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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is concerned with the cultural resources survey of 245 acres of the White Oak Creek Wildlife Management Area (WMA), located within Cass, Morris, and Titus counties, Texas. This work was undertaken in order to identify any cultural resources located within the newly acquired areas and to evaluate their potential for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

The present survey resulted in the identification and recording of one nonsite locality. The locality is of an undetermined prehistoric period and is considered to be ineligible for inclusion in the NRHP.
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ABSTRACT

In order to gain additional access roads into the White Oak Creek Wildlife Management Area (WMA), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (CE), Fort Worth District, has obtained three additional properties totaling 245 acres. Geo-Marine, Inc., of Plano, Texas (GMI), was contracted by the CE to perform a cultural resources inventory of these properties. This work was conducted in accordance with, and in partial fulfillment of, the CE's obligation under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended through 1992 (PL 89-665; 80 Stat. 915; 16 U.S.C. § 470 et seq.); the Archeological and Historical Preservation Act of 1974, as amended (PL 93-291); the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (PL 90-190); and Executive Order No. 11593, "Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment."

The fieldwork for this purchase order was conducted on July 16-17, 1997, July 23, 1997, and August 20, 1997. The third trip was required to complete coverage of the 35-acre tract in Cass County, which had not been completely surveyed due to some confusion regarding the tract's specific location. The field crew consisted of Mr. Steven Hunt (Field Supervisor), Mr. Michael Brack, Mr. Brad Cole, Ms. Melissa Zabecki, Mr. Steven Baird, and Ms. Kellie Krapf. A total of 12 person-days was expended during the period of fieldwork, for an average of 20.4 acres surveyed per person-day. As a result of the survey, one prehistoric locality was discovered.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The construction of Cooper Lake in northeastern Texas required that, as a form of natural resources mitigation, an area of about 25,000 acres downstream in Bowie, Cass, Morris, and Titus counties, known as the White Oak Creek Wildlife Management Area (WMA), be developed and utilized for wildlife habitat (Figure 1). In 1997, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (CE), Fort Worth District, acquired an additional 245-acres in three tracts in order to provide better access into the White Oak Creek WMA. Geo-Marine, Inc. (GMI), of Plano, Texas, was contracted under Purchase Order DACW63-97-P-0884 to undertake a cultural resources investigation of these properties. This work was conducted in accordance with and in partial fulfillment of the CE’s obligation under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended through 1992 (PL 89-665; 80 Stat. 915; 16 U.S.C. § 470 et seq.); the Archeological and Historical Preservation Act of 1974 as amended (PL 93-291); the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (PL 90-190); and Executive Order No. 11593, “Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment.”

This report presents the results of an intensive pedestrian survey of 245 acres within the White Oak Creek WMA in Cass, Morris, and Titus counties. Fieldwork was undertaken on July 16-17, July 23, and August 20, 1997, by Mr. Steven Hunt (Field Supervisor), Mr. Michael Brack, Mr. Brad Cole, Mr. Steven Baird, Ms. Melissa Zabecki, and Ms. Kellie Krapf, all of GMI. Dr. Maynard Cliff, also of GMI, served as Principal Investigator for the project. As a result of this project, one prehistoric locality was identified. The locality is considered to be ineligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

This report contains four chapters. Chapter 2 provides information on the natural and cultural setting of the project area. Research goals and methods for the survey are presented in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 presents the research results, including a description of the single identified locality, and recommendations for its treatment. A list of references follows the main body of the report. Included as an appendix is a listing of curated material resulting from the 245-acre survey (Appendix A).
CHAPTER 2
NATURAL AND CULTURAL SETTING
OF THE PROJECT AREA

NATURAL SETTING

Geology and Geomorphology

The White Oak Creek Wildlife Management Area (WMA) occupies parts of Bowie, Cass, Morris, and Titus counties in Northeast Texas, and includes the lower portion of the flood plain of White Oak Creek, as well as parts of the flood plains of the Sulphur River and several of its tributaries. The region lies within the Gulf Coastal Plains physiographic province which is a segment of the Mesozoic-Cenozoic coastal geosyncline (Murray 1960). This geosyncline forms a gradually sloping basin which dips toward the Gulf of Mexico and contains formations of limestone and sandstone deposited along the margins of an ancient receding coastline. The geologic strata forming Cass, Morris, and Titus counties, as well as the southern portion of Bowie County, were deposited during the Eocene, Pleistocene, and Holocene periods (Bureau of Economic Geology [BEG] 1964, 1966). Extensive areas of recent (i.e., Holocene) alluvium are found within the flood plains of White Oak Creek, the Sulphur River, and their associated tributaries, as well as several small areas of Pleistocene fluviatile terrace deposits located south of the Sulphur River in northeastern Cass County, south of White Oak Creek in northwestern Morris County, and north of the Sulphur River in Bowie County (BEG 1966).

Soils associated with the survey areas in Morris and Titus counties include: Ashford clay, 0 to 1 percent slopes; Besner-Talco complex, 0 to 2 percent slopes; Estes clay loam, frequently flooded; Freestone fine sandy loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes; Gladewater clay, frequently flooded; Talco-Raino complex, 0 to 1 percent slopes; and Woodell fine sandy loam, 5 to 20 percent slopes. Soil mapping at this level of detail is not available for Cass County; however, the General Soil Map: Cass and Marion Counties, Texas (United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service [USDA, SCS] 1974) shows that the survey area in Cass County falls within the Kirvin-Bowie association.

The Kirvin-Bowie association is an area of gently undulating to gently rolling, well-drained, loamy upland soils. This association is used for pasture and woodlands. Kirvin soils make up about 45 percent of the association and Bowie soils about 35 percent, with the remaining 20 percent being composed of soils in narrow flood plains or soils that are moderately well drained. Both the Kirvin and Bowie soils are ultisols. Kirvin soils consist of a brown fine sandy loam A horizon that is underlain by a red clay subsoil. Bowie soils consist of a fine sandy loam A horizon underlain by a yellowish brown sandy clay loam (USDA, SCS 1974).
Ashford clay, 0 to 1 percent slopes, is an alfisol, found on nearly level and poorly drained soil in low-lying areas on stream terraces. A very dark grayish brown clay A horizon is underlain by a light brownish gray clay subsoil with brown mottling (USDA, SCS 1990:19-20).

Besner-Talco complex, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is an area of well-drained, nearly level to gently sloping soils found on terraces adjacent to large streams. Both soils comprising the complex are alfisols. Besner soil is found in ridges and mounds 30-120 cm higher than the surrounding Talco soil. The complex is composed of approximately 65 percent Besner soil and 20 percent Talco soil, with the remaining 20 percent of the complex composed of small areas of Derly, Freestone, and Nahatche soil. Besner soil consists of a dark brown fine sandy loam over a loamy subsoil. Talco soil consists of a brown to gray loam A horizon over a grayish brown to light brownish gray clay loam subsoil (USDA, SCS 1990:22).

Estes clay loam, frequently flooded, is an inceptisol found on nearly level and poorly drained soil in the flood plains of large streams. It consists of a dark grayish brown clay loam strata underlain by grayish brown clay subsoil (USDA, SCS 1990:32-33).

Freestone fine sandy loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes, is an alfisol found on gently sloping interfluves, along foot slopes, and at the heads of drainages. It consists of a brown sandy loam surface horizon over a clay subsoil (USDA, SCS 1990:33-34).

Gladewater clay, frequently flooded, is an inceptisol, consisting of nearly level, poorly drained and very slowly permeable soil on frequently flooded bottomlands. It is characterized by a very dark grayish brown clay surface layer underlain by a gray clay subsoil (USDA, SCS 1990:34-35).

The Talco-Raino complex, 0 to 1 percent slopes, is found on nearly level to slightly depressional, mounds stream terraces. Both the Talco and Raino soils are alfisols. The complex is composed of about 60 percent Talco and 25 percent Raino soil, with the remaining 15 percent of the complex consisting of small areas of Freestone, Derly, and Woodtell soils. The Talco soil consists of a brown silt loam surface layer underlain by a brownish yellow to light brownish gray clay subsoil. Raino soil begins with a brown to yellowish brown loam A horizon, underlain by a yellowish brown, grayish, brownish, and reddish clay subsoil (USDA, SCS 1990:46-47).

The Woodtell fine sandy loam, 5 to 20 percent slopes, is an alfisol that occurs on gentle to moderately steep slopes and is moderately well drained. It consists of a brown fine sandy loam underlain by a red and gray clay. The substratum consists of a stratified light gray shale and strong brown sandy clay loam (USDA, SCS 1990:51).

Climate

The climate of the WMA area is subtropical, marked by long hot summers and short cool winters. The primary influences on the climate are the latitude, warm winds from the Gulf of Mexico, and cooler northern winds from the continental land mass to the north. Cold waves in the winter are rare and not severe, usually lasting only one or two days. The average summer temperature is around 27° C and the average daily maximum temperature is 33 to 34° C. In winter, the average temperature is 6 to 7° C. The last freezing temperature in spring is usually attained before April 11, and the first freezing temperature in fall usually does not occur until after November 1. The number of days in the growing season with temperatures above the freezing mark averages about 209 (USDA, SCS 1980:2, 81, 1990:2-3, Tables 1, 2, and 3).

Precipitation is fairly heavy throughout the year; prolonged droughts are rare, and the frequent afternoon thunderstorms in summer are adequate to maintain crops. Such afternoon thunderstorms occur about 50 days of the year in Bowie County and about 44 days out of the year in Morris County. Severe storms, including
tornadoes, strike the area occasionally and often cause flooding and erosion. Every few years in the summer or fall, a tropical depression moves inland causing extremely heavy rains for one to three days. Mean annual precipitation is about 1,110 to 1,140 mm, with 52 to 53 percent of this falling between April and September. The growing season for most crops falls within this period. As the average winter temperature is above freezing, snowfall is variable but rare (USDA, SCS 1980:2, 1990:3).

Flora

The WMA area falls near the ecotone between the Pineywoods and the Post Oak Savannah of East Texas and includes within it several vegetation zones: the Willow Oak-Water Oak-Blackgum Forest and White Oak-Elm-Hackberry Forest within the bottomlands, and the Pine-Hardwood Forest (Shortleaf Pine-Post Oak-Southern Red Oak subtype), Other Native and/or Introduced Grasses, Post Oak Woods/Forest, and Post Oak Woods, Forest, and Grasslands Mosaic on the uplands (McMahan et al. 1984).

The most extensive vegetation group on the uplands within the survey area is the Post Oak Woods, Forest, and Grasslands Mosaic. It is closely associated with another major vegetation type within the WMA uplands, the Post Oak Woods/Forest. Both vegetation types are most apparent on the soils of the Post Oak Savannah. Plants commonly associated with the Post Oak Savannah include blackjack oak, eastern redcedar, mesquite, black hickory, live oak, sandjack oak, cedar elm, hackberry, yaupon, poison oak, American beautyberry, hawthorn, supplejack, trumpet creeper, dewberry, coral-berry, little bluestem; silver bluestem, sand lovegrass, beaked panicum, three-awn, sprangle grass, and tickclover (McMahan et al. 1984:19).

The Pine-Hardwood Forest (Shortleaf Pine-Post Oak-Southern Red Oak subtype) covers a large portion of Northeast Texas, including portions of all four WMA counties, and occurs on sandy uplands. The most common trees present within this vegetation zone are red oak, post oak, hickory, and shortleaf pine (USDA, SCS 1990:52). Other associated species for this vegetation zone are: loblolly pine, black hickory, sandjack oak, flowering dogwood, common persimmon, sweetgum, sassafras, greenbriar, yaupon, wax myrtle, American beautyberry, hawthorn, supplejack, winged elm, beaked panicum, spranglegrass, Indiangrass, switchgrass, three-awn, bushclover, and tickclover (McMahan et al. 1984:25).

The least extensive of the upland vegetation groups within the WMA is Other Native Grasses and/or Introduced Grass. This vegetation type was created by the clearing of the ancient forests. The plant communities are a mixture of native or introduced grasses and forbs on grassland sites or mixed herbaceous communities resulting from the clearing of woody vegetation and may represent the early stages in the development of the Young Forest vegetation type (McMahan et al. 1984:29).

Fauna

Probably the most important faunal resources in the region would have been species such as deer, squirrel, rabbit, and turtle, which have generally been among the most numerous animal remains recovered from archeological sites in Northeast Texas (Bruseth and Perttula 1981). Deer, due to its large size, actually provided the bulk of protein in the diet of prehistoric and early historic peoples. Remains of reptiles other than turtle, and small rodents, have also been recovered from archeological contexts at many sites in Texas, but it is difficult to discern whether or not they contributed to the diet or were simply intrusive into the deposits (Martin et al. 1987). In addition, it is safe to say that numerous types of invertebrates were abundant within the WMA, along with various types of molluscs, including both bivalves and gastropods, and crustaceans known to have been used by southeastern Native American tribes (Swanton 1946). Among the fish resources, economically important families for both prehistoric and historic populations probably would have included gar, crappie, bass, buffalo, shad, sucker, carp, bowfin, shiner, pickerel, catfish, sunfish, and drum (Heartfield and Dieste 1984a:2-5, 1984b:2-5). Of the amphibians, only true frogs are
valued for dietary purposes today, while the full range of frogs, turtles, turtle eggs, salamanders, and alligators would have been useful for both prehistoric and early historic populations. A wide variety of migratory birds, such as ducks, geese, and cranes, would have been most numerous in the late fall and early winter, while other resident birds, such as turkeys, doves, and pigeons, would have been available on a year-round basis.

CULTURAL SETTING

Introduction

The area of extreme Northeast Texas, which includes the WMA, is included within the archeological region known as the Great Bend (Schambach 1982:1), which takes its name from the Great Bend of the Red River at Fulton, Arkansas. It includes that portion of the Red River drainage between extreme southeastern Oklahoma and the vicinity of Shreveport, Louisiana. As an archeological area, the Great Bend includes portions of Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana, and Arkansas, and is centered in Arkansas and Louisiana (Schambach 1982:Figure 1-2). In Northeast Texas, the Great Bend region includes the lower reaches of the Sulphur River and White Oak Creek, on which the WMA is located.

The following sections are intended to provide a general background to the archeology of Northeast Texas. The first section gives a brief summary of previous archeological research carried out within the general area of the Sulphur River basin. The second briefly discusses the nature of the prehistoric and historic Native American archeological records in broad terms, and the third considers the historic Euro-American and African-American settlement in the area.

Previous Archeological Research

In recent years, several detailed overviews of the development of prehistoric archeology in the WMA specifically (Cliff and Peter 1992; Perttula 1988a; Peter et al. 1991:Appendix I), and in East Texas in general (Guy 1990), have been written and the interested reader is referred to them for more detail. Organized archeological research in Northeast Texas has a relatively long history, going as far back as 1911 with Clarence B. Moore’s river boat survey of sites along the Red River in Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas (Moore 1912). In the 1920s and early 1930s, researchers from the University of Texas undertook intermittent investigations in Northeast Texas, aimed primarily at the many large mound sites in this region, although the research was limited by difficulties in funding (Barnard 1939; Dickinson 1941; Goldschmidt 1935; Jackson 1932; Krieger 1946; Lewis 1987; Pearce 1932; Scurlock 1962). This situation improved in the late 1930s, when additional funding for archeology became available through the Works Progress Administration (WPA), a federal jobs program (Creel 1984; Davis 1970; Hamilton 1972; Schambach 1982). At the same time, avocational archeologists from Dallas and Texarkana also began to work in the region (see for example, Harris 1953 and Miroir n.d.).

Following World War II, the federal government began a program of reservoir construction in many states, including Texas. These investigations, conducted by the River Basin Survey (RBS) and its successors, were undertaken at, among others, Wright Patman Lake (Jelks 1961; Stephenson 1950) and Cooper Lake (Duffield 1959; Gilmore and Hoffrichter 1964; Johnson 1962; Moorman and Jelks 1952). Additional research was subsequently undertaken at Wright Patman Lake (Briggs and Malone 1970) and Cooper Lake (Doehner and Larson 1978; Doehner et al. 1978; Hyatt and Doehner 1975; Hyatt and Skinner 1971; Hyatt et al. 1974) during the 1970s. The Cooper Lake project became active again in the mid-1980s and, as part of this effort, additional archeology was undertaken (Bailey et al. 1991; Bousman et al. 1988; Cliff et al. 1995; Fields et al. 1991, 1993, 1994; Gadus, Fields, and Bousman 1992; Gadus, Fields, Bousman, Tomka, and Howard 1992).
Research at the WMA began with the preparation of a research design for the project (Peter et al. 1990). Soon after, intensive pedestrian survey of selected portions of the WMA began (Cliff, ed. 1994; Cliff and Peter 1992; Cliff, White, Hunt, Pleasant, and Shaw 1996). This was followed by test excavations at three sites (41CS150, 41CS151, 41CS155/156) in 1992-1993 (Cliff and Hunt 1995) and two sites (41BW553 and 41TT670) in 1996 (Largent et al. 1997). Finally, mitigation of Area C at site 41CS151 was undertaken in 1993 (Cliff, Green, Hunt, Shanabrook, and Peter 1996).

A concern for historic Euro-American and African-American archaeological remains in Northeast Texas is an extremely recent development compared to prehistoric research in the area. Prior to the 1970s, historic archeological and architectural sites in Northeast Texas generally were not considered to have a significant research potential (Perttula 1988a:16). Historic archeology in Northeast Texas has largely concentrated on mid-nineteenth to twentieth century occupations, reflecting the limited nature of prior European contacts. One important exception to this is the Roseborough Lake site, the location of an eighteenth-century French trading post and a later, early-nineteenth century component (Gilmore 1986).

This increased interest in historic archeology has been expressed primarily through the recording and evaluation of historic sites during intensive pedestrian surveys. Large numbers of historic sites were identified during the University of North Texas’ Red River Archeological Project (Gilmore and McCormick 1980, 1982), as well as in recent surveys at Cooper Lake (Bailey et al. 1991; Jurney and Bohlin 1993; Jurney et al. 1993; McGregor and Roemer 1989) and the Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant/Red River Army Depot (Cliff and Peter 1994; Espey, Huston and Associates, Inc., 1980; Peter and Cliff 1990a, 1990b). More extensive investigations have been undertaken at historic sites at Cooper Lake, including test excavation (Green et al. 1996; McGregor et al. 1996; Perttula 1989), the relocation of the Tucker and Sinclair cemeteries (Lebo 1988; Winchell et al. 1992), and the mitigation of the James Frank site (41DT97; Perttula, ed. 1989).

Native American Culture History

The following brief discussion of the prehistoric archeological record in the vicinity of the WMA in Northeast Texas draws from previous summaries by Perttula (1988a), Story (1981, 1990), and Thurmond (1990). Following Kenmotsu and Perttula (1993), the period of Native American occupation in Northeast Texas has been subdivided into eight temporal divisions, with the later periods being the best dated (Table 1).

The Paleo-Indian period (ca. 9500-7000 B.C.) is the earliest generally recognized period of human occupation of Eastern North America. Sites of this period are characterized by the presence of lanceolate projectile points, such as Clovis, Plainview, Dalton, Scottsbluff, and San Patrice. The use of nonlocal lithic materials, often derived from considerable distances, suggests a high degree of group mobility (Meltzer and Smith 1986; Shafer 1977; Story 1990:177). These groups are usually characterized as ‘big game hunters’ from their association with extinct megafauna kill sites; however, more recent work at sites such as Aubrey (41DN479) in North Central Texas (Ferring 1989), suggests that other resources were also being exploited. Most of the Paleo-Indian materials from Northeast Texas are either isolated surface finds or mixed with later
Table 1
Native American Cultural Sequence for the Great Bend Region of Northeast Texas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporal Period</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paleo-Indian</td>
<td>9500 - 7000 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaic</td>
<td>7000 - 200 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Ceramic</td>
<td>200 B.C. - A.D. 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative Caddoan</td>
<td>A.D. 800 - 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Caddoan</td>
<td>A.D. 1000 - 1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Caddoan</td>
<td>A.D. 1200 - 1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Caddoan</td>
<td>A.D. 1400 - 1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Caddoan</td>
<td>A.D. 1680 - 1860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

materials (Carley n.d.; Perttula 1988a:17); only rarely have Paleo-Indian sites in good stratigraphic context been found (Perttula 1988a:17; Preston 1972, 1974), and fewer have received any sort of systematic excavation. Horizontally stratified early Paleo-Indian deposits may have been present at the Forrest Murphey site (41MR62), at Lake O’ the Pines, but the site was reportedly destroyed by dam construction before being excavated (Perttula 1988a:17; Perttula et al. 1986:47; Story 1990:184-185). The discoveries of the Forrest Murphey and Aubrey sites suggest that well-preserved Paleo-Indian sites in Northeast Texas will only be found by examining deeply stratified terraces or by penetrating more recent Holocene alluvium in modern flood plain situations.

The Archaic period is characterized by increasing complexity of settlement systems, increasing population size and density, increasing sedentism, and the development of distinct group territories (Perttula 1988a:17; Story 1985:52). It is subdivided into three “subperiods:” Early (7000 to 4000 B.C.), Middle (4000 to 2000 B.C.), and Late (2000 to 200 B.C.). (Fields and Tomka 1993; Peter et al. 1991:Appendix I; Story 1985, 1990). Archaic remains are usually found in upland settings and are frequently mixed with later material (Campbell et al. 1983; Story 1981). Although definite steps toward food production were being taken elsewhere in the eastern United States during this period (Ford 1985:347-349; Watson 1988), no such evidence of food production has been reported for Northeast Texas in the Archaic (Perttula 1988a:17; Story 1990:Table 56).

The Early Ceramic period (200 B.C.-A.D. 800) is generally not well defined and is largely identified by similarities in pottery and projectile points to sites of the Fourche Maline tradition north of the Red River (Perttula et al. 1993; Peter et al. 1991:Appendix I; Story 1990). Despite these similarities to Fourche Maline, no Early Ceramic period burial mounds are known in the Texas portion of the Great Bend. The few that are known in East Texas occur to the south, in the Sabine and Neches river basins around the Toledo Bend and Sam Rayburn areas (see Story 1990:Figure 41), and at the Coral Snake (16SA48) and Jonas Short (41SA25) mound sites (Jensen 1968; McClurkan et al. 1966, 1980). The lack of such evidence in Northeast Texas leaves open the question of whether or not this area was undergoing the same processes of cultural evolution presumably responsible for the development of burial mound building elsewhere (see Perttula 1988a:18; Story 1990). Perttula (1988a:18) has noted an apparent concentration of Early Ceramic period sites within the Sulphur River basin, although this may be more the result of intensity of research or factors of site preservation rather than the actual presence of an unusually large Early Ceramic population.
The Formative (A.D. 800-1000) and Early Caddoan (A.D. 1000-1200) periods in Northeast Texas are not well defined. These periods are characterized by what may best be termed the Alto complex or Alto sphere, a widespread manifestation related to the Alto phase, originally defined at the George C. Davis site in Cherokee County, Texas, south of the Great Bend area (Newell and Krieger 1949). The Alto complex is strongly influenced by the Coles Creek culture, which it appears to partially overlap in time. There are, however, a number of differentiating characteristics (Neuman 1970), such as new projectile point types (i.e., Hayes and Homan arrow points), new ceramic vessel forms (i.e., the carinated bowl and the bottle), and new modes of vessel decoration (i.e., fine engraving with red pigment filler). It has been suggested that these and other cultural innovations, including the introduction of the bow and arrow and increased food production based on maize, may have led to increases in population and sociopolitical complexity during these periods (Perttula 1988a:18).

The Middle Caddoan period (A.D. 1200-1400) in the Great Bend region includes what is known as the Haley phase. The Haley phase appears to represent a development out of the earlier Alto complex and continuities from the earlier period include the use of shaft grave burials for some members of the society, who were accompanied into the afterlife by relatively rich grave offerings (Kelley et al. 1988:26). This phase was centered in the Great Bend area in Arkansas, but northwestern Louisiana and Northeast Texas did fall within its peripheral influence and a Haley phase component has been recognized at the Hatchel site in Bowie County (Davis 1970:44). Despite its presence in Texas, however, the Haley phase was apparently most fully elaborated in the Arkansas portion of the Great Bend. The complexity of the mortuary ceremonialism and apparent status ranking evident in the burials recovered from Haley phase sites, as well as the presumed organizational control necessary to construct the mound centers, strongly suggests that there was “a political and religious hierarchy that operated throughout the Haley Focus [sic] society” (Wyckoff 1974:110).

The Late Caddoan period (A.D. 1400-1680) includes the final part of the prehistoric period and the initial years of European contact (for a recent overview of this period and the subsequent Historic Caddoan period, see Perttula 1992). The survivors of the de Soto entrada apparently entered Northeast Texas about midway through the Late Caddoan period, and the latter part appears to have overlapped with the initial movements of European explorers and traders into the area. In the lower Sulphur River basin in Northeast Texas, two archeological complexes have been defined for the Late Caddoan period—the Titus phase and the Texarkana phase (Schambach 1982; Thurmond 1985). The Titus phase appears to be centered in Titus and Camp counties, while the Texarkana phase is located in the upper portion of the Great Bend of the Red River and extends southward to include a portion of the lower Sulphur River drainage (Wyckoff 1974:Figure 4). Both the Titus and Texarkana phases appear to be characterized by small hamlets or farmsteads which were probably occupied by small family groups of shifting agriculturalists. These farmsteads contain a limited number of structures and a small family cemetery (see Brewington et al. 1995; Jelks 1961; Perttula 1988a) and were presumably associated with larger, more permanent suprhousehold sites (both mound centers and nonmound cemeteries) which served to integrate the scattered households into a unified social group. In the case of the Titus phase, this function appears to have been served solely by large mortuary sites which served as cemeteries for a portion of the society. In contrast to this, the Texarkana phase appears to have retained the older pattern of mound ceremonial centers, such as the Hatchel site.

The Historic Caddoan period (A.D. 1680-1860) began with the explorations of the survivors of La Salle’s Texas colony and ended with the expulsion of the Caddo from Texas in 1859. European contacts with the region were intermittent until the late seventeenth century, when French explorers entered the area. This prompted Spanish expeditions to emphasize Spanish claims to the region and also resulted in the founding of missions among the Caddo. The group closest to the project area was the Kadohadacho Confederacy, originally composed of five groups: the Kadohadacho, the Petit Caddo, the Upper Natchitoches, the Upper Nasoni, and the Nanatsoho. According to Williams (1974:286), the Upper Yatasi and the Cahinnio joined the confederacy at a later time, possibly in the early eighteenth century in the case of the Cahinnio and in the 1760s in the case of the Yatasi.
Between 1788 and 1800, the groups of the Kadohadacho Confederacy were forced south into Louisiana by the severity of Osage raids (Smith 1995:82-83; Williams 1974:297), where they settled on Caddo Lake. The Kadohadacho remained here until they agreed to leave Louisiana and enter Texas following the signing of the Caddo Treaty of 1835 (Williams 1974:309). By 1854, they were residing, along with other Native American groups, on a tract of land on the Brazos River in North Central Texas which had been selected for them (with their help) by the federal government. Subsequently, they were moved to what was then Indian Territory in 1859 (Swanton 1946:99).

European and American Historical Background

The period of European exploration and settlement, and the subsequent North American and African-American development of Northeast Texas, is briefly covered in the remaining section of this chapter. For more extensive treatments of this period in Northeast Texas, the reader is referred to Peter and Cliff (1990a:Chapters 3 and 7) and Peter et al. (1991:Appendix J).

The earliest Europeans known to have visited Northeast Texas were the remnants of the de Soto expedition under Luis de Moscoso de Alvarado. However, regular contact between the Europeans and Caddo did not begin until the late sixteenth century, when French explorers, probing down the Mississippi River and along the Gulf Coast, established the colony of Louisiana. In order to bolster their claims to the region and defend the border of New Spain against French encroachment, the Spanish sent several expeditions into the region and established the first missions among the Caddo. Texas was established by the Spanish during the eighteenth century, but Spanish influence among the Caddo remained minimal due to the distance from their base in New Spain, and the superior attractions offered by the French. Following the Seven Years' War, the colony of Louisiana was ceded by France to Spain, obviating the need for a strong Spanish presence along the border. In the early 1800s, Spain retroceded Louisiana to France, from whom it was purchased by the United States in 1803.

Aggressive American settlers soon began to infiltrate Northeast Texas, which was considered part of Miller County, Arkansas. The Spanish and, after 1821, Mexicans were unable to stop the flow of Americans into Texas. Incompatibilities between Mexican practice and American expectations led to increasing turmoil within Texas and, in 1836, to the Texas Revolution. The economy of the region at first consisted of subsistence agriculture by yeoman farmers; however, after the 1830s cotton plantations became an increasingly important segment of the local economy. In both 1850 and 1860, slaves made up over half of the population of Bowie County, while the other three counties were not far behind (see Campbell 1989:Maps 4 and 5).

Given the origins of most of its inhabitants, it is not surprising that Texas supported secession in 1860. Northeast Texas was fortunate to escape the direct impact of the Civil War, although its inhabitants suffered from the interruption in trade and the collapse of the southern economy after the war. Following the war and the emancipation of the slaves, a new economic system arose based on tenancy and sharecropping, preserving as much of the antebellum social structure as possible. The extension of the railroads into Northeast Texas during this period allowed other resources, such as lumber, iron, and coal, to be exploited.

Dramatic changes occurred in Northeast Texas during the 1920s and 1930s. The discovery of oil and gas deposits in the region added a strong economic underpinning for the area, while the Depression led to the abandonment of many farms in the region—largely those of tenants and sharecroppers. Since World War II, the region has been characterized by economic stability and increasing urbanization, with the expansion of medium-size urban centers such as Texarkana and Mount Pleasant. While agriculture, lumbering, and coal have remained significant industries, tourism and recreation have become increasingly more significant in the region.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND METHODS

The cultural resources investigations reported on here were undertaken in order to identify any prehistoric or historic archeological sites, or any other important cultural resources, contained within 245 acres of the White Oak Creek Wildlife Management Area (WMA), in Cass, Morris, and Titus counties, Texas (Figures 2, 3, and 4). This cultural resources work was undertaken with three primary management goals in mind:

1. to locate cultural resources occurring within the designated survey areas;
2. to assess the significance of those resources in regard to their potential for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP); and
3. to make recommendations for the treatment of those resources based on their NRHP assessments.

For the 245 acres considered in this report, the first of these goals was accomplished by a program of intensive pedestrian survey and shovel testing undertaken using the field methodology described in the second part of this chapter. As a result of this investigation, one prehistoric locality was discovered. The locality is considered to be ineligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

INTENSIVE SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The intensive pedestrian survey of the 245 acres discussed in this report was undertaken in three phases. The main part of the effort was undertaken on July 16-17, 1997, by a five-person crew (one field supervisor and four crew members), with additional visits made to the area on July 23, 1997, and August 20, 1997, by a crew of two persons. In all, the pedestrian survey involved a total of 12 person-days in the field, for an average daily work figure of 20.4 acres surveyed per person-day. A literature and archival search was conducted to determine if any previously recorded sites are present within the project area. Site records of the Texas Archeological Research Laboratory (TARL) at the University of Texas at Austin were consulted. No previously recorded sites were found within the survey areas.

In undertaking their work, the field crews systematically traversed the survey areas in parallel transects at varying intervals of 20-30 m. Since ground cover hindered site detection in most areas, shovel tests were excavated frequently in all locations which were judged to have any probability of archeological deposits, such as (1) level to moderately level upland edges at the tops of slopes overlooking stream bottoms; (2) level to moderately level terraces adjacent to stream flood plains; (3) level to moderately level knolls or benches on or at the base of slopes adjacent to stream flood plains; and (4) flood plain rises or levee remnants. These shovel tests usually were excavated to (or into) the clay subsoil, or to a depth of 50 cm, whichever was...
Figure 2. Topographic map of the 201-acre survey area in Titus County.
Figure 3. Topographic map of the 10-acre survey area in Morris County.
Figure 4. Topographic map of the 34-acre survey area in Cass County.
applicable. The fill from these survey shovel tests was screened through 6.4-mm hardware cloth. An area
was considered to contain a site when cultural materials were collected from two or more shovel tests
excavated at approximately 20-m intervals. Cultural properties that fell below this threshold were considered
nonsite localities or isolated finds. A standardized Survey Unit Form was completed for each shovel test
which contained cultural remains. These forms described, at a minimum, the soil colors and textures
observed in the unit and the cultural materials recovered.

Fifty-four shovel tests were excavated during the period of fieldwork for this project, for an average of one
shovel test for every 4.5 acres surveyed. The number of shovel tests is unusually low, since much of the
survey area consisted of steep slopes or the bottom of drainage gullies (see Figures 2, 3, and 4). The upland
portions of the survey areas all appeared to have been cleared for cultivation at one time, with the 201-acre
survey area in Titus County having been under the plow most recently. This apparently resulted in thin to
nonexistent topsoil across much of the upland portions of the survey area. Surface erosion was especially
severe in the 10-acre and 34-acre survey areas, in Morris and Cass counties, respectively.

ARTIFACT TREATMENT AND ANALYSIS

Cultural artifacts collected during this phase of survey at the WMA were removed to the laboratory facilities
of Geo-Marine, Inc. (GMI), in Plano, Texas, where all artifacts were washed, catalogued, and labeled in
compliance with TARL standards. Artifact analysis was undertaken at GMI's facilities by GMI personnel.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

RESULTS

As previously described, only one cultural property was found within the three survey areas—a prehistoric locality.

Locality 1

Locality 1 consists of an isolated find of one flake in a shovel test in a heavily dissected area near the eastern edge of the 201-acre survey area in Titus County (see Figure 2). Four additional shovel tests were dug at 20- to 30-m intervals surrounding the initial unit, with the interval varying in order to place the shovel tests in areas that were not eroded. None of these additional shovel tests contained any other cultural material. The artifact recovered is an unmodified, chert, secondary flake that has been heat treated. It is between 6.3 and 9.5 mm in size and weighs .3 g. Based on the ephemeral nature of Locality 1, it is believed to have no research potential, and it is recommended that it be considered ineligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of the intensive pedestrian survey of 245 acres at the White Oak Creek Wildlife Management Area (WMA) in Titus, Morris, and Cass counties, only one cultural resource, a prehistoric locality, was identified. This locality consisted of an isolated flake in a single shovel test. Additional shovel testing in this vicinity uncovered no other material. This locality is considered ineligible for inclusion in the NRHP and no further work is required.
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APPENDIX A

CURATED MATERIALS
RESULTING FROM THE 245-ACRE SURVEY
AT THE WHITE OAK CREEK
WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT AREA (WMA)
CURATED MATERIALS

The materials from this investigation are curated at the Texas Archeological Research Laboratory (TARL) at the University of Texas, Austin. The following list of items enumerates the materials curated at this facility under Purchase Order DACW63-97-P-0884, with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District:

1. One copy of the Scope of Work;
2. One copy of the Final Report;
3. All of the original field notes, maps, and records; and
4. One acid-free copy of all field notes, maps, and records.