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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Phase I Archaeological Investigations were conducted on a 505 acre parcel of land just north of Enos, Newton County, Indiana by the staff of Archaeological Research, Inc. Prior to field testing a background document search was conducted. **NO existing prehistoric or historic archaeological properties were encountered during the course of this investigation. NO further historic or archaeological investigations are recommended.**

PROJECT AREA and AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECT

The client is planning to take ecosystem restoration measures proposed as a part of the Efroymson Section 206 project on land owned by The Nature Conservancy, located near Enos, Newton County, Indiana. The proposed project would involve burning, planting, blocking drainage ditches and breaking drainage tiles to restore wetlands in the former Beaver Lake. Specifically, seven units, totaling 1510 acres lie on either side of Rt. 41 north of Enos, Newton County, Indiana. They are located in Sections 1, 3, 4, 9, and 11-14, Township 30 North and Range 9 West and are shown on the Enos 7.5' USGS topographic quadrangle map. Of these 1510 acres, 505 have been recognized as High Potential Areas by the Indiana SHPO due to their elevation of 670’ or higher or containment of the specific soil types of Brems, Morocco, Oakville, Tedrow, Watseka and Zaborosky. These 505 acres require archaeological survey; the units contain no standing structures. The total number of acres surveyed is approximately 505 acres or 2,043,735 square meters.

U.S. Army Engineer District, Chicago provided ARI with a 7.5 minute series topographic map and an aerial map delineating the location of the proposed project area and specifying the location of high probability soil types (**SEE ATTACHMENTS 1 and 2**). The archaeological and historical background documentary research in the Department of Natural Resources Offices Division of Historic Preservation was conducted on the proposed project area in June 2005.

The area of potential effect (APE) includes areas of reasonably anticipated direct and indirect impacts. In other words, the APE may extend beyond the area of direct physical impact for particular types of cultural resources. For instance, a view shed or vantage points for Native American religious or
traditional cultural properties may extend farther than the APE. Auditory and vibration impacts may affect religious or traditional cultural properties or may affect standing structures. Other indirect impacts may also result from informal traffic, either pedestrian or vehicular, outside the designated area of construction.

In the case of this project the APE for archaeological investigation was determined to be the area of direct impact or the 505 acres parcel recognized as a High Potential Area.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION
The proposed project area is divided into seven units which are located in the following sections, township and range (SEE ATTACHMENT 3):

Newton County, Indiana, Near Enos 7.5' series quadrangle
Sections 1, 3, 4, 9, and 11-14, Township 30 North and Range 9 West

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTARY and LITERATURE SEARCH
The purpose of the background documentary and literature search is to evaluate the existing data on cultural resources within the APE of the proposed project area and identify the potential for impacts to significant historic properties. For the purposes of this search, all cultural resources that are listed on or eligible for state or national registers of historic places are considered to be significant historic properties. Objectives include assessment of the known cultural resources that are within the area of potential direct impact by proposed construction, and evaluation of the adequacy of previous cultural resource investigations in the project area for planning and management. The background documentary and literature search does not entail field work, but identifies the known cultural resources in the project area and evaluates the known gaps in the identification and evaluation of cultural resources.

METHODOLOGY
The background documentary and literature search was compiled from a number of sources, including summaries of previous cultural resource investigations within the sections containing the APE.
The following sources were identified and consulted:

* Archaeological Survey site files housed at the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology.

* Archaeological review and compliance reports housed at the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology.

* Historic Plats and Atlases housed at the Archaeological Research Incorporated including Government Land Office maps

* Historic County Histories, Plats and Atlases housed at the Newberry Library in Chicago

* National Register of Historic Places, Newton County, Indiana updated as of June 2005.

* National Historic Landmark Register, Newton County, Indiana.

* Indiana Historic Landmarks Foundation.

* Indiana Department of Natural Resources, State Register updated as of November 2004.

**PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS**

Six cultural resource investigations have been conducted within the current project area. It is listed in **TABLE 1**. The professional records of this survey and subsequent testing is housed at the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology located in Indianapolis, Indiana.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Publication Type:</th>
<th>Prepared For:</th>
<th>Description of Project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Phase 1A Cultural Resources</td>
<td>K-Plus Consulting</td>
<td>Phase 1A Cultural Resources Reconnaissance Survey, Molson Farm Cellular Tower Site (SAC-1701A), Morocco, Newton County, Indiana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1: Previous Investigations within Newton County, Indiana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Investigator(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Beam, Longest and Neff</td>
<td>Review of Archaeological Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Indiana Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Archaeological Reconnaissance and Recommendations, INDOT Project ST-019-1(), DES. 9229805, Replacement of Structure Over Bogus Island Ditch on US41, Newton County, Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Indiana Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Archaeological Report for Hanger Ditch Relocation along S.R. 14 from 0.2 mile to 0.5 miles East of U.S. 41 in Newton County, Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Division of Historic Preservation</td>
<td>Archaeological Field Reconnaissance, Willow Slough Fish and Wildlife Area, Newton County, Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Indiana Historical Bureau</td>
<td>An Archaeological report on Newton County, Indiana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PREVIOUSLY RECORDED CULTURAL RESOURCES

The Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology follows a program that requires a trinomial archaeological site number (using the Smithsonian Institution Trinomial System) be assigned for any evidence of human occupation over 50 years of age. The trinomial archaeological site number is assigned by the Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology.

The list of National Register of Historic Places does not preclude that other cultural resources may have formally been determined eligible without filing a National Register of Historic Places nomination. Alternatively, cultural resources may be identified, assigned a site number, but never evaluated in the context of National Register of Historic Places eligibility.

Previously recorded archaeological sites

The Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology database lists over two hundred archaeological sites in Newton County. Of these, there are 18 archaeological sites located within McClellan Township of Newton County. These are summarized below in **TABLE 2**. There are a total of 2 recorded sites within the footprint of the project area, 12-N-218 and 12-N219, which are listed in...
bold in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Affiliation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Eligible for National Register</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric; potentially Historic</td>
<td>12-N-0108</td>
<td>Information Not Available</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric; Historic</td>
<td>12-N-0109</td>
<td>Information Not Available</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Not Available</td>
<td>12-N-0110</td>
<td>Information Not Available</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric; potentially Historic</td>
<td>12-N-0111</td>
<td>Information Not Available</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric; potentially Historic</td>
<td>12-N-0112</td>
<td>Information Not Available</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric; potentially Historic</td>
<td>12-N-0118</td>
<td>Information Not Available</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric; potentially Historic</td>
<td>12-N-0123</td>
<td>Information Not Available</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric; potentially Historic</td>
<td>12-N-0124</td>
<td>Information Not Available</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric; Historic</td>
<td>12-N-0125</td>
<td>Information Not Available</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric; potentially Historic</td>
<td>12-N-0126</td>
<td>Information Not Available</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric;</td>
<td>12-N-0127</td>
<td>Information Not Available</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Affiliation</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Eligible for National Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potentially Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric; Historic</td>
<td>12-N-0215</td>
<td>Information Not Available</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric; potentially Historic</td>
<td>12-N-0216</td>
<td>Information Not Available</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric; Historic</td>
<td>12-N-0217</td>
<td>Information Not Available</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric; potentially Historic</td>
<td>12-N-218</td>
<td>Information Not Available</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric; potentially Historic</td>
<td>12-N-219</td>
<td>Information Not Available</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric; potentially historic</td>
<td>12-N-0220</td>
<td>Information Not Available</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Not Available</td>
<td>12-N-0223</td>
<td>Information Not Available</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2: Previously Reported Sites within the Project Area.**

The U.S. Army Engineer District, Chicago provided information suggesting that aboriginal occupation sites are likely to occur on upland peninsulas, sand ridges, and former islands in and around Beaver Lake. Unit 3.1, located within the project area contains two known sites (12-N-218 and -219).

A report published in 1951 by the Indiana Historical Bureau specifically references the archeological investigation done by Joseph E. Hiestand in county of Newton, Indiana (SEE ATTACHMENTS 4 and 5). Hiestand addresses numerous sites in the Newton County Area. However, he specifically addresses site number 12N218 located within the project area, which he refers to as Village Site 6, in section 9, T30 N, R9 W, northwest of Bogus Island. This site is referred to
as an island out in the lake bed which was formerly called Cherry Island due to the numerous cherry trees which cover it. The Bogus Island area is historically connected with outlaws and fugitives who occupied the area used it as a hideout after the removal of the Potawatomi Indians. The Village Site 6 was allegedly a ferry point to and from the Bogus Island site as well as an Indian camp. Flint chips and burned rock were reportedly prevalent at this site (Hiestand: 1951 p. 38).

A historic resource entitled Standard History: Jasper and Newton Counties, Indiana, discusses the history of Newton County, specifically, certain land formations located within the project area.

“About the only points of interest for the archaeologist are also in the Beaver Lake district. Before the lake was drained and the adjacent lands given over to cultivation there was an elevated sandy ridge east of the southern shores, along which were several clusters of prehistoric mounds. One of the groups contained seven distinct mounds from 2 to 12 feet in height and from 20 to 80 feet in diameter, in which were found bones, pottery and various implements.” (Darroch, William and Hamilton, Louis: 1916, p. 244)

Previously recorded historical (standing structures) sites
The Historic Landmarks Foundation and the Indiana County Survey and Report Map indicate that no historic preservation surveys have been completed in Newton County, Indiana. The Indiana Department of Natural Resources did provide one resource, located within Newton County, as listed on the Indiana Register of Historic Sites and Structure Properties. This resource is not located within the project area, and is listed in TABLE 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Reason for Listing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newton County Bridge #57, 1916</td>
<td>Conrad Vicinity</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3: Relevant Indiana Register of Historic Sites and Structure Properties.

For the purposes of this report a review of cultural resources that are listed on the National Register of Historic Places was undertaken as part of the background literature search. There are 3 cultural resources that appear on the National Register of Historic Places in Newton County, Indiana. None of these are within
the Project Area. They include the following in Table 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Date Listed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ade, George, House</td>
<td>E of Brook off IN 16</td>
<td>Brook</td>
<td>1976-09-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCain—Turner House</td>
<td>124 W. Jasper Street</td>
<td>Goodland</td>
<td>1994-03-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott—Lucas House</td>
<td>514 S. Main Street</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>2003-06-22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Relevant National Register of Historic Places Properties

The National Historic Landmark (NHL) listing was consulted; no properties are listed in Newton County.

Examination of the 1876 Illustrated Historical Atlas of the State of Indiana shows that there were no standing structures within the project area at that time (See Attachment 6). General Land Office maps and plat maps show no cultural resources within the project area.

**Affected Environment**

It is necessary to understand the geomorphology and topography of the project area prior to conducting field investigations. Any such study necessitates a discussion of not only physiography, but also soils, drainage systems, and present land uses. These factors contribute to an understanding of what the prehistoric and historic landscape looked like at the time of site formation as compared to the present landscape. These factors are well discussed in the Indiana Academy of Science, Indiana Sesquicentennial Volume, Natural Features of Indiana, edited by Alton A. Lindsey published in 1966. As this is well represented in the literature, this section provides brief insight as to how the study area has changed. Furthermore, this section is useful in predicting areas of high site probability, i.e. settings that would have been attractive for prehistoric settlement.

**Physical Setting**

The project units include the generally sandy bed of former Beaver Lake, and several sandy knolls or former islands. Beaver lake, once the largest natural body of water ever to be in Indiana, was seven miles long, five miles wide and covered sixteen thousand square acres. The lake bottom consisted of muck, while sandy shores were indented with numerous arms and inlet. The shoreline is
recorded to have extended 2-3 miles deep through sand hills and groves of white and burr oak (Kentland: Newton County Indiana).

Beaver Lake covered between 14,000 and 25,000 acres at a water level between 665 MSL and 670 MSL elevations. Originally, it included portions of sections 1-24 in T30N R9W; sections 33-35 in T31 R9W; and sections 7, 18, and 19 in T30N R8W. In 1853, the first crude ditch was cut from the northwest corner of the lake to the Kankakee River in order to drain Beaver Lake. At this time, approximately 8,000 acres were drained causing the shoreline to recede about 100 yards. By 1876, local farmers had drained Beaver Lake to only 1/10th its size. Historic materials conflict regarding the final dates of Beaver Lake’s existence. However, it was not until after 1900 that Beaver Lake was completely gone (U.S. Army Engineer District, Chicago: 2003; Kentland: Newton County).

The draining of Beaver Lake resulted in the cultivation of the former lake bed and establishment of fertile farms. Sand ridges and sandy loams with intermediate alluvial lake basins comprised the north area of former Beaver Lake. This formation coupled with alternate ridges and valleys provided an ideal farming environment (F.A. Battey: 1883). Much of the former bed of Beaver Lake is now owned by The Nature Conservancy (U.S. Army Engineer District, Chicago: 2003).

Of these areas, different parts of the project units are in pasture, row crops of corn or soybeans, or woods.

Drainage

Although the Project Area consists of 1,510 acres, 505 acres of the total project area have been recognized as High Potential Areas by the Indiana SHPO due to their elevation of 670’ or higher or containment of the specific soil types of Brems, Morocco, Oakville, Tedrow, Watseka and Zaborosky. Due to an agreement between the Indiana SHPO and the Army Corp. of Engineers, only the High Potential Areas consisting of 505 acres were surveyed. The drainage of each of these soil types is described below:

Brems - very deep and moderately well drained
Morocco - very deep, poorly drained soil
Oakville – very deep, excessively drained soil
Tedrow – very deep, somewhat poorly drained soil
Watseka – very deep, somewhat poorly drained
Zaborosky – very deep, somewhat poorly drained

Soils -
The soil types noted as High Potential Areas by the Indiana SHPO are described below:

**Brems**: Brems sand, 0-6 percent slopes. This soil is light colored, sandy in texture and on sloping uplands. It is very deep and moderately well drained with rapid permeability. Brems soils formed in acid sandy outwash and are located on outwash plains. This soil series has low available water for plant growth and a medium organic matter content. Mean annual precipitation is about 35 inches and mean annual temperature is about 50 degrees. Elevation ranges from 580 to 1,700 feet above sea level.

**Morocco**: Of the Gilford Series, very deep, poorly drained soil that formed in loamy over sandy sediments and are on swells on outwash plains, rises on lake plains and flood-plain steps. Permeability is moderately rapid in the solum and rapid in the substratum. Slope ranges from 0 to 3 percent. Mean annual temperature is approximately 50 degrees F. Mean annual precipitation is about 35 inches. Elevation ranges from 580 to 1,530 feet above sea level.

**Oakville**: Spinks (Montcalm) Series. Oakville soils are located on either lake plains, dunes and on, foot slopes of moraines, till plains, outwash plains and beach ridges. Very deep, excessively drained soil formed in sandy eolian deposits on dunes and beach ridges on outwash material. Slopes range from 0 to 60 percent. Mean annual precipitation is about 34 inches and mean annual temperature is about 50 degrees F. Elevation ranges from 580 to 1,530 feet above sea level.

**Tedrow**: The Tedrow Series consists of very deep, somewhat poorly drained soils formed in sandy glaciolacustrine or eolian deposits on dunes and low beach ridges on lake plains, and on outwash plains. Permeability is rapid and the slope ranges from 0 to 6 percent. Mean annual temperature is approximately 51 degrees and the mean annual precipitation is 33 inches. Thickness of the solum ranges from 24 to 54 inches. Elevation ranges from 575 to 800 feet above sea level.

**Watseka**: Watseka series is very deep, somewhat poorly drained that formed in sandy eolian or outwash sediments. Permeability is rapid and the slope ranges
from 0 to 4 percent. These soils are located on outwash plains or stream terraces. Mean annual precipitation is approximately 35 inches. Mean annual air temperature is about 52 degrees F. Elevation ranges from 680 to 1,360 feet above sea level.

**Zaborosky:** Very deep, somewhat poorly drained, rapidly permeable soil on lake plains makes up the Zaborosky series. They formed in eolian sandy deposits located over buried sandy sediments. Slopes range from 0 to 4 percent. Mean annual temperature is 51 degrees F and mean annual precipitation is about 37 inches.

The U.S. Army Engineer District, Chicago provided the information regarding the soil types of each the project area’s seven units in the initial request provided in October 2003:

"UNIT 1.1 - most of this 350-acre unit is in corn, below 670’, with low potential for archaeological sites; about 5 acres of wind-eroded knolls at unit’s north boundary (above elevation 670’) require archaeological survey; about 5 acres of Zaborosky soils along the unit’s east border require archaeological survey; and about 15 acres of Tedrow soils in the northwest portion of the unit require survey.

UNIT 1.2 – about 80 acres of Tedrow and Zaborosky soils in this unit require survey (see maps attached to this scope). UNIT 2.2 – about 125 acres of Tedrow, Zaborosky, and Oakville soils in this unit require survey.

UNIT 2.3 - most of the unit is sand knolls above 670’ (consisting of Morocco, Brems, and Oakville soils), with high potential for archaeological sites; about 35 acres of this unit require survey.

UNIT 2.4 – about 20 acres of Zaborosky soil in the southwest corner of this unit require survey.

UNIT 3.1 -most of this 600-acre unit is below 670’ (in soybeans), on former lakebed with low potential for archaeological sites; a prominent wooded knoll (about 10 acres of Oakville soils) on unit’s north boundary requires survey (this area may have been disturbed
by borrowing); a low knoll (about 20 acres of Brems soils, at elevation 670’) near unit’s northwest corner also needs survey; and about 190 acres of Zaborosky and Tedrow soils also require survey (this soil type occurs throughout the unit). This unit also contains two known archaeological sites (11-N-218 and 11-N-219). ;

UNIT 2.1 lies in the former bed of Beaver Lake, below elevation 670’, and contains none of the “high potential” soil types; it has little or no potential for archaeological sites, and does not require survey.” (U.S. Army Engineering District, Chicago: 2003)

The resource entitled Counties of Warren, Benton, Jasper and Newton, Indiana provided the following information regarding the geology and archaeology within the project area as recorded in 1883:

Paleozoic Geology -

“As before mentioned, nearly the whole surface of this county is deeply covered with glacial drift impenetrable to the geologist’s eye. It is known from the geology of the adjoining regions to the north and from deep bores, that the northern part of the country is underlaid with Niagara limestone of the Upper Silurian age; that the Valley of the Iroquois is underlaid by Genesee shale (or black shale) of the Devonian age. Inferentially, the southern portion of the county should be underlaid by rocks of the Upper Devonian groups, or of the Subcarboniferous age.” (F.A. Battey & Co.: 1883, p. 616)

Archaeology -

“Stone implements of the pre-historic age are often found scattered over this country, more especially those used for the taking of fish. While the sand hillocks and knolls of the northern part of the country are often mistaken for works of the Mound-Builders, it is true that many such elevations have been capped by the homes and tumuli of that race. The elevated sandy ridge east of the southern part of Beaver Lake, built up by the winds to a height of seventy or eighty feet, which gives a wide outlook toward the rising sun and a grand view of the lake in its ancient dimensions, was extensively occupied by the Mound-Builders. Several clusters are reported, one of which contained seven mounds from two to
twelve feet in height, and from twenty to eighty feet in diameter. Partially explored, two of these gave up bones, pottery and implements of our extinct predecessors.” (F.A. Battey & Co.: 1883, p. 618)

Economic geology -
“The northern areas, as before mentioned, are sand ridges, sandy loams, with intermediate alluvial lake basins. These need special treatment, and are being cultivated by immigrants from Chicago and the East, with astonishing success.” (F.A. Battey & Co.: 1883, p. 618)

Potential for Deeply Buried or Deeply Buried Upland Sites
Archaeological materials are intrinsically associated with the soil and sediment in which they are found. Because of this, artifacts are subjected to the same pedogenic processes of additions, transformations, removals and biological activity (Birkeland 1984; Buol et al 1973) as the soil solum and, consequently, artifacts frequently become buried. The method and manner by which archaeological materials become buried has been discussed in detail by: Bettis and Thompson 1982; Butzer 1982; Waters 1992; Wood and Johnson 1978 among others. Identification of landforms that are frequently subjected to processes of erosion and deposition can facilitate the discovery of buried archaeological materials.

The burial of archaeological deposits in upland settings has received relatively little attention in the archaeological literature. Burial by Holocene loess deposition (Abbott and Tiffany 1986; Hajic 1992) as well as developmental upbuilding (Artz 1992; Johnson 1985) are the processes most likely responsible for the incorporation of upland archaeological materials into the soil solum. Spatially, these processes along with eolian and colluvial deposition have the potential to cover large portions of the landscape, thereby masking the signature of an entire site. On a smaller scale, the processes of pedoturbation (Wood and Johnson 1978) significantly affect soil development and facilitate artifact burial. However, while it is not considered likely that processes such as frost heaving and rodent activity would consume an entire site, they certainly have a negative affect on contextual integrity (Artz 1992; Bocek 1986). Recent work in western Illinois by Van Nest (1992) has shown that developmental upbuilding in the form of in situ soil development as well as additions of eolian dust accumulates at a rate of 0.08mm/yr. This level of sedimentary deposition
would result in the burial of artifacts to a depth of 20 cm in 2,500 years and 30 cm in 3,700 years (Van Nest 1992: 287). While these figures demonstrate the potential for upland site burial, modern land use practices, particularly intensive mechanized agriculture as well as the thickness of Holocene loess have significantly lessened the affects of airborne sedimentary accumulation particles. Therefore, while upland sites buried to a depth at -- or just below -- the typical plowzone are possible, deeply buried upland sites are not considered likely to occur. All subsurface tests in upland areas would be excavated through the A and into the B soil horizons, a depth below which buried cultural materials are not likely.

Project Area Vegetation
Different parts of the project units are in pasture, row crops of corn or soybeans, or woods.

NEWTON COUNTY REGIONAL CULTURAL CONTEXT
Notable syntheses of the major prehistoric temporal periods in Indiana are included in “Prehistoric Indians of Indiana,” “Outline of Selected Characteristics of Prehistoric Cultures in Indiana,” “Chronology of Selected Historic Events in Late 17th-19th Century Indiana.” These prehistoric temporal periods are particularly outlined in “Indiana’s Cultural Resources Management Plan 1998-2003” published by the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology as well as James H. Kellar’s “An Introduction to the Prehistory of Indiana (1993). Only a brief synopsis of these time periods is included below.

Paleoindian
The initial occupation of Indiana likely occurred around 10,000 B.C., and lasted until roughly 7,500 B.C. Paleoindian peoples were likely organized into small, highly mobile family groups that wandered the landscape in search of subsistence that centered on foraging and large game hunting consisting of mammoths, bison and mastadons.

Archaic
The Archaic period begins in Indiana around 8,000 B.C. and lasts to about 700 B.C. and represents a period of climatic change that resulted in a shift in available flora and fauna, from large game animals to smaller species adapted to the prevailing mild climate. This change in climate and available resources
caused human populations to adjust their subsistence strategy and material culture in order to exploit a new suite of resources. The Archaic period generally is divided into three parts, Early, Middle, Late and Terminal. Based on available evidence, it appears that Early Archaic settlement patterns were roughly similar to those of the Paleoindian period, with subsistence orientation directed towards large, migratory game.

The Archaic period is represented on a site just south of the project area, in Cambridge City along US Highway 40. The Boyd Site (Plunkett 1998) contained a number of intact archaic midden deposits. This site was extensively tested prior to IDOT construction activity along US 40.

**Woodland**
The term Woodland, is a general one used to describe cultural developments that occurred roughly between 700 B.C to A.D. 1000. The transition from Late Archaic to Woodland is time transgressive, occurring earlier in some areas, and later in others. Like the Archaic period this period is divided into Early, Middle and Late. This period is characterized by the appearance of ceramic vessels, burial of the dead in mounds and increased reliance on wild and cultivated plant foods.

**Mississippian**
During the Mississippian Period (A.D. 1000 through approximately A.D. 1700), population, social complexity and cultural expression reached levels that surpassed those attained by earlier Iowa groups. This was in part facilitated by the addition of intensive corn cultivation to traditional subsistence practices which remained hunting and wild plant gathering.

**Historic Period**
The United States government did not regulate this region of North America until 1787, when the Northwest Ordinance named territory north of Ohio River in the northwest portion of the Ohio Valley (Darroch, William and Hamilton, Louis: 1916), and a commandment of the military post at Vincennes was empowered to administer civil and criminal justice in present day Newton County (Centennial History Committee: 1960). Regardless of declaration and the posting of military justice the area comprising the present day county of Newton was primarily uncharted by white men until the mid-late 1800’s.

The first settlements in the county of Newton occurred along the water courses,
specifically, the Kankakee River at the northern end, and the Iroquois river at the southern end (Darroch, William and Hamilton, Louis: 1916). Prior to 1900, a large portion of Newton County was covered by water, an area known as Beaver Lake. Historic Maps and records indicate that the Potawatomi, Sioux, Iroquois and Kickapoos occupied this area of Newton County prior to their removal from the state of Indiana. During the historic period beginning in the mid 18th century, the tribal groups located most closely to the project area were the Potawatomi Indians who occupied the project area (SEE ATTACHMENTS 6 and 7).

Primarily occupied by the Potawatomi Indians, Newton County was originally governed by the Indian justice system (Centennial History Committee: 1960). The Potawatomi had original control of this section of Indiana with their boundaries set on the west at the Rock River; on the east at the Scioto River; on the north at Lake Michigan; and on the south at the Ohio River (Ade, John: 1911). The Potawatomi Indian population totaled up to 4,000 in northern Newton County until 1832. Their Chief village was Chitchakos at the Tippecanoe river (F.A. Battey & Co.:1883: p. 633).

Historic Euro-American Archaeological Research Incorporated examined historic plats, maps and recorded histories from 1829-1960, housed both in office and at the Newberry Library in Chicago, to determine land ownership areas targeted for standing structures or historic archaeological materials.

The project area lies in McClellan Township located in the northern portion of Newton County. The portion of Indiana containing Newton County was ceded to the United States in 1832 when the U.S. government received land south of Lake Michigan to the Iroquois river. The development of Newton County, Indiana dates back to 1832 when the United States government took possession of the land included in the present day boundaries. As the youngest county, number 92, in Indiana, Newton County has a complex past which reflects changes in ownership, county boundary lines, landscape and inhabitants.

Newton County is located at the Northwest corner of the state. Presently, its western boundary is set at the line dividing Illinois and Indiana; its eastern boundary is the current Jasper county, within which county seat Rensselaer is located; its southern boundary is the current county of Benton, which is a
continuation of the rich black belt of Illinois; and its northern boundary is Lake county which separates it from Lake Michigan (Ade, John: 1911).

The earliest accounts of white men hunting on Beaver lake date back to 1827 (Burroughs: 1925, p. 98). However, it was not until 1832 that the Logansport Treaty, granted the US government land south of the Lake Michigan border and to the Iroquois River (Centennial History Committee: 1960). A record left by John Darroch, primary organizer of the first distinctive government of Newton County, describes the forecast of this region about this time.

"After the Black Hawk War of 1832, the Indians having all moved west of the Mississippi River, emigration from the older states of the Union became so great that the legislature of Indiana, through the efforts of John Wanten of Jennings County, chairman of the Committee on the Formation of New Counties, passed a bill in the year 1835 to lay off into counties the northwestern portion of Indiana. Following are the counties created: Jay, Adams, DeKalb, Steuben, Whitley, Kosciusco, Fulton, Marshall, Stark, Pulaski, Jasper and Newton." (Darroch, William and Hamilton, Louis: 1916, p. 169 v. 1)

In 1835, state legislature divided the northern part of Indiana into 14 different tracts, one of which was called Newton and included parts of now Lake, Porter, Jasper, and Newton counties (SEE ATTACHMENT 8: TABLE OF HISTORY OF NEWTON COUNTY BOUNDARIES). The land of Newton County proved difficult to overcome and was described as being literally lost for 20 years (Centennial History Committee: 1960). Once again, regardless of claim, the area of Newton County remained primarily occupied by the Potawatomi Indian Tribe until 1837-38 when a General Tipton ordered the final and principal removal of the Potawatomi tribe from their former territory (Ade, John: 1911).

This era marks the beginning of a transition period. With the Indians moving out and permanent settlers not yet settled, the white men who moved into the Newton County area consisted of a group of trappers, squatters and outlaws. Specifically, these men congregated on Bogus Island, an island on Beaver Lake, which was an isolated area far removed from any established trails. Their main intention was counterfeiting, larceny and horse thieving. Bogus Island was an island in the center of Beaver Lake, in sections 15, 16, and 19, T30 N R9W (Enos 7.5’ map). Bogus Island was used by this gang of counterfeiters and horse
thieves from about 1837 through 1858 (U.S. Army Engineering District, Chicago: 2003).

Isolated by water, marsh and heavy timber, Bogus Island proved to be a well protected escape and housed a two room hide out excavated and from a cave by the outlaws. Accessibility to Bogus Island was minimal and revealed itself only when the wind was in from the north and the waters of Beaver lake blew to southern shores revealing a sandbar, upon which stolen horse were walked onto Bogus Island. (Burroughs: 1925). So prevalent was horse stealing and counterfeiting that Legislature passed an act “authorizing the formation of companies for the detection and apprehension of horse-thieves and other felons, and defining their powers” (C F.A. Battey & Co.:1883: p. 640).

Historical descriptions of the geographical features of Bogus Island include, that of a hole in the ground supposed to be camping spot of counterfeiters’ cabins and operations located midway of “Bogus Island” at the head of a small ravine which dipped sharply east, which has produced artifacts of coins and counterfeiter paraphernalia (Burroughs: 1925 p. 149). Certain historic records classify Bogus Island into two sections, Big Bogus and Little Bogus. These are presumed to be two sections of the same whole, since the locations of each are similarly described. Specifically, the deep sink of old Beaver Lake is believed to be located to the southeast of Big Bogus (Burroughs: 1925 p.136), and Little Bogus was supposedly reached from the west and northwest by lonely trails, obscure and winding (Burroughs: 1925 p. 145).

The land along the Kankakee River, the northern boundary of present day Newton County, has been referred to as having an impenetrable character, thus contributing to the Bandits of the Prairie, the counterfeiters, and burglars who monopolized Bogus Island (Burroughs: 1925 p. 172-174). The reputation of the Beaver Lake Region during this period, as described by historian John Shaffer, is as follows:

“Men of all casts and stations in life made regular trips into that country in season, to hunt and fish, and it was always difficult to judge what they were at home by their conduct on one of these trips.” (Darroch, William and Hamilton, Louis: 1916, p. 216 v. 1)

Following removal of the Potawatomi, authorities, set out to capture counterfeiters in 1839, by unleashing a group headed by Aaron M. Goodnow.
They captured but a few of the noteworthy felons (Darroch, William and Hamilton, Louis: 1916).

With removal and clean up in progress, present day Newton County’s original boundaries were set in 1839 (SEE ATTACHMENT 8: TABLE OF HISTORY OF NEWTON COUNTY BOUNDARIES):

“Beginning at the southeast corner of township 29, range 5, west; thence west to the state line; thence north thirty miles; thence east on the line dividing towns 33 and 34, to the northeast corner town 33, range 5, west; thence south thirty miles, to the place of beginning.” (Ade, John: 1911, p. 55)

A new era brought a new caliber of settlers in the early 1850’s. Wealthy men from New York, and the East Coast, moved into the area building more traditional structures and living more traditional lives. Settlers of this period include: Alexander J. Kent (the founder of Kentland, Newton County), Cephas Atkinson, Moses Fowler, Parnham Boswell, Anson Wolcott, Ad. Raub, Adam Earl, Ed Sumner and Lemuel Milk. Exceptionally notable of these men is Lemuel Milk (Centennial History Committee: 1960).

Lemuel Milk settled close to Beaver Lake upon his arrival in the 1850’s. A man of wealth, he owned 40,000 acres of this land of which 25,000 were subdivided into farms. Mr. Milk undertook the most extraordinary alteration to the landscape of Newton County, the draining of Beaver Lake beginning in 1853. In 1853, the State of Indiana undertook to reclaim portion of swamp tract surrounding Beaver Lake by running a ditch from northwest comer of lake to the Kankakee River causing the shoreline to recede approximately 100 yards (Burroughs: 1925 p. 128). The first efforts to drain Beaver Lake consisted of cutting a ditch from northwest part of river to Kankakee River, the contract work of which was taken by Austin M. Puett, grandfather of Judge William Darroch. The Beaver Lake once prevalent with beaver, muskrat, otter, duck, geese, every species of fish, was replaced by modern farms, fields of grain and vegetables, orchards and stretched of greensward, herds and droves of livestock (Darroch, William and Hamilton, Louis: 1916, p. 243).

Come the year 1859, another attempt to rid the Newton County area of undesirables was undertaken by the Jasper County Rangers by Tom Barker (Centennial History Committee: 1960). This attempt was accompanied with the
official formation of Newton County as the 92nd and last county of Indiana (SEE ATTACHMENT 8: TABLE OF HISTORY OF NEWTON COUNTY BOUNDARIES). This area was proposed to be named Beaver, hence the lake, but it was thought more appropriate to name it Newton in connection with Jasper County to the east. The source of this reference being the names of two men, both having served under General Francis Marion, in the renowned Swamp Fox of the Carolinas (Centennial History Committee: 1960). Shortly following the formation of Newton County, Z.T. Wheaton presented petition in 1862 to be in civil township set off from Beaver named McClellan and consisted of town 30, range 9 and 10.

In 1868, with the Bogus Island criminals staying put, Dr. John F. Shronts a pioneer doctor of Momence, IL, started practice in Beaver Lake Country. His willingness to service the counterfeiters and horse thieves led to more information regarding the secret hideouts of the land. He describes traveling the hog-back highway within the Lake bed and “Lyons Lane,” a gateway from Momence, IL to Beaver Lake Country, notorious for its difficult mud, thicket, scrub and miniature sand dunes, which led to the humble cabins of trappers and hunters and isolated abodes of the “Bogus Island” bandits (Burroughs: 1925 p. 105 & 151).

While Newton County was seemingly active, the first school house in Newton County was not built until 1854, in Morocco, Indiana (Ade, John: 1911). In fact, property ownership of the Beaver Lake area was uncertain during the late 1850’s and early 1870’s. Early in 1857 Michael G. Bright, then a prominent lawyer and politician of Indiana, owned all of the fractional lots of land abutting on the margin of Beaver Lake. Mr. Bright, in an attempt to better his acreage, drew up his own map which assumed that he owned the land under the water, the lake in its entirety. Due to this action, he had legal battle with a Mr. William C. Blake who claimed to own but one island in the lake, Bogus Island. Mr. William Blake was determined wrong in court of law and ordered leave Bogus Island (Darroch, William and Hamilton, Louis: 1916, p. 224-226 v. 1).

Michael G. Bright, bondsman of a John P. Dunn, then auditor of the state of Indiana who deposited some of the trust funds of the state into a bank that failed in 1859, offered to settle the existing deficit with enough of the Beaver Lake property to cover it. In an attempt to protect his assets, he offered up land parcels in a checkerboard pattern, each alternative 40 acre tract belonging to him and the other the government. Acquilla Jones, treasurer of state, was authorized and directed by the legislature to take the conveyance from Bright.
in trust for the state and to convey the lands to the state of Indiana. In 1865 legislature passed an act calling for the sale of lands in Newton County acquired by conveyance of Michael Bright and wife of Acquilla Jones and by Jones to the state. When the government brought forth this land for sale, Bright put the land he still owned on the market and all were sold between 1865 to 1870 (Darroch, William and Hamilton, Louis: 1916, p. 224-226 v. 1).

The draining of Beaver Lake continued in 1871. However, exposure of formerly covered land resulted in a party of raiders from Chicago headed by Amzi B. Condit and Perker Dresser to build board houses on every quarter section of the lake bed believing it to be government land. These actions prompted the 1873 act passed by Congress that provided that the State of Indiana and her assignees, having drained and reclaimed what is known as the bed of Beaver Lake, in Newton County Indiana, and titles of the existing landowners’ were honored. In 1879, a man named Jacob B. Julian brought suit against all title owners of land on the former lake bed by interpreting law of 1873 to read that the State became owner of all the lots of land in the bed of Beaver Lake that had not theretofore been conveyed by the State under the Act of 1865. The courts ruled in favor of this interpretation. However, previous owners appealed in 1889 and were allowed to return at the price of 37 cents per acre (Darroch, William and Hamilton, Louis: 1916, p. 224-226 v. 1).

In the 1870’s the population of McClellan County increased slowly and reached a total of 141 (Ade, John: 1911). 1873 saw the completion of the ‘Big Ditch,’ the project undertaken in anticipation of draining Beaver Lake, in the form of a dam opened to release the water. By 1876 Beaver Lake was only 1/10th its original size (Centennial History Committee: 1960). Shortly following, the Lemuel Milk ditch of 1853 was widened and deepened and the Beaver Lake was drained in its entirety. (Burroughs: 1925).

The introduction of more land meant the introduction of more people. The Population of McClellan Township rose from 155 in 1880 to 178 in 1890 (Ade, John: 1911). The largest increase of the century occurred between 1890 and 1900 when the draining of the lake provided ample land for cultivation and the population rose to 299 people (Ade, John: 1911).

Beaver Lake was completely gone by the 1900’s (Centennial History Committee: 1960); (Ade, John: 1911). What ensued was an era of development and regulation. Post drainage of the Beaver Lake exposed the narrow “hog-back”
of sand with 6-8 foot logs filled in gaps. A severe alteration in landscape meant the elimination of the Bogus Island Bandits and the exposition of the criminal’s means by which to break the law, the pathways used by bandits on Bogus Island to travel through Beaver Lake (Burroughs: 1925 p. 147).

While the residences of Newton County managed their man-made farmland, descendents of founding families, such as Jenny Conrad, daughter of Lemuel Milk, founded the town of Conrad, (Centennial History Committee: 1960). Jennie Minerva Conrad, born on June 5, 1855 to parents Lemuel and Jane Ann (Platt) Milk, saw the draining of Beaver Lake within her lifetime. Heir to her father’s acres of land in the Beaver Lake region, Ms. Conrad succeeded in the family’s ranching of Oak Dene Farms, which consisted of a ranch house with outbuildings (U.S. Army Engineering District, Chicago: 2003). Her lucrative enterprise resulted in the need for a place near home, to ship her cattle, produce and manufactured goods to market. The result of which was the city of Conrad (Schmal: 1990, p. 10).

The town of Conrad stood about ¾ miles north of the old shoreline of Beaver Lake, along the railroad just east of present day Rt. 41. The plan of Conrad was supposedly based off of that of Indianapolis (Schmal: 1990, p. 12), and included a church, post office, school, stockyards and cottages for employees, Conrad Hotel. Railroad sidings were built for both a cement block factory and the stockyard. The Mission of Conrad church initially of Presbyterian origin and later of catholic denomination was built on August 4, 1908 (Schmal: 1990, p. 10). Founder Mrs. Conrad donated four miles, one hundred feet wide of right-of-way to the Chicago, Indiana and Southern railroad, now New York Central (Schmal: 1990, p. 10).

The town of Conrad was once part of a 7,000 acre tract, a dream of Jennie Milk Conrad, made tangible by her passion for its development and the dedication of parks and street names to her family. It remained active only until 1925. By 1930, most of the buildings were gone. The death of Jennie Conrad in 1939 left Conrad to be a ghost town. A few concrete foundations currently remain. The town site is owned by The Nature Conservancy (U.S. Army Engineering District, Chicago: 2003). The Newton County Bridge #57 built in 1916, located in the Conrad Vicinity, has been listed on the Indiana Department if Natural Resources State Register for engineering.
In the years to follow, McClellan Township, specifically land in the project area, remained both privately owned for farming and governmentally owned as a conservation area.

GROUND COVER/INVESTIGATION TECHNIQUES/RESULTS
The field investigations and reported format were completed to meet the guidelines as set forth by the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology.

The field survey was conducted on 20-24 June, 30 June, 11-15 July, 27 and 28 July and 1 August 2005 by David Keene, Margaret Hayes, and Steve Parrish for a total of 40 person days. The particular ground cover with land use along the corridor was recorded on an overall sketch map. Representative soil profiles and maps of soil testing/augering areas were also recorded. The following is a summary of our field investigations. Please note that unless otherwise stated the ground surface was surveyed at 10 meter transect intervals with shovel test units 15 meters apart in a checkerboard pattern. Shovel test units were excavated to a depth of approximately 70 cm below surface and screened through 1/8 inch hardware cloth. The reader should consult Attachments 9a and 9b for the exact location of areas surveyed within the overall project area.

UNIT 1.1 – Most of this 350-acre unit was under cultivation. Only the northwest portion and the very eastern portion of this area contained soil types which required survey. Since the area was under cultivation and surface visibility was 100% survey crews examined over 40 acres. Shovel test units were placed at irregular intervals to test depth of soil deposits and assess potential for buried sites. Over 100 test units excavated to a depth of approximately 80 cm. No archaeological resources were encountered. Most of the area was sand and filled with water washed stones, and mussel shells.

UNIT 1.2 – This entire unit was under cultivation at the time of survey. Visibility was 100%. Most of the area except for the northwest 20 acres was investigated. No cultural material suggest of archaeological sites were encountered.

UNIT 2.3 – This entire unit was forested at the time of survey. It is higher than most of the surrounding areas. A modern farm house was located along the northern portion of the project area. This entire unit was surveyed. It was the most difficult area to survey because of ground cover. Surface visibility was less than
50%. Survey crews attempted to place test units on a 15 meter checkerboard grid pattern throughout the area. This proved difficult since vegetation and tree roots often required that the units be moved off grid. Soils were thin and mostly sandy lake bottom soils much like the rest of the project area. No archaeological sites were encountered during the investigation of these areas.

UNIT 2.4 - At the time of survey most of this area was a fallow field covered with prairie grasses. Shovel testing was required here. It should be noted that the entire unit was surveyed. Not just the high probability areas. The entire area was low and featureless. It contained the characteristic of a drained lake bottom much like the other units. No archaeological resources were encountered.

UNIT 3.1 - This unit contains two recorded archaeological sites (11-N-218 and 11-N-219). Site 218 is located on a large kidney shaped sand dune referred to as Cherry Island. Only the very southern tip of this sand island is within the project area. At the time of survey the portion of the island within the project area was covered with trees and grass. It was clear that most of the surface was heavily disturbed by ‘sand mining’ activities. There was almost no intact ground surface. Shovel test units were conducted at irregular intervals. No archaeological resources were encountered on this feature.

A portion of Site 219 is also located within the survey area just west of 218. This site is in a low area. No diagnostics were encountered when this site was first recorded. At the time of survey the area was under cultivation. The corn crop was low. Visibility was excellent. Shovel tests were completed within the recorded boundaries of the site. No archaeological material was recovered.

The remaining portion of 3.1 subject to survey was very flat and under cultivation. No archaeological material was encountered.

UNIT 2.1 - Only the northwest ¼ of this area was surveyed. The area was under cultivation. Visibility was 100%. Area was low and flat. No archaeological resources encountered.

UNIT 2.2 - This entire parcel was under cultivation. There was a sand dune near the southeast ¼ of the parcel that was being mined for sand during the time of investigation. The remaining portion of the parcel was flat, visibility excellent - 100%. No archaeological resources encountered.
SURVEY LIMITATIONS
There were no serious limitations to a comprehensive survey of the project area.

CONCLUSION
Although research into archaeological site files and historic documents suggest that there were recorded prehistoric sites, these sites have been disturbed and require no further investigation. During the course of this investigation no archaeological resources (neither historic nor prehistoric) were encountered. Additionally, there are no documented historic ruins located within the project area.
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Attachment 8: Table of History of Newton County Boundaries as delineated in the Indiana Atlas of Historical County Boundaries.

“February 7, 1839: NEWTON created from non-county areas attached to ST. JOSEPH, WARREN, and WHITE

(Heavy line depicts historical boundary. Base map shows present-day information)”

(Siuko, Peggy Tuck: Atlas of Historical County Boundaries p. 215)

“NEWTON not fully organized, parts attached to ST. JOSEPH, WARREN, and WHITE for administrative and judicial purposes.

(Heavy line depicts historical boundary. Base map shows present-day information)”

(Siuko, Peggy Tuck: Atlas of Historical County Boundaries p. 215)
“February 1, 1836: NEWTON lost to PORTER and to creation of LAKE/Result of this change: NEWTON’s attachment to ST. JOSEPH effectively ended, although a small remnant of the attached area remained between the north line of twp. 32 and the Kankakee River.

February 17, 1838: Attachment of NEWTON to WHITE confirmed [no change]. Northern boundary of Newton redefined, would have created a dispute with LAKE and PORTER, but change never took effect; corrected February 11, 1839.

(Heavy line depicts historical boundary. Base map shows present-day information)

(Siuko, Peggy Tuck: Atlas of Historical County Boundaries p. 216)

“February 11, 1839: Boundary line separating NEWTON from LAKE and PORTER redefined, correcting mistake of February 17, 1838 [no change].

June 3, 1839: NEWTON lost all territory to JASPER; NEWTON eliminated.

(Heavy line depicts historical boundary. Base map shows present-day information)

(Siuko, Peggy Tuck: Atlas of Historical County Boundaries p. 216)
“December 8, 1859: NEWTON re-created from JASPER with different boundaries from original 1835 county.

March 8, 1923: Northern boundary of NEWTON along Kankakee River adjusted to match ditching of streambed [not mapped].

(Heavy line depicts historical boundary. Base map shows present-day information)

(Siuko, Peggy Tuck: Atlas of Historical County Boundaries p. 217)
Attachment 9A: Topo Maps with Survey Areas Outlined
Attachment 9B: Topo Maps with Survey Areas Outlined