARCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% AGRICULTURE</td>
<td>TOPOGRAPHIC: KAVINES CUT INTO RIDGE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% RANCHING</td>
<td>COASTAL BLUFF FROM 0'-200'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NATURAL VEGETATION</td>
<td>VEGETATIVE: FOREST CREATES EDGE ALONG RIDGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>ROAD: GRAVEL ACCESS ROADS TO FARMS AND RESIDENCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>FENCE: WOOD POST AND WIRE IN SOME FIELDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% PARK</td>
<td>WATER: ADMIRALTY INLET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTHER: EBLA HISTORICAL RESERVE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES
*EXCELLENT VISTAS OF EBEYS PRAIRIE, COASTLINE, OLYMPICS AND INLAND TO MOUNT BAKER.
*SMITH FARM
*J.EBEBY HISTORIC MARKER ON RIDGE
DESCRIPTION: This half section in the northern portion of Ebey's Prairie and includes the commercial part of Coupeville known as Prairie Center. Primary access is along Engle and Terry roads which intersect in Prairie Center and along Cook Road which runs northwest across the prairie. Pasture lands and croplands surround the commercial district with higher residential densities clustered within the Coupeville city limits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANDUSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>10-35</th>
<th>35-50</th>
<th>50-75</th>
<th>75-100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% AGRICULTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% RANCHING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NATURAL VEGETATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% COMMERCIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% PARK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANDUSE ACTIVITY</th>
<th>BOUNDARY DEMARcation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CROPLAND: ROTATING</td>
<td>TOPOGRAPHIC: EDGE OF RIDGE IN NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASTURE: GRAZING</td>
<td>DIVIDES UPLANDS FROM PRAIRIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOREST</td>
<td>VEGETATIVE: SMALL WETLAND EAST OF CITY LIMITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRASSLAND</td>
<td>ROAD: TERRY ROAD, ENGLE ROAD, COOK RD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WETLAND</td>
<td>FENCE: WOOD POST AND WIRE IN PASTURE AND ALONG PROPERTY LINES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWELLINGS: MULTIPLE</td>
<td>WATER:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWN</td>
<td>OTHER: COUPEVILLE CITY LIMITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECREATION:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: PRAIRIE CENTER COMMERCIAL DISTRICT
**DESCRIPTION**

This half section is located in the heart of Ebeys Prairie. Primary access is along Ebeys Landing Road which cuts across the prairie, and Engle Road which runs north-south along the west edge of the section. One large dairy farm is located in the northern portion of the section, with pasture lands surrounded by the croplands which dominate the prairie.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANDUSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>% AGRICULTURE</th>
<th>% RANCHING</th>
<th>% NATURAL VEGETATION</th>
<th>% RESIDENTIAL</th>
<th>% COMMERCIAL</th>
<th>% PARK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>10-35</td>
<td>35-50</td>
<td>50-75</td>
<td>75-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROPLAND:</td>
<td>ROTATING</td>
<td>PERMANENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASTURE:</td>
<td>GRAZING</td>
<td>HOLDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOREST:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GRASSLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRASSLAND:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WETLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings:</td>
<td>MULTIPLE</td>
<td>SINGLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town:</td>
<td></td>
<td>SINGLE BUILDING</td>
<td>GROUP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:** SHERMAN DAIRY FARM

**BOUNDARY DEMARCATION**

- **TOPOGRAPHIC:** Ridges visually define prairie
- **VEGETATIVE:** Occasional hedgerows between field crops
- **ROAD:** EBEYS LANDING ROAD AND ENGLE ROAD
- **FENCE:** Wood post and wire as holding pens for dairy cows
- **WATER:**
- **OTHER:**
**DESCRIPTION**
This half section is located in the East Woodlands and the NE portion of Ebey's Prairie. Primary access is along Terry Road which runs east-west, joining Highway 20 to the north and Fort Casey Road which runs north-south. Residences are scattered in the woodlands and along roads, with large open spaces in cropland and pasture lands.

**LANDUSE CATEGORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Agriculture</th>
<th>% Ranching</th>
<th>% Natural Vegetation</th>
<th>% Residential</th>
<th>% Commercial</th>
<th>% Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-35</td>
<td>35-50</td>
<td>75-100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LANDUSE ACTIVITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landuse Category</th>
<th>Landuse Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cropland</td>
<td>Rotating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasture</td>
<td>Grazing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BOUNDARY DEMARCATION**

- **Topographic:** East Woodland Ridge on east portion of section
- **Vegetative:** Woodlands define landuses
- **Road:** Terry Rd, HWT 20, and Ft. Casey Road
- **Fence:** Wood post and wire along property and pasture areas
- **Water:**
- **Other:**

---

**Sources:** USGS, Field Observation, Air Photos, Other
**Date:** Sept. 1983
**Inventory By:** Gilbert/Scena
**Film Units:** LA42-4, 11, 12, 13, 7, 19
**EBEY'S LANDING NATIONAL HISTORICAL RESERVE**

**SITE ID:** N. Sec. 8 T. 31 N. R. 1 E.

**QUAD NAME:** COUPEVILLE

**SOURCES:**
- [ ] USGS
- [ ] FIELD OBSERVATION
- [ ] AIR PHOTOS
- [ ] OTHER

**DATE:** SEPT. 1985

**INVENTORIED BY:** GILBERT/SCENA

**FILM UNITS:** L11-12, 21-23, 32-33

---

**DESCRIPTION:** This half section is located along the Coastal Strip, encompassing Ebeys Landing and a portion of Ebeys Prairie. Primary access is along Ebeys Landing Road which cuts through the center of the Prairie and down the bluff to the beach. This site blends the agricultural character of Ebeys Prairie with a strong coastal flavor.

---

**LANDUSE CATEGORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Category</th>
<th>&lt; 10</th>
<th>10-35</th>
<th>35-60</th>
<th>60-75</th>
<th>75-100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Vegetation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LANDUSE ACTIVITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Rotating</th>
<th>Permanent</th>
<th>Grazing</th>
<th>Holding</th>
<th>Forest</th>
<th>Grassland</th>
<th>Wetland</th>
<th>Multiple</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Single Building</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cropland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BOUNDARY DEMARCATION**

- **Topographic:** Pt. Ebeys Ridge, Coastal Bluff from 0-60' and Ravines.
- **Vegetative:** Woodlands on Ridge Frame Prairie
- **Road:** Ebeys Landing Road Divides Croplands
- **Fence:** Wood and Wire Fence Along Road and Property Lines
- **Water:** Admiralty Inlet

**NOTES:** Issac Ebeys Historic Marker
- *There is one archeological site in this half section*
DESCRIPTION: This half section is located along the southern edge of Ebeys Prairie where it meets the Fort Casey Uplands. Primary access is along Engle Road which runs north-south through the site, offering excellent views of the prairie and Olympic Mountains to the west. This site is dominated by the large sweeping bowl of agricultural land that characterizes Ebeys Prairie.

LANDUSE CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% AGRICULTURE</th>
<th>% RANCHING</th>
<th>% NATURAL VEGETATION</th>
<th>% RESIDENTIAL</th>
<th>% COMMERCIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>10-35</td>
<td>35-50</td>
<td>50-75</td>
<td>75-100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LANDUSE ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CROPLAND:</th>
<th>ROTATING</th>
<th>PERMANENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PASTURE:</td>
<td>GRAZING</td>
<td>HOLDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOREST</td>
<td>GRASSLAND</td>
<td>WETLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWELLINGS:</td>
<td>MULTIPLE</td>
<td>SINGLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWN</td>
<td>SINGLE BUILDING</td>
<td>GROUP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BOUNDARY DEMARCATION

TOPOGRAPHIC: RIDGE OF FT. CASEY UPLANDS ALONG S. EDGE OF SECTION

VEGETATIVE: WOODLANDS ON RIDGE DIVIDE LANDUSES. SOME HERBGRASS.

ROAD: ENGLE ROAD SLICES THROUGH PRAIRIE

FENCE:

WATER:

OTHER:

NOTES:

DESCRIPTION:

DESCRIPTION:

DESCRIPTION:

DESCRIPTION:

DESCRIPTION:

DESCRIPTION:

DESCRIPTION:

DESCRIPTION: