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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In May of 1997 Coastal Environments, Inc., conducted a cultural resources survey of a proposed construction area along Bayou Fountain, in East Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana, for the New Orleans District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. This survey was part of the preliminary preparation for the Bayou Fountain Channel Enlargement, a portion of the larger Amite River and Tributaries, Louisiana, East Baton Rouge Parish Watershed Flood Control Project. The survey area consisted of a section of Bayou Fountain 200 ft (60.96 m) wide, extending 2.6 mi (4.18 km) downstream from Gardere Lane, southeast to Siegen Lane (Figure 1-1).

An intensive records check was conducted before beginning the fieldwork to locate any previously recorded sites the project area. Aboriginal sites of unknown affiliation, including Wilson Place (16EBR1), Mitchell Village (16EBR3) and Knox Place (16EBR4), are located immediately north and northwest of the project area (see Figure 1-1). Excavations conducted at the nearby Lee (16EBR51), Sarah Peralta (16EBR67) and Kleinpeter (16EBR5) sites have encountered deposits dating to the Tchula through early Mississippi periods. The geography of this region, consisting of a water body close to a high terrace, remained favorable for human occupation into the historic period. The historic Kleinpeter-Knox site (16EBR65), located on the bluff immediately north of the survey area, was occupied from 1786 through the twentieth century. Also, a Civil-War-era earthen stockade known as the Highland Stockade (16EBR89) has been identified approximately 800 m north of the eastern end of the project Right-of-Way (ROW). The primary aim of these investigations was to ensure that no previously unrecorded historic or prehistoric sites exist in or near the project ROW proper.

This report is organized as follows: Chapter 2 summarizes information on the physical environment, including the landforms, sediment deposition, and soil types found in the survey area. Chapter 3 summarizes previous research conducted in East Baton Rouge Parish and the Bayou Fountain area. Chapter 4 briefly discusses the cultural background of the greater Baton Rouge vicinity from the prehistoric era to the twentieth century. A subsection is concerned specifically with the history of the Bayou Fountain area, while Chapter 5 traces the historic ownership of each of the properties through which the present ROW passes. In Chapter 6 results of the field investigation and recommendations for the proposed project are presented.
Figure 1-1. The survey area along Bayou Fountain, East Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana (Base map: U.S.G.S. Plaquemine and St. Gabriel, Louisiana, 7.5-minute quadrangles 1980).
CHAPTER 2

NATURAL SETTING

Geology and Soils

The present study area along Bayou Fountain is located in the Mississippi River floodplain, at the foot of the Pleistocene terrace in East Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana. Geographically, the area is bound on the northeast by a bluff that overlooks the Mississippi River floodplain, and on the west by the backswamp and natural levee of the Mississippi River. The bluff line of the uplands is the western edge of the Prairie Complex (formerly called "Prairie Terrace"), a geological formation that reaches a thickness of 500 ft (152.5 m) (Autin et al. 1991b:556). The Prairie Complex region is characterized by rolling hills that are dissected by various streams and drainages. It is now believed that this complex consists of at least two major chrono-stratigraphic components, with primary aggradation cycles climaxing during the late Pleistocene interglacial stages (Autin et al. 1991b:558-560).

The Prairie Complex and other Pleistocene terrace formations developed between about 1.5 million and 13,000 years B.P. (before present) during Pleistocene interglacial periods, when the northern glaciers melted and sent huge volumes of water through the inland drainage system. The Pleistocene was characterized by several cooling and warming phases, each of which had its effect on the sedimentation rate of the Mississippi, and thus the topography of Baton Rouge. As glacial ice melted, sea levels rose. This increase in sea level gradually decreased the gradient of the Mississippi River, and thus, reduced its rate of flow. At approximately 12,000 B.P. the Mississippi River increased in volume, but decreased in speed of flow, and began to meander (Autin et al. 1991b:561). During this period the river deposited the eroded Pleistocene terrace soils downstream and contributed to the creation of the alluvial plain. This floodplain can be identified by its fluvial, colluvial, and deltaic, deposits.

Naturally occurring surface soils of the survey area consist of frequently flooded Mississippi River backswamp sediments with intrusions, at the lower end of the survey area, of colluvium from the adjacent uplands (Autin 1991a) (Figure 2-1). The common upland soil series is called Olivier silt loams. This series consists of characteristically poorly to moderately well drained, and moderately to slowly permeable soils, which are found on level to gently sloping surfaces (U.S. Department of Agriculture [USDA hereafter] 1968:29-30, Plates 37 and 41). Though this soil series was not found in the survey area, it is the source of the soils found in the colluvial fans, which appear to extend into the survey area. The Terrace Escarpments is a landform located between the terraces and the flood plains (USDA 1968:6). The characteristic soil is usually silt or silt loam, though sandy loams and silty clays also occur (USDA 1968:34). The Terrace Escarpments series occurs in the survey area nearest the Pleistocene terrace.
Figure 2-1. Soil series in the survey area and its vicinity (source: USDA 1968).
Mhoon silty clay series and the Mhoon silty clay loam series are typically found in level or nearly level parts of the Mississippi River flood plain (USDA 1968:28). These soils consist of Mississippi River flood plain sediments. The soils on most of the south side of Bayou Fountain these Mhoon silty clay and silty clay loams. Two other soil series were also present within the survey area. There were small areas of Sharkey clay, a series that is typically found in depressions within the flood plain. The Commerce series, grading from silt to sand, is a Mississippi River alluvium, typical of its natural levees (USDA 1968:31).

The majority of the surface along both banks of the survey area is classified as "Made land". Made land consists of dredge spoil, the by-product of previous engineering efforts at flood control and drainage improvement. Generally, Made land is a silt loam or silty clay loam two to four feet thick (USDA 1968:26).

**Flora and Fauna**

The natural vegetation of the survey area probably consisted of bottomland cypress forests. These forests were largely removed during the late eighteenth century, however. Since the establishment of plantations and farms, vegetation has consisted primarily of cypress, cottonwood, willows, hackberries, blackberries, and grasses.

Fauna found prior to modern development of the area included typical bottomland species, such as white-tailed deer, skunks, squirrels, raccoons, the small southern red wolf, and rabbits. The mixed hardwoods of the bottomlands of the area offered seasonal habitat for deer and turkeys. Bison inhabited the prairies on the Pleistocene uplands prior to, and just after, European contact, though their numbers probably were low (Lowery 1974:502). Predators, aside from humans, included various martins, minks and other weasels, lynx, and panthers. In the nineteenth century bears were heavily hunted, soon limiting their range to the inaccessible parts of Louisiana. Later twentieth century suburban expansion into the study area has driven out the deer, last of the large native herbivores, and the bobcat, last of the larger predators. Only smaller animals such as minks, skunks, raccoons, opossums, squirrels, and of course, various snakes, remain in the area.
CHAPTER 3

PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS

Relatively little archaeological work has been conducted in East Baton Rouge Parish, the seat of the state capital. This situation results from rapid urban growth and industrialization in the twentieth century. Large-scale construction in the recent past has destroyed known archaeological sites, and undoubtedly, has also destroyed or obscured many undocumented sites. Even so, the few sites that have been documented contribute to an overview, however imperfect, of life in the parish in both the prehistoric and historic periods.

The East Baton Rouge Parish area has been occupied by various groups from the Paleo-Indian through historic periods. The Biltmore site (16EBR66) produced an artifact scatter that suggests a Paleo-Indian or Early Archaic date. Blackwater Bayou (16EBR33) is also thought to span the Late Paleo-Indian through Middle Archaic periods (Bryant 1985). On the east bank of the Comite River, an Archaic artifact scatter in a plowed field was recorded by Richard Weinstein in 1981, as the Templet site (16EBR53).

Several mound sites have been examined and documented in the parish. At least two of the known mounds may date to Archaic times. A charcoal sample from a human cremation taken from Mound A at Monte Sano Bayou (16EBR17) has produced a radiocarbon date of circa 4220 B.C. (CEI 1977). The two conical mounds at this site were destroyed in 1967 by the expansion of the Formosa Plastics Corporation plant. Recent efforts attempting to detect a surviving midden have proved fruitless (Perrault 1993). The Narcille Drouin Mound (16EBR54), located on the west bank of Bayou Baton Rouge, has produced only a few lithic remains, and therefore, is assumed to date to the Archaic period (Robert Neuman, personal communication 1993). Three radiocarbon dates derived from organic samples taken from the Louisiana State University Campus Mounds (16EBR6) suggest that these features date from the Middle to Late Archaic period.

Formative stage occupation of present-day East Baton Rouge Parish area is indicated by the complex of six platform mounds, recorded by Kniffen in 1936 as the Kleinpeter site (16EBR5), located at the confluence of Bayous Fountain and Manchac. Artifacts housed at the Louisiana State University Museum of Geoscience suggest that a long occupational sequence, extending from the Tchula through Mississippi periods, is represented at that site (Jones and Shuman 1986). Recent work at the Sarah Peralta site (16EBR67) has provided strong evidence of Tchula period occupations which may extend back into the Poverty Point period and forward into the early Marksville period (Perrault 1994). The Lee Site (16EBR51), located just outside the survey area (see Figure 1-1), was tested by CEI in 1984-85 (Weinstein et al. 1985). This site dates primarily to the Tchula period, although other components related to early Marksville, Baytown, and late Coles Creek period occupations also occur. The Tucker
mound (16EBR21), on the east bank of the Comite River, was originally recorded by William G. Haag, who thought the site dated to Baytown or Coles Creek times, or later.

Although a number of historic sites have been investigated in East Baton Rouge Parish in the last 15 years, most have been located in downtown Baton Rouge. Such studies include Haag’s investigation in Catfish Town and neighboring Beauregard Town (Haag 1974, 1984); Castille, McCloskey, and Glander’s survey of the main Baton Rouge Post Office parking lot on the corner of North Boulevard and Maximilian Street (Castille et al. 1979); Shafer, Berle, and Rhodes’ intensive investigation of the proposed construction site of the Baton Rouge Front Levee near the Pentagon Building Complex (Shafer et al. 1984); and Shuman and Jones’ survey for the new Public Transportation Facility on the corner of Florida Boulevard and North 22nd Street (Shuman and Jones 1986). More recent projects involved testing and/or excavation at Magnolia Cemetery (no state site number assigned; Hahn 1992), the Old Louisiana State Penitentiary (16EBR19; Wurtzburg and Hahn 1992), the Pentagon Barracks (16EBR43; Holland 1993; Hahn in press), the new State Capitol building (16EBR79; Coastal Environments, Inc. 1997; Hahn et al. 1994), Fuerte San Carlos (16EBR150), the site of the old Louisiana State University Baton Rouge Campus (16EBR155), the Ellis site (16EBR148), and a nineteenth century house site (16EBR151) located a short distance south of the Pentagon Barracks (Hays 1996). Survey and testing have also been conducted at five industrial historic sites (16EBR58, 95, 96, 98 and 99) located on the east bank of the Mississippi River in the immediate vicinity of the Interstate 10 bridge (Hinks et al 1993).

In the greater Baton Rouge area, few sites dating to the colonial and Civil War eras have been investigated. Work by CEI and Louisiana State University at the late-eighteenth-century plantation of Magnolia Mound produced remains of the colonial period (Burden and Castille 1981a, 1981b; Burden and Gagliano 1977; Lane 1980). The Longwood (16EBR41), Gartness (16EBR39) and Kleinpeter-Knox (16EBR65) sites reflect the importance of cotton and sugar cane plantations in the parish in the nineteenth century. The remains of Civil War occupation are preserved in Baton Rouge proper at Magnolia Cemetery, and at the earthen breastwork (16EBR52) and gun emplacement (16EBR42, Locality A), sites near one of the most important Civil-War-era sites in the state, the Port Hudson Battlefield (16EBR42). Just northwest of the intersection of Starring Lane and Highland Road, overlooking Bayou Fountain, is a small Civil war earthwork known as the Highland Stockade (16EBR89; Casey 1983:75).
CHAPTER 4

CULTURAL BACKGROUND

Aboriginal Culture History

The following discussion is offered to familiarize the reader with the general sequence of cultural history in the study. Figure 3-1 provides an outline of our current understanding of the prehistoric sequence of cultural development in south Louisiana.

Paleo-Indian Period, Prior to 7000 B.C.

Initial human occupation of this region occurred during the Paleo-Indian period. Archaeological evidence from other portions of North America suggests that the populations involved were probably small bands of hunter-gatherers adapted to terminal Pleistocene or very early Holocene environments. The spread of this Paleo-Indian culture can be traced by very distinctive projectile point forms: Clovis, Folsom, Quad, Dalton, Plainview, Scottsbluff, etc.

The late Paleo-Indian period is characterized by the divergence of fluted point types. Scottsbluff and similar points have a western distribution, while Dalton and related projectile points have a southeastern and midwestern distribution. Goodyear (1982) argued that the Dalton Horizon dated from 8500 to 7900 B.C., and that it represented an adaptation to environmental changes at the end of the Pleistocene. Weinstein et al. (1977:3) proposed a Jones Creek phase, based on finds of Plainview, Dalton, and San Patrice points at the Jones Creek (16EBR13) and Blackwater Bayou (16EBR33) sites in East Baton Rouge Parish. This phase is considered transitional to the Early Archaic.

Early Archaic Period, 6000–5000 B.C.

The Early Archaic period was a time of adaptation to the changing environments associated with early post-glacial regimes. A technological break with the earlier fluted-point tradition developed, though there were continuities with transitional complexes such as San Patrice. The development of side-notched, corner-notched, and stemmed types of projectile points are characteristic of the Early Archaic. Weinstein et al. (1977:4) established an Early Archaic, St. Helena phase in the Florida Parishes, based on scattered finds of Kirk and Palmer points.

Middle Archaic Period, 5000–3000 B.C.

The Middle Archaic period was characterized by widespread regional differentiation of cultures, and a number of developments in ground-stone technology. The latter included
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE</th>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>CULTURE</th>
<th>TIME INTERVAL</th>
<th>PHASES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A.D. 1800</td>
<td>EASTERN AREA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HISTORIC</td>
<td>VARIOUS CULTURES</td>
<td>A.D. 1700</td>
<td>CENTRAL AREA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WESTERN AREA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A.D. 1600</td>
<td>VARIOUS TRIBES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LITTLE PECAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A.D. 1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PETITE ANSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MISSISSIPPAIN</td>
<td>A.D. 1200</td>
<td>BAYOU PETIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PLAQUEMINE</td>
<td></td>
<td>BAYOU PARK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BAYOU CHENE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COLES CREEK</td>
<td>TRANSITIONAL COLES CREEK</td>
<td>A.D. 1000</td>
<td>ST. GABRIEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THREE BAYOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HOLLY BEACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A.D. 900</td>
<td>BAYOU RAMOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A.D. 850</td>
<td>MORGAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JEFF DAVIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A.D. 700</td>
<td>BAYOU CUTLER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WHITE LAKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WELSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BAYTOWN</td>
<td>TROSVILLE-LIKE</td>
<td>A.D. 400</td>
<td>WHITEHALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROANOKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARKSVILLE</td>
<td>MARKSVILLE</td>
<td>A.D. 200</td>
<td>GUNBOAT LANDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MAGNOLIA &amp; MANDALAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VEAZEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LAKE ARTHUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TCHULA</td>
<td>TCHEFUNCTE</td>
<td>A.D. 1</td>
<td>BEAU MIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LAFAYETTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GRAND LAKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POVERTY POINT</td>
<td>POVERTY POINT</td>
<td>250 B.C.</td>
<td>PONTCHARTRAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500 B.C.</td>
<td>GARCIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BEAU RIVAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1000 B.C.</td>
<td>BAYOU JASMINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RABBIT ISLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1500 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3000 B.C.</td>
<td>PEARL RIVER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COPELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5000 B.C.</td>
<td>BAYOU BLUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5000 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6000 B.C.</td>
<td>MONTE SANO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BANANA BAYOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000 B.C.</td>
<td>ST. HELENA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITHIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8000 B.C.</td>
<td>JONES CREEK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VATICAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000 B.C.</td>
<td>STROHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-PROJECTILE POINT</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4-1. Aboriginal culture sequence for southern Louisiana.
grooved axes, atlatl weights and pendants, as well as more extensive use of grinding stones, which first appeared in the previous period. This period also roughly corresponded with the Altithermal (also called Hypsithermal) Interval, which brought increased warmth and aridity to the mid-continent (Wood and McMillan 1976; Saucier 1994:44-46). Affects of this climatic shift on other portions of the Southeast are not well known at present.

Two Middle Archaic phases have been identified within southeast Louisiana. The Amite River phase, proposed by Gagliano (1963:114) on the basis of sites found along the terraces overlooking the middle Amite River, was perhaps the earlier of the two. The sites were characterized by the Almagre, Morhiss, Shumla, Wells, and Kent point types. The other phase, Monte Sano, was based initially on the small mound site of that name (16EBR17) at which salvage excavations were conducted by Haag and Ford in 1967. The two low platform mounds at the site may have served as cremation areas. Artifacts from the larger mound included Late Archaic dart points, microlithic tools, and a red jasper locust effigy bead. A radiocarbon date of 6220 ± 140 B.P. was obtained from cremated bone from one of the mounds (Coastal Environments, Inc. 1977:243). Other mound sites in this region, including Hornsby (16SH21) (Gibson and Shenkel 1989:10) and the LSU mounds (16EBR6) (Homburg 1992), have yielded similar early dates.

**Late Archaic Period, 3000–1500 B.C.**

Research elsewhere in eastern North America suggests that the Late Archaic period was a time of marked population increases and the beginning of extensive trade networks. The establishment of large habitation sites such as Indian Knoll, Kentucky (Webb 1946) reflect the increased population. The exotic raw materials that have been found at some sites provide evidence of the trade networks. Plant cultivation involving locally domesticated squash, and various seed plant species began during this period (Chomoko and Crawford 1978; Smith 1989).

The only late Archaic phase identified for southeast Louisiana is Gagliano’s (1963:113) Pearl River phase which he based on a series of oyster shell middens associated with early coastal features. Diagnostic artifacts include Kent, Pontchartrain, Macon, Hale, and Palmillas projectile points and various types of atlatl weights.

**Poverty Point Period, 1500–500 B.C.**

In much of eastern North America this time interval witnessed a transition from Archaic hunting and gathering cultures to Woodland cultures characterized by food production, pottery manufacture, and mound building (Stoltman 1978:715-717). Current interpretations suggest that these three features have different and possibly unrelated origins. There is evidence of local domestication of squash and native seed-plants by 1500 B.C. (Smith 1989). Ceramics probably appeared somewhat earlier than this in the third millennium B.C. along the Atlantic Coast (Stoltman 1978:715), and mound building may have begun in the lower Mississippi Valley before 3,000 B.C. (Gibson and Shenkel 1988).

In the Lower Mississippi Valley this transition was marked by the development of the distinctive Poverty Point culture. Among the material characteristics of this culture were baked clay balls called “Poverty Point objects,” microlithic and lapidary industries, and earthworks
(Webb 1977). Pottery was not abundant, but fiber-tempered and sand-tempered wares have been found at several sites. Subsistence data are few, but they suggest a continuation of an Archaic pattern of intensive collecting of wild plants and animals (Jackson 1986).

Two temporally distinct Poverty Point phases have been identified in southeast Louisiana. The earlier Bayou Jasmine phase is based largely on data from the Bayou Jasmine site (16SJB2) in St. John the Baptist Parish and the Linsley site (16OR40) in Orleans Parish (Gagliano 1963:116). The succeeding Garcia phase was defined on the basis of collections from the Garcia site (16OR34), also in Orleans Parish (Gagliano 1963:116).

**Tchula Period, 500 B.C. – A.D. 1**

This period in the Lower Mississippi Valley is characterized by the integration of food production, pottery manufacture, and mound building into a single cultural system. In the southern portion of the valley these developments take place in an archaeological culture called Tchefuncte. Originally defined in southern Louisiana (Ford and Quimby 1945), Tchefuncte culture is now recognized to extend as far north as the vicinity of Clarksdale, Mississippi, and as far west as northeast Texas. The diagnostic artifacts of this and most of the succeeding prehistoric cultures of the Lower Mississippi Valley are distinctive ceramics. Tchefuncte pottery is characterized by a laminated paste which appears to lack tempering. Replication studies suggest that the laminated texture is simply the result of minimal preparation of the raw material (Gertjejansen 1982), an expected feature of an incipient ceramic technology. Other diagnostic attributes of Tchefuncte ceramics include the use of podal supports and decorative techniques such as jab-and-drag incising.

The evidence for food production in Tchefuncte culture presently comes from one site, Morton Shell Mound (16IB3), where remains of two possibly tropical cultigens, squash and bottle gourd, and one possible native cultigen, knotweed, were recovered (Byrd and Neuman 1978:11-13). Given the limited nature of these findings, the importance of cultivation in relation to the remainder of the subsistence base is still uncertain. Mound construction, now well documented for the preceding Late Archaic and Poverty Point periods, is surprisingly not clearly associated with Tchefuncte culture. Alan Toth (1988:27) suggested that Tchefuncte burial mounds may be evidence of diffusion of certain Marksville burial practices among a few late Tchefuncte groups.

Two Tchula period phases have been identified in southeast Louisiana. One, the Pontchartrain phase, is based on Ford and Quimby’s (1945) early work at sites around Lake Pontchartrain. It includes occupations which probably span the entire period and should be subdivided. Most of the known components are located southeast of the present region in the Pontchartrain Basin. The other Tchula period phase, Beau Mire, is believed to date to the latter portion of the period (Weinstein and Rivet 1978; Weinstein et al 1977:7).

Components of this phase have been reported at the Kleinpetter (16EBR5) and Kuttruff (16AN9) sites, both near the project area. Analysis of the substantial Tchefuncte component of the Sarah Peralta site (16EBR67) suggests a relatively strong Beau Mire occupation (Perrault 1994).
Marksville Period, A.D. 1–400

In many parts of eastern North America, this period is marked by evidence of extensive interregional contact referred to as the Hopewell Interaction Sphere (Caldwell and Hall 1964). Hopewell Interaction Sphere societies in the Ohio and Illinois river valleys acquired large quantities of exotic raw materials, including obsidian, copper, mica, shark’s teeth, and marine shells, in exchange for specialized finished goods such as copper panpipes and ear spools (Stoltman 1978:721). Within the Lower Mississippi Valley, the culture which participated in this interaction sphere is termed Marksville. Toth (1988:211-213) has argued that Marksville culture developed out of Tchefuncte as a result of intermittent contacts with cultures in the Illinois River Valley area. He emphasizes that the evidence for Hopewell interaction is largely limited to the Marksville mortuary system and some characteristics of ceramic decoration. Other cultural subsystems, such as subsistence and settlement pattern, may have changed very little. Though data are limited, it appears that subsistence was based on intensive collecting of wild plant foods and faunal resources, including fish, supplemented by a few cultigens (Asch et al. 1979). Present evidence indicates that maize was either not present at this time or of only minor importance.

Two Marksville period phases have been identified in the region, Smithfield and Gunboat Landing. Smithfield is an early Marksville phase identified by Toth (1988) on the basis of excavations at the site of that name (16WBR2-3) in West Baton Rouge Parish. Other components are present at the Monks (16PC5) and Medora (16WBR1) sites (Toth 1988:206-209). The Gunboat Landing phase is a late Marksville phase proposed by Weinstein et al. (1977) on the basis of Weinstein’s (1974) excavations at several sites on the lower Amite River.

Baytown Period, A.D. 400–700

The period following the Hopewell florescence has been characterized as a time of cultural decline throughout much of eastern North America (Griffin 1967:187; Phillips 1970:901). However, a number of researchers have recently suggested that the apparent decline may not have been as pervasive as previously believed. In the Midwest, Braun (1977) and Styles (1981) have argued that this period was a time of population growth and increased regional social integration. In the Lower Mississippi Valley the Baytown period was marked by the appearance of two painted pottery complexes (Belmont and Williams 1981). The earlier complex, termed the Quafalorma horizon, developed during the Troyville sub-period. The later complex, called the Woodville horizon, characterized the Deasonville sub-period and was less elaborate. The remainder of the ceramic assemblage of Baytown culture consisted of a large quantity of Baytown Plain and smaller amounts of decorated types such as Mulberry Creek Cord Marked, Salomon Brushed, and Alligator Incised.

Changes were also occurring in the stone tool tradition during this period. Small arrow points began to replace dart points, indicating the introduction of bow-and-arrow technology. Subsistence data from the Lower Mississippi Valley are limited for this period, but in the Midwest, Styles (1981) has identified a pattern of intensive, localized collecting of wild plant and animal resources, increasingly supplemented by cultivation. Mound building continued in the Baytown period but there are indications that, by the end of this time, their function shifted from burial site to building platform (Rolingson 1982).
A single Baytown period phase, Whitehall, has been identified in southeast Louisiana (Phillips 1970:911-912). This phase is present in components of the Smithfield (16WBR3) and Kleinpeter (16EBR5) sites in East and West Baton Rouge Parishes.

**Coles Creek Period, A.D. 700–1200**

Elsewhere in eastern North America the Late Woodland period began a transition to the Mississippi period. Within the Lower Mississippi Valley, a cultural florescence that shows a marked resemblance to Weeden Island culture of northwest Florida, occurs during this period. The precise nature of the relationship of Coles Creek culture to Weeden Island is uncertain, but the similarities in ceramic decoration and community pattern are unmistakable. Both were characterized by the use of incised, stamped, and punctuated pottery types in which the decorative zone is largely restricted to a band around the rim of the vessel, and by the construction of small platform mounds around plazas. The latter are generally interpreted as an indication of the development of stratified social systems.

These societies were apparently based on economies which included the cultivation of maize. While direct evidence for this is lacking from sites in the Lower Mississippi Valley, the remains of corn have been recovered from Weeden Island sites (Milanich and Fairbanks 1980:127) and from contemporary Late Woodland sites in the Midwest (Styles 1981). Hunting and gathering continued along with the cultivation of other plants, such as squash and gourds.

Three Coles Creek period phases are presently recognized within southeast Louisiana. The earliest of these is the Bayou Cutler phase (Kniffen 1936; Phillips 1970:920-923). The majority of Bayou Cutler sites are located in the Mississippi River deltaic plain and the Pontchartrain Basin. A middle Coles Creek period, Bayou Ramos phase has been established by Weinstein et al. (1978:22-23) on the basis of test excavations at the Bayou Ramos I site (16SMY133) in St. Mary Parish. The third Coles Creek period phase, St. Gabriel, dates to the very end of the period and is based on Woodiel’s (1980) excavations at the St. Gabriel site (16IV128) in Iberville Parish. Weinstein (1987:90) identified additional St. Gabriel phase components in the pre-mound levels at Medora and at the Bayou Goula site (16IV11) in Iberville Parish. It is also one of the components present at the Kleinpeter site (16EBR5) (Jones et al. 1993).

**Mississippi Period, A.D. 1200–1700**

The last prehistoric period in eastern North America witnessed the development of chiefdom-level societies based on intensive cultivation of maize, beans, and squash. Perhaps the most dynamic of these societies appeared in the Middle Mississippi Valley between A.D. 900 and A.D. 1050. Referred to as the Mississippian culture, it was characterized by a shell-tempered ceramic industry and a settlement pattern that often included large mound centers and nucleated habitation sites which were often fortified (Stoltman 1978:725). During the first centuries of the second millennium A.D., this culture spread rapidly along the major river valleys of this portion of the continent. The nature of this expansion, either by movement of people or diffusion of ideas, is still debated. However, by A.D. 1200 Mississippian culture was found as far south as northern Mississippi and as far east as Georgia.
In the Lower Mississippi Valley a syncretic culture developed from exotic Mississippian and indigenous influences. Phillips (1970) considered the resident culture to have been Plaquemine, an outgrowth of Coles Creek culture that began about A.D. 1000. According to him, the interaction between Mississippian and Plaquemine cultures resulted in gradual changes in the Plaquemine ceramic tradition and settlement pattern. Later in the period, after A.D. 1400, an actual intrusion of Mississippian groups displaced the resident Plaquemine groups. Brain (1978) offered a somewhat different interpretation of this sequence of events. He argued that the Lower Mississippi Valley culture which experienced the initial Mississippian contact at about A.D. 1000 was Coles Creek, and that the resulting hybridization produced Plaquemine culture.

The remainder of the period saw a gradual increase in Mississippian influence, at least in the Yazoo Basin, until about A.D. 1400, when a full Mississippian cultural pattern developed (Brain 1978:362). Brain's reinterpretation of the cultural sequence has resulted in a shift in the established chronologies. Phases such as Crippen Point, Gordon, and Preston, which were formerly considered Plaquemine culture manifestations of the early Mississippi period, are now placed late in the Coles Creek culture. The latter is now thought to persist until A.D. 1200 and includes a number of changes in ceramic technology which had previously been considered indicators of Plaquemine culture.

While disagreeing somewhat on the origin of Plaquemine culture, all authorities concur that it exhibited numerous continuities with the preceding Coles Creek culture. Several of the Plaquemine ceramic types appear to have been direct outgrowths of Coles Creek types. There were some changes, however, including the addition of small amounts of finely ground shell and other organic matter to the clay during pottery manufacture. Decorative embellishments often covered the entire body of the vessel. Mound construction continued on a greater scale than in the previous period. The mounds were larger, there were more at each site, and there were more mound sites. Intensive agriculture is thought to have been the economic base on which this florescence was built, but there is little evidence of it in the Lower Mississippi Valley until late in the Mississippian period.

Two Mississippi period phases, Medora and Delta Natchezan, have been identified in the present region. Medora is an early Plaquemine phase based on Quimby's (1951) excavations at the type site. Other components are present at the Kleinpeter (16EBR5), Livonia (16PC1), and Rosedale (16IV1) sites (Weinstein 1987:96). The principal ceramic types associated with this phase include Plaquemine Brushed, var. Plaquemine; Mazique Incised, var. Manchac; Addis Plain, var. Addis; and L'Eau Noire Incised. Delta Natchezan is a late Plaquemine phase which is based on Quimby's (1957) excavations at the Bayou Goula site.

**Historic Overview of the Region**

**European Exploration, 1542–1717**

European exploration of the greater Baton Rouge area began in 1542 when the survivors of the DeSoto expedition passed down the Mississippi River on their way to the Gulf of Mexico. However, extensive European contact did not occur until the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. In 1682, an exploring party led by Rene-Robert Cavelier, Sieur de La Salle and Henri de Tonti, traveled from Canada down the Mississippi River to its mouth. There La Salle laid claim to the Mississippi River, every tributary river flowing into it, and all
of the lands drained by them, for France. Two years later, La Salle again attempted to find the mouth of the Mississippi River, this time from the Gulf of Mexico. However, he missed the river and established his short-lived colony on the coast of Texas.

In 1698 Pierre LeMoyne Sieur de Iberville, a Canadian, headed the first successful French colonization effort to the Gulf of Mexico. He was accompanied by a younger brother, Jean Baptiste LeMoyne Sieur de Bienville. In February, 1699, the Canadians founded a settlement at Biloxi Bay and immediately began exploration of the lower Mississippi River. Iberville, leaving the Bayougoulas village at present-day Bayou Goula, traveled up the Mississippi River for a distance of 5 to 5½ leagues when on 17 March 1699 he:

... came on the right side of the river to a little stream in which the Indians informed us that there were great numbers of fish. Here I had nets set out but caught only two catfish... The stream is the dividing line between the Ouma's hunting ground and the Bayougoulas. On the bank are many huts roofed with palmettos and a maypole with no limbs, painted red, several fish heads and bear bones being tied to it as a sacrifice [Iberville in McWilliams 1981:65]

A contemporary account, by André Penicaud, stated that:

... we... found very high banks called écorts in that region, and in savage called Istrouma, which means red stick, as at this place there is a post painted red that the savages have sunk there to mark the land line between the two nations, namely: land of the Bayagoulas, which we were leaving, and land of another nation—thirty leagues upstream from the baton rouge—named the Oumas [McWilliams 1953:25].

Neither Penicaud nor Iberville indicate the celebration of the calumet ceremony, signifying friendship between the Canadians and the Houmas at Baton Rouge. This lack of ceremony suggests that the settlement encountered by the explorers was not one of the main villages, but was, instead, a relatively small encampment. Other early travelers through the Baton Rouge area included Henri de Tonti, in 1699–1700 and 1702, who led expeditions between Canada, the country of the Illinois, and the Gulf Coast (Murphy 1941:82-84).

The location of Iberville's "maypole" is generally held to be at Scott's Bluff in present-day Scotlandville (Meyers 1976:7-9). It is interesting to note that when Penicaud passed through the area in 1704, he made no mention of any Indians in the area, even though his party remained in Baton Rouge for ten days (Penicaud in McWilliams 1953:81-82).

**French Colonization, 1717-1763**

The first documented European settlers at Baton Rouge were members of the D'Artaguetue family, who obtained a land grant in about 1717. When Bernard Diron and Pierre D'Artaguetue visited their concession in 1718, they found two white settlers and 25 black slaves, residing there. By 1722, about half of the concession had been cleared and 30 whites, 20 black slaves, and two Indian slaves lived there (Meyers 1976:10-13). The settlement soon failed, probably due to poor husbanding by the Company of the Indies. When Father Paul du Poisson arrived in Baton Rouge in June of 1727, the concession had been abandoned (Meyers 1976:17). Although the location of Baton Rouge was well known during this period, it was not until the 1760s that an attempt was made to resettle the area.
Canada and the mid-continent of North America underwent changes in suzerainty due to treaties ending the latest colonial war, signed in 1762-1763. France divested herself of all of her north American colonies. Canada and French claims east of the Mississippi River and north of the Isle of Orleans went to Great Britain, while all of the remainder of Louisiana went to Spain. Spain turned all of Florida over to Britain. In effect, the lands east of the Mississippi River, except the Isle of Orleans, became British, and those west of the river were placed under Spanish control.

**English West Florida, 1763–1783**

Although the Spanish took several years to assert their control over New Orleans and the rest of Louisiana, Britain took immediate control of the eastern half of the North American continent. In October 1763, Florida was divided into East Florida and West Florida. The British were not especially effective in colonizing most of West Florida. The British did, however, grant a number of patents in the Baton Rouge area, though with indifferent success. Enough grants, however, were settled in the Natchez area to warrant subdividing British West Florida into four districts—Pensacola, Mobile, Manchac, and Natchez.

With its capital located at Pensacola, much of the settlement of British West Florida occurred in that area. Many of those associated with the government at Pensacola, however, acquired land grants in the Baton Rouge vicinity. Montford Browne and George Johnstone, both of whom served as acting governors of British West Florida between 1766 and 1770, acquired grants in the area—Browne's at the former location of Ecores Blancs, then called "the Milk Cliffs of Pointe Coupee," and Johnstone's at Scott's Bluffs. Other grantees included Francois Pousset who was speaker of the General Assembly of West Florida in 1766 (Dalrymple 1978:139). Other concessions settled in the Baton Rouge area include those held by McIntosh, John Francis, Dr. Samuel Flower, David Williams, Oliver Pollock, and Richard Carpenter.

In January 1778, less than two years after the American colonies declared their independence from Britain, the American Revolution came to Baton Rouge, which at the time was alternately known as New Richmond. In 1777, James Willing unsuccessfully attempted to persuade the citizens of West Florida to join the Americans in their fight for freedom. Willing returned the following January and raided uncooperative plantations from Manchac to Natchez. British troops were sent from Pensacola to the Manchac District in July 1778 to prevent further disorder (Meyers 1976:32-36).

Spain, allied with France and the American Colonies in the American Revolution, declared war against Britain in June 1779. In that year, fearing attack, Lieutenant-Colonel Alexander Dickson abandoned Fort Bute at Manchac and built a redoubt on the plantation of Flowers and Watts (Dalrymple 1978:29). Despite English efforts, Baton Rouge fell to Spanish forces in September 1779. In addition to taking the fort at Baton Rouge, the Spanish also seized the British posts at Manchac and Pensacola, effectively ending British control of West Florida and also gaining control of both banks of the Mississippi River, below Natchez.

**Spanish West Florida, 1783-1810**

The Spanish were more successful at attracting settlers to lower Louisiana than either the French or British had been. The population of the Baton Rouge district grew from 270
inhabitants in 1785, to 3,820 in 1805, though about a third of these were Spanish soldiers (Manhein and Whitmer 1991:62).

The plantation economy of the region grew under Spanish rule, but by the 1790s persistent problems with the indigo crop, foreign competition, and technological advances in the granulation of sugar and the ginning of cotton led to a shift toward sugar and cotton as the principal commercial crops. Sugar cultivation was common along the river south of Baton Rouge; north of the city, cotton became the preferred crop.

In 1800 all of Louisiana was ceded to France. Three years later, in 1803, the United States bought Louisiana from France by the Louisiana Purchase. West Florida, including Baton Rouge, had been considered part of Louisiana since the French took possession of the Mississippi Valley. However, Spain insisted, without proof, that it was not transferred to France, and not, therefore, included in the great land sale to the United States. In spite of the American claim, Baton Rouge and West Florida remained under Spanish control until 1810. In 1803, the Spanish capital of West Florida was moved from Pensacola to Baton Rouge. Within two years of becoming the capital, Baton Rouge and the surrounding area had grown to a community of 3,820 people (Meyers 1976:67).

Some West Feliciana residents, especially those of Anglo-American origin, were displeased with the rather ineffectual, though benign, Spanish despotism. Their first overt act of rebellion occurred in August, 1804, when local republicans unsuccessfully attacked the Spanish fort at Baton Rouge. Resentment of the Spanish crown continued to grow in West Florida and by 1810 had become dangerous. Republican revolutionaries declared West Florida an independent republic and took Fuerte San Carlos on September 23, 1810.

A self-styled “West Florida Republic,” with its capital at St. Francisville, was proclaimed three days later. Ignoring its pretended status as an independent nation, Louisiana territorial Governor William C.C. Claiborne simply took official control of the fledgling republic for the United States, on December 7 1810. Claiborne subsequently divided the “republic” into six parishes, of which East Baton Rouge was one (Fortier 1909:2:636-638).

As white settlers were extracting themselves from Spanish rule, their slaves were similarly growing restive with their lot. In 1811, a slave revolt, possibly involving 500 individuals, was effectively, though viciously, crushed by New Orleans militia and United States troops stationed in Baton Rouge (Wall 1984:99). This was the largest and last uprising of slaves in Louisiana.

Statehood, 1812–Present

The introduction of the steamboat to the Mississippi River in 1812 significantly increased river traffic at the port of Baton Rouge, and concomitantly the population of the town. On January 16, 1817, Baton Rouge was incorporated. By 1820 the population had grown slightly, there being 4,808 persons in East Baton Rouge Parish (Favrot n.d.:13). Through the nineteenth century the population of the greater Baton Rouge area grew with the continuing expansion of plantations and dependent industries along the Mississippi River.

Outside events were to continue to affect Louisiana in the mid-nineteenth century. In 1860, Lincoln, a Republican, was elected President of the United States. Louisiana's planters
pushed the state towards secession. In January 1861, a special legislative session at Baton Rouge voted to secede from the Union.

After joining the Confederate States of America almost immediately after secession, Louisiana soon felt the effects of the Civil War. On April 25, 1862, Union forces led by Commodore David Farragut captured New Orleans. After this success, Farragut, on May 7, 1862, took Baton Rouge, which numbered approximately 7,000 inhabitant (Spedale 1985:5).

Baton Rouge had strategic value for the Confederates. Control of Baton Rouge was necessary for the movement of vital war supplies from the Red River and Texas, and as a base for military action against New Orleans. On July 27, 1862, a Confederate force left Vicksburg, intent on capturing Baton Rouge. The Confederate ironclad Arkansas was also sent to Baton Rouge (Winters 1963:111).

The Confederates began their unsuccessful attack on Baton Rouge on August 5, 1862. The CSS Arkansas never made it to Baton Rouge, having been burned and set adrift by her captain only four miles above the town (Spedale 1985:40-41; Winters 1963:121). The entire Confederate effort was a failure.

In 1864 the 4th Wisconsin Cavalry established a post on Highland Road overlooking Bayou Fountain (Casey 1983:75). At this place, on July 29, six companies of New York cavalry defended themselves from an attack by Confederate irregulars. According to Powell Casey (1983:75), the stockade's emplacements were still visible in 1983 at the former location of Highland Road School. Today, that location is about 850 m northwest of the intersection of Highland and Gardere Lane (see Figure 1-1).

In 1867, the United States Congress passed the Military Reconstruction Act, establishing a loyal Union government in Louisiana. The recovery of Baton Rouge following the Civil War was a long and painful process. In 1882, the state government was moved to Baton Rouge from New Orleans and the following year the city was connected by rail to New Orleans for the first time (Carleton 1981:128).

Twentieth-century Baton Rouge has continued on the course set by nineteenth-century events. This century has been characterized by periods of prosperity and depression, resulting from the state's dependence on mono-cultures, and the lack of a diversified economy. Today much of the city's economy is directly related to state government expenditures. The arrival of the boll weevil in 1907 damaged the cotton industry in the surrounding region, though sugarcane cultivation continued. The failure of the cotton crop and the birth of the petroleum industry along the Mississippi River in the early twentieth century, resulted in a shift to dairy farming in East Baton Rouge Parish. In the 1930s, at least 49 dairies were operating in the parish, however increased land values resulting from industrial and suburban growth, and the rise of large automated dairies, has seriously reduced the number of surviving family farms in East Baton Rouge Parish. Persisting agricultural pursuits are now dominated by the less-labor-intensive beef industry. Once the backbone of the regional economy, agriculture is now overshadowed by industry in the parish.

The twentieth century has seen intensive industrialization of the north Baton Rouge area (Carleton 1981). In April 1909 the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey began construction of its original Baton Rouge installations and has been expanding ever since. Following a series
of corporate changes, in 1973 Standard Oil Company of Louisiana came under the aegis of Exxon Company, USA. The year 1941 saw the opening of Exxon Chemical Company, USA operations in Baton Rouge. Ethyl Corporation opened its Baton Rouge operations in 1937 on land north of the Standard Oil refinery. The Copolymer Rubber and Chemical Corporation operated a manufacturing plant at the beginning of WW II. Growing public concern with pollution-caused environmental degradation in the 1960s and 1970s lead to State and Federal legislation. The legislation, in turn, created the need for the waste-disposal industries, which now line the Mississippi River. These and other large industries have had a significant effect on the Baton Rouge area.
CHAPTER 5

PROPERTY OWNERSHIP IN THE BAYOU FOUNTAIN AREA

Historic Overview of the Dutch Highlands

In the 1770s, Acadian and German immigrants moved into the project area and settled above Bayou Manchac (Dieler 1909:106; Meyers 1976:54-55). A number of German families journeyed from Pennsylvania via Frederic County, Maryland to Bayou Manchac, hoping to establish a community in the British settlement (Huguet 1976:4-5).

At first, the German families established themselves below Hackett's Point on the opposite side of the river, but they were forced to abandon their homes and seek out the highlands after several successive floods. The area they inhabited—located in T8S, R1E—came to be known as the Dutch Highlands. The Dutch Highlands are situated along Highland Road, Bayou Fountain, and Ward's Creek between present-day Ben Hur Road and Siegen Lane. The first settlement of the "Dutch Highlands" was made in 1784 by Johann George Klinepeter, Emeric Adams, Henry Thomas, George Garig, and Paul Sharp (De Bow 1851:254-5). They established themselves on the Hill of the Fountains, so called because of the numerous springs that flowed from it into Bayou Fountain below. Hill of the Fountains was the last bluff line leading to the Gulf of Mexico (Huguet 1976:5-6). After the German settlement was established there, it became known as the Dutch Highlands—so named because of the local misinterpretation of "Deutsche," [German] which was thought to mean "Dutch" by Anglo-Americans. Among the Germans who settled there were several interconnected families—Kleinpeter, Ory, Sharp, Englehart, Thomas, Adams, Traeger, Bouillon, Rhine, and Garig. These families became a tightly-knit community that spawned generations of descendants known as "Highlanders" (Dieler 1909:10510; Huguet 1976:5-6).

The first staple crops produced by the German settlers were indigo, tobacco and corn. They soon discovered the soil was well-adapted for cotton agriculture, and concentrated their efforts on cotton cultivation. Johann Klinepeter erected the first cotton gin in the Highlands in about 1790 (De Bow 1851:254-5).

The German settlers, devoutly Catholic, established the old St. Gabriel Church and many are buried there, including the Kleinpeter matriarch, Gertrude Heitzinger Kleinpeter, wife of Johann [John] Georg Kleinpeter. Many of their descendants are buried in the Old Highland Cemetery near Louisiana State University (Huguet 1976:12-13, 18).

After the West Florida Rebellion of 1810, the former Spanish colony became part of the United States. There followed several decades of increasing prosperity, tempered only by the
occasional bad growing season or the removal of the tariff on imported sugar cane, which devalued American cane. Tariff removal may have been responsible for the sale of several Highlands properties in the 1840s, as Anglo-American planters moved into the area. Cotton and cane agriculture supported by slave labor continued to be the backbone of the local economy.

Sugar cane was being grown on a small scale in Louisiana as early as 1745, but the sugar culture did not really take hold until after 1794. As colonial powers already controlled sugar-producing centers in Central American and the Caribbean, the impetus to produce sugar in Louisiana was minimal (Rehder 1971:66). Also, the process of manufacturing sugar from cane was not well-developed in eighteenth-century Louisiana. However, by the late eighteenth century, sugar production in the colony was on the upswing. Between 1799 and 1802 alone, sugar exported from Louisiana to the United States increased from 773,542 to 1,576,933 pounds (Tregle 1942:25-7).

Not until 1795 did a planter named Etienne de Boré, working with a West Indian sugar-maker and newly-purchased equipment, successfully granulate sugar for commercial purposes. With a successful granulation process and the introduction of commercial sugar production, Louisiana was catapulted into a half-century of unprecedented sugar production (Rehder 1971:44-5).

Already engaged in cotton agriculture, Johann Georg Kleinpeter was the first planter to successfully grow sugar cane on the Dutch Highlands. His son, John Baptist Klinepeter, erected the first steam sugar mill on the Highlands in 1832. By 1851, at least fifteen to twenty mills were established there. Klinepeter was so successful in his efforts that many of his neighbors devoted their entire plantations to sugar cultivation (De Bow 1851:616).

An increase in sugar production is evident after the 1840s collapse of cotton prices, when sugar became the means by which many area planters achieved financial salvation (Rehder 1971:75). Sugarcane appears to have replaced cotton as the primary crop grown on the Highlands in the nineteenth century, while corn – always critical for animal fodder and human consumption – remained important.

A change from cotton to sugar agriculture was not a cheap transition in the early 1800s, when the capital necessary for developing a fifty-hand sugar plantation was about $40,000 (Rehder 1971:68). By mid-century, a steam engine, sugar mill, and associated equipment from an English supplier could cost as much as $12,500 [2,500£] (Kerr 1851:78-79). Add to that basic price the cost of shipping, set-up, sugar house construction, and the hiring of an engineer to oversee the installation of equipment, and even sugar plantations of moderate size, like those found on Bayou Fountain, could be quite expensive to establish.

The sugar harvest in Louisiana had to be completed before the onset of the first frost. Harvest generally ran from October through December, during which time work was constant. Cane was cut by workers using cane knives, then either laid on the ground in stacks (mattresses) or transported immediately in wagons or two-wheeled carts to the sugar house. Carts were drawn by either oxen or mules. Later in the century, rail cars on portable, light-gauge tracts were used on some plantations (Maygarden, et al 1994:3-3.4). When Philip Garig sold his sugar plantation to John Baptist Klinepeter in 1852, a railroad (RR) was included in the inventory (CR-G:151).
Animal-powered mills were used at first, and were still common in smaller sugar houses into the twentieth century. Either oxen or mules could be used to power the mill. Animal-powered mills generally had vertical arrangement of rollers, but steam-powered mills with horizontal rollers appeared by 1822 (Sitterson 1953:140).

The Civil War dealt a severe blow to Louisiana agriculturalists, and naturally affected sugar production on the Highland plantations. Union soldiers camped on the banks of Bayou Fountain between Starring and Gardere Lanes, ransacking plantation homes, destroying sugar houses, and confiscating cotton. With the elimination of slavery, large-scale crop production ceased for a number of years. Many longtime Highlands planters never recovered from the financial devastation, but some were able, after a time, to reestablish themselves (Huguet 1976:14-15). The Louisiana sugar industry as a whole had recovered by 1870 (Rehder 1971:78).

The Highlands area remained largely agricultural – devoted primarily to sugar cane and cotton agriculture – well into the twentieth century. Sugar plantations began to decline in the area in the 1920s, possibly due, at least in part, to a blight called mosaic cane disease (Rehder 1971:50). Today, the area is largely residential. Mineral exploitation is common, especially in the sections south of Bayou Fountain.

All lands granted by the British, Spanish and later American governments, are referred to in the following discussion by U.S. Land Office, Greensburg, Louisiana section numbers. All sections within the project ROW fall within Township 8 South, Range 1 East. Sections are discussed numerically below.

Section 37

Section 37 (see Figure 1-1) consisting of 664.30 acres was confirmed to the Heirs of Nicolas Trist by Act of Congress on March 3, 1819 (Louisiana State Land Office Tract Book [hereafter cited as LSLO] 1:44). The U.S. Commissioners recommended confirmation of claim number A 344 in 1813, primarily upon the basis of a prior British patent. "A" claims were those based upon either British or Spanish authority and were considered by the commissioners to be the most valid of land claims lodged in the newly-acquired territory. The commissioners commented that 1000 acres had been inhabited and cultivated from 1800 to 1814, and had been owned by Trist since November 3, 1777 (American State Papers [hereafter cited as ASP] 3:43).

The land was part of an original grant of 2,000 acres made to Philip Barber (ASP 3:43) or Philip Brown (Judges Books [hereafter cited as JB] R:398) under a 1774 Royal Letter Patent from King George III. An indenture dated November 3, 1774, made between “Philip Brown, a reduced subaltern, and Nicholas Trist, Ensign in His Majesty’s Service” gave each man half of the estimated 2000 acre tract. The land was situated on the “second terrace of lands found on leaving the river,” and was favorably described.

These lands enjoy the advantage of being perfectly secure, without levees, from the Mississippi at its highest stage; equally adapted to both cotton and cane. The tract was one of the first locations... in that section of the country; and its quality is indicated by a heavy growth of magnolia, poplar, hiccory [sic], oaks of different kinds, ash, etc., etc. It contains a sufficiency of swamp for the purposes of a large plantation. Some years ago, about 150 acres were cleared and cultivated for a short time (Brown and Trist 1774).
Nicholas Trist was born into a landed family in Devonshire, England in 1743. As the fifth son he had no hope of inheriting his father's estate, and joined the Eighteenth or "Royal Irish" Regiment of Foot. Posted to the American colonies, Trist traveled widely through the North American British holdings. He took this opportunity to acquire several pieces of land, including his tract in British West Florida on Bayou Fountain. By 1775, he had saved enough money to resign his commission (Kolodny 1990:183).

Trist married Elizabeth House, a Pennsylvania Quaker, in 1774. Elizabeth's mother ran a boarding house in Philadelphia which became a meeting place for members of the Continental Congress. Elizabeth formed a lifelong friendship with the young Thomas Jefferson, even caring for his oldest daughter, Martha, after the death of her mother (Kolodny 1990:184-5).

Shortly after Trist resigned from the military, he traveled to Louisiana to establish a home for his wife and young son, Hore Browse Trist. Mrs. Trist and the baby remained with her mother. Trist developed sympathies for the colonials and was forced to leave British Manchac after joining Captain James Willing on his raids of British plantations in the area (Meyers 1976:32-3; Phillip Rivet, personal communication 1997). Thereafter, Trist moved south of Bayou Manchac to land near the St. Gabriel church and later became a naturalized American citizen.

Mrs. Trist left Philadelphia in 1783 with her eight year old son on a journey to Louisiana that would take almost one year to complete. She kept a journal—intended for her friend, Thomas Jefferson—during her voyage down the Mississippi River in which she recorded numerous scientific observations on the flora, fauna, and Indians encountered by her party. Shortly before reaching Natchez, Mississippi, the point of debarkation for Mrs. Trist, she was informed that her husband had died some four months earlier. She was forced to oversee his succession and sale of goods before leaving Louisiana in 1785 (Kolodny 1990:187-95).

It is not certain whether Nicholas Trist ever established a domicile on Bayou Fountain. Besides the St. Gabriel property, on which he did build a house, Trist also owned land in Natchez. He was probably living in St. Gabriel land by 1778 when British merchant, John Fitzpatrick, wrote to John Miller that, at Miller's request, he had assisted Trist, noting that "his effects are still in my store" (in Dalrymple 1978:277).

Mrs. Trist oversaw the public sale of her husband's goods, but did not sell the land on Bayou Fountain. She returned east with her son, who eventually married and bought Birdwood Plantation next to Jefferson's Monticello in 1798. He resided there with his mother and family until 1804, when Jefferson appointed him to the position of Port Collector for the lower Mississippi River in New Orleans. Shortly after relocating with his wife, two sons, and mother, Hore Browse Trist died of yellow fever. His mother remained with the widow, Mary Brown Trist, until she remarried in 1807. Elizabeth returned to Virginia and lived as a houseguest with friends and family until eventually taking up permanent residence at Monticello in 1823. One of her two grandsons, Nicholas Philip Trist, married Jefferson's grand-daughter in 1824 (Kolodny 1990:190-7). Elizabeth Trist died and was buried at Monticello in 1828 (Phillip Rivet, personal communication 1997).
According to family correspondence, Mary Trist also lost her second husband. She lived on the Bayou Fountain property from 1811 to 1816 and suffered great hardship trying to support herself and two small sons. She married a third time, and moved with her new husband to the Bayou Lafourche area. Her eldest son, Nicholas, farmed the Bayou Fountain land for a short time in the 1820s, but was wiped out by a hurricane and abandoned his efforts (Phillip Rivet, personal communication 1997).

On March 14, 1844, the grandsons of Nicholas Trist – William Horace Brown Trist of Ascension Parish and Nicolas Trist of Havana, Cuba – sold to James Hutches “that half of a tract of land of 2000 English acres . . . at the place called the Dutch Highlands.” Neither buildings nor improvements were noted in the sale, but this omission does not guarantee their absence. Slaves and stock were not noted as being included in the $2,300 sale price (JB:398).

Only four months later, however, Hutches sold what appeared to be a working plantation to Francis Hacket. Hacket purchased the plantation, along with all stock of horses, mules, and hogs, farming equipment, buildings, and improvements. In addition, 26 slaves – six men, six women, and fourteen children – were included in the selling price of $16,868.90, more than seven times what Hutches had paid for the property (Notaries Books [hereafter cited as NB] recorded July 22, 1844: L:35).

Hacket kept the plantation until March 6, 1848, when he sold it to Andrew Matta for $20,000. Included with the land were buildings and improvements, all stock of horses, oxen, cows, and hogs, farming utensils, wagons, carts, corn and fodder, as well as 27 slaves (Conveyance Record [hereafter cited as CR] B:41). No sugar-processing equipment was mentioned in the conveyance, but cane was likely being grown on the land at this time. It is not known if either Hacket or Matta established a residence on the plantation. Matta was married to Alice Rouzan, daughter of J. P. Meffre Rouzan (see Sec. 51), and he may have resided at Longwood Plantation. He was counted in the 1850 census of slaves as a resident of Baton Rouge (United States Slave Schedule [hereafter cited as Slave Sched.] 1850).

During the year Matta owned the plantation, it almost doubled in value. On May 28, 1849, Matta exchanged 280 superficial arpents (S.A.), 20 front/14 deep, in the upper part of Section 37 for 294 S.A., 21 front/14 deep, in Section 38. This exchange was made with Francis and George Klinepeter out of lands originally granted to Louis Favrot (CR-C:69). When Francis Hacket repurchased the plantation on September 20, 1849, it was noted to be “the same plantation acquired from present seller by present purchaser, except for a portion of said tract acquired from Francis and George Klinepeter in exchange for a similar amount, making the whole tract more or less the same as when first acquired.” The plantation, now consisting of 800 S.A., buildings and improvements, all stock, and 40 slaves, sold for $38,700 (CR-C:149).

Hacket appears to have been a fairly successful sugar planter prior to the Civil War. Statistics for the years 1849 through 1859 record several productive seasons (Table 5-1). Champomier noted that Hacket's sugar house was equipped with steam power. Hacket's plantation had a low yield of only 59 hogsheads (1,000 to 1,100 lb. each) in 1850, a year in which Champomier noted that eight sugar-producing parishes, including East Baton Rouge Parish, had made no more than “three-fifths of a full crop” (1850:51). The next two years produced decent crops for Hacket, but he had a yield of only 68 hogsheads in 1853. The
Table 5-1. Sugar Statistics for the Plantation of Frances Hacket.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On High Rd. to Manchac</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. Hogsheads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frances [sic] Hacket</td>
<td>1849 - 1850</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Hacket, s*</td>
<td>1850 - 1851</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1851 - 1852</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1852 - 1853</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1853 - 1854</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1854 - 1855</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1855 - 1856</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1856 - 1857</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1857 - 1858</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1858 - 1859</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[from Bouchereau]</td>
<td>1861 - 1862</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*steam power used in sugar house
source: Bouchereau 1870:13; Champomier 1850 - 1860

reason for this temporary decline in production is not known, as neighboring plantations appear to have had bumper crops that year.

Nevertheless, the following two years were highly productive for Hacket. A low yield of 85 hogsheads (now measured as 1,100 pounds each) may have been due to an extraordinarily dry spring and an early frost in October that shortened the growing season by two months (Champomier 1856:v). Hacket produced no sugar the following year, probably owing to several successive dry springs and summers and an exceedingly wet and cold winter (Champomier 1857:v). Hacket’s production rebounded in the two years before the Civil War, however, and he enjoyed his highest yield in 1860 (see Table 5-1).

In 1850, Hacket was noted as having 250 improved acres and 550 unimproved acres with a cash value of $16,000. He owned 17 horses, 12 mules, 8 milk cows, 16 working oxen, 20 "other" cattle, twenty hogs, and no sheep. His plantation produced 1,200 bushels of "Indian corn," 24 bushels of Irish potatoes, 9 bushels of sweet potatoes, 30 pounds of butter, 58 hogsheads of cane sugar and 4,000 gallons of molasses (United States Agricultural Census [hereafter cited as Ag] 1850). By contrast, Hacket was noted in 1870 with only 15 improved acres and 70 unimproved acres worth only $800. He had 5 horses, 2 mules, 6 milk cows, no working oxen, 3 other cattle, and 10 hogs. He was noted as having produced 32 pounds of wool, but no sheep were counted in his inventory. He produced 160 bushels of Indian corn and 30 bushels of sweet potatoes (1870 Ag. Census).

During Reconstruction, Hacket was forced to sell his 800 arpent plantation to Nathan King Knox for only $5,000. Buildings and improvements were included in the sale, but no stock was noted (CR-Y:92, April 9, 1869). No sugar production took place on the plantation between 1869 and 1870 (Bouchereau 1870:13). After 1872, when Knox acquired the properties which would become Bellonia Plantation in Sections 67 - 69, no separate production figures for the plantation in Section 37 are noted. Presumably sugar continued to be grown there, so the sugar was probably processed and included with Bellonia’s yield. The tract seems to have been used strictly as farm land and no residence is ever mentioned in the
conveyances. There probably were structures on the tract at this time—perhaps an overseer’s house or tenant houses—but the sugar house was apparently no longer in use.

Knox retained the land until his death, when it passed to his daughter, Ella Knox Keener. Knox had previously sold the upper portion of the section to Benjamin Hinson and the extreme southwestern part of Section 37 was added to the tract, so that the property then totaled 520 S.A. In the inventory for the succession of Nathan King and Fipporah Bryan Knox, recorded January 27, 1887, the plantation, valued at $3,000, is noted as containing buildings and improvements (CR-9: 412).

Mrs. Keener held the land until at least 1895 when the Kaiser and Swenson map of East Baton Rouge Parish was produced. When superficial arpents were converted to acres, the tract contained 440 acres (Figure 5-1). Although no conveyance could be identified, the property passed at some point to John McQuaid, who sold it to William S. Klinepeter on April 26, 1929 for $6,000 (CR-225:103). Klinepeter sold the tract to Regina Klinepeter McQuaid, the ex-wife of John McQuaid, for $2,000 on December 9, 1933 (CR-277:315). Regina McQuaid kept the tract less than two years, selling it, less 42 acres, to Agnes Klinepeter, et al, on March 12, 1935 for $9,950 (CR-292:361). The tract was purchased by Albert Foster Fritchie on October 8, 1949 (CR-838:207), and was subsequently sold in small tracts thereafter.

**Section 38**

Section 38 (see Figure 1-1) was confirmed to Louis Favrot under TPO Blanchard by Act of Congress on May 8, 1822 (LSLO 1:44). Confirmation of claim number A 45 was made by the U. S. Commissioners in 1820, on the basis of a Spanish patent issued December 12, 1788 (ASP:413). The original grant was approximately 1,200 arpents, but it was confirmed for 1,050.27 acres (ASP:413; LSLO 1:44). The land was noted to have been inhabited and cultivated from 1790 to 1829 (ASP:413).

Favrot was not the original grantee for Section 38. In proceedings to settle a dispute between Ignace Babin and Joseph Le Blanc, Spanish Commandant Francisco Rivas noted that Babin had been granted what would become Section 38 in 1788 by Governor Esteban Miro (Sp.Ar.2:262-5).

The property was divided among Babin's heirs by a public sale held December 12, 1791 to settle the succession of Ignace Babin. Although most of the offered items were purchased by family members, the practice of holding a public sale was customary when a number of heirs were involved. The 1799 Spanish map of the Manchac District (Figure 5-2) shows the section divided into five equal parcels each with six arpents fronting on Bayou Fountain. They were owned east to west by Victor Blanchard, Isadore Blanchard, Olivier Blanchard, Pedro Babin, and Joseph Babin. The Blanchard brothers were Ignace Babin’s step-sons (Sp.Ar.2:240-1).

Louis Favrot acquired the property from George de Passau in an act passed before a New Orleans notary on March 5, 1819 (NB-B:33). It is not known when De Passau acquired the land from the Babin/Blanchard heirs. A former Alcado of the Highlands under the Spanish, de Passau had left the region quite suddenly in about 1808 and subsequently sold off his properties there. In 1806, de Passau reported to Governor Carlos de Grand-Pré that he had uncovered a conspiracy among his slaves to poison him. Further, it was implied that a slave
Figure 5-1. Kaiser and Swenson map of East Baton Rouge Parish showing land ownership along Bayou Fountain in 1895 (Kaiser and Swenson 1895).
Figure 5-2. Plat map of plantations along Bayou Fountain (Pintado 1799).
belonging to Joseph Sharp, his neighbor and one of the Dutch Highlanders, and an "old, blind, free negro [sic] hoodoo doctor" were responsible for inciting his slaves to murder. After two years of conducting interviews with local planters and a number of slaves, Spanish authorities discovered that de Passau had perpetrated a hoax to injure the reputation of Joseph Sharp. When his duplicity was discovered, de Passau took his slaves and all his moveable property and departed West Florida in the middle of the night (Sp.Ar. 13:45).

When Louis Favrot acquired the property, it was described as being located "on the left bank of Bayou Fountain in the place called Highlands of the Germans, the said land having twenty-four arpents face [and] forty deep; the inferior line [bounded] by land of Trist and to the other line by land heretofore belonging to Simon Forest now to Steven Henson." Favrot, a judge under the Americans, was the eldest son of Pierre Favrot, former commandant at the Spanish posts of Plaquemines and Baton Rouge. In an exchange executed November 10, 1823, Pierre Favrot received the plantation, measuring twenty-four arpents front on Bayou Fountain, from his son and William Joyce (NB-B:33).

Pierre Joseph Favrot was a French Creole who served three governments during his long military and diplomatic career. The family military tradition dated back toFrançois Faverot, who served three sixteenth-century French kings. Pierre carried on the tradition, enlisting in the French military while still in his teens (Parkhurst 1945:682; 688). Under Spanish administration, Don Pedro Favrot became one of Governor Bernardo de Galvez's most trusted advisors. It was common Spanish practice to promote Creoles to positions of responsibility, allowing Spanish administrators to benefit from the insight and connections of the French officers (Parkhurst 1945:694).

Favrot accompanied Galvez on the 1779 expedition in which Fort Bute was taken from the English, and was left in charge of the newly-acquired territory at Baton Rouge. In 1783, he married Dona Francesca [Françoise] Gerard, daughter of the surgeon at Pointe Coupée. They would have six children together (Parkhurst 1945:697-699; 711). Favrot later served as commandant of the Post of the Plaquemines, but returned to Baton Rouge in 1801. Learning of the retrocession of Louisiana to France, Favrot left Spanish service and retired to his plantation on the western side of the Mississippi River (Meyers 1976:72). Favrot's knowledge was valuable to the Americans, and he served as a member of the Committee of Defense of the state legislature during the War of 1812 (Parkhurst 1945:695).

The Favrots continued to reside in West Baton Rouge Parish or in Baton Rouge, but maintained the plantation on Bayou Fountain. Pierre Favrot died in 1824 and was buried in the Highland Cemetery near the south gate of Louisiana State University (Round Table Club [hereafter cited as RTC] 1989:95). On March 28, 1825, the plantation was divided into four lots with six arpents front each and sold at public auction. Pierre Favrot’s heirs were listed as Henry, Louis, Josephine, Octavia, and Fulcherie Favrot. Lots one and two, on the upper side of Bayou Fountain, were purchased by the Widow Françoise Gerard Favrot for $2,600 (JB-1:18). Lots three and four on the lower side of the bayou, were sold to Louis Favrot, also for $2,600 (JB-1:20).

Madame Favrot exchanged lot one for lands of Florentin Aucoin on December 23, 1826 (JB-N:32). Her heirs, named as Henry, Octavia, and Fulcherie Favrot, apparently inherited the two lots of their brother, Louis, as well. On December 18, 1844, they exchanged the three lots totaling 21F/40D for lands of William Reynaud of West Baton Rouge Parish (JB-Q:655).
On March 20, 1849, Reynaud sold the 840 acre tract to Frances and George Klinepeter for $7,000 (CR-M:315). A portion of the land – probably used primarily for sugar cultivation – was incorporated into the plantation of Francis Klinepeter, which encompassed parts of Sections 37, 38, and 55. Although the buildings noted in the public sale held for the succession of Francis Klinepeter were not located on the land acquired from the Favrots, they do reflect the typical Dutch Highlands sugar plantation of the middle-nineteenth century. Buildings included two dwelling houses, outbuildings, one large corn crib, seven plantation cabins, a gin house, and one large brick sugar house with engines and kettles (March 4, 1871, CR-Z:555).

No sugar production for Francis and/or George Klinepeter is noted by Champomier or Bouchereau, but the 1850 agricultural census does include 86 hogsheads of cane sugar and 6,800 gallons of molasses. In addition, the brothers were noted as having 300 improved acres and 2,639 unimproved acres worth $30,625. They had 12 horses, 6 mules, 30 milk cows, 24 working oxen, 50 other cattle, 40 sheep, and 70 hogs. They produced that year 3,750 bushels of Indian corn, 30 bushels of Irish potatoes, 150 bushels of sweet potatoes, and 10 tons of hay (1850 Ag. Census). Since no wool was produced, it appears that many of the animals were slaughtered for meat.

The plantation of Francis Klinepeter was divided into 15 lots of approximately 50 acres each and sold at public auction. The Klinepeter heirs were listed as Francis and Sebastian Klinepeter and their mother, Mary A. Klinepeter. Cornelia Klinepeter Stokes purchased several of the lots including those in the western portion of the old Favrot tract (lots eleven through thirteen) for $2,250 (CR-Z:555). The tract, totaling 150.42 acres, was exchanged for lands of Nathan King Knox on February 6, 1872 (CR-1:495).

Knox sold all but 25 arpents on the extreme eastern part of Section 38. This tract was included in the inheritance of his daughter, Ella Knox Keener (CR-9:412), and can be seen attached to the 440 acre plantation designated as Mrs. E. Keener on the 1895 Kaiser and Swenson map of East Baton Rouge Parish (see Figure 5-1).

Mrs. Keener had the land until at least 1895 when the Kaiser and Swenson map was published. Although no conveyance could be identified, the property passed at some point to John McQuaid, who sold it to William S. Klinepeter on April 26, 1929 for $6,000 (CR-225:103). Klinepeter sold the tract to Regina Klinepeter McQuaid, the ex-wife of John McQuaid, for $2,000 on December 9, 1933 (CR-277:315). Regina McQuaid kept the tract less than two years, selling it, less 42 acres, to Agnes Klinepeter, et al, on March 12, 1935 for $9,950 (CR-292:361). It was then purchased by Albert Foster Fritchie on October 8, 1949 (CR-838:207), and was sold in subsequently smaller tracts thereafter.

**Section 50**

Section 50 (see Figure 1-1) was confirmed to the heirs of Francisco Bouligny by Act of Congress on May 8, 1822 (LSLO 1:44). Confirmation of claim number B 6 was made by the U. S. Commissioners in 1813 on the basis of a Spanish order of survey issued by Governor Esteban Miro (ASP:413). “B” claims were those which were founded upon orders of survey, requetes, permission to settle, or other evidence of claims which the commissioners generally recommended for confirmation. The original grant to Bouligny was approximately 2,400
acres, but Section 50 was entered at 791.72 acres (ASP:413; LSLO 1:44). The land had been neither cultivated nor inhabited (ASP:143).

Francisco Bouligny was born in Alicante, Spain in 1737. Arriving in Louisiana as Governor Alejandro O’Reilly’s aide-de-camp in 1769, he remained in service until his death in 1800 (Weddle 1995:91). Bouligny joined with a prominent New Orleans French Creole family when he married Marie Louise Le Sénéchal d’Auberville in 1770 at St. Louis Cathedral. He proceeded thereafter to acquire numerous properties in Louisiana, the first of which was the former plantation of his wife’s family, one league above New Orleans (Din 1993:45-50).

Bouligny was instrumental in the founding of New Iberia, a settlement established for natives of Málaga, Spain. While visiting in Spain, Bouligny had developed a close relationship with Don José de Galvez, the uncle of Bernardo de Galvez and a highly-placed Spanish official. Impressed with Bouligny’s Memoria on Louisiana, José de Galvez had appointed him Lieutenant-Governor under his nephew. Friendly at first, Bouligny and the governor had continuous disagreements over policy. Galvez was also jealous of the trust his uncle placed in Bouligny (Weddle 1995:64-85).

The enmity of Galvez had a profound influence on the career of Bouligny, even after the Governor left Louisiana. Nevertheless, Bouligny brought forty-five men from New Iberia to support the 1779 Galvez campaign that captured Fort Bute and Baton Rouge from the British (Weddle 1995:99).

After leaving New Iberia in the same year, Bouligny continued to compile “a brilliant war record” in campaigns at Mobile and Pensacola, but his relationship with Galvez prevented his promotion (Weddle 1995:64-85).

From the time he settled in Louisiana, Bouligny began to acquire property, hoping to build a firm financial empire. The property in question, referred to as the Manchac property, consisted of an original grant of 640 superficial arpents from Governor Luis de Unzaga y Amezaga in 1771, to which was later added about 1,800 arpents (Figure 5-3).

Financial problems plagued Bouligny throughout his later life, and in 1788, he received permission to sell the Manchac land to Daniel Clark, Jr. However, the sale was never completed, and the property remained undeveloped. In 1792, local residents submitted a memorial to Governor Francisco Luis Héctor, Baron de Carondelet, in which they voiced complaints about absentee landowners, including Bouligny (Din 1993:165).

The property remained abandoned until 1860, although the family may have harvested cypress from the land. The lumber industry was well-established, even in colonial Louisiana, and considerable income could be had from the production of barrel staves and lumber for construction (Dalrymple 1978:6). The property was finally sold to William B. Walker at public auction to satisfy a family suit involving virtually all the heirs. The 791.72 acre “cypress swamp” was bounded “north by Bayou Fountain, south by James Nelson, east by George de Passau, [and] west by lands confirmed in the name of Josiah Barker and Louis Beauregard” (CR-R:140).

Walker added the property to Woodstock, a thriving sugar plantation with land in several sections (Figure 5-4). Sugar production was steady throughout the second half of the
Figure 5-3. Spanish-period draft of a plat map showing the Bayou Fountain area after 1799 (Pintado post-1799).
Figure 5-4. Persac map of 1858 showing plantations along Bayou Fountain (Persac 1858).
nineteenth century (Table 5-2). Champomier noted the presence of a steam or a steam and kettle apparatus in a brick sugar house topped by a slate roof. In 1876, the presence of an open-strike pan was noted (see Table 5-2). The sugar house and other primary buildings were on the Mississippi River side of the property, so Section 50 was likely used for cultivation and lumber production.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Apparatus in sugar house</th>
<th>Description of sugar house</th>
<th>No. hogsheads</th>
<th>Weight in lbs.</th>
<th>Gallons molasses</th>
<th>Bbls. corn in shuck</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*1849-50</td>
<td>steam</td>
<td></td>
<td>334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-51</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-52</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>445</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852-53</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853-54</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854-55</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855-56</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-57</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857-58</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858-59</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>1165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†1861-62</td>
<td>steam &amp; kettle</td>
<td>brick &amp; slate roof</td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>487,200</td>
<td>33,800</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>326,000</td>
<td>19,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>steam, kettles,</td>
<td>open-strike pan</td>
<td>335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>405</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>630,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>437,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Compiled from Champomier 1849-1859
†Compiled from Bouchereau, various years
Walker and Johnson were censused in 1850 with 450 improved acres and 1,400 unimproved acres valued at $55,500. The plantation owned 10 horses, 30 mules, 12 milk cows, 16 working oxen and 15 other cattle, as well as 30 hogs. Woodstock lands produced 3,000 bushels of Indian corn, 600 bushels of Irish potatoes, 1,000 bushels of sweet potatoes, 200 tons of hay, 334 hogsheads of cane sugar, and 30,000 gallons of molasses (1850 Ag. Census). In addition, the plantation owned 76 slaves – 29 men, 24 women and 23 children (1850 Slave Sched.).

Walker and Johnson were not included in the agricultural census of 1870. The plantation was sold by Ellen Johnson Walker, the widow of William B. Walker, to Burton Lumber Co. on March 27, 1888. The property, described as encompassing all of Sections 50 and 53, as well as parts of Sections 47 and 52, was sold for $31,000 (CR-10:210).

During the years Burton Lumber Co. owned the approximately 3000 acre tract, it became known as Burtville Plantation. Joseph A. Grace of Plaquemines in Iberville Parish purchased the property for $25,000 on March 12, 1902 (CR-27:486). Grace kept the property less than a year before selling it to Sabin J. Gianelloni on December 29, 1902 for $25,000 (CR-28:561). Gianelloni added this parcel to Longwood Plantation (see Section 51), and it was held by his heirs until 1965 (see Figure 5-1).

It is not known how long the plantation continued to produce sugar. Sabin Gianelloni and his wife, Julia Lefebre, were listed in the advance directory of sugar manufacturers until at least 1917 (A. Bouchereau, various years). However, no evidence of sugar production remained in the inventory of his succession made on July 31, 1934. Counted among his property were “800 head of grown mixed neat cattle, 250 yearling neat cattle, 150 calves, 9 registered Hereford bulls, 180 graded Hereford bulls, 25 head of hogs, 150 head of sheep, 16 mares, 16 colts, and 7 mules.” In addition, there were several tractors, threshers, harrows, hoes, seed cleaners, cultivators, plows, and a corn-picking machine (CR-283:440). The Gianelloni's appear to have abandoned the cultivation of sugar to concentrate on ranching, perhaps due to the mosaic corn blight of the 1920s (Rehder 1971:45).

The Gianelloni heirs sold the property, noted in the conveyance as Longwood and Burtville Plantation, as five tracts encompassing parts of Sections 43, 44, 50, 51, and 53 to the Dawl Corporation on August 26, 1965. The selling price was $1,788,500 (CR-1869:340). The land in Section 50 appears not to have been developed residually to any extent, but mineral leases are common in the later records.

Section 51

Section 51 (see Figure 1-1) was part of the Spanish land grant of Francisco Bouligny. It is not known when the tract passed into the hands of Josiah Barker, but the sale was probably transacted in New Orleans, where both families lived (Greensburg District Claim Papers [hereafter cited as GDCP] Roberts:19). Barker’s claim of 1052.12 acres was confirmed by special act of Congress on February 9, 1833 (LSLO 1:44). The land was in cultivation in 1828 and 1829, when Joshua [sic] Barker produced 308 hogsheads of sugar. His yield was down to 202 hogsheads the next year (Deglos 1892:65).

On June 3, 1845, Thomas Hazard Barker of New Orleans purchased the plantation from his father (Mortgage Records [hereafter cited as MR] A:46). Barker does not appear in the sugar statistic from 1845 to 1847, so the sugar house may have been idle during that time.
Two years later, Thomas Barker sold the property to Jacques Philip Meffre Rouzan of Jefferson Parish and Thomas Mille of Iberville Parish for $145,000. In mortgage records entered February 19, 1847, the plantation consisting of 1001 S.A. and described as “the sugar plantation known as Longwood Plantation on the left bank of the Mississippi River” was sold with its present crop. Improvements included “a sugar house and machinery, . . . boiling house with set and curing houses, mill house, negro [sic] cabins, hospital and dependencies, corn houses, stables, meal house, corn mill, blacksmith shop, saw mill, the dwelling house and its dependencies, and the household furniture; together with all horses, mules, oxen, ploughs, harrows, spades, horse carts, axes, wheelbarrows, and cattle” (MR-A:46).

The production of Longwood Plantation appears to have been fairly consistent in the years it was owned by Rouzan and Mille. A particularly low yield of 43 hogsheads in 1856-57 was probably due to a series of dry springs and summers interspersed with cold, wet winters (Champomier 1857:v). Longwood had centrifugals used to extract the liquid from the cane and a rail to transport cane from the field (Table 5-3).

Mille and Rouzan were censused in 1850 with 450 improved acres and 1,200 unimproved acres valued at $80,000. They had 15 horses, 25 mules, 8 milk cows, 20 working oxen, 7 other cattle, and 3 sheep. Longwood produced 6,000 barrels of Indian corn, 200 tons of hay, 550 hogsheads of cane sugar, and 35,000 gallons of molasses (1850 Ag. Census). Although Woodstock plantation was a 3,000 acre plantation and Longwood only about 1,000 acres, Longwood's production was greater, as was the number of slaves attached to the property. In 1850, Longwood had 118 slaves – 49 men, 31 women, and 38 children under sixteen years old (1850 Slave Sched.).

Section 51 was probably used almost exclusively as farm land and for the harvesting of cypress. The houses and primary buildings associated with Longwood were on the Mississippi River side of the property.

At some point, Thomas Mille sold his interest in the plantation to Jacques Meffre Rouzan. Rouzan sold Longwood to his son, Jean Meffre Rouzan, on February 14, 1879 for $60,000. The sugar house, mill, engines and machinery, all stock, wagons and carts, implements of husbandry, and all personal property were included in the sale price (CR-4:532). Jean Meffre Rouzan kept Longwood until his death in 1892.

Interest in the plantation was then split among the Rouzan heirs. One-quarter interest was sold by Amelie Rouzan Loddell to Sabin J. Gianelloni, both of West Baton Rouge Parish, on April 30, 1892. The selling price was $11,500 (CR-15:324). Three days later a public sale was held to satisfy a suit brought by David McCan against the heirs of Jean Meffre Rouzan, named as James Rouzan, Oscar Rouzan, and Alice Rouzan Matta. Half-interest in the plantation, with all properties real and personal belonging to Longwood Plantation, was sold to Emile Lefebre, the father-in-law of Sabin Gianelloni for $32,000 (May 3, 1892, CR-15:329). Gianelloni sold his interest in the plantation to Lefebre for $15,000 on March 3, 1897. The plantation was noted as having 700 S.A. (CR-21:93).

Emile Lefebre kept the property until his death. On March 21, 1901, the heirs of Emile Lefebre, in this transaction listed as the widow Mrs. V. M. Lefebre, Charles Lefebre, Coraline L. Burn, and Eliza Lefebre Aillet, sold half-interest in Longwood to their daughter/sister, Julia.
Table 5-3. Sugar Statistics for Longwood Plantation, Rouzan and Mille.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Apparatus in sugar house</th>
<th>Description of sugar house</th>
<th>No. hogsheads</th>
<th>Weight in lbs.</th>
<th>Gallons molasses</th>
<th>Bbls. corn in shuck</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*1849-50</td>
<td>steam</td>
<td></td>
<td>538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-51</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>415</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-52</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852-53</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853-54</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854-55</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855-56</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-57</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857-58</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858-59</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>635</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†1861-62</td>
<td>steam, train, open-strike pan &amp; centrifugals</td>
<td>brick and slate</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>210,600</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>435</td>
<td>487,200</td>
<td>33,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td>207,000</td>
<td>10,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>steam, kettles, open-strike pan</td>
<td></td>
<td>291</td>
<td>349,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>340</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>298</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>504</td>
<td>675,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>277</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Compiled from Champomier 1849-1859
†Compiled from Bouchereau, various years

L. Gianelloni, the wife of Sabin Gianelloni. This half-interest sold for $41,666.33 1/3 (CR-26:109). In a transaction made the same day, the heirs — with Julia Gianelloni replacing her sister — sold to Eliza Lefebre Aillet, the other half-interest in the plantation, also for $41,666.33 1/3 (CR-26:111).
The following year, Mrs. Aillet sold her half-interest to her brother-in-law, Sabin Gianelloni, for $50,000 (CR-27:599). Longwood was combined with the other Gianelloni property, Woodstock (later Burtville) Plantation (see Section 50). At that time, the combined properties were still producing sugar. Mr. and Mrs. Gianelloni of Longwood Plantation are noted as sugar manufacturers until at least 1917 (A. Bouchereau, various years). However, sometime before the death of Sabin Gianelloni, sugar ceased to be a primary crop. The inventory associated with the succession of Gianelloni bears no evidence of sugar cultivation on Longwood/Woodstock plantation which may have been given over to ranching (see Section 50).

The property remained in the Gianelloni family until it was sold by the Gianelloni heirs – Vivian J. Gianelloni, Giles S. Gianelloni, Ignatius Gianelloni, and Lois Gianelloni – to the Dawl Corporation for $1,788,500. The property was described as five tracts equaling 1,784.96 acres in Sections 43, 44, 50, 51, and 53 (CR-1869:338). Like Section 50, also owned by Gianelloni, the land in Section 51 appears to have never been residentially developed to a great extent, but mineral leases are common in the records.

Section 67

Section 67 (see Figure 1-1) was confirmed to Josan [Johann, John] Georg Klinepeter by Act of Congress on March 3, 1819 (LSLO 1:44). Klinepeter received the original grant of 333.5 arpents from Governor Esteban Miro on April 24, 1787. The U. S. commissioners noted that the land included in claim number A 143 had been occupied since 1785 (ASP:38). Johann Klinepeter was one of the founding members of the Dutch Highlands community centered on Bayou Fountain. Klinepeter was married to Gertrude Heitzinger and was probably a native of the Alsace region of Germany, as their daughter, Eva, was noted as a “native of Strassburg” in the entry of her marriage to Johann Rein (Deiler 1909:108; Heuget 1976:13).

In 1851, Josiah Klinepeter wrote a narrative family history recounting the story of his family's immigration to Louisiana. Around 1774, Johann, his wife Gertrude, and their six children left their Pennsylvania home accompanied by an Indian guide named Captain White Eye. The party traveled to Hagerstown, Maryland, a point of entry and departure for German immigrants. They departed Maryland with a group of Germans including Philip Englehardt and Mathias Ory, arriving at British Manchac on August 12, 1774. Ten years later, the group relocated to the Hill of the Fountains, thereafter known locally as the Dutch Highlands. All but one of Johann Klinepeter's children – George – married into other German immigrant families who settled on Bayou Fountain (Table 5-4). George married Marguerite Riter of the Parish of St. Gabriel (Huguet 1976:6-8).

At first the settlers planted indigo, but abandoned it after only a few years partly because of the sickness it produced. Cotton became their next cash crop; but in the nineteenth century, sugar would supersede all other crops on the Highlands. John Klinepeter does not appear to have established a large sugar house or to have been more than a moderate planter. Sugar statistics show a high year with 135 hogsheads and a low year, in which his land was inundated, with 17 hogsheads (Championier 1844, 1852). However, during this time the part of Section 67 included within this study was owned by John Baptist Klinepeter.

John Klinepeter sold off part of his land, along with land he had acquired from Joseph Sharp, to his son, John Baptist on March 5, 1841. The 450 arpent tract was sold with
Table 5-4. The Family of John Klinepeter of the Dutch Highlands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1      | Johann Georg Klinepeter and Gertrude Heitzinger | Johann Baptist  
|        |                       | m. Catherine Sharp [Md.]  
|        |                       | a. Joseph m. Caroline Theresa Dardenne  
|        |                       | • Mathilde m. Thomas Cropper  
|        |                       | • Josephine m. Alverini Marionneaux  
|        |                       | • Euphemia Henriette m. Amilcar Dupuy  
|        |                       | • Paul Gervais m. Pamela Isabella Klinepeter  
|        |                       | b. Isabella m. Henry Thomas [Md.] |
| 2      | Joseph                | Magdalena Sharp [Md.]  
|        |                       | • Marie Rose m. Jean Michel Bouillon  
|        |                       | • Elisabeth Floresca |
| 3      | Georg                 | Marguerite Judith Riter  
|        |                       | m. Franz [François] m. Adelaide Traeger  
|        |                       | • A. Cornelia m. William Stokes  
|        |                       | • Frances Amelia m. Thomas Byrne  
|        |                       | b. Julia m. Jean Traeger  
|        |                       | c. Jean m. Marie Rose Bouillon  
|        |                       | • Elvira m. John Huguet  
|        |                       | • Carolina m. Samuel McConnell  
|        |                       | • Josiah m. Elene Elder |
| 4      | Catharine             | Emmerich Adam [Emerick Adams] [Md.]  
|        |                       | m. Catherine m. Jacob Mueller [Md.]  
|        |                       | b. Eve m. Johann Thomas  
|        |                       | • Georg  
|        |                       | c. Marie m. Georg Kraus [Md.]  
|        |                       | d. Mathias  
|        |                       | e. Michael |
| 5      | Barbara               | Jacob Schlatter [Md.]  
|        |                       | m. Catherine  
|        |                       | • Ernestine m. James Robertson  
|        |                       | • Michael m. Lodiska Desobry |
| 6      | Eva                   | Johann Rein [Reine] [Md.]  
|        |                       | m. Johann Rein [Reine] [Md.] |

Source: Deiler 1909:108.

buildings and improvements and stock of cattle and hogs for $6,000 (JB-Q:374). No sugar house or apparatus was noted. The land was incorporated into John Baptist Klinepeter’s Hard Times Plantation, a fairly large sugar plantation encompassing parts of three sections. In 1830, Lewis Klinepeter, John Trager, and John Baptist Klinepeter erected a sugar house; then in 1832, John Baptist built the first steam-powered sugar mill in the district (Huguet 1976:8).
His lowest yield was in 1857, when his land produced only 16 hogsheads of sugar. Several seasons of dry springs and summers and cold, wet winters combined to keep sugar production low throughout the state (Champomier 1857:v). In the 1855-56 growing season, Klinepeter up-graded his equipment to a vacuum, as opposed to open-pan, apparatus (Table 5-5). A vacuum allowed the cane liquid to be boiled at a lower temperature, resulting in greater efficiency in crystallizing sugar from the juice (Maygarden et al 1994:3/21).

The 1850 agricultural census indicates that John Baptist Klinepeter had 400 improved acres and 377 unimproved acres with a total value of $20,000. Stock included 10 horses, 12 mules, 25 milk cows, 20 working oxen, and 20 other cattle. Hard Times produced 3,000 bushels of Indian corn, six 400-pound bales of cotton, 50 bushels of peas and/or beans, 20 bushels of Irish potatoes, 150 bushels of sweet potatoes, 300 pounds of butter, 50 tons of hay, 200 hogsheads of cane sugar, and 12,000 gallons of molasses (1850 Ag. Census).

On March 16, 1857, part of the plantation was purchased from the estate of Amelia Klinepeter by Alfred Duplantier and was incorporated into his Doolittle Plantation (see Section 68). The land containing buildings and improvements sold for $16,650 (MR-F:342). The tract now included half of Section 73 acquired by John Baptist Klinepeter from George Klinepeter (see Section 68). Duplantier's sugar house was equipped with a steam and kettle apparatus (see Table 5-5).

Like other local planters, Duplantier apparently suffered financial hardship after the Civil War. This land was seized and sold at public auction to satisfy a suit filed against Duplantier by former governor, William C. C. Claiborne on May 6, 1871. The tract sold for $4,000 to Francis Gardere (CR-Z:594).

Gardere's heirs, listed as Edward, Fergus, and Elza sold the land on June 4, 1873 to W. H. Gayle, Jr. for $7,110. A year earlier, Nathan King Knox had purchased the other part of Duplantier's Doolittle Plantation (CR-1:348). Apparently Gayle and Knox were in business together, as they were counted together in Bouchereau's sugar statistics for several years (see Table 5-5). They apparently shared a common sugar house, which was noted as being destroyed between 1878 and 1881, during which time Gayle appears to have used a portable steam apparatus to process his sugar. In 1878, Knox and Gayle had only 32 hogsheads of sugar between them. Thereafter, their yields were counted separately. Gayle's high yield during the time he owned the land was only 26 hogsheads (see Table 5-5).

A suit brought against Gayle by Fergus Gardere, probably for non-payment on the mortgage carried by the Gardere heirs, caused the land to be sold once again at public auction. It was purchased by the Gardere heirs for $2,700. The property included buildings and improvements, growing crop, wagons, carts, and gears (CR-6:55). Fergus Gardere incorporated the land into his Chatsworth Plantation (see Figure 5-4), but sold a third interest in the property to Joseph Staring on February 24, 1891 for $2,000. The tract was noted at that time as containing in highlands (Section 68) and alluvial soil (Section 73) from 400 to 450 acres (CR-14:15).

Staring and Gardere held the land together (see Figure 5-1) until 1899, when Staring purchased the remaining interest in the plantation from the Gardere heirs (recorded December 26, 1899, CR-24:226). Staring produced sugar there until at least 1917, as he is noted in the
Table 5-5. Sugar Statistics for John Baptist Klinepeter, Alfred Duplantier, Knox and Gayle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Apparatus in sugar house</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Description of sugar house</th>
<th>No. hogheads</th>
<th>Weight in lbs.</th>
<th>Gallons molasses</th>
<th>Bbls. corn in shuck</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*1844</td>
<td>J.B. Klinepeter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>254</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849-50</td>
<td>steam</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-52</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852-53</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853-54</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854-55</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855-56</td>
<td>vacuum</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-57</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857-58</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858-59</td>
<td>steam A. Duplantier</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-62†</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>steam &amp; kettle</td>
<td>W.H. Gayle, Jr. destroyed</td>
<td>&quot;sold cane&quot;</td>
<td>)</td>
<td>)</td>
<td>)</td>
<td>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>steam &amp; kettle</td>
<td>Gayle Knox</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>steam portable STOP [steam train, open-strike pan]</td>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>steam portable STOP</td>
<td>Gayle Knox wood</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Compiled from Champomier 1849-1859
†Compiled from Bouchereau, various years

directory of sugar manufacturers as Joseph Staring of Doolittle Plantation (A. Bouchereau, various years). The plantation and its inventory were included in Staring’s succession (Probate Records [hereafter cited as Pr] Filed October 4, 1920: 3171). It was described as a 450 arpent tract on the highlands with buildings and improvements. Sugar cane and corn appear to have
been the primary crops when the inventory of this property was made. Included in the inventory were:

- 70 acres plant cane
- 26 acres first year stubble
- 19 acres second year stubble
- 161 acres corn
- 26 mules
- 2 horses
- 30 cattle
- 15 hogs
- 10 sheep
- 1 automobile
- 1 truck
- 9 wagons
- 10 plows
- 1 stubble digger
- 2 disc cultivators
- 1 gas loader
- 1 corn crusher
- 1 corn planter
- 2 revolving harrows
- 2 4-mule plows
- 2 flutes
- 1 lister
- 1 mower
- 3 walking cultivators
- 1 spring-tooth harrow
- 1 clod chopper.

At his death, all of Joseph Staring's property passed to his son and sole heir, Dr. Houston L. Staring, from Albuquerque, New Mexico. Staring began selling off the properties formerly owned by his father in the 1920s and 1930s primarily for residential development.

Sections 68 and 73

Sections 68 (No. A 85) and 73 (No. A 84) (see Figure 1-1) were confirmed to George Klinepeter by Act of Congress dated March 3, 1819 (LSLO 1:41). The claims were recommended for confirmation on the basis of a Spanish patent dated January 27, 1791 (ASP:36). Section 68 consisted of 358.65 acres and Section 73 equaled 240.20 acres (LSLO 1:41).

George Klinepeter was the son of Johann and Gertrude Klinepeter (see Table 5-4). George married Marguerite Judith Riter of the Parish of St. Gabriel [Manchac] on January 7, 1793. Included in the marriage contract enacted before Francisco Rivas, Commandant of Fort Bute, was a donation made to the bride by Don Nicolas de Verbois, Commandant of the Coast of Iberville, and his wife Doña Louisa Amarante, of "two untrained Negroes, first to come to this country" after the ban on slavery had been lifted by Spanish Governor Bernardo de Galvez (Huguet 1976:8-9). George Klinepeter was the first planter to successfully grow sugarcane on
the Dutch Highlands in the early nineteenth century (Huguet 1976:7). Thereafter, sugar would be the primary cash crop grown by the Highlanders.

The plantation was sold at public auction on November 10, 1825 to settle the succession of George and Margaret Klinepeter. It was noted at that time to include a residence with buildings and improvements and land of 10 arpents front and 40 deep on Bayou Fountain (Section 68), as well as 130 arpents in the lowlands (Section 73). Included in the inventory were 12 slaves, sold individually. The property was purchased by John Baptist Klinepeter for $3,500 (JB-M:172).

John Baptist incorporated the property into his Hard Times Plantation for about ten years. On July 15, 1834, he sold the property to Louis Daigre for $6,000. Included with the land were buildings and improvements, as well as eight slaves – three adult males, four adult females, and one child (JB-O:313).

In the next 11 years, the plantation appears to have been used primarily for speculation, as it changed hands four times. Daigre sold it on February 5, 1836 to Caroline Verbois Duplessis, along with five slaves, for more than double what he had paid less than two years earlier – $14,300 (JB-P:14). On January 5, 1837, Mrs. Duplessis sold the land for $7,000 to Daniel T. Haworth. No slaves were noted in the sale, which may account for the reduction in value from one sale to the other (JB-P:270). Haworth sold it to John S. Balsennur [may be Ballinger] for $8,000. The tract was described as having 530 arpents, 400 on the highlands and 130 on the opposite side of Bayou Fountain in the bottoms (JB-P:423).

On May 9, 1845, the land was purchased from Balsennur by Jacob Smith, who owned other tracts on Bayou Fountain (see Section 70). Presumably, his sugar production from both plantations was counted together in yearly sugar statistics (Table 5-6), but Smith’s sugar house was located on his plantation in Section 70 (S.B.-K:115).

In 1850, Smith was censused with 300 improved acres and 750 unimproved acres valued at $15,000. Stock included 7 horses, 4 mules, 8 milk cows, 24 working oxen, 10 other cattle, 40 sheep, and 30 hogs. His plantation produced 900 bushels of Indian corn, 80 pounds wool, 15 bushels of peas and/or beans, 6 bushels of Irish potatoes, 30 bushels of sweet potatoes, 25 pounds of butter, 10 tons of hay, 1 hogshead of cane sugar, and 400 gallons of molasses (1850 Ag. Census).

Smith kept the land until his death. The above tract was sold with another 400 arpents (see Section 70) at public auction to settle Smith’s succession. Alfred Duplantier purchased both parcels on December 15, 1859 for $63,500. This parcel was noted as containing 656 arpents cultivated as a sugar plantation, along with buildings and improvements (Sheriff’s Books [hereafter cited as SB] K:115). This tract became part of Duplantier’s Doolittle Plantation, already established on land in Section 67, purchased March 16, 1857 from the estate of Amelia Klinepeter (MR-F:342).

As previously mentioned, Duplantier suffered reduced circumstances after the Civil War and his lands were sold at public auction. On February 3, 1872, Nathan King Knox purchased this tract with buildings and improvements for $5,750 (CR-1:348).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Apparatus in sugar house</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Description of sugar house</th>
<th>No. hogsheads</th>
<th>Weight in lbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*1849-50</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Jacob Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-51</td>
<td>steam</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-52</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>mostly overflowed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852-53</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>J. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853-54</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854-55</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855-56</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-57</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857-58</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858-59</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-62†</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>A. Duplantier</td>
<td></td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>steam &amp; kettle</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>wood destroyed</td>
<td>no yield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Knox &amp; Gayle</td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>STOP [steam train, open-strike pan]</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>no yield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>no yield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>103,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Knox Heirs</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>97,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Compiled from Champomier 1849-1859
†Compiled from Bouchereau, various years

Knox was a resident of Baton Rouge who began to buy up property along the highlands after the Civil War. In 1857, Knox built the home later used as the governor's mansion on North Street. One of the five wealthiest men in Baton Rouge in 1870, he was listed as a "money lender" (Carleton 1981:167,100). Knox seems not to have suffered money problems after the war. The heart of his holdings on Bayou Fountain became Bellonia Plantation, encompassing Sections 68 and 69 and half of Section 72 (see Figure 5-1).

It is unknown what types of buildings were included in Section 68 when Knox acquired it, but his residence was established in Section 69. Knox sold off some of the tract not fronting on Bayou Fountain. The part of Bellonia acquired from Duplantier was noted in Knox's succession as equaling 450 acres (CR-9:412). Bellonia was held by the Knox heirs – William, Nathan, and Elia Knox Keener – until it was sold to James Knox and Joseph Staring for $10,000. Bellonia was noted at that time as equaling 750 acres and was sold with mules and tools (recorded December 5, 1896, CR-20:423).

Bellonia was still being used as a sugar plantation in the twentieth century. Staring and Knox of Bellonia Plantation are listed in the directory of sugar producers until at least 1917 (A. Bouchereau, various years). In his succession filed October 4, 1920, Joseph Staring is noted
as owning a half-interest in "Bellona" plantation, comprised of 750 acres (Pr.3171). The inventory for Bellonia includes buildings and improvements, as well as:

- 22 acres plant cane
- 27 acres last year stubbles
- 29 acres second year stubbles
- 137 acres corn
- 15 acres hay
- 14 mules
- 3 wagons
- 6 double plows
- 2 disc cultivators
- 1 stubble digger
- 1 revolving harrow
- 1 corn planter
- 1 mower
- all farming implements.

Staring's interest in Bellonia passed to his son and sole heir, Dr. Houston Staring of New Mexico. Staring and Knox produced sugar until at least 1917 on Bellonia Plantation (A. Bouchereau, various years). In a partition executed on March 16, 1925, Dr. Staring and James Knox split the plantation, with Knox retaining the plantation house and associated properties comprised of three lots. Staring retained the westernmost property consisting of 179.31 acres in Section 68 (CR147:192). Staring began selling off all the properties formerly owned by his father, primarily for residential development, beginning in the 1920s.

Sections 69 and 72

Sections 69 and 72 (see Figure 1-1) were confirmed to Joseph Klinepeter by Act of Congress dated March 3, 1819 (LSLO 1:44) based upon two Spanish patents. The patent for Section 69 was issued on October 8, 1787 for 400 arpents, and the patent for Section 72 was issued on January 3, 1795 for 180 arpents (ASP:37). Joseph Klinepeter established his residence on the highlands in Section 69. In registering the land, the American commissioners awarded Section 72 to Joseph Klinepeter, but recorded his name in its French form as Joseph Petitpierre on documents involving Section 69 (Figure 5-5).

Joseph Klinepeter was the son of Johann or John Klinepeter (see Table 5-4). On February 1, 1796, he married Magdelena Sharp, a member of one of the original German families who had settled on the highlands in 1784. The couple had eight children together. During his lifetime, Joseph constructed the house known today as the Klinepeter-Knox house, which is still standing (Castille et al. 1985:3-3).

Joseph died in 1823, but Magdelena continued to live with the children on the property until her death in 1834. In the inventory of Joseph's succession (Pr. 172 [orig.406]), filed April 17, 1823, the property is described as "the plantation whereon resided the deceased containing ten arpents front by forty in depth on the highland, and eight arpents front by about twenty in depth on the lowland, together with the dwelling house, outhouses, and other improvements . . . appraised at six thousand five hundred dollars." Property associated with the plantation included three adult male slaves and one female with her four children, having a
Figure 5.5: Plat map showing plantations along Bayou Fountain in 1852 (Bryd 1852).
total value of $2500. In addition, the inventory included 5 horses and a colt, 3 oxen, 45 head of cattle, 40 hogs, 3 ploughs, 2 harrows, several hoes, axes, and saws, 4 sickles, carpenters tools, three saddles, an ox cart, 75,000 shingles, hardware, 20 iron pots, 2 spinning wheels, and a folding walnut table (Pr. 172 [orig. 406]).

Klinepeter may not have been heavily invested in sugar agriculture before his death. No sugar house, sugar, or molasses were noted in the inventory, but the absence does not necessarily indicate a total lack of production. He certainly appears to have engaged in commercial lumber production, as evidenced by the number of shingles he possessed. The shingles were separated into two grades. An appraiser valued 11,000 of the shingles at $3 per thousand, and 64,000 others at $2 per thousand (Pr. 172 [orig.406]). The shingles were no doubt cypress cut from the swampy lowlands in Section 72.

When Magdelena Klinepeter died, the plantation was sold at a public auction held at the home on January 15, 1834. The inventory associated with the sale includes personal and household items, as well as all items associated with the running of the plantation (J.B.-R:173). At the public sale held in the succession of Joseph and Magdelena Klinepeter, their son, Andrew purchased the part of Section 68 fronting on Bayou Fountain and all of Section 72. His cousin, Michael Adams, son of Emeric Adams and Catherine Klinepeter Adams (see Table 5-4), purchased the upper part of Section 68 consisting of 200 S.A.

The plantation purchased by Andrew Klinepeter for $2,200 was noted as including 200 S.A. with all buildings and improvements, to which were added 180 S.A. of bottom land (M.R.-J:106). Presumably the plantation house was included in the price, but no mention of it was made. Four adult male slaves, one adult female, and three children were adjudicated to various bidders, with Andrew Klinepeter purchasing a family of four for $1,600 (J.B.-R:173).

Klinepeter sold the plantation on May 12, 1836 to Philip Garig. The price of $14,000 included buildings, improvements, crops, and 9 slaves (J.B.-P:182). Garig's sugar house was equipped with the more primitive horse-powered mill (Table 5-7). The 1850 census shows Garig with 120 improved acres and 450 unimproved acres, having a value of $7,000. He owned 8 horses, 7 mules, 1 milk cow, 20 working oxen, 2 other cattle, and 25 hogs. The plantation produced 750 bushels of Indian corn, 20 bushels of peas and/or beans, 20 bushels of Irish potatoes, 30 bushels of sweet potatoes, 25 pounds of butter, 10 tons of hay, 80 hogsheads of cane sugar, and 4,000 gallons of molasses (1850 Ag. Census).

Garig kept the property until September 3, 1852, when he sold 250 arpents to John Baptist Klinepeter (CR-G:151). The property was described as "a tract or plantation situated in the Highlands ... wherein Philip Garig now resides." Excluded from the sale was "the sugar house, mill, kettles, machinery attached thereto, brick, cooler, RR [railroad], etc., and the loose lumber, pickets and shingles." The remainder of the property was sold to Jacob Smith (JB-P:183), and was later acquired by Nathan King Knox and added to Bellonia Plantation. It is noted in his succession as the Jonathan Smith tract (CR-9:412).

Smith had an established sugar mill on his property in Section 70, so probably used the land he purchased for cultivation and the harvesting of wood. John Baptist Klinepeter also had an established plantation with a steam-powered mill in Section 67, and so had no need for one which was powered by horses. Also, Garig produced no sugar in the 1851-52 growing
Table 5-7. Sugar Statistics for Philip Garig, John Baptist Klinepeter, and Nathan King Knox.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Apparatus in sugar house</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Description of sugar house</th>
<th>No. hogsheads</th>
<th>Weight in lbs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*1849-50</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Philip Garig</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-51</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>J.B. Klinepeter</td>
<td></td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-52</td>
<td>horse powered mill</td>
<td>P. Garig</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>steam</td>
<td>J.B. Klinepeter</td>
<td></td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[mostly overflowed]</td>
<td></td>
<td>no yield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852-53</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853-54</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854-55</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855-56</td>
<td>vacuum</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-57</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857-58</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858-59</td>
<td>steam</td>
<td>J.B. Klinepeter</td>
<td></td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Knox &amp; destroyed</td>
<td>Gayle</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>STOP [steam train, open-strike pan]</td>
<td></td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>no yield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>no yield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>103,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Knox Heirs</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>97,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Compiled from Champomier 1849-1859
†Compiled from Bouchereau, various years

season due to flooding (see Table 5-7). This lack of production may have been the reason Garig was forced to sell his property.

John Baptist Klinepeter had his residence on Section 67, so the Klinepeter-Knox house was either unoccupied during this time or perhaps occupied by an overseer. The property was sold by his heirs to James Fuqua for $3,300 (recorded January 17, 1870, CR-Y:388). No individual sugar statistics are recorded for this property after it left the ownership of Philip Garig. Klinepeter incorporated it into his Hard Times Plantation, and it later became part of Nathan King Knox’s Bellonia Plantation.

The land seems to have been used primarily for speculation until it was purchased by Nathan King Knox in 1877. Fuqua barely held title to the property, selling it on January 6, 1870 to James A. Payne. Fuqua realized a profit of $700 on the sale. Payne sold it later the same year to Pleasant L. Sandidge for $6,000 (recorded December 20, 1870, CR-Z:255). Sandidge sold the tract back to Payne for $5,000 (recorded January 11, 1873, CR-1:540), who sold it the same year to James Scarborough for $3,720, a loss of $1,800 (recorded October 27,
On December 28, 1875, Scarborough sold the 250 arpent tract to Grace Payne Timms of Putnam County, West Virginia for $1,500 (CR-3:291).

Timms kept the land until March 19, 1877, when she sold it to Nathan King Knox (CR-3:613). Knox incorporated the property into Bellonia Plantation (see Figure 5-1). Knox already owned property and was engaged in sugar agriculture in Section 37, as well as on Bellonia Plantation. The sugar house was destroyed around 1877, as noted in the sugar statistics for 1878 (see Table 5-7). The sugar house he shared with Gayle was rebuilt by 1881, and equipped with a steam train, open-strike pan, and centrifugals. It is uncertain exactly where on Bellonia Plantation the new mill was located.

When Knox died, the plantation passed to his heirs – William K., Nathan, and Ella Knox Keener. Bellonia was noted as comprising four tracts totaling about 868 acres. Inventory attached to the plantation confirms that sugar agriculture was still being practiced on Bellonia at the time of Knox's death. The inventory included:

-24 mules
-2 very old horses
-8 oxen
-7 cane wagons
-2 ox carts
-2 small carts
-1 dray
-1 lot blacksmith's tools
-1 lot carpenter's tools
-1 lot sugar house lamps
-1 lot agriculture implements, including harrows, plows, diggers, cultivators, pea rakes, stubble diggers
-119 hogsheads sugar
-8 barrels bleedings
-14 barrels molasses
-85 hogsheads [empty?]
-300 cords wood.

On December 5, 1896, Bellonia Plantation was sold by the Knox heirs to James W. Knox and Joseph Staring (CR-20:423). Staring and Knox produced sugar until at least 1917 on Bellonia Plantation (A. Bouchereau, various years). Staring's half-interest was noted in his succession, and a plantation inventory was included (see Section 68). His interest passed to his son, Dr. Houston Staring, of New Mexico. A partition of the property was executed between Houston Staring and James Knox on March 16, 1925, with Knox retaining the plantation house and associated properties. The Knox family kept the property until the death of William C. Knox and his wife, Selma Comeaux Knox in 1981 (Castille et al. 1985:3-10).

Section 70

Section 70 (see Figure 1-1) was confirmed to Emeric [Emerick, Emerich, Amerigo] Adams by Act of Congress dated March 3, 1819, by virtue of a Spanish patent (LSLO 1:44). Adams was awarded the patent for 400 arpents on January 8, 1788, and was living there with
his family at the time (ASP:338). Emeric Adams was married to Catharine Klinepeter, daughter of Johann and Gertrude Klinepeter, before they left Pennsylvania to settle in Louisiana. They had five children together (see Table 5-4).

At the public sale held for the succession of Emeric Adams, Michael Adams purchased the 200 arpents fronting Bayou Fountain, having previously purchased the upper 200 arpents of his father's land. The tract was described as "five arpents front and forty deep on the Highlands, bounded above by said Michael Adams and below by lands formerly belonging to William Rhoddy [Reddey]" (recorded April 4, 1824, JB-L:435). Although no inventory was included, the $920 price probably included the Adams domicile, although Michael Adams does not appear to have lived on the property. He quickly sold the property in two parcels.

In two sales executed the same day, February 2, 1843, Michael Adams sold his son, Samuel Adams, 5 front/20 deep (100 S.A.) "adjoining Garig's back line, bounded above by L. Balsennur and below by the seller." The sale was executed for $800 (JB-Q:520). William Edmundson purchased 5 front/20 deep (100 S.A.) "bounded south by Jacob Smith, west by J. L. Balsenour [Balsennur], and east by the seller." The price of the 100 arpent tract was also $800 (JB-Q:520).

Neither Samuel Adams nor William Edmundson appear in the sugar statistics for East Baton Rouge Parish, although Edmundson [Edmunston] is included in the 1850 agricultural census (see below). Samuel Adams kept his tract only a year before selling it to George Washington Hacket for $800. The selling price included "improvements" (recorded December 7, 1844, JB-S:13). Hacket sold the land back to Michael Adams for $800 (recorded September 15, 1846, CR-A2:14). Michael Adams sold the tract to Jacob Smith, along with improvements and two adult male slaves, for $9,200. The land was valued at $7,000 (recorded December 28, 1847, CR-A1:270). Smith established a sugar plantation on the land.

In 1850, Smith was censused with 300 improved acres and 750 unimproved acres valued at $15,000. Stock included 7 horses, 4 mules, 8 milk cows, 24 working oxen, 10 other cattle, 40 sheep, and 30 hogs. His plantation produced 900 bushels of Indian corn, 80 pounds wool, 15 bushels of peas and/or beans, 6 bushels of Irish potatoes, 30 bushels of sweet potatoes, 25 pounds of butter, 10 tons of hay, 1 hogshead of cane sugar, and 400 gallons of molasses (1850 Ag. Census).

Favorable growing seasons ending in 1853 and 1854 produced the highest yields for Smith's plantation. He produced only six hogsheads in the year ending 1852, noted as having had a cold, dry spring (Champomier 1852:i4). The plantation had no yield in 1857, also a bad growing year (Champomier 1857:v), but rebounded with a solid production of 138 hogsheads the following year (Table 5-8).

Alfred Duplanter purchased two tracts at a public sale held for Smith's succession on December 15, 1869. Part of the property, designated as a 656 arpent sugar plantation, became the heart of Bellonia Plantation (see Section 68). The other tract purchased by Duplanter was the old Adams plantation, described as situated one-half mile below the 656 arpent plantation and "bounded above by John Klinepeter, below by Ursin Thomas, west by J. M. P. Rouzan, [and] cultivated as a sugar plantation." The inventory attached to the plantation included slaves – 14 adult men, 7 adult women, and 7 children – buildings, improvements, mattresses
### Table 5-8. Sugar Statistics for Jacob Smith and Alfred Duplantier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Apparatus in sugar house</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Description of sugar house</th>
<th>No. hogsheads</th>
<th>Weight in lbs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*1849-50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacob Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-51</td>
<td>steam</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-52</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>mostly overflowed</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852-53</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>J. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853-54</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854-55</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855-56</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-57</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857-58</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>A. Duplantier</td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858-59</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Jacob Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. Duplantier</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-62†</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Compiled from Champlonier 1849-1859
†Compiled from Bouchereau, various years

[stacked, cut cane in the field], and all "seed canes." The plantation also came with a full complement of stock and equipment, including:

- thirteen mules
- fifteen oxen
- thirty head of cattle
- seven horses and colts
- about 100 head of sheep
- two wagons
- seven carts
- one pair timber wheels
- farming utensils
- blacksmith's tools
- 500 barrels corn
- one lot of fodder.

Both properties and their inventory were adjudicated to Duplantier for $63,500. Other bidders purchased 3,390 feet of lumber, 71 hogsheads, 100 barrels of molasses, 1 omnibus, 1 buggy, and house and kitchen furniture (SB-K:115).

Duplantier went bankrupt and lost all his Bayou Fountain properties after the Civil War. The above property was purchased by Mary B. Smith, the widow of Jacob Smith on December 31, 1869 (CR-Y:356). The parcel was sold for the succession of Mary B. Smith to Thomas Duggan on February 15, 1874 for $1,440. No sugar house is mentioned in the sale. Duggan
sold the property to Joshua P. Wilson for $2,200 nine months later (recorded November 13, 1874, CR-2:524).

Wilson retained the tract for ten years, selling it back to Duggan on January 22, 1885 for $2,400. Arthur Gardere purchased the property with buildings and improvements on March 5, 1891 for $3,000 (CR-14:24). The property and several others belonging to the Gardere heirs – William, Corrine, and Alice Gardere, and Louise Gardere Oliver – were sold to D. R. Gooch, Jr. on May 27, 1918. This tract is described as 183.71 acres, bounded north by Jonathan Smith, rear by Alonzo Smith, below by Ursin Thomas, and front by Bayou Fountain (CR-70:319). Gooch sold the property on June 8, 1937 (CR-343:200) to Robert L. Fugler, Sr., who began selling the property for development almost immediately.

The second parcel of 5 front/20 deep (100 S.A.) sold by Michael Adams to William Edmundson must now be examined (JB-Q:520). Edmundson is censused in 1850 with 25 improved acres and 75 unimproved acres worth $800. He owned 4 horses, 7 milk cows, 10 other cattle, 40 sheep and 30 hogs. He produced 300 barrels of Indian corn, 20 pounds of wool, 6 bushels of peas and/or beans, 24 bushels of Irish potatoes, 45 bushels of sweet potatoes, 10 pounds of butter, 1 ton of hay, 30 hogsheads of cane sugar, and 2,400 gallons of molasses (1850 Ag. Census). He must not have had a sugar house, since he was never listed in the sugar statistics for the parish.

Edmundson kept the property until after the Civil War when, apparently suffering financial hardship, he sold it to Henry Connor of Baton Rouge for $425 (recorded December 12, 1867, CR-W:305). Connor must have defaulted on his mortgage, because the property was sold to satisfy a suit brought by Edmundson against Mrs. Ann Connor, et al. Nathan K. Knox purchased the property at the public sale (CR-5:27), and it became attached to Bellonia Plantation (see Table 5-7).

When Knox died, the plantation passed to his heirs – William K., Nathan, and Ella Knox Keener (see Sections 68 and 69). On December 5, 1896, Bellonia Plantation was sold by the Knox heirs to James W. Knox and Joseph Staring (CR-20:423). Staring and Knox produced sugar until at least 1917 on Bellonia Plantation (A. Bouchereau, various years). Staring’s half-interest was noted in his succession, and a plantation inventory was included (see Section 68). His interest passed to his son, Dr. Houston Staring, of New Mexico. A partition of the property was executed between Houston Staring and James Knox on March 16, 1925, with Knox retaining the plantation house and associated properties. The Knox family kept the property until the death of William C. Knox and his wife, Selma Comeaux Knox in 1981 (Castille et al. 1985:3-10).

Section 71

Section 71 (see Figure 1-1) was confirmed to Josan [Johann] Klinepeter under Francisco Rivas by Act of Congress, March 3, 1819 (LSLO 1:44). The confirmation was based on a Spanish patent for 400 arpent issued on December 17, 1792 (ASP:38). The 1799 map (see Figure 5-2) shows the property under “Juan Petit Pierre.” However, a later map (see Figure 5-3) shows it under Rivas and Simon Allain. An examination of the Spanish West Florida archives and Clerk of Court’s records did not discover any further record of Johann Klinepeter owning the land.
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Francisco Rivas was an officer in the Spanish Royal Army. Rivas served as commandant at Fort Bute for several years, until it's abandonment in 1794 (Sp.Ar.II: 265). No succession for Francisco Rivas or Simon Allain could be found, but on May 1, 1818, Mrs. Marguerite Babin, sold 200 arpents to William Roddey [Reddey]. It was noted that the land had been purchased from the estate of her former husband, Simon Allain (JB-F:369). The other 200 arpents had been purchased by Joseph McAlpine, who sold his tract to Reddey on January 14, 1804 (Sp.Ar.VIII:2; JB-L:335).

Reddey exchanged the McAlpine tract for land belonging to William Jennison on January 13, 1824 (JB-L:335). Jennison sold the property with buildings and improvements to William Lockwood four years later for $1,500 (CR-M:149). Lockwood lost the land when it was seized to satisfy his debt by the Bank of Louisiana. It was sold at public auction to Ursin Thomas on August 3, 1833 for $410 (SB-B:60).

Thomas is censused in 1850 (1850 Ag. Census) as having 30 improved acres and 65 unimproved acres valued at $1,000. He had 5 horses, 6 mules, 10 working oxen, and 15 sheep. He produced 150 barrels of Indian corn, 24 bushels of Irish potatoes, 9 bushels of sweet potatoes, and 30 pounds of butter (from sheep's milk?). Thomas kept the land until his death, when it passed to his heirs (see Figure 5-1).

The 20-acre tract between Highland Road and Bayou Fountain was purchased by William Winnfield from Caroline and Benjamin Thomas for $400 (recorded December 15, 1904, CR-33:30). Winnfield sold it to Arthur Gardere on April 3, 1908, and it was one of the properties purchased from his estate by D. R. Gooch, Jr. on May 27, 1918. This tract and the 183 acre tract in Section 70 were sold for $7,560 (CR-70:319). Gooch sold the properties for $6,500 to Robert L. Fugler, Sr. (CR-343:20), who began selling the property for development almost immediately.

The other half of the original Rivas/Allain tract was purchased by William Denham for $1,500 on May 31, 1819 (JB-F:369). William Reddey had retained the property for one year. Denham sold it two years later to John White for $1,000. It was described as "200 arpents beginning from the lower line of the tract granted originally to Francisco Rivas, being the same tract . . . which Reddey purchased from the widow of Simon Allain" (recorded July 2, 1821, JB-I:259).

White kept the property less than a year, selling half of it on January 21, 1822 to Anthony Trager for $1,850. It was described as being "bounded north by Simon Daigre, west by William Roddey [Reddey], east by Madame Triste, and south by Bayou Fountain" (JB-K:64). William W. Trager [Trager] obviously inherited the property, and sold it to Clarissa Klinepeter Balsenur for $1,000 on January 5, 1848 (CR-A:1:283). She sold it less than one year later to John C. Adams for $1,000 (recorded April 29, 1850, CR-D:168).

Lewis Adams bought the property on February 2, 1851 for $1,500 (CR-E:299). Adams appears in the sugar statistics well into the 1880s. Having sold this property to Henry Schorter for $1,169 on March 1, 1884, Adams must have had additional property on which he planted sugar. He is noted in different years as having a steam-driven mill, a portable horse-driven mill, and, later, an H. Sharp's purchased after the 1883 growing season which produced his highest yield (Table 5-9). The Sharp's apparatus may have been a vacuum or another type of steam engine.
Table 5-9. Sugar Statistics for W. Lewis Adams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Apparatus in sugar house</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Description of sugar house</th>
<th>No. hogsheads</th>
<th>Weight in lbs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>steam</td>
<td>Lewis Adams</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>H. portable</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>H. portable</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>steam &amp; kettle</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>H. portable</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>H. portable</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>H. Sharp's</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†Compiled from Bouchereau, various years

The land was publicly auctioned in the succession of Henry Schorter on January 13, 1891, when it was purchased by Henry Newell for $466.75. Newell sold it to Julius Aucoin in August of the same year for $2,500 (CR-14:386). In action initiated by East Baton Rouge Parish against Julius Aucoin, the property was once again auctioned off and purchased by Mrs. Anne Schorter for $1,125 (CR-19:483). No mention is made of sugar-processing equipment.

Mrs. Schorter sold the land with buildings and improvements to Marion Frances on June 11, 1883 for $3,000 (CR-20:304). However, the 1895 map of East Baton Rouge Parish still shows Aucoin as the owner (see Figure 5-1). The property is noted in the succession inventory of Marion Frances as 100 acres bounded north by Thomas, east by Knox [Keener], and south and west by Bayou Fountain (filed August 8, 1931, Pr.2681).

The land made a huge leap in value between 1931, when the inventory was made, and 1958, when the heirs sold the land, now noted as containing 101.02 acres, to Emile Gautier Ezell. Ezell paid $161,632 for the tract (CR-1392:269).

Ezell sold the part of the tract fronting Bayou Fountain, 28.70 acres, to A. E. Fabacher in 1960 for $18,500 (CR-1494:465). Fabacher sold the parcel to Sabin J. Gianelloni, Jr. on September 26, 1962 for $250,000 (CR-1660:365). The land was purchased by Fred B. and Virginia Kniffen on July 3, 1978 (CR-orig.68, bundle 6799). Kniffen was Boyd Professor of Geography and Anthropology Emeritus at Louisiana State University, and contributed numerous studies on Louisiana culture and history before his death in the 1980s. The property is today owned by Samuel J. Kniffen.
CHAPTER 6

RESULTS OF INVESTIGATIONS

Fieldwork began on May 5, 1997 and was completed on May 9, 1997. Field methods involved a pedestrian survey and the excavation of shovel and auger tests. Shovel tests were dug to a depth of approximately 50 cm and were approximately 30 cm wide. These tests were spaced about 50 m apart, on two transects, one on each side of the bayou. Additionally, 2-meter-deep auger tests, were excavated at 100 m intervals along one transect on the north side of the bayou. In all, 168 shovel tests and 42 auger tests were excavated (Figure 6-1). Where possible, soils from these tests were screened through 1/4 in wire mesh; however, due to the high clay content of many of the deposits most were sorted by trowel.

Based on the locations of recorded sites in the general area, those parts of the survey area considered to have the greatest likelihood of containing cultural resources were those areas located closest to the uplands, especially in the lower 1.4 km at the southeastern end of the ROW. A comparison of soil profiles from auger tests excavated in the survey area (Figure 6-2) with soil profiles from two nearby sites, 16EBR51 and 16EBR67, suggests that prehistoric-aged materials would likely be encountered between about 33 cm to two meters below the ground surface. Both of these sites are located on the toe of the terrace and are covered with terrace colluvium. Away from the terrace edge the deposition rates in the survey area may have differed somewhat. Deeply buried prehistoric materials should have been detected in the auger tests or along eroding portions of the bayou’s bank. Historic materials could occur in either shovel or auger tests.

Soil stratigraphy and characteristics were recorded at the time of excavation. The auger tests indicated, in the portions of the survey area nearest the Pleistocene terrace, that subsurface soils were usually clay or silt loams. Soils away from the bluffs were generally coarser grained, being predominantly silty or sandy loams (see Figure 2-1). This conforms well with what is known about the sources of the sediment in the survey area (see Chapter 2). Clayey and silty soils, probably colluvium from the nearby terrace, typify the lower part of the survey area. Most of the upper part of the survey area consists of sandy and silty alluvial soils deposited by the Mississippi River and the drainages feeding Bayou Fountain.

Ground visibility throughout the survey area was generally poor. Piles of household, garden, and stable trash were commonly encountered along the bank overlooking Bayou Fountain, at the back ends of pastures and yards. The survey area encompasses a nearly flat, low elevation, flood-prone surface. The ROW consisted of either swampy woodlands or back-pastures and yards.

No significant cultural materials were found in the course of the survey. However, five shovel tests (St 17, St 18, St 23, St 28, St 58) and one auger test (At 13) revealed historic,
Figure 6-1. The locations of subsurface tests (St= shovel test, At= auger test) excavated in the project ROW.
Figure 6-2. Typical soil profiles. Auger test 5 was located close to the terrace at the lower end of the survey area. Auger test 27 was located away from the terrace, well into the Mississippi River flood plain. The top strata of auger test 27 may represent dredge spoil. Surface elevations were roughly the same for both tests (15 ft AMSL).

mostly late twentieth century, material (Table 6-1). This material consisted of either recently deposited household debris, or isolated, out-of-context pre-twentieth century artifacts.

Low discontinuous spoil piles, apparently remnants of an artificial levee system, lined the banks of the bayou behind some of the improved properties. Additionally, mounds of spoil, some roughly 2 m high, were present at the lower end of the survey area near Siegen Lane. These piles were deposited by previous drainage projects conducted in the study area. Where recognizable, spoil deposits were avoided when excavating. However, where it was not possible to discern such disturbed soils, shovel tests and auger tests were occasionally excavated on these surfaces.
Table 6-1. Subsurface Tests Containing Cultural Materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provenience</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Depth (cm)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St 17</td>
<td>near Highland Rd</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>small Rangia, gravel, rusty can frags., glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 18</td>
<td>near Highland Rd</td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>bottle-glass, plastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 23</td>
<td>near Highland Rd</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>gravel, rusty can frags., glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 28</td>
<td>near Highland Rd</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>piece of wagon tire (61x8x1 cm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30-50</td>
<td>piece of wagon tire (15x8x1 cm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 58</td>
<td>back end of pasture</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>brick frags and modern construction debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 13</td>
<td>near Highland Rd</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>small brick frags., plow brace (7.5x4x.5 cm)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations

Pedestrian survey and systematic shovel and auger testing encountered no evidence of cultural resources over fifty years of age within the project ROW. Although the Bayou Fountain area was conducive to human occupation in both historic and prehistoric times, sites were generally located on the terrace paralleling the bayou to the north, and not in the floodplain of the watercourse proper. It is, therefore, recommended that the proposed channel enlargement project be allowed to proceed as planned.
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SCOPE OF SERVICES

CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY OF BAYOU FOUNTAIN CHANNEL ENLARGEMENT, EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH WATERSHED FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LOUISIANA

1. Introduction
The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District (COE), in cooperation with the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development, Office of Public Works, the City of Baton Rouge, and East Baton Rouge Parish plans to construct drainage improvements along portions of Bayou Fountain, East Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana. These flood control measures were identified as part of the larger Amite River and Tributaries, Louisiana East Baton Rouge Parish Watershed Flood Control Project. A feasibility study and final environmental impact statement for the Amite River and Tributaries Project was completed during 1995. Cultural resources investigations are required prior to completing drainage improvements in East Baton Rouge Parish. The investigations are to be conducted on a watershed by watershed basis. The delivery order period is 20 weeks.

2. Study Area
The study area will include the Bayou Fountain Watershed located in the southern portion of East Baton Rouge Parish. The bayou originates on the Louisiana State University Campus and generally flows in a southeasterly direction into Bayou Manchac. The major tributaries to Bayou Fountain are Elbow Bayou, Bayou Fountain North Branch, Bayou Fountain South Branch, and Selene Bayou. Bayou Fountain and tributaries drain about 40 square miles (Attachment 1).

Drainage improvements along Bayou Fountain will consist of clearing and removing snags along approximately 11 miles of Bayou Fountain from the bayou’s mouth upstream to Siegen Lane and from Gardere Lane upstream to Ben Hur Road. Channel widening will be completed between Siegen and Gardere Lanes to create a .50-foot-wide bottom with 3:1 bank slopes channel. Detailed background research, including land tenure research and an intensive survey for cultural resources, will be conducted for the approximately
2.6-mile reach of Bayou Fountain between Gardere and Siegen Lanes identified for channel enlargement (Attachment 2).

3. **Background Information**
Cultural resources investigations were conducted within the study area during the reconnaissance phase of the study (Goodwin et al. 1990). Potential cultural resources concerns were identified as part of these and recommendations were incorporated in the COE's 1995 feasibility report.

4. **Study Requirements**
The study 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; and

The work will be divided into three phases. Phase 1 shall consist of literature review and background research. Phase 2 will consist of intensive cultural resources survey, and Phase 3 will entail data analysis and report preparation.

a. **Phase 1: Literature Search and Records Review.** The Contractor shall commence, upon work item award, with a literature, map, and records review specific to the study area. This phase shall include the review and synthesis of literature obtained during previous research including but not limited to archeological, historical and geomorphologic reports covering the study area. The State Archeologist's site and standing structure files and the National Register of Historic Places will be consulted to establish a current and complete distribution of historic properties in the vicinity of the study area. A detailed
chain of title from the earliest land claims through modern time shall be conducted for a portion of the study area. The chain of title shall include property within the 200-foot-wide by approximately 2.6-mile-long reach of the study area located between Gardere and Siegen Lanes and shown on the project construction maps (Attachment 2).

At a minimum, the background research, records review, and land claim research will be sufficient for developing the historic context(s) of the study area. The effort should be conducted to a level sufficient for assessing the significance of any sites recorded as a result of the investigations in Phase 2.

b. Phase 2: Intensive Survey and Site Recording. Field investigations shall commence within 10 days of award date. The investigations shall consist of an intensive pedestrian survey and subsurface testing within the construction right of way. Transects are to be spaced no greater than 25 m (meter) intervals apart. Shovel tests will be excavated at a maximum of every 50 m; shovel tests on adjacent transects will be offset. Shovel tests will be approximately 30 cm in diameter and will be excavated 50 cm deep or to sterile subsoil. One transect of auger tests shall be excavated every 100 m along the project length to supplement shovel testing. Auger tests will be excavated to depths of 2 m. Soils from the excavations will be screened through 1/4 in (.6 cm) hardware cloth. Soils with high clay content may be hand trowelled to detect the presence or absence of artifacts. The stratigraphy, soil characteristics and a description of artifacts will be recorded for all excavations. All excavations will be backfilled upon completion of the recordation process.

Sites identified during the survey will be mapped, photographed, and plotted on the appropriate USGS 7.5' series topographic quadrangle and on copies of the project maps provided as Attachment 2. Additional shovel tests will be excavated to determine the nature and extent of each site (i.e., cultural affiliation, integrity, preservation, size, depth, stratigraphy, etc.).

A management summary succinctly reporting the results of the research shall be submitted to the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) within 10 days of completion of the Phase 1 research (SEE SECTION 6a).
c. **Phase 3: Data Analysis and Report Preparation.** All data will be analyzed using currently acceptable scientific methods. The Contractor shall catalog all artifacts, samples, specimens photographs, drawings, etc., utilizing the format currently employed by the Office of the Louisiana State Archaeologist. The catalog system will include site and provenience designations.

All background literature and records research, fieldwork and laboratory data will be integrated to produce a graphically illustrated, scientifically acceptable report discussing the project as a whole. The contractor will synthesize the archeological, historical, and geomorphologic information obtained during Phase 1 with the results and observations of the field survey to assess the nature of the resource base in the study area. The contractor will complete and file state site forms with the Office of the Louisiana State Archaeologist and cite the resulting state-assigned site numbers in all draft and final reports of this investigation. The contractor shall provide preliminary site assessments and discussions on the potential project impacts for any given resource identified within the study area.

6. **Reports**

   a. **Preliminary reports.** Two copies of a management summary will be submitted to the COR within 10 days after completion of the Phase 2 tasks. The report will summarize succinctly, the results of each phase of research (i.e. number, type, brief description and any assessment of project impacts for all cultural resources located during the investigations. The report shall recommend which (if any) sites should be avoided or what the potential impacts to any sites may be. The summary report is not intended to be a lengthy interim report, but shall contain enough information to serve as a planning aid and a means of informing the COR.

   b. **Monthly Progress Reports.** One copy of a brief and concise statement of progress shall be submitted each month throughout the duration of the delivery order. These reports, which may be in letter form, should summarize all work performed, all information gained, or any 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. The monthly report should
also note difficulties, if any, in meeting the contract schedule.

c. Draft and Final Reports. Five copies of the draft report integrating all phases of this investigation will be submitted to the COR for review and comment 8 weeks after the date of delivery order. The contractor shall submit one copy of the appropriate state site forms or updates for sites discovered or revisited as a result of these investigations.

The COR will provide all review comments to the contractor within 6 weeks after receipt of the draft reports (14 weeks after date of order). Upon receipt of the review comments on the draft report, the contractor shall incorporate or resolve all comments and submit one preliminary copy of the final report to the COR within 2 weeks (16 weeks after date of order).

Upon approval of the preliminary final report by the COR, the contractor will submit one reproducible master copy, one copy on floppy diskette as required in the contract and 35 copies of the final report to the COR within 20 weeks after date of order. Included as an appendix to the final report will be a complete and accurate listing of cultural material and associated documentation recovered and/or generated. A copy of the Scope of Services shall be bound as an appendix with the Final Report.

The written report 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 1-inch margins; (3) the reference format of American Antiquity will be used. Spelling shall be in accordance with the U.S. Government Printing Office Style Manual dated January 1973.

7. Discovery of Human Skeletal Remains
In the event that the field survey and site recordation procedures performed during this study encounter unmarked burial sites or human skeletal remains, the provisions of the Louisiana Unmarked Human Burial Sites Preservation Act [Louisiana R.S. 8:671 through 681 and R.S. 36:209(I) and 802.13] shall apply. Upon discovery of such remains, the contractor shall immediately cease activities which could further disturb the unmarked burial, human skeletal remains or associated burial artifacts. The contractor will notify the COR of the discovery as soon as possible to determine
the appropriate plan of action regarding the discovery. The contractor will also be responsible for notification of the law enforcement agency with jurisdiction over the remains within 24 hours of its discovery. The COR will notify the Louisiana Division of Archaeology of the discovery. In no event will human skeletal material be excavated and/or collected from the field with approval of the COR.
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