

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations for individual properties and districts. See instructions in How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form (National Register Bulletin 16A). Complete each item by marking "x" in the appropriate box or by entering the information requested. If any item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, architectural classification, materials, and areas of significance, enter only categories and subcategories from the instructions. Place additional entries and narrative items on continuation sheets (NPS Form 10-900a). Use a typewriter, word processor, or computer, to complete all items.

1. Name Of Property

historic name Grand Portage National Monument
other names/site number Grand Portage (Site 21CK6), Fort Charlotte (21CK7), and the Grand Portage Trail

2. Location

street & number Off U. S. Highway 61 within the area of the Grand Portage Indian Reservation not for publication N/A
city or town Grand Portage vicinity X
state Minnesota code MN county Cook code 031
zip code 55605

3. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1986, as amended, I hereby certify that this nomination request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property meets does not meet the National Register Criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant nationally statewide locally. (See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Signature and title of certifying official Date

State or Federal agency and bureau

In my opinion, the property meets does not meet the National Register criteria. (See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Signature of commenting or other official Date

Patrick McCormack, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, Minnesota Historical Society
State or Federal agency and bureau

4. National Park Service Certification

I hereby certify that this property is:	Signature of Keeper	Date of Action
<input type="checkbox"/> entered in the National Register <input type="checkbox"/> See continuation sheet.	_____	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> determined eligible for the National Register <input type="checkbox"/> See continuation sheet.	_____	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> determined not eligible for the National Register <input type="checkbox"/> removed from the National Register	_____	_____
other (explain): _____	_____	_____

5. Classification

Ownership of Property

(Check as many boxes as apply.)

- private
- public-local
- public-State
- public-Federal

Category of Property

(Check only one box.)

- building
- district
- site
- structure
- object

Number of Resources within Property

(Do not include previously listed resources in the count.)

Contributing	Noncontributing	
0	3	building sites
1	0	structures
2	9	objects
0	1	Total
3	13	

Name of related multiple property listing

(Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing.)

N/A

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register

7

6. Function Or Use

Historic Functions

(Enter categories from instructions.)

COMMERCE/ TRADE/ trade

DOMESTIC: camp

Current Functions

(Enter categories from instructions.)

OTHER/ National Monument

LANDSCAPE: forest

7. Description

Architectural Classification

(Enter categories from instructions.)

other: French *pièces-sur-pièces* or "Red River Frame"

Materials

(Enter categories from instructions.)

foundation Stone

walls Wood

roof Shake

other

Narrative Description

(Describe the historic and current condition of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

(See Continuation Sheets)

Grand Portage National Monument
Name of Property

Cook County, MN
County and State

8. Statement Of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria

(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

- A** Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- B** Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- C** Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.
- D** Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Criteria Considerations

(Mark "x" in all the boxes that apply.)

Property is:

- A** owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.
- B** removed from its original location.
- C** a birthplace or grave.
- D** a cemetery.
- E** a reconstructed building, object, or structure.
- F** a commemorative property.
- G** less than 50 years of age or achieved significance within the past 50 years.

Narrative Statement of Significance

(Explain the significance of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

9. Major Bibliographical References

Bibliography

(Cite the books, articles and other sources used in preparing this form on one or more continuation sheets.)

Previous documentation on file (NPS):

- preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested
- previously listed in the National Register
- previously determined eligible for the National Register
- designated a National Historic Landmark
- recorded by Historic American Building Survey # _____
- recorded by Historic American Engineering Record # _____

Areas of Significance

(Enter categories from instructions.)

ARCHEOLOGY: Historic Aboriginal
ARCHEOLOGY: Historic Non-Aboriginal

EXPLORATION/SETTLEMENT

COMMERCE

TRANSPORTATION

POLITICS/GOVERNMENT

Period of Significance

1731-1951

Significant Dates

N/A

Significant Person

(Complete if Criterion B is marked above.)

N/A

Cultural Affiliation

EURO-AMERICAN

OJIBWE

Architect/Builder

N/A

Primary location of additional data:

- State Historic Preservation Office
- Other State agency
- Federal agency
- Local government
- University
- Other

Name of repository:

Grand Portage Monument Headquarters, Grand Marais, MN

Grand Portage National Monument
Name of Property

Cook County, MN
County and State

10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property 709.97 acres

UTM References

(Place additional UTM references on a continuation sheet.) SEE CONTINUATION SHEET

1	_____	_____	_____	3	_____	_____	_____
	Zone	Easting	Northing		Zone	Easting	Northing
2	_____	_____	_____	4	_____	_____	_____
					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	See continuation sheet.	

Verbal Boundary Description

(Describe the boundaries of the property on a continuation sheet.)

Boundary Justification

(Explain why the boundaries were selected on a continuation sheet.)

11. Form Prepared By

name/title Douglas A. Birk
organization Archaeologist/Historian date 2 March 2005
street & number 4522 Nokomis Avenue South telephone (612) 722-4231
city or town Minneapolis state MN zip code 55406

Additional Documentation

Submit the following items with the complete form:

Continuation Sheets

Maps

A **USGS map** (7.5- or 15-minute series) indicating the property's location (See maps filed with original nomination).

A **Sketch map** for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources.

Photographs

Representative black and white photographs of the property.

Additional items

(Check with the SHPO or FPO for any additional items.)

Property Owner

(Complete this item at the request of SHPO or FPO.)

name _____
street & number _____ telephone _____
city or town _____ state _____ zip code _____

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement: This information is being collected for application to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.).

Estimated Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 18.1 hours per response including time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comment regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Chief, Administrative Service Division, National Park Service, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paper Work Reductions Project (1024-0018), Washington, DC 20503

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 5

Page 1

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

5. CLASSIFICATION

List of Contributing and Noncontributing Resources within the GRPO Historic District

Resources	Number and Identity of Resources	
	<i>Contributing</i>	<i>Noncontributing</i>
<i>Buildings</i>	1-Great Hall (CR-5)** 1-Kitchen (CR-16)** 1-Warehouse/Canoe Shed (CR-47)** 1-Gatehouse (CR-14)**	1-Public Restroom Facilities 1-GRPO Maintenance Facilities 1-GRPO Ranger Station 1-GRPO Ranger Residence
<i>Sites</i>	1-Fort Charlotte Site Complex** 1-Grand Portage Site Complex 1-Grand Portage trail corridor**	0
<i>Structures</i>	1-Stockade (CR-19) 1-Stone Highway Bridge (CR-59)	1-Grand Portage Trail Improvements 1-Public Roads (Highways crossing the portage) 1-Public Roads (Within the lakeshore unit) 1-Snow Creek Footbridge 1-Footbridges by Grand Portage Bay 1-Fort Charlotte Restroom & Picnic Facilities 1-Mount Rose Trail & Trail Improvements 1-Secure Parking/Storage Areas 1-Grand Portage Dock (CR-97) 1-USID Dock (CR-54)
<i>Objects</i>	0	1-Fort Charlotte Stone Monument
TOTAL	9	15

** Indicates properties listed on the NRHP database in 1976. The Crawford Cabin, listed in 1976 as an historic building, was determined ineligible and was removed from the NRHP in 1986. The totals here do not match those in Section 5 of the form, because previously listed properties are not counted in Section 5 of the form.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 1

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

7. DESCRIPTION

SUMMARY STATEMENT

The Grand Portage National Monument (GRPO) is a National Park Service (NPS) park unit near the United States-Canadian Border in extreme northeastern Minnesota. The GRPO contains 709.97 acres, including the Grand Portage, a historic carrying place on the old Voyageurs Highway canoe route that connects Lake Superior with navigable waterways to the northwest. The park is bounded on the north and south by the Grand Portage Indian Reservation, on the west by the Pigeon River, and on the east by a bay of Lake Superior. The lakefront area of the park lies within the community of Grand Portage, the home place and government/business center of the Grand Portage Band of Minnesota Chippewa (Ojibwe, Ojibway, *Anishinaabeg*).

Congress set the GRPO aside in 1958 to preserve and interpret historical properties relating to the North American fur trade, as well as to foster relations and promote employment with the Grand Portage Ojibwe and to protect scenic and natural values. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the Grand Portage was vital to trade and exploration in the Northwest. Today the GRPO is a multifaceted cultural and natural resource that incorporates sites, landscapes, structures, reconstructions, and ecosystems important to North American Indian, French and British colonial, and Canadian and United States history (Cockrell 1983).

Initially used by Native American/First Nation peoples, the Grand Portage was opened to commercial traffic by French traders in the early 1700s A.D. Trade activities peaked there under the North West Company (NWC), a Montreal-based coalition of British traders, following the American Revolution. By 1804 the NWC and competing traders abandoned intensive use of the Grand Portage, leaving behind a rich tangible legacy of their passing in the form of archeological remains and cultural landscapes.¹ Later episodes of human activity often added to, altered, or degraded those resources. Since the 1930s, efforts to protect and maintain cultural properties, landscapes, and reconstructions at Grand Portage have been assisted by local Ojibwe workers, many descended from individuals who may have been there as early as the 1730s (e.g., Blackwell et al. 1983:61-62, 74-75).

A district National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) Inventory-Nomination Form was completed for the GRPO in 1976, and it was listed on the NRHP in 1977. The nomination found the GRPO significant for “its important association with the fur trade and the exploration and colonization of the northwest, its historic and geographic link between the United States and Canada, and its excellent state of preservation in a semi-wilderness setting” (Busch 1976; NPS 2003:171). The nomination defined the principal areas and period of significance for the district to be the history and archeology of the North American fur trade between 1730 and 1804. The district’s boundaries corresponded with the GRPO’s administrative boundaries (Busch 1976).

Among seven contributing properties listed in the NRHP database following the 1976 nomination are: two sites (the Grand Portage trail and the Fort Charlotte site complex), an historic 1890s cabin (the Crawford Cabin), and four reconstructed fur trade buildings (the Great Hall, Gatehouse, Warehouse, and Kitchen). Noncontributing properties include one non-historic building (the public restroom) and one non-historic structure (the Grand Portage Dock). Although mentioned in the nomination (Busch 1976), the reconstructed NWC stockade (i.e., fort enclosure) is not listed in the database. The 1976 nomination was later found inadequate for the management needs of the GRPO, partly because it made little mention of archeological resources and ignored other resource classes altogether, including properties dating to the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Likewise, the nomination did not adequately document or justify how the historic reconstructions meet the criteria for NRHP listing as contributing structures.

¹ Cultural landscapes are settings that people have created in the natural world. Through interwoven patterns of built and natural elements, cultural landscapes reflect how humans have adapted to and manipulated the land. As with an historic district, a cultural landscape is composed of constituent areas or features that may or may not contribute to the significance of an eligible NRHP property. For more information on how cultural landscape principles might be applied at the GRPO, see Burt (2001) and NPS (2003:175-177).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 2

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

The 1976 nomination is now also seriously outdated. Since the time of its writing, the GRPO has been the subject of increased research and planning activities that have helped to further identify, delineate, and assess cultural and natural resources within the park. More recent park projects include the inventory of cultural and natural resources (e.g., Woolworth and Woolworth 1982; Birk 2001), archeological investigations along the Grand Portage trail corridor (e.g., Birk and Cooper 2001; Cooper 2004), renewed study of archival materials relating to Grand Portage (White 2004), and oral interviews with tribal elders to build awareness of sites with ethnographic or traditional cultural significance (Auger and Driben 2000). Other initiatives have reexamined the park's mission and priorities, explored alternatives for managing and using the park, defined and inventoried cultural landscapes, and established appropriate interpretive themes and visitor experience goals (e.g.; Burt 2001; NPS 2003; GRPO 2004). Among research designed to increase current understanding of natural environments at the GRPO are geomorphological studies that address regional glacial and post-glacial history and the influences of natural features, soils, and drainage on vegetation and human land use (e.g., Phillips 2003). Historical and archeological studies at Voyageurs National Park, another Minnesota-based NPS park unit noted for its fur trade heritage and its location on the historic Voyageurs Highway, have also cast light on the use of the Grand Portage (e.g., Catton and Montgomery 2000; Birk and Richner 2004).

The present NHRP nomination is a revision of the 1976 original. The GRPO district boundaries still correspond with the administrative boundaries of the park, but the *areas of significance* have been retailored and the *period of significance* is now extended from 1731 through 1951 (see Section 8 of the printed form above). As indicated on the chart (Section 5, Page 1), contributing resources within the district now include three archeological sites, four replicated fur trade era buildings, one replicated fur trade era structure, and one early twentieth century stone highway bridge. Among noncontributing resources are four buildings, ten structures, and one object. A broader discussion of cultural sites and loci begins on page 15 of Section 7, below.

GRAND PORTAGE AND THE NORTHWEST FUR TRADE

The Grand Portage is located on the northwestern periphery of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River drainage in the midcontinent of North America. It is a place celebrated for its associations with the northern fur trade, a dynamic enterprise that forged diverse and insoluble relationships between Indian and non-Indian peoples as early as the seventeenth century A. D. At its most elemental level the fur trade involved the bartering of Indian furs, provisions, and services for imported European goods and commodities. In broader view, however, the trade entailed a profound intercultural exchange of languages, ideas, materials, technologies, diseases, and genes while promoting commercial, political, and marital alliances within a global economy.

French and later British traders commonly entered the Great Lakes-Northwest trade by traveling west from Montreal. The use of Indian guides, birchbark canoes, and a vast network of established Indian canoe routes and portages assisted their movements (Morse 1969; Birk 1994a). From the beginning, the fur trade built on entrenched Indian exchange practices while catering to Indian preferences and needs (e.g., White 1982, 1987). Over time, as the business of accruing and transporting goods grew more complex and exchange frontiers expanded westward, the systems of trade were institutionalized. Certain individuals, like voyageurs, became specialists in the trade hierarchy just as certain places, like entrepôts, gained wider distinction as nodes or corridors of commerce. The most influential settlements were those that played strategic roles in the flow of workers, provisions, merchandise, and information (e.g., Hirth 1976).

Grand Portage became such a place in the eighteenth century. Through regular use, the Grand Portage emerged as a hub for local trade and as a transshipment center--a gateway community that linked markets and linear transportation lanes in the east with branching trade routes and mosaic trade districts to the northwest (Birk 1984:51-52). Between 1731 and 1804 tons of supplies and furs were shuttled over the portage; some, in and out of the warehouses eventually built at either end of the trail. After 1760 the portage became a general rendezvous. It was a veritable beehive of activity during summers, but in winters the outposts there were comparatively quiet and staffed only by small crews engaged in local trading and facilities management (Gilman 1992). At the height of the trade, around 1800, Grand Portage was the western headquarters of the NWC and the rival XY Company (XYC),

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 3

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

two of the largest commercial establishments in North America. When the NWC and XYC moved their operations north to Kaministikwia (later Fort William, Ontario) at the start of the nineteenth century, Grand Portage lost its identity and its status as an *entrepôt*, abruptly becoming remote to the main channels of trade and communication and less important to the outside world.

In some respects, the relative geographical isolation of Grand Portage is as conspicuous today as it was in former times. Ojibwe residents there recently observed: "One cannot think of Grand Portage at all without noting that it is far from other places." That seclusion, along with local conditions and shifting economic and political forces, has long shaped historical and cultural developments at Grand Portage (Blackwell et al. 1983:65).

SETTING

The GRPO is in a forested region of rugged topography in Cook County, Minnesota, on the northwest side of Lake Superior. The Monument lies within the Canadian biotic province near the southern edge of the Canadian Shield. Terrain in the vicinity of the GRPO is sculpted by uplift, glaciation, and erosion and characterized by rock ridges and rolling hills interspersed with swamps, marshes, ponds, and lakes (Cleland 1966:9; Ojakangas and Matsch 1982:175-176). The primary upland forest vegetation consists of dense stands of conifers, birch, aspen, and maple. Spruce, tamarack, cedar, fir, willow, hawthorn, and alder flourish in low or poorly drained areas (e.g., Marschner 1974; Woolworth 1975a:274; Birk 2001). Surface soils, typically underlain by bedrock, stones and gravel, or lacustrine clays (Phillips 1995:18, 32; 2003), are thin, infertile, and of little value for agriculture.

Prior to intensive logging in the late nineteenth century, few, if any, large winter fauna other than black bear, moose, and caribou were found in the forest lands of northeastern Minnesota, including the Grand Portage area (e.g., Breckenridge 1949:128-131; Gilman 1992:95). With the exception of caribou, which will seasonally gather in small bands (Cochrane 1996:63), these are non-gregarious species prone to live in relative isolation. Comparing the poverty of game animals around Grand Portage to the great number of fish in Lake Superior, one writer in the late eighteenth century said "the waters alone are abundantly inhabited" (Lamb 1970:96). Fur traders at Grand Portage at the time were more dependent on imported foods for their diet than on local fish and game or on local agriculture, including domestic livestock (Woolworth 1975a:280-281). Throughout much of the historic period, the local Ojibwe, too, were skilled *collectors* rather than *producers* of food (Noble 1989a:14).

Climatic conditions at Grand Portage are generally cool and moist and subject to the lake effect of Lake Superior. The average annual temperature there is about 39-degrees Fahrenheit. The average annual snowfall of 60 to 68 inches is high even by Minnesota standards. Indeed, one of the greatest Minnesota snowfalls ever recorded within a 24-hour period was 28.0 inches that fell at the Pigeon River in April 1933. The greatest annual snowfall on record, amounting to 147.5 inches (12.29-feet), occurred at the same location during the winter of 1936-37 (Tester 1995:39). At Grand Portage, the number of days each year with snow cover (usually between 100 and 140 days) can actually exceed the number of frost-free days during the growing season (usually between 80 and 125 days) (Grout et al. 1959:xv, 10-11; Cleland 1966:9).

Long and short-term fluctuations in moisture and temperature are known. For example, the Little Ice Age (LIA), a period of 300 years or more characterized by episodes of increased cooling and moisture, occurred in the midcontinent during terminal precontact and early postcontact times (Cleland 1966:34-36; Birk 1991:243-245). On a lesser scale, some decades, years, or seasons also stand out in contrast to the expected norm. For example, the period 1800-1808 was one of generally decreased precipitation, lowered water levels, and increased danger of wild fires throughout much of the western Lake Superior Region (e.g., Gates 1965:197, 252). Conversely, the winter of 1798 was so unusually severe that ice hindered the movement of NWC vessels on the Great Lakes as late as June 1799 (Thompson 1969:84).

Droughty conditions can constrain the mobility of human groups, disrupt fisheries, retard maple sugaring, and devastate wild rice crops, just as increased or extended cool-moist conditions could also shape economic opportunities and limit human population

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 4

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

growth. Indeed, the LIA may have influenced a shift to a fur-trading economy for Native groups throughout the upper Great Lakes Region at or about the time of their initial exposure to Euroamerican traders and trade goods. The same developments may also have enhanced tribal differences and stimulated the movement of some Native groups into areas with greater hunting potentials resulting in increased intertribal tensions and warfare (e.g., Cleland 1966:34-36; Birk 1991:243-245; Clark 1999:32). The annual parade of seasons gave a cyclical rhythm to social and economic activities at Grand Portage (e.g., Winchell 1899:503n; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:202-205; Blackwell et al. 1983:15-20), affecting the tempo of the fur trade, the first major postcontact industry and intercultural exchange to flourish there (Gilman 1992:3, 56-62; Birk 1994a:361).

Human activities in the Grand Portage area are also influenced by the topography. Extending about four to five miles inland along the shore of Lake Superior in Cook County is a coastal belt of long rocky ridges separated by longitudinal valleys. The uplands just beyond the coastal ridges are more uniformly elevated and have lesser relief. About 50 miles back from the lake and 900 feet higher in elevation, is the rim of the Superior basin. Throughout the entire area, drainage patterns, stream channels, land and water transportation routes, and even the character of the Superior shoreline, are all widely influenced by the placement and structure of the ancient bedrock (Winchell 1899:503-507; Schwartz 1928; Grout et al. 1959:2-4; Ojakangas and Matsch 1982:175-176).

Grand Portage is a place of majestic scale and natural beauty with many prominent landmarks. The lakefront area of the GRPO faces Grand Portage Bay, a horseshoe-shaped inlet that forms the deepest natural indentation on the Minnesota coast of Lake Superior (Schwartz 1928:29). Flanking the northeast side of the bay is the rolling ridge of Hat Point (*Pointe au Chapeaux*), backed farther inland by the promontory of Mount Josephine, the top of which towers nearly 750-feet above the surface of the lake. The opposite, southwest edge of the bay is framed by the sloping headland of Raspberry Point (*Pointe à la Framboise*). About a mile offshore, in the center of the bay and partly shielding the bay from the big lake, is Grand Portage Island (also known as Pete's Island, Sheep Island, *Isle aux Mouton*, etc.) (Gates 1965:92-93; Grout et al. 1959:134). Near the lakefront within the GRPO is an imposing hill known as Mount Rose. The rounded and rocky summit of the hill rises several hundred feet above the bay and overlooks all of the historic properties clustered along the shoreline there (Winchell 1899:341; Thompson 1969:64; Gilman 1992:5), as well as the mouth of Grand Portage Creek, a stream channel that drains from the interior highlands and skirts the base of Mount Rose before entering Lake Superior. Mount Rose once served as a vantage to watch for approaching watercraft, the earliest such documented use perhaps occurring in 1767 (Carver 1956:127-128).

Grand Portage Bay is deceptively shallow for its size. At present lake levels as far as a half-mile from shore the bay is less than ten feet deep. One writer, referring to a NWC schooner in 1800, said the "Bay is so shoal that the vessel must be almost light before she can approach the shore." For that reason the largest schooners typically anchored by Grand Portage Island a mile or so offshore (Thompson 1969:96; Lamb 1970:94). So did ships that visited Grand Portage in the nineteenth century (e.g., Armstrong and Wentworth 1892:181; Woolworth 1979:109). Government engineers made preliminary surveys in the harbor in the 1880s with an eye towards possible future improvements, probably including dredging (WHC 11:125n4). A possible target for dredging may have been a "subaqueous ridge or barrier" formed by heavy waves breaking offshore. In the 1890s it is said that, "Boats drawing over a foot of water may ground on this barrier, but between it and the shore the water is deeper" (Lawson 1893:251).

Among other natural features along the North Shore are relic beach ridges and erosional bluffs marking prior surface levels of Lake Superior or earlier lakes, like glacial lakes Duluth, Algonquin, and Nipissing. The higher lake levels were caused by the ponding of glacial meltwater near the end of the Wisconsinan period of glaciation thousand years ago (Wright 1972:568-569; Phillips 2003). While the lake surface now stands at about 600 to 602 feet above mean sea level (amsl), at Grand Marais just 36-miles southwest of Grand Portage abandoned beach ridges are found as high as 1270 feet amsl (Grout et al. 1959:72). A gravel bar atop Mount Josephine at about the same elevation is one of the most northerly relic beaches of Glacial Lake Duluth in Cook County. During earlier, proglacial phases, the ponded meltwaters at Grand Portage likely stood even higher, causing the rocky summit of Mount Josephine to once be an offshore shoal (Phillips 1995:31, 36). The level of Lake Superior has also been as much as 200 feet lower than now. The present level was attained when the enormous weight of glacial ice in the Superior Basin was

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places

Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 5

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

removed and the earth's crust at the outlet of the lake (at present-day Sault Ste. Marie) rebounded to a higher elevation (Ojakangas and Matsch 1982:110). If human interactions with the lake occurred throughout these episodes of change, then it is possible that archeological materials or deposits might lie on old beach lines well above or below the present surface of Lake Superior (e.g., Phillips 1995). As in other areas given to radical water-level fluctuations (e.g. Fedje and Christensen 1999), archeological materials on the present shoreline may only reflect a part of the range and sequence of local human coastal occupation.

Several relic shorelines and erosional bluffs are present at Grand Portage Bay and in adjoining areas farther inland (Lawson 1893; Grout et al. 1959:9, 27, 71, 134; Johnson 1961:3; Phillips 1995; 2003). Some of the relic shorelines are better defined than others, but many consist of reworked deltaic materials washed down from an old pre-glacial drainageway just northwest of the bay (Winchell 1899:341-342). One abandoned beach ridge may be the aforementioned "subaqueous ridge or barrier" on the floor of Grand Portage Bay. Another, comprised largely of gravel and boulders, underlies the reconstructed NWC Great Hall at the GRPO (Woolworth 1975a:15). The upper road to Hat Point east of the Monument is likewise built along the crest of an abandoned beach ridge about 35 feet above the lake (Grout et al. 1959:6, fig. 5). The latter ridge, a sea-cliff carved out of delta materials, is one of the most striking shore features at Grand Portage (Lawson 1893:251). Areas behind or between the lower inland beach ridges are often poorly drained or subject to flooding, qualities that made them unsuited for habitation purposes either seasonally or longer term (e.g., Woolworth and Johnson 1963:1). Drainage is also influenced by the nature of surface soils which, on lakefront tracts at Grand Portage Bay, range from fine sand to impermeable clays variously underlain at no great depth by slate bedrock (Woolworth 1963:6). Given these conditions, the commercial and residential buildings and structures that once stood near the lakefront at Grand Portage Bay were probably sited, in large part, with regard to elevation, soils, slope, drainage, and other environmental factors. The lengthy tradition of lake-oriented settlement practices and the general sparsity of prime settlement areas on the lakefront mean that some landscapes or terrain features there may have accommodated continuous, varied, or repetitive land use over great periods of time. The presence or absence and nature of cultural materials on relic beach ridges at the bay might help to date their formation or to date associated lake-level stands or fluctuations.

One impact of intensive and sustained settlement and land use at Grand Portage Bay in the late eighteenth century A. D. was deforestation. The development and maintenance of trading post facilities, the unending need for firewood, and possible activities like canoe making, ship building or repair, cooperage, gardening, and grazing livestock, stripped much of the immediate lakefront of tree cover. Wood fuel was scarce at the bay as early as 1793, and contemporary descriptions of Grand Portage suggest that areas adjoining the portage, for a mile or so inland, were generally cut over (e.g., Thompson 1969:22, 27, 50, 106; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:183). Some cutover areas may have reverted to grass, contributing to the "abundance of hay" reported at Grand Portage in the late 1700s (Lamb 1970:97). Similar conditions prevailed in the early 1890s when the overland passage through the hills at Grand Portage was said to be "fairly free from timber" (Lawson 1893:249).

Natural openings were a rarity in the forested uplands about Lake Superior in early postcontact times. In fact, except for beaches, barren rock exposures, and the occasional storm-ravaged landscape or *grand-brulé* (i.e., burned out areas; see Gates 1965:77), they were nonexistent. North American Indian peoples, including Ojibwe, some times used fire to manipulate their environments and as a means to create or maintain habitats that might improve hunting and foraging opportunities (e.g., Pyne 1982; Gilman 1992:95). Extensive peripheral clearings at settlements like Grand Portage might create an inconvenience or hardship to persons in need of firewood or building materials. However, the same clearings could offer some relief from flying insects or a greater level of protection against the threat of forest fires, wild animals, and surprise attack from hostile forces. A sparse ground cover could also accelerate snow melt and increase runoff and evaporation, leaving a more hospitable or aesthetic living environment--at least in the eyes of Europeans (e.g., Madson 1982).

The settlement and land-use practices of one generation or group can easily alter or destroy material evidences left by another. For example, drainage ditches dug to facilitate human settlement at Grand Portage Bay damaged earlier cultural remains in the lakefront area, while archeological loci on relic beach ridges there have also been impacted by modern road and housing

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 6

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

construction (e.g., Woolworth 1962a:12; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: Nos. 4, 41, 42; Noble 1989b). Farming activities, like gardening and raising cattle, pigs, and fox, have also taken a toll. From about 1914 through 1940 the main road leading from Grand Portage to the outside communities of Mineral Center and Grand Marais ran along the lakeshore through archeologically sensitive areas on either side of Grand Portage Creek. An intersecting road that cut through the northeast end of the old NWC depot site to reach the nearby commercial center of Grand Portage village impacted other resources (Woolworth 1963:7; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: Nos. 49 and 50). The use of some areas within the depot compound for tourist parking further damaged fur-trade archeological deposits by the reconstructed Great Hall (Cockrell 1983:33).

Lake Superior is another destructive force, which, through wave action, currents, fluctuations, and shifting ice, has long scoured the shoreline at the GRPO. In some places 30 to 40 feet of the shoreline at Grand Portage Bay have been inundated or lost to erosion in less than a hundred years (Woolworth 1962a:12, 1963:7; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:41-42). Any archeological evidence there, like the remains of canoe landings or structures near the water's edge (e.g., Woolworth 1975:205), may now be flooded or destroyed. One former notable feature, a point of land just east of the mouth of Grand Portage Creek, has been reduced and inundated within the past century or so by the collective energies of storms, ice heaves, and lake-level fluctuations. Lateral movements of the creek have also eroded archeological remains near the lakefront. In 1977 rain-induced flooding and the abnormally high level of Lake Superior necessitated bank-stabilization efforts along the Superior shoreline and the creek (Cockrell 1983:58; Lynott 1983). A decade later, continued lakeshore erosion called for additional stabilization (Noble 1989a:26-29).

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

Nestled on the shore of Grand Portage Bay opposite Grand Portage Island and abutting the GRPO along the lower reaches of Grand Portage Creek, is the community of Grand Portage. The village and the GRPO are within the area of the Grand Portage Indian Reservation, home to the Grand Portage Band of Ojibwe. The band, the village, the reservation, the island, the creek, the bay, and the GRPO all derive their name from the Kitchi Onigum or "great carrying place" (e.g., Gilfillan 1976:27), a *grand* and historic portage that wends overland from the bay to Fort Charlotte, a landing on the Pigeon River.

The Pigeon River is now part of the international border between the United States and Canada. The GRPO encompasses the Grand Portage trail corridor including about 102 acres on the Pigeon River, 530 acres along the portage corridor, and 78 acres at Grand Portage Bay. Given its configuration the GRPO can be thought of as three interconnected archeological site complexes: those at Pigeon River and Grand Portage Bay and the portage trail corridor that links the two. All three of these complexes are now in the protective custody of the NPS, and all three contribute to the historical significance of the GRPO Historic District.

Human interactions with these landscapes over time involve a diverse range of settlement and land-use activities at either end of the portage with mostly transient portaging, camping, hunting and gathering, and trail improvement activities occurring in between. Original Land Survey records suggest that very little pine timber had survived logging operations and wild fires within the area of the GRPO by the early 1890s (Birk 2001). Commercial logging was begun on the Pigeon River by 1898 and all forestlands within the Grand Portage Indian Reservation were cut over by 1929 (Gilman 1992:113-114). Abandoned homestead sites and logging-related properties, including logging roads, are expected in interior locations along the portage trail. Trails of unknown antiquity also branch from the Grand Portage to reach other locales, the most notable being the Silver Mountain and Cascades trails (e.g., Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:15, 17, 206-210; Cockrell 1983:77; Gilman 1992:113; Birk 1998:14-15).

The Grand Portage is the first leg of a remarkable inland canoe route that passes from Lake Superior through a chain of lakes and rivers along the present international boundary between Ontario and Minnesota. That mainline route, sometimes called the "Voyageur's Highway," links with a vast network of other branching canoe trails in the hinterlands beyond (Morse 1969). Few viable inland water routes emanate from the west side of Lake Superior, and the Grand Portage-Pigeon River route early proved to be the most direct and efficient gateway to the "border lakes" region and the far Northwest (Gilman 1992:4).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places

Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 7

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

The Pigeon River is a relatively short stream headwatering at the rim of the Superior basin about 50 miles west of Grand Portage Bay and entering Lake Superior about five miles to the northeast. The river is navigable by canoe for much of its length above Fort Charlotte. For 20 miles below Fort Charlotte, however, the Pigeon River is impassable. That stretch follows an eastward course through a sinuated series of rapids, canyons, and falls before reaching the big lake. The terrain on the Canadian side of the lower Pigeon River is too rugged and the distance between the lake and navigable parts of the river too great for portaging to be practical there (Schwartz 1928:27; Buck 1931:3; Burpee 1931:362; Morse 1969:30, 75-79; Birk 1998:6).

The terrain on the American side is more accommodating though still a formidable challenge. There, the southwest trend of the Superior shoreline and the imposing indentation of Grand Portage Bay conspire to shorten the distance between the lake and the navigable stretch of the Pigeon River at Fort Charlotte (Schwartz 1928:27; Buck 1931:3). Also present are strategic gaps that align in the high rock ridges behind Grand Portage Bay to form a natural corridor leading into the interior. That inland corridor can be seen from the bay and from the top of Mount Rose and could well have been discovered from either vantage. The first two gaps, within two miles of the lake, are remnants of the aforementioned pre-glacial drainageway that now contains the main stem of Grand Portage Creek (Schwartz 1928:28-29). The creek forks within a longitudinal valley above the second gap. The lesser branch of the creek drains that long narrow valley from the northeast and the dominant branch drains from the southwest. The portage trail parallels the creek's main channel on its north side through the first two gaps. Then it crosses the lesser branch of the creek and climbs sharply to the northwest to reach a level terrace near a third gap, the highest of the three gaps. Beyond the third gap the trail passes through an area of dissected terrain where it crosses two branches of Poplar Creek, a minor northerly flowing branch of the Pigeon River (Winchell 1899:505; Phillips 2003).

The Grand Portage trail corridor incorporates the geographical space traversed by all past and present portage trail alignments between Grand Portage Bay and the Pigeon River landing at Snow Creek (Fort Charlotte). The corridor is said to take full advantage of "every favorable place in the topography" (Schwartz 1928:27-29), and to generally follow a course that cannot be improved upon even with the use of modern maps (e.g., Birk 1994a:373-374). The straight-line distance between the east and west ends of the portage is 7.3 miles, but the winding and undulated route of the trail and a northward arc in its course (a radial arcing distance of up to 1.25 miles) add to the trail's overall length.

Archeologists are now studying how the track of the portage trail, as mapped in the late nineteenth century, corresponds with that used during the eighteenth century or earlier. As presently maintained, the trail follows a course suggested by the 1892-1893 Original Land Survey records of the General Land Office (Trygg 1966; Cockrell 1983:110). Given the dynamics of pedestrian travel in northern forest environments, where fallen trees, excessive moisture, and other factors might compel detours, the Original Land Survey may provide only a "snapshot" image of the portage. That is, the land survey records may just delineate the course of the trail as it appeared at the time of the survey, after much of the area had been cut over.

Today, the portage trail corridor is often thought of in two parts: the eastern "half" that threads through gaps and valleys to avoid surmounting the highest rocky ridges and the western "half" that generally passes over the most-elevated terrain to avoid steep slopes and swamps. The division between the two "halves" is loosely defined by the intersection of the portage trail with old U. S. Highway 1 (also known locally as old Highway 61). The portage intersects new U. S. Highway 61, today's "North Shore Drive," about 0.7 miles from the shore of Lake Superior, and it intersects old Highway 1 about 2.9 miles farther on, or about 3.6 miles from the lake. Between the area of Mount Rose and new Highway 61 a 100-foot wide strip of NPS land now protects the portage. The strip is centered on the trail. From new Highway 61 to Fort Charlotte the protective corridor is about 600 feet wide (Cockrell 1983:2). The two public highways, a logging road known as Cowboys Road, and some other former and extant roads at or near Grand Portage Bay, have physically disfigured or destroyed short segments of the portage while also impacting the trail's setting and feeling at those points (e.g., Cockrell 1983:46-47).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 8

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

The elevation where the portage trail crosses old Highway 1 is about 518 feet above the level of Lake Superior. From that crossing the portage climbs another 180 feet to the northwest to reach the crest of a ridge (Schwartz 1928:29). Where the portage hits the 1,300-foot contour atop that ridge, a half mile west of old Highway 1, is about the actual midpoint of the Grand Portage. That summit was known to nineteenth-century travelers as the *Abita*, the Ojibwe word for half (Baraga 1966, II:4) or, loosely, half way (Winchell 1899:505), and might be called Abita Ridge. In any case, by following that crest on a westerly course, the trail skirts a large valley on its north side. The valley edge is partly defined by a rocky precipice with a vertical drop of up to fifty feet or more. At the head of the valley, about two miles west of old Highway 1, the portage turns to the northwest for about one-half mile to avoid swamplands on the south side. At the far end of that notable jog, about two miles east of the Pigeon River landing (Fort Charlotte), the trail crosses what is today a wetland area (Beaver Pond Swamp) on a plank-walk built on the back of a beaver dam. From there the trail runs almost directly west over level-to-rolling terrain (with some bedrock exposures) to the Pigeon River.

The landing at Pigeon River is 1,235 feet amsl or 633 feet above Lake Superior. Elevation is gained and lost in traversing the portage, however, and estimates drawn from modern topographic maps suggest that the total change in elevation over the length of the trail is actually over 1800 feet or almost three times the 633 feet noted for the portage termini alone. The gains and losses in elevation are greatest on the east half of the trail indicating that most gradient on the portage occurs between Lake Superior and the 1,300-foot contour of Abita Ridge. The maximum elevation on the portage, about 1,338 feet amsl (or 736 feet above the level of Lake Superior), likely occurs on the flank of a rocky ridge east of the Beaver Pond Swamp (Phillips 2003:26).

On a different scale, the ascent from Lake Superior through the Grand Portage and up the Pigeon River to the height-of-land separating the Laurentian and Hudsonian basins is the steepest part of the entire historic canoe route that once ran between Montreal and Athabasca (Morse 1969:75-77; Birk 1998:6).

Today the Grand Portage trail appears as little more than a footpath cut through the forest. In places the tread of the trail is underlain or strewn with rocks or interlaced with exposed tree roots. Many parts of the trail are poorly drained. The NPS has installed bridged walkways and other improvements to overcome this latter problem. Though bridges and corduroy were also used in the past (e.g., Winchell 1899:504; Woolworth 1993:47), some early fur traders, nonetheless, spoke of trudging through knee-deep mud and clay when crossing the portage. It didn't help that primary use of the trail occurred during the annual period of greatest precipitation (the maximum rainfall typically occurring in June) (Grout et al. 1959:11). At the same time, the dense northern forests shaded the trail, keeping it wet, harboring flying insects, and stifling breezes--giving what one traveler described as a "closeness of the air" (Thompson 1969:126).

Prior to the time the NWC made improvements to the trail, heavily outfitted canoe brigades could take up to ten days to move from Lake Superior to the Pigeon River (Wallace 1934:41). During the heyday of the fur trade, with the NWC installed at Grand Portage, the same carry might take from five to seven days (Gilman 1992:19). Some men loaded with packs or kegs weighing 180 pounds or more were able to make a round trip on the portage within six hours (Buck 1931:9). Because porters often moved at a trot and took short rests en route, their actual progress was about as expedient as that of an unencumbered walker, who, under optimal conditions and without rests, might cross the portage in 2.5 hours (Thompson 1969:77-78).

Early fur traders tried using horses and oxen on the portage but under normal conditions in warmer seasons of the year, the trail was best suited for human porters (Burpee 1931:373-374; Thompson 1969:106; Gilman 1992:18). Animal-drawn carts or sleds were more commonly used during the "off season" (other than summers) or during the nineteenth century, when traffic on the portage was greatly reduced. Diminished forest cover along some parts of the portage in the 1800s opened extensive views of the surrounding terrain and perhaps changed the surface environment of the trail (e.g., Winchell 1899:341, 502-503). In 1858, for example, the trail was said to be dry and in good condition, making it passable for oxen teams (Hind in Dawson 1968).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 9

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Lengthy carrying places like the Grand Portage were commonly divided into *posés* (pauses) where travelers might stop to rest, eat, quench their thirst, secure their cargoes and canoes, camp, or engage in other activities. The interval between resting places was called a “carry” and also a “posé.” The number of carries and stopping places on a portage are an index to its overall difficulty or length. Research is now being conducted within the Grand Portage trail corridor to more closely define past systems, practices, and facilities used in portaging there, particularly during the height of the fur trade. The study approach builds on the assumption that the intervals between resting points within the corridor varied with “pheric distance,” a measure of the time and energy needed to cross the intervening space (Birk 1994a:370-371; Birk and Cooper 2001).

In the early 1790s the Grand Portage was said to have 16 traditional resting places (Gates 1965:96), which divided the trail into 17 carries. The number, placement, and function of the *posés* may have varied over time from the portage’s ancient origins through the era of the fur trade to the early nineteenth century when the old NWC trail improvements were deteriorated and the trail became choked with vegetation (e.g., Woolworth 1993:47-49). If all things were equal, the expected distance between each of the 16 *posés* on the trail might be about one-half mile. Given the vagaries of slope, drainage, and other conditions, however, it is more likely that resting places were set at somewhat irregular intervals, perhaps closer together in areas of rugged, steep, or poorly drained terrain. The association of *posés* with sources of potable water, like stream crossings, or features like trail junctures also affected their spacing along the Grand Portage trail (e.g., Thompson 1969:127; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:21, 66-67, II: No. 102; Gilman 1992:18; Birk 1994a:371).

In 1822 the American surveyor, Joseph Delafield, noted three stream crossings on the portage that he called First, Second, and Third Rivers. The stream crossings were earlier bridged by the NWC, but by 1822 those structures had rotted away. Today, the portage trail crosses four notable waterways, including three streams and a large swamp or pond (Beaver Pond Swamp). The three streams in ascending order from Lake Superior are the lesser (northeast) fork of Grand Portage Creek and the south and north forks of Poplar Creek. The south fork of Poplar Creek is longer and larger than the north fork of Poplar Creek. It drains extensive marshlands and usually remains active even during dry periods. The flow of the north fork is intermittent. All three of the named creek or “river” crossings are now in the area between Highway 61 and old Highway 1. New footbridges have been built over each of these streams by the NPS.

Delafield’s First and Second Rivers are likely the northeast branch of Grand Portage Creek and the south fork of Poplar Creek. His “Third River,” by virtue of being “next” in the sequence, must refer to either the north fork of Poplar Creek or the drainage of Beaver Pond Swamp. If the north fork of Poplar Creek was dried up or deemed insignificant at the time of his midsummer visit, then the latter interpretation would seem most viable. In any case, Delafield’s observations provide important clues about early portage use. For example, he associated a grassy clearing at the crossing of the Second River (the south fork of Poplar Creek) with a stopping place or *posé* of the early fur trade. The distance up portage from there to the north fork of Poplar Creek is short of what might be considered a “standard” *posé* on the trail. The need for drinking water along the trail, however, suggests that the north fork may also have been an alluring, if not mandatory stopping place, next in line up portage from the Second River. The greater volume and quality of water at the south fork of Poplar Creek during most seasons of the year may have made that location a more attractive and enduring camping spot.

Delafield’s men camped one night at another presumed *posé* at “a little mud hole called a spring.” The spring was somewhere beyond Second River near where the trail entered an area of more level terrain. Such an area can only be west of old Highway 1 at Abita Ridge. It cannot be to the east because the terrain between the forks of Poplar Creek is rolling or dissected and the trail beyond the north fork of Poplar Creek ascends for a mile or so before surmounting Abita Ridge (Thompson 1969:127-128; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I: 63; II: No. 102).

The NWC geographer David Thompson referenced other landmarks along the portage trail in addition to the stream crossings (Thompson 1969:78; Thompson 1824). Traveling down portage in 1824 Thompson noted one of these, the “first *Gallé*,” within

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 10

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

4,000-feet of the present shoreline of Lake Superior. He encountered the “first” *gallé* as he descended from the hills above Grand Portage Bay, suggesting that other *gallé* might be located at lower elevations closer to the lake. In fur trade parlance, the term *gallé* was sometimes used interchangeably with *galeet* to denote a gravelly bank (Gates 1965:250n4; Birk 1989:35), a shingly beach, or a boulder or flat-topped rock (Curot 1911:409n40; McDermott 1941:79-80). Though uncertain, *gallé*, as used by Thompson at Grand Portage, might refer to relic beach ridges or erosional surfaces marking prior high water levels in the Superior Basin. Indeed, the apparent elevation of the “first *Gallé*,” between about 820-860 feet amsl (David J. Cooper, GRPO Archeologist, personal communication), appears to coincide with the Tofte stage of former lower Glacial Lake Algonquin (Grout et al. 1959:70-71) or the Beaver Bay 3 and 4 levels (Phillips 1995: fig. 11).

A second landmark, the Parting Trees, was said by Thompson to be 5,880-feet (1,960 yards or 1.1 miles) northward or up portage from the west gate of the NWC depot on Grand Portage Bay (Thompson 1969:78; Woolworth 1993:47). Though not further identified, the Parting Trees, by Thompson’s measurement, must have been very close to the first gap—the first opening or “parting” of the rocky ridges above the lake. While this may fit the name, there might be other explanations. As already noted, the forests along the Grand Portage trail, as high as the first gap, were generally cutover by the time of Thompson’s surveys. Today, just beyond the crossing of Highway 61, about one mile up portage from the NWC depot, the portage trail is straight and lies perpendicular to the shore of Grand Portage Bay. At 1.1 miles, or at about the point where the intensive early timber harvesting may have ended, the portage turns slightly to the northwest and drops in elevation. It may have been about there that outbound travelers got their last or “parting” glimpse of the big water before entering the closed forest environment beyond. The Parting Trees may thus have been both a fixed location on the portage as well as a real and cognitive boundary where traders left thoughts of Montreal and Lake Superior behind to focus instead on the trials and trails ahead. During the heyday of the fur trade, the Parting Trees may have been an established *posé*. If so, it was likely the second customary resting place on the trail when traveling up portage from the bay. In June 1823, for example, after Thompson’s party landed at the bay, his men carried the cargo and canoe one mile up portage before camping for the night. A computer-generated profile of the portage corridor terrain shows that the viewshed from the projected Parting Trees locus, with the vegetation removed, includes a clear panorama of Lake Superior.

Another landmark, known to David Thompson as “the Fountain,” is a natural spring possibly at or near the “little mud hole” mentioned by Delafield beyond Second River. In 1798 Thompson placed the Fountain 7,140 yards (4 miles) up portage from Lake Superior, at about the place where the trail levels out atop Abita Ridge. In 1823 Thompson indicated that in heading up portage, the “Country ascends gradually, and at times very perceptible [sic] to the Fountain” and then levels out for a half mile (Woolworth 1993:47, 49). Another possible clue is offered by the geologist Newton Winchell, who, in 1893, noted that a spring or seep was a “short” distance from the Abita, in a spot on the “east” (i.e., the north) side of the trail (Winchell 1893). Using these various lines of evidence, archeologists, in April 2000, found a series of what appear to be culturally modified watering holes near the crest of Abita Ridge. These pits are now under study to determine their possible origin, purpose, and identity.

The Meadow, a fourth landmark noted by David Thompson, was said to be 6 to 6.5 miles up portage from Grand Portage Bay (or about 2 to 2.5 miles down portage from the Pigeon River landing) (Thompson 1969:78; Woolworth 1993:47, 49). In Thompson’s time, as today, “meadow” was a term used to describe “a rich grass-field or low lands by rivers or bottom” (Webster 1970:187). The Meadow noted by Thompson was likely an ill drained grassy lowland or a wetland possibly dissected by a stream. The aforementioned Beaver Pond Swamp, located about two miles down portage from Fort Charlotte, is the obvious candidate for the Meadow. Beaver activities, logging, and a proliferation of brushy vegetal growth today have vastly altered that area. Presumably, during the heyday of the fur trade, that portion of the portage trail running through the Meadow was equipped with a wooden catwalk or “causeway” that, by 1822, was “entirely rotten, full of holes and dangerous” (Woolworth 1993:47).

Up portage from the Meadow or Beaver Pond Swamp the Grand Portage parallels the north side of Snow Creek, a short west-flowing brook that enters the Pigeon River about 400 feet upstream from a whitewater rapids. About one-half mile below the rapids is the Cascades, the place where the Pigeon River begins its turbulent descent through a chaotic and near unbroken

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 11

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

succession of canyons, rapids, and falls. An old road (now a trail) leading southeast from the Cascades intersects the Grand Portage not quite a mile east of the Pigeon River landing.

In the area of that upper landing the Pigeon River has “swampy margins with shallow offshore terraces of mud and clay that drop off into the deeper open channel” (Birk and Wheeler 1976:793). Some areas of the river bottom by the landing consist of exposed clay or bedrock, or sedimentary deposits containing large quantities of tree bark.

The Fort Charlotte site complex involves the remains of fur trade facilities that once stood along the Pigeon River at the head of the portage on either side of the mouth of Snow Creek. Evidence suggests that the NWC conducted operations along the river north of the creek (between the creek and the whitewater rapids), while the XYZ and perhaps other earlier firms occupied an area along the river south of the creek. To reach these various facilities the portage trail probably forked somewhere east of the Pigeon River so that one branch of the trail led to the south side of the creek and the other continued along the north side. The main trail, the one most used and over the greatest length of time, was that on the north side. Underwater archeological investigations conducted at the main Pigeon River landing suggest that, through about 1780 or so, the main portage intersected the river very close to the mouth of Snow Creek. With the formation and growth of the NWC, the portage landing migrated downstream, first to the place where the NWC built a canoe landing and quay or “dock” (Winchell 1899:502n), and later to where the trail meets the river today, at a point about midway between Snow Creek and the head of the whitewater rapids (Birk 1975a:83; Birk and Wheeler 1976; Wheeler et al. 1975:44; Birk 1979). Modern recreational use of the landing, along with floating ice, fluctuating water levels, river currents, and log drives on the Pigeon River, may have damaged early landing structures or associated offshore archeological deposits at Fort Charlotte (Birk 1975a:76-77).

Given the dispersion of fur trade era facilities at Grand Portage Bay, the portage trail corridor there likely also involved a number of branching paths near the shoreline which conjoined some distance inland (e.g., Davis 1961a; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:67-68; Phillips 2003:43). The main stem of the historic portage trail there may have been a “public road” that extended from the shoreline up the east side of Grand Portage Creek to where it connected with a side trail and ford from the NWC depot (Woolworth 1975:205). Other branches of the trail may have originated along the lakefront farther east. Presently, the main trail traverses part of the lower valley floor of the creek, but such use may have been impractical during flood events or seasons of high discharge (Phillips 2003:27, 43).

ARCHEOLOGICAL PROPERTIES

The archeological loci that help convey the historic significance of the GRPO are mostly in terrestrial settings, though some may be in wetland environments and others are offshore. The greatest number and mix of known loci are those on the lakefront at Grand Portage Bay. Considerable archeological fieldwork has been done at that locale, mostly to guide reconstructions or to evaluate loci or deposits and assess the potential impacts of planned developments on those resources. Some of the investigations have been carefully conceived, executed, and reported. In other instances, however, unrealistic goals, often hampered by poor field conditions, limited resources, and untrained crews has led to sparse and uncertain results. Some of the findings have been so vaguely or inconsistently reported that, at times, it is difficult to understand what was found or which descriptions or conclusions, if any, are correct. For example, artifact distributions are often little exploited in early reports, and some artifacts and artifact assemblages appear to have been misidentified (e.g., see discussion of these issues in: Noble 1989a:39-40; 1990:5, 9). Many features and deposits exposed through excavation on the lakefront at Grand Portage Bay are in need of further study to verify their location or to define their integrity and research value (e.g., Thompson 1969:167; Noble 1990:5, 9, 11-13). Because some areas once said to contain no archeological materials or no significant materials have more recently been found to contain important cultural remains, all negative archeological findings reported prior to the use of interval sampling or other systematic methodologies may require reevaluation. Throughout many areas of the GRPO there is an enduring potential for the discovery of previously unknown or undetected archeological materials or loci.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places

Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 12

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

The GRPO's archeological database includes datum points, grids, excavations, features, deposits, piece-plotted artifacts, and other qualities. The database will be easier to comprehend and manage once it is entered into a Geographical Information System (GIS) with other layers of information relating to topography, hydrology, soils, vegetation, viewsheds, park developments, roadways, etc. The combined datasets can provide new insights into the cultural and natural history of the GRPO as well as the history of archeological investigations there. The same information might also be used to stratify the GRPO into areas of high, medium, and low probability to develop predictive models for the occurrence of other unrecorded properties. Insights gained in this manner might also reveal the environmental preconditions of sites and site settings in the vicinity of the GRPO (e.g., Phillips 1995:56).

Archeological studies at the GRPO have largely focused on the historic fur trade. However, older cultural materials do appear at either end of the Grand Portage. Indeed, some reports indicate that "stone flakes, along with an occasional stone tool, and fragments of worked copper" have been found during most excavations at Grand Portage Bay (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No.51) and along the portage trail itself (e.g., Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:22). Prehistoric ceramics and diagnostic prehistoric features have not been reported. Although of seemingly meager extent, the greatest grouping of portage-related prehistoric cultural materials at the GRPO may be along the lakefront east of Grand Portage Creek. There is no known physical evidence within the boundaries of the GRPO to suggest that Grand Portage was an important settlement locus for Native American/First Nation peoples at any time prior to the nineteenth century A. D. (Clark 1999:28, 34). Of course, current perceptions of the presence, distribution, or density of Native American cultural materials at the GRPO may be clouded by sampling or reporting biases. Additional research and evaluation are needed to interpret the available data and to determine its significance. The recovery of prehistoric cultural materials on the portage is important because the presence of such materials at either end of the trail does not, in and of itself, unequivocally indicate precontact use of that overland route. Knowledge of precontact materials or loci along the trail would further suggest the antiquity and fixedness of the trail corridor.

French traders frequented the portage between 1731 and 1760 (Nute 1944:22; Woolworth 1982:110) and perhaps earlier (e.g., Burpee 1931:361), yet suspected French-era deposits or structures at Grand Portage Bay have eluded archeological discovery. Surprisingly little information about French activities at Grand Portage is found in available written records either. Nevertheless, some scholars suggest that French traders erected buildings at Grand Portage before 1760 (e.g., Warren 1957:137, 189; Buck 1931:4; Babcock 1940a:7; Nute 1944:42, 305; Woolworth 1967:7; 1982:111), that they had facilities at both ends of the portage as early as 1732 (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:28, 32), or that they maintained structures at each end of the portage from ca. 1732 through 1760 (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:257). An unsubstantiated "French post" at the Pigeon River landing even has an assigned cultural resource inventory number (CR-105) (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II:4). Other researchers are skeptical of such varied interpretations (e.g., Burpee 1931:365; Thompson 1969:15; Gilman 1992:40). The apparent lack of French-colonial materials on the lakefront at Grand Portage Bay west of Grand Portage Creek hints that the greatest potential for such materials there may lie in areas east of the creek (Brown 1937:457). To date, the only documented French colonial archeological loci at the GRPO are those identified during field investigations at the Pigeon River landing (Birk and Wheeler 1976) and at the suspected Parting Trees pose on the Grand Portage trail (Douglas A. Birk, personal observation). Barring future archival discoveries, most questions regarding French presence at Grand Portage may only be answered through further archeological inquiry.

The earliest known trading houses at Grand Portage Bay were those established by British traders in about 1768. The houses were built west of Grand Portage Creek at the place later developed for the NWC depot (Nute 1940:134; 1944:42, 305). Other trade facilities were later constructed along the lakefront and, by 1793, the NWC alone was said to have sixteen buildings within its fort. The NWC also claimed dominion over adjoining parcels at the bay and may have opened facilities at the Pigeon River at the time of its formation (1783). Rival traders soon followed the NWC's example by building a "hangard or store" on the Pigeon River in 1785 (Gates 1965:94; Thompson 1969:45-46, 64). Being more abundant and pervasive, material evidence of British presence at Grand Portage has proved easier to find, identify, and interpret than that relating to earlier French colonial operations.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 13

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Some features noted or implied in early historical records have yet to be identified through archeology. For example, the NWC had horses, cattle, hogs, and sheep at Grand Portage (Thompson 1969:53, 101; Gilman 1992:5, 18), which likely necessitated the use of barns, stables, pens, or corrals. The central clearing at Grand Portage Bay could have been used for pasturage, and grazing livestock there may actually have given the NWC a reason and excuse to fence the perimeters of that opening. To overwinter livestock required labor-intensive preparations. Hay was said to be abundant at Grand Portage in the late 1700s, but it had to be cut and stacked by hand. At the same time, cold damp fog, along with high levels of ground moisture and lingering winters, often caused harvested hay to rot (e.g., Thompson 1969:85). Gardening was similarly impaired by weather and soil conditions. Potatoes were the only food crop typically grown with any success (e.g., Thompson 1969:101; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:204). The size, location, and arrangement of the NWC's barns, corrals, pastures, and gardens are presently unknown.

Another poorly documented structure on the lakefront at Grand Portage Bay, somewhere east of Grand Portage Creek, was the "premier's scaffold" (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:11). Dictionaries from the nineteenth century and today define a scaffold as "a temporary stage or frame of wood" (e.g., Webster 1970:266). Scaffolds were often used in the northwest fur trade for the winter storage of meat. They were also made in various forms as racks for drying fish and meat, storing canoes, as vantages for sentries or lookouts, and as burial platforms (scaffold burials).

As far as is known, the "premier's scaffold" is only mentioned by name in the literature in the year 1800 (Thompson 1969:91-93; Gilman 1992:71). That date and other circumstances have led to some speculation about the nature and purpose of the "premier's scaffold." In the late 1700s, Simon McTavish, the general manager of the NWC, made annual summer visits to Grand Portage to oversee and promote the company's trade. His aggressive inclinations and acts against the competing XYC earned him nicknames like *Le Marquis* and *Le Premier* (Bryce 1912:23; Burpee 1931:371; Thompson 1969:91-92; Wallace 1934:19, 485-486). In light of the latter nickname, some historians suggest that the "premier's scaffold" at Grand Portage may have involved both McTavish as well as the heated NWC-XYC rivalry (e.g., Thompson 1969:92). One guess is that the scaffold was a mock hangmen's platform built under McTavish's direction in an area of the lakefront controlled by the NWC as a means to intimidate XYC employees operating out of a nearby fort (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:11).

Perhaps a more convincing explanation is that the scaffold was associated with an Indian known as the Premier. Fur trade records show that an Ojibwe chief of that title or name was active in the Border Lakes region at the turn of the nineteenth century. That chief or his followers could have visited Grand Portage and built a scaffold there for any number of purposes. The "premier's scaffold" was not the chief's burial platform, for both the Premier and Jeune Premier (apparently his son) were very much alive *during and after* 1800 (e.g., Gates 1965:103, 161-162, 173, 175-176, 212-214, 240; cf. Lovisek 1993).

The best explanation might be that the scaffold was the burial platform of another, earlier chief also known as the Premier who was perhaps the progenitor or namesake of the Premier and Jeune Premier mentioned above. That earlier chief was also referred to as Nectam (Gates 1965:103) or, more correctly in Ojibwe, as Nitam or Nee-tum (variably spelled) meaning "first or the first" (Baraga 1966, II:305; Blessing 1971:220); that is, literally, the *premier*, a man first in importance or rank among his peers and, perhaps, the first of his chieftain lineage. The status of the Nitam or Nectam is further suggested by the fact that he had sufficient influence to be considered the "first chief, or Sachem, of all the Algonquin tribes inhabiting the different parts" of the Border Lakes country (Lamb 1970:106).

The Ojibwe use of scaffold burials is sometimes questioned today, even though several early observers document such use for selected members of Ojibwe society. Dr. John McLoughlin, an early resident in the Rainy Lake country, once noted that, upon dying, the "commonality" among the Ojibwe were buried in the ground, while chiefs were put in coffins and then placed in their coffins on posts about six feet above ground (McLoughlin n.d. 7). According to trader, Peter Grant, writing in 1804, "the bodies of some of their most celebrated chiefs are raised upon high scaffolds, with flags flying and the scalps of their enemies, with other

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 14

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

trophies of their prowess, suspended from a high pole.” Grant also noted that, “all those monuments are not intended so much to distinguish their great men from the vulgar as to ensure to their departed souls the same respectability in the next world which they enjoyed in this” (Bushnell 1927:3-4). In 1823 another writer observed that: “Great respect is paid by the Chippewas [Ojibwe] to the corpses of their distinguished men; they are wrapped up in cloths, blankets, or bark, and raised on scaffolds” (Keating 1959, II:155).

Some nineteenth-century observers wrongly identified the NWC’s depot on Grand Portage Bay as Fort or “Port” Charlotte. One who erred in that regard said the scaffold burial of a distinguished Ojibwe chief stood for years near that bayside fort. Though not named, the revered chief was said to have died around 1783 (Keating 1959, II:155), or about the time a smallpox epidemic swept through the Northwest (Gilman 1992:63-64). When the NWC moved its depot from Grand Portage to Kaministikwia after 1800, the Ojibwe thought “it would be unbecoming the dignity of their friend to rest anywhere but near a fort.” As a result, they also moved the chief’s remains to the new location. The Ojibwe thereafter continued to maintain the scaffold burial and, the NWC, as a show of respect and goodwill, kept a British flag flying over the chief’s remains (Keating 1959, II:155-156; Gilman 1992:147n29). Coincidentally, French records indicate an unnamed Saulteur (Ojibwe) chief of Grand Portage in 1742, who possessed great influence, courage, and resolution (Burpee 1968:383-384). That chief may well have been the Premier, perhaps an elder at the time of his death (if he died in 1783), whose cherished remains and memory may have ultimately been taken to Kaministikwia.

The “premier’s scaffold” could have stood near the NWC’s Grand Portage depot for 20 years or more before the time it was mentioned in writing in 1800. Exactly where the scaffold stood is open to question. There is suspicion, however, based on an oral account, that a point of land just east of the mouth of Grand Portage Creek was once called “Premier’s Point.” The “premier’s scaffold” may have been located on or near that point and could have shared its name with that now diminished landscape feature (Cochrane 2000; Thompson 1969:91).

Indians and non-Indians readily collaborated in the fur trade yet, in their daily lives, in the Northwest, there was often a social distance between them. Segregation might continue after death through the use of separate burial grounds. A “burying ground of the whites” kept at Grand Portage Bay in the late eighteenth century was not entirely exclusive, because at least one Ottawa was interred there (James 1956:22). The same area could also have been used as an Indian cemetery before and after the fur trade era. While the placement of the “burying ground of the whites” is not precisely known from available records, a possible location is suggested by the discovery of human burials on an old beach ridge overlooking Grand Portage Bay. The burial area, setback about 1000 feet from the lake, lies outside the boundaries of the GRPO. Development activities there in the 1930s reportedly uncovered the remains of a “voyageur with red hair” (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No. 91) and another individual interred with two probable French-period Jesuit-style finger rings (Anonymous 1939). This evidence has led to some speculation that the old ridge-top cemetery was “used to bury the remains of trade employees who died in the service of the NW Co.” (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No. 91). Another burial grounds found within the area of the GRPO and tentatively identified as an Ojibwe cemetery of the early nineteenth century (CR-53) is discussed below.

There is substantial documentation for nineteenth-century human occupancy and use of the lakefront area at the GRPO and particularly from the 1830s on. The loci and components associated with later, non-fur trade aspects of site use have received increased attention from park managers and archeologists in recent years and, indeed, such properties are now a matter of considerable historical interest and administrative concern. Some paintings and photographs depict late nineteenth and twentieth century buildings and structures on the lakefront at Grand Portage Bay. A systematic examination of these illustrations, in conjunction with oral traditions, informant interviews, land-record studies, aerial imagery, and archeological ground-truthing, can help to further reconstruct the history and arrangement of post-fur trade and reservation-period settlement activities in the lakefront area of the GRPO. Again, this process could be assisted, and the results enhanced, through the use of a GIS.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 15

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

THE SITES

The GRPO Historic District contains three contributing sites: the Fort Charlotte site complex on the Pigeon River, the Grand Portage site complex on Grand Portage Bay, and the Grand Portage trail corridor that connects the two. Each site contains an array of cultural features and loci, but only the Grand Portage site complex contains historic reconstructions as well as another contributing property—a twentieth century highway bridge (CR-59)—that is independently eligible for listing on the NRHP. This section discusses the three contributing sites and their integral properties, including the reconstructions and the highway bridge.

The “nesting” of resources at the GRPO is evident in the state archeological site file maintained by the Minnesota Office of the State Archeologist. The state file lists the GRPO as site 21CK6. Within 21CK6, at Fort Charlotte, the NWC site locus north of Snow Creek is listed as 21CK7 and the XYC site locus south of the creek is 21CKaa. Site 21CK12 is a multicomponent site locus on Grand Portage Bay, and other numbers are being assigned to site loci along the Grand Portage trail. With the exception of 21CK12, none of the state site numbers are further referenced in this nomination.

The primary designator numbers used here are cultural resource numbers (CR-1, CR-2, etc.) assigned by consultants in 1982 (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II) as well as some NPS Classified Structures Identification Numbers (IDLCS) and associated NPS Historic Structure numbers (HS).

THE GRAND PORTAGE TRAIL CORRIDOR

The Grand Portage trail corridor (CR-101/ IDLCS 70007/ HS-08) is one of three contributing sites at the GRPO. The portage links the Pigeon River landing at Fort Charlotte with the lakefront at Grand Portage Bay. The trail is variably estimated to be between 8.2 and 8.5 miles (13.1 and 13.6 km) long. The Grand Portage was initially developed and used by Native peoples. Its commercial use began in 1731 and peaked with the operations of the NWC and other firms between 1780 and 1802. From 1731 through the 1890s, thousands of people crossed the portage. Most traveled on foot and some on ox or horse-drawn carts. At least two hapless individuals, who suffered accidents, were carried over in litters (e.g., James 1956:21; Thompson 1969:79). Snowshoes, sleds, and dogsleds have long assisted winter travel on the portage and, in recent years, cross-country skis have also been used. The operation of snowmobiles on the portage is prohibited except for members of the Grand Portage Ojibwe band who may cross the trail at approved road crossings. Under the terms of the Webster-Ashburton Treaty of 1842, the portage trail is an international road that still remains free and open to citizens of the United States and Great Britain (Busch 1976).

At the Lake Superior end, the historic portage trail likely began on the shore of Grand Portage Bay at the point of land (“Premier’s Point”) just east of Grand Portage Creek. The main stem of the trail, the extreme south end of which was sometimes called the “public road” (CR-95), apparently extended up the east side of the creek through the area now occupied by NPS-maintenance buildings to where it conjoined with a side trail leading from the NWC depot. West of the creek, the side trail ran through a seasonal camping area that was used by NWC voyageurs during the annual summer rendezvous. At the place where the side trail crossed the creek was either a ford (CR-74) or a bridge. Somewhere north of the ford the Grand Portage also linked with another side trail or trails emanating from the XYC depot or others landing or camping areas well east of the creek, and mostly beyond the boundaries of the GRPO (Davis 1961a; Gates 1965:93; Woolworth 1975:205; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:47, 67-68, 257-258).

Few early travelers described the Grand Portage in any detail (e.g., Thompson 1824; Thompson 1969:27-28, 77, 127-128). Those who did often noted the presence of posés, campsites, and bridges on the portage (CR-102) or named landmarks like the Meadow, the Fountain, First River, the Parting Trees, and the first Gallé. Each of these loci or places is a part of the larger portage site complex, and each may have potential for archeological investigation.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places

Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 16

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Ongoing GRPO research is assembling documentary and archeological evidence of use of the Grand Portage and seeking to reconcile that evidence with the topography of the trail corridor. One thrust of the project is to determine the location, age, content, and configuration of old posés on the portage. Another is to compare the present course of the portage with that earlier recorded by David Thompson and others, including the Original Land Surveys. Knowledge of abandoned posés and trail segments and their interrelationship with various terrain and water features will enhance current understanding of how the portage corridor was used and how that use may have developed or changed over time (Birk and Cooper 2001).

The dynamics of trekking over long portages in areas of rugged and heavily forested terrain almost ensures that the Grand Portage trail has meandered over the years. Lateral shifts of the trail might be expected within a given corridor in response to tread deterioration, erosion, or forest fires, or to trail blockages like flooding, tree (wind) falls, and landslides. The nature of the terrain and drainage within the corridor presupposes a greater potential for trail meandering in some areas of the corridor than in others. One way to document possible lateral movements of the trail is to look for evidence of former pathways where they merge or diverge from the present trail. Another is to look for abandoned paralleling trail segments along a series of survey transects laid out at regular intervals perpendicular to the current trail and extending out 100 feet or more on either side. To be most effective, such surveys should be done during the spring or fall when the leafy vegetation is down and surface features are most obvious. The various pathways, branching trails, and named landmarks (like posés, landforms, and streams) along the portage could become points for historical interpretation, enhancing the visitor experience (Birk 1994a:370-371).

Prehistoric and historic artifacts were found along the Grand Portage before recent portage studies began in 2000 (Anonymous 1934:131; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:22), but no systematic archeological investigations had been conducted there (Woolworth 1982:115). Because cultural materials and features within the trail corridor could originate with human activities unrelated to the portage, care must be taken when evaluating the context and meaning of such finds. For example, cultural materials or loci contemporary with various stages of glacial lake developments in the Superior basin might now appear on relic beach ridges well back from the present shoreline. If those materials or loci would happen to be in locations later intersected by the portage, they might easily be interpreted as evidence of ancient portage use when, in fact, they are not. Therefore, independent archeological surveys should be conducted to search for cultural materials and loci along relic beach strands that pass through the GRPO at or inland from Grand Portage Bay. If ancient cultural materials are found on the old beaches above the bay, but only within or very near the present portage corridor, such data might help to date the genesis of portage use. The same or related finds might also help to develop a chronology of lake-level changes. Any evidence that more fully demonstrates the nature, range, and antiquity of early human activities within the Grand Portage locale could be a welcome addition for cultural interpretations there.

Noncontributing Structures on the Grand Portage Trail

Grand Portage trail improvements. Noncontributing facilities at the GRPO include various structural improvements on the portage trail. Modern development of the portage began with the re-opening of the trail in the late 1940s by Boy Scouts (Cockrell 1983:16). In 1954 the NPS dedicated funds to further clear the portage and install footbridges and walkways (Cockrell 1983:33). Some wooden trail bridges and walkways were also replaced or added in 1975, and similar activities continued in 1976 (Cockrell 1983:57-58). The portage and its footbridges were badly damaged by storms and flooding in September 1977, and sixteen bridges were either repaired or replaced in 1981 (Cockrell 1983:58, 65). None of the wood-structure trail improvements on the Grand Portage today are over 30 years old, and trail maintenance is an ongoing activity.

Public roads. Parts of two public roads, old Highway 1 and State Highway 61 (also known as the North Shore Drive), intersect the Grand Portage trail well inland from Lake Superior. The legislation that established the GRPO in 1958 did not authorize the acquisition of extant road rights-of-way within the Monument (Cockrell 1983:46, 110). No part of any public or Grand Portage Indian Reservation right-of-way is owned or maintained by the NPS.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 17

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

THE FORT CHARLOTTE SITE COMPLEX (ON THE PIGEON RIVER)

The Fort Charlotte site complex is another of the three contributing sites at the GRPO. This site, on the Pigeon River at the west end of the Grand Portage trail corridor, is densely wooded, fairly inaccessible, and largely undisturbed. It contains visible surface remains that suggest the scale and interrelationship of former buildings and structures there, including the layout of extensive palisade works. The site complex is divided into two primary loci by the intervening flowage of Snow Creek. The remains of a probable XYZ fort (CR-104) on the south side of the creek appear as an L-shaped enclosure measuring about 250 feet along each greater axis. The XYZ fort may have overlain, incorporated, or replaced earlier buildings or structures (e.g., Thompson 1969:46-47). All fur-trade facilities at the XYZ locus, regardless of function or commercial affiliation, are believed to date to the period ca. 1784-1805. The XYZ likely operated there between 1798 and 1804, or throughout the corporate existence of that particular fur trade firm.

On the north side of Snow Creek are the remains of the NWC's Fort Charlotte (CR-103), a fur-trade compound even larger than the XYZ fort. The NWC's fort occupied the entire Pigeon River frontage between the mouth of Snow Creek and the first rapids downstream. If French-colonial traders built houses or structures at the west end of the portage (CR-105), they likely did so in the area later used by the NWC. When the NWC was formed, it may, in turn, have adopted any extant facilities there for its own use. A palisade enclosure measuring about 160-foot square apparently contained the core area of the old NWC fort. Surface features within and west of that core enclosure may represent the remains of fur-trade warehouses, dwellings, and trash middens. Other associated facilities may have included a possible semi-subterranean icehouse or powder magazine and a horse or cattle barn or stable. Also visible are the remains of several lineal and intersected footing trenches left from various episodes of palisade construction, replacement, or repair.

Summers were the busiest season at the Pigeon River landing, but residential population there was probably never large. Surface evidence for old fireplaces at the NWC fort suggests that few buildings there were actually heated. Abutting the suspected core area of the old NWC fort on the north side were several yards enclosed with palisades. The yards were likely added to facilitate the NWC's growing transshipment operations but also to appropriate and control the remaining frontage aside the slack water of the river below Snow Creek. No evidence for buildings or structures is seen within the appended yards, which may have been intermittently used for camping or as places to store or repair canoes, arrange the cargoes and property of transient brigades, chop and stockpile firewood, or pen domestic animals. The NWC also claimed and maintained additional open space around the perimeter of its fort. That space, allegedly kept open by tilling the soil (e.g., Pendergast 1957:109), provided a firebreak, garden, possible pasturage, and a security zone. The general size of the clearing was evident as late as the early 1920s.

The best natural canoe landing on the Pigeon River at Fort Charlotte is the low and gently contoured shoreline between the southwest corner of the NWC's fort and the mouth of Snow Creek. Archeologists working offshore there have recovered a sample of prehistoric Indian materials. They have also identified components attributable to French and British colonial and Early American activities, as well as more recent logging and recreational use. The underwater investigations, begun in 1963, but mostly conducted in the 1970s, recovered about 12,500 artifacts. Among the finds is a unique assemblage of organic materials (like parts of fur trade-era moccasins, canoes, canoe paddles, wooden kegs, and other items) not usually found in terrestrial archeological contexts (Birk 1975a: 83, 1975b; Birk and Wheeler 1976:798; Wheeler et al. 1975:44, 85-93, 96-99, 102, 104-105; Wheeler and Woolworth 1968:234; Sage n.d.:22-25). The sparse prehistoric Indian component has yielded no diagnostic artifacts other than a crude corner-notched projectile point tentatively assigned through typological comparison to the Woodland period (Birk and Wheeler 1976). Additional evidence of prehistoric activities at the west end of the portage can likely be found on adjacent shoreline areas at and on either side of Snow Creek at its mouth.

Submerged in the river channel opposite the old NWC canoe landing, are the remains of two rock-filled timber cribs that were used to control log drives on the Pigeon River around 1900. One of the cribs is on the Minnesota side of the river and the other

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 18

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

is on the Ontario side (Birk 1975a:76; Wheeler et al. 1975:40-42; Gilman 1992:113-114). Photographs of the cribs taken in the 1920s show details of their original construction (e.g., Wheeler et al. 1975:41). The crib on the Minnesota side has collapsed and now appears only as a rock pile on the river bottom. Also on the shoreline at Fort Charlotte are remnants of an old log quay or dock, which was likely constructed by the NWC in the 1780s (Wheeler et al. 1975:42-43).

Noncontributing Structures/Objects at the Fort Charlotte Site Complex

Snow Creek footbridge. In 1981 the NPS constructed a footbridge across the mouth of Snow Creek to accommodate site tours given when the Monument hosted the 1981 International Fur Trade Conference. The footbridge, since maintained, is a simple structure made of lightweight dimensional lumber supported on stakes.

Fort Charlotte stone monument. A stone monument stands at the location where the Grand Portage intersected the Pigeon River in the 1930s. Local resident, Ernie Spry, built the cemented cobblestone monument as a Civilian Conservation Corps project in 1936 (GRPO file H2217, 12/11/1979, Superintendent Ivan Miller, file memo). Though intended to commemorate the site or portage (e.g., Bonney 1961:5), the monument has no plaque or markings, and today its original purpose is not readily apparent. The real value of the monument seems to be its use as a datum or reference for conducting archeological surveys and as a reminder of where the portage trail intersected the Pigeon River at the time of the monument's construction.

Public restroom and picnic facilities. At the west end of the Grand Portage trail near the Fort Charlotte site complex is a public outhouse (pit toilet) that was installed by the NPS in the early 1980s along with two picnic tables and two fire rings.

THE GRAND PORTAGE SITE COMPLEX (ON GRAND PORTAGE BAY)

A third contributing site at the GRPO is the Grand Portage site complex on Grand Portage Bay. Within this site are two contributing structures and four contributing reconstructed buildings (see Section 5, Page 1) as well as a number of additional constituent elements (e.g., features and loci) that help convey the site's historical significance. The Crawford Cabin (CR-37), once part of this site, is now gone. A prehistoric lithic concentration (CR-51) falls outside the assigned period and area of NRHP significance. A Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) stone highway bridge (CR-59), not mentioned in the 1976 NRHP nomination, has since been determined eligible for listing on the National Register. Each of the resources is discussed here individually.

Crawford Cabin (CR-37). The Crawford Cabin, a log residence built within the area of the old NWC depot in the 1890s, was listed on the 1976 NRHP nomination as an historic building (Busch 1976). At that time the cabin had already been moved to a new location on the Monument grounds. A 1982 study determined that the cabin had "no significance in terms of the fur trade" and recommended that it be removed from the GRPO (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No.37). In 1986 the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office concurred with this appraisal and agreed that "removal of the cabin" would "have no effect on the Monument" (Fridley 1986). The cabin was subsequently hauled off.

Prehistoric lithic concentration (CR-51). In 1962, archeologists found a locus of prehistoric lithic materials while exploring an area near the shore of Grand Portage Bay east of Grand Portage Creek. This locus is five feet above the present level of Lake Superior near the southerly margin of an abandoned roadway (CR-50) about 130 feet southeast of the old BIA school (CR-58). Soils excavated from an area of about 300 square feet within the locus, when screened, produced what has been described as a "moderate quantity" of worked flakes and a "handful" of chipped-stone tools (including a knife, a projectile point, and three scrapers). No prehistoric ceramics were recovered. The lithic materials were found in a "dark soil zone" either 8-10 inches or 8-12 inches below the ground surface. The lithic assemblage has been variably dated to ca. 500 B.C. to 0 A.D., ca. 1 A.D. to 1,000 A.D., and ca. 2,000 B.P., or to the Archaic period, 7,000 to 2,500 years ago (NPS 2003:169; Woolworth 1962b, 1962c, 1962d;

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 19

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:235, II: No.51). Recent studies suggest the land area containing the lithic concentration was underwater during Archaic times, which could mean that it represents a later, aceramic, Woodland occupation that occurred after a lowering of the lake level (e.g., Clark 1999:37). Whatever the correct date, the lithic concentration is not included within the historic district's areas of significance and it predates the period of significance. That does not preclude the need for a more complete analysis of the materials and their context to determine the potential significance of this locus to the history of Grand Portage. Indeed, if it has significance and retains integrity this locus might be eligible for listing on the NRHP in its own right.

Grand Portage Creek Stone Bridge (CR-59/ IDLCS 70009/ HS-09). A two-lane stone highway bridge owned by the Grand Portage Ojibwe Band lies within the county-maintained right-of-way of CSAH 17 (Mile Creek Road). The bridge is at a road crossing of Grand Portage Creek about 325 feet north-northeast of the old NWC depot and about 500 feet upstream from the mouth of the creek. The bridge was designed by the CCC Indian Division-Cass Lake, Minnesota, and was built by the CCC as a work relief project for the village of Grand Portage. The bridge measures about 28 feet wide and 50 feet long. It is equipped with pedestrian walkways and low retaining walls and is a typical WPA-era structure in that it exhibits heavy massing, use of local materials, and a design intended to harmonize with the natural surroundings. The bridge was built between about 1938 and 1940 to replace an older (ca. 1914-1940) bridge (CR-49) that once crossed the creek at a location nearer to the lake (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No.59). The Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office, in April, 1996, determined that the stone highway bridge (CR-59) is eligible for listing on the NRHP by itself as an element in the development of Grand Portage by State and Federal authorities in the 1930s and 1940s. The stone bridge is also assumed to have cultural significance to the Grand Portage Band of Minnesota Chippewa (NPS 2003:178).

NWC depot (CR-1) Archeological Features. The archeological remains of the NWC's depot or "Big Fort" are on gently sloping terrain on the lakefront between Grand Portage Creek and Mount Rose. This multicomponent site locus contains some indication of prehistoric activities. Evidence for possible early French presence is disputed. The best-known deposits relate to fur-trade operations dating from about 1768 through the early nineteenth century and to various Indian and non-Indian occupations dating to the Reservation Period (ca. 1850s through the 1930s). As already noted, the NWC had sixteen buildings within their fort. These buildings, of log or timber construction, were crafted using mostly indigenous materials. The *in situ* fur-trade components of the depot are of continuing importance to GRPO research and interpretation programs even though they have been considerably disturbed and contaminated by modern land use. Among the known impacts are residential and commercial activities, landscaping, tourism, and archeological investigations (Noble 1990).

The remains of two buildings made of *de piquets* (*pieux en terre, poteaux en terre, or en pile*) log construction (CR-12 and CR-32) are reported within the area of the NWC depot. In such construction, the walls of the buildings (in this case, the outer walls) were made of tightly spaced vertical *piquets* (i.e., round posts). The *piquets* were planted in the ground within linear footing trenches (e.g., Richardson 1973; Moogk 1977:30-31). This mode of construction is often associated with French-colonial outposts. Knowing that, some researchers tentatively identified the two buildings with a pre-1760 French occupation based solely on architectural style (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:28; II: No. 12; Noble 1990:11-13). No French-period artifacts are reported in or around the reputed *de piquets* buildings or elsewhere within the area of the old NWC depot (e.g., Brown 1937:457). Given the long tradition of *de piquets* construction in the northwest fur trade—a tradition that persisted into the nineteenth century—it can be argued that architectural treatment alone is not sufficient to assign any building at the GRPO to the French colonial period. Temporal assignment may not be easily resolved, for even the location of one of the supposed *de piquets* buildings (CR-12) is now in doubt, and a recent attempt to find its remains was unsuccessful (Noble 1990).

The relative age of some early buildings and structures at the depot locus can be surmised through the positioning, content, and overlap of features. Archeologists believe some of the oldest historic features in the depot area are a palisade footing trench (CR-44) and the nearby remains of a building (CR-45). Both of these features, near what later became the main gate of the NWC depot, are tentatively linked to pre-1785 British fur-trade activities and may be associated with firms that later merged to

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 20

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

form the NWC (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: Nos. 44 and 45). Intensive use of the depot area by the NWC between ca. 1778-1803 is reflected by the archeological remains of the Great Hall (CR-5), kitchen (CR-16), palisades (CR-19), main gate and Gatehouse (CR-14), and other structures, including a well (CR-17). Archeologists have excavated all of these loci, along with the locus of a warehouse of an apparent NWC-rival (CR-47) (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II).

The remains of many lesser-known buildings and structures in the area of the old NWC depot await further examination and analysis (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I: 117-122; Gilman 1992:131). These include CR-3, CR-9, and CR-27, possible dwellings, each with a fireplace; CR-7, CR-8, CR-10, and CR-15, possible dwellings or workshops, each with a fireplace; and CR-6, a two-room structure with two fireplaces (perhaps the dwelling of the NWC's resident proprietor). Others are CR-11, a possible food-storage building supported on posts and, CR-13, a possible food-storage building with a cellar. Still other archeological features in the area of the old NWC depot that may be identified with building foundations are CR-22 through CR-26, CR-28 through CR-31, CR-33 through CR-36, and CR-38 (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II).

Other structures at the NWC depot include CR-18, a stone-lined drainage ditch south of the NWC kitchen and CR-46, a hewn board-lined ditch that once drained areas north and west of the kitchen. Also present are CR-20, CR-21, and CR-40, footing trenches that may outline various configurations of the depot palisade and CR-39, slag deposits that may result from a fur trade-era blacksmith shop (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II).

Available evidence suggests that early historic use of the depot locus may involve three major phases of development. That part of the fort lying nearest to the mouth of Grand Portage Creek may have first been established in 1768, possibly in an area of prior French occupancy (e.g., Nute 1944:305; Gilman 1992:51). The fort was apparently expanded westward in about 1778 or 1780 when the NWC organized, and then northward in the mid-1780s or later to the foot of Mount Rose. With the latter expansion, the fort's palisade enclosures reached their maximum extent (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:10, 102, II: No. 1; Gilman 1992:71). At some point, shoreline erosion, perhaps exacerbated by high water, the loss or removal of vegetation, and the use of the beach as a canoe landing, may have forced the NWC to move the southernmost palisade of the depot further inland (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No. 40). An observer in 1802 noted that the "regularity & position" of the "numerous buildings" within the depot and the "neatness & order" of things there indicated the judgment and taste of the NWC proprietors. Nothing there, it was said, was "superfluous or unnecessary" (Thompson 1969:109).

The NWC kept a small "trading post" with three or four men at Grand Portage after moving its headquarters to Kaministikwia (later Fort William) (Masson 1960, II:35; Dawson 1970:35-36). In 1816 a house was dismantled at Fort William and taken to Grand Portage, where it was reassembled alongside another "well preserved house, measuring 12 by 12 feet" (Birk 1998:10). These buildings may have been at or near the location of the former NWC depot. Also present in the area of the depot site locus is archeological evidence of several post-fur trade era buildings. These include the ca. 1856-1870s Nelson Drouillard house and blacksmith shop (CR-4), two small Ojibwe residential buildings (CR-42), and some surviving remains from the Crawford farm dated ca. 1910 to the 1930s (CR-37 and CR-41) (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II). Early in the site development process (begun in the 1930s), these various features were considered an annoyance to archeological work being conducted on earlier fur trade loci.

NWC depot (CR-1) Historical Reconstructions. When the NWC removed to Kaministikwia, its depot at Grand Portage was razed. Some building hardware and materials were salvaged from the depot, but other structural remnants were likely burned or otherwise rendered useless. The NWC continued to operate at Grand Portage at a much-reduced scale for a few years, but, by 1822, the old depot was an archeological ruin (Cockrell 1983:8; Gilman 1992:91-92). No fur trade-era buildings survive at the depot or elsewhere at the GRPO, and there are no known illustrations or detailed descriptions of these facilities (Thompson 1969:v, 166; Cockrell 1983:2; Gilman 1992:70).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places

Continuation Sheet

Section 7Page 21

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Archeologists excavated the remains of several fur trade era structures at the NWC depot before 1971. Some of these structures were later replicated for purposes of public interpretation and commemoration. The reconstructions (collectively, the “stockade complex”) emphasize the people, events, and facilities of the fur trade during the period from 1731 to circa 1804. In addition to the fort’s stockade (CR-19), they include the Great Hall (CR-5), Kitchen (CR-16), and Gatehouse (CR-14) within the stockade, and a Warehouse/Canoe Shed (CR-47) located just beyond. The reconstructions are now central attractions at the GRPO. Most were recognized for contributing to the National significance of the GRPO in the 1976 NRHP nomination (Busch 1976), and they are so recognized today. The following summary describes the history and appearance of the reconstructions and reveals some of the extensive research and planning done to authenticate their presentation:

(a) Great Hall (CR-5/ IDLCS 12003/ HS-01). Sometime, perhaps around 1780, the NWC erected a large hall within the depot to accommodate meetings, dining, dancing, and other business and social activities. At either end of the spacious central room gaping fireplaces likely flanked bedrooms or offices (Babcock 1940a). This principal building has been called the “House,” the “Mess House, the “Dining Room,” and “one large hall” (Thompson 1970), as well as the “main trading hall” (Babcock 1940a). Today it is known as the “Great Hall” (Thompson 1970). The first Great Hall reconstruction, completed between 1938 and 1940, was plagued by historical inaccuracies. The building housed a museum with crafts and exhibits and a sandwich shop (Cockrell 1983:15-16). It was generally neglected during World War II, appeared “weather-beaten” by 1956, and required re-roofing in 1963 (Cockrell 1983:33, 39; Gilman 1992:129). The reconstruction burned to the ground in 1969 after being struck by lightning. The fire so severely damaged the stone fireplaces and chimneys they had to be demolished and hauled away (Woolworth 1975a:27, 33; Cockrell 1983:50). Archeologists reexamined the building site in 1970 and found architectural evidence missed during prior excavations (Cockrell 1983:20, 50-51). At the same time, the NPS completed a Historic Structures Report to assist in designing and constructing the replacement facility as well as furnishing the interior spaces (Thompson 1970).

A new reconstruction of the Great Hall, executed with a “pronounced emphasis on authenticity,” was begun in 1971 and opened to the public in 1973. It measures 30 by 95-feet, stands 1½ stories high, and is made in the post-on-sill (*pièces-sur-pièces*) style with squared logs hand-hewn from local timbers. A rectangular central dining room on the main floor has a large, random-coursed, stone fireplace at either end. The Great Hall also has a hip roof, six gable dormers, 12/12 double-hung windows with interior shutters, panel doors with transoms, and a 20 by 30-foot basement. A porch runs along the entire front side facing the lake (Busch 1976; Cockrell 1983:21, 50-51; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No. 5; Gilman 1992:132). A Halon fire suppression system installed in the Great Hall in 1978 (Cockrell 1983:60) was completely replaced by a water sprinkler-type fire suppression system in 2004. The sprinkler system also covers the Kitchen and Warehouse.

(b) Kitchen (CR-16/ IDLCS 04987/ HS-04). Archeologists excavated the remains of a kitchen behind the Great Hall in 1970 (Woolworth 1975a; Cockrell 1983:20, 51). The kitchen was built about the same time as the Great Hall (ca. 1785). It provided food storage and preparation facilities for the depot staff and for NWC partners and other privileged personnel who took meals in the Great Hall dining room during the annual summer rendezvous (e.g., Thompson 1969:90, 106). The presence of the kitchen was first suspected from descriptions of similar facilities at Fort William in Ontario, Canada (Gilman 1992:130-131). The archeological ruins of the Grand Portage kitchen were later identified on the basis of its predicted location, its aligned relationship with the Great Hall, and the associated concentration of food-related artifacts and features (Woolworth 1975a).

A 1973 NPS-Historic Structures Report recommended that the kitchen be reconstructed from the archeological findings and from evidence for kitchens, bake ovens, and foodways at Fort William and other North American fur trade sites (Thompson 1973; Cockrell 1983:54-55). The new kitchen, now equipped with a water sprinkler-type fire suppression system, was completed and opened to the public in 1978 (Cockrell 1983:60). It is a 1½-story post-on-sill (*pièces-sur-pièces*) log structure measuring about 27 by 35-feet. Other features include a gable roof, two dormers, and 12/12 double-hung windows. The top floor has an exterior door. The kitchen, with open porches on all but the southwest side, is attached to the back of the Great Hall

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 22

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

by a covered walkway. The kitchen building has a large central fireplace and a sub-floor cooler. It is furnished with a range of period kitchen furniture, kitchenware, utensils, food-storage containers, and other equipment.

(c) Warehouse/Canoe Shed (CR-47/ IDLCS 04995/ HS-03). In 1963 archeologists found the remains of a warehouse southwest of the NWC's depot enclosure several hundred feet from the Great Hall. The remains were excavated in 1964 and further examined in 1970 (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No. 47; Cockrell 1983:51). The 18.5 by 52-foot warehouse, perhaps belonging to traders working in opposition to the NWC, stood on a foundation of wooden pilings set on sloping ground (Cockrell 1983:19). A NPS-Historic Structures Report was completed for the warehouse in 1972. It drew upon archeological, historical, and architectural evidence to formulate plans and specifications for reconstruction (Koue and Thompson 1972). The reconstruction was opened to the public in 1973 as a Canoe Shed/Warehouse furnished with displays of birchen canoes along with tools and gear used to make, maintain, or navigate such vessels (Cockrell 1983:54). The reconstruction is a one-story log building with room for overhead storage. It is made in the post-on-sill (*pièces-sur-pièces*) style with a shingled gable roof, notched/pinned corner bracing, nine-pane hopper windows, plank flooring, and vertical panel doors with wrought-iron hardware. On the lakeside of the reconstruction is a large door with an exterior loading platform and boat ramp.

(d) Gatehouse (CR-14/ IDLCS 06064/ HS-02). In 1936 archeologists found evidence for an elevated Gatehouse or watchtower within the northeast angle of the NWC fort, at the "main" or east gate. Prior to the last expansion of the depot in the 1780s, the same Gatehouse in the same location would have been near the center of the original fort's northwest palisade. A replicated Gatehouse was first erected in about 1938. The archeological remains of the actual Gatehouse were more fully excavated in 1964. A contemporary NPS-Historic Structures Report gave plans for rebuilding the gatehouse (Riley et al. 1964), and a more accurate reconstruction was placed on the original site over a double-gated entrance in 1965. The latter reconstruction was scorched during the Great Hall fire of 1969. The Gatehouse, measuring 13 by 13-feet, stands on four large 12-foot vertical wooden corner posts or piers. Frost heave and rot made it necessary to replace the corner support posts in 1991. The outer walls of the Gatehouse are made of squared horizontal-timbers mortised into corner posts. Corner braces, notched and pinned into the corner posts, also help support the Gatehouse. An exterior stairway on the west side with pinned steps leads up to a vertical-board entrance door equipped with wrought iron hardware. The Gatehouse has a shingled hip roof and exposed rafter tails. Small squared lookout-openings appear on each of the four sides (Cockrell 1983:42; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No. 14; David J. Cooper, personal communication).

(e) Stockade (CR-19/ IDLCS 04979/ HS-05). The reconstructed NWC depot stockade consists of several intersected palisade walls that form the perimeter of the 2.3-acre depot enclosure. The palisades are made of tightly spaced, vertical, cedar and spruce-log pickets that stand about 14-feet high. Archeological evidence shows the original enclosure was enlarged twice, first to the southwest along the lakefront and then to the northwest towards Mount Rose. The first stockade reconstructions, erected in 1940, were not entirely accurate (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No. 19; Cockrell 1983:15), and they deteriorated by 1956 (Cockrell 1983:33). Further field investigations were conducted in 1963-64 (Cockrell 1983:19, 39) and, guided by a NPS-Historic Structures Report (Riley et al. 1964), the rotted palisades were replaced by 1966. The replacement corrected errors in the original reconstruction and added a new Gatehouse and two sets of double gates equipped with replicated wrought-iron hardware (Cockrell 1983:19, 42; Busch 1976). Further work done in 1981 as part of a restoration plan generally realigned and stabilized the stockade posts and supports (Cockrell 1983:64-65). Today, as in the past, maintenance of the stockade is an ongoing process performed whenever the need arises.

Other Constituent Elements of the Grand Portage Site Complex that Help Convey Historical Significance

Old ford at Grand Portage Creek (CR-74). An old ford on Grand Portage Creek is located 122 feet upstream from the stone bridge on Highway 17 (CR-59). The ford is tentatively attributed to the fur trade era. It might have been part of a side trail that led from the "main" or "east" gate of the NWC depot to join the main corridor of the Grand Portage just beyond the ford on the

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places

Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 23

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

east side of the creek. There is speculation that a "small wooden bridge" may have been built at the ford by British troops in 1778 (i.e., Woolworth 1975:205). Use and maintenance of the ford may have extended into the twentieth century. Possible groomed segments of old roadway are visible on either side of the creek in the area of the ford. The most visible segment said to be ten feet wide, fifty feet long, and 1.5 feet deep, lies east of the creek. Other than surface reconnaissance, no archeological investigation has been conducted to define or evaluate this stream crossing (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No. 74).

Old Grand Portage roadway and bridge (CR-50 and CR-49). Between about 1914 and 1940 the first vehicular road connecting Grand Portage with the outside world ran along a section of the lakefront at Grand Portage Bay. Part of the abandoned roadbed (CR-50) is still visible within the area of the old NWC depot and on the opposite (east) side of Grand Portage Creek. The extant ditched roadbed is about 16 feet wide. In some areas it is 1.5 feet higher than the adjacent terrain. Excavations in a part of the abandoned roadbed east of the creek revealed a historic Ojibwe burial (CR-53) and the remains of a post-1856 USID warehouse (CR-54). The roadbed also overlies archeological remains in the area of the NWC depot, west of Grand Portage Creek. Where the road crossed Grand Portage Creek, about 90 feet upstream from its mouth, the abutments (CR-49) of a former steel bridge are present on either stream bank. Other than surface reconnaissance, no archeological investigation has been conducted to define or evaluate these features (Woolworth 1963:7; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II, Nos.49, 50, 53, 54).

Voyageur's campgrounds. During the period 1775-1802, the NWC's annual summer rendezvous brought hundreds of men to Grand Portage. The voyageurs that paddled freight canoes from Montreal to the portage were often referred to derogatorily as *mangeurs de lard* or pork eaters. The pork eaters stayed at the portage for a short time each summer before returning to Montreal with the company's winter harvest of furs. According to written testimony, they camped together and kept their great Montreal canoes "on the point" just east of Grand Portage Creek. The eastern and inland boundaries of their seasonal camp (CR-52) are uncertain, but one estimate suggests the camp could extend 500 feet along the shore and back 300 feet. Because the pork-eaters did not have tents and took shelter beneath their overturned canoes, it is presumed that most of their camping occurred near the shore. The area of the campgrounds could have moved or expanded eastward along the shore during times of increased rivalry. Exploratory excavations in the supposed area of the camp in 1962 proved inconclusive (Nute 1925:164; Thompson 1969:65, 69, 91-92, 112-116; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:11, 101-103, II: No.52; Gilman 1992:7, 71).

Other fur traders who frequented the rendezvous at Grand Portage were the Northmen, winterers from the NWC's interior trading houses. The Northmen were full-time employees who shared feelings of superiority to the seasonal pork-eaters. While at Grand Portage, during the early 1790s, they camped apart from the Montrealers in an area west of Grand Portage Creek on either side of the aforementioned path leading from the NWC depot to the Grand Portage trail. Each post or brigade of Northmen also camped as a separate group, "in tents of different sizes pitched at random" (Gates 1965:93; Thompson 1969:65). During the period of NWC-XYC rivalry, when the NWC maintained a larger labor force, some Northmen may also have pitched their tents east of the creek near its mouth (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:11; II: No. 52). Additional excavation, guided by historical research and, perhaps, remote sensing, is recommended to learn more about the voyageurs and their campgrounds, including their material possessions, life styles, and practices when bivouacked at Grand Portage. It should be noted that some Montreal canoe brigades passed through Grand Portage to meet NWC winterers at Rainy Lake. Indeed, this practice was apparently well established by 1784 (Duckworth 1990:25; Birk and Richner 2004:10).

Boucher's Fort or "Little Fort" (CR-55) and Palisade (CR-61). The Northmen relied on their employers for their material needs, and they might be charged exorbitant prices for merchandise obtained at their wintering quarters. At Grand Portage, NWC copartners operated a small retail shop and canteen in a small fort where the Northmen and other workers (*engagés*) could obtain food, drink, clothing, and other items at "discounted" rates. The "Little Fort" was open only during summer rendezvous. Managers included one Joseph Lecuyer and later a man named Jean Marie Boucher. The "Little Fort" had an air of independence that attracted voyageurs and kept them from loitering at the company's main depot (the "Big Fort") (Nute 1940; Thompson 1969:112-116; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:10, 102-103, 1982, II: No. 55; Gilman 1992:7, 10, 55).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 24

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Reports on the “Little Fort” are inconsistent, and its size and placement are unclear. Some scholars think that it began as a British garrison in 1778 with a building or a “few temporary structures” within a stockade (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:10, 38). Materials for building the fort apparently consisted of 200 logs, each 14 feet in length (Gilman 1992:55). If the logs were used to erect a one-story, post-on-sill building, then one researcher estimates that the footprint of the building may have been as large as 18 by 58 feet (N. Woolworth 1975:205). If, instead, the logs were used to build a palisade enclosure (without corner bastions) and if the logs averaged one-foot in diameter and were closely spaced, then the fort could have measured 50 feet on a side or some other combination, such as 40 by 60 feet. If the pickets were offset or were of smaller diameter and if the defensive works included bastions, then the fort would obviously have been of lesser size. The best evidence places the “Little Fort” east of Grand Portage Creek, northeast of the pork eater’s camp, near the shore of Lake Superior (Nute 1940:119, 136, 138; Gilman 1992:7). One report suggests the fort’s remains could be about 50 feet from the lake shore (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:10). Another report states, without qualification, that the fort itself was originally built just ten feet from the sandy beach (Woolworth 1975:205), a position that would have left its remains vulnerable to later shoreline erosion.

In 1962 and 1975 archeologists in search of the “Little Fort” examined the remains of a linear trench (CR-61) on the south side of the NPS lakefront service road (a section of road now also known as old BIA 5, old CSAH 17, or the Boneyard Road). The trench, a footing trench located about 100 feet from the beach and 350 feet east of Grand Portage Creek, was initially discovered in 1961 (Johnson 1961:5). The east-west trending trench was later variably reported to be about 60 or 70 feet long and to contain a tightly-spaced row of rotted *posts* or small *stakes* or small *pickets* or post *butts* or wooden post *moulds* or small post *moulds* (Woolworth 1962c, 1962d, 1967:5; 1975b:2; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:253-254, II: No. 61). Whatever the nature of these representations, they were found about 12 inches below the ground surface and either averaged “from 1 to 2 inches” or ranged “from 4 to 6 inches” in diameter (Woolworth 1975b:2; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No. 61). At its easterly end the trench feature is said to turn northward (away from the lake) “at a right angle.” Two different grid locations are given for CR-61 in the archeological literature, and it is uncertain which, if either, location is correct. Nonetheless, the feature is identified in one report as part of “a small palisade or fence probably erected by the North West Company” to delimit and enclose the land area it claimed at Grand Portage Bay (Woolworth 1962b, 1962c; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:254, II: No. 61). Another report concludes that evidence is lacking to connect the feature with early fur-trade era fences (Thompson 1969:93n1).

The NWC may have erected fences at Grand Portage beyond its depot palisades as a means to demarcate and control additional space (e.g., Thompson 1969:92-93). Such activity could have certainly occurred during the period of NWC-XYC rivalry. Just how extensive, secure, or permanent any perimeter fences at the lakefront clearing at Grand Portage Bay may have been is open to question. In the late 1790s one observer noted: “The bottom of the bay, which forms an amphitheater, is cleared of wood and inclosed.” He also indicated that, “on the left corner of it [the clearing], beneath a hill [Mount Rose]...is the [NWC] fort, picketed in with cedar pallisadoes”(Lamb 1970:96-97). Some scholars take this to mean the entire lakefront clearing was enclosed with “pickets or fences,” and that it was so enclosed by 1796 (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:43, II: No.61).

Seemingly contradictory information hints that the clearing was not outlined by fences, but was rather “bounded in front by the lake, on the south West side by the old [NWC] fort, on the North East by [the NWC’s] Fort Boucher...and in the rear by the woods” (Nute 1940:138; Thompson 1969:116, 169). The area between the Big and Little Forts may thus have been left “open and not inclosed” (Nute 1940:137). Even if the clearing was enclosed by artificial barriers along its inland margins, it is difficult to understand why any part of such an enclosure, let alone an apparent palisade like that defined as CR-61, would be erected so near and parallel to the lake shore.

Excavations in the same area as CR-61 also uncovered CR-55, the outline of a fenced enclosure made of brush or small pickets. CR-55 is variably reported to measure “roughly” 20 by 35 feet or to be “approximately” 30-foot square.” The excavators surmised that CR-55 once enclosed a “log or pole and bark structure” which served as a canteen, store, and dwelling with storage facilities (Woolworth 1975b:2; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No. 55). One report indicates “a strong probability”

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 25

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

that the remains at CR-55 are actually those of ‘Boucher’s Fort’” while another report states, without reservation, that they *are* the remains of the fort (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:254, II: No. 55). Either conclusion is inconsistent with the idea that Boucher’s “Little Fort” originated as a military outpost enclosed by substantial log pickets (Gilman 1992:55; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:38). Given the location of the aforementioned CR-61 and its more-robust pickets, that feature seems a better candidate for the palisade of a fort than does CR-55. Indeed, historic photographs reveal that several ca. 1880s residences in the general area of CR-55 were surrounded by fences made of tightly spaced small-diameter poles (e.g., Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I: 222, Fig. 29). That evidence could explain the origins of CR-55. The reported discovery of possible ca. 1880 building remains within the same area as CR-55 might further support this notion (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:254).

An assemblage of what has been called “miscellaneous cultural debris” recovered at the location of CR-55 has yet to be analyzed. The area near the NPS lakefront service road north of CR-61 was once cultivated, leaving a plow zone 8-10 inches deep. Archeologists report evidence of fur trade era structures under the ca. 1880 building remains north of CR-61. Similar fur-trade deposits may lie beneath the service road (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:254, II: No. 55). Additional documentary research and careful stratified excavations, assisted by remote sensing and GIS mapping, are recommended to further define, identify, and evaluate the complex array of archeological features and deposits in and around the area of CR-55 and CR-61. Related information might also be obtained through investigating adjacent areas offshore.

Ojibwe burial ground (CR-53). In 1962 archeologists trenching the area of the supposed voyageurs camp (CR-52) uncovered and removed four unmarked Ojibwe burials. Three of the burials were on a low hill or knoll just east of Grand Portage Creek in the area opposite the old NWC depot. As previously noted, the fourth burial was found under the bed of the ca. 1914 roadway (CR-50) at the foot of the knoll closer to the shore of Lake Superior. The exact age and extent of the former burial grounds are unknown, and other unmarked graves may be present. Investigators suggest that interments at this location may have occurred between about 1805, after the NWC withdrawal, and the mid-1850s, when government officials built a warehouse on the southeastern margin of the knoll. Another estimate by the same investigators dates the burials to the period ca. 1800-1825. No oral traditions about the burials or the burial grounds were voiced in the local Ojibwe community at the time of exhumation (Woolworth 1962b, 1962c; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II). The discovery of human remains raises legal and ethical questions regarding the future use or investigation of the area of this site locus.

Ojibwe Midewiwin grounds (CR-89). A former Midewiwin/Roman Catholic religious property may be near the north edge of the GRPO below the present Roman Catholic Church (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:20, 182-183). There are no known surface indications of this possible Traditional Cultural Property (TCP), no fieldwork has been conducted to locate or identify possible subsurface remains, and presently it is uncertain whether the presumed locus is within or outside the GRPO boundaries. A candidate location for this locus has been the scene of other activities over the years, which may have compromised the setting and destroyed any earlier cultural evidence (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No.89). Nonetheless, some resident members of the Grand Portage band consider the supposed location “to have particular religious significance” (Noble 1998) and believe the best management approach is “to leave it alone” (Tim Cochrane, GRPO Superintendent, personal communication).

Historical records show that, in 1838, a Catholic trader and some local Ojibwe built a cedar-bark mission near the lakefront at Grand Portage Bay to attract an itinerant Catholic priest. The mission may have been constructed where the Ojibwe earlier held Midewiwin (“Grand Medicine”) ceremonies. The 30 by 40-foot bark mission, with door and window coverings of doeskins, served as a chapel and school. Nearby, the Ojibwe also built a small log house for the priest, with a stone fireplace. The mission was apparently rebuilt on two later occasions at or near the same place (Woolworth 1965:305). The second mission, a 12 by 18-foot birch-bark wigwam, was erected in 1846. The second mission was replaced with another of similar construction the year after the 1854 Treaty was signed. A government school opened at the same time (Woolworth 1965:307, 309; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:190). Conflicting reports indicate that a log church—the Holy Rosary Church-- was either built in 1865 on a hill overlooking the older mission site (Woolworth 1965:310) or that it was initially erected on the spot of the earlier missions

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 26

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

and then moved to its present hilltop position in 1865 (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:20, II: No.89; NPS 2003:170). Additional study is needed to determine the nature, location, and potential significance of this complex property, but the potential for finding human remains places legal and ethical limits on future intrusive field investigations in this area.

USID warehouses (CR-54). The United States Indian Department (USID) built a warehouse and dock (or pier) on the lakefront east of Grand Portage Creek in 1856. These facilities eased the delivery, storage, and distribution of annuity goods owed the Grand Portage band of Ojibwe under the 1854 Treaty of La Pointe (Wisconsin), a treaty ratified in 1855. A second USID warehouse was added just west of the first in about 1869. Both warehouses were made of logs. The first warehouse measured 18 by 24 feet and may have had a cellar. The other, of unlisted dimension, had a cellar 15 feet wide and 42 inches deep. Both warehouses were razed by 1910. Archeologists apparently found the remains of the second warehouse with a few “relatively modern artifacts” beneath the bed of the ca. 1914 lakeshore drive during exploratory excavations in 1962 (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:190, 197, II: No.54). The USID dock (a part of CR-54) is a noncontributing property that lies beyond the Monument boundaries (see further discussion of the USID dock, below).

USID buildings (CR-62 and CR-63). About 330 feet north of the USID dock on the south side of the NPS lakefront service road archeologists have identified the remains of two possible USID buildings dating to the period ca. 1860-1900. Cross-trenching the remains of these buildings in 1975 suggested they were each about 15 feet wide. Their longer dimensions are unknown. Artifacts recovered during excavations imply the buildings may have served as dwellings and for storage. The remains of earlier fur-trade structures, dating to the period 1790s-1805, may underlie those of the USID buildings (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II). Additional fieldwork is needed to define and evaluate these features.

USID school (CR-84). In 1857 the USID opened an elementary school for the Grand Portage band of Ojibwe to further satisfy the stipulations of the Treaty of 1854. The school (CR-84) was located about 1000 feet east of the stone highway bridge (CR-59) on Grand Portage Creek, about 250 feet from the shore of Grand Portage Bay, and about 85 feet northeast of the La Garde/La Plante house (CR-86). The school was about 18-20 feet wide, 30 feet long, and 16 feet high. It was made of hand-hewn dovetailed logs with clapboarded gables and sawn cedar shingles. Millwork for the school was brought in from La Pointe, Wisconsin. The building exterior was whitewashed. A wood stove, vented through a central brick chimney, provided heat. An overhead loft may have been used to house male teachers. The building had many six-pane windows, each with two movable sashes. All of the windows faced south, towards the lake. The exterior doorway opened to the west. Enrollment at the school the year it opened included 21 girls and 20 boys, though the average daily attendance was only one half or less of that number. Average attendance at the school in 1889 was 10 or 12 pupils. On occasion, for lack of other options, transient visitors to Grand Portage sometimes slept overnight in the school. The school burned in June 1907. No archeological investigations have been conducted at the old school. The remains now appear to be buried or sealed beneath the fill used to construct the “boneyard,” a fenced NPS storage area (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:190-191, 197-199, II: No. 84; Blackwell et al. 1983:49-50).

USID teacher’s house (CR-77). The residence for the USID schoolteacher between ca. 1855 and 1882 sat about 450 feet east of Grand Portage Creek on the north side of what is now the NPS lakefront service road. This whitewashed building, likely made of hand-hewn logs and measuring about 14 by 18 feet, is known only from historic photographs.

BIA school and outbuildings (CR-58). The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) built a second elementary school at Grand Portage in about 1914, after the first one (CR-84) burned. The BIA school and associated structures were on the low hill or knoll about 60 feet east of Grand Portage Creek and 70 feet south of Highway 17. The original school building, measuring about 18 by 35 feet, faced the lake and was accessed through a doorway at its east end. Sometime later, another building, about 25 by 43 feet, was added to the south end of the first, giving the whole an L-shaped configuration. A porch at the southern end covered the new main entrance. A rock-lined flagpole base sits 25 feet southwest of the southwest corner of the schoolhouse.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 27

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

In 1938 when the BIA school was replaced by a new elementary school (located outside the area of the GRPO), the old BIA schoolhouse was adapted as a cooperative store and warehouse. Among outbuildings southwest of the school was a wooden shed used by the cooperative for storing kerosene, a commodity regularly issued to members of the Grand Portage Ojibwe. The BIA school buildings were torn down in 1946. Archeological investigations at the school site locus in 1962 and 1975 focused on exposing and mapping the stone and concrete foundations of the buildings and porches (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:253). The foundations are still visible today.

BIA agency barn, storage, and administrative buildings (CR-64, CR-65, and CR-66). As part of a BIA farming initiative begun at Grand Portage in 1900, three BIA agency buildings were erected on the north side of what is now the NPS lakefront service road east of Grand Portage Creek. The buildings were used to house government food and supplies, as a workshop and livestock barn, and as an administrative center for an assistant government farmer who resided and worked at Grand Portage from about 1900 to 1918. The agency building was used as a dwelling for a number of years and may have survived until 1946.

Extant remains of these buildings include a 15 by 20-foot concrete slab from a barn and another slab from a building measuring 24 by 40 feet. Dimensions are not available for some smaller sheds or garages, which apparently lacked concrete slabs or floors. A USCE survey marker now embedded in the barn foundation shows that the barn was gone by 1935. Other than visual inspection and mapping, no archeological investigations have been conducted on any of these BIA buildings. Test excavations conducted in the area of the concrete slabs and foundations in 1961 focused on recovering possible prehistoric Indian and fur-trade materials. No significant artifacts from the BIA-era were found, and it has been suggested that the remains of the buildings themselves are the most important physical reminders of the former BIA agency (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II).

General store/post office (CR-68). An early general store/post office was located in an area about 395 feet east of Grand Portage Creek and about 250 feet due north of the USID dock (CR-54) on the north side of what is now the NPS lakefront service road. The store/post office building was about 20 feet square. Hugh McCulloch probably built it in 1849. McCulloch apparently ran the store through 1863 and then sold it to Peter Bradshaw, who operated the store through 1867. The location of the store is estimated from historic photographs. No specific archeological investigations have been conducted to find or identify its remains (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No.68).

Clark's general store and house (CR-67). A general store/post office and a small house sat on the northeast side of the intersection of Highway 17 with what is now the NPS lakefront service road. The buildings were in an area about 220 feet east of Grand Portage Creek and north of the old BIA school (CR-58). Physical details of the store and house are estimated from old photographs. The store building was about 20-24 feet wide and 40 feet long. It stood almost two stories high. A wooden awning stood in the front (supported on posts) and a low shed was attached at the rear. The roof slanted towards the back of the building. J. W. Clark operated the store from about 1918 or 1922 to 1935. It contained facilities for a post office. The Clark family lived in a small one-story house behind the store. No specific archeological investigations have been conducted to find or identify their remains (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No.67).

Spruce-Cyrette cabin (CR-75). The Spruce-Cyrette dwelling or cabin was located in what is now the northeast corner of the intersection of County Highway 17 and a branch road that runs north to the commercial center of Grand Portage village. The cabin was the home of the Ojibwe medicine man Joe Spruce (Me-nah-eegonce or Little Spruce) and his wife, Wah-zush-koonce, and later of Nancy, a granddaughter of the Spruce family, and Nancy's husband Paul Cyrette (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No. 75). The Ojibwe musicologist and ethnographer Frances Densmore visited Joe Spruce at his cabin in August 1905. She took a photograph of him and his wife in the cabin and described some of the cabin's contents, including "Deerskin folded ready to make into moccasins" and "four clocks, all of them wrong" (Gilman 1992:121). Densmore also noted a bark storage lodge near the cabin, and, somewhere up the hill, "the tented birch bark grave" of Little Spruce's son (Woolworth 1979:110). The cabin was occupied from about the 1890s until 1938, when it burned. It was made of hewn logs, stood 1½ stories high, and, by

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 28

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

an estimate based on photographic evidence, may have been about 14 to 16 feet wide and 20 feet long. A second house may have built on the site of the first by 1941. No investigations have been conducted to locate, identify, or evaluate the remains of these buildings (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No. 75).

Posey cabin (CR-76). The Posey cabin, the dwelling of Mr. and Mrs. Alec Posey, stood about 30 feet southeast of a stone well house between Grand Portage Creek and the road that runs north from the area of the reconstructed NWC depot to the commercial center of Grand Portage village. The Posey family occupied the cabin from ca. 1920 to the 1950s. It was removed from its original site to another location in about 1939-1940 as part of a village renewal program. No formal investigations have been conducted to locate, identify, or evaluate the original site of the Posey cabin (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No. 76).

Gagnon house (CR-73). The businessman-entrepreneur, Peter Gagnon, lived and worked on Grand Portage Island from about 1890 to the 1920s (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No. 100), and then took residence on the mainland. His mainland home stood east of Highway 17 about 50 to 75 feet north of the Clark Store (CR-67). The Gagnon house was once said to be "the most pretentious home" at Grand Portage, suggesting that it may have either been the largest or the most attractively decorated and maintained house there, or both. No investigations have been conducted to locate, identify, or evaluate the remains of this dwelling (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No. 73). Members of the Gagnon family still live at Grand Portage, and they might have photographs that show the old Gagnon house and other buildings or structures at that place.

Louis/Flatte house (CR-73). This house was located in an area to the rear of the Clark Store (CR-67) east of Highway 17. It was the residence of Joseph Louis Maymushkowaush, a hereditary chief through his father Louis Maymushkowaush. Joseph was the last principal chief of the Grand Portage band (Blackwell et al. 1983:63, 77). When he died in 1920 his daughter's husband, Mike Flatte, acquired the title and symbols (i.e., the medals and flags) of the chieftainship, which was then largely an honorary position (Gilman 1992:123). The Flatte family also lived in the house. Little is known about the house, and there have been no investigations to locate, identify, or evaluate its former site (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No. 73).

La Garde/La Plante house (CR-86) or Maintenance Alternative I (21CK12). This multicomponent locus is on a knoll (sometimes referred to as the La Plante Knoll) near the east end of the GRPO property and close to Grand Portage Bay. The knoll lies between the NPS "boneyard" storage enclosure and the adjacent NPS lakefront service road. It consists of a ca. 3-foot thick deposit of surface soils (including old beach deposits) overlying a mass of slate bedrock (Stoltman 1961). Several archeologists have tested this area with mixed results. At one time, during an early phase of archeological investigations at Grand Portage, the area of the knoll was "written off" as having no tangible evidence of fur trade era occupations (e.g., Stoltman 1961; Davis 1961b; Woolworth 1962a:14-15; Thompson 1969:164-165).

More recent studies indicate that the knoll contains a locus with two historic components. The older component is identified with the fur trade on the basis of a recovered assortment of artifacts including glass trade beads, gun spalls, clay smoking pipe fragments, and a trade-silver cross (Noble 1988). A second component relates to residential use during the period ca. 1890 to 1967. This multicomponent locus is now known as Maintenance Alternate I (21CK12). Portions of the knoll and the locus were damaged by construction of the lakefront road (now the NPS service road) in 1938. At that time from 2 to 3 feet of surface soil was removed from the road corridor (and, perhaps, some from adjacent areas) and used to fill a low spot farther to the east. Topsoil was also introduced to the area of the knoll in the early 1900s to prepare a garden and chicken yard (Davis 1961b; Woolworth 1962a:12-13).

The fur-trade component at the Maintenance Alternate I site locus was first correctly identified during a 1988 archeological survey done in advance of proposed NPS development projects. Excavations conducted at that time indicate that the fur-trade locus/component covers an area of about 600 square meters, measuring about 40 m (120 feet) east-west by 15 m (45 feet) wide. It occupies the space between the fenced boneyard and the lakefront service road and generally straddles the present approach

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 29

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

lane to the boneyard. The same area is now also used for the storage of firewood and other NPS materials. The fur-trade locus was probably more extensive before the damages caused by road construction in 1938. Preliminary analysis and evaluation of the fur-trade locus suggests the extant remnant is contemporaneous with the NWC depot and that it may be part of another, perhaps competing, fur trade operation (Noble 1988, 1989a, 1995, 1998).

Later use of the knoll may have also adversely impacted and contaminated the fur-trade locus. The Le Garde family built a one-story frame house on the knoll, north of the service road, in about 1910. William La Plante later lived there from about 1950 until his death in 1967. The house, measuring about 15 by 20 feet, burned in 1968 (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No. 86). Investigations in the area around the La Plante house in 1961 produced an assemblage of historic materials said to date from the turn of the twentieth century (Woolworth 1962a:11-12). The collection may include unidentified or misidentified fur-trade artifacts (Stoltman 1961). To the rear of the house site, in a brush thicket, was an "immense" deposit of bottles and cans dating from the 1950s and 1960s. The "dump" deposit and the remains of the dwelling have not been evaluated (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No. 86). Neither have other modern trash dumps seen in the vicinity of the boneyard.

Old ice house and cabin (CR-87). A log cabin and ice house once stood on the south edge of the "La Plante Knoll," south of the NPS lakefront service road and opposite the La Garde/La Plante/Maintenance Alternate I site locus (CR-86/21CK12). The log cabin was an Ojibwe dwelling, and the contemporary icehouse may have been for private use. Both structures overlooked Grand Portage Bay. They were gone by about 1915. The physical remains of these buildings may overlie a deposit of earlier fur-trade materials, perhaps a part of the fur-trade component recorded north of the road. Limited archeological testing in the area of the cabin and icehouse in 1961 recovered a large sample of wire nails and other historic debris, including glass seed beads, which archeologists dated to ca. 1890-1910. The concentrations of wood charcoal and fire-hardened clay suggest the buildings were destroyed by fire. As previously noted, construction of the lakefront service road removed 2 to 3 feet of soil from the knoll within the road right-of-way (Stoltman 1961; Woolworth, 1962a:8, 12-13; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No. 87).

Deschampes/Grandlouis house (CR-88). This Ojibwe house was near the northeast corner of the GRPO, 85 feet south of the north boundary, 180 feet west of the east boundary, and 160 feet north of the NPS lakefront service road. A driveway once ran between the house and the service road. The dwelling was built about 1938 or about the time the lakefront road was established. Joe Deschampes apparently occupied the house in 1941, and then the Alec Grandlouis family lived there through about 1968. The vacated building was burned by the NPS. The house was a one-story frame building measuring 20 by 25 feet. Material evidence of the house may now lie buried beneath the NPS "boneyard" storage facility. No investigations have been conducted to identify or evaluate the original house site (Woolworth 1962a:8; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No. 88).

Cabin (CR-85). An Ojibwe log cabin once stood near the northeast corner of the GRPO, about 150 feet east of the area of the USID school (CR-84) and the Deschampes/Grandlouis house (CR-88) and about 210 feet from the shore of Grand Portage Bay. Very little is known about this cabin, other than the fact that its presence is documented on an 1861 map (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No. 85). Though uncertain, archeologists may have tested this or some other Ojibwe cabin site in the same vicinity in 1961. Records shows that they dug into an "abrupt, steep faced" mound-like feature just west of the Monument's east boundary and found tar paper, galvanized iron roofing material, and round wire nails associated with a slate rock foundation (Stoltman 1961). CR-85 was apparently not affected by the construction of the NPS "boneyard" storage facility.

Cabins (CR-81, CR-82, and CR-83). Three probable Ojibwe log cabins once stood in an east-west line about 250 feet from the shore of Grand Portage Bay, in an area north of a later BIA building (CR-65). Very little is known about the three cabins, other than the fact that they appear on an 1861 map (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II). Archeological testing completed in 1998 shows that "building debris is distributed widely" in the area between the foundations of the former BIA buildings (CR-65 and CR-66) and the wetland to the north (Noble 1998). Whether any of the debris originated with the three cabins is uncertain.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 30

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Log buildings (CR-78, CR-79, and CR-80). Three unidentified log buildings once stood in an east-west line about 250 feet from the shore of Grand Portage Bay, in an area just east or northeast of the teacher's house (CR-77). The three buildings, perhaps including a dwelling and a stable, were set about 50 feet apart. The westernmost of three buildings was the largest. Other than their appearance on an 1861 map little is known about these buildings (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II).

Cabins (CR-69, CR-70, and CR-71). Three small Ojibwe log cabins once stood in a north-south line about 200 feet east of Grand Portage Creek and about 200-300 feet inland from the lake shore, apparently close to the area later occupied by the Gagnon house (CR-73), the Louis/Flatte house (CR-72), and the Clark store (CR-67). Little can be said about these cabins, now known only from their appearance on an 1861 map (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II).

Beartail cabin (CR-56). This feature is the only Ojibwe cabin site to be fully excavated at Grand Portage. The cabin was located east of Grand Portage Creek and west of the old USID warehouse (CR-54) on the north side of the abandoned ca. 1914 lakefront roadway (CR-50). The cabin was the residence of Charley Beartail or Muck-azo, a prominent member of the Grand Portage Ojibwe band. It measured about 14 feet long and 10 feet wide. It had an 8 by 10-foot cellar that was at least 6 feet deep. When excavated in 1962, the cellar contained bricks from a fallen chimney and a large quantity of artifacts dating to ca. 1890-1900. Among the recovered artifacts were logging tools, rat traps, files, cartridge cases, broken dishes, and several earthenware jugs ranging in size from 0.5 to 3 gallons (Woolworth 1962d:2; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No. 73).

Ojibwe cabin (CR-57). This log cabin was located near the east bank of Grand Portage Creek a short distance southeast of the stone highway bridge (CR-59). The cabin could involve two buildings attached end-to-end or one long building divided at the center with a partition wall. It is said to have been the residence of Mrs. Spruce and Mrs. Tamarack, the plural wives of a local male resident. Archeological testing of this feature in 1962 found no trace of building foundations, but did uncover a small trash pit and a scatter of artifacts that the excavators date to the period ca. 1890-1920. The fact that the cabin supposedly stood in the area of an old voyageur's campground (CR-52) might explain the recovery of clay smoking pipe fragments and glass seed beads in the excavation (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No. 57).

Archeologists engaged in a bank stabilization project along the lower reaches of Grand Portage Creek in 1982 found a concentration of historic artifacts (whiteware and bottle glass sherds and wire and cut nails) with pig and cow bones in an area of the creek bank near the Ojibwe cabin site (CR-57). The accumulated trash appeared to the excavators to have been deposited on the creek bank over an extended period of time. An "abrupt lack of artifacts" was noted north and south of this apparent trash dump (Monk 1984:1-2). Though uncertain, the association between this dump and the cabin is suspected.

Old Garden Plot (CR-60). A small oval garden plot is noted on a 1937 map on the west bank of Grand Portage Creek in a low-lying area north of the NWC depot. The garden plot, about 80 by 100 feet, was partly destroyed by the construction of the road that later became County Highway 17. The garden plot may have been used by nearby Ojibwe residents during the 1920s and early 1930s. There is no known visible evidence of this feature today (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No. 60).

Southwest end trash dumps. In 1984 a surface concentration of old cans, bottles, and kitchenware was found in an area south of Mount Rose and west of Highway 17 where the NPS proposed to establish new visitor and maintenance facilities. This trash dump, about 20 meters in diameter, is 90 meters east of a wooden GRPO sign, 100 meters west of a pedestrian crossing in the road, and about ten meters into the woods. Visible materials at the dump locus appear to date from ca. 1890 or 1900 to the 1950s (Monk 1984). Later field surveys in the same general area, between the Isle Royale parking lot and the western edge of the Monument, found several additional domestic refuse dumps. The dumps are likely associated with one or more houses that may have been removed from that place (Noble 1988). These features or loci have not been further investigated or evaluated.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places

Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 31

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Noncontributing Buildings/Structures at the Grand Portage Site Complex

Mount Rose Trail and trail improvements. Mount Rose is a natural lookout. The hill has long attracted climbers and sightseers, likely including Indian peoples and early fur traders and explorers intent on watching for the approach of canoes or sailing vessels (e.g., Carver 1956:127-128; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: No.48; Gilman 1992:126). A modern trail to the summit of Mount Rose follows a winding switch back course that requires a climb of about 300-feet over a distance of one-half mile. The age of the first modern trail to the summit is uncertain, but Ojibwe laborers working through the NPS reconstructed the Mount Rose Trail and its attendant signage in 1963. Parts of the trail remained dangerous after these improvements and, in 1975, the NPS installed additional stone retaining and barrier walls to increase public safety (Cockrell 1983:39, 57). A stone retaining wall at the trail terminus on the summit of Mount Rose was likely built some time after 1975 (Paul "Duane" Spry, GRPO Maintenance Worker, personal observation). None of the existing Mount Rose Trail improvements are over 45 years old.

Footbridges by Grand Portage Bay. In about 1983 the NPS installed a footbridge near the mouth of Grand Portage Creek to accommodate pedestrian traffic between lakefront areas to the east and west (Lynott 1983). The footbridge is downstream from the former stream crossing of the old lakefront road that was in use from about 1914 through 1940 (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II: Nos. 49 and 50). Two other recent NPS footbridges cross Grand Portage Creek north of the reconstructed NWC depot opposite Mount Rose. One, rebuilt in 1999, connects the path from the Holy Rosary Church with the old NWC depot. The other, perhaps dating to 1981 and serving the Grand Portage trail, crosses the creek east of the Ojibwe community Pow-Wow Grounds.

Public roads. Parts of three paved and two unpaved public roads are within the lakefront area of the GRPO. Legislation establishing the GRPO did not authorize the acquisition of extant road rights-of-way within the Monument (Cockrell 1983:46, 110), and none of these roads are owned or maintained by the NPS. The roads include CSAH 17 (also known as Mile Creek Road) and CSAH 73/BIA 2 or the Store Road (that runs north from CSAH 17 through the commercial center of Grand Portage village to State Highway 61). Also included is the Lower Bay Road, which intersects CSAH 17 near the Grand Portage school, runs southwards towards Grand Portage Bay, and then eastward along and parallel to the shore of the bay.

The NPS lakefront service road is known as old BIA 5, old CSAH 17, or the Boneyard Road. This unpaved dead-end road is part of a former public thoroughfare (a segment of today's Lower Bay Road). It was cut off just beyond the entrance to the boneyard near the eastern boundary of the Monument as part of construction activities in 1988-1989. A short (57-meter long) segment of the West Townsite Road runs through the northwest corner of the lakeshore unit of the GRPO west of the Holy Rosary Church cemetery. This gravel road does not appear to have a BIA number. Formerly used as a driveway for three tribal residences, the road was closed in 2003 by the Grand Portage Band. There is some suspicion that the road segment may overlie a part of the old Grand Portage trail or the late eighteenth century "public road" (CR-95), but the roadbed has been graded to the point that the original historic surface might now be gone (David J. Cooper, personal communication).

Secure parking/storage areas. Two secure enclosures are positioned near the lakefront at the GRPO. One is the parking area for vehicles left by visitors to Isle Royale National Park, a NPS park located 22 miles offshore. The Isle Royale parking area, completed in the 1960s, consists of a gravel pad enclosed by a chain-link fence. It is on the west side of CSAH 17 southwest of the reconstructed NWC depot. There are no other structures and no buildings in the parking area (Cockrell 1983:27). The second secure enclosure is known as the "boneyard." It consists of a gravel pad that is enclosed by a chain-link fence for purposes of equipment and materials storage. The only extant buildings in the boneyard are a Sears-brand prefabricated metal storage building and some wooden sheds for covering lumber, all of which were erected in the early 1990s.

Public restroom facilities. Southwest of the NWC depot is a public restroom with men's and women's facilities, running water, flush toilets, and a diesel-powered emergency generator. The rest room facility, measuring 16 by 33-feet, was constructed by the NPS in 1978 (Cockrell 1983:56).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 7

Page 32

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

GRPO maintenance facilities. The NPS maintains a cluster of year-round maintenance buildings in a wooded area on the west side of CSAH 17 between the stone highway bridge (CR-59) and the Holy Rosary Church. The maintenance buildings date to the mid-to-late 1960s. The main building is L-shaped and actually consists of two prefabricated metal buildings butted together. It is used for workshops and equipment storage and as an office for the maintenance foreman. Two adjacent small metal sheds provide for equipment and fuel storage. None of the buildings are historic. However, they may be situated in an area once occupied by the main corridor of the Grand Portage trail, and where there could be potential for the presence of prehistoric or historic archeological materials (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:258).

GRPO Ranger Station. A building now used as the GRPO ranger station sits aside the public parking lot by the main entrance to the reconstructed NWC depot. The building is a former CCC-era residence. It was built for the Minnesota Department of Conservation in the 1930s for use at the Mount Maud fire lookout tower, a facility in the uplands about three miles west of Grand Portage Bay. The building was moved to the Monument as a temporary snack/curio shop for the Grand Portage band of Ojibwe after the Great Hall fire of 1969. In 1975, when a new Radisson Inn opened nearby, the Ojibwe food concession at the park ended, and the building became a ranger station/information-visitor contact center (Cockrell 1983:49, 57). The building has been extensively remodeled at its new location. The lap-sided and gabled one story frame building has an enclosed shed-roof porch on the east side. It measures 20 by 31 feet (including a 6-foot addition on the east end). In April 1996 the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office determined that the building is not eligible for listing on the NRHP.

Ranger residence. A NPS-owned residence sits south of Mount Rose on the east (lakefront) side of CSAH 17. The residence, now occupied by a GRPO ranger, was rebuilt in 1985 over the remains of an earlier home. Only a 1960s vintage basement survives from the first home, a building moved there in about 1957 or 1958 (David J. Cooper, personal communication).

Grand Portage dock (CR-97). A NPS-owned dock is at Grand Portage Bay in front of the reconstructed NWC depot. Frances Andrews, the Grand Portage Band, and Cook County Historical Society initially built the dock in 1931 as a memorial to the Andrews family and to commemorate the landing of French fur traders at Grand Portage in 1731 (NPS 2003:173). When constructed, the dock was said to rest on the original pilings of an old NWC pier. However, the remains of that structure were never wholly documented (e.g., Buck 1931:15; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:97-98), and the pilings might well be associated with a later commercial fishing dock perhaps linked with the BIA or the American Fur Company. Ojibwe tribal members provided the timber for the 1931 dock, and the Minnesota Highway Department donated planks for the decking (Cockrell 1983:13-14).

The dock was heavily damaged by an ice storm in 1951. It was subsequently repaired by the NPS (Cockrell 1983:14, 33) and extensively rebuilt again in the mid-1970s. While the dock is built to appear old and rustic, it has never been considered a historical reconstruction. The dock is presently maintained by the NPS as a community dock to facilitate public boat access to Isle Royale and the GRPO. The dock rests on the bed of Lake Superior, on non-NPS land just outside of the Monument boundaries. It consists of stone-filled timber cribs spiked to the lake bottom with pilings, overlain by timber stringers, and decked with wooden planks. Though uncertain, likely all that now remains from the 1931 dock are the lower cribs, or those structural elements of the dock that are underwater. The present dock, which measures 271 feet long by 13 feet wide, has a 35-foot left-projecting ell at the outer end (Cockrell 1983:33; David J. Cooper, personal communication).

USID dock (CR-54). In 1856 the USID built a log dock on the shore of Grand Portage Bay. It stood opposite the two USID warehouses (CR-54), about 300 feet northeast of the mouth of Grand Portage Creek. The dock, reported to be about 50 to 75-feet long and 20 feet wide, last appears on a photograph taken in the early 1890s (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:97). Some remains of the dock are on the bed of Lake Superior, on non-NPS land just outside of the Monument boundaries. The remains have not been explored, identified, or evaluated by archeologists.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 8

Page 1

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

8. SIGNIFICANCE

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

The GRPO Historic District is listed in the NRHP at the National level of significance under Criterion A for contributing to the broad patterns of American history in the areas of Exploration/Settlement, Commerce, Transportation, Politics/Government, and Archeology (Historic Aboriginal and Historic Non-Aboriginal) throughout the period of significance from 1731 through 1951. The GRPO district is eligible under Criterion D for having provided important archeological and cultural information about Indian and non-Indian peoples and their activities at Grand Portage during the period of significance, and for its potential to yield additional information through further studies.

Some replicated fur-trade-era facilities at the NWC depot locus are contributing properties under Criterion A as outlined above and under Criteria Consideration E. The reconstructions include the fort's stockade (CR-19) and four related buildings: the Gatehouse (CR-14), Great Hall (CR-5), and Kitchen (CR-16), and a Warehouse/Canoe Shed (CR-47). No fur trade-era buildings survive at the GRPO, and none are known to be documented by illustrations or detailed descriptions. Though constructed of new materials between 1970 and 1981, the reconstructions are accurately planned and executed representations of original facilities. They stand on the actual footprints of those facilities on the original site, and they help to convey the historic and contemporary significance of the lakefront at Grand Portage Bay in a dignified manner.

The GRPO is significant within several statewide thematic contexts: Portage Trails in Minnesota (1630s-1870s), Exploration/Fur trade (1650-1840), Settlement and Fishing on Lake Superior (1854-1930), and North Shore Tourism and Recreation (1870-1945).

The GRPO is also significant for its history of archeological investigations. Knowledge of this history, as documented in this section, is useful for understanding the theoretical and methodological development and results of field studies at the park and throughout much of Minnesota during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

SUMMARY STATEMENT

Grand Portage is celebrated as a harbor, a thoroughfare, a rendezvous, a base for exploration, a village, a center for commerce and tribal government, and a political bargaining chip. Its name and much of its historical significance are derived from a formidable portage, over eight miles long, which links the Great Lakes with an interconnected series of inland waterways to the Northwest. Key to the development of the North American fur trade, the Grand Portage gave Canadian explorers access to the northern Plains and to travel routes extending to the Arctic and Pacific Oceans. In the late eighteenth century the portage became a hub of seasonal coalescence and transshipment activities that linked suppliers in far-off places like England, the West Indies, and Brazil with a network of trading posts set in mosaic Native hunting territories throughout western Canada. The setting of Grand Portage, on the west side of Lake Superior and near the mid-point of a 3,000-mile commercial canoe transportation system, enhanced its role in channeling, shaping, and controlling the northwestern Montreal fur trade. Inspired by these qualities, one historian has declared that Grand Portage was once "probably the single most important fur trade location in the world" (Lass 1977:49).

North American Indian peoples knew the use of canoes and portaging thousands of years before the arrival of Europeans, and they initially opened the Grand Portage route. French colonials traveling west from Montreal first arrived at Lake Superior early in the seventeenth century. Having learned of the Grand Portage from Indian informants by at least 1722, the French began crossing it in 1731 to advance their affairs and alliances in more remote areas to the Northwest. From then through the mid-1800s, the portage attracted a colorful succession of French, British, and American fur traders (Buck 1931; Gilman 1992:93-112). Between 1780 and 1802, at the height of the commercial traffic, Grand Portage was a western headquarters and regional trade center of the NWC. It was also the scene of an annual summer gathering that made it one of the busiest nodes of human activity in the midcontinent

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places

Continuation Sheet

Section 8

Page 2

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

(Buck 1931:3; Birk 1984:52; Gilman 1992:1). By promoting the mercantile interests of France and Great Britain, the Grand Portage facilitated the spread of European colonialism and the development of the nations of North America (e.g., Rich 1966:38-40; Thompson 1969:ix). In the nineteenth century Grand Portage also played an important part in settling the disputed boundary between Minnesota and Ontario, which is to say between Canada and the contiguous United States in the region west of Lake Superior (Morse 1969:75; Lass 1980).

The most enduring human presence at Grand Portage is that of aboriginal North Americans, including, most recently, the Ojibwe, Algonkian-speaking peoples with Woodland cultural traditions. Details surrounding the emergence of the Ojibwe people or the Ojibwe identity are often debated (e.g., Schenck 1997; Clark 1999). Some traditional accounts indicate that, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the Saulteur (Ojibwe) of the eastern Lake Superior region extended their territorial prerogatives westward with the advancing fur trade (Warren 1957; Dewdney 1975). A group since known as the Grand Portage Ojibwe established ties to Grand Portage by the 1730s. They were active in that region throughout the fur trade era, and they remain a vital community today (Buck 1931:11; Woolworth 1982:110; Blackwell et al. 1983; Gilman 1992:32, 38). All landscapes, resources, sites, properties, themes, and contexts that are now part of the GRPO story are in some way linked to the Grand Portage Ojibwe. The GRPO was formed through their invitation and cooperation, and efforts to maintain and interpret historic properties and traditions at Grand Portage have long been assisted by that local band or by individual members of the band (e.g., Babcock 1940b; Cockrell 1983:1, 3; Blackwell et al. 1983:61-62, 74-75).

Affairs at Grand Portage became more varied and intense with the arrival of Europeans in the eighteenth century. The Ojibwe initially allied with the French to fight the British but, after the fall of New France, in 1760, the Ojibwe sided with their former enemies. Through long contact with the new regime, some Grand Portage Ojibwe remained pro-British well into the nineteenth century. The Ojibwe also clung to their land base and cultural traditions (Warren 1957:292-293). Then, in 1854, in the face of shifting political forces and increased hardship, they ceded much of their territory to the United States. The political changes gave Grand Portage an important and lasting role in the establishment and maintenance of the United States-Canadian border.

Once identified with or confined to a reservation, the Ojibwe were exposed to government agents and government economic, social, and education programs. More non-Indians began moving into the Grand Portage area after the period of the American Civil War, and commercial logging was initiated there in the 1880s. Despite these intrusions and its rich maritime history, Grand Portage remained relatively isolated until the 1920s when the first all-weather road, a highway between Duluth, Minnesota, and Fort William, Ontario, was completed (Woolworth 1982:113; Gilman 1992:109-114, 125; Birk 1998). The history and scenery of Grand Portage have great appeal to outsiders, and access afforded by automobiles drew growing numbers of tourists. Grand Portage was designated a National Historic Site in 1951, and a National Monument in 1960 (Gilman 1992:129-130). Now owned and administered by the NPS, the GRPO is maintained with the continuing help and cooperation of the Grand Portage Ojibwe and the encouragement of a public support group known as The Friends of Grand Portage.

The central focus of interpretation at the GRPO is the NWC fur trade. However, the NPS and others are keenly aware that some properties unrelated to either the NWC or the fur trade also contribute or have potential to contribute to the Monument's historical significance (e.g., NPS 2003; GRPO 2004). The central place of park interpretations is the old NWC depot (the "stockade complex") with its reconstructed facilities on the lakefront at Grand Portage Bay. Generally unknown to the visiting public is the fact that the lakefront area at the Monument has also been the scene of other intense cultural activities. The more-recent episodes of human settlement and industry there, in particular, have impacted older properties at the Monument, while adding to the breadth and complexity of the GRPO story.

Shifting sentiments, paradigms, and perspectives, along with the growing results of field and material studies, site evaluations, and historical syntheses, will likely continue to change the perceived significance of properties and landscapes at the GRPO (e.g., Thompson 1969:viii-ix; Anonymous 1982; Burt 2001). At the same time, the emphasis of interpretation and other programs could

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 8

Page 3

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

also change. Indeed, the awakened concern for other-than-fur trade-related Indian heritage and the growing corpus of literature on Grand Portage and its environs promise to chart new directions for research, management, and commemoration there in the coming millennium (e.g., Light n.d.; Sage n.d.; Buck 1931; Thompson 1969, 1970; Woolworth 1965, 1975; Birk and Wheeler 1976; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I and II; Anonymous 1982; Blackwell et al. 1983; Cockrell 1983; Gilman 1992; Birk 1998; Clark 1999; Birk and Cooper 2001; Burt 2001; Phillips 2003; NPS 2003; GRPO 2004; Cooper 2004; White 2004).

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The prehistoric past has not been a priority for field investigation at the GRPO, and little has been written about it. Nonetheless, the potential for ancient archeological components in that vicinity is inferred from the occurrence of Paleoindian, Archaic, and Woodland aboriginal materials in adjacent areas of Ontario, Michigan, and Minnesota (e.g., Clark 1995, 1999; Steinbring 1974:68). Archeological studies also suggest that the waterways between Lake Superior and the Winnipeg (Manitoba) formed a natural "migratory corridor" that promoted the east-west movement of people, materials, and ideas in prehistoric times (Steinbring 1974:67; Stoltman 1973:112). Such early interactions likely paved the way for later historic systems of trade in the same region.

Archeologists and historians generally skirt the issue of how long Native peoples knew of the Grand Portage by saying that "generations" of Indians used it (Buck 1931:3; McGovern 1934:13) for "untold centuries" before the time of European contact (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:62). One writer suggests Indians knew the portage perhaps as long as 8,000 years before the arrival of Europeans (Wheeler 1985:77). The best known material evidence for early peoples at Grand Portage are the presence of chipped-stone tools and scattered deposits of chipping debris that results from stone-tool manufacture. Ancient ceramics, commonly used by archeologists for determining dates and cultural affiliations, are presently unknown there. Whether such ceramics are truly absent or whether they have just not been recovered or reported is yet uncertain.

A persistent expectation is that archeological evidence will eventually reveal the full range and sequence of Native American/First Nation settlement and land use activities in the Grand Portage locale. Such evidence could lie anywhere within the arc of Grand Portage Bay or nearby Wausaugoning Bay, or Pigeon Point, or at the mouth of the Pigeon River where seasonal fish runs and cultivable soils may have been major attractions. There is no reason to believe the entire archeological record of local cultural developments is contained within the boundaries of the GRPO or that materials or deposits previously defined there accurately reflect or represent local prehistory (e.g., Clark 1999:28, 47).

The presence of ancient cultural materials along and at either end of the portage trail implies and may demonstrate use of the trail by prehistoric peoples (e.g., Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:22, II: No.51; Birk and Wheeler 1976). Further study of these remains may ultimately refine our understanding of early portage use while providing details about related cultural activities.

After contacting Europeans in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, many northern Indians participated in the fur trade as hunters, guides, interpreters, consumers, allies, and marriage partners. Ojibwe peoples lived in the Grand Portage area by the 1730s but other groups also visited there in the eighteenth century, including the Iroquois, Ottawa, Cree, and Assiniboine (e.g., Lass 1980:5; Gilman 1992:74). Members of all of these groups may have camped at the lakefront on Grand Portage Bay. Whether material evidence of their passing can be isolated and defined archeologically and whether any such remains can be differentiated from contemporary Euroamerican camps is uncertain. Campsite setting and distribution models, supported by historical records and ethnographic analogies, might ultimately show how different Indian peoples used their surroundings, channeled their energies, and organized themselves both in groups and on landscapes at Grand Portage (e.g., Clark 1995:26). Questions regarding certain aspects of past human behavior will need to take varied water levels into account, because, in former times, as noted, water levels in the Superior basin have been both higher and lower than at present (e.g., Phillips 1995, 2003; Clark 1999:37).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 8

Page 4

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

The French were the first non-Indians to frequent Grand Portage. At the vanguard were French *coureurs de bois*, unlicensed traders who often kept their movements and geographical knowledge a secret (Holder 1967:130). Such men were quick to learn the ways and byways of Indians they met (Blackwell et al. 1983:24). Evidence shows that clandestine French traders reached the northern plains by the 1680s (Burpee 1968:6-7; Holder 1967:130; Birk 1997:9). One of their earliest points of entry to areas northwest of the Great Lakes was via the Kaministikwia River, a stream that flows into Lake Superior about 38 miles northeast of Grand Portage. The Kaministikwia and Grand Portage canoe routes meet at Lac la Croix, about 110 miles west of Lake Superior, and from there they follow a common course to Rainy Lake and beyond (Morse 1969:79-80). The French knew of the Pigeon River by the mid-1600s, of the Grand Portage connection to the Pigeon River by 1722, and of the intricacies of the Grand Portage-to-Lac la Croix route by 1726 (e.g., Burpee 1931:361; Nute 1944:22, 33-35, 305; Thompson 1969:10).

In 1731 the French abandoned the Kaministikwia route to Lac la Croix in favor of the shorter Grand Portage route. Use of the Grand Portage expedited their travels to the northwest and, by allowing the French to make other geographical discoveries and alliances in the midcontinent, it greatly extended their influence (Kellogg 1931:357; Thompson 1969:13). Pierre La Vérendrye, who spearheaded French entry through the Grand Portage, first called it “du portage de Nantaouagan,” but later referred to it as the “grand portage du Lac Supérieur” (Burpee 1931:361-364; 1968:91, 436-437; Gilfillan 1976:27).

To facilitate their travels, La Vérendrye’s men made improvements at many carrying places along the route from Grand Portage to Lac la Croix and Rainy Lake (Burpee 1968:115). Though uncertain, they and other French traders may have also built houses, shelters, or other facilities at either or both ends of the Grand Portage trail (e.g., Warren 1957:137, 189; Nute 1944:42, 305; Lamb 1970:69). French-colonial presence reached a zenith at Grand Portage in the early 1750s (Nute 1932:433) just a few years before the last great war between France and England for supremacy in North America. France’s loss of the war in 1760 created turmoil among its former Indian allies and left a lucrative void in the northern fur trade (Buck 1931:4; Burpee 1931:361-362).

Archeologists have found only sparse evidence of French activities at Grand Portage. No French colonial archeological features or loci have been identified at the lakefront area at Grand Portage Bay, though such are almost certain to exist. To date, the only distinctive French period artifacts recovered there are two Jesuit-style finger rings found with a human burial just beyond the present boundaries of the GRPO (Anonymous 1939). A French component recently identified at the Parting Trees posé on the portage trail has helped to identify and delineate that historic resting place. Another scatter of French period materials found offshore at the Pigeon River landing (Fort Charlotte) may support the notion that French houses or structures once stood at the west end of the portage. The Fort Charlotte materials, along with other artifacts retrieved at the landing, also show how use of the west portage terminus shifted over time (Wheeler et al. 1975:44, Birk 1975a). Beyond their obvious value for demonstrating and interpreting early French activities at the GRPO, the French components provide comparative evidence for studying the material record of French presence elsewhere (e.g., Brain 1979:42; Birk 1982, 1991, 1994, 1995). The French legacy remains strong at Grand Portage where many Ojibwe residents today have French surnames and where some area landmarks, including the Grand Portage itself, bear French toponyms typically derived from older Indian names.

After French capitulation, British traders followed the French example by trading westward from Montreal across the Great Lakes. The British took control of the midcontinental fur trade, but they relied on experienced French-Canadian workers for their labor force. Initially, the British trade was heavily regulated (Nute 1944:38) and openly resisted by some former Indian allies of the French. As a precautionary measure, in 1762, the first British trade expedition to travel to Grand Portage under the new regime was provided with a military escort (WHC 11:213n1; Kellogg 1931:357; Dawson 1970:35). In the late 1760s growing numbers of British traders passed through Grand Portage, causing that passage to become increasingly congested (Parker 1976:132). By the eve of the American Revolution the competition between rival traders there was heated and intense (Davidson 1967:8-9; Innis 1973:194). Nonetheless, British troops sent to the portage in 1778 to settle disputes and maintain order instead spent much of their time building a fort and clearing a public road by the bay (Woolworth 1975; Gilman 1992:55).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places

Continuation Sheet

Section 8

Page 5

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

To reduce the costs and risks associated with trafficking through Grand Portage, some British traders began making improvements there. After a new trading fort was built at Grand Portage Bay in or around 1768, the construction of other houses or forts at both ends of the portage soon followed (Woolworth 1982:111). Facilities built at the Pigeon River landing were eventually named Fort Charlotte, apparently in honor of Queen Charlotte, the wife of George III of England (Upham 1969:x, 136). The commercial forts provided shelter and protection for the traders and their property. The forts were also constructs through which the traders could exert or exhibit authority, and structure and maintain social divisions. By commanding space, the forts were also a means to control privileged access to the main portage trail and the choicest landings, while depriving others of these same benefits. Though uncertain, the British traders may have sought permission from the Ojibwe for the right to use and occupy land at Grand Portage just as some did in later years at Kaministikwia (e.g., Greenberg and Morrison 1982:88).

Realizing that cooperation could increase profits and minimize risks, several Montreal traders and firms operating through Grand Portage, began, as early as 1775, to form annual common-stock trade alliances. The group became known as the NWC (Wallace 1934:4-5). The move to consolidate may have been accelerated in 1781-1782 when a smallpox epidemic swept through northwestern Indian populations reducing the number and productivity of Indian hunters in an area from Lake Superior to Athabasca (Gilman 1992:63). By 1783 the NWC emerged as a monopolistic consortium capable of going head-to-head with all other outfitters that got in their way, including the Hudson's Bay Company (HBC) that operated through Hudson Bay (Lamb 1970:5). To avoid confronting the NWC at Grand Portage some rival Montreal traders began traveling to the Northwest on a less-direct route through Fond du Lac Superior (now Duluth) and central Minnesota via Otter Tail Lake to the north-flowing Red River (e.g., Birk 1984). The NWC's resolve to control the strategic passage through Grand Portage was nonetheless regularly tested by other competitors.

The continuing expansion of NWC trade frontiers in the Northwest eventually led the company to engage two groups of employees to transport its cargoes. Together the groups comprised over 1,000 men. About half of the men (the "pork eaters") shuttled goods and furs between Montreal and Grand Portage. The rest (the Northmen or winterers) provided similar service between Grand Portage and interior outposts west and northwest of the Great Lakes (Nute 1925; Davidson 1967:22; Birk and Richner 2004). Between the 1780s and 1802 the two groups met in rendezvous at Grand Portage each summer and bivouacked at Grand Portage Bay (Gates 1965:93). Their camps were separated one from the other, and they were also set apart from camps of competing firms and likely those of the Indians as well. The segregated camps, like the Grand Portage forts, helped to define and enforce social and occupational categories and relationships among and between these diverse human groups. Though uncertain, it may now be possible to distinguish the segregated camping arrangements through studying the archeological record. The historical importance of the various transient seasonal camping loci cannot be overestimated. Labor-class engagés in the fur trade were typically illiterate, so many aspects of their lives, including their material culture, daily practices, and human condition, might best be learned through studying the physical evidence left in the places where they lived, worked, traveled, or died.

Waterways provided the primary means for the pork eaters and other traders to reach Grand Portage, but transportation lanes to the east and west of the portage were much different. To the east, Lake Superior, a 400-mile long freshwater sea with great stretches of rocky shoreline, formed an unpredictable environment often given to dense fog, sudden squalls, contrary winds, and high waves. The lake's great expanse invited the use of large vessels to safely and economically shuttle commodities between Sault Ste. Marie (at the outlet of the lake) and Grand Portage. By the late eighteenth century, the vessels of choice were Montreal canoes (*canots de maître*) and schooners. In contrast, the shallow, sinuous, waterways and numerous portages west of Grand Portage demanded the use of smaller, portable birchen craft like North, Indian, or express canoes. A Montreal canoe could carry 8,000 pounds, including an equipped crew and three tons of cargo, while a North canoe, filled to the gunnels, might carry 2,500-3,000 pounds (Quaife 1916:190; Morse 1969:20; Gates 1965:97). Portaging was commonly done on the quota system, requiring each laborer (engagé) to carry so many packs or pieces over each portage. To reach Lac la Croix from Grand Portage canoe brigades had to pass over the elevated rim of the Superior basin. In addition, the canoe route between Lake Superior and Lac la Croix included 29 portages, which together equaled fifteen miles of trail (Morse 1969:67-69, 75-77). As the NWC's trade

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 8

Page 6

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

extended farther to the northwest, a special brigade of Montreal pork eaters was eventually called upon each summer to transport some company goods from Grand Portage to Rainy Lake (beyond Lac la Croix). There they met and exchanged packs with the Athabasca Brigade, giving those far north traders the extra time needed to travel to Rainy Lake and return to their wintering quarters before freeze-up (Morse 1969:84; Thompson 1969:72-73).

During the heyday of the fur trade the NWC annually transshipped great quantities of goods, commodities, furs, and gear over the Grand Portage, but relatively few canoes (e.g., Nute 1944:42, 305; Thompson 1969:74; Upham 1969:136). The NWC got many of its interior canoes from Ojibwe living in the border lakes region west of Grand Portage. The Ojibwe might deliver new canoes to either Fort Charlotte or the NWC's Rainy Lake post, or they sold them at or near the actual places of manufacture somewhere in between (e.g., Quaife 1916:200; Nute 1941b:271; Gough 1988:8). When the XYC formed in 1798 and set out to use the Grand Portage, the NWC threatened their operations by extending its own use and control of space at the Grand Portage Bay and Pigeon River landings. The NWC also sought to buy up all of the canoes the Ojibwe brought to the Pigeon River. Through this means, they hoped to force the XYC to endure the added effort, indignity, and expense of acquiring canoes elsewhere and then have to carry them over the portage from Lake Superior (Thompson 1969:91; Gilman 1992:71). Even Native peoples found ways to avoid the strenuous task of transporting canoes over the portage if they could. For example, some Ojibwe found it preferable to build new canoes at the far end of the portage rather than carry their old ones across (e.g., James 1956:21). Horses and oxen were used at various times to shuttle cargoes over the portage as well, but, in the eighteenth century, human porters did most of the carrying.

The annual summer gathering of traders at Grand Portage required a great deal of planning and expenditure. The area's remote location, the short growing season, and the general scarcity and dispersion of local food resources meant that provisions had to be routinely imported for the summer rendezvous. Imported foods were also supplied to outbound brigades and, on some level, to wintering personnel stationed at Grand Portage and Fort Charlotte. Provisions were often stockpiled at the portage, but occasionally the stores ran short. The diets of the labor-class engagés differed from that of men of the privileged class (e.g., partners, proprietors, clerks, guides, and interpreters) in the fur trade, and the degree of difference might vary by time, place, and circumstance (e.g., Cleland 1970; Birk 1984). At Grand Portage, at the end of the eighteenth century, engagés lived on a diet of corn and grease sometimes supplemented by rations of bread and pork or whatever they themselves could pilfer, catch, scavenge, or buy. In contrast, the privileged class routinely enjoyed more elaborate menus that might include beef, ham, fish, venison, peas, potatoes, tea, and even fresh milk (Thompson 1969:66-67, 106-107). Archeological deposits at the GRPO may reflect class-related variance in dietary regimes and consumption patterns between NWC and XYC personnel, just as they might also be used to define foodway differences between French and British colonials (e.g., Cleland 1970).

The high cost of transportation led to a steep incline in the value of imported trade goods west of Montreal and particularly west of Grand Portage (e.g., Gilman 1992:58). NWC winterers relied on the company for their needs, and they often paid premium prices for merchandise purchased from company stores. During summer gatherings at Grand Portage the men could get relatively "discounted" rates on food, drink, and other items. The source of the discounted commodities was a company subsidiary or canteen run out of a "Little Fort" on the lakefront northeast of the pork eater's camp. The small seasonal retail operation was also once called "Boucher's Fort" after its last proprietor, Jean Boucher. The "Little Fort" kept revelers and spies away from the NWC's main depot (the "Big Fort"), while, at the same time helping to secure that company's claim to a larger area on the lakefront at Grand Portage Bay (Thompson 1969:112-116; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:102-103, 1982, II: No. 55; Gilman 1992:7, 55). Part of the concern was that, during the summer rendezvous, warehouses at the NWC depot were glutted with goods and supplies. To protect against theft, losses by fire, or unwanted intrusions, the NWC kept its engagés in outlying camps, closed the depot gates at sunset, and posted sentries at night (Gates 1965:93). Again, the segregated living and working arrangements of the engagés and privileged class should reflect in material remains at the GRPO.

In 1783, following the American Revolution, Britain signed the Treaty of Paris giving the United States claim to territories west of Lake Superior and south of the Pigeon River, including the Grand Portage locale (Lass 1980). British firms like the NWC at first

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 8

Page 7

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

disregarded the claim. Because of its own considerable power and the remoteness of the western Superior region from the principal seats of government, the NWC continued to make free use of the Grand Portage. By 1800, however, growing threats by the United States to impose stiff taxes, licensing fees, and other restrictions on foreigners operating on what it considered to be American soil finally forced the Montrealers to take notice (Davidson 1967:105; Nute 1944:42, 306-307; Gilman 1992:84, 89).

The high fortune and efficiency of the NWC are reflected in the growth and permanency of its facilities at either end of the Grand Portage. The nucleus of the NWC's depot at Grand Portage Bay was likely an earlier fort established there in 1768. The fort was later expanded at least twice; once in about 1778 when the NWC organized, and again in the 1780s, several years *after* the Treaty of Paris was signed (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:10, II: No. 1). The forts assisted the day-to-day operations of the NWC, and they were also a display of authority and wealth that might impress Indians and opposition traders (e.g., Buck 1931:7). In 1788 the NWC went so far as to request a special land grant from the British government that would allow it to remake the Grand Portage trail into a private wagon road. The request was denied when it became obvious that such authority would give the NWC a virtual stranglehold on the trail at the expense of rival firms (Buck 1931:9). Even without the land grant, the NWC found ways to make it difficult for others to use the portage. Some Indians, in defiance of the NWC, portaged their furs overland from Fort Charlotte to Grand Portage Bay taking care to avoid "the trader's road" (James 1956:51).

Commercial use of the portage peaked after the formation of the Montreal-based XYC. The XYC was a formidable competitor in the Northwest and, like the NWC, it invested heavily in building and maintaining transshipment facilities at Grand Portage. The size of the XYC's fort on the Pigeon River south of Snow Creek attests to the lofty ambitions of the new firm. At the same time, the XYC's Pigeon River fort hints at the likely features and dimensions of its lesser-known depot on Grand Portage Bay. The latter outpost was apparently located east of the NWC's "Little Fort" in an area now beyond the boundaries of the GRPO. In response to the invigorated competition at Grand Portage and the growing American threat, the NWC, in 1801, began shifting its operations from Grand Portage to Kaministikwia (later Fort William) in what is now Ontario, Canada. The move was completed in 1804, the same year the NWC and XYC merged (Innis 1973:228-229; Thompson 1969:121; Gilman 1992:92). Without the excitement of the annual rendezvous, Grand Portage again became a quieter place, less important to the northwestern trade and less visible to the outside world.

The NWC continued to maintain a small trading post at Grand Portage Bay after 1803, but it did little to keep the Grand Portage-Lac la Croix route in repair. In fact, the opposite was true. In 1806 when rival traders determined to use that route, the NWC rushed to drop trees "across the road, at the portages, and on all the narrow creeks" by which the competitors had to pass (Wallace 1934:23; Gilman 1992:100-101). Their actions may have curtailed commercial use of the Grand Portage route for "some years" (Nute 1941a:16). At the same time, the large forts and facilities at either end of the Grand Portage, probably stripped of their ironworks, glass windows, and other reusable parts, were allowed to deteriorate so they too would be of little interest or use to rivals. Nevertheless, some functional trading houses were said to remain at Fort Charlotte and Grand Portage Bay as late as 1816, and the main portage trail, though then becoming "overgrown with heavy brush," was yet passable (Von Graffenried 1819:22-23). Indeed, ox teams could traverse the trail in 1858 (Hind in Dawson 1968), and it saw continued use through the end of the nineteenth century (e.g., Winchell 1899).

With the merger of the NWC and XYC, the Montrealers escalated their rivalry with the HBC. The HBC held a royal charter from the seventeenth century that granted them virtual sovereignty over the entire watershed of Hudson Bay. The HBC domain included an estimated 1.5 million square miles together incorporating nearly 40 percent of modern Canada along with parts of what are now Minnesota and North Dakota (Newman 1985:87). In 1807, the Scotsman, Thomas Douglas, fifth earl of Selkirk, became a principal stockholder in the HBC. He advanced plans to relocate Scottish peasants to the HBC territories as a means to give them a new start in life and to help bolster the British economy. In 1811, with his colonial schemes more fully developed, Selkirk persuaded the HBC to give him land for agricultural settlements centering on the Red River Valley west of Lake Superior.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 8

Page 8

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

The area provided became known as the Selkirk Grant or Assiniboia. It encompassed 116 thousand square miles including most of the Red and Assiniboine river valleys and a wide sweep of what is now northern Minnesota (e.g., Birk 1998).

Though wildly controversial, Assiniboia played a significant role in shaping the formation of western Canada. The grant contained Indian-occupied territories and some lands claimed by the United States. It also included areas commonly traversed or exploited by the NWC. Indeed, being on the NWC's trade route between Grand Portage and Athabasca, the Red River settlements hindered the NWC's ability to provision certain of its outposts with buffalo meat (pemmican) from the northern plains. Earlier the NWC shipped pemmican from its prairie forts on the Assiniboine River (in Manitoba, Canada) to Grand Portage for use in provisioning canoe parties embarking from Fort Charlotte (Nute 1941a:48n1). Already smarting from American interference with its Great Lakes supply lines during the War of 1812, the NWC vehemently opposed the attempts by Selkirk and the HBC to undo or override its operations in the Northwest. The NWC's moves to stop development of the new colonies and to dislodge immigrant settlers there soon erupted in violence (e.g., Birk 1998).

Selkirk responded by attempting to destroy the NWC, in part by barring their access to Athabasca and the Pacific slope trade (Nute 1941b:283-284). Selkirk got himself appointed as a justice of the peace, and in 1816 he traveled west from Montreal with a private army of over 100-armed mercenaries. The force quickly captured Fort William, the NWC depot at Rainy Lake, and other NWC posts, including Grand Portage. Property and supplies were seized at these installations and from an American trading post at Fond du Lac, a former NWC stronghold at the head of Lake Superior about 160 miles southwest of Grand Portage. To justify his actions at Fond du Lac and Grand Portage Selkirk argued that the boundary between British and American territories in the Northwest was not yet settled and, until the Americans took actual possession of the land, their claims meant nothing (e.g., Birk 1998).

As part of his scheme to control land and resources, Selkirk dispersed his men as well as much of the livestock captured at Fort William to various other locations. He also had a log house dismantled at Fort William and re-erected at Grand Portage. At the same time, Selkirk developed a series of new trails to distribute goods among his scattered forces and to maintain communications. Though Selkirk died in 1820, his vendetta against the NWC severely weakened that firm (Gray 1964; Birk 1998). The political landscape was further changed between 1815 and 1822 when the United States sought to block British intrigues in the Northwest by opening a number of frontier military posts south of Lake Superior and in the Mississippi Valley as far north as present-day Minneapolis and St. Paul (Smith 1985:96-98). Also, in 1816, the Congress passed an act making it illegal for foreigners to trade within United States' territories. The HBC's hopes of controlling those Minnesota-area lands granted to Selkirk south and southeast of Pembina were further eroded in 1818 when England and the United States agreed upon the forty-ninth parallel as the international boundary in the Red River Valley and west to the Rocky Mountains (Nute 1941b:283, 286-287). In 1821 the hapless NWC united with the HBC under the banner and leadership of the HBC. The new HBC continued to operate through Hudson Bay, eliminating most connections to Montreal and allowing former trade routes emanating from the north shore of Lake Superior to "slip back into the arms of the wilderness" (Gluek 1965:93). The old forts at Grand Portage also fell further into ruin, becoming largely inconspicuous except for the clearings where they once stood (Bigsby 1850:404-406; Lass 1980:41; Gilman 1992:92).

Between 1822 and 1824, British and United States' commissioners explored various canoe routes leading west from Lake Superior to find an acceptable course for the international boundary between Superior and the Lake-of-the-Woods. Neither party was at first willing to give up Grand Portage. The British argued for a line running through Fond du Lac well south of Grand Portage while the Americans vigorously proposed a line through Kaministikwia well to the north. A report of their findings was filed in 1827 but the actual boundary, as presently established, was not settled upon until the Webster-Ashburton Treaty of 1842. The treaty has kept portages along the international boundary in northern Minnesota free and open to citizens of the United States and Canada (Nute 1941a:15-18, 100; Lass 1980:40-49; Burt 2001, 1:12).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 8

Page 9

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Meanwhile, the American Fur Company (AFC) gained control of the fur trade in northern Minnesota and, in 1823, set out to win the trade of the Grand Portage Ojibwe. The Ojibwe there remained pro-British, however, and, in 1824, some HBC men are said to have “carried off” the entire band with dogsleds rather than chance leaving them to interact with the Americans (Gilman 1992:104; Buck 1931:11). At that time, during winters, the Ojibwe still typically dispersed from Grand Portage, where game and firewood were scarce (e.g., James 1956:23). As part of their seasonal round of activities, the Ojibwe occupied scattered camps along the shore of Lake Superior and westward into the boundary waters (Gilman 1992:94-95, 110). The local trade remained competitive and, because some of the Ojibwe camps attracted traders, it went in many directions. Despite continued opportunities for the Indians to trade furs, the value of the fur trade was in decline.

Between 1833 and 1847, a series of secret and illegal agreements between the HBC and AFC allowed the HBC to monopolize the fur trade in the northern border region of Minnesota in return for providing annual payments to the AFC (e.g., Nute 1941b:277; Gilman 1992:104-105). Lacking competition, the HBC traders could demand higher prices for their merchandise while cutting back on the gifting of amenities. Such actions chipped away at the Ojibwe political and economic powers leaving them with fewer viable options for the future.

To exploit the Lake Superior fisheries, the AFC, in 1836, established several fishing stations on the lake including one at Grand Portage Bay. The latter outpost was intended to catch fish in shoreline areas from Grand Marais to the mouth of the Pigeon River and out around Isle Royale. The fishing station at Grand Portage included dwellings along with a cooperage, stable, and other buildings. The proprietor’s house, the heart of the AFC compound, was erected on gentle rising ground overlooking the bay. It was flanked in front by his son’s house and a new store. The other buildings were apparently arranged without order or symmetry. Harvested fish were salted, packed in barrels, and shipped out by schooner. In full operation the Grand Portage fishery employed two coopers and some 30 men, including about 20 Ojibwe. The “off-season” allowed these workers to engage in other activities, like cutting stave wood and making nets. Plagued by poor markets and hard times, the AFC’s Lake Superior fishing operations were finally abandoned in 1842 when the company went bankrupt (Nute 1944:175-180; Blackwell et al. 1983:39). While the precise location of the Grand Portage fishing station is now uncertain, some scholars think it may have stood on the remains of the old NWC depot or on the nearby lakefront east of Grand Portage Creek. Some of the old fishery buildings may have survived and been used later for other purposes (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, II:177-178).

The fishing enterprise, despite its failure, continued to link the Grand Portage Ojibwe to outside markets. The employment also made them less dependent on hunting and less susceptible to the HBC. Nonetheless, their tradition of gathering together during warmer seasons to harvest fish left them open to other external forces. The early nineteenth century was full of movements intended to “civilize,” Christianize, and relocate North American Indian peoples (e.g., Blackwell et al. 1983:40). A key element in most such programs in the Great Lakes region was to lure the Indians away from their semi-nomadic lifestyle and to remake them as sedentary agriculturists (e.g., Widder 1981; Birk 1997). Catholic missionaries, with the help of local traders, baptized many of the Grand Portage Ojibwe in the 1830s and 40s. Catholic mission facilities, some of bark construction, were also established at Grand Portage Bay (Woolworth 1965). The actual location of the various chapels and mission houses is now unclear, and they may or may not have been within the area of the GRPO.

Meanwhile, the fur trade continued along the international boundary. The HBC operated a wintering post at Moose Lake about 18 miles northwest of Grand Portage (Owen 1852:411). Other traders later used oxen on the Grand Portage to help supply a string of interior outposts as far west as the Lake-of-the-Woods (Gilman 1992:112). In the early 1840s another independent firm, the Cleveland Company, opened a trading post at Moose Lake (Nute 1941b:277n12). At the same time, they also established an agricultural settlement and trading post on the American side of the Pigeon River, near its mouth. Through these outlets the company hoped to seize the local Ojibwe trade from the HBC and to attract other Indians from Canada (Rich 1959:525-527; 1967:255).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 8

Page 10

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Beginning a new settlement near the mouth of the Pigeon River was assisted by a local surge in agricultural interest (Gilman 1992:107) and by the opening of a Catholic mission there in 1842 (Buck 1931:11). The soil at the new settlement was better adapted to agriculture than at Grand Portage Bay. Within a few years the only standing structures on the lakefront at Grand Portage were a group of "poor Indian huts" occupied, perhaps intermittently, by about 80 Ojibwe (Thompson 1969:133). Things got worse when the Cleveland Company went bankrupt and left the area in 1845 (Rich 1959:526). Four years later, after sporadic use, the Catholic mission was removed to Fort William (Mission Diary, 21 July 1849; Buck 1931:11; Nute 1944:309-310; Gilman 1992:108).

By 1850, the year after Minnesota became a United States' territory, some northern Ojibwe relinquished claims to the entire Canadian shore of Lake Superior (Gilman 1992:109), a move that invited a stream of prospectors to search for ores in the vicinity of Thunder Bay. The mining fever led to the establishment of Prince Arthur's Landing (later Port Arthur), a new bustling village with a fine harbor about four miles north of the Kaministikwia river.

The North Shore of Lake Superior south of the Canadian border was similarly opened to broader white settlement and exploitation in 1855. Ratification of a treaty signed the previous year by the Ojibwe ceded all of their lands along the shore of the lake except for two small reservations, one at Fond du Lac and the other at Grand Portage (Blackwell et al. 1983:47; Culkin 1931:27). At the same time, a new lock opened at Sault Ste. Marie allowing steamboats to enter Lake Superior from Lake Huron without the need for portaging (Davis 1968:2). Entrepreneurs now rushed to claim potential town and mill sites all along Minnesota's North Shore.

In return for surrendering the land, the Grand Portage Ojibwe received payments of \$19,000 a year for twenty years and other lesser awards, including a government blacksmith and school (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:190; Gilman 1992:109). Reservation life marked a dramatic turning point for the Ojibwe and it challenged them, individually and collectively, in new and different ways. Like other peoples, they strove to maintain their political and cultural identities, typically responding to foreign ideas and things by reinterpreting them within the framework of their own knowledge and understanding (e.g., White 1982, 1987). In the face of unrelenting exploitation and change, including ravaging diseases, the welfare and lifeways of the Ojibwe were profoundly disrupted. Vacillating and poorly managed government programs and policies often failed to protect their rights or to adequately provide for their welfare. Outsiders backed by enabling legislation benefited from the situation by taking more land and resources from the Ojibwe. Not until many of the basic tenets underlying nineteenth century Indian affairs were finally overturned in the twentieth century was it possible for the Ojibwe to gain greater control of their lives and destinies (e.g., Rubinstein and Woolworth 1981:23-24).

The early Reservation Period at Grand Portage dates to the middle-to-late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Material evidence of cultural properties and landscapes from that period is found within the GRPO on the lakefront at Grand Portage Bay. Included are the remains of private commercial establishments and government agency houses, warehouses, barns, and schools. Some of these buildings enjoyed a long life and may have been remodeled or reused for purposes for which they were not originally intended. Many of the buildings stood in areas east of Grand Portage Creek and some upon the ruins of the old NWC depot west of the creek. Unlike earlier fur trade facilities, Reservation-Period cultural properties are often documented through oral accounts, photographs, and large-scale maps. As resources that reflect the human condition and community structure at Grand Portage in the years after 1854 they can add to an understanding of coeval Indian-white relations. On a different scale, the same resources might illuminate the nature and impacts of the treaty process and subsequent government education-acculturation-assimilation programs on Indian peoples in the western Great Lakes region.

Among many changes that occurred at Grand Portage after the Treaty of 1854 was the appearance of the Ojibwe village. By 1856, government officials had erected a dock (or pier) on the lakefront and a warehouse nearby for storing annuities. Surveyors carved up the adjacent areas into blocks, streets, and alleys. Thereafter, those Ojibwe who would build a house each received a lot measuring roughly 100 by 200 feet. Each family living in a house was also given furnishings like a cook stove and utensils, a table

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 8

Page 11

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

and chairs, a bureau and bedstead, and other items. A school was built nearby. Everything seemed designed to impose new levels of control and order on the lives and lifestyles of the Ojibwe.

The plan to remake the Ojibwe into sedentary and self-sufficient agriculturists at Grand Portage was greatly impeded by their continued roving habits. In the course of a year the Ojibwe pursued a traditional seasonal round of economic activities to exploit fish, game, maple sugar, and other resources. The poor soils and short growing season also made it impossible for the Ojibwe to produce a surplus of tilled vegetal crops at Grand Portage, and there were no natural or viable market outlets for such produce even if they could (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:190; Blackwell et al. 1983:49). Furs continued to sell, however, and so did logs. The surrounding forests soon attracted lumbermen who felled trees and floated logs to distant sawmills. There were few good stable jobs on the reservation, and many Ojibwe who could not find employment in logging camps were forced by economic circumstances to relocate elsewhere. Those disinclined to move often suffered hardships like poor hunts, failed wild rice crops, droughts, and severe winters of heavy snow. Some died of disease (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:191-193).

Grand Portage remained fairly isolated and difficult to approach by any means other than water until 1925 when an all-weather vehicular road was completed between Duluth and Fort William (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:212). A network of Indian trails and winter roads were in use on the North Shore of Lake Superior prior to that time, but the rugged terrain, swamps, and forests made overland travel extremely difficult. The new highway stimulated tourism and a new outside interest in the human and natural history of Grand Portage (Buck 1931:13). In 1931, just six years after the new highway opened, the local Cook County Historical Society (CCHS) and the Minnesota Historical Society (MHS) cosponsored a celebration to mark the 200th anniversary of the landing of French explorers at Grand Portage (Burpee 1931:359n1). About the same time, the CCC built a new stone highway bridge across Grand Portage Creek, as part of a work relief project for the village of Grand Portage.

Efforts to promote preservation and interpretation were set-aside during World War II, but, in 1951, Grand Portage was designated a national historic site. In 1958, coincidental with Minnesota's statehood centennial observance, the Grand Portage Ojibwe donated lands for a national monument. The United States Congress soon after authorized the establishment of the proposed monument, and the GRPO became a reality in 1960 (Woolworth 1982:114; Cockrell 1983:1).

HISTORY OF ARCHEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS

Archeological initiatives at the GRPO have evolved over the years, and the high visibility and lasting impacts of this work make the park significant for its history of archeological investigations. The chronology of fieldwork outlined here helps demonstrate and explain the changes in archeology research goals, data-recovery methods, and preservation philosophies at the park and throughout much of Minnesota in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Initial field interests at Grand Portage were aimed at locating and describing fur trade era facilities. By the late twentieth century the research became more sophisticated and included the discovery and evaluation of all cultural resources within the area of the Monument--not just fur trade properties. The archeological literature from the GRPO shows that fieldwork there did not always kept pace with contemporary methodological developments or theoretical shifts in the field of archeology. Evident, too, is that material remains at Fort Charlotte and Grand Portage Bay have been treated much differently in the past. Fieldwork and management projects remain unfinished in many areas of the park, including along the portage trail. To date, little is known about archeological resources in the Grand Portage locale beyond the Monument boundaries.

The first phase of field investigation at Grand Portage, an episode of initial curiosity, occurred in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. During that time, various observers described the condition of the Grand Portage trail, certain posés on the trail, and visible surface features at either end of the portage. They engaged in what today are thought of as reconnaissance-level surveys. In 1823, for example, one traveler noted a small clearing on the trail that he thought had "every appearance" of once

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places

Continuation Sheet

Section 8

Page 12

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

being a “common stopping place” or posé of the traders. He saw little at Fort Charlotte “except the cleared ground” where the fort once stood and the remains of the old NWC “landing place or dock” on the riverfront (Thompson 1969:127-128). Another visitor, in 1893, said the old dock or quay at Fort Charlotte was a platform made of cedar logs projecting from the riverbank near the level of the water. In the clearing on the upland terrace nearby he saw the outlines of old buildings (Winchell 1899:502).

In 1823 a grassy clearing was also one of the most visible indicators of the old NWC depot site at Grand Portage Bay (Cockrell 1983:8; Gilman 1992:91-92). Observant visitors there in the early 1900s saw evidence of sunken palisade lines and collapsed fireplaces, as well as parts of an old wharf lying in the nearby shallows of Lake Superior (Buck 1931:15). At about the same time, a teacher at the Grand Portage Indian School recognized the historical importance of these cultural ruins and voiced concerns that they were being lost to erosion and development. The future of the portage and Fort Charlotte were also in doubt (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:ix). The teacher’s call for action not only attracted outside attention but, in many ways, it set the course for subsequent research and preservation efforts at Grand Portage (Sage n.d.:3).

In 1922 the MHS initiated a lengthy involvement with Grand Portage by completing a preliminary historical study of the sites and people there, focused most prominently on the fur trade (Buck 1931:2; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:ix-xx). That same year, a team of artists and local Ojibwe, under MHS sponsorship, surveyed the ruins at Fort Charlotte (Swanson 1991:272). The primary and most important result of their work was to produce a detailed map of the visible archeological features along the bank of the Pigeon River on either side of Snow Creek (e.g., Buck 1931:13-15; Wheeler et al. 1975:39; Jones 1980:2). Photographs taken during the expedition show the extent of forest cover at the old fort site complex as well as other details, including a view of the old NWC quay (Wheeler et al. 1975:40). This pioneering field survey set a new standard for archeological observation and recordation at Grand Portage, and it provided essential primary documentation that has since helped stimulate and guide all subsequent archeological investigations at Fort Charlotte.

The 1922 archival and field studies also aroused interest in creating a state park at Fort Charlotte to include nearby scenic areas along the Pigeon River (Buck 1931:15). Between 1924 and 1927, workers with the Minnesota Geological Survey explored and mapped the area of the Grand Portage and suggested how the local geology and topography influenced the course of that trail as well as the flow of the Pigeon River (e.g., Schwartz 1928). In 1931 the CCHS sponsored a bicentennial celebration at Grand Portage to commemorate initial use of the portage by French traders. The CCHS also opened a small museum at the NWC depot site and built what they supposed to be a replica of the old NWC dock on the nearby shore of the bay (Cockrell 1983:13-14). By 1934 the envisioned park plan shifted to incorporate the Grand Portage trail and the fort sites at either end (McGovern 1934:12). That plan later became the conceptual model used in establishing the GRPO (e.g., Cockrell 1983:26).

The value in studying artifacts and artifact distributions was under-appreciated by early investigators at Grand Portage. Cultural objects were at first seen as simple reminders of the past. For example, a sample of old knife blades, tools, and “broken china” unearthed at Fort Charlotte in 1922 (Buck 1931:15) was treated as a collection of oddities best suited for public exhibition. In the early 1930s, a group of local Ojibwe laborers clearing brush from the portage and Fort Charlotte discovered many “evidences” of earlier use of those areas. The “evidences,” including “rusty gun barrels, knives, bits of china, and pieces of clay pipes,” were turned over to the CCHS museum for public display (Anonymous 1934:131). Similarly, old copper kettles removed from underwater at the Pigeon River landing were given as curios to the MHS in 1932 (Buck 1931:15; Anonymous 1932:104).

A second phase of archeological study at Grand Portage, begun largely in response to hard economic times, used archeology as a means to create jobs and promote tourism. The work involved large-scale excavations and reconstructions at the old NWC depot complex at Grand Portage Bay, which was then a part of the Grand Portage Indian Reservation. Digging commenced in 1936, during a great national depression, with funding provided by the Civilian Conservation Corps through the United States Indian Service. The Grand Portage Ojibwe and the CCHS jointly shared the operations with guidance from the MHS. The new

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 8

Page 13

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

arrangement allowed MHS archeologists to supervise and report on the excavations (Anonymous 1936a:347; 1936b:461; Gower 1972:11-12; Cockrell 1983:14-16; Gilman 1992:128).

Despite limited financial support and the use of small untrained crews (Babcock 1940:6; Woolworth 1963:2; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:xi), these early excavations had the ambitious goal of determining the “exact site, ground plan, and method of construction” of every house and structure within the old depot. Indeed, the objective was to recover physical evidence to abet reconstruction of those facilities (Anonymous 1936b:461-462). The 1936 work progressed by trenching or by digging pits within a grid. The excavations uncovered hundreds of fur trade artifacts and many structural features. The latter included footing trenches for palisades that once surrounded the 2.3-acre depot complex (Anonymous 1936a:347; 1936b:461-462; 1937:328). Continued excavations in 1937 exposed additional areas of the fort’s interior along with the remains of other old buildings and even greater quantities of artifacts (Brown 1937; Woolworth 1967; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:228).

The 1930s work sought to recover narrowly selected types of information with little thought given to comparative studies or theoretical concerns. Through direct observation and intuition the archeologists simply hoped to “learn as much as the ground [would]...tell” about the past. Artifacts were still largely embraced as “objects illustrative of life at old Grand Portage” rather than as data or assemblages appropriate for addressing questions related to cultural, temporal, functional, economic, or behavioral issues. Some items, like handmade locks and hinges, were largely valued as “patterns” for replicating hardware (Brown 1937:457). An intact wooden door and a palisade picket were also used to guide replications. Some artifacts recovered during the investigations were “classified and mounted” for display at Grand Portage in the onsite county museum building (Anonymous 1941:215). Despite good intentions, the open-ended exhibition of materials, the continued fiscal austerity, and other factors put detailed interpretation of the excavated remains on hold for over a quarter century (Woolworth 1963:2).

Also telling about the 1930s excavations is the great deal of work completed in such a short time. By the end of the 1937, for example, after just two seasons of fieldwork, the remains of the palisades and thirteen buildings had been uncovered, including the area of the NWC’s Great Hall (Brown 1937; Woolworth 1963:15-16; 1967:4; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:228). Though heralded at the time, the results of this work, in hindsight, reveal the sad legacy of emphasizing architectural reconstruction and artifact display over other aspects of archeology. From the critical vantage of today, it appears that much of the depot site was sacrificed for very little gain. As early as the 1960s critics noted that any concern for “historical values” shown during this early phase of investigation was purely “incidental” (Woolworth 1963:2).

Despite obvious handicaps and flaws, the 1930s investigations did produce important information relating to the depot site locus and the use of that area before, during, and after the era of the NWC. Indian artifacts found through excavation were mostly limited to fragments of stone pipes and “implements used in working hides.” The paucity of ancient cultural materials and the lack of French-colonial debris suggested to excavators that the depot locus saw little use before its development by British fur traders in the mid-1700s. Earlier fur trade activities, they suggested, might have occurred on the lakefront east of Grand Portage Creek (Brown 1937:457). The most visible outcome of the fieldwork was the reconstruction of the fort’s wooden palisades and Great Hall between 1938 and 1940. America’s entry into World War II put further archeological fieldwork and reconstruction activities at Grand Portage on hold (Woolworth 1963:16-17; 1975a:283; Sage n.d.). By the 1950s the reconstructed palisades and Great Hall were already in a state of deterioration and neglect (Gilman 1992:129). In 1960 the reconstructions, along with the CCHS museum and artifacts, were turned over to the NPS.

A third phase of archeological study occurred at Grand Portage Bay between 1961 and 1975; that is, during the opening years of direct NPS administration of the newly formed GRPO. Initial efforts involved the reanalysis and reporting of prior fieldwork and the resumption of fieldwork needed to guide further reconstruction. Ancillary surveys were used to assess the impacts of recent land alterations and the possible affects of future facility developments on the integrity of archeological deposits (Woolworth 1963; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:xii). The need for more rigorous pre-construction surveys and monitoring became

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 8

Page 14

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

evident at Grand Portage in 1962 after some fur trade era archeological features were inadvertently destroyed by sewer and water line installations (Sage n.d.:12).

In 1961, University of Minnesota (UM) archeologists conducted surveys to determine what specific impact construction of a new visitor's center and parking lot might have on cultural properties east of Grand Portage Creek (Johnson 1961; Stoltman 1961). Similar work was later performed there by MHS archeologists with eventual expansion of these efforts into other areas north and west of the old NWC depot (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:xii, 232, 234-237). Each field project generally involved the removal or trimming of some vegetation and the establishment of new baselines, data points, or site grids. Each excavation, too, no matter how extensive or productive, routinely led to suggestions for further digging.

Though the 1961 UM and MHS investigations were done for much the same reason, the approaches to data recovery were quite different. The UM study, conducted as a field school, began with making a contour map before selected parts of the mapped area were tested through systematic excavations. All test pits were dug in arbitrary levels within a grid, all displaced soils were screened, and all recovered artifacts were recorded with field numbers. Features were also numbered, and features and soil profiles within each excavation unit were drawn to scale and photographed. Particular attention was given to recording artifact-provenience data and to taking samples of charred wood for possible use in radiocarbon dating (Johnson 1961; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:230-231). The UM investigators were also the first at the GRPO who sought to recover all artifacts or classes of artifacts through excavation rather than just retrieving selected "diagnostic" materials or representative samples of artifacts. The results, while never fully exploited, were well suited for studying spatial, temporal, cultural, and functional variables through the distribution of archeological materials and features.

MHS archeologists, working with salaried crews, adopted a more aggressive and less exacting data-recovery strategy. Finding the traditional process of hand excavation to be "slow and costly" (Woolworth 1962a:10), they determined that mechanized trenching would be a more rapid and economical means of testing relatively large areas in a short time (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:234). As a result, in 1961, they began using power equipment to search for buried archeological features and deposits, a practice that continued with MHS excavations on the lakefront at the GRPO through 1971 (Woolworth 1975a:24, 29; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:232, 242). With this method, trenches and cross-trenches were dug down into sterile subsoils with a backhoe, and the sidewalls of each trench were then hand trimmed with shovels to look for possible features. In places where features were identified, mechanical trenching operations were sometimes further supplemented with hand excavations. Backfilling was completed with a bulldozer (Woolworth 1962a:10-12; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:232, 234; Noble 1989a:16). The limited results of this approach has led to the characterization of MHS fieldwork conducted on the lakefront during the early 1960s as "exploratory excavation" or "salvage archeology" (e.g., Woolworth 1982: 114-115; Noble 1989a:16-17; Light n.d.:2-3).

In 1969 the reconstructed Great Hall burned after being struck by lightning. Hundreds of artifacts and other archeological materials stored in the hall were lost in the conflagration (Sage n.d.:15). The following year MHS archeologists cleared away the charred surface debris to reinvestigate underlying remnants of the original historic building. In 1971 they explored the remains of a former NWC kitchen building just behind the Great Hall. In each case, some sod and debris was removed and other site leveling was done with power equipment in advance of more detailed hand excavations conducted within the context of a grid (Woolworth 1975a:28-30; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:245-246). Physical evidence of building foundations and porches was found, and about 12,000 fur trade era artifacts were recovered. The findings integrated into planning documents (e.g., Thompson 1970; 1973), resulted in the reconstruction of a new Great Hall in 1974 and of the NWC kitchen four years later. The last MHS excavations at the lakeshore unit of the GRPO were smaller operations conducted between 1973 and 1975 to provide clearance for various development projects and to reexamine the sites of the original BIA schoolhouse and "Boucher's Fort" (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:xiii; Sage n.d.:21-22, 25).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 8

Page 15

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Completion of the Great Hall and kitchen at the NWC depot site marked the end of large-scale archeological excavations and reconstructions on the lakefront at Grand Portage Bay. It also brought the historical replications and interpretations at the GRPO to a new level of authenticity (Gilman 1992:132). Analysis of the 1970-1971 findings, completed in 1975, involved discussion of subsistence modes, the conservation and artistic illustration of artifacts, and studies correlating artifact types and assemblages with human behaviors (e.g., Woolworth 1975a; Miller 1975). The greater sophistication of analysis is clearly seen in the treatment of a sample of ceramic and glassware vessels found in the area of the kitchen structure. Realizing that the number and variety of these vessels had interpretive value beyond mere typological description, the investigators made inquiries that included looking at the cost and availability of such objects, the distance between Grand Portage and known sources of supply for such items, and the status, preferences, and practices of individuals who lived at or visited the depot (Lofstrom 1975a, 1975b).

For several years after 1975 no archeological work was done within the GRPO at Grand Portage Bay. By then, budgetary and philosophical shifts had led to a slowdown in NPS restoration and development projects (Noble 1989a:17). There was also a shuffling of NPS administrative boundaries, which, in the early 1970s, moved managerial control of the GRPO between three separate NPS regional offices within a period of just two years (Cockrell 1983:56). By the time fieldwork resumed at the GRPO, the directions and goals of North American archeology had changed. Historical archeologists now sought to study the past unencumbered by the mere need to reconstruct and furnish buildings or to “verify” information found in documentary records. Drawing upon their anthropological training, many set out to define universal laws of human behavior or to explore the mechanisms and processes of cultural change. At the same time, advances in geophysical prospection technologies (e.g., Noël Hume 1975:36-42; Weymouth 1976; Williams and Shapiro 1982:13) and the introduction of shovel-test (interval) sampling revolutionized the methods and standards of conducting archeological surveys on uncultivated landscapes in the upper Midwest (e.g., Lovis 1976; Birk and George 1976). New legislation, like the Archeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 and the 1979 Archeological Resources Protection Act, also mandated federal agencies to be more vigilant in safeguarding and otherwise managing archeological resources on federal lands (Knudson et al. 1995:4-5). Along with declining interest in big excavations, salvage projects, and costly reconstructions, greater emphasis was placed on the *in situ* preservation of archeological remains. Now, resource exploitation could only be approved after all other protection options were exhausted (Canouts 1977). These factors, coupled with continued fiscal restraints and heightened cultural material curation concerns, considerably altered the goals and philosophical incentives for doing archeology at the GRPO (Sage n.d.:28).

The latest phase of archeological investigation on the lakefront at Grand Portage Bay began in the early 1980s when the NPS-Midwest Archeological Center (MWAC) took responsibility for the survey and evaluation of cultural properties at the GRPO. Since 1984, MWAC archeologists have conducted compliance surveys on the lakefront to examine areas of proposed road alignments, housing and visitor or maintenance facilities, and shoreline/bank stabilization projects (Lynott 1988; Noble 1989a). The methods they use to find, identify, delimit, and evaluate cultural deposits or loci range from surface reconnaissance, systematic shovel testing, and cut-bank profiling to photographic and cartographic analysis and informant interviews (Noble 1989a, 1990). New curatorial standards have also been adopted. The artifact and photographic inventory catalogues from the GRPO are now entered into national databases, and the materials themselves are stored in facilities with climate control. These initiatives are greatly facilitated by the use of computers, a revolutionary technology unavailable to archeologists who worked at the GRPO through 1976, and apparently first used there by MWAC archeologists in 1978 (e.g., Huggins and Weymouth 1979). The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) and the recognition of Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) and Cultural Landscapes are also new developments that will continue to influence surveys, evaluations, and preservation and interpretative programs at the GRPO (Burt 2001; NPS 2003).

Reports of field investigations at the lakeshore unit of the GRPO are mostly manuscripts or memos with limited circulation (e.g., Gilman 1982:136; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:xx, 270; Lynott 1988; Noble 1988, 1989b, 1995, 1998). Some of these documents summarize prehistoric as well as historical archeological studies (e.g., Thompson 1969:163-166; Cockrell 1983:144-146; Sage n.d.; Light n.d.; Clark 1999:37-38). One major study recites the history of investigations at the Monument and also

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places

Continuation Sheet

Section 8

Page 16

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

provides an overview and inventory of the known cultural resources (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982). Missing from the corpus of archeological literature from the GRPO, however, are published reports such as routinely produced for similar studies at Fort William and Fort Michilimackinac, two other Great Lakes' depot sites associated with the Northwest fur trade (e.g., Dawson 1970; Cloutier et al. 1976; Fox 1977; Maxwell and Binford 1961; Miller and Stone 1970; Stone 1974; Heldman 1977; Heldman and Grange 1981; Adams 1989). Clearly, at the GRPO, additional popular and technical publications, including advanced material culture and foodway studies, are needed to illustrate and disseminate the results of archeological research on the lakefront at Grand Portage Bay (e.g., Woolworth 1975:63, 272; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:260).

The archeological investigations at Fort Charlotte are dissimilar in many ways from those conducted at Grand Portage Bay. Much of the difference can be ascribed to the isolation of Fort Charlotte, its early abandonment as a settlement locus, and the proclivity of modern researchers and managers to focus attention on cultural properties at the east end of the portage. As already noted, an initial phase of field reconnaissance at Fort Charlotte culminated with the mapping initiative of 1922. For almost fifty years thereafter no substantive fieldwork was conducted at the west end of the portage. Indeed, few archeologists ever visited that place. A UM crew was there in 1933, but the tangible results of that visit, if any, are apparently lost. In 1961 another UM crew, a group of students on a day-trip, recorded some surface features and noted that the site area was then densely vegetated except for a small clearing by the Pigeon River landing north of Snow Creek (Bonney 1961:5-7).

The difficulty in traveling to Fort Charlotte was considerably eased in 1964 when a new road was cut through the forest to Partridge Falls, an historic river portage less than two miles upstream from Fort Charlotte. The opening of the road led to concerns that Fort Charlotte would become a target of increased vandalism. NPS officials thought of having the old NWC compound there excavated to salvage archeological evidence before it was damaged or lost (Davis 1964), but the plan was never pursued.

Archeological activities resumed at Fort Charlotte in 1963 when a team of MHS scuba divers conducted a two-day underwater reconnaissance survey offshore at the Pigeon River landing. Underwater archeology was then a new field of inquiry in North America, and none of the divers or team leaders was trained in archeology. Nonetheless, they recovered a grab sample of a few dozen artifacts from the river bottom and, like other visitors before them, observed the remains of the old NWC quay (Wheeler et al. 1975:7, 22). Some of the same team members earlier explored offshore archeological potentials in selected areas at Grand Portage Bay with lackluster results (Wheeler et al. 1975:14). They were drawn to the Pigeon River after it was learned that sports divers found artifacts on the river bottom there. The natural conditions of the river channel, with dark-colored waters, sunken trees, bark deposits, mud and clay sediments, aquatic vegetation, and an abundance of leeches, made it an undesirable and challenging dive environment (Wheeler et al. 1975:22).

In 1971 a MHS dive team conducted another one-day underwater search at the Pigeon River landing. The stated goal of the search was to find lost or discarded fur trade items or habitation debris co-mingled with evidence of "the drinking bouts that customarily preceded the final departure of the brigades for remote wintering stations" (Wheeler et al. 1975:22, 37). The unexpected recovery of unique organic artifacts instead pointed to a greater wealth of unique offshore archeological potentials (Wheeler et al. 1975:36-37, 39). These potentials were further explored each year from 1972 through 1976 by other MHS dive teams led by an archeologist/diver. The latter expeditions treated the river bottom and the adjoining bed of Snow Creek as parts of a traditional archeological site where it was assumed that the types, frequencies, and distributions of artifacts and features were related to the nature, intensity, and patterning of past human activities (Wheeler et al. 1975:44; Birk 1975a:83-84; 1975b). The goals of investigation and the recovery methods also became increasingly refined as the physical integrity and interpretive value of the offshore deposits were more fully revealed (e.g., Birk and Wheeler 1976:793).

The 1972-1976 investigations at Fort Charlotte began with plotting the shorelines and marshy margins of a 500-foot stretch of the river channel and then mapping the contours of about 100, 000 ft² of the contiguous river bottom. Vegetation was cut or trimmed in some places on the American side to gain access to the river's edge and the banks of Snow Creek (Wheeler et al. 1975:40).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places

Continuation Sheet

Section 8

Page 17

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Fieldwork focused on the systematic retrieval of artifacts from underwater and the identification of offshore features, components, and activity areas. The dive teams explored and mapped the remains of the old NWC quay and sought physical evidence of a "supposed bridge" shown on the 1922 site map at the mouth of Snow Creek. Some shoreline areas were mapped to illustrate possible relationships between offshore cultural evidence and adjacent terrestrial features, like visible palisade lines. Artifact provenience data were recorded through piece plotting or by grid units. Excavation was confined to a series of grid units laid out in the shallows along the shore of the Pigeon River. Vertical (stratigraphic) controls were not maintained during the excavations. Large artifacts within the grid units were retrieved by hand. A gas-powered diaphragm pump assisted the recovery of smaller cultural materials. Displaced sediments and other materials passed through the suction pump and were lifted by the force of the pump into a two-screened sluice box set up downstream from the excavations (Wheeler et al. 1975:43-44).

The pump and screen system facilitated the systematic retrieval of over 6500 glass trade beads from the river bottom in addition to hundreds of other cultural items. Together these objects now comprise one of the largest extant collections of fur trade era artifacts recovered at the GRPO. Preliminary analysis of the artifacts and their distribution in relation to the shoreline and quay shows how the portage terminus was used and, how, over time, the landing migrated from near the mouth of Snow Creek to points farther downstream (e.g., Birk and Wheeler 1976:793; Birk 1975a:83-84). Test excavations conducted offshore at the XYZ site locus in 1976 also show that archeological deposits exist in the Pigeon River shallows upstream from Snow Creek (Birk and Wheeler 1976:792, fig. 2). To date, no evidence has been found offshore to support or verify the former existence of the "supposed bridge" at the mouth of Snow Creek (Wheeler et al. 1975:43-44).

Preliminary results of the underwater investigations at Fort Charlotte have been published (e.g., Wheeler and Woolworth 1968; Wheeler et al. 1975; Birk and Wheeler 1976; Birk 1975, 1980), but no comprehensive field report has yet been issued to detail the goals, methods, and results of the intensive 1972-1976 operations. Given the importance of the Fort Charlotte data for defining the material culture of the fur trade, interpreting cultural developments at Grand Portage, and demonstrating temporal shifts in the use and development of the Pigeon River landing and Fort Charlotte, completion of such a field report should now be a priority.

MWAC archeologists explored upland areas of the Fort Charlotte site complex between 1978 and 1980. Their use of electronic geophysical prospection equipment and computers introduced a new level of technological sophistication to archeological fieldwork conducted at the GRPO (Huggins and Weymouth 1979). During the course of their studies, MWAC teams installed permanent mapping reference points within the site area and used them to map visible surface features and to layout grids needed to guide the remote sensing surveys (Jones 1980:11). A total of 1750m² were then explored with magnetometers. The results of the mapping and geophysical observations were compared with those illustrated on the 1922 site map.

The MWAC surveys reveal that cultural magnetism in the area of Fort Charlotte tends to be masked by the presence of shallow igneous bedrock formations and iron-rich surface soils. While some surface remains, like collapsed fireplaces, appeared as magnetic anomalies, many visible features went virtually undetected by the magnetometers. The MWAC studies demonstrate the general thoroughness and accuracy of the 1922 site map and they show how time and public use have adversely affected the archeological record since that map was made. Other than "natural" deterioration, occasional uprooted trees, and looting, the most damaging impacts to the site area north of Snow Creek result from pedestrian traffic and camping activities and from the use and occasional relocation of NPS privy facilities (Huggins and Weymouth 1979; Jones 1979, 1980; Calabrese 1981).

In 1979 MWAC archeologists conducted a shovel test survey in an area peripheral to Fort Charlotte north of the Grand Portage trail. The survey was intended to find and record archeological resources while, at the same time, delimiting areas without archeological values that might become future alternate locations for camping and pit-toilet facilities (Jones 1980:28-29). The survey area incorporated about one-third of the NPS acreage at the west end of the GRPO. Shovel test spaced at intervals of from 18 to 25m demonstrated a simple soil stratigraphy and a general sparsity of topsoil development. No new archeological resources

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 8

Page 18

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

were discovered (Jones 1980). In 1980 the shovel testing was extended into areas south of Snow Creek with similar negative results (Calabrese 1981).

Research and management goals at the west end of the portage are now consistent with those at Grand Portage Bay and along the portage trail. The current NPS philosophy, a result of years of experience, is to maintain “an appropriate balance of scientific investigation, historic interpretation, and preservation” (Calabrese 1981:3). That philosophy, involving *in situ* preservation, is considered appropriate for managing archeological resources at the GRPO well into the future.

Another initiative will also help facilitate the GRPO’s resources management programs. A draft Cultural Landscapes Inventory (CLI) completed in 2001 identifies and partitions features of the “overall cultural landscape” at the GRPO. It explores natural, human-impacted, and visual areas and edges of the park’s landscapes and related stories, properties, and perspectives that endow Grand Portage with a “sense of place.” The CLI discusses significance in a way that espouses the particulars and overriding themes of Grand Portage’s varied functions over time. It examines historic alterations to the landscape and recognizes sources of information that help document the alterations. In part, the CLI also addresses the use of archeological potentials to develop reconstructions, which, in turn, help define and showcase GRPO’s cultural landscapes and properties (Burt 2001). The approach is geared to identifying, interpreting, and protecting resources, all top management priorities at the GRPO.

CONCLUSIONS

The GRPO Historic District is listed in the NRHP at the National level of significance under evaluation Criteria A and D. The district contains nine contributing resources, which include three sites, four replicated historic buildings, one replicated historic structure, and one early twentieth century stone bridge. Among noncontributing resources are four buildings, ten structures, and one object (for a full listing of these resources see Section 5, Page 1, above).

The three contributing sites (or “site complexes”)—at Pigeon River, at Grand Portage Bay, and the portage corridor between—embrace a range of largely invisible loci and deposits that embody a material record of the past. That record, in combination with related documentary, ethnographic, geographic, and testimonial evidence, has potential to impart the story of prior human experience at Grand Portage, particularly in the years following the arrival of Ojibwe and fur traders in the eighteenth century.

The historic reconstructions, clustered on the lakefront at Grand Portage Bay, are also essential to interpretations of the historic fur trade and to public appreciation and enjoyment of the park. Although the reconstructions symbolize only a small percentage of the historic buildings and structures that once occupied the Grand Portage site complex, these imposing three-dimensional representations, standing as they are in a picturesque setting aside Lake Superior and the Grand Portage Indian village amidst archeological remains, ethnographic landscapes, and living-history camp and garden exhibits, enable the park to successfully convey its historical identity and “sense of place” (e.g., Burt 2001; NPS 2003:173).

The Grand Portage Creek Stone Bridge (CR-59) is eligible by itself for listing on the NRHP for its associations with government relief projects of the 1930s and the initial development of Grand Portage as a national park. The bridge is also significant as an example of a rustic CCC-era design that uses indigenous materials to harmonize with its natural surroundings. Although not owned or maintained by the NPS, the bridge is addressed in GRPO management plans that include provisions for its future preservation and use (NPS 2003).

Significance. The *period of significance* for the GRPO Historic District is the historic time range during which the district was occupied or used for which it is likely to yield important information (NRB-36:23). As defined here, the period of significance extends from 1731 through 1951; that is, from the date of the first documented use of the Grand Portage by French traders through to the period following World War II when public interest in Grand Portage was reawakened. Throughout that time, Grand

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 8

Page 19

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Portage witnessed an ebb and flow of conditions and activities that together form a seamless continuum or progression of natural, historical, and cultural developments.

Within the framework of Minnesota history, the period of significance includes part of the initial Contact Period (A.D. 1650-1837) and all of the Post-Contact Period (1837 to 1945). The period of significance may someday be adjusted to accommodate new discoveries that fall within the National Register's standard minimum fifty-year *look back period*—but only if such are found to be of exceptional importance and meet the proper requirements for consideration, like Criteria Consideration G (e.g., NRB-15:41-43). The period of significance might also be extended back in time if stronger evidence of older Native American/First Nation cultural activities or French fur trader operations is recovered or identified, especially within the Contact Period before 1731.

Areas of significance are determined through evaluating the district's primary resources within historic contexts. As defined patterns, themes, or trends in history, the contexts may be expressed on a variety of scales or levels from local, state, or national. The contexts promote understanding of specific events, properties, and places and help clarify their historical meaning and, hence, their significance (NRB-15:7, 9).

The GRPO is listed on the National Register under evaluation Criterion A for its association with events and processes that have substantially contributed to broad patterns of history. The district's areas of significance include Exploration/Settlement, Commerce, Transportation, Politics/Government, and Archeology (Historic Aboriginal and Historic Non-Aboriginal). The GRPO contains resources that are also associated with Minnesota's statewide thematic contexts. The statewide contexts principally associated with the GRPO Historic District are: Portage Trails in Minnesota (1630s-1870s), Exploration/Fur trade (1650-1840), Settlement and Fishing on Lake Superior (1854-1930), and North Shore Tourism and Recreation (1870-1945). Together with the above referenced NRHP areas of significance, the statewide contexts help to organize information and to pose research questions about heritage resources. At the GRPO, all interlock to provide an overview of Grand Portage history as well as a framework to assess the significance and integrity of the park's archeological resources. A growing interest in interpreting non-fur trade properties at the GRPO may well affect resource management goals and priorities there in the future.

The GRPO district is listed under evaluation Criterion D for providing important information about the past and for its potential to provide further important information within the areas and contexts cited above and for the same period of significance (1731 through 1951). Much of the potential is represented in the archeological record. Data recovered in field investigations at the GRPO might confirm, contradict, or disprove other forms of historical information, while at the same time helping to define and explain cultural and natural developments not documented in paper records or oral traditions.

Despite its long and colorful fur trade history, the GRPO has no surviving fur trade-era buildings or structures. Even before the establishment of the GRPO, Minnesota historical organizations, eager to recreate the entire NWC depot (Babcock 1940:7), erected some reconstructions on the grounds of that old fort at Grand Portage Bay. Reconstructions are not usually considered for listing on the NRHP. They can be eligible, however, if they possess integrity and if they satisfy regular evaluation requirements and special NRHP Criteria Considerations. Reconstructions must meet the special requirements if they are the focal point of a district (NRB-15:25) as they are at the GRPO.

The GRPO reconstructions are contributing properties under Criteria Consideration E. In addition to the old NWC fort stockade (CR-19), the rebuilt facilities include the NWC's Great Hall (CR-5), Kitchen (CR-16), and Gatehouse (CR-14), all within the stockade, and a Warehouse/Canoe Shed (CR-47) located just beyond the outer walls. The reconstructions hint at the scale, integration, and complexity of the fort's facilities, they suggest the intensity of early French and British fur trade operations at Grand Portage, and they help convey the historical significance of Grand Portage during the period from 1731 to circa 1804. The reconstructions are currently furnished and interpreted to portray the historic scene of 1797 (NPS 2003:173).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 8

Page 20

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Because of the paucity of written testimony, the reconstructions are based largely on archeological evidence and on comparative studies of similar facilities seen or described elsewhere. Indeed, from the time archeological investigations began in 1936 through the major excavations of the 1970s, all fieldwork done in the area of the NWC depot was geared to reconstruction (Anonymous 1936a:347; 1936b:461; Woolworth 1975a:9; Noble 1990:5; Gilman 1992:130). The initial replications of the stockade and Great Hall, completed by 1940, were later replaced by facilities of higher quality (Cockrell 1983:15, 20-21, 51, 54, 60). The greater accuracy of the later reconstructions is attributed to more thorough historical research, greater attention to details of design and workmanship, and greater sensitivity to the physical setting. Other enhancements include the use of replicated hardware, furniture, kitchen and tableware, and birchen canoes, plus installations like a flagpole, outdoor bake oven, fur press, and gardens (NPS 2003:173). Costumed interpreters, who exhibit or demonstrate daily activities like building canoes, baking bread, appraising furs, or tending fires and gardens, animate and humanize the interpretations.

The depot reconstructions all stand on the exact site of the originals, and they represent what is known or surmised about some principal features of the old NWC fort. For example, the stockade demonstrates the great energy and material investments made by the NWC in erecting perimeter walls that served variously for security and defense and as a social barrier, animal enclosure, wind break, and symbol of power and resolve. Today, as in the past, the stockade displays and reinforces the old NWC's command of location and space on the bay. Gated openings in the outer walls control access to the fort and shape the flow of pedestrian traffic. The buildings, too, have formal and informal doorways and public and private spaces, so that people today might respond to some aspects or features of the reconstructions much as people did in the eighteenth century. In that regard, the reconstructions might be seen as components of a built environment that trigger or shape desired behaviors. By projecting a real sense of the aura and purpose of the original depot and by providing appropriate contexts and props for historical interpretation, the reconstructions add substantially to visitor experiences at the GRPO.

In summary, the reconstructions stand out as the most widely recognized iconic elements of the GRPO, as attributes of a proposed cultural landscape (Burt 2001), and as the primary entry/contact point for most public visitation. The reconstructions recreate original facilities at their original locations. They are presented in a dignified manner as part of a restoration master plan using NPS Historic Structures Reports to help with their design, construction, and furnishings. Their contribution to the Monument and its interpretive programs is enhanced by the fact that no other historic fur trade-era buildings or structures with the same association have survived at the GRPO. The reconstructions contribute to the overall sense of historic time and place, and they help convey both the historic and contemporary significance of the lakefront at Grand Portage Bay.

Integrity. For a district to be listed in the NRHP a majority of its significant properties must possess integrity, the ability to convey their significance (NRB-15:44). A district is not eligible if it has been so impacted by alterations and intrusions that it no longer conveys a sense of an historic environment (NRB-15:46). The GRPO district's three contributing sites are deemed significant under evaluation Criteria A and D. The sites retain essential features that help define their character and appearance during the period of significance. They are also in overall good condition, to the extent that each site is able to convey important historical associations and has potential to yield data important for answering specific research questions. The relative isolation of the GRPO along with a sparse local human population, limited modern development, and the wide-scale ownership of adjacent lands by Native Americans, have all worked to protect the physical and aesthetic wholeness of the landscapes of which the district is a part. At the same time, since at least 1960, NPS programs, policies, and personnel have also provided effective management of natural and cultural resources within the GRPO.

In many respects the Grand Portage area is little different today than it was during the closing decades of its 220-year period of significance. The most obvious changes to the physical and cultural landscape since 1951 have been on or near the lakefront by Grand Portage Bay, and in the interior uplands where there has been a gradual infilling and maturing of forest vegetation earlier removed by harvests and wild fires. The greatest known concentrations of *in situ* primary archeological features and deposits in

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 8

Page 21

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

the park today are at Fort Charlotte and on the lakefront at Grand Portage Bay. Other important, but less concentrated and less dense primary deposits are reported by ongoing surveys in the portage corridor. The heritage resources at the Fort Charlotte site complex and along the portage corridor are, overall, in the best physical condition. The best-preserved archeological resources within the Grand Portage site complex on the bay are probably those that have drawn the least attention in the past or that lie outside the areas of intensive modern development.

The GRPO sites have integrity of location, setting, association, and feeling. The replicated fur trade-era buildings and structure have the same attributes as well as integrity of design. The Grand Portage Creek Stone Bridge (CR-59) alone further adds the integrity of materials and workmanship (Burt 2001, 3:48). All of these qualities reinforce the district's integrity and significance.

The qualities of location, setting, association, and feeling can also easily transport the willing participant into the imaginative realm of former times. Today, anywhere on the lakefront at the GRPO one can enjoy expansive views of Lake Superior and of the distant landforms that frame Grand Portage Bay. The views are even more spectacular and sweeping when seen in a boat offshore or from the flanks or summit of Mount Rose, the domed hill towering over the old NWC depot. Broad views are "a critical component" of the Grand Portage landscape, and they are as pleasing today as they once were important to local residents for sighting approaching canoe brigades, ships, and storms (Burt 2001, 3:57).

Other timeless qualities survive at Grand Portage, including some buttressed by the fur trade-era reconstructions and living history encampments. At the NWC depot today, as in years gone by, the summer visitor experiences shore breezes, breaking waves, squawking gulls, and fluttering flags. Add to that the voices and movements of people dressed in eighteenth century garb, the scent of wood smoke, furs, and baking bread, distorted images seen through wavy panes of window glass, and the lights and shadows of the stockade or a bark wigwam. A further scan reveals a canoe, fur press, outdoor oven, piles of firewood, and gardens. On the lakefront nearby are traces of nineteenth century houses, government buildings, stores, and schools overlooked by an historic log church, which sits on an elevation just beyond the GRPO's boundaries. Further inland are great, forested hills and ridges, often shrouded by fog, through which the old Grand Portage trail ascends into the interior. Other than a few modern highway crossings, residential intrusions, and conveniences like catwalks and pedestrian bridges, the portage trail retains much of its historic character and offers many of the same physical challenges that confronted earlier travelers. Repeated trekking on the portage breeds a greater familiarity so that certain parts of the trail soon become like old friends, or—in the case of steep climbs, deep holes, and protruding rocks—old adversaries. Knowing the history and geology of the portage makes crossing it a more satisfying activity. At the upper end of the trail a dense forest now envelops the remains of Fort Charlotte and the old Pigeon River landing, masking the former celebrity and hubbub of that place. The river itself, in a similar state of wildness, still beckons voyagers to follow its course westward. The fur traders and their original forts are gone, but the river, winds, and stories flow on.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Site integrity and research potentials are values rooted in perception and approach. At the GRPO, the standards for evaluating sites has changed over the years and so have the outcomes. For example, an area once dismissed as having no meaningful cultural evidence was later re-examined using different methods and found to contain two important historic components (see discussion in Noble 1988). If sites or deposits are defined as loci of past human activity, then, to be considered significant, each locus must contain adequate information to determine what human activity or activities are represented by the evidence. However, if archeological sites or deposits are defined as loci of cultural materials rather than as loci of past human activity, then sparse or discontinuous archeological deposits are not so easily written off as having no potential for conducting meaningful archeological research. The same is true of archeological materials found in areas of disturbance or secondary deposition such as might occur with cultivation or inundation (Schiffer and Gumerman 1977:183). Current NPS procedures at the GRPO ensure that qualities like lack of integrity or potential must be amply demonstrated before archeological deposits can be deemed insignificant or nonessential to interpretative programs there.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 8

Page 22

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Many aspects of Grand Portage history and archeology can be further investigated under NRHP criteria and statewide thematic contexts. In some cases, available data can be subjected to additional study or reanalysis to more fully answer earlier research questions or to address new ones. When organized by area of significance or context, some questions will overlap and may appear redundant. The following discussions explore some possible directions for future research and preservation at the GRPO. The suggested queries should not be considered a complete review or a prioritization of these interests.

Precontact cultural activities are poorly known at the GRPO. Despite extensive archeological investigation, few ancient Indian artifacts other than lithic chipping debris, a few chipped-stone tools, and fragments of worked native copper have been found. Archeologists suggest that some aceramic lithic deposits at the GRPO might either be of preceramic origin (e.g., Woolworth 1962b) or that they could date to the period of initial contact when Native ceramics were replaced by brass kettles (e.g., Johnson 1961:5). Determining the age or cultural affiliation of such materials is confounded by limited sample sizes, the paucity of diagnostic items, an insufficiency of stratigraphic separation, and a lack of radiometric dates (Clark 1995, 1999).

Among questions that can be asked when studying prehistory at the GRPO are: What are the nature, sequence, and intensity of prehistoric cultural developments at Grand Portage? Does the prehistoric archeological record at the GRPO reflect broader local or regional patterns of Native American/First Nation prehistory? How does the prehistoric archeological record on the lakefront at Grand Portage Bay compare with that found along the portage trail and at Fort Charlotte? What local resources and habitats were exploited by ancient Indian peoples, and when? How did an apparent abundance of fish and the relative scarcity of other dietary resources affect the seasonal activities and movements of Native peoples, including the historic patterns of group coalescence and dispersion? When did ancient peoples first learn the use of watercraft and specifically the use of lightweight portable bark canoes in this northern region? How long have Native Americans used the Grand Portage corridor, and how has their use of the portage trail developed or changed over time? How did participation in the fur trade affect Native Americans and Euroamericans, and Native American use of the Grand Portage?

The GRPO lies within the boundaries of the Grand Portage Indian Reservation, and it is highly visible within the local Ojibwe community. The Ojibwe residents have deep connections to and concern for Indian heritage properties at the GRPO. In recent years, throughout North America, it has become increasingly common for historic sites managers and archeologists to question their own handling of Indian heritage sites and to assess the possible impacts of their policies and practices on living indigenous peoples (Banks and Sundstrom 1999). Some sensitive loci or areas at the GRPO that may pose future management challenges are possible human cemeteries and potential TCPs (Traditional Cultural Properties). Among concerns in this regard may be how to protect the graves and cultural landscapes of Native peoples without stifling scientific inquiries into the history, demographics, and ecology of ancient human populations. Also, how to identify Native religious sites without violating the privacy and spiritual traditions of modern Indian peoples, and how to build stronger inter-group alliances or partnerships in regard to archeological research and preservation efforts (e.g., King 2003).

During the nineteenth century and particularly after the Treaty of 1854, the Grand Portage Ojibwe were exposed to a number of government and church-supported programs that overtly attempted to change their way of life, their beliefs, and their worldview. The possible questions here seem endless and may range from very simple to complex. What materials were used in building post-treaty Indian cabins? How common were fireplaces, and how were they built? How, by the mid-1800s, had Ojibwe material wants and possessions changed from the glory days of the fur trade? Did the introduction of new social ideas and economic values find material or spatial expression among the Ojibwe that might appear in the archeological record? Were gender, status, age, or occupation in the Ojibwe community reflected by the design, placement, size, complexity, arrangement, or association of buildings at Grand Portage Bay? How did the Ojibwe respond to the architecture of their buildings and the new grid layout of their community? How and where were fences used in the community after 1854? What constituted public space, and how was such space used or maintained? What affect did sedentary reservation life have on diets, household activities, social relations, daily practices, sanitation, and other aspects of Ojibwe culture? What can be learned through archeological studies of late nineteenth

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 8

Page 23

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

century community development, commercial and agricultural activities, ethnicity, and task differentiation? How and to what extent did living conditions vary between Indians and non-Indians at Grand Portage village? How did late nineteenth century developments at Grand Portage village compare with those at places in adjoining regions during the same time?

There are many questions regarding human ecological relationships at the GRPO that can be used to further develop historical contexts and interpretations and to devise predictive models for the occurrence and distribution of cultural properties. How have climatic episodes like the Altithermal or Little Ice Age affected human cultural adaptations and developments at Grand Portage? How have climatic conditions or irregularities similarly affected population movements, living conditions, or daily practices at Grand Portage? What factors have influenced human population size or growth? What role have geology and topography played in the settlement and use of the land? How have elevation, slope, drainage, surface soil characteristics, and viewsheds influenced the placement, arrangement, use, maintenance, or abandonment of domestic and commercial facilities? How have fluctuating lake levels influenced human-land and human-water relationships? How have lake-level shifts affected the setting and integrity of archeological deposits or current perceptions of the archeological record? How have recent land-use practices and resource extraction activities (e.g., logging, hunting, and fishing) impacted local environments and habitats or the integrity or preservation of archeological remains? How have natural conditions, like soil chemistry and moisture, influenced the preservation of organic and ferrous metal artifacts at Grand Portage? Is there need for a contingency plan to further stabilize the Superior shoreline, the banks of Grand Portage Creek, or the banks of the Pigeon River at Fort Charlotte, in the event of a sudden increase or decrease in water levels or catastrophic flooding?

In the late eighteenth century, fur traders at Grand Portage depended heavily on imported foods, though they also engaged in agriculture, tended livestock, and satisfied part of their dietary needs through the procurement of local fish and game. What game animals and birds were available in the Grand Portage area during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries? How important were migratory waterfowl to local diets? Were wild turkeys available (as suggested by the discovery of their faunal remains in archeological contexts at Grand Portage)? How extensive were the fur-traders' gardens, where were they located, and what was their annual production? What facilities were constructed to accommodate the storage of potatoes or other vegetal crops, and where were those facilities located? Where were the NWC's livestock facilities, like barns or stables, located?

Some reports about area fauna based on archeological findings at the GRPO might also be questioned. For example, the discovery of white-tailed deer and elk bones in fur trade-era deposits at Grand Portage has led to speculation that deer and elk were locally available during the eighteenth century (e.g., Woolworth 1975:280; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982, I:203). The historic habitat preferences and range of these animals in Minnesota prior to the beginning of intensive logging and agriculture, however, would seemingly argue against that notion (e.g., Breckenridge 1949:127-130). For example, it is possible that venison, in the form of hams or haunches, was brought to Grand Portage from afar, perhaps from Sault Ste. Marie or through Fond du Lac Superior (present-day Duluth Harbor). An important test would be to seek additional deer and elk remains in archeological deposits at Grand Portage that both predate and postdate the heyday of the fur trade. If such bones were found in prehistoric as well as a broader spectrum of historic deposits, then there would be cause to believe that deer and elk were present in the local environment prior to the massive ecological disruptions of the nineteenth century. If such bones are only found in late eighteenth century deposits, then the argument that venison was introduced to Grand Portage from distant hunting grounds might be better supported.

Of related importance is to determine exactly which skeletal elements of each species are present at Grand Portage. If skeletal elements like lower leg bones, back bones, ribs, and skull parts of deer and elk are present in archeological deposits there then it might be assumed that the animals were killed nearby and their carcasses were taken to the fort largely intact. Conversely, if these same anatomical parts are typically missing from archeological contexts at GRPO then it might be argued that the animals were killed and processed at places farther removed so that only the largest and most meaty parts were taken to Grand Portage.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 8

Page 24

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Many questions may also be asked regarding the management of cultural resources and landscapes at the GRPO. Which areas have potential for the discovery of previously undetected archeological properties, what kinds of properties are likely to found, and what methods might best be used for making such discoveries? What archival sources might provide further information about French presence at Grand Portage or other aspects of Grand Portage history? What more can be learned about GRPO heritage resources and history through the systematic study of early maps and photographs, or through using such evidence in conjunction with other sources like informant interviews, oral traditions, government, church, and business records, aerial imagery, and archeological evidence? Might such studies, aided by ground-truthing, extend current knowledge and appreciation of nineteenth and early twentieth century cultural properties within the GRPO? Through the use of available cultural and natural landscape data and a GIS, how well can modern researchers reconstruct the location, sequence, and association of former dwellings and other facilities in the lakefront area of the GRPO? What loci defined through survey or excavation at Grand Portage Bay are now in need of further study or evaluation (even if only minimally to determine their exact location or to define their contents, structure, age, purpose, condition, and research potentials)? Which areas at the GRPO previously reported to have no archeological values may now be in need of further study to verify those findings?

The Grand Portage trail shaped settlement and commercial activities at Grand Portage. The trail also channeled the movement of many early trade expeditions traveling northwest from Montreal, and it largely determined the role that Grand Portage played in establishing the international border between Minnesota and Ontario. The GRPO district obviously derives much of its significance from the trail, yet until recently the trail remained little explored as a cultural landscape. What more can be learned from studying the portage? What do the placement and course of the trail reveal about its Indian architects, their travel modes and strategies, their economies, or their worldview? What kinds of archeological materials have been recovered along the portage trail corridor? Precisely where and under what conditions were the materials found, and what does their discovery reveal about the prehistoric or historic use of that overland route? Can cultural remains be found along the portage trail that might ultimately demonstrate the age and intensity of portage use in precontact times? How might physical evidence for old cultural landmarks, posés, or features like stream crossings, homesteads, logging properties, or abandoned segments of trail extend our knowledge of early portage use? How have the practices or dynamics of traversing the portage changed over time? How closely does the present trail follow that used by ancient peoples, or by voyageurs at the end of the eighteenth century? Is there any evidence that competition, strife, or other conditions caused the use of more than one trail or a system of multiple trail segments within the portage corridor during the fur trade era? Can documentary and archeological evidence of the portage be reconciled through additional research? How old are the trails that branch from the Grand Portage to reach other sites or locales?

Despite some intensive archeological investigations at Fort Charlotte in the past, details of fur trade activities in the area of the Pigeon River landing are still poorly known. Is there additional evidence of prehistoric activities or settlement at the west end of the portage? Did French-colonial traders build houses or other structures at the Pigeon River landing prior to 1760? Were buildings or structures present within the area of the XYZ fort on the south side of Snow Creek prior to 1798, the year the XYZ was formed? What motivated the expansion of NWC trade facilities at Fort Charlotte, and when did the expansions occur? How many buildings at Fort Charlotte were heated and used as living quarters? When was the latest residential use of Fort Charlotte? What impact does continued recreational use of the Grand Portage have on archeological features or deposits at Fort Charlotte? Obviously, much work remains to be done.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 9

Page 1

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

9. REFERENCES CITED

Adams, Diane L.

1989 Lead Seals from Fort Michilimackinac, 1715-1781. *Archeological Completion Report Series, Number 14*. Mackinac Island, Michigan: Mackinac State Historic Parks.

Anonymous

1932 Accessions. *Minnesota History*, 13(1):98-104.

1934 General Minnesota Items. *Minnesota History*, 15(1):126-131.

1936a General Minnesota Items. *Minnesota History*, 17(3):346-354.

1936b Minnesota Historical Society Notes. *Minnesota History*, 17(4):459-464.

1937 General Minnesota Items. *Minnesota History*, 18(3):327-333.

1939 "Building Rises on Burial Ground." *Duluth Herald*, August 25, 1939.

1941 Local Historical Societies. *Minnesota History*, 22(2):215-219.

1982 Draft Boundary Evaluation Report. Grand Portage National Monument. Unpublished report in the Grand Portage National Monument Archives, H22 (Cultural Resources BK6), Grand Marais, Minnesota.

Armstrong, Benjamin G., and Thomas P. Wentworth

1892 *Early Life Among the Indians. Reminiscences from the Life of Benjamin G. Armstrong*. Ashland, Wisconsin: A. W. Bowron Press.

Auger, Donald J. and Paul Driben

2000 *Grand Portage Chippewa. Stories and Experiences of Grand Portage Band Members*. Grand Portage: Grand Portage Tribal Council.

Babcock, Willoughby M. Jr.

1940a "Re-building the Grand Portage Stockade: Some Problems in Historical Reconstruction." *The Museum News*, December 15, 1940, pages 6-8.

1940b General Minnesota Items. *Minnesota History*, 21(2):206-207.

Banks, Kimball M. and Linea Sundstrom (editors)

1999 Native Americans and Historic Preservation. *Plains Anthropologist*, 44(170) Memoir 31.

Baraga, Bishop Frederic

1966 *A Dictionary of the Otchipwe Language, Explained in English*. Reprint. Minneapolis: Ross and Haines.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 9

Page 2

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Bigsby, John J.

1850 *The Shoe and Canoe or pictures of Travel in the Canadas, Illustrative of Their Scenery and of Colonial Life.* 2 volumes. London: Chapman and Hall.

Birk, Douglas A.

1975a Recent Underwater Recoveries at Fort Charlotte, Grand Portage National Monument, Minnesota. *The International Journal of Nautical Archeology and Underwater Exploration* 4(1):73-84.

1975b "A Research Proposal for Completing the Fort Charlotte Underwater Archeology Project at Grand Portage National Monument, Minnesota." Unpublished proposal. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society, Archeology Files.

1979 Whitewater Archeology. *The Minnesota Volunteer* 42(244):12-19.

1980 The Anatomy of a Late Eighteenth Century Padlock from Fort Charlotte, Grand Portage National Monument, Minnesota. *Association for Preservation Technology Bulletin*, 12(4):45-48.

1982 The La Verendryes. Reflections on the 250th Anniversary of the French Posts of La Mer de l'Ouest. In *Where Two Worlds Meet. The Great Lakes Fur Trade*, 116-19. *Minnesota Historical Society, Museum Exhibit Series No. 2.* Carolyn Gilman, editor. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society.

1984 John Sayer and the Fond du Lac Trade: The North West Company in Minnesota and Wisconsin. *Rendezvous. Selected Papers of the Fourth North American Fur Trade Conference, 1981*, pp. 51-61. Thomas C. Buckley, editor. St. Paul: North American Fur Trade Conference.

1989 *John Sayer's Snake River Journal, 1804-05: A Fur Trade Diary from East Central Minnesota.* Minneapolis: Institute for Minnesota Archaeology.

1991 French Presence in Minnesota: The View from Site Mo20 near Little Falls. In *French Colonial Archaeology. The Illinois Country and the Western Great Lakes*, 237-66. John A. Walthall, editor. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

1994a When Rivers Were Roads. Deciphering the Role of Canoe Portages in the Western Lake Superior Fur Trade. *The Fur Trade Revisited. Selected Papers of the Sixth North American Fur Trade Conference, Mackinac Island, Michigan, 1991*, 359-76. Jennifer Brown, W. Eccles, and Donald Heldman, editors. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

1994b A Preliminary Survey of Site 47PE22 and Other Areas of Suspected French Presence on the Southeast Shore of Lake Pepin, Pepin County, Wisconsin. *The Institute for Minnesota Archaeology Reports of Investigations*, No. 305. Minneapolis.

1995 The Marin Posts: A Preliminary Consideration of Some Mid-Eighteenth Century Fort Sites in the Upper Mississippi Valley. Paper presented at the Historical Archaeology Conference of the Upper Midwest, Red Wing, Minnesota, August 26, 1995.

1997a Putting Minnesota on the Map: Early French Presence in the Folle Avoine Region Southwest of Lake Superior. *The Minnesota Archaeologist*, 51:6-26.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 9

Page 3

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Birk, Douglas A. (cont'd)

1997b Church-Schools and Chiefs' Houses: A Documentary View of Protestant Missions in the Folle Avoine District of the St. Croix Valley, 1833-1850. *The Minnesota Archaeologist*, 52:38-51.

1998 The Hudson Bay Trail: A Study of Nineteenth Century Travel Routes Between Grand Portage, Minnesota, and Fort William, Ontario. *Institute for Minnesota Archaeology Reports of Investigations*, Number 466. Minneapolis.

2001 "Original Land Survey Records Research Project." An unpublished letter report to David Cooper, Chief of Resource Management, Grand Portage National Monument, 29 June 2001.

Birk, Douglas A. and David Cooper

2001 Grand Portage National Monument, Grand Portage Survey Project, 2000 Progress Report. *Institute for Minnesota Archaeology Reports of Investigations*, Number 603.

Birk, Douglas A., and Douglas C. George

1976 A Woodland Survey Strategy and Its Application in the Salvage of a Late Archaic Locus of the Smith Mounds Site, (21-Kc-3), Koochiching County, Minnesota. *The Minnesota Archaeologist*, 35(3):1-30.

Birk, Douglas A., and Jeffrey J. Richner

2004 From Things Left Behind: A Study of Selected Fur Trade Sites and Artifacts, Voyageurs National Park and Environs, 2001-2002. Unpublished report issued jointly as *Midwest Archeological Center, Technical Report Number 84*, and *Institute for Minnesota Archaeology, Reports of Investigations Number 606*.

Birk, Douglas A., and Robert C. Wheeler

1976 Fort Charlotte Underwater Archeology Project. *National Geographic Research Reports 1975*, 791-99. Washington: National Geographic Society.

Blackwell, Billy, et al.

1983 *A History of Kitchi Onigaming: Grand Portage and Its People*. Cass Lake: Minnesota Chippewa Tribe.

Blessing, Fred K., Jr.

1971 The Ojibway Observed. *Occasional Papers in Minnesota Anthropology*, Number 1. St. Paul: Minnesota Archaeological Society.

Bonney, Rae

1961 "Site Survey of Eastern Cook County Minnesota." Unpublished directed research project for Professor Elden Johnson, University of Minnesota, first summer session, 1961. Copy in the Cook County Reports Files, Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Brain, Jeffrey P.

1979 Tunica Treasure. *Harvard University, Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archeology and Ethnology 71*. Cambridge.

Breckenridge, W. J.

1949 A Century of Minnesota Wild Life. *Minnesota History* 30(2):123-134; (3):220-231.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 9

Page 4

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Brown, Ralph D.

1937 Recent Excavations at Grand Portage. *Minnesota History*, 18(4):456-458.

Bryce, Rev. George

1912 Mackenzie-Selkirk-Simpson. *The Makers of Canada*, Volume 5. University Edition. Toronto: Morang.

Buck, Solon J.

1931 *The Story of the Grand Portage*. Minneapolis: Private printing.

Burpee, Lawrence J.

1931 Grand Portage. *Minnesota History* 12(4):359-377.

Burpee, Lawrence J. (editor)

1968 *Journals and Letters of Pierre Gaultier De Varennes De La Vérendrye and His Sons*. Reprint of 1927 Champlain Society edition. New York: Greenwood Press.

Burt, Geoffrey

2001 *National Park Service Cultural Landscapes Inventory. Grand Portage National Monument, Minnesota. (Draft)*. Omaha: National Park Service Midwest Regional Office.

Busch, Thomas P.

1976 *Grand Portage National Monument National Register of Historic Places Inventory-Nomination Form*. Omaha: National Park Service.

Bushnell, David I., Jr.

1927 Burials of the Algonquian, Siouan, and Caddoan Tribes West of the Mississippi. *Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of Ethnology, Bulletin 83*. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Calabrese, F. A.

1981 "1980 Center Archeological Investigations at the Fort Charlotte Complex, Grand Portage National Monument, Minnesota." Unpublished memo to the Superintendent, Grand Portage National Monument, dated September 22, 1981. Copy in the Grand Portage National Monument Archives, H2217, Archeology, Fort Charlotte File, Grand Marais, Minnesota.

Canouts, Veletta

1977 Management Strategies for Effective Research. *Conservation Archeology. A Guide for Cultural Resource Management Studies*, 121-127. Michael B. Schiffer and George J. Gumerman, editors. New York: Academic Press.

Carver, Jonathan

1956 *Travels Through the Interior Parts of North America, in the Years 1766, 1767, and 1768*. Reprint. Minneapolis: Ross and Haines.

Catton, Ted and Marcia Montgomery

2000 *Special History: The Environment and the Fur Trade Experience in Voyageurs National Park, 1730-1870*. Lincoln: Midwest Archeological Center, National Park Service.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 9

Page 5

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Clark, Caven P.

1995 Archeological Survey and Testing at Isle Royale National Park, 1987-1990 Seasons. *Midwest Archeological Center Occasional Studies in Anthropology, No. 32*. Lincoln: National Park Service, Midwest Archeological Center.

1999 Late Prehistoric Cultural Affiliation Study, Grand Portage National Monument, Minnesota. *Cultural Resources Report No. 111*. Tempe, Arizona: Archeological Consulting Services, Ltd.

Cleland, Charles E.

1966 The Prehistoric Animal Ecology and Ethnozoology of the Upper Great Lakes Region. *Museum of Anthropology, Anthropological Papers, No. 29*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan.

1970 Comparison of the Faunal Remains from French and British Refuse Pits at Fort Michilimackinac: A Study in Changing Subsistence Patterns. *Canadian Historic Sites: Occasional Papers in Archaeology and History, No. 3*. Ottawa: National Historic Sites Service.

Cloutier, Jean-Pierre, James A. Burns, Elizabeth Redfern, and Rose Wark

1976 *Fort William. Food-Related Artifacts*. Fort William Archaeological Project. Ontario Ministry of Culture and Recreation.

Cochrane, Jean Fitts

1996 Woodland Caribou Restoration at Isle Royale National Park. A Feasibility Study. *Technical Report NPS/NRISRO/NRTR/96-03*. National Park Service, Great Lakes Cluster. Isle Royal National Park.

Cochrane, Tim

2000 Notes from a telephone interview with Alan R. Woolworth, 22 March 2000. Unpublished document. Copy in the Cultural Landscape File, Resource Management Division, Grand Portage National Monument, Grand Marais, Minnesota.

Cockrell, Ron

1983 *Grand Portage National Monument, Minnesota: An Administrative History*. National Park Service. Revised edition. Omaha: National Park Service. Midwest Regional Office.

Cooper, David J.

2004 *Of Sextants and Satellites: David Thompson and the Grand Portage GIS Study*. Paper presented at the 2004 Rupert's Land Colloquium, in Kenora, Ontario.

Culkin, William E.

1931 *North Shore Place Names*. St. Paul: Scott-Mitchell Publishing.

Curot, Michel

1911 A Wisconsin Fur-Trader's Journal, 1803-04. *Collections of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin*, 20:396-471. Reuben Gold Thwaites, editor. Madison.

Davidson, Gordon C.

1967 *The North West Company*. New York: Russell and Russell.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 9

Page 6

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Davis, Eliot

1961a Unpublished letter to Russell W. Fridley, Director, Minnesota Historical Society, dated April 6, 1961. Copy in the Grand Portage National Monument Archives, H2215, Historical Research Relating to National Park Service Areas, December 1960-December 1962. Grand Marais, Minnesota.

1961b Unpublished memo to Regional Director, Region Two, dated October 5, 1961. Copy in the Grand Portage National Monument Archives, H2215, Archeological Research Relating to National Park Service Areas (No. 1), July 1960-December 1962. Grand Marais, Minnesota.

1964 Unpublished memo to Regional Director, Midwest Region, dated March 9, 1964. Copy in the Grand Portage National Monument Archives, H2215, Archeological Research Relating to National Park Service Areas (No. 2), January 1963-December 1964. Grand Marais, Minnesota.

Davis, Jessie C.

1968 *Beaver Bay. Original North Shore Village*. Duluth: St. Louis County Historical Society.

Dawson, Kenneth C. A.

1970 Preliminary Archeological Investigations of Fort William in Northwestern Ontario. *Historical Archaeology*, 4:34-50.

Dawson, Samuel J.

1968 *Report on the Exploration of the Country Between Lake Superior and the Red River Settlement, and Between the Latter Place and the Assiniboine and Saskatchewan*. Appendix No. 36. Reprint of 1859 edition. New York: Greenwood Press.

Dewdney, Selwyn

1975 *The Sacred Scrolls of the Southern Ojibway*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Duckworth, Harry W. (editor)

1990 *The English River Book. A North West Company Journal and Account Book of 1786*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Fedje, Daryl W. and Tina Christensen

1999 Modeling Paleoshorelines and Locating Early Holocene Coastal Sites in Haida Gwaii. *American Antiquity* 64(4):635-652.

Fox, William A.

1977 Archeological Investigation of the North West Company Great Hall Cellar, Fort William, 1976. *Data Box, 348. Research Manuscript Series*. Toronto: Historical Planning and Research Branch, Ontario Ministry of Culture and Recreation.

Fridley, Russell W.

1986 Unpublished letter to Randall R. Pope, Acting Regional Director, National Park Service, from Russell W. Fridley, Minnesota State Historic Preservation Officer, dated March 25, 1986. Copy on file at the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office, Minnesota Historical Society (Referral File Number Z-856), St. Paul, Minnesota.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 9

Page 7

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Gates, Charles M. (editor)

1965 *Five Fur Traders of the Northwest*. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society.

Gilfillan, Rev. Joseph A.

1976 Minnesota Geographical Names Derived from the Chippewa Language. *The Minnesota Archaeologist*, 35(4):25-51.

Gilman, Carolyn

1992 *The Grand Portage Story*. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press.

Gilman, Carolyn (editor)

1982 Where Two Worlds Meet. The Great Lakes Fur Trade. *Minnesota Historical Society, Museum Exhibit Series No. 2*. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society.

Gluek, Alvin C., Jr.

1965 *Minnesota and the Manifest Destiny of the Canadian Northwest. A Study in Canadian-American Relations*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Gough, Barry M. (editor)

1988 The Journal of Alexander Henry, The Younger, 1799-1814. Volume I. *Publications of the Champlain Society, LVI*. Toronto: The Champlain Society.

Gower, Calvin W.

1972 The CCC Indian Division: Aid for depressed Americans, 1933-1942. *Minnesota History* 43(1):3-13.

GRPO (Grand Portage National Monument)

2004 *Grand Portage National Monument. Draft Long Range Interpretive Plan*. Grand Portage National Monument: National Park Service.

Gray, John M.

1964 *Lord Selkirk of Red River*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Greenberg, Adolph M. and James Morrison

1982 Group Identities in the Boreal Forest: The Origin of the Northern Ojibwa. *Ethnohistory* 29(2):75-102.

Grout, Frank F., Robert P. Sharp, and George M. Schwartz

1959 The Geology of Cook County Minnesota. *Minnesota Geological Survey, Bulletin 39*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Heldman, Donald P.

1977 Excavations at Fort Michilimackinac, 1976: The Southeast and South Southeast Row Houses. *Archaeological Completion Report Series*, No. 1. Mackinac Island, Michigan: Mackinac Island State Park Commission.

Heldman, Donald P. and Roger T. Grange, Jr.

1981 Excavations at Fort Michilimackinac, 1978-1979: The *Rue de la Babillarde*. *Archaeological Completion Report Series*, No. 1. Mackinac Island, Michigan: Mackinac Island State Park Commission.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 9

Page 8

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Hirth, Kenneth G.

1976 Interregional Trade and the Formation of Prehistoric Gateway Communities. *American Antiquity* 43(1):35-45.

Holder, Preston

1967 The Fur Trade as Seen From the Indian Point of View. *The Frontier Re-examined*. John F. McDermott, editor. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Huggins, Robert, and John W. Weymouth

1979 *A Magnetic Survey of Fort Charlotte, Grand Portage National Monument*. National Park Service. Ms. on file, Midwest Archeological Center, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Innis, Harold A.

1973 *The Fur Trade in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

James, Edwin

1956 *A Narrative of the Captivity and Adventures of John Tanner During Thirty Years Residence Among the Indians in the Interior Parts of North America*. Reprint. Minneapolis: Ross and Haines.

Johnson, Elden

1961 "Interim report on excavations at the Grand Portage National Monument, June 12-July 14, 1961." Unpublished memo to Russell Fridley, Director, Minnesota Historical Society, dated August 16, 1961. Copy in the Grand Portage National Monument Archives, H2215, File No. 1, Grand Marais, Minnesota.

Jones, Bruce A.

1979 "Travel to Fort Charlotte, Grand Portage National Monument, Minnesota, September 10-25, 1979." Unpublished report. National Park Service. Lincoln: Midwest Archeological Center.

1980 *Historic Site Archeology at Fort Charlotte, Grand Portage National Monument*. National Park Service. Ms. on file, Midwest Archeological Center, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Keating, William H.

1959 *Narrative of an Expedition to the Source of St. Peter's River, Lake Winnepeek, Lake of the Woods, &c.* Two Volumes. Reprint. Minneapolis: Ross and Haines.

Kellogg, Louise Phelps

1931 The French Regime in the Great Lakes Country. *Minnesota History* 12(4):347-358

King, Thomas F.

2003 Places That Count. Traditional Cultural Properties in Cultural Resource Management. *Heritage Resource Management Series*. New York: Alta Mira Press.

Knudson, Ruthann, Francis P. McManamon, and J. Emlen Myers

1995 *The Federal Archeology Program: Report to Congress for 1988-90*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 9

Page 9

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Koue, A. Lewis and Erwin N. Thompson

1972 *Historic Structure Report, Warehouse, Grand Portage National Monument, Grand Portage, Minnesota*. National Park Service. Denver Service Center.

Lamb, W. Kaye (editor)

1970 *The Journals and Letters of Sir Alexander Mackenzie*. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada.

Lass, William E.

1977 *Minnesota. A Bicentennial History*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

1980 *Minnesota's Boundary With Canada. Its Evolution Since 1783*. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press.

Lawson, Andrew C.

1893 "Sketch of the Coastal Topography of the North Side of Lake Superior with Special Reference to the Abandoned Strands of Lake Warren." *The Geological and Natural History Survey of Minnesota, Twenty Annual Report for the year 1891*, 181-289. Minneapolis: Harrison & Smith, Printers.

Light, Christopher J.

n.d. *Archeology of Grand Portage National Monument*. Unpublished report. Copy in the Grand Portage National Monument Archives, Grand Marais, Minnesota.

Lofstrom, Edward U.

1975a Synoptic Outline of the Ceramics Recovered from the Grand Portage Kitchen Structure. In *Archeological Excavations at the North West Company's Depot, Grand Portage, Minnesota, in 1970-1971 by the Minnesota Historical Society*, pp.185-226. Alan R. Woolworth, editor. Unpublished, typewritten report prepared for the National Park Service.

1975b Synoptic Outline of Glass Storage Containers from the Grand Portage Kitchen Structure. In *Archeological Excavations at the North West Company's Depot, Grand Portage, Minnesota, in 1970-1971 by the Minnesota Historical Society*, pp.227-250. Alan R. Woolworth, editor. Unpublished, typewritten report prepared for the National Park Service.

Lovis, William A.

1976 Quarter Sections and Forests: An Example of Probability Sampling in the Northeastern Woodlands. *American Antiquity* 41(3):364-372.

Lovisek, Joan A.

1993 The Political Evolution of the Boundary Waters Ojibwa. *Papers of the Algonquian Conference*, 24:280-305. W. Cowan, editor. Ottawa: Carleton University.

Lynott, Mark J.

1983 "Trip Report to Grand Portage including the survey of a proposed footbridge construction site." Unpublished memo report, dated August 9, 1983. Copy in the Grand Portage National Monument Archives, H2217, Fort Charlotte File, Grand Marais, Minnesota.

1988 "Archeological Survey of a Proposed Road Construction Locality at Grand Portage, Minnesota." Manuscript on file, Midwest Archeological Center, Lincoln.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 9

Page 10

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

McDermott, John Francis

1941 A Glossary of Mississippi Valley French, 1673-1850. *Washington University Studies, New Series, Language and Literature*, 12. St. Louis.

McGovern, S. H.

1934 Restoring the Trail of the Voyageurs. *The Minnesota Conservationist*, (January): 12-15.

McLoughlin, Dr. John

n.d. "Description of the Indians from Fort William to Lake of the Woods." *Masson Papers*. McGill University Library, Montreal. [Typed copy in MHS Archives & Manuscripts.]

Madson, John

1982 *Where the Sky Began. Land of the Tallgrass Prairie*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Marschner, F. J.

1974 *Map of the Original Vegetation of Minnesota*. Office of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Masson, L. R (editor).

1960 *Les Bourgeois de la Compagnie du Nord-Ouest*. Two volumes. Reprint Edition. New York: Antiquarian Press.

Maxwell, Moreau S., and Lewis H. Binford

1961 Excavation at Fort Michilimackinac, Mackinaw City, Michigan, 1959 Season. *Publications of the Museum*, Volume 1, Number 1. East Lansing: Michigan State University.

Miller, Catherine S.

1975 Faunal Remains from the Kitchen Structure and Vicinity. In *Archeological Excavations at the North West Company's Depot, Grand Portage, Minnesota, in 1970-1971 by the Minnesota Historical Society*, pp.311-322. Alan R. Woolworth, editor. Unpublished, typewritten report prepared for the National Park Service.

Miller, J. Jefferson, II, and Lyle M. Stone

1970 *Eighteenth-Century Ceramics From Fort Michilimackinac. A Study in Historical Archaeology*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Mission Diary

1849 "Diary of the Mission of the Immaculate Conception of the Jesuit Fathers on Lake Superior Starting in the Year of Our Lord 1848," translated copy in possession of Grand Portage National Monument.

Monk, Susan

1984 "Archeological survey at Grand Portage NM." Unpublished report, date November 5, 1984. National Park Service. Lincoln: Midwest Archeological Center.

Moogk, Peter N.

1977 *Building a House in New France. An Account of the Perplexities of Client and Craftsmen in Early Canada*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 9

Page 11

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Morse, Eric W.

1969 *Fur Trade Canoe Routes of Canada/ Then and Now*. Queen's Printer, Ottawa.

Newman, Peter C.

1985 *Company of Adventurers*. New York: Viking Penguin.

NPS (National Park Service)

2003 *Grand Portage National Monument, Minnesota. Final General Management Plan/ Environmental Impact Statement*. Denver: National Park Service Planning and Design Services, Denver Service Center.

Noble, Vergil E.

1988 Trip Report, Grand Portage National Monument, July 23-August 2, 1998. Unpublished report. National Park Service. Lincoln: Midwest Archeological Center.

1989a *An Archeological Survey of Development Projects Within Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, Minnesota*. National Park Service. Lincoln: Midwest Archeological Center.

1989b Trip Report, Grand Portage National Monument, September 18-29, 1989. Unpublished report. National Park Service. Lincoln: Midwest Archeological Center.

1990 *A Report on Archeological Investigations Within the Grand Portage Depot (21CK6), Grand Portage National Monument, Minnesota: The Kitchen Drainage Project*. National Park Service. Lincoln: Midwest Archeological Center.

Noble, Vergil E. (Cont'd)

1995 Trip Report, Grand Portage, May 15-19, 1995. Unpublished report. National Park Service. Lincoln: Midwest Archeological Center.

1998 Trip Report, Grand Portage National Monument, August 10-14, 1998. Unpublished report. National Park Service. Lincoln: Midwest Archeological Center.

Noël Hume, Ivor

1975 *Historical Archaeology*. New York: W. W. Norton

NRB-15

1991 How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. *National Register Bulletin 15*. Washington: U. S. Department of the Interior.

NRB-36

1993 Guidelines for Evaluating and Registering Historical Archeological Sites and Districts. *National Register Bulletin 36*. Washington: U. S. Department of the Interior.

Nute, Grace Lee

1925 The Voyageur. *Minnesota History* 6(2):155-167.

1932 News and Comments. *Minnesota History* 13(4):432-433.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 9

Page 12

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Nute, Grace Lee (cont'd)

1941a *The Voyageur's Highway. Minnesota's Border Lake Land.* St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society.

1941b Hudson's Bay Company Posts in the Minnesota Country. *Minnesota History* 22(3):270-289.

1944 Lake Superior. *The American Lakes Series.* Milo M. Quaife, editor. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company.

Nute, Grace Lee (editor)

1940 A British Legal Case and Old Grand Portage. *Minnesota History* 21(2):117-148.

Ojakangas, Richard W., and Charles L. Matsch

1982 *Minnesota's Geology.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Owen, David D.

1852 *Report of a Geological Survey of Wisconsin, Iowa, and Minnesota.* Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo.

Parker, John (editor)

1976 *The Journals of Jonathan Carver and Related Documents, 1766-1770.* Bicentennial Edition. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press.

Pendergast, Russell A.

1957 *The XY Company 1798 to 1804.* Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Ottawa.

Phillips, Dr. Brian A. M.

1995 *Grand Portage State Park Geomorphological Features and Potential Archeological Sites. The Identification of Geomorphic Features as a Predictive Model for Archeological Sites in the Minnesota Northshore State Parks.* Unpublished report. Duluth: Archeometry Laboratory, University of Minnesota.

2003 *Geomorphological and Historical Observations in the Grand Portage National Monument. A Report for the National Park Service, Grand Portage National Monument, Grand Marais, Minnesota.* Unpublished report. Thunder Bay: Lakehead University.

Pyne, Stephen J.

1982 *Fire in America. A Cultural History of Wildland and Rural Fire.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Quaife, Milo Milton (editor)

1916 Extracts from Capt. McKay's Journal and Others. *Proceedings of Sixty-Third Annual Meeting,* 186-210. Madison: The State Historical Society of Wisconsin.

Rich, Edwin E.

1959 *The History of the Hudson's Bay Company, 1670-1870.* 2 Volumes. London: The Hudson's Bay Record Society.

1966 *Montreal and the Fur Trade.* Montreal: McGill University Press.

1967 *The Fur Trade and the Northwest to 1857.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 9

Page 13

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Richardson, A. J. H.

1973 A Comparative Historical Study of Timber Building in Canada. *Association for Preservation Technology Bulletin*, 5(3):77-102.

Riley, Robert, Francis R. Roberson, Wilfred D. Logan, and Merrill J. Mattes

1964 *Historic Structures Report, Reconstruction of the North West Company Stockade, Grand Portage National Monument*. National Park Service. Midwest Regional Office, Omaha, Nebraska.

Rubinstein, Mitchell E. and Alan R. Woolworth

1981 The Dakota and Ojibway. *They Chose Minnesota. A Survey of The State's Ethnic Groups*, 17-35. June D. Holmquist, editor. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society.

Sage, Jon

n.d. "The Archeology of Grand Portage." Unpublished report. Copy in the Grand Portage National Monument Archives, Grand Marais, Minnesota.

Schenck, Theresa

1997 "*The Voice of the Crane Echoes Afar.*" *The Sociopolitical Organization of the Lake Superior Ojibwa, 1640-1855*. New York: Garland Publishing.

Schwartz, George M.

1928 The Topography and Geology of the Grand Portage. *Minnesota History*, 9(1):26-30.

Schiffer, Michael B. and George J. Gumerman (editors)

1977 *Conservation Archeology. A Guide for Cultural Resource Management Studies*. New York: Academic Press.

Smith, Alice E.

1985 *From Exploration to Statehood. The History of Wisconsin*, Vol. I. Second Printing. Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin.

Steinbring, Jack

1974 The Preceramic Archaeology of Northern Minnesota. *Aspects of Upper Great Lakes Anthropology. Papers in Honor of Lloyd A. Wilford*, pp. 64-73. Elden Johnson, editor. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society.

Stoltman, James B.

1961 Unpublished letter to Eliot Davis, Superintendent, Grand Portage National Monument, dated September 10, 1961. Copy in the Grand Portage National Monument Archives, H2215, Archeological Research Relating to National Park Service Areas (No. 1), July 1960-December 1962. Grand Marais, Minnesota.

1973 The Laurel Culture in Minnesota. *Minnesota Prehistoric Archaeology Series*, No. 8. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society.

Stone, Lyle M.

1974 *Fort Michilimackinac, 1715-1781: An Archaeological Perspective on the Revolutionary Frontier*. East Lansing: Publications of The Museum, Michigan State University.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 9

Page 14

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Swanson, Mary Towley

1991 Dewey Albinson. The Artist as Chronicler. *Minnesota History* 52(7):264-278.

Tester, John R.

1995 *Minnesota's Natural Heritage. An Ecological Perspective*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Thompson, David

1824 Journal. Reel 5, Series 1, Bound Volume 26 (September 3-5, 1824).

Thompson, Erwin N.

1969 *Grand Portage. A History of the Sites, People, and Fur Trade*. U. S. Department of the Interior. Washington: National Park Service.

1970 *Grand Portage National Monument Great Hall—Historic Structures Report, History Data Section*. U. S. Department of the Interior. Washington: National Park Service.

1973 *Historic Structure Report, Kitchen, Grand Portage National Monument, Minnesota*. National Park Service. Denver Service Center.

Trygg, J. William

1966 *Composite Map of United States Land Surveyors' Original Plats and Field Notes*. Minnesota Series, Sheet 16. Ely Minnesota.

Upham, Warren

1969 *Minnesota Geographic Names. Their Origin and Historic Significance*. Reprint. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society.

Von Graffenried, Lt. Friedrich

[1819?] "Six Years in Canada, 1813-1819. From the diary and travel memoirs of the Lieutenant Friedrich Von Graffenreid." Translated from German into English. Unpublished. Typed copy in the Old Fort William Library, Thunder Bay, Ontario.

Wallace, W. Stewart (editor)

1934 (1968) *Documents Relating to the North West Company*. Reprint edition. New York: Greenwood Press.

Warren, William W.

1957 *History of the Ojibway Nation*. Minneapolis: Ross and Haines.

Webster, Noah

1970 *A Compendious Dictionary of the English Language*. A facsimile of the first (1806) edition, with an introduction by Philip B. Gove. Bounty Books.

Weymouth, John W.

1976 *A Magnetic Survey of the Walth Bay Site (39WW203)*. Midwest Archeological Center. Lincoln: National Park Service.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 9

Page 15

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

WHC
1855-1931 *Collections of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin*. 31 vols. Madison.

Wheeler, Robert C.
1985 *A Toast to the Fur Trade. A Picture Essay on Its Material Culture*. Ardis H. Wheeler, editor. St. Paul: Wheeler Productions.

Wheeler, Robert C. and Alan R. Woolworth
1968 Quetico-Superior Underwater Research Project. *National Geographic Research Reports, 1963 Projects*, pp. 231-239. Washington: National Geographic Society

Wheeler, Robert C., Walter A. Kenyon, Alan R. Woolworth, and Douglas A. Birk
1975 "Voices From the Rapids. An Underwater Search for Fur Trade Artifacts, 1960-73." *Minnesota Historical Archeology Series* No. 3. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society.

White, Bruce M.
1982 Give Us a Little Milk. The Social and Cultural Meanings of Gift Giving in the Lake Superior Fur Trade. *Minnesota History* 48(2):60-71.

1987 A Skilled Game of Exchange. Ojibway Fur Trade Protocol. *Minnesota History* 50(6): 229-240.

2004 *Grand Portage National Monument Historic Documents Study*. Unpublished Report. St. Paul: Turnstone Historical Research

Widder, Keith R.
1981 "Founding La Pointe Mission," *Wisconsin Magazine of History*, 64(3):181-201.

Williams, J. Mark, and Gary Shapiro
1982 A Search for the Eighteenth Century Village at Michilimackinac. A Soil resistivity Survey. *Archaeological Completion Report Series*, Number 4. Mackinac Island, Michigan: Mackinac Island State Park Commission.

Winchell, Newton H.
1893 Newton Winchell's Grand Portage Field Notes, July 29-31, 1893. In *Newton H. Winchell & Family Papers*. Minnesota Historical Society.

Winchell, Newton H. (editor)
1899 The Geology of Minnesota. *The Geological and Natural History Survey of Minnesota, Volume 4 of the Final Report*. St. Paul: Pioneer Press Company.

Woolworth, Alan R.
1962b "Preliminary report on Exploratory Archeological excavations at Grand Portage National Monument, July-August, 1962." Unpublished report. Copy in the Grand Portage National Monument Archives, H2215, Archeological Research Relating to National Park Service Areas (No.1), Grand Marais, Minnesota.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 9

Page 16

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Woolworth, Alan R. (cont'd)

1962c Unpublished letter to Eliot Davis, Superintendent, Grand Portage National Monument, dated August 20, 1962. Copy in the Grand Portage National Monument Archives, H2215, Archeological Research Relating to National Park Service Areas (No. 1), July 1960-December 1962. Grand Marais, Minnesota.

1962d "Summary Statement Concerning Archeological Investigations at Grand Portage, 1962." Unpublished report. Copy in the Grand Portage National Monument Archives, H2215, Archeological Research Relating to National Park Service Areas (No.1), July 1960-December 1962. Grand Marais, Minnesota.

1963 "Archeological Excavations at the Northwest Company's Fur Trade Post, Grand Portage, Minnesota, in 1936-1937 by the Minnesota Historical Society." Unpublished, typewritten report prepared for the National Park Service. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society.

1967 Archeological Excavations at Grand Portage: An 18th Century Fur Trade Metropolis. *The Minnesota Archaeologist*, 29(1):3-17.

1975b "Emergency Field Testing at Grand Portage National Monument, Minnesota, 1975." Copy in the Grand Portage National Monument Archives, H22, Cultural Resource Studies and Research-Resources Management (5). Grand Marais, Minnesota.

1982 The Great Carrying Place. In *Where Two Worlds Meet. The Great Lakes Fur Trade*, 110-115. *Minnesota Historical Society, Museum Exhibit Series No. 2*. Carolyn Gilman, editor. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society.

1993 "An Historical Study of the Grand Portage, Grand Portage National Monument, Minnesota." Unpublished, typewritten report. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society.

Woolworth, Alan R. (compiler)

1962a "Archeological Test Excavations At Grand Portage National Monument, June-September, 1961." Unpublished report compiled from the notes of Dr. Elden Johnson. Copy in the Grand Portage National Monument Archives, H2215, File No. 1, Grand Marais, Minnesota.

Woolworth, Alan R. (editor)

1975a "Archeological Excavations at the North West Company's Depot, Grand Portage, Minnesota, in 1970-1971 by the Minnesota Historical Society." Unpublished, typewritten report prepared for the National Park Service. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society.

Woolworth, Alan R. and Loren C. Johnson

1963 "Summary Statement Concerning the Grand Portage Archeological Project, 1963." Unpublished, typewritten report prepared for the National Park Service. Copy in the Grand Portage National Monument Archives, H2215, Archeological Research Relating to National Park Service Areas (No. 2), Grand Marais, Minnesota.

Woolworth, Alan R. and Nancy L. Woolworth

1982 "Grand Portage National Monument. An Historical Overview and An Inventory of Its Cultural Resources." Two Volumes. Unpublished, typewritten report prepared for the National Park Service. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 9

Page 17

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Woolworth, Nancy L.

1965 The Grand Portage Mission: 1731-1965. *Minnesota History*, 39(8):301-310.

1975 Grand Portage in the Revolutionary War. *Minnesota History*, 44(6):198-208.

1979 Miss Densmore Meets the Ojibwe: Frances Densmore's Ethnomusicology Studies Among the Grand Portage Ojibwe in 1905. *The Minnesota Archaeologist*, 38(3):106-128.

Wright, H. E., Jr.

1972 Physiography of Minnesota. *Geology of Minnesota: A Centennial Volume*, pp. 561-578. St. Paul: Minnesota Geological Survey.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places

Continuation Sheet

Section 10

Page 1

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

10. Geographical Data

UTM References (keyed to attached boundary maps)

FORT CHARLOTTE (Property abutting Pigeon River, west end of the GRPO)

Point	Zone	Easting	Northing
A	16	289041	5320777
B	16	289408	5320768
C	16	289400	5320462
V	16	289393	5320287
W	16	289382	5319957
X	16	288585	5319977
Y	16	288590	5320144

GRAND PORTAGE (Property on Grand Portage Bay, east end of the GRPO)

Point	Zone	Easting	Northing
J	16	299645	5315927
K	16	299664	5315927
L	16	299664	5315956
M	16	300051	5315948
N	16	300047	5315847
O	16	299371	5315209
P	16	299125	5315217
Q	16	299130	5315355
R	16	299213	5315352
S	16	299235	5315748
T	16	299601	5315738
U	16	299603	5315925

GRAND PORTAGE TRAIL (Corridor connecting the east and west ends of the GRPO)

Point	Zone	Easting	Northing	
D	16	294924	5319945	Juncture of Cowboys Road and the Grand Portage Trail
E	16	296054	5319494	Juncture of Old Highway 1 and the Grand Portage Trail
F	16	299381	5316829	Juncture Highway 61 and the Grand Portage Trail
G	16	299440	5316578	Lower Grand Portage Trail (center)
H	16	299460	5316316	Lower Grand Portage Trail (center)
I	16	299514	5316270	Lower Grand Portage Trail (center)

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section 10

Page 2

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

Verbal Boundary Description

The area of the GRPO fronting Grand Portage Bay lies wholly within the S½ Section 4 and the N½ Section 9, Township 63 North, Range 6 East. Beginning at the waterline of Lake Superior, the boundary proceeds north 301.3 feet on the east edge of the SW¼ of the SE¼ of Section 4, west 1,320 feet to the bed of Grand Portage Creek, south 120 feet, west 120 feet, south 660 feet, west 1,200 feet, south 1,316.37 feet, west 275 feet, south 443.63 feet, east 800.21 feet to the waterline of Lake Superior, and thence along the shoreline of the lake to the place of beginning. The rights-of-way for existing Bureau of Indian Affairs roads within the above described parcel of land are excluded therefrom.

The Pigeon River unit of the GRPO, that part surrounding the Fort Charlotte site complex at the west end of the Monument, lies in the NE¼ Section 29, Township 64 North, Range 5 East.

The GRPO also includes the Grand Portage trail, which extends from Lake Superior to the Pigeon River. The portage is protected by a strip of land that is 100 feet wide and centered on the old trail for about a mile from Grand Portage village to U. S. Highway 61. The remainder of the trail, from Highway 61 to Fort Charlotte, is protected by a strip of land 600 feet wide centering on the old trail as delineated on original General Land Office survey maps.

Boundary Justification

The National Register boundaries correspond to the administrative boundaries for the GRPO established by an act of Congress in 1958.

The GRPO administrative boundaries for the Grand Portage trail within Section 4, Township 63 North, Range 6 East are shown incorrectly on the Grand Portage, Minn.-Ont. USGS Quadrangle (1959, Photorevised 1976, 7.5 Minute Series). As shown on the Quad, the portage follows a road within Section 4, not the course of the present trail.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section Additional Documentation

Page 1

Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, MN

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION: PHOTOGRAPHS

The black-and-white photographs numbered 1 through 6 were taken on 17 November 1998 by Douglas A. Birk. The original 35mm negatives are at the Grand Portage National Monument Headquarters in Grand Marais, Minnesota.

Photo No.	Description of View
1	North-northeast view from the top of Mount Rose showing the strategic gap that forms a portal for the Grand Portage trail in the high rock ridges behind Grand Portage Bay.
2	East view from the top of Mount Rose showing the reconstructed North West Company Great Hall (CR-5), kitchen (CR-16) and palisade (CR-19) on the right, the modern NPS parking lot (near center), and shoreline areas of the lakeshore unit east of Grand Portage Creek.
3	West view of Mount Rose taken by the remains of BIA agency building, CR-66 (foreground).
4	North view from area of CR-58, the remains of the BIA School (foundation remains visible in foreground), across the intersection of CSAH 17 and the NPS lakefront service road towards the <i>Holy Rosary Church</i> (on the hill, aside CSAH 17).
5	Southwest view of the old grade and ditches of abandoned road, CR-50, with the palisade (CR-19), the roof of the Great Hall (CR-5), and the south slope of Mount Rose visible in the background. Photo taken in the area of CR-54, the remains of the USID Warehouse.
6	Northwest view of CR-86, the remains of the LaPlante House (depression at middle right) flanked by stored NPS materials at the NPS Boneyard.