ABSTRACT

This document provides an assessment of three cemeteries associated with the Bannack State Park in Bannack, Montana. Administered by the Parks Division of the Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks Department, it is located 25 miles southwest of the Beaverhead County seat of Dillon. Bannack’s history spans about 130 years, beginning with the discovery of gold in 1862. By 1864 Bannack became the Montana Territorial Capital, only to lose this title to nearby Virginia City in 1865. Bannack remained an active town, with cycles of population expansion and decline, into the twentieth century. Today it is administered as a “ghost town.”

Bannack incorporates three known cemeteries: Old Cemetery, New Cemetery, and the Marysville Cemetery. The Old Cemetery is situated on a south facing ridge nose northeast of and in sight of the town. New Cemetery is situated on a broad, level ridge nose about a mile northwest of town. Marysville was a “suburb” of Bannack and this cemetery, much smaller than the others, is found about a mile southeast of town on a small ridge overlooking Grasshopper Creek about a quarter of a mile to the southeast.

This assessment involved the identification and mapping of each cemetery. All marked stones were recorded and assessed for long-term preservation needs. Photographs of many stones were also taken as part of the long-term documentation process. The work will assist Bannack State Park meet Actions A4-15 (document markers and plat) and A4-16 (monitor changes) of Goal 4d (Cemetery Management Guidelines) in the Bannack State Park Management Plan (Anonymous 2001:62).

The assessment also involved the examination of a broad range of cemetery planning issues, including landscape and cemetery character, historical background, vegetation and grass issues, pedestrian and universal access, vehicular access, security and vandalism, site amenities and signage, utilities, individual grave or lot fences, and grave markers. Each of these issues has been considered for the different cemeteries with recommendations for long-term preservation. This work will assist Bannack State Park meet Policy P4-5 through P4-10 (Cemetery Policies) and Action A4-19 (Sign for policies) of Goal 4d (Cemetery Management Guidelines) in the Bannack State Park Management Plan (Anonymous 2001:62).

This study also provides recommendations for immediate conservation treatments of stones and grave fences. This work is designed to comply with the Standards of Practice of the American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works, the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Preservation, and the 1964 Venice Charter on Conservation. The proposed work is also consistent with the Bannack Preservation Philosophy as outlined by the Park’s Management Plan (Anonymous 2001:15-20).
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INTRODUCTION

Nature of the Project

This project was conducted for the Parks Division of the Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks Department. The author, Dr. Michael Trinkley, Director of Chicora Foundation and Ms. Debi Hacker, the Foundation’s Conservation Administrator, conducted the investigations. The work took place between October 13 and 17, 2003, with this report prepared immediately afterwards. The goal of the study, very loosely stated, is to assist Bannack State Park manage the three cemeteries (Old Cemetery, New Cemetery, and Marysville Cemetery) associated with the park and on park property. While a Management Plan for the Park had been developed two years previously (Anonymous 2001), action on the cemeteries had been delayed since the plan provided relatively little direct guidance. This work, then, is intended to help supplement the overall park management plan and provide specific recommendations on the long-term preservation of the cemeteries.

Bannack State Park is one of 41 parks administered by the Parks Division and is located 25 miles southeast of the Beaverhead County seat of Dillon (Figure 1). It is surrounded to the north and south by lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and on the east and west by private property. The surrounding lands are used for grazing and there are still active claims on mineral rights.

Bannack has an operational budget of only $35,000 and a very small full-time staff (at the present) of two individuals – a Manager, (Ms. Angie Hurley) and Operations Specialist (Mr. Tom Lowe). There is an expectation of a third full-time employee (a Maintenance Supervisor), and historically the park staff has swelled during the summer through the use of temporary staff. We also understand that the Park will be hiring a part-time interpreter. Volunteers (primarily through the Bannack Association) are also a major factor in the park’s operation. Visitation is approximately 30,000 individuals a year, although no effort has been made to calculate visitation to the various cemeteries.

Figure 1. Location of Bannack State Park in southwestern Montana.
With the limited budget and staff one of the critical concerns was that our recommendations and action plans would be workable and could be implemented by the Park with its available resources. It was also critical that the recommendations be consistent with the existing Bannack Management Plan (Anonymous 2001), especially in terms of its Preservation Philosophy (Anonymous 2001:15-20). Bannack is managed as a “ghost town” and part of the “Bannack Experience” is the ability to “experience the past,” while maintaining an “atmosphere of abandonment.” This creates some significant preservation challenges – many of which were recognized in the overall management plan. Others will be outlined during these discussions.

The existing Bannack Management Plan included very limited recommendations concerning the cemetery under Issue 4: Cultural Resource Management. Goal 4d specified:

Implement cemetery management guidelines and policies that retain the historic integrity of the cemetery, respect the memory of those interred there, and maintain the site in accordance with the Bannack Experience for current and future generations.

Six policies are then listed, followed by six actions intended to assist in the management consistent with the state policies. The policies are (the occasional reference to cemetery, rather than cemeteries, is likely a simple mistake and these policies are interpreted to be applicable to all three Bannack cemeteries):

P4-5: Alteration, removal, destruction or replacement of any tombstone or grave marker in the Bannack cemetery is prohibited.

P4-6: No additional burials may occur in the Bannack Cemeteries.

P4-7: In accordance with the Montana State Parks policy on Burial or Spreading of Cremated Remains, “Burials and spreading of cremated remains will not be allowed . . .”

P4-8: Decorations/adornments placed in the cemetery will be left for no longer than one year. Each spring, all decorations must be removed or replaced.

P4-9: Preserve the current gravesites, markers and grave fencing in a manner that retains the historic integrity, honors the memory of the deceased, and retains the “atmosphere of abandonment.”

P4-10: Any discoveries of previously unknown burial sites will be handled in accordance with the State Burial Bill and the Antiquities Act.

The actions resulting from these policy statements include:

- conduct historic research for the cemeteries (A4-15),
- plat and document all markers (A4-15),
- monitor the cemeteries for change (A4-16),
- pursue grants and funding for management activities (A4-17),
- maintain the fencing around the cemeteries (A4-18),
- develop signage for ownership and policies (A4-19), and
- determine the need to close the cemeteries (A4-20).

Of these, we understand that the last (A4-20) has already been accomplished and the various cemeteries are no longer under the control of the local Cemetery Board, but are owned in fee simple by the State of Montana. We also understand that maintenance of fencing (at the Old and New Cemeteries) is an on-going activity (A4-18).
This current investigation has accomplished the need for documentation and platting of the cemeteries (a portion of A4-15) and has begun the process of providing the data necessary for long-term monitoring of the cemeteries (A4-16). This work also outlines the signage that we believe is appropriate for each of the three cemeteries, allowing the Park to meet Action A4-19. While this study does not directly pursue funding for maintenance of the grave markers and fences, it does provide very specific recommendations for conservation action – allowing the creation of a realistic budget to accomplish A4-17.

The only issue, we believe, that is left unaddressed is the need for additional historical research. As revealed in the following discussion, there is much that remains unknown concerning these cemeteries and additional historical research remains a critical need.

Issues incorporated in the plan, therefore, include mapping of each cemetery and the development of a comprehensive list of stones and other markers or fences present. Preservation planning issues include an examination of the landscape and cemetery character, vegetation and grass issues, pedestrian and universal access, vehicular access, security and vandalism, site amenities (including signage), utilities, and preservation/conservation needs of the fences and grave markers.

**Historical Background**

Bannack’s history began with the discovery of gold in Grasshopper Creek in 1862. By early the next year the town was booming with a population of perhaps 5,000. This prosperity was short lived and, by later in 1863 gold had been discovered in Virginia City to the east. There was a relatively short period of lawlessness and in May 1864 Bannack became the Montana Territorial Capital. This, too, lasted only a brief time and by 1865 Virginia City had captured the territorial capital. Nevertheless, Bannack achieved some degree of stability and continued to expand, albeit at a slow pace, through the 1870s. The town’s fate, however, was sealed when, in 1880, the Union Pacific bypassed Bannack and built a spur line to Dillon instead.

Accounts indicate that even with the town’s demise clearly there was still “an endless stream of hopefuls trying anything that might pay” (Anonymous 2001:2). The gold mining industry progressed from placer mining to hydraulic and underground (or hard) mining and finally to dredges. The town continued until the 1940s with much of the property purchased by Western Montana College and the Beaverhead County Museum Association. In 1954 the property was donated to the State of Montana. Acquisition continued over the next 25 years.

It is somewhat surprising that Bannack has never had a comprehensive historical study conducted. As best as we are able to discern, historical research has been limited to specific “need-to-know” projects and has usually been conducted by in-house personnel. As a result of one such project, the current visitor’s guide to the town (Anderson n.d.) was completed. Even the Bannack Interpretative Plan and Conceptual Design Plan (Prairie Wind Architecture 1995) fails to provide any detailed historical research to support its interpretation recommendations and fails to incorporate the cemeteries into any aspect of the plan.

Consequently, while the broad themes of Bannack’s history are well known – and often recounted – the details of the history are either unknown or only very poorly documented. This leaves unaddressed a broad range of questions specific to the cemeteries, such as

- When was the first burial?
- When was the Old Cemetery replaced by the New Cemetery?
- Were graves actually opened and individuals removed to the New Cemetery?
- Why was the New Cemetery created?
- Who is buried in the Maryville Cemetery?
Did Bannack have an undertaker?
Were the coffins made in Bannack or shipped in?
Do any of the extant account ledgers include coffins or other burial goods?
Who might have made the grave fences in Bannack?
Who are the different families and individuals buried in the different cemeteries and what might their social status tell us about their burial location?
What records exist concerning monuments brought into Bannack?
What was death and burial like in a frontier gold town?
Do any photographs exist for any of the cemeteries or burials at Bannack?
What death records are available for the Bannack cemeteries and what might those records tell us?

Clearly there are a great many questions concerning the cemeteries that only very careful and detailed historical research can address. While resources are limited, this is an issue that – after nearly 50 years of State ownership – should be addressed.

The Old Cemetery

This site is situated on a south facing ridge slope about 900 feet northeast of the main Bannack Road and the old stage road. It is reached by a heavily eroded dirt road that winds up the hillside. The cemetery is at an approximate elevation of 5,900 feet above mean sea level (AMSL). The boundaries are established by a jack fence that has been erected by the park. The entrance has a UTM coordinate of 343391E 5002844N (Zone 12, NAD27 datum) and the cemetery encompasses approximately 0.6 acre. Although expansion was possible to the north, the cemetery is bounded to the south, east, and west by relatively steep slopes. While called the “Old Cemetery” today, it has apparently also been called the Bannack Boot-Hill Cemetery by the Beaverhead County Cemetery Board.

This cemetery is reputed to be the earliest used by Bannack residents and the first marked grave dates to November 1862 – about four months after the first gold was discovered. The mean date of the marked graves is 1878, although the graveyard was used until at least 1906 (the date of the last marked burial). The large and impressive Trask plot was last used in 1870, suggesting that the cemetery was still a viable – and respected – part of the landscape until at least that time.

The New Cemetery

The New Cemetery is situated 1.5 miles northwest of Bannack on a relatively level and broad plateau adjacent to the road leading into the town. It is at an elevation of 5940 feet AMSL and the gate entrance is at a UTM of 341674E 5004090N (Zone 12, NAD27 datum). The cemetery measures about 405 by 240 feet and encompasses approximately 2.2 acres.

Called the “New Cemetery” this is presumed to have replaced the original cemetery, likely because of its rocky soils and limited size. The topography of this “new” location allowed for easy expansion – although it was certainly less convenient to town.

The earliest identified marker in the cemetery is 1877 and the latest marked grave is 1968. This reveals very clearly that the two cemeteries have an overlap of at least 29 years and the mean date for burials in the New Cemetery is 1908. While certainly more recent than the Old Cemetery, this does not clearly indicate when (or why) the first cemetery ceased being used by the Bannack community.

Maryville Cemetery

The Maryville Cemetery is situated about 0.7 mile southeast of the intersection of the main Bannack Road and the stage road. It is found on a south facing ridge nose and measures about 200 feet northeast-southwest. The single (possibly double) row of graves takes up all of the available level land to the south, east, and west, with the cemetery encompassing about 0.1 acre. The UTM point at the south edge
of the cemetery is 344268E 5002335N (Zone 12, NAD27 datum).

This cemetery is reported to have been used by Maryville (earlier Centerville) community or suburb associated with Bannack. The size, however, suggests that it is little more than a family graveyard and additional historical research is desperately needed for this site. The single marked grave is that of an individual who was buried in 1865. Regrettably nothing is known about this person or his association with Bannack. The grave has also been marked relatively recently, suggesting that there may be family members who know more about this particular cemetery.

Understanding Conservation/Preservation

There is a tendency for governing organizations to act in haste when it comes to cemetery preservation and to engage in
activities and repairs that are not in the best long-term interests of the cemetery. At least one reason for these problems is that governing bodies are often not aware of acceptable conservation procedures. Being unaware that some approaches are better than others, they are often swayed by commercial appeal, low cost, or advertising claims.

There are certain minimal ethical standards to which any activity in a historic cemetery should adhere:

- The condition of the object (whether stone, iron, or some other material) must be carefully documented before any intervention.
- All methods and materials used during treatments must be fully documented to help future generations understand what was done.
- Any intervention must be the minimum necessary. Less is almost always considered better.
- The intervention must be governed by unswerving respect for the aesthetic, historical, and physical integrity of the property. In other words, it is essential that the historic fabric be respected.

These rules apply to all aspects of cemetery conservation/preservation, including ironwork, stonework, and even landscape modifications.

It is also useful to understand the essential difference between “restoration” and “conservation/preservation.” One of the foremost architects of the nineteenth century, John Ruskin, commented that restoration “means the most total destruction which a building can suffer.” The same can be said for cemetery stones, ironwork, fences, and landscape.

 Restoration means returning an object to “like new” condition. This approach typically shows disregard for the original, historic fabric, replacing bits and pieces here and there in order to make the historic object new. This approach also often mixes incompatible materials – causing deterioration of the very object that we are attempting to preserve.

In contrast, conservation/preservation seeks to minimize future deterioration, stabilizing an object’s condition and maintaining its integrity. Essential to our understanding of conservation and preservation is also an appreciation for appropriate maintenance. I have found that preventative maintenance will often dramatically reduce the need for far more costly, intrusive, conservation treatments. In other words, by appropriately painting ironwork we may slow deterioration and often prevent more drastic intervention, such as recasting decorative elements. By appropriately managing the landscape we can reduce the potential for fire and the loss of wood and stone features in the cemetery.

This report focuses on conservation and preservation and I encourage the caregivers at Bannack to likewise avoid efforts of “restoration” that are likely to cause more harm than good.

Finally, Bannack must understand that all conservation repairs or treatments are routine maintenance – they must not be considered permanent. There is virtually nothing that can be “done” and then forgotten. Just as a building requires constant attention, intervention, and repair, so too will cemetery objects that receive conservation attention.

This conservation philosophy (consistent with the Standards of Practice of the American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works, the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Preservation, and the 1964 Venice Charter) is entirely in harmony with that already stipulated by the Bannack Management Plan. Specifically, this Plan requires:

- All preservation projects will meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Preservation (Anonymous 2001:16, 20)
A minimalist approach will be used in all treatments of historic fabric (Anonymous 2001:18)

An aggressive preventative maintenance approach (Anonymous 2001:18)

The retention of original materials where ever and when ever possible (Anonymous 2001:18)

When new materials are introduced they should be the least amount necessary and a kind reflecting what would have been used originally (Anonymous 2001:19)

Repairs or modifications must be preceded by study and recordation (Anonymous 2001:19)

No restoration – or reconstruction -- will be undertaken (Anonymous 2001:19).

Within these broad guiding principles, however, there is still considerable flexibility – and the potential for legitimate differences of opinion among conservators. Like many issues there are small zones of black and white and rather large areas of gray.

Acceptable Conservation/Preservation Procedures

I will briefly outline a few critical issues for different conservation or preservation approaches at Bannack’s cemeteries. In some cases volunteers may be able, with training, to carry out simple activities. In many cases, most particularly conservation of stone, volunteers are strongly advised not to undertake the work. In fact, even professionals in related fields may be inappropriate. Just as one would not ask a house painter to repair a portrait, it is important that handymen or stone/brick masons familiar primarily with modern materials and techniques not undertake the conservation treatments outlined in this assessment. The work should be completed by conservators thoroughly familiar with the exacting requirements of the treatment involved.

Stone Conservation

Fragment storage protects fallen or broken stones from loss and damage. At present there appears to be no procedure to ensure that damaged stones are identified and cared for. A number of toppled and displaced stones were found at New Cemetery. In one case a foot stone was found about 200 feet from its head stone, suggesting that it may have been intentionally removed from its plot and later dropped.

Repairing damage is the surest way to protect broken or disassociated stones, but in many cases fragments can be provided temporary storage until funding is available for repair. Temporary storage should be in a dry, secured facility. Individual items should be marked with information concerning where they were found.

Resetting is a common need at many old cemeteries, and a number of stones require this at both the Old and New Cemetery. The simplest resetting involves stones which are tilted or which have come out of the ground.

Table 1. On-Line Sources of Conservation Philosophy Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The AIC Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://aic.stanford.edu/pubs/ethics.html">http://aic.stanford.edu/pubs/ethics.html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www2.cr.nps.gov/tps/secstan1.htm">http://www2.cr.nps.gov/tps/secstan1.htm</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Preservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www2.cr.nps.gov/tps/secstan4.htm">http://www2.cr.nps.gov/tps/secstan4.htm</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1964 Venice Charter (This is the basis for many later western statements on conservation protocols)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.icomos.org/venice_charter.html">http://www.icomos.org/venice_charter.html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These should never be reset using concrete, but rather should be set in pea gravel and sand.

In cases where stones are loose in a supporting base, resetting involves the use of a wet, high lime mortar mix. Appropriate is a 1:4:8 mix (1 part of white Portland cement, 4 parts hydrated lime, and 8 parts clean graded sand or marble dust). Cement, mortar mixes, epoxy, or other adhesives should never be used for this purpose.

At times resetting may be made more complex by the presence of corroded iron or brass dowels. Often these will need to be removed before the stones can be reset. Such a repair requires that the old pins be drilled out using a core drill, new pins of stainless steel be inserted using an appropriate epoxy, and mortar then used to set the monument. This is work that should only be undertaken by a stone conservator.

Cleaning stones simply for the sake of appearances is usually ill-advised. Such efforts endanger the stone and often promote even quicker soiling afterwards. Where cleaning is critical, it should be limited to the use of low pressure (i.e., less than 90 p.s.i.) water and soft bristle brushes. All other chemicals should be avoided without the specific advice and recommendation of a conservator.

Commercial stone cleaning methods are generally not appropriate for use in historic burial grounds. In absolutely no case should sandblasting, stone refinishing or polishing, or high pressure chemical or water washing be used at the Bannack cemeteries. Commercial cleaning agents should only be used under the direction of a stone conservator.

Coatings are not recommended for any stone material at Bannack. Many coatings are actually detrimental to the stone, causing staining, efflorescence or spalling. Moreover, coatings are not reversible, so once applied they are impossible to remove should detrimental effects be noted. There are a very few that appear to be vapor permeable and are being tested for possible use on stone. Even these, however, should be used only under the direction of a stone conservator and then sparingly.

Mechanical repair most often means the rejoining of fragmented stones. Such work should be undertaken only by stone conservators trained in this area.

In most cases gravestones are fragile and their repair is delicate work. There are many commercial products on the market, used by many commercial stone companies, that are totally inappropriate for historic stone.

Appropriate conservation treatment will usually involve drilling and pinning, carefully aligning the two fragments. Threaded nylon or stainless steel rod and epoxy adhesives formulated for the specific stone are used in this type of repair. Diameters and lengths of pins vary with the individual application, depending on the nature of the break, the thickness of the stone, its condition, and its expected post-repair treatment.

Sometimes pins are not used to save time and money. Instead the pieces are simply joined using epoxy or some other adhesive. Experience indicates that for a long-lasting repair, even in non-structural applications, use of pins is advised. Moreover, most adhesives are far stronger than the stone itself, meaning that failure of the repair is likely to cause additional damage to the stone.

At times mechanical repairs also involve dismantling intact elements and ensuring that a sound foundation is present. Foundation work may involve filling in depressions, establishing a concrete footing, or taking other measures to ensure that subsidence is minimized. Then the entire structure is repaired as it is reassembled.

There are cemeteries where concrete has been used to effect repairs of broken stones. This is inappropriate. Not only is the result aesthetically unappealing, but the concrete is far harder than the stone and can cause long-term deterioration through leaching of contaminants in the concrete into the stone. Because the
concrete is very difficult to remove, I generally recommend that stones repaired with concrete be left as they are, as long as the old repair is stable and causing no immediate damage or problems. Such repairs, however, should be carefully monitored. It is likely that the time will come when these old repairs will fail and a more appropriate repair will become possible.

**Composite stone repair** consists of filling voids with a natural cementitious composite stone material resembling the original as closely as possible in texture, color, and strength. This type of repair may be used to fill gaps or losses in marble and is often used to help slow spalling of bedded sandstone exposed to the elements.

Under no circumstances should latex materials be used in composite stone repair. A more suitable material is a product called Jahn. This closely resembles the natural strength of the original stone, contains no synthetic polymers, exhibits good adhesion, and can be color matched if necessary. This product, however, is available only to trained stone conservators.

**Ironwork Conservation**

There are two iron fences at New Cemetery - one is a pipe railing and the other is an ornate cast and wrought fence. These fences exhibit beautiful workmanship and every effort should be made to preserve and protect these features. Any eventual repairs should focus on retaining all the existing materials. Using new materials is not only aesthetically inappropriate, but often causes galvanic reactions between dissimilar metals.

The single best protection of ironwork is maintenance - and this revolves around painting. Painting maintenance should begin with a good surface cleaning, followed by removal of loose rust and flaking paint (of which there is almost none on either fence). Typically a stiff wire brush is adequate for this.\(^1\)

A rust converter should be applied as an undercoat followed by an appropriate top coat as recommended by the manufacturer. Two examples of rust converters tested by the Canadian Conservation Institute and found to be effective are Rust Converter by Rust-o-lem and Corrosion Control Industries CCI 921.

Generally top coats will be alkyd rather than latex. In no case should the paint be applied thickly – this obscures detail and does not appreciably lengthen the lifespan of the paint. In fact, thick paint can chip more easily than a thinner coat.

There is remnant paint on both fences suggesting they were painted white. Consequently, we recommend a flat or semi-glossy white. Gloss enamels should be avoided.

Repair may include reattachment of elements. Ideally repairs should be made in a manner consistent with original construction. While welding is often expedient, this approach may cause a radical change to the ironwork. Once welded pieces are no longer able to move with expansion/contraction cycles, this causes internal stresses that may lead to yet additional structural problems.

In addition, while wrought iron is easy to weld because of its low carbon content, cast iron contains up to 4% carbon and is difficult to weld. Welding on cast iron should be done only by firms specializing in this work and capable of preheating the elements.\(^2\) An alternative is to

\(^1\) Abrasive cleaning is not recommended for either fence – adequate cleaning is possible by hand and will leave a surface suitable for the application of a rust converter.

\(^2\) The reason that cast iron is so hard to weld without cracking is its rigidity. When one small area is heated, causing it to expand, the unheated area resists – and cracks.
braze cast iron since this approach requires much less heat.

When used, welds should be continuous and ground smooth, in order to eliminate any gaps or crevices. When finished, it should be difficult to distinguish the weld – the original metal should blend or flow directly into the reattached part.

**Wood Conservation**

Substantial amounts of literature exist on the subject of wood deterioration related to the penetration of water; however, there was a limited amount of information specific to arid and semi-arid regions. Non-biological deterioration may be termed “weathering” – the process of changing color, becoming rough, and developing small checks that ultimately enlarge.

This weathering process involves several factors. While seasonal changes may have limited affects given the gradual nature of the changes, it is likely that daily fluctuations are more problematic. More damaging are the effects of UV light and water. The carbohydrate portions (i.e., the cellulose and hemicellulose) and the lignin portions of wood are degraded and photodissociated. Surface material that is soluble washes away, leaving a loose combination of cellulose fibers. The surface continues to delaminate; combined with shrinkage and swelling this creates the checks or cracks that are characteristic of “weathered” wood. Other mechanical weathering occurs from wind, sand abrasion, and other forces.

This weathering can be forestalled by the use of finishes. At Bannack there is evidence that all of the wood grave enclosures were at one time whitewashed. This is a very good protective measure.

Many of the wood fences, however, evidence advanced deterioration from weathering. The typical treatment for small and contained wood items is the use of a two-component low-viscosity modified epoxy resin system capable of saturating the deteriorated fibers of wood. Examples of such epoxies include JP-146 Epoxy Consolidant (PRG, Inc.) Con Serv Flexible Consolidant 100 (Conservation Services) and Liquid Wood (Abatron, Inc.). This serves as a “primer” for an epoxy filler that helps replace the lost wood structure. Examples include JP-6 Epoxy Bonder Paste (or JP-146 mixed with FM-250 Powdered Filler), Con Serv Flexible Patch 200, or Woodepox-2. The best description of this process is provided by the U.S. General Services Administration Historic Preservation Technical Procedure 06300-01, Epoxy Repair for Deterioration and Decay in Wooded Members.

While epoxy repair has a long, and generally successful, history, it is not always an appropriate action. It is often inappropriate if, the wood is to remain unpainted (the epoxy results in a shiny or wet-looking surface), is to be coated with whitewash (whitewash will not adhere appropriately to epoxy), or if the area is large (since the repairs are costly).

In other words, wholesale treatment of the wood grave fences – coating them in epoxy – is not an appropriate course of action. Using epoxy repair to replace wood at or below ground level, however, is an appropriate action. This will help stabilize those fences that are approaching failure from biodeterioration.

For those fence supports that evidence biodeterioration (rot) at ground level but are not yet in failure, the use of a borate product to control decay may be appropriate. Most borate products are suitable for application only where the object is protected from direct water exposure. Impel Rods, however, are a solid borate that are placed into holes drilled in the wood. When moisture levels rise, the Impel Rods dissolve and diffuse through the wood, providing protection against decay fungi.

Many of the wood fences require only minimal intervention consisting of reattaching fallen pickets or other items. This work should, wherever possible, use original elements. Where new nails are necessary historically appropriate
replacements should be used (one source is Tremont Nail).

Replacing Wood Grave Fences

The Bannack Management Plan is quite clear that lost elements are not to be replaced. We respect that decision, but believe that is appropriate to mark those gravesites where grave fences were originally located but have now disappeared. This serves to help the visitor better understand, and appreciate the historic landscape and its character. It also serves to clearly mark graves that might otherwise be lost, ensuring that the known wishes of family members are respected.

Our recommendation is to create only corner posts with a top rail. No side panels, pickets, or other adornments would be added. This would create a “skeleton” fence, allowing visitors to have a “feeling” for the original graveyard, without crossing the line and attempting to reconstruct lost elements.

For such work rough white pine lumber boards are appropriate, although we recommend that to minimize maintenance the corner posts (nominally 5x5s) be either CCA (chromated-cooper-arsenate) or ACQ (alkaline copper quat) pressure treated. Both should have a retention level of at least 0.40.

The size of such fences should be based on the remaining elements. Where the remains are inadequate for appropriate sizing a standard can be deduced from those still standing. Fasteners for the CCA or ACQ posts must be hot-dipped galvanized. Tremont Nail manufactures hot-dipped galvanized nails suitable for this application.

After erection the fences should be allowed to weather several weeks and then should be whitewashed to blend in with the historic fabric.

Where remnants of the original fence are still present, the remains should be fully documented, but should be allowed to remain on-site in their current condition. This will help the visitor understand (1) the historic nature of the site and (2) that the skeleton fence is a replacement.

Whitewashing

Whitewash, sometimes called “limewash,” is a traditional external finish. Whitewash not only provides an appearance that is unobtainable with any modern material (such as paint), but it also has a protective function.

Whitewash has the same basic technology as other lime materials – it is vapor permeable, allowing any moisture that may enter to evaporate again, protecting not only the coating, but also the underlying material. It also has “self-healing” abilities and repairs any minor shrinkage cracks that may appear in the coating. Whitewash also has the ability to consolidate and tighten the surface to which it has been applied.

There are a wide variety of whitewash formulas and any historic reference is likely to provide some variation. In general, however, whitewash is a combination of slaked lime (usually in the form of lime putty) and additional water. It can also be made from hydraulic lime for use over a sound surface.

Basic whitewash is made from mature non-hydraulic lime putty and water. Lime putty, however, is difficult to obtain so the use of dry, hydrated builder’s lime is often suggested. There is little question that lime putty is preferable, but hydrated lime can be satisfactory. Thoroughly mix hydrated lime (Type S) with water to a putty consistency and allow to stand for at least 24 hours, although up to 2 weeks is preferred. Before applying, screen the mix through a fine screen (window screen will work) and thin with water to the consistency of light cream. An alternative to mixing is to purchase whitewash premixed. One source is U.S. Heritage in Chicago, Illinois.

The surface must be clean and sound. Lichen and other biological growth should be carefully removed. The surface must also be thoroughly dampened and allowed to absorb
the moisture before the whitewash is applied. Immediately prior to application the whitewash should be whisked to ensure complete dispersion. As far as possible all of the whitewash for a job should be batched, combining and intermixing all separately mixed ingredients at the start of the job. Elevations should be coated in their entirety. You should make sure that your work stops at logical places where any minor color change will not be seen. The whitewash should be agitated throughout its application to ensure that the lime doesn’t settle out.

Whitewash should be applied in very thin, even coats. Multiple coats are always required - four coats are normally the minimum, with six or seven often being applied. Best practice indicates that an additional two coats should be applied after an initial period of weathering. Each coat must be allowed to dry and cure slowly over several days. Prior to the application of the next coat the wall will need to be again wetted down.

There are special whitewash brushes that are densely filled, 100% natural white tampico fiber set in hardwood block. They can be found at good quality paint stores. The whitewash is worked well into the surface by brushing in all directions and finishing, if possible, in one direction. It is important to keep a wet edge throughout the application. Those who specialize in whitewash emphasize that each coat should be well burnished into the surface with the brush as the wash begins to “gel.”

The ideal conditions for whitewash application are warm - not hot - and humid weather. The wash will require protection from over-rapid drying by wind and sun as well as damage from either rain or frost. The whitewash should cure within two or three days under favorable conditions.

Lime products should be handled with care. Slaked limes are caustic and are irritating or drying to the skin. Avoid skin or eye contact. Avoid inhaling lime dust. Wear clothes that provide maximum skin cover, wear gloves, and use eye protection. Wear a respirator when mixing dry materials. Consult a Material Safety Data Sheet for complete information.

Understanding Priorities

A decision matrix may be used to evaluate the different variables that go into prioritizing a preservation treatment. This is a flexible tool that both allows weights to be given to different actions and also allows the actions to be clearly justified.

Typically four issues are considered. **Urgency** is the need for immediate intervention, either to protect the object, minimize future repair costs, or protect visitors. Urgency is evaluated from 5 (very urgent) to 1 (low urgency). **Cost** is the evaluation of funds and/or time required (again with 5 representing a very high cost and 1 a very low cost). **Time to Implement** represents how quickly the project can be completed - some projects will require only an hour (resetting a stone), while others will require days or weeks (such as eliminating sagebrush, leveling the soil, and planting native grass). Using the same scale, 1 would represent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Urgency</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whitewash fences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reset stones</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair iron fences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epoxy treat wood</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate grass</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair fences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair broken stones</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Evaluated 1-5, 5 most urgent, lowest cost or time, highest positive impact)
the least amount of time to implement, while 5 would represent the most. Finally Impact is a value judgment concerning visual impact or public perception – a gauge of how positively a treatment intervention will be viewed by the public. Again 1 would represent a very low (perhaps invisible) impact, while 5 would be the highest positive impact.

Given the above sample, the highest priorities may be rehabilitating the grass, followed by repairing stones. Secondary priorities might be resetting stones and whitewashing fences. Here, however, is another issue that must be considered. It makes no sense to whitewash a fence that will need to be partially dismantled in order to conduct an epoxy treatment or repair elements. In other words, even this decision matrix must be used with judgment and care. Cemetery preservation activities should be carefully planned – not conducted as isolated actions.
OLD CEMETERY

Landscape Character

This is the closest cemetery to Bannack, situated only 900 feet from the town core. While on a significant rise overlooking town, it is not readily visible from within town. It has been called “boot hill,” although this term¹ is usually reserved for graveyards where the less desirable elements were buried – and this is clearly not the case at Bannack.

The topography is generally level, although there are steep slopes to the east, west, and south that serve to circumscribe the cemetery and certainly would have limited its historic expansion. While the cemetery could easily have been expanded northward that was not done, perhaps because of the very rocky soils. Some attribute the development of New Cemetery to the difficulty reaching this original graveyard, but that seems unlikely since bodies would certainly have been delivered by wagon.

The site is today reached by way of a heavily eroded rock and soil road that winds its way up to the cemetery from the stage road that leads out of Bannack. The cemetery is surrounded by a jack fence and entrance is by way of a gate about two-thirds of the way along the west side. While necessary for management purposes it seems unlikely that any fence would have been present historically – and it is therefore not a defining element.

The site is today dominated by two features – a cut sandstone wall surrounding the marble Trask monument (Figure 4) and eight standing wood grave fences (two of which are also the site of a juniper tree – the only significant vegetation on the site). The importance of these elements can be grasped immediately by examining a photograph showing the cemetery in 1882 (Figure 5). Originally thought to represent tents, we have found that the white features are actually whitewashed grave fences – the cemetery at that time was characterized by these features.

¹ This term seems to have originated from an 1873 newspaper account of Dodge City that claimed some were “dying with their boots on.”
The rest of the landscape is rather bleak – taken over by sagebrush and native grasses, and heavily impacted by worn pedestrian paths that wander through the graves. No other three-dimensional features attract your attention or help characterize the landscape.

Consequently, the defining landscape elements at the Old Cemetery are (1) its prominent elevation and open viewscape of the surrounding countryside and portions of Bannack, (2) the Trask monument and wall, and (3) the standing wood grave fences. These elements of the cemetery are therefore of special importance and every effort should be made to maintain these features and ensure their long-term integrity.

Vegetation

The site area is dominated by sparse native grasses such as bunchgrasses and wheatgrass (*Agropyron* spp.), and clumps of sagebrush (*Artemisia* spp.). Much of the cemetery is not vegetated and bare, rocky soil dominates (see, for example, Figure 4). The nature of the sagebrush has resulted in a number of pedestrian paths being worn through the cemetery in an effort to avoid the sagebrush.

Sagebrush is a woody perennial shrub that may grow from a foot to 4 feet in height (with some reported to be as high as 10 feet). A stout trunk bears many side branches that ascend upward. The shiny grayish green leaves contain aromatic oils with an odor described as between turpentine and camphor. Sagebrush prefers drier plains or rocky areas with deep soils and is found from about 4,000 to 10,000 feet in elevation.

Vegetation

It has been argued that the sagebrush creates a sense of "abandonment." In so far as this plant characterizes the plains this may be so.
Historically, however, it was quickly used by the townspeople for kindling and disappeared from the landscape. It is also likely that it would not have been allowed to gain a foothold in the cemetery since it causes significant problems in pedestrian access. In addition, it is critical that caregivers understand that the cemetery is a sacred site containing the remains of individuals buried by friends, family, and society. There is a presumption that burial locations will be minimally maintained in a manner that respects this sacred nature – and the “abandonment” of a cemetery is inappropriate.

Today sagebrush has another significant problem – its flammability. The Montana Natural Heritage Program reports that vegetation consisting of sagebrush and wheatgrass – while the cover is usually less than 50% and litter cover is generally light – very successfully carries fire, as the Alkali Creek Fire quite effectively demonstrated.

Fire in the Old Cemetery would cause irreparable damage to the wood grave fences and marble monuments. The ability to manage sagebrush vegetation is currently provided in the Bannack Management Plan since it clearly states that vegetation negatively affecting historic resources or public health and safety may be removed (Policy P7-2).

Since the sagebrush is creating worn pathways, promoting erosion and compaction, is historically inappropriate for the cemetery, indicates a disrespect for those buried in the cemetery, and promotes an unacceptable fire risk to the historic fabric we propose that all sagebrush be removed and replaced by native grasses appropriate for the area. I understand that these might include wheatgrass, needlegrass, big bluestem, or other plants that are part of the original climax community in the area. The Park should consult with botanists familiar with the selection of native grasses for the most appropriate choice (i.e., a grass that is suitable to the environmental stresses, will establish quickly, but is otherwise slow and low growing, and that is able to withstand pedestrian traffic without damage).

In this cemetery, given the relatively small size and rather low density, it should be possible to remove the sagebrush in one phase – I recommend the use of a circular saw on the shaft of a 2-cycle nylon trimmer. All sagebrush should be gathered and removed from the cemetery. The should be followed by hand spreading of suitable soil fill to level the pedestrian pathways, and then seeding the entire cemetery. Care should be taken to avoid filling in grave depressions or otherwise altering the cemetery topography – the leveling should be limited to infilling clearly defined walkways where erosion and compaction has occurred.

I recommend that a fire perimeter be created around the cemetery. The width should be as much as the Park can (or is allowed to) create and maintain.

The only other vegetation in the Old Cemetery is a single juniper (Juniperus sp.) tree. The tree has a bhd of 5 inches and is about 8 feet in height. Fowells (1965:219) notes that this tree is rather slow growing, reaching a height of 13 to 14 feet after 40 years. This suggests that the specimen in the cemetery dates from the last half of the twentieth century – essentially after the site was acquired by the State of Montana. Fowells also notes that the most common means of seed dispersal is by birds. As such it is a recent, and probably accidental, intrusion into the cemetery.

This juniper is situated in and between two wood graves fences, making maintenance impossible and, with continued growth, threatening the integrity of the two grave artifacts.

We recommend that the juniper be removed from the cemetery. This should be done by sawing off individual branches, allowing access to the base of the tree. The tree should then be cut as close to the ground as possible. No effort should be made to remove the stump either manually or through decay inducing chemicals.
Pedestrian and Universal Access

There is a pedestrian pathway from the town that leads to the cemetery. While well worn, it is not well marked, nor is its difficulty (given its steepness and rockiness) explained in any signage or brochure. It is likely that relatively few of the visitors opt to make this trek. The Park staff, however, does offer to drive older visitors to the site, especially if they have relatives buried there.

The improvement of this pathway could be accomplished by volunteer youth groups using railroad ties for steps and treated timbers for railings. Certainly this could be accomplished in a manner that would retain the rustic characteristic of the area; yet the question must be raised whether additional visitation at the cemetery would be a good thing. We are of the opinion – comparing the “wear and tear” at Old Cemetery (with relatively modest visitation) to that at New Cemetery (which is far more accessible) that additional visitation at this time would not be in the best interests of the resource and that no effort should be made to improve the pathway or encourage additional visitation.

At the present time pedestrian access within the cemetery is controlled only by the random growth of sagebrush. As a result pedestrian pathways crisscross the cemetery, avoiding sagebrush clumps but otherwise providing direct routes from one item of interest to another. These paths have caused erosion up to 2-inches in depth and are visually distracting.

We hope that eliminating the sagebrush, infilling the erosional paths, and densely planting a suitable grass will begin to heal the landscape. We remain concerned, however, whether this will be adequate to prevent the re-establishment of new pathways. We hope with the sagebrush no longer directly traffic, it will be more dispersed and less likely to cause damage – but this remains an issue which must be monitored.

The simplest solution – the creation of boardwalks, or other pathways in the cemetery – is historically inappropriate. Cemeteries historically had a sufficiently low usage rate that erosional paths were not likely to occur. Today, with perhaps 15% of Bannack’s 30,000 visitors (or 4,500 people) visiting the cemetery every year, some pedestrian control may ultimately be necessary in order to secure the safety of the cemetery.

This principle has already been recognized in the Bannack Management Plan. Goal 1c specifies that normal wear and tear effects from visitors will be limited to ensure the long-term preservation of the site. Specifically a policy is implemented that allows the Park Manager to close site areas on a seasonal or rest-rotation basis. The guiding principle in such decisions is whether the site and its historic fabric are being damaged by over-use.

Midway between the extremes of continued erosion and closing the cemetery, is the possibility of creating some form of low visibility pathways. One means of doing so, without affecting the character of the site, would be to use a soil solidifier on defined pathways laid out to direct pedestrians from one area to another.

Soil solidifiers have been successfully used by historic sites in the East. While they will eventually be damaged by rainfall and wear, needing reconditioning, they are environmentally sound, can last a relatively long time, and provide pathways that do not detract from the landscape or visual character of the cemeteries.

One such product is PolyPavement (323-954-2240, www.polypavement.com). At a cost of 32 to 44¢/ft. it is possible to create pathways that will last from 8 to 12 years. Pathways can be created with an expected life of 3 to 7 years for about 14 to 20¢/ft. The difference, basically, involves the volume of material used and the technique of application (soil mixing versus spraying). Either way, only the upper 2-inches would be disturbed and, for most areas, this is likely to be fill soil given the current level of damage.
Universal access is another difficult issue. The Bannack Management Plan already recognizes this issue and notes that an effort will be made to provide access to site resources through displays and activities at the Visitor Center. While the creation of soil pathways would enhance access, the location of the cemetery makes universal access problematic (see our earlier discussion regarding pedestrian access).

**Vehicular Access**

While the cemetery is only 0.4 mile from the center of Bannack, the route is difficult and, at times, demands a 4-wheel drive vehicle. There is no roadway leading into the cemetery. The cost of improving this access road is likely prohibitive and, given the site’s isolation I don’t believe that improvements would be in the cemetery’s best interests.

Since vehicular traffic is limited to park maintenance, improvements in parking are not necessary.

**Security and Vandalism**

While the cemetery is physically close to Bannack and the various park offices, it remains difficult to monitor since it is not visible from the town and limited access by vehicle hinders any sort of routine patrol.

On the other hand, this limited access to the site has probably worked to help minimize damage to the cemetery. We found no displaced stones or evidence that the wood grave fences were being damaged. There are very few items that would attract theft. And there is no damage to stones that is consistent with vandalism. In general, site use seems to be respectful and of limited concern. In fact, the wear of the ground surface by pedestrians is of far greater importance at New Cemetery.

There is an unlocked fence gate at the north edge of the park property. This gate has not been locked in the past and I am not able to document any indication of past problems. Nevertheless, I recommend that it be locked to prevent unauthorized access to the property and, particularly, to the cemetery.

Ideally the cemetery should be visited by a staff member daily. Given the staffing level, however, this seems unreasonable. Consequently, at least a weekly visit should be made. During this inspection the entire cemetery should be walked, to allow an inspection for damage, loss of historic elements, evidence of vandalism, and assessment of overall site conditions. Ideally this inspection should result in a formal report (a checklist is adequate) that is signed and dated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Suggested Regulatory Signage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Rules for the Enjoyment of Old Cemetery**

1. This cemetery is open from 8:00am until 5:00pm. Anyone on site after those hours is trespassing and is subject to prosecution under Montana State Law 45-6-203.
2. Fire is a constant threat to these fragile historic resources. Please, no smoking or open lights within 50 feet of this cemetery.
3. The stones and graves fences in this cemetery are old and fragile. They are not only sacred remembrances of loved ones, but very significant historic features that belong to all citizens. Please take care not to lean, sit, or in any way damage these features. Parents, please ensure that your children are attended to in order to prevent their injury or damage to the cemetery.
4. For the safety and well-being of others, please refrain from taking any animals into the cemetery.
5. No alcoholic beverages are allowed on Montana public property, including this cemetery.
6. This is a sacred spot where the earliest settlers of Bannack remain buried. Please ensure that the dignity of the site is maintained.

To report any problems, call __________ at any hour.
Figure 6. Sketch map of the Old Cemetery, Bannack State Park, Bannack, Montana.
Site Amenities

There are no site amenities, such as benches, trashcans, or even signage, at Old Cemetery.

Given the difficulty reaching the site and the resulting relatively low level of visitation compared to New Cemetery, I do not recommend the placement of either benches or trashcans.

I do recommend appropriate signage. Two signs are recommended. One should indicate the name of the site, that it is under the control of the Parks Division of the Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks Department, and should list that the cemetery is part of a National Historic Landmark. The second sign should be regulatory in nature – listing appropriate use rules. At a minimum these should include: (1) the hours the cemetery is open for visitation, (2) a prohibition against rubbings, (3) a warning that stones and grave fences are old and fragile, and to avoid leaning or sitting on them, (3) a requirement that all children must be accompanied and monitored by an adult, (4) a prohibition against dogs or other animals in the cemetery, (5) a prohibition against alcohol in the cemetery, (6) a prohibition against smoking or open lights within 50 feet of the cemetery, and (7) a prohibition against inappropriate behavior. A suggested sample is provided by Table 3.

Cemetery Features

This discussion covers wooden grave fences, commercial monuments, fieldstone markers, grave mounds, grave depressions, and the one lot that is elevated above the rest of the cemetery in a cut stonewall.

The cemetery today evidences at least five rows of graves, not all clearly aligned (see Figure 6). These graves are very approximately oriented magnetic west-northwest by east-southeast. It is likely – although unproven at this time – that there were originally at least six rows and that some graves may extend beyond the jack fence on the southwest edge (although this is on a slope).

Wood Grave Fences

We have been unable to identify any previous analysis of wood grave fences and there seems to be no clearly defined protocols for their long-term preservation. These fences, however, are found in a number of western cemeteries, although generally in very small numbers. Their construction, based on available photographs, appears remarkably similar. They are generally the size of a grave, are typically about 4 feet in height, and are constructed rather robustly using heavy corner posts, sometimes plain and occasionally turned. Where better preserved they seem to exhibit some form of upper and lower support for pickets placed between 4 and 6 inches on center. Sometimes
these pickets are carefully worked, at other times they are rather plain. Detailing varies, but the fences are generally well constructed, exhibiting mortise and tendon connections, pegging, and mitered joints. Nails may be either machine cut or wire.

Although we have done no detailed historic research, it seems reasonable that these fences were constructed to ensure the sanctity of the grave – to prevent it from being lost or being desecrated by animals.

As previously discussed, these fences throughout the west tend to be badly weathered, exhibiting checking and splitting of the wood, decay where the corner posts have ground contact, and are frequently either missing their pickets or the fence has completely collapsed.

At Old Cemetery there are eight grave fences still standing (although many are in failure or badly dilapidated) and at least four that have collapsed, today consisting only of fragments.

These are extraordinarily important aspects of the cemetery’s landscape and historic fabric. A very high priority is given to their long-term preservation and that will require careful intervention. As proposed in the preceding discussion, repairs should focus on stabilizing those that are still standing, providing adequate intervention to prevent failure where it is imminent and to provide for the long-term stabilization of the features. The four that have already collapsed should be re-established only as a skeleton using new, but compatible materials (and where possible leaving the remaining original fabric on-site after it has been thoroughly documented). This will allow visitors to better understand the organization and size range of these structures.

**Commercial Monuments**

There are eight commercial monuments at the New Cemetery. At least one of these is a modern granite marker that has been set in concrete. This stone, in particular, creates discordance in the cemetery. We understand that the Park has already gotten a commitment that the stone will be replaced with a marker.

![Figure 8. Example of a collapsed grave fence (Grave 22). Such spots should be marked by a replacement skeleton fence.](image)

![Figure 9. Example of modern monument (Grave 8) that should be replaced with a more historically sensitive memorial.](image)
more fitting for the cemetery. Something in a marble, for example, would be less intrusive and blend in better.

The other monuments are generally in good condition, although many do require resetting. In some cases this work is simple and requires only the use of a 1:2:8 white Portland cement:hydrated mason’s lime:sand or marble dust mortar mix for re-attachment. In other cases ferrous dowels will either need to be replaced or stainless steel dowels will need to be added. In one case a new base must be created for a stone that is found loose, leaning in sagebrush. Individual stone treatments are provided in the appendix.

Fieldstone Markers

Only one burial (Grave 48) clearly uses a fieldstone for marking. Others may exist and the stones have been displaced or covered over.

A critical preservation concern with these markers is that they not be damaged or removed during efforts to remove the sage. They represent an important historical feature and their retention should be given a high priority.

Wooden Headboards

A few headboards are still found in this cemetery, although we suspect that most have disappeared. Since these were a significant feature of all Western graveyards their retention should be given a very high priority.

The level of intervention will depend on the condition of the marker. In general, however, they may be treated like the grave fences, with the below grade portion of the marker treated with epoxy and the above grade segment whitewashed.

Grave Mounds and Depressions

Both of these features can be easily damaged or obscured by maintenance activities.

The grave mounds at the Old Cemetery are clearly defined stacks of soil, gravel, and cobbles and represent materials that were stacked on top of the grave. They may be disturbed by removing sagebrush, pedestrian activities, or leveling previous pedestrian pathways.

The grave depressions are most likely the result of coffins and/or human remains decomposing and allowing the overlying soil to collapse. They may be disturbed by leveling efforts in the cemetery filling the depressions with new soil. I encourage the depressions to be left unaltered in order to preserve the historic character of the cemetery. If, however, they must be filled to avoid liability, no filling or leveling should be done until the depressions are checked against the cemetery map (Figure 6).
and the location is verified. These depressions mark graves that would, if filled, be lost without prior recordation.

**Elevated Family Lot**

There is one lot that is surrounded by a 3-foot wall of dry laid coursed rubble consisting of roughly squared sandstone. The interior of the wall has been filled with soil and a marble pedestal tomb is placed in the lot (Trask lot; Grave 5). This lot – both today and historically – dominates the cemetery and is one of the defining elements. The memorial is clearly seen in the 1882 photograph as a small, dark squared feature blocking several of the whitewashed wood grave fences (see Figure 5).

The west wall has collapsed and much of the retained soil has eroded out. The rocks were piled back in the lot, although no effort was made to reconstruct the wall. This feature requires immediate intervention since it is such a prominent aspect of the cemetery. The lot is also filled with sagebrush and the monument requires resetting.

**Priorities**

A variety of issues should be addressed at Old Cemetery, without any indication of priority, these include:

- the removal of sagebrush, filling of pedestrian paths, and seeding of native grass
- the preservation of the wood grave fences

![Figure 11. Trask plot west wall showing its current condition. This wall requires immediate intervention.](image)

![Figure 12. Trask plot showing south wall and original dry laid wall condition.](image)
The whitewashing of the grave fences
the setting up of skeleton fences
the preservation of wood headboards
the resetting of commercial monuments
the replacement of the one modern marker
the erection of signage
the removal of the juniper tree in the cemetery
locking of the gate uphill from the cemetery
instituting weekly patrols of the cemetery, and
repair of the Trask wall

This represents a range of actions – some of which are relatively inexpensive and require only reallocation of staff time (such as the weekly patrol or locking of the gate) to those that can be achieved within the current funding level, but require planning (such as the removal of the juniper tree and sagebrush) to those that will require additional funding (such as the resetting of markers and repair of the fences). To help the Park plan for the different actions, Table 4 is a decision matrix that may help prioritize these different actions.

Using this decision matrix we see that landscape intervention issues – removing the juniper, rehabilitating the grass (i.e., removing the sagebrush and planting native grass), and erecting signage – rank very high. This suggests that these three items – while not involving any conservation treatments – should be immediately implemented as the highest priorities.

These first three items are then followed by two items – locking the property gate and instituting weekly patrols – that can be accomplished with little time or money (although they have very low public visibility and therefore don’t rank particularly high). These, too, should be done immediately.

Toward the bottom half of the list are a range of conservation treatments. Some are very important, but all rank relatively lower since they have relatively higher costs and, in some cases, won’t attract a great deal of public notice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Urgency</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remove juniper tree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate grass</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erect signage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lock property gate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly patrols</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair Trask wall</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitewash wall</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reset stones</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create skeleton fences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epoxy treat wood</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair fences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluated 1-5, 5 most urgent, lowest cost or time, highest positive impact)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEW CEMETERY

Landscape Character

The new cemetery is situated about 1.5 miles northwest of Bannack. While situated adjacent to a major road, the cemetery is outside the direct overview of the Bannack Park staff. This relatively isolated location has security implications that will be discussed in a following section. The topography is level, representing a broad plateau with a very gradual slope to the southwest (see Figure 2).

As previously discussed, this is called the “New Cemetery” since it is thought that the townspeople began shifting to the use of this plot in the 1870s, although burials continued at the Old Cemetery until at least 1906.

The new cemetery encompasses about 2.2 acres – significantly larger than the Old Cemetery and this size – coupled with the level topography – is certainly part of the landscape character. Upon entering the cemetery there is a wide expanse of burials, representing different forms and materials. Perhaps most notable are the large number of standing grave fences – far more than we have seen documented at other western frontier or “boot hill” cemeteries. These fences represent a very significant cultural element.

These fences today, however, are somewhat masked by the dense sagebrush that has been allowed to grow up in the cemetery. As will be discussed below, we view this sagebrush as volunteer growth that detracts from the landscape character, as well as affects the long-term preservation of the cemetery as both a historic site and a sacred place.

With additional vegetation maintenance, these fences would become the single most important three-dimensional feature of the cemetery. As such we will encourage considerable efforts to preserve and protect these remains as significant contributors to the “Bannack Experience.”

The viewshed of this cemetery has been negatively affected by a large utility substation adjacent to the north. Of less impact (since similar features would have existed historically)
are the above ground utility poles bordering the edge of the highway to the west. While it is unlikely that the substation can be moved or that any visual buffering is possible, Bannack should be careful to ensure that no additional intrusions are allowed.

Similarly, the current graveled access road and parking area to the west of the cemetery are somewhat harsh and detract from the overall appearance of the cemetery. There is a historic entrance to the cemetery at its south edge and a road runs through the cemetery, likely a vestige of when burials were taking place at the cemetery. It is not appropriate to allow access through this gate into the cemetery (nor is access currently possible since the cattle guard has collapsed), but consideration should be given to softening the parking area (and this will be discussed below).

**Vegetation**

Unfortunately we have no photographs of what the New Cemetery looked like during its period of greatest use – probably the first quarter of the twentieth century. Nevertheless, it is today overrun with sagebrush (see Figures 13 and 14) and this is causing significant problems.

Many of the sagebrush issues were previously discussed for Old Cemetery, but they bear at least brief repetition. The sagebrush, most fundamentally is inappropriate in a historic cemetery – it would not have been allowed during the period of active use and it is inconsistent with what is still a sacred site. Its associations with “abandonment” are, in fact, what makes it so incompatible with this site.

In addition, the sagebrush is causing pedestrians to create deeply worn and eroded paths through the cemetery (Figure 14) and these are damaging the visual integrity, feeling, and sense of place.

![Figure 14. View of paths created through the dense sagebrush vegetation. Note also how the grave fences dominate the visual landscape and represent the most significant three-dimensional focus in New Cemetery.](image)

Finally, the sagebrush is creating a wildfire hazard that is unacceptable at this very fragile historic site. Any fire will cause extensive damage or loss of wood grave fences and wood headboards, as well as damage to marble stones.

As a consequence, one of our strongest recommendations is that all sagebrush from within the fenced cemetery be immediately removed and replaced with native grasses. In addition, a defensible perimeter should be cleared around the outside edge of the cemetery to assist in minimizing the fire danger.

As previously discussed, the sagebrush can be removed using 2-cycle gas trimmers fitted with circular saw blades. These will allow
easy cutting of the sagebrush, that can then be hand collected and removed from the cemetery for disposal.

Afterwards all erosional areas must be filled with suitable soil by hand and then native grasses, such as wheatgrass, needlegrass, big bluestem, or other plants that are part of the original climax community in the area should be planted.

Given the size of the cemetery, and the need to keep pedestrians off the seeded areas, there has been some discussion of possibly phasing this process. While I would prefer to see it done immediately, as a single phase – even if that required closing the cemetery to pedestrian traffic for a season – I can appreciate the possible need to phase the operation.

If phasing is done I recommend that the cemetery be divided immediately south of the current pedestrian gate. That would allow the north half to be seeded while access to the south half was made through the vehicle gate at the south end. Then the south end could be closed for seeding and access to the north half of the cemetery could be accessed through the pedestrian gate. The exterior sagebrush removal for fire control should be part of the project’s first phase.

During this operation I encourage the Park to develop signage explaining to the public what is being done and asking their patience and cooperation. Something such as the verbiage in Table 5 might be appropriate, although you may also wish to add further information about the type(s) of native grasses being used, creating a mini-ecology exhibit.

No other vegetation (such as trees or intentional plantings) was identified at the site and we do not feel that the addition of any other materials would be appropriate.
Pedestrian and Universal Access

We have previously discussed (for Old Cemetery) our concern that the cemetery usage may cause new erosional paths in the native grasses. This concern is based on the very heavy visitation of the cemetery and absence of any means to direct foot traffic.

Pathways in the cemetery are historically inappropriate - the cemetery, historically, never had the level of visitation to make pathways a necessity. That may be changing today, especially if there is no feasible means of limiting foot traffic in the cemetery.

Modern paths of concrete, brick, asphalt, or even boards are particularly inappropriate. They are too harsh and visually intrusive. Gravel paths might be acceptable, but even they would create distinct features that clash with the landscape and ambience of the cemetery.

A more appropriate approach, we believe, is the use of a soil solidifier to create dirt pathways. These would blend into the landscape and appear natural, rather than artificial.

The product previously mentioned (and there are others) is PolyPavement (323-954-2240, www.polypavement.com). This is a liquid that is mixed into soil tilled to a depth of 2-inches, compacted, and allowed to set. At a cost of 32 to 44¢/ft. it is possible to create pathways that will last from 8 to 12 years. While this is admittedly a high front-end cost, it would provide a relatively long-term solution and prevent extensive maintenance needs.

More critical would be establishing where pathways need to be established, laying them out in a manner that doesn’t create discordance in the cemetery, and then encouraging pedestrians to stay on the paths.

Establishing pathways can often be accomplished effectively by a landscape architect - and the Parks Division of the Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks Department may have such in-house expertise. A critical element is to attempt to prevent straight line paths and instead wind the pathway from one interesting feature to another. Pedestrians can be encouraged to stay on such paths by occasional signage, ranging from an explanation of why the paths are necessary, to “Please Don’t” placed in paths that are in the process of being created.

Regardless of the approach used, it is critical that the Park begin to take control of public access in the cemetery. For too long pedestrians have been allowed to go, and do, whatever they liked. At least part of this attitude by visitors, we believe, is based on the site being seen as an extension of an abandoned town, rather than a sacred - and historic - cemetery. In such circumstances the public may mistakenly believe that “abandoned” is equated with “no longer cared for.” By removing the sagebrush and reseeding, the Park will be taking a very large step toward reclaiming the cemetery. Visitors will begin to see the cemetery being treated as a valuable asset and will be reminded that it is cared-for graveyard. This will be further reinforced by appropriate signage (discussed below).

If pathways are ultimately put into place – and we believe there is some justification for doing so - they should be 48-inches in width where possible to allow for handicapped access. The level topography of this site, combined with its proximity to a road and parking area, make universal access a cost-effective undertaking. This is particularly important since neither Old Cemetery nor the Maryville Cemetery can reasonably be made accessible.

Vehicular Access

The access road to Bannack State Park is only 200 feet from the cemetery. This presents mixed blessings - the site is readily accessible for maintenance and security, but it is also readily accessible to vandals. Moreover, the site is 1.5 miles from the Park presence, making management even more difficult. In addition, the cemetery may be “happened upon” by
visitors before they arrive at the formal Park entrance and are advised of different Park rules.

Regardless, the access is there and part of the Park’s plan must be how to deal with this situation. A variety of security recommendations are offered in the following section. In terms of the access road and parking lot themselves, we have several suggestions. While the gravel access road may be appropriate – and even necessary given the climate of the area – the parking lot, in such close proximity to the cemetery, is a harsh feature.

Ideally the parking area should be moved away from the cemetery, perhaps closer to the road, and a winding interpretative path created leading to the cemetery. This would provide some separation between automobiles and the historic fabric, promoting greater reverence and a more peaceful nature within the cemetery. It would also allow a greater opportunity for interpretation of the cemetery along the pathway leading to the site, should the Park chose to do so in the future.

At a minimum, we recommend that the parking area be softened, perhaps by converting it from gravel to soil (using a soil solidifier if necessary).

The need for maintaining the southern vehicular gate into the cemetery should be carefully evaluated. Currently it is unusable since the wood cattle guard has collapsed. This suggests that there has been no recent need to get maintenance vehicles in the cemetery and the simplest solution would be to fill the ditch and close the opening with fencing. If vehicular access is needed (perhaps as part of the fire plan or perhaps for the removal of sagebrush and seeding), then the cattle guard should be replaced and a suitable gate erected (and locked) to prevent unauthorized entrance.

Similarly, we encourage the Park to evaluate the need for the road that surrounds the cemetery on the outside of the fence. While working at the cemetery we noticed one vehicle that drove around the outside of the cemetery; they never stopped and actually visited the cemetery. This sort of “drive-by” tourism should be discouraged since it will ultimately damage the fragile ecosystem, including the historic fabric of the cemetery.

If the road is needed for fence maintenance one solution would be to erect wood bollards placed in concrete holes with locks. These could be quickly removed for access, but would eliminate casual drivers.

**Security and Vandalism**

We found that easy site access was affecting the historic fabric of the cemetery. We have previously mentioned the pathways that in some cases have caused erosion 2 to 3-inches into the soil. We also found at least one footstone displaced from its headstone by 200 feet – suggesting that it had been picked up, perhaps as a souvenir, and later abandoned (perhaps as other visitors arrived). We have also found pickets far displaced from their wooden grave fences. We also observed wood headboards in sound condition broken off at ground level as though kicked. The one family plot with a cast iron fence has lost its gate to theft.

These problems are made all the worse by the distance from the Bannack Park and the oversight of staff.

We again emphasize that at least some of this damage is the result of a lack of signage and a feeling of abandonment that encourages visitors – absent any education to the contrary – to believe that there is no need to show respect and care for the cemetery.

Consequently, a variety of actions are critically needed to take control of the cemetery and help visitors understand that the graveyard is not only part of a “park,” but it is also a sacred spot, an outdoor museum, and part of a fragile ecosystem.

Several actions already proposed or to be proposed will assist. Removing the
sagebrush, previously recommended, will assist not only by making the cemetery looked more cared for and less “abandoned,” but it will also help provide more open sight lines through the cemetery, allowing better visual control. Moving the parking area further away from the cemetery will make it somewhat more difficult to remove items from the cemetery. Repairing the grave fences and conducting treatments on the stones, to be proposed in a following section, will also assist in giving the cemetery a more cared for appearance. One of the most important first steps is the erection of regulatory signage and this will be discussed in the section below on amenities. Taken together we believe that these actions will help reduce harsh use.

In terms of traditional security issues, we believe that the gate to the cemetery should be locked when the park is closed and unlocked when the park is opened the following day. This would, of course, require that the vehicle opening in the fence be either closed or gated as well.

A greater presence of Park staff would also make a difference and, to this end, we recommend establishing periodic patrols of the site. Given its distance from the Park we understand that this is difficult, but we also believe that this distance makes a routine patrol all the more important. Consequently, we hope that at least a daily patrol will be possible (as well as a brief opening and closing inspection on a daily basis) during the active season and perhaps a once a week patrol (as well as a brief opening and closing inspections on a daily basis) during the off season.

The one gate that is left in the cemetery, a pipe fence gate, is not a particularly valuable commodity. Nevertheless, we recommend that the gate be secured using stainless steel cable. This will serve to harden the target, making it more difficult (although not impossible) to steal.

The current site fence, while not particularly attractive, is acceptable and likely represents one type that would have been present historically. In the future, when fence repair/replacement becomes necessary we do recommend that the area encompassed be increased. There is at least one clearly defined grave and possibly one additional grave outside the current fence. Moving the fence out 50 feet in all directions would provide a buffer zone for fire control within the fenced area and would be nearly certain to include any outlying graves.

The new fence may be a woven wire such as is present on the front (i.e., west face) currently, but the use of barbed wire (found to the north, east, and south) should be avoided. A better alternative would be a 2x4 no-climb woven wire fence, since that would deter climbers when the gates are locked.

An even more appropriate choice – although slightly more expensive – would be a decorative woven wire. Such fences were typical in cemeteries during the period from about 1900 through 1940 and would soften the generally harsh and utilitarian appearance of most fences. This type of mesh is difficult to acquire. We have identified three manufacturers in the region: Davis Wire (877-328-4748, www.daviswire.com/products/ag/info_predator.html), Hutchinson Fence (406-254-8095, www.hutchinson-inc.com/html/fence_wire/fence/ornamental.php), and American Fence (512-930-4000, www.afence.com/SpecialtyFenceCAT/loopwire.htm).

Site Amenities

At the present time there are no amenities at the cemetery – no trash can, no benches, no bathroom facilities, and no signage. For the most part we believe this is appropriate. There are, however, two issues that the Park should quickly address.
As with the case at Old Cemetery, the single greatest need is for regulatory signage. That proposed in Table 3 for Old Cemetery is equally appropriate for the New Cemetery. Should walkways be established it would be appropriate to include an additional request that visitors stay on the established paths.

During our inspection of the cemetery we found a very large number of cigarette butts throughout the cemetery. Absent any warning against smoking this is understandable. Nevertheless, this practice is not only dangerous, but also unsightly. We recommend two steps to contain the practice.

First, in addition to the general signage there should be a second sign that, again, points out the danger and requests that visitors not smoke (see Table 6). This sign should be displayed prominently in the parking area (while the other warning against smoking will be on the regulatory signage at the entrance to the cemetery).

Second, we recommend a fireproof butt can for the cemetery, providing a safe location for individuals to deposit their cigarettes. One source is Johnsons Environmental Products (800-652-1222; http://www.buttstop.com). While there is the common plastic version that seems strangely out of place no matter where placed, this firm also has far more discrete (and longer-lasting) stainless steel models.

### Utilities

There are no utilities present on-site. We do not recommend any modifications. Vegetation should be appropriate for the climate and not require artificial watering. Bathrooms and water fountains would be out of place at this cemetery and create needless maintenance problems for a park staff that is already stretched too thin. Lighting might deter night-time vandalism, but we have seen no good evidence that damage to the cemetery is occurring at night. It seems far more likely that most damage is being done during normal visiting hours. We also discourage the placement of any poles within or immediately adjacent to the cemetery.

### Iron Fences

There are three iron fences in the cemetery - one is a decorative cast iron example, another is a pipe rail fence, and the third consists of decorative woven wire attached to a metal pipe frame. There are two additional fences that, while wooden, incorporate metal elements - one has decorative woven wire
attached and the other has wrought hairpin sections incorporated into a wood frame.

These five fences represent a range of different types and they make a significant contribution to the landscape character of the cemetery. They are deserving of efforts to ensure their long-term preservation.

The cast iron fence (Plot 5) includes a front element (facing west) of bow and picket with open or scroll posts. The remaining three sides are a more simple picket design (Figure 18). The gate for this fence was stolen several years ago. This is a most unfortunate and regrettable loss of historic fabric.

The pipe rail fence consists of sections of galvanized pipe and cast white metal connectors, using cast iron corner posts (Plot 22). This is a relatively common design with corner urns and a somewhat similar design was found in Dillon’s Mount View cemetery.

The woven wire fence on a metal pipe frame (Plot 28) is of special interest since the fencing was attached using wire nails placed in drilled holed and bent upward as hooks to catch the woven fabric. This is a rather unique solution and indicates local invention.

At Plot 91 there is a conventional wood grave fence frame. Instead of wood pickets, however, the builder used sections of wrought bow elements with a decorative top picket design (Figure 21). This is an unusual fence and it required considerable skill to set the metal in a consistent, overlapping fashion.

The final example, at Plot 111, is another traditional wood grave fence frame, but it has been covered with woven wire, rather than encased with pickets. This fence is of special interest since remnants of a white paint or whitewash can still be seen on the woven sections of fence.

Figure 18. Fence at Plot 5 showing the open or scroll gate posts, bow and picket design on the front sections, and simple picket design on the remaining sides.

Figure 19. Pipe rail fence at Plot 22 showing a corner post.
All of these fences are in need of immediate intervention. In the case of the decorative cast iron fence, sections need to be removed from soil, and other sections need to be better secured. The pipe rail fence requires more extensive repairs to prevent sections from being stolen or suffering additional damage. All of the fences should be immediately painted in order to protect the metal from further deterioration.

Ferrous metal should be treated with a rust converter. Corrosion on the metals is so light that no surface preparation (such as scraping or air abrasives) is necessary. Appropriate materials are either Rust Reformer (a Rust-o- leum product available at hardware stores) or CCI 921 (Corrosion Control Industries, 877-661-7878, www.neutralrustinc.com/neutralrust661.htm).

Afterwards the metal should be coated with two light coats of an appropriate alkyd paint as recommended by the manufacturer. In the case of the Rust-o- leum product one of their semi-gloss paints would be appropriate. The CCI-921 requires top coating with CCI Flex Coat. Wood elements should be whitewashed (see below).

Wood Grave Fences

The wood grave fences that have been previously discussed for Old Cemetery and the importance of their long-term preservation cannot be overstressed. They are critical elements of the cemetery and providing defining character. Given their fragility, they should receive a very high treatment priority.

The fences at New Cemetery are very similar to those from Old Cemetery, and while there is considerable variability Figures 23 and 24 illustrate some of the variations. Corner posts measure between 4 and 6-inches square. These posts all appear to have had some degree of finishing or decoration, ranging from several caps to mitered molding. There is a top and bottom rail, generally 2 by 4-inches and often mortised into the corner posts. There are bottom boards, generally 1 by 10-inches and at the top of these there is often a piece of 1 by 2 serving as a water course or

Figure 20. Woven wire fence on metal posts at Plot 28.

Figure 21. Example of metal bow design set in a wood grave fence frame at Plot 91.
molding. These 1 by 10s are often, but not always, mitered.

The pickets may be attached to the surface of the 2x4 rails or, more frequently were set into the rails, often being covered by a piece of molding. Pickets range from simple points to more elaborate scroll work.

Most of the enclosures were solid, having no gate or access ports. A few, however, did have gates, although often the entrance was of very limited size and, as seen in Figure 24, was limited by the top and bottom rails.

Both machine cut and wire nails are found in the fences, as well as pegs (although generally the use of pegs is limited to attaching the rails to the corner posts when mortise and tendon joints are present).

Deterioration as wood rot is found where the corner posts make ground contact. Elsewhere the primary form of deterioration is weathering – checking, cracking, and erosion of the wood, often accompanied by loosening and failure of nailed members (although the nails rarely show significant corrosion or failure).

We have previously recommended a rather limited approach to the treatment of these objects. We have recommended that where there is active rot and the posts are in danger of failure, that an epoxy consolidant be used. We have also suggested that where the wood is still sound consideration be given to the use of a solid boron rod, such as Impel Rods, to deter rot.

We have also recommended that
where wood elements (such as pickets, base boards, or moldings) are loose and in danger of being lost, they should be reattached using appropriate nails. Otherwise, we discourage the replacement of lost elements or other more aggressive interventions. As a final step we recommend that the fences be whitewashed – this step is not only historically appropriate, but the whitewashing will help the wood resist further weathering.

Where fences are in the process of failing, we suggest more aggressive intervention to prevent that failure. This may consist of replacing one or more corner posts. The goal should not be to reconstruct the fences, but rather to prevent further loss of historic fabric.

There are several areas where wood fences have collapsed, although dimensions and placement are still very clear. In those areas we recommend that skeleton fences be erected and whitewashed in order to give visitors a sense of the original cemetery. The remains of the original fence should be documented and allowed to remain on site – providing a visual reminder to visitors of the site’s age and the inability of any human construction to last forever.

**Copings**

Although there is only one family lot with concrete coping, several graves do have this type of coping material. Some are in excellent condition, while several are in advanced states of deterioration. Where the concrete has failed it seems clearly associated with the use of very large, rounded cobble aggregate typical of the mine tailing piles found around Bannack. These cobbles are especially poor aggregate and we suspect the concrete failed over repeated freeze-thaw cycles.

Where the coping has failed it will probably be ineffectual to attempt repair.
remove it, and replace the coping with a new pour.

There are some grave copings where the deterioration is limited. In those cases it is possible to repair the concrete – and this is likely to be less costly than removal and replacement. The appropriate approach is to remove all damaged concrete and extend the removal to a depth of 2-inches beyond the damage. The new surface should be roughened to help ensure good adhesion of new material. Depending on the degree of damage it may be necessary to install fiberglass rebar set in epoxy to help tie the existing concrete with the new pour. Suitable fiberglass rods can be obtained from Preservation Resource Group (800-774-7891, www.prginc.com/epoxies/fiberglass. html). The concrete is then coated with an epoxy bonding agent (examples include Fosroc Nitobond EP, Tamms Duralcrete, or equivalent) applied according to the manufacturer’s directions. New air-entrained concrete is added to match the original in strength, color, finish, and profile.

**Commercial Markers**

The cemetery includes a range of marble and granite markers. These are generally in good condition with only two damaged stones. There are, however, a very large number of stones that require resetting. As previously discussed, this may entail simply resetting with a 1:2:8 mix of white Portland cement, hydrated mason’s lime, and suitable aggregate (either sand or marble dust) or it may require that pre-existing ferrous dowels be removed and replaced with stainless steel dowels to prevent jacking from corrosion products. In some cases the original stone failed to incorporate dowels and they may need to be added for additional security.

There are also stones that need to be reset in the ground – being entirely loose on the surface of the cemetery or that are severely tilted.

In general this work requires a conservator, although Park maintenance staff or
Figure 29. Sketch map of New Cemetery, Bannack State Park, Bannack, Montana.
volunteers could reset those stones that are either tilted or out of the ground.

**Wood Markers**

There are a number of wood markers still standing in the cemetery. Only one appears to be modern (exhibiting galvanized Phillips head screws); the remainder are all historic and in generally deteriorating condition. Most are suffering from the same problems reported for the wood grave fences – and treatments should be similar.

Those markers that are intact but suffering from ground contact decay should be removed from the ground and the below grade portion strengthened using epoxy impregnation. The above grade portion, which is generally heavily weathered, should be painted with a lime whitewash. They should then be reset.

There are several wood markers that appear to have been vandalized – being kicked and broken at ground level. Intact wood is still visible below grade and the fracture is clearly defined. These can be repaired by removing the below grade section and treating using epoxy consolidants. An inch or so of the above grade portion should likewise be impregnated with epoxy. The two sections should then be joined with epoxy. Stainless steel straps may be necessary to provide support, but these will be at or below grade and therefore not noticeable.

**Priorities**

There is a rather long list of needs at New Cemetery. Some of the concerns previously discussed are the result of several decades of deferred maintenance. Other problems are the inevitable result of a site being “too loved,” that is, having too many visitors. As this list of needs is examined, the initial reaction might well be one of hopelessness – a feeling that there are just too many things that need to be done, too little money, and too few staff. This is, of course, why priorities are so important. Not all of the needs are equal in urgency – not all will result in equal visitor or supporter appreciation – and not all are costly. By creating – as was done at Old Cemetery – a decision matrix, it is possible to...
more appropriately evaluate the needs and establish long-term budgets and actions.

The issues raised in the preceding discussions include (in no particular order):

- remove the sagebrush from the cemetery
- fill erosional areas and plant native grasses
- create pathways using a soil stabilizer
- move and soften the parking lot
- repair (and secure) the vehicle entrance to the cemetery
- close the surrounding road with bollards
- create signage for the cemetery
- lock the cemetery gate daily
- create a formalized system for patrolling the cemetery
- replace the current fence with a woven wire fence
- create No Smoking signs and install a suitable butt can
- repair the cast iron and pipe rail fences
- paint all metal fences in the cemetery
- conduct epoxy treatment of the below grade portions of the wood fence posts
- use boron treatment for wood rot where appropriate
- reattach loose parts of the wooden grave fences
- whitewash the wood grave fences
- replace posts of wooden grave fences as necessary to prevent failure
- erect skeleton fences to mark locations where fences are known to have once stood
- repair concrete copings
- repair monuments
- reset monuments
- conduct epoxy treatments of wood headboards
- repair broken wood headboards, and
- revise flower policy.

Table 7 lists these items based on the combine scores of urgency; cost; time to implement; and the positive impact of the action on the site, family, or visitors.

The two highest rated actions are the installation of a butt can (along with additional “no smoking” signage) and revising the flower policy. The first action is deemed critical since fire is such an extreme danger to the site and a very large number of cigarette butts were found in the cemetery. Moreover, it is relatively inexpensive to implement, can be accomplished quickly, and is likely to have a significant impact on the site. Likewise, a revision of the flower policy, while not quite as urgent, will result in a marked visual improvement of the cemetery, can be quickly accomplished, and will have positive benefits to visitors.

Following these initial two actions are six deemed of near equal priority. The first is the erection of regulatory signage. This is relatively inexpensive, can be accomplished quickly, will have a significant impact on the care given the cemetery, and is considered urgent since there are, at present, no posted rules.

The next five items include resetting stones (critical to avoid loss of historic fabric), painting the iron fences (critical to prevent additional corrosion and to provide a more realistic view of the cemetery), reattaching loose wood grave fence items (critical to prevent loss of these items), replacing wood grave fence posts (critical to prevent failure of some fences), and repair of the wood markers (critical since these monuments are especially fragile and are being lost at an alarming rate). This last item, however, helps illustrate how the decision matrix must be carefully interpreted.

Repair of the wood markers – while very important – should be combined with their epoxy treatment since one action without the other is pointless. Likewise, it may be appropriate to repair the iron fences (with a score of 15) prior to painting the fences (with a score of 18).

Very high on this list is the need to repair the two damaged markers – prior to additional damage or loss. This illustrates another feature of the matrix table – it does not...
take into consideration cost savings by combining actions.

In other words, by combining some treatments (such as monument repair, resetting monuments, and ironwork treatments) there can be a substantial saving over doing them at separate times.

At the bottom of the recommended actions are replacing the perimeter fence and moving the parking lot – two issues that are likely to be relatively expensive, take considerable time to accomplish, and that while important, are not considered immediately critical. In a similar fashion, the creation of skeleton fences and repairing the vehicle entrance (and cattle guard) would be good things to do (the former would help interpret the site to visitors and the latter would provide maintenance access to the cemetery), neither is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Urgency</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Install butt can (&amp; signage)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise flower policy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erect signage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reset stones</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint iron fences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reattach loose fence parts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace grave fence posts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair wood markers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair broken monuments</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate grass</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitewash fences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epoxy treat wood markers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair iron fences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish pathways</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lock property gate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly patrols</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close surrounding road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boron treat for rot</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair concrete copings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epoxy treat wood fences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create skeleton fences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair vehicle entrance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace perimeter fence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move parking lot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluated 1-5, 5 most urgent, lowest cost or time, highest positive impact

And while the epoxy treatment of the fences scores only 13, we should point out that this relatively low score is the result of the action’s high cost and low visual impact. In spite of this the action is considered very critical for the long-term preservation of the fences - and they, in turn are considered critical for the long-term preservation of the cemetery’s visual and historic character.

An effort should be made to minimize costs by combining actions - for example, it is likely that the cost of creating two signs (one for New Cemetery and one for Old Cemetery) will be less than if each had a sign created a few months apart. We encourage the Park to take advantage of savings of scale and to combine actions into an appropriate flow of resources. In a similar manner, it may be appropriate to combine some actions on the basis of available summer help, even when the individual actions not be rated as high as others. In other words, adapt the decision matrix to the situation at hand.
MARYVILLE CEMETERY

Landscape Character

Situated about 0.7 mile from Bannack, this is a seemingly small cemetery that is difficult to recognize and rarely visited. It is situated on a ridge nose that can reached only by a back road and a short walk up a relatively steep hill. Only a few graves appear to be present.

Vegetation is primarily native grass, although sagebrush is intruding from the east and west slopes. There are, however, no clearly defining vegetative characteristics.

Grave markings, for the most part, are small and leave little visual impression. There was, at one time, at least one wood grave fence and that feature, if intact, would be a central element that would help define the cemetery’s landscape.

Historic Context

While both the Old and New Cemeteries require additional historic research, the need for research at the Maryville Cemetery is particularly strong. We understand that the cemetery is named for a nearby mining community (originally called Centerville), that was a “suburb” of Bannack. Yet there is little information concerning either the rise, or demise, of this community. Nor is there any information concerning how this community differed from Bannack. Or why the community might need its own cemetery. Or why, if a cemetery was needed, it was so small. In fact, we must question whether this cemetery is, in fact, associated with Maryville or whether it might be a small family plot.

Figure 32. View of the Maryville Cemetery looking south. The cemetery is situated in the foreground of the utility pole (a collapsed wood grave fence is visible in the center of the photograph).
Of course none of these issues directly affect the development of a preservation plan for this cemetery, although they certainly affect how the cemetery is interpreted to the public and the signage that is erected. Indirectly the results of additional historic research may affect preservation by pointing out the need to increase the size of the cemetery’s boundaries.

Vegetation

As previously mentioned, the site, at a macroscale, is dominated by native grasses and encroaching sagebrush (see Figure 32). Yet when we look more closely (Figure 33) we see that the soil is very rocky and largely barren of any vegetation. At least some areas of the cemetery appear to have been worked and explorative trenches intrude on several graves (although no human remains were visible at the time of this assessment).

The sagebrush, because of the very low site visitation, is not creating erosional pathways. Its only hazard to the cemetery, in fact, is its flammability.

At this site it seems appropriate to remove the sagebrush – for fire control assistance – although there seems to be little reason to attempt to establish additional native grass.

Pedestrian and Universal Access

At the present time there is no substantial pedestrian access – the site is not part of any Bannack tour and being unmarked, it is does not attract hikers. At this use level we see no need to promote pathways or be concerned with efforts to control movement on the site.

Likewise, the site is not a realistic candidate for universal access. It is very far removed from accessible roads (as well as supervision) and the steep slopes would require extensive work to make it accessible even for hikers.

Vehicular Access

The base of the ridge is accessible by vehicle – at least during the dry season. Since this site has little, or no, visitation we see no reason to improve access. In fact, the site is so far removed from Park supervision that we believe it is best served by not being promoted.

Security and Vandalism

This appears to be a very little known site and, receiving little visitation, it is not subject to many of the problems found at both Old and New Cemetery. In addition, the Park has already taken some useful security precautions. For example, the road leading to the site has a locked gate – and this is a good measure since a parked car at the gate would attract more attention than a car parked at the base of this very isolated ridge.
As suggested for the other cemeteries, this site should be routinely inspected. We would like to suggest weekly, but recognize that this is probably unrealistic given the size of the Park’s staff. Consequently, we recommend that there be a formalized inspection monthly. This should help identify problems such as vandalism or erosion.

We also recommend that the site be fenced as soon as practical. As an initial, cost-effective step, a jack fence would be appropriate. Approximately 240 linear feet of fencing material would be required.

Coupled with this fence we recommend signage for the site. Since the cemetery has very low visitation we recommend very rudimentary signage, such as that suggested by Table 8.

We do not recommend that the explorative mine pits in the cemetery be covered or backfilled. Given the low visitation it seems unlikely that they pose any significant threat (although the Park should independently assess this risk). We also believe that the mining activities – even in the midst of a cemetery – are an important part of the “Bannack Experience,” as well as the Bannack storyline. If interpretation of this site is ever prepared, there should be a discussion of how the greed for wealth was so great that nothing – not even a cemetery – was sacred.

**Site Amenities**

There are no site amenities at the Maryville Cemetery, nor do we recommend any given its low visitation and isolated location.

**Cemetery Features**

The Maryville Cemetery consists of nine clearly identifiable grave mounds forming a single line oriented south-southwest by north-northeast. It is possible that a second row exists to the west, although this is difficult to determine since there is much disturbance from exploratory mining pits on the edge of the cemetery. Three of the nine mounds are marked by fieldstones at the head of the graves, three more are marked by stones at the foot, and one is marked by stones at both the head and foot. A single grave has no marker (although a mound is clearly present) and the final grave is marked.

---

**Table 8. Suggested Regulatory Signage**

**Maryville Cemetery**

This cemetery is under the control of Bannack State Park (Parks Division of the Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks Department).

This is a sacred spot where the earliest settlers of Bannack remain buried. Please ensure that the dignity of the site is maintained.

For access or to report any problems, call ________ at any hour.

---
Figure 35. Sketch map of the Maryville Cemetery.
by a commercial granite marker. There are also the remains of a single wood grave fence that has collapsed and been spread over an area measuring about 20 feet in diameter. Since the area is heavily disturbed by mining, it is impossible to be certain where this fence was originally situated (archaeological investigations might identify the location, although we doubt that such work is necessary for appropriate long-term preservation actions).

The commercial marker is of some interest since the Park staff reports that it simply “appeared” there. The stone is a plaque marker for Bernard Dowling (1804-1865). Its sudden appearance indicates that someone outside the Park knows of the cemetery’s location and believes they know which grave is that of their ancestor. An effort should be made to identify the kin of Bernard Dowling since they may be able to contribute to our historic understanding of the cemetery.

Unfortunately the stone is not particularly sensitive to the historic character of the cemetery. Given the low incidence of visitation, however, it seems unnecessary to attempt replacement. The Park, however, should work toward avoiding additional modern stones of this type being placed in the cemetery.

While we have elsewhere recommended that the lost wood grave enclosures be replaced by skeleton fences to help restore (or maintain) the landscape character, this practice is not appropriate at Maryville since it is impossible to determine where the fence was originally constructed.

Figure 36. Plot 1, grave of Bernard Dowling, view to the west.

Figure 37. Area of collapsed wood grave fence. Notice how the fence is spread over a relatively large area, possibly by the excavation of the exploratory pits.
Priorities

Because of the relative isolation of the Maryville Cemetery we offer few recommendations for changes. The issues raised in the preceding discussions include (in no particular order):

- remove the sagebrush from the cemetery
- create signage for the cemetery
- create a formalized system for patrolling the cemetery
- install a jack fence around the cemetery, and
- conduct additional historical research.

Table 8 lists these items based on the combine scores of urgency; cost; time to implement; and the positive impact of the action on the site, family, or visitors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Urgency</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erect signage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove sagebrush</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install jack fence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly patrols</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct historic research</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluated 1-5, 5 most urgent, lowest cost or time, highest positive impact)

The issue of greatest concern at this cemetery is the erection of appropriate signage. Beyond that action, the others are all of approximately equal significance and should be done as possible by the Park.
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APPENDIX 1. OLD CEMETERY
### CEMETERY FIELD SURVEY SHEET
#### INDIVIDUAL MARKER/MONUMENT

**Cemetery:** Old Cemetery  
**Grave #:** 1  
**Section #:**  
**Lot #:**  
**Photo No:**

**Name(s) on marker:** Dunlap, Samuel F. & Alex C.

**Type of Marker/Monument:**  
- [ ] tablet headstone  
- [ ] government issue  
- [ ] raised top  
- [ ] bedstead/cradle  
- [x] ledger  
- [ ] die in socket  
- [ ] lawn-type  
- [ ] pulpit  
- [ ] table tomb  
- [ ] obelisk  
- [ ] die on base  
- [ ] plaque  
- [ ] die, base, cap  
- [ ] box tomb  
- [ ] other:

**Inscription:**  
SAMUEL F. 1828-1878  
ALEX C. 1858-1870  
DUNLAP

**Inscription Technique:**  
- [x] carved  
- [ ] painted  
- [ ] other:

**Material:**  
- [ ] marble  
- [x] granite  
- [ ] sandstone  
- [ ] slate  
- [ ] limestone  
- [ ] fieldstone  
- [ ] other stone:  
- [ ] wood  
- [ ] concrete  
- [ ] cast iron  
- [ ] zinc  
- [ ] other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**  
**Height:**  
**Width:**  
**Thickness:**

**Gravestone Design Features:**  
- [ ] Bible  
- [ ] willow and urn  
- [ ] lamb  
- [ ] Masonic  
- [ ] finger pointing  
- [ ] clapping hands  
- [ ] cross  
- [ ] cross & crown  
- [ ] dove  
- [ ] other fraternal order:  
- [ ] other design:

**Condition of Marker:**  
- [ ] weathered  
- [ ] cracked  
- [ ] broken  
- [ ] vandalized  
- [ ] unattached  
- [ ] loose  
- [ ] leaning  
- [ ] repaired  
- [ ] biologicals  
- [ ] stained  
- [ ] portions missing:

**Stonecutter’s Name:**  
**City:**  
**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**  
**Material:**  
**Design/initials:**  
**Condition:**

**Coping:**  
**Material:**  
**Design:**  
**Condition:**

**Fencing:**  
**Material:**  
**Design:**  
**Condition:**

**Grave Orientation:**  
**Marker inscription faces what direction:**

**Grave Goods:**

**Surveyor:** Hacker  
**Date:** October 2003
Cemetery: Old Cemetery  
Grave #: 2  
Section #:  
Lot #:  
Photo No: 

Name(s) on marker: Herr, Michael

Type of Marker/Monument:  
- tablet headstone
- government issue
- raised top
- bedstead/cradle
- ledger
- die in socket
- lawn-type
- pulpit
- table tomb
- obelisk
- die on base
- plaque
- die, base, cap
- box tomb
- other:

Inscription:
FATHER
MICHAEL S. HERR
BORN
JAN. 30, 1842
DIED
JUNE 11 1906

Inscription Technique:  
- carved
- painted
- other:

Material:  
- marble
- granite
- sandstone
- slate
- limestone
- fieldstone
- other stone:
- zinc
- wood
- concrete
- cast iron
- other material:

Gravestone Size (ft/in):  
Height:  
Width:  
Thickness:  

Gravestone Design Features:  
- Bible
- willow and urn
- lamb
- Masonic
- finger pointing
- clasp hands
- cross
- dove
- other fraternal order:
- other design:

Condition of Marker:  
- weathered
- cracked
- broken
- vandalized
- unattached
- loose
- leaning
- repaired
- biologicals
- stained
- portions missing:
- other: much erosion around stone

Stonecutter’s Name:  
City:  
Location of Mark:  

Footstone:  
Material: gray marble  
Design/initials: M.S.H.  
Condition:  

Coping:  
Material: field stone  
Design: partial surround  
Condition:  

Fencing:  
Material:  
Design:  
Condition:  

Grave Orientation:  
Marker inscription faces what direction:  

Grave Goods: stack of cobbles in front of stone

Surveyor: Hacker  
Date: October 2003
Cemetery: Old Cemetery  Grave #: 3  Section #: Lot #:  Photo No:

Name(s) on marker: Herr, Nerva

Type of Marker/Monument: □ tablet headstone □ die in socket □ die on base □ government issue □ lawn-type □ plaque □ raised top □ pulpit □ die, base, cap □ bedstead/cradle □ table tomb □ box tomb □ ledger □ obelisk □ other:

Inscription:
MOTHER
NERVA HERR
BORN
NOV. 28, 1853
DIED
APR. 28, 1902

Inscription Technique: □ carved □ painted □ other:

Material: □ marble □ granite □ sandstone □ slate □ limestone □ fieldstone □ other stone: □ zinc □ wood □ concrete □ other material:

Gravestone Size (ft/in): Height: Width: Thickness:

Gravestone Design Features: □ Bible □ willow and urn □ clapping hands □ flowers □ lamb □ cross □ cross & crown □ dove □ Masonic □ other fraternal order: □ inverted torch □ finger pointing □ other design:

Condition of Marker: □ weathered □ unattached □ cracked □ broken □ vandalized □ unattached □ loose □ leaning □ repaired □ biologicals □ stained □ portions missing:

Stonecutter’s Name:  City:  Location of Mark:

Footstone: Material: gray marble  Design/initials: N.H.  Condition:

Coping: Material:  Design:  Condition:

Fencing: Material:  Design:  Condition:

Grave Orientation:  Marker inscription faces what direction:

Grave Goods:

Surveyor: Hacker  Date: October 2003
Cemetery Field Survey Sheet

**Individual Marker/Monument**

**Cemetery:** Old Cemetery  
**Grave #:** 4  
**Section #:**  
**Lot #:**  
**Photo No:**

**Name(s) on marker:** Herr, Horace L.

**Type of Marker/Monument:**  
- [ ] tablet headstone  
- [ ] die in socket  
- [ ] die on base  
- [ ] government issue  
- [ ] lawn-type  
- [ ] plaque  
- [ ] raised top  
- [ ] pulpit  
- [ ] die, base, cap  
- [ ] bedstead/cradle  
- [ ] table tomb  
- [ ] box tomb  
- [ ] ledger  
- [ ] obelisk  
- [ ] other:

**Inscription:**
HE SHALL GATHER THE LAMBS WITH HIS ARM./HORACE L./Son of M.S. & N. Herr./DIED/ Feb. 17, 1879./Aged/1 Yr. 11 Ms. 25 Ds./We loved this tender little one, / And would have wished him stay, / But our Father's will be done / He shines in endless day.

**Inscription Technique:**  
- [ ] carved  
- [ ] painted  
- [ ] other:

**Material:**  
- [ ] marble  
- [ ] granite  
- [ ] sandstone  
- [ ] slate  
- [ ] limestone  
- [ ] fieldstone  
- [ ] other stone:  
- [ ] cast iron  
- [ ] zinc  
- [ ] wood  
- [ ] concrete  
- [ ] other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**

- [ ] Height:  
- [ ] Width:  
- [ ] Thickness:

**Gravestone Design Features:**

- [ ] Bible  
- [ ] willow and urn  
- [ ] cross  
- [ ] cross & crown  
- [ ] lamb  
- [ ] dove  
- [ ] inverted torch  
- [ ] Masonic  
- [ ] other fraternal order:  
- [ ] other design:

**Condition of Marker:**

- [ ] weathered  
- [ ] cracked  
- [ ] broken  
- [ ] vandalized  
- [ ] unattached  
- [ ] loose  
- [ ] leaning  
- [ ] repaired  
- [ ] biologicals  
- [ ] stained  
- [ ] portions missing:  
- [ ] other: base is missing

**Stonecutter’s Name:**  
**City:**  
**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**

- [ ] Material:  
- [ ] Design/initials:  
- [ ] Condition:

**Coping:**

- [ ] Material:  
- [ ] Design:  
- [ ] Condition:

**Fencing:**

- [ ] Material:  
- [ ] Design:  
- [ ] Condition:

**Grave Orientation:**

- [ ] Marker inscription faces what direction:

**Grave Goods:**

**Surveyor:** Hacker  
**Date:** October 2003
Cemetery Field Survey Sheet

**Individual Marker/Monument**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery: Old Cemetery</th>
<th>Grave #: 5</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th>Photo No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name(s) on marker:** Trask, Henry S. & Charles S.

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- □ tablet headstone
- □ die in socket
- □ die on base
- □ government issue
- □ lawn-type
- □ plaque
- □ raised top
- □ pulpit
- □ die, base, cap
- □ bedstead/cradle
- □ table tomb
- □ box tomb
- □ ledger
- □ obelisk
- □ other: pedestal tomb

**Inscription:**
HENRY S. TRASK / DIED / Dec. 19. 1865. / Aged 18 Ys. 18 Ds. /
CHARLES S. TRASK / Died Oct. 9. 1870. / AGED / 5 Ys. 7 Ms. 24 Ds.

**Inscription Technique:**
- □ carved
- □ painted
- □ other:

**Material:**
- □□ marble
- □□ granite
- □□ sandstone
- □□ slate
- □ limestone
- □ fieldstone
- □ other stone:
- □ cast iron
- □ zinc
- □ wood
- □ concrete
- □ other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**
- **Height:** 52”
- **Width:** 9”
- **Thickness:** 9”

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- □ Bible
- □ willow and urn
- □ clapping hands
- □ flowers
- □ lamb
- □ cross
- □ cross & crown
- □ Masonic
- □ dove
- □ inverted torch
- □ other fraternal order:
- □ other design: draped

**Condition of Marker:**
- □ weathered
- □ cracked
- □ broken
- □ vandalized
- □ unattached
- □ loose
- □ leaning
- □ repaired
- □ biologicals
- □ stained
- □ portions missing:
- □ other:

**Stonecutter’s Name:**

**City:**

**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**
- **Material:**

**Design/initials:**

**Condition:**

**Coping:**
- **Material:** dry laid cut sandstone
- **Design:** built up wall
- **Condition:** w wall collapsed

**Fencing:**
- **Material:**

**Design:**

**Condition:**

**Grave Orientation:**
- Marker inscription faces what direction:

**Grave Goods:**

**Surveyor:** Hacker

**Date:** October 2003
South façade of wall showing intact wall

West façade showing collapsed (and restacked) wall and Trask pedestal tomb

wall measures 11’3” e-w and 12’9” n-s and is 2’10 to 3’ in height; oriented 105°; 18 lf need resetting
Cemetery Field Survey Sheet
Individual Marker/Monument

Cemetery: Old Cemetery  Grave #: 6  Section #:  Lot #:  Photo No:

Name(s) on marker: H.S.T.

Type of Marker/Monument: □ tablet headstone  □ die in socket  □ die on base
□ government issue  □ lawn-type  □ plaque
□ raised top  □ pulpit  □ die, base, cap
□ bedstead/cradle  □ table tomb  □ box tomb
□ ledger  □ obelisk  □ other:

Inscription:
H.S.T.

Inscription Technique: □ carved  □ painted  □ other:

Material: □ marble  □ granite  □ sandstone  □ slate
□ limestone  □ fieldstone  □ other stone:  □ wood
□ cast iron  □ zinc  □ concrete
□ other material:

Gravestone Size (ft/in): Height: Width: Thickness:

Gravestone Design Features: □ Bible  □ clapping hands  □ flowers
□ willow and urn  □ cross  □ cross & crown
□ lamb  □ dove  □ inverted torch
□ Masonic  □ other fraternal order:
□ finger pointing  □ other design:

Condition of Marker: □ weathered  □ cracked  □ broken  □ vandalized
□ unattached  □ loose  □ leaning  □ repaired
□ biologicals  □ stained  □ portions missing:
□ other:

Stonecutter’s Name:  City:  Location of Mark:

Footstone: Material: marble  Design/initials: H.S.T.  Condition:

Coping: Material: Design:  Condition:

Fencing: Material: Design:  Condition:

Grave Orientation: Marker inscription faces what direction:

Grave Goods:

Surveyor: Hacker  Date: October 2003
Cemetery Field Survey Sheet

**Cemetery:** Old Cemetery  **Grave #:** 7  **Section #:**  **Lot #:**  **Photo No:**

**Name(s) on marker:** Pond, Cordelia

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- [x] tablet headstone
- [ ] die in socket
- [ ] die on base
- [ ] government issue
- [ ] lawn-type
- [ ] plaque
- [ ] raised top
- [ ] pulpit
- [ ] die, base, cap
- [ ] bedstead/cradle
- [ ] table tomb
- [ ] box tomb
- [ ] ledger
- [ ] obelisk
- [ ] other:

**Inscription:**
In Memory / of / CORDELIA A./
Wife of / HENRY S. POND. / Born / Feb. 23, 1852 /
Died / Sept. 27, 1875.

**Inscription Technique:** [x] carved  [ ] painted  [ ] other:

**Material:**
- [x] marble
- [ ] granite
- [ ] sandstone
- [ ] slate
- [ ] limestone
- [ ] fieldstone
- [ ] other stone:
- [ ] zinc
- [ ] wood
- [ ] concrete
- [ ] other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**
- **Height:**
- **Width:**
- **Thickness:**

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- [ ] Bible
- [ ] willow and urn
- [x] cross
- [ ] cross & crown
- [ ] lamb
- [ ] dove
- [ ] Masonic
- [ ] other fraternal order:
- [ ] finger pointing
- [ ] other design:

**Condition of Marker:**
- [ ] weathered
- [ ] unattached
- [ ] cracked
- [x] broken
- [ ] vandalized
- [ ] biologicals
- [ ] loose
- [ ] stained
- [ ] leaning
- [ ] repaired
- [ ] portions missing:
- [ ] other:

**Stonecutter’s Name:**

**City:**

**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**
- **Material:**
- **Design/initials:**
- **Condition:**

**Coping:**
- **Material:** fieldstone
- **Design:** outlines grave
- **Condition:**

**Fencing:**
- **Material:** wood
- **Design:** rectangular
- **Condition:**

**Grave Orientation:**

**Marker inscription faces what direction:**

**Grave Goods:**

**Surveyor:** Hacker  **Date:** October 2003
Cordelia A. Pond marker and associated wood grave fence
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Old Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grave #</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section #</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot #</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name(s) on marker</td>
<td>Bell, William H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Marker/Monument</td>
<td>☑ tablet headstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ government issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ raised top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ bedstead/cradle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ ledger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ die in socket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ lawn-type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ pulpit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ table tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ obelisk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ die on base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ plaque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ die, base, cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ box tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscription</td>
<td>WILLIAM H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOV. 12, 1862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscription Technique</td>
<td>☑ carved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ painted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>☐ marble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ granite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ sandstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ slate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ fieldstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ other stone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ cast iron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ zinc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ other material:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravestone Size (ft/in)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Height:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Width:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thickness:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravestone Design Features</td>
<td>☐ Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ willow and urn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ lamb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☑ Masonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ finger pointing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ clapping hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ flowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ cross &amp; crown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ dove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ inverted torch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ other fraternal order:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ other design:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of Marker</td>
<td>☐ weathered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ cracked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ broken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ vandalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ unattached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ loose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ leaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ repaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ biologicals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ stained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ portions missing:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☑ other: set in concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonecutter’s Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Mark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/initials:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grave Orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marker inscription faces what direction:</td>
<td>October 2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Front of Bell Memorial
Cemetery: Old Cemetery          Grave #: 9          Section #:          Lot #:          Photo No:

Name(s) on marker: none

Type of Marker/Monument: ☒ tablet headstone         ☐ die in socket         ☐ die on base
☐ government issue         ☐ lawn-type         ☐ plaque
☐ raised top         ☐ pulpit         ☐ die, base, cap
☐ bedstead/cradle         ☐ table tomb         ☐ box tomb
☐ ledger         ☐ obelisk         ☐ other:

Inscription: (none)

Inscription Technique: ☐ carved         ☐ painted         ☐ other:

Material: ☐ marble         ☐ granite         ☐ sandstone         ☐ slate
☐ limestone         ☐ fieldstone         ☐ other stone:
☐ cast iron         ☐ zinc         ☐ wood         ☐ concrete
☐ other material:

Gravestone Size (ft/in):  Height:          Width:          Thickness:

Gravestone Design Features: ☐ Bible         ☐ cleping hands         ☐ flowers
☐ willow and urn         ☐ cross         ☐ cross & crown
☐ lamb         ☐ dove         ☐ inverted torch
☐ Masonic         ☐ other fraternal order:
☐ finger pointing         ☐ other design:

Condition of Marker: ☒ weathered         ☐ cracked         ☐ broken         ☐ vandalized
☐ unattached         ☐ loose         ☐ leaning         ☐ repaired
☐ biologicals         ☐ stained         ☐ portions missing:
☐ other:

Stonecutter’s Name:          City:          Location of Mark:

Footstone:          Material:          Design/initials:          Condition:

Coping:          Material:          Design:          Condition:

Fencing:          Material:          Design:          Condition:

Grave Orientation: Marker inscription faces what direction:

Grave Goods: grave covered with field stones

Surveyor: Hacker          Date: October 2003
Mounded grave with wood headboard
APPENDIX 2. NEW CEMETERY
**Cemetery Field Survey Sheet**

**Individual Marker/Monument**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery: New Cemetery</th>
<th>Grave #: 1</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th>Photo No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name(s) on Marker:** Lenkersdorfer, George A.

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- [ ] tablet headstone
- [ ] die on base
- [ ] government issue
- [ ] die in socket
- [ ] lawn-type
- [ ] raised top
- [ ] pulpit
- [ ] bedstead/cradle
- [ ] table tomb
- [ ] ledger
- [ ] obelisk
- [ ] other:

**Inscription:** (Masonic symbol)/GEORGE A. LENKERSDORFER/BORN JAN. 21, 1870/DIED NOV. 10, 1902

**Inscription Technique:**
- [x] carved
- [ ] painted
- [ ] other:

**Material:**
- [ ] marble
- [ ] granite
- [ ] sandstone
- [ ] other stone:
- [x] limestone
- [ ] fieldstone
- [ ] wood
- [ ] concrete
- [ ] cast iron
- [ ] zinc
- [ ] other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**
- Height: 43”
- Width: 41”
- Thickness: 22”

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- [ ] Bible
- [ ] willow and urn
- [ ] lamb
- [x] Masonic
- [x] finger pointing
- [ ] clamping hands
- [ ] flowers
- [ ] cross
- [ ] dove
- [ ] other fraternal order:
- [ ] other design:

**Condition of Marker:**
- [ ] weathered
- [ ] cracked
- [ ] broken
- [ ] vandalized
- [ ] unattached
- [ ] loose
- [ ] leaning
- [ ] repaired
- [ ] biologicals
- [ ] stained
- [ ] portions missing:
- [ ] other:

**Stonecutter’s Name:**

**City:**

**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**
- Material: Granite
- Design/initials: blank
- Condition: Good

**Coping:**
- Material:
- Design:
- Condition:

**Fencing:**
- Material:
- Design:
- Condition:

**Grave Orientation:** 270 degrees

**Marker inscription faces what direction:**

**Grave Goods:**

**Surveyor:** Hacker

**Date:** October 2003
Cemetery: New Cemetery  
Grave #: 2  
Section #:  
Lot #:  
Photo No: 1:3-4

Name(s) on marker: Clouti, John

Type of Marker/Monument:  
- tablet headstone  
- government issue  
- raised top  
- bedstead/cradle  
- ledger  
- die in socket  
- lawn-type  
- pulpit  
- table tomb  
- obelisk  
- die on base  
- plaque  
- die, base, cap  
- box tomb  
- other:

Inscription: (Masonic symbol)/ILI REPOSE/LE CORP. DE/JOHN CLOUTI-/E REPOUX. DE/ROSA MAILHOIT/DECE DELE 23/SEP 1909 ALA/DE 52 ANE 9/MOIS 10. JOUR

Inscription Technique:  
- carved  
- painted  
- other: hand carved

Material:  
- marble  
- granite  
- sandstone  
- limestone  
- fieldstone  
- zinc  
- cast iron  
- other stone:  
- slate  
- wood  
- concrete  
- other material:

Gravestone Size (ft/in):  
- Height: 32”  
- Width: 12-1/2”  
- Thickness: 1-1/2”

Gravestone Design Features:  
- Bible  
- willow and urn  
- lamb  
- Masonic  
- finger pointing  
- flowers  
- cross  
- dove  
- other fraternal order:  
- other design:

Condition of Marker:  
- weathered  
- cracked  
- broken  
- biologicals  
- stained  
- unattached  
- loose  
- leaning  
- portions missing:  
- other: evidence of whitewash on both headstone and footstone

Stonecutter’s Name:  
City:  
Location of Mark:

Footstone:  
- Material: sandstone  
- Design/initials: blank  
- Condition: good

Coping:  
- Material:  
- Design:  
- Condition:

Fencing:  
- Material:  
- Design:  
- Condition:

Grave Orientation: 95 degrees  
Marker inscription faces what direction:

Grave Goods: footstone measures 13” H, 13-1/2” W, 1-1/2” Th; wood grave fence 48x86”

Surveyor: Hacker  
Date: October 2003
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery: New Cemetery</th>
<th>Grave #: 3</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th>Photo No: 1:5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name(s) on marker: Ovitt, Mable P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Marker/Monument:</td>
<td>tablet headstone</td>
<td>die in socket</td>
<td>die on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>government issue</td>
<td>lawn-type</td>
<td>plaque</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>raised top</td>
<td>pulpit</td>
<td>die, base, cap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bedstead/cradle</td>
<td>table tomb</td>
<td>box tomb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ledger</td>
<td>obelisk</td>
<td>other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscription Technique:</td>
<td>carved</td>
<td>painted</td>
<td>other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material:</td>
<td>marble</td>
<td>granite</td>
<td>sandstone</td>
<td>slate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>limestone</td>
<td>fieldstone</td>
<td>other stone:</td>
<td>wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cast iron</td>
<td>zinc</td>
<td>concrete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other material:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravestone Size (ft/in):</td>
<td>Height: 24”</td>
<td>Width: 12-1/2”</td>
<td>Thickness: 4”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravestone Design Features:</td>
<td>Bible</td>
<td>clapping hands</td>
<td>flowers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>willow and urn</td>
<td>cross</td>
<td>cross &amp; crown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lamb</td>
<td>dove</td>
<td>inverted torch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masonic</td>
<td>other fraternal order:</td>
<td>other design:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>finger pointing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of Marker:</td>
<td>weathered</td>
<td>cracked</td>
<td>broken</td>
<td>vandalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unattached</td>
<td>loose</td>
<td>leaning</td>
<td>repaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>biologicals</td>
<td>stained</td>
<td>portions missing:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other: good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonecutter’s Name:</td>
<td>City:</td>
<td>Location of Mark:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footstone: Material:</td>
<td>Design/initials:</td>
<td>Condition:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping: Material:</td>
<td>Design:</td>
<td>Condition:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing: Material:</td>
<td>Design:</td>
<td>Condition:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grave Orientation: 270 degrees</td>
<td>Marker inscription faces what direction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grave Goods:</td>
<td>quartz rock outline of grave, white gravel fill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveyor: Hacker</td>
<td>Date: October 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cemetery Field Survey Sheet
Individual Marker/Monument

Cemetery: New Cemetery
Grave #: 4
Section #:  
Lot #:  
Photo No:  

Name(s) on marker: Underwood, M.

Type of Marker/Monument:  
- [ ] tablet headstone  
- [ ] die in socket  
- [ ] die on base  
- [ ] government issue  
- [ ] lawn-type  
- [ ] plaque  
- [ ] raised top  
- [ ] pulpit  
- [ ] die, base, cap  
- [ ] bedstead/cradle  
- [ ] table tomb  
- [ ] box tomb  
- [ ] ledger  
- [ ] obelisk  
- [x] other: funeral home  

Inscription: M. UNDERWOOD/ [ ] – 1916/BRUNDAGE SERVICE

Inscription Technique:  
- [ ] carved  
- [ ] painted  
- [x] other: imbossed  

Material:  
- [ ] marble  
- [ ] granite  
- [ ] sandstone  
- [ ] slate  
- [ ] limestone  
- [ ] fieldstone  
- [ ] other stone:  
- [ ] cast iron  
- [ ] zinc  
- [ ] wood  
- [ ] concrete  
- [x] other material: galvanized iron and aluminum  

Gravestone Size (ft/in):  
- Height:  
- Width:  
- Thickness:  

Gravestone Design Features:  
- [ ] Bible  
- [ ] willow and urn  
- [ ] claspers hands  
- [ ] flowers  
- [ ] lamb  
- [ ] cross  
- [ ] cross & crown  
- [ ] dove  
- [ ] inverted torch  
- [ ] Masonic  
- [ ] other fraternal order:  
- [ ] other design:  

Condition of Marker:  
- [ ] weathered  
- [ ] cracked  
- [ ] broken  
- [ ] vandalized  
- [ ] unattached  
- [ ] loose  
- [ ] leaning  
- [ ] repaired  
- [ ] biologicals  
- [ ] stained  
- [ ] portions missing:  
- [x] other: deteriorated  

Stonemaster’s Name:  
City:  
Location of Mark:  

Footstone:  
Material:  
Design/initials:  
Condition:  

Coping:  
Material:  
Design:  
Condition:  

Fencing:  
Material:  
Design:  
Condition:  

Grave Orientation:  
Marker inscription faces what direction:  

Grave Goods:  

Surveyor: Hacker  
Date: October 2003
**Cemetery Field Survey Sheet**

**Individual Marker/Monument**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery: New Cemetery</th>
<th>Grave #: 5a</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th>Photo No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name(s) on marker:** Ashworth, George

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- [ ] tablet headstone
- [ ] die in socket
- [ ] die on base
- [ ] government issue
- [ ] lawn-type
- [ ] plaque
- [ ] raised top
- [ ] pulpit
- [ ] die, base, cap
- [ ] bedstead/cradle
- [ ] table tomb
- [ ] box tomb
- [ ] ledger
- [ ] obelisk
- [ ] other:

**Inscription:** GEORGE ASHWORTH/1896-1948

**Inscription Technique:**
- [x] carved
- [ ] painted
- [ ] other:

**Material:**
- [ ] marble
- [ ] granite
- [ ] sandstone
- [ ] slate
- [ ] limestone
- [ ] fieldstone
- [ ] other stone:
- [ ] wood
- [ ] concrete
- [ ] other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**
- Height: 12”
- Width: 24”
- Thickness: 4”

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- [ ] Bible
- [ ] willow and urn
- [ ] lamb
- [ ] Masonic
- [ ] finger pointing
- [ ] clapping hands
- [ ] cross
- [ ] dove
- [ ] other fraternal order:
- [ ] other design:

**Condition of Marker:**
- [ ] weathered
- [ ] unattached
- [ ] cracked
- [ ] broken
- [ ] vandalized
- [ ] loose
- [ ] leaning
- [ ] repaired
- [ ] biologicals
- [ ] stained
- [ ] portions missing:
- [x] other: good

**Stonecutter’s Name:**

**City:**

**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**
- Material: 
- Design/initials: 
- Condition:

**Coping:**
- Material: 
- Design: 
- Condition:

**Fencing:**
- Material: cast iron
- Design: 
- Condition: fair

**Grave Orientation:** 290 degrees

**Grave Goods:** family plot L=23’3” W=13’1” Ht=42”

**Surveyor:** Hacker

**Date:** October 2003
Cemetery Field Survey Sheet

Individual Marker/Monument

Cemetery: New Cemetery  Grave #: 5b  Section #:  Lot #:  Photo No: 1:9

Name(s) on marker: Ashworth, Raymond E.

Type of Marker/Monument:
- [] tablet headstone
- [] die in socket
- [] die on base
- [] government issue
- [] lawn-type
- [] plaque
- [] raised top
- [] pulpit
- [] die, base, cap
- [] bedstead/cradle
- [] table tomb
- [] box tomb
- [] ledger
- [] obelisk
- [] other:

Inscription: RAYMOND E./ASHWORTH/MONTANA/PVT./U.S. MARINE CORPS/FEBRUARY 11, 1899/NOVEMBER 13, 1936

Inscription Technique:
- [] carved
- [] painted
- [] other:

Material:
- [] marble
- [] granite
- [] sandstone
- [] slate
- [] limestone
- [] fieldstone
- [] other stone:
- [] wood
- [] concrete
- [] cast iron
- [] zinc
- [] other material:

Gravestone Size (ft/in):
- [] Height:
- [] Width:
- [] Thickness:

Gravestone Design Features:
- [] Bible
- [] willow and urn
- [] lamb
- [] Masonic
- [] finger pointing
- [] other fraternal order:
- [] other design:

Condition of Marker:
- [] weathered
- [] cracked
- [] broken
- [] vandalized
- [] unattached
- [] loose
- [] leaning
- [] repaired
- [] biologicals
- [] stained
- [] portions missing:
- [] other: good

Stonecutter’s Name:

City:

Location of Mark:

Footstone:
- Material:
- Design/initials:
- Condition:

Coping:
- Material: concrete
- Design: square curb
- Condition: good

Fencing:
- Material: cast iron
- Design:
- Condition: fair

Grave Orientation: 290 degrees  Marker inscription faces what direction:

Grave Goods: family plot L=23’3” W=13’1” Ht=42”

Surveyor: Hacker  Date: October 2003
Cemetery Field Survey Sheet

Individual Marker/Monument

Cemetery: New Cemetery  Grave #: 5c  Section #:  Lot #:  Photo No:

Name(s) on marker: Burrell, John A.

Type of Marker/Monument:  [ ] tablet headstone  [ ] die in socket  [ ] die on base
[ ] government issue  [ ] lawn-type  [ ] plaque
[ ] raised top  [ ] pulpit  [ ] die, base, cap
[ ] bedstead/cradle  [ ] table tomb  [ ] box tomb
[ ] ledger

Inscription: JOHN A. BURRELL/AUG. 12, 1913/AUG. 12, 1915

Inscription Technique:  [x] carved  [ ] painted  [ ] other:

Material:  [x] marble  [ ] granite  [ ] sandstone  [ ] slate
[ ] limestone  [ ] fieldstone  [ ] other stone:  [ ] wood
[ ] cast iron  [ ] zinc  [ ] other material:

Gravestone Size (ft/in):  Height: 10”  Width: 17-1/2”  Thickness: 5”

Gravestone Design Features:  [ ] Bible  [ ] clasping hands  [ ] flowers
[ ] willow and urn  [ ] cross  [ ] cross & crown
[ ] lamb  [ ] dove  [ ] inverted torch
[ ] Masonic  [ ] other fraternal order:  [ ] other design:
[ ] finger pointing

Condition of Marker:  [ ] weathered  [ ] unattached  [ ] cracked
[ ] unattached  [ ] loose  [ ] broken  [ ] vandalized
[ ] biologicals  [ ] stained  [ ] leaning  [ ] repaired
[ ] biologicals  [ ] portions missing:
[ ] other: good

Stonecutter’s Name:  City:  Location of Mark:

Footstone:  Material:  Design/initials:  Condition:

Coping:  Material:  Design:  Condition:

Fencing:  Material: cast iron  Design:  Condition: fair

Grave Orientation: 290 degrees  Marker inscription faces what direction:

Grave Goods: family plot L=23’3” W=13’1” Ht=42”; field stone at head and foot of grave

Surveyor: Hacker  Date: October 2003
Cemetery: New Cemetery

Grave #: 5d

Section #: Lot #: Photo No: 1:6

Name(s) on marker: Ashworth, James

Type of Marker/Monument: □ tablet headstone □ die in socket □ die on base
□ government issue □ lawn-type □ plaque
□ raised top □ pulpit □ die, base, cap
□ bedstead/cradle □ table tomb □ box tomb
□ ledger □ obelisk □ other:

Inscription: JAMES/ASHWORTH/1894-1935

Inscription Technique: □ carved □ painted □ other:

Material: □ marble □ granite □ sandstone □ slate
□ limestone □ fieldstone □ other stone: □ wood
□ cast iron □ zinc □ concrete
□ other material:

Gravestone Size (ft/in): Height: 12” Width: 24” Thickness: 4”

Gravestone Design Features: □ Bible □ clasping hands □ flowers
□ willow and urn □ cross □ cross & crown
□ lamb □ dove □ inverted torch
□ Masonic □ other fraternal order: □ other design:
□ finger pointing

Condition of Marker: □ weathered □ cracked □ broken □ vandalized
□ unattached □ loose □ leaning □ repaired
□ biologicals □ stained □ portions missing:
□ other: good

Stonecutter’s Name:

City:

Location of Mark:

Footstone: Material: Design/initials: Condition:

Coping: Material: Design: Condition:

Fencing: Material: cast iron Design: bow and picket Condition: fair

Grave Orientation: 290 degrees Marker inscription faces what direction:

Grave Goods: family plot L=23’3” W=13’1” Ht=42”; field stones outline grave

Surveyor: Hacker Date: October 2003
James Ashworth stone to the right; note also two types of ironwork design comprising fence
Cemetery Field Survey Sheet

Individual Marker/Monument

**Cemetery:** New Cemetery  **Grave #:** 6  **Section #:**  **Lot #:**  **Photo No:**

**Name(s) on marker:** Ashworth, William R.

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- □ tablet headstone
- □ government issue
- □ raised top
- □ bedstead/cradle
- □ ledger
- □ die in socket
- □ lawn-type
- □ pulpit
- □ table tomb
- □ obelisk
- □ die on base
- □ plaque
- □ die, base, cap
- □ box tomb
- □ other:

**Inscription:** WILLIAM R. ASHWORTH/1862-1934

**Inscription Technique:**  □ carved  □ painted  □ other:

**Material:**
- □ marble
- □ granite
- □ sandstone
- □ slate
- □ limestone
- □ fieldstone
- □ other stone:
- □ wood
- □ concrete
- □ cast iron
- □ zinc
- □ other material: set on concrete

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**  **Height:** 8”  **Width:** 16”  **Thickness:** 3”

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- □ Bible
- □ willow and urn
- □ lamb
- □ Masonic
- □ finger pointing
- □ clasp hands
- □ cross
- □ dove
- □ other fraternal order:
- □ other design:

**Condition of Marker:**
- □ weathered
- □ unattached
- □ cracked
- □ loose
- □ broken
- □ leaning
- □ vandalized
- □ repaired
- □ biologicals
- □ stained
- □ portions missing:
- □ other: good

**Stonecutter’s Name:**  **City:**  **Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**  **Material:**  **Design/initials:**  **Condition:**

**Coping:**  **Material:**  **Design:**  **Condition:**

**Fencing:**  **Material:**  **Design:**  **Condition:**

**Grave Orientation:**  **Marker inscription faces what direction:**

**Grave Goods:**

**Surveyor:** Hacker  **Date:** October 2003
Cemetery: New Cemetery

Grave #: 7

Section #: 

Lot #: 

Photo No: 1:9

Name(s) on marker: Thompson, Velma George

Type of Marker/Monument: □ tablet headstone □ die in socket □ die on base

□ government issue □ lawn-type □ plaque

□ raised top □ pulpit □ die, base, cap

□ bedstead/cradle □ table tomb □ box tomb

□ ledger □ obelisk □ other:


1907./DIED OCT. 25.1909/AGE 2 YRS. 9 MOS. AND 20 DAYS/A loving one from us has gone,/A voice

we loved is stilled;/A place is vacant in our home,/that never can be filled.

Inscription Technique: □ carved □ painted □ other:

Material: □ marble □ granite □ sandstone □ slate

□ limestone □ fieldstone □ other stone: □ wood □ concrete

□ cast iron □ zinc □ other material: concrete grave surround, 3x5 feet

Gravestone Size (ft/in): Height: 23” Width: 14” Thickness: 14”

Gravestone Design Features: □ Bible □ clapping hands □ flowers

□ willow and urn □ cross □ cross & crown

□ lamb □ dove □ inverted torch

□ Masonic □ other fraternal order: □ other design: stump, 3-dimensional

□ finger pointing □ other:

Condition of Marker: □ weathered □ cracked □ broken □ vandalized

□ unattached □ loose □ leaning □ repaired

□ biologicals □ stained □ portions missing:

□ other:

Stonecutter’s Name: 

City: 

Location of Mark: 

Footstone: Material: 

Design/initials: 

Condition: 

Coping: Material: concrete 

Design: square curbing 

Condition: fair

Fencing: Material: 

Design: 

Condition: 

Grave Orientation: 270 degrees 

Marker inscription faces what direction:

Grave Goods: 

Surveyor: Hacker 

Date: October 2003
VELMA GEORGE
DAUGHTER OF M. A. & M.
EDMUND THOMPSON
BORN JAN 5, 1907
DIED OCT. 25, 1907
AGE 2 YRS. 6 MO. 20 DAYS
Cemetery: New Cemetery
Grave #: 8

Name(s) on marker: Ashworth, James “Ted” Edmund

Type of Marker/Monument:

- □ tablet headstone
- □ government issue
- □ raised top
- □ bedstead/cradle
- □ ledger
- □ die in socket
- □ lawn-type
- □ pulpit
- □ table tomb
- □ obelisk
- □ die on base
- □ die, base, cap

Inscription: SON/JAMES “TED” EDMUND/ASHWORTH/AUG. 27, 1859/ APR. 27, 1922

Inscription Technique:

- □ carved
- □ painted
- □ other:

Material:

- □ marble
- □ granite
- □ sandstone
- □ slate
- □ limestone
- □ fieldstone
- □ cast iron
- □ zinc
- □ wood
- □ concrete
- □ other stone:

Gravestone Size (ft/in):

- Height: 8”
- Width: 16”
- Thickness: 3”

Gravestone Design Features:

- □ Bible
- □ willow and urn
- □ lamb
- □ Masonic
- □ finger pointing
- □ clapping hands
- □ cross
- □ dove
- □ other fraternal order:
- □ other design:

Condition of Marker:

- □ weathered
- □ unattached
- □ biologicals
- □ cracked
- □ loose
- □ stained
- □ broken
- □ leaning
- □ portions missing:
- □ vandalized
- □ repaired

Stonecutter’s Name:

City:

Location of Mark:

Footstone: Material: Design/initials:

Coping: Material: Design:

Fencing: Material: Design:

Grave Orientation: 270 degrees

Marker inscription faces what direction:

Grave Goods: gravel on grave

Surveyor: Hacker

Date: October 2003
**Cemetery Field Survey Sheet**

**Individual Marker/Monument**

**Cemetery:** New Cemetery  
**Grave #:** 9  
**Section #:**  
**Lot #:**  
**Photo No:**

**Name(s) on Marker:** Ashworth, Jesse Clare

**Type of Marker/Monument:**  
- [ ] tablet headstone  
- [ ] die in socket  
- [ ] die on base  
- [ ] government issue  
- [ ] lawn-type  
- [ ] plaque  
- [ ] raised top  
- [ ] pulpit  
- [ ] die, base, cap  
- [ ] bedstead/cradle  
- [ ] table tomb  
- [ ] box tomb  
- [ ] ledger  
- [ ] obelisk  
- [ ] grass-type

**Inscription:** WIFE/JESSE CLARE/ASHWORTH/JUNE 17, 1826/DEC. 14, 1912

**Inscription Technique:**  
- [x] carved  
- [ ] painted  
- [ ] other:

**Material:**  
- [ ] marble  
- [ ] granite  
- [ ] sandstone  
- [ ] slate  
- [ ] limestone  
- [x] fieldstone  
- [ ] other stone:  
- [ ] wood  
- [ ] concrete  
- [ ] cast iron  
- [ ] zinc  
- [ ] other material: gravel on grave

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**  
- Height: 8”  
- Width: 16”  
- Thickness: 3”

**Gravestone Design Features:**  
- Bible  
- willow and urn  
- lamb  
- Masonic  
- finger pointing  
- clasping hands  
- cross  
- dove  
- other fraternal order:  
- other design:

**Condition of Marker:**  
- [ ] weathered  
- [ ] cracked  
- [ ] broken  
- [ ] vandalized  
- [ ] unattached  
- [ ] loose  
- [ ] leaning  
- [ ] repaired  
- [ ] biologicals  
- [ ] stained  
- [ ] portions missing:

**Stonecutter’s Name:**  
**City:**  
**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**  
**Material:**  
**Design/initials:**  
**Condition:**

**Coping:**  
**Material:**  
**Design:**  
**Condition:**

**Fencing:**  
**Material:**  
**Design:**  
**Condition:**

**Grave Orientation:** 270 degrees  
**Marker inscription faces what direction:**

**Grave Goods:** gravel on grave

**Surveyor:** Hacker  
**Date:** October 2003
Cemetery Field Survey Sheet

**Individual Marker/Monument**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery:</th>
<th>New Cemetery</th>
<th>Grave #:</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section #:</td>
<td>Lot #:</td>
<td>Photo No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Name(s) on marker:** Ashworth, Edmund

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- tablet headstone
- die in socket
- die on base
- government issue
- lawn-type
- plaque
- raised top
- pulpit
- die, base, cap
- bedstead/cradle
- table tomb
- box tomb
- ledger
- obelisk
- other:

**Inscription:** EDMUND/ASHWORTH/OCT. 18, 1824/JUNE 1, 1905

**Inscription Technique:**
- carved
- painted
- other:

**Material:**
- marble
- granite
- sandstone
- slate
- limestone
- fieldstone
- other stone:
- wood
- concrete
- cast iron
- zinc
- other material: gravel on grave

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**
- Height: 8”
- Width: 16”
- Thickness: 3”

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- Bible
- willow and urn
- lamb
- Masonic
- finger pointing
- clasp hands
- flowers
- cross
- dove
- cross & crown
- other fraternal order:
- other design:

**Condition of Marker:**
- weathered
- cracked
- broken
- vandalized
- unattached
- loose
- leaning
- repaired
- biologicals
- stained
- portions missing:
- other: good

**Footstone:**
- Material: |
- Design/initials: |
- Condition: |

**Coping:**
- Material: |
- Design: |
- Condition: |

**Fencing:**
- Material: |
- Design: |
- Condition: |

**Grave Orientation:** 270 degrees

**Grave Goods:** gravel on grave

**Surveyor:** Hacker

**Date:** October 2003
### CEMETERY FIELD SURVEY SHEET
#### INDIVIDUAL MARKER/MONUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery: New Cemetery</th>
<th>Grave #: 11</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th>Photo No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name(s) on marker:** Teeter, George E.

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- tablet headstone
- die in socket
- die on base
- government issue
- lawn-type
- plaque
- raised top
- pulpit
- die, base, cap
- bedstead/cradle
- table tomb
- box tomb
- ledger
- obelisk
- other:

**Inscription:** GEORGE E. TEETER / OCT. 13, 1858 / MAR. 20, 1921

**Inscription Technique:**
- carved
- painted
- other:

**Material:**
- marble
- granite
- sandstone
- slate
- limestone
- fieldstone
- other stone:
- wood
- concrete
- cast iron
- zinc
- other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**
- Height: 24”
- Width: 10-1/2”
- Thickness: 8”

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- Bible
- willow and urn
- lamb
- Masonic
- finger pointing
- clapping hands
- cross
- dove
- other fraternal order:
- other design:

**Condition of Marker:**
- weathered
- unattached
- cracked
- broken
- vandalized
- biologicals
- loose
- leaning
- repaired
- stained
- portions missing:
- other: good

**Stonecutter’s Name:**

**City:**

**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**
- Material:
- Design/initials:
- Condition:

**Coping:**
- Material:
- Design:
- Condition:

**Fencing:**
- Material:
- Design:
- Condition:

**Grave Orientation:** 280 degrees

**Marker inscription faces what direction:**

**Grave Goods:**

**Surveyor:** Hacker

**Date:** October 2003
# Cemetery Field Survey Sheet

**Individual Marker/Monument**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery: New Cemetery</th>
<th>Grave #: 12</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th>Photo No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name(s) on marker:** Gray, Mary J.

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- [ ] tablet headstone
- [ ] government issue
- [ ] raised top
- [ ] bedstead/cradle
- [ ] ledger
- [ ] die in socket
- [ ] lawn-type
- [ ] pulpit
- [ ] table tomb
- [ ] obelisk
- [ ] die on base
- [ ] plaque
- [ ] die, base, cap
- [ ] box tomb
- [ ] other:

**Inscription:** MARY J. GRAY/1863-1923

**Inscription Technique:**
- [x] carved
- [ ] painted
- [ ] other:

**Material:**
- [ ] marble
- [ ] granite
- [x] sandstone
- [ ] slate
- [ ] limestone
- [ ] fieldstone
- [ ] other stone:
- [ ] wood
- [ ] concrete
- [ ] cast iron
- [ ] zinc
- [ ] other material: die is concrete

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**
- Height: 13”
- Width: 24-1/2”
- Thickness: 9”

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- [ ] Bible
- [ ] willow and urn
- [ ] lamb
- [ ] Masonic
- [ ] finger pointing
- [ ] claspimg hands
- [ ] cross
- [ ] dove
- [ ] other fraternal order:
- [ ] other design:

**Condition of Marker:**
- [ ] weathered
- [ ] unattached
- [ ] biologicals
- [ ] cracked
- [ ] loose
- [ ] biologals
- [ ] stained
- [ ] broken
- [ ] leaning
- [ ] portions missing:
- [x] other: good
- [ ] vandalized
- [ ] repaired

**Stonecutter’s Name:**

**City:**

**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**
- Material: 
- Design/initials: 
- Condition:

**Coping:**
- Material: 
- Design: 
- Condition:

**Fencing:**
- Material: 
- Design: 
- Condition:

**Grave Orientation:** 280 degrees

**Marker inscription faces what direction:**

**Grave Goods:**

**Surveyor:** Hacker

**Date:** October 2003
**Cemetery Field Survey Sheet**

**Individual Marker/Monument**

**Cemetery:** New Cemetery  
**Grave #:** 13  
**Section #:**  
**Lot #:**  
**Photo No:**

**Name(s) on marker:** Stevens, Father James

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Marker/Monument:</th>
<th>□ tablet headstone</th>
<th>□ die in socket</th>
<th>□ die on base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ government issue</td>
<td>□ lawn-type</td>
<td>□ plaque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ raised top</td>
<td>□ pulpit</td>
<td>□ die, base, cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ bedstead/cradle</td>
<td>□ table tomb</td>
<td>□ box tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ ledger</td>
<td>□ obelisk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ tablet headstone</td>
<td>□ die in socket</td>
<td>□ die on base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ government issue</td>
<td>□ lawn-type</td>
<td>□ plaque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ raised top</td>
<td>□ pulpit</td>
<td>□ die, base, cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ bedstead/cradle</td>
<td>□ table tomb</td>
<td>□ box tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ ledger</td>
<td>□ obelisk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inscription:** FATHER/JAMES STEVENS/1829-1917

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription Technique:</th>
<th>□ carved</th>
<th>□ painted</th>
<th>□ other:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material:</th>
<th>□ marble</th>
<th>□ granite</th>
<th>□ sandstone</th>
<th>□ slate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ limestone</td>
<td>□ fieldstone</td>
<td>□ other stone:</td>
<td>□ concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ cast iron</td>
<td>□ zinc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ other material:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gravestone Size (ft/in):</th>
<th>Height: 30”</th>
<th>Width: 23”</th>
<th>Thickness: 15”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Gravestone Design Features: | □ Bible | □ clapping hands | □ flowers |
|                            | □ willow and urn | □ cross | □ cross & crown |
|                            | □ lamb | □ dove | □ inverted torch |
|                            | □ Masonic | □ other fraternal order: | □ other design: |
|                            | □ finger pointing |          |         |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition of Marker:</th>
<th>□ weathered</th>
<th>□ cracked</th>
<th>□ broken</th>
<th>□ vandalized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ unattached</td>
<td>□ loose</td>
<td>□ leaning</td>
<td>□ repaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ biologicals</td>
<td>□ stained</td>
<td>□ portions missing:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ other: good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stonecutter’s Name:**  
**City:**  
**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**  
**Material:**  
**Design/initials:**  
**Condition:**

**Coping:**  
**Material:**  
**Design:**  
**Condition:**

**Fencing:**  
**Material:**  
**Design:**  
**Condition:**

**Grave Orientation: 280 degrees**  
**Marker inscription faces what direction:**

**Grave Goods:**

**Surveyor:** Hacker  
**Date:** October 2003
Cemetery Field Survey Sheet  
Individual Marker/Monument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery: New Cemetery</th>
<th>Grave #: 14</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th>Photo No: 2:23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name(s) on marker:** Lenkersdorfer, Willie

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- [ ] tablet headstone
- [ ] government issue
- [ ] raised top
- [x] bedstead/cradle
- [ ] ledger
- [ ] die in socket
- [x] die on base
- [ ] plaque
- [ ] die, base, cap
- [ ] box tomb
- [ ] obelisk
- [ ] lawn-type
- [ ] pulpit
- [ ] table tomb
- [ ] other:

**Inscription:** (scroll motif) WILLIE/SON OF/W.N.V. and IDA/LENKERSDORFER/BORN JAN. 1, 1893/DIED JULY 22, 1897

**Inscription Technique:**
- [x] carved
- [ ] painted
- [ ] other:

**Material:**
- [x] marble
- [ ] granite
- [ ] sandstone
- [x] other stone: granite base
- [ ] slate
- [ ] limestone
- [ ] fieldstone
- [ ] wood
- [ ] concrete
- [ ] cast iron
- [ ] zinc
- [ ] other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**
- Height: 17”
- Width: 20”
- Thickness: 14”

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- Bible
- willow and urn
- lamb
- Masonic
- finger pointing
- [x] other design: scroll
- claspings hands
- cross
- dove
- other fraternal order:
- [x] other design:
- flowers
- cross & crown
- inverted torch
- [ ] biologicals
- [x] stained
- [x] portions missing:

**Condition of Marker:**
- [ ] weathered
- [x] unattached
- [x] loose
- [x] biologicals
- [x] stained
- [x] portions missing:
- [ ] repaired
- [ ] vandalized

**Stonecutter’s Name:**

**City:**

**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**
- Material: [ ]
- Design/initials: [ ]
- Condition: [ ]

**Coping:**
- Material: [ ]
- Design: [ ]
- Condition: [ ]

**Fencing:**
- Material: [ ]
- Design: [ ]
- Condition: [ ]

**Grave Orientation:** 270 degrees

**Marker inscription faces what direction:**

**Grave Goods:**

**Surveyor:** Hacker

**Date:** October 2003
Cemetery Field Survey Sheet

**Individually Marker/Monument**

**Cemetery:** New Cemetery  
**Grave #:** 15  
**Section #:**  
**Lot #:**  
**Photo No:** 2:22

**Name(s) on marker:** Sherwood, Frank M.

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- tablet headstone
- government issue
- raised top
- bedstead/cradle
- ledger

**Inscription:** (front: bird in branch; R,L, back: morning glory) FRANK M./SHERWOOD/BORN/APR. 6, 1860/ DIED/MAY 6, 1898/“At Rest”//SHERWOOD

**Inscription Technique:**
- carved
- painted
- other:

**Material:**
- marble
- granite
- sandstone
- slate
- limestone
- fieldstone
- other stone: granite base
- cast iron
- zinc
- wood
- concrete

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**
- Height: 39”
- Width: 18”
- Thickness: 18”

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- Bible
- willow and urn
- lamb
- Masonic
- finger pointing
- weathered
- cracked
- broken
- vandalized
- unattached
- loose
- stained
- portions missing:

**Condition of Marker:**
- weathered
- unattached
- cracked
- broken
- vandalized
- loose
- stained
- portions missing:

**Condition of Marker:**
- weathered
- unattached
- cracked
- broken
- vandalized
- loose
- stained
- portions missing:

**Stonecutter’s Name:**  
**City:**  
**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**
- Material:
- Design/initials:
- Condition:

**Coping:**
- Material:
- Design:
- Condition:

**Fencing:**
- Material:
- Design:
- Condition:

**Grave Orientation:** 280 degrees  
**Marker inscription faces what direction:**

**Grave Goods:**

**Surveyor:** Hacker  
**Date:** October 2003
FRANK M.
SHERWOOD
BORN
APR. 6, 1860
DIED
MAY 6, 1898
**Cemetery Field Survey Sheet**

**Individual Marker/Monument**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery: New Cemetery</th>
<th>Grave #: 16</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th>Photo No: 2:2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name(s) on marker:** Morrison, Lawrence L.

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- □ tablet headstone
- □ government issue
- □ raised top
- □ bedstead/cradle
- □ ledger
- □ die in socket
- □ lawn-type
- □ pulpit
- □ table tomb
- □ die on base
- □ die, base, cap
- □ obelisk
- □ box tomb
- □ other: pedestal tomb

**Inscription: Front:** H/HB/LAWRENCE L./MORRISON/BORN AT DALLAS OR./DEC. 29, 1864/DIED/AT BANNACK MONT./JAN 19,1879/He shall gather the lambs/w/His arm, and carry/them in His bosom. **Left Panel:** “Be ye also ready for/in such an hour as ye/think not, the son/of man cometh.” **Right Panel:** “Let me die the death/of the righteous, and let my last end be like His.”

**Inscription Technique:**
- □ carved
- □ painted
- □ other:

**Material:**
- □ marble
- □ granite
- □ sandstone
- □ slate
- □ limestone
- □ fieldstone
- □ other stone: sandstone base
- □ cast iron
- □ zinc
- □ wood
- □ concrete
- □ other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**
- Height: 56”
- Width: 5”
- Thickness: 8”

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- □ Bible
- □ willow and urn
- □ lamb
- □ Masonic
- □ finger pointing
- □ clasping hands
- □ cross
- □ dove
- □ other fraternal order:
- □ other design:

**Condition of Marker:**
- □ weathered
- □ unattached
- □ biologicals
- □ cracked
- □ loose
- □ stained
- □ broken
- □ leaning
- □ repaired
- □ vandalized
- □ portions missing:
- □ other:

**Stonecutter’s Name:**

**City:**

**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**
- Material:
- Design/initials:
- Condition:

**Coping:**
- Material:
- Design:
- Condition:

**Fencing:**
- Material: wood grave
- Design:
- Condition:

**Grave Orientation:** 280 degrees

**Marker inscription faces what direction:**

**Grave Goods:** wood grave fence measures 5x8’ and is 50” in height

**Surveyor:** Hacker

**Date:** October 2003
**Cemetery Field Survey Sheet**

**Individual Marker/Monument**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery: New Cemetery</th>
<th>Grave #: 17</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th>Photo No: 2:4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name(s) on marker:** O’Leary, James

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- ☑ tablet headstone
- ☐ die in socket
- ☐ die on base
- ☐ government issue
- ☐ lawn-type
- ☐ plaque
- ☐ raised top
- ☐ pulpit
- ☐ die, base, cap
- ☐ bedstead/cradle
- ☐ table tomb
- ☑ box tomb
- ☐ ledger
- ☑ obelisk
- ☐ other: pedestal tomb

**Inscription:** JAMES/O’LEARY/DIED/May 29, 1883, AGED/37 Years

**Inscription Technique:** ☑ carved

**Material:**
- ☑ marble
- ☐ granite
- ☐ sandstone
- ☐ slate
- ☐ limestone
- ☐ fieldstone
- ☐ other stone:
- ☐ wood
- ☐ concrete
- ☐ cast iron
- ☐ zinc
- ☐ other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**
- Height: 3’
- Width: 18”
- Thickness: 18”

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- ☑ Bible
- ☐ willow and urn
- ☐ lamb
- ☐ Masonic
- ☐ finger pointing
- ☐ other design:
- ☐ clapping hands
- ☐ cross
- ☐ dove
- ☐ other fraternal order:
- ☐ flowers
- ☐ cross & crown
- ☐ inverted torch
- ☐ biologicals
- ☐ stained
- ☐ other: portions missing:

**Condition of Marker:**
- ☑ weathered
- ☑ unattached
- ☐ loose
- ☐ cracked
- ☑ broken
- ☐ leaning
- ☐ vandalized
- ☐ repaired

**Stonecutter’s Name:**

**City:**

**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**
- Material:
- Design/initials:
- Condition:

**Coping:**
- Material:
- Design:
- Condition:

**Fencing:**
- Material: wood
- Design:
- Condition:

**Grave Orientation:**

**Marker inscription faces what direction:**

**Grave Goods:** wood grave fence measures 8’2” by 5’5” and 4’ in height; collapsing

**Surveyor:** Hacker

**Date:** October 2003
# Cemetery Field Survey Sheet

**Chicora Foundation, Inc.**

PO Box 8664  
Columbia, SC 29202  
803-787-6910

**New Cemetery**

**Grave #**: 18a  
**Section #**:  
**Lot #**:  
**Photo No**:  

**Name(s) on marker**: Clements, Delia

**Type of Marker/Monument**:  
- tablet headstone
- die in socket
- die on base
- government issue
- lawn-type
- plaque
- raised top
- pulpit
- die, base, cap
- bedstead/cradle
- table tomb
- box tomb
- ledger
- obelisk

**Inscription**: (primitive angel flying, holding baby)/DELIA/CLEMENTS/Wife of/THOS. CLEMENS/Died/March 17, 1895,/Aged 28 Years

**Inscription Technique**:  
- carved
- painted
- other:

**Material**:  
- marble
- granite
- sandstone
- slate
- limestone
- fieldstone
- other stone:
- wood
- concrete
- cast iron
- zinc
- other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in)**:  
- Height: 35-1/2”  
- Width: 17”  
- Thickness: 2-1/4”

**Gravestone Design Features**:  
- Bible
- willow and urn
- lamb
- Masonic
- finger pointing
- other design: angel flying w/baby in arms

**Condition of Marker**:  
- weathered
- cracked
- broken
- vandalized
- unattached
- loose
- leaning
- repaired
- biologicals
- stained
- portions missing:
- other:

**Stonecutter’s Name**:  
**City**:  
**Location of Mark**:  

**Footstone**:  
- Material: marble  
- Design/initials: D.C.  
- Condition: good

**Coping**:  
- Material:  
- Design:  
- Condition:

**Fencing**:  
- Material: wood  
- Design:  
- Condition:

**Grave Orientation**:  
- Marker inscription faces what direction:

**Grave Goods**: wood grave fencing 5’2” by 8’, height 50”; footstone measures 7” H, 4-1/2” W, 2-1/4” Th

**Surveyor**: Hacker  
**Date**: October 2003
Cemetery: New Cemetery
Grave #: 18b

Name(s) on marker: Clements, baby

Type of Marker/Monument: ☒ tablet headstone
☐ government issue
☐ raised top
☐ bedstead/cradle
☐ ledger

Inscription: Another little lamb has gone to dwell/with Him who gave. Another little darling/babe is sheltered in/the grave. God needed/one more angel child/Amidst His shining/band, An [sic] so He bent/with loving smile/And clasped our/darlings hand.

Inscription Technique: ☐ carved
☐ painted
☐ other:

Material: ☒ marble
☐ granite
☐ sandstone
☐ slate
☐ limestone
☐ fieldstone
☐ zinc
☐ wood
☐ concrete
☐ other material:

Gravestone Size (ft/in): Height: 26”
Width: 9”
Thickness: 2-1/4”

Gravestone Design Features:
- Bible
- willow and urn
- lamb
- Masonic
- finger pointing

Condition of Marker: ☒ weathered
☐ cracked
☐ broken
☐ vandalized
☐ unattached
☐ loose
☐ leaning
☐ repaired
☐ biologicals
☐ stained
☐ portions missing:
- ☐ other: out of ground, laying between head and foot stones

Stonecutter’s Name:
City:
Location of Mark:

Footstone: Material: Design/initials: Condition:

Coping: Material: Design: Condition:

Fencing: Material: wood Design: Condition:

Grave Orientation:

Marker inscription faces what direction:

Grave Goods: wood grave fencing 5’2” by 8’, height 50”

Surveyor: Hacker
Date: October 2003
**Cemetery Field Survey Sheet**

**Individual Marker/Monument**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery:</th>
<th>New Cemetery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grave #:</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section #:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot #:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Name(s) on marker:** McMannis, Regina Best

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- tablet headstone
- raised top
- bedstead/cradle
- ledger
- government issue
- die in socket
- die on base
- lawn-type
- pulpit
- table tomb
- obelisk
- die, base, cap
- box tomb
- other:

**Inscription:** REGINA BEST/MCMANNIS/1900-1920

**Inscription Technique:**
- carved
- painted
- other:

**Material:**
- marble
- granite
- sandstone
- slate
- limestone
- fieldstone
- wood
- concrete
- cast iron
- zinc
- other stone:
- other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**
- Height: 11”
- Width: 24”
- Thickness: 6”

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- Bible
- Willow and urn
- lamb
- Masonic
- finger pointing
- clapping hands
- cross
- dove
- cross & crown
- other fraternal order:
- other design:

**Condition of Marker:**
- weathered
- unattached
- biologicals
- cracked
- loose
- stained
- broken
- leaning
- portions missing:
- vandalized
- repaired
- other:

**Stonemcutter’s Name:**

**City:**

**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**
- Material:
- Design/initials:
- Condition:

**Coping:**
- Material: field stones
- Design:
- Condition:

**Fencing:**
- Material:
- Design:
- Condition:

**Grave Orientation:** 270 degrees

**Marker inscription faces what direction:**

**Grave Goods:** field stones outline grave

**Surveyor:** Hacker

**Date:** October 2003
### Cemetery Field Survey Sheet

**Individual Marker/Monument**

**Cemetery:** New Cemetery  
**Grave #:** 20  
**Section #:**  
**Lot #:**  
**Photo No:**

**Name(s) on marker:** Bessette, Margaret M.

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- [ ] tablet headstone  
- [ ] government issue  
- [ ] raised top  
- [ ] bedstead/cradle  
- [ ] ledger  
- [ ] die in socket  
- [ ] lawn-type  
- [ ] die on base  
- [ ] plaque  
- [ ] die, base, cap  
- [ ] table tomb  
- [ ] box tomb  
- [ ] obelisk  
- [ ] other:

**Inscription:** GRANDMOTHER/BESSETTE/1839 MARGARET M. 1898

**Inscription Technique:**
- [ ] carved  
- [ ] painted  
- [ ] other:

**Material:**
- [ ] marble  
- [ ] granite  
- [ ] limestone  
- [ ] fieldstone  
- [ ] cast iron  
- [ ] zinc  
- [ ] other stone:  
- [ ] sandstone  
- [ ] slate  
- [ ] marble  
- [ ] granite  
- [ ] sandstone  
- [ ] slate  
- [ ] other material: set on concrete base

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**
- Height: 20”  
- Width: 31”  
- Thickness: 12”

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- [ ] Bible  
- [ ] willow and urn  
- [ ] lamb  
- [ ] Masonic  
- [ ] finger pointing  
- [ ] clasp hands  
- [ ] cross  
- [ ] dove  
- [ ] other fraternal order:  
- [ ] other design:

**Condition of Marker:**
- [ ] weathered  
- [ ] cracked  
- [ ] broken  
- [ ] vandalized  
- [ ] unattached  
- [ ] loose  
- [ ] leaning  
- [ ] repaired  
- [ ] biologicals  
- [ ] stained  
- [ ] portions missing:

**Stonecutter’s Name:**  
**City:**  
**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**  
**Material:**  
**Design/initials:**  
**Condition:**

**Coping:**  
**Material:**  
**Design:**  
**Condition:**

**Fencing:**  
**Material:**  
**Design:**  
**Condition:**

**Grave Orientation:**  
**Marker inscription faces what direction:**

**Grave Goods:**

**Surveyor:** Hacker  
**Date:** October 2003
Cemetery Field Survey Sheet

**Individual Marker/Monument**

**Cemetery:** New Cemetery  
**Grave #:** 21  
**Section #:**  
**Lot #:**  
**Photo No:**

**Name(s) on marker:** Bessette, Georgia A. M.

**Type of Marker/Monument:**  
- [ ] tablet headstone  
- [x] die in socket  
- [x] die on base  
- [ ] government issue  
- [ ] lawn-type  
- [ ] plaque  
- [ ] raised top  
- [ ] pulpit  
- [ ] die, base, cap  
- [ ] bedstead/cradle  
- [ ] table tomb  
- [ ] box tomb  
- [ ] ledger  
- [ ] obelisk  
- [x] other: pedestal tomb

**Inscription:** In Memory of/GEORGIA A.M./BESSETTE/Wife of/JOHN LENKERSDORFER/BORN/MAY 20, 1877,/DIED/JUNE 18, 1897./LENKERSDORFER

**Inscription Technique:**  
- [x] carved  
- [ ] painted  
- [ ] other:

**Material:**  
- [x] marble  
- [ ] granite  
- [ ] sandstone  
- [ ] slate  
- [ ] limestone  
- [ ] fieldstone  
- [x] other stone: on granite base  
- [ ] cast iron  
- [ ] zinc  
- [ ] wood  
- [ ] concrete  
- [ ] other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**  
**Height:** 7’  
**Width:** 31”  
**Thickness:** 31”

**Gravestone Design Features:**  
- [ ] Bible  
- [ ] willow and urn  
- [ ] cross hands  
- [ ] flowers  
- [ ] lamb  
- [ ] cross & crown  
- [ ] dove  
- [ ] inverted torch  
- [ ] Masonic  
- [ ] other fraternal order:  
- [ ] other design:

**Condition of Marker:**  
- [ ] weathered  
- [ ] cracked  
- [ ] broken  
- [ ] vandalized  
- [ ] unattached  
- [ ] loose  
- [ ] leaning  
- [ ] repaired  
- [ ] biologicals  
- [ ] stained  
- [ ] portions missing:

- [ ] other:

**Stonecutter’s Name:**  
**City:**  
**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**  
**Material:** marble  
**Design/initials:** none  
**Condition:**

**Coping:**  
**Material:**  
**Design:**  
**Condition:**

**Fencing:**  
**Material:**  
**Design:**  
**Condition:**

**Grave Orientation:** 270 degrees  
**Marker inscription faces what direction:**

**Grave Goods:** footstone measures 13”H, 7”W, 2-1/4”Th

**Surveyor:** Hacker  
**Date:** October 2003
**Cemetery Field Survey Sheet**

**Individual Marker/Monument**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery: New Cemetery</th>
<th>Grave #: 22a</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th>Photo No: 3:10-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name(s) on marker:** Sarault, Clarence, Francis, & Maxie

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- ☒ tablet headstone
- ☐ die in socket
- ☐ die on base
- ☐ government issue
- ☐ lawn-type
- ☐ plaque
- ☐ raised top
- ☐ pulpit
- ☐ die, base, cap
- ☐ bedstead/cradle
- ☐ table tomb
- ☐ box tomb
- ☐ ledger
- ☐ obelisk
- ☐ other: pedestal tomb

**Inscription:**

**Front:** MAXIE/SARAULT/Died/May 25, 1888./Aged/16 Mo’s 8 D’ys./Beneath this stone in soft repose/I laid a mother’s dearest pride./A flower that scarce had waked to life and light and beauty ere it died.

**Right:** CLARENCE/SARAULT/Died/Aug. 25, 1889./Aged/4 Yrs 6 M’s 3 D’s./’Tis a little grave but O have care, for world wide hopes are buried there, how much of light, how much of joy, is buried with a darling boy. **Left:** FRANCIS/SARAULT/Died/Nov. 19, 1887./Aged 31 Years./This stone was erected by his bereaved wife as a small tribute to his many virtues./As a kind Husband and Father and Friend.

**Inscription Technique:** ☒ carved ☐ painted ☐ other:

**Material:** ☒ marble ☐ granite ☐ sandstone ☐ slate
- ☐ limestone ☐ fieldstone ☐ other stone:
- ☐ cast iron ☐ zinc ☐ wood ☐ concrete
- ☐ other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height:</th>
<th>Width:</th>
<th>Thickness:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- ☐ Bible
- ☐ willow and urn
- ☐ lamb
- ☐ Masonic
- ☐ finger pointing
- ☐ clasping hands
- ☐ cross
- ☐ dove
- ☐ other fraternal order:
- ☐ other design:

**Condition of Marker:**
- ☐ weathered
- ☐ cracked
- ☐ broken
- ☐ vandalized
- ☐ unattached
- ☐ loose
- ☐ leaning
- ☐ repaired
- ☐ biologicals
- ☐ stained
- ☐ portions missing:
- ☐ other:

**Stonecutter’s Name:** MONT. MARBLE WORKS  
**City:** HELENA  
**Location of Mark:** right base

**Footstone:**
- **Material:** marble  
- **Design/initials:** M.S.  
- **Condition:** out of grnd

**Coping:**
- **Material:**  
- **Design:**  
- **Condition:**

**Fencing:**
- **Material:** pipe fence  
- **Design:**  
- **Condition:** fair

**Grave Orientation:**

**Marker inscription faces what direction:**

**Grave Goods:** wood grave enclose, coffin-shaped.

**Surveyor:** Hacker  
**Date:** October 2003
Fence at Plot 22, close-up of corner post design

Portion of stone and coffin-shaped enclosure on grave 5a
Stonecarver’s name at base of monument
Cemetery Field Survey Sheet

**Individual Marker/Monument**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery: New Cemetery</th>
<th>Grave #: 22b</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th>Photo No: 3:12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name(s) on marker:** Sarault, Clarence, Francis, & Maxie

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- [ ] tablet headstone
- [ ] die in socket
- [ ] die on base
- [ ] government issue
- [ ] lawn-type
- [ ] plaque
- [ ] raised top
- [ ] pulpit
- [ ] die, base, cap
- [ ] bedstead/cradle
- [ ] table tomb
- [ ] box tomb
- [ ] ledger
- [ ] obelisk
- [x] other: pedestal tomb

**Inscription:**
FROM 22A: Front: MAXIE/SARAULT/Died/May 25, 1888./Aged/16 Mo’s 8 D’ys./Beneath this stone in soft repose/I laid a mother’s dearest pride./A flower that scarce had waked to/life and light and beauty ere it died. Right: CLARENCE/SARAULT/Died/Aug. 25, 1889./Aged/4 Yrs 6 M’s 3 D’s./Tis a little grave but O have/care, for world wide hopes/are buried there, how/ much of light, how much/of joy, is buried with a/darling boy. Left: FRANCIS/SARAULT/Died/Nov. 19, 1887./Aged 31 Years./This stone was erected by/his bereaved wife as a small/tribute to his many virtues./As a kind Husband and/Father and Friend.

**Inscription Technique:**
- [x] carved
- [ ] painted
- [ ] other:

**Material:**
- [x] marble
- [ ] granite
- [ ] sandstone
- [ ] slate
- [ ] limestone
- [ ] fieldstone
- [ ] other stone:
- [ ] cast iron
- [ ] zinc
- [ ] wood
- [ ] concrete
- [ ] other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**

**Height:**

**Width:**

**Thickness:**

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- [ ] Bible
- [ ] willow and urn
- [ ] lamb
- [ ] Masonic
- [ ] finger pointing
- [ ] claspng hands
- [ ] cross
- [ ] dove
- [ ] other fraternal order:
- [ ] other design:

**Condition of Marker:**
- [ ] weathered
- [ ] cracked
- [ ] broken
- [ ] vandalized
- [ ] unattached
- [ ] loose
- [ ] leaning
- [ ] repaired
- [ ] biologicals
- [ ] stained
- [ ] portions missing:
- [ ] other:

**Stonecutter’s Name:** MONT. MARBLE WORKS  
**City:** HELENA  
**Location of Mark:** right base

**Footstone:**
- **Material:** marble  
- **Design/initials:** C.S.  
- **Condition:** out of grnd

**Coping:**
- **Material:**  
- **Design:**  
- **Condition:**

**Fencing:**
- **Material:** pipe fence  
- **Design:**  
- **Condition:** fair

**Grave Orientation:** Marker inscription faces what direction:

**Grave Goods:** wood grave enclose, coffin-shaped.

**Surveyor:** Hacker  
**Date:** October 2003
Cemetery: New Cemetery  Grave #: 22c  Section #:  Lot #:  Photo No: 3:12

Name(s) on marker: Sarault, Clarence, Francis, & Maxie

Type of Marker/Monument:  
- ☒ tablet headstone
- ☐ die in socket
- ☐ die on base
- ☐ government issue
- ☐ lawn-type
- ☐ plaque
- ☐ raised top
- ☐ pulpit
- ☐ die, base, cap
- ☐ bedstead/cradle
- ☐ table tomb
- ☐ box tomb
- ☐ ledger
- ☐ obelisk
- ☐ other: pedestal tomb

Inscription: FROM 22A: Front: MAXIE/SARAULT/Died/May 25, 1888./Aged/16 Mo’s 8 D’ys./Beneath this stone in soft repose/I laid a mother’s dearest pride./A flower that scarce had waked to/life and light and beauty ere it died. Right: CLARENCE/SARAULT/Died/Aug. 25, 1889./Aged/4 Yrs 6 M’s 3 D’s./'Tis a little grave but O have/care, for world wide hopes/are buried there, how much of light, how much/of joy, is buried with a/darling boy. Left: FRANCIS/SARAULT/Died/Nov. 19, 1887./Aged 31 Years./This stone was erected by/his bereaved wife as a small/tribute to his many virtues./As a kind Husband and/Father and Friend.

Inscription Technique:  ☒ carved  ☐ painted  ☐ other:

Material:  ☒ marble  ☐ granite  ☐ sandstone  ☐ slate  
- ☐ limestone  ☐ fieldstone  ☐ other stone:  
- ☐ cast iron  ☐ zinc  ☐ wood  ☐ concrete  
- ☐ other material:

Gravestone Size (ft/in):  Height:  Width:  Thickness:

Gravestone Design Features:  
- ☐ Bible  ☐ clasing hands  ☐ flowers
- ☐ willow and urn  ☐ cross  ☐ cross & crown
- ☐ lamb  ☐ dove  ☐ inverted torch
- ☐ Masonic  ☐ other fraternal order:
- ☐ finger pointing  ☐ other design:

Condition of Marker:  
- ☐ weathered  ☐ cracked  ☐ broken  ☐ vandalized
- ☐ unattached  ☐ loose  ☐ leaning  ☐ repaired
- ☐ biologicals  ☐ stained  ☐ portions missing:

Stonecutter’s Name: MONT. MARBLE WORKS  City: HELENA  Location of Mark: right base

Footstone:  Material: marble  Design/initials: F.S.  Condition: out of grnd

Coping:  Material:  Design:  Condition:

Fencing:  Material: pipe fence  Design:  Condition: fair

Grave Orientation:  Marker inscription faces what direction:


Surveyor: Hacker  Date: October 2003
Cemetery: New Cemetery  Grave #: 23  Section #:  Lot #:  Photo No: 3:13

Name(s) on marker: Gauthier, Earnest, Grace, & Frankie

Type of Marker/Monument:
- tablet headstone
- die in socket
- die on base
- government issue
- lawn-type
- plaque
- raised top
- pulpit
- die, base, cap
- bedstead/cradle
- table tomb
- box tomb
- ledger
- obelisk
- raised top
- pulpit
- die, base, cap
- tablet headstone
- die in socket
- die on base
- government issue
- lawn-type
- plaque
- raised top
- pulpit
- die, base, cap
- bedstead/cradle
- table tomb
- box tomb
- ledger
- obelisk
- raised top
- pulpit
- die, base, cap
- tablet headstone
- die in socket
- die on base
- government issue
- lawn-type
- plaque
- raised top
- pulpit
- die, base, cap
- bedstead/cradle
- table tomb
- box tomb
- ledger
- obelisk
- raised top
- pulpit
- die, base, cap

Inscription:
Front: EARNEST/Born/NOV. 7, 1891/Died/NOV. 11, 1891
Right: GRACE/BORN/MAY 15, 1882/DIED/APRIL. 21, 1897
Left: FRANKIE/BORN/MAY 20, 1885/DIED/SEPT. 24, 1889
Back, on base: children of/MARY & FRANK/GAUTHIER

Inscription Technique:
- carved
- painted
- other:

Material:
- marble
- granite
- sandstone
- slate
- limestone
- fieldstone
- other stone: granite base
- cast iron
- zinc
- wood
- concrete
- other material:

Gravestone Size (ft/in):
- Height: 8-1/2’
- Width: 17”
- Thickness: 17”

Gravestone Design Features:
- Bible
- claspings hands
- flowers
- willow and urn
- cross
- cross & crown
- lamb
- dove
- inverted torch
- Masonic
- other fraternal order:
- other design:
- finger pointing

Condition of Marker:
- weathered
- cracked
- broken
- vandalized
- unattached
- loose
- leaning
- repaired
- biologicals
- stained
- portions missing:

Stonecutter’s Name:  City:  Location of Mark:

Footstone:
- Material: marble
- Design/initialed: none
- Condition:

Coping:
- Material: 
- Design:
- Condition:

Fencing:
- Material: 
- Design:
- Condition:

Grave Orientation: 280 degrees  Marker inscription faces what direction:

Grave Goods:
- single marble footstone measures 8-1/2”H, 6” W, 2-1/4” Th

Surveyor: Hacker  Date: October 2003
Chicora Foundation, Inc.  
PO Box 8664  
Columbia, SC 29202  
803-787-6910

Cemetery Field Survey Sheet  
Individual Marker/Monument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery: New Cemetery</th>
<th>Grave #: 24</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th>Photo No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Name(s) on marker: A., S.

Type of Marker/Monument:  
- [ ] tablet headstone  
- [ ] government issue  
- [ ] raised top  
- [ ] bedstead/cradle  
- [X] ledger  
- [ ] lawn-type  
- [ ] pulpit  
- [ ] table tomb  
- [ ] obelisk  
- [ ] die on base  
- [ ] die in socket  
- [ ] die, base, cap  
- [X] box tomb  
- [ ] other: funeral home

Inscription: no surviving inscription (see footstone below)

Inscription Technique:  
- [ ] carved  
- [ ] painted  
- [ ] other:

Material:  
- [ ] marble  
- [ ] granite  
- [ ] sandstone  
- [X] slate  
- [ ] limestone  
- [ ] fieldstone  
- [ ] other stone:  
- [ ] wood  
- [ ] concrete  
- [ ] cast iron  
- [ ] zinc  
- [ ] other material: galvanized iron

Gravestone Size (ft/in):  
- Height:  
- Width:  
- Thickness:

Gravestone Design Features:  
- [ ] Bible  
- [ ] willow and urn  
- [ ] lamb  
- [ ] Masonic  
- [ ] finger pointing  
- [ ] clasping hands  
- [ ] cross  
- [ ] dove  
- [ ] other fraternal order:  
- [ ] other design:

Condition of Marker:  
- [ ] weathered  
- [ ] cracked  
- [ ] broken  
- [ ] vandalized  
- [ ] unattached  
- [ ] loose  
- [ ] leaning  
- [X] repaired  
- [ ] biologicals  
- [ ] stained  
- [ ] portions missing:

Stonecutter’s Name:  
- City:  
- Location of Mark:

Footstone:  
- Material: gray  
- Design/initials: S.A.  
- Condition: displaced

Coping:  
- Material:  
- Design:  
- Condition:

Fencing:  
- Material:  
- Design:  
- Condition:

Grave Orientation:  
- Marker inscription faces what direction:

Grave Goods: footstone measures 12”H, 5-1/4”W, 2” Th

Surveyor: Hacker  
Date: October 2003
Cemetery: New Cemetery  Grave #: 25  Section #:  Lot #:  Photo No: 3:14

Name(s) on marker: Ames, Nathan A.

Type of Marker/Monument:  □ tablet headstone    □ die in socket    □ die on base
                         □ government issue    □ lawn-type    □ plaque
                         □ raised top    □ pulpit    □ die, base, cap
                         □ bedstead/cradle    □ table tomb    □ box tomb
                         □ ledger    □ obelisk

Inscription: NATHAN A./AMES/ BORN JULY 11, 1846/ DIED MAR. 20, 1923

Inscription Technique:  □ carved    □ painted    □ other:
Material:  □ marble    □ granite    □ sandstone    □ slate
           □ limestone    □ fieldstone    □ other stone:
           □ cast iron    □ zinc    □ wood    □ concrete
           □ other material: on concrete base

Gravestone Size (ft/in):  Height: 31”  Width: 13-1/2”  Thickness: 26”

Gravestone Design Features:  □ Bible    □ clasping hands    □ flowers
                            □ willow and urn    □ cross    □ cross & crown
                            □ lamb    □ dove    □ inverted torch
                            □ Masonic    □ other fraternal order:
                            □ finger pointing    □ other design: star and garland

Condition of Marker:  □ weathered    □ cracked    □ broken
                      □ unattached    □ loose    □ vandalized
                      □ biologicals    □ stained    □ repaired
                      □ other:    □ portions missing:

Stonecutter’s Name:  City:  Location of Mark:
Footstone:  Material: marble  Design/initials: N.A.  Condition: out of grnd
Coping:  Material:  Design:  Condition:
Fencing:  Material:  Design:  Condition:

Grave Orientation: 280 degrees  Marker inscription faces what direction:
Grave Goods: footstone measures 13-1/2”H, 6-1/4”W, 2-1/2”Th
Surveyor: Hacker  Date: October 2003
NATHAN A
AMES
BORN JULY 11, 1849
DIED MAR. 20, 1919
**Cemetery Field Survey Sheet**  
**Individual Marker/Monument**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery:</th>
<th>New Cemetery</th>
<th>Grave #: 26</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th>Photo No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name(s) on marker:** Ames, Nita & Sadie

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- [ ] tablet headstone
- [ ] government issue
- [ ] raised top
- [ ] bedstead/cradle
- [ ] ledger
- [x] tablet headstone
die in socket
die on base
government issue
lawn-type
pulpit
die, base, cap

**Inscription:** AMES/NITA/1892  1902/SADIE/1898  1901

**Inscription Technique:** [x] carved

**Material:**
- [ ] marble
- [x] granite
- [ ] sandstone
- [ ] slate
- [ ] limestone
- [ ] fieldstone
- [ ] zinc
- [ ] wood
- [ ] concrete

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):** Height: 12” Width: 14” Thickness: 5-1/2”

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- [ ] Bible
- [ ] willow and urn
- [ ] lamb
- [ ] Masonic
- [ ] clapping hands
- [ ] cross
- [ ] dove
- [x] cross & crown
- [ ] other fraternal order:
- [ ] other design:

**Condition of Marker:**
- [ ] weathered
- [ ] unattached
- [ ] biologicals
- [ ] loose
- [ ] cracked
- [ ] stained
- [x] loose
- [ ] broken
- [ ] leaning
- [ ] vandalized
- [ ] repaired
- [ ] portions missing:

**Stonecutter’s Name:**

**City:**

**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**
- [ ] Material:
- [ ] Design/initials:
- [ ] Condition:

**Coping:**
- [ ] Material:
- [ ] Design:
- [ ] Condition:

**Fencing:**
- [ ] Material:
- [ ] Design:
- [ ] Condition:

**Grave Orientation:**
- [ ] Marker inscription faces what direction:

**Grave Goods:**

**Surveyor:** Hacker

**Date:** October 2003
Cemetery Field Survey Sheet
Individual Marker/Monument

Cemetery: New Cemetery  Grave #: 27  Section #:  Lot #:  Photo No: 2:18

Name(s) on marker: Peck, William

Type of Marker/Monument: ☒ tablet headstone  ☐ die in socket  ☐ die on base
☐ government issue  ☐ lawn-type  ☐ plaque
☐ raised top  ☐ pulpit  ☐ die, base, cap
☐ bedstead/cradle  ☐ table tomb  ☐ box tomb
☐ ledger  ☐ obelisk  ☐ other:

Inscription: (Masonic symbol on open book) WILLIAM PECK/DIED/NOV. 21, 1877/AGED/88 YEARS.

Inscription Technique: ☒ carved  ☐ painted  ☐ other:

Material: ☒ marble  ☐ granite  ☐ sandstone  ☐ slate
☐ limestone  ☐ fieldstone  ☐ other stone:  ☐ wood  ☐ concrete
☐ cast iron  ☐ zinc  ☐ other material:

Gravestone Size (ft/in):  Height:  Width:  Thickness:

Gravestone Design Features: ☐ Bible  ☐ willow and urn  ☐ clasp hands  ☐ flowers
☐ lamb  ☐ cross  ☐ cross & crown  ☐ dove
☐ Masonic  ☐ other fraternal order:  ☐ inverted torch
☐ finger pointing  ☐ other design: open book

Condition of Marker: ☐ weathered  ☐ cracked  ☐ broken  ☐ vandalized
☐ unattached  ☐ loose  ☐ leaning  ☐ repaired
☐ biologicals  ☐ stained  ☐ portions missing:
☐ other:

Stonecutter’s Name:  City:  Location of Mark:

Footstone:  Material: marble  Design/initials: none  Condition:

Coping:  Material:  Design:  Condition:

Fencing:  Material: wood grave  Design:  Condition:

Grave Orientation:  Marker inscription faces what direction:

Grave Goods: wood grave fence measures 5’3” by 9’2” and is 53” high

Surveyor: Hacker  Date: October 2003
Cemetery: New Cemetery
Grave #: 28
Section #: Lot #: Photo No: 1:13

Name(s) on marker: Gray, William A.

Type of Marker/Monument: □ tablet headstone □ die in socket □ die on base
□ government issue □ lawn-type □ plaque
□ raised top □ pulpit □ die, base, cap
□ bedstead/cradle □ table tomb □ box tomb
□ ledger □ obelisk □ other:

Inscription: (hand from cloud, 1 finger grabbing flowers) WILLIAM A./SON OF/ROBERT N. & SUSAN E./GRAY; Born in Clark Co. Mo./NOV. 23, 1861;/DIED/JULY 23, 1891//Death's but a path that must be
trod/If man would ever pass to God.

Inscription Technique: □ carved □ painted □ other:

Material: □ marble □ granite □ sandstone □ slate
□ limestone □ fieldstone □ other stone: sandstone base
□ cast iron □ zinc □ wood □ concrete

Gravestone Size (ft/in): Height: 43” Width: 24” Thickness: 12”

Gravestone Design Features:
□ Bible □ clasping hands □ flowers
□ willow and urn □ cross □ cross & crown
□ lamb □ dove □ inverted torch
□ Masonic □ other fraternal order:
□ finger pointing □ other design:

Condition of Marker: □ weathered □ cracked □ broken □ vandalized
□ unattached □ loose □ leaning □ repaired
□ biologicals □ stained □ portions missing:

Stonecutter’s Name: City: Location of Mark:

Footstone: Material: Design/initials: Condition:

Coping: Material: Design: Condition:

Fencing: Material: pipe & wire Design: decorative woven wire Condition: good

Grave Orientation: Marker inscription faces what direction:

Grave Goods: fence, behind monument, measures 4’ by 7” and is 3’3” high

Surveyor: Hacker Date: October 2003
Cemetery: New Cemetery
Grave #: 29
Section #:
Lot #: Photo No: 1:14

Name(s) on marker: Gray, Susan E.

Type of Marker/Monument: 
- tablet headstone
- government issue
- raised top
- bedstead/cradle
- ledger
- die in socket
- lawn-type
- die on base
- pulpit
- table tomb
- die, base, cap
- obelisk
- box tomb

Inscription: SUSAN E./WIFE OF/R.N. GRAY/BORN/JUNE 22, 1840/DIED/NOV. 10, 1903//DEVOTED WIFE AND MOTHER/GONE BUT NOT FORGOTTEN

Inscription Technique: 
- carved
- painted
- other:

Material: 
- marble
- granite
- sandstone
- slate
- limestone
- fieldstone
- zinc
- wood
- concrete
- other material:

Gravestone Size (ft/in): Height: Width: Thickness:

Gravestone Design Features: 
- Bible
- willow and urn
- lamb
- Masonic
- finger pointing
- clasp hands
- cross
- dove
- other fraternal order:
- other design:

Condition of Marker: 
- weathered
- unattached
- loose
- biologicals
- cracked
- stained
- broken
- leaning
- vandalized
- repaired
- portions missing:

Stonecutter’s Name: City: Location of Mark:

Footstone: Material: Design/initials: Condition:

Coping: Material: Design: Condition:

Fencing: Material: Design: Condition:

Grave Orientation: Marker inscription faces what direction:

Grave Goods:

Surveyor: Hacker Date: October 2003
**CEMETERY FIELD SURVEY SHEET**

**INDIVIDUAL MARKER/MONUMENT**

| Cemetery: New Cemetery | Grave #: 30 | Section #: | Lot #: | Photo No: |

Name(s) on marker: Gray, Robert

| Type of Marker/Monument: | tablet headstone | government issue | raised top | bedstead/cradle | ledger | die in socket | lawn-type | pulpit | table tomb | obelisk | die on base | die, base, cap | box tomb | other: |

Inscription: ROBERT N./GRAY/Apr. 8 1838/Aug. 20 1920

| Inscription Technique: | carved | painted | other: |

Material: marble granite sandstone slate limestone fieldstone other stone: granite zinc wood concrete other material:

| Gravestone Size (ft/in): | Height: | Width: | Thickness: |

Gravestone Design Features: Bible willow and urn lamb Masonic finger pointing clapping hands cross dove other fraternal order: cross & crown inverted torch other design:

| Condition of Marker: | weathered | cracked | broken | vandalized | unattached | loose | leaning | repaired | biologicals | stained | portions missing: |

| Stonecutter’s Name: | City: | Location of Mark: |

Footstone: Material: Design/initials: Condition:

Coping: Material: Design: Condition:

Fencing: Material: Design: Condition:

Grave Orientation: 270 degrees Marker inscription faces what direction:

Grave Goods:

Surveyor: Hacker Date: October 2003
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery:</th>
<th>New Cemetery</th>
<th>Grave #:</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Photo No:</th>
<th>2:12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name(s) on marker:</td>
<td>Jaggers, Robert John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Marker/Monument:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ tablet headstone</td>
<td>□ government issue</td>
<td>□ die in socket</td>
<td>□ die on base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ raised top</td>
<td>□ lawn-type</td>
<td>□ pulpit</td>
<td>□ plaque</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ bedstead/cradle</td>
<td>□ die, base, cap</td>
<td>□ table tomb</td>
<td>□ box tomb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ ledger</td>
<td>□ obelisk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscription:</td>
<td>ROBERT JOHN JAGGERS/1860-1916/SANDBERG FUNERAL HOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscription Technique:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ carved</td>
<td>□ painted</td>
<td>□ other: embossed, cast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ marble</td>
<td>□ granite</td>
<td>□ sandstone</td>
<td>□ slate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ limestone</td>
<td>□ fieldstone</td>
<td>□ other stone:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ cast iron</td>
<td>□ zinc</td>
<td>□ wood</td>
<td>□ concrete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ other material: metal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravestone Size (ft/in):</td>
<td>Height:</td>
<td>Width:</td>
<td>Thickness:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravestone Design Features:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Bible</td>
<td>□ clasping hands</td>
<td>□ flowers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ willow and urn</td>
<td>□ cross</td>
<td>□ cross &amp; crown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ lamb</td>
<td>□ dove</td>
<td>□ inverted torch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Masonic</td>
<td>□ other fraternal order:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ finger pointing</td>
<td>□ other design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of Marker:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ weathered</td>
<td>□ cracked</td>
<td>□ broken</td>
<td>□ vandalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ unattached</td>
<td>□ loose</td>
<td>□ leaning</td>
<td>□ repaired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ biologicals</td>
<td>□ stained</td>
<td>□ portions missing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ other: good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonecutter’s Name:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Location of Mark:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footstone:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Condition:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/initials:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Condition:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Condition:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grave Orientation:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marker inscription faces what direction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grave Goods:</td>
<td>Company still listed in Anaconda, MT yellow pages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveyor:</td>
<td>Hacker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>October 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Cemetery Field Survey Sheet**

**Individual Marker/Monument**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery: New Cemetery</th>
<th>Grave #: 32</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th>Photo No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name(s) on Marker:** Underwood, Mary

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- ☒ tablet headstone
- ☐ die in socket
- ☐ die on base
- ☐ government issue
- ☐ lawn-type
- ☐ plaque
- ☐ raised top
- ☐ pulpit
- ☐ die, base, cap
- ☐ bedstead/cradle
- ☐ table tomb
- ☐ box tomb
- ☐ ledger
- ☐ obelisk
- ☐ other: pedestal tomb

**Inscription:** (open book) MARY/UNDERWOOD/DIED/NOV. 30, 1888/AGED/35 YRS 3MS/29 DAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription Technique:</th>
<th>☒ carved</th>
<th>☐ painted</th>
<th>☐ other:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material:</td>
<td>☐ marble</td>
<td>☒ granite</td>
<td>☐ sandstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ limestone</td>
<td>☐ fieldstone</td>
<td>☐ other stone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ cast iron</td>
<td>☐ zinc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ other material:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**
- Height: 41”
- Width: 20”
- Thickness: 20”

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- ☐ Bible
- ☐ willow and urn
- ☐ lamb
- ☐ Masonic
- ☐ finger pointing
- ◐ clasping hands
- ☐ cross
- ☐ cross & crown
- ☐ dove
- ☐ inverted torch
- ☐ other fraternal order:
- ☐ other design: open book

**Condition of Marker:**
- ☐ weathered
- ☐ unattached
- ☐ biologicals
- ☐ other:
- ☐ cracked
- ☐ loose
- ☐ stained
- ☐ broken
- ☐ leaning
- ☐ portions missing:
- ☐ repaired
- ☐ vandalized

**Stonecutter’s Name:**

**City:**

**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:** Material: marble

**Material:**

**Design/initials:** M.A.U.

**Condition:**

**Coping:** Material:

**Material:**

**Design:**

**Condition:**

**Fencing:** Material:

**Material:**

**Design:**

**Condition:**

**Grave Orientation:** 260 degrees

**Marker inscription faces what direction:**

**Grave Goods:** footstone measures 15”H, 8-1/4”W, 2-1/4”Th

**Surveyor:** Hacker

**Date:** October 2003
### Cemetery Field Survey Sheet

**Individual Marker/Monument**

**Cemetery:** New Cemetery  
**Grave #:** 33  
**Section #:**  
**Lot #:**  
**Photo No:** 2:4

**Name(s) on Marker:** McClellan, John S.

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- ☒ tablet headstone
- ☒ die on base
- ☐ government issue
- ☐ plaque
- ☐ raised top
- ☐ die, base, cap
- ☐ bedstead/cradle
- ☐ box tomb
- ☐ ledger
- ☐ obelisk
- ☐ other:

**Inscription:** MCCLELLAND/ /JOHN S./MCCLELLAND/Died/Dec. 11, 1894,/Aged/70 Years./After lifes [sic] fitful dream/comes rest.

**Inscription Technique:** ☒ carved  
☐ painted  
☐ other:

**Material:** ☒ marble  
☐ granite  
☐ sandstone  
☐ other stone: granite base  
☐ limestone  
☐ fieldstone  
☐ zinc  
☐ wood  
☐ concrete  
☐ other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**  
- Height: 26”  
- Width: 20”  
- Thickness: 12”

**Gravestone Design Features:**  
- Bible  
- willow and urn  
- lamb  
- Masonic  
- finger pointing  
- clawing hands  
- cross  
- dove  
- other fraternal order:  
- other design:

**Condition of Marker:**  
- ☒ weathered  
- ☒ unattached  
- ☒ cracked  
- ☒ loose  
- ☒ broken  
- ☒ stained  
- ☒ portions missing:  
- ☒ repaired  
- ☐ vandalized  
- ☐ other:

**Footstone:**  
- Material: marble  
- Design/initials: McC  
- Condition: out of grnd

**Coping:**  
- Material:  
- Design:  
- Condition:  

**Fencing:**  
- Material:  
- Design:  
- Condition:  

**Grave Orientation:** 260 degrees  
**Marker inscription faces what direction:**

**Grave Goods:**

**Surveyor:** Hacker  
**Date:** October 2003
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery:</th>
<th>New Cemetery</th>
<th>Grave #:</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Photo No:</th>
<th>2:3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Name(s) on marker: Ferster, James S. & Luceta A.

Type of Marker/Monument:  
- [ ] tablet headstone  
- [ ] government issue  
- [ ] raised top  
- [ ] bedstead/cradle  
- [ ] ledger  
- [ ] die in socket  
- [ ] lawn-type  
- [ ] pulpit  
- [ ] table tomb  
- [ ] obelisk  
- [ ] die on base  
- [ ] die, base, cap  
- [ ] box tomb  
- [ ] other: pedestal tomb

Inscription: South: JAMES S./FERSTER/Born/ JAN. 20, 1819/Died/DEC. 11, 1892  

Inscription Technique:  
- [X] carved  
- [ ] painted  
- [ ] other:

Material:  
- [X] marble  
- [ ] granite  
- [ ] sandstone  
- [ ] slate  
- [ ] limestone  
- [ ] fieldstone  
- [ ] other stone: granite base  
- [ ] cast iron  
- [ ] zinc  
- [ ] wood  
- [ ] concrete  
- [ ] other material:

Gravestone Size (ft/in):  
- Height:  
- Width:  
- Thickness:

Gravestone Design Features:  
- Bible  
- willow and urn  
- lamb  
- Masonic  
- finger pointing  
- other fraternal order:  
- other design:

Condition of Marker:  
- weathered  
- cracked  
- broken  
- vandalized  
- unattached  
- loose  
- leaning  
- repaired  
- biologicals  
- stained  
- portions missing:

Stonecutter’s Name:  
City:  
Location of Mark:

Footstone:  
- Material: marble  
- Design/initials: none  
- Condition:

Coping:  
- Material:  
- Design:  
- Condition:

Fencing:  
- Material:  
- Design:  
- Condition:

Grave Orientation:  
- Marker inscription faces what direction:

Grave Goods: south footstone: 12x6x2-1/4”; north footstone: 14-1/2x6-3/4x2-1/4”

Surveyor: Hacker  
Date: October 2003
Cemetery: New Cemetery  Grave #: 35  Section #:  Lot #:  Photo No: 1:16-17

Name(s) on marker: Wilson, Eliza

Type of Marker/Monument:  
- □ tablet headstone  - □ government issue  - □ die in socket  - □ die on base
- □ raised top  - □ lawn-type  - □ pulpit  - □ die, base, cap
- □ bedstead/cradle  - □ table tomb  - □ obelisk  - □ box tomb
- □ ledger  - □ other:

Inscription: ELIZA/WILSON/1870-1917

Inscription Technique:  
- □ carved  - □ painted  - □ other:

Material:  
- □ marble  - □ granite  - □ sandstone  - □ slate
- □ limestone  - □ fieldstone  - □ other stone:  - □ concrete
- □ cast iron  - □ zinc  - □ wood  - □ other stone:
- □ other material: quartz cobbles set in Portland cement; sandstone plaque with name

Gravestone Size (ft/in):  Height: 34”  Width: 21”  Thickness: 13”

Gravestone Design Features:  
- □ Bible  - □ claspings hands  - □ flowers  - □ cross & crown
- □ willow and urn  - □ cross  - □ dove  - □ inverted torch
- □ lamb  - □ Masonic  - □ other fraternal order:  - □ other design:
- □ finger pointing  - □ other design:

Condition of Marker:  
- □ weathered  - □ cracked  - □ broken  - □ vandalized
- □ unattached  - □ loose  - □ broken  - □ repaired
- □ biologicals  - □ stained  - □ portions missing:  - □ other: cobbles are disassociated from mortar, portions in failure

Stonecutter’s Name:  City:  Location of Mark:

Footstone:  Material:  Design/initials:  Condition:

Coping:  Material: cobbles  Design: grave outlined  Condition:

Fencing:  Material:  Design:  Condition:

Grave Orientation: 270 degrees  Marker inscription faces what direction:

Grave Goods:

Surveyor: Hacker  Date: October 2003
Cemetery Field Survey Sheet

Individual Marker/Monument

Cemetery: New Cemetery
Grave #: 36
Section #: Lot #: Photo No: 1:19

Name(s) on marker: Avery, Wm.

Type of Marker/Monument: 
- ☑ tablet headstone
- ☑ government issue
- ☑ raised top
- ☑ bedstead/cradle
- ☑ ledger
- ☑ die in socket
- ☑ lawn-type
- ☑ pulpit
- ☑ table tomb
- ☑ obelisk
- ☑ die on base
- ☑ plaque
- ☑ die, base, cap
- ☑ box tomb
- ☑ other:

Inscription: WM. AVERY/CO. C./48 OHIO INF.

Inscription Technique: ☑ carved
- ☐ painted
- ☐ other:

Material: ☑ marble
- ☐ granite
- ☐ sandstone
- ☐ slate
- ☐ limestone
- ☐ fieldstone
- ☐ other stone:
- ☐ wood
- ☐ concrete
- ☐ other material:

Gravestone Size (ft/in): Height: Width: Thickness:

Gravestone Design Features:
- ☑ Bible
- ☑ willow and urn
- ☑ lamb
- ☑ Masonic
- ☑ finger pointing
- ☑ clapping hands
- ☑ cross
- ☑ dove
- ☑ other fraternal order:
- ☑ other design:

Condition of Marker:
- ☑ weathered
- ☑ cracked
- ☑ broken
- ☑ vandalized
- ☑ unattached
- ☑ loose
- ☑ leaning
- ☑ repaired
- ☑ biologicals
- ☑ stained
- ☑ portions missing:
- ☑ other: out of ground, leaning on fence

Stonecutter’s Name: City: Location of Mark:

Footstone: Material: Design/initials: Condition:

Coping: Material: Design: Condition:

Fencing: Material: wood grave Design: Condition:

Grave Orientation: 280 degrees
Marker inscription faces what direction:

Grave Goods: wood grave fence measures 46”x8’, 4’ high

Surveyor: Hacker Date: October 2003
**Chicora Foundation, Inc.**  
**PO Box 8664**  
**Columbia, SC 29202**  
**803-787-6910**

---

**Cemetery Field Survey Sheet**  
**Individual Marker/Monument**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery: New Cemetery</th>
<th>Grave #: 37</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th>Photo No: 2:8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name(s) on marker:** Tash, Pearl Irene

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- ☑ tablet headstone
- ☑ die in socket
- ☑ die on base
- ☑ government issue
- ☑ lawn-type
- ☑ plaque
- ☑ raised top
- ☑ pulpit
- ☑ die, base, cap
- ☑ bedstead/cradle
- ☑ table tomb
- ☑ box tomb
- ☑ ledger
- ☑ obelisk
- ☑ other:

**Inscription:** (Gothic “T”) PEARL IRENE/Dau. Of G.M. & Susie E./TASH/Born May 23, 1892/Died Jan. 22, 1903

**Inscription Technique:**
- ☑ carved
- ☑ painted
- ☑ other:

**Material:**
- ☑ marble
- ☑ granite
- ☑ sandstone
- ☑ slate
- ☑ limestone
- ☑ fieldstone
- ☑ other stone: granite socket
- ☑ cast iron
- ☑ zinc
- ☑ wood
- ☑ concrete
- ☑ other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**  
- **Height:** 22-1/2”  
- **Width:** 21-1/2”  
- **Thickness:** 13”

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- ☑ Bible
- ☑ willow and urn
- ☑ lamb
- ☑ Masonic
- ☑ finger pointing
- ☑ claspung hands
- ☑ cross
- ☑ cross & crown
- ☑ dove
- ☑ inverted torch
- ☑ other fraternal order:
- ☑ other design: Gothic “T”
- ☑ weathered
- ☑ cracked
- ☑ broken
- ☑ vandalized
- ☑ unattached
- ☑ loose
- ☑ leaning
- ☑ repaired
- ☑ biologicals
- ☑ stained
- ☑ portions missing:

**Stonecutter’s Name:**  
**City:**  
**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**  
**Material:**  
**Design/initials:**  
**Condition:**

**Coping:**  
**Material:**  
**Design:**  
**Condition:**

**Fencing:**  
**Material:**  
**Design:**  
**Condition:**

**Grave Orientation:** 260 degrees  
**Marker inscription faces what direction:**

**Grave Goods:**

**Surveyor:** Hacker  
**Date:** October 2003
PEARL IRENE
Daughter of S. & J. TASH
Born May 22, 1893
Died Jan. 22, 1919
Cemetery Field Survey Sheet
Individual Marker/Monument

**Cemetery:** New Cemetery  
**Grave #:** 38  
**Section #:**  
**Lot #:**  
**Photo No:** 2:7

**Name(s) on marker:** Meade, Perry J.

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- □ tablet headstone  
- □ government issue  
- □ die in socket  
- ■ die on base  
- □ raised top  
- □ die, base, cap  
- □ bedstead/cradle  
- □ table tomb  
- □ ledger  
- □ obelisk  
- □ other:

**Inscription:** (3-D lamb, missing head)(scroll on rock pile with ivy) PERRY J. MEADE/FEB. 26, 1895/SEPT. 14, 1896//This lovely bud so young so fair,/Called hence by early doom,/Just came to show how sweet a flower in/paradise would bloom.

**Inscription Technique:**
- □ carved  
- □ painted  
- □ other:

**Material:**
- ■ marble  
- □ granite  
- □ sandstone  
- □ slate  
- □ limestone  
- □ fieldstone  
- □ other stone:  
- □ wood  
- □ concrete  
- □ cast iron  
- □ zinc  
- □ other material: concrete base

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**
- **Height:** 27”
- **Width:** 13-1/4”
- **Thickness:** 19”

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- □ Bible  
- □ willow and urn  
- □ cross  
- □ cross & crown  
- □ lamb (3-D)  
- □ dove  
- □ inverted torch  
- □ Masonic  
- □ other fraternal order:  
- □ finger pointing  
- □ other design:

**Condition of Marker:**
- □ weathered  
- □ cracked  
- □ broken  
- □ vandalized  
- □ unattached  
- □ loose  
- □ leaning  
- □ repaired  
- □ biologicals  
- □ stained  
- □ portions missing:  
- □ other:

**Stonecutter’s Name:**  
**City:**  
**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**
- **Material:** marble  
- **Design/initials:** P.J.M.  
- **Condition:**

**Coping:**
- **Material:**  
- **Design:**  
- **Condition:**

**Fencing:**
- **Material:**  
- **Design:**  
- **Condition:**

**Grave Orientation:** 270 degrees  
**Marker inscription faces what direction:**

**Grave Goods:**

**Surveyor:** Hacker  
**Date:** October 2003
Cemetery: New Cemetery  
Grave #: 39  
Section #:  
Lot #:  
Photo No: 2:6

Name(s) on marker: Meade, Perry E.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Marker/Monument:</th>
<th>tablet headstone</th>
<th>die in socket</th>
<th>die on base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>government issue</td>
<td></td>
<td>lawn-type</td>
<td>plaque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raised top</td>
<td></td>
<td>pulpit</td>
<td>die, base, cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bedstead/cradle</td>
<td></td>
<td>table tomb</td>
<td>box tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ledger</td>
<td></td>
<td>obelisk</td>
<td>other:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inscription: (hand comes up from clouds, points up to crown) PERRY E. MEADE/BORN/NOV. 30, 1865/DIED AUG. 28, 1895//Not lost to thought but/Gone before, where we/Shall meet to part no more.

Inscription Technique:  
- carved
- painted
- other:

Material:  
- marble
- granite
- sandstone
- slate
- limestone
- fieldstone
- other stone: granite socket
- cast iron
- zinc
- wood
- concrete

Gravestone Size (ft/in):  
- Height: 22”
- Width: 21”
- Thickness: 13-1/2”

Gravestone Design Features:  
- Bible
- willow and urn
- lamb
- Masonic
- finger pointing
- other design: clouds, crown

Condition of Marker:  
- weathered
- cracked
- broken
- vandalized
- unattached
- loose
- leaning
- repaired
- biologicals
- stained
- portions missing:

Stonecutter’s Name:  
City:  
Location of Mark:

Footstone:  
Material:  
Design/initials:  
Condition:

Coping:  
Material:  
Design:  
Condition:

Fencing:  
Material:  
Design:  
Condition:

Grave Orientation:  
Marker inscription faces what direction:

Grave Goods:

Surveyor: Hacker  
Date: October 2003
BORN
NOV. 30, 1865
DIED
AUG. 28, 1895
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery: New Cemetery</th>
<th>Grave #: 40</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th>Photo No: 2:5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name(s) on marker:** Lipe, Samuel Albert

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- ☒ tablet headstone
- ☒ die in socket
- ☒ die on base
- ☒ government issue
- ☒ lawn-type
- ☒ plaque
- ☒ raised top
- ☒ pulpit
- ☒ die, base, cap
- ☒ bedstead/cradle
- ☒ table tomb
- ☒ box tomb
- ☒ ledger
- ☒ obelisk
- ☒ other:

**Inscription:** (3-D lamb, missing head) SAMUEL ALBERT/Son of/J.H. & ANNIE LIPE/Born/May 5, 1898./Died/Sept. 3, 1898.

**Inscription Technique:** ☒ carved

**Material:**
- ☒ marble
- ☒ granite
- ☒ sandstone
- ☒ slate
- ☒ limestone
- ☒ fieldstone
- ☒ other stone: granite base
- ☒ cast iron
- ☒ zinc
- ☒ wood
- ☒ concrete
- ☒ other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**
- **Height:** 26”
- **Width:** 18-1/2”
- **Thickness:** 11”

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- ☒ Bible
- ☒ willow and urn
- ☒ lamb 3D
- ☒ Masonic
- ☒ finger pointing
- ☒ clapping hands
- ☒ cross
- ☒ dove
- ☒ other fraternal order:
- ☒ other design:

**Condition of Marker:**
- ☒ weathered
- ☒ cracked
- ☒ broken
- ☒ vandalized
- ☒ unattached
- ☒ loose
- ☒ leaning
- ☒ repaired
- ☒ biologicals
- ☒ stained
- ☒ portions missing:
- ☒ other:

**Stonecutter’s Name:**
- **City:**
- **Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**
- **Material:** marble
- **Design/initials:** S.A.L.
- **Condition:**

**Coping:**
- **Material:**
- **Design:**
- **Condition:**

**Fencing:**
- **Material:**
- **Design:**
- **Condition:**

**Grave Orientation:**
- Marker inscription faces what direction:

**Grave Goods:** footstone measures 7-1/2” H, 6” W, 2-1/4” Th

**Surveyor:** Hacker
- **Date:** October 2003
SAMUEL ALBERT
Son of
C. H. & ANNIE LIPE
Born
May 2, 1892
Died
Sept. 8, 1893.
Cemetery Field Survey Sheet
Individual Marker/Monument

Cemetery: New Cemetery
Grave #: 41
Section #: 
Lot #: 
Photo No: 2:1

Name(s) on marker: Bell, Ella May

Type of Marker/Monument: [ ] tablet headstone [ ] die in socket [ ] die on base
[ ] government issue [ ] lawn-type [ ] plaque
[ ] raised top [ ] pulpit [ ] die, base, cap
[ ] bedstead/cradle [ ] table tomb [ ] box tomb
[ ] ledger [ ] obelisk [ ] other:

Inscription: (scroll w/fern, daisy, rose) ELLA MAY BELL/Died Jan. 26, 1896/Aged 18 Yrs. 6 Ms. 10 Das.

Inscription Technique: [✓] carved [ ] painted [ ] other:

Material: [✓] marble [ ] granite [ ] sandstone [ ] slate
[ ] limestone [ ] fieldstone [ ] other stone: [ ] wood
[ ] cast iron [ ] zinc [ ] other material:

Gravestone Size (ft/in): Height: 31” Width: 21-1/2” Thickness: 17-3/4”

Gravestone Design Features: [ ] Bible [ ] claspings hands [ ] flowers
[ ] willow and urn [ ] cross [ ] cross & crown
[ ] lamb [ ] dove [ ] inverted torch
[ ] Masonic [ ] other fraternal order: [ ]
[ ] finger pointing [ ] other design: scroll

Condition of Marker: [ ] weathered [ ] cracked [ ] broken
[ ] unattached [ ] loose [ ] vandalized
[ ] biologicals [ ] stained [ ] repaired
[ ] other:

Stonecutter’s Name: 
City: 
Location of Mark:

Footstone: Material: marble Design/initials: E.M.B. Condition:

Coping: Material: Design: Condition:

Fencing: Material: Design: Condition:

Grave Orientation: 260 degrees Marker inscription faces what direction:

Grave Goods: footstone measures 9”H, 8-1/2”W, 2-1/4”Th

Surveyor: Hacker Date: October 2003
No. 41 is on far right
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery: New Cemetery</th>
<th>Grave #: 42</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th>Photo No: 2:1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name(s) on marker:** Bell, Samuel L.

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- ☒ tablet headstone
- ☐ die in socket
- ☐ die on base
- ☐ government issue
- ☐ lawn-type
- ☐ plaque
- ☐ raised top
- ☐ pulpit
- ☐ die, base, cap
- ☐ bedstead/cradle
- ☐ table tomb
- ☐ box tomb
- ☐ ledger
- ☐ obelisk
- ☐ other:

**Inscription:** SAMUEL/L./BELL/1895-1913

**Inscription Technique:**
- ☐ carved
- ☐ painted
- ☒ other: burnt

**Material:**
- ☐ marble
- ☐ granite
- ☐ sandstone
- ☐ slate
- ☐ limestone
- ☐ fieldstone
- ☐ other stone:
- ☐ wood
- ☐ concrete
- ☐ other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**
- Height: 34”
- Width: 14-3/4”
- Thickness: ¾”

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- ☐ Bible
- ☐ willow and urn
- ☐ lamb
- ☐ Masonic
- ☐ finger pointing
- ☐ clapping hands
- ☐ cross
- ☐ dove
- ☐ other fraternal order:
- ☐ other design:
- ☐ cracked
- ☐ loose
- ☐ stained
- ☐ broken
- ☐ leaning
- ☐ portions missing:
- ☐ weathered
- ☐ unattached
- ☐ biologicals
- ☐ other:

**Condition of Marker:**
- ☒ weathered
- ☐ cracked
- ☐ broken
- ☐ vandalized
- ☐ unattached
- ☐ loose
- ☐ repaired
- ☐ weathered
- ☐ biologicals
- ☐ other:

**Stonecutter’s Name:**

**City:**

**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**

**Material:**

**Design/initials:**

**Condition:**

**Coping:**

**Material:**

**Design:**

**Condition:**

**Fencing:**

**Material:**

**Design:**

**Condition:**

**Grave Orientation:**

**Marker inscription faces what direction:**

**Grave Goods:** wood headboard support on rear attached using galvanized Phillips head screws

**Surveyor:** Hacker

**Date:** October 2003
No. 42 is in center
**Cemetery Field Survey Sheet**

**Individual Marker/Monument**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery: New Cemetery</th>
<th>Grave #: 43</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th>Photo No: 2:1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name(s) on marker:** Bell, Frank U.

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- □ tablet headstone
- □ government issue
- □ raised top
- □ bedstead/cradle
- □ ledger
- □ die in socket
- □ lawn-type
- □ pulpit
- □ table tomb
- □ obelisk
- □ die on base
- □ die, base, cap
- □ box tomb
- □ other:

**Inscription:** FRANK U./BELL/1886-1954

**Inscription Technique:**
- □ carved
- □ painted
- □ other:

**Material:**
- □ marble
- □ limestone
- □ cast iron
- □ other material:
- □ granite
- □ fieldstone
- □ zinc
- □ sandstone
- □ other stone:
- □ slate
- □ wood
- □ concrete

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**
- □ Height: 14”
- □ Width: 20”
- □ Thickness: 8”

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- □ Bible
- □ willow and urn
- □ lamb
- □ Masonic
- □ finger pointing
- □ clapping hands
- □ cross
- □ dove
- □ other fraternal order:
- □ other design:

**Condition of Marker:**
- □ weathered
- □ cracked
- □ broken
- □ vandalized
- □ unattached
- □ loose
- □ leaning
- □ repaired
- □ biologicals
- □ stained
- □ portions missing:
- □ other:

**Stonecutter’s Name:**

**City:**

**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**
- □ Material:
- □ Design/initials:
- □ Condition:

**Coping:**
- □ Material:
- □ Design:
- □ Condition:

**Fencing:**
- □ Material:
- □ Design:
- □ Condition:

**Grave Orientation:**

**Marker inscription faces what direction:**

**Grave Goods:**

**Surveyor:** Hacker

**Date:** October 2003
No. 43 is on far left
Cemetary Field Survey Sheet
Individual Marker/Monument

Cemetery: New Cemetery  Grave #: 44  Section #:  Lot #:  Photo No:

Name(s) on marker: Mathews, Rufe

Type of Marker/Monument: □ tablet headstone  □ die in socket  □ die on base  □ die in socket  □ die on base  □ die on base
□ government issue  □ die in socket  □ die on base  □ die on base  □ die on base  □ die on base
□ raised top  □ die in socket  □ die on base  □ die on base  □ die on base  □ die on base
□ bedstead/cradle  □ die in socket  □ die on base  □ die on base  □ die on base  □ die on base
□ ledger  □ die in socket  □ die on base  □ die on base  □ die on base  □ die on base

Inscription: RUFE/MATHEWS/1851-1907

Inscription Technique: □ carved  □ painted  □ other:

Material: □ marble  □ granite  □ sandstone  □ slate
□ limestone  □ fieldstone  □ other stone:  □ other stone:
□ cast iron  □ zinc  □ wood  □ concrete
□ other material: set on concrete base

Gravestone Size (ft/in): Height: 18-3/4”  Width: 8-1/4”  Thickness: 6”

Gravestone Design Features: □ Bible  □ clapping hands  □ flowers
□ willow and urn  □ cross  □ cross & crown
□ lamb  □ dove  □ inverted torch
□ Masonic  □ other fraternal order:  □ other design:
□ finger pointing  □ other design:

Condition of Marker: □ weathered  □ cracked  □ broken  □ vandalized
□ unattached  □ loose  □ leaning  □ repaired
□ biologicals  □ stained  □ portions missing:
□ other:

Stoncutter’s Name:  City:  Location of Mark:

Footstone:  Material:  Design/initials:  Condition:

Coping:  Material:  Design:  Condition:

Fencing:  Material:  Design:  Condition:

Grave Orientation:  Marker inscription faces what direction:

Grave Goods: stone is set upright, as if headstone, on concrete base or pad

Surveyor: Hacker  Date: October 2003
**Cemetery Field Survey Sheet**

**Individual Marker/Monument**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery: New Cemetery</th>
<th>Grave #: 45</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th>Photo No: 1:21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name(s) on Marker:** unknown

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- ☒ tablet headstone
- ☒ die in socket
- ☒ government issue
- ☒ lawn-type
- ☒ raised top
- ☒ pulpit
- ☒ bedstead/cradle
- ☒ table tomb
- ☒ ledger
- ☒ obelisk
- ☒ die on base
- ☒ plaque
- ☒ die, base, cap
- ☒ box tomb
- ☒ other:

**Inscription:** [top portion missing] [died] Jan. 29, 1901

**Inscription Technique:** ☒ carved

**Material:**
- ☒ marble
- ☒ granite
- ☒ sandstone
- ☒ slate
- ☒ limestone
- ☒ fieldstone
- ☒ other stone:
- ☒ wood
- ☒ concrete
- ☒ cast iron
- ☒ zinc
- ☒ other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**
- Height: remaining 8”
- Width: 10”
- Thickness: 2”

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- ☒ Bible
- ☒ willow and urn
- ☒ lamb
- ☒ Masonic
- ☒ finger pointing
- ☒ clapping hands
- ☒ flowers
- ☒ cross
- ☒ dove
- ☒ inverted torch
- ☒ other fraternal order:
- ☒ other design:

**Condition of Marker:**
- ☒ weathered
- ☒ unattached
- ☒ biologicals
- ☒ cracked
- ☒ loose
- ☒ stained
- ☒ broken
- ☒ leaning
- ☒ repaired
- ☒ portions missing: top

**Stonecutter’s Name:**

**City:**

**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**
- Material:

**Design/initials:**

**Condition:**

**Coping:**
- Material:

**Design:**

**Condition:**

**Fencing:**
- Material:

**Design:**

**Condition:**

**Grave Orientation:**

**Marker inscription faces what direction:**

**Grave Goods:**

**Surveyor:** Hacker

**Date:** October 2003
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery: New Cemetery</th>
<th>Grave #: 46</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th>Photo No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Name(s) on marker: Ryburn, Robert C.

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- [ ] tablet headstone
- [ ] government issue
- [ ] raised top
- [ ] bedstead/cradle
- [ ] ledger
- [x] die in socket
- [ ] lawn-type
- [ ] pulpit
- [ ] table tomb
- [ ] obelisk
- [ ] die on base
- [ ] plaque
- [ ] die, base, cap
- [ ] box tomb
- [ ] other:

**Inscription:** ROBERT C./RYBURN/MAR. 8, 1907/APRIL 23, 1907

**Inscription Technique:**
- [x] carved
- [ ] painted
- [ ] other:

**Material:**
- [x] marble
- [ ] granite
- [ ] sandstone
- [x] other stone: granite base
- [ ] slate
- [ ] limestone
- [ ] fieldstone
- [ ] zinc
- [ ] wood
- [ ] concrete
- [ ] other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**
- Height: 25”
- Width: 19”
- Thickness: 10-1/2”

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- [ ] Bible
- [ ] willow and urn
- [ ] lamb
- [ ] Masonic
- [ ] finger pointing
- [ ] clapping hands
- [ ] cross
- [ ] cross & crown
- [ ] dove
- [ ] inverted torch
- [ ] other fraternal order:
- [ ] other design:

**Condition of Marker:**
- [x] weathered
- [ ] unattached
- [ ] biologicals
- [ ] other:
- [ ] cracked
- [ ] loose
- [ ] stained
- [ ] broken
- [ ] leaning
- [ ] portions missing:
- [ ] vandalized
- [ ] repaired

**Stonecutter’s Name:**

**City:**

**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**
- Material:
- Design/initials:
- Condition:

**Coping:**
- Material:
- Design:
- Condition:

**Fencing:**
- Material:
- Design:
- Condition:

**Grave Orientation:** 270 degrees

**Marker inscription faces what direction:**

**Grave Goods:**

**Surveyor:** Hacker

**Date:** October 2003
CEMETERY FIELD SURVEY SHEET
INDIVIDUAL MARKER/MONUMENT

Cemetery: New Cemetery  Grave #: 47  Section #:  Lot #:  Photo No:

Name(s) on marker: Renner, Frederick

Type of Marker/Monument: ☑ tablet headstone  ☐ die in socket  ☐ die on base
☑ government issue  ☐ lawn-type  ☐ plaque
☑ raised top  ☐ pulpit  ☐ die, base, cap
☐ bedstead/cradle  ☐ table tomb  ☐ box tomb
☐ ledger  ☐ obelisk  ☑ other: w/shield

Inscription: FRED’K RENNER/CO. A/WASH. GD/MO. MILL

Inscription Technique: ☑ carved  ☐ painted  ☐ other:

Material: ☑ marble  ☐ granite  ☐ sandstone  ☐ slate
☐ limestone  ☐ fieldstone  ☐ other stone:  ☐ wood  ☐ concrete
☐ cast iron  ☐ zinc  ☐ other material:

Gravestone Size (ft/in):  Height:  Width:  Thickness:

Gravestone Design Features:  ☐ Bible  ☐ clapping hands  ☐ flowers
☐ willow and urn  ☐ cross  ☐ cross & crown
☐ lamb  ☐ dove  ☐ inverted torch
☐ Masonic  ☐ other fraternal order:  ☐ other design:
☐ finger pointing  ☐ other design:

Condition of Marker:  ☐ weathered  ☐ cracked  ☐ broken  ☐ vandalized
☐ unattached  ☐ loose  ☐ leaning  ☐ repaired
☐ biologicals  ☐ stained  ☐ portions missing:
☐ other:

Stonecutter’s Name:  City:  Location of Mark:

Footstone:  Material:  Design/initials:  Condition:

Coping:  Material:  Design:  Condition:

Fencing:  Material:  Design:  Condition:

Grave Orientation:  Marker inscription faces what direction:

Grave Goods:

Surveyor: Hacker  Date: October 2003
Cemetery Field Survey Sheet

Individual Marker/Monument

Cemetery: New Cemetery  Grave #: 48  Section #:  Lot #:  Photo No:

Name(s) on marker: White, G.H.

Type of Marker/Monument:  
- [ ] tablet headstone  
- [ ] die in socket  
- [ ] die on base  
- [ ] government issue  
- [ ] lawn-type  
- [ ] plaque  
- [ ] raised top  
- [ ] pulpit  
- [ ] die, base, cap  
- [ ] bedstead/cradle  
- [ ] table tomb  
- [ ] box tomb  
- [ ] ledger  
- [ ] obelisk  
- [x] other: w/shield

Inscription: G.H. WHITE/CO. F./96 ILL. INF.

Inscription Technique:  
- [x] carved  
- [ ] painted  
- [ ] other:

Material:  
- [x] marble  
- [ ] granite  
- [ ] sandstone  
- [ ] slate  
- [ ] limestone  
- [ ] fieldstone  
- [ ] other stone:  
- [ ] wood  
- [ ] concrete  
- [ ] cast iron  
- [ ] zinc  
- [ ] other material:

Gravestone Size (ft/in):  Height:  Width:  Thickness:

Gravestone Design Features:  
- [ ] Bible  
- [ ] willow and urn  
- [ ] claspings hands  
- [ ] flowers  
- [ ] lamb  
- [ ] cross  
- [ ] dove  
- [ ] cross & crown  
- [ ] Masonic  
- [ ] other fraternal order:  
- [ ] inverted torch  
- [ ] other design:

Condition of Marker:  
- [ ] weathered  
- [ ] cracked  
- [ ] broken  
- [ ] vandalized  
- [ ] unattached  
- [ ] loose  
- [ ] leaning  
- [ ] repaired  
- [ ] biologicals  
- [ ] stained  
- [ ] portions missing:

Stonecutter’s Name:  City:  Location of Mark:

Footstone:  Material:  Design/initials:  Condition:

Coping:  Material:  Design:  Condition:

Fencing:  Material:  Design:  Condition:

Grave Orientation:  Marker inscription faces what direction:

Grave Goods:

Surveyor: Hacker  Date: October 2003
Cemetery Field Survey Sheet
Individual Marker/Monument

Cemetery: New Cemetery  Grave #: 49a  Section #:  Lot #:  Photo No:

Name(s) on marker: Gibson, David

Type of Marker/Monument: ☑ tablet headstone  ☐ die in socket  ☐ die on base
☑ government issue  ☐ lawn-type  ☐ plaque
☑ raised top  ☐ pulpit  ☐ die, base, cap
☐ bedstead/cradle  ☐ table tomb  ☐ box tomb
☐ ledger  ☐ obelisk  ☑ other: w/shield

Inscription: DAVID GIBSON/CORP. CO. C./1 CONN. H.A.

Inscription Technique: ☑ carved  ☐ painted  ☐ other:

Material: ☑ marble  ☐ granite  ☐ sandstone  ☐ slate
☐ limestone  ☐ fieldstone  ☐ other stone:  ☐ wood
☐ cast iron  ☐ zinc  ☐ other material:

Gravestone Size (ft/in): Height: Width: Thickness:

Gravestone Design Features: ☐ Bible  ☐ willow and urn  ☐ clapping hands  ☐ flowers
☐ lamb  ☐ cross  ☐ cross & crown  ☐ inverted torch
☐ Masonic  ☐ dove  ☐ other fraternal order:  ☐ other design:
☐ finger pointing

Condition of Marker: ☐ weathered  ☐ cracked  ☐ broken  ☐ vandalized
☐ unattached  ☐ loose  ☐ leaning  ☐ repaired
☐ biologicals  ☐ stained  ☐ portions missing:
☐ other:

Stonecutter’s Name:  City:  Location of Mark:

Footstone: Material: Design/initials: Condition:

Coping: Material: concrete Design: Condition:

Fencing: Material: Design: Condition:

Grave Orientation: Marker inscription faces what direction:

Grave Goods: part of family plot, measuring 18x12 feet

Surveyor: Hacker  Date: October 2003
**Cemetery Field Survey Sheet**

**Individual Marker/Monument**

Cemetery: New Cemetery  
Grave #: 49b  
Section #:  
Lot #:  
Photo No: 

**Name(s) on marker:** Gibson, Margaret C.

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- [ ] tablet headstone
- [ ] government issue
- [ ] raised top
- [ ] bedstead/cradle
- [x] ledger

**Inscription:** G/MARGARET C. GIBSON/AUG. 8, 1848/MAR. 6, 1926

**Inscription Technique:**  
- [x] carved
- [ ] painted
- [ ] other:

**Material:**
- [x] marble
- [x] granite
- [ ] fieldstone
- [ ] sandstone
- [ ] slate
- [ ] limestone
- [ ] cast iron
- [ ] zinc
- [ ] other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**  
Height: 46”  
Width: 27”  
Thickness: 12”

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- [ ] Bible
- [ ] willow and urn
- [ ] lamb
- [ ] Masonic
- [ ] finger pointing
- [ ] other:

**Condition of Marker:**
- [ ] weathered
- [ ] unattached
- [ ] biologicals
- [ ] other:

**Stonecutter’s Name:**  
City:  
Location of Mark: 

**Footstone:**  
Material:  
Design/initials:  
Condition: 

**Coping:**  
Material: concrete  
Design:  
Condition: 

**Fencing:**  
Material:  
Design:  
Condition: 

**Grave Orientation:**  
Marker inscription faces what direction:

**Grave Goods:** part of family plot, measuring 18x12 feet

**Surveyor:** Hacker  
Date: October 2003
**Cemetery Field Survey Sheet**

**Individual Marker/Monument**

**Cemetery:** New Cemetery  
**Grave #:** 49c  
**Section #:**  
**Lot #:**  
**Photo No:**

**Name(s) on marker:** Gibson, Fred J.

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- ☑ tablet headstone
- ☑ die in socket
- ❏ die on base
- ☑ government issue
- ❏ lawn-type
- ☑ plaque
- ☑ raised top
- ❏ pulpit
- ❏ die, base, cap
- ❏ bedstead/cradle
- ❏ table tomb
- ☑ box tomb
- ❏ ledger
- ❏ obelisk
- ❏ other:

**Inscription:** GIBSON / FRED J. / JULY 11, 1874 / NOV. 5, 1937

**Inscription Technique:**
- ☑ carved
- ❏ painted
- ❏ other:

**Material:**
- ☑ marble
- ❏ granite
- ❏ sandstone
- ❏ slate
- ❏ limestone
- ❏ fieldstone
- ❏ other stone:
- ❏ wood
- ❏ concrete
- ❏ other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**
- **Height:** 38”
- **Width:** 30”
- **Thickness:** 12”

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- ❏ Bible
- ❏ willow and urn
- ❏ clapping hands
- ❏ cross
- ❏ flowers
- ❏ lamb
- ❏ cross & crown
- ❏ dove
- ❏ inverted torch
- ❏ Masonic
- ❏ other fraternal order:
- ❏ other design:
- ❏ finger pointing
- ❏ other:

**Condition of Marker:**
- ❏ weathered
- ❏ cracked
- ❏ broken
- ❏ vandalized
- ❏ unattached
- ❏ loose
- ❏ leaning
- ❏ repaired
- ❏ biologicals
- ❏ stained
- ❏ portions missing:
- ❏ other:

**Stonecutter’s Name:**

**City:**

**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**
- **Material:**
- **Design/initials:**
- **Condition:**

**Coping:**
- **Material:** concrete
- **Design:**
- **Condition:**

**Fencing:**
- **Material:**
- **Design:**
- **Condition:**

**Grave Orientation:** 250 degrees  
**Marker inscription faces what direction:**

**Grave Goods:** part of family plot, measuring 18x12 feet

**Surveyor:** Hacker  
**Date:** October 2003
CEMETERY PRESERVATION PLANS

HISTORIC RESEARCH

IDENTIFICATION OF GRAVE LOCATIONS AND MAPPING

CONDITION ASSESSMENTS

TREATMENT OF STONE AND IRONWORK

Chicora Foundation, Inc.
P.O. Box 8664 • 861 Arbutus Drive
Columbia, South Carolina 29202-8664
Tel: 803/787-6910
Fax: 803/787-6910
Email: chicora@chicora.org
www.chicora.org
Cemetery Reconnaissance Inspection Checklist

Name of Cemetery: Armstead

Location: Beaverhead County  State: MT  Site No.:

UTM Coordinates: Datum: NAD27  Zone: 12  E: 354704  N: 4979629

Date: 10/15/03  Photographs: Roll 5, 4-7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance Item</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Unsat</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Grounds</td>
<td>Grass is cut, no rubbish or debris on the ground. Good landscaping</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒ Very limited sagebrush and dense, well established native grasses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Roads</td>
<td>Paved with no potholes and no flooding</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒ NA; no road to site, it is located immediately off the interstate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Burial Sites</td>
<td>No sinking burial sites. Old flowers and other items disposed of properly</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒ Five of the six identified graves are marked by mounds, only one depression (although three other reputed graves were not found)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Monuments</td>
<td>Intact, not broken or in need of repair/replacement. In proper position.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒ Remains of some sort of enclosure around two identifiable graves, as well as remains of one grave fence – both fallen and in disrepair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Plaques or Other Features</td>
<td>Clean and maintained with no broken items</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Structures or Buildings</td>
<td>Clean and maintained, good general housekeeping. No structural deficiencies. Roof and gutter good condition.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Safety</td>
<td>No hazardous conditions such as uneven sidewalks or fire conditions. No monument threats.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Drainage</td>
<td>Proper maintenance of culverts, downspouts, grates and good site drainage.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒ NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Utilities</td>
<td>Has water and electricity.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒ NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. ADA</td>
<td>Meets ADA requirements for bathrooms, parking, access routes.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒ Not accessible, but universal access not warranted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Other</td>
<td>General observations regarding monuments.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒ Jack fence should be enlarged to incorporate two graves currently under fence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Overall Condition of Site</td>
<td>Standard: Excellent site had no discrepancies. It was clean and well maintained with the monuments in overall good condition. Good site has minor discrepancies, however, it was clean and well maintained. Fair site required repairs and/or maintenance. Abandoned site requires extensive preservation efforts.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Priorities:
- Enlarge the fence to include the two graves currently under the fence.
- Develop and install identification and regulatory signage.
- Ensure that the site is checked on a periodic basis.
- Identify, if possible the three additional graves reputed to be on the site.
- Document in greater detail the wooded fences on-site.
View of the cemetery from the Interstate, looking toward the reservoir

View of two grave mounds within the original plot boundary (marked by large upright posts)
Grave Mound F situated under the jack fence

Remnant grave fence collapsed on top of Grave Mound D
USGS topographic map (Red Rock 1976) showing the Armstead Cemetery
## Cemetery Reconnaissance Inspection Checklist

**Name of Cemetery:** Poindexter Burial Ground  
**Location:** Beaverhead County  
**State:** MT  
**Site No.:**

---

**UTM Coordinates:**  
**Datum:**  
**Zone:**  
**E:**  
**N:**

**Date:** 10/17/03  
**Photographs:** Roll 5, 8-25

### Maintenance Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Unsat</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Grounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grass is cut, no rubbish or debris on the ground. Good landscaping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cemetery is in deep grass, much debris, irrigation pipes stacked in cemetery, deep ruts from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>irrigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paved with no potholes and no flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Currently no direct access to cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Burial Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No sinking burial sites. Old flowers and other items disposed of properly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area heavily damaged by cultivation, stones toppled, coping intentionally taken up and stacked,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fences removed, much damage overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some monuments are broken, all monuments toppled, many appear to be displaced; all fences down,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>many corner posts broken, much fencing missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Plaques or Other Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clean and maintained with no broken items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Much damage overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Structures or Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clean and maintained, good general housekeeping. No structural deficiencies. Roof and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gutter good condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No hazardous conditions such as uneven sidewalks or fire conditions. No monument threats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walking in the cemetery is very hazardous; dense deposits of mouse fecal material poses hanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>virus threat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proper maintenance of culverts, downspouts, grates and good site drainage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area over water by irrigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Has water and electricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>ADA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meets ADA requirements for bathrooms, parking, access routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site is not accessible, but at present there is probably no need to attempt universal access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General observations regarding monuments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cemetery needs to be IMMEDIATELY reclaimed by city and entire acreage indicated in deed fenced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall Condition of Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard: Excellent site had no discrepancies. It was clean and well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maintained with the monuments in overall good condition. Good site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>has minor discrepancies, however, it was clean and well maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair site required repairs and/or maintenance. Abandoned site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>requires extensive preservation efforts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks:** This site has been extensively damaged by cultivation – monuments appear to have been toppled so as not to interfere with cultivation/irrigation; trees appear to have been cut down for same reason; materials displaced and stacked. This site evidences heavy vandalism.

### Priorities:

- Immediately establish claim to acreage specified in deed by fencing
- Contact the Montana Bureau of Investigation and request investigation under Montana Code of Law 45-6-104
- Immediately prohibit all trespass, including operation of irrigation through the cemetery
- Make arrangement to cut and remove grass by hand; begin establishing native grasses in the cemetery area
- Inventory all monuments and prepare measurements in anticipation of re-associating monuments
- Conduct historic research with particular emphasis on identification of photographs that might show the cemetery when intact; contact relatives of those buried in cemetery for information on those present and burial locations
- Retain conservator for additional advice on restoration of the cemetery
Charles Bliven marble pedestal tomb

Isaac Van Camp marble pulpit marker
Dumped bases and (in foreground) marble pedestal tomb of Martha Jane Van Camp

Cast iron fence posts broken off at ground level (note clean break at same location on both)
Stacked granite coping and fragments of granite fence posts

Virginia Elizabeth Reynolds marble headstone and (to right) marble headstone for son of R & V Reynolds
Marble headstone for Richard A. Reynolds

Marble pedestal tomb of Emily G. Kelley
Marble headstone of William J. Wood

Base sections, one labeled “Mother”
Marble die for Alice E. Orem

Marble pedestal tomb for Sarah Emerick
Marble die for Duanna Emerick

Marble pedestal tomb for Martha Jane Van Camp
Granite plaque marker for E.W. Butts (base immediately adjacent)

Marble headstone for Lenita May Bliven
Additional notes:

- See attached list for identified stone transcriptions
- Total number of stones present is not known – this represents only a reconnaissance
- The total number of graves is unknown and very likely much greater than the stones that remain (many graves were probably marked using impermanent markers); the only way to determine the total number of graves would be to conduct either a penetrometer or ground penetrating radar survey
- No portion of the cemetery acreage should be exchanged for road access since there is no way to be certain where burials are located
Gray marble pulpit marker, no base, on back:
   ISAAC VAN/CAMP/DIED/AUG. 28. 1900/AGED/78Y6M1D

Gray marble draped pedestal marker:
    EMILY G./KELLEY./BORN/Aug. 10. 1820/DIED/Mar 22. 1891

Gray marble, die in socket, flat on ground, no base:
   As the leaf falleth/off the vine/VIRGINIA ELIZABETH/Wife of/R.A. REYNOLDS/Born March 11.
   1834/Died June 8.1885/Superior excellence hath departed

Gray marble headstone, lying on ground:
    Son of/R. & V. Reynolds

Marble headstone, flat on ground:
    RICHARD A. REYNOLDS/DIED/JAN. 1904/ AGED 62 YEARS/Thy will be done

Nearby above:
    2 marble bases
    2 coping corners for pipe fence
    1 concrete marker, possibly footstone

Marble die, no base, on back:
    DUANNA/Daughter of/[ ]. W. EMERICK/Died/Nov. 20, 1887/Aged/23 Years./ [ ] rests here

Marble pedestal tomb, on back:
    In memory of/our/darling Mother/SARAH EMERICK/Died/APR. 20. 1880/Aged/43 Yrs.

Nearby above two markers:
    1 marble base
    1 granite base

Marble die, no base, on back:
    ALICE E./DAU. OF/J.C. & S.A. OREM/DIED/AUG. 19. 1882/AGED/10 YRS. 3 MOS.

Nearby above marker:
    1 marble base
    1 marble base: [On]ly sleeping

Granite die, polished face, no base, leaning on tree stump:
    SACRED TO THE/MEMORY OF/RILLA WIFE OF/C.F. HAWKES/DIED JUNE 9, 1891./AGED 27
    YEARS

Nearby above marker:
    1 granite base

Marble headstone, on back:
    (cross)/ WILLIAN J./Son of/ N.H. & C. WOOD/DIED/Apr. 2, 1874./AGED/6 Mos. 8 d’s.

Nearby above marker:
    1 white marble base: MOTHER
    1 white marble socket
    1 square concrete base
    3 concrete bases

Gray marble pedestal tomb, no base, on side:
   CHARLES BLIVEN/Died/FEB. 21. 1892/Aged/50 Yrs. 2 Mo./20 Days
Marble pedestal tomb, on face:

ERECTED TO THE MEMORY OF/MARTHA JANE/WIFE OF/ISAAC VAN CAMP/DIED APR. 27.
1892/AGED/61, YRS. 6, MO./15, DYS./Tis hard to break the tender cord/When love has bound the
heart/Tis hard so hard to speak the words,/Must we forever part?

Nearby above marker:
4 granite bases

Marble and concrete coping stacks

Found together in one area:
1 marble base
2 limestone (or gray marble) bases
3 limestone (or gray marble) corner posts
1 limestone (or gray marble) coping
1 coping pipe section

Found in one area:
1 sandstone base

Marble die, no base, on back:
LENITA MAY/DAU. OF/CHAS. & SARAH./BLIVEN/Died/July 23, 1888./aged 3 Yrs. 1 Mo. & 23 Dy's.

Granite plaque marker:
E.W. BUTTS./DIED MAY 30, 1884./AGED 37 YS. 3 Ms. 18 Ds./EMMA J./WIFE OF/E.W. BUTTS./DIED
JUNE 8, 1883./AGED 32 Ys. 4 Ms. 5 Ds./BUTTTS

Nearby above marker:
5 granite bases