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1.0 INTRODUCTION

In July of 2007, The 106 Group Ltd. (106 Group) conducted a cultural resources assessment for the Woodbury Northeast Alternative Urban Areawide Review (AUAR). The assessment was conducted under contract with Bonestroo on behalf of the City of Woodbury. The project area is located in Sections 1 and 2, T28N, R21W, Woodbury Township, Washington County, Minnesota (Figure 1). Given that the regulatory review for this project is at the state or local level, review of the AUAR by the Minnesota Office of State Archaeologist is appropriate. If properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places are known to exist in the project area, additional consultation with the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) is appropriate. If there will be any federal involvement in the future (e.g., federal permitting or funding), the project must comply with Section 106 of the National Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, and with other applicable federal and state mandates. For projects requiring Section 106 compliance, consultation with SHPO is required.

The study area for the assessment is the same as the project area and includes all areas of proposed construction activities or other potential ground disturbing activities associated with future development (see Figure 1). According to the information provided to the 106 Group by Bonestroo, this area measures 589 acres (238.4 hectares). The objective of the cultural resources assessment was to identify any archaeological or historic properties within the project area that may require further investigation in order to determine their potential eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP); to identify any sites or structures that have been locally designated as places of importance; to assess the potential for unknown archaeological resources to be located within the Woodbury Northeast project area; and to identify architectural history properties that are 45 years of age or older within the project area that may require additional survey.

The cultural resources assessment for the Woodbury Northeast AUAR included background research and a visual reconnaissance of the project area in order to assess the potential for archaeological resources and architectural history properties. The following report presents the methodology, previous cultural resources investigations in the project area, and results of the assessment. Appendix A includes the photographs taken in the field of architectural history properties that are over 45 years old.
Woodbury Northeast AUAR
Cultural Resources Assessment
Washington County, Minnesota

Project Location

One Mile Context Study Area

Figure 1
2.0 METHODS

2.1 BACKGROUND RESEARCH

On July 20, 2007, background research was conducted using the SHPO site files for information on previously identified archaeological sites within one mile (1.6 kilometers [km]) of the project area (Context Study Area, see Figure 1). Previously inventoried architectural history properties and reports of previously conducted surveys in the project area were also reviewed. In addition, researchers examined historical maps of the project area at the Minnesota Historical Society library, and historical aerial photographs at the University of Minnesota’s Borchert Map Library.

2.2 STUDY AREA

The study area for the cultural resources assessment is the same as the project area and includes the entire area within the Woodbury Northeast AUAR project boundary. The project area for the Woodbury Northeast AUAR is approximately 589 acres (238.4 hectares) (see Figure 1).

2.3 ARCHAEOLOGY FIELD METHODS

To assess the potential for archaeological resources, project archaeologists conducted a windshield survey of the entire project area. Ground disturbance, and other landscape features were noted on field maps. There is the potential for discovering intact pre-contact archaeological resources anywhere in Minnesota where the ground remains relatively undisturbed. However, there is greater potential if undisturbed land is:

- within 500 ft. (150 m) of an existing or former water source of 40 acres (19 hectares) or greater in extent, or within 500 ft. (150 m) of a former or existing perennial stream;
- located on topographically prominent landscape features;
- located within 300 ft. (100 m) of a previously reported site; or
- located within 300 ft. (100 m) of a former or existing historic structure or feature (such as a building foundation or cellar depression).

In addition, archaeologists compared historical documentation, such as plat maps and aerial photographs, with current field conditions to assess the potential within the project area for intact historical archaeological sites.

Areas defined as having a relatively low potential for containing intact archaeological resources include inundated areas, former or existing wetland areas, poorly drained areas, and areas with a 20 percent or greater slope. Low potential areas and areas in which Holocene (less than 10,000 years old) deposits have been significantly disturbed are defined as having little or no potential for containing intact archaeological resources.
2.4 ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY FIELD METHODS

The project area was visually surveyed for architectural history properties on July 27, 2007. The survey crew had access to the project area only via public roads. Standing structures that appeared to be at least 45 years old were identified and photographed. Standing structures that were visible on topographic maps, but not visible from the public roads during the survey were noted.

If, in the future, there will be federal involvement (e.g., through federal permitting or funding) for a project within the boundaries of the Woodbury Northeast AUAR project area, that project must comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, which could involve the completion of a field survey to identify any architectural history properties that are potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP. Should such a survey be undertaken, the current assessment, including photographs (Appendix A), will provide baseline information about properties within the project boundaries that are over 45 years old and would need to be surveyed.
3.0 PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS

3.1 ARCHAEOLOGY

Research indicated that no archaeological surveys have been completed in the project area (see Figure 1). In 2000 a project for a proposed new pipeline was planned along an existing pipeline corridor, running north-south in the E ½ of Section 1 of the AUAR area. This project was reviewed by SHPO, which recommended that no archaeological survey was necessary because of disturbance from earlier pipeline construction (Zschomler 2000).

The SHPO databases search indicated that no archaeological sites have been reported (not field checked), or recorded (confirmed in the field) within the project area.

In order to understand the character of the nearby archaeology and place the project area in an archaeological context, a search of the SHPO database for previously recorded archaeological sites within one mile of the project area was made (Context Study Area, see Figure 1). No archaeological sites have been reported or recorded within one mile of the project area. The nearest archaeological sites are three small precontact artifact scatters that are located between two and three miles to the north or west of the AUAR area.

3.2 ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY

Based on the results of the SHPO files query, no architectural history properties within the project area have been previously inventoried. The SHPO conducted an inventory of architectural history properties in Washington County in 1979; no properties within or adjacent to the project area were inventoried at that time.

Two previous historical studies are noteworthy. The Washington County Historical Society has republished a history of Woodbury Township that was first published in 1976 (WHC 2000). This study was published by the Woodbury Heritage Commission in 1976; however, no heritage commission or local government contact for heritage preservation in Woodbury is currently on record with the Minnesota SHPO. Washington County Land Management sponsored a historic context study of the county in 1999. Researched and written by Carole Zellie, this study has a brief historical background for each township, and makes recommendations for historic preservation tasks as part of county and local planning for growth and development. The study notes that Woodbury Township never had a centralized commercial district, was not incorporated as a village until 1967, and was suburbanized directly from agricultural land in the last quarter of the twentieth century.
3.2.1 Century Farms

Minnesota’s Century Farm program, coordinated by the Minnesota Farm Bureau and the Minnesota State Fair, honors the state’s agricultural heritage and culture. As a way of paying tribute to the significance of Minnesota’s family farming traditions, both past and present, the program recognizes families who have owned their farms for at least 100 years and are currently involved in agricultural production of a 50-acre farm, or larger. Although over 70 Century Farms are currently recognized in Washington County, the database of Century Farms on the Farm Bureau’s website is incomplete for the county. The database is organized by family name, and the Century Farm applications that provide more information, such as location, are not posted on the website yet. Therefore, it could not be determined if any of the architectural history properties that were identified during this assessment are associated with a Century Farm.
4.0 RESULTS

4.1 ARCHAEOLOGY

The topography of the Woodbury Northeast AUAR project area is characterized by rolling hills with occasional wetlands, ponds and small lakes (Figure 2). Several farm fields are planted in crops. Occasional trees dot the project area, and there are two parcels that have dense concentrations of trees, which may represent virgin forest. The earliest available aerials dating to 1936 and subsequent aerials dating to 1957 and 1964, show the same forested parcels in the N ½ of the SE ¼ of Section 1 (approximately 58 acres [23.5 hectares]), and the SW ¼ of the SW ¼ of the NE ¼ of Section 2 (approximately 5.25 acres [2 hectares])(Figure 3). It is possible that these tree-covered parcels were never cleared for agriculture and may represent the landscape as it was first encountered by Euro-Americans in the mid-nineteenth century.

FIGURE 2. PHOTOGRAPH OF ROLLING HILLS, POND, AND PLANTED CROP, TYPICAL OF THE TOPOGRAPHY OF THE PROJECT AREA
Figure 3
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The major ground disturbance in the project area is a sand extraction operation located in the W ½ of Section 1. The sandpit and associated buildings are approximately 28.75 acres (11.6 hectares) in size (see Figures 3 and 4). A Northern Natural Gas pipeline runs north-south through Section 1, and disturbs a narrow corridor through the project area (Zschomler 2000). The construction of new roads and the expansion of existing roads have also disturbed some areas.

![Figure 4. Sand extraction operations, off Cottage Grove Drive in the project area](image)

4.1.1 Precontact (pre-A.D. 1650) and Contact Period (A.D. 1650-1837) Archaeology

There is potential for finding intact archaeological resources throughout the undisturbed portions of the project area, including agricultural fields and the potentially uncleared wooded parcels (see 4.1 above). There is potential to find precontact archaeological resources near the wetlands and small ponds located throughout the project area, although the highest potential for such resources is under the conditions mentioned in the Methods section, such as near a significant water source or on a prominent landscape feature, which are primarily absent from the project area.
4.1.2 Post-Contact (post-A.D. 1837) Archaeology

Multiple documentary sources were consulted prior to the field assessment, including the Trygg map (1964), a series of maps of the region that show the conditions and historical features noted during the original land survey, historical aerial photographs, and historical plat maps. The following discussion of historical maps makes references to Sections 1 and 2, all within Township 28N and Range 21W.

Examination of the Trygg map (1964) showed no structures or historical features in the project area. The Washington County plat map from the 1874 Andreas Atlas of Minnesota also indicates there were no residences or public structures in the project area at that time. An unnamed road runs along the northern border of the project area.

The 1901 Northwest Publishing Co. plat map of Woodbury Township shows four farmsteads and owners’ names located in parcels ranging from 80 acres to 166 acres within the project area. The farmsteads coincide with architectural history properties Field Nos. 1 and 2, and the two abandoned properties along the northern edge of the project area (see Figure 3). Public School No. 36 is marked in the NW ¼ of Section 1, just south of Interstate (I) 94 and east of Cottage Grove Drive. The road along the northern border of the project area is depicted, and additional roads are present along the section line borders.

The 1926 Swain plat map does not mark any structures such as schools and farmsteads, but does label the parcel owners. Many of the names are the same as those marked on the 1901 plat map. Public School No. 36 is not marked on this or subsequent plat maps. The 1938 Hudson plat map and the 1969 Rockford plat map show only minor changes in the size of parcels, with parcel sizes ranging from 30 acres to 166 acres. The exception is two small parcels containing residences on the 1969 Rockford map; these coincide with Field Nos. 3 and 4. I 94 has replaced TH 12.

The earliest available aerial photographs, dating to 1936, show the four farmsteads marked on the 1901 Northwest Publishing Co. plat map, and clearly show the two forested parcels mentioned earlier, one in the SW ¼ of the NE ¼ of Section 2, and another in the N ½ of the SE ¼ of Section 1 (see Figure 3). The 1957 aerial photo shows the same four farmsteads and untouched forested parcels, as well as two additional residences on the west side of Manning Avenue in Section 1; these coincide with Field Nos. 3 and 4. The 1964 aerial shows the same structures and features as the 1957 aerial, and for the first time extraction pits north of the farmstead in the SW ¼ of the SW ¼ in Section 1 (Field No. 2). According to the evidence of the historical aerial photographs, the sand extraction operations started here between 1957 and 1964. The 1964 aerial photograph shows the ponds in the project area almost completely dry. It should also be noted that Hudson Road, a two-lane asphalt road that runs parallel to I 94 through the project area, is not visible or marked on any of the sources that were reviewed, thereby indicating this to be a relatively recently built road.
Field reconnaissance confirmed that three abandoned farmsteads within the project area are relatively undisturbed from an archaeological perspective other than removal of the buildings (see Figure 3). There is potential for intact post-contact archaeological resources within the project area. The two abandoned farmsteads on the south side of I 94, as well as the abandoned farmstead along Hudson Road (Field No.1) could contain intact archaeological resources. The potential historical significance of any post-contact archaeological resources that might exist, however, is unknown at this stage.

4.2 Architectural History

The 106 Group identified a total of four properties with buildings or structures that are at least 45 years old in the project area. The farmstead located on Hudson Road (Field No. 1), appears to be abandoned. A silo and two outbuildings were still standing, but a house was not visible from the road among the trees and significant undergrowth. The buildings that were visible were collapsing, including a building with only portions of three stone walls standing. There is no street mailbox at the location to provide an address.

The farmstead located at 705 Cottage Grove Drive (Field No. 2) may be the original farmstead shown on the 1901 plat map. Although partly obscured by trees, the house appears to have retained its original form, but has been covered in vinyl siding. The barn near the road is in fair condition. The houses located at 322 Manning Avenue (Field No. 3) and 510 Manning Avenue (Field No. 4) first appear on the 1957 aerial photographs. One property in the SW ¼ of NE ¼ of the SW ¼ of Section 1 was not visible from the road (see Figure 3). The property is visible on the current aerial images, and the field survey noted the property’s driveway, but it could not be accessed. This property is not visible on the 1964 aerial photograph and is presumed to be less than 45 years old. Further study of all architectural history properties would be required in order to determine their potential eligibility for listing on the NRHP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field No.</th>
<th>SHPO No. / previously inventoried</th>
<th>Address / TRS Property</th>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Property Types</th>
<th>Date (Estimate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Hudson Road SW ¼ NE ¼ NE ¼ See 1</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>Stone foundation/ wood and metal outbuildings/ silo</td>
<td>foundation c. 1890 silo c. 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>705 Cottage Grove Drive</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>House and barn</td>
<td>c. 1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>322 Manning Avenue</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>House and garage</td>
<td>c. 1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>510 Manning Avenue</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>House and garage</td>
<td>c. 1950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.0 SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 ARCHAEOLOGY

With the exception of ground disturbance such as the sand extraction operation, and certain natural conditions mentioned earlier such as wetland and steep slopes, the project area has the potential for containing precontact and post-contact archaeological resources. There is potential for finding intact precontact archaeological resources throughout the undisturbed portions of the project area, including agricultural fields and the potentially uncleared wooded parcels. There is potential to find precontact archaeological resources near the wetlands and small ponds located throughout the project area, although the highest potential for such resources is under the conditions mentioned in the Methods section, such as near a significant water source or on a prominent landscape feature, which are primarily absent from the project area.

The highest potential for finding post-contact archaeological resources are the locations of existing or former farmsteads, as shown on the plat maps and aerial photographs, and described in the Results section (see Figure 3). Two abandoned farmsteads just south of I-94 can be located by the trees that once surrounded the farm buildings. Also, the abandoned farmstead just off Hudson Road (Field No. 1) may still contain historic archaeological resources. These farmsteads appear to be undisturbed other than the removal of buildings. The post-contact archaeological resources could consist of building foundations, early and rudimentary structures, privies, or dump sites from early settlement, to name a few site types. These resources can reveal how early settlers utilized the resources, how they constructed their buildings, and how they interacted with the community. Ethnic characteristics can sometimes be revealed through house and barn designs, and building layout typical of different European countries. If ground disturbing activities are planned for the project area, a Phase I archaeological survey would identify archeological properties and determine their potential eligibility for listing on the NRHP.

5.2 ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY

In general, the project area is rural, on the very edge of advancing suburban development. This is illustrated by the recent construction of a new Gander Mountain retail store directly adjacent to the project area, in the NE ¼ of the NW ¼ of Section 2. The 106 Group identified a total of four properties that contain buildings, structures and/or sites that appear to be 45 years of age or older within the project area that may be potentially significant. None of these properties have been previously inventoried according to the SHPO database. If these properties are to be impacted by future development projects, further study of them is recommended in order to determine their potential eligibility for listing on the NRHP.
6.0 CONCLUSIONS

6.1 CITY PHILOSOPHY AND POLICY

There are a number of ways to proceed with decision-making regarding the potential archaeology, architectural history, and cultural landscape resources within the Woodbury Northeast project area. All decisions made will be guided by existing legal requirements. Because there is no Heritage Preservation Commission currently on record for the city, the Woodbury Planning Commission, as an agent of the City, should also be consulted regarding any future developments in this area to serve as a guide when making decisions about historic properties. Decisions may also be informed by processes less formal but equally important. The City of Woodbury may choose to adopt a philosophical platform that places high value on community resources and cultural heritage; in doing so, future choices made are aligned with ethical values and cultural stewardship, as well as federal and/or state legislation.

In all cases, sensitivity with and local efforts towards cooperation and dialogue with the community residents and the local Native American communities is paramount. Although no Native American burial mounds, sacred landscapes, or National Register eligible precontact archaeological sites are identified in the project area to date, such places are considered sacred and meaningful to contemporary American Indian peoples. It is recommended here that the city of Woodbury’s efforts support appropriate levels of historical and archaeological surveys prior to any future development, in order to prevent intentional or unintentional damage to, or destruction of, important cultural properties without due process and consideration.

6.2 STATE LEGISLATION

If there is any public involvement in a future development within the Woodbury Northeast AUAR project area the following Minnesota laws should be taken into account.

**Minnesota Field Archaeology Act, 1963 (M.S. 138.31 – 138.42)**

This Act established the Office of State Archaeologist (OSA) and directs OSA and MHS to make recommendations for the preservation of archaeological sites endangered by construction or development on all public lands. The OSA issues licenses, with the concurrence of the Minnesota Indian Affairs Council, for all archaeological investigations associated with public funding or on public land.

- Licensure through the OSA is required for field archaeology undertaken on all lands or waters owned, leased by or subject to the paramount right of the state or its subdivisions, as well as on lands impacted by publicly-funded development projects (http://www.admin.state.mn.us/osa/).
Only professional archaeologists meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Archaeology (36 CFR Part 61) may be licensed to conduct such investigations in the state of Minnesota.

When a state archaeological site is known or suspected to exist, the controlling agency must submit development plans to MHS and OSA for review.

The controlling agency (RGU), in consultation with MHS and OSA, is directed to preserve such sites and is authorized to use its funds for such activities.

If a site is related to American Indian history or religion, OSA must coordinate with the Minnesota Indian Affairs Council (MIAC) for review and comment.

For more information see http://www.mnhs.org/preserve/shpo/index.html

**Minnesota Private Cemeteries Act, 1975 (M.S. 307.08)**

This act provides protection for marked and unmarked human burials and remains older than 50 years, and located outside of platted, recorded or identified cemeteries, protection from unauthorized disturbance. This statute applies to burials on either public or private lands or waters. Highlights include:

- It is a crime to intentionally destroy or remove human skeletal remains or burials.
- The Act directs the OSA to authenticate all burial sites.
- When human remains or burials are American Indian, the OSA and MIAC must attempt to identify their tribal identity.
- No authenticated American Indian burial may be relocated without approval of the MIAC.
- When American Indian burials are known or suspected to exist on public lands, the political subdivision controlling the land must submit development plans to the state archaeologist and the MIAC for review prior to advertising bids.

For further information see http://www.admin.state.mn.us/osa/

**Minnesota Historic Sites Act, 1965 (M.S. 138.661 - 138.6691)**

This Act creates a state register of properties “possessing historical, architectural, archaeological, and aesthetic values” for which adverse effects resulting from state funded or licensed projects must be mitigated. Important points:

- Historic sites are defined as properties named in the Act or listed on the National Register of Historic Places.
- Similar to federal regulations, any undertaking receiving funding or licensing by any political subdivision is covered by the Act.
- If the undertaking affects historic sites, the agency must consult with the Minnesota Historical Society (MHS) to avoid or mitigate adverse effects.
- If the parties agree in writing to an appropriate course of action, the undertaking may proceed.
- If the parties cannot reach agreement, any of the parties may request that the governor appoint a mediation task force.

For more information see http://www.mnhs.org/preserve/shpo/index.html
6.3 **FEDERAL LEGISLATION**

If there is any federal involvement in a proposed future development through funding, permitting, loans or other federal action, there are a number of applicable federal laws, of which the National Historic Preservation is the most significant.

**National Historic Preservation Act of 1966**

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires Federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation a reasonable opportunity to comment on such undertakings. The State Historic Preservation Office acts on behalf of the Advisory Council in each state. The Section 106 process seeks to accommodate historic preservation concerns with the needs of Federal undertakings through consultation among the agency officials and other parties with an interest in the effects of the undertaking on historic properties, commencing at the early stages of project planning. The goal of consultation is to identify historic properties potentially affected by the undertaking, assess its effects and seek ways to avoid, minimize or mitigate any adverse effects on historic properties. In addition to ground disturbing activities, a Federal undertaking includes such activities as transfer of funds, transfer of property, issuing of permits, and providing loans.

For further information see the Advisory Council website at http://www.achp.gov/regs.html
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

In April of 2008, The 106 Group Ltd. (106 Group) conducted a Phase IA archaeological survey for the Woodbury Northeast Alternative Urban Areawide Review (AUAR). The survey was conducted under contract with Bonestroo on behalf of the City of Woodbury. The project area is located in Sections 1 and 2, T28N, R21W, Woodbury Township, Washington County, Minnesota (see Figure 1). Given that the regulatory review for this project is at the state or local level, review of the AUAR by the Minnesota Office of the State Archaeologist (OSA) is appropriate. If properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are known to exist in the project area, additional consultation with the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) is appropriate. If there will be any federal involvement in the future (e.g., federal permitting or funding), the project must comply with Section 106 of the National Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, and with other applicable federal and state mandates. For projects requiring Section 106 compliance, further consultation with SHPO is required.

In 2007, the 106 Group completed a cultural resources assessment for the Woodbury Northeast AUAR project (Boden 2007). This assessment identified areas of potential for archaeological resources, and recommended a Phase I archaeological survey be conducted if ground-disturbing activities were planned for the project area. The 2007 assessment also identified four standing structures over 45 years old within the project area. No analysis or recommendations have been made regarding these properties.

The study area for the Phase IA archaeological survey is the same as the project area and includes all areas of proposed construction activities or other potential ground-disturbing activities associated with future development (see Figures 1 and 2). According to the information provided to the 106 Group by Bonestroo, this area measures 589 acres (238.4 hectares). The objective of the Phase IA archaeological survey was to identify any archaeological properties within the project area that may require further investigation in order to determine their potential eligibility for listing on the NRHP, and to assess the potential for unknown archaeological resources to be located within the project area that may require additional survey.

The Phase IA archaeological survey included a systematic walk-over of the entire project area that was accessible at the time of the survey in order to assess the potential for archaeological resources. The following report presents the methodology, previous cultural resources investigations in the project area, results of the Phase IA archaeological survey, and recommendations regarding archaeological resources.
2.0 METHODS

2.1 OBJECTIVES

The primary objectives of the Phase IA archaeological survey were to determine whether the area affected by the proposed project contains any archaeological resources, and if those resources are potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP. All work was conducted in accordance with the SHPO’s Manual for Archaeological Projects in Minnesota (Anfinson 2005) and The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation [48 Federal Register 44716-44740] (National Park Service [NPS] 1983).

2.2 ARCHAEOLOGY

2.2.1 Background Research

In 2007, the 106 Group conducted a cultural resources assessment, including background research using the SHPO site files for information on previously identified archaeological sites within one mile (1.6 kilometer [km]) of the project area (Boden 2007). Previously inventoried architectural history properties and reports of previously conducted surveys in the project area were also reviewed. In addition, USGS topographic quadrangle maps, historical plat maps, aerial photographs, and data on project soils were reviewed in order to assess the portions of the project area that possessed a higher potential for containing archaeological sites.

2.3 STUDY AREA

The study area for the Phase IA archaeological survey is the same as the project area and includes the entire 589-acre (238.4-hectare) area within the project boundary (see Figures 1 and 2).

2.3.1 Field Methods

The entire project area that was undisturbed and accessible at the time of the survey was subjected to systematic pedestrian surface reconnaissance. Systematic pedestrian surface reconnaissance was conducted to ascertain whether above-ground features, such as earthworks or abandoned structural foundations, were present within the area, and to identify areas of high potential for buried archaeological resources. Pedestrian transects were placed 15 m (50 ft.) apart to ensure adequate coverage of the ground surface, which exhibited an average of 50-90 percent visibility. Parcel 17 of the project area was not subjected to systematic pedestrian surface reconnaissance because access to the private property was not available at the time of survey.
3.0 LITERATURE SEARCH

3.1 PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL STUDIES

Research indicated that no archaeological surveys have been completed in the project area (see Figure 1). In 2000, a project was planned for a proposed new pipeline along an existing pipeline corridor, running north-south in the E ½ of Section 1, near the east end of the project area. This project was reviewed by SHPO, which recommended that no archaeological survey was necessary because of disturbance from earlier pipeline construction (Zschomler 2000). In 2007, the 106 Group completed a cultural resources assessment for the Woodbury Northeast AUAR project (Boden 2007).

The SHPO database search indicated that no archaeological sites have been reported (i.e., not field checked), or recorded (i.e., confirmed in the field) within the project area.

In order to understand the character of the nearby archaeology and place the project area in an archaeological context, a search of the SHPO database for previously recorded archaeological sites within one mile of the project area was conducted (Context Study Area, see Figure 1). No archaeological sites have been reported or recorded within one mile of the project area.

3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL HISTORY OVERVIEW

The project area is located in Sections 1 and 2, T28N, R21W, Woodbury Township, Washington County, Minnesota. The project area consists of agricultural fields of harvested corn and soybeans, some wooded areas, and a sand mining operation. The topography is undulating with a topographically prominent area in the south, adjacent to the mine operation.

Geologically, the project area lies within the Mississippi Valley Outwash geomorphic region. The project area lies within the SSWD soil landscape unit, described as: alluvial soils undifferentiated; loamy over sandy, well drained, light colored soils; organic soils over sandy; and sandy over sandy, well drained, dark colored soils. The SSWD soil landscape units make up approximately 46 percent of the Mississippi Valley Outwash geomorphic region (Agricultural Experiment Station 1973).

The soil associations for the project area include the Ostrander-Baytown-Ripon association. The Ostrander-Baytown-Ripon association is found on nearly level to moderately sloping, well drained, medium textured soils on uplands (Vinar 1980).
4.0 RESULTS

4.1 ARCHAEOLOGY

Staff from the 106 Group conducted a Phase IA archaeological survey of the project area on April 15 and 16, 2008. Kristen J. Bastis, M.A., RPA, served as principal investigator and field supervisor. Fieldwork was conducted by Mark Doperalski, B.A., Christopher Moose, B.A., and Michael Beck, B.A. (see Appendix A).

Field conditions presented approximately 50-90 percent surface visibility in harvested agricultural fields previously planted with corn or soybeans. There were also low-lying areas containing standing water or aquatic plants, which are an indication that the land is intermittently inundated with water. The landscape was level to undulating and included some topographically prominent areas. There were four areas of disturbance due to previous construction activities within the project area, such as sand mining and infrastructure development, which are therefore considered to have low potential to contain intact archaeological resources (see Figure 2).

The entirety of the project area where access was available was subjected to systematic pedestrian reconnaissance to assess areas of high potential and areas where subsurface archaeological testing (Phase IB) will be needed due to lack of surface visibility. The area of the sand mining operation was not walked over during this survey because of obvious high levels of disturbance. Parcel 17 in the southeast corner of the project area, consisting of 65.3 acres (26.4 ha), was not surveyed because access to the private property was not available (see Figure 2). The four standing structures over 45 years old that were identified in the 2007 assessment were not evaluated during this project.

No archaeological sites were located during the Phase IA archaeological survey of the accessible portions of the project area. However, during pedestrian reconnaissance a total of three areas consisting of 8.4 acres (3.4 ha) were situated such that they have a high potential for containing intact archaeological resources. These areas exhibited poor surface visibility (below 25 percent) and will therefore require a Phase IB subsurface archaeological investigation in order to fully complete the archaeological analysis of site identification (see Figure 2).

Area 1 is a relatively flat yet topographically prominent area near the east end of the project area, (see Figure 2). Area 1 is located in the NE quarter of Section 1, T28N, R21W, and covers roughly 7.3 acres (3.0 ha).

Area 2 is situated on a relatively flat yet topographically prominent area above and to the northeast of a lake north of Hudson Road, in the northwest corner of the project area (see Figure 2). Area 2 is located in the NE quarter of Section 2, T28N, R21W, and covers approximately 0.5 acres (0.2 ha).
Area 3 is located on a small grassy rise just above and to the southeast of the same lake as Area 2 (see Figure 2). Area 3 is situated in the NE quarter of Section 2, T28N, R21W, and covers roughly 0.6 acres (0.2 ha).
5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 ARCHAEOLOGY

No archaeological features or sites were located during the Phase IA archaeological survey of the accessible portions of the project area. The majority of the project area was agricultural fields of harvested corn or soybeans. These areas are recommended as requiring no further archaeological investigations. However, Areas 1-3 appeared undisturbed, had poor surface visibility due to vegetative cover, and were situated near water sources on prominent topographic features; therefore, they are considered to have a high potential for intact archaeological resources. The 106 Group recommends that Areas 1-3 be subjected to Phase IB subsurface archaeological testing. The 106 Group also recommends a Phase IA survey be conducted for Parcel 17 that was not surveyed because access was not available at the time of this survey.

The 106 Group identified in its 2007 assessment four architectural history properties within the project area that were over 45 years old. No analysis or recommendations were made regarding these properties during this survey.
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