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ABSTRACT

A Survey of Archeological and Historical Resources
Within the Bonneville Unit of the Central Utah Project: Deer Creek Dam Enlargement

By
Frank W. Hull
and
Craig W. Fuller

Four small archeological sites were found but were of insufficient significance to warrant their further study or preservation. Providing the enlargement of Deer Creek Reservoir represents the only alternative, a comprehensive study of the community and its historic resources has been recommended, especially as it relates to the use of land and water. In addition, study has been recommended of the settlement as it relates to the understanding of agricultural development in Utah.
The following report is submitted in partial fulfillment of contract No. CX 8880-6-0021 between the University of Utah and the U.S. National Park Service, as revised by Change Order No. 2, dated April, 1976. This revision required an archeological and historical evaluation of the cultural resources in the area effected by the proposed Deer Creek Enlargement. This report, therefore, as stipulated in the amended Exhibit C, is the separate investigative statement.

The Bureau of Reclamation Offices in Provo, Utah, furnished the survey crew with the necessary 7.5 minute U.S.G.S. maps upon which the proposed enlargement shore line had been drawn. Since the contour interval of 1682.5 meters above sea level includes the town of Charleston in the area to be inundated, a historian from the Utah State Historical Society was employed to prepare the evaluation of historical resources. The sections that follow, therefore, have been compiled by two authors, each dealing with the cultural resource in the scope of their respective expertise. All data generated by this survey are on file at the Archeology Laboratory, University of Utah, and may be consulted upon request by qualified persons.
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Introduction

Archeological investigations of the area affected by the proposed Deer Creek Dam Enlargement construction indicate that the impact upon the archeological resources will be insignificant. There were four archeological sites found which were unrecorded (see Fig. 1), but there was no indication of deep cultural deposits or structural remains. Excavation of these sites would not increase the knowledge of the prehistory of the Heber Valley.

A review of the research files at the University of Utah Archaeology Laboratory has become a standard operating procedure prior to field work. Nearly 30 years of systematic recording provided the survey crew with the most complete cultural resource information available. In order to complete the record search, the files at the Antiquities Section of the Utah State Historical Society were also checked for possible site designations made by other governmental agencies.

Preliminary investigations proved that there had been no previous record of archeological sites in the proximity of the Deer Creek Reservoir, so the four sites found during this survey have increased our knowledge of the region.
**Survey Techniques**

The investigation of the Deer Creek Enlargement posed no special problems, and, as a result, there were no innovative techniques utilized. Two persons conducted this survey during mid-summer, and they found the agriculturally productive land very difficult to survey with the crops near their maximum height and thickness. Because of this situation, the thrust of the intensive survey was aimed at the pasture land and the periphery of the reservoir, while reconnaissance level survey was more applicable to the crop land. Particular care was taken while traversing the broader bottom land to note and thoroughly investigate any mounds or depressions. These features are often indicators of long periods of aboriginal occupations, such as those associated with the Fremont culture (See Fig. 2 for chronological chart of Utah prehistoric cultures).

**Setting**

The Deer Creek Reservoir is located in Wasatch County on the Provo River south of Heber City, Utah. The dam is about 12 kilometers south of Heber City where the Heber Valley narrows into the Provo Canyon. The storage area extends upstream a distance of about eight kilometers. The elevation of the spillway is 1651 meters above sea level. High mountains ranging from 2400 meters to over 3100 meters in elevation ring the study area, creating a pleasant alpine-like setting.
The plant communities found growing on the land designated for survey are in no way to be considered indicative of the species native to the Heber Valley prior to European settlement. Reed's canary grass (*Phalaris arundinacea*), for example, was found commonly growing in ditches and sloughs indicating introduced species. The riparian vegetation was dominated by cottonwood (*Populus angustifolia*), willow (*Salix exigua*), wild rose (*Rosa* sp.), numerous hydrophytic species, and various plants requiring mesic conditions.

The hillsides on either side of the Deer Creek Reservoir were dominated by sagebrush (*Artemisia c.f. tridentata*), serviceberry (*Amelanchier utahensis*), rabbitbrush (*Chrysothamnus c.f. nauseosus*), oak brush (*Quercus gambelii*), cheatgrass (*Bromus tectorum*), bluegrass (*Poa c.f. segunda*), wheatgrass (*Agropyron* sp.), and numerous forbs. Other plants present in lesser degrees are equally important when considering paleoenvironmental factors, but they need not be listed here because of the nature of this investigation. An awareness of the environmental setting in which aboriginal man carried out his daily routines helps in determining potential site locations and also the types of sites likely to be encountered. The high mountain valley setting of the Deer Creek Reservoir suggests that open hunting sites would be more likely encountered than permanent village sites. Local informants spoke of a "60 day growing season" and "39 inches of snow overnight,"
which supports the hypothesis of a nonagricultural utilization of the Heber Valley.

**Sites**

The four archeological sites found during this survey are discussed separately below and evaluated as to the state of preservation and their potential contribution to the study of Utah prehistory.

**42Wa7**

This is an open hunting/camp site located on a sagebrush point that extends out into the present Deer Creek Reservoir. A lithic scatter 5 meters by 15 meters of 15 chert and chalcedony waste flakes defined the limits of occupation, and there were no indications of structures or deep cultural deposits. Wave action had created a bank near the site, and examination revealed no lenses or charcoal eroding out of this bank. The lack of diagnostic artifacts or datable material at this site discourages further examination.

A pattern of site location emerged with this and the two following sites, all located on points of high ground overlooking the valley on the north side of easterly flowing streams.

**42Wa8**

This site is similar in location to 42Wa7. It is also an open hunting camp that is located on a point extending eastward into Deer Creek Reservoir. A waste flake scatter of about 20 pieces of chert
and chalcedony defined the area of occupation 10 meters by 5 meters with no structures visible. The material observed was undiagnostic and undatable, which would argue against further examination of this site.

42Wa9

This is an open hunting/camp site that is located on a point to the north of an easterly flowing stream similar to sites 42Wa7 and 42Wa8. A small lithic scatter 5 meters by 5 meters of primarily chalcedony waste flakes was found, but no indications of structures or deeper cultural deposits were observed. Further examination of this site would be pointless.

42Wa10

This site did not conform to the location pattern so neatly followed by the three sites found upstream. The only variation, however, was the absence of a nearby stream. This hunting/camp site was marked only be a small chalcedony and quartzite waste flake scatter 5 meters by 5 meters. No further examination of this site is recommended due to undatable and undiagnostic material.

Discussion

Few sites had previously been recorded in Wasatch County, so this survey of the proposed Deer Creek Dam Enlargement was begun with very little cultural resource background available. As a direct
result of this survey, the archeological resource record was increased by 100% in the Heber Valley, and investigations by the University of Utah for the Central Utah Project account for eight of the 10 recorded sites in Wasatch County.

The four sites found during this survey are impossible to fit into the chronological chart of Utah prehistoric cultures (see Fig. 2) because there were no diagnostic or datable artifacts observed. The short growing season and harsh winters seem to rule out an agriculturally based subsistence economy, and the aboriginally important pinyon pine, which would have provided reason for at least occasional gathering visitations into the valley, does not grow on the hillsides.

The artifact remains were very sparse and totally undiagnostic, and the artifact inventory was composed only of waste flakes. Seed gathering could be suggested based upon the kinds of plants found in the valley, but no grinding or milling stones were found.

**Recommendations**

The four sites recorded during this survey are not of a unique character, nor do they have the depth of cultural deposition associated with stratified open sites. For these reasons, as well as the undatable artifacts, no recommendations for further work or examination of these archeological sites are offered by this report.
Some caution should be exercised in any excavation or soil disturbing activity that might result from the recommendations arising out of the historical resource study (see Historical Resources, this report). Subsurface structures could possibly be obscured by agricultural crops, buildings or past land "improvements" especially near the fish hatchery and the town of Charleston. Contractors should be cognizant that archeological remains have been encountered in similar Utah communities, and the proper authorities should be notified immediately if any ancient remains are uncovered.

In summary, this study finds that the construction of the Deer Creek Dam enlargement as proposed will have no detrimental effect upon the archeological resources of the Heber Valley. No recommendations are made for further study or preservation of the four archeological sites.
HISTORICAL RESOURCES:
DEER CREEK RESERVOIR - CHARLESTON

By Craig W. Fuller

Introduction

This historical site survey is being conducted under contract with the Department of Anthropology, University of Utah. The scope of the study is the community of Charleston and an area extending north encompassing the Midway Fish Hatchery, "Stringtown," a portion of the "Midway-Charleston" road (State Highway 113); the area to the east encompassing the Upper Charleston Canal and the Upper Charleston Canal Road; to the south portions of U.S. Highway 189 and the Charleston Cemetery, and an area of land extending along the county highway into Round Valley; and to the west the Denver and Rio Grande Railroad track now being utilized by the Heber Creeper Railroad Company.

The historical consultant has conducted a research project on the development of irrigation in the valley, therefore has a sound historical understanding of the valley and county. Presently, the consultant is an employee of Utah State University's History Department as Field Coordinator for a local history project. The project is funded by the Kellogg Foundation. He is further conducting a research project dealing with early agricultural practices and the use of land in the valley.
This survey will trace the early history of Charleston as it is associated with the Great Basin and Heber Valley. It will discuss briefly the physical setting as well as the historical growth and development as these relate to an understanding of Charleston's history and its buildings.

This report will conclude with a discussion of each of the potential historic sites, recommendations and summary, and a photographic survey and map of the sites in and around the community of Charleston.

General History

Physical Setting

Charleston is situated at the extreme southwestern section of Heber Valley. Heber Valley is known as a "back-valley" of the Wasatch Mountain Range. Other "back-valleys" found in the Wasatch mountains include: Rhoades, Morgan, Ogden, and Mantua. Out of all of these, Heber Valley is considered the most productive agriculturally. 1

Geologically, Heber Valley is an alluvial valley penetrated from the north by the historic Timpanogos River (today called the Provo). The river flows generally in a northeast to southwest direction forming a natural boundary for the community of Charleston. Lesser streams feed the Provo River. Some of these small streams
which form an extensive natural irrigation network include: Daniels Creek, Lake Creek, Center Creek, Pine Creek, and Snake Creek. Round Valley situated over a range of hills to the south of Charleston is drained by Main Creek.

Heber Valley's average elevation is 5,500 feet (1676 meters) above sea level; Charleston being slightly less than 5,500 feet (1676 meters). At this altitude the average yearly frost free period is between 70 and 80 days. Consequently, agriculture and horticulture are limited.

The valley has a wide-range average annual precipitation. The average precipitation in Heber City is 14.98 inches, while at the mouth of Snake Creek situated immediately to the northwest of Midway, the average precipitation is 22.20 inches.² According to the Koppen classification and modified by Glen Trewartha, Heber Valley is a Db or continental climate.³

Heber Valley is surrounded by the Wasatch Mountains, including the southern tip of the Rhoades Plateau. The mountains to the east rise gently joining the heel of the Uinta Mountains. To the south and southeast respectively, the mountains range from moderately rounded mountains to steep and sharply defined mountains. Round Valley is nestled in the extreme southern end of the Rhoades Plateau.
The mixture of chestnut and weisenboden or bogsoil found primarily along the Provo River provide the rich nutrient for such grasses as: blue bench, wheat grass, sandberg, and bluegrass. Combined with Holmes-Rasband Association soil, Spaa-Chatwin Association soil, the Big Pole-Kovich Association soil, and others, the valley is virtually a garden of Eden for the dairy and livestock industries.  

Early History

Prior to the whitemen's intrusion, Heber Valley provided the Timpanogos Utes of Utah Valley with virtually an inexhaustible supply of fish and game including deer. In addition to a summer storehouse, Heber Valley was an important crossroad for the Timpanogos Utes and related tribes. An extensive trail system passed through Heber Valley providing easy access to the northeast and to the east from the Utes' winter campgrounds.

Whitemen's thrust into the Great Basin came primarily from three directions. Leading this thrust were the Spaniards from Taos and Santa Fe, New Mexico. In September of 1776 a small expedition led by Friars Dominguez and Escalante made contact in Utah Valley with the Timpanogos Utes. The results of this contact from the southeast was a continuous contact with the area and people. Trade was often carried out without specific permission from Spanish and later Mexican government officials.
History heretofore has not recorded extensive continued contact with New Mexico. But what evidence there is, points to continuous contact with the Indians of the Great Basin. Undoubtedly because of the proximity to Utah Valley, other major Indian trails, and the Dominguez-Escalante Trail, Heber Valley was visited frequently by the Spanish and later French and Americans working out of New Mexico.

A second group to reach the Great Basin were American explorers from the east. The Lewis and Clark expedition provided a gateway for the American furtrapper and trader to apply his talents. The third group involved with the Great Basin were the English. Primarily they moved into the Basin from the northwest.

By the second decade of the 19th century, the Great Basin and Heber Valley were crisscrossed by numerous individuals. Trappers and traders such as William H. Ashley, Etienne Provost, the Robidoux brothers, and later by John C. Fremont (1845), and others visited Heber Valley. John C. Fremont was so impressed with the beauty that he jotted down some views of the valley.

By mid-century, whitemen were determined to make the Great Basin their permanent domain. The Mormons first settled in the valley of the Great Salt Lake and immediately after 1847 extended their settlements primarily in a north-south axis from Salt Lake City.
With a rapid increase of settlers, a continuous need for suitable areas were sought for settlement by the Mormon leaders. Coupled with the Utah War and the subsequent billeting of unfriendly and unwanted troops, the need arose to find a suitable bypass whereby the soldiers of Johnston's army could be easily supplied from Fort Bridger without continuous contact with the heart of Zion.

Provo Canyon, Heber Valley, and the Kamas Prairie provided the ideal route. Construction began immediately. In the early summer of 1858 a small party of Mormon explorers reported back to Brigham Young that Heber Valley was well suited for livestock. Young sent word to Provo that as soon as the road was completed and a colonizing expedition could be made ready, settlement should occur.

In the spring of 1859 a small party reached Heber Valley via the Provo Canyon Road. One area immediately recognized as suitable for settlement was at the head of Provo Canyon. This settlement grew into the community of Charleston. The community and adjacent area were recognized for the abundance of natural grasses and supply of water. The primary agricultural interests were in livestock and dairying and remain so today.

Growth and Development of Charleston and Heber Valley

By January of 1862 the residents of the valley petitioned the territorial legislature to create their own county. Carved out of
Utah County, Wasatch County and the county seat, Heber City, were established in January of 1862.

The valley continued to grow and develop as an extensive irrigation system was developed. However, this growth was interrupted during the 1860's with the outbreak of the Black Hawk War. Forting was required necessitating the abandonment for a time of the outlying communities including Charleston. Once peace was restored, Charleston, like the other communities in the valley, resumed its activities.

Substantial growth transpired in Charleston so that a mercantile store was established by George Daybell. Shortly thereafter in the '90's, the Charleston Co-operative Creamery was established to produce cheese and butter. The creamery was later destroyed by fire but the Daybell Mercantile (or commonly called the "Old North Store") still stands. A new and larger grade school was built in Charleston. The two story red sandstone building was completed in 1902 and remains as the oldest public school building in the county.

The Denver and Rio Grande Western constructed a railroad to Heber Valley in 1899. In September of that year regular passenger and freight service was established.

Growth along the Wasatch Front necessitated an extensive water system to meet future water needs. In the 1920's a diversion
canal was constructed across the Kamas Prairie. The canal diverts high water runoff from the Weber River to the Provo River. The plans called for several storage facilities to be located on the upper Provo River. 6

The severe drought in the 1930's punctuated the need for additional water storage for the Wasatch Front. According to previous plans, Deer Creek Dam was under construction by 1938. Situated to the southwest of Charleston, water from the newly constructed dam soon flooded a portion of the town located along the river. A part of the town was relocated, the town hall was moved to Salt Lake, and, just recently, moved to the Lagoon amusement park in Davis County.

In addition to the Deer Creek Dam, reclamation plans outlined another reservoir to be built at the Bates Ranch located directly south of the Kamas Prairie on the Provo River or to enlarge Deer Creek Dam. The Bates site was soon scuttled in favor of a site at the Jordanelle downstream from the Bates ranch.

The Jordanelle is located approximately one mile south of the Hailstone junction (U. S. Highways 40 and alternate 189).

Charleston remains today a dairying and livestock oriented community. Green fields dotted with milk sheds and barns are scattered along the Provo River and the several canals which help
provide needed water to the farms. The other communities in the valley have changed. Although the valley still remains agriculturally oriented, recreation and summer retreats have made their economic impact. Even with these changes, many historic buildings and potentially historic sites exist in the valley and in Charleston today.

Potential Historical Sites Surveyed

Introduction

A thorough historical site survey of Charleston and the area which would be affected by the enlargement of Deer Creek Reservoir was conducted. A short description and location of each potential historic site follows. Photographs of most of the sites appear in the Illustrations section (see Figures 4 through 6). Site numbers correspond with the photographs found at the end.

Site No. 1. House owned by Francis Fail. Located on the Stringtown road north of the Cascade Road. Constructed in 1894, the house is a story and a half "T" shape with an added wooden lean-to. The cross of the "T" is constructed of native potrock prevalent in the area of Midway. Some modernization has taken place, such as the addition of the skylight.

Site No. 2. House owned by Kay Probst. Located on the Stringtown road at the junction with the Cascade Spring Road. Built in 1909, the wooden structure (possibly potrock with wooden siding) has a salt box
roof. The front facade is balanced with a door centered between two windows.

Site No. 3. Abandoned house and outbuilding. Located at the junction of the Cascade Springs Road and the Stringtown Road on the southwest corner. Wooden frame saltbox style. Undetermined age of the building, estimated at the turn of the century. Located on Wasatch State Park land.

Site No. 4. Extremely large two story barn with a gabled lean-to and to the rear attached single story shed. Located at the junction of Stringtown Road and the Wasatch State Park Chalet Road. Undetermined age or owner.

Site No. 5. Located on State Highway 113 south of Midway is the Midway Fish Hatchery which is state owned. Parts of the hatchery were constructed in 1909 by the Provo Valley Trout Company. The original intent was to breed and raise trout for use by the Provo Company. Several fish runs were constructed and a home built at the hatchery. In 1912 the hatchery was purchased by the Wasatch Trout Company and operated until 1916 when John and William VanWagoner bought the hatchery for the purpose of raising trout for the fish markets located in Park City. The hatchery changed hands again in 1921 when the Timpanogos Rod Club purchased the hatchery for a private fishing club. The Utah Fish and Game Department obtained the
hatchery in 1924 for the breeding and raising of various species of trout to be planted in lakes and streams of the area. Many additions and modifications have been made over the years including a building constructed by the Works Progress Administration in 1940-1941.

Site No. 6. A potrock hipped gabled single story home with a medium hipped roofed potrock outbuilding. Located on State Highway 113 south of Midway and so marked on the map, the house was constructed in 1909. It is presently owned by Fred Parker.

Site No. 7. The J. Fred Price home and farm is located off State Highway 113 south of Midway. Made of potrock and constructed sometime at the turn of the century, the home is on ground which is believed to be part of the first grist mill in the Midway area. Known as the Wood's Farm, John H. VanWagoner erected the mill in 1861.

Site No. 8. The old North Store or the George Daybell Store or the Red and White Mercantile Store is located on State Highway 113 just south of the main part of Charleston. Built shortly before the turn of the century, the old North Store along with several other mercantile establishments helped to serve the needs of Charleston. The building is cut stone single story with a wooden and glass front facade. Presently it stands empty.

Site No. 9. Built in 1913, this two story hipped cross gabled brick home is the largest dwelling in Charleston. Located on Highway 113
west of the L.D.S. Church, the house is presently owned by the 
Buehner family of Salt Lake City. The home was originally built by 
Nymphus "Uncle Nif" C. Murdock shortly before he died in 1917. 
Uncle Nif owned and operated a mercantile store as well as being 
involved in other business enterprises in Charleston. He was elected 
to the state legislature and was Charleston's first postmaster.

Site No. 10. Erected in 1885, the house is a two story brick with a 
wooden lean-to. The house is located on the west side of Highway 
113 in Charleston. The roof is steep gabled with a return cornice. 
It has a centered main door front facade.

Site No. 11. Located on Highway 113 at Third North in Charleston, 
this story and half brick L-shaped home was built in 1894. The 
house has an open front porch with a small front gable.

Site No. 12. The house was constructed in 1908 and is presently owned 
by Cachus Casper. The house is an oblong story and a half with a 
lean-to. In addition to the house there are a number of outbuildings 
dated at the turn of the century.

Site No. 13. The house owned by Ruth Pyper and was built in 1915. 
It is a two story cross gabled with a cornice return. It has an open 
porch. The house is located on the Upper Charleston Canal Road 
directly east of Charleston.

Site No. 14. This house is also located on the Upper Charleston
Canal Road east of Charleston. The house is a story and a half stucco dwelling with an attached lean-to. The front facade is off center. The owner is undetermined as is the age. Construction is estimated to be about 1895.

Site No. 15. The house is presently occupied by Reed Tufts. Built in 1894, it is located east on Second South on the south side of the street. It has a cornice return with a balanced front facade.

Site No. 16. This house is also located on east Second South on the south side of the street in Charleston. The house is probably stone or brick covered with clapboard. It was constructed in 1894.

Site No. 17. Constructed in 1891, the two story home is presently owned by Lynn Sohrveide. Located at the intersection of First East and Center in Charleston, the house is a high gabled L-shaped dwelling with cornice return and an open porch.

Site No. 18. The house is a T-shaped story and a half with attached lean-to. Presently owned by George Flora, it was built in 1900. The main second story window is a gable with an overhang. The roof trim is classified as cornice boxed plain.

Site No. 19. Located on Second North and Church Street in Charleston, this 1885 brick home is owned by Hugh Webster. The T-shaped house is a story and a half, the cross bar being the front of the house. The
front facade is balanced. The other portion of the T has a gable with an overhang. The front window heads are arched with radiating voussoirs.

Site No. 20. The public grade school building was built in 1902 and is presently the oldest standing educational building in the valley. Constructed out of red sandstone, the building is presently owned by Charleston City Corporation. It is occupied by the city as well as several artists, the upstairs being utilized for community recreation activities.

Site No. 21. This saltbox shaped house is located on Center and First East in Charleston. Constructed in 1896, it is presently owned by Glen Webb. The wooden flushboard framed home has a balanced front facade with an open porch. Some 15 yards to the west is a potrock outbuilding constructed about the same time.

Site No. 22. This T-shaped house was constructed in 1907 and is presently owned by Luden Brown. It appears that some modifications have been made with the enlargement of the second story window. The front facade is balanced with no porch.

Site No. 23. This story and a half T-shaped flush board dwelling was built in 1885. Presently owned by Mary Caspar, it stands abandoned. It has a cornice return, an open front porch, and a second story dormer door. The house is located at the corner of Church Street and Second South in Charleston.
Site No. 24. Constructed in 1904, this house has undergone extensive remodeling. Owned by William Busse, it is located on Second South between Church Street and Highway 113.

Site No. 25. The Charleston cemetery is on the fringe of this study. Many of the original settlers are buried at the cemetery.

Site No. 26. This house is presently occupied by Valeo Winterton. Built in 1898, the house is a two-story house with a veranda on two sides of it. The house is located approximately a half mile west of the Upper Charleston Canal on what is known as the Charleston Bridge Road.

Site No. 27. Owned by Grant Winterton, the house was built in 1911. It would not qualify for any historic register.

Site No. 28. Across the street from the Grant Winterton home is the Max Carlson home. Story and half saltbox design, this house was constructed in 1891. It is located about a quarter mile west of the Upper Charleston Canal on the Charleston Bridge Road.

Site No. 29. The James Webb home was built in 1906. It is located on the corner of First East and First South in Charleston.

Site No. 30. Like the Webb home, the Davis house was built after the turn of the century (1906). It is located on 2nd South and 1st East in Charleston.

Site No. 31. The Merle C. Jacobsen home was built in 1901. It is situated on State Highway 113 next to the Old North Store. The house
is a story and a half with attached lean-to. It has a balanced front facade.

Site No. 32. The Richard Hansen home located on State Highway 113 between First and Second North has been modified in recent years. The estimated age of the house is slightly before the turn of the century. The house has no significant architectural features.

Site No. 33. This home is located on the Upper Charleston Canal Road. Considered eclectic architecturally, it is a two story frame house with an open porch on two sides. The house was constructed about 1910.

In addition to the above listed potential historic homes and buildings, there are several other homes and buildings which would indirectly be affected by the enlargement of Deer Creek Reservoir. Although not directly involved with the area to be inundated, they are situated on roads or in close proximity to the area under survey, so that some environmental effect would be felt. Most of these homes are of the 1890 vintage and would easily qualify for the Century Home Register, as would all those listed above built before 1909.

Finally, no effect would be felt in Round Valley. There are no potential historical buildings or homes. There are, however, several homes potentially significant that would be effected because of the close proximity of the proposed impounded waters of Deer Creek.
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Heber Valley has been richly endowed with an abundance of water and lush vegetation. For this reason, the history of Charleston and Heber Valley has always been linked to the production of food. It served as summer hunting and fishing grounds for the Timpanogos Utes living in Utah Valley. Since the settlement by whitemen, the valley has produced an abundance of butter and cheese, beef, and wool.

Charleston and the valley have traditionally been a part of the movement of people and their products. The Timpanogos Utes passed through the area on their way to trade, hunt and fish, and make war on other Indians to the east and northeast. Provo Canyon and the upper stretches of the Provo River served the whitemen equally well. The Provo Canyon Road and Heber Valley proved to be an excellent link between a hostile army sent to control the rebellious Mormons and the nearest military posts to the east. The road and later the construction of the Denver and Rio Grande Western railroad unlocked the valley for the exportation of agricultural surpluses.

Heber Valley remains today strongly agriculturally oriented. However, more and more the valley is becoming a playground of the Wasatch Front. Charleston for the most part still retains the agricultural flavor, being liberally dotted with barns, milking sheds, haystacks, and alfalfa fields.
With the possibility of the Deer Creek Dam enlargement, Charleston will see history being repeated. In the late 1930's, the community was called upon to sacrifice a part of itself to the lower water users. In that process, it lost several outstanding historical buildings. The community still contains many fine pre-twentieth century homes and outbuildings, however. Although from this preliminary survey none of the homes or the several public buildings recorded as sites appears to be architecturally significant, they are important to the total historical and cultural understanding of the valley and the state in terms of total community involvement in the livestock and dairying industries.

**Recommendations**

Because of the short time allotted for this survey, it is strongly urged that further in-depth studies be made concerning the historical architectural features which may have been overlooked. Furthermore, if no suitable alternative can be found to the enlargement of Deer Creek Reservoir, a comprehensive study should be taken of the community as a whole as it relates to use of land and water, and the settlement as it relates to the understanding of agricultural development in Utah.

From a historical perspective, other suitable alternatives to the enlargement of the Deer Creek Dam should be investigated. The
historical mood of Heber Valley and Charleston has been that they have sacrificed much for the interests along the Wasatch Front. The proposed enlargement of Deer Creek resulting in the inundation of Charleston will give rise to additional and long felt antagonisms towards down stream water users.
FOOTNOTES


3Ibid., p. 46 ff.


6Craig Woods Fuller, Development of Irrigation in Wasatch County (MS Thesis, Utah State University, 1973), p. 144.
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Utah prehistory breaks readily into three distinctive episodes.

1. From 10,000 or more years ago, until A.D. 400, the only culture represented in Utah, as well as the rest of the Great Basin, was the Desert Archaic. That culture is characterized as a hunting-gathering one; a flexible, highly-adaptive lifeway that was universal over the world at that time. For example, basketry was a highly developed craft by 8000 B.P. The durable and unbreakable baskets were used for carrying; flat ones were used for harvesting, winnowing and roasting the hard seeds that were staple foods; jug-shaped baskets lined with pinon gum or pitch were used as water bottles. Thin slabs of stone and oval pebbles were the millstones used to grind the seeds for mush and gruel dishes. A bewildering variety of chipped stone knife and projectile forms were made of obsidian or other volcanic glasses that take the sharpest edges of all stones used for chipping. The domiciles were not fixed, but varied as the annual cyclical round followed a seasonal, well-scheduled harvesting of both plants and animals. Realize the 'wandering' was neither aimless nor random. Rather, it reflected lifelong and intimate year-round knowledge of a territory where mineral, plant, animal and water resources were to be found. The social order was no doubt simple; the effective unit was the primary or extended family that some have called a microband. Attuned as it was to the varied but somewhat scant resources of the arid West, the Archaic lifeway showed little change for thousand of years. This stability is interpreted as evidence of comparable environmental stability; at least, such changes as occur seem to be correlates of perceptible shifts in climate.

2. From A.D. 400 to A.D. 1200 to 1300 most of Utah was occupied by Fremont peoples. The culture is uniquely Utahn, having developed in the state from an Archaic base after the transmission of certain technological complexes across the Southwest from Mexico. Here reference is to the practice of cultivation of corn, squash, and beans, the making of pottery, and perhaps the concept of permanent housing in semisubterranean structures with wood and mud superstructure. Fremonters blended the gathering practices of the Archaic with the new ideas. South of the Colorado River, however, there was little evidence of the Fremont culture;
The river seems to form a fairly sharp southern boundary. South lay the province of the Anasazi or Pueblo, a complex culture more heavily committed than the Fremont to agriculture with great emphasis on arts and crafts, religion, and utilizing stone architectural structures, as well as the pit house, for dwellings. The Anasazi developed out of a basketmaker culture which was based on a hunting and gathering lifestyle that had incorporated some limited agricultural practices. That the Anasazi and Fremont are quite comparable cultures is obvious. The nature of the relationship is unclear but will be dealt with later.

3. Upon the disappearance of the Fremont in the 13th century A.D., the Shoshoni-speakers (Paiute, Gosiute, and Ute) took over the territory. They practiced the Archaic lifeway that had remained characteristic of the entire west (except Utah) from the beginning. There is no evidence of archeological nature that the Fremonters "reverted" to the Archaic practices. Instead it seems that the Shoshoni-speakers who were in possession of Utah upon first white contact were migrants from Southern California and Nevada. They may have been a factor in the disappearance of the Fremont, or they may have expanded eastward into a territory already empty of human occupants by the 14th century. The linguistic evidence is firm as to the time and direction of expansion of the Shoshoni tribemen; what is lacking is knowledge of the nature of the contact, if any, with the Fremont.

Figure 2 is a chronological chart of Utah prehistoric cultures.

Note: This paper was originally written as part of the 1975 Leigh lecture given by Dr. Jesse Jennings.
FIGURE 1. MAP SHOWING SITE LOCATIONS AND AREA SURVEYED.
Figure 2.
Chronological chart of Utah prehistoric cultures.
Department of Anthropology  
SITE SURVEY SHEET  
Archeological Survey  
University of Utah  

Site No. 42Wa7  
County Wasatch  
State Utah  

1. Map Reference Aspen Grove Quad  
2. Type of Site Open hunting camp  
3. Cultural Affiliation (if known) unknown  
4. Location  

NE1/4 NW1/4  
Sec. 28  
T. 4S  
R. 4E  

5. Owner and Address unknown  
6. Previous Owners unknown  
7. Tenant none  
8. Informants none  
9. Previous Designations for Site none  

10. Site description, position, & surrounding terrain This is a lithic scatter on the side of the point north of the entry of Decker Creek into Deer Creek Reservoir.  

11. Area of Occupation 15 x 15 m  

12. Depth and Character of Fill none  

13. Present Condition  
Some evidence of disturbance by recreation activities.  

14. Material Collected none  

15. Material Observed 15 flakes of chert, quartz, 2 partially worked projectile points  

16. Material Reported and Owner none  

17. Recommendations for Further Work none  

18. Photo Nos. none  

19. Type of map made by survey party See report, Deer Creek, Central Utah Project, 1976  

Recorded by N. Coulam  
Date 4 Aug 1976
SITE SURVEY SHEET

Archeological Survey

Site No. 42 Wa8 County Wasatch State Utah

1. Map Reference Aspen Grove Quad

2. Type of Site Open hunting camp

3. Cultural Affiliation (if known) unknown

4. Location below railroad tracks on point projecting into Deer Creek Reservoir
   center of SW 1/4 of Sec. 28 T. 4S R. 4E

5. Owner and Address unknown

6. Previous Owners unknown

7. Tenant unknown

8. Informants none

9. Previous Designations for Site none

10. Site description, position, & surrounding terrain This is a lithic scatter on the south side
    of the point that extends into the reservoir about 1 kilometer south
    of Decker Creek.

11. Area of Occupation 10 x 5m

12. Depth and Character of Fill none

13. Present Condition undisturbed

14. Material Collected 1 projectile point, 1 biface

15. Material Observed 20 flakes of chert and quartzite, 1 projectile point, 1 biface

16. Material Reported and Owner none

17. Recommendations for Further Work none

18. Photo Nos. none

19. Type of map made by survey party See report: Deer Creek, Central Utah Project, 1976

   Recorded by N. Coulam Date 4 Aug. 1976
Department of Anthropology  
SITE SURVEY SHEET  
Archaeological Survey  
University of Utah

Site No. 42Wa9  
County Wasatch  
State Utah

1. Map Reference Aspen Grove Quadrangle

2. Type of Site Open hunting camp

3. Cultural Affiliation (if known) unknown

4. Location NW 1/4 NW 1/4 on a point at the northwest corner of Section 33.

5. Owner and Address Unknown

6. Previous Owners Unknown

7. Tenant None

8. Informants None

9. Previous Designations for Site None

10. Site description, position, & surrounding terrain This is a lithic scatter on the south side of the point in the sagebrush flats. This site is near the second small tributary south of Decker Creek that flows into Deer Creek Reservoir.

11. Area of Occupation 5 x 5m

12. Depth and Character of Fill none

13. Present Condition undisturbed

14. Material Collected none

15. Material Observed 10 flakes of chert and quartzite

16. Material Reported and Owner none

17. Recommendations for Further Work none

18. Photo Nos. none

19. Type of map made by survey party See report, Deer Creek, Central Utah Project, 1976

Recorded by N. Coulam  
Date 4 Aug 1976
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>1. Map Reference</strong></th>
<th>Aspen Grove Quadrangle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Type of Site</strong></td>
<td>Open hunting camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Cultural Affiliation (if known)</strong></td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Location</strong></td>
<td>SE 1/4 NE 1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Owner and Address</strong></td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Previous Owners</strong></td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Tenant</strong></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Informants</strong></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Previous Designations for Site</strong></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Site description, position, &amp; surrounding terrain</strong></td>
<td>This is a lithic scatter on the south side of a point of land extending out into Deer Creek Reservoir about 2 kilometers south of Decker Creek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. Area of Occupation</strong></td>
<td>5 x 5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. Depth and Character of Fill</strong></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13. Present Condition</strong></td>
<td>undisturbed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14. Material Collected</strong></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15. Material Observed</strong></td>
<td>20 flakes of chert and quartzite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16. Material Reported and Owner</strong></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17. Recommendations for Further Work</strong></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18. Photo Nos.</strong></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19. Type of map made by survey party</strong></td>
<td>See report: Deer Creek, Central Utah Project, 1976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Recorded by* N. Coulam *Date* 4 Aug 1976