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ABSTRACT

An archaeological survey of the route of the proposed Drennan Road and Plantation Drive in central Montgomery County, Texas was performed by Brazos Valley Research Associates (BVRA) on July 13, 2010 under Antiquities Permit 5696 for the City of Conroe. The total length of the two roads as currently proposed is 5170 feet, and the area investigated consisted of 7.4 acres. No archaeological sites were found, and no artifacts were collected. Copies of the report are on file at the Texas Historical Commission, Texas Archeological Research Laboratory, the Texas State Library, City of Conroe, and BVRA.
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DEFINITION OF STUDY AREA

The City of Conroe plans to construct two new roads as Phase I of the proposed Plantation Drive and Drennan Road Project in the city limits of Conroe (Figure 1). The new roads will be named Drennan Road and Plantation Drive. Construction of Plantation Drive will begin at Farm-to-Market Road 3083 and extend 3920 feet to the south where it will connect with the proposed Drennan Road. From there, the new road will extend 1250 feet to the west where it will connect with Interstate Highway 45. Both roads will consist of four lanes and a median. The project area is depicted on the USGS 7.5' topographic quadrangle Conroe (3095-132) dated 1958 and photorevised in 1976 (Figure 2) and an aerial photograph dated 2005 (Figure 3).
Figure 1. General Location
Figure 2. Project Area on Topographic Quadrangle
Figure 3. Project Area on Aerial Photograph
MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

This project was performed in order to identify any cultural resources that might be present within the project area. The client is the City of Conroe, and BVRA was retained to perform the archaeological survey. William E. Moore was the Principal Investigator. Edward P. Baxter was the Project Archaeologist, and he was assisted by Philip C. Bishop. The field survey involved sixteen person hours and was performed on July 13, 2010. The reviewing agency is the Texas Historical Commission, Archeology Division.
METHODS

Prior to entering the field, the site records at the Texas Archeological Research Laboratory and the Texas Archeological Sites Atlas were checked for the presence of previously recorded sites and prior archaeological surveys and projects in the project area and vicinity. Relevant archaeological reports documenting work in Montgomery County were reviewed in order to become familiar with the types of prehistoric and historic sites found in the area. Those reports reviewed include work in the San Jacinto River Basin by Harry J. Shafer (1968) and a 450-acre tract in Harris and Montgomery counties conducted by BVRA (Moore 1991). The project area was investigated by a 100% Pedestrian Survey and shovel testing. Shovel tests were dug to sterile clay in most areas. Two tests were excavated in areas where gravel and concrete and overburden spoil was present. Excavated earth from the tests was screened using ¼ inch hardware cloth. Shovel test data were entered onto a log (Appendix I), and the project was documented through field notes and digital photography. Sixteen shovel tests were excavated (Figure 4).
Figure 4. Location of Shovel Tests
RESULTS

Examination of the files at TARL in Austin, Texas and the Atlas revealed no previously recorded prehistoric sites had been recorded in close proximity to the project area. In addition, there is no evidence that the area had been visited by a professional archaeologist. At the time of this survey, the northern two-thirds of the area was in developed pasture that had been heavily disturbed by plowing, ponds, contouring, and a road to an office complex. The rest of the area was in thick woods. Soils in the area consisted of sandy loam over clay in most areas. At two shovel test locations, clay was observed at the surface, and two areas had been disturbed by overburden and spoil, gravel, and concrete. Most of the shovel tests were terminated at depths of 65 cm or less when clay was encountered. Only two tests were dug past this depth, and they were stopped at 90 cm and 100 cm. Figure 5 illustrates the pasture present in the northern portion of the project area. No archaeological sites were found, and it is our opinion that the project area was not occupied in prehistoric times because of the distance from the area to a perennial stream. The nearest such water source is Stewarts Creek that is 8000 feet to the east.
Figure 5. View of Pasture in Project Area
RECOMMENDATIONS

No evidence of a prehistoric or historic site was found as a result of this survey. It is recommended that the client be allowed to proceed with construction as planned. Should evidence of an archaeological site be encountered during the construction of the road, all work must stop until the Texas Historical Commission can evaluate the situation. This survey was conducted in accordance with the Minimum Survey Standards as outlined by the Texas Historical Commission.
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## APPENDIX I: SHOVEL TEST LOG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shovel Test</th>
<th>Depth (cm)</th>
<th>Soil Type</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>sandy loam over clay</td>
<td>clay at 40 cm (pasture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>disturbed</td>
<td>overburden spoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>old road cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>sandy loam over clay</td>
<td>clay at 30 cm (pasture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>disturbed</td>
<td>gravel and concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>sandy loam over gravel</td>
<td>deflated pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>clay silt/ gravels</td>
<td>deflated pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>sandy loam over clay</td>
<td>clay at 10 cm (woods by drainage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>sandy loam over clay</td>
<td>clay at 30 cm deflated pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>sandy loam over clay</td>
<td>clay at 55 cm (wooded area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>sandy loam over clay</td>
<td>clay at 90 cm (wooded area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>sandy loam over clay</td>
<td>clay at 55 cm (wooded area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>wooded area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>sandy loam over clay</td>
<td>clay at 30 cm (wooded area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>sandy loam over clay</td>
<td>clay at 90 cm (wooded area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>sandy loam over clay</td>
<td>clay at 45 cm (wooded area)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>