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Recently, at the request of Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, we carried out test excavations at three Caddo sites (41HO211, 41HO214, and 41HO216) thought to be associated with a late 17th–18th century Nabedache Caddo village in a recently acquired tract of land along San Pedro Creek at Mission Tejas State Park, Houston County, Texas (Perttula and Nelson 2006). The three sites had been found in a 2004 archeological survey of this tract of land (Cooper and Cooper 2005). Two of the sites—Nabedache Blanco (41HO211) and Nabedache Azul (41HO214)—turned out to have been occupied in historic times by the Nabedache Caddo.

Historical and Archeological Context of the Nabedache Caddo Village

In the Caddo language, Nabedache (the phonemic form is nabaydacu) means blackberry place (Rogers and Sabo 2004:629). The Nabedache Caddo were known to have a large village along San Pedro Creek in the late 17th and 18th centuries. Archeological remnants of this village have been previously located in and near the state park (see Erickson and Corbin 1996; Perttula 2005), all situated on landforms along the San Pedro Creek floodplain/upland margins.

The archeology of the Hasinai Caddo groups (of which the Nabedache Caddo are one of at least nine groups) is associated with the Allen phase (ca. A.D. 1650–1800). The Allen phase Caddo groups are direct ancestors of the Hasinai tribes who were living in or near the Spanish missions that had been periodically established and maintained in the region ca. 1690–1731, and these tribes continued to live there until the 1830s (see Jackson 1999: Plate 98).

The archeology of the Hasinai Caddo groups are one of at least nine groups is associated with the Allen phase (ca. A.D. 1650–1800). The Allen phase Caddo groups are direct ancestors of the Hasinai tribes who were living in or near the Spanish missions that had been periodically established and maintained in the region ca. 1690–1731, and these tribes continued to live there until the 1830s (see Jackson 1999: Plate 98).

Allen phase components are found in the Neches and Angelina river basins in Cherokee, Anderson, Houston, Rusk, and Nacogdoches counties and usually contain small amounts of European trade goods (e.g., glass beads, metal knives, gun parts, and lead balls) found in village and burial contexts. Caddo domestic remains at these settlements include a variety of decorated and plain ceramic fine wares (principally Patton Engraved) and brushed utility wares, triangular and stemmed arrow points, elbow pipes, ground stone tools, and bone tools.

Although a single farmstead may have had only one or two structures, an Allen phase Caddo community, such as the Nabedache village, was apparently composed of many farmsteads spread out over a considerable distance. While in the community of the Nabedache Caddo on San Pedro Creek in 1687, Henri Joutel noted:
we took the path to the village where the Indians conducted us to the chief’s hut which was a long league’s distance from the entrance to the village. On the way, we passed several huts that were grouped in hamlets; there were seven or eight of them, each with twelve to fifteen huts together with space between each other and fields around the huts (Foster 1998:206).

The area known to have been occupied by the Nabedache Caddo in the late 17th century was also called “Tejas” or “Texas” by the Spanish (Figure 1), while the French called the Caddo in this area the “Cenis.” In fact, the Caddo settlement along San Pedro Creek was commonly referred to by the Spanish and French through the late 18th century as San Pedro de los Nabedachos (Bolton 1987:45). The village was the principal entranceway to the lands of the Hasinai Caddo tribes, and one of the routes of the Camino Real—Camino de los Tejas—came to and through this place from the late 17th century to the early 19th century (see Corbin 1991).

The Spanish were determined to have effective control of the East Texas lands and bring missions to the Caddo peoples (R. Jackson 2005:22–23, 26). In 1690, they established two missions in the vicinity of the Nabedache village: Mission San Francisco de los Tejas and Mission El Santisimo Nombre de Maria. The San Francisco de los Tejas mission was established in the midst of the Nabedache village along San Pedro Creek. The other mission was established much closer to the Neches River itself. The two missions were abandoned by the Spanish in 1692 and late 1693, but subsequent missionaries and travelers who passed through the area and the Nabedache settlements on the way to other Caddo villages east of the Neches River remembered the location of these abandoned missions (see Tous 1997:85–86; Forrestal 1999). Juan Pedro Walker’s 1806 map of the San Pedro Creek and Neches River area (McGraw et al. 1991: Figure 26) even shows “Ancienne Mission de San Pedro” astride the Camino de los Tejas and west of the Neches River. The second Mission San Francisco de los Tejas was reestablished (and subsequently renamed Mission San Francisco de los Neches) in 1716, 4 leagues (ca. 10.4 miles) east of the first mission, across the Neches River (Foik 1999:145–147; Forrestal 1999:191–192).

Historical accounts place the late 17th and early 18th-century Nabedache village 2–3 leagues (5.2–7.8 miles) from the Neches River crossing but
“farther from the village to the crossing of the river than to the river at its nearest point, for as early as 1691 it was found that the best crossing was downstream a league or more” (Bolton 1987:43). At its closest point, Mission Tejas State Park is approximately 7 km (4 miles) from the confluence of San Pedro Creek and the Neches River, and it is on the east or south side of the creek. Corbin (1991:195 and Figure 28) and Foster (1998:192) both agree that the principal Nabedache Caddo village was on the west or north side of San Pedro Creek, not far from the Neches River. Bolton (1987:26–27), however, placed the Nabedache settlements, as well as Mission San Francisco de los Tejas, on the east or south side of San Pedro Creek.

Based on the historical and archeological information that bears on the question of the location of both the Nabedache Caddo settlements as well as Mission San Francisco de los Tejas, the historical information summarized by Corbin (1991) makes it probable that the Nabedache Caddo village was primarily on the west side of San Pedro Creek, as was the 1690–1693 Mission San Francisco de los Tejas. The Spanish approached both places from the west along Camino de los Tejas. The 1702 Delisle map has the Nabedache on the west side of the Rio aux Cenis (the Neches).

Since the village was dispersed over more than 2.6 miles along the creek, and included more than 100 houses, the Nabedache Caddo occupations at such Allen phase Caddo sites as 41HO6, 41HO64, and 41HO65 (Perrutla 2005)—or any such sites at Mission Tejas State Park—would have made up only a very small part of the community. Other parts of the Nabedache community could well have been situated on the south and east sides of San Pedro Creek, on suitable sandy and elevated landforms near the creek where farming could be undertaken.

Delisle’s map of 1702 shows that the westernmost Caddo groups lived on and near the Rio aux Cenis (likely the Neches River) (Jackson 1999: Plate 10). One of these groups was the Nabedache Caddo living west of the Neches River on San Pedro Creek.

A 1728 map has the Neches and Navidachos (i.e., Nabedache) groups living at the headwaters of the Rio de los Ayanis (probably the Angelina River), while 1740s maps show the San Pedro or Naoudiches living east of the Trinity River and west of the Neches River. The 1740 map by Sandoval and Franquis (J. Jackson 1999:242) depicts the Nabedache as living well to the north of the Camino de los Adaes. A 1771 map by Jose de Urrutia and Nicolas LaFora shows rancherias of San Pedro Caddo people situated east of the Neches River, but west of Nacogdoches (R. Jackson 2004:11).

Although there were outbreaks of epidemics at the Spanish settlement of Nacogdoches in the late 1770s through the early 1780s, the Hasinai Caddo groups remained in their East Texas homelands. In the early 1800s, the Caddo lived outside of the Spanish settlement of Nacogdoches, and as far west as the Neches River, but north of the El Camino Real. In his 1828 inspection of the province of Texas, General Teran reported that the Nabedache had a population of only 15 families (J. Jackson 2005:115). Earlier, in 1767, Solis stated that the Tejas community on San Pedro Creek was large and populous (Forrestal 1997:131–132). By around 1836 to 1842, the Hasinai tribes had all been forcibly pushed out of East Texas.

**Archeological Investigations**

The archeological work at the Nabedache Blanco and Nabedache Azul sites included shovel testing, metal detector investigations, and controlled hand excavations in key site areas. An area measuring 5400 sq m was systematically examined by metal detecting at the Nabedache Azul site. We examined approximately 9000 sq m with metal detectors at the Nabedache Blanco site. Following the completion of the metal detecting grids, and armed with the results of the old and newly-excavated shovel tests, we completed the hand excavation of a series of 1 x 1 m units (22 sq m at the two sites). The placement of units was based on the spatial density of Caddo lithic and ceramic artifacts, and on the location of pre-1800 metal artifacts. To increase the likelihood that small artifacts, especially glass beads, would be recovered from the sites, the matrix from 25% of each unit level, zone, or strata containing Caddo ceramic and lithic artifacts was collected and screened through 1/32-inch fine screen (about 120 fine-screen samples from the two sites).

**Nabedache Blanco Site (41HO211)**

The Nabedache Blanco site is located on a probable alluvial fan and lower toe slope immediately adjacent to the San Pedro Creek floodplain. The site covers approximately 10,300 sq m. The findings from the shovel tests and the metal detecting indicated that important archeological deposits containing aboriginal ceramic sherds, lithic artifacts and tools, and 17th and 18th century metal artifacts and glass beads, were concentrated in two areas on the alluvial fan. There were few archeological materials in the lower toe slope deposits.

With the exception of a few widely-scattered metal detector hits, most hits clustered on the eastern part of the alluvial fan. In this location, an area measuring about 240 sq m contained hits with a Spanish spur fragment, a French-style iron hoe, and a possible iron strike-a-light. Gun parts and glass beads were found in the 1 x 1 m excavations. All these artifacts came from less than 20 cm bs. Aboriginal Caddo ceramic sherds are concentrated in the same part of the site. Of the 16 recovered artifacts of European derivation, 81% were found in the upper 30 cm of the archeological deposits.

The decorated aboriginal ceramic sherds and two radiocarbon dates indicate that the main occupation of the site took place after ca. A.D. 1650 and that this occupation
was concentrated on the northern part of the lowest-lying area of the landform overlooking the San Pedro Creek floodplain. During the course of this Caddo occupation, the residents of the site obtained a few European trade goods.

The two calibrated radiocarbon dates obtained from the Nabedache Blanco site are on charred hickory nutshells. At 2 sigma, the first calibrated sample has age ranges of A.D. 1510–1600 and A.D. 1620–1950, with a calibrated intercept of A.D. 1660 (Beta-206839). The second date is slightly younger, with a 2 sigma calibrated age range of A.D. 1660–1950 (Beta-206840), and the oldest intercept is A.D. 1680 (other intercepts are A.D. 1730, 1810, 1930, and 1950). Both the calibrated dates and the intercepts suggest that the Nabedache Blanco site was occupied early in the Allen phase.

**Nabedache Azul Site (41HO214)**

The Nabedache Azul site is on a colluvial bench along a lower upland slope above the San Pedro Creek floodplain. A deep gully cuts across the bench and marks the northern extent of the site. Shovel testing and metal detecting hits indicate that the Nabedache Azul site covers about 4400 sq m. Sediments on the site are fairly shallow (ca. 30 cm) on the main part of the landform but are more than 60 cm thick at the northern end of the site where archeological materials occur on the floodplain.

The metal detecting effort covered the colluvial bench and a portion of the northern part of the site, all west of the gully. There were a number of metal detector hits in the central part of the site, mostly concentrated in a ca. 1000 sq m area of the colluvial bench. The one brass tinkler recovered by Cooper and Cooper (2005) from the Nabedache Azul site also came from this same area. Most of the metal in this central area appears to be from an 18th-century Caddo occupation and includes gun parts, lead balls, lead sprue, iron knives, iron kettle fragments, and a rolled piece of brass. Twenty-three metal artifacts of apparent 18th-century age were recovered from the metal detecting work. Glass beads, gunflints, and one sherd of majolica were also found in the 1 x 1 m hand-excavated units in this area. Aboriginal Caddo lithic and ceramic artifacts are concentrated in the same area in which the European trade goods were found.

Most of the European trade goods were recovered from 0–20 cm bs (87%). The remainder came from 20–30 cm bs. More than 94% of the glass beads were found in fine-screen columns, but the only other European trade item recovered in the fine-screen columns was a piece of lead sprue with a cut-out from a lead ball.

Radiocarbon samples from the Nabedache Azul site came from charred hickory nutshells and from the organics preserved inside the paste of a Patton Engraved sherd. The first date (Beta-206841) has a 2-sigma age range of A.D. 1660–1950, with intercepts of A.D. 1680, 1740, 1800, 1930, and 1950. The other date—from the Patton Engraved sherd—has a 2-sigma age range of A.D. 1460–1650, with calibrated intercepts of A.D. 1520, 1580, and 1630 (Beta-206842). Both calibrated dates leave open the possibility that the Caddo occupied the Nabedache Azul site to some extent early in the Allen phase as well as later when the majority of the European trade goods were obtained.

**European Trade Goods**

The most significant artifacts recovered in the test excavations are of European derivation. Of the 61 artifacts collected, 16 are from Nabedache Blanco and 45 from Nabedache Azul. They include drawn glass beads of various colors, gunflints, a sherd of Mexican majolica, and a variety of metal goods. Among the metal goods found during the metal detecting and controlled excavations are a Spanish-style spur and a French iron hoe from Nabedache Blanco as well as gun parts (from French flintlock muskets), knives, parts of iron and brass kettles, wrought nails, and a cuprous button from Nabedache Azul. A decorated butt plate finial from a musket found at Nabedache Azul can be dated to ca. 1730–1760. The recovery of these unique artifacts at Nabedache Blanco and Nabedache Azul is prima facie archeological evidence that the two sites were part of the late 17th–18th century Nabedache Caddo village on San Pedro Creek.

With the recovery of European trade goods at the Nabedache Blanco and Nabedache Azul sites during this project, there are nine recorded historic Caddo sites located in or near Mission Tejas State Park. The following sites are located within the park: 41HO91, 41HO122, and 41HO147 on the south side of San Pedro Creek (Erickson and Corbin 1996) and downstream from this current project. Other sites include 41HO6, 41HO64, 41HO65, and 41HO67, which are located on the north side of the creek, within a few miles radius of, but not within the park (see Perttula 2005). Other discoveries of European trade goods have been informally reported along San Pedro Creek over the years (Jay Blaine, 2005 personal communication). The existence of such a dense cluster of historic Caddo sites containing European trade goods is unprecedented, except perhaps in the Natchitoches, Louisiana, region.

**Glass Beads**

The most common European trade goods found at the two sites are glass beads. Although not chemically sourced, these beads were likely made in Venice or Amsterdam and brought to Texas as the principal item of trade. They comprise two classes (cf. Kidd and Kidd 1970:50, 53), namely Class I, a tubular-shaped bead with simple or monochrome bodies, and Class II, a rounded drawn bead with simple or monochrome bodies. A total of 28 beads were found: 10 at the Nabedache Blanco site and 18 from the Nabedache Azul site.
The colors of the 10 beads recovered from the Nabe-
dache Blanco site are as follows: white (n=8), blue (n=1),
and black (n=1). The blue bead (IIa43 in Kidd and Kidd’s
[1970] classification scheme) and the black (IIa7) bead are
small in size, around 2.27 mm in length. The white beads
include small and very small (less than 2 mm in length) beads
(IIa13) as well as large ovoid (IIa15) white beads (n=3).
All these bead classes are represented in the thousands of
glass beads recovered from 41HO64 on the north side of San
Pedro Creek (Perttula 2005: Table 1). The IIa13 and IIa39
beads were the most common type in that late 17th-early 18th
century Nabedache Caddo bead assemblage, though many of
them were medium or large in size. The IIa15 beads are not
well represented in the 41HO64 group, accounting for less
than 1% of the sample, while they comprise 30% of the
Nabedache Blanco bead assemblage.

The 18 beads from the Nabedache Azul site are also
of varying colors: white (n=8), blue (n=6), and black (n=4).
The white beads are all small or very small (IIa13). The blue
beads are of two shades and various sizes: The translucent
aqua blue beads (IIa39) are large (n=2) and small (n=3) or
very small, and the brite blue bead (IIa43) is small (n=1).
The black beads are all small in size and include two shapes:
rounded (IIa7) (n=3) and tubular (Ia2) (n=1). Both of these
bead types are rare in the 41HO64 assemblage, accounting
for only 12 of the 7646 beads (Perttula 2005: Table 2).
However, these two classes of black beads are present in
larger amounts in the La Belle shipwreck collection, and they
probably represent some of the beads that Joutel’s party
brought with them to the Nabedache Caddo village in 1687
(Perttula and Glascock 2003).

The bead assemblages from the two sites at Mission
Tejas State Park are too small to place them in the developing
bead chronological sequence proposed by Perttula (2005:
Table 2) or Smith (2002). None of the chronologically
specific bead types associated with the 18th century (Smith
2002:59–60) are present in the sites.

Mexican Ceramics
One small piece of tin-glazed majolica was recovered at the
Nabedache Azul site. The sherd is undecorated and probably
comes from a plate. This sherd has a thick and evenly-applied
glaze with extensive crazing on both sherd surfaces. The paste
is a very pale brown (10YR 8/4). Descriptions provided by
Fournier (1997:218, 2003:300) of majolica produced in
Mexico in colonial times, specifically from the Puebla region
of central Mexico, suggests that the majolica sherd is probably
from a vessel that originally was Puebla White or from the
undecorated portion of an 18th-century vessel that originally
was Puebla Polychrome or Puebla Blue-on-white. The majolica
pastes from this region “are usually light-colored, and the
texture is grainier and less refined” (Fournier 2003:300).

Gunflints
There are four gunflints from the Nabedache Blanco (n=1)
and Nabedache Azul sites (n=3). The recovery of gunflints is
consistent with the use of French flintlock muskets by the
Nabedache Caddo living at the two sites.

The gunflint from the Nabedache Blanco site is a
spall gunflint made from a gray chert (Figure 2c). The gunflint
has a wedge-like shape and a stepped cross-section as well as a
visible bulb of percussion, along with retouch and use around
the heel. There are no obvious residues on the gunflint. Only
parts of two working edges are carefully worked to an edge
by secondary flaking. Its size is consistent with use on a
French musket (Smith 1960:44).

The first of the three gunflints from the Nabedache
Azul site is a fragment of a spall gunflint made from a honey-
colored chert. The fragment has step flaking on one edge, no
visible blade scar, but radiating lines from the missing bulb of
percussion. The second gunflint is on a light gray chert that
has heat spalls from exposure to fire. There is a blade scar on
the ventral side, and the gunflint has two working edges
marked by step flaking and crushing. The flint is only 15.5
mm in length, suggesting it was probably made for use in a
pistol (Smith 1960:44), or had been reworked.

The third gunflint is a well-made flint (probably made
by the Caddo) from a gray chert. One edge of the gunflint
opposite the heel (Kenmotsu 1991: Figure 7c) has cortical
remnants, suggesting this material was gathered from local
lithic resources. The one working edge is steep with step flak-
ing. The gunflint is a suitable size for use in a French musket.

Gun Parts and Ammunition
Gun parts and ammunition are present at both the Nabedache
Blanco and Nabedache Azul sites. They do appear to be more
abundant at the latter site, as is the case for other kinds of
European trade goods.
At the Nabedache Blanco site, metal detecting recovered a flattened lead ball and a small piece of lead sprue cutting (Figure 2a–b). The piece of lead sprue indicates that the Caddo living at the site may have been making their own lead bullets. The one lead ball is spheroid-shaped, with one flattened side, suggesting it had been fired. The lead ball (12.8 mm diameter, 12.2 grams) would have been used in a French flintlock musket. Its size is comparable to a French infantry ball (Hamilton 1979: Table 16). There is evidence of sprue cutting on the ball.

Two lead balls came from the central part of the Nabedache Azul site. One is flattened from being fired (Figure 3c), and is 20.2 mm in diameter (12.7 grams). The other small lead ball has not been fired (Figure 3e), and is 14.5 mm in diameter. A small piece of a possible iron gun barrel fragment was also found in the eastern part of the Nabedache Azul site.

A circular piece of lead sprue (weighing 12.4 grams) has a cut-out on one edge, as if a lead ball had been removed from it (see Figure 3d). The diameter of the cut-out is only ca. 11.0 mm. The lead sprue mass is 32.3 x 34.5 mm in length and width.

A gooseneck-style (cf. Hamilton 1968:15 and Plate 22) iron guncock for a French musket was found during metal detecting at the Nabedache Azul site (Figure 3a). The guncock has a wide comb (11.3 mm in width) and a flat face. Its overall height is 64.5 mm, slightly smaller than the guncock from 41HO64 (Perttula 2005: Figure 7b).

One of the more diagnostic metal gun parts found at the site is a brass butt plate finial engraved with parallel lines and scrolls (Figure 3b). This particular butt finial is part of what Hamilton (1968) refers to as a Type D buttplate made by the French between ca. 1730–1760. This was a common grade trade gun (Hamilton 1979:212).

On the outer surface of the finial are engraved parallel lines along the borders of the butt plate. These lines end in two scrolls. The front part of the finial has two engraved ovals surrounded by ticked lines. The tip of the finial itself has notched and engraved lines along the edges and across the face; this style of engraving has been called the “torch” finial by Hamilton (1968).

The maximum width of the finial is 18.0 mm, and it is 1.7 mm thick. The back of the finial has a perforated tongue that was used for pin fastening.

According to Blaine and Harris (1967:66), this particular style of finial engraving is similar to a French pattern available as early as 1705. The remainder of the butt plate would have been decorated with a bow-arrow-club design. Engraved butt plates and butt plate finials similar to this one from the Nabedache Azul site have been found at a ca. mid-18th century Tunica Indian site in Louisiana (Hamilton 1979:213), 18th-century Osage sites in Missouri (Hamilton 1960: Figure 52), the 1715–1781 occupation at Fort Michilimackinac in Michigan (Hamilton 1976: Figure 4g), and the mid-18th century Gilbert site in northeastern Texas (Blaine and Harris 1967: Figure 37c, f).

Colonial Period Metal Artifacts

The wide range of metal artifacts found at the two sites suggests that the Nabedache Caddo living there had ready access to European metal tools and goods. Probably one of the most significant metal artifacts recovered during our investigations...
is an iron spur fragment from the Nabedache Blanco site. Spur fragments are very rarely found in historic Caddo sites (Jay Blaine, 2005 personal communication).

The spur fragment (Figure 4) actually consists of three spikes from a pointed star rowel (estrella) (see Simmons and Turley 1980: Figure 3 and Plate 20). These rowels have six spikes (espiga), of which three are preserved on the artifact from the Nabedache Blanco site. The spikes on this spur are approximately 65 mm in length.

Simmons and Turley (1980) suggest that pointed six-star rowels were used as early as the 16th century by the Spanish conquistadors. They also note that although this style of spur “had gone out of fashion in central Mexico by the seventeenth century, examples continued to see service in the northern Borderlands where all durable goods were passed from father to son over generations” (Simmons and Turley 1980:111). Through time, apparently, the spike or espiga on Spanish spurs tended to decrease in size, and by the mid-1600s, the number of spikes on the rowel increased from six to eight (Simmons and Turley 1980:111). Thus, this spur may date prior to the mid-1600s and would constitute very early evidence of contact between the Spanish and the Nabedache Caddo.

One iron hoe was found at the Nabedache Blanco site (Figure 5). The hoe has been forged from two separate pieces of iron, with a cylindrical haft that has a ridge at the bottom where the haft meets the blade. It also has rounded shoulders and an oval blade with a rounded bit. The blade length is 101 mm, and a maximum blade width of 108.5 mm.

This form of hoe was probably made for trade by the French (Brain 1979:144–145). It does not resemble Spanish Colonial style hoes (Simmons and Turley 1980: Plate 4). The hoe appears to be a Type A, Variety 2 hoe, as defined by Brain (1979) in reference to the 18th-century hoes found at the Trudeau site in Louisiana. Blaine (1992: Figure 3) documents a similar hoe from the mid-18th century Gilbert site (41RA13) in the upper Sabine River basin.

Two possible fragments of French tripod-style cast iron kettles (Brain 1979:136–137) were found at the Nabedache Azul site (Figure 6a). The first piece may be part of the kettle rim, and there is at least one rusted rivet visible just under the lip. The second piece is a slightly flared kettle rim with three visible rivets that would have held the kettle bail lugs on to the kettle.

A rolled piece of brass, possibly a tinkler (see Figure 6b), was also found at the Nabedache Azul site. This piece of brass has a straight base and well-done crimping of the cut brass sheet. It would have been attached with a string or thong to an article of clothing through holes at the top and bottom of the cone. Similar artifacts from the Gilbert site (Jelks 1967:Figure 43f–i) may have been made by the aboriginal occupants of the site from pieces cut from a kettle. They were not obtained in finished form from the French (Jelks 1967:92).

Two possible hand wrought nails or nail fragments were also recovered from the Nabedache Azul site (Figure 6c). The more complete nail is 48+ mm in length, with an 8.2 mm head diameter. Although the nails are poorly preserved, they probably had “rose heads” (Brain 1979:156).

Several iron knife blade fragments were found in three metal detector hits in the main part of the Nabedache Azul site. One piece is a small blade fragment, and another iron piece is a thicker butcher knife blade (Figure 6d). The fragment is 110.6 mm in length, 23.0 mm wide, and 5.0 mm thick.

The third knife fragment is a piece of a Type 2 French iron case knife as defined by Harris et al. (1965: Figure 20e). It has a straight cutting edge with a downward curve at the tip (which is missing). A distinctive feature of the case knife is a rod-like extension at the butt of the blade that held the handle (Figure 6e). There is no evidence of a separate flange.
the Camino de Tejas crossing of the creek and the Neches River. The mission was a key nexus of European-Caddo interaction and economic-social relationships (cf. Barr 2005).

The archeological work consisted of shovel testing, systematic metal detector investigations of most of each site’s extent, the hand excavation of a series of 1 x 1 m units, and the fine-screening of matrix samples from each unit to recover glass trade beads and other evidence of European goods on these Caddo sites. The combination of these field approaches was successful in recovering glass beads and other European trade goods at two of the sites, namely Nabedache Blanco (41HO211) and Nabedache Azul (41HO214).

The types of European trade goods recovered, the Caddo ceramic wares and stone tools, and four calibrated radiocarbon dates, indicate that the two sites were probably occupied from the late 17th century to around 1760 by Nabedache Caddo people. However, recovery of the Spanish spur fragment suggests the possibility of an even earlier occupation. The archeological remains from these two sites, along with a number of other historic Caddo sites on San Pedro Creek, constitute the best available evidence that they are part of the Nabedache Caddo village—or more likely, part of one Nabedache Caddo village—that had been visited and described by both Spanish missionaries and French explorers in the late 17th and 18th centuries. This concentrated loci of historic Caddo archeological sites on San Pedro Creek is unique in East Texas archeology.

The main occupation at the Nabedache Blanco site (41HO211) took place after ca. A.D. 1650—based on the decorated aboriginal ceramic sherds and the radiocarbon dates—and this occupation was concentrated on the landform overlooking the San Pedro Creek floodplain. During the course of this Caddo occupation, the residents of the site obtained European trade goods that included beads, gun parts, a metal hoe, a strike-a-light, and a Spanish spur. These items were most likely obtained from both the French and Spanish in some kind of informal exchange relationship with the Nabedache Caddo. The recovery of the spur may be evidence of early direct contact between the Spanish and the Nabedache Caddo.

At the Nabedache Azul site, European trade goods were found in a domestic Nabedache Caddo context, where they had been discarded along with broken pottery vessels and other everyday things. The metal objects included 18th-century gun parts, lead balls, lead sprue, iron knives, iron kettle fragments, and a rolled piece of brass. A decorated butt plate finial from a musket found at this site can be dated to ca. 1730–1760.

The wide range of metal artifacts found at the two sites indicate that the Nabedache Caddo had ready access to European metal tools and goods, and they used and reworked the metal to suit their own purposes (Ehrhardt 2005). When the metal tools no longer served a useful purpose or were broken, they were readily discarded, seemingly because the
Caddo could easily replace them. A piece of lead sprue recovered from the Nabedache Blanco site suggests that the Caddo living there around the turn of the 18th century had gained the technological expertise to make their own lead bullets. Tinklers (ornaments made to wear on clothing) appear to also have been made by the aboriginal Caddo occupants of the site from pieces cut from a kettle.

The recovery of gunflints is consistent with the use of French flintlock muskets by the Nabedache Caddo living at the two sites. The muskets were primarily used for hunting and obtaining deer hides for trade. Glass beads and gunflints were also found at Nabedache Azul, along with one sherd of Mexican majolica that must have been brought overland in a supply train from the Mexico City area. Among the European trade goods recovered at the two Nabedache Caddo sites, the most common are the glass beads of various colors. The beads were likely made in Venice or Amsterdam and brought to Texas as the principal item of trade; they probably represent some of the beads Joutel’s party brought with them to the Nabedache Caddo village in 1687.

With the possible exception of some of the gun flints that may have been manufactured by the Caddo, the remainder of these European goods were acquired by the Nabedache Caddo from the French and Spanish traders and colonists who traversed the San Pedro Creek area in the late 17th and 18th centuries. Most Europeans were interested in civilizing the Caddo, converting them to Christianity, and encouraging them to be trading partners and military allies (Barr 2005:155). However, the Spanish at the newly founded mission de los Tejas continued to think of the Caddo as no more than “barbarous savages” (Barr 2005:168; Weber 2005:85).

The Nabedache Caddo potters living at the two sites continued to manufacture fine ware and utility ware vessels following contact with the Europeans and also after the introduction of metal cookware such as iron kettles. These findings imply that traditional means of food processing and culinary practices were maintained by these Caddo groups through at least the 1760s.

The presence of lithic debris from the two Nabedache Caddo sites is evidence these peoples continued to make and use chipped stone tools at the same time they adopted and began to use metal tools. However, the small amount of lithic debris at the Nabedache Azul site is notable given the age of the Caddo occupation (ca. 1730–1760) and the relative abundance of metal artifacts found there. It is probable the very low density of stone tool working debris at this site is indicative of the abandonment of aboriginal stone tool knapping activities and the replacement of stone tools with metal tools obtained from French traders. If so, the Caddo most likely relied on European metal tools which had, in effect, become part of a foreign economy. The Caddo continued to use ground stone tools for grinding and crushing plant foods after ca. 1650, pointing to (as do the aboriginal ceramic vessels and sherds) a maintenance of traditional technologies of food processing even after European contact.

These two sites are Caddo habitation sites that were probably occupied a generation or less by a family or a related series of families of Nabedache Caddo. European trade goods, particularly glass beads and metal goods, are more abundant at the Nabedache Azul site than they are at the Nabedache Blanco site. Since the Nabedache Azul site apparently is younger than the historic Caddo occupation at the Nabedache Blanco site, this difference in abundance of trade goods may reflect (1) the development over time of more reliable access by the Caddo to trade goods because of more intensive European settlement in East Texas, (2) the burgeoning deer hide trade, marked by the trade goods used by the French traders to pay for the hides, and (3) the formulation of European trade and political policies that fostered the exchange of trade goods to favored Indian nations (see Weber 2005). Related to these factors is the position of the Nabedache Caddo settlements relative to European settlements and European roads and trade routes in East Texas. Story (1995:245) has suggested that in the 18th century, Hasinai Caddo settlements were likely to be established in areas “more strategically located for interaction with Europeans,” particularly “near European settlements or along roadways leading to these settlements.” Clearly, the location of the Nabedache Caddo village—the westernmost Caddo village in East Texas, along and near the Camino de Tejas—was a principal stop-over place for European traders and settlers moving between East Texas, Natchitoches, and San Antonio.
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Architecture Variability of the Late Woodland and Plains Village Occupations at the Indian Springs Site (41RB81), Roberts County, Texas

J. Brett Cruse

Between April 2002 and May 2006, archeologists and volunteers under the direction of Texas Historical Commission (THC) regional archeologist Brett Cruse conducted excavations at the Indian Springs site (41RB81), a multicomponent site located on the M-Cross Ranch in northern Roberts County, Texas (Figure 1). The ranch, which lies within the breaks north of the Canadian River, is owned by John Erickson, who brought the Indian Springs site to the attention of THC archeological steward Doug Wilkens in 1990. Wilkens, in turn, assisted THC archeologists in recording the site in 1991 during the Canadian River Breaks Reconnaissance project (Mercado-Allinger et al. in press). It would be a decade later, however, that the potential significance of the site to Southern Plains archeology would be recognized.

In November 2000, as archeologists and volunteers were completing salvage excavations of a Plains Village pit-house at Hank’s site (41RB109), also on the Erickson Ranch (Boyd and Wilkens 2001), Erickson and Wilkens took the author to the Indian Springs site where they pointed out a rock alignment that appeared to mark one corner of a prehistoric structure. Rock-lined structures are commonly found along the Canadian River and its drainages and are typically
associated with Plains Village Antelope Creek phase and Buried City Complex sites; but what was particularly intriguing about the Indian Springs site was that it did not appear to be a Plains Village site. In fact, a number of artifacts have been surface collected from the eroded eastern face of the terrace on which the site sits, and nearly all of the surface-collected materials are Woodland period items consisting of thick parallel-corded ceramics and corner notched arrow-points. None of the collected artifacts appear to date to the Plains Village period. Could it be that the rock-lined structure we had discovered in this eroded terrace was associated with the Plains Woodland occupation of the site? Few Woodland period structures have been documented anywhere on the Southern Plains, and none have been recorded within the Texas Panhandle. A quick examination of the terrace edge revealed that a thick midden deposit covered a large portion of the site area; it was from this midden that the artifacts appeared to be eroding. The location of the structure, on or within the midden deposit, suggested an association with the midden. Because we believed there was a strong likelihood the apparent structure could be associated with the Woodland occupation, we began to make plans to conduct test excavations at the site for the following spring.

Site Investigations
Prior to the planned excavations, John Erickson, the land owner, tried to determine the size and shape of the suspected structure by using a steel pokey rod to trace out the rock alignment. When his rod made contact with a rock, Erickson marked its location with a pin flag and then exposed the top of each rock with posthole diggers. By working his way around the perimeter of the structure, Erickson discovered it was rectangular in shape and it measured a surprising 10.5 m by 8.2 m! He began referring to this structure as the “Big House,” which we later formally designated as Structure 1 (Figure 2).

Erickson’s explorations were far from done. With his pokey rod and posthole diggers, he continued searching across the site for other buried rocks and structures and found two additional structures. Structures 2 and 3, both circular and measuring approximately 4 m in diameter, are located to the south and west of Structure 1 (Figure 2). Investigation of the southwest end of the site, begun when human finger bones were found on the surface near some clusters of caliche rocks, resulted in the discovery of Structure 4, a small circular pit-house described below.

Basing our decision on information Erickson gathered at the site, we excavated a series of 1 m² and 2 m² units within the four structures. In April 2002, aided by a contingent of volunteers, we began investigating the site, spending six days on this initial effort. Since then, additional week-long excavations have been conducted, most recently during May 1–6, 2006. To date, 99 m² have been excavated at the site, more than 14,400 artifacts have been recovered, all or portions of 4 structures have been investigated, and 9 additional cultural features have been excavated.

Structures and Features
Structure 1 is a large, roughly rectangular-shaped structure with a floor area of approximately 86 m². Excavations within the structure have exposed about 52 m² of the floor and walls (Figure 3). No obvious entryway has yet been discovered for the structure. The floor of the structure appears to be shallow, only about 20 cm below what would have been the ground surface when the structure was built. No evidence has been found to suggest that the floor was prepared in any way other than smoothing and leveling. The structure was built on a thick midden deposit and, because it is on the down slope side of the landform, the same midden deposits also filled the structure after it was abandoned. Because the sediments within the structure are so homogenous, it is difficult to discern the floor contact as well as the edges of other cultural features. The walls of the structure are marked by caliche rocks—some that are fist size, while others are small boulders. None of the rocks are slabs like those typically found in Antelope Creek phase houses. Most of the larger rocks evident within the Structure 1 walls are located around the southeastern corner. The rocks are not part of a stacked wall. Rather, they occur as a single layer, and we believe they served to help stabilize posts that were placed around the wall periphery. Though no wall post holes have yet been detected, the rocks appear to have been placed inside a shallow trench along the wall.
periphery. We assume posts were also set in the trench to serve as the walls. A single post hole for an interior support post was located during the excavations near the southwest corner of the structure. The post hole is roughly 20 cm across and the hole, which has been severely damaged by rodents, appears to extend to about 40 cm below the floor level.

To date, the excavations have exposed little more than half of the wall periphery. There appears to be a double row of rocks along the southwestern and western wall segments but only a single row of rocks along the southeastern and eastern wall segments (Figure 4). It is unclear why some places contain a single row and others a double row, but this variance possibly arose from attempts to stabilize or repair the walls. We have recovered a few small pieces of daub from the Structure 1 excavations; but daub is not common, and no charred post fragments have been located. It is clear that the structure did not burn.

Within the Structure 1 excavations, four features have been identified on the structure floor. One of the features, Feature 4, was a cluster of bison bone elements found near the north wall of the structure. Though no pit outline was discernible, the bones were tightly clustered in an area approximately 60 cm in diameter, and it is likely they were deposited in a small pit. The feature consisted of about 20 ankle, leg, and rib elements from several individual bison. Several of the bones were broken, but none of them were burned or exhibited any other modification. Apparently Feature 4 was associated with a bone processing area.
Feature 5 is a circular, rock-filled hearth on the floor of the structure (Figure 5). It was found in Unit 31 approximately 4 m from the south wall, 4 m from the north wall, and 3.5 m from the west wall. The caliche rocks of the hearth were in a shallow basin that measured approximately 50 cm in diameter and 15 cm deep. The entire hearth fill was collected for flotation analysis, but the analysis has not been completed. Some burned bone and wood charcoal was recovered from the hearth. A sample of the charcoal produced a radiocarbon date of A.D. 790–1000 (corrected 2-sigma range; conventional radiocarbon age is A.D. 860 ± 40 B.P.) from Beta Analytic. A large amount of the feature fill was bagged for flotation analysis, which is ongoing. The one notable artifact that was recovered from the feature is a bison tibia digging stick. Tibia digging implements are typically viewed as horticulture-related tools, though no other direct evidence for horticulture has yet been found with the Late Woodland occupations of the site.

Feature 6 is a large circular pit (Figure 6) that was most likely used for storage. It is located approximately 1 m north of the south wall of the structure. The pit measures 1.04 m by 1.02 m across and is 61 cm deep. It has relatively straight walls and a flat bottom. The fill of the pit is noticeably darker than the surrounding soil. It contains substantially more charcoal than the midden deposits into which it was dug, and charcoal flecks are scattered throughout the feature fill. A sample of the charcoal produced a radiocarbon date of A.D. 790–1000 (corrected 2-sigma range; conventional radiocarbon age is A.D. 860 ± 40 B.P.) from Beta Analytic. A large amount of the feature fill was bagged for flotation analysis, which is ongoing. The one notable artifact that was recovered from the feature is a bison tibia digging stick. Tibia digging implements are typically viewed as horticulture-related tools, though no other direct evidence for horticulture has yet been found with the Late Woodland occupations of the site.

Feature 7 is another pit feature located just to the north and west of Feature 6. This circular pit is substantially smaller than Feature 6, but it also is assumed to have functioned as a storage pit. The pit measured approximately 70 cm in diameter, was 30 cm deep, and was basin shaped in profile. Three manos were found at the bottom of the pit.

Structures 2 and 3 are both surface structures marked by rock rings. Each structure measures roughly 4 m in diameter. The caliche rocks associated with these structures were simply laid on top of the ground, and we presume the rocks were used as weights around the edge of some type of brush or hide hut. However, around Structure 2 there appear to be substantially more rocks than would be needed to weigh down the bottom of a hide covering. Within the center of Structure 2, we excavated Unit 6, a 2m² unit, to determine if the structure contained a central hearth feature. This effort was successful: we located a central hearth and designated it Feature 1. When first detected, the hearth feature appeared as an oblong shaped charcoal stain that measured 100 cm east-west and 62 cm north-south. No rocks were associated with the hearth. When excavated, the feature was a shallow basin only 6 cm deep. It contained charcoal flecks, some patches of ash, a few small fragments of burned bone, and a few small burned rock fragments. A charcoal sample from the feature produced a date of A.D. 1460–1660 (corrected 2-sigma range; conventional radiocarbon age is A.D. 1670 ± 40) from Beta Analytic.

Within Structure 3 we excavated 14 m² and identified a central hearth feature, Feature 3, in this structure as well. Like the central hearth in Structure 2, the hearth feature in Structure 3 is a circular, shallow, unlined hearth containing charcoal flecks, burned bone, and some ash. The hearth measures only 25 cm in diameter and is 5 cm deep. A charcoal sample from Feature 3 produced a date of A.D. 1400–1460 (corrected 2-sigma range; conventional radiocarbon age is A.D. 1500 ± 40) from Beta Analytic. The radiocarbon dates...
from Structures 2 and 3 indicate they were occupied at the terminal end of the Plains Village period or in the early Protohistoric period. No diagnostic artifacts have been recovered directly associated with either Structure 2 or Structure 3.

Structure 4 is a small circular pithouse (Figure 7) located on the southwest edge of the site. The structure measures 2.3 m north-south by 2.2 m east-west and is approximately 40 cm deep. On the west side of the structure is a sloping ramp-like entrance that is 1.8 m long and 0.6 m wide. At the outside edge of the entryway is a shallow step or basin, apparently designed to prevent rain from running down the entrance and into the structure. No structural post holes were detected during the excavations, and no rocks were found along the walls or entryway. The fill inside the pithouse was gray clay that had obviously been brought in. When the pithouse was constructed, the clay apparently was used to cover the entire superstructure.

On the floor of the structure we found three small pit features (Features 2, 8, and 9), each filled with ash. One of the ash pits (Feature 2) was in the center of the floor while the other two were along the south (Feature 8) and east (Feature 9) walls. From the central ash pit we recovered two charred corn cobs (although the macrobotanical studies are not yet completed) and a piece of cordmarked ceramic. Charred wood from the pit produced a radiocarbon date of A.D. 1280–1400 (corrected 2-sigma range; conventional radiocarbon age is A.D. 1330 ± 40) from Beta Analytic. Another date on charred wood recovered from Feature 8 produced a radiocarbon date of A.D. 1290–1410 (corrected 2-sigma range; conventional radiocarbon age is A.D. 1370 ± 40) from Beta Analytic. These dates place Structure 4 solidly within the Plains Village period on the Southern Plains. The function of this structure is not clear, but its small size and proximity to a number of small rock cairns suggest it may have had a ceremonial function. Conversely, it may simply be a residential structure like the small circular houses found at the Odessa Yates site in Oklahoma and the Buried City site in Ochiltree County (Brosowske 2005:143–144).

Artifacts
To date, a total of 14,451 artifacts have been recovered from the excavations at the Indian Springs site. Bone, mostly small fragments from medium and large mammals such as deer and bison, account for 57.6% (n=8,316) of the artifacts, followed by lithic debitage at 39.1% (n=5,647), pottery and daub at 2.1% (n=306), flaked stone tools at 1.0% (n=146), and ground stone at 0.25% (n=36). Flaked stone tools, fashioned primarily from local cobbles of Alibates agate, include projectile points, biface fragments, drills, retouched flakes, and scrapers. The 56 projectile points (Figure 8) that have been recovered from the site are dominated by corner- and basal-notched arrowpoints such as Scallorn and Deadman. These expanding stem point forms are typical of Woodland period sites of the region. There are also some side-notched forms in the collection that are similar to Reed and Washita arrowpoints. Interestingly, the Washita-like points from the site generally exhibit shallow notches, unlike the typical Washita point. In addition, a small number of dart points have also been recovered from the site. The other flaked stone artifacts are tools associated with cutting and scraping activities and include retouched flakes, refined bifaces, and scrapers.

The ceramics from the site are, for the most part, thick, parallel-cordmarked wares (Figure 9). Containers appear to be dominated by jars. Though most rims are not decorated, a few of the rims show lip decorations in the form of stick or finger nail impressions. Bone, grit, and grog are the favored tempering agents. For the most part, the ceramics are typical of Woodland period pottery on the Southern Plains.
Figure 8. Various arrow and dart points from the site.
Summary and Comparisons
The archeological investigations and ongoing analysis of the recovered materials from the Indian Springs site have provided a tremendous amount of information about the occupations of the site. Various groups occupied the site over a span of at least 550 years. Beginning in the Late Woodland period, occupants built Structure 1, a large 10.5 m by 8.2 m rectangular, shallow structure with walls that were apparently lined with posts and caliche rocks that helped support the posts. Evidence for an entryway for the structure remains to be found, and it appears that the structure did not have a depressed central floor channel—a common feature in later Plains Village structures in the region. Internal floor features include storage and refuse pits, a rock-lined hearth, and at least one roof support post.

Structure 1 appears to be unique for Woodland period structures in the region. Within the Southern Plains as a whole, the Woodland period is poorly known, and few sites of this time period have been investigated. In the immediate area, Hughes (1962) defined the Lake Creek complex based on limited testing and surface collected materials at the Lake Creek site in Hutchinson County. The complex is characterized by deeply cordmarked ceramics, mostly corner-notched arrowpoints, and flake knives. House types are unknown. In neighboring Oklahoma, a number of Woodland sites have been recorded (Lintz 1976, 1978; Drass 1997), but none with architectural remains similar to Structure 1 at the Indian Springs site. Drass (1997) considers the Custer Phase (A.D. 800–1250) in western Oklahoma as a transitional stage between Plains Woodland and Plains Village. House types of the phase are not well documented, but the ones that have been investigated are small rectangular houses with wall posts, but no rocks along the walls (Hofman 1984, Drass and Moore 1987).

Some similarities can be seen between Structure 1 at Indian Springs and Las Animas Tradition houses of southeastern Colorado, which date from A.D. 500–1400 (Campbell 1976; Gunnerson 1989). Las Animas Tradition houses, though typically small and circular, nonetheless are marked by shallow floors and low rock walls similar to Structure 1 at Indian Springs. According to Campbell (1976:61), some rectangular houses appear by A.D. 1000.
Acknowledgements
The other Indian Springs structures are also unique in the region. Structure 4 clearly dates to the Plains Village period, but it is quite dissimilar to other Plains Village structures that have been documented in the area. Its circular small size, lack of wall rocks and post holes, and extended ramp entryway is much more similar to pithouses of the same time period in eastern New Mexico rather than the rectangular slab-lined or picket posts walled Plains Village structures of the Southern Plains (Lintz 1986, Wiseman 2002). Structures 2 and 3, which date to the very late Village period or early Protocultural period, more closely resemble tepee rings rather than formal houses, though with Structure 2 in particular, there appear to be far too many rocks than what would be needed for a tepee. Clearly, more investigation of these structures is needed.

In summary, the volunteer work that has taken place at the Indian Springs site has made some important contributions to the archeology of the Southern Plains; continued investigations and analysis of the recovered materials promises to be even more enlightening. Clearly, the Indian Springs site holds great promise to further our understanding of the Plains Villager culture in the region and the transition to a Plains Village culture. This transition, which took place around A.D. 1000–1200, is a time when groups shifted from a hunter-gatherer lifestyle to bison hunting and horticulture. The architectural variability present at the site suggests that the region may have been influenced by different cultural groups through time. Future investigations at the site should shed additional light on the poorly known Plains Woodland culture of the region and the development of the Plains Village culture in the eastern portion of the Texas Panhandle.
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Anomaly II Returns from Maiden Voyage

With Steve Hoyt at the project’s helm, the new Anomaly II performed flawlessly on its first extended “tour of duty.” This archeological survey vessel was used recently in initial field operations for the Texas Historical Commission (THC) Indianola Survey Project, which included collecting data on the archeological remains of the Indianola port facilities and any shipwrecks in the vicinity. Indianola, a booming railroad terminus and port city in the mid-1800s, was ravaged by hurricanes in 1875 and 1886, and virtually abandoned after the last one.

During the 10-day field project, two electronic instruments mounted aboard the Anomaly II collected data in Matagorda Bay. The primary survey instrument was the THC’s marine magnetometer, which detects iron objects resting on, or buried in, the seafloor. This instrument can easily detect the wrecks of both the sailing ships and the steam ships that visited the port of Indianola since all these historic ships contained large amounts of iron in the construction, rigging and propulsion. It is also handy for detecting the remains of the wharves where those ships transferred cargo. Indianola had three long wharves extending more than 2000 feet offshore to reach water deep enough for steamers to approach.

To supplement the magnetometer, the THC rented a side-scan sonar unit, mounted on the bow of the boat, which uses reflected sound waves to create a picture of the sea floor and any objects resting on it. Sonar images of a shipwreck are very useful for identifying the size and various features of the wreck before divers descend into the murky waters and start crawling around on it.

The Anomaly II continuously collected data from the instruments while it traveled over the survey area on lines spaced 20 meters apart, eventually covering a total distance of about 233 miles. Well over a million magnetometer readings were recorded, and more than 2000 sonar files were created. All these data are now being processed and analyzed, and will form the basis of planning for the diving phase of the operation scheduled for late spring.

From the THC Archeology Division, Director Jim Bruseth and Field Archeologists Bill Pierson and Maureen Brown assisted on the survey, spending two to five days each on the project. Several volunteers, including marine stewards, provided additional support. With volunteer participation, the project team was able to have at least two people on the boat at all times; without them, the survey would not have been possible. In addition to volunteering time on the boat, Jack Jackson provided the free use of his house in Port O’Connor as the project headquarters and personnel quarters. The location was ideal because of its proximity to the survey area and because the house included a boat stall and lift. With a lift just outside the back door of the house, the crew was able to lock the boat at night with the electronics onboard, thus saving a considerable amount of setup and breakdown time each day.

Steve Hoyt
Marine Archeologist
THC Archeology Division

The Curatorial Facility Certification Program is Well Underway

The Curatorial Facility Certification Program (CFCP) has certified three facilities to date: the Corpus Christi Museum of Science and History, the Center for Archeological Research at the University of Texas at San Antonio, and the Sam Houston Memorial Museum in Huntsville. All three served as test facilities for the program, and CFCP documents were recently revised in order to improve the certification process for both the THC and the curatorial facilities.

Continues on following page.
Eight other museums and repositories are currently undergoing the certification process and will be completing the program within the year. Six curatorial facilities applied for the 2007 TPTF grants, and four facilities received a total of $69,780 to improve conditions for their held-in-trust collections.

Changes were made to Chapters 26 and 29 of the Texas Administrative Code concerning held-in-trust collections. The definitions in each chapter were evaluated for consistency. Collections management responsibilities that were contained in Chapter 26 were moved to Chapter 29, the appropriate location for this information. Minor changes were made to Chapter 29 to reflect the recent revisions to the CFCF, most notably the inclusion of an additional deficiency factor for incomplete cataloging of collections, the additional six-month extension for the self evaluation, and the requirement of a plan and schedule for correcting disabling and deficiency factors due within 90 days of certification.

Elizabeth Martindale
Curatorial Facility Certification Program Coordinator
THC Archeology Division

---

Texas Historical Commission Grants Awards
Stellar Contributions to Archeological Research in Texas

Three worthy groups of archeologists recently received Texas Historical Commission (THC) Awards of Merit for their outstanding accomplishments in field research, artifact analysis, and report production. At the THC Archeology Committee Meeting held on October 25, 2006, Jack Jackson, Margaret Howard, and Luis Alvarado of the Clinical Resources Program of the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department received a THC Award of Merit for their investigation and report, “History and Archeology of Lipantitlan State Historic Site.” Robert J. Malouf, William A. Cloud, and Richard W. Walter with the Center for Big Bend Studies also were honored at the October 2006 meeting. They headed the award-winning research and analysis reported in “The Rosillo Peak Site.”

Last January, at the first quarterly meeting for 2007, the THC presented an Award of Merit to Steve Carpenter, Michael Chavez, Kevin Miller, and Len Lawrence of SWCA, Inc., for the research they published in their report, “The McKinney Roughs Site 41BP627.”

---

THC Chairman John Nau and Executive Director Larry Oaks present the Award of Merit to TPWD representatives Margaret Howard and Tina and Sam Jackson, family members of Jack Jackson who passed away last fall.

On behalf of the Center for Big Bend Studies, Andy Cloud accepts the Award of Merit from THC Executive Director Larry Oaks and THC Chairman John Nau.

Ken Lawrence represents his company, SWCA, Inc., as he receives the Award of Merit from Dr. Eileen Johnson, THC commissioner, and Dr. James Bruseth, Archeology Division director.
Landowners Help Reveal the Past in Victoria County

John and Frances McNeill probably found it odd that a volunteer from a state agency would care about the dirt they were having hauled off from their property. Once they heard Jimmy Bluhm’s story, though, they were eager to go along with his intriguing request.

When it comes to tracking down archeological finds, Jimmy Bluhm is persistent—one of the many assets that make him a valuable member of the Texas Archeological Steward Network. When Bluhm learned about soil that possibly contained material associated with early inhabitants of what is now Victoria County, he was determined to find out about its origins. Several weeks later, he finally located the source of that precious dirt, the McNeills’ ranch.

The McNeills agreed to interrupt their own work to let a team of avocational archaeologists investigate a portion of their ranch that was subsequently recorded as the McNeill-Gonzales Ranch site (41VT141). The enthusiastic cooperation of these landowners led to archeological findings that shed light on the history of that area.

Don and Bette Burris have allowed professional and avocational archeologists unlimited access to their Victoria County property for more than 30 years. Controlled excavations have been conducted at the Lindsey (41VT4) and the Burris Bison (41VT66) sites, used also as a Southern Texas Archeological Association Field School.

Likewise, John and Sue Gibbs have spent the last 30 years supporting archeological research and education on their property, which has led to investigations adjoining Linn Lake sites 41VT80, 81, and 93. They allowed the University of Texas at San Antonio to conduct a field school activity at Linn Lake.

The Texas Historical Commission recognized the contributions of the McNeill, Burris, and Gibbs families to the discovery and preservation of bits of Victoria County’s past. Each family received a Historic Texas Lands Plaque at a Texas Archeology Month workshop for landowners titled “Protecting Our Archaeological Resources for the Future,” held at the Museum of the Coastal Bend in Victoria last October.

More than 90% of the archeological sites in Texas are located on private property. Unfortunately, many landowners mistakenly believe the state of Texas can take away their land if it is historically significant. The purpose of the workshop was to educate landowners regarding their rights and encourage them to recognize and act upon their potential to help archeologists literally unearth Texas’ past.

Susan Hammack
Archeology Month Coordinator and Editor
THC Archeology Division

Texas Archeology Month Gets Better Every Year!

How good was Texas Archeology Month (TAM) 2006? The participants say it best:

• Our event was most informative, interesting, and well attended.
• It is nice to listen to speakers who know what they’re talking about.
• Our speaker did an excellent job.
• More people came than we expected!
• All our tours were booked, with waiting lists.

• The brochures and posters were wonderful—provided lots of information.

Last October’s Texas Archeology Month had events to educate and entertain people of all ages and interests. TAM participants took advantage of a myriad of opportunities to learn about and enjoy bits and pieces of the past offered at more than 90 events held all over the state.

More than 39,600 folks attended events organized by the 36 sponsors who returned our evaluation forms. That’s almost double the reported attendance for TAM 2005! But we don’t want TAM’s ever increasing success story to curb our enthusiasm for getting even more people involved in TAM 2007. In the “Looking Ahead” section of this issue you will find information on how to get started planning your role this fall in the next biggest and best Texas Archeology Month.

Susan Hammack
REGIONAL AND STEWARD NEWS

Rose Treviño Leaves a Legacy of Enthusiasm for Texas Archeology

After years of struggling with her health, Rose Treviño passed away peacefully at her home in Laredo on July 11, 2006. Rose was a strong advocate for many causes, an award-winning photographer, Poet Laureate of the 1989 Hispanic Women's Conference, and a life-long student of history and archeology. She assembled a vast collection of books, maps, documents, and photographs that were donated to the Texas A&M International University Killam Library Special Collections and Archives in 2005 as the Rose Treviño Regional History Special Collection. Her generosity was even extended to the Maswa Boarding School for Girls in Tanzania, Africa, where there is a library wing named in her honor. Rose's dedication to historic preservation on both sides of the Rio Grande led to her appointments to the Old San Antonio Road Preservation Commission and the Texas Historical Commission by Texas governors William Clements and Ann Richards.

Rose took part in numerous archeological excavations in Central America, Mexico and Texas. She was an active member of the Texas Archeological Stewardship Network for 18 years, founded the Webb County Archeological Society and served several terms as Regional Director of the Texas Archeological Society (TAS). TAS members will undoubtedly recall her gracious hospitality at the annual conferences held in Laredo. Her seemingly boundless enthusiasm for Texas archeology was inspirational and will be missed by the youth she mentored, the decision-makers she "pestered," and the rest of us who were fortunate to have crossed her path.

Students Loved to Hear “Cap” Ebersole Talk About Archeology

C. R. Ebersole passed away in Austin on December 8, 2006. A long-time resident of Houston, Richey (also known as “Cap”) was an active member of the Houston and Texas archeological societies and served among the ranks of the Texas Archeological Stewardship Network (TASN) from 1993 to 2005. He enjoyed sharing his passion for Texas archeology by giving talks to hundreds of students in the Houston area. The many thank you letters from elementary school classes in his TASN file attest to his popularity as a speaker.

A lawyer by profession, Richey was known to be a unique character by his friends and colleagues. It was his expertise in land title searches that led to his collaboration with archeologist Dr. Ken Brown of the University of Houston on the George R. Brown Convention Center project in Houston in 1984. Richey conducted title documentation and archival research for each city block within the convention center development. He subsequently participated in a variety of cultural resource management projects and co-authored several publications with professional archeologist Roger Moore.

Richey’s legal profession and archeological avocation converged again in the early 1990s, when he made use of “The Artifact,” a 14-foot skiff received in payment for his professional services, to undertake a comprehensive survey along the shores of Galveston Bay. With the aid of fellow stewards Sheldon Kindall and Dick Gregg, hundreds of archeological sites were recorded and assessed in this high impact area.

Pat Mercado-Allinger
State Archeologist
THC Archeology Division
Regional Archeologists’ Reports

Mountain/Pecos & Plains

During this reporting period, stewards in the Plains and Mountain/Pecos regions contributed more than 1660 hours toward steward activities and drove more than 14,300 miles to conduct those activities. Stewards distributed approximately 700 items of educational material and gave presentations to about 1900 people. They also assisted 154 landowners, other individuals, and agencies. They recorded 23 new sites, monitored or investigated 118 other sites, and worked on getting 17 artifact collections analyzed or otherwise documented.

Tom Adams reports that he monitored 5 sites, assisted 5 landowners, and documented 1 artifact collection.

During this reporting period Jack Skiles monitored 8 significant sites, gave presentations to 108 people, and assisted 6 agencies and institutions.

Alvin Lynn did not let major surgery in 2006 stop him from spending 368 hours conducting steward related activities that had him on the road for a total distance of more...
than 3570 miles. Alvin continues to work on the analysis of artifacts from his investigations at site 41RB111, an 1868 army depot site in Roberts County. He also is continuing work on several sites related to Colonel Kit Carson’s 1864 campaign against the Indians along the Canadian River. Alvin is preparing a book on Carson and the sites he has documented that are related to Carson’s campaign. During this reporting period, Alvin also assisted Texas Parks and Wildlife Department archeologists with a preliminary survey of the 1874 Battle of Palo Duro Canyon site in Palo Duro Canyon State Park.

In February 2006, scholars from Ciudad Ojinaga, Chihuahua, and from the Chihuahuan Desert Research Institute enjoyed educational day tours in the La Junta area of Mexico, with Enrique Madrid as their guide. Enrique met with local citizens and organizers in March to plan the new Presidio City Museum in Presidio. And in May, in the capacity of Tribal Historian, Enrique helped organize the Jumano Apache Tribal meeting in Redford.

Pinky Robertson was busy during this period teaching rock art recording to TAS members at Comstock. He also helped with the TAS Ceramics Academy at Midland. In addition, Pinky played host to the meeting of the 2006 Southwestern Federation of Archeological Societies in April and served as the editor for the papers that were given at the 2005 Federation Meeting and subsequently published in the 2005 Transactions.

Joe Rogers reports that he monitored 1 significant site, provided assistance to 27 landowners or other individuals, and made presentations to more than 1180 people. Joe assisted with the ongoing excavations at the Indian Springs site in Roberts County, and he also attended the TAS field school in June.

During this reporting period Rolla Shaller assisted Texas Parks and Wildlife Department archeologists and volunteers with a metal detector survey in Palo Duro Canyon State Park to trace the route of the 1874 Battle of Palo Duro Canyon. He also helped fellow steward Teddy Stickney and the TAS Rock Art Task Force record several rock art locations in the Panhandle. In April, Rolla traveled to Midland to attend the Southwestern Federation of Archeological Societies Meeting, where he gave a presentation on the archeological investigations that have taken place at the Colonel Evans supply depot site in Roberts County. In May, along with members of the Panhandle Archeological Society, Rolla assisted with the survey, recording, and salvage excavation of a bison bone bed on the River Breaks Ranch west of Amarillo.

According to Cynthia Smyers, the bison skeleton she and her family salvaged from an eroding dune site in Crane County last fall is being analyzed by Dr. Robert Pickering of the Buffalo Bill Historic Center in Cody, Wyoming. A Washita arrowpoint and a Harrell arrowpoint are associated with the skeleton. Once the analysis is complete, Cindy intends to document the results of the investigations for publication. Cindy also has been busy trying to record sites in the area ahead of all the oil and gas explorations that are currently taking place.

The TAS Rock Art Task Force kept Teddy Stickney busy recording rock art at five different locations in the Panhandle, a task that had her on the road for 1750 miles. She also assisted with the TAS Rock Art Academy at Comstock. Deborah Summers has been busy working on the bison exhibit now on display at the city offices in Stinnett. The Late Archaic-age bison bones were discovered and subsequently excavated during the construction of a city swimming pool in 2004.

Evans Turpin reports that a new rock art site has been identified in Pecos County. Members of the Iraan Archeological Society have made an initial visit to the rock shelter site and have documented many painted hand prints and parallel lines within the shelter. The site is recorded at TARL as 41PC595.

Doug Wilkens is conducting ongoing investigations at several sites on the M-Cross Ranch in Roberts County. These efforts include work at the Indian Springs site (41RB81). Doug also reports that he was interviewed on a local radio station regarding his interest and research into the archeology of Ochiltree and Roberts counties and his being a steward for the THC. According to Doug, feedback from the public has been very favorable. Move over Rush!

Forts/Hill Country & Lakes/Brazos

Stewards in Regions 3 and 4 were busy the past year doing archeological surveys, small testing programs, site recording, and public outreach. They surveyed or tested numerous properties, including large rural farms or ranches, in several Central Texas counties: Bandera, Hays, Travis, Edwards, Mills, and Mason. Excavations also took place in this area of the state, most notably in Williamson and Hamilton Counties. During Texas Archeology Month, October 2006, archeology events such as fairs and lectures were held in Kerr, Bandera, Hamilton, Burleson, Dallas, Ellis, Bell, and Bosque Counties, to name a few. Individual stewards completed a myriad of activities year round throughout the region:

Del Barent continued his work with a local group to bring a Native American history center to downtown Goldthwaite. Jackson and McElhaney, an architectural firm in Austin, has developed the initial plans for the group’s vision: a center that will highlight native plants and their uses by native peoples.

Jay Blaine has overcome significant health challenges to remain an active steward who has provided valuable assistance.
to fellow stewards, THC staff, and a large number of professional archeologists in Texas and beyond.

Jim Blanton reports four sites monitored and two landowners assisted.

Dan Brown includes archeological information in his frequent presentations, six of them being given in 2006/2007.

David Calame has become known as one of the most active stewards in survey and site recording, and also in public education and outreach. David has recorded 45 new sites and met with many landowners, providing them with a variety of assistance. Four new sites have been recorded and four monitored. A draft article on a cache in the Lake Medina area has been produced for the STAA journal La Tierra.

Kay Clarke continues to be one of our most active stewards in the Lakes/Brazos regions. She has presented 10 talks, assisted a number of landowners, and offered the most help on the World War II project. Two small excavation programs have been particularly important: one at the location of the old settlement of Pool Branch, and the other, a just-completed excavation of an Archaic-period earth oven, encountered during quarrying on the San Gabriel River.

Jose Conteras met with several landowners in south central Texas, monitoring and investigating sites in his area.

Glen Dolese offered assistance to a number of landowners and monitored at least 14 archeological sites. He participated with fellow steward Kay Clarke in excavations at the Indian Mound Ranch.

R.C. Harmon, an ever popular spokesman for Texas archeology, offered 11 public presentations and monitored or investigated several sites. He also assisted a number of landowners in the past year.

Max Hibbits presented a program on historic Robertson Colony to an audience of 35. During the year he has helped several individuals and organizations with archeological issues.

Doris Howard has also assisted numerous organizations and individuals with varied archeological efforts. Accomplishments in her area include recording of a new site in the Llano Uplift region and preparation of the 41LL414 artifact collection for permanent curation. Doris is an active member of the Llano Uplift Archeological Society where, among other tasks, she helps with the program schedule.

Claude Hudspeth participated in site survey at the Millington Site, Dobbs Run Ranch, and Fort Milam. With THC archeologist Debra Beene, he inspected Lower Pecos State Archeological Landmarks. Claude also hosted the 2006 annual conference of the Texas Archeological Society, That have precluded his usual energetic archeology activities in recent months Larry has experienced difficult hospital stays and provided archeological assistance in the Dallas County area. Mary Malaine and Dan Potter have been working with Del Barnett in further study of organic residues in bedrock mortars from Mills County.

Bonnie McKee is monitoring sites, answering landowner questions, giving public programs, and continuing her work raising funds for a history museum located in Nokona, Texas.

Clint McKenzie reports that he has monitored 20 sites, assisted a number of landowners, and worked on a State Archeological Landmark. Clint and other stewards and Southern Texas Archeological Association members have been involved in excavations at a small but well-preserved rock shelter in northern Bexar County.

Assisted by members of the Travis County Archeological Society, Nick Morgan has been involved in archeological testing at an impacted site in Bastrop County. He has also been involved with various TAS and Travis County Archeological Society functions over the past year.

Laurie Moseley continues to work with land developers and landowners in his area. His work with the Springstown Legends Museum secured placement of the Fullingham Collection of artifacts.

Glynn Osburn reports one monitored site. He is one of the stewards involved in testing on the Sprague property in Hamilton County.

Reeda Peel’s passion is rock art. This year she helped a University of Texas student obtain a fellowship for rock art study. Reeda also supplied a beautiful illustration for the Texas Beyond History web site.

Two efforts stand out in Ona B. Reed’s mind when considering the past year’s experiences. One was her flight along the Chisholm Trail from Fredericksburg, Texas, to Abilene, Kansas. (Ona B. is a pilot.) She also launched a survey of Camp Howze and the Gainesville Army Airfield, both World War II installations.

Larry Riemenschneider reports 16 new archeological sites recorded and another successful archeology fair; but in recent months Larry has experienced difficult hospital stays that have precluded his usual energetic archeology activities in the San Angelo area. We certainly hope Larry is back on his feet and feeling much better soon.

Sometimes together and sometimes solo, Jim and May Schmidt have been involved in most of the public archeology occurring in Central Texas. They have worked archeology fairs, recorded new sites, and participated in several other important archeological projects in Bastrop, Williamson, and Edwards Counties. Jim spearheaded the task of floting materials from the 2006 TAS field school at Paris.

Jimmy Smith reported 114 hours conducting various steward activities in the northern and central regions of Texas.

Frank Sprague was featured in a recent article on private land archeology published in Texas Co-op Power Magazine. The piece described the sites on Frank’s property
in Hamilton and the excavations conducted by a number of stewards and members of the Tarrant County Archeological Society. Frank has also responded to several landowner inquiries in his area, some of them stemming from a very successful October 2006 Archeology Month event.

Alice Stultz moved from San Angelo to Austin. She nevertheless found time to give two public programs and provide assistance to several landowners in her new location.

Art Tawater participated in two TASN surveys in the past year, both in Edwards County. He also helped several landowners in the Parker County area and the owner of the Askey Ranch in Wise County.

Brenda Whorton reports 3500 miles on the road helping landowners and organizations.

Woody and Kay Woodward contributed significantly to the successful 2006 Kerrville Archeology Awareness Fair. They also participated in TASN surveys as well as fieldwork organized by the Hill Country Archeological Association. They accomplished these efforts in spite of an auto accident Kay suffered this past year. Happily, Kay reports she has mended and is back in the driver’s seat, ready to put in many more stewardship miles.

Bill Young continues to spend much of his time documenting historic cemeteries in Navarro County. He has given a number of public programs and continues his series of historical articles for the Corsicana Daily Sun newspaper.

REGIONS 5 & 6 • JEFF DURST

Forest/Independence/Tropical

Stewards Pat and Beth Aucoin of Harris County continue their volunteer work at the San Jacinto Battlefield site and at the site of San Felipe de Austin. They also are assisting in the search for the early 19th-century site of Champ d’Asile in Liberty County and for Lafitte’s home on Galveston Island. Additionally, both Pat and Beth spend a tremendous amount of time making archeology presentations to school-age children in the Houston area.

Bill Birmingham of Victoria County continues to make a stellar contribution to the TASN. Bill was recently appointed to the advisory board at the Museum of the Coastal Bend in Victoria, where he donates many hours working on exhibits about the native peoples of the Coastal Bend area. Bill has most recently been actively analyzing and documenting several artifact collections donated to the museum, including one outstanding collection that Bill donated himself. Bill’s work with the Museum of the Coastal Bend and with local landowners led the museum to sponsor a landowner workshop. At this event, landowners from Victoria County learned about the value of conserving archeological sites on private property. Three Texas Historic Lands plaques were awarded at the workshop to area landowners who have allowed extensive archeological investigations to take place on their properties.

Jimmy Bluhm of Victoria County recently received a Norman G. Flagg Certificate of Outstanding Performance at the annual TASN meeting in honor of his meritorious work on the McNeill-Gonzales site in Victoria County. This past year he and a crew of volunteers, including several other TASN stewards, have been involved in the tedious and time-consuming project of processing the artifacts from the site and entering the records into a computer database. Jimmy also arranged to have the University of Texas at Austin conduct a summer field school at the site in June 2006. Through Jimmy’s efforts, this very important site will become the subject of multiple archeological reports that soon will be available to the archeological community. The owners of this site, John and Francis McNeill, were honored recently at the Museum of the Coastal Bend landowners workshop for allowing archeologists to conduct several seasons of research on their property.

Pat Braun of Aransas County has also made a significant contribution to the project at the McNeill-Gonzales site in Victoria County. Pat was responsible for setting up the computer database into which all of the data pertaining to the excavation are being recorded. Pat recently arranged an educational boat trip with the director of the Aquatic Education Program at Texas A&M Corpus Christi Center for Coastal Studies, where they discussed the history and future of the endangered coastal environment. Most recently, Pat has been involved in creating an archeological exhibit, The Early Peoples of Texas, at the Museum of the Coastal Bend. Pat was also honored with the Norman G. Flagg Certificate of Outstanding Performance at the 2006 TASN meeting in Austin.

Bob Everett of Guadalupe County has been putting together four new archeological exhibits at the Heritage Museum in Seguin. As host of a museum open-house in October 2006, Bob met the public for artifact identification and offered site surveys for interested landowners in Guadalupe County.

Dick Gregg is one of the first recipients of the newly established Norman G. Flagg Certificate of Outstanding Performance given at the annual TASN meeting this past July in Austin. He is an appropriate choice for this award. The San Felipe de Austin excavation, the San Jacinto Battlefield exploration, the search for the historic site of Champ d’Asile, and the Brazoria County Antebellum Plantation Project are just a few of the numerous projects Dick has worked on during this reporting period.

Sheldon Kindall of Harris County has also been busy over the past few months, working closely with David and Jean Murph and other landowners in Liberty County to intensify the search for Champ d’Asile. Sheldon recently visited the purported site of Fort Teran in Tyler County along with other members of the stewards network and THC staff. Plans have been made to return to this location in April of 2007 to determine the exact location of the Mexican period fort along the Neches River.
Rick Proctor of Lamar County successfully completed his second year as Camp Boss for the 2006 Texas Archaeological Society field school held in Paris and hosted by the Valley of the Caddo Archeological Society (VoCAS). Once again, Rick and the folks from the VoCAS did an outstanding job hosting over 300 field school participants. As the current president of the VoCAS, Rick is always active in giving focus and direction to this eager and growing society.

Sandra Rogers of Walker County continues to make outstanding contributions to the stewards’ network. Her involvement in the Brazoria County Antebellum Plantation Survey is significant, as is her continued support to the efforts at the San Jacinto battlefield survey. Sandra is also currently involved with the Texas Archeological Society’s efforts to help further educate interested members who seek to better understand the archeology of the state. Sandra serves on the Academy Committee of TAS that is now organizing a ceramics workshop to be held in Nacogdoches.

Johnney and Sandra Pollan of Brazoria County continue their substantial involvement with the Brazoria County Antebellum Plantation Survey. During the hot summer months of 2006, they turned their attention to indoor activities, conducting archival research at the Brazoria County Historical Museum. Additionally, they have devoted a great deal of time working on an exhibit of Pre-Columbian ceramics on display at the Brazosport Museum of Natural Science in Lake Jackson. They also presented an excellent segment on historic ceramics at the 2006 TASN annual meeting in Austin.

Mark Walters of Smith County was honored at the 2006 annual TASN meeting in Austin for his outstanding contribution to the preservation of archeological sites in Texas. Mark has a passion for locating and recording sites and has recorded more than 300 sites during the past 15 years. Mark’s interests have not only been in finding and recording the sites but also in protecting them. This past year Mark was responsible for nominating 15 sites for State Archeological Landmark designation. Recently he received a TAS Donor’s Fund Grant to study the fauna recovered from an important Smith County site, 41SM325. It was with great appreciation that Mark was presented with the Norman G. Flagg Certificate of Outstanding Performance at the TASN meeting. Most recently, Mark organized the 14th Annual East Texas Archeological Conference held this year in Tyler. Mark is truly an amazing steward and serves as an inspiration to us all.

Steward Achievements Acknowledged at 2006 Workshop

The 2006 Texas Archeological Stewardship Network (TASN) annual workshop, held in Austin July 22–23, offered stewards important educational opportunities as well as formal recognition for their achievements. Attendees were offered training in the use of digital photography and the identification of historic ceramics. The following stewards were presented special certificates of appreciation for their volunteer efforts from February 2005 through January 2006:

- Tom Adams
- Beth Aucoin
- Pat Aucoin
- Del Barnett
- Jerry Bauman
- Frank A. Binetti
- Bill Birmingham
- Jay Blaine
- Jimmy Bluhm
- Charles Bollich
- Pat Braun
- David Calame, Sr.
- Kay E. Clark
- Jose Contreras
- Robert Crosser
- Robert Everett
- Richard (Dick) Gregg
- Andrew Hall
- R. C. Harmon
- Patti Haskins
- Max Hibbits
- Marilyn Horton
- Walter Horton
- Doris Howard
- Joe Hudgins
- Don G. Hyett
- Bryan Jameson
- Joe Louis Jones
- H. (Don) Keyes
- Sheldon Kindall
- Doug Kubicek
- Emery Lehnert
- Alvin Lynn
- Enrique Madrid
- Nelson Marek
- Tom Middlebrook
- Laurie Moseley
- Doug Nowell
Austin to Host Major Archeology Conference

We are delighted to report that for the first time ever, the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) will hold its annual conference in Austin. This conference typically attracts thousands of archeologists from around the globe, so the Austin conference will likely draw a large number of attendees. It will be held at the Austin Convention Center from April 25–29, 2007, two weeks after the THC’s Annual Historic Preservation Conference. The downtown Hotel Hilton will serve as the conference headquarters. A preliminary program is posted on the SAA website at www.saa.org/meetings/prelimProgram.html.

A number of interesting excursions have been organized for conference goers by SAA Local Advisory Committee co-chairs, State Archeologist Pat Mercado-Allinger and Texas Archeological Society Executive Director Pam Wheat-Stranahan. Among the choices are a trip to the San Antonio missions, a tour of the Belle shipwreck, and a visit to the Gault Site in Bell County. The Gault Site Laboratory, which houses evidence of nearly 11,000 years of occupation at this site, is also a part of this third excursion.

Archeology Division Director Jim Bruseth will lead the special Belle tour and tell the fascinating story of the discovery of the 17th-century French shipwreck and its recovery, which he directed. Bruseth will accompany the group to the Texas State History Museum to view a display of artifacts recovered from the shipwreck. They will then travel to College Station to visit the Texas A&M University Conservation Research Laboratory, where the ship’s hull is undergoing chemical treatment in a large holding tank. Tour participants will also learn how more than one million Belle artifacts have been conserved at the lab.

The prospect of having such an important archeological conference in Austin is exciting. By the way, if you are able to attend, don’t miss the SAA’s Archeology Month poster contest; the THC will be entering the new Texas Archeology Month poster into the competition.
Montana is the Setting for Rock Art Conference Summer 2007

Rock art, a nonrenewable resource, is a valuable expression of shared human cultural heritage. The oldest rock art association, the American Rock Art Research Association (ARARA), will hold its 33rd annual conference in Billings, Montana, June 29–July 2, 2007. Billings, located in the southeastern part of Montana, is northeast of Yellowstone Park on the Yellowstone River. This is an area that holds an abundance of varied and fascinating archaeological features.

ARARA has planned a diverse program that explores many facets of prehistoric rock art. Conference activities include field trips and forums on education and conservation. Conference contacts are Donna Gillette, rockart@ix.netcom.com, and Mavis Greer, ARARA president, mavis@GreerServices.com. The ARARA web site is www.arara.org.

For information about the Billings area go to http://ci.billings.mt.us/Visit/visitor.php.

Plan Now to Participate in Texas Archeology Month 2007

October 2007 will be upon us sooner than you think. The momentum and response to the statewide Texas Archeology Month (TAM) observance easily sustains a host of educational exhibits, demonstrations, lectures, public forums, and tours and, of course, archeology fairs.

TAM events increase public awareness of the historical significance of the state’s archeological sites and the contributions of professional and avocational archeologists. We encourage everyone to support and participate in their local TAM activities or even better, organize one!

If you are planning a public TAM event for the first time, request a copy of How to Plan and Manage an Archeology Fair, which contains simple instructions for creating a variety of different kinds of activities. Some sponsors have been involved in TAM for years. For others, TAM 2006 was their first ambitious leap into the world of archeology. Many sponsors were willing to share their tips for success with us. Here are the tips that were emphasized the most:

• Remember the three P’s: Plan, Prepare, Publicize!
• Start planning your event as early as possible. Line up your speakers, craftspeople, audiovisual equipment, location, and dates. Some of these people and things can be in high demand.
• Publicize everywhere you can think of, get the word out early, and get the facts right! Distribute flyers and TAM Calendar of Events booklets to schools, libraries, grocery stores—anywhere people gather. Submit press releases to local newspapers and broadcast media at least two weeks before your event.
• Do not assume promises will be kept or equipment will work! Double check everything, then triple check, then be sure your back-up plan is organized and ready to go.
• If possible, have a back-up overflow area if crowds are much larger than expected.
• Recruit more volunteers than you think you would ever need and recruit them early!
• Take advantage of the resources offered by the THC.
• Publicize everywhere you can think of, get the word out early, and get the facts right!
• Involve local schools, scouting organizations, youth agencies, and college students.

Once you have decided what type of event you want to host, please share the information with us so we can include it in the TAM 2007 Calendar of Events. You’ll find the event form and the materials request form on the following pages. Further information about TAM 2007 is available at www.thc.state.tx.us/archeology/aatam.html.

Susan Hammack
How to Plan and Manage an Archeology Fair

Archeology fairs emphasize hands-on activities, displays and interactive exhibits. This manual contains a step-by-step checklist for planning a fair and ideas for activities including spear toss with atlatl, demonstration dig, flintknapping, wild-plant use, pottery making, rock-art painting, basket making, storytelling, tipi life, traditional foods and weaving. Also included are handouts to be used with various activities, as well as forms for scheduling volunteers and requesting publicity. About 40 pages long, the manual is intended for three-hole punching and placement in a notebook so you can add information, forms and other activity ideas of your own.

Texas Archeology in the Classroom: A Unit for Teachers

You can use this valuable classroom resource throughout the year. The four-part unit includes:

- Background sections that explain how archeologists work and provide overviews of archeological sites and Native Americans in Texas from Paleoindian through historical times.
- More than 20 activities or lesson plans using archeological topics for learning across the curriculum.

Texas Archeology Month 2007 Calendar Booklets

This colorful booklet produced each year contains listings and descriptions of TAM events throughout the state — approximately 80 in all. Event sponsors can mail them out as publicity and distribute them before and during their events.

Posters

New Texas Archeology Month posters will be designed and produced if we receive sufficient donations to cover the cost of printing.

Brochures

Brochures feature a variety of archeological topics. A special folder to hold and display the brochures is also available.

ORDER FORM

PLEASE SEND ME:

____ copy(ies) of How to Plan and Manage an Archeology Fair  ____ Texas Archeology Month posters (if available)
____ copies of the Texas Archeology Month 2007 Calendar booklet ____

BROCHURES: Indicate how many of each brochure you would like to receive.

____ How to Get Involved in Texas Archeology  ____ Documenting Archeological Collections  ____ Historic Texas Land Plaque
____ Texas Archeology Month  ____ Texas Archeological Stewardship Network  ____ What Does an Archeologist Do?
____ Laws that Protect Archeological Sites  ____ Marine Archeology in Texas  ____ Destruction of Archeological Sites in Texas
____ Special folder to hold and display the brochures

NAME: ______________________________________________________ ORGANIZATION: ________________________________________________
ADDRESS: _________________________________________________ CITY: ______________________ STATE: _________ ZIP: ___________
PHONE: ___________________________________ EMAIL ADDRESS: ____________________________________________________________

Send requests to TEXAS HISTORICAL COMMISSION, Archeology Division, P.O. Box 12276, Austin, TX 78711-2276; fax 512/463-8927. Or email donna.mccarver@thc.state.tx.us. For more information call 512/463-6090.
**EVENT TITLE:**

Event description: Be as specific as possible and give **details**. Provide descriptions of activities and presenters, topics of lectures and demonstrations and any other interesting details that will encourage the public to attend. Attach separate sheet if necessary.

**EVENT DATE(S):** ___________________ **EVENT HOURS:** ___________________ **ADMISSION FEES:** ___________________

Is event open to general public? **(a requirement for calendar listing)** ___________________

Event location (include name of place where event will be held, such as Blank County Museum):

**NAME OF PLACE:** ______________________________________________________________________________________________________________

**STREET ADDRESS (INCLUDE DIRECTIONS IF NECESSARY):** _______________________________________________________________________________________________

**CITY:** _______________________________ **COUNTY:** _______________________________________________________________________________

Event sponsor(s): ____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Contact name, phone number and email address (if available) of one or two people who can be reached easily, and web address of organization. This information may be printed in the *Calendar of Events* booklet and listed on the THC web site:

(1) **NAME:** ___________________________________________ **PHONE:** ________________________ **EMAIL:** ___________________________________________

(2) **NAME:** ___________________________________________ **PHONE:** ________________________ **EMAIL:** ___________________________________________

**WEB SITE (IF ANY):** __________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Person, organization and address where **main** event sponsor can be reached by mail:

**NAME** _____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

**ORGANIZATION** ______________________________________________________________________________________________________

**MAILING ADDRESS** _____________________________________________________________________________________________________

**CITY** ___________________________________________ **STATE** ________________________ **ZIP** ________________________

Number of *TAM 2007 Calendar of Events* booklets you request for distribution: ***NONE*** __ 25-50 __ 50-100 __ 100-200 __ 200+

Complete one form for each event and return by **July 2, 2007**, or email the required information by the same date. For additional information, email Susan Hammack at the address below or call 512/463-9505.

We welcome color photos of TAM 2006 events for possible publication in the *TAM 2007 Calendar of Events* booklet. We also can request permission to print photos from local newspapers if you provide a news clipping.
Current Archeology in Texas is published semiannually by the Texas Historical Commission (THC). Address correspondence to Editor, Current Archeology in Texas, Archeology Division, P.O. Box 12276, Austin, TX 78711-2276; fax 512/463-8927; or email susan.hammack@thc.state.tx.us. Portions of the newsletter (not including Current Research items) that are not copyrighted or reprinted from other sources may be reprinted without permission. For information about alternate formats of this publication, contact the THC at 512/463-6096.
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