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On Jonuary 7, 1993, the Texas Department of Transportation (Tx DoT) learned that prehistoric archeological materials had been reportedly unearthed during improvements to highway FM 1520 in Camp County. As the project was being undertaken with State funds, Tx DoT, in compliance with the Texas Antiquities Code, ordered a cessation of work in the immediate area until the archeolooical significance of the area could be evaluated. Evaluation included surface examination, shovel testing and gradall scraping.

This report briefly describes the site area, work conducted, and artifacts recovered. It also discusses the results of the fieldwork and makes recommendations concerning resumption of road improvements.

Based on the field observations, road construction clearly encountered prehistoric cultural materials. A prehistoric ceramic assemblage appears to date to the Caddo Titus Focus, though the general small size of the sherds makes it difficult to identify the recovered sherds positively with specific Titus Focus pottery types. A prehistoric lithic assemblage is probably associated with the prehistoric ceramics, though the comparison of one lithic piece with a Carrollton dart point, generally associated with the middle Archaic, could be used to argue for an earlier component, perhaps located slightly west of and uphill from the ceramic assemblage.

A few historic artifacts could date to virtually any part of the twentieth century. Largely recovered from old cut faces adjacent to a ditch south of the existing road, the historic artifacts appear to represent casual roadside trash disposal rather than a historic occupation site.

Investigations revealed that some areas of soil undisturbed by present road construction still existed within the right-of-way. However, observations did not indicate any in situ cultural features or undisturbed cultural deposits. Observation of the field north of the new right-of-way revealed extensive historic terracing, which undoubtedly continued into what is now the northern edge of the highway right-of-way. This terracing, and associated cultivation, has almost certainly disturbed most of the surface soils in the vicinity; no developed A-horizons were observed within the right-of-way. Thus, it was concluded that the likelihood of in situ deposits within the right-of-way is probably remote, though an occasional isolated feature may still survive.

At the present time the majority of surface-disturbing construction has been completed. This includes the removal of ground surfaces prior to depositing fill to raise the new road bed, and digging of ditches at the northern side of the new road. Remaining work consists almost entirely of depositing more fill for the new road bed and adjacent shoulders, road surfacing, removal of existing pavement, and sodding of the existing cut banks adjacent to the road to reduce erosion.

It is recommended, therefore, that construction be allowed to proceed without further archeological investigations. If any additional surface disturbing activities remain, the work will be monitored by an archeologist.
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## INTRODUCTION

On January 7, 1993, the Texas Department of Transportation (Tx DoT) learned that prehistoric archeological materials had been unearthed during improvements to highway FM 1520 in Camp County. As the project was being undertaken with State funds, Tx DoT, in compliance with the Texas Antiquities Code, ordered a cessation of work in the immediate area until the archeological significance of the area could be evaluated.

A preliminary investigation was conducted on January 8, 1993. Subsequent consultation with the Texas Historical Commission led to additional work being conducted at the site, 41 CP 221 .

This report briefly describes the site area, work conducted, and artifacts recovered. It also discusses the results of the fieldwork and makes recommendations concerning resumption of road improvements.

## SETTING

Site 41 CP 221 is located in the northwest angle formed by the junction of FM 1520 and Pistol Mills Roads (Figure 1). The area is at an elevation of approximately 370 feet NGVD (USGS 1965), on the lower slopes of the east facing slope of a high rounded ridge, which reaches a maximum elevation of approximately 400 feet NGVD. Picket Spring Branch, an intermittent tributary of Cypress Creek, flowed in a northeasterly direction at a distance of approximately 240 meters southeast of the location. The creek is now flooded by Lake Bob Sandlin. The portion of FM 1520 east of the intersection with Pistol Mills Road was built after the construction of Lake Bob Sandin, post1965. Geologic deposits on which the site is located have been depicted as belonging to the Eocene Carrizo Sand and/or undivided Wilcox Formation (Bureau of Economic Geology 1979). Soils at the site have been depicted as Bowie fine sandy loam, $2-5 \%$ slopes, with Kirvin Gravelly fine sandy loam, $2-5 \%$ slopes, to the west (Soil Conservation Service 1990:map sheet 44).

## INITIAL OBSERVATIONS

The area immediately in the vicinity of the archeological remains is depicted in Figure 2. The intersection of FM1520 (survey station $286+65$ feet) and Pistol Mills Road is approximately at the level of the original ground surface. As one proceeds west along FM 1520, the road is within a progressively deeper cut, which reaches a maximum depth of over 10 feet. The summit of the hill is at approximately survey station $295+00$ feet (Figure 1). A Texas Utilities Railroad crosses under FM 1520 at approximate survey station $298+00$ feet. The field north of FM 1520, and, thus, the new parts of the right-ofway, were observed to have been terraced extensively.

Within the construction area, the original FM 1520 and Pistol Mills Road were still in use. The proposed ditch at the north side of the new road had been excavated, with the edge of the original ground surface being cut down into geologic deposits at a distance of approximately 10 feet from the northern edge of the new right-of-way. A topsoil storage pile was present in the northwest angle of the two roads, covering nearly all of the new right-of-
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way in this vicinity. Fill dirt had been deposited to depth of several feet along the new road bed west of Pistol Mills Road, though a few areas of old top soil, apparently relatively undisturbed by road improvements, were present immediately adjacent to the edges of the fill dirt.

The originally observed artifacts had been found eroding from the cut face and surfaces of the completed ditch on the north side of the right-of-way, extendin\& west from just west of Pistol Mills Road for a distance of approximately $1 \$ 0$ feet, almost to the vicinity of a hay bale weir at survey station $290+00$ feet. This area (Figure 2, Area A) was walked over and several more potsherd $\leqslant$ and small lithic flakes were recovered from the lower slopes of the ditch cut.

Towands the summit of the hill, beyond the pottery scatter, a few fragment of lithic debris were found on the eroded cut bank extending from the northern edge of the right-of-way down to the road grade (Figure 2 , Area B). In this area, the cut reaches a maximum depth of over 10 feet, and is mainly through geologic deposits.

On the south side of the highway, historic debris and a little lithic debris was scattered along and down the cut bank from near the summit of the hill to the road intersection (Figure 2, Area C). In this area, the cut bank extended from the edge of the right-of-way down to the road grade. Near the summit of the hill a considerable amount of spoil (either from original highway construction or the construction of the Texas Utilities railroad) had been deposited on the original ground surface, and it was difficult to determine whether the historic material was eroding from the original surface or the redeposited material.

A further scatter of prehistoric ceramics was found between the existing and new toads close to the junction of $F M 1520$ and Pistol Mill Road (Figure 2, Area D). It appeared that this vicinity included a portion of the new right-of-way, and that not all of the topsoil from the plowed field had been removed prior to importation of fill for the new roadbed.

## SHOVEL TESTING

Seven shovel tests, each about $30 \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}$ in plan, were excavated in those areas that appeared to be the least disturbed, and the most likely to produce cultural remains. Fill was screened through $1 / 4$-inch hardware mesh, and excavation was continued until a clayey $B$-horizon was reached.

Only one of the seven shovel tests, ST. 1 , produced any cultural remains, a single potsherd, which was recovered from a depth of approximately 20 cm . The cracked, but generally intact, base of a ceramic vessel was found on the surface neaf the intersection of the northern edge of the new road and Pistol Mills Road. The location was designated and marked ST. 7 , though it was not really a shovel test. The following briefly describes the locations (depicted on Figure 2) and profiles of each of the shovel tests:

ST. 1 Located on the southern flank of the raised new road bed, in an area where several potsherds were found on the surface (Area D) of a ditch
between the two roads. This area, within new right-of-way, was originally within the plowed and terraced field.

0-5 cm; recently deposited fill
$5-35 \mathrm{~cm} ;$ loYR 4/4 (moist), l0YR 6/3 (dry), fine sandy loam; appears to conform to the E-horizon of Bowie soils
$35+\mathrm{cm}$; 7.5YR 5/6 (dry), fine sandy clay loam; appears to conform to the B-horizon of Bowie soils

ST. 2 Located 12 paces west of ST. 1 on the south flank of the raised road bed, just north of exposed geologic deposits.
$0-40 \mathrm{~cm}$; recently deposited fill
ST. 3 Located north of ST. 2 , on north flank of raised road bed, south of exposed geologic deposits.
$0-30 \mathrm{~cm} ; 10 \mathrm{YR} 6 / 3$ (dry), fine sandy loam; Bowie E-horizon
$30+\mathrm{cm}$; $7.5 \mathrm{YR} 5 / 6$ (dry), fine sandy clay loam; Bowie B-horizon
ST. 4 Located north of ST. 3, at survey station $289+00,10$ feet from north edge of right-of-way, just north of cut ditch.

0-6 cm; loYR 5/2 (dry), fine sandy loam; possibly the A-horizon of Bowie soils
6-35 cm; loYR 6/3 (dry), fine sandy loam; Bowie E-horizon
$35+\mathrm{cm} ; 7.5 Y R 5 / 6$ (dry), fine sandy clay loam; Bowie B-horizon
ST. 5 Located 9 paces east of ST. 4 , on the top edge of the cut ditch, just north of a large erosional feature, in the center of an approximately 5 meter long area of mottled darker fill apparent in the face of the cut ditch. This area of darker fill coincides with the alignment of a raised berm in the terraced field to the north, and is believed to be a remnant of that historic berm.
$0-22 \mathrm{~cm} ;$ l0YR 6/3 (dry), fine sandy loam; Bowie E-horizon $22-45 \mathrm{~cm}$; l0YR 5/3 (dry), mottled fine sandy loam, few charcoal
fragments, no cultural remains; believed to be remnant of terrace berm visible in field to north of right-of-way
$45-60 \mathrm{~cm} ; 10 Y R \mathrm{~K} / 3$ (dry), fine sandy loam; Bowie E-horizon
$60+\mathrm{cm} ; 7.5 \mathrm{YR} 5 / 6$ (dry), fine sandy clay loam; Bowie B-horizon
ST. 6 Located on narrow strip south of topsoil storage pile and cut ditch at west side of Pistol Mills Road.

0-5 cm; recent wash
$5-45 \mathrm{~cm}$; $10 Y R$ 6/3 (dry), fine sandy loam; Bowie E-horizon $45+\mathrm{cm} ; 7.5 Y R 5 / 6$ (dry), fine sandy clay loam; Bowie B-horizon

ST. 7 Located at junction of ditches north side of FM 1520 and west side of Pistol Mills Road. Approximately 30 cm west of a cut and abandoned telephone cable. This was not a shovel test, but the location of a cracked but virtually intact pot base, eroding from the surface. The upper broken edges of the base were clearly older than the recent
road construction, and one portion of the broken edge exhibited gopher gnawing. The base was excavated and the area around it was probed, but no additional vessels were located. Soil consisted of l0YR 6/3 (dry), fine sandy loam; Bowie E-horizon.

ST. 8 Located between the topsoil storage pile and cut ditch at west side of Pistol Mills Road, just south of a built-up access ramp to the soil storage pile.
$0-5 \mathrm{~cm}$; recent wash
$5-10 \mathrm{~cm}$; 10YR 5/3 (dry); fine sandy loam; Bowie A- or E-horizon 10-50 cm; l0YR 6/3 (dry); fine sandy loam; Bowie E-horizon $50+\mathrm{cm}$; 7.5YR 5/6 (dry) clay; Bowie B-horizon

## ADDITIONAL TESTING

Aftef consultation with the Texas Historical Commission, gradall scraping was undertaken in the vicinity of the pot base, ST. 7 , to ensure that the vessel base was not associated with an in-situ burial. An area approximately 4 meters $\times 4$ meters was scraped in shallow levels to a depth of approximately 60 cm befow the existing surface. The scraping was conducted under the supervision of an archeologist, and samples of fill were periodically screened through $1 / 4-i n c h$ hardware mesh. No cultural materials were found during screening and none were observed during the scraping. No evidence of a burial, @ither in the form of bone, grave goods, or grave fill, was observed during the excavations. The profile revealed by the excavation consisted of:

0-5 cm; recent wash from construction activities
$5-35 \mathrm{~cm}$; loYR 6/3 (dry), fine sandy loam, Bowie E-horizon $35-60 \mathrm{~cm}$; 7.5YR 5/6 (dry), fine sandy clay, Bowie B-horizon

To a ugment the gradall testing, an area 1 meter $x 1.5$ meters located immediately west of the gradall scrape was hand-excavated to a depth of 35 cm . Fill was screened through $1 / 4$-inch hardware cloth. A few small potsherds and some piedes of locally occurring ferruginous gravels were found within the upper 15 cm . No cultural materials were found below a depth of 15 cm .

## ARTIFACT DESCRIPTIONS

Artifacts collected from the project area, including collections made by Mr. Nelson, the local volunteer archeological steward who reported the site, are described below.

## Prehistofic Ceramics

Prehistoric ceramics are listed in Table l by decorative technique, temper, and general area from which they were recovered.

Appl qued
Two appliqued sherds were found. One of the appliqued sherds has an indistinkt decorative motif, which may have been achieved more by nail

Table 1
Prehistoric Ceramics

impressing than actual applique (Figure 3:a). Curvature of the sherd indicates it wals probably from a jar-shaped vessel, but the sherd is too small to calculate a diameter. The paste is hard and includes grog. The exterior surface and core are very dark gray to dark gray (l0YR 3/l to 7.5YR 4/0) in color, while the interior surface is pale brown (10YR 6/3). Thickness varies between 7.0 and 7.9 mm .

The other appliqued sherd (Figure $3: b$ ) has a more distinctly appliqued technique and motif, and can be compared with the type Harleton Appliqued (Suhm and Jelks 1962). The sherd has virtually no curvature. The paste is hard and includes grog. The exterior surface is gray to light brownish gray (l0YR 5/l to l0YR 6/2), the interior surface is dark gray (10YR 4/1), and the core is dark gray (7.5YR 4/0). Sherd thickness is 7.9 mm without the applique, and 10.0 mm with the applique.

## Brushed/Incised

Sixty-one brushed/incised sherds were found. They exhibit a variety of orientation and intensity of brushing, with many sherds appearing to be quite


Figure 3. Prehistoric ceramics: a-b) appliqued; c-1) brushed/incised.
worn, or weathered, on the surfaces. One sherd (Figure 3:i) is decorated on both exterior and interior faces. The orientation of the illustrated examples (Figure $\beta: c-1$ ) was determined by assuming that smoothing marks on the interior surfaces were oriented in a horizontal manner.

None of the sherds give any real indication of vessel shape; though most have very little curvature, indicating diameters of well over 20 cm . The single rim sherd (Figure 3:c) suggests a mouth diameter of about 15 cm ; however, this may be an unreliable estimate because of the small size of the sherd. The rim appears to be relatively vertical, with the lip being rounded from the inside to cause a slight overhang on the exterior.

A11 of the sherds appear to be tempered with grog and/or crushed hematite; no bone tempering was observed. Paste is generally hard, and surface colors are generally in the pale brown (10YR 6/3) to reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/6) ranges.

Sherd thickness ranges between 5.0 and 9.8 mm , with the median thickness being 7.5 mm . Figure 4 graphically depicts the numbers of each sherd of a particulal thickness. It is clear that most of the sherds have thicknesses of between 6.1 and 8.6 mm .


Figure 4. Brushed/incised sherds by thickness
Brushed and Punctated
Four brushed and punctated sherds were identified, three with decoration on the exterior surface only, and one with decoration on both exterior and interior surfaces.

Two sherds (Figure 5:a,b) could possibly be from the same vessel. Both are from an apparently jar-shaped vessel, with a single horizontal row of punctations piercing the brushing around the neck constriction. Diameter at the neck =onstriction exceeds 20 cm . Paste is hard, with temper including grog and hematite particles. The exterior surfaces are dark gray (l0YR 4/1), cores are dark gray ( $7.5 \mathrm{YR} 4 / 0$ ) to very dark gray (7.5YR 3/0), and interior surfaces are light brownish gray ( 10 YR 6/2) to pale brown (10YR 6/3). Each has a thifknesses of 8.3 mm .

Punctations on the other other sherd decorated only on the exterior (Figure 5:c) are not as distinct, and may be surface imperfections rather than deliberate punctating. Again, the sherd appears to be from a jar-shaped vessel, with punctations, piercing the brushing, encircling the neck constriction. The sherd has very little curvature, indicating a diameter of well over 20 cm . Paste is hard, with temper including grog and crushed hematite. The


Figure 5. Prehistoric ceramics: a-d) brushed and punctated; e-r) engraved.
exterior surface is dark grayish brown ( $10 \mathrm{YR} 4 / 2$ ), the core is very dark gray (7.5YR 3) 0), as is the interior surface. Thickness is 6.4 mm .

One fherd (Figure 5:d) is decorated with incising or brushing on one face, and punctating on the other. The sherd is too small to determine which surface is \&xterior and which interior. Paste is hard, with grog temper. Surfaces are grayish brown (10YR 5/2) to light brownish gray (10YR 6/2), and the core is very dark gray (7.5YR 3/0). Thickness is 6.4 mm .

## Engraved

Seventeen engraved sherds were found; only one of which included bone in the temper, the remainder being tempered with grog and/or grit.

The ${ }^{\text {sherd }}$ which included bone in the temper (Figure 5:e) is a small rim sherd, with the vestige of an apparently excised area just below the lip. The lip is rqunded. Mouth diameter of the vessel is estimated to have been about 20 cm . The paste is hard. Exterior and interior surfaces are well smoothed, and are dark grayish brown (10YR 4/2) to grayish brown (10YR 5/2) in color. The core is dark gray (7.5YR 4/0). Thickness is 6.0 mm .

One df the engraved rim sherds (Figure 5:f) can be identified with the type Ripley Engraved (Suhm and Jelks 1962). Decoration consists of a horizontal excised line just below the lip from which depend excised hachures, or triangles. These extend for approximately 1 cm , ending just above another horizontal excised line. The lip is thinned from the interior, and slightly everted. Rim diameter is estimated to have been about 17 cm . The paste is hard. Sulrfaces are well smoothed with a slight lustre. They are very dark gray (7.5YR 3/0) to black (7.5YR 2/0) in color; the core is black. Thickness is between 6.4 and 6.8 mm .

Another engraved rim sherd (Figure 5:g) appears to have more of a rectilinear motif. The lip is rounded, smoothed from the interior and slightly everted. Diameter at the mouth is estimated to have been about 14 cm . Paste is dense and compact, with temper appearing to consist of very finely ground hematite. Surfaces feel softer than the other engraved sherds, and appear somewhat worn, but with vestiges of a slight polish. Surfaces and core are light reddish brown (5YR 6/4) to pink (7.5YR 7/4) in color. Thickness is 6.7 mm .

The remaining two rims include only small portions of engraving, insufficient to suggest the overall motif. One sherd (Figure 5:h) includes a roughly thiangular engraved element below a horizontal line just below the lip. The sherd exhibits virtually no curvature with which to estimate a diameter. The lip is rounded, smoothed from the inside, and slightly everted. Paste is hard, and temper includes grog and hematite. The surfaces are smoothed, but do not exhibit any polish or lustre. Interior and exterior surfaces pre reddish gray ( $5 \mathrm{YR} \mathrm{5/2)} \mathrm{and} \mathrm{the} \mathrm{core} \mathrm{is} \mathrm{dark} \mathrm{gray} \mathrm{(7.5YR} \mathrm{4/0)} \mathrm{to}$ very dark gray (7.5YR 3/0). Thickness is 6.3 mm . The other rim (Figure 5:i) includes pnly a single engraved line. The lip is rounded, smoothed from the interior, and slightly everted. The sherd is too small to estimate the rim diameter. The surfaces are smoothed but feel sandy. Paste is hard, and appears to include sand temper. Surfaces and core are light brown (7.5YR 6/4) in color. Thickness is 6.4 mm .

Thre of the engraved body sherds include portions of fairly extensive, generally triangular, excising. One sherd (Figure 5:j) includes two parallel, horizont $l_{l}$ engraved lines with a roughly triangular excised area perpendicular to one of the lines. Surfaces are fairly well smoothed, but feel sandy. Paste is hard, and temper includes sand and hematite. The exterior surface is pale brown (10YR 6/3) to grayish brown (10YR 5/2), the interior surface is grayish brown (10YR 5/2), and the core is dark gray (7.5YR 4/0). Thickness is 6.5 mm . One sherd (Figure $5: k$ ) includes a portion of an apparently triangular area of excision. Paste is hard and includes grog. Surfaces are well smoothed and exhibit a slight lustre. The exterior surface is grayish brown (10YR 5/2) to dark gray (10YR 4/1), the interior surface is dark gray (10YR 4/1) to yery dark gray ( $10 \mathrm{YR} 3 / 1$ ), and the core is dark gray (7.5YR 4/0). Thicknes $\$$ is 5.0 mm . One sherd (Figure 5:1) includes a straight engraved line and an excised triangular area that retains a very slight trace of red pigment. Paste is hard, and includes grog and hematite. Surfaces are smoothed with a slight lustre. The exterior surface is dark gray (l0YR 4/1), the core is dark gray (7.5YR 4/0), and the interior surface is dark grayish brown (1 $1 \mathrm{YR} 4 / 2$ ). Thickness is 6.4 mm .

One of the engraved sherds (Figure $5: m$ ) exhibits a deep, excised curved line, and perhaps vestiges of excised lines along two of the broken edges. Paste is hard, and includes grog and hematite. The exterior is well smoothed, does not exhibit any lustre, but does exhibit hairline cracks. The exterior surface is light brownish gray ( $10 \mathrm{YR} 6 / 2$ ) to pale brown (10YR 6/3), the interior surface is light brown (7.5YR 6/4), and the core is dark gray (7.5YR 4/0). THickness is 8.1 mm .

The temaining five engraved sherds (Figure $5: n-r$ ) exhibit only fragments of straight, single, engraved lines. The paste of each is hard, with temper including grog and hematite. Surfaces are well smoothed and, generally, slightly 1 ustrous. Surfaces are generally lighter shades of brown (10YR 4/1, $5 / 1,5 / 2,5 / 3,6 / 3 ; 7.5 Y R 5 / 3,6 / 3$ ), and cores are dark gray (7.5YR 4/0, 10YR 4/1). Thlicknesses are: 5.7, 6.6, 4.8, 5.0, and 7.2 mm respectively.

Three engraved sherds exhibit carinations. One of the sherds (Figure 6:a) also has a red ( $10 \mathrm{R} 4 / 8$ ) slip on the exterior and interior surfaces. The decorative motif, just above the carination, consists of excised chevrons or triangles. The surfaces are well smoothed, and the exterior exhibits a slight lustre. Paste is hard, and includes grog and hematite; the core is very dark gray (7. SYR 3/0). Wall thickness is 7.4 mm above the carination, and 5.8 mm below the carination. One sherd (Figure 6:b) includes three possibly engraved lines, within a generally triangular area. Surfaces are well smoothed, but feel somelwhat soft. The paste is dense and compact, with very finely ground hematite as temper. Surfaces and core are pale brown ( $10 \mathrm{YR} 6 / 3$ ) in color. Thickness is 5.1 mm . The final carinated, engraved sherd exhibits a fragment of an applarently vertical line above the carination (Figure 6:c). Surfaces are well smoothed, but feel slightly sandy. Paste is hard, and includes sand and finely ground hematite with a very occasional fragment of grog. Surfaces and core are pale brown (10YR 6/3) in color. Thickness is 6.8 mm .

## Incisfed

One of the incised rim sherds (Figure 6:d) includes two almost vertical, narrow but deep, incised lines. The lip is rounded, smoothed from the inside


Figure 6. Prehistoric ceramics: a-c) engraved; d-g) incised; h-m) fingernail punctated; $n$ ) roughened $r i m ; ~ o-r)$ undecorated rims.
and slightly everted. The sherd is too small to estimate rim diameter. The paste is hard, and includes grog in the temper. Surfaces are well smoothed, with the finterior being almost polished. The exterior surface is dark grayish brown ( $10 \% R 4 / 1$ ), the interior surface is pale brown ( $10 Y R 6 / 3$ ) with very dark gray (10YR 3/1) fire clouding, and the core is very dark gray (7.5YR 3/0). Thickness is 8.0 mm .

The ofher rim sherd (Figure 6:e) includes a horizontal line just below the lip. The rim exhibits very little curvature, and the diameter could not be estimated The lip is thinned and rounded from the inside, and slightly everted. Paste is hard, and includes grog in the temper. The surfaces are well smoothed, and pale brown (10YR 6/3) in color. The core is dark gray (7.5YR 4/0). Thickness is 5.7 mm .

One of the incised body sherds (Figure 6:f) is decorated with three faint incised lines, apparently oriented diagonally, with ticking apparent on one of the lines. Paste is hard, and includes grog in the temper. Surfaces are well smoothed. The exterior surface is brown (7.5YR 5/3, 5/3), the interior surface is brown to light brown (7.5YR 5/4, 6/4), and the core is very dark gray ( $7.5 \nmid \mathrm{R} \mathrm{3/0)}$. Thickness is 5.0 mm .

The final incised sherd includes fragments of an apparently straight line and a triangular motif (Figure 6:g). The incising is broad and shallow. Paste is hard and includes grog in the temper. Surfaces are well smoothed. The exterfor surface is dark grayish brown (l0YR 4/2), the interior surface is reddish brown ( 5 YR 5/4, 5/5) , and the core is dark gray (7.5YR 4/0). It has a thickness of 6.0 mm .

## Punctated

The six punctated sherds are all decorated with fingernail impressions. Two of the sherds (Figure 6:h,i) include patterns made with differentially oriented impressions, two (Figure 6:j,k) have all of the impressions similarly aligned, and two (Figure 6:l,m) include only a single impression each. The paste of each is hard, with grog temper being prominently visible in five specimens (Figure 6:h-1), while the paste of the other is sandy and exhibits finely crashed hematite. The following summarizes temper, color, and the thickness of each sherd:

| Figure \# | Temper | Exterior | Interior | Core | Thickness |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6:h | grog | 10YR 4/1 | 10YR 4/2 | 7.5YR 3/0 | 5.4 mm |
| 6: i | grog | 7.5YR 6/4 | 7.5YR 6/2 | 7.5YR 4/0 | 5.8 mm |
| 6: j | grog | 10YR 4/1 | 10YR 4/1 | 7.5YR 4/0 | 7.7 mm |
| 6: k | grog | 10YR 6/3 | 10YR 6/3 | 7.5YR 4/0 | 4.6 mm |
| 6:1 | grog | 7.5YR 5/3 | 10YR 5/2 | 7.5YR 4/0 | 7.4 mm |
| 6:m | sand | 7.5YR 6/4 | 7.5YR 6/4 | 7.5YR 6/4 | 5.9 mm |
| Stipped |  |  |  |  |  |

Five body sherds with red slip on both the exterior and interior surfaces were otherwise undecorated. The paste of each is hard, and each exhibits fairly finely crushed grog in greater or lesser extents. Surfaces are well smoothed, but not polished. Cores are black. Thicknesses are: 6.7, 6.0, 5.9, 5.8 , and $\$ .3 \mathrm{~mm}$.

Fourteen sherds with a red slip on the exterior and traces of red slip on the interior were reconstructed to form the flat base of a vessel. Diameter of the base was 9 cm . Walls were broken off almost immediately above the base, the breaks appearing to be old, with gopher gnawing visible along one section of the broken edge. The paste is hard, with grog being prominent in the temper. Surfaces are smooth, but not polished. Thickness of the walls varied between 4.7 and 5.4 mm , while the thickness of the base is about 5.4 mm .

## Roughened Rim

One rim sherd (Figure 6:n) was noted with a "roughened" exterior, which may be the result of incomplete smoothing of coils on the exterior, or the result of dragging fingers around the exterior rim. The interior surface is well smoothed. The lip is rounded, smoothed from the inside, and considerably thicker than the lower wall. Paste is hard, with grog clearly visible in the temper. The exterior surface is grayish brown (10YR 5/2), the interior surface is grayish brown (10YR 5/2) to dark gray (10YR 4/1), and the core is dark gray (7.5YR 4/0). Maximum thickness at the 1 ip is 11.5 mm , and thickness of the lower wall at the break is 8.2 mm .

Undecorated
Ninety-four undecorated sherds were found; three of which included bone in the temper, and the remainder of which did not, being tempered with grog and/or crushed hematite.

Only four rims were identified within the undecorated sherds. One (Figure 6:0) has a rounded lip, smoothed from the inside, and everted. Curvature is too little to estimate a rim diameter. Paste is hard, with grog temper. The surfaces are not well smoothed, particularly on the exterior, where they feel somewhat lumpy. Thickness is 8.3 mm . Another rim sherd (Figure 6:p) has an extremely everted lip, rounded from the interior. The sherd is too small to estimate rim diameter. Paste is hard, with grog temper. Surfaces are poorly smoothed. Thickness at the lowest portion of the wall is 4.9 mm . Another rim sherd (Figure 6:q) has an everted lip, rounded and smoothed from the interior. The sherd is too small to estimate original rim diameter. Paste is hard, with grog temper. The exterior surface is poorly smoothed, while the interior surface is well smoothed. Thickness at the lowest portion of the wall is 6.9 mm . The final undecorated rim sherd (Figure 6:r) has a rounded lip, smoothed from the inside and slightly overhanging on the exterior. The sherd is too small to estimate original rim diameter. The paste is hard with hematite in the temper. The exterior surface is quite rough, while the interior is well smoothed. Thickness at the lowest part of the wall is 3.9 mm .

Two of the undecorated sherds appeared to include wall to base junctions, indicating at least two flat based vessels. One of the sherds had apparent base and wall thicknesses of 5.8 and 7.0 mm respectively, while the other had thicknesses of 9.6 and 6.3 mm .

The undecorated body sherds were similar in paste, finish, and color to the variqus decorated sherds, with thinner sherds generally being more highly smoothed to lightly polished. The sherds with bone temper had thicknesses of $6.5,6.6$, and 7.1 mm . Thickness of the non-bone tempered, undecorated sherds
ranged between 4.3 and 13.6 mm , with the median thickness being 7.0 mm . Figure 7 depicts graphically the number of sherds by thickness. Most of the sherds have a thickness of between 5.7 and 8.3 mm . The sherds with a thickness of greater than 10 mm probably represent basal fragments, though they do not include such diagnostic characterstics.


Figure 7. Undecorated grog-tempered sherds by thickness.

## Prehistoric Lithics

Prehistoric lithics collected from the site are listed in Table 2.

Table 2
Prehistoric Lithics

| Descripti | 1on | Material | Area A | Area B | Area | Area |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dart point | at fragment | local quartzite | 1 | - | - | - |
| Bifaces | (Knives?) | local quartzite | 2 | - | - | - |
| Biface ff | fagment | non-quartzite | 2 | - | - | - |
| Utilized | flake | non-quartzite | 1 | - | - | - |
| Debitage | miscellaneous | local quartzite | 40 | - | 18 | 2 |
| Debitage, | miscellaneous | non-quartzite | 10 | - | - | - | 1962, Turner and Hester 1985). Most of the blade is missing, shoulders are square, and the stem contracts slightly to a straight base. It is made of quartzite, weak red ( $10 \mathrm{R} 4 / 3$ ) over much of the exterior, and weak red (2.5YR $5 / 2$ ) on the interior. Dimensions are: length, 3.25 cm ; width, 2.25 cm ; and thickness, 0.92 cm .

The two bifaces were probably used us knives. One (Figure 8:b) has one straight 申dge and one concave edge. The base is straight and roughly perpendicular to the straight edge. Material is quartzite, dusky red (10R 3/3) to dark gray (5YR 4/l) with patches of reddish yellow (7.5YR 6/6). Dimensions are: length, 5.43 cm ; width, 2.56 cm ; thickness, 1.07 cm . The other (Figure 8:c) is missing the distal tip. One edge appears to have been straight, and


Figure 8. Prehistoric lithics: a) dart point; b, c) bifaces (knives?); d,e) biface fragments; f) utilized flake.
roughly perpendicular to the straight base. The other edge may also have been straight, but it is not perpendicular to the base, and the corner is considerably more rounded than the other corner. Material is a dark gray (l0YR 4/l) quartzite, with dusky red (l0R 3/2) coloration over much of the surface. Dimensions are: length, $4.80 \mathrm{~cm} ;$ width, $3.17 \mathrm{~cm} ;$ and thickness, 1.04 cm .

One of the biface fragments (Figure 8:d) appears to be from a biface with a convex base. The edges do not exhibit fine retouch, and it is possible that the fragment broke during manufacture. Material is a grayish brown (l0YR 5/2) chert. Dimensions are: length, $1.95 \mathrm{~cm} ;$ width, $2.36 \mathrm{~cm} ;$ thickness, 0.90 cm . The other biface fragment (Figure 8:e) is extremely small, and appears to be a corner fragment. Material is very pale brown (loYR 8/3) chert. Dimensions are: length, 1.24 cm ; width, $1.18 \mathrm{~cm} ;$ thickness, 0.58 cm .

One flake (Figure 8:f) with apparent edge working or utilization scars was noted. The worked edge is at one end of a convex curve, the remainder of the edge apparently having been formed by burin blows. Material is yellowish brown (10YR 5/6) chert, with cortex still remaining along one edge.

Miscellaneous debitage consisted mostly of flakes and chips of locally occurring quartzite, generally in shades of reds (l0R 4/2) to grays (l0YR4/1). Non-quartzite debitage included five interior flakes of light brownish (10YR $6 / 2$ to $10 Y R 7 / 3$ ) chert, an interior flake of waxy-looking, pinkish gray (SYR $6 / 2$ to $5 Y R \quad 7 / 2$ ) chert, three interior flakes of light gray (7.5YR 7/1 to 7.5YR 8/1) chert or novaculite, and one interior flake of pink (7. SYR 8/3) chert.

## Historic Artifacts

Historic materials collected from the site consist of:

```
1 stoneware sherd (brown) from Area A,
7. whiteware sherds (undecorated) from Area C,
l glass sherd (clear) from Area A, and
l) glass sherd (milk or white) from a canning jar lid from Area C.
```

None of the historic artifacts include any makers marks, or other aiagnostic marks indicative of specific manufacturing methods or manufacturing dates.

## DISCUSSION

Based on the field observations, road construction clearly encountered prehistoric cultural materials. The prehistoric ceramic assemblage appears to date to the Caddo Titus Focus, though the general small size of the sherds and lack of overall vessel shapes makes it difficult to identify the recovered sherds positively with specific Titus Focus potery types. The prehistoric lithic assemblage is probably associated with the prehistoric ceramic assemblage, though the comparison of one lithic piece with a Carrollton dart point, generally associated with the middle Archaic, could be used to argue for an earlier component, perhaps located slightly to the west, uphill from the ceramic assemblage. The historic assemblage could date to virtually any part of the twentieth century. It was largely recovered from old cut faces adjacent to the ditch south of the existing road, and appears to represent casual rdadside trash disposal rather than a historic occupation site.

Seven shovel tests revealed that some areas of soil undisturbed by road construction still existed within the right-of-way. Such areas were present, below some areas of imported road fill, particularly where the fill was within new right-of-way (originally part of the plowed field to the north); and north of the cut ditch at the north edge of the road, within approximately 10 feet of the northern edge of the right-of-way, though a telephone cable has been installed recently in this area.

None of the shovel tests encountered any concentrations of prehistoric debris. In fact, only one sherd (from shovel test l) was recovered from the shovel tests. Nor did the shovel tests indicate any cultural features, and no prehistoric cultural features were observed in cut banks, in particular the ditch and cut banks at the north edge of the road. The only possible indication of potentially in situ deposits consisted of the one pot base, that was recorded as shovel test 7 , but this was found on the surface within one foot of an old abandoned telephone cable, and none of the upper portions of the pot were found in the vicinity. Further, the broken edges (just above the base) were clearly old breaks, not recent; and gopher gnawing was evident along one section of the edge. Gradall clearing and additional hand-excavation in the. vicinity of the pot base failed to reveal any indications of in situ burial.

Observation of the field north of the new right-of-way revealed extensive historic terracing. This terracing undoubtedly continued into what is now the northern edge of the highway right-of-way. This terracing, and associated cultivation both before and after the terracing, has probably disturbed most of the surface soils in the vicinity; shovel test profiles did not reveal any well developed A-horizons. Thus, it is concluded that the likelihood of in situ deposits within the right-of-way is probably remote, though an occasional isolated feature may still survive.

No artifacts were observed within the right-of-way east of Piston Mills Road, an area that appeared to have been fairly extensively disturbed when the present FM 1520 was built, post-1965.

At the present time the majority of surface-disturbing construction has bee.: completed. This includes the removal of ground surfaces prior to depositing fill to raise the new road bed, and digging of ditches at the northern side of the new road. Remaining work consists almost entirely of depositing more fill for the new road bed and adjacent shoulders, road surfacing, removal of existing pavement, and sodding of the existing cut banks adjacent to the road to reduce erosion.

It is recommended, therefore, that construction be allowed to proceed without further archeological investigations. If any additional surface disturbing activities remain, the work will be monitored by an archeologist.
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## State of Texas

## ARCHEOLOGICAL SITE DATA FORM

Instructions: Answer all questions. Be specific in distinguishing between "none" and "none observed" or "unknown": if in doubt. enter "unknown." Where question is foliowed by (Yes)(No). simply circle answer. Enter measurements in metric. Attachments may be used to complete any question: at question, write "See Attachment $\qquad$ " and number attachments consecutively. List all attachments at end of this form.

## GENERAL INFORMATION

Temporary Site No.

Site Name_______________________
Project Name FM1520
CSJ 1232-03-009

| Project Funding Source(s) TxDoT |
| :--- | :--- |
| Owner and Address $\quad$ TxDoT |
|  |
| Informant and Address $\quad$ Bo Ne1son |

Additional Sources of Information ______________
$\qquad$
Previous Investigations
Who None except Bo Nelson
Why Collector turned steward

CName of Original Recorder of Site

## RECORDING INFORMATION

Name of Recorder G R Dennis_Price

Institutional Affiliation, if any

Date January 13, 1993

## LOCATIONAL INFORMATION

County Camp
USGS Map Name \& No. Monticello, Tx

$$
3395-111
$$

## Elevation 360=370 feet NGVD

UTM: Zone 15

| 3 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 0 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Northing 3 | 6 | 5 | 8 |  | 1 |  | 0 |

$\qquad$
Description of Location (include nearby USGS topographic landmarks as well as on-site references: note mileages. distances, etc.)
Site is located in the northwest angle made
by FM 1520 and Pistol Mills Road, see
attached quad map. $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
L_____



$\qquad$

$$
\text { Permanent Site No. } \quad 41 C P 221
$$

WORK PERFORMED BY FIELD PERSONNEL

Excavation (yes) KNXY

Method Gradall scraping and hand excavation of an area approx. $4 \times 5$ meters

| Notes | (Yes) XNW |
| :---: | :---: |
| Where Housed TxDoT |  |
| Photographs |  |
| Slides-Color |  |
| Black \& White | X (SXISX) ( No ) |
| Prints-Color | (Yes) XNW |
| Black \& White | (HXXX (No) |
| Where Housed TxDoT |  |
| Collections |  |
| Where Housed TxDoT |  |

Collection Techniques (e.g., controlled, noncontrolled, select, random, arbitrary: describe) Everything that was seen was collected

Kinds of Materials Collected Prehistoric ceramics, Prehistoric lithics, historic ceramics

Special Samples (c.g., carbon, archeomagnetic, plant: list and describe)

## ENVIRONMENTAL LOCATION

```
Nearest Natural Water Source Picket Spring Branch,
    is approx. 240 meters southeast of
site.
    Distance 240 meters
Drainage Basin Cypress
```

Drainage Type (e.g., riverine, playa, marine)
Riverine
Soil Origins (may be multiple)

| Colluvial | (Yes) (ONOX | Alluvial | (Yes) | (No) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Eolian | (Yes) (No) | Marine | (Yes) | (No) |

Soil Type (e.g., clay loam, sand) $\qquad$
Bowie fine sandy loam
Vegetation (list dominant, others if known) $\qquad$
Fallow pasture grasses etc.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Ground Surface Visibility Ettremely good in
disturbed highway construction areas

Environmental Setting of Site (include pertinent landforms, slope, visible landmarks, etc.)
Located on lower east-facing slope of a
rounded hill, west of Picket Springs Branch.
Is in the northwest angle formed by FM 1520 and Pistol Mills Road

Geologic deposits are Eocene Carrizo Sand
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Additional Comments $\qquad$

SITE CONDITION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Approximate percentage of site remaining intact 0\% within highway R.o.W.
Natural Impacts (include erosion, spalling, sloughing, etc.)
Probably erosion, but could also have been subject to colluviation burial from wash from upslope

Artificial Impacts (include construction, plowing, etc.) The area has been extensively terraced and cultivated in the past. Site has
also been impacted by original construction of the County Road (now FM1520) and

Pistol Mills Road, and the re-alignment of FMIS20 after constr. of Lake Bob Sandlin Known or Perceived Future Impacts Most of the presently planned highway
construction surface disturbance has
been completed. Adjacent areas, not inspected, will probably be subject tō
agricultural activities.

Potential for State Archeological Landmark

LIST ALL ATTACHMENTS (Where applicable, refer to question that is being supplemented)

1. Quad map section showing site location
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 

$=6$
"
8. $\qquad$

XXRY (No) area within highway
r.o. wi only
XXPS (No) area within highway
r.o. w. only
Potential for National Register of Historic Places
XXXS) (No) area within highway
Submitted? r.o.w. only

Uncertain/Unknown? $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
9.
10.
11.
12.
13.
14.
15.

Other (give numbers)

Current Registration
State Archeological Landmark $\quad X X X \$ X$ (No)

Other $\qquad$

Recommended Actions (regional and project specific research, management, preservation)
No further work is recommended within the present highway right-of-way
$\qquad$

## Scate of Texas

## ARCHEOLOGICAL SITE DATA FORM

1nstructions: Answer all questions. Be specific in distinguishing betwecn "nonc"and"none obscrved" or "unknown": ifindoubt. :nter "unknown." Where question is foliowed by (Yes)(No). simply circle answer. Enter measurements in metric. Altachments nay be used to complete any question: at question. write "Sce Attachment $\qquad$ "and number attachmenes consecutively. Listall machments at end of this form.

## SENERALINFORMATION

Cemporary Site No.
'ermanent Site No. 41 CP 222
:ite Name
'roject Name FM 1520 reconstruction
CSI 1232-03-009
'roject Funding Sourco(s)
$\qquad$

## iwner and Address

State-owned $R=0-W$
Iformant and Address
3o_Nelson
3t 4 Box_259B-1
3ittshurg, TX_75686
dditional Sources of Information
evious Investigations
Who Bo Nelson

What Infermant noticed materials eroding rom $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{W}$ after rains.

When January 1993

[^0]
## RECORDING INFORMATION

Name of Recorder Stephanie S. Strickland__

TxDOT
Institutional Affiliation, if any $\qquad$ $\because$

Datc _January 27._1993

LOCATIONAL INFORMATION


## Site Size (estimate if necessary)

At Present $\frac{30 \mathrm{~m} \times 100 \mathrm{~m}}{\text { At Original Occupation } \frac{\text { Unknown }}{\text { Examination of the }}}$
Basis for Determination Enant.
site with the informant.

Circumstances of Observation Routine oxami nation prior to recording site.
Depth of Cultural Deposit Surfical and disturbed

Basis for Determination Shovel tests performed within $\mathrm{R}-0-\mathrm{W}$ were negative. On the east, the site may extend into the densely wooded area outside of $\mathrm{k}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{W}$.
Time Periods of Occupation (e.g.. Prehistoric-Early Archaic: may be multiple)
Archaic, Late Prehistoric

Components (refers to discreet occupations)

| Single | (Yes) (No) | Multiple | (Yes) (No) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\cdot$ | Unknown | (Yes) (No) |  |

Site Type (e.g.. open campsite, military post, rockshelter)
Unknown--possibly an open campsite

Jultural Features (If present, describe: c.g., burned rock nidden, hearth, structural remains; how do they relate to :omponents. time periods, physiography: how many are here, spatial distribution, size, contents. etc.)
№ features were observed
$\therefore$
$\therefore ـ$
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## State of Texas

## ARCHEOLOGICAL SITE DATA FORM

Instructions: Answer all questions. Be specific in distinguishing between"none" and "none observed"or"unknown": if in doubt. enter "unknown." Where question is foliowed by (Yes) (No). simply circle answer. Enter measurements in metric. Attachments may be used to complete any question: at question, write "Sec Attachment "and number attachments consecutively. List all attachments at end of this form.

## GENERAL INFORMATION

Temporary Site No.
Permanent Site No. 41CP 223
Site Name
Project Name FM1520 reconstruction
CSJ 1232-03-009

Project Funding Sourco(s)
$\qquad$

| Owner and Address |  |
| :---: | :---: |

State-owned R-O-W

## Informant and Address

## Bo Nelson

Rt. 4 Box 259 B-1
Pittsburg, TX 75686
Additional Sources of Information

Previous Investigations
Who Bo Nelson
Who Bo Nelson

What Informant noticed materials eroding out of $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{W}$ after rainstorms in the area.

When Ianuary 1993

Why Informant is a volunteer archeological

- steward for OAS.
lame of Original Recorder of Site


## RECORDING INFORMATION

Name of Recorder $\frac{\text { Stephanie S. Strickland }}{\text { TxDOT }}$

Institutional Affiliation, if any

Date January 27, 1993

## LOCATIONAL INFORMATION

County Camp
USGS Map Name \& No. $\frac{\text { Montice } 110}{3395-111}$ 3395-111
Elcvation 350 MSL

UTM: Zone
15
$\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Easting } \frac{3}{3} & \frac{0}{6} & \frac{9}{5}, & 0 & 0 \\ \text { Northing } & & & \end{array}$ Latitude____ $/$ _____

Longitude __ $/$ _ 1 ___
Description of Location (include nearby USGS topographic landmarks as well as on-site references; note mileages, distances. etc.)
The site is located on the east side of $F M$ 1520, approximately 1.1 mile from the intersection of Pistol Mills Rd. and FM 1520. The portion of the $R-0-W$ involved is between two telephone poles with markers "383.79 $\mathrm{BM}^{\prime \prime}$ and "385.59" nailed to them. Approximately 300 feet across EM 1520 is an abandoned one-room structure. This structure is shown on the topographic map. Note that the structure is outside of the $\mathrm{R}-0-\mathrm{H}$.

Permanent Site No.

## ćultural manifestations

Site Size (estimate if necessary)
At Present $15 \mathrm{~m} \times 75 \mathrm{~m}$
At Original Occupation Unknown_______
Basis for Determination Informant and examination of the site.

Circumstances of Observation Routine examination of site in order to record it.
Depth of Cultural Deposit Surfical(within R-O-W)
Basis for Determination Negative shovel tests within apparently undisturbed areas of the R-0-W.

Time Periods of Occupation (e.g.. Prehistoric-Early Archaic: may be multiple)
Innidentified prehistoric: possibly late - 9 th Century; 20th Century

Components (refers to discreet occupations)

| Single | (Yes) (No) | Multiple | (Yes) (No) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Unknown | (eg) (No) |  |

Basis for Determination Observation and examina-tion of the site, as well as surface collection proyided by the informant.

Site Type (e.g., open campsite. military post, rockshelter) Unknown

Zultural Features (lf present, describe: e.g., burned rock nidden, hearth, structural remains; how do they relate to :omponents. time periods, physiography; how many are here, spatial distribution, size, contents, etc.)
No features were observed.
$\qquad$

## This Page Redacted Per THC Policy

## Permanent Site No.

$\qquad$

SKETCH MAP OF SITE AND SURROUNDING TOROGRAPHIC FEATURES (include North arrow and scale: note if map was not made on site). Attach photocopy of topographic map showing site location.

NOTE: Map was not drawn at the site Nenctan



Figure 2. Detail of project area in vicinity of site 41 CP 221.
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