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ABSTRACT

An archaeological survey for the proposed Drennan Road East in central Montgomery County, Texas was performed by Brazos Valley Research Associates (BVRA) on July 13, 2010 under Antiquities Permit 5698 for the City of Conroe. The new road will be 2150 feet long and 62 feet wide (3.1 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.
DEFINITION OF STUDY AREA

The City of Conroe plans to construct a new road to be named Drennan Road East in the city limits of Conroe, Texas as Phase III of the proposed Plantation Drive and Drennan Road Project (Figure 1). The new road will begin at the intersection of the proposed Plantation Drive North and Plantation Drive South and extend east to North Frazier Street (State Highway 75). The new road will be 2150 feet in length and 62 feet in width (3.1 acres), and it 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 Phillip 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 primarily by shovel testing, since most of the ground surface was obscured with forest litter due to the presence of thick woods. Shovel tests were dug to sterile clay, and 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. Eight 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. Also, there is no evidence that the area has been surveyed or visited by a professional archaeologist. At the time of this investigation, the area was in thick woods with poor surface visibility (Figure 5). Disturbance was observed in the area of shovel tests 5-8 where clearing and scraping had taken place. Five of the eight shovel tests encountered clay at or within 10 cm of the surface, and clay was present at 25 cm in one test. The only shovel test that was dug through deep sandy soil was the first test at the extreme western end of the proposed road. It was dug through 90 cm of sandy loam before clay was encountered. The only structure within the right-of-way is a modern metal building that was being used for storage. This structure will be demolished or moved, but it has no architectural or historic significance. 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 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>90</td>
<td>sandy loam over clay</td>
<td>clay at 90 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>sandy loam over clay</td>
<td>clay at surface (wooded area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>sandy loam over clay</td>
<td>clay at 25 cm (wooded area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>sandy loam over clay</td>
<td>clay at 10 cm (wooded area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>clay at 10 cm (partly cleared and scraped)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>clay at surface (partly cleared and scraped)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>clay at surface (partly cleared and scraped)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>clay at surface (partly cleared and scraped)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>