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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This report for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District (Delivery Order 03 of Contract No. DACW29-88-D-0121), presents the results of archeological testing and significance assessment of batture components of the Ashland-Belle Helene Plantation Site (16AN26) in Ascension Parish, Louisiana. The project area is located at River Mile 182.9-R, on the east (left descending) bank of the Mississippi River (Figure 1). The project area is approximately 550 m long and 12.5 acres in area, it contains the remains of a nineteenth and early twentieth century warehouse, a relict levee, and a brick scatter.

The batture components of the site were located during a 1984 cultural resources survey conducted by R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc. prior to planned revetment construction (Goodwin, Yakubik et al. 1985). During that survey, a portion of a massive brick foundation was discovered protruding from the riverbank bluff. Brick rubble was located both at the foot of the bluff and on the natural levee above the bluff. Based on artifactual material and on historic documentation, this component was identified as the remains of a warehouse associated with Ashland Plantation, a National Register of Historic Places property. The batture features were damaged by natural and cultural forces, however, further archeological testing was recommended to assess their significance, both because of their association with a prominent figure in local history, Duncan Farrah Kenner, because of their potential to contribute important archeological data about the economy of the period [36 CFR 60.4(b, d)], and because of their association with a National Register site.

A second scatter of handmade bricks was located during the 1984 investigations. No in situ remains were observed in the vicinity, and very few artifacts were recovered. Because of the paucity of in situ remains, and the apparent poor research potential of that component, no further archeological testing was recommended at that time (Goodwin, Yakubik et al. 1985).

Current field investigations at 16AN26 were designed to assess the significance of the batture component applying the National Register criteria (36 CFR 60.4). Additional survey examined the batture in front of the Ashland-Belle Helene National Register property in order to determine the presence or absence of additional features. One additional feature was located, and all three batture features were evaluated to determine if they should be incorporated into the Ashland-Belle Helene National Register boundary.

Organization of the Report

Chapter II examines the natural and cultural setting of the project area and discusses historic bankline changes at Ashland-Belle Helene Plantation. Chapter III reviews previous archeological investigations on the east bank of Ascension Parish. The historic and economic development of Ashland-Belle Helene Plantation, with an emphasis on the period under ownership of Duncan F. Kenner, is presented in Chapter IV. Chapter V examines the field methodology used at 16AN26, while the results of the fieldwork are contained in Chapter VI. Chapter VII presents the laboratory analysis of the recovered artifacts. Conclusions and recommendations are presented in Chapter VIII, which also considers the significance of the examined components of the site applying the National Register criteria (36 CFR 60.4).
Figure 1. Excerpt from the Carville and Gonzales 7.5' Quadrangle maps showing the project area
CHAPTER II

NATURAL SETTING

The project area is situated between Mississippi River Miles 182 and 183, in portions of Sections 15 and 18-20 of Township 10S, Range 2E. The work area occupies former river frontage of the Ashland-Belle Helene Plantation. Centered across the river from Modeste and Philadelphia Point, this batture area is within western Ascension Parish, on the inside slope of a long cutbank. The project area has been affected by fluvial activity and by levee construction, borrow pit excavation, and industrial use of the batture.

The climate of southeastern Louisiana is humid and subtropical, with an average daily difference between maximum winter and summer temperatures of only 26 degrees (USDA 1976). Extreme temperatures rarely occur. During the recorded years of 1951-1980, nearby Donaldsonville registered a record high of 102°F on June 30, 1954, and a record low temperature of 10°F on December 13, 1962 (Jay Grimes, Assistant State Climatologist, personal communication 1989). Annual precipitation is 60.3 inches, with the greatest amount of rainfall occurring in the summer, and the least in the fall (USDA 1976).

This area is considered part of the southern Mississippi Alluvial Valley subregion of the Gulf Coastal Plain. It falls within the Pontchartrain drainage basin (USDI 1983), it has an elevation of approximately 25 feet NGVD. This elevation is a product of natural levee formation which occurred primarily during the post-glacial rise in sea level, when the Mississippi River Valley became entrenched and filled the surrounding area with alluvium. These vertical accretion sediments were deposited during floods, when sediments suspended in flood waters precipitated on the banks adjacent to the river channel (Smith et al. 1985:8-9).

The Mississippi River has occupied its present meander belt for approximately 4,800 years (Saucier 1974:22). During this time, lateral migration, overbank flood deposition, and bank caving have aided in the formation and destruction of the natural levees. Bank cutting also has altered the natural levee significantly. The Pontchartrain Levee District has recorded bankline loss of as much as 150 feet between 1869 and 1949 in the vicinity of the project area. The Channel Improvement Data Report (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1987:43-44) indicates that bank cutting has been a continual threat to the bankline in this reach. The segment of the New River Bend Revetment area just upriver from Site 16AN26 required more than $1.5 million in maintenance costs since its construction in 1964.

While bankline cutting is occurring in some areas, deposition is occurring in others. Soil profiles around the warehouse remains at 16AN26 indicate that up to 70 cm of soil (five different strata) capped the feature. This alluvial sedimentation is concentrated around and over the excavated foundation remains, forming a small mound.

When field work was conducted during this project, the river stage at nearby Donaldsonville was 9.7 feet on January 4, 1989. By January 12, the river had risen to 14.8 feet, by January 26, it was 20.6 feet (Times-Picayune 1989). The Pontchartrain Caving Bank maps indicate that in 1896 and again in 1914, the river bankline was within 2.5 m of the site, if not closer, allowing diurnal fluctuations to submerge the site. As the water level retreats, deposition of alluvium occurs.

Batture soils in Ascension Parish consist of Convent soils that belong to the Commerce soil association. Flooding subjects these soils to both deposition and erosion. Convent soils can be described as silt loams or very fine sandy loams. They are mildly alkaline, but organically rich (USDA 1976:12). These soils are recent, therefore, they lack a true profile. The 8-inch thick surface layer is composed of a dark grayish-brown friable silt loam over a subsoil of grayish-brown or gray sandy loam. The slopes range from 0 to 3 per cent (USDA 1976:12). Free water is abundant in these soils and a wet surface is common, however, the saturation level is not great enough to inhibit vegetation cover.

The vegetation growing on the batture is unique in its ability to tolerate frequently saturated soil and active sedimentation above its roots. The dominant canopy trees located on the batture are black willow (Salix nigra), cottonwood (Populus deltoids), sycamore (Platanus occidentalis), and hackberry (Celtis laevigata), as well as locust (Gleditsia aquatica), sweet gum (Liquidamber styraciflua), green ash (Fraxinus
pennsylvania), nuttall oak (Quercus nutalli), water oak (Quercus arkansana), elm (Ulmus), and pecan (Carya illinoensis). Shrubs, or understory vegetation, consist of woody perennials, such as poison ivy (Rhus radicans), grape (Vitis radicans), trumpet creeper (Campsis radicans), groundnut (Apios tuberosa), and buckwheat vine (Fagopyrum esculentum) (Conner et al. 1975).

A drainage ditch between two borrow pits separates the project area into a north and a south division. The northern (upriver) portion contains the main levee, portions of a remnant levee, a borrow pit containing water, a small cluster of trees on the remnant levee near the drainage ditch, a limestone yard and transfer terminal, and grasses. The southern portion consists of the main levee, a water-filled borrow pit, a remnant levee, mature woods with a woody vine undergrowth, and scrub brush and grasses near the shoreline. At the south end of the project area is a parking lot.

Faunal species found during the early historic period, and some found in the area today, include black bear (Euarctos americanus), mountain lion (Felis concolor), deer (Odocoileus virginianus), cottontail rabbit (Sylvilagus floridanus), swamp rabbit (Sylvilagus aquaticus), raccoon (Procyon lotor), gray fox (Urocyon cinereoargenteus), opossum (Didelphis marsupialis), gray squirrel (Sciurus carolinensis), and fox squirrel (Sciurus niger). Several species of birds, fish, and reptiles also were common (Shelford 1963; Lowery 1974).

Overbank flooding, bankline cutting, sediment deposition, and saturation subsidence have altered the original biota, the landscape, and the archeological data base. The artificial flood control features, such as revetments, protection levees and borrow areas, confine the river. These features create a narrower channel for the river to flow in, increasing the speed and erosional energy of the river. The only area left to be inundated is the batture area. Thus, archeological features located in the batture are either destroyed or buried by alluvium to such an extent that archeological shovel testing techniques fail to locate some potential sites. A detailed description of the effect of river confinement construction on the archeological record is discussed in Goodwin, Hinks et al. 1989. The effects of the river on the batture components of Site 16AN26 are discussed more fully in Chapter VI.
CHAPTER III
PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS

Previous Cultural Resource Studies Near the Project Area

Several archeological studies have examined historic archeological remains on the east bank of Ascension Parish. Heartfield, Price and Greene, Inc. (1980) conducted a cultural resources survey of a proposed IT Ascension Parish hazardous waste management facility near Burnside, Louisiana. During this survey, two historic sites were recorded, Burnside Cemetery (16AN28) and Conway's Sugar Mill (16AN29). Neither was within the direct impact zone for the proposed facility. Burnside Cemetery was not considered eligible for the National Register, but further testing was recommended at Conway's Sugar Mill.

Coastal Environments, Inc. (CEI) conducted several cultural resources surveys within Ascension Parish between 1981 and 1988. The first of these studies (McCloskey et al. 1981; Castille and Pearson 1982) was conducted for Miller Coal Systems, Inc. at a proposed coal transfer facility downriver from Darrow, Louisiana. During these investigations, Hermitage Plantation (16AN24), a National Register property, and Pierre Robert (16AN33), the remains of a 1931-1982 house, were investigated. CEI also recorded four historic sites that were outside their study area (16AN30, 16AN31, 16AN32, and 16AN34).

In 1987, CEI examined a proposed telephone cable route in Ascension and Livingston Parishes for Certified Engineering, Inc. (Coastal Environments, Inc. 1987). Two historic sites, located along the north edge of the parish on the Bayou Manchac drainage, were identified during that survey. Manchac Bluff (16AN38) was primarily a Coles Creek prehistoric site, but several historic artifacts from an unidentified component also were present. Galveztown (16AN39) was the remains of a Spanish colonial town on the Amite River where a number of eighteenth and nineteenth century artifacts were recovered, further testing was recommended to determine its significance.

In 1988, CEI (Kelley 1989) conducted investigations along the Aben and Marchand Revetment areas in Ascension Parish for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District. Five historic sites were identified, 16AN45 through 16AN49. Of these, four consisted of late nineteenth/early twentieth century domestic remains on the batture of the Mississippi River, the fifth, 16AN46, contained two large granite blocks. None of these sites was considered to be significant cultural resources, and no further testing was recommended.

Guevin (1983) conducted an ethnohistorical reconstruction of the early historic culture of the Houma Indians in an attempt to predict locations of historic Houma village sites in southeastern Louisiana. During this study, he probatively identified the Great Houma's Village (16AN35), an eighteenth century historic Houma habitation site that was evaluated as a significant cultural resource. Further testing was recommended. In addition, archeological remains associated with the nineteenth century Houmas House Plantation were recovered; this component was not evaluated.

R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc. (Goodwin, Yakubik et al. 1985) conducted archeological investigations near the Marchand Revetment as part of a study of five revetment areas for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District. During that study, two batture features associated with Ashland-Belle Helene Plantation (16AN26) were identified. a brick foundation and a brick scatter (originally numbered 16AN38 and 16AN37, respectively). The brick foundation was interpreted as the remains of a warehouse. Although damaged, the brick foundation was thought to be potentially significant because of its association with Duncan Kenner, the owner of Ashland Plantation, and because of its potential to contain previously unrecorded data. The Ashland-Belle Helene Plantation house was placed on the National Register in 1979, further testing at the warehouse was recommended to determine whether the warehouse component should be incorporated with the house on the National Register. The brick scatter (16AN37) was found to lack archeological integrity. No further work was recommended. In review of the 1985 report of investigation, the Louisiana State Historic Preservation Officer combined the two features under the existing 16AN26 site designation. Site numbers 16AN37 and 16AN38 subsequently have been reassigned to other sites in Ascension Parish.
Previously Recorded Sites Located Near the Project Area

Eighteen historic archeological sites have been identified on the east bank of Ascension Parish (Table 1). Most of the sites are nineteenth and early twentieth century sugar plantations and their associated sugar mills. Six sugar plantations (16AN24, 16AN26, 16AN30, 16AN31, 16AN32, and 16AN34) and two sugar mills (16AN29 and 16AN37) have been recorded. At 16AN24, 16AN26, and 16AN30, are listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Each site includes interrelated components such as overseer and laborer cabins, detached kitchens, sugar mills, barns and sheds, privies, and wells. The archeological components of these sites have not been tested extensively even though these sites have historic value, archeological integrity, and research potential.

Four sites (16AN45, 16AN47, 16AN48, and 16AN49) consist of scatters of late nineteenth and twentieth century domestic refuse on the batture. There is no evidence of in situ archeological deposits at these four sites. Rather, the deposits probably were redeposited by the river. These sites do not have archeological integrity, and they are not significant cultural resources.

The six remaining historic sites reflect a variety of cultural activities. Site 16AN28 is a twentieth century cemetery, which probably is not eligible for the National Register (cf. 36 CFR 60.4). Site 16AN33 is the razed remains of a twentieth century house that has little historic or scientific importance. Two large granite blocks of unidentified function were observed at 16AN46. The remaining two sites both dated from the eighteenth century. Site 16AN35 was the remains of an early eighteenth century historic Houma Indian village, with a nineteenth century plantation component. Site 16AN39 was the remains of Galveztown, a Spanish-colonial town from which eighteenth and nineteenth century artifacts were collected. These two sites probably are eligible for the National Register, although further testing is necessary to confirm this evaluation. There has been no extensive testing of archeological components at any of the above mentioned sites. While some of the sites have been tested to evaluate their eligibility for the National Register, full scale excavations have not been conducted.

Finally, the recorded historic archeological sites within the study area in Ascension Parish do not reflect the breadth of anticipated historic archeological remains. Most of the sites are postbellum and twentieth century, and most are plantation sites. Only two contained eighteenth century components. A variety of cultural and economic activities are not represented in the recorded database. Types of sites that have not been recorded include eighteenth and nineteenth century farmsteads, commercial and religious structures, and industrial sites other than sugar mills.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>River Mile</th>
<th>Recorded by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16AN24</td>
<td>Hermitage Plantation</td>
<td>Nineteenth century sugar plantation; the big house, still standing, was built in 1812-1814; archeological components not tested extensively; NRHP property</td>
<td>M. 173.7-R</td>
<td>CEI 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16AN26</td>
<td>Ashland-Belle Helene Plantation</td>
<td>Nineteenth century sugar plantation; the big house, still standing, was built 1840-1841; batture components include warehouse remains and brick scatter; the house and surrounding property are on the NRHP</td>
<td>M. 182.9-R</td>
<td>Hayward 1979; RCG&amp;A 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16AN28</td>
<td>Burnside Cemetery</td>
<td>Approximately 20 interments; headstones dated 1907-1943; not eligible for NRHP</td>
<td>M. 170.5-R</td>
<td>HPG 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16AN29</td>
<td>Conway's Sugar Mill</td>
<td>Nineteenth century cistern, probable sugar mill, possible crypt burial; and nineteenth-twentieth century domestic refuse</td>
<td>M. 170.5-R</td>
<td>HPG 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16AN30</td>
<td>Tezcuco Plantation</td>
<td>Mid nineteenth-twentieth century sugar plantation; big house still standing; archeological components not tested extensively; NRHP property</td>
<td>M. 169.5-R</td>
<td>CEI 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16AN31</td>
<td>Monroe Plantation</td>
<td>Mid nineteenth-twentieth century sugar plantation, including some standing structures and cemetery; archeological components not tested extensively</td>
<td>M. 169.0-R</td>
<td>CEI 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16AN32</td>
<td>Bruslie Plantation</td>
<td>Mid nineteenth-twentieth century sugar plantation; no standing structures; late nineteenth-earlytwentieth century artifacts collected; not tested extensively</td>
<td>M. 169.4-R</td>
<td>CEI 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site #</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>River Mile</td>
<td>Recorded by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16AN33</td>
<td>Pierre Robert</td>
<td>1931-1982 house site; not significant</td>
<td>M. 175.2-R</td>
<td>CEI 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16AN34</td>
<td>Riverton Plantation</td>
<td>Nineteenth century sugar plantation, not tested extensively</td>
<td>M. 171.1-R</td>
<td>CEI 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16AN35</td>
<td>Great Houma's Village</td>
<td>Eighteenth century historic Houma Indian site; nineteenth century sugar plantation; numerous historic Indian artifacts and nineteenth century artifacts surface collected; nearby Houma Plantation big house on NRHP</td>
<td>M. 170.4-R</td>
<td>Guevin 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16AN37</td>
<td>Yarbourough Sugar House Site</td>
<td>Second half nineteenth century sugar mill complex and domestic remains; not tested extensively</td>
<td>N/A (Bayou Manchac drainage)</td>
<td>Saltus 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16AN38</td>
<td>Manchac Bluff</td>
<td>Unknown; with prehistoric Coles Creek component; historic component not significant</td>
<td>N/A (Bayou Manchac drainage)</td>
<td>CEI 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16AN39</td>
<td>Galveztown</td>
<td>Remains of Spanish colonial town; eighteenth and nineteenth century ceramics recovered from site; not tested extensively</td>
<td>N/A (Bayou Manchac drainage)</td>
<td>CEI 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16AN45</td>
<td>Marchand A</td>
<td>Late nineteenth-early twentieth century domestic remains; not significant</td>
<td>M. 178.4-R</td>
<td>CEI 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16AN46</td>
<td>Marchand B &amp; C</td>
<td>Two large granite blocks; not significant</td>
<td>M. 179.5-R</td>
<td>CEI 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16AN47</td>
<td>Marchand D</td>
<td>Late nineteenth-early twentieth century domestic remains; not significant</td>
<td>M. 179.7-R</td>
<td>CEI 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16AN48</td>
<td>Marchand E, F, G</td>
<td>Late nineteenth-twentieth century domestic remains; not significant</td>
<td>M. 179.8-R</td>
<td>CEI 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16AN49</td>
<td>Marchand H, I, J</td>
<td>Late nineteenth-early twentieth century domestic remains; not significant</td>
<td>M. 179.9-R</td>
<td>CEI 1988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* Data from the State Site Files, Louisiana Division of Archaeology, Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism, Baton Rouge.
CHAPTER IV
THE HISTORIC SETTING OF THE NEW RIVER BEND PROJECT AREA

Initial Colonization

Acadian refugees from Nova Scotia were the first historic settlers in the New River Bend project area. During the later half of the eighteenth century, these French-speaking petite habitants, or small farmers, settled small tracts of land measuring approximately five to six arpents front on the Mississippi River. In 1767, the first settlement was established in Ascension Parish at the confluence of Bayou Lafourche and the Mississippi River (west bank). This Acadian settlement was called “la deuxieme cote des Acadiens,” the second Acadian Coast (Arsenault 1966:202). The east bank study area in Ascension Parish was settled around 1785 (Brasseaux 1987:113).

Contemporary historical accounts reveal that raising hogs and growing corn, rice, and vegetables were the chief agricultural pursuits of these Acadian farmers. The first Louisiana Acadian colonists grew wheat, grains, and flax; but the subtropical climate of south Louisiana did not provide the proper environment for these cultigens. Corn, peas, beans, and rice replaced wheat, and cotton replaced flax for clothing. According to the 1777 census, the typical Acadian resident of Ascension Parish owned fifteen head of cattle, twelve hogs, and one sheep (Brasseaux 1987:121).

The first Acadian colonists in Ascension Parish were too poor to afford slaves. As their farmsteads developed, however, some landowners in the area became moderately prosperous. The 1777 census shows that 39 per cent of the Acadian Coast landowners in Ascension Parish owned at least one slave. Seventy-nine per cent of the households in Ascension Parish owned at least one slave by 1810 (Brasseaux 1987:196).

Spanish law mandated forced heirship of land holdings, upon the father’s death, half of the estate was divided among the surviving children. As a result, original family land grants were divided into progressively smaller tracts with each generation. According to Brasseaux (1987:107), “the constant reduction of familial landholdings made farming increasingly difficult on the Acadian Coast.” The overcrowding of the Acadian settlements in the project area was alleviated somewhat by access to uninhabited lands along Bayou Lafourche. The first exodus down Bayou Lafourche occurred in the 1770s, when 17 families, primarily 1767 immigrants from Ascension Parish, moved into the Lafourche interior.

By 1800, the agrarian prosperity of the Acadian Coast attracted wealthy Anglo-Americans into the area. Sugar cane agriculture was discovered to be profitable on a large scale around the time of the Louisiana Purchase. This discovery forever changed the socioeconomic base of Ascension Parish and all of south Louisiana. Ascension Parish, including the New River Bend study area, was prime agricultural land; some of the largest and most successful sugar cane plantations in the south were established there. The initial investment in sugar cane agriculture was expensive. The large tracts of land needed for sugar plus machinery and slaves cost the average sugar planter in 1860 a minimum of $10,000.00 (Schmitz 1977:108), and could exceed $200,000.00 (Taylor 1976:65). As a result of this shift from vegetable farming to large scale sugar cane agriculture, many of the small Acadian farmsteads in Ascension Parish were consolidated into larger plantations.

Land Tenure

The names of the particular Acadian landowners in the study area during the colonial eighteenth century are not available in historical records. The original United States land claims of the project area show that William Kenner and Phillip Minor owned this land at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Their Ascension Parish claim was confirmed by the United States Government on January 6, 1821. The claim measured 28 arpents front by 40 deep. Kenner and Minor eventually acquired an additional 16 arpents of river front property, enlarging their holdings to 44 arpents front on the Mississippi River. The children of Kenner and Minor inherited the 44-arpent Linwood Plantation. The six heirs of William Kenner divided his
three-quarters interest (32 arpents), while B. Minor inherited Phillip Minor’s one-fourth share (12 arpents). The heirs proceeded to buy each others’ shares, eventually, Phillip Minor acquired one-half interest, Duncan Kenner one-fourth, and George Kenner acquired a one-fourth interest. On December 28, 1836, Phillip Minor, Duncan Kenner, and George Kenner partitioned their land. Minor received the upper 20 arpents, while Duncan and George Kenner divided equally the lower 24 arpents front of Linwood. Duncan Kenner increased his holdings by purchasing three adjacent downriver arpents front from Theodore Segond in 1843. The following year, Duncan bought his brother George’s interest. Previously, George Kenner had increased his holdings through various transactions to total 17 arpents front. Duncan added these tracts to his estate. On May 5, 1858, Duncan Kenner purchased the downriver 24-arpent front Bowden Plantation at the succession sale of General Hore Browse Trist. After this purchase, Duncan Kenner’s total estate measured 54 arpents front on the Mississippi River.

Duncan Kenner’s estate remained intact after his death in 1887. Kenner’s wife, Nanine, donated most of the Ashland and Bowden property to her daughters Rosella and Blanche (N. B. Trist, December 1, 1888, NONA). This property was auctioned on March 2, 1889; it was adjudicated to Hypolite P. Ousset for $85,100.00 (COB 34, Folio 425, Ascension Parish). The purchase excluded the furniture and contents of the great house, the store, and the sugar, molasses, and rice crops of 1888 (COB 34, 425, Ascension Parish). Ousset sold the property to George B. Reuss a few days later for $75,000.00.

Reuss renamed the property Belle Helene Plantation and joined others in forming the Belle Helene Planting Company in 1889. Reuss served as the first president of the corporation. Between 1894 and 1900, John C. Klos became president of the Belle Helene Planting Company, he resided at the Belle Helene plantation during this period. In May 1911, Belle Helene was subdivided and some parcels were sold. Figures 2 and 3 show the subdivision. Helene Reuss Hayward, G. B. Reuss’s first granddaughter for whom the plantation was named, inherited the unsold portions of Belle Helene Plantation in 1939.

Duncan Farrah Kenner

Duncan Farrah Kenner was a distinguished political figure and one of the most successful and innovative nineteenth century sugar planters in the state. In 1836, Kenner was elected to the Louisiana House of Representatives from Ascension Parish. In 1850, he lost a close race for Lieutenant Governor to his friend, Judah P. Benjamin. Kenner was elected President of the State Constitutional Convention in 1852 and from 1866 to 1867. He again served as State Senator in 1877. In 1878, he ran for the United State Senate and lost. In 1882, Kenner was appointed by President Chester A. Arthur to the United State Tariff Commission.

During the Civil War, Kenner was a member of the Provisional Congress of the Confederacy, he later served as the Louisiana state representative to the Confederate Congress, where he was named chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. Duncan Kenner’s diplomatic mission to Europe during the Civil War was perhaps his best known political endeavor. Believing that the support of France and Britain was crucial to the success of the Confederacy, he persuaded Judah P. Benjamin, the Secretary of State of the Confederacy, and President Jefferson Davis, to seek recognition of the Confederacy as a sovereign nation by Britain and France. As part of this petition to Britain and France, the Confederacy agreed to the abolition of slavery. Kenner infiltrated Union lines and sailed from New York on February 11, 1863, under the disguise of A. B. Kingslake (Kenner Papers, Box 1, Folder 2, LSU). However, the military victories of Union General William Sherman in the South ended Kenner’s diplomatic efforts.

After the Civil War, Kenner’s political interests once again focused on the sugar industry. Sugar legislation on both the state and federal level was one of his lifelong concerns. In 1846, Kenner addressed the State Senate concerning the tariff on foreign sugar:

Whereas, the Tariff of 1842 has produced no more than sufficient revenue to defray the necessary expenses of the general Government, and only affords an adequate incidental
Figure 2. Excerpt of the 1911 Survey by Daney and Wadill of Belle Helene Plantation Study Area Showing the First Subdivision (COB 31, Folio 251, Ascension Parish).
protection to American Industry and American Manufacturers against foreign competition
and foreign policy and a consequent encouragement to Commercial enterprise, to
agricultural pursuits and to the development of our internal resources. And whereas it is
believed that the people of Louisiana are opposed to any alteration of the special duty on
sugar until further experience has shown that a modification is required to promote their
general welfare, Therefore-Be it Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Louisiana
that our Senators and Representatives in Congress be, and they are hereby requested to
oppose all attempts to alter or modify the tariff act of the 30th August, 1842, and
contemplated by the present Secretary of the Treasury (Tregle 1942:136).

On November 20, 1877, a group of sugar planters and merchants met at the office of the Crescent
City Oil Company in New Orleans and formed the Louisiana Sugar Planter’s Association. The Association
was formed to support favorable federal legislation (specifically to maintain the tariff on imported sugar), and
to develop better cane culture and sugar manufacturing techniques. Duncan Kenner was elected the first
President of the Association and held this office for ten years until his death in 1887. During the 1880s, the
sugar tariff was a constant controversy; members of the Louisiana Sugar Planter’s Association sent
committees to Washington to oppose any reduction in sugar duties, and Duncan Kenner was the leading
spokesman.

Ashland, Bowden, and Belle Helene Plantations

Kenner’s Ashland and Bowden sugar plantations were among the most successful in the South
before and after the Civil War. Sugar and rice reports show that Ashland’s annual sugar production
averaged approximately 927 hogsheads of sugar between 1844 and 1858 (Champomier 1844-1862) (Table
2). Kenner purchased the downriver Bowden Plantation, and crop yields averaged approximately 1,623
hogsheads a year between 1859 and 1862 (Champomier 1844-1862) (Table 2). Sugar production at Ashland
and Bowden was outstanding considering that the average sugar plantation in south Louisiana produced
an annual output of approximately 150 hogsheads during the antebellum nineteenth century (Heitmann

In 1860, Duncan Kenner owned 473 slaves, who shared living quarters in 95 slave dwellings. The
1860 census showed that Kenner owned substantial livestock including 50 horses, 173 mules, 26 dairy
cows, 57 oxen, 370 sheep, 22 hogs, and 39 head of cattle. The cash value of his estate, which included
Ashland and Bowden plantations, was estimated at $190,000.00 (Menn 1964:122).

Kenner believed that investing in the latest technological advances in the sugar industry would
provide higher sugar yields. For example, the following transcript of a handwritten letter by Kenner in 1846
concerns a contract for a new, larger engine for his sugar mill at Ashland:

Ashland, January 22, 1846

My Dear Sir,

You must really excuse my negligence, on the receipt of your favor, relative to an engine -
I threw it in my desk - intending to write you in a day or two - since then I have been so
much occupied with the election, that I have never thought of anything else. And your letter
entirely escaped my mind until a M. Beshet came down to look at the dryer house. Your
ideas for an engine I agree very much. The engine for which I have contracted is of the
following dimensions - 14 inches cylinder - 5 feet stroker - 3 boilers made of 1/4 inch iron -
30 feet in length and 36 inches in diameter. The mill 5 feet long and 28 inches in diameter -
The roller to weight 9, 10,000 in diameter and the mill and engine placed on iron bed plates
- and that to weigh about 52 tons - The cart to be $7500, - $2500 on delivery of the
machinery - $2500 March 1847 - $2500 Jan. 1848. Mr. Bringier - when he saw my contract
Table 2

SUGAR AND RICE PRODUCTION AT ASHLAND, BOWDEN, AND BELLE HELENE PLANTATIONS
(Champomier 1844-1862; Bouchereau and Bouchereau 1869-1917)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season Ending</th>
<th>Ashland  (Owned by D.F. Kenner)</th>
<th>Bowden  (Owned by H.B. Trist Until 1858)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>1156 hhds. sugar</td>
<td>566 hhds. sugar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>965 &quot;</td>
<td>388 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>590 &quot;</td>
<td>735 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>859 &quot;</td>
<td>632 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>710 &quot;</td>
<td>595 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>1169 &quot;</td>
<td>600 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>1370 &quot;</td>
<td>810 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>1397 &quot;</td>
<td>755 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>570 &quot;</td>
<td>500 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>342 &quot;</td>
<td>200 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>1080 &quot;</td>
<td>550 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>D.F. Kenner bought Bowden; until 1862, their crops were combined.</td>
<td>2002 hhds. sugar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>1500 hhds. sugar</td>
<td>940 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>2150 &quot;</td>
<td>940 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Not Listed</td>
<td>350 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>116 hhds. sugar</td>
<td>290 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>352 &quot;</td>
<td>348 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>363 &quot;</td>
<td>285 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>193 &quot;</td>
<td>242 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>296 &quot;</td>
<td>334 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>424 &quot;</td>
<td>384 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Ashland</td>
<td>Bowden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>415 hhds. sugar</td>
<td>555 hhds. sugar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>481 &quot;</td>
<td>475 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>273 &quot;</td>
<td>274 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>335 &quot;</td>
<td>520 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>355 &quot;</td>
<td>450 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>From 1881 until 1888, Kenner combined his crops with J.L. Brent.</td>
<td>938 hhds. sugar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>6200 bbl. rice</td>
<td>530 hhds. sugar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>5390 &quot;</td>
<td>579 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>4035 &quot;</td>
<td>1053 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>6016 &quot;</td>
<td>1014 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>8769 &quot;</td>
<td>1194 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>7068 &quot;</td>
<td>954 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td></td>
<td>1170 &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1889

1890
Belle Helene Planting Co., Inc. purchased both Ashland and Bowden. After 1890, they were combined as Belle Helene Plantation. 1199 hhds. sugar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sugar Production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>2,000,000 lbs. sugar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>1,349,497 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>2,690,098 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>1,057,068 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>3,221,833 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>2,112,667 lbs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1897
After 1896, Ashland was recorded separately from Belle Helene, but no crops were reported.

Belle Helene

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sugar Production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>2,396,215 lbs. sugar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>2,344,000 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>2,481,500 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1,255,786 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>3,279,240 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>3,279,240 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>4,905,837 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>2,185,735 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>3,775,166 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>3,075,365 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>2,464,000 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>4,150,000 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>4,596,545 lbs. sugar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>2,890,794 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>4,089,912 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>4,119,225 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>2,896,080 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>2,410 bbls. syrup</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and talked with Mr. Armstrong - wished him to make one precisely like it for him (M. B) - but this contractor was unwilling to do so - as it was his first year and he did not wish to undertake more than he thought he could perform well. They have three other contracts - though small ones - My Mill is to be made after the pattern of Leeds' [Foundry].

I do not know for which one of your places you wish an engine - but my opinion is that of all the work I have seen done for the planters - Leeds mills and engines are the best - particularly his mills and housing - they are more substantial - more iron put in and better finished. It is true they are higher priced. I hear you are coming down here and should you not contract for one before coming down you can read my contract - it may suggest something to you.

The election has been very animated, but I have carried my election by 8 votes - two democratic representatives elected from our parish - one by 2 and one by 4 votes - the parish went democratic for Gov. and sent Gov. by 30 for the first and 60 for the second. Our defeat throughout the state will be overwhelming - we will hardly have a Tyler's guard in within branch of the Tigris Batture - nothing seen in the horse line.

With best regards to your family, I remain yours,
Duncan Kenner
(Kenner Papers, Box 1, Folder 2, LSU)

In 1851, Kenner installed a vacuum apparatus to his sugar mill (Champomier 1851). Bowden's sugar house was equipped with a Rillieux vacuum pan apparatus. In 1870, a steam tram and a centrifuge were installed at Ashland (Bouchereau and Bouchereau 1870). Kenner was continually adding new technology to his sugar estate. Sitterson (1953) wrote:

Duncan F. Kenner, on his Ashland and Bowden plantations, was perhaps the first planter to demonstrate the practicability of portable railways, using iron rails, for the delivery of cane (Sitterson 1953:263).

In 1882, Duncan Kenner was the first Louisiana planter to install John S. McDonald's patented hydraulic pressure regulator at his Ashland sugar mill. The regulator relieved the pressure on the roller shafts, preventing constant breakage (Sitterson 1953:28, Heitmann 1987. 111). Figure 4 shows McDonald's regulator as it appeared in an advertisement in 1885 (Louisiana Sugar Planter Association 1885.40).

After the Civil War, the sugar output at Ashland and Bowden decreased (Table 2). Beginning in 1881, Kenner combined his crops with those of General Joseph Lancaster Brent, his daughter Rosella's husband. Brent owned the Landry plantation, adjacent to and downriver from Bowden. Brent managed the agricultural affairs of Ashland and Bowden after Kenner retired to New Orleans. Between 1883 and 1888, only rice yields were reported at Ashland, while the sugar crop was reported from Bowden (Bouchereau and Bouchereau 1880-1888) (Table 2). In 1887, the year Kenner died, the sugar mill at Ashland was replaced by a steam-powered rice mill. Duncan Kenner's succession states that the rice mill operated "with twelve pounders and other necessary machinery and equipment" (N. B. Trist 1888, NONA). In that same year, a double effect apparatus was installed at the Bowden sugar house.

When George B. Reuss and the Belle Helene Planting Company acquired Ashland and Bowden properties in 1889, sugar was being grown and processed on the former Bowden property and rice was grown on the Ashland portion. The old Bowden sugar mill was abandoned in 1892 (Louisiana Sugar Houses 1892,55). A new sugar factory was constructed downriver in 1889. By 1915, this sugar factory was equipped with a nine-roller, six-foot mill. The sugar plant facilities included a 14-mile standard gauge railroad. This plant remained operational until the 1920s.
McDONALD'S
Automatic Hydraulic Pressure Regulator
FOR SUGAR MILLS.

All parties interested in the extraction of cane juice by mill process, are invited during the coming grinding season, to investigate the working of the Hydraulic Regulator, now used by so many Sugar Mills in this and other States.

You are respectfully invited to inspect for yourself its operations on the Two, Three, Five and Six Roller Cane Mills, with and without shredder.

Advantages claimed over Mills, without this Appliance, are as follows:

1. An increased percentage of juice extracted.
2. Less liability to a breakage of your mill.
3. A uniform pressure exerted on the top roller.
4. It regulates the increase and decrease feed of cane on carrier, that occurs on all mills,
5. It regulates the working of the mill as a governor does an engine.

Your attention is particularly called to these important advantages claimed.

For the unperceived losses of sugar mills, by inadequate compression, and other evils of the cane mills, are annually much greater than the whole cost of this apparatus. For particulars and pamphlets,

JOHN S. Mc DONALD.
P. O. Box 2255. 42 DECATUR STREET. New Orleans, La., U. S. A.

Figure 4. 1885 Advertisement of McDonald's Hydraulic Pressure Regulator (Louisiana Sugar Planter Association 1885).
The batture now is occupied by the Belle Helene Transfer Terminal Limestone Yard operated by Hall-Buck Marine Services Company. According to Mr. James Gandy, who manages the yard, that facility was constructed in 1974 or 1975 on land leased from Belle Helene Plantation. The facility originally marketed shells and Gulf of Mexico sand, but since the late 1970s it has specialized in marketing limestone and in transferring chemicals onto barges (James Gandy, personal communication 1989). Currently, the majority of the yard is covered with packed limestone and cement, and with large mounds of limestone and bulldozed spoil piles. A large central area has been built up 1 to 2 m to facilitate the chemical transfer from the yard.

Levees and the Ashland Warehouse

The construction of levees was a constant activity along the batture of the Ashland plantation property area on the eastbank of Ascension Parish. There are few records of the first levees. Governor O'Reilly's 1770 land ordinances specified that levee and road construction and maintenance was required by property owners under liability of land grant revocation. Therefore, the first Acadian colonists in the study area had to build their own levees to prevent flooding from the annual rise of the Mississippi River. The earliest specific documentation of levee construction in the study area is provided from Duncan F. Kenner's era. Figure 5 indicates that in 1869 a new levee was needed along the batture in front of Ashland. Therefore, a levee was in place prior to 1869. Between 1869 and 1872, the levee fronting Ashland was constructed to accommodate the large Ashland warehouse on the batture (Figure 6) (Goodwin, Yakubik et al. 1985). By the early 1900s, the irregularly shaped pre-1872 levee encircling the warehouse (Figure 6) was replaced with a setback levee, this new levee was enlarged in 1906 (Figure 7). Another levee setback was constructed in 1908 (Figure 8) just downriver from the warehouse area. The 1908 levee system fronting the study area property was abandoned and rebuilt in 1930 (Figures 7 and 9).

From this series of levees, a scenario can be reconstructed concerning the construction and destruction of the warehouse remains at 16AN26. Archival documentation concerning the Ashland warehouse indicates that this structure (shown in Figure 6) was in existence during Duncan F. Kenner's ownership, 1840-1880. During the Civil War, Union troops from the 111th Indiana Regiment landed at this warehouse. We noticed that a steamboat, whose repeated whistles had attracted our attention, seemed to be landing at our warehouse (Brent Recollections, LSU).

The warehouse at 16AN26 probably was destroyed during levee construction between 1872, when it was depicted on the Mississippi River Commission Map (Figure 6), and 1911 when it was not shown on the subdivision plan of Belle Helene Plantation (Figure 3). Historic plantation warehouses were rare since most sugar and cotton plantations did not need warehouses to store their products. The hogsheads of sugar usually were loaded directly from the sugarhouse onto steamboats and shipped to New Orleans to be stored in warehouses there. Cotton also was shipped to New Orleans where it was stored and pressed at one of the cotton press warehouses. The need for a large brick warehouse at Ashland is testimony to the enormous production of sugar there during the nineteenth century. Figure 10 is a photograph of a steamboat warehouse located in Bayou Courtableau during the late nineteenth century.

Historic Brickmaking

Ashland and Belle Helene Plantations, like other large Louisiana plantations, were self-contained communities that included stores, workshops, and brick kilns. Bricks from the Belle Helene brick kiln were found during survey, and Historic Standing Structure No. 626 in Ascension Parish was constructed of bricks labeled "R.K.G. Belle Helene." This structure is a ca. 1850s Creole cottage situated about two miles upriver from Belle Helene, in Township 10S, Range 2E, Section 11, near Mount Houmas Plantation. No direct historical documentation concerning the Ashland brick kiln was located. However, considering the number of brick structures at Ashland, including the massive great house, the huge brick warehouse, race horse stables, barns, and the brick sugar mill, a kiln must have been part of the Ashland Plantation setting. Oral informants Gaynell Moore, a tour guide at Belle Helene, and William Hayward, son of Helene Reuss.
Figure 6. Excerpt from 1872 Mississippi River Commission Map Showing Levee Position and Warehouse at Ashland Plantation.
Figure 7. 1931 Pontchartrain Levee District Map, Showing the Levees and Banklines at Belle Helene Plantation (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District).
Figure 8. 1908 Proposed Levee Construction Map at Belle Helene Plantation (Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development, Baton Rouge).
Figure 9. 1930 Map Showing the Land Used or Damaged in the Belle Helene New Levee (Center for Regional Studies)
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Figure 10. Ca. 1920 Photograph of a Steamboat Warehouse on Bayou Courtableau (Southeastern Architectural Archives, Tulane University Library).
Hayward, stated that the Belle Helene brick kiln was the former Ashland brick kiln, and that it was located in front of the big house, near the modern levee. They believed the "R.K.G." initials on some of the stamped Belle Helene bricks were for the following individuals: Reuss, the owner of Belle Helene, John Klos, a nephew of Reuss who managed the plantation, and a Mr. Gondron, who may have managed the plantation store (Gaynell Moore and William Hayward, personal communications 1989).

Summary of Significant Historic Themes

The New River Bend project area initially was settled by Acadian farmers. During the colonial eighteenth century, the Acadians built levees, cleared land, cultivated corn, beans, rice, and cotton, and raised hogs, cattle, and sheep. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, the socioeconomic patterns of the study area were changing. Large scale sugar cane agriculture replaced the diversified small farming of the Acadians. By 1830, large sugar plantations were the dominant historic Mississippi River settlement pattern in Ascension Parish.

Duncan F. Kenner’s Ashland Plantation was one of Louisiana’s most successful sugar plantations. Kenner was an important political figure and planter. It was during his tenure at Ashland that the batture warehouse, 16AN26, was built. Considering that most plantations did not maintain warehouses, and because the Ashland warehouse was very large, this plantation warehouse was an exceptional structure. Indirect evidence indicates that the Ashland warehouse was constructed of bricks made from the plantation kiln. The warehouse structure was destroyed between 1880 and 1911, as a result of levee construction.
CHAPTER V
FIELD METHODOLOGY

In accordance with the research design, the project area was surface collected, shovel tested, and augered to locate and to define the limits of batture components of the Ashland-Belle Helene Plantation. The entire batture directly in front of the Ashland-Belle Helene National Register property was examined as was the area surrounding the previously located brick foundation and brick scatter (Figure 11). The previously identified brick foundation and brick scatter were examined to assess their condition. Cultural remains observed during the pedestrian survey were evaluated to determine the need for further testing. Surface artifacts observed near the "warehouse" also were collected.

A site plan was then drawn documenting natural and cultural features such as natural and artificial levees, borrow pits, drainage ditches, components associated with the limestone yard, as well as the location of the Ashland-Belle Helene plantation house. The map included the locations of shovel and auger tests, excavation units, and identified archeological components. The elevations and locations of the features and excavations were recorded using an electronic distance meter (EDM); these data were tied to fixed levee monuments.

Shovel tests were placed at 10 to 20 m intervals across the project area to locate and determine the extent of archeological deposits. Sixty-seven shovel tests were excavated in front of Ashland-Belle Helene Plantation; another 65 were excavated near the warehouse; and, 11 were excavated in the brick scatter area. The shovel tests were excavated to 40 cm; soils were examined for cultural remains, and the stratigraphy of each shovel test was recorded. Based on the results of these shovel tests and of the pedestrian survey, the approximate size of each archeological feature was determined.

Twelve 2-inch Dutch auger tests were excavated within the project area to locate deeply buried archeological deposits. These auger tests were excavated in the undisturbed portion of the limestone yard, primarily the south portion of the yard, as well as between the levee and the borrow pits. Auger tests were excavated to a depth of 2 m, except when excavation was impeded by subsurface obstructions. Stratigraphic profiles were drawn of auger tests, and soil colors were recorded using Munsell Soil Color Charts. The excavated soils also were examined for artifactual remains.

A 1.5 m probe was used within features to define the extent of the buried deposits. Although no buried foundation remains were located near the old levee or brick scatter, probing was used near foundation remains to determine the placement of excavation units and the boundaries of the foundation remains and brick rubble.

Nine 1 x 1 m test excavation units were placed within the features that were identified. Six units were excavated in the warehouse area; two units were excavated in the brick scatter area; and, one unit was excavated at the riverside toe of the old levee near the warehouse. These units were excavated in 10 cm levels, and soils were examined for artifacts. All units were described, photographed, and drawn to scale. Following completion of site testing, all excavation units were backfilled.

A large brick pier or foundation section of the warehouse was located at the bluff edge near the river. This foundation section, which was identified during the 1984 field investigations, was drawn in plan view and photographed. In addition, a 2 m long profile was drawn of the foundation cross section and of the adjoining soil stratigraphy.
Figure 11. Site plan of 16AN26 project area.
CHAPTER VI
RESULTS OF THE FIELD INVESTIGATIONS

Introduction

Archeological testing showed that the entire batture area directly in front of the National Register portion of 16AN26 was damaged and disturbed, and that no in situ archeological remains were present. Large portions of the area could not be tested because the ground was impenetrable. Also, the area near the levee has been disturbed by a large borrow pit. Pedestrian survey, shovel testing, and auger testing directly in front of Belle Helene resulted in the recovery of only a scattering of twentieth century refuse. Soil deposits generally were mixed. No archeological remains were identified other than a small portion of a nineteenth/early twentieth century levee. Because of the dearth of archeological remains, no further testing was conducted in that portion of the project area.

The batture near the warehouse foundation and brick scatter was examined visually and shovel tested. These two features, along with the remains of a pre-1906 levee, were the only archeological deposits recorded. Additional testing was conducted to enable the assessment of the significance of these remains applying the National Register criteria. Unit 1 was placed adjacent to the old levee, which was enlarged in 1906. Units 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, and 9 were placed within and around the brick foundation, while Units 6 and 7 were placed within the previously identified brick scatter.

Brick Foundation Area

The brick warehouse foundation is eroding out of the top of the cutbank overlooking the Mississippi River, in woods just south of the limestone yard area and immediately adjacent to a drainage ditch. Brick rubble, including some bonded foundation segments, is present at the foot of the cutbank, which is within the river during moderately high water. The major concentration of building debris is contained within a 30 m square area (0.22 acres), although some brick and other artifacts are present in the surrounding area, especially in the disturbed area north of the foundation. All of the observed and recovered bricks in the area, with the possible exception of a firebrick fragment, were handmade.

During the 1984 investigations, an in situ segment of the brick foundation was observed and recorded at the edge of the cutbank. Also, brick rubble was observed at both the foot and top of the cutbank. These observations, along with the historical documentation, suggested that the foundation was the remains of a warehouse, probably built by Duncan Kenner and used to house hogsheads of sugar (Goodwin, Yakubik et al. 1985). No other in situ foundation remains were observed.

Since the 1984 investigations, some changes have occurred to the foundation. Bankline cutting has been marginal and has resulted in little additional damage to the foundation. However, around 1987, the Levee Board divided the borrow pit near the riverside toe of the modern levee into two segments and cut drainage ditches from these borrow pits to the Mississippi River. These ditches were deepened in December 1988 (Edward Jumonville II, personal communication 1989). This construction destroyed archeological deposits within the two ditches and damaged deposits between them. For example, in situ brick from the surviving remnant of a brick foundation was observed eroding in the south edge of the southern ditch; a portion of that foundation wall was destroyed during the excavation of the ditches.

The hypothesized brick warehouse area was shovel tested and probed to delineate its extent. Based on these tests, the approximate size of the surviving warehouse remains was estimated at 12 m square, adjacent to the cutbank edge and the drainage ditch. Six 1 x 1 m excavation units were placed within and around the foundation, and the surviving foundation section at the cutbank edge was recorded. This foundation section, along with the six excavation units, is described below.
Exposed Foundation

The 1.15 x 1.8 m foundation section protruding from the cutbank (Figure 12) was recorded, and the 2 m wide Profile A, showing a cross section of the foundation and the adjacent cutbank profile, was drawn (Figure 13). In this profile, 15 soil strata were present; these strata formed three general developmental episodes.

Strata I and II are horizontally bedded layers of dark brown clayey silt and brown silt located at the top of the profile. These strata contained no artifacts, charcoal, or other cultural remains. Rather, they were natural riverine sediments.

Strata III to XIII were composed of a variety of soils ranging from brown and dark brown silt to very dark grayish brown silt and very dark gray silty clay. Strata III and IX contained large brick chunks; most of the intervening strata contained brick fragments. Two layers of packed calcined clam shell mortar were present. All of the strata other than Strata III and V contained charcoal, and the overall tone of these strata was grayish brown compared to the brown tone in Strata I, II, XIV, and XV. Several artifacts were recovered from Strata IX and XII above the first step of the spread foundation footing. These included whiteware fragments, window and clear bottle glass, bone, nails, and iron fragments.

Strata XIV and XV, the basal strata, were dark brown silt and clay. Both contained large brick chunks, with those in Stratum XIV forming an incomplete layer. While some charcoal was present in Stratum XIV, no mortar or other artifacts were observed in these strata. These strata extended from the top of the spread footing to the bottom of the foundation.

The surviving portion of the foundation is an 11 course high construction. The lower 7-8 courses are a spread footing, 1.15 m wide, resting on the batture, which provided a firm, large base for the building. This large footing was necessary because of the relatively soft nature of the batture soils. This footing is topped with a two brick (0.22 m) wide foundation base for the main building construction. It is centered on the south portion of the foundation footing. Stratigraphic soil profiles indicate that the south half of the foundation was within the building. Based on the irregular brick arrangement on the river side of the foundation, it is likely that the foundation continued toward the river; portions of the building have been destroyed by riverine cutting. While the north face of the foundation was exposed by this cutting, the cutbank is held in place by the foundation (Figure 13).

Based on observation of the stratigraphy in relation to the brick foundation, the following interpretations can be made. The foundation was constructed, with its wide spread footing, to accommodate the weight of the building. Following its initial construction, the ground around the foundation, at least on the south side, was filled to the top of the spread footing with Strata XIV and XV. The top of Stratum XIV probably was the ground surface during the active use of the building. During the gradual process of building destruction, Strata III to XIII were formed. Based on the charcoal present throughout most of these strata, it is likely that at least a portion of the building burned. Finally, following the building destruction phase, Strata I and II were deposited over the site by the river.

Excavation Units 2, 3, 8, and 9

Excavation Units 2, 3, 8, and 9 (Figure 14) were four connected units placed over the foundation and part of an interior floor. These units were located about 3 m south of the modern drainage ditch and about 5 m from the cutbank (Figure 11).

Unit 2 was located at the northeast end of the four units (Figure 14). Six soil strata were excavated in the unit, the top and probable exterior of a brick foundation was exposed (Figure 15). Strata I to III were composed of brown and grayish brown silts and silty clays containing brick fragments, calcined clam shell mortar, coal fragments, and some modern refuse. These strata covered the entire unit, including the foundation. Strata IV to VI were fill strata adjacent to the foundation. Stratum IV was a layer of brick and mortar rubble containing some bottle glass, a wire nail, iron fragments, coal and slag. The face of one of
Figure 12. Photograph of foundation protruding from bluff edge.
Figure 13. Stratigraphic profile of Profile A at 16AN26.
Figure 14. Plan of Excavation Units 2, 3, 8, and 9 at 16AN26.
Figure 15. Stratigraphic profile of Excavation Unit 2 at 16AN26.
the brick fragments had been whitewashed. Stratum V, composed of very dark grayish brown silt, contained a fragment of banded whiteware, bottle and window glass, a nail and various sheet iron fragments, an iron cap, some brick and mortar, coal, and slag. Stratum VI, a dark brown clayey silt, exposed a nail fragment near the top and a few brick and mortar fragments.

Unit 8 was located immediately south of Unit 2 (Figure 14). It was excavated to expose the top of the foundation; the soils immediately east of the foundation were not excavated because of the narrow space between the foundation and the wall of the unit. Three strata (I to III) were excavated in Unit 2 (Figure 16). In addition to the brick, mortar, and coal fragments, a fragment of ironstone was excavated from the unit.

Excavation Units 3 and 9 were located west and southwest of Unit 8 (Figure 14). Eight strata were present in these adjacent units above a mortar-covered brick floor (Figure 17). Strata I and II, composed of dark brown clayey silt and very dark grayish brown silt, contained some brick fragments and coal cinders. Stratum III consisted of a compact black layer of coal and coal cinders which covered the south two-thirds of Unit 3. Stratum IV was a dark grayish brown clayey silt layered with brown silt, while Stratum V was a layer of crushed brick rubble. Strata VI and VII rested on the brick floor. Stratum VI was very similar to Stratum IV, since both were composed of natural riverine sediments. Stratum VII was a dark grayish brown silty clay, with brick and mortar fragments. Stratum VIII was a layer of crushed mortar overlying in situ brick two courses lower than the brick floor. Whiteware, bone, and a cut nail were recovered from these units in addition to the brick, mortar, coal, and coal cinders.

A portion of a massive brick foundation and a mortar-covered brick floor were exposed in these four excavation units (Figure 14). The top surviving portion of the brick foundation was seven courses wide. Along the east side of the foundation, a five-stepped brick spread footing began four to five courses down from the top surviving portion of the foundation (Figure 15). While the spread footing was not excavated to the bottom, its construction is very similar to that of the foundation segment at the edge of the bluff (Figure 13). Probing indicated that the foundation does not extend beyond the lower exposed step; based on the Figure 13 profile, the lower exposed step probably is three brick courses deep. The foundation in these units differs from the previously discussed foundation in that the upper portion is much wider than the one on the bluff edge foundation segment. The highest surviving portion of the foundation is one course higher than the brick floor.

The brick floor covers most of Unit 9 and the north end of Unit 3 (Figure 14), and extends to the edge of the brick foundation. It is covered with mortar and gradually slopes toward the northwest corner of Unit 9. The right angle formed by the floor near the northeast corner of Unit 3 indicates that the exposed brick in the south portion of Unit 3 is part of the foundation and not part of a damaged floor.

**Excavation Unit 4**

Excavation Unit 4 was located about 10 m south of Unit 3 (Figure 11). It was excavated in 15 levels containing nine strata (Figure 18). These strata included three basic depositional sequences. Strata I to V contained a variety of dark and very dark brown, yellowish brown, and grayish brown soils. While both Strata I and V contained a few brick fragments, no other artifacts were observed or recovered from these strata. All five strata sloped upward from the south to the north over the mounded Stratum VI, with the upper layers more level than the lower layers. These strata were naturally deposited riverine sediments overlying rubble from the warehouse.

Stratum VI contained a dark brown silty clay packed with brick rubble and some mortar and coal. It was a wedge-shaped stratum which covered the north half of the unit. A few artifacts were recovered from this layer, including a cut nail, some bottle glass fragments, and a fragment of a nineteenth century ginger beer bottle. In addition, one partial brick stamped with "[R.K].G. [BELLE H]ELENE LA" was recovered from this rubble. Stratum VI was brick rubble associated with the destruction of the warehouse structure.

Strata VII to IX were present immediately prior to the collapse of the warehouse. They included dark brown silty clay and yellowish brown sandy silt divided by a thin band of dark grayish brown hard silty clay.
UNIT 8

ELEVATION 7.886 METERS

KEY

STRATUM I: 10YR 4/3 DARK BROWN SILTY CLAY, WITH LIMESTONE, AND SOME BRICK, MORTAR, AND COAL FRAGMENTS

STRATUM II: 10YR 3/2 VERY DARK GRAYISH BROWN CLAYEY SILT, WITH BRICK, MORTAR, AND COAL FRAGMENTS

STRATUM III: 10YR 5/2 GRAYISH BROWN SILT, WITH SOME 10YR 5/3 BROWN SILT, WITH BRICK AND MORTAR FRAGMENTS

Figure 16. Stratigraphic profile of Excavation Unit 8 at 16AN26.
Figure 17. Stratigraphic profile of Excavation Units 3 and 9 at 16AN26.
UNIT 4

FACING WEST

FACING NORTH

ELEVATION 8.119 METERS

KEY

STRATUM I: 10YR 2/2 VERY DARK BROWN Silt Loam with roots and a few brick fragments
STRATUM II: 10YR 4/4 DARK YELLOWISH BROWN SAND
STRATUM III: 10YR 3/2 VERY DARK GRAYISH BROWN SILTY CLAY
STRATUM IV: 10YR 3/3 DARK BROWN SILTY CLAY
STRATUM V: 10YR 4/4 DARK YELLOWISH BROWN Silt, with some brick
STRATUM VI: 10YR 4/3 DARK BROWN Silt, hard packed with brick rubble, nails, coal, stoneware, glass, and mortar
STRATUM VII: 10YR 4/3 DARK BROWN Silt clay, with brick
STRATUM VIII: 10YR 4/2 DARK GRAYISH BROWN HARD SILTY CLAY
STRATUM IX: 10YR 5/4 YELLOWISH BROWN SANDY Silt, with some brick

0 25 CM

Figure 18. Stratigraphic profile of Excavation Unit 4 at 16AN26.
These strata contained brick fragments, and one nail. Other than several brick fragments, Stratum IX did not contain artifacts.

Based on the stratigraphic sequence and on the artifact distribution, the general depositional sequence of Unit 4 appears to have progressed through three phases. Strata VII to IX were deposited prior to the warehouse destruction and included a few artifacts deposited during the active use of the warehouse. Stratum VI was rubble deposited during the destruction of the building; it contained some artifacts dating to the terminal use of the building. These included one post-1889 brick, and the only stamped brick recovered from the foundation area. Based on the historical documentation, this brick probably was part of a late nineteenth or early twentieth century modification to the building rather than part of the original construction. Finally, Strata I to V were deposited over the brick rubble after the building was destroyed.

Excavation Unit 5

Excavation Unit 5 was located about 7 m southeast of Unit 2, toward the old levee (Figure 11). It was excavated in seven levels, and contained five strata (Figure 19). Stratum I was a thin layer of very dark brown loam. Stratum II was dark yellowish brown silt, while Strata III to V were dark brown and dark grayish brown silts and clays. No artifacts were observed or recovered from this unit, and probing indicated no obstructions below the bottom of the unit.

Unit 5 contained riverine deposits. No artifacts were present. As discussed in Chapter II, the warehouse remains are located within a mounded area caused by the sedimentation around the collapsed building. This induced mounding extended beyond the edge of the building remains. Unit 5 was within the mound area, but external to the cultural remains that induced mound development.

Brick Scatter Area

The brick scatter area is located on the cutbank of the Mississippi River, adjacent to a raised gravel parking lot of a marine services company. It lies about 125 m south of the brick foundation area (Figure 11). Its maximum extent is about 70 m north-south, parallel to the river, by 10 m (0.15 acres), although the primary concentration is within the northern 10 x 30 m area.

Eleven shovel tests were placed in the brick scatter area to define its stratigraphy and extent. These were placed in two rows at 10 m intervals, with one row near the parking lot, and the other 10 m to the west, between the parking lot and the river. These shovel tests produced three tentative conclusions: the south half of the scatter has been disturbed by parking lot construction, the scatter was not present beyond the visible extent of the surface brick, and, the cultural deposits did not extend deeper than the surface deposit. This shovel testing was supplemented by two excavation units.

Excavation Units 6 and 7

Excavation Units 6 and 7 were placed in the less disturbed northern portion of this scatter. Unit 6 contained four strata (Figure 20). Stratum I was dark brown silt mixed with very dark grayish brown silt and clay. It contained handmade brick fragments, machine-made bottle glass, a twentieth century earthenware fragment with a maroon glaze, a "DEEP SOUTH" jar lid, iron wire, and many pieces of gravel. Stratum II was composed of dark brown silt with some gravel and brick chips. Strata III and IV were layered with dark brown clay and silt, they contained no artifacts or evidence of cultural disturbance. While Strata I and II had been disturbed and contained twentieth century debris, Strata III and IV were riverine sediments.

Excavation Unit 7 was very similar to Unit 6. The upper 8 cm contained a mixed deposit of dark gray silty clay and dark yellowish brown silty clay. Brick fragments were located near the surface, but no other artifacts were present. Strata II and III contained thin riverine sediments of dark brown silt, dark yellowish brown silt, and dark grayish brown silty clay. No artifacts or evidence of cultural disturbance were found in these strata.
UNIT 5

KEY

STRATUM I: 10YR 2/2 VERY DARK BROWN ORGANIC LOAM
STRATUM II: 10YR 3/4 DARK YELLOWISH BROWN SILT
STRATUM III: 10YR 3/3 DARK BROWN SILTY CLAY
STRATUM IV: 10YR 4/2 DARK GRAYISH BROWN SILT
STRATUM V: 10YR 3/2 VERY DARK GRAYISH BROWN CLAY

Figure 19. Stratigraphic profile of Excavation Unit 5 at 16AN26.
UNIT 6

KEY

STRATUM I: 10YR 4/3 DARK BROWN SILT, MIXED WITH 10YR 3/2 VERY DARK GRAYISH BROWN SILT AND 10YR 3/2 VERY DARK GRAYISH BROWN CLAY. BRICK, GRAVEL, AND SOME MODERN ARTIFACTS PRESENT

STRATUM II: 10YR 4/3 DARK BROWN SILT, WITH A FEW BRICK CHIPS

STRATUM III: 10YR 3/3 DARK BROWN CLAY, LAYERED WITH 10YR 3/2 VERY DARK GRAYISH BROWN CLAY

STRATUM IV: 10YR 4/3 DARK BROWN SILT, LAYERED WITH 10YR 4/4 DARK YELLOWISH BROWN SILT, AND SIMILAR COLORS

Figure 20. Stratigraphic profile of Excavation Unit 6 at 16AN26.
Based on these two excavation units, along with the shovel tests and surface examination, the brick scatter deposit is a 5 cm to 10 cm thick layer of brick mixed with gravel and twentieth century artifacts resting on riverine deposits. There was no evidence of in situ remains below the mixed surface layer.

Old Levee Area

The remains of an old levee, which was enlarged in 1906, are present east of the foundation area, along the west edge of the borrow pit (Figure 11). This levee, referenced in Chapter IV, was constructed after 1872 and was replaced with the current levee system in 1930. The surviving portion is nearly 200 m long and up to 10 m wide, covering about 0.5 acres. A portion near the north end was destroyed by the construction of a set of pipelines and by the excavation of two modern ditches that drain the divided borrow pit.

The levee and surrounding batture were examined visually for artifactual remains, and the batture in front of the levee was shovel tested at 10 m intervals to delineate the extent of cultural remains. Based on these observations, some conclusions were possible. The levee contained numerous mixed bricks and brick fragments, including quite a few stamped "B H" and "R.K.G. BELLE HELENE LA." These bricks, discussed in Chapter IV, were made at the Belle Helene brickyard after 1889. Their mixture within the levee documents the 1906 levee enlargement. Also, while numerous bricks were scattered along the riverside toe of the levee, surface examination and shovel testing indicated they did not extend beyond about 5 m to 8 m from the levee toe.

Excavation Unit 1

Excavation Unit 1 was placed near the riverside toe of the old levee. It was excavated in seven levels, and contained three strata (Figure 21). Stratum I was a very dark brown with brick fragments, pebbles, coal, whiteware, brown lead glazed earthenware, bottle glass, and window glass. Stratum II was dark brown silty clay containing numerous brick fragments, along with whiteware, machine made and unidentified bottle glass, window glass, and iron fragments. Stratum III contained dark brown clayey silt mottled with dark grayish brown clay. It did not contain any brick or other artifacts.

The artifacts recovered suggest that both Strata I and II consisted of soil deposits associated with the 1906 levee enlargement. While the recovered artifacts were not precisely datable, Strata I and II contained a post 1889 brick stamped "B H." None of the brick fragments in either stratum were in situ, but had been deposited randomly. These layers rested on Stratum III, which contained no artifacts or evidence of cultural disturbance.

Summary

Archaeological investigation of the batture portion of 16AN26 resulted in the identification and testing of three features: a brick foundation, a brick scatter, and an old levee remains. Six excavation units were placed in and around the foundation. These units, along with shovel tests and probing, indicated the size of the surviving portion of the building and various construction characteristics. The surviving portions of the foundation measured approximately 12 m square, with at least 5 m along the west side destroyed by riverine cutting and an unknown distance to the north destroyed by modern construction activities. The handmade brick foundation was up to seven bricks wide in addition to a spread footing. The brick floor within the building was covered with a layer of mortar.

Two units were placed in the brick scatter area. Based on data recovered from these units and the shovel tests, the brick scatter was a twentieth century deposit with no archaeological integrity. There was no evidence of in situ deposits, or of cultural deposits below the surface layer.
UNIT 1

FACING NORTH       FACING EAST

KEY

STRATUM I: 10YR 2/2 VERY DARK BROWN ORGANIC LOAM WITH SURFACE BRICKS, PEBBLES, AND COAL
STRATUM II: 10YR 3/3 DARK BROWN SILTY CLAY MOTTLED HEAVILY WITH IRON OXIDES, WITH LARGE BRICK FRAGMENTS, BRICK RUBBLE, COAL, AND GLASS
STRATUM III: 10YR 3/3 DARK BROWN CLAYEY SILT MOTTLED WITH 10YR 4/2 DARK GRAYISH BROWN CLAY AND IRON OXIDES.

0 25
CM

BRICK FRAGMENTS

Figure 21. Stratigraphic profile of Excavation Unit 1 at 16AN26.
Finally, a unit was placed adjacent to the old levee remains. This unit recorded early twentieth century fill associated with the 1906 enlargement of the levee. No intact features or deposits were located near the levee.
CHAPTER VII

LABORATORY ANALYSIS

Introduction

A total of 168 artifacts were recovered from 16AN26 including 33 ceramic sherds, 67 glass fragments, 35 metal artifacts including 11 nails, and 11 bricks. Artifacts were washed and sorted into material categories, cataloged, and encoded into a computerized site catalog to allow further manipulation of the data. The computerized site catalog is organized by category, functional group, type, and subtype. The first level, category, is based on the format used by the Louisiana Division of Archaeology. The second level, functional group, is based on the classification established by South (1977). The third and fourth levels, type and subtype, are based on diagnostic attributes. The resulting code identifies the artifact down to the subtype level and allows for detailed pattern analysis.

The following discussion describes the artifacts collected from three features within 16AN26, the brick foundation, the brick scatter, and the old levee. Following this discussion, special attention is focused on the brick remains recovered from these areas. Materials recovered from 16AN26 are listed on Table 3. Table 4 shows chronological information for ceramic and glass types and for nails. Metric and non-metric brick attribute data are recorded on Table 5. Attribute data for bricks include metric data (length, width, thickness), Munsell color designations, hardness values derived from the Mohs test, presence or absence of glaze or mortar, and recordation of maker’s marks.

In the foundation area, 102 artifacts were collected. Thirty-five, mostly ceramic sherds, were recovered during surface collection. Eight plain whiteware sherds, three porcelain sherds, three pieces of white earthenware bisque, two white undecorated ironstone sherds, and two whiteware/ironstone sherds were recovered. One piece of domestic gray, salt-glazed and albany slip stoneware and one piece of industrial buff-bodied stoneware also were collected. In addition, one stoneware drainage pipe fragment was found.

Glass found during surface collection included five pieces of unidentified bottle glass, two window glass fragments, and one fragment of amethyst, mold-blown glass. Amethyst colored glass has a use popularity date range of 1875-1920, with a mean date of 1898. Also recovered was one cobalt blue, machine-made pharmaceutical bottle embossed with the words "BROMO SELTZER/EMERSON DRUG CO/BALTIMORE MD." Bromo Seltzer was formulated and trademarked in 1889, after 1907, its bottles were manufactured by the Maryland Glass Corporation. Cork enclosures were in use until 1928 (Fike 1987) The 16AN26 example probably had a cork enclosure and dates from 1907 to 1928.

Two bricks and one brick fragment were collected from the surface of the warehouse area. One was a partial machine-made brick, stamped with the maker’s mark "...MBLE," (Brick No. 1) Although weathered, the brick’s light yellowish brown color and hardness suggests that it could be a fire brick. The term ‘fire brick’ describes a brick that can withstand high temperatures. The other was a whole handmade brick with calcined clamshell mortar adhering to it (Brick No. 2).

One pike, a tool often used for logging, and one shell button with a brass shank also were found in proximity to the brick foundation. The shell button dates from the late nineteenth/early twentieth century. Shovel testing in the foundation area recovered one green, unidentified bottle glass fragment.

Thirty-eight artifacts were found in Excavation Unit 2 in the foundation area. Eighteen metal artifacts included four tin can fragments, three pieces of slag, two wire nails, three unidentified nails, one aerosol can, one top or cap, and four unidentified metal objects. The use popularity date range for wire nails post dates 1890. Twelve fragments of unidentified bottle glass including one molded piece were collected, as were three pieces of mold-blown glass and one fragment of window glass. One annular whiteware sherd was recovered. Annular whiteware has the same use popularity date range as plain whiteware. One partial handmade brick and a piece of calcined clamshell mortar were found. The partial handmade brick had either whitewash or plaster on one side (Brick No. 3). One piece of coal was collected.
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Table 3

RECOVERED MATERIAL FROM SITE 16AN26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERAMIC MATERIALS</th>
<th>Surface Collection</th>
<th>Shovel Tests</th>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>Unit 2</th>
<th>Unit 4</th>
<th>Unit 6</th>
<th>Unit 8</th>
<th>Unit 9</th>
<th>Profile A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated, hard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer printed, soft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic gray, salt glazed and albany slip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial, buff bodied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware/ironstone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, undecorated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginger beer bottle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buff Bodied Earthenware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown lead glaze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Earthenware Bisque</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate Earthenware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware Drainage Pipe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Collection</td>
<td>Shovel Tests</td>
<td>Unit 1</td>
<td>Unit 2</td>
<td>Unit 4</td>
<td>Unit 6</td>
<td>Unit 8</td>
<td>Unit 9</td>
<td>Profile A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fragments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Machine-made, partial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handmade, partial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handmade, whole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calcined Clam Shell Mortar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAUNAL</td>
<td>Non-human bone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>Blown in Mold</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amethyst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aqua</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fire Polished Lip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Light green</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lip, Toolled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aqua</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Machine-Made Bottle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pharmaceutical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cobalt blue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Collection</td>
<td>Shovel Tests</td>
<td>Unit 1</td>
<td>Unit 2</td>
<td>Unit 4</td>
<td>Unit 6</td>
<td>Unit 8</td>
<td>Unit 9</td>
<td>Profile A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Bottle Glass</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amethyst</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light green</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark green</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melted Glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**METAL**

| Aerosol can        | 1            |        |        |        |        |        |        |           |
| Tin can            | 4            |        |        |        |        |        |        |           |
| Flat iron          | 1            |        |        |        |        |        |        |           |
| Iron band          | 1            |        |        |        |        |        |        |           |
| Lid                | 1            |        |        |        |        |        |        |           |
| Pike               | 1            |        |        |        |        |        |        |           |
| Slag               | 2            | 3      |        |        |        |        |        |           |
| Top/cap            | 1            |        |        |        |        |        |        |           |
| Nails              |              |        |        |        |        |        |        |           |
| Cut                | 2            |        |        |        |        |        |        | 1         |
| Wire               | 2            |        |        |        |        |        |        |           |
| Unidentified       | 3            | 1      |        |        |        |        |        | 2         |

**Unidentified Metal Object**

| 2            | 4 | 1 | 2 |

**SHELL**

| Shell button      | 1 |        |    |    |    |    |    |           |

**STONE**

| Chert pebble      | 1 |        |    |    |    |    |    |           |
| Coal              | 2 |        | 1 |    |    |    |    |           |
| Unidentified stone| 1 |        |    |    |    |    |    |           |

**TOTAL**

| 39 | 20 | 40 | 38 | 11 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 12 |
Table 4

CHRONOLOGY OF CERAMIC TYPES, GLASS TYPES, AND NAILS RECOVERED FROM SITE 16AN26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Type</th>
<th>Use Popularity</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Date Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CERAMIC WARE AND DECORATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic gray stoneware,</td>
<td></td>
<td>1810-1900</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Goodwin, Yakubik, and Gendel 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray salt glazed and albany slip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial stoneware,</td>
<td></td>
<td>1850-1900</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Ketchum 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buff bodied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, plain</td>
<td></td>
<td>1820-1900+</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>South 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware/Ironstone</td>
<td></td>
<td>1813-1900+</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Goodwin, Yakubik, and Gendel 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone, white, undecorated</td>
<td></td>
<td>1813-1900</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Wetherbee 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowware, ginger beer bottle</td>
<td></td>
<td>1830-1900</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Ramsay 1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIAGNOSTIC GLASS ATTRIBUTES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lip, tooled</td>
<td></td>
<td>1850-1920</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Munsey 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire-polished lip</td>
<td></td>
<td>ca. 1880</td>
<td></td>
<td>Munsey 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine-made</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post 1920</td>
<td></td>
<td>Munsey 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amethyst color</td>
<td></td>
<td>1875-1920</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Jones and Sullivan 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NAILS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut</td>
<td></td>
<td>1815-1890</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Nelson 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wire</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post 1890</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nelson 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick No.</td>
<td>Length (cm)</td>
<td>Width (cm)</td>
<td>Thickness (cm)</td>
<td>Munsell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9.6cm</td>
<td>6.0cm</td>
<td>10YR 8/4 very pale brown and 10YR 6/4 light yellowish brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.4cm</td>
<td>10.3cm</td>
<td>6.1cm</td>
<td>5YR 5/4 reddish brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.6cm</td>
<td>2.5YR 6/8 light red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10.1cm</td>
<td>6.1cm</td>
<td>2.5YR 5/6 red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9.3cm</td>
<td>5.9cm</td>
<td>2.5YR 3/4 dark reddish brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9.8cm</td>
<td>6.5cm</td>
<td>2.5YR 5/8 red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9.8cm</td>
<td>6.6cm</td>
<td>2.5YR 5/6 red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10.1cm</td>
<td>6.7cm</td>
<td>2.5YR 5/6 red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9.1cm</td>
<td>6.8cm</td>
<td>2.5YR 4/4 reddish brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9.3cm</td>
<td>6.3cm</td>
<td>2.5YR 4/4 reddish brown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Excavation Unit 4 in the foundation area produced 11 artifacts. These included one yellowware ginger beer bottle sherd, which has a use popularity date range of 1830-1900 and a mean date of 1865. Also recovered were four unidentified bottle glass fragments, two cut nails, one unidentified nail, and one unidentified metal object. Cut nails have a use popularity date range of 1815-1890 and a mean date of 1853. One piece of calcined clam shell mortar and one partial handmade brick were collected. The brick had the maker’s mark "[R K.G./BELLE H]ELENE LA" (Brick No. 4). The Ashland Plantation was purchased by John B Reuss in 1889 who renamed it “Belle Helene” (see Chapter IV), indicating that these bricks postdate 1889. The initial "R" stood for Reuss, the initial "K" was for John C. Klos, John Reuss’ nephew, who managed the plantation ca. 1890-1920, and the initial "G" stood for Gondron, who managed the plantation store (William Hayward and Gaynell Moore, personal communication 1989).

Excavation Unit 8 in the foundation area produced one artifact, a piece of undecorated white ironstone. Five artifacts were recovered from Excavation Unit 9, one plain whiteware sherd, two faunal remains, and two cut nails.

Twelve artifacts were recovered from Profile A. Profile A shows the bluff edge of the foundation and the adjacent soil profile (see Chapter VI). One molded and two plain whiteware sherds were collected, as were one fragment of non-human bone, three fragments of window glass, one fragment of bottle glass, two unidentified nails, and two unidentified metal objects.

Excavation Unit 6 in the brick scatter area yielded three artifacts. One indeterminate earthenware sherd, one clear machine-made bottle glass base, and one metal jar lid. The jar lid was stamped with the words ”Deep South.” The use popularity date range for machine-made bottle glass is post 1920.

Sixty-two artifacts were collected from the old levee area. Shovel testing produced 19 artifacts, including one light green, fire-polished bottle lip and one aqua, tooled bottle lip. Fire-polished bottle lips date from ca. 1880, while tooled bottle lips have a use popularity date range of 1850-1920 and a mean date of 1885. Also recovered were nine brick fragments, two machine-made bottle glass fragments, one piece of green unidentified bottle glass, two pieces of slag, two pieces of coal, and one unidentified stone.

Three partial handmade bricks were found during surface collection in the old levee area. All three were stamped with part or all of the maker’s mark ”R.K.G/Belle Helene LA” (Bricks No. 5, 10, and 11). One of the bricks, Specimen No. 10, had a raised band on one face perpendicular to the long axis of the brick. This band may have been caused during the drying process when wet bricks were laid on wooden slats, the spacing between the slats would have produced a raised band.

Excavation Unit 1 in the old levee area produced 40 artifacts, including three partial handmade bricks (Bricks No. 6, 7, and 8). Two of the bricks were stamped with all or part of the maker’s mark ”B H,” which probably stood for Belle Helene. Glass artifacts included 18 fragments of unidentified bottle glass, six pieces of machine-made bottle glass, two pieces of window glass, and one mold-blown glass fragment. Five ceramic sherds were found: two plain and two molded whiteware sherds, and one buff-bodied earthenware sherd with a brown lead glaze. Metal artifacts included one piece of flat iron, an iron band, and two unidentified metal objects. One chert pebble also was collected.

One partial handmade brick was found between the old levee area and the foundation area during surface collection (Brick No. 9). The brick had the maker’s mark ”B H” and two raised bands on one face perpendicular to the long axis of the brick, similar to the band observed on Specimen No. 10 collected from the old levee area.

One soil sample was taken from Unit 2, Stratum V (Figure 15), located in the foundation area. The heavy fraction component produced glass, brick, and mortar fragments as well as coal, slag, shell, bone, seeds, and one lead shot. The light fraction component yielded charcoal, twigs, wood, bark, shell, and seeds.

Handmade bricks from 16AN26 were compared with handmade bricks recovered from sites discovered during the Cultural Resources Survey of Gretna Phase II Levee Enlargement Item (Goodwin,
Athens et al. 1989). The average dimensions of the partial handmade bricks from Site 16AN26 were 9.7 cm (n=9) x 6.3 cm (n=10). Length was recordable for only one of the bricks, Specimen No. 2; it was 22.4 cm long. Munsell colors of the 16AN26 handmade bricks ranged from dark reddish brown to weak red. Average dimensions for handmade bricks from Site 16JE207 were 20.7 cm (n=8) x 9.2 cm (n=16) x 6.0 cm (n=16). One handmade brick from Site 16JE208 had a width of 9.0 cm and was 6.3 cm thick; length measurement was not recordable. Site 16JE209 produced one brick with a width of 9.0 cm; width was the only brick dimension left intact. Site 16JE211 had two handmade bricks with average dimensions of 20.8 cm x 9.3 cm x 5.95 cm. Munsell colors for these handmade bricks varied. The handmade bricks from 16AN26 were on average 0.5 cm wider and 0.3 cm thicker than Site 16JE207 examples. Bricks from Site 16JE208 and 16JE209 were 0.7 cm narrower than the average 16AN26 handmade brick; thickness of the 16JE208 brick was the same. Handmade bricks from 16AN26 were 0.4 cm wider and 0.35 cm thicker than the average handmade brick from Site 16JE211.

The average 16AN26 handmade brick was softer than those recovered from 16JE207, 16JE208, 16JE209, and 16JE211. The average Mohs test value for handmade bricks from 16AN26 was 2.6 (n=10) and ranged from 1.5 to 3.5. Average Mohs test values for 16JE207, 16JE208, 16JE209, and 16JE211 were 3.0 (range of 1.5 to 4.5), 3.5, 3.5, and 4.0 (range of 3.5 to 4.5), respectively.

The 16AN26 handmade bricks also were compared to the handmade bricks from 16PC33, Lakeland Plantation on the Mississippi River, in Point Coupee Parish (Goodwin, Gendel, and Yakubik 1984). Handmade bricks from 16PC33 had average dimensions of 20.4 cm (n=12) x 9.6 cm (n=13) x 5.6 cm (n=13). Mohs values ranged from 2.0 to 3.5 (n=13), with an average of 2.9. The handmade bricks from 16AN26 were on average 0.1 cm wider, 0.7 cm thicker, and they were slightly softer.

A final comparison was made using the brick attribute data gathered from the brick subassemblage found at 16IV147, near White Castle, Iberville Parish, LA (Goodwin, Armstrong et al. 1988). The handmade bricks from 16AN26 were compared to the "country" (Shenkel and Beavers 1978) bricks of 16IV147. The average dimensions of the 16IV147 bricks were 21.6 cm (n=5) x 10.55 cm (n=14) x 5.73 cm (n=14). The average Mohs test value for the 16IV147 bricks was 2.65 and ranged from 1.5 to 3.5. Thus, 16AN26 bricks were 0.85 cm narrower, 0.57 cm thicker, and they had almost equivalent Mohs test values.

The one 16AN26 possible machine-made fire brick was compared to the fire bricks recovered from sites 16JE211 and 16JE209 from the Gretna survey (Goodwin, Athens et al. 1989). The average dimensions of the partial fire bricks from 16JE211 were 10.9 cm (n=4) x 6.1 cm (n=4); length was not recordable. The fire brick from 16JE209 was 11.1 cm wide and 5.0 cm thick; length was not recordable. The 16AN26 partial fire brick was 9.6 cm wide and 6.0 cm thick. The 16AN26 brick was 1.3 cm narrower and 0.1 cm thinner than the 16JE211 brick; it was 1.5cm narrower and 1.0 cm thicker than the brick from Site 16JE209. The Mohs test value of 4.5 for the 16AN26 fire brick was similar to the Gretna fire bricks, which ranged from 3.5 to 4.5.

In summary, only slight differences exist between handmade bricks from 16AN26 and those from the Gretna survey, Lakeland Plantation, and from 16IV147. Attribute data from such a small sample can be used only for comparative purposes, however, these analyses may aid future studies of brick morphology.
CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Foundation Area

The archeological deposits at the foundation feature contained several elements. The foundation itself included an unusually wide spread footing, in some areas at least 1.15 m wide. The upper surviving portions of this foundation varied considerably, from two bricks wide at the bankline (Figure 13) to seven bricks wide at floor level toward the east edge of the building (Figure 14). At least a portion of the building had a mortar-covered brick floor.

Only a portion of the foundation has survived. Its west end was destroyed by riverine cutting, as evidenced by the incomplete foundation segment protruding from the bluff edge and by the large brick rubble concentration, including articulated brick segments, at the foot of the bluff. The north end of the building was destroyed by a modern borrow pit drainage ditch, remains of in situ brick are eroding from the south wall of the ditch. Also, at least some of the associated deposits north of the building were disturbed by the placement of nearby pipelines. Based on evidence gathered from excavations and probing, the surviving portion of the building is estimated at 12 m square, adjacent to the bluff edge and to the modern drainage ditch.

The historical and archeological evidence indicates that this building is the remains of a batture warehouse associated with Ashland-Belle Helene Plantation. It was constructed by Duncan Kenner prior to the Civil War, and it was the warehouse mentioned by Kenner’s daughter as she recounted the landing of the Union soldiers at the plantation in 1862. It was located adjacent to the Ashland-Belle Helene Plantation, where it was used to store processed sugar. The warehouse is depicted on the 1872 Mississippi River Commission Map (Figure 6), on the map, it is surrounded by a levee that no longer exists. While its exact date of destruction is unknown, the building no longer was standing by the 1920s. It is not depicted on the 1921 Mississippi River Commission Map, and two elderly residents do not remember the structure. Lewis R. Roth worked at the nearby Bowden sugarhouse, which was owned by John Reuss, before World War I. While he remembers Belle Helene Plantation and many of its buildings, he does not remember a building by the landing. Processed sugar was placed directly on the batture prior to shipment rather than in a warehouse (Lewis R. Roth, personal communication 1989). Wilford Duplesis moved to the area in 1921 and currently owns a portion of the original Belle Helene farmland. He, too, remembers the various plantation buildings, but he does not remember a warehouse building by the landing (Wilford Duplesis, personal communication 1989). The recollections of these residents correspond to the archeological evidence, since recovered artifacts generally date from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The levee construction sequence near the warehouse may provide insight into the terminal use date of the warehouse. On the previously mentioned 1872 Mississippi River Commission Map (Figure 6), the warehouse is surrounded by an irregularly shaped protrusion in the levee system. This indicates that the building was threatened by riverine cutting necessitating the irregular levee design. Prior to the end of the century, this irregular protrusion in the levee was replaced with another levee, which was enlarged in 1906.

Brick Scatter Area

The brick scatter area is located adjacent to the Mississippi River, immediately west of a modern raised parking lot. It is parallel to the river, and it contains handmade brick fragments, gravel, and some twentieth century artifacts. There is no evidence of in situ structural remains associated with this brick scatter.

The source of this brick remains unclear. It may be residual debris from an old spur levee because it is similar to the brick scatter found near the riverside toe of the levee near Unit 1, located east of the
warehouse, which was enlarged in 1906 (Figure 7). The main Mississippi River levee originally stood a short distance inland from this area (Figures 7 and 8), this levee was replaced in 1908. Figure 8 depicts a large building at the riverside toe of the proposed new levee. This building was destroyed by levee construction and by excavation of the adjacent borrow pit. The brick could have come from that building. Finally, the raised parking lot adjacent to the brick scatter area was constructed in part with brick debris, the brick scatter could have originated during construction of the parking lot.

Old Levee Area

The old levee area is located east (directly inland) of the warehouse, adjacent to and on the river side of a borrow pit. Its date of construction is unclear, however, it is not depicted on the 1872 Mississippi River Commission Map (Figure 6) indicating a post-1872 construction date. It was enlarged in 1906 and replaced with the modern levee system in 1930 (Figures 7 and 9). The archeological remains corroborate these dates, since several post-1889 Belle Helene bricks were recovered from the levee.

The surviving portion of the levee was constructed with fill containing a considerable amount of brick rubble. This brick currently extends 5 to 8 m from the riverside levee toe. The archeological evidence indicates that the levee toe may have extended 1 to 2 m closer to the river and may have been somewhat lower than the modern ground surface. However, erosion of the old levee and riverine sedimentation have cut the face of the levee, depositing considerable brick rubble at its toe and burying the brick rubble within batture sediments.

Recommendations

The three batture features of 16AN26 were evaluated applying the National Register of Historic Places criteria of significance (36 CFR 60.4(a-d)). As a significant exemplar of events of historical significance, a site must possess the traits necessary to convey an historical or thematic context. In addition to having a strong association with those events, a site must possess contextual integrity. To manifest the requisite integrity for National Register eligibility, a site must possess in situ surface or subsurface cultural deposits. In general, an archeological site must have integrity, and satisfy both criteria a and d to be evaluated as a significant resource. These criteria will be applied to each of the three identified batture features at 16AN26.

Foundation Area

The warehouse remains are located on a cutbank overlooking the Mississippi River. Portions of the warehouse have been destroyed by riverine cutting and by drainage ditch and pipeline construction. The warehouse remains are associated with at least two significant historical themes identified by the State of Louisiana. plantation archeology and the influence of the Mississippi River on historic settlement (Smith et al. 1983). In addition, warehouse remains along the Mississippi River have been identified as potentially significant cultural resources (Goodwin, Hanks et al. 1989). Warehouses along the Mississippi River were important components of southern Louisiana plantations and they are potentially significant resources for understanding the plantation complex. Thus, the warehouse foundation is associated with events (themes) significant in the regional history (36 CFR 60.4(a)). The warehouse was built by Duncan Kenner, the owner of Ashland Plantation until his death in 1887. As discussed in Chapter IV, Kenner was a regionally important planter and military leader for whom the city of Kenner, Louisiana, is named. Kenner owned the plantation during the significant period identified in placing the landward components of Ashland-Belle Helene Plantation on the National Register. Thus, the warehouse foundation also is associated with the life of a significant historical figure (36 CFR 60.4(b)).

However, most of the warehouse has been destroyed by natural and cultural forces, those portions no longer are in situ, and have little locational integrity. The integrity of setting, workmanship, and feeling is lacking because of site destruction processes and the twentieth century natural environmental changes.
to the surrounding batture. The integrity of design is limited to the construction design of the warehouse foundation and floor, part of which has been recorded and part of which has been destroyed. The warehouse foundation has some integrity of materials in the partial foundation, but these materials (primarily bricks) have limited research potential beyond what has been recorded. Finally, the integrity of association is limited by the site destruction processes. Much of the brick floor was covered with mortar. Based on the excavated units, few, if any, intact historic deposits associated with the use of the warehouse are present on top of that floor.

The limited archeological integrity of the warehouse remains directly affects the research potential of the site [36 CFR 60.4(d)]. The major questions that could be addressed at this site concern its architecture. How large was the building? What was its floorplan? Was the entire floor covered with brick? Because of the dearth of associated artifacts and the incompleteness of the foundation, it is unlikely that significant new data would be learned about this site, or about plantation warehouses in general, through additional excavation. Because of prior destruction, complete and meaningful archeological documentation is not feasible.

**Brick Scatter Area**

The brick scatter is a surface deposit, extending 5 to 10 cm deep and containing handmade brick and twentieth century artifacts. It cannot be associated directly with a specific historic event or structure. Therefore, it cannot be associated with significant historical themes or patterns, or with significant persons. No in situ structural remains or culturally significant deposits were located in the area. The site had no archeological integrity or research potential. Additional archeological investigations would not produce additional important scientific or historical data.

**Old Levee Area**

The levee is located directly west of the foundation remains. It probably was constructed between 1880-1900 and enlarged in 1906. Early levees are mentioned in *Louisiana's Comprehensive Archaeological Plan* as potentially significant archeological resources. They are discussed in relationship to two important historical themes, the influence of the Mississippi River on historic settlement and Euro-American influence on the landscape (Smith et al. 1983:47-48). Levee construction was vital to the historic development of southeastern Louisiana, and these levees clearly are part of an important regional historical pattern (Goodwin, Hicks et al. 1989).

The old levee remains are not directly associated with a person important in history or with important distinctive artistic or architectural construction characteristics. Also, the research potential of this feature is virtually nil. In addition to damage by erosion and riverine cutting, the basic construction techniques for late nineteenth century levees is known. Further examination of this levee would not provide significant additional information about that class of feature.

**Conclusions**

The three extant batture features of 16AN26 (Ashland-Belle Helene Plantation) included the remains of a warehouse associated with the plantation, a brick scatter, and a ca. 1880-1900 levee, which was enlarged in 1906. All three were evaluated applying the National Register criteria of eligibility (36 CFR 60.4), and none were found significant. Further archeological investigations on the batture would not provide significant additional information about regional historical themes or about the adjacent National Register site. No further work at the batture component of 16AN26 is recommended. No change in the National Register boundaries of the Ashland-Belle Helene property is recommended.
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SITE NAME: Ashland-Belle Helene Plantation

SITE SURVEY NO.: 16AN26

QUADRANGLE: USGS 7.5 minute series topographic, Carville, LA quadrangle, 1974

UTM COORDINATES: Zone 15, N3339350, E692370

W 1/4 of the W 1/4 of Section 19, Township 10 S, Range 2 E

SITE DESCRIPTION, CONDITION, AND PRESENT AND FUTURE IMPACTS:
The batture features of Site 16AN26 were examined prior to planned revetment construction. These features included the remains of a foundation, a brick scatter; and an old levee. The foundation was interpreted as a circa 1840s-1900 warehouse located a short distance downriver from the historic Ashland-Belle Helene plantation landing. A reference to the warehouse was discovered in an 1862 document detailing Union soldiers landing at the plantation, near the warehouse (The Brent Recollections, Department of Archives and Manuscripts, Louisiana State University). While the remains originally were constructed on the landside of the levee, they currently lie along the bluff edge overlooking the Mississippi River. The extant portion of the warehouse measured about 12 m square. An unknown amount of the foundation was destroyed by riverine cutting; the riverbank in front of the bluff at the time of survey was covered with handmade bricks. Also, a portion of the warehouse to the north was destroyed by pipeline and modern drainage ditch construction. The foundation was wide and contained a spread footer about 1.15 m wide, and was seven bricks wide at floor level. At least some of the warehouse had a brick floor covered with mortar. Few artifacts directly associated with the operation of the warehouse were recovered.

The brick scatter was located about 125 m south of the foundation, near the river, and adjacent to a modern raised parking lot. The brick scatter consisted of a surface deposit of handmade brick mixed with gravel and some twentieth century artifacts. It did not extend beyond about 10 cm in depth, and there was no evidence of in situ structural remains.

The old levee was located about 40 m inland from the warehouse remains. Based on historical maps, it was constructed between 1880 and 1900, it was enlarged in 1906, and was replaced by the modern levee in 1930. The remains are nearly 200 m long, and up to 10 m wide, and are fairly eroded. Toward the north end the levee has been impacted by the excavation of modern borrow pit drainage ditches. Handmade brick and brick rubble are scattered throughout the levee fill, and along the toe of the levee. Some of these bricks are stamped "B H" or "R.K.G. BELLE HELENE LA." These bricks postdate 1889, when the plantation name was changed to Belle Helene. Some late nineteenth or twentieth century artifacts also are present.

SURVEY METHODS AND DESCRIPTION OF MATERIALS COLLECTED: The area directly in front of the National Register portion of Ashland-Belle Helene Plantation was shovel tested and augered; no archeological deposits were located. The three previously discussed features were located and shovel tested at 10 m intervals to delineate boundaries. Nine 1x1 m units were placed in these three areas: six by the warehouse, two in the brick scatter, and one at the old levee. Four units, at the warehouse, were excavated to in situ foundation remains. The other five units also were placed within the identified features, and were excavated through the cultural deposits into sterile batture soils. Excavated soils were examined for artifacts, and detailed notes were kept for each excavation unit. A bluff edge profile, showing a portion of the warehouse foundation, also was drawn. Photographs were taken of each unit, along with other visible cultural remains.

A total of 168 artifacts were recovered during the 1989 excavations at the batture features of 16AN26. Late nineteenth and early twentieth century artifacts and cultural materials were recovered from the warehouse area. These included whiteware, ironstone, bone china, nails, bottle and window glass, a carved shell button, a pike, some bone, handmade brick, calcined clam shell mortar, and coal. Most were deposited by riverine activity, and could not be associated with the use of the warehouse. Cultural remains recovered...
from the brick scatter included handmade brick, gravel, a jar lid, a modern ceramic sherd, and machine made glass. None of these artifacts originated from in situ deposits. Artifacts located at the old levee include handmade brick, whitteware, bottle and window glass, and iron fragments. These artifacts were secondarily deposited as part of the levee fill.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The warehouse has little archeological integrity, and little research potential. The brick scatter has no archeological integrity, and neither it nor the old levee have substantive research potential. None of the three batture features of Site 16AN26 is a significant cultural resource, and none meets the criteria of significance as defined by the National Register. No further archeological testing is recommended at the three batture features of Site 16AN26.

REMARKS: A professional report on this site is in preparation under U.S. Army Corps of Engineers contract DACW29-88-D-0121, Delivery Order 03, Significance Assessment of 16AN26, New River Bend Revetment, Ascension Parish, Louisiana.

RECORDED BY: R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc.
Stephen Hinks, M.A.

DATE: March 1, 1989
APPENDIX II

SCOPE OF WORK
1. **General Nature of the Work to be Performed.** The Contractor shall complete the significance assessment of two brick features (formerly reported as sites 16AN37 and 16AN38) associated with Ashland-Belle Helene Plantation (16AN26) (Enclosure 1, Site Form). The goals of this investigation are a) to assess whether sufficient data exist to warrant seeking a determination of eligibility for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places for the batture portion of site 16AN26; b) to establish the temporal and functional relationship of the batture features to Ashland-Belle Helene Plantation; c) to analyze the data collected; and d) to prepare a final report of investigation. The delivery order period is 159 days.

2. **Project Background.** The two brick features in question were found in 1984 by R. Christopher Goodwin and Associates, Inc. (Goodwin et al. 1985:133-135, 188, 194) during a survey conducted for the US Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District. Both features are located on the Mississippi River batture between miles 183.8 and 181.5, on the river's left descending bank. The purpose of the 1984 survey was to locate all sites in the gap between existing segments of the New River Bend and Marchand Revetments. A literature search specific to the reach was completed. The project was not designed to include extensive testing. The significance of the two features, identified as sites 16AN37 and 16AN38 in the report, was not unequivocally established to the satisfaction of the State Historic Preservation Officer (by letter dated November 13, 1984; Enclosure 2). Since that time, the State Archeologist's office has reassigned numbers 16AN37 and 16AN38 to two new sites, and included the two New River Bend batture features with 16AN26. Because the National Register of Historic Places boundary of Ashland-Belle Helene Plantation stops at the landside edge of the River Road, the two batture features are considered part of the larger Ashland-Belle Helene archeological site but technically are not part of the National Register of Historic Places property.

The two brick features appear to date from the first half of the nineteenth century. Associated artifact assemblages were not found in 1984. However, two historic sherds were identified as having been found on the surface close to the former 16AN37. Former site 16AN37 was described as a brick scatter rather than a brick foundation. Shovel tests around the feature yielded negative results. Former site 16AN38 was identified as a foundation of seven courses of tiered brick in association with a brick floor two courses in height. Records research suggested that the massive foundation was the Ashland Plantation warehouse. Both features have been damaged by erosion and industrial related clearing on the batture. Their condition is expected to have changed since 1984.

3. **Project Impact.** The US Army Corps of Engineers plans to construct the downstream segment of New River Bend Revetment in 1989. The revetment will be a continuous, articulated concrete mattress which will extend from the low water line to a point several hundred feet into the river channel. To prepare for revetting, a 300 foot wide corridor will be cleared of all vegetation. The 150 to 200 foot strip immediately adjacent to the bank line will be graded to a standard slope. Slope preparation may remove 12 or more vertical feet from the bank line profile. Both brick features will be removed in the process.

4. **Study Requirements.** The work to be performed by the Contractor will be divided into two phases. Testing and Assessment of Significance and Project Impact, and Data Analysis and Report Preparation. Any literature search necessary to complete this study shall be conducted concurrently with the field investigation.
a. **Phase 1: Testing and Assessment of Significance and Project Impact.** Phase I will commence within 10 days after the date of the order.

The Contractor shall inspect the maximum length of the bank line historically associated with the Ashland-Belle Helene property to relocate features identified during the 1984 survey and all newly exposed features. Any new features or eroding deposits not previously reported will be mapped, recorded and tested. Recordation should include the location and extent of any alteration or erosion sustained to the bank line and archeological deposits since 1984.

All batture features associated with 16AN26 will be sufficiently tested using shovel, auger or other excavation techniques to determine and record total site size, depth of all deposits, stratigraphy, distribution of strata across the site, cultural association, function, approximate date of occupation, and condition. Testing shall proceed in a controlled manner. Site boundaries, test excavation units, feature boundaries and activity areas will be measured and mapped to scale on a detailed site map which relates the batture expression of 16AN26 to the structural remains located on the land side of the Mississippi River levee. All test units will be profiled, drawn and photographed. All site maps will be scaled and will accurately reference grid locations in terms of levee stations or range markers in close proximity to the work area. The actual elevation (NGVD) of all features, the top of bank, and top and bottom of cultural strata, will be determined and mapped.

The Principal Investigator shall meet the COR on-site during the testing phase to discuss findings and recommendations.

All excavation units will be backfilled prior to completing field investigations.

This investigation shall conclude evaluation of all batture features associated with Ashland-Belle Helene Plantation against the National Register of Historic Places criteria of significance (36CFR60.4). Adequate information will be retrieved to seek a determination of eligibility from the Keeper of the National Register, and to innumerate project effects on the resource. The evaluation will be conducted utilizing current professional standards and guidelines including, but not limited to:

- the National Park Service's draft standards entitled, "How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation", dated June 1, 1982;
- the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation as published in the Federal Register on September 29, 1983;
- Louisiana's Comprehensive Archaeological Plan, dated October 1, 1983;

b. **Phase 2: Data Analysis and Report Preparation.** The Contractor shall catalog all artifacts, samples, specimens, photographs, drawings, etc., utilizing the format currently employed by the Office of the Louisiana State Archeologist. The catalog system will include site and provenience designations.

All coring and test excavation data will be analyzed using current scientific methods. Appropriate previously collected, and all newly collected, literature, map, field and laboratory data will be integrated to produce a single, graphically illustrated, scientifically acceptable draft report. The impacts of the proposed revetment and of all previous construction on 16AN26 will be assessed and discussed in detail.

The Contractor shall provide justification of the rationale used and a detailed explanation of why the resource does or does not meet the National Register significance criteria (36CFR60.4). It will not be
sufficient to make recommendations based solely upon the condition and artifactual content of the site. The significance assessment will be stated in terms of the context of similar Mississippi River floodplain sites. Arguments for associative significance with historic personages will be discussed with the COR and the staff of the State Archeologist prior to the submission of the draft report. A research design for data recovery will be formulated should the batture features associated with 16AN26 be assessed significant on their own merit. The research design will identify hypotheses to be studied and data collection techniques required to gather or extract data necessary to address specific hypotheses. Site size, site condition, physical location and project impacts will be taken into account in recommending future data recovery methods. Inferential statements and conclusions will be supported by field, map, or archival data.

5. Reports.
   a. **Monthly Progress Reports.** One copy of a brief and concise statement of progress shall be submitted with and for the same period as the monthly billing voucher throughout the duration of the delivery order. These reports, which may be in letter form, should summarize all work performed, information gained, or problems encountered during the preceding month. A concise statement and graphic presentation of the Contractor's assessment of the monthly and cumulative percentage of total work completed by task shall be included each month. The monthly report should also note difficulties, if any, in meeting the contract schedule.
   
   b. **Project Map.** The Contractor will submit one marked copy of the New River Bend/Marchand Revetment aerial mosaic project map (Enclosure 3, Sheet 29, Mississippi River File No. 1-127) to the COR 30 days after the date of the order. The project map will be marked in ink, to scale, to show the boundaries of 16AN26 (batture and protected portions of the site) and all features on the batture.
   
   c. **Draft and Final Reports (Phases 1 and 2).** Five copies of a draft report integrating all phases of this investigation will be submitted to the COR for review and comment 69 days after the date of the order.

The draft and final reports shall include all data and documentation required by 36CFR60-63 to prepare a request for a Determination of Eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places for the batture portion of 16AN26 should the area be found to be significant, with data producing potential.

The Contractor shall recommend mitigation procedures which are appropriate to the site, its physical setting and condition.

These written reports shall follow the format set forth in MIL-STD-847A with the following exceptions: 1) separate, soft, durable, wrap-around covers will be used instead of self covers; 2) page size shall be 8-1/2 x 11 inches with a 1-1/2-inch binding margin and 1-inch margins on all other edges; 3) the text reference and Reference Cited formats of the Society for American Archaeology will be used; 4) Spelling shall be in accordance with the U.S. Government Printing Office Style Manual, dated January 1973.

The body of each report shall include the following: 1) introduction to the study and study area; 2) environmental setting; 3) review and evaluation of previous archeological investigations; 4) research design; 5) description of field and laboratory methodology; 6) data analyses and cultural material inventories; 7) data interpretation and analysis of the effectiveness of the methods used; 8) integration of archeological and historical data; 9) conclusion; 10) data recovery recommendations and research design; 11) references cited; and 13) appendices, as appropriate.

The COR will provide all review comments to the Contractor within 60 days after receipt of the draft reports (129 days after the date of the order). Upon receipt of the review comments, the Contractor shall incorporate or resolve all comments with the approval of the COR and submit one reproducible master copy and 40 bound copies of each report of investigation, and all separate appendices to the COR within 159 days after the date of the order.
d. **Site Forms.** The Contractor will fill out an updated Louisiana site form for 16AN26. This form will correct previously filed information and summarize what is known of the entire resource as a result of this investigation. The Contractor shall file duplicate illustrated forms with the Office of the Louisiana State Archeologist and the COR 69 days after the date of the order. The Contractor shall copy-furnish the COR with the letter transmitting the site form to the State Archeologist.

6. **Disposal of Records and Artifacts.** All records, photographs, artifacts, and other material data recovered under the terms of this delivery order shall be recorded and catalogued in a manner compatible with those systems utilized by the Louisiana SHPO and by State and Federal agencies which store archeological data. They shall be held and maintained by the Contractor until completion of the delivery order. Final disposition of the artifacts and records will be in accord with applicable Federal and State laws. Unless otherwise specified, artifacts will be returned to the landowner or permanently housed with the Louisiana Division of Archaeology and Historic Preservation or in a repository selected by the State Archeologist. The Principal Investigator shall inform the COR in writing when the transfer of data has been completed and shall forward to the COR a catalog of items entered into curation. The location of any notes, photographs or artifacts which are separated from the main collections will also be documented. Presently existing private archeological collections from the project area which are used in data analyses will remain in private ownership. The Contractor shall be responsible for delivery of the analyzed archeological materials to the individual landowners, the Louisiana SHPO's office, or any other repository designated by the Government following acceptance of the final report. All artifacts to be permanently curated will be cleaned, stabilized, labeled, catalogued on typed State curation forms, and placed in sturdy bags and boxes which are labeled with site excavation unit or survey collection unit provenience.
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Site Name: Ashland (Belle Helene)  
State Survey No.: 16AN26

Other Site Designations

Instructions for Reaching Site: Hwy. 75 (River Road) 2 miles south of Geismar.

Parish Ascension

USGS Quad: Donaldsonville and White Castle, 1962 ± 1963, 15'

UTM Coordinates: Zone 15 Easting 692850 Northing 3339450

Geographical Coordinates: Latitude Longitude

PHYSICAL SETTING

Land Form Geologic Processes

Elevation 20-25'

Slope Site Position with Respect to Terrain Approx. 1500' NE of Mississippi River.

Nearest Water: Mississippi River Flooding

Soil Characteristics

Floral Communities: Large live oak trees planted in rows on west, east, and north sides.

Faunal Communities

Other Potential Resources

Nearest Known Site: 16AN3

SITE DESCRIPTION

Site Size Plan: Massive simplicity

Orientation Stratigraphy

Artifact Density Artifact Distribution

Cultural Features: Plantation home and four small frame buildings.


Presumed Function

COLLECTIONS

Survey Method

Assessment of Collecting Conditions

Description of Material

CONDITIONS

Present Use Erosion or Disturbance Deteriorated

Probable Future Destruction
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Site Name  Ashland (Belle Helene)  Site Survey Number  16AN26

References

See National Register files at the Division of Historic Preservation, Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism, Baton Rouge.
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SITE RECORD FORM

Site Name: Marchand Brick Scatter

State Survey No.: 164926

Other Site Designations: none

Instructions for Reaching Site:
LA Highway 75; at M-182.7-L; between Levee Stations 2390 and 2400
Parish Ascension

USGS Quad: Carville, La. (1974) 7.5 minute series of the W of the irreg-of Section 20 Township 10S Range 2E

UTM Coordinates:
Zone 15
Easting 692,510
Northing 33,39,170

Geographical Coordinates:
Latitude 30° 10' 13"
Longitude 91° 00' 06"

PHYSICAL SETTING

Land Form: Natural Levee

Geologic Processes: Erosion

Elevation: 15'

Slope: Gently sloping

Site Position with Respect to Terrain: Batture

Nearest Water: Mississippi River

Flooding: Seasonal

Soil Characteristics: Silt loam and sandy loam

Floral Communities: Batture species (pioneer vegetation)

Faunal Communities: Batture species

Other Potential Resources

Nearest Known Site

SITE DESCRIPTION

Site Size: 25 m x 5 m

Plan: Rectangular

Orientation: Parallel to river

Stratigraphy: Surface

Artifact Density: Moderate

Artifact Distribution: Discrete

Cultural Features: none

Cultural Affiliation: Early 20th century

Presumed Function: Architectural; cabins

COLLECTIONS

Survey Method: Surface collection; 20 m transect intervals

Assessment of Collecting Conditions: High visibility; conditions good

Description of Material: Bricks and brick fragments

CONDITIONS

Present Use: none - batture

Erosion or Disturbance: Heavy

Probable Future Destruction: Site virtually destroyed
SITE EVALUATION

Research Potential: none

State or National Register Eligibility: Not eligible

Recommendations: Site lacks contextual integrity; wave-washed; not viewed as significant

QUAD MAP OF SITE AREA

See attached map

RECORDS

Owner and Address: Pontchartrain Levee District

Tenant and Address: 

Informants: 

Previous Investigations: none

Previous Collections and Availability: R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc

1306 Burdette St., New Orleans, La., 70118

References: See attached sheet

Photographs and Maps: See attached sheet

Remarks: 

Recorded by: Peter A. Gendel, Ph.D. Date: 8/27/84
Figure 4. Excerpt from the Carville and Gonzales 7.5 minute U.S.G.S. Quadrangle showing the Marchand project area.
SITE RECORD FORM, Continued

Site Name: Marchand Brick Scatter


Photographs and Maps: R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc., New Orleans, Louisiana; Department of the Army, New Orleans District, Corps of Engineers.

SITE NAME: MARCHAND - 1

STATE SURVEY NO.: 16 AN26

OTHER SITE DESIGNATION: BELLHELENE LANDING

SITE LOCATION AND APPROACH: At Downriver end of Hall Buck Marine Service Co. BELLHELENE Transfer Terminal Limestone Yard, on river side

PARISH: ASCENSION

USGS QUADS. 15 MIN: WHITE CASTLE, LA. 7.5 MIN: CARVILLE, LA.

GEOGRAPHIC COORDINATES:

UTM COORDINATES: 3339000N 691900E

OF THE OF THE SW1/4 OF SECTION 15, TOWNSHIP 95.

RANGE ___.

PHYSICAL SETTING

LANDFORM: ON BATTER OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, ERODING FROM BANK

GEOMORPHIC PROCESSES:

ELEVATION & RELIEF: 10 M. ABOVE

NEAREST WATER: MISSISSIPPI RIVER 45 M., BORROW PIT/POINT 150 M. TOWARD LEVEE

POSITION WITH RESPECT TO TERRAIN:

SOIL CHARACTERISTICS: RIVER CLAY WITH THIN HUMUS LAYER

FLORAL COMMUNITIES:

FAUNAL COMMUNITIES: NATURAL LEVEE VEGETATION, WITH SOME LARGE TREES

NEAREST KNOWN SITE: BELLHELENE (ASHLAND) GREAT HOUSE IS ACROSS LEVEE AND IMMEDIATELY UPRIVER

SITE DESCRIPTION

SITE SIZE: BRICKS SCATTERED 10M. X 10M.

CONFIGURATION: (irregular, elliptical, linear, discontinuous)

DENSITY OF CULTURAL MATERIALS:
DEPTH OF DEPOSIT/STRATIGRAPHY: AT LEAST 1.5 M. BELOW TOP OF BANK. ONE HEAVY TIERED ("STEPPED") FOUNDATION W/AT LEAST 7 TIERS

FEATURES: ASSOCIATED BRICK WALLS (FALLEN)
1. COURSE BRICK PLATFORM ERODING FROM BANK

DATING/CULTURAL AFFILIATION:

PRESENT CONDITION/PRESERVATION: BULLDOZED; FOUNDATION IS PROTECTED BY BANK

PRESENT USE: OCCUPIES DOWNRIVER, RIVERSIDE CORNER OF LIMESTONE YARD

PRESENT AND FUTURE IMPACTS: DOZING HAS NEARLY DESTROYED SITE. LARGE TREES WERE PUSHED UNTO STRUCTURE. REVESTMENT CONSTRUCTION COULD DESTROY SITE.

COLLECTIONS

SURVEY/EXCAVATION METHOD: LOCATED ON TRANSECT SURVEY

DESCRIPTION OF MATERIAL: BRICKS, MORTAR, AND LATE 19TH-20TH CENTURY POTTERY

SITE EVALUATION

RESEARCH POTENTIAL: BELL HELENE LANDING SHOWN ON MRC MAPS

STATE OR NATIONAL REGISTER ELIGIBILITY: BELL HELENE GREAT HOUSE ALREADY LISTED NATL. REGISERK -

RECOMMENDATIONS: SITE AREA OF NATL. REG. PROP. NEEDS TO BE EXPANDED

RECORDS

OWNER/TENANT AND ADDRESS: HALL - BUCK MARINE SERVICES

INFORMANTS:

PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS:

COLLECTIONS & AVAILABILITY:
BELL HELENE (ASHLAND) MAPS; 5 - REVESTMENT PROJECT
PHOTOGRAPHS & MAPS: MARCHAND MAP PHOTOS; B & W ROLL REVESTMENT #5; #5 9-14

REFERENCES: SEE GOODWIN FIVE REVESTMENT ITEMS RPT 976

RECORDED BY: T. EMERSON
DATE: Aug. 18, 1984

ADDITIONAL REMARKS
**NAME**

Ashland

AND OR COMMON

Belle Helene

**LOCATION**

**STREET & NUMBER**

Highway 75 (River Road) 2 miles south of Geismar

**CITY TOWN**

Geismar

**STATE**

Louisiana

**CITY OF VICINITY OF**

Geismar

**COUNTY**

Ascension

**CODE**

022

**CODE**

005

**CLASSIFICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>OWNERSHIP</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>PRESENT USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT</td>
<td>PUBLIC</td>
<td>OCCUPIED</td>
<td>AGRICULTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC</td>
<td>PRIVATE</td>
<td>UNOCCUPIED</td>
<td>COMMERCIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>BOTH</td>
<td>WORK IN PROGRESS</td>
<td>EDUCATIONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>PUBLIC ACQUISITION</td>
<td>ACCESSIBLE</td>
<td>ENTERTAINMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEING CONSIDERED</td>
<td>IN PROCESS</td>
<td>YES RESTRICTED</td>
<td>RELIGIOUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GOVERNMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INDUSTRIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OWNER OF PROPERTY**

Helene Reuss Hayward

Route 1 Box 566

White Castle

**VICINITY OF**

Louisiana

**LOCATION OF LEGAL DESCRIPTION**

Ascension Parish Courthouse

Donaldsonville

**REPRESENTATION IN EXISTING SURVEYS**

Louisiana Historic Sites Survey

1978

State Historic Preservation Office
The interiors have suffered considerably from neglect, vandalism, and use of the house by various film companies. None of the mantels remain, and floors in the first floor have been removed, though the floor in the hall has been replaced. Interior doors consist of one large panel and doorways are in heavy holder molded frames. Ground floor rooms have heavy denticular cornices. The double parlors each have ceilings consisting of a central acanthus leaf cluster surrounded by scroll patterns.
ASHLAND-BELLE HELENE

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Ashland-Belle Helene is significant due to its architecture and also due to its association with Duncan F. Kenner (1813-1887), sugar planter and political figure.

Ashland-Belle Helene exemplifies the massiveness, extreme simplicity, and dignity which are generally held to epitomize the Classical Revival style of architecture. Because it is articulated in the manner of an independent pavilion, free of service attachments and with the same severe trabeated logia on all four facades, it is a more complete classical statement than the vast majority of Louisiana plantation houses. In addition, with its broad spread of eight giant pillars across each facade and its full heavy entablature, Ashland-Belle Helene is among the grandest and largest plantation houses ever built in the state.

Duncan Kenner was born in New Orleans and educated in the city's public schools and at Miami University in Ohio. After four years of travel and study in Europe, he read law in the office of John Slidell. But instead of practicing, he settled at Ashland Plantation, where he became a sugar planter and horse breeder. It is often said that he named his plantation after the home of Henry Clay, whom he admired.

In 1839 he married Anna Guillelimine Nanine Bringier, member of an old and influential French family of Louisiana. 1 In about 1840, Kenner began construction on a home for his bride, and the result was the present building, finished about 1841. Many secondary sources attribute the design for Ashland to New Orleans architect James Gallier, Sr. 2

Prior to the Civil War, Kenner could boast of a moderately successful political career. In 1836 he was elected to the state House of Representatives from Ascension Parish, and in the years following he served several terms in the legislature, first in the House and then in the Senate. He was a member of the state constitutional convention of 1845, and president of the state constitutional convention of 1851. 3

By 1860, in addition to Kenner and his wife and their two daughters, Ashland supported some 473 slaves, making Kenner the eighth largest slaveholder in the state. The slaves lived in 95 slave dwellings on the

---

**SPECIFIC DATES**

1841

**STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Ashland-Belle Helene is significant due to its architecture and also due to its association with Duncan F. Kenner (1813-1887), sugar planter and political figure.

Ashland-Belle Helene exemplifies the massiveness, extreme simplicity, and dignity which are generally held to epitomize the Classical Revival style of architecture. Because it is articulated in the manner of an independent pavilion, free of service attachments and with the same severe trabeated logia on all four facades, it is a more complete classical statement than the vast majority of Louisiana plantation houses. In addition, with its broad spread of eight giant pillars across each facade and its full heavy entablature, Ashland-Belle Helene is among the grandest and largest plantation houses ever built in the state.

Duncan Kenner was born in New Orleans and educated in the city's public schools and at Miami University in Ohio. After four years of travel and study in Europe, he read law in the office of John Slidell. But instead of practicing, he settled at Ashland Plantation, where he became a sugar planter and horse breeder. It is often said that he named his plantation after the home of Henry Clay, whom he admired.

In 1839 he married Anna Guillelimine Nanine Bringier, member of an old and influential French family of Louisiana. 1 In about 1840, Kenner began construction on a home for his bride, and the result was the present building, finished about 1841. Many secondary sources attribute the design for Ashland to New Orleans architect James Gallier, Sr. 2

Prior to the Civil War, Kenner could boast of a moderately successful political career. In 1836 he was elected to the state House of Representatives from Ascension Parish, and in the years following he served several terms in the legislature, first in the House and then in the Senate. He was a member of the state constitutional convention of 1845, and president of the state constitutional convention of 1851. 3

By 1860, in addition to Kenner and his wife and their two daughters, Ashland supported some 473 slaves, making Kenner the eighth largest slaveholder in the state. The slaves lived in 95 slave dwellings on the
property. In the 1860 Census, Kenner listed the value of his real estate as $190,000 and the value of his personal property as $250,000. He owned 2000 acres of improved land, and an additional 1600 acres of unimproved land. He had $65,000 worth of farming implements and machinery, and $23,067 worth of livestock, including 50 horses, 173 mules, 57 oxen, 370 sheep, and 65 cattle. During the previous year the plantation had produced 1500 thousand-pound hogsheads of sugar, 56,000 gallons of molasses, and 20,000 bushels of corn.

With the coming of the war, Kenner continued to be active in politics. In 1861, he was one of Louisiana's seven delegates to the provisional Congress of the Confederacy at Montgomery, Alabama. After the Confederate government was set up and the capital moved to Richmond, he became a member of the new government's House of Representatives, where he was chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. As the war went on, he became convinced that European recognition was essential for the South to win and that slavery was a primary factor in the European nations' refusal to grant it. In 1864, when the cause of the South was desperate, Kenner urged his friend Secretary of State Judah P. Benjamin to send a special commission to Europe to offer England and France the abolition of slavery in return for recognition. President Jefferson Davis reluctantly agreed to the plan but instead of appointing a commission he followed Benjamin's advice and appointed Kenner sole envoy with the rank of minister plenipotentiary. But by the time Kenner arrived in Europe in early 1865, Sherman's campaign had destroyed all confidence in the chances of the South's success, and the mission was a failure.

At the end of the war, Kenner returned to a plantation in ruins, for Ashland was raided by Union troops in 1862. Although the house was not burned, his valuable horses had been seized, his overseers captured, and his slaves freed. At the age of fifty-two he had to start over again, but by persistence and great business skill he built up an estate which was even larger and more valuable at the time of his death than it had been before the war. According to the 1870 Census, by that year he had already made a good start on his return to prosperity. At that time he had 2300 acres of improved land and 1,000 acres in unimproved land. Under the column headed "Total Amount of Wages Paid During the Year, Including Value of Board," he listed $25,000. It seems likely that many of his former slaves had become laborers for him. In the course of the previous year, the plantation had produced 391 thousand-pound hogsheads of sugar, 24,000 gallons of molasses, and 5000 bushels of corn. The estimated value of all his produce for that year was $40,000.
Kenner is said to have been the first in the state to use the portable railroad to carry cane from fields to mill and to have been among the earliest users of several other technological innovations in the sugar industry. He was a leader in organization of the Louisiana Sugar Planter's Association in 1877, serving as the first president of each.

Political activism continued to be a habit with him. During 1866-1867, he represented Ascension Parish in the state Senate, and in 1877 he was elected state senator from New Orleans, where by then he spent most of his time. In the late 1870's, he ran for the U. S. Senate, but was defeated. In 1882 he was appointed to the U. S. Tariff Commission. He was chairman of the building committee for the Cotton Exposition held in New Orleans in 1884 - 1885. Kenner died in New Orleans in 1887.

In 1889, Ashland was purchased by John B. Reuss, a German immigrant who became a prosperous sugar planter. Reuss re-named the plantation "Belle Helene" in honor of his grand-daughter Helene Reuss, who grew up to become Mrs. W. Campbell Hayward, the present owner of the house.
NOTES


3 "Kenner," DAB.


5 "Kenner," DAB.

6 1870 Census. Ascension Parish, Louisiana. Agriculture Census, 6th Ward, p. 1 Kenner's name was not listed in the Agriculture Census of 1880, possibly because his main residence was in New Orleans by that time.

7 "Kenner," DAB.

8 Baldridge, "Haywards."


| ACREAGE OF NOMINATED PROPERTY | 34 acres |
| UTM REFERENCES |    |
| ZONE | EASTING | NORTHING |
| A | 35 | 6192 | 820 |
| B | 5 | 6192 | 70 |
| CITY | 5 | 6192 | 870 |
| ZONE | EASTING | NORTHING |
| C | 3 | 6192 | 870 |
| D | 3 | 6192 | 870 |
| E | 3 | 6192 | 870 |

BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION:
Begin at the intersection of the River Road and the unnamed side access road and proceed northeast 2010 ft. then turn northwest 90° and proceed 1000 ft. then turn southwest 90° and proceed back to the River Road then proceed southeast along the River Road back to the original intersection.

LIST ALL STATES AND COUNTIES FOR PROPERTIES OVERLAPPING STATE OR COUNTY BOUNDARIES

| STATE | CODE | COUNTY | CODE | STATE | CODE | COUNTY | CODE |

FORM PREPARED BY

Douglas Hayward

ORGANIZATION

DATE

STREET & NUMBER

Rt. 1 Box 566

TELEPHONE

(504) 473-9037

CITY OR TOWN

White Castle

STATE

Louisiana

70788

STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER CERTIFICATION

THE EVALUATED SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS PROPERTY WITHIN THE STATE IS

NATIONAL

STATE

LOCAL

As the designated State Historic Preservation Officer for the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (Public Law 89 665) I hereby nominate this property for inclusion in the National Register and certify that it has been evaluated according to the criteria and procedures set forth by the National Park Service.

SIGNATURE

DATE

1-2-79

FOR NPS USE ONLY

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PROPERTY IS INCLUDED IN THE NATIONAL REGISTER

DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF ARCHEOLOGY AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION

ATTEST

KEEPER OF THE NATIONAL REGISTER


