

Indiana Archaeological Short Report Frequently Asked Questions

What has changed with this new version?

- 1) You can now save a copy of the short report if you are using the Word version.
- 2) There is a place for the Principal Investigator to sign under Principal Investigator field.
- 3) The values in the Natural Region in the dropdown box are now the same as the map in the instructions.
 - a. Please note that if you are using the Word version of the form, there are two dropdown boxes for Natural Region. The value list was too long to be in one so, you will need to look at both lists to find the selection you need.

I already have a format I like for Phase Ia Archaeological Survey Reports. Do I have to use this short report format?

No, the DHPA does not require that you have to use the short report format. However, please include all necessary information. Incomplete or inaccurate reports may not be approved.

What kind of information should be placed in the Known Cultural Manifestations field?

The intent of this field is to provide the cultural context for the region of the survey area, not a general overview of the prehistoric/historic sequence of the Midwest. Part of the purpose of conducting background research is to address the potential of finding sites and specific types of sites. Research can lead to locating previously unrecorded sites. The research should be conducted prior to the field investigations. Even if no sites are recorded during the survey (thereby using the short form), it is still important to fill out this section, which also provides a context for future archaeologists. If the project changes, it is easier to catch that the potential site might be impacted. In turn, the possibility of finding more sites and limiting the destruction of others is enhanced. The current *Guidebook for Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory—Archaeological Sites* explains what is required in reports. With full reports, authors can organize the information in different ways. With the short report, the same is also true. There are three main text boxes (known sites, known surveys/investigations, and known cultures/additional information). One can put the list of sites in the site box. One can also include the relevant information about those sites (time period, type, eligibility, etc.) in the site info box or put that information in the known cultural manifestations/additional information field. There might not be sites within 1 mile but five miles away is Casears, the Reid site, or you are in the same quad map as Prather or Goodall, etc., which would be important to include in this field. Below are some examples from the INDOT CRM manual of possible record's reviews in full reports (yellow could be site information, green survey information, and bolded is potential cultural information, which do overlap).

Example 1

*Information in the DHPA files shows that the archaeological record of Floyd and surrounding counties covers the complete range of the known prehistoric occupation of the region. **Paleoindian through Mississippian sites are documented (Angst 1998) and the Falls of the Ohio region has an established culture history based on many years of research (Jantzen 1977, Collins 1979, Granger 1988, Anslinger 1996, Munson & McCullough 2003).** Notable nearby sites include **12-FI-1, the multicomponent Reed shell mound (Angst 1998); 12-FI-11, a Paleoindian site (Angst 1998:7); and the extensive culture sequence excavated by Indiana State University at the Caesar's***

Casino just downriver from the project area (Stafford 2004). A subsurface reconnaissance just upstream from the project area identified substantial buried archaeological resources (Waters and McCullough 2001).

Several sites are recorded within and near the proposed project area including 12-FI-2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 16, and 17. **These sites are primarily prehistoric habitation sites ranging in age from Late Archaic through Woodland.** Most of the recorded sites near the project area lack diagnostic artifacts and are of unknown prehistoric age. One site, 12-FI-8, is recorded adjacent to the project area. The documented archaeological record in and around the project location clearly indicates that prehistoric archaeological sites would be expected within the project area. **In addition, the fact that buried archaeological deposits are recorded both up and downstream from the project area clearly indicates that buried archaeological deposits are likely to be present within the project area as well.** Supporting evidence for the potential for buried deposits is the lack of components predating the Late Archaic on surface sites in and around the project area.

Example 2

The records check utilized site records, maps, and materials on file at the Indiana IDNR, DHPA and INDOT, CRS. The purpose of this search was to locate, identify, and evaluate the known and expected cultural resources that might be affected by this project. The records check was conducted at a level specific to the project area and was then broadened to include a 1.6 km (1 mi) radius around the project area in order to evaluate the potential impact of the project on nearby archaeological resources.

Archaeological data collected from the files at DHPA and INDOT, CRS show that Greene County is represented by all periods of Indiana prehistory, spanning nearly 12,000 years of human occupation (Black 1933; Kellar 1983; Tomak 1970; Stafford et al. 1988). Certain types of topography within the county appear to have particular cultural sequence associations. **Upland areas tend to have transient Early, Middle, and Late Archaic affiliations, as well as some more established Late Woodland components (Holycross 2001).** Closer to major drainages and marshy areas, Riverton/Terminal Archaic and Middle Woodland/Allison LaMotte occupations occur more frequently, as well as larger more complex Middle to Late Archaic and Late Woodland/Albee culture sites (Holycross 2001). **The county has been the focus of a multitude of archaeological investigations since Black (1933) first conducted archaeological reconnaissance surveys, which identified over 250 habitation sites, mounds and cemeteries. In addition, Tomak (1969, 1970, 1971, 1978) has identified 248 various prehistoric sites that have included the Davis Village site (12-Gr-315) and the Beehunter site (12-Gr-315), both of which consisted of Middle to Late Archaic and Late Woodland occupations with Albee Phase components (Holycross 2001). A series of Woodland mounds were also identified approximately seven miles northwest of the project areas within the city limits of Worthington that have since been destroyed (Curtis Tomak, Personal Communication 2007).**

Contact and pre-contact Native American groups included the Piankashaw who were one of the Algonquin tribes and part of the Miami Federation. Prior to 1800, the Piankashaw allowed other Algonquin tribes to settle in the area, including the Wea and the Delaware. The only non-native peoples within the area during this period were trappers and explorers who utilized the waterways of the White and Eel Rivers for travel into the interior of the state. In 1806, the first non-native settlement within the area began and greatly increased after the signing of the Fort Wayne Treaty in 1809 and the Battle of Tippecanoe in 1811. Native populations were then forced west, with the last remaining bands removed by 1819 (Historic Landmarks Foundation 2000).

As of June 4, 2007, 1,789 archaeological sites have been recorded in Greene County. Based upon the records check, no archaeological sites were identified within the newly proposed project areas and neither project ROW has not been subject to a previous archaeological field reconnaissance. Three Phase Ia reconnaissance surveys and one records check have been conducted and recorded within 1.6 km (1 mi) of the project areas and are shown in Figure 2 (King 2004; McCullough 1987; Stillwell 2001, 2004). None of the Phase Ia reconnaissance surveys identified any cultural resources. Thirteen archaeological sites have also been identified within this same 1.6 km (1 mi) radius of the project areas and are presented in Table 1.

Many of these sites have incomplete records, but those that are known appear to have primarily Archaic affiliations, three of which were habitation sites. Six of the thirteen sites (12-Gr-117; 12-Gr-347; 12-Gr-677; 12-Gr-975; 12-Gr-976; 12-Gr-1135) are located within upland areas, including all but one of these habitation sites. The remaining sites (12-Gr-208; 12-Gr-209; 12-Gr-216; 12-Gr-642; 12-Gr-676; 12-Gr-985; 12-Gr-986) are adjacent to or near Richland Creek and mostly constitute smaller lithic scatters. The proposed project areas cross two separate tributaries to Richland Creek that contain numerous wetland areas. While the potential exists for small lithic scatters or isolated finds within the ROW corridors, based upon previous site locations within the area, the potential for larger habitation sites appear to be negligible.

Table 1. List of sites within a 1.6 km (1 mi) radius of the proposed project areas

Site No.	Cultural Affiliation	Site Type	Eligibility
12-Gr-117	Unknown Prehistoric	Unknown	Unknown
12-Gr-208	Unknown Prehistoric	Lithic Scatter	Unknown
12-Gr-209	Unknown Prehistoric	Unknown	Unknown
12-Gr-216	Unknown Prehistoric	Camp	Unknown
12-Gr-347	Unknown Prehistoric	Camp	Unknown
12-Gr-642	Unknown Prehistoric	Unknown	Unknown
12-Gr-676	Unknown Prehistoric	Unknown	Unknown
12-Gr-677	Unknown Prehistoric	Unknown	Unknown
12-Gr-975	Early, Middle, Late Archaic	Camp	Unknown
12-Gr-976	Early, Middle, Late Archaic	Camp	Unknown
12-Gr-985	Unknown Prehistoric	Lithic Scatter	Unknown
12-Gr-986	Unknown Prehistoric	Lithic Scatter	Unknown
12-Gr-1135	Early Archaic	Camp	Unknown

The 1876 Illustrated Historical Atlas shows coal and iron mines 1.6 km (1 mi) south and southeast of the project areas, in addition to the large Richland Iron Furnace foundry 1.6 km (1 mi) to the southwest (Anonymous 1876). No other historical structures, activity areas or cemeteries appear to have been located near the project areas.