3.15 CULTURAL RESOURCES

3.15.1 Introduction

"Cultural resources" are defined as the broad pattern of events, real properties, and cultural life ways or practices that have significance to humans. Buildings and places where events have occurred, archeological sites containing information about human activities, traditional places or activities that hold special significance, and folkways that are practiced as either cultural or life sustaining are all part of the broad category features of groups of people. Cultural resources typically found in or near the LOMR include Native American habitation and burial sites, historic trails, settlements, farmsteads, shipwrecks, bridges, and dams.

3.15.2 Regulatory Setting

Projects involving federal land, funds, review, or permitting are subject to compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA of 1966 (16 USC 470). Section 106 requires federal agencies such as the USACE to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. An "historic property" is any district, archeological site, structure, sacred site, or object that is included on or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). As the lead federal agency with jurisdiction over the permitting of commercial dredging along the LOMR, the USACE is responsible for ensuring compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA and other pertinent cultural resource laws and regulations. Section 106 also requires that the USACE consult with SHPOs, federally recognized Native American tribes, local governments, and other interested parties regarding the proposed undertaking. In addition, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) would be consulted for projects adversely impacting historic properties.

Part of the USACE's responsibility under the NHPA is to determine areas that may be affected by the undertaking, or the Area of Potential Effect (APE). Project-related activities with the potential to directly affect historic properties include excavation and removal of sand and gravel from the main channel of the LOMR. Potential indirect effects that may result from increased river bed degradation related to dredging include erosion, induced instability, headcutting, and related channel effects from dredging activities. Areas affected by erosion induced by headcutting could include banks of the LOMR and localized areas of tributaries. Because of the above known and potential impacts, the APE for this Project was determined to include the main channel of the LOMR from the confluence of the Missouri

and Mississippi Rivers in St. Louis, Missouri (RM 0) to Rulo, Nebraska at RM 498 and extending from the top of bank to approximately 50 feet below the river bottom (i.e., the greatest potential depth of dredging activities). The APE also includes perennial tributaries joining the LOMR for a distance of 0.25 mile upstream or to the first upstream control point. A "control point" includes any natural streambed feature or human-made structure that provides grade control and controls or impedes the upstream progress of a headcut. Because degradation of the tributaries is not likely to extend more than 20 feet beyond the current banks of the LOMR and its tributaries, the APE extends 20 feet landward of each bank.

Sand plants owned and operated by the dredging permit applicants are not included in the APE as they were previously permitted by the USACE, if authorization was required. It is reasonably foreseeable that some alternatives may result in extraction of sand or gravel from new upland mining sources. These upland mining sources are not included in the APE for this Project because actions related to the upland mining sources would not be subject to any of the USACE permits that would be issued under this Project. Construction and operation of proposed sand plants and alternate mining sources were considered in the indirect effects analysis (See Section 4.13).

3.15.3 Cultural Resources Setting

The cultural setting establishes the prehistoric and historic context from which to identify and evaluate historic properties. The setting focuses on major prehistoric and historic themes that have occurred in the area over time.

3.15.3.1 Prehistoric Context

The regional precontact chronology for Missouri has been divided into the following five cultural periods: Paleoindian (12,000–8,000 before Christ [BC]), Dalton (8,000–7,000 BC), Archaic (7,000–1,000 BC), Woodland (1,000 BC – *Anno domini* [AD] 900), and Mississippian (AD 900–1,700) (Chapman 1975, 1980). Each time period can be further subdivided into further defined periods (i.e. Early, Middle, and Late Archaic). Also, because the Project area is long, roughly 517 river miles in length, localized cultural expressions in some portions of the Project area differ somewhat from other areas (e.g., the Kansas City Hopewell and Steed-Kisker cultural components found near Kansas City and the Cahokia cultural complex found near St. Louis). The following discussion traces the broad periods of human settlement and the associated artifacts and sites that may exist within the APE.

The Paleoindian Period (12,000–8,000 BC) is defined by nomadic hunters whose ancestors migrated to North America from northeast Asia (Chapman 1975). These highly mobile hunters subsisted on large game, including the mammoth, mastodon, and giant bison. Numerous Paleoindian sites have been reported in the LOMR Valley near the greater vicinity of St. Louis (Chapman 1975, Warren and O'Brien 1982).

The Dalton Period (8,000–7,000 BC) was similar to the preceding Paleoindian Period. However, due to late Pleistocene/early Holocene environmental changes, subsistence strategies also changed. Changes from nomadic hunting to hunter-gatherer (forager) subsistence are indicated by a greater reliance on smaller game animals (Chapman 1975).

The Archaic Period (7,000–1,000 BC) is defined by a shift in subsistence strategies and technological change, evidenced through artifacts and faunal remains. The Archaic Period experienced a warming climate that created a wider variety of food sources, including riverine resources such as shellfish, turtles, and fish; plant foods; and game animals (Chapman 1975, Warren and O'Brien 1982). The shifted subsistence strategy used a greater diversity of resources and shifted to smaller animals, following the disappearance of the mega fauna. The increase in food resource variety initiated a general trend toward sedentary subsistence (Warren and O'Brien 1982). The appearance of large shell midden sites indicates an increase in the exploitation of aquatic resources in some major river valleys. Site numbers and densities increased throughout the Archaic Period. Archaic sites are present in all major river drainages in north Missouri.

The Woodland Period (1,000 BC – AD 900) saw an increase in settlement size and sedentary behavior (Warren and O'Brien 1982: 79). The most notable technological change was the introduction of pottery. Early Woodland sites along the LOMR are characterized by Black Sand Pottery, which likely was introduced from the north (Chapman and Chapman 1983). The middle Woodland Period is characterized by mound building, more refined grit-tempered ceramics, and greater importance on horticulture. The Middle Woodland is further associated with the Hopewellian Interaction Sphere (Caldwell 1964), which is reflected by specific design motifs on ceramic vessels, elite burials, and exotic exchange goods.

The Mississippian Period (AD 900–1,700) saw a rise in social complexity, extensive maize agriculture, mound construction, and long-distance trade (Chapman 1980). The most diagnostic artifact of the Mississippian Period is shell-tempered ceramics such as jars, bowls, plates, beakers, bottles, and large pans. The Mississippian site of Cahokia, near the City of St. Louis, is the largest precontact site north

of Mexico. The Mississippian culture spread from Cahokia up the Missouri River into Kansas, and a second center was located near Kansas City, Missouri (Chapman and Chapman 1983, Shippee 1972).

During the Protohistoric through early historic periods (approximately AD 1400 to AD 1820) the LOMR was within the territory of a number of tribes, including the Osage, Sauk, Otoe, Missouria, Kansa, and Peoria. The Missouria occupied villages along the Missouri River. One of the largest villages, Missouri Village, was documented west of the confluence of the Grand and LOMR (Chapman and Chapman 1983). Sometime between 1723 and 1728, the Osage moved next to the Missouri Village to be close to the French Orleans Fort so that they could engage in trade (Chapman and Chapman 1983). By 1800, following wars with neighboring tribes, the Sauk moved into the upper Mississippi in the vicinity of St. Louis.

3.15.3.2 Historic Context

This section outlines the major historic themes that shaped the development of the Missouri River basin.

Exploration and Settlement

Spanish explorers, followed by French and British fur traders, were the first Europeans to enter the Missouri River basin. In 1763, French authorities in New Orleans granted Maxent, Laclede, and Company exclusive rights to the fur trade on the Missouri River. The company began construction of a post in 1764, which was named for King Louis IX of France. By the end of 1764, approximately 40 families had settled in the new village of St. Louis. The settlers called the village *Pain Court* (short of bread), perhaps indicating early hardships or simply the lack of agriculture. St. Louis, as well as the future state of Missouri, became part of the Spanish Empire after the French were defeated in the Seven Years' War. In 1765, St. Louis became the capital of Spanish Upper Louisiana. Under the Spanish, residents were ethnically French; and French fur companies, in particular Laclede, dominated the economy (Journal Entry December 11, 1803 [The Journals of the Lewis and Clark Expedition 2005]).

In 1803, the Missouri River basin became part of the United States with the Louisiana Purchase. President Thomas Jefferson's interests in the basin's physical geography and ecology, and its Native American tribes led to the Lewis and Clark Expedition. The expedition explored the Missouri River basin from December 1803 to July 1804. During this time, Lewis and Clark documented the lifeways

and material culture of tribes, including the "Sauckee and Kickapoos;" numerous French settlements along the banks of the Missouri River, including St. Charles, La Charette, Jefferson City, Arrow Rock, Kansas City, and St. Joseph; and early American farmsteads (Journal Entry December 8, 1803, May 5, 1804 –June 1804 [The Journals of the Lewis and Clark Expedition 2005]).

After the Louisiana Purchase, most Americans moved into the established French villages, as well as St. Louis, as towns and cities expanded (Violette 1918: 43; City of St. Louis 2009). Other communities, such as St. Joseph, became remote outposts. St. Joseph served as a last supply point before the western frontier. From 1821 to 1826, St. Charles served as Missouri's first state capital (Violette 1918: 39). In 1826, the capital moved to Jefferson City—a trading post between St. Louis and Kansas City (McMillen and Murphy 1996).

Transportation

The steamboat contributed to further development of the Missouri River basin. Sixteen steamboats were operating in spring 1837; 4 years later, 26 boats were engaged in trade along the Lower Missouri (Petersen 1955: 101). Some steamboat landings were incorporated into towns, while others served simply as a point of transport. For example, Keytesville Landing (located in what is now Chariton County, Missouri) served as a landing for goods shipped to Keytesville about 6 miles north of the Missouri River. At one time, the landing consisted of a tobacco warehouse and general trading post (Smith and Gehrig 1923: 230).

Steamboats also drastically altered the riverine environment. For example, "One steamboat consumed 20 cords of wood a day on an upstream journey, which resulted in the elimination of forests along the riverbanks (Galat et al. 2005: 438)." The river was further altered to improve navigation and safety (see Sections 4.2.3 through 4.2.5). As early as 1824, Congress appropriated funds for the USACE to remove large tree snags and other obstacles in the Missouri River channel. Government snag boats and river-based work crews continued their efforts to improve navigability through the late 1870s (Missouri River Ecosystem 2002: 26).

The hazards associated with steamboat navigation were greater along the Missouri River than along the Mississippi River. During the early- to mid-18th century, hundreds of ships were lost due to snags, explosions, and collisions (Larson and Norris 2008: 65). The steamer *Saluda* exploded near Lexington, Missouri in 1852; the *Arabia*, a side-wheel steamboat, hit a snag in the Missouri River and sank near present day Parkville, Missouri in 1856; and the *Princess*, a stern-wheel steamer, sank at Napoleon,

Missouri in 1868 (Corbin 2000: 11-20, 147-157). Fluctuations in the main river channel have left many shipwrecks, such as the *Bedford* and *Argonaut*, miles away from the Missouri River (Larson and Norris 2008). The remains of wrecked steamboats serve to document specific stages of technology and a manner of commerce that was eventually replaced by railroads and automobiles.

Steamboating on the river reached its peak in the late 1850s and declined following development of the railroads. On July 4, 1851, at St. Louis, Missouri, ground-breaking for the Pacific Railroad marked the beginning of what would later be known as the Missouri Pacific Railroad (Sabin 1919). The first section of track was completed in 1852. In 1865, it became the first railroad to serve Kansas City. The Hannibal and Saint Joseph Railroad, which was completed in 1859 and linked the communities of Hannibal and St. Joseph, was the first to cross the Missouri River (Violette 1918: 237). Railroads would ultimately have a greater influence on the Missouri River basin's settlement patterns when compared to steamboats (Missouri River Ecosystem 2002: 24).

Bridges were necessary to the success of Missouri's transportation systems. Originally simply built, locally maintained structures, Missouri's bridges eventually reflected innovative designs and the use of stronger building materials, such as steel and concrete (Fraser 1996: 10). Bridges accommodating both railways and roadways were constructed into the 1940s. One of the more noteworthy railroad bridges is Kansas City's Armor, Swift, Burlington (ASB) Bridge, which sported a unique double-neck, vertical-lift structure that carried railroad and highway traffic. Originally, the bridge carried railroad traffic on its lower deck and automobile traffic on its upper deck (1996: 16). Bridge building advanced during the late 19th and early 20th centuries with the formation of national and local bridge companies. Construction companies followed national trends, which were moving away from regionally influenced designs, such as wooden covered bridges and various truss and arched styles, to more durable designs of pressed concrete.

3.15.4 Background Research

A background review of the APE and adjacent areas was conducted to identify specific previously recorded cultural resources within the APE. The research consisted of a review of the NRHP, *Abandoned Shipwrecks on Missouri River Channel Maps of 1879 and 1954* (USACE Kansas City District 2000), *Missouri Historic Bridge Inventory* (FRASER design 1996), Lewis and Clark Expedition data from the USACE GIS files, and GIS data and survey reports from the SHPOs of Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska. Where possible, NRHP eligibility determinations for specific sites were noted. The primary resource types identified from the records search were archaeology sites, shipwrecks, bridges,

and the Lewis and Clark Trail and campsites. A total of 128 cultural resources were identified in the Project APE. These resources include 91 shipwrecks, 12 Lewis and Clark campsites, 10 archaeology sites, and fifteen bridges. The majority of sites (112 or 88 percent) have not been relocated or evaluated for inclusion in the NRHP. In terms of location, 113 sites were identified in the main channel, 13 were identified along the banks of tributaries, and two were identified at a proposed sand plant location.

The general location of most cultural resources such as shipwrecks, bridges, and Lewis and Clark campsites are known; but many shipwrecks are reported in more than one location that are often widely separated. Also, because only part of the Project area previously has been inventoried for archeological sites, unrecorded prehistoric archeological sites could occur in the APE. Prehistoric sites are not likely within the active Missouri River channel or immediately adjacent to it through most of the LOMR area, however, because of scouring from the meandering river over the last 150 years.

The known cultural resources in the St. Joseph, Kansas City, Waverly, Jefferson City, and St. Charles segments of the LOMR are discussed in the following sections. Specific site type, name, and eligibility status of cultural resources in each segment are presented in Tables 3.15-1 through 3.15-5. To protect sites from looting or vandalism, specific site locations for archeological sites and shipwrecks are not presented in this document. Most of the cultural resources listed in the tables are reported as unevaluated because they have not been formally evaluated for eligibility for listing in the NRHP, either because they have not been evaluated as part of the Section 106 process or because the physical remains have not been identified. If identified and evaluated, all of the Lewis and Clark sites and most of the shipwrecks would be eligible for listing in the NRHP.

St. Joseph Segment

Table 3.15-1 outlines the 21 sites identified in the St. Joseph segment, which include 14 shipwrecks, two Lewis and Clark campsites, three bridges, and two archaeology sites. The three bridges are the only properties in this segment that are listed, or eligible for listing, in the NRHP. No cultural resources were identified within the perennial tributary buffer (0.25 mile upstream or to the first control point and 20 feet landward of each bank) in this segment. Two sites were identified at a potential sand plant location, and 18 sites were identified within the main channel of the LOMR.

Table 3.15-1 Cultural Resources in the St. Joseph Segment

Site Type	Site Name/No.	Location[a]	NRHP Eligibility
Bridge	Rulo	MC (RM 498)	Listed
Shipwreck	*Bertha*	MC	Unevaluated
Campsite	1806 Lewis and Clark	MC (RM 448.8)	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Emilie No. 2*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Denver City*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Dorothy*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Mt. Sterling*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Pathfinder*	MC	Unevaluated
Campsite	1806 Lewis and Clark	MC (RM 442.3)	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Missouri Mail*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Della*	MC	Unevaluated
Bridge	Atchison	MC (RM 422.6)	Eligible
Bridge	Leavenworth	MC	Eligible
Shipwreck	*Arabian*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Hesperian*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Platte Valley*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Tom Morgan*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Minnie*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Express*	MC	Unevaluated
Archaeology site	PL341	SP	Unevaluated
Archaeology site	PL110	SP	Unevaluated

Note: NRHP = National Register of Historic Places.

[a] Location: MC = Main channel; SP = Proposed sand plant location.

Sources: USACE 2000, FRASER Design 1996, USACE n.d.

Kansas City Segment

Table 3.15-2 outlines the 12 sites indentified in the Kansas City segment, which include five shipwrecks, six bridges, and one archaeology site. The six bridges are eligible for listing in the NRHP. All five shipwrecks are unevaluated as to their NRHP eligibility. One site, archaeology site PL288, was identified within the perennial tributary buffer. This site was determined ineligible for listing in the NRHP through survey and evaluation.

Table 3.15-2 Cultural Resources in the Kansas City Segment

Site Type	Site Name	Location [a]	NRHP Eligibility
Archaeology site	PL288	T	Not eligible
Bridge	Fairfax	MC (RM 372.6)	Eligible
Bridge	Fairfax (1955)	MC (RM 372.6)	Eligible
Bridge	Broadway	MC	Eligible
Shipwreck	*Fire Canoe*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Bennett*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Mike Bauer*	MC	Unevaluated
Bridge	Armour-Swift-Burlington (ASB) Railroad Bridge	MC (RM 365.6)	Eligible
Shipwreck	*Glenmore*	MC	Unevaluated
Bridge	Paseo	MC (RM 364.8)	Eligible
Bridge	Liberty Bend	MC (RM 352.7)	Eligible
Shipwreck	Corvette	MC	Unevaluated

Note: NRHP = National Register of Historic Places.

[a] Location: MC = Main channel; T = Tributary.

Sources: USACE 2000, FRASER Design 1996, USACE n.d.

Waverly Segment

Table 3.15-3 outlines the 15 shipwrecks that are located in the Waverly segment. None of the shipwrecks has been evaluated for their NRHP eligibility. The USACE established a no-dredge zone for the *Saluda*, which is located near the town of Lexington, Missouri. No cultural resources were identified within the perennial tributary buffer in the Waverly segment.

Table 3.15-3 Cultural Resources in the Waverly Segment

Site Type	Site Name	Location[a]	NRHP Eligibility
Shipwreck	*Wakendah*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Saluda*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Nymph*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Zephyr*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Missouri*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Princess*	MC	Unevaluated

Table 3.15-3 Cultural Resources in the Waverly Segment

Site Type	Site Name	Location[a]	NRHP Eligibility
Shipwreck	*Leavenworth*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Ariel*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Roy Lynds*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Eagle*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Diana*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Tropic*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*John Golong*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Govener Allen*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*T.T. Hilman*	MC	Unevaluated

Note: NRHP = National Register of Historic Places.

[a] Location: MC = Main channel.

Sources: USACE 2000, FRASER Design 1996, USACE n.d.

Jefferson City Segment

Table 3.15-4 outlines the 29 sites identified in the Jefferson City segment, which include 19 shipwrecks, six archaeology sites, three bridges, and one campsite. The Rocheport Bridge, Jefferson City Bridge and shipwreck *Radnor* were determined eligible for listing in the NRHP. The remaining sites have not been evaluated for their eligibility for listing in the NRHP. Eight sites were identified within the perennial tributary buffer, and 21 were identified within the main channel of the LOMR.

Table 3.15-4 Cultural Resources in the Jefferson City Segment

Site Type	Site Name/No.	Location[a]	NRHP Eligibility
Shipwreck	*Joseph Kinney*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Dart*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Timour*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Naomi*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Sonora*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*West Wind*	MC	Unevaluated
Bridge	Glasgow Railroad Bridge	MC (RM 226.3)	Not Eligible
Bridge	Rocheport Bridge	MC	Eligible
Bridge	Jefferson City	MC	Eligible
Shipwreck	*Annie Lee*	MC	Unevaluated

Table 3.15-4 Cultural Resources in the Jefferson City Segment

Site Type	Site Name/No.	Location[a]	NRHP Eligibility
Shipwreck	*Chariton*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Plow Boy No. 2*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Radnor*	MC	Eligible
Archaeology Site	MU134/MU135	T	Unevaluated
Archaeology Site	BO1000	T	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Little Dick*	T	Unevaluated
Archaeology Site	BO1100	T	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Marie*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Bright Light*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Martha Stevens*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Floyd*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Diana*	MC	Unevaluated
Archaeology site	CY28	T	Unevaluated
Archaeology site	CO52	T	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Statie Fisher*	MC	Unevaluated
Archaeology site	CO108	T	Unevaluated
Campsite	Lewis and Clark 1804	T	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Emma*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Dew Drop*	MC	Unevaluated

Note: NRHP = National Register of Historic Places.

[a] Location: MC = Main channel; T = Tributary.

Sources: USACE 2000, FRASER Design 1996, USACE n.d.

St. Charles Segment

Table 3.15-5 outlines the 51 sites that are located in the St. Charles segment. These sites include 38 shipwrecks, nine Lewis and Clark campsites, three bridges, and one archaeology site. Washington Bridge, Blanchette Bridge, and Daniel Boone Bridge are eligible for listing in the NRHP. The remaining sites and shipwrecks have not been evaluated for eligibility for the NRHP. Four sites were identified within the perennial tributary buffer, and 47 sites were identified within the main channel of the LOMR.

Table 3.15-5 Cultural Resources in the St. Charles Segment

Site Type	Site Name/No.	Location[a]	NRHP Eligibility
Shipwreck	*E.H. Durfee*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Camden*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Gus Fowler*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*New St. Paul*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Nodaway*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Lancaster*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Robert Emmett*	MC	Unevaluated
Campsite	1804 Lewis and Clark	MC (RM 108.2)	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Lancaster (1932)*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Mandan*	MC	Unevaluated
Archaeology Site	GA184	T	Unevaluated
Campsite	1804 Lewis and Clark	MC (RM 104.3)	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Chariton*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Cappa*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Alert*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Washington*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Lynchburgh*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Petral*	T	Unevaluated
Campsite	1804 Lewis and Clark	MC (RM 72.5)	Unevaluated
Campsite	1806 Lewis and Clark	MC (RM 72.1)	Unevaluated
Bridge	Washington Bridge	MC (RM 67.5)	Eligible
Bridge	Blanchette Bridge	MC	Eligible
Shipwreck	*Seventy-Six*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*John Bell*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Duncan S. Carter*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Montana*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Lily*	T	Unevaluated
Campsite	1804 Lewis and Clark	MC (RM 46.1)	Unevaluated
Bridge	Daniel Boone Bridge	MC (RM 43.9)	Eligible
Shipwreck	*James Lyons*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*General McNeil*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Ella Kimbrough*	MC	Unevaluated
Campsite	1804 Lewis and Clark	MC (RM 29.0)	Unevaluated

Table 3.15-5 Cultural Resources in the St. Charles Segment

Site Type	Site Name/No.	Location[a]	NRHP Eligibility
Shipwreck	*Tyler*	MC	Unevaluated
Campsite	1806 Lewis and Clark	MC (RM 28.4)	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Hermann*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*St. Anthony*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Hermann*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*St. Luke*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Benton No. 1*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Far West*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Halycyon*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Haidee*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Car of Commerce*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*John Hancock*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*New Georgetown*	MC	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Julia*	MC	Unevaluated
Campsite	1806 Lewis and Clark	MC (RM 7.0)	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Georgetown*	MC	Unevaluated
Campsite	*Lewis and Clark*	T (RM 7.0)	Unevaluated
Shipwreck	*Bald Eagle*	MC	Unevaluated

Note: NRHP = National Register of Historic Places.

[a] Location: MC = Main channel; T = Tributary.

Sources: USACE 2000, FRASER Design 1996, USACE n.d.

3.15.5 References

3.15.5.1 Printed Literature

Ambrose, S. E. 1996. Undaunted Courage. The Wilson Bulletin 100: 272–284.

Binford, L. R. 1980. Willow Smoke and Dogs' Tails: Hunter-Gatherer Settlement Systems and Archaeological Site Formation. American Antiquity 45: 4-20.

Caldwell, J. R. 1964. Interaction Spheres in Prehistory. Pp. 133–143 in Hopewellian Studies, J. R. Caldwell and R. L. Hall (eds.). Illinois State Museum Scientific Papers Volume. Illinois State Museum, Springfield.

Chapman, C. H. 1980. The Archaeology of Missouri, II. University of Missouri Press, Columbia.

Chapman, C. H. 1975. The Archaeology of Missouri, I. University of Missouri Press, Columbia.

Chapman, C. H. and E. F. Chapman. 1983. Indians and Archaeology in Missouri. University of Missouri Press, Columbia.

Corbin, A. 2000. The Material Culture of Steamboat Passengers: Archaeological Evidence from the Missouri River. New York: Klumer Academic/Plenum Publishers. Website (http://books.google.com/books?id =KDlt1jsnVVQC&pg=PP1&dq=The+Material+Culture+of+Steamboat+Passengers:+Archaeological+Evidence+from+the+Missouri+River&lr=#v=onepage&q=&f=false) accessed December 2009.

Division on Earth and Life Studies National Research Council. 2009. Washington, D.C: National Academy Press. Website (www.nap.edu/catalog/10277.html) accessed November 2009.

FRASER Design. 1996. Missouri Historic Bridge Inventory. Report submitted to the Missouri Highway and Transportation Department, Jefferson City, MO.

Galat, D. L., C. R. Berry, Jr., E. J. Peters, and R. G. White. 2005. Missouri River. Pp 427–480 in A.C. Berke and C.E. Cushing (eds.). Rivers of North America. Elsevier, Oxford.

Johnson, A. E. 1976. A Model of the Kansas City Hopewell Subsistence Settlement System. Pp. 7–15 in Hopewellian Archaeology in the Lower Missouri Valley, A. E. Johnson (ed.). University of Kansas Publications in Anthropology, Volume 8. University of Kansas, Lawrence.

The Journals of the Lewis and Clark Expedition. 2005. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press. Website (http://lewisandclarkjournals.unl.edu/) accessed January 2010.

Kay, M. 1980. The Central Missouri Hopewell Subsistence-Settlement System. (Missouri Archaeological Society Research Series Number 15.) University of Missouri and Missouri Archaeological Society, Columbia.

Larson, T. H. and F. T. Norris. 2008. Magnetometer Survey for Buried Steamboats near the Mouth of the Missouri River. Paper presented at the Symposium on the Application of Geophysics to Engineering and Environmental Problems, April 6–10, 2008.

McMillen, M. F. and D. Murphy. 1996. A to Z: The Dictionary of Missouri Place Names. Columbia, MO: Pebble Publishing.

Missouri River Master Manual. 2003. Hearing before the Committee on Indian Affairs on Impact Suffered by the Tribes in the Upper Basin on the Missouri River. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office. October 16.

Petersen, W. I. 1955. Steam boating on the Missouri River. Iowa Journal of History 53.

Reid, K. C. 1984. Nebo Hill and Late Archaic Prehistory on the Southern Prairie Peninsula. (University of Kansas Publications in Anthropology Number 15.) University of Kansas, Lawrence.

Sabin, E. L. 1919. Building the Pacific Railroad. Philadelphia, PA: J.B. Lippincott Co. Website (http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=9V0EAAAAMAAJ &oi= fnd&pg= PA13&dq=Building+the+Pacific+Railroad&ot) accessed November 2010.

Shippee, J. M. 1972. Archeological Remains in the Kansas City Area: The Mississippian Occupation. (Missouri Archaeological Society Research Series Number 9.) University of Missouri and Missouri Archaeological Society, Columbia.

Smith, T. B. and P. S. Gehrig. 1923. History of Chariton and Howard Counties, Missouri. Historical Publishing Co., Topeka-Indianapolis.

St. Louis City Planning Commission. 2009. Physical Growth of the City of Saint Louis. Website (http://stlouis.missouri.org/heritage/History69/) accessed October 2009.

The Missouri River Ecosystem: Exploring the Prospects for Recovery. 2002. Committee on Missouri River Ecosystem Science Water Science and Technology Board.

USACE (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers). 2006. Missouri River Mainstem Reservoir System Master Water Control Manual Missouri River Basin. Omaha, NE: USACE, Northwestern Division.

USACE (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers). 2000. Abandoned Shipwrecks on Missouri River Channel Maps of 1879 and 1954. Rulo, Nebraska to Mouth. Kansas City, KS: USACE, Kansas City District.

USACE (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers). n.d. Website (www.nwk.usace.army.mil/projects/mitigation/bankstabilization.htm) accessed December 2009.

Violette, E. M. 1918. A History of Missouri. Boston, MA: D.C. Heath and Co., Publishers. Website (http://books.google.com/books?id=nLvUqMuVR2cC&pg=PA1&dq=A+History+of+Missouri&lr=#v=onepage&q=&f=false) accessed October 2009.

Warren, R. E. and M. J. O'Brien (eds.). 1982. Holocene Dynamics. In The Cannon Reservoir Human Ecology Project: An Archaeological Study of Cultural Adaptations in the Southern Prairie Peninsula. New York: Academic Press.

Wayman, N. L. 1971. Life on the River. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc.

Willey, G. R. and P. Phillips. 1958. Method and Theory in American Archaeology. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

3.15.5.2 Personal Communications

Wheeler, Cody. USACE Regulatory Project Manager. Email to Timothy Meade, USACE District Archaeologist, et al. September 23, 2009.

Weston, Tim. Archaeologist, Kansas State Historic Preservation Office. Email to Cody Wheeler, USACE Regulatory Project Manager, October 1, 2009.