

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Department of Historic Resources 2801 Kensington Avenue, Richmond, Virginia 23221

Travis A. Voyles Secretary of Natural and Historic Resources Julie V. Langan Director

Tel: (804) 367-2323 Fax: (804) 367-2391 www.dhr.virginia.go

June 23, 2023

Mr. Andrew Dietrich Dewberry 8401 Arlington Boulevard Fairfax, Virginia 22031

Re: Van Buren Road North Extension Prince William County, Virginia DHR File No. 2021-0073

Dear Mr. Dietrich:

The Department of Historic Resources (DHR) has received for our review and comment additional information regarding avoidance of site 44PW2105 and the effects to historic properties of the above referenced project. Our comments are provided as assistance in meeting the responsibilities under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for Federally funded transportation projects.

DHR understands that the proposed road alignment has been modified to avoid direct impacts to site 44PW2105, a property determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). DHR also understands that the site will be called out for avoidance in construction drawings and marked in the field via orange safety fencing. DHR appreciates Prince William County's work to avoid effects to this resource. A supplemental Phase I survey was completed to encompass areas of the revised Area of Potential Effects (APE) for the new alignment that were not surveyed originally. The results of this investigation, reported via an addendum to the Phase I report, is consistent with applicable standards and guidelines and DHR understands that this survey did not encounter any additional historic properties.

Based on the information provided, DHR concurs that the historic properties in the APE will not be adversely affected by the undertaking. Implementation of the undertaking in accordance with the finding of no adverse effect as documented fulfills the federal agency's responsibilities under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. If for any reason the undertaking is not or cannot be conducted as proposed in the finding, consultation under Section 106 must be reopened.

Thank you for your consideration of historic resources. Please contact me at <u>samantha.henderson@dhr.virginia.gov</u> or (804) 482-6088 if you have any questions or if we may provide any further assistance.

Sincerely,

Samantha Henderson, Archaeologist Review and Compliance Division

Eastern Region Office 2801 Kensington Avenue Richmond, VA 23221 Tel: (804) 367-2323 Fax: (804) 367-2391 Western Region Office 962 Kime Lane Salem, VA 24153 Tel: (540) 387-5443 Fax: (540) 387-5446 Northern Region Office 5357 Main Street PO Box 519 Stephens City, VA 22655 Tel: (540) 868-7029 Fax: (540) 868-7033



8401 Arlington Boulevard Fairfax, VA 22031 703.849.0100 703.849.0118 fax www.dewberry.com

May 23, 2023

Virginia Department of Historic Resources Attn: Ms. Samantha Henderson 2801 Kensington Avenue Richmond, VA 23221

Re: Revised Cultural Resources Determination of Effect for the Proposed Van Buren Road North Extension, Prince William County, Virginia VDOT Project No. 0627-076-321, UPC No. 118643 DHR File #: 2021-0073

Dear Ms. Henderson,

Dewberry Engineers Inc. (Dewberry) on behalf of the Prince William County Department of Transportation and with the support of the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) is providing the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (DHR) information regarding the subject project referenced above. This project is being administered as a Locality Administered Project (LAP) by Prince William County (PWC) and has received funding for the next stage of the project. As this project will utilize federal funding, the locality, on behalf of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and VDOT, is continuing consultation of this undertaking with your office in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), as amended, and its implementing regulations, 36 CFR 800.

Project Description

In accordance with the Revised (2017) Prince William County Comprehensive Plan (PWCCP) and Revised (2016) Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP), the Prince William County (PWC) Department of Transportation is proposing to extend Van Buren Road on new alignment from its existing termini at the intersection with Dumfries Road (Route 234) north for approximately 2.5 miles to a portion of existing Van Buren Road directly south of Cardinal Drive for an additional approximate 0.2 miles. The project would construct a four-lane divided urban collector roadway. Construction of a 10-foot wide shared-use path and a 5-foot wide sidewalk would be included to provide non-motorized transportation alternatives. The project would also include construction of an approximately 235' bridge spanning Powell's Creek perpendicular to the waterway and associated stormwater management facilities. The project area is located in the southeastern region of Prince William County, Virginia (Attachment 1).

Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, we anticipate an Environmental Assessment (EA) will be determined to be the appropriate level of documentation to evaluate the Van Buren Road North Extension project. The proposed EA is being prepared in accordance with FHWA's regulations implementing NEPA (23 CFR §771.119).

Project History, Background, and Previous Coordination

On March 12, 2021, Dewberry initiated consultation with DHR during the scoping phase of the NEPA documentation process. The letter indicated twenty-seven (27) previously recorded archaeological resource sites overlap with the project area. Of those, DHR has already recommended two of the sites as not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), while the remaining sites remain unevaluated. Additionally, an architectural property resides adjacent, but outside of the APE on the project's northern portion. In a letter dated March 30, 2021, DHR provided comments and assigned the following DHR File #: 2021-0073 (Attachment 2).

Dutton + Associates, LLC (Dutton or D+A) conducted a Phase I identification survey for the proposed project in November of 2021, which resulted in the identification of four (4) previously unrecorded sites (44PW2102, 44PW2103, 44PW2104, and 44PW2105). Given the history of site 44PW2104 and 44PW2105 and their spatial relationship, both sites were recommended as potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP. Site 44PW2102 and 44PW2103 were identified as small prehistoric lithic scatters, which were recommended not eligible for listing in the NRHP. Following consultation with PWC and VDOT, a Phase II evaluation survey was undertaken for site 44PW2104 and 44PW2105. Information on site 44PW2104 and 44PW2105 from the Phase II field work can be found in Attachment 2.

Dutton submitted the "Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of the ±37.2 Hectare (±91.8 Acre) Van Buren Road Extension Project Area and Phase II Archaeological Evaluation of Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105" to DHR on August 5, 2022, in support of the Section 106 process for this NEPA study. The report was hand-delivered to DHR per the methods DHR described in the March 30, 2021 scoping response letter. Comments were received from DHR on September 6, 2022. DHR concurred that site 44PW2102 and 44PW2103 are not eligible for listing in the NRHP, site 44PW2104 required additional information to assess eligibility for listing in the NRHP, and site 44PW2105 is eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion D, with recommended avoidance. Dutton submitted a revised "Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of the ±37.2 Hectare (±91.8 Acre) Van Buren Road Extension Project Area and Phase II Archaeological Evaluation of Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105" to DHR on October 13, 2022, to further support the Section 106 process for this NEPA study. Comments on the revised submission were received from DHR on November 9, 2022 (Attachment 2). DHR concurred that Site 44PW2104 is not eligible for listing in the NRHP after review of the supplemental information provided.

On November 11, 2022, Dewberry submitted a review package to DHR requesting concurrence to utilize controlled site burial on a portion of site 44PW2105, as we believed this would protect the resource in place. We also requested DHR's concurrence with a no adverse effect determination for the proposed controlled site burial approach for site 44PW2105 and the ineligibility for NRHP listing of other identified resources in the project's Area of Potential Effects (Attachment 2).

On December 16th, 2022, a response to the concurrence request indicated that DHR did not concur with the recommendation for intentional site burial, citing concerns about adverse effects to site 44PW2105 from subsequent construction and compaction of the resource from the roadway design as proposed. Further consultation with DHR was suggested.

A meeting was held with the DHR, PWC, VDOT, Dutton, and Dewberry on January 20, 2023 to discuss the comments received from DHR and proposed alternatives to further avoid site 44PW2105. This meeting was held with the understanding that DHR may provide comments and guidance, however, no determinations would be made until a revised submittal was made to DHR. In addition to previously communicated concerns regarding site compaction, DHR voiced concern about future access to the site and potential for preventative steps to be taken during construction (e.g. leaving the site forested, fencing off the site). Potential shifts to the proposed alignment and relocation of a stormwater management facility was discussed, and it was agreed that the design team would look further into avoidance of the resource and potential implications of alignment shifts and needs for further Phase 1 surveys.

Revised Treatment of Archeological Sites & Supplemental Phase 1 Survey

In response to the feedback received during the January meeting with DHR, the proposed Van Buren Road alignment was shifted approximately 170' to the west to move the road completely off site 44PW2105 (See Attachment 4 with proposed shifted alignment shown in black and original design shown in purple). This was done by reducing the radius of the curve to the south of the site and then running the alignment along a straight tangent (west of site 44PW2105) until it tied in with the curve to the north of the site. The design was modified without infringing upon the VDOT design guidelines for a 40-mph GS-7 roadway (Urban Collector VDOT designation). Through shifting the alignment, the entire roadway footprint avoids impact to site 44PW2105. In addition, the roadway profile was adjusted so that the proposed elevation of the roadway adjacent to site 44PW2105 is very close to the existing ground elevation. This allows the limits of



construction through this area in question to tie out quickly and provide an approximate 10' buffer between the outer limits of site 44PW2105 and the construction limits of the roadway.

The proposed shift in alignment resulted in limits of disturbance that extended outside of the original area of investigation for the Phase 1 Cultural Resources survey performed for the project. In order to confirm that the new alignment was not impacting any previously unidentified archaeological resources, Dutton performed a supplemental Phase 1 cultural resource survey of the expanded right-of-way in April of 2023. No additional cultural resources were identified in the expanded survey area, and it is Dutton's recommendation that no further archaeological or architectural surveys are warranted in the expanded right-of-way. Prince William County and VDOT concur with the findings of the supplemental survey. A copy of Dutton's report for the supplemental survey, entitled "Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of a Proposed Realignment of the Van Buren Road Expansion Project", is included here as Attachment 3.

Revised Request for DHR Review and Concurrence

As currently proposed, the footprint of the Van Buren Road Extension North project has been shifted to avoid site 44PW2105. We believe the roadway design as currently shown will avoid all potential adverse effects to the resource. We are requesting DHR's concurrence with a no adverse effect determination resulting from the proposed avoidance of site 44PW2105 and the absence of other NRHP eligible resources in the project's Area of Potential Effects. Site 44PW2015 will be protected during construction activities by installing orange safety fencing around the limits of the resource and the resource will also be marked on the construction plans to prohibit inadvertent impacts to the site. The orange safety fencing will be maintained for the duration of the construction of the project. Upon project completion, the orange safety fencing will be removed. Exhibits of the surveyed areas and the proposed revised Van Buren Road North Extension alignment are attached, as well as proposed roadway plans detailing the roadway design adjacent to the resource (Attachment 4).

Should you need any additional information or have any questions feel free to contact me at Beth Patrizzi at <u>bpatrizzi@dewberry.com</u> or 703.698.9069 or Andrew Dietrich at <u>adietrich@dewberry.com</u> or 703.849.0351.

Sincerely, Dewberry Engineers Inc. Beth J. Patrizzi DN C-US, E-opatrizzi@dewbery.com, O-Dewbery Engineers Inc. OU-1661, Reason 1 am the author of this document DN C-US, E-opatrizzi@dewbery.com, Calibrian Status Reason 1 am the author of this document

Beth J. Patrizzi Senior Environmental Scientist

- Encl: Attachment 1: Project Area Figure
 Attachment 2: Previous DHR Comment and Coordination Letters
 Attachment 3: Dutton + Associates Phase I Supplemental Memo and Map
 Attachment 4: Design Plan View, Design Profile View, Design Cross Section
- cc: John Simkins, FHWA Eric Rothermel FHWA Sherry Djouharian, PWC DOT Justin Patton, PWC Archaeologist Thomas Wasaff, VDOT Environmental Anissa Brown, VDOT Environmental Raymond Ezell, VDOT Environmental





Miles



0.25

0.5

Figure 1. Study Area for the Van Buren Road Extension Project.

March 2021



703.849.0100 703.849.0118 fax www.dewberry.com

March 12, 2021

Virginia Department of Historic Resources Ms. Julie Langan, Director 2801 Kensington Avenue Richmond, VA 23221

Re: Proposed Van Buren North Extension Project: From Existing Van Buren Road & Dumfries Road (Route 234) Intersection to the Existing Van Buren Road South of Cardinal Drive in Prince William County, Virginia.

Dear Ms. Julie Langan:

The Prince William County Department of Transportation is proposing to extend Van Buren Road from its existing termini at the intersection with Dumfries Road (Route 234) north for approximately 2.5 miles to a portion of existing Van Buren Road directly south of Cardinal Drive. Figure 1 is enclosed, and it provides a map of the proposed study area. Dewberry, on behalf of the Prince William County Department of Transportation, is in the process of preparing a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document, given the potential for federal funding, and future permitting.

The purpose of the project is to improve accessibility to Route 234 by providing an important bypass for local and regional traffic and reduce congestion along parallel facilities including I-95 and Route 1 by proving an alternate route for vehicle traffic between Dale Boulevard and Route 234. This connection would provide for better connections to local schools, residential areas, and churches surrounding the project area (Figure 1.). As part of the Prince William County Comprehensive Plan, this project would further efforts by the County to ensure adequate transportation facilities exist to serve the mobility needs of residents, visitors, and businesses.

The roadway would be designed as a 4-lane divided major collector facility with shared-use path and sidewalk facilities. The project also includes a bridge over Powell's Creek. The roadway type and characteristics are confirmed with the Revised 2016 Prince William County Comprehensive Plan.

Twenty-seven (27) previously recorded archaeological resource sites are located within the project area. Two of the archaeological sites have been recommended not eligible for National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) listing while the remaining sites remain unevaluated. An architectural site resides adjacent to the northern portion of the project area but is outside of the project area and no impacts to this architectural site are anticipated. DHR confirmation will be acquired. A Phase 1 Cultural Resources Survey will be completed to support the project's NEPA document. No impacts to 4(f) or 6 (f) properties are anticipated. An ePIX report has been started for this project (DHR File # 2021-3407). Additionally, FHWA sent out Tribal consultation letters on March 11, 2021 and can be provided upon request. Attached to this letter is the VCRIS Maps and records of the sites within the project area for your reference, the associated reports can be provided upon request.

To assist us in identifying environmental impacts, constraints, or other concerns that may affect design and construction of this project, please provide us with any comments or concerns that your agency may have regarding impacts to resources under your agency's jurisdiction.

We look forward to receiving your comments on this project. Please submit comments and information within 30 days from the date of receipt or April 19th, 2021 at the latest. Thank you in advance for your assistance. If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me at (703) 849-0175, by email at kdonovan@dewberry.com, or at the following address:

Kelly Donovan Environmental Scientist Dewberry Engineers Inc. 8401 Arlington Boulevard Fairfax, Virginia 22031

Sincerely, Dewberry Engineers Inc.

Kellyt

Kelly Donovan Environmental Scientist

Enclosure: Figure 1 – Study Area

cc: Sherry Djouharian, Prince William County Department of Transportation Dagmawie Shikurye, Prince William County Department of Transportation Mark Brewer, Dewberry Engineers Inc. Beth Moyer, Dewberry Engineers Inc.

Dewberry



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Department of Historic Resources

2801 Kensington Avenue, Richmond, Virginia 23221

Matt Strickler Secretary of Natural Resources Julie V. Langan Director

Tel: (804) 367-2323 Fax: (804) 367-2391 www.dhr.virginia.gov

30 March 2021

Ms Kelly Donovan Dewberry Engineering Inc. 8401 Arlington Boulevard Fairfax, Virginia 22031

Re: Extension of Van Buren Road Prince William County DHR File # 2021-0073

Dear Ms Donovan:

The Department of Historic Resources (DHR) has received your 12 March 2021 letter initiation consultation with our office regarding the above referenced project. It is our understanding that Prince William County proposes to extend Van Buren Road from its existing termini at the intersection with Dumfries Road (Route 234) north for approximately 2.5 miles to a portion of existing Van Buren Road directly south of Cardinal Drive.

Your 12 March correspondence states there are twenty-seven (27) previously recorded archaeological sites within the project area of potential effects (APE). Of those, DHR has already recommended two of the sites as not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), while the remaining twenty-five sites remain unevaluated. Additionally, one known architectural property adjacent, but outside of the APE on the project's northern portion. The initiation letter mentions Prince William County will complete a Phase I cultural resources survey for the undertaking. Please provide one hard copy archival copy and one electronic copy on disc of the Phase I survey report and associated survey forms per our Survey Guidelines to DHR for our review and comment when available.

We note that a draft application for this undertaking was created in our ePix electronic system. The DHR requests this draft ePix application be deleted and all further correspondence and submissions for this project to DHR be provided to us hard copy and under the above referenced DHR File Number.

If you have any questions regarding our comments, please contact me at (804) 482-6090.

Sincerely, na

Mare Holma, Architectural Historian Division of Review and Compliance

Administrative Services 10 Courthouse Ave. Petersburg, VA 23803 Tel: (804) 862-6408 Fax: (804) 862-6196 Eastern Region Office 2801 Kensington Avenue Richmond, VA 23221 Tel: (804) 367-2323 Fax: (804) 367-2391 Western Region Office 962 Kime Lane Salem, VA 24153 Tel: (540) 387-5443 Fax: (540) 387-5446 Northern Region Office 5357 Main Street PO Box 519 Stephens City, VA 22655 Tel: (540) 868-7029 Fax: (540) 868-7033



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Department of Historic Resources

2801 Kensington Avenue, Richmond, Virginia 23221

Travis A. Voyles Acting Secretary of Natural and Historic Resources Julie V. Langan Director Tel: (804) 482-6446 Fax: (804) 367-2391 www.dhr.virginia.gov

6 September 2022

Ms Beth Patrizzi Dewberry Engineering Inc. 8401 Arlington Boulevard Fairfax, Virginia 22031

Re: Extension of Van Buren Road—Phase I Cultural Resource Survey and Phase II of Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105, Prince William County DHR File # 2021-0073

Dear Ms Patrizzi:

The Department of Historic Resources (DHR) has received for our review and comment the report "Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of the ± 37.2 Hectare (± 91.8 Acre) Van Buren Road Extension Project Area and Phase II Archaeological Evaluation of Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105" (August 2022) prepared by Dutton and Associates. Based on the information provided, it is DHR's opinion that this investigation and its report, primarily the Phase II evaluation of 44PW2104 and 44PW2105, fail to meet applicable standards and guidelines.

The documentation in the report shows techniques which are inconsistent with standard archaeological field practice and minimum standards for documentation of archaeological data. Generally, a majority of the field investigation photos are blurry and/or out of focus. Every Phase I STP photo is taken too close to the STP to show the soil stratigraphy and lacks a scale. The field excavation techniques depicted in many of the profile and test unit photos from the Phase II evaluations appear to be inconsistent with standard archaeological practice, exhibited by messy test units covered in loose soil and with sloping/messily cut walls. Many of the Phase II profile photos lack a scale and are poor quality.

The stratigraphy exhibited in the profile photos for both sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105 is more complex than is reflected in both the profile drawings and the excavation techniques. As an example, Test Unit (TU) 2 within site 44PW2104 (figures 9-7 and 9-8) clearly show an upper stratum on dark brown loamy soil

Western Region Office 962 Kime Lane Salem, VA 24153 Tel: (540) 387-5443 Fax: (540) 387-5446 Northern Region Office 5357 Main Street PO Box 519 Stephens City, VA 22655 Tel: (540) 868-7029 Fax: (540) 868-7033 Eastern Region Office 2801 Kensington Avenue Richmond, VA 23221 Tel: (804) 367-2323 Fax: (804) 367-2391 Page 2 6 September 2022 Ms Beth Patrizzi

which has a sharp transition to a light reddish-brown clayey soil halfway through the profile. The profile drawing and narrative contend that this unit exhibited a single A Horizon stratum of 30 cm thick topsoil. This interpretation is clearly inconsistent with the soils shown in the field and incorrect. The stratigraphy in TU 1 of site 44PW2105 is similarly described as a single 60cm thick stratum of topsoil over subsoil with no cultural features, is depicted as such in the profile drawing, and was excavated in the field as one monolithic stratum. The soils shown in the profile photo clearly show several distinct strata, likely feature fill, and the adjacent unit (TU 3) contains feature fill which extends into TU 1. All of these potential feature strata have been lumped into one "A Horizon" stratum. The DHR is concerned that this issue, which is present in almost every test unit excavated during this Phase II evaluation of sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105, shows a lack of a basic understanding of soil stratigraphy and stratigraphic excavation technique.

On a more editorial note, DHR requests that the consultant include the counts of bone in the artifact tables. Regarding the Phase I portion of the report DHR requests that, when an archaeological site is present, one of the representative STP profiles and photo included in the report be from within the site. The discussion of Area D, specifically when discussing the identification of sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105, is confusingly worded. Due to the wording of the narrative combined with a difficult to follow numbering system for the STP transects, it is difficult to understand what site the consultant is discussing throughout the narrative. We note that the number of positive STPs in the narrative for site 44PW2104 is inconsistent with the mapping. Finally, DHR requests the report include information regarding the staff who completed/oversaw this work in the field, not just the Principal Investigator.

At this point, the consultant cannot reverse the excavations that have already taken place or correct the problems in the field excavation and field documentation techniques. These issues hamper the ability to delineate most of the artifacts excavated stratigraphically within the sites and limit our full understanding of these resources. We recommend the consultant revise the report to fully describe and more correctly interpret the stratigraphy shown in the field. The DHR requests that revised profile drawings more accurately reflect the variations in the natural stratigraphy, not be created by drawing a straight line between either ends of the unit profile.

Despite the above noted deficiencies, DHR believes there is sufficient information provided to discuss the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations for the four archaeological sites (44PW2102, 44PW2103, 44PW2104, and 44PW2105) identified during the Phase I. Based on the information provided, DHR concurs with the consultant's recommendation that sites 44PW2102 and 44PW2103 are not eligible for listing in the NRHP. We also concur sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105 are potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP.

On 1 September 2022 the report and its recommendations regarding the NRHP eligibility of sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105 were presented to the Archaeological Subcommittee of our Department's National Register Evaluation Committee. It is the Committee's opinion that the documentation provided is insufficient to formally assess site 44PW2104 for its eligibility for listing in the NRHP. Regarding site 44PW2105, while DHR notes significant issues with the documentation and interpretation of the soil stratigraphy at this site, it is the Committee's opinion that sufficient information was provided to concur

Page 3 6 September 2022 Ms Beth Patrizzi

with the consultant's recommendation that site 44PW2105 is eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion D. DHR recommends avoidance of this resource.

If you have any questions regarding our comments, please contact me at (804) 482-6090.

Sincerely,

Marc Holma, Architectural Historian Division of Review and Compliance



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Department of Historic Resources

2801 Kensington Avenue, Richmond, Virginia 23221

Travis A. Voyles Acting Secretary of Natural and Historic Resources

Julie V. Langan Director Tel: (804) 482-6446 Fax: (804) 367-2391 www.dhr.virginia.gov

9 November 2022

Ms Beth Patrizzi Dewberry Engineering Inc. 8401 Arlington Boulevard Fairfax, Virginia 22031

Re: Extension of Van Buren Road—Revised Phase I Cultural Resource Survey and Phase II of Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105, Prince William County DHR File # 2021-0073

Dear Ms Patrizzi:

The Department of Historic Resources (DHR) has received for our review and comment the revised report "Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of the ± 37.2 Hectare (± 91.8 Acre) Van Buren Road Extension Project Area and Phase II Archaeological Evaluation of Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105" (August 2022) prepared by Dutton and Associates. The report was revised in response to DHR's comments dated 6 September 2022. The revisions included revised profile drawings and soil descriptions for sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105 as well as clarifications in the Phase I mapping. While some of DHR's previously expressed concerns regarding the field documentation could not be addressed as the fieldwork had already been completed, the revisions adequately address DHR's concerns regarding the report. It is DHR's opinion that the report generally meets applicable standards and guidelines and DHR accepts the report as a reasonable and good faith effort to identify historic properties

On 4 November 2022 the report and its recommendations regarding the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility of sites 44PW2104 were presented to the Archaeological Subcommittee of our Department's National Register Evaluation Committee. Based on the information provided, the Committee concurred with the consultant's recommendation that site 44PW2104 is not eligible for listing in the NRHP. Please note that the disc containing the electronic version of the report was corrupted. Please provide to DHR a new disc with the report on it.

If you have any questions regarding our comments, please contact me at (804) 482-6090.

Sincerely. ma

Marc Holma, Architectural Historian Division of Review and Compliance

Western Region Office 962 Kime Lane Salem, VA 24153 Tel: (540) 387-5443 Fax: (540) 387-5446 Northern Region Office 5357 Main Street PO Box 519 Stephens City, VA 22655 Tel: (540) 868-7029 Fax: (540) 868-7033

Eastern Region Office 2801 Kensington Avenue Richmond, VA 23221 Tel: (804) 367-2323 Fax: (804) 367-2391

C: Mr. David Dutton, Dutton + Associates



703.849.0100 703.849.0118 fax www.dewberry.com

November 17, 2022

Virginia Department of Historic Resources Attn: Mr. Marc Holma 2801 Kensington Avenue Richmond, VA 23221

Re: Cultural Resources Determination of Effect for the Proposed Van Buren Road North Extension, Prince William County, Virginia VDOT Project No. 0627-076-321, UPC No. 118643 DHR File #: 2021-0073

Dear Mr. Holma,

Dewberry Engineers Inc. (Dewberry) on behalf of the Prince William County Department of Transportation and with the support of the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) is providing the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (DHR) information regarding the subject project referenced above. This project is being administered as a Locality Administered Project (LAP) by Prince William County (PWC) and has received funding for the next stage of the project. As this project will utilize federal funding, the locality, on behalf of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and VDOT, is coordinating this undertaking with your office in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), as amended, and its implementing regulations, 36 CFR 800.

Project Description

In accordance with the Revised (2017) Prince William County Comprehensive Plan (PWCCP) and Revised (2016) Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP), the Prince William County (PWC) Department of Transportation is proposing to extend Van Buren Road on new alignment from its existing termini at the intersection with Dumfries Road (Route 234) north for approximately 2.5 miles to a portion of existing Van Buren Road directly south of Cardinal Drive for an additional approximate 0.2 miles. The project would construct a four-lane divided urban collector roadway. Construction of a 10-foot wide shared-use path and a 5-foot wide sidewalk would be included to provide non-motorized transportation alternatives. The project would also include construction of an approximately 235' bridge spanning Powell's Creek perpendicular to the waterway and associated stormwater management facilities. The project area is located in the southeastern region of Prince William County, Virginia (Attachment 1).

Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, we anticipate an Environmental Assessment (EA) will be determined to be the appropriate level of documentation to evaluate the Van Buren Road North Extension project. The proposed EA is being prepared in accordance with FHWA's regulations implementing NEPA (23 CFR §771.119).

Treatment of Archeological Sites

On March 12, 2021, Dewberry initiated consultation with DHR during the scoping phase of the NEPA documentation process. The letter indicated twenty-seven (27) previously recorded archaeological resource sites overlap with the project area. Of those, DHR has already recommended two of the sites as not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), while the remaining sites remain unevaluated. Additionally, an architectural property resides adjacent, but outside of the APE on the project's northern portion. In a letter dated March 30, 2021, DHR provided comments and assigned the following DHR File #: 2021-0073 (Attachment 2).

As further detailed in Attachment 3, Dutton + Associates, LLC (Dutton or D+A) conducted a Phase I identification survey for the proposed project in November of 2021, which resulted in the identification of four (4) previously unrecorded sites (Field Sites 1-4). Given the history of Field Sites #1 and #2 and their spatial relationship, both sites were recommended as potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP. Field Sites #3 and #4 were identified as small prehistoric lithic scatters, which were recommended not eligible for listing in the NRHP. Following consultation with PWC and VDOT, a Phase II evaluation survey was undertaken for Field Sites #1 and #2. Information on Field Site #1 and #2 from the Phase II field work can be found below:

<u>Field Site #1 (Site #44PW2104)</u> does not possess new or important archaeological data that can contribute to a greater understanding of the site's and/or region's history beyond what the documentary record has already provided. As such, it is D+A's recommendation that Field Site #1 is not eligible for listing in the NRHP.

Given the presence of significant archaeological deposits with intact soils and structural remains, <u>Field Site #2 (Site #44PW2105)</u> contains important archaeological data that can contribute to a greater understanding of domestic occupation at the site and in the region in the mid-eighteenth century. The site contains no above ground elements or related landscape features. It is D+A's recommendation that Field Site #2 is eligible for listing in the NRHP under criterion D.

In advance of the Phase I and II report, Dutton provided a Treatment of Archaeological Sites summary which includes additional details on Field Sites #1 and #2 and recommended site treatment (Attachment 3).

Dutton submitted the "Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of the ±37.2 Hectare (±91.8 Acre) Van Buren Road Extension Project Area and Phase II Archaeological Evaluation of Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105" to DHR on August 5, 2022, in support of the Section 106 process for this NEPA study. The report was hand-delivered to DHR per the methods DHR described in the March 30, 2021 scoping response letter. Comments were received from DHR on September 6, 2022 (Attachment 5):

<u>Site #44PW2104 (Field Site #1):</u> A meeting was held with DHR, Dutton, and Dewberry to discuss the comments and to ensure all DHR recommendations were being addressed. Revisions to the report would include additional details and clarifications on Site #44PW2104 to allow for eligibility concurrence (recommended Not Eligible).

<u>Site #44PW2105 (Field Site #2):</u> DHR confirmed concurrence with the recommendation that Site #44PW2105 is eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion D. In addition, DHR recommended avoidance of the resource.

Dutton submitted the revised "Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of the ±37.2 Hectare (±91.8 Acre) Van Buren Road Extension Project Area and Phase II Archaeological Evaluation of Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105" to DHR on October 13, 2022, to further support the Section 106 process for this NEPA study. Comments were received from DHR on November 9, 2022 (Attachment 5):

<u>Site #44PW2104 (Field Site #1):</u> DHR confirmed concurrence with the recommendation that Site 44PW2104 is not eligible for listing in the NRHP.

Avoidance alternatives considered for Site #44PW2105, including alignment shifts, were significantly limited. Alternatives were reviewed for impacts to natural resources, sensitive environmental areas, adjacent communities, future access to adjacent parcels, alignment constraints presented by the existing electrical transmission lines, a proposed Prince William County Service Authority pump station, and federal right-of-way for I-95. Due to these identified constraints, it was determined that complete avoidance of Site #44PW2105 was not practicable.

Given the well-defined nature of the site and its position on the landform, controlled site burial was determined to be the most practicable alternative that minimized direct effects to Site #44PW2105. It is



anticipated that the incorporation of controlled site burial of Site #44PW2105 will not diminish the aspects of historic integrity that qualifies this site for the NRHP and will avoid any adverse effect from this undertaking (project) to historic archaeological properties. Proposed construction at the location of Site #44PW2105 would entail preserving the resource underneath approximately 7 feet of fill as shown in the attached figures. No excavation or removal of soil from within the limits of Site #44PW2105would be required for the construction of the proposed road. Additionally, the stormwater management pond shown directly adjacent and to the west of Site 44PW2105 (Attachment 4) would be relocated to the north, outside of the sites limits. All proposed drainage facilities (including inlets, pipes, and ditches) within the proposed Site #44PW2105limits would be located on the east side of the road where Site #44PW2105 is under a larger amount of fill so as to prevent excavation or soil removal from Site #44PW2105.

As currently proposed, though the footprint of the Van Buren Road Extension North project overlaps a portion of Site #44PW2105, we believe the resource would be protected in place by a controlled site burial approach. We are requesting DHR's concurrence with a no adverse effect determination as a result of the proposed controlled site burial approach for Site #44PW2105 and the ineligibility for NRHP listing of other identified resources in the project's Area of Potential Effects. Exhibits of the surveyed areas and the proposed Van Buren Road North Extension alignment are attached, as well as proposed roadway plans detailing the crossing area (Attachment 4).

Should you need any additional information or have any questions feel free to contact me at Beth Patrizzi at <u>bpatrizzi@dewberry.com</u> or 703.698.9069 or Andrew Dietrich at <u>adietrich@dewberry.com</u> or 703-849-0351.

Sincerely, Dewberry Engineers Inc.

Beth J. Patrizzi Senior Environmental Scientist

- Encl: Attachment 1: Project Area Figure Attachment 2: DHR Scoping Materials Attachment 3: Dutton + Associates Summary and Recommendation Attachment 4: Design Plan View, Design Profile View, Design Cross Section Attachment 5: DHR Comment and Concurrence Letters Attachment 6: Site Burial Protocol
- cc: John Simpkins, FHWA Eric Rothermel FHWA Sherry Djouharian, PWC DOT Justin Patton, PWC Archaeologist Thomas Wasaff, VDOT Environmental Anissa Brown, VDOT Environmental Raymond Ezell, VDOT Environmental





COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Department of Historic Resources

2801 Kensington Avenue, Richmond, Virginia 23221

Travis A. Voyles Acting Secretary of Natural and Historic Resources Julie V. Langan Director Tel: (804) 482-6446 Fax: (804) 367-2391 www.dhr.virginia.gov

16 December 2022

Ms. Beth Patrizzi Dewberry Engineering Inc. 8401 Arlington Boulevard Fairfax, Virginia 22031

Re:

Extension of Van Buren Road—Determination of Effect Prince William County DHR File # 2021-0073

Dear Ms Patrizzi:

The Department of Historic Preservation (DHR) has received your request for our review and comment on the determination of effect for the above referenced project. Based on the information provided, DHR does not concur with Prince William County's recommendation that intentional site burial beneath seven feet of fill and a four-line urban road will not adversely affect Site 44PW2105, a property determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. It is our opinion that burial in place would inevitably result in construction and long-term compaction impacts on the site. Therefore, it is DHR's opinion the construction of Van Buren Road North Extension as currently designed will result in an adverse effect to Site 44PW2105. Additionally, we believe archaeological data recovery would be the most appropriate mitigation measure for this resource. Please continue to consult with us in order either find alternatives that avoid adversely affecting Site 44PW2105 or to develop a Memorandum of Agreement to address the adverse effect.

If you have any questions regarding our comments, please contact me at (804) 482-6090.

Sincerely, Han

Mard Holma, Senior Architectural Historian Division of Review and Compliance

C: Mr. David Dutton, Dutton + Associates

Western Region Office 962 Kime Lane Salem, VA 24153 Tel: (540) 387-5443 Fax: (540) 387-5446 Northern Region Office 5357 Main Street PO Box 519 Stephens City, VA 22655 Tel: (540) 868-7029 Fax: (540) 868-7033 Eastern Region Office 2801 Kensington Avenue Richmond, VA 23221 Tel: (804) 367-2323 Fax: (804) 367-2391



Dutton + Associates

DATE > May 2023

PREPARED FOR > Dewberry Engineers, Inc.

PREPARED BY > Dutton + Associates, LLC

PHASE I CULTURAL RESOURCE SURVEY OF A PROPOSED REALIGNMENT OF THE VAN BUREN ROAD EXPANSION PROJECT

PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY, VIRGINIA

Prepared For: Dewberry Engineers, Inc. 8401 Arlington Boulevard Fairfax, Virginia 22031

PREPARED BY: DUTTON + ASSOCIATES, LLC 1115 CROWDER DRIVE MIDLOTHIAN, VIRGINIA 23113 804.897.1960

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: DAVID H. DUTTON, M.A.

MAY 2023

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	
2. Research Design	
Archival Research and Context Development	2-1
Field Survey	2-1
Report and Record Preparation	
Qualifications and Standards	
3. ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY RESULTS	
Pedestrian Survey	
Subsurface Survey	
4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
APPENDIX A: RESUMES	A-1

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1: Aerial image illustrating the proposed realignment and expanded ROW (green) a	nd
the original ROW limits (red). Source: ROW file data provided by Dewberry	. 1-2
Figure 1-2: USGS topographic map illustrating the proposed realignment and expanded ROV	N
(green) and the original ROW limits (red). Source: ROW file data provided by	
Dewberry	. 1-2
Figure 3-1: General view of terrain and vegetation in the southern portion of the ROW	
expansion area facing north.	. 3-1
Figure 3-2: General view of terrain and vegetation in the northern portion of the ROW	
expansion area facing south	. 3-2
Figure 3-3: representative view of domestic debris disposal observed in the ROW expansion	
area	. 3-2
Figure 3-4: Plan view of shovel test excavations in the ROW expansion area.	. 3-4
Figure 3-5: Soil profile of Shovel Test F10.	. 3-5

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

1. INTRODUCTION

In April 2023, Dutton + Associates, LLC (D+A), working under contract to Dewberry Engineers, Inc. (Dewberry), conducted a Phase I cultural resources survey of an expanded right-of-way (ROW) associated with a proposed realignment of the Van Buren Road Expansion project in Prince William County, Virginia (project area) (Figures 1-1 and 1-2). The expanded ROW is ± 2.34 hectares (± 5.78 acres). The proposed realignment is in response to avoidance measures currently planned for archaeological Site 44PW2105, which was identified during Phase I cultural resource survey of the original proposed Van Buren Road Expansion project alignment. The following document was prepared as an addendum to the Phase I identification survey report for Van Buren Road Extension project area titled, *Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the* ± 37.2 -*Hectare* (± 91.8 -*Acre) Van Buren Road Extension Project Area and Phase II Archaeological Evaluation of Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105* (Dutton 2022).

The Phase I cultural resource survey was conducted for planning purposes in order to confirm the presence or absence of cultural resources located within or immediately adjacent to the project area in order to make recommendations regarding their eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). All research, fieldwork, and recording conducted as part of these investigations conform to the guidance specified in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation (Federal Register 48:44716-44742, September 29, 1983), and the Virginia Department of Historic Resources' (VDHR) Guidelines for Conducting Historic Resources Survey in Virginia (rev. 2017).

Principal investigators meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (48 FR 44716) for archaeology, history, architecture, architectural history, or historic architecture. David H. Dutton, M.A. served as the Principal Investigator, oversaw archaeological investigations, and coauthored the report. Copies of all field notes, maps, correspondence, and research materials are on file at D+A's main office in Midlothian, Virginia.



Figure 1-1: Aerial image illustrating the proposed realignment and expanded ROW (green) and the original ROW limits (red). Source: ROW file data provided by Dewberry



Figure 1-2: USGS topographic map illustrating the proposed realignment and expanded ROW (green) and the original ROW limits (red). Source: ROW file data provided by Dewberry

2. RESEARCH DESIGN

The Phase I cultural resource survey of the project area was undertaken in order to confirm the existing condition of the property, note any surface evidence of cultural activity, recommend and implement an appropriate survey methodology for the property based upon the results of the background research and field reconnaissance, and identify the presence or absence of cultural resources on the property. The background research, field reconnaissance, and field survey methodologies are summarized below.

ARCHIVAL RESEARCH AND CONTEXT DEVELOPMENT

For the purposes of this addendum, the archival research and historic context developed for the Phase I report for the Van Buren Road Extension project was used and is incorporated herein by reference.

FIELD SURVEY

Architectural Resources

No buildings or structures are located within or immediately adjacent to the project area; therefore, no additional architectural survey was conducted of the project area specifically. The results of the Phase I architectural survey for the Van Buren Road Extension, which included survey of all buildings and structures 50 years or age or older located within and adjacent to the project area was used for the purposes of assessing impacts and is included herein by reference.

Archaeological Resources

At the outset of field investigations, a pedestrian survey of the project area was conducted to document existing conditions and to note surface evidence of cultural activity or material and identify areas with the potential for intact subsurface archaeological resources. Following the pedestrian survey, systematic shovel testing was conducted within those portions of the project area that had potential for buried archaeological deposits. Shovel test placement was avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water saturated soils at the time of the survey. Shovel tests were excavated at a maximum of 15-meter (50-foot) intervals along transects spaced 15 meters (50 feet) apart. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 38 centimeters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests in each direction were documented. Shovel testing did not occur outside of the limits of the expanded ROW.

For any archaeological resources identified during the survey, photographs were taken of the general vicinity and of any visible features. A field map was prepared showing site limits, feature locations, permanent landmarks, topographic and vegetational variation, sources of disturbance,

and all surface and subsurface investigations. GPS coordinates for all identified site locations were recorded and sufficient information was included on maps to permit easy relocation of sites. Notes were taken on surface and vegetational conditions, soil characteristics, dimensions and construction of features evident, and the amount and distribution of cultural materials present. All subsurface archaeological excavations were backfilled and returned to pre-survey conditions.

REPORT AND RECORD PREPARATION

The results of the study are accompanied by maps and photographs as appropriate and were synthesized and summarized in this addendum to the Phase I identification survey report for Van Buren Road Extension project area titled, *Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the* ± 37.2 -Hectare (± 91.8 -Acre) Van Buren Road Extension Project Area and Phase II Archaeological Evaluation of Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105 (Dutton 2022). All research material and documentation generated by this project are on file at D+A's office in Midlothian, Virginia.

QUALIFICATIONS AND STANDARDS

The D+A personnel who directed and conducted this survey meet the professional qualification standards of the Department of the Interior (48 FR 44738-9). All work was conducted in accordance with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation* (Federal Register 48:44716-44742, September 29, 1983), and VDHR's *Guidelines for Conducting Historic Resource Survey in Virginia* (rev. 2017).

3. ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY RESULTS

Archaeological survey of the proposed ROW expansion involved both pedestrian survey and systematic subsurface testing. The results of the field survey are summarized below.

PEDESTRIAN SURVEY

At the outset of field efforts, a systematic pedestrian survey was conducted throughout the project area. There are no visible structures currently standing on the property, though the remnants of domestic debris and dumping are evident, which is consistent with what was encountered during the original survey. The terrain of the project area is gently rolling and consists primarily of the eastern edge of a finger ridge and is typical of terrain areas throughout the Virginia Piedmont. (Figure 3-1). Vegetation consisted of mature hardwoods and saplings with minimal understory. (Figure 3-2, Figure 3-3, Figure 3-4). Aside from the domestic dumping, there were no visible landscape features or evidence of cultural material or activity greater than 50 years of age.



Figure 3-1: General view of terrain and vegetation in the southern portion of the ROW expansion area facing north.



Figure 3-2: General view of terrain and vegetation in the northern portion of the ROW expansion area facing south.



Figure 3-3: Representative view of domestic debris disposal observed in the ROW expansion area.

SUBSURFACE SURVEY

Following pedestrian survey, individual grids of shovel tests were established on landforms that exhibited the potential for intact significant archaeological deposits to be present. Shovel test grids were not established in areas with slopes greater than 15 percent, in areas with water saturated soils or wetlands at the time of the survey, or areas with visible evidence of severe soil disturbance.

Transects were labeled sequentially with letter designations and shovel tests were number numerically. A total of six transects, A through F, were established within the expanded ROW alignment. A total of 67 shovel tests were laid out at 15-meter (50-foot) intervals along transects spaced at 15-meter (50-foot) intervals. Seven shovel tests were not excavated due to slope or surface debris. No shovel tests were positive for cultural material.



Figure 3-4: Plan view of shovel test excavations in the ROW expansion area.

Soils throughout the ROW expansion area were consistent in both structure and depth. A typical soil profile consisted of two soil strata with a 2.5 Y 7/2 pale brown loam ranging in depth from 17 cm to 40 cm overlying a 5 YR 6/4 light reddish brown clay subsoil (Figure 3-5).





2.5Y 7/2 loam 0-20 cm

5Y 6/4 clay 20-25 cm

Figure 3-5: Soil profile of Shovel Test F10.

THIS PAGE INTENTIOALLY LEFT BLANK

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

No shovel test pits were positive for cultural material and no subsurface features were identified. It is therefore D+A's recommendation that no additional archaeological survey is warranted for the ROW expansion area.

No architectural resources were located either within or within line of sight of the proposed ROW expansion area. *As such, it is D+A's recommendation that no additional architectural survey is warranted for the ROW expansion area.*

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX A: RESUMES

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
DAVID H. DUTTON

Partner



Dutton + Associates

Education

Master of Arts, 1990 Archaeological Studies Boston University Boston, Massachusetts

Bachelor of Science, 1986 Anthropology and Sociology Virginia Commonwealth University Richmond, Virginia

Appointments

Historic Advisory Committee, Woodrow Wilson Bridge Design Competition, 1998

Dept. of the Army Counterpart Regulations Task Force, NCSHPO, 1999

Virginia Department of Historic Resources Archaeology Advisory Group, 2000

Historic Preservation Committee Chesterfield County, Virginia 2011

Dominion Historic, Scenic, and Cultural Advisory Group, 2017 Mr. Dutton has over 31 years of professional historic preservation experience throughout the East Coast, with a focus on Section 106 coordination and review. He directed the Virginia Department of Historic Resources Division of Project Review where he managed all federal and state environmental reviews, rehabilitation tax credit project certification, historic preservation easements, covenants, and archaeological permits. Prior to his work at the state, Mr. Dutton served as a project review archaeologist for the President's Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. His geographic responsibility was the southeastern United States.

Mr. Dutton has managed the successful completion of multiple cultural resource projects for public and private clients including identification, evaluation, and data recovery efforts for archaeological and architectural properties, HABS documentation, Battlefield Cultural Heritage Plans, Interpretive Concept Plans, and Integrated Cultural Resource Management Plans (ICRMP). In addition, he has negotiated successful agreements under Section 106 for a wide variety of projects. Specific examples include a memorandum of agreement for the Dominion Surry-Skiffes-Whealton transmission line project and a programmatic agreement for the closure of Fort Monroe, a National Historic Landmark District.

Mr. Dutton brings clients both experience and expertise ensuring cultural resource requirements are successfully and efficiently integrated into project planning and construction.

1115 CROWDER DRIVE, MIDLOTHIAN, VIRGINIA 23113 'TEL 804.897.1960

Dutton + Associates

D

DAVID H. DUTTON Partner

Professional Experience

Dutton + Associates, LLC, Partner, Richmond, Virginia, 2005 – Present. Directs the firm's technical services which include review of projects pursuant to federal and state historic preservation regulations, cultural resource plan development, field investigations, laboratory processing and analyses, and report preparation.

American Civil War Center at Historic Tredegar, Chief Operating Officer, Richmond, Virginia, 2002 – 2006. Managed the Tredegar Iron Works site, the financial performance of the Foundation and construction of the Foundation's new exhibition facility and exhibit In the Cause of Liberty.

Cultural Resources Inc., President and Principal Investigator, Williamsburg, Virginia, 1999 – 2002. Managed the firm's financial and technical performance. Directed and authored several cultural resource management studies including identification, evaluation, and data recovery efforts.

Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Director, Division of Project Review; Richmond, Virginia, 1994-1999. Managed all federal and state review and compliance programs; generated policies, specifications, and standards; directed the state historic preservation easement program; interfaced with federal and state executives, elected officials, developers, architects, and engineers on project development and implementation; managed the review and certification of plans for federal and state rehabilitation tax credits; and commented on proposed federal and state legislation and regulations as well as on national and regional historic preservation issues.

Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Archaeologist Planner; Richmond, Virginia, 1992-1994. Planned, coordinated, and supervised the statewide program in archaeological preservation planning; developed and implemented historic preservation plans; and managed, monitored, and evaluated grantee performance for departmental grants awarded in preservation planning.

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Historic Preservation Specialist, Staff Archaeologist; Washington, D.C. 1989 – 1992. Reviewed federal projects under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for the southeast United States; consulted with Congressional offices, federal and state agencies, local governments, and members of the general public; developed and reviewed historic property management plans; and assisted in development of federal policy for the identification and treatment of historic property.

Example Projects and Publications

2007 Project Management of cultural resource team for King William Reservoir Archaeological Services Contract.

2008 Programmatic Agreement for the Closure of Fort Monroe and the Management of Historic Properties. 2017 Regulatory assistance for the Surry-Skiffes-Whealton Transmission Line Project, Surry and James City Counties and the City of Newport News.

2017 Regulatory assistance for the Atlantic Coast Pipeline project, North Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, and Penssylvania.

1115 CROWDER DRIVE, MIDLO THIAN, VIRGINIA 23113 'TEL 804.897.1960





PROJECT MANAGER <u>www</u>		DESIGN FEATURES RELATING TO CONSTRUCTION REVISED	STATE SHEET NO
SURVEYED BY, DATE XXX DESIGN BY <u>YYY</u>	CROSS SECTIONS	OR TO REGULATION AND CONTROL OF TRAFFIC MAY BE SUBJECT TO CHANGE AS DEEMED	PROJECT SHEET NO.
SUBSURFACE UTILITY BY, DATE ZZZ	SCALL I IN IU II	NECESSARY BY THE DEPARTMENT VA. 627	Van Buren NEPA
	B		
		lg ta ∽l	
200		Si p p	200
			190
180			180
170			170
	144+25.00		
		Van Buren Road - Alternative #2	
<i>150 50</i>	ϕ 50	100	150
			PROJECT SHEET NO.

REPORT >

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±37.2-Hectare (±91.8-Acre) Van Buren Road Extension Project Area and Phase II Archaeological Evaluation of Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105

DATE > AUGUST 2022 REVISED > OCTOBER 2022

PREPARED FOR > Dewberry Engineers, Inc.

LOCATION > Prince William County, Virginia



PREPARED BY >
Dutton + Associates, LLC

Dutton Associates

PHASE I CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY OF THE ±37.2 HECTARE (±91.8 ACRE) VAN BUREN ROAD EXTENSION PROJECT AREA AND PHASE II ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION OF SITES 44PW2104 AND 44PW2105

PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY, VIRGINIA

PREPARED FOR: DEWBERRY ENGINEERS, INC. 8401 ARLINGTON BOULEVARD FAIRFAX, VIRGINIA 22031

PREPARED BY: DUTTON + ASSOCIATES, LLC 1115 CROWDER DRIVE MIDLOTHIAN, VIRGINIA 23113 804.897.1960

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR DAVID DUTTON, M.A.

AUGUST 2022 REVISED OCTOBER 2022

ABSTRACT

In October and November 2021, Dutton + Associates, LLC (D+A) conducted a Phase I and Phase II cultural resource survey of the ± 37.2 hectare (± 91.8 acre) Van Buren Road Extension project area in Prince William County, Virginia. The project area is located east of Montclair, Virginia, and is bounded on the north by Cardinal Drive, on the east by Interstate-95, on the south by Dumfries Road (Route 234), and on the west by adjacent wooded parcels and residential development. The project extends the existing Van Buren Road on the south side of Cardinal Drive to Route 234. For the purposes of cultural resource survey, the project's direct area of potential effect (APE) was defined as the limits of proposed ground disturbance associated with construction of the project to include stormwater management facilities. The project's indirect APE includes the area immediately adjacent to the proposed project.

No previously recorded architectural resources were located within or immediately adjacent to the project area APE and reconnaissance level architectural survey did not result in the identification of any buildings or structures either within or immediately adjacent to the project area APE 50 years of age or older. As such, it is D+A's recommendation that no further architectural survey is warranted.

Background research indicated that seven previously recorded archaeological sites (six small prehistoric lithic scatters and one nineteenth century trash scatter) were mapped either within or immediately adjacent to the project APE. Historic documents, maps, and aerial images also indicated that William Jennings, a former freed slave, owned and occupied property within the project area APE on a part time basis during the last quarter of the nineteenth century and in to the second quarter of the twentieth century. Mr. Jennings also owned and occupied property in the District of Columbia.

Following systematic pedestrian survey of the project area APE full grids of shovel tests at 15meter (50-foot) intervals were placed in areas with the potential to contain intact archaeological deposits. These included upland landforms with well drained soils and slopes of less than 15%. Areas with slope greater than 15%, were water saturated at the time of the survey, delineated wetlands, or exhibited evidence of severe subsurface disturbances were not tested. While soils in the project area APE are well drained, over 40% of the project area is sloped 15% or more with some areas exhibiting steep and pronounced slopes of 40% or more.

A total of 574 shovel tests were excavated in the project area APE. Twentieth century cultural material was recovered from shovel testing along with some eighteenth and nineteenth century material. Large amounts of modern and mid to late twentieth century refuse was encountered in the northern and southern portions of the project area and was not collected. Subsurface shovel testing resulted in the identification of four previously unrecorded sites; 44PW2102, 44PW2103, 44PW2104, and 44PW2105.

Site 44PW2104 is a late nineteenth-century domestic site, which appears to be associated with William Jennings, who was a freed slave that owned and occupied the property from 1883 until 1921. Given the presence of cultural material dating from the time period the property was occupied by Mr. Jennings and observed structural debris and two possible pits associated with

buildings or structures, it is D+A's recommendation that Site 44PW2104 is potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP and that site avoidance or Phase II evaluation be undertaken.

Site 44PW2105 is small site with fewer and slightly earlier domestic material. Given the location of the site in relation to Site 44PW2104 and the Jennings property as shown on the 1937 aerial, the finds were interpreted as a likely outbuilding of the Jennings and associated with their overall agricultural complex. Given the potential association with the Jennings property it is D+A's recommendation that Site 44PW2105 is potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP and that site avoidance or Phase II evaluation be undertaken.

Sites 44PW2102 and 44PW2103, both consist of small amounts of prehistoric lithic material recovered from a limited number of shovel tests. The lack of diagnostic artifacts at either site, coupled with the limited amount of material, limits the potential of either of these sites to contribute new or important information about the prehistory of the area and or region. It is therefore D+A's recommendation that Sites 44PW2102 and 44PW2103 are not considered potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP and no further work is warranted for these sites.

Of the seven previously recorded sites were reidentified during the current Phase I survey. For those resources located in the northern segment of the project area APE where adjacent residential development and improvements have occurred, it is very likely that construction has destroyed the identified resources. It is also possible and likely that recordation of site data from early surveys resulted in mismapping or misprojecting site locations or that the sites are located closer to the edge of landforms and outside of the current project area APE. It is therefore D+A's opinion that no further consideration is warranted for those previously recorded sites located within or adjacent to the project area APE as they could not be reidentified.

From March through April 2022, D+A completed Phase II evaluation survey of Site 44PW2104 and 44PW2105, located in the Van Buren Road Extension project area APE. The two sites were identified during Phase I survey of the project area APE and were recommended potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP. The goal of the Phase II evaluation was to determine the overall significance and eligibility of Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105 for listing in the NRHP. This was accomplished through a combination of detailed historic research and field investigations consisting of the excavation of close interval shovel test pits and test units.

SITE 44PW2104

Site 44PW2104 is a late nineteenth early twentieth-century domestic site associated with William Jennings, who was a freed slave that owned and occupied the property from 1883 until 1921. Mr. Jennings' father was also a freed slave and worked for President James Madison in the White House. Phase II evaluation survey of Site 44PW2104 resulted in defined site boundaries encompassing +/-0.47 hectares (+/-1.16 acres) within the proposed project APE. The recovery of artifacts up to the western boundary of the project APE suggests that potential exists for the site to continue further west beyond the present study and project limits. Shovel testing and unit excavation revealed that the site area within the APE had been impacted by the demolition of and removal of buildings and structures, which appeared to be standing as late as the early 1940s. Artifacts recovered consisted of late nineteenth to early twentieth century ceramics and glass, all

recovered from Stratum I topsoil with no stratigraphic or chronological separation. Site soils in six of the nine excavated units revealed sharp transitions between topsoil and subsoil indicative of soil removal across a large portion of the site. The absence of evidence of subsurface archaeological features or any evidence of a surviving cultural occupation layer severely limits the overall potential of that portion of the site located within the project APE to contain intact significant archaeological deposits with research potential. Pushpiles containing building demolition debris located off to the side of the site further supports the interpretation that the area was scraped during building and structure demolition. Unit excavation around two depressions located within the site did not reveal any evidence of structural use and their presence appears to be more a result of timber removal or tree fall than use and occupation of the site. Given the documented presence of disturbed and cut soils and the absence of significant intact subsurface archaeological features or deposits within the project APE, the potential for that portion of Site 44PW2104 that is located within the APE to possess new or important archaeological data that can contribute to a greater understanding of the site's and/or region's history beyond what the documentary record has already provided is limited. As such, it is D+A's recommendation that the portion of Site 44PW2104 that is in the project APE is not eligible for listing in the NRHP under criterion D. No further archaeological work is recommended for Site 44PW2104 within the APE.

SITE 44PW2105

Phase II evaluation revealed that Site 44PW2105 is a mid-eighteenth-century domestic site, not an agricultural building as originally interpreted, and was likely associated with John Canterbury, who appears to have owned and occupied the property until 1760, at which time the land was sold to Bertrand Ewell who did not reside on the property. Phase II evaluation testing of Site 44PW2105 resulted in defined site boundaries encompassing ± -0.26 hectares (± -0.65 acres). Based on Phase I and Phase II testing, it appears that the entirety of Site 44PW2105 is located within the project APE. Shovel testing and unit excavation revealed the presence of an intact cultural layer containing brick and stone structural rubble, oyster shell deposits, and eighteenth-century artifacts in intact soils across much of the site. Artifacts recovered include Westerwald stoneware, white salt glaze stoneware, North Devonshire plain and slip decorated wares, Delftware, dark green bottle glass bases, case bottle glass, and bone handled cutlery. The variety and use popularity dates of the recovered artifacts support a domestic occupation dating to the mideighteenth century. Given the presence of significant archaeological deposits with intact soils and structural remains, it is D+A's opinion that Site 44PW2105 contains important archaeological data that can contribute to a greater understanding of domestic occupation at the site and in the region in the mid-eighteenth century. As such, it is D+A's recommendation that Site 44PW2105 is eligible for listing in the NRHP under criterion D and site avoidance or controlled site burial is recommended.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1-1
Project Location and Area of Potential Effect	1-1
2. RESEARCH DESIGN	
3. Environmental Context	
Physical Description and Location	
Geology and Topography	
Hydrology	
Pedology	
4. PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS	
Previous Surveys Relevant to the Site	
Previously Identified Archaeological Sites Within One Mile	
Previously Identified Architectural Resources Within One Mile	
Battlefields	
5. CULTURAL CONTEXT	
Paleoindian Period (Prior to 8000 b.c.)	
Archaic Period (8000 to 1200 b.c.)	
Woodland Period (1200 b.c. to 1600 a.d.)	
Settlement to Society (1607 – 1750)	
44PW2104 and 44PW2105	
Colony to Nation (1750 – 1789)	
44PW2104 and 44PW2105	
Early National Period (1789 – 1830)	
Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105	
Antebellum period (1830 – 1860)	
Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105	5-16
Civil War (1861 – 1865)	5-16
Reconstruction and Growth (1865 – 1917)	
Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105	
World War I to World War II (1917 – 1945)	
Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105	
New Dominion (1945 – Present)	5-31
Property Ownership	
6. PHASE I EXPECTED RESULTS	
7. PHASE I FIELD SURVEY RESULTS	
Architectural Field Results	7-1
Phase I Archaeological Field Results	
Pedestrian Survey	
Subsurface Testing	7-6
Area A and Area B	
Area C	
Area D	
Area E	
Area F	
8. PHASE I CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	

9. PHASE II EVALUATION OF SITES 44PW2104 AND 44PW2105	
Site 44PW2104	
Close Interval Shovel Testing	
Unit Excavation	
Test Unit 1	
Test Unit 2	
Test Unit 3	
Test Unit 4	
Test Unit 5	
Test Unit 6	
Test Unit 7	
Test Unit 8	
Test Unit 9	
Artifact Analysis and Discussion	
Site Stratigraphy	
Site 44PW2105	
Close Interval Shovel Testing	
Unit Excavation	
Test Unit 1	
Test Unit 2	
Test Unit 3	
Test Unit 4	
Test Unit 5	
Test Unit 6	
Test Unit 7	
Artifact Analysis and Discussion	
Site Stratigraphy	
10. PHASE II CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
Site 44PW2104	
Site 44PW2105	
11. References	11-1
APPENDIX A: RESUMES	A-1
APPENDIX B: PHASE I ARTIFACT INVENTORY	B-1
APPENDIX C: PHASE II ARTIFACT INVENTORY	C-1
APPENDIX D: V-CRIS FORMS	D-1

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1: General location of the project area.	1-2
Figure 1-2: Aerial view of project APE shown in red. Source: Google Earth 2020	1-3
Figure 3-1: Aerial view of the Van Buren Road Extension project area (red). Source: Google	
Earth 2018	3-1
Figure 3-2: Soil Survey of the Van Buren Road Extension project area APE showing soil types	s.
Source: USDA	3-3

Figure 4-1: Previous surveys (gray hatched) conducted within 1.0 mile (green) of the northern
half of the project area (orange). Source: V-CRIS
Figure 4-2: Previous surveys (gray hatched) conducted within 1.0 mile (green) of the southern
half of the project area (orange). Source: V-CRIS
Figure 4-3: Map detailing all archaeological resources (red) within 1.0 mile (green) of the
northern half of the project area (orange). Source: V-CRIS
Figure 4-4: Map detailing all archaeological resources (red) within 1.0 mile (green) of the
southern half of the project area (orange). Source: V-CRIS
Figure 4-5: Map detailing all architectural resources (blue hatched) within 1.0 mile (green) of the
northern half of the project area (orange). Source: V-CRIS
Figure 4-6: Map detailing all architectural resources (blue hatched) within 1.0 mile (green) of the
southern half of the project area (orange). Source: V-CRIS
Figure 4-7: Map of the Battle of Cockpit Point depicting the project area in relation to the battle.
Source: V-CRIS
Figure 5-1: Detail of Virginia depicting the general vicinity of the project area. Source: Library
of Congress
Figure 5-2: Detail of A map of the most inhabited part of Virginia containing the whole province
of Maryland, 1755. Source: Library of Virginia
Figure 5-3: Detail of The marches of Lord Cornwallis in the Southern Provinces, 1787 by
Faden, depicting the general vicinity of the project area. Source: Library of Congress 5-12
Figure 5-4: Detail of <i>Prince William County</i> , by Wood in 1820, depicting the project area.
Source: Library of Virginia
Figure 5-5: Detail of <i>Map of n. eastern Virginia and vicinity of Washington</i> , 1862, depicting the
project area. Source: Library of Congress
Figure 5-6: Sketch of Virginia and the Rebel Camps and Batteries depicting the approximate
location of the project area. Source: URS
Figure 5-7: Detail of <i>Miscellaneous lithographed proof sheets of areas in Virginia</i> , 1863.
depicting the project area. Source: Library of Congress
Figure 5-8: Map of the Battle of Cockpit Point depicting the project area in relation to the battle.
Source: V-CRIS
Figure 5-9: Detail of <i>Map of Prince William County</i> , <i>Virginia</i> , 1901 by Brown, depicting the
project area. Source: Library of Congress
Figure 5-10: Plat of Townsend Property, by R.M. Bartenstein & Assocs. In 1972. detailing a
portion of the project area and Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105. Source: PWCDB
623·108 5-26
Figure 5-11: Detail of the 1927 topographic map <i>Quantico VA</i> depicting the project area
Source: USGS 5-28
Figure 5-12: Detail of a 1937 aerial depicting the project area Source: Prince William County
Mapper 5-22. Detail of a 1957 actual depicting the project area. Source. Timee withain county
Figure 5-13: Detail of the 1940 topographic map $Quantico VA$ depicting the project area
Source: USCS 5 20
Figure 5 14: Detail of a 1037 period depicting Sites AADW2104 and AADW2105 Source: Drince
William County Manner 5 21
Figure 5 15: Detail of a 105/ aerial depicting the project area. Source: Drines William County
Monpor
маррет

Figure 5-16: Detail of the 1966 topographic map, <i>Quantico, VA</i> , depicting the project area.
Figure 5-17: Detail of the 1983 topographic map, <i>Quantico, VA</i> , depicting the project area.
Source: USGS
Figure 5-18: Detail of a 2006 aerial depicting the project area. Source: Google Earth
Figure 7-1: Northern boundary of project area. Photo taken facing east
Figure 7-2: Southern boundary of project area. Also an example of the housing developments
bordering the project area. Photo taken facing west7-2
Figure 7-3: Example of the high density of trash found in the southern portion of the project area.
Figure 7-4: Retention basin found near the northern housing development
Figure 7-5: Typical vegetation found in the project area
Figure 7-6: Typical vegetation found in the northern and southern boundaries of the project area.
Photo taken facing southwest
Figure 7-7: View of Powell's Creek looking upstream
Figure 7-8: Composite map of project area with shovel test locations and identified sites
Figure 7-9: Gentle slope leading to fence that forms the western boundary in Area A and part of
Area B. Photo taken from Pl4 facing southwest
Figure 7-10: Slope marking boundary between Areas A and B. Photo taken facing west7-10
Figure 7-11: View of Powell's Creek. Photo taken facing northwest
Figure 7-12: Typical vegetation seen in Area A. Photo taken facing west
Figure 7-13: Typical vegetation seen in Area B. Photo taken from PL6, facing north
Figure 7-14: Raised landform in the middle of Area A. Photo taken from PL2, facing south. 7-12
Figure 7-15: Shovel test plan of Areas A and B
Figure 7-16: Soil profile of Shovel Test B2 in Area B
Figure 7-17: Soil profile of Shovel Test M 1.5 in Area B
Figure 7-18: Soil profile of Shovel Test C3 in Grid A1
Figure 7-19: Slope leading down to the northern boundary of Area C. Photo taken facing north.7-
16
Figure 7-20: Transmission line ROW that forms the western boundary of Area C. Photo taken
Figure 7.21. Western houndary of Crid D2 that loads to drainage/floadalain. Dhoto taken facing
Figure 7-21: Western boundary of Ond B2 that leads to dramage/noodplain. Photo taken facing
West
Figure 7-22: Part of fandrorm in Area C4 hear-level with interstate 1-95. Photo taken facing east.
Figure 7-23: Typical vegetation seen in Area C along with an example of the disturbances
typically seen in the area 7-19
Figure 7-24: Road trace that bisects floodplain in Grid C2. Photo taken from PL10 facing north
7-20
Figure 7-25: Shovel test plan of Area C 7-21
Figure 7-26: Shovel test map of Grids C1, C2, and C3.
Figure 7-27: Shovel test map of Grids C4 and C5 7-24
Figure 7-28: Soil profile of Shovel Test N1 in Grid C2 7-25
Figure 7-29: Soil profile of Shovel Test F2 in Grid C1
Figure 7-30: Soil profile of Shovel Test B1 in Grid C3
Figure 7-31: Slope leading down to truck rest area roadway. Photo taken facing east 7-26

Figure 7-32: Delineated wetlands along the western boundary of Grid D1. Photo taken facing
northeast7-27
Figure 7-33: Typical vegetation seen in Area D. Photo taken from PL 16 facing south
Figure 7-34: Example of the significant disturbance found in Grid D2 in Area D. Photo taken
facing east
Figure 7-35: Structural stone debris in pushpiles found in Grid D2. Photo taken facing south.7-29
Figure 7-36: Machine-cut brick likely from collapsed chimney fall and other debris pushed
together
Figure 7-37: Shovel test plan of Area D
Figure 7-38: Representative artifacts recovered from 44PW2104
Figure 7-39: Representative artifacts recovered from 44PW2105
Figure 7-40: Artifacts recovered from 44PW21027-34
Figure 7-41: Soil profile of Shovel Test F3 in Grid D47-35
Figure 7-42: Soil profile of Shovel Test E5 and feature in Grid D37-35
Figure 7-43: End of eastern landform sloping downwards to the unnamed creek that forms the
boundary between E and F. Photo taken facing north
Figure 7-44: Intersection of Van Buren Rd and Copper Mill Dr that marks the southern boundary
of Area E and the project area7-36
Figure 7-45: Trash, pushpiles, and debris commonly seen in the eastern landform of Area E.
Photo taken facing west
Figure 7-46: Typical vegetation seen in Area E. Taken from Judgmental 2 facing northwest. 7-38
Figure 7-47: Periwinkle found running along the lower edge of the southern ridge in the eastern
landform. Photo taken facing east7-38
Figure 7-48: Shovel test plan of Area E
Figure 7-49: Artifacts recovered from 44PW21037-40
Figure 7-50: Soil profile of F2 in Area E
Figure 7-51: Soil profile of Judgmental 1 in Area E
Figure 7-52: Slope leading down to the unnamed creek forming the boundary between Areas F
and D
Figure 7-53: Example of protective netting seen near housing development
Figure 7-54: Example of vegetation seen around the grid in Area F. Photo taken facing north7- 43
Figure 7-55' STP Map of Area F
Figure 7-56: Soil profile of Judgmental 5
Figure 9-1: Plan of close interval shovel testing and artifact distributions at Site 44PW2104
during Phase I and II excavations
Figure 9-2: Detail view of artifact distribution and excavation unit placement within the limits of
Site 44PW2104
Figure 9-3: Plan view of base of excavation in Unit 1
Figure 9-4: Profile of north wall of Test Unit 1 at base of excavation
Figure 9-5: Profile of east wall of Test Unit 1 at base of excavation featuring scrap metal
embedded in the wall
Figure 9-6: Profile drawing of east wall of Unit 1
Figure 9-7: Plan view of Unit 2 base of excavation
Figure 9-8: Profile view of north wall Unit 2 at base of excavation
Figure 9-9: Profile drawing of Unit 2 north wall

Figure 9-10: Plan view of base of excavation of Unit 3	9-12
Figure 9-11: Profile of north wall of Unit 3 (left) at base of excavation.	9-12
Figure 9-12: Profile drawing of north wall of Unit 3 base of excavation	9-13
Figure 9-13: Plan view of base of excavation of Unit 4.	9-15
Figure 9-14: Profile view of north wall of Unit 4, base of excavation.	9-16
Figure 9-15: Profile drawing of north wall of Unit 4 base of excavation	9-16
Figure 9-16: Plan view of base of excavation of Unit 5.	
Figure 9-17: Profile view of Unit 5 base of excavation	9-19
Figure 9-18: Profile drawing of the north wall of Unit 5 base of excavation.	9-20
Figure 9-19: Plan view of Unit 6 base of excavation	9-21
Figure 9-20: Profile view of north wall of Unit 6 at base of excavation	9-22
Figure 9-21: Profile drawing of north wall of Unit 6 at base of excavation	9-22
Figure 9-22: Plan view of Unit 7 at base of excavation	9-24
Figure 9-23: Profile view of north wall of Test Unit 7 at base of excavation	9-24
Figure 9-24: Profile drawing of north wall of Unit 7 at base of excavation	9-25
Figure 9-25: Plan view of Unit 8 base of excavation	9-26
Figure 9-26: Profile view of north wall Unit 8 base of excavation.	9-27
Figure 9-27: Profile drawing of north wall Unit 8 base of excavation.	9-27
Figure 9-28: Plan view of Unit 9 base of excavation	
Figure 9-29: Profile view of south wall Unit 9 base of excavation.	
Figure 9-30: Profile drawing of south wall Unit 9 base of excavation	9-30
Figure 9-31: Representative artifacts recovered from Site 44PW2104 during Phase II evalu	ation
survey	9-32
Figure 9-32: Chart of artifacts by material type for Site 44PW2104	9-32
Figure 9-33: Chart of refined earthenware from Site 44PW2104 by type	9-33
Figure 9-34: Chart of iron artifacts recovered from Site 44PW2104 by type.	9-33
Figure 9-35: Chart of glass recovered from Site 44PW2104 by type.	9-34
Figure 9-36: Chart of glass recovered from Site 44PW2104 by color	9-34
Figure 9-37: Chart of artifacts by use classification for Site 44PW2104	9_35
Figure 9-38: Plan view of Phase I and close interval testing at Site 44PW2105	9_37
Figure 0-30: Plan of close interval shovel testing artifact concentrations and excavation u	$\frac{1}{1}$
nlacement at Site <i>A</i> /PW/2105	0_38
Figure 0.40: Dian view of Unit 1 base of exception	0.30
Figure 0.41: Plan view drawing of Unit 1 base of excavation	0 /0
Figure 9-41. Frail view drawing of Onit 1 base of excavation.	0.41
Figure 9-42. Frome view of north wall Onit 1 at base of excavation	0 42
Figure 9-45: Profile drawing of Unit 1 north wall.	9-42
Figure 9-44: Plan view of Unit 2 base of excavation	
Figure 9-45: Profile drewing of Unit 2 north well	
Figure 9-40: Profile drawing of Unit 2 horse of execution	
Figure 9-47: Plan view of Unit 3 base of excavation	9-4/
Figure 9-46: Plan view drawing of Unit 3 base of excavation.	
Figure 9-49: Profile view of south wall Unit 3 at base of excavation.	
Figure 9-50: Profile drawing of Unit 3 north Wall.	
Figure 9-51: Plan view of Unit 4 base of excavation	
Figure 9-52: Profile view of north wall Unit 4 at base of excavation	
Figure 9-53: Profile drawing of Unit 4 north wall.	9-52

Figure 9-54: Plan view of Unit 5 base of excavation	54
Figure 9-55: Plan view drawing of Unit 5 base of excavation	55
Figure 9-56: Profile view of east wall Unit 5 at base of excavation9-5	55
Figure 9-57: Profile drawing of Unit 5 east wall9-5	56
Figure 9-58: View of south wall Unit 5 at base of excavation9-5	56
Figure 9-59: View of west wall Unit 5 at base of excavation9-5	57
Figure 9-60: Plan view of Unit 6 base of excavation9-5	59
Figure 9-61: Plan view drawing of Unit 6 at base of excavation9-6	60
Figure 9-62:Profile view of north wall Unit 6 at base of excavation9-6	60
Figure 9-63: Profile drawing of north wall Unit 6 at base of excavation9-6	61
Figure 9-64: Profile view of east wall Unit 6 at base of excavation	61
Figure 9-65: Profile view of south wall Unit 6 at base of excavation9-6	62
Figure 9-66: Profile view of west wall Unit 6 at base of excavation9-6	62
Figure 9-67: Plan view of Unit 7 base of excavation9-6	64
Figure 9-68: Profile drawing of Unit 7 north wall9-6	65
Figure 9-69: Plan view drawing of Unit 7 base of excavation9-6	65
Figure 9-70: representative artifacts recovered from Site 44PW2105 during Phase II evaluation	1
survey	67
Figure 9-71: Chart of artifacts by material type for Site 44PW21059-6	68
Figure 9-72: Chart of refined earthenware recovered from Site 44PW2105 by type9-6	68
Figure 9-73: Chart of coarse earthenware recovered from Site 44PW2105 by type9-6	69
Figure 9-74: Chart of glass recovered from Site 44PW2105 by type9-6	69
Figure 9-75: Chart of glass recovered from Site 44PW2105 by color9-7	70
Figure 9-76: Chart of iron by type recovered from Site 44PW21059-7	71

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3-1: Unit summary of soils within the Van Buren Road Extension project. Source: USDA
Table 4-1: Phase I archaeological surveys that have crossed into the project area
Table 4-2: Previously identified archaeological sites located within 1.0 mile of the project area.
Sites highlighted orange are mapped within the project area. Site in bold text have been
determined eligible or potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP
Table 4-3: Previously identified architectural resources located within 1.0 mile of the project
area. Those resources in bold text are listed in the NRHP or have been determined
eligible for listing
Table 5-1: Chain-of-title for land encompassing Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW21055-36
Table 9-1: Table of artifacts recovered from Unit 1, Surface and Stratum I9-6
Table 9-2: Table of artifacts recovered from Unit 2, Stratum I
Table 9-3: Table of artifacts recovered from Unit 3, Stratum I
Table 9-4: Table of artifacts recovered from Unit 4, Surface and Stratum I9-17
Table 9-5: Table of artifacts recovered from Unit 5, Stratum 1. 9-20
Table 9-6: Artifacts recovered from Unit 6, Stratum I. 9-23
Table 9-7: Table of artifacts recovered from Unit 7, Stratum I. 9-25
Table 9-8: Table of the artifacts recovered from Unit 8, Stratum I. 9-28
Table 9-9: Table of the artifacts recovered from Unit 9, Stratum I. 9-31

Table 9-10: Table of the artifacts recovered from Unit 1, Stratums I and II.	9-42
Table 9-11: Table of the artifacts recovered from Unit 2, Stratum I.	9-45
Table 9-12: Table of the artifacts recovered predominately from Unit 3, Stratum II	9-49
Table 9-13: Table of the artifacts recovered predominately from Unit 4, Stratum II	9-52
Table 9-14: Table of the artifacts recovered from Unit 5, Stratum I.	9-57
Table 9-15: Table of the artifacts recovered predominately from Stratum II in Unit 6	9-63
Table 9-16: Table of the artifacts recovered from Unit 7, Stratum I.	9-65

1. INTRODUCTION

In October and November 2021 and March and April 2022, Dutton +Associates, LLC (D+A) conducted a Phase I and Phase II cultural resource survey of the ±37.2 hectare (±91.8 acre) Van Buren Road Extension project area in Prince William County, Virginia. The effort was intended to identify cultural resources within the project area, to make recommendations as to whether any cultural resources present may be potentially eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and to assess potential impacts to those resources that are considered NRHP-eligible. Background research and field reconnaissance were used to develop an appropriate survey strategy, which was then implemented.

A Phase I survey of the project area resulted in four sites, 44PW2102, 44PW2103, 44PW2104, and 44PW2105. Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105 were recommended for further Phase II evaluation testing to determine their overall significance and eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). In March and April 2022, Phase II evaluation survey was completing of Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105 and the results of that effort are also reported in this document.

All research, fieldwork, and recording conducted as part of these investigations conformed to the guidance specified in the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation* (Federal Register 48:44716-44742, September 29, 1983) and the Virginia Department of Historic Resources' (VDHR) *Guidelines for Conducting Historic Resources Survey in Virginia* (rev. 2017). The D+A Project Manager, Project Archaeologist, and Architectural Historian directing the surveys meet the professional qualification standards of the Department of the Interior 48 FR 44738-9). David H. Dutton, M.A. served as the Principal Investigator, prepared the research design, and oversaw project management. Dara Friedberg, M.S., conducted the background research and coauthored the report. Christine Muron, M.A. supervised the fieldwork and was assisted in the field by Michael Lundberg, M.A., Justin Morey, B.A, Jacob Sullivan, B.A., John Hartmann IV, B.A., Courtney Roark, B.A., Delania Hunter, B.A., Rebecca Mattson, M.A., and Katie Gill, B.A. Copies of all field notes, maps, correspondence, and research materials are on file at D+A's main office in Midlothian, Virginia.

PROJECT LOCATION AND AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECT

The Van Buren Road Extension project area is located east of Montclair, Virginia, and is bounded on the north by Cardinal Drive, on the east by Interstate-95, on the south by Route 234 (Dumfries Road), and on the west by adjacent parcels (Figures 1-1 and 1-2). The project extends the existing Van Buren Road on the south side of Cardinal Drive to Route 234. For the purposes of cultural resource survey, the project's direct area of potential effects (APE) was defined as the limits of proposed ground disturbance associated with construction of the project to include stormwater management facilities. The project's indirect APE includes the area immediately adjacent to the proposed project.



Figure 1-1: General location of the project area.



Figure 1-2: Aerial view of project APE shown in red. Source: Google Earth 2020

2. RESEARCH DESIGN

The Phase I cultural resource survey of the Van Buren Road Extension project area was undertaken in order to confirm the existing condition of the property, note any surface evidence of cultural activity, recommend and implement an appropriate survey methodology for the property based upon the results of the background research and field reconnaissance, and identify the presence or absence of cultural resources on the property. This resulted in the identification of two archaeological sites which underwent Phase II archaeological evaluation survey in order to confirm the existing condition of the property, determine the presence or absence of cultural resources, and assess their eligibility for listing in the NRHP. The background research, field reconnaissance, and field survey methodologies are summarized below.

ARCHIVAL RESEARCH

In November 2021, D+A conducted background research with the goal of identifying all previously recorded historic properties located within and in the vicinity of the project area in accordance with VDHR's guidance document titled *Guidelines for Conducting Cultural Resources Survey in Virginia* (rev. 2017). Background research was conducted at the VDHR and on the internet and including the following sources:

- > VDHR V-CRIS site files; and
- > National Park Service, American Battlefield Protection Program, maps and related documentation.

As part of this Phase I study, D+A checked resource data at each of the above sources to verify accuracy and ensure the information was up to date at the time of the survey. In further preparation for the Phase I survey, D+A conducted additional review of the following documents and sources for information relative to unrecorded historic property locations in the project area:

- County Tax Assessors records;
- USDA Historic Aerial Imagery;
- > U.S. Geological Survey Topographic Maps;
- > Previous historic resource survey documents;
- > Prince William County RELIC Room; and
- > Local historical society archives.

The additional review conducted in support of the Phase I survey was designed to identify all properties greater than 50 years of age located within the project area. Historic properties include architectural resources, historic and cultural landscapes, battlefields, and historic districts.

CONTEXT DEVELOPMENT

Information from the literature review and background search was used in conjunction with additional research to develop a cultural and historical context to place the project area and any identified historic resources within their appropriate context for evaluations of historical

significance. This context was developed through review of previous cultural resource studies, published and unpublished manuscripts, historic maps, aerial photographs, local histories, and a variety of internet sources.

For the purposes of this effort, a comprehensive cultural context of Prince William County was prepared summarizing general historical trends, settlement patterns, and development with a focus on the vicinity of the project area. Further analysis and context development was undertaken for the defined survey area so that newly recorded resources could be effectively evaluated.

For Phase II evaluation purposes, additional information was gathered on previously recorded sites with similar cultural and chronological contexts in order to form a basis for comparison of site integrity and information potential. This information was gathered from V-CRIS and previous survey documents on file at the VDHR.

FIELD SURVEY

Phase I Architectural Survey

The background research conducted in support of the Phase I reconnaissance survey was designed to identify all properties greater than 50 years of age located within the project APE and immediately adjacent to the APE. Visual inspection included digital photo documentation of each property's existing conditions and setting. Photographs of primary elevations and general setting were taken from public ROW and where possible, on private property. Resources over 50 years of age were identified and confirmed by the Prince William County tax records, historic aerial photography, and field inspection. Virginia Cultural Resource Information System (V-CRIS) site forms were completed for all cultural resources, 50 years of age or older identified during the survey and were submitted to VDHR.

Phase I Archaeological Survey

At the outset of field investigations, a pedestrian survey of the project area was conducted to document existing conditions and to note surface evidence of cultural activity or material and identify areas with the potential for intact subsurface archaeological resources. For any newly encountered archaeological resources identified during the reconnaissance, photographs were taken of the general vicinity and of any visible features. A field map was prepared showing feature locations, permanent landmarks, topographic and vegetation variation, as well as sources of disturbance. Sufficient information was included on the map to permit easy re-identification of the resources.

Following the pedestrian survey, systematic shovel testing was conducted throughout the high probability sections, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water saturated soils at the time of the survey. Shovel tests were excavated at a maximum of 15-meter (50-foot) intervals along transects spaced 15 meters (50 feet) apart. The shovel test interval may be extended in areas where soils and topography indicate that the potential for archaeological deposits to be present was considered low. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed

through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.30 meters (1 foot) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

For any archaeological resources identified during the survey, photographs were taken of the general vicinity and of any visible features. A field map was prepared showing site limits, feature locations, permanent landmarks, topographic and vegetational variation, sources of disturbance, and all surface and subsurface investigations. GPS coordinates for all identified site locations were recorded and sufficient information was included on maps to permit easy relocation of sites. Notes were taken on surface and vegetational conditions, soil characteristics, dimensions and construction of features evident, and the amount and distribution of cultural materials present. All subsurface archaeological excavations were backfilled and returned to pre-survey conditions.

Phase II Evaluation Survey

The primary goal of the archaeological evaluation survey was to make recommendations concerning the eligibility of Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105 for listing in the NRHP. As such, the field techniques used were based on local factors of landform, soil formation processes, historical land use, surface conditions, and the overall goal of the project.

Field investigation began with the excavation of shovel tests at 7.5-meter (25-foot) intervals across the site in an effort to further refine site limits, as well as define the relative densities of archaeological materials. An additional goal of the close interval shovel testing was to systematically examine the subsurface deposits and to rapidly identify any areas that may contain buried intact cultural strata and/or features. Shovel tests were excavated within the grid established during the Phase I survey.

Shovel tests measured approximately 38 centimeters (15 inches) in diameter and all excavated soils were screened through 1/4-inch mesh hardware cloth. Depths of shovel tests were recorded in reference to the ground surface. Descriptions of soil texture and color followed standard terminology and the Munsell (1994) soil color charts. All shovel test data was recorded on standard forms and identified on maps of the survey area. A representative sample of shovel tests were photo-documented so that the stratigraphy encountered in these tests was represented.

Shovel tests were excavated stratigraphically and close attention was paid to the distinction between soil horizons. Investigators identified any areas where possible buried cultural strata might be present. All artifacts were bagged and numbered by provenience. Ten centimeters of culturally sterile subsoil was excavated in all shovel tests to ensure that all buried cultural deposits were identified. To ensure that the site boundaries were adequately defined, two negative shovel tests were excavated at all boundaries of the site.

In addition, following close interval shove testing, targeted metal detection was undertaken at Site 44PW2105 to further supplement site delineation efforts. Metal detection consisted of 1-meter (3-foot) sweeps to either side of transects placed between the shovel transects. All positive metal

detector hits were excavated and recorded. Metallic material less than 50 years of age was noted and discarded in the field.

Following completion of the shovel tests, field analysis of the stratigraphic and artifact density data was used to establish the location of test units. The goal of the excavation of test units was to thoroughly examine site stratigraphy, provide a representative sample of the artifact assembly contained within the site for analysis, and to identify any possible buried cultural features or horizons.

Test units measured 1-meter by 1-meter (3.2-feet by 3.2-feet) in size and were excavated stratigraphically. A total of seven test units were excavated. Cultural material recovered was bagged in reference to the northwest corner of the unit and the level from which they were collected. When stratigraphic breaks were identified the newly encountered soil was uncovered completely. Prior to excavation, the top of any newly encountered strata, and the base of excavation of each test unit was photo-documented. To ensure that all buried cultural materials were identified, at least one, and, if possible, two sterile 4-inch (10-centimeter) levels were excavated in each test unit. Following completion of excavation, test units were photographed and profiled. If test unit excavation revealed any subsurface cultural features, the features were mapped and photographed in plan-view.

LABORATORY ANALYSIS

All artifacts generated in the course of the survey were provenienced in the field and recorded. Following fieldwork, the artifacts were transported to the D+A laboratory facilities where they were cleaned, sorted, and identified. After processing, all artifacts were inventoried using Microsoft Excel. A computer-printed artifact inventory of prehistoric and historic artifacts is included as an appendix to this report.

Identification of diagnostic artifacts was made by consulting existing comparative collections and available regional literature regarding artifact types. Artifacts were assigned dates through the comparison of identified artifacts with other material culture classes having documented use-popularity patterns. Ceramics and glass provided primary chronological information. All artifacts were placed in polyethylene re-sealable storage bags and placed in acid free boxes suitable for permanent curation. At the conclusion of the survey, arrangements will be made with the client regarding final deposition of the artifacts.

REPORT AND RECORD PREPARATION

Information from field survey was used in conjunction with background research and context development to assess each identified cultural resource for potential NRHP-eligibility. A results section was prepared that summarizes the field findings, assessment of significance and NRHP-eligibility. The results of the study are accompanied by maps and photographs as appropriate and were synthesized and summarized in this report along with the research design, archives search, and cultural contexts. All research material and documentation generated by this project are on file at D+A's office in Midlothian, Virginia. VDHR site forms (Virginia Cultural Resources Information System (V-CRIS) were completed for all cultural resources, 50 years of age or older,

identified during the survey. Site forms for archaeological sites are included as an appendix to this report.

QUALIFICATIONS AND STANDARDS

The D+A personnel who directed and conducted this survey meet the professional qualification standards of the Department of the Interior (48 FR 44738-9). All work was conducted in accordance with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation* (Federal Register 48:44716-44742, September 29, 1983), and VDHR's *Guidelines for Conducting Historic Resource Survey in Virginia* (rev. 2017).

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT

PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION

The Van Buren Road Extension project area consists of ± 37.2 hectares (± 91.8 acres) of land situated in the Piedmont physiographic region in Virginia (Figure 3-1). The project area is located between Cardinal Drive to the north and Dumfries Road (Route 234) to the south and is bounded to the east by Interstate 95 and to the west by forested land and modern residential development., with Independent Hill Drive to the west. The project area consists of primarily of woodlands, with some open areas associated with an electric transmission line corridor, and limited residential development. Runoff from the project area drains south and east towards Powells Creek and unnamed tributaries of Dewey's Creek.



Figure 3-1: Aerial view of the Van Buren Road Extension project area (red). Source: Google Earth 2018

GEOLOGY AND TOPOGRAPHY

The project area topography is characterized by several well-defined finger ridges that overlook Powells Creek and tributaries of Dewey's Creek. Modest relief and low slopes are associated with the Mesozoic lowlands subprovince of the Piedmont region. The area is underlain by Mesozoic sedimentary and igneous rocks. A well-dissected, dendritic drainage pattern occurs throughout this region with broad, low ridge, extensive upland "flats" and shallow, sluggish drainage ways. The elevation of the project area ranges from approximately ± 15.8 meters (52 feet) above mean sea level (AMSL) in the lower-lying areas of the project APE to ± 66.1 meters (217 feet) AMSL in the northern upland portions of the project APE.

HYDROLOGY

The northern portion of the project APE drains into Powells Creek and its unnamed tributaries and the southern portion of the project APE drains into unnamed tributaries of Dewey's Creek. Powells Creek flows directly into the Potomac River, while Dewey's Creek flows into Quantico Creek before emptying into the Potomac. The Potomac River then runs into the Chesapeake Bay before ultimately flowing into the Atlantic Ocean.

PEDOLOGY

The project area is dominated by soils of the Piedmont region which are characterized by slopes from 0-50% and are well drained to somewhat excessively drained (Figure 3-2 and Table 3-1). The most prominent soil types within the project area are Dumfries sandy loam and Quantico sandy loam. A total of 6.2% of the soils located within the project area APE are considered poorly drained. Approximately 44.1% of the project area APE soils are rated as sloped 15% or greater. Of the project area APE soils, approximately 19% is classified as prime farmland by the USDA.



Figure 3-2: Soil Survey of the Van Buren Road Extension project area APE showing soil types. Source: USDA

-

Man unit symbol	Man unit name	Rating	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
map unit symbol	map unit name	Rating	Acres III AOI	reitent of AOI
15A	Comus loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Well drained	1.9	2.0%
16A	Delanco fine sandy loam, 0 to 4 percent slopes	Moderately well drained	4.6	5.0%
18C	Dumfries sandy loam, 7 to 15 percent slopes	Well drained	8.7	9.4%
18D	Dumfries sandy loam, 15 to 25 percent slopes	Well drained	13.1	14.3%
18E	Dumfries sandy loam, 25 to 50 percent slopes	Well drained	18.3	19.9%
27A	Hatboro-Codorus complex, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Poorly drained	5.7	6.2%
34C	Lunt loam, 7 to 15 percent slopes	Well drained	0.2	0.2%
47B	Quantico sandy loam, 2 to 7 percent slopes	Well drained	18.0	19.6%
47C	Quantico sandy loam, 7 to 15 percent slopes	Well drained	12.2	13.3%
47D	Quantico sandy loam, 15 to 25 percent slopes	Well drained	3.0	3.3%
55D	Watt channery silt loam, 15 to 25 percent slopes	Somewhat excessively drained	3.2	3.5%
55E	Watt channery silt loam, 25 to 50 percent slopes	Somewhat excessively drained	2.8	3.1%
Totals for Area of Intere	est		91.7	100.0%

 Table 3-1: Unit summary of soils within the Van Buren Road Extension project. Source: USDA

4. PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS

This section includes a summary of all the cultural resource management events that have taken place within the project area registered at VDHR through November 2021. It also lists all previously identified architectural resources and archaeological sites located within the project area, as well as within one mile of the project area. The project area is not part of the Journey Through Hallowed Grounds Scenic Byway.

PREVIOUS SURVEYS RELEVANT TO THE SITE

Research at the VDHR reveals that 31 Phase I archaeological surveys have been conducted within one mile of the project area (Figures 4-1 and 4-2). Of these seven have crossed into various portions of the project area (Table 4-1).



Figure 4-1: Previous surveys (gray hatched) conducted within 1.0 mile (green) of the northern half of the project area (orange). Source: V-CRIS



Figure 4-2: Previous surveys (gray hatched) conducted within 1.0 mile (green) of the southern half of the project area (orange). Source: V-CRIS

VDHR Report #	DHR Report Title	Author Affiliation	DHR Report Year
FX-158	Phase I Cultural Resource Reconnaissance	Karell Archaeological	1987
	Survey for the Interstate-95 HOV Lane	Services	
	Project, Fairfax and Prince William Counties,		
	Virginia		
PW-016	A Prehistoric Cultural Resources	Thunderbird Archaeological	1982
	Reconnaissance of Neabsco and Powells	Associates (Thunderbird	
	Creek, Prince William County, Virginia	Research Corp.)	
PW-051	Phase I Archaeological Survey of Areas of	Virginia Commonwealth	1990
	Proposed Highway Improvements to Route	University Archaeology	
	234, Prince William Forest Park, Prince	Research Center	
	William County, Virginia		
PW-132	Phase I Archeological Investigation of	Thunderbird Archaeological	1995
	Chartwell and Wickcliffe Properties, Prince	Associates (Thunderbird	
	William County	Research Corp.)	
PW-386	Phase I Archaeological Investigation of the	TRC Environmental (TRC	2005
	Route 234 Gateway Project, Prince William	Garrow and Associates)	
	County, Virginia		
PW-570	A Phase I Archeological Investigation of the	Thunderbird Archaeological	2002
	345 Acre Kramer Property, Parcels A, B and	Associates (Thunderbird	
	C, Prince William County, Virginia	Research Corp.)	

T II 41 DI T		41 41	1.4	AT • A
Γορίο Δ.Τ. Ρρόζο Ι	archaeological	curveys that ha	ive erocced into	the project greg
$1 a D C = 1 \cdot 1 Habel I$	archaeologicai	sui vevs mai na	ive crosseu meo	inc project area.
		•/		
VDHR Report #	DHR Report Title	Author Affiliation	DHR Report Year	
------------------	--	--	-----------------------	
ST-153	Phase I Archeological Investigations of the I- 95/395 HOV/Bus/HOT Lanes Project, Arlington, Fairfax, Prince William and Stafford Counties and the City of Alexandria, Virginia	Thunderbird Archaeological Associates (Thunderbird Research Corp.)	2007	

PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES WITHIN ONE MILE

There are 198 previously recorded archaeological sites located within one mile of the project area (Figures 4-3 and 4-4, Table 4-2). The project area crosses over seven previously identified archaeological sites. These include six prehistoric sites and one site dating to the first half of the nineteenth century. These sites have not been formally evaluated for inclusion in the NRHP.

Included among the remaining sites are camps, cemeteries, dwellings, earthworks, forts, a furnace, a lawn, a military camp, a mill, a mine, an outbuilding, a quarry, a tavern, and lithic and trash scatter. The sites range in date from the prehistoric period to the twentieth century. VDHR has determined two sites to be eligible for listing in the NRHP: an iron furnace (VDHR #44PW0629) and a camp (VDHR #44PW2040). An additional site has also been determined to be potentially eligible for listing: an earthworks (VDHR #44PW1229). The remaining previously identified archaeological sites have been determined not eligible for listing or have not been formally evaluated for inclusion in the NRHP.



Figure 4-3: Map detailing all archaeological resources (red) within 1.0 mile (green) of the northern half of the project area (orange). Source: V-CRIS



Figure 4-4: Map detailing all archaeological resources (red) within 1.0 mile (green) of the southern half of the project area (orange). Source: V-CRIS

Table 4-2: Previously identified archaeological sites located within 1.0 mile of the project area. Sit	tes
highlighted orange are mapped within the project area. Site in bold text have been determined eli	igible or
potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP.	

VDHR ID#	Site Type	Temporal Association	NRHP Status
44PW0001	Cemetery, Church	17th Century: 2nd half (1650 - 1699), 18th	Not Evaluated
		Century (1700 - 1799), 19th Century (1800 -	
		1899), 20th Century (1900 - 1999)	
44PW0052	Camp, temporary	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW0128	Dwelling, single	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.), 17th Century: 2nd half (1650 - 1699)	
44PW0129	Fort	19th Century: 3rd quarter (1850 - 1874)	Not Evaluated
44PW0130	Fort	19th Century: 2nd/3rd quarter (1825 - 1874)	Not Evaluated
44PW0131	Dwelling, single	18th Century (1700 - 1799)	Not Evaluated
44PW0132	Earthworks	19th Century: 2nd/3rd quarter (1825 - 1874)	Not Evaluated
44PW0172	Quarry	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW0199	Other	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW0303	Mine, gold	20th Century: 2nd quarter (1925 - 1949)	Not Evaluated
44PW0309	Camp, temporary	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW0310	Camp, temporary	No Data	Not Evaluated

VDHR ID#	Site Type	Temporal Association	NRHP Status
44PW0311	Camp, temporary	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW0617	Lithic workshop	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	DHR Staff: Not
		A.D.)	Eligible
44PW0618	Lithic workshop	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	DHR Staff: Not
4 4 5 1 4 6 6 6 6	2 611	A.D.)	Eligible
44PW0628	Mill, raceway	18th Century (1700 - 1799), 19th Century	DHR Staff: Not
44000000	те	(1800 - 1899)	Eligible
44PW0629	Iron furnace,	18th Century (1700 - 1799), 19th Century: 1st quarter (1800 - 1825)	DHR Board Det. Eligible
11PW0630	Camp temporary	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B C 1606	Not Evaluated
HI W0050	Camp, temporary	A D)	Not Evaluated
44PW0631	Camp. temporary	No Data	Not Evaluated
14PW0632	Comp. tomporary	Prohistorio/Unknown (15000 B C 1606	Not Evaluated
44F W 0032	Camp, temporary	A D)	Not Evaluated
44PW0752	Camp Dwelling	Early Woodland (1200 B C - 299 A D) 18th	Not Evaluated
111 11 0752	single. Lithic	Century (1700 - 1799)	1 tot El tuluitoù
	workshop		
44PW0753	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW0754	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW0755	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW0756	Camp, Lithic	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
440000757	workshop	A.D.)	Net Feel at al
44PW0/57	Camp	<null></null>	Not Evaluated
44PW0758	Camp, Lithic	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
44000750	workshop	A.D.)	Net Feel at al
44PW0759	Camp	AD)	Not Evaluated
44PW0760	Camp	A.D.) Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B C 1606	Not Evaluated
441 ₩0700	Camp	A D)	Not Evaluated
44PW0761	Camp. Lithic	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
	workshop	A.D.)	
44PW0762	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
	•	A.D.)	
44PW0763	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW0764	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW0765	Camp, Lithic	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
44000000	workshop	A.D.)	
44PW0766	Camp	Early Archaic ($8500 - 6501$ B.C.), Early Woodland (1200 P.C. 200 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
11DW0767	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 P.C 1606	Not Evaluated
441 W0/0/	Camp	A D)	
44PW0768	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
	h	A.D.)	
	1		

VDHR ID#	Site Type	Temporal Association NRHP Status	
44PW0769	Camp	No Data	Not Evaluated
44PW0770	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0771	Camp	No Data	Not Evaluated
44PW0772	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0773	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0774	Camp	Late Archaic (3000 - 1201 B.C.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0775	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0776	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0777	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0778	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0779	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0780	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0781	Camp, temporary, Lithic workshop	Archaic (8500 - 1201 B.C.), Late Woodland (1000 - 1606)	Not Evaluated
44PW0782	Camp	No Data	Not Evaluated
44PW0783	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0784	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0785	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0786	Camp	No Data	Not Evaluated
44PW0787	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0788	Camp, Lithic workshop	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0789	Camp, Dwelling, single	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.), 18th Century: 4th quarter (1775 - 1799)	Not Evaluated
44PW0790	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0791	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0792	Camp	No Data	Not Evaluated
44PW0793	Camp	Early Woodland (1200 B.C 299 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0794	Camp	Late Archaic (3000 - 1201 B.C.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0795	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0796	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated

VDHR ID#	Site Type	Temporal Association NRHP Status	
44PW0797	Camp	No Data	Not Evaluated
44PW0798	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0799	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0800	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0801	Camp	Early Archaic (8500 - 6501 B.C.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0802	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0803	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0804	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0805	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0806	Camp, Lithic workshop	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0807	Camp, Lithic workshop	Early Woodland (1200 B.C 299 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0808	Camp, Dwelling, single	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.), 18th Century: 1st half (1700 - 1749)	Not Evaluated
44PW0809	Camp, Dwelling, single	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0810	Camp, Lithic workshop	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0811	Camp, Dwelling, single	Woodland (1200 B.C 1606 A.D.), 18th Century: 4th quarter (1775 - 1799), 19th Century: 1st quarter (1800 - 1825)	Not Evaluated
44PW0812	Camp, Dwelling, single	20th Century (1900 - 1999)	Not Evaluated
44PW0813	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0814	Camp, Other	Historic/Unknown, Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0815	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0816	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0817	Camp	Woodland (1200 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0818	Camp	Early Archaic (8500 - 6501 B.C.), Woodland (1200 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0819	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0820	Camp, Dwelling, single	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.), 18th Century: 4th quarter (1775 - 1799), 19th Century: 1st quarter (1800 - 1825)	Not Evaluated
44PW0821	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated

VDHR ID#	Site Type	Temporal Association	NRHP Status
44PW0822	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW0823	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
44000004	Comp	A.D.) Prehistoria/Unknown (15000 P.C. 1606	Not Evaluated
44F W 0624	Camp	A D)	Not Evaluated
44PW0825	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
	- · · · ·	A.D.)	
44PW0839	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW0840	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
44000041	Comm	A.D.)	Not Employed
44PW0841	Camp	A D)	Not Evaluated
44PW0842	Lithic workshop	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
	r	A.D.)	
44PW0843	Camp	Early Woodland (1200 B.C 299 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0844	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW0845	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW0846	Camp	No Data	Not Evaluated
44PW0847	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
44000049	Comp	A.D.) Drobistorio/Unknown (15000 P.C. 1606	Not Evaluated
44P W 0848	Camp	A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW0849	Lithic quarry, Lithic	Late Archaic (3000 - 1201 B.C.)	Not Evaluated
	workshop		
44PW0850	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
44DW0851	Comp	A.D.) Drobistorio/Unknown (15000 P.C. 1606	Not Evaluated
44F W 0651	Camp	A D)	Not Evaluated
44PW0924	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	DHR Staff: Not
	1	A.D.)	Eligible
44PW0925	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	DHR Staff: Not
		A.D.)	Eligible
44PW0926	Other	19th Century: 4th quarter (1875 - 1899), 20th	DHR Staff: Not
44DW0021	Comp	Century: 1st half (1900 - 1949)	Eligible Not Evaluated
441 0000	Camp	A D)	Not Evaluated
44PW0932	Camp	No Data	Not Evaluated
44PW0933	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
	- ·····T	A.D.)	
44PW0934	Lithic scatter	Pre-Contact	DHR Staff: Not
			Eligible
44PW0935	Lithic scatter	Pre-Contact	DHR Staff: Not
44000000	T :4h:	Des Costant	Eligible
44PW0936	Litnic scatter	Pre-Contact	DHK Staff: Not Fligible
			Eligible

VDHR ID#	Site Type	Temporal Association	NRHP Status
44PW0937	Camp	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	DHR Staff: Not
		A.D.), 18th Century (1700 - 1799)	Eligible
44PW1229	Earthworks	19th Century: 3rd quarter (1850 - 1874)	DHR Staff:
			Potentially Eligible
44PW1248	Camp, base	19th Century: 2nd half (1850 - 1899)	Not Evaluated
44PW1265	Camp, temporary	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW1294	Lithic scatter	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW1295	Dwelling, single	19th Century: 1st half (1800 - 1849)	Not Evaluated
44PW1296	Camp, temporary,	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
	Lithic scatter	A.D.)	
44PW1297	Camp, temporary,	Pre-Contact	Not Evaluated
	Lithic scatter		
44PW1298	Camp, temporary,	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
	Lithic scatter	A.D.)	
44PW1299	Camp, temporary, Lithic scatter	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW1300	Camp, temporary,	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
	Dwelling, single,	A.D.), 18th Century (1700 - 1799), 19th	
	Lithic scatter	Century (1800 - 1899)	
44PW1301	Camp, temporary,	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
	Lithic scatter	A.D.)	
44PW1302	Camp, temporary,	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
440001202	Lithic scatter	A.D.)	Nat Frahratad
44P W 1505	Lithic control Trach	Century (1800 - 1809) 20th Century (1000	
	scatter	(1900 - 1899), 20th Century (1900 -	
44PW1304	Camp temporary	Historic/Unknown Prehistoric/Unknown	Not Evaluated
111 11 1501	Lithic scatter. Trash	(15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Tiot Evaluated
	scatter		
44PW1305	Camp, temporary,	Early Woodland (1200 B.C.E - 299 C.E),	Not Evaluated
	Dwelling, single,	Colony to Nation (1751 - 1789), Early	
	Lithic scatter, Other	National Period (1790 - 1829), Antebellum	
		Period (1830 - 1860)	
44PW1306	Camp, temporary,	Late Woodland (1000 - 1606), Contact Period	Not Evaluated
	Dwelling, single,	(1607 - 1750), Colony to Nation (1751 -	
	Lithic scatter, Other	1789), Early National Period (1790 - 1829),	
		Antebellum Period (1830 - 1860), Civil War	
		(1861 - 1865), Reconstruction and Growth $(1866 - 1016)$	
//PW1307	Camp temporary	$\begin{array}{c} (1000 - 1710) \\ \text{Middle Archaic (6500 - 3001 B C) Early} \end{array}$	Not Evaluated
THI W 1307	Lithic scatter	Woodland (1200 B C - 299 A D)	
44PW1308	Camp, temporary.	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
	Lithic scatter	A.D.)	
44PW1309	Camp, temporary,	Middle Archaic (6500 - 3001 B.C.)	Not Evaluated
	Lithic scatter		
44PW1310	Camp, temporary,	Middle Archaic (6500 - 3001 B.C.)	Not Evaluated
	Lithic scatter		

VDHR ID#	Site Type	Temporal Association	NRHP Status
44PW1311	Camp, temporary,	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
	Dwelling, single,	A.D.), 19th Century: 4th quarter (1875 -	
	Lithic scatter	1899), 20th Century: 1st half (1900 - 1949)	
44PW1312	Camp, temporary,	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
	Lithic scatter	A.D.)	
44PW1313	Camp, temporary,	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
	Lithic scatter	A.D.)	
44PW1314	Camp, temporary,	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
	Lithic scatter, Trash	A.D.), 19th Century (1800 - 1899), 20th	
	scatter	Century (1900 - 1999)	
44PW1315	Camp, temporary,	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
	Lithic scatter, Trash	A.D.), 20th Century (1900 - 1999)	
	scatter		
44PW1316	Camp, temporary,	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
	Lithic scatter	A.D.)	
44PW1317	Trash scatter	20th Century (1900 - 1999)	Not Evaluated
44PW1318	Camp, temporary,	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
	Lithic scatter	A.D.)	
44PW1319	Camp, temporary,	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
	Lithic scatter	A.D.)	
44PW1320	Camp, temporary,	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
	Lithic scatter	A.D.)	
44PW1321	Trash scatter	19th Century: 1st half (1800 - 1849)	Not Evaluated
44PW1322	Lithic scatter	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW1323	Camp, temporary,	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
	Lithic scatter	A.D.)	
44PW1324	Cemetery	19th Century (1800 - 1899)	Not Evaluated
44PW1417	Lithic scatter	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW1418	Lithic scatter	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW1419	Lithic scatter	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW1420	Camp, temporary	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW1421	Lithic scatter	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW1422	Lithic scatter	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW1423	Camp, temporary	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW1424	Dwelling, single,	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
	Lithic scatter	A.D.), 18th Century: 4th quarter (1775 -	
		1799), 19th Century: 1st half (1800 - 1849)	
44PW1425	Camp, temporary	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW1426	Lithic scatter	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	

VDHR ID#	Site Type	Temporal Association	NRHP Status
44PW1427	Lithic scatter, Military	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
	camp	A.D.), 19th Century: 2nd half (1850 - 1899),	
44DW1429	Comp. tomporory	20th Century (1900 - 1999)	Not Evoluted
44P W 1428	Dwelling single	A D) 19th Century (1800 - 1899)	Not Evaluated
44PW1429	Lithic scatter	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW1430	Lithic scatter	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW1431	Lithic scatter	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
14PW1432	Lithic scatter	A.D.) Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C. 1606	Not Evaluated
441 1452	Littlic scatter	A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW1433	Lithic scatter	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW1434	Lithic scatter	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
440321425	T'd' second se	A.D.)	
44PW1435	Litnic scatter	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606 ΔD)	Not Evaluated
44PW1436	Lithic scatter	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW1437	Lithic scatter, Mill	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.), 20th Century (1900 - 1999)	
44PW1438	Military camp	19th Century: 2nd half (1850 - 1899)	Not Evaluated
44PW1439	Lithic scatter	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
44 DW 1450	Comp. tomporary	A.D.) Middle Woodland (300, 000 A.D.) Late	DUD Staff: Not
441 1439	Trash scatter	Woodland (1000 - 1606), 20th Century (1900	Eligible
		- 1999)	Ligion
44PW1460	Lithic scatter	Late Archaic (3000 - 1201 B.C.)	DHR Staff: Not
			Eligible
44PW1678	Lithic scatter	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
44PW1679	Lithic scatter	A.D.) Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
	Little seater	A.D.)	Not Evaluated
44PW1697	Dwelling, multiple	20th Century (1900 - 1999)	Not Evaluated
44PW1702	Lithic scatter	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW1718	Trash scatter	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	DHR Staff: Not
		A.D.), 18th Century: 4th quarter (1775 -	Eligible
44PW1759	Lithic scatter	Historic/Unknown Prehistoric/Unknown	Not Evaluated
111 11 11 1755	Littlie Soutor	(15000 B.C 1606 A.D.)	Tiot Evaluated
44PW1760	Lithic scatter	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
		A.D.)	
44PW1840	Tavern/Inn	Contact Period (1607 - 1750), Colony to	Not Evaluated
		Nation (1/51 - 1/89), Early National Period	
		(1750 - 1625), Anteolehum Period (1850 - 1860), Civil War (1861 - 1865)	
		Reconstruction and Growth (1866 - 1916),	

VDHR ID#	Site Type	Temporal Association	NRHP Status
		World War I to World War II (1917 - 1945),	
		The New Dominion (1946 - 1991), Post Cold	
		War (1992 - Present)	
44PW1841	Lawn	18th Century: 2nd half (1750 - 1799), 19th	Not Evaluated
		Century (1800 - 1899)	
44PW1842-	Camp	Colony to Nation (1751 - 1789)	Not Evaluated
0001	~		
44PW1842-	Camp	Colony to Nation (1751 - 1789)	Not Evaluated
0002			
44PW1842-	Camp	Colony to Nation (1751 - 1789)	Not Evaluated
0003			
44PW1859	Dwelling, single,	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
	Lithic scatter	A.D.), 19th Century: 4th quarter (1875 -	
		1899), 20th Century: 1st quarter (1900 - 1924)	
44PW1866	Dwelling, single	Antebellum Period (1830 - 1860), Civil War	DHR Evaluation
		(1861 - 1865), Reconstruction and Growth	Committee: Not
		(1866 - 1916)	Eligible
44PW1878	Camp, temporary,	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	DHR Staff: Not
	Lithic scatter	A.D.)	Eligible
44PW1879	Camp, temporary,	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	DHR Staff: Not
	Lithic scatter	A.D.)	Eligible
44PW1888	Dwelling, single,	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
	Lithic scatter, Store	A.D.), 20th Century (1900 - 1999)	
44PW1898	Lithic quarry, Lithic	Prehistoric/Unknown (15000 B.C 1606	Not Evaluated
	scatter	A.D.)	
44PW2011	Earthworks	Civil War (1861 - 1865)	Not Evaluated
44PW2040	Camp, temporary,	Pre-Contact, Contact Period (1607 - 1750),	DHR Evaluation
	Dwelling, single	Colony to Nation (1751 - 1789), Early	Committee: Eligible
		National Period (1790 - 1829), Antebellum	_
		Period (1830 - 1860), Civil War (1861 -	
		1865), Reconstruction and Growth (1866 -	
		1916)	
44PW2072	Lithic workshop	Pre-Contact	Not Evaluated
44PW2073	Outbuilding	World War I to World War II (1917 - 1945),	Not Evaluated
	_	The New Dominion (1946 - 1991)	

PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES WITHIN ONE MILE

Review of VDHR records identifies 62 previously recorded architectural resources located within one mile of the project area; none of which are located within the project area (Figures 4-5 and 4-6, Table 4-2). Included among the resources are archaeological sites, an automobile showroom, a battle site, a bridge, a cemetery, a church, commercial buildings, a doctor's office, an earthworks, a furnace, a gymnasium, historic districts, a mining structure, offices, a park, a road, a school, a sewer/water works, single dwellings, stores, and a tavern. The range in date from the early eighteenth century to the mid-twentieth century. There are four resources listed in the NRHP: Cabin Branch Pyrite Mine Historic District (VDHR #076-0289), Prince William Forest Park Historic District (VDHR #076-0299), Dumfries Tavern (VDHR #212-0001), and Weems-Botts House (VDHR #212-0010). Additionally, there is one resource that has been determined eligible

for listing in the NRHP: Neabsco Mills Ironworks Site (VDHR #076-0265). The remaining resources have been determined not eligible for listing or have not been formally evaluated for inclusion in the NRHP.



Figure 4-5: Map detailing all architectural resources (blue hatched) within 1.0 mile (green) of the northern half of the project area (orange). Source: V-CRIS



Figure 4-6: Map detailing all architectural resources (blue hatched) within 1.0 mile (green) of the southern half of the project area (orange). Source: V-CRIS

VDHR ID#	Resource Name	Туре	Year	NRHP Status
076-0265	Neabsco Mills Ironworks Site	Furnace	1730Ca	DHR Board Det.
	(Historic/Current), Tayloe's Iron			Eligible
	Works (Historic)			
076-0284	Bailey House (site) (Historic/Current),	Archaeological	1790Ca	Not Evaluated
	Callender House (Historic), Terrapin	Site		
	Forest (Current)			
076-0289	Cabin Branch Pyrite Mine Historic	Mining	1889	NRHP Listing, VLR
	District (Historic)	Structure		Listing
076-0299	Chopawamsic Recreation	Park	1933	NRHP Listing, VLR
	Demonstration Area (Historic), Prince			Listing
	William Forest Park Historic District			
	(Historic/Current)			
076-0485	James Tasee House, 15605 Cardinal	Single Dwelling	1900Ca	DHR Staff: Not Eligible;
	Drive (Historic/Location)			Not Extant
076-0486	Miller House, Cardinal Drive	Store/Market	1915Ca	DHR Staff: Not Eligible;
	(Historic/Location), R. W. Brundt Store			Not Extant
	(Historic)			
076-0487	House, Cardinal Drive	Single Dwelling	1900Ca	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
	(Function/Location)			

Table 4-3: Previously identified architectural resources located within 1.0 mile of the project area. Those resources in bold text are listed in the NRHP or have been determined eligible for listing.

VDHR ID#	Resource Name	Туре	Year	NRHP Status
076-5059	House, 17020 Jefferson Davis Highway (Function/Location)	Single Dwelling	1930	DHR Staff: Not Eligible; Not Extant
076-5309	House, 17431 Van Buren Road (Function/Location)	Single Dwelling	1932Ca	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
076-5336	Neabsco Baptist Church and Cemetery (Historic/Current)	Church/Chapel	1882Ca	Not Evaluated
076-5337	Bailey Cemetery at Tacey Place (Historic/Location), Tacey-Bailey Cemetery (Historic/Current)	Cemetery	1885Ca	Not Evaluated
076-5716	Bridge # 1004, Jefferson David Hwy (Rt 1), Powells Creek (Function/Location)	Bridge	1927	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
076-5769	Rifle Pit, Dumfries Road (Function/Location)	Earthworks	1861Ca	Not Evaluated
076-5770	Historic Road Bed, adjacent to Van Buren Road (Function/Location)	Road/Road Trace	1891Pre	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
076-5842	Cockpit Point Battlefield (Descriptive)	Battle Site	1862Ca	Not Evaluated
076-5844	House, 15623 Bushey Drive (Function/Location)	Single Dwelling	1948	Not Evaluated
076-5845	House, 15615 Bushey Drive (Function/Location)	Single Dwelling	1951	Not Evaluated
076-5846	House, 15611 Bushey Drive (Function/Location)	Single Dwelling	1950	Not Evaluated
076-5847	House, 15529 Cardinal Drive (Function/Location)	Single Dwelling	1901	Not Evaluated
076-5849	Industrial Buildings, 15051 Birchdale Avenue (Function/Location), Virginia American Water (Current Name)	Sewer/Water Works	1965Ca	Not Evaluated
076-5868	Dale City Sections 1 & 2 Historic District (Current Name)	Historic District	1966Ca	Not Evaluated
076-5869	Dale City Section 5 Historic District (Current Name)	Historic District	1966Ca	Not Evaluated
076-5874	Apple House (Current Name), House, 17409 Mine Road (Function/Location)	Single Dwelling	1960Ca	DHR Evaluation Committee: Not Eligible
076-5875	House, 17415 Mine Road (Function/Location), McCant House (Current Name)	Single Dwelling	1930Ca	DHR Evaluation Committee: Not Eligible
076-5876	River Oaks Vet Hospital (Current Name), Veterinarian Hospital, 15508 Neabsco Mills Road (Function/Location)	Office/Office Building	1950Ca	Not Evaluated
076-5877	Mid-Atlantic Wrecking Service (Current Name), Office Building, 15524 Neabsco Mills Road (Function/Location)	Office/Office Building	1956Ca	Not Evaluated
076-5878	Dominion Wrecker Service (Current Name), Office Building, 2630 Hanco Center Drive (Function/Location)	Office/Office Building	1945Ca	Not Evaluated
076-5879	Office Building, 15528 Neabsco Mills Road (Function/Location)	Office/Office Building	1940	Not Evaluated
076-5880	Automobile Dealership, 15605 Jefferson Davis Highway (Function/Location),	Automobile Showroom	1968Ca	Not Evaluated

VDHR ID#	Resource Name	Туре	Year	NRHP Status
	Lindsay Chevrolet/Nissan Dealership (Current Name)			
212-0001	Dumfries Tavern (Historic), Love's Tavern (Historic), Old Hotel (NRHP Listing), Stagecoach Inn (Historic), Williams Ordinary (Historic/Current)	Tavern/Ordinary	1765Ca	NRHP Listing, VLR Listing
212-0004	Brawner Property (Current), Merchant House Site (Historic)	Archaeological Site	1700Ca	Not Evaluated
212-0005	Tebbs-Mundy House Site (Historic)	Archaeological Site	1780Ca	Not Evaluated
212-0008	Dumfries Public Cemetery (Current), Quantico Church Site and Dumfries Cemetery (Historic)	Archaeological Site	1752	Not Evaluated
212-0010	Weems-Botts House (Historic), Weems-Botts Museum & William Grayson Memorial (Current)	Single Dwelling	1790Ca	NRHP Listing, VLR Listing
212-0022	House, 17651 Graham Street (Function/Location), R. F. Waters House (Historic)	Single Dwelling	1918Ca	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
212-0023	Belle Framing (Current Name), Commercial building, 17646 Main Street (Function/Location), Waters Garage (Historic)	Store	1920	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
212-0024	House, 17630 Graham Street (Function/Location), Mrs. Brawner House (Historic)	Single Dwelling	1925Ca	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
212-0025	Cropper's Auto Care (Current Name), Garage, 17660 Main Street (Function/Location), George Water House (Historic), House, 17662 Main Street (Function/Location)	Single Dwelling	1930Ca	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
212-5017	Clint and Janie Abel House, 100 Old Stage Coach Rd (Historic/Location), Commercial building, 17575 Old Stage Coach Road (Function/Location), Premier Automotive (Current Name), Water Treatment Systems, 17575 Old Stage Coach Road (Historic)	Single Dwelling	1931	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
212-5018	House, 107 Waters Lane (Historic), House, 17546 Waters Lane (Function/Location)	Single Dwelling	1950	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
212-5019	House, 105 Waters Lane (Historic), House, 17540 Waters Lane (Function/Location)	Single Dwelling	1945	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
212-5020	House, 103 Waters Lane (Historic), House, 17530 Waters Lane (Function/Location)	Single Dwelling	1952	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
212-5021	Commercial Building, 17521 Tripoli Boulevard (Function/Location), House,	Single Dwelling	1950	DHR Staff: Not Eligible

VDHR ID#	Resource Name	Туре	Year	NRHP Status
	17521 Tripoli Boulevard (Function/Location), Margo's (Historic)			
212-5022	17505 Tripoli Boulevard (Function/Location)	Single Dwelling	1950	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
212-5023	Brown Brothers Hobby Shop (Current)	Commercial Building	1940	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
212-5024	House, 17660 Colonial Street (Function/Location)	Single Dwelling	1945Ca	Not Evaluated
212-5025	Dumfries Elementary School (Historic/Current)	School	1939	Not Evaluated
212-5026	House, 17481 Tripoli Boulevard (Function/Location)	Single Dwelling	1950	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
212-5027	House, 17485 Tripoli Boulevard (Function/Location)	Single Dwelling	1951	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
212-5028	House, 17495 Tripoli Boulevard (Function/Location)	Single Dwelling	1950	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
212-5029	House, 17499 Tripoli Boulevard (Function/Location)	Single Dwelling	1950	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
212-5030	House, 17496 Tripoli Boulevard (Function/Location)	Single Dwelling	1950	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
212-5031	House, 17500 Tripoli Boulevard (Function/Location)	Single Dwelling	1950	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
212-5032	House, 17510 Tripoli Boulevard (Function/Location)	Single Dwelling	1950	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
212-5033	House, 17530 Tripoli Boulevard (Function/Location)	Single Dwelling	1950	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
212-5034	Commercial building, 17541 Jefferson Davis Highway (Function/Location), The Car Store (Current Name)	Commercial Building	1940	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
212-5035	Commercial Building, 17540 Tripoli Boulevard (Function/Location), REO's Tattooing (Current Name)	Commercial Building	1950	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
212-5036	Commercial Building, 17555 Jefferson Davis Highway (Function/Location), Pure Car Buying (Current Name)	Commercial Building	1960	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
212-5037	Commercial Building, 17651 Main Street (Function/Location), Dumfries Car Wash (Current Name)	Other	1965	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
212-5039	Store, 17682 Main Street (Function/Location), Two Guys Antiques and Collectibles (Current Name)	Store	1939	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
212-5045	General Joseph M. Heiser Jr. Memorial Boys and Girls Club (Current Name), Social Hall, 17565 Old Stage Coach Road (Function/Location)	Gymnasium	1950	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
212-5046	Dental Office, 17569 Old Stage Coach Road (Function/Location), Dental	Doctors Office/Building	1940	DHR Staff: Not Eligible

VDHR ID#	Resource Name	Туре	Year	NRHP Status
	Office, James D. Hale, DDS (Current Name)			

BATTLEFIELDS

The project area is not located in any battlefields. The nearest battle, according to the American Battlefield Protection Program (ABPP), was on the Potomac River: Cockpit Point Battle (Figure 4-7). The study area for the battle is approximately 0.5 mile east of the project area, the National Register potentially eligible area lies 2.5 miles east of the project area, and the core of the battle is approximately 3 miles east of the project area.



Figure 4-7: Map of the Battle of Cockpit Point depicting the project area in relation to the battle. Source: V-CRIS

5. CULTURAL CONTEXT

The following section provides a brief summary of the general overarching regional prehistoric and historic themes relevant to Virginia and Prince William County. The primary emphasis of this context focuses on the anthropological and material culture trends in prehistory and history, and describes how people throughout time could have left their archaeological mark on the landscape of the project area specifically. Prehistoric and historic occupation statistics and trends were analyzed, as were historic maps and available first-hand accounts which aided in establishing the appropriate cultural context for the project area as defined by the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation* and the Virginia Department of Historic Resources' *How to use Historic Contexts in Virginia: A Guide for Survey, Registration, Protection, and Treatment Projects* (VDHR 2017). Additional research was carried out for land encompassing Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105 and a chain of title for these sites is located at the end of the chapter.

PALEOINDIAN PERIOD (PRIOR TO 8000 B.C.)

Recent archaeological findings in Virginia have found the first Paleoindians are projected to have arrived in southeastern North America between 15,000 and 11,000 years ago, or approximately 13000 to 9000 B.C. (McAvoy and McAvoy 1997). Three of the earliest archaeological sites associated with Paleoindian occupation in Virginia are the Cactus Hill site (VDHR #44SX0202) located along the Nottoway River in Sussex County, the Thunderbird Site (VDHR #44WR0011) in Warren County, and the Saltville site (VDHR #44SM0037) in Smyth County. These early populations coincided with the late glacial era when sea levels were approximately 230 feet below their present-day level (Anderson et al. 1996:3). The Laurentide Ice Sheet covered much of northern North America, lowering temperatures in the region and creating an ideal environment for a boreal forest (Delcourt and Delcourt 1981). Paleoindians apparently survived in this environment through opportunistic hunting and gathering of smaller mammals, fish, and wild plants (Anderson 2001). Seasonably mobile, these Paleoindians utilized different food sources at different times of the year, an extensive subsistence pattern that required a large territory.

Accordingly, the Paleoindians may have maintained a central base camp located either in a diverse ecozone where flora and fauna were easily procured or near lithic sources that contained cryptocrystalline stone. Wider ranging satellite camps would then have been seasonally occupied to exploit other natural resources, be they lithic material, flora, or fauna (Anderson et al 1996; Daniel 1996; Binford 1980). Most Paleoindian sites are small and scattered, suggesting that the groups lived in small familial bands distributed across the landscape. The lack of status items among their archaeological remains suggests that these groups recognized little differentiation in status, and probably employed an egalitarian social structure. Ethnographic analogies suggest that Paleoindians might have maintained this rough equality by shunning aspiring leaders, and methods of property redistribution.

The Paleoindians relied upon durable and easily-shaped cryptocrystalline materials such as chert and jasper for their tools. They fashioned these rocks into a variety of instruments, among which were scrapers, gravers, and adzes. Paleoindian projectile points tended to be fluted and bifacially sharpened. Due to time and rising sea levels, many Paleoindian material culture finds are limited to isolated projectile points. Researchers differentiate the Paleoindian Period into three smaller periods reflecting changes in the morphology of projectile points. These periods include the Early Paleoindian (9500-9000 B.C.), the Middle Paleoindian (9000-8500 B.C.), and the Late Paleoindian (8500-8000 B.C.).

During the Early Paleoindian, Paleoindians produced large fluted Clovis points, a style widespread throughout North America, which could be affixed to a spear shaft. Sites from this period are found throughout the eastern seaboard in very low densities. Regions depicting greater concentrations of these sites are in Tennessee, the Cumberland and Ohio River Valley, western South Carolina, the northern Piedmont of North Carolina, and southern Virginia (Anderson 1990:164-71; Daniel 1996; Ward and Davis 1999).

The Middle Paleoindian saw a modification of Clovis points, such as the disappearance of the fluting in some cases and the addition of "ears" at the base of the point. The appearance of these new types, such as the Cumberland, Simpson, Clovis variants, and Suwanee points, might reflect changes in subsistence patterns as the result of rising global temperatures. During this time, it is theorized that American Indians began to radiate out from their previous range of occupation to exploit resources from more distant environments (Anderson 1990; Anderson et al. 1996; Ward and Davis 1999:31).

Changes to the projectile points intensified during the final centuries of the Paleoindian Period resulting in an increased number of changes in projectile point morphology. The Dalton and Hardaway types and other variants allowed late Paleoindian peoples to hunt new species.

The Paleoindian's scattered settlement pattern and simple culture contribute to the limited number of associated sites in the region, fewer than 75 sites have been identified in present-day Virginia and only 25 have been positively identified in the entire Chesapeake (Turner 1989; Dent 1995). Those Paleoindian sites that have been located tend to be quarry sites, which groups frequently visited and areas where several bands gathered (Meltzer 1988; McAvoy 1992). Many sites were likely destroyed when warming global temperatures melted the glaciers and inundated the low-lying Paleoindian settlements.

ARCHAIC PERIOD (8000 TO 1200 B.C.)

Dramatic climatic changes beginning about 10,000 years ago prompted a reconfiguration of prehistoric people's subsistence strategies and social organization. Specifically, global temperatures began rising with the dawn of the Holocene geological period, simultaneously shrinking the glaciers and raising sea levels. In North America, the Laurentide Ice Sheet gradually receded northward, making the southeastern portion of the modern-day United States warmer and drier. The boreal forest of the Pleistocene era slowly gave way to a mixed conifer and northern hardwood forest. The area began to assume its modern-day climate and floral and faunal species. This warming also resulted in dramatic hydrological changes for coastal Virginia. As the sea level gradually climbed, the land was flooded; as a result, the lower reaches of the Susquehanna River flooded to form the Chesapeake Bay.

These climatic changes created new food sources for prehistoric people. The warmer, drier climate led to a greater biodiversity, especially floral, as spruce and fir forests gave way to nut- and fruitbearing trees (Aaron 2009:17). This allowed humans to rely more heavily on gathering wild plants, nuts, and berries. Indeed, archaeologists have discovered tools, such as nutting stones and pestles, for processing vegetable materials. The creation of the Chesapeake Bay, furthermore allowed Archaic people to exploit seafood, such as anadromous fish and shellfish. The appearance of shell middens during the period testifies to the importance of mollusks to the Archaic diet (Dent 1995).

To exploit these new resources, Archaic people likely intensified their seasonal movement, splitting their time between a semi-permanent base camp and smaller, dispersed hunting and gathering camps. Bands of as many as 30 people may have gathered in the base camp for part of the year, and then dispersed into "microbands," composed of a single family or two, in other seasons (Griffin 1952; Anderson and Hanson 1998; Ward and Davis 1999). The range of band movement would have occurred over relatively large regions. These larger base camps are theorized to have been located along rich environmental areas near the Fall Line or along main rivers.

New subsistence patterns also required new technologies and the adaption of existing technologies to be suitable to existing game. "The spear thrower [called an atlat1] added range and power to the hunter's arm. The axe enabled people to fell trees. The mortar and pestle made it easy to pound and grind nuts, seeds, and roots" (quoted in Aaron 2009:18). With new technologies, smaller game could be more easily hunted and plants could be processed more effectively. The resulting products of these technologies differentiate the Archaic Period into three smaller periods. The period also saw innovations in project point manufacturing. In a further divergence with the paleoindians who relied heavily on cryptocrystalline lithics, Archaic people utilized more materials, such as quartzite and quartz.

The Early Archaic (8000-6500 B.C.) is characterized by projectile points with corner and sidenotches, rather than hafting the points to a wood shaft by fluting as the Paleoindians did. The resulting points, such as the Kirk Stemmed and Notched, Palmer Corner-Notched, Fort Nottoway, Kessell, Charleston, and Amos, are thus readily distinguishable from Paleoindian points (Custer 1990). Early Archaic people hunted caribous, elk, moose, deer, and bear (Egloff and Woodward 1992:12). Additionally, there appears to be an increase in population at this time.

The Middle Archaic (6500-3000 B.C.) is defined primarily by the appearance of stemmed projectile points which were fitted into a hold in the spear shaft. Therefore, points such as the LeCroy, Stanly, Morrow Mountain, and Guilford are diagnostic of middle Archaic assemblages. Some evidence also points to the use of grinding technology to make atlatls, or spear throwers, in this period. Mortar and pestles also began to appear during the Middle Archaic, as did axes. The ability to more easily clear forests, resulted in a change in hunting as deer, bear, turkey, and other animals came to the cleared land to eat the new, low-lying growth (Egloff and Woodward 1992:14-15).

Researchers have also pointed out that contexts from this period contain a larger amount of "expedient" stone tools, owing in part to the rapid environmental changes of the Climatic Optimum, which dates from 6000 to 2000 B.C. (Wendland and Bryson 1974; Claggett and Cable

1982; Ward and Davis 1999). These tools were makeshift and less formal, allowing their owners to use them for a wider variety of activities than tools designed for specific uses. The greater density and disbursement of archaeological sites from this period indicates a consistent rise in American Indian populations.

By the Late Archaic (3000-1200 B.C.), a more congenial climate and more abundant food sources led to dramatic population increases, there are estimates of tens of thousands of Virginia Indians during this time (Egloff and Woodward 1992:20). To be certain, this apparent increase might be exaggerated because late Archaic people had a richer material culture than previous peoples and hence left more archaeological evidence of their existence (Klein and Klatka 1991). Nonetheless, the greater number of late Archaic sites relative to earlier periods suggests that the human population did in fact expand over the course of the Archaic Period. According to Barber et al. (1992), late Archaic sites were more than twice as numerous as middle Archaic sites. As humans occupied the land more densely, they also became more sedentary and less mobile, perhaps owing to the greater reliance on plant-based food resources compared to hunting and fishing. Late Archaic people settled along fertile flood plains (Egloff and Woodward 1992:20).

American Indians from this region may also have begun to domesticate plants such as goosefoot, squash, and gourds (Yarnell 1976:268; Chapman and Shea 1981:70). They also used squash and gourds for food storage, in addition to earthen artificial pits (Egloff and Woodward 1992:22). The projectile point technology of the Late Archaic Period is dominated by stemmed and notched point forms, many with broad blades, likely used as projectiles or knives. These points diminish in size towards the latter portion of this period (Dent 1995; Justice 1995).

It should also be noted that prehistoric sites that consist of lithic debitage, no diagnostic artifacts, and an absence of ceramic artifacts likely date to the Archaic Period. These sites are described in the records as "Prehistoric/Unknown," however they are most likely to date to this period despite not having a specific temporal designation.

WOODLAND PERIOD (1200 B.C. TO 1600 A.D.)

The American Indians of the Woodland Period began to maintain a greater reliance on horticulture and agriculture based on the cultivation of maize, imported from Mesoamerica via the Mississippi Valley, as well as squash, beans, and other crops. This increased sedentism and the nucleating of societies (Klein and Klatka 1991; Mouer 1991). Populations during this time began to consolidate into villages near rivers and floodplains with fertile soil, favorable terrain, and access to fauna. Satellite procurement camps are far less frequent than in the Archaic Period.

The Woodland Period is defined foremost by the development of a ceramic technology for storing and cooking food. Although Archaic people had carved out vessels from soft soapstone, prehistoric Americans did not begin shaping ceramic vessels until around 1200 B.C. The earliest pottery produced on the coastal plain, the Marcey Creek Plain, and other types, in fact resembled those soapstone vessels, suggesting that they were used for similar purposes. Woodland peoples, however, modified the square- or oval-shape soapstone inspired vessels. They began decorating the pieces with cord and tempering them with soapstone and other types of grit to make them stronger. Examples include Selden Island ceramics (tempered with soapstone) and Accokeek pieces (which used sand and grit for tempering). Anthropologists divide the period up into smaller periods based on changing projectile points and ceramics, as well as settlement patterns.

The beginning of the Early Woodland (1200 B.C.-A.D. 300) is defined by the appearance of ceramics from prehistoric archaeological context. Ceremonialism associated with the burial of the dead also appears at about 500 B.C. with stone and earth burial cairns and cairn clusters in the Shenandoah Valley (McLearen 1992; Stewart 1992). Early Woodland settlements in the Piedmont region of Virginia are located along rivers as well as in interior areas and there is evidence to suggest the Piedmont areas developed a more sedentary lifestyle during this time (Klein and Klatka 1991; Mouer 1991). Many Early Woodland sites in the Piedmont are permanent or semi-permanent villages that are large and intensively occupied. This corresponds with the domestication of weedy plants such as the goosefoot and sunflower along intentionally cleared riverine areas.

During the Middle Woodland (A.D. 300-1000), there is an increase in sites along major trunk streams and estuaries as people move away from smaller tributary areas and begin to organize into larger groups (Hantman and Klein 1992). The Middle Woodland diet becomes more complex as people begin to exploit nuts, amaranth, and chenopod seeds in addition to fish, deer, waterfowl, and turkey. Corn by this time had transformed into the large ears familiar today. The bow and arrow replaced spears for hunting (Egloff and Woodward 1992:25). With more specialized crafts and increased trade came status. Evidence of rank societies emerges more clearly with the spreading of religious and ritual behavior including symbols and regional styles apparent in ceramic styles and other sociotechnic and ideotechnic artifacts.

Variance in ceramic manufacture is a hallmark of the Middle Woodland Period. Pope's Creek ceramics are associated with the beginning of this period, and Mockely ceramics with the later. Pope's Creek ceramics are tempered with medium to coarse sand, with occasional quartz inclusions, and interior scoring has also been recorded (Stephenson 1963:94; McLearen and Mouer 1989). The majority of Pope's Creek ceramics have net-impressed surfaces (Egloff and Potter 1982:99; McLearen and Mouer 1989:5). Shell-tempered Mockley ceramics first appeared around 200 A.D. in Virginia to southern Delaware. There was a variation in surface treatments for Mockley that included plain, cord-marked, and net-impressed (Egloff and Potter 1982:103; Potter 1993:62).

By the Late Woodland Period (A.D. 1000-1606), the use of domesticated plants had assumed a role of major importance in the prehistoric subsistence system. The arrival and cultivation of beans joined corn and squash as the three major crops (Egloff and Woodward 1992:26). The adoption of agriculture represented a major change in the prehistoric subsistence economy and settlement patterns. Expanses of arable land became a dominant settlement factor, and sites were located on fertile floodplain soils or, in many cases, on higher terraces or ridges adjacent to them.

Virginia Indians became more settled and developed strong identities to their local settings. They began to organize into villages and small hamlets with more substantial housing that may have been placed in rows around a plaza (Egloff and Woodward 1992:26). These villages were highly nucleated and occasionally fortified with palisades. The fortifications demonstrate inter-group conflict.

SETTLEMENT TO SOCIETY (1607 – 1750)

At the time of European arrival, Virginia Indians belonged to three distinct languages groups. This included Algonquian-speaking tribes on the coastal plain which was centered around the Powhatan confederacy; Iroquoian-speaking tribes like the Nottoway and Meherrin south of the James River and the Cherokees in southwestern Virginia; and the Sioux or Siouan-speaking people of the Piedmont (Aaron 2009:19-20).

Some Virginia Indian villages in Prince William County became established between 500 and 900 A.D. By 1500, the county shores were inhabited by the Doegs (also known as Tauxenent, Taux, or Toags), an Algonquin tribe of the Powhatan Confederacy (Karnes 1998:2). The Doegs had a structured society and their main village was known as Tauxenent which was located on the north bank of the Occoquan River (now in Fairfax County) (Figure 5-1). There was a lesser village at Quantico Creek, known as Pamacocack (Roach 2002). In addition to hunting and foraging for nuts and berries, the Doeg cultivated a variety of vegetables, including maize, pumpkins, sunflowers, beans, squash, and tobacco.



Figure 5-1: Detail of Virginia depicting the general vicinity of the project area. Source: Library of Congress

The region of Virginia which is now Prince William County within the Potomac Valley did not experience much European settlement until the mid-seventeenth century. During this period, treaties with the American Indians prevented colonization of the Upper Peninsula by Europeans. Once a 1648 treaty opened up the region to European expansion, however, colonization began swiftly. As Europeans settled, the existing Doeg population in the region fell precipitously due to disease and the relocation of some Doeg to Piscataway territories on the east bank of the Potomac River and others south to integrate with other groups (Roach 2002).

The territory that became Prince William County was originally included as part of Northumberland County when it was established in 1648. At that time, only the very end of the peninsula between the Potomac and Rappahannock Rivers was settled by English (Curtis 2006). The following year, the area was part of a tremendous land grant issued by King Charles II to a group of wealthy English investors. This grant, consisting of all land between the Potomac and Rappahannock Rivers was known as the Northern Neck Proprietary. These "Lords" then leased out large tracts of their respective lands to smaller land investors who in-turn sold or leased the land to those who actually settled the area.

The first land patent in Prince William County may have been established in 1653 to Thomas Burbage who received some 3,000 acres between the Occoquan River and Neabsco Creek, in present-day Woodbridge (Brown 1994:6). Within the next five years all land along the Potomac River was patented in huge plantations. Each patent encompassed a large amount of land. In the mid-seventeenth century, Henry Corbin began acquiring land in what would become Prince William County. This would eventually encompass 3,000 acres between Powell's Creek on the south, Neabsco Creek on the north, Potomac River on the east, and the vicinity of present-day Lake Montclair on the west; this included the northern portion of the project area (Curtis 2006:60). The estate would later be known as Leesylvania (VDHR #44PW0007).

Most of the settlement was limited to the eastern portions of present-day Prince William County near the Potomac River. Up to that time, settlement of the interior portions of the county and Virginia as a whole occurred slowly as the area was still inhabited and threatened by local Indians. In 1722, the Treaty of Albany was signed removing the remainder of American Indians to west of the Blue Ridge and an inward push of European settlers occurred quickly. Beginning at the time, large amounts of land were leased and sold to land speculators from Tidewater Virginia and Maryland eager for new land as the tobacco lands further east were wearing out from over cultivation of tobacco.

After its early introduction, tobacco quickly became the dominant crop in Virginia. It was tobacco that determined the pattern of nearly every aspect of life, encompassing the economy, the cultural landscape, and social relations (Kulikoff 1986; Moore 1976). As the popularity of the crop increased in Europe so too did the population of Virginia as did planters' reliance on slave labor in lieu of indentured servants (Salmon 1983:11-12, 15, 20).

In addition to tobacco farming, one of the early industries in the area was iron. Just north of the project area, stood Tayloe's Mill beginning in 1732. John Tayloe leased approximately 4,000 acres along Neabsco Creek that had the needed iron ore and trees for charcoal (Curtis 2006:77). His mill would also become known as Neabsco Mill and was located at Neabsco Creek, west of present-day I-95 (VDHR ID# 44PW0629 and 076-0265). The mill produced iron for all types of ship fittings including nails, spikes, angles, bars, anchors, and other gear that were later used to supply equipment to the revolutionary forces. The ironworks served the entire Tidewater area, reducing the area's dependence on England for manufactured goods (Karnes 1998).

Perhaps the most important early road in the region was the old Potomac Path. The road began as an American Indian path and roughly followed the alignment of present-day U.S. Route 1. This road would connect a chain of frontier forts, such as those at Hunting Creek and Neabsco Creek, and allow easier communication between each fort. With this road and these forts, a ferry operated on the Occoquan River at present-day Woodbridge, approximately five miles northeast of the project area (Curtis 2006:56).

With the increase in population, Prince William County was formed in 1730 by parceling off sections of King George and Stafford Counties. The first courthouse was located at Woodbridge (Curtis 2006:7). At that time, Prince William County encompassed all of "Northern Virginia," however the county was drastically reduced in size when Fairfax County was formed from it in 1742 and again when Fauquier County was created a decade later. Throughout the mid-eighteenth century, all of these counties grew dramatically as populations rose and pushed inland.

Early homes constructed in eastern Prince William County include Rippon Lodge (1725), Bel Air (1740) and Leesylvania Plantation (1747). In 1725, Richard Blackburn built Rippon Lodge on a high point overlooking Neabsco Creek, less than two miles east of the project area (Karnes 1998:8). Henry Lee II constructed in what is now Leesylvania State Park, approximately three miles east of the project area. And Major Charles Ewell constructed Bel Air in 1740 less than four miles northwest of the project area (Curtis 2006:48). The community of Minnieville grew around Bel Air and the Ewell family would own portions near the southern end of the project area.

The economy of Prince William County and the northern Virginia region as a whole was centered primarily on the cultivation of tobacco during this period. Early planters found Prince William to be fertile and in addition to other crops and livestock, tobacco was the primary cash crop grown (Brown 1994:24). The Tobacco Inspection law, passed in Virginia in 1730 to prevent the exportation of bad quality tobacco, required all exported tobacco shipments to be inspected and bear an official certificate (PWCHC 2012). A reliable road network was not yet in place, so tobacco inspection stations and warehouses were constructed along waterways which served as the primary transportation and shipping routes. In Prince William, warehouses were located along the Occoquan, Neabsco, Quantico, Chopawansic waterways. "Rolling roads" slowly became established to allow farmers not on navigable waterways to get tobacco to warehouses and ports. Eventually, towns grew around the warehouses such as Dumfries, Prince William's first town, approximately one mile south of the project area (Brown 1994:24).

Dumfries began with the establishment of Richard Gibson's mill site at the mouth of Quantico Creek around 1690. By 1713, merchants moved into the area, then known as Quantico, and began a flourishing tobacco trade on the Potomac River. A tobacco warehouse was established in Dumfries in 1730 (Martin 1836). With this warehouse, Dumfries became the largest port in Prince William County during this time, and for a while, competed with Alexandria in Fairfax County to the north as the primary port in northern Virginia. Dumfries officially became a town in 1749 and in 1763 it reached an economic milestone by exporting more tobacco tonnage than the colony of New York (PWCHC 2012).

In 1742, when Prince William County was divided in half and the northern part, above the Occoquan River and Bull Run, became Fairfax County, Prince William's courthouse was relocated. A new courthouse was constructed on the plantation of Philemon Waters, known as Ashmore, along Cedar Run west of present-day Independent Hill (Harrison 1924:316). When Fauquier County was established from the western part of Prince William County in 1759, the

courthouse was relocated to the bustling town of Dumfries (Frazier et. al. 1989). The town was illustrated on Fry and Jefferson's 1755 map of the colony (Figure 5-2).



Figure 5-2: Detail of A map of the most inhabited part of Virginia containing the whole province of Maryland, 1755. Source: Library of Virginia

44PW2104 AND 44PW2105

Prior to ownership by the Ewell family, it appears that a portion of the southern end of the project area and Site 44PW2105 was owned, and likely occupied by John Canterbury. Canterbury appears on early rent rolls in Prince William County; the earliest existing roll in which he is listed is 1739 at which time he had 100 acres (Mason n.d.a). In 1739, he requested a survey of, what he believed to be, about 200 acres of "waste and ungranted lands" on the south side of Powell's Run between Col. Fitzhugh, Col. Tayloe's, and John Vickan's lines. The survey resulted in a tract of 370 acres (PWC Survey and Warrant 1742). It's unclear when Canterbury passed away and when his property came into the hands of Bertrand Ewell. On the rental role for Prince William County in 1760, Col. Bertrand Ewell had 830 acres. Interestingly, it appears that he also had John Canterbury's land which consisted of 370 acres (Mason n.d.b). Bertrand Ewell did not occupy Canterbury's land, however. A later deed indicates that Canterbury's land may have been occupied, at least for a time, by Benjamin Wilkerson (PWCDB U:186).

Bertrand Ewell was a member of the influential Ewell family known of Dumfries and Bel Air. He was noted as being of Buck Hall and married Francis Kenner circa 1731. Between 1694 and 1743, he took up several land grants along the branches of Quantico and Chopawamsic creeks (Wohlhueter 2006:29-30). Bertrand was very active in the county and at various times served as a church warden, vestryman, justice, and surveyor. As a surveyor he is particularly known for mapping the county line between Prince William and Fauquier (Ewell 1990:64).

COLONY TO NATION (1750 – 1789)

During the second half of the eighteenth century, Prince William County's population grew as additional communities and towns were established throughout the county's interior. As the increasing population pressed westward into the interior lands of the county, a network of roads developed. The Potomac Path continued to be a major thoroughfare. Because it was used as an early mail route, it came to be known as the King's Highway (Karnes 1998). Another significant road in the area was Dumfries Road. This route began in Dumfries at the intersection of the Potomac Path (the north-south road) and extended about 50 miles west and crossed the Blue Ridge Mountains. This provided the outlying settlers with the means to transport their crops to the port, in turn increasing the port's business. The intersection of Dumfries Road and the Potomac Path was soon an important crossroads near the waterfront and lead to further growth of the town of Dumfries (Karnes 1998).

Villages that had been previously established continued to grow. Dumfries grew rapidly, and had other industries, including a granary, five hotels, three grist mills, a bakery, a shipyard, and a ferry to Maryland. The town became so pivotal to the economy and commerce of Prince William County during this time, that the county seat and courthouse were relocated to Dumfries in 1759. The Town of Dumfries was enlarged in 1761, resulting in the condemnation of a portion of land owned by Maj. Bertrand Ewell (Ewell 1990:64). Other towns became established. By 1755, Occoquan was noted as an industrial town, less than six miles northeast of the project area. The town had a strategic location at the head of a navigable tributary of the Potomac with ample water power (VHLCS 1983). There grew a diverse economy of shipping and industries of cotton, flour, and grist mills (Karnes 1998:13-14).

Despite the population increase within the county, ownership of land in the mid-eighteenth century was split between sixteen large land holders or lease holders who held between 1,000 and 10,000 acres and those that held between 100 and 300 acres of land (Mason 2010). An early estate west of the project area was Terrapin Forest; it would later be known as the Bailey House (VDHR #076-0284). The land had originally consisted of two tracts of land totaling approximately 179 acres (WPA 1941:101).

Many estates, particularly the larger ones, continued to be used for tobacco. As the century progressed, however, the tobacco industry slowly began to wane. Depleted soils from years of intense cultivation limited the productivity of the area which, coupled with a tired market for tobacco in Europe, led to a reduction in profitability. Many planters shifted towards wheat and other grains which were in high demand in European markets (Hill et. al. 2005). With this shift, iron works along water ways in the county began to transition to flour works, although nearby Neabsco Mill remained an iron works. Other products grown in the county included corn, oats, hay, and various green vegetables (Curtis 2006).

While the market for crops grown in Virginia and throughout America was in high demand in European markets, tensions between the colonies and England began to put a strain on trade as the century progressed. Repeated laws and taxes were passed by the Crown in their attempts to pay the debt accrued during the French and Indian War. These taxes burdened the colonists and restricted exports. In response the Virginia Convention adopted resolves against the importation

of British goods and the importation of slaves in 1774. The Virginia Convention also required each county to form a volunteer company of cavalry or infantry to prepare for an armed conflict. Prince William had already formed a volunteer unit a year before, known as the Independent Company of Prince William, led by Captains William Grayson and Philip Richard Francis Lee.

When the war did break out, men from Prince William joined others from around Virginia to form two regiments sanctioned by the third Virginia Convention in 1775 (PWCHC 2012). Thomas Winder Ewell served as the Captain of the 1st Regiment of the Virginia State Line (*Southern Campaign* n.d.). Both of Virginia's units served in the Revolutionary War, and throughout the conflict, there were a number of troop movements through Prince William County; however, it was not the site of any significant battle or action, although some prisoners were held at Dumfries (Brown 1994:50).

During the American Revolution, some Hessian prisoners of war were brought to the Dumfries area and put to work constructing buildings. According to a 1980 Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission survey, the prisoner camp was south of Powell's Creek, however, its precise location was unknown. Local lore has it that the approximately dozen prisoners that died of disease were buried on the previously mentioned Bailey estate (VHLC 1980).¹ The graves of the Hessian soldiers were supposedly found in the Montclair neighborhood in the 1940s, however this has never been confirmed, and the graves have not been relocated.

Impacts to the county during the war occurred late in the conflict and included the plundering of plantations along the Potomac River by privateers (Palmer 1881). The last, and most significant, troop movement through the county occurred in September 1781. When portions of Gen. George Washington's Continental Army crossed the Occoquan River en route to Yorktown on September 27, 1781, the majority of the army marched south along the Potomac Path, or "Rochambeau Route" (Figure 5-3) (Olsen n.d.). However, the ferry at Colchester on the Occoquan River was insufficient for the heavy artillery and wagon train moving with the troops. Washington ordered the Virginia Militia to clear a road and prepare for the crossing of the wagons at Wolf Run Shoals on the upper river. From this point, the new road headed south towards Dumfries, in the vicinity of present-day Lake Montclair west of the project area (Curtis 2006).

¹ There is a Bailey/Callender/Eastman Cemetery at the Four Seasons at Historic Virginia Subdivision that has marked graves which postdate the eighteenth century.



Figure 5-3: Detail of *The marches of Lord Cornwallis in the Southern Provinces*, 1787 by Faden, depicting the general vicinity of the project area. Source: Library of Congress

44PW2104 AND 44PW2105

At the project area, in April 1780 Bertrand Ewell sold to his son, Thomas Winder Ewell, several tracts of land for 5,000£, including 44PW2104 and 44PW2105 (PWCDB U:186). This land transfer included:

...all that tract of land purchased by me of the Executors of a certain Thomas Young, also one other tract or parcel of land purchased by me of the Ex^{TS.} of a certain ______Canterbury and also all the land on the north side of the Beaver Dam Run. Beginning in the fork of the Beaver dam run below the main road running up the south branch and binding therewith to the fork of the coal pit branch thence up the coal pit branch to the head thereof thence by a line to the head of Cornelius Kincheloe's Spring branch thence down the same to Powells run, thence down Powells run to a line made and settled with Benjamin Wilkerson deceased and is Canterbury's line then with his and Young's lines to the beginning including the plantations now in Possession of Drury, Harris, Stifle, Nickins, Mattingley, Ratcliff, Green, Beaver, Williams, and Gardinhire which Several tracts of Land...contain one Thousand acres more or less and also one piece or parcel of meadow Land adjoining the Town of Dumfries (PWCDB U:186). A slightly later deed between Bertrand Ewell and another son, Solomon, indicates the amount of land that Bertrand had amassed though there are few existing deeds of these transactions. Bertrand gifted Solomon 600 acres adjacent to Thomas Winder Ewell's land, which lay to the west, Bertrand Ewell's land, and another son's, Charles, land. This deed also indicates that the land was being leased out (PWCDB U:302).

EARLY NATIONAL PERIOD (1789 – 1830)

In the years following the Revolutionary War, the shift to grain cultivation that had begun prior to the war continued in Prince William County. The intensive tobacco cultivation previously pursued in the area had succeeded in severely depleting the area's soils of much-needed nutrients and cultivation of tobacco was reduced drastically. Meanwhile, the European market for grains had increased substantially during this time, and the new country was able to trade freely across the Atlantic. The shift to grains slowly led to replenishment of nutrients and viability of area soils.

There was, however, a pause in trade with the onset of a second war with Britain. With the outbreak of the War of 1812, residents along the coast of Virginia became uneasy because of their proximity to the British along the waterways. The high elevations of Terrapin Forest were used as lookout points for intruding British ships (VHLC 1980). Nearby, just as it had during the American Revolution, Neabsco Mills Ironworks produced iron for weaponry during the War of 1812.

As soil nutrition was depleted from excessive tobacco cultivation, rainfall was able to cause increased runoff which eventually led to silt in the area's waterways. By the end of the century, the Quantico Creek was nearly completely clogged with silt, preventing most ocean-going vessels from entering the Dumfries harbor. Bertrand Ewell was among those attempting to revive the small town by establishing Newport at the mouth of Dumfries Creek in 1787 and in establishing Carrborough on the opposite shore (currently the home of Quantico Marine Base) in 1788 (Wohlhueter 2006:31). Ships were forced to anchor in the river, and have smaller boats ferry the goods from shore. The silting, coupled with the crash of the tobacco market following the Revolutionary War led to economic turmoil for the town. The shifting population westward was the final factor to Dumfries' demise, when a petition was sent to the General Assembly from county residents asking for the courthouse to be moved to a more suitable location was granted (Frazier et al. 1989). In 1822, the County's courthouse was relocated to Brentsville, in the central part of the county (Karnes 1998). Siltation not only affected Quantico Creek and Dumfries, but other county harbors including the former hub of commerce in Occoquan.

The demise of the Prince William County waterfront, coupled with the transition to grain production prompted further shift of the population inland. Meanwhile, the European market for grains had increased substantially during this time, and the new country was able to trade freely across the Atlantic. The shift to grains led to a replenishment of nutrients and viability of area soils. Grains also required less space to grow and less labor to cultivate, leading to the breakup of many of the large Colonial-era plantations into smaller homesteads and farms (PWCHC 2012). The rise of grains also led to additional mill construction along interior waterways, including along Powell's Creek. For example, Dyer's Mill was in the vicinity of present-day Lake Montclair, west of the project area (Curtis 2006:61). To the northeast, in order to adjust to the somewhat unpredictable economy left by the Revolution, Tayloe's Mill adjusted to accommodate the

changing needs. By the time of its closing in 1828, the ironworks had evolved into a multifaceted industrial plantation which included shipbuilding, milling, smithing, leatherworking, farming, and shoemaking. The mill was illustrated on John Wood's 1820 map of Prince William County (Figure 5-4).

North of the project area, a ferry began operating at Occoquan in 1793. It was soon replaced by a bridge which drew people away from Colchester and its ferry further east (History of U.S. 1 2012). In 1804 Occoquan became a formal town and "it flourished as a commercial and industrial center" (VHLCS 1983). The state's first major cotton mills were put into operation in the town during this time. A wooden bridge was erected at the Colchester ferry crossing along the Potomac Path, leading to the name of Woodbridge for Thomas Mason's nearby plantation, and eventually the community that formed there. This bridge would be destroyed by a flood in 1807 (History of U.S. 1 2012).

Throughout the early 1800s, Prince William County experienced a drop in overall population resulting from generally bad economic conditions and the lure of fertile land west of Prince William. Between 1810 and 1830, the population of the county fell nearly eighteen percent from 11,311 residents to 9,330, more than 40 percent of whom were slaves (Martin 1836; USCB). Throughout the nation, "Black labor became the foundation stone not only of the Southern social structure, but of Northern manufacture and commerce, of the English factory system, of European commerce, of buying and selling on a worldwide scale" (DuBois 2007).



Figure 5-4: Detail of *Prince William County*, by Wood in 1820, depicting the project area. Source: Library of Virginia

SITES 44PW2104 AND 44PW2105

The land encompassing Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105, would remain in the Ewell family though Thomas Winder Ewell passed away in 1784. In his last will and testament, written in 1780, Thomas bequeath his estate to his parents, Bertrand and Francis Ewell. After the death of his parents, Thomas's estate was then to be divided among his siblings. However, it was understood by his family that shortly before his passing Thomas had planned to bequeath his estate to his sister, Sarah Ewell. Therefore, in 1784, the Legatee of Thomas's last will and testament conveyed their interest in the estate to Sarah (PWCDB W:16). In 1815, Sarah Ewell was taxed on 500 acres of land near Dumfries (PWCLTB 1815). The parcel remained in the Ewell family after Sarah's passing in 1823 (Turner 2006:1).

ANTEBELLUM PERIOD (1830 – 1860)

Throughout the Antebellum Period, agriculture continued to dominate the economy of Prince William County. Revitalization of the soils of Prince William County from more sophisticated farming techniques, such as crop rotation, kept the agriculturally based economy steady and farming became more diversified. The Commonwealth undertook an advertising campaign promoting agricultural opportunities in Northern Virginia which drew in northern farmers (Karnes 1998:15). Many of the new northern dairymen took interest in the fallow lands in eastern Prince William (Curtis 2006). With smaller farms worked by northerners, the number of slaves within the county decreased by 38 percent between 1830 and 1860 (USCB).

Northeast of the project area, Occoquan continued to grow. In 1836 it was described as having "about 50 dwelling houses, several mercantile stores and various mechanics, a cotton manufactory in complete operation...an extensive manufacturing flour mill...with appendages of grist, saw, and plaster mills. A handsome and permanent bridge is erected across the river at this place" (quoted in VHLCS 1983).

Commerce in the region of Prince William County increased with the coming of the railroad. A charter was granted by the Virginia General Assembly to the Richmond, Fredericksburg and Potomac (RF&PRR) Railroad in 1834 (McCartney 2002). Beginning in Richmond, however, the line would not reach Prince William County until after the Civil War. Central Prince William County, however, did witness rail line construction during this period. The Orange and Alexandria Railroad (O&ARR) was begun in 1850 and completed in 1854, and the Manassas Gap Railroad (MGRR) was begun in 1851 and completed in 1859. The juncture of these two lines occurred in the village of Tudor Hall in 1858; it was later renamed Manassas Junction, approximately 13 miles northwest of the project area (Wieder 1998:16).

An 1862 map illustrates the large number of small farms lining the roadways throughout the county including along Telegraph Road, so called because of the communication lines strung along side it, east of the project area (Figure 5-5). There are a number of small, cultivated properties lining the road; there also appears to be cultivated land west of Telegraph Road in the vicinity of the project area. According to surveys conducted by the WPA during the Great Depression, west of the project area was the Weaver Place. It appears that one of the earliest European owners of the land was William Carr, one of the trustees of the early town of Dumfries (Morton 19-; WPA

1941:89). Later, the estate was known among some as the silk farm for here there was an attempt to raise silk worms on a large scale (Morton 19-).



Figure 5-5: Detail of *Map of n. eastern Virginia and vicinity of Washington*, 1862, depicting the project area. Source: Library of Congress

SITES 44PW2104 AND 44PW2105

Near the southern end of the project area, land encompassing Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105 continued to be in the hands of the Ewell family and was listed in land tax records as Sarah Ewell's estate. However, in 1846 John Thomas began paying taxes on the 500 acres (PWCLTB). The deed book with the deed from Sarah E. Hays, niece of Sarah Ewell, and others, Deed Book 17, no longer exists and is simply referenced in a later deed. In 1851, George H. and Sarah Ann Cockrell and John and Sarah Thomas sold land that included a portion of the project area and Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105. This was 424 acres sold to John M. Green and Christopher C. Claggett for \$800 (PWCDB 21:414). The deed and tax records give no indication of buildings on the property. In Prince William County, the 1850 federal census has a George H. Cockrell, a merchant, and Sarah with three children, Samuel (13), George H. (11), and Charles W. (1). There is, however, another George H. Cockrell and Sarah in Washington, D.C. with six children, Catharine (15), Samuel (13), George (12), William (9), Elizabeth (7), and Charles (1) (USCB 1850). This appears to have been an error in recording or perhaps the Cockrell's split their time between the two locations.

CIVIL WAR (1861 – 1865)

When the Civil War erupted in 1861, Prince William County was caught in the middle of the conflict. The location of the county made it one of the most active and important regions during the war. Situated between the Union and Confederate capitals along a strategically important interior roads, railways, and waterways, Prince William County was the site of several key battles

and occupations. While all three of the major battles in the county (First Manassas, Second Manassas, and Bristoe Station) and the majority of significant troop movements and occupations occurred to the west of the project area along the Alexandria and Orange Railroad and the Warrenton Turnpike; there was important activity in the vicinity of the project area along the Prince William County waterfront as well.

Prior to the railroad, the principal route of supply and communication for the federal capital in Washington D.C. was the Potomac River and afterwards the waterway continued to play an important role. Thus, any ship arriving or departing Washington, D.C. traveled past the Prince William County waterfront during its voyage. Within two weeks of the start of the Civil War, the Confederate Army established gun batteries atop the hills of the waterfront in order to fire at the Union's supply ships. Four major batteries were installed on bluffs located at Freestone Point, Cockpit Point, Shipping Point, and Evansport. By early 1862, there were approximately 37 heavy guns and many smaller ones installed at these batteries. In addition, the steamer George Page was stationed in Quantico Creek, and was used to intercept small ships and to shell the Maryland shore. The Confederate batteries were manned by some 11,200 men who were stationed in the Occoquan-Dumfries-Quantico area.

To counter these batteries, Union Brig. Gen. Joseph Hooker and 8,000 soldiers and 3 field batteries were stationed at Charles County, Maryland opposite Cockpit Point and Shipping Point (Salmon 2001:12). A series of balloon flights in November and December 1861 revealed the extent of the Confederate fortifications (Figure 5-6). The majority of troops were quartered in large camps located along Telegraph Road. Along Powell's Run, there were four regiments of artillery. Cavalry was used as patrols and pickets along the entire riverbank and to the north (Fleming et al. 2008:13). An 1863 map also depicts a "Line of Rifle Artificial pits" near the southern end of the project area (Figure 5-7). The village of Dumfries became strategically significant to the winter camps set up nearby and troops drained the local farmers of food and timber (Connery 2011:118; Curtis 2006).



Figure 5-6: *Sketch of Virginia and the Rebel Camps and Batteries* depicting the approximate location of the project area. Source: URS



Figure 5-7: Detail of *Miscellaneous lithographed proof sheets of areas in Virginia*, 1863, depicting the project area. Source: Library of Congress

Beginning in January 1862, several small engagements took place on the Potomac River. The Battle of Cockpit Point occurred on January 3, 1862 (Figure 5-8) (Salmon 2001:14). The Union commanding officer of the Potomac Flotilla, Lieut. Robert H. Wyman, tested the Confederate capabilities at Cockpit Point. He believed that the batteries at the point could fire down and across the river, but not up the river. Wyman sent the USS *Anacostia* and USS *Yankee* to engage the batteries. The *Anacostia* was out of reach of the batteries but the *Yankee* was not and took fire. The engagement ended when two shells, one from *Anacostia* and one from *Yankee*, simultaneously exploded inside one of the batteries, thereby dismounting the gun that was there (Arford-Horne et al. 2014:2/45-46).

By March 1862, Confederate Commander-in-chief Joseph E. Johnston determined that Northern Virginia was going to be indefensible during an extended war and abandoned much of it, including eastern Prince William County and the Potomac defenses and batteries along the Potomac. At that time, all troops stationed there were ordered to evacuate to south of the Rappahannock River. From that point in the war onward, the eastern portion of the county and the vicinity of the project area were relatively quiet with the exception of the movement of federal supplies and troops up and down Telegraph Road.

Prince William County, on the border of the occupied zone, was too large for the Union army to garrison every road or town, so instead a picket line stretching from Fairfax through the county to Stafford was established, and roving bands of cavalry patrolled the area periodically (Townsend 2011).



Figure 5-8: Map of the Battle of Cockpit Point depicting the project area in relation to the battle. Source: V-CRIS

Early on in the war Confederate Wade Hampton was also seen frequently in eastern Prince William County. After the Battle of First Manassas in the summer of 1861 Hampton and Hampton's Legion spent the remainder of the summer and fall learning the geography of the area well. Notable camp locations included Old Brentsville, on the hill, and Bacon's Race Church, Maple Valley, and Freestone Point, on the Potomac. They went into winter encampments on the Occoquan River to guard the west bank (Coxe 1915). Hampton was in the area again the following winter and used his knowledge of the road networks well.

In the winter of 1862, Union Gen. Ambrose Burnside was encamped across from Fredericksburg on the Rappahannock River. He drew supplies for his army from a depot in Dumfries (Roach 2003). Hampton's scouts reported that the Federals did not have a large force in Dumfries and that the town had become "an assembly point for the wares of sutlers, civilian merchants licensed to sell to the armies" (Longacre 2003:114). Because these purveyor of goods were civilians, there were few soldiers to guard them. Several Confederate units raided Dumfries to harass U.S. forces and to try to obtain supplies (Roach 2003). In December 1862, Hampton raided the region.

On December 10, Hampton and 520 "thinly clad and scantily fed" troopers of the 1st North Carolina, 1st and 2nd South Carolina, and the Davis and Cobb Legions left Brandy Station and were back in familiar territory by the 12th (Hampton 1862a; Longacre 2003:114). According to Hampton, his first objective was to "take Dumfries, with such stores as were there, and then to sweep the Telegraph road up to Occoquan" (Hampton 1862a). He divided his forces a few miles from Dumfries and then took the town (Longacre 2003:114).

Having succeeded in the main part of my expedition, I at once made arrangements to attempt the capture of the troops on the Telegraph road and at Occoquan. No alarm had been given to them, and their dispersion and capture would have been easy; but I found that Sigel's corps was on the march, and as we were compelled to retire for 5 miles by the same road on which he would approach the town, I deemed it most prudent to get my wagons and prisoners off at once (Hampton 1862a).

He therefore left and marched, camping that night near Morrisville. Hampton captured 50 prisoners and 24 sutlers wagons with stores; he also took the telegraph office (Hampton 1862a). Hampton's actions gained him praise from his superiors and the spoils provided his men with warm clothing, horse tack, and equipment of all kinds, as well as enough edibles to last more than a week (Longacre 2003:115).

Hampton's second mission was launched on December 17 and involved 465 men under 6 commanders. They crossed the Rappahannock River "at the Rappahannock railroad crossing and moved to Cole's store [at Independent Hill], where we bivouacked that night" (Hampton 1862b). The following morning they proceeded northeast towards Occoquan. As they approached the town, Hampton once again divided his forces. The multi-pronged offensive gave the raiders access to several local warehouses and enabled them to capture every picket (20) on the three roads. Additionally, a supply train belonging to Maj. Gen. Franz Sigel's 11th Army Corps was overtaken while crossing to the north bank of the Occoquan. Enemy forces coming from the direction of Alexandria forced an early end to the raid and Hampton struck out once more for Cole's Store and then encamped that night at Tackett's Ford (Longacre 2003:115-116; Hampton 1862b). By
December 20 they were back among Confederate forces with "well-stocked wagons, 150 prisoners, 30 stands of rifles, and another regimental flag" and a number of civilians (Longacre 2003:116). The hardships felt by the Rebels would be temporarily relieved by what Hampton called "all sorts of nice things, Christmas presents sent by the Yankees to their friends in the Army" (Longacre 2003:117).

By Christmas 1862, Maj. Gen. J.E.B. Stuart felt that Confederate forces would be helped by a third, stronger raid on both Dumfries and Occoquan, believing that there had been time enough for the towns' supplies to have been replenished. Stuart was hoping for a big payoff from two or three areas as well as depleting Union outposts between the Potomac and the Rappahannock. On the morning of December 26, almost 2,000 troopers and four artillery pieces under Stuart, Hampton, Fitzhugh Lee, and Pelham crossed the Rappahannock at Kelly's Ford (Longacre 2003:118). With 850 men and one section of artillery, Hampton moved toward Occoquan (Hampton 1863).

I proceeded to my destined point by way of Cole's store. At this latter place, finding that my road was guarded by the pickets of the enemy, I detached 25 men to get behind them while I drove them in with 20.² The guide to the former party unfortunately mistook the road, so that the pickets, when attacked in front, were enabled to retreat toward Dumfries. Of the 15 pickets on this road, my men took 4, and the others, in endeavoring to escape, fell into the hands of a squadron of Lee's brigade, which was on the same road. Having cleared the way, I pushed toward Occoquan (Hampton 1863).

Again, Hampton divided his forces with the view of one force driving the enemy out of Occoquan while the remaining two cut off the retreat. However, the attack was made prematurely and only nineteen prisoners were captured. He found that supplies in the town had not been replenished from his earlier raid and only eight wagons were taken. He expected his brigades to rejoin near Occoquan, however this did not happen so Hampton returned to Cole's Store where he met them (Hampton 1863).

In Dumfries, Stuart found the garrison to be too reinforced "to take by storm" and that the supplies that they had hoped to take had been "spirited away a few hours before their arrival" Longacre 2003:119). In the hopes of having some success, Stuart pushed on to Fairfax. As the forces were enroute to Brentsville, Stuart learned of Federals heading toward them from the northeast. Hampton and Col. Butler responded by hustling his main body up the road toward the advancing Federals and Butler had an altercation near Bacon Race. After venturing farther north into Fairfax County, Stuart finally headed back towards the Rappahannock with his plunder. The spoils, however, paled in comparison to those Hampton had secured on his earlier forays (Longacre 2003:120, 122).

RECONSTRUCTION AND GROWTH (1865 – 1917)

The Civil War affected Virginia severely resulting in a heavy loss of life, devastated economy, and destruction of farms. Over one-fifth of the South's adult white male population died for the

² A detachment of the 17th Pennsylvania Cavalry picketed from the town of Occoquan to Neabsco Creek and from there to Dumfries (Price 1862).

Confederacy and 37,000, mostly southern, black persons perished in the Union Army and thousands more in the contraband camps, Confederate Army labor gangs, and disease-ridden shanty towns (Foner 2014:125). Within Prince William County, there was a loss of man power and draft animals as well as severe property damage. Contemporary reports from the war reveal that nearly all citizens of the area had deserted their homes when the armies and fighting arrived in 1862. Many citizens and soldiers returned to find their homes destroyed and looted. Redevelopment of personal and commercial property throughout Prince William County occurred slowly following the end of the war. As with much of the rest of Virginia, economic realities following the end of the Civil War resulted in slow redevelopment of the area's agricultural and industrial capabilities. Throughout the "south as a whole, the real value of all property, even discounting that represented by slaves, stood 30 percent lower than its prewar figure, and the output of the staple crops cotton, rice, sugar, and tobacco, and food crops like corn and potatoes, stood far below their antebellum levels" (Foner 2014:125).

With the replanting of crops and rebuilding of infrastructure, the region slowly recovered and new businesses emerged. The railroads were among the first resources to return, which was vital for the recovery of agriculture in the region. Farmers relied on the railroad to get their crops to market, and within a few years of peace the O&ARR was operational again. The RF&P RR was repaired and extended north. By 1872, it had reached Quantico and by 1900 it was in Washington, D.C. (Karnes 1998:16).

Aiding in the recovery of agriculture, which remained the primary economy of the region, was the shift to smaller sharecrop and tenant farm systems. Many of the former large plantations were no longer viable without the assistance of slave labor, and many large properties were broken up and sold as smaller farms. Near the northern end of the project area, it appears that the Stonnell and Merchant families, both white families, lived in the late nineteenth century. To the west of the project area is the Merchant-Stonnell family cemetery. In 1870, William H.A. Merchant was identified as a hotel keeper and Richard Stonnell was identified as a farmer (USCB).

Throughout the history of Prince William County, several free African American families held land (Batestown n.d.). With a base of free African American communities prior to the Civil War, afterwards, these communities were able to grow. North of the project area, black families lived along a two-mile stretch of old Neabsco Road (now Cardinal Drive) between old Dumfries Road (now Dyer's Road) and a log schoolhouse and Neabsco Church, west of the project area (Scheel 2000). The congregation for Neabsco Church began forming in 1861 when slaves worshipped nearby; a church was erected circa 1881 (PWCHC 1999).

South of the project area, the African American community of Batestown formed on land near Cabin Branch Creek that had historically been owned by free blacks (Batestown n.d.). The area was named after Mary Bates, an enslaved woman on the Graham plantation. After emancipation she and her husband opened a store to serve the many black residents of the area. Cabin Branch School was opened in 1889 and Little Union Baptist Church opened in 1903 (*Little Union Baptist Church* n.d.). By the end of the nineteenth century, the community had 150 residents (Payne-Jackson and Taylor n.d.).

Besides a shift to smaller farms during the Reconstruction Period, a transition in production occurred as well, helping to revive success in the region. The diversified farming, which had been the primary endeavor in the years leading up to the Civil War and the years immediately following it, was soon replaced by focused dairy farming. Dairy farming was able to flourish with the assistance of advanced refrigeration technology devised around the turn of the twentieth century that allowed not only the improved storage of milk on the farm, but safer transport by rail to commercial centers in Alexandria and Washington D.C. by refrigerated cars.

Additionally, following the Civil War, extensive timbering also took place. Around the Neabsco Creek watershed, the smoke created by the heavy logging and nearby sawmills led the area to be called Smoketown (Curtis 2006:114). Along the Potomac River, the economic sources focused on commercial fishing and lumbering. In addition to industrial applications along the Prince William County waterfront, some areas became known for their recreational amenities, particularly in the vicinity of Leesylvania and early Quantico (Karnes 1998:21).

South of the project area, in what is now Prince William Forest Park, were two mines. The first, which operated for only a few years before closing in 1885, was the Greenwood Gold Mine. This mine appears to have been at the headwaters of the North Fork of Quantico Creek and associated buildings were likely southwest of the mine artificial pits. The second, the Cabin Branch Mine, operated between 1889 and 1920 along the North Fork just west its confluence with the South Fork, less than one mile south of the project area. The mine grew, producing high grade pyrite ore and employing up to 300 people, including many residents of Batestown (Bedell 2004:87-88). The mine became a boost for the economy of Dumfries. In the late nineteenth century there was a large market for pyrite as inexpensive methods of extracting sulfuric acid from the ore was discovered (Fanning 2000:15-16).

A 1901 map of Prince William County illustrates Dumfries south of the project area (Figure 5-9). Neabsco Mills is still noted northeast of the project area. While a few homes were identified near the northern end of the project area, the majority of the project area was devoid of development which, research has revealed, was not the case.



Figure 5-9: Detail of *Map of Prince William County, Virginia*, 1901 by Brown, depicting the project area. Source: Library of Congress.

SITES 44PW2104 AND 44PW2105

Shortly after the end of the war, John M. Green and Christopher C. Claggett divided their acreage in the vicinity of the project area equally. Claggett's portion would be 212 acres on Telegraph Road. The tract had no buildings on it in 1871 and was valued at \$848 (PWCLTB 1871). This included a portion of the project area and Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105. In 1870, Christopher C. Claggett was identified as a white farmer with real estate valued at \$1,600 and personal estate valued at \$200 (USCB).

In addition to freed African American families settling north and south of the project area, at least one black family owned land within the project area. Franklin Jennings, an enslaved man freed prior to the Civil War, purchased approximately 156 acres through which the project area appears to extend (PWCDB 34:237).

Claggett passed away in 1872. Prior to his death, his land was believed to have consisted of 212 acres and was valued at \$3 per acre. Buildings were not taxed on Claggett's land until after his death (PWC Chancery 1882-012; PWCLTB). The tract was surveyed in 1881 resulting in an area of 156¹/₂ acres; a plat resulting from this survey has not been located at this time (PWC Chancery 1882-012). Claggett's land was auctioned in 1880 and Franklin Jennings was the highest bidder at \$424. At \$2 per acres, this was lower than the former value though it was "considered an excellent price considering the location and quality of land" (PWC Chancery 1882-012). Beginning in 1876, the building(s) on the tract was valued at \$100 (Site 44PW2104), a value that would generally

remain consistent (PWCLTB). A later plat of the property depicts the buildings associated with the family (Figure 5-10).

Franklin Jennings was the son of Paul Jennings and Fannie Gordon Jennings. Paul Jennings was a slave to James Madison at Montpelier and Fannie Gordon was enslaved to Charles P. Howard at Howard Place. Paul would relocate to the White House when Madison served as President between 1809 and 1817. Franklin was born in 1836 and as such was also enslaved to Charles P. Howard (Taylor 2012:122). After the death both Fanny Jennings and Dolley Madison in 1844, Paul Jennings would live in Washington, D.C. full time while his children remained in Orange County (Taylor 2012:151).

Between 1834 and 1856, Charles P. Howard, a Quaker from Pennsylvania who had moved to the south because of his bride, freed 23 enslaved persons in the household including Franklin Jennings in 1856 – "I do manumit, emancipate and set free a young negro male slave named Franklin, sometimes called Franklin Jennings, a bright mulatto, and about twenty years of age" (quoted in Taylor 2012:194). Upon his freedom, Franklin lived in Ohio and Washington, D.C.

When the Civil War erupted, Franklin and two of his brothers joined nearly 180,000 black men who took up arms for the Union. In May 1864, Franklin Jennings enlisted for a three-year term in the 5th Massachusetts Colored Cavalry. Franklin's regiment was placed on picket duty at City Point, Virginia. Both Franklin and his brother, John, were part of the famous Black Phalanx that saw action and glory on June 15, 1864 at Petersburg. Franklin's regiment was then sent to Point Lookout, Maryland, that summer to guard the Confederate prisoners of war there before being sent once more to Virginia. Jennings was among the Federal troops camped outside of the City of Richmond in April 1865 and the 5th Massachusetts Colored Cavalry had the great honor to be the first Union regiment to enter the fallen capital (Taylor 2012:208-211).

After the war, Franklin lived in Washington, D.C. with his father and brothers. Franklin married Mary Logan in 1868 and the couple moved to Ohio where they lived until circa 1880 when they moved back to the east coast (Taylor 2012:215). Franklin Jennings was the highest bidder for the tract of land encompassing Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105. However, the couple did not live solely in Prince William County. Mary inherited her family's dwelling on K Street in Washington, D.C. leading her and Franklin to split their time between the two locations. The couple also acquired additional parcels in Washington, D.C. (Taylor 2012:226).

Given that the Jennings split their time between two locations, it is unclear if they had a dominant residence. The couple appeared in the Dumfries District of Prince William County in the federal census of 1900, 1910, and 1920. In 1900 and 1910, Franklin Jennings was identified as a farmer living with his wife. Additional individuals in his household in 1910 were his son Franklin H. [Hugh] (a farmer), daughter-in-law Alice, granddaughter Roberta, grandson Henry S. Earley (also a farmer), and a hired man, Elijah Grayson (also a farmer) (USCB). Franklin Jennings was also a voter in Prince William County (Turner n.d.:51). There are also a few newspaper notices in Washington, D.C. and the City of Alexandria that notes Franklin Jennings as being of Dumfries. Alternatively, Jennings does appear in a few Washington, D.C. One of Franklin sons, Hugh,

would go on to be a trustee of the First Mount Zion Baptist Church which moved to Route 234 in 1947 (*First Mount Zion Baptist Church* n.d.).



Figure 5-10: Plat of Townsend Property, by R.M. Bartenstein & Assocs. In 1972, detailing a portion of the project area and Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105. Source: PWCDB 623:108

WORLD WAR I TO WORLD WAR II (1917 – 1945)

Throughout the first half of the twentieth century, Prince William and most of Northern Virginia continued to be characterized as agricultural with small and large farmsteads lining the growing road network. With the outbreak of World War I, many young men enlisted in the military. In 1917, the U.S. Government leased two tracts of land in southeastern Prince William County known as the Hutchison Tract and the Quantico Company Tract; the government purchased the land in 1918 and 1919. This would become Quantico Marine Base, the first Marine training center not housed on a Naval Base. It currently occupies properties adjoining the south side of the Prince William Forest Park, just south of Dumfries (USCPI 1919).

The interwar years in Prince William County were uneventful. South of the project area, the Cabin Mine Branch closed in 1920, reacting to a significant decline in the nation's production of sulfuric acid after World War I (Fanning 2000:15). This left 200 to 300 men in the region suddenly without work (Kuhn and Bedell 2011:81).

While still remaining rural, small commercial towns continued to slowly grow and there was an increase in church and commercial building construction at small crossroads communities. The rate of suburbanization increased in the 1920s as the widespread use of automobiles and trucks led to the development and improvement of roadways throughout the county that began to forever change the character of the county. East of the project area, Telegraph Road was straightened and widened to become the Richmond-Washington Highway and eventually U.S. Route 1.

Despite the improved roads, the vicinity of the project area remained mostly rural and minimally developed. Dumfries continued to exist as only a small town on the edge of the Marine Corps Base Quantico. The Cherry Hill peninsula to the east of the project area became the site of a large waste processing plant. This plant converted table scraps and dead livestock into soap. The plant furnished work for many of the community's residents, and provided a few side benefits. Fishermen noted that the size of the catfish increased, having apparently fed on the grease being dumped into the river. But the plant was a mixed blessing. The area was known for the smell generated by the plant, which sometimes could be detected up to 15 miles away. The plant remained in operation until the 1950s.

South of the project area, the Recreational Demonstration Areas (RDA) and Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), New Deal programs, were put to use to create Prince William Forest Park. The National Park Service created a program, RDA, which focused on acquiring lands that "were no longer suitable for agriculture but that, if returned to natural condition and if within a reasonable distance of metropolitan areas, would provide a much needed recreation facility for large numbers of people" (quoted in Kuhn and Bedell 2011:82). With its location near Washington, D.C., Chopawamsic was viewed as the model example for the entire RDA program.

One of the initial requirements...was that the area should be from two to ten thousand acres and within a radius of approximately fifty miles of a population center. Other criteria were abundance of good water, available building material, and an interesting environment (quoted in Kuhn and Bedell 2011:85).

The condition of the area that would become Prince William Forest Park was described in the *Washington Evening Star* as "a dismal countryside of eroded, sterile fields, dilapidated little farm houses, ancient graveyards overgrown with blackberry grambles [sic], cut-over woodlands, abandoned mining operations. Half the farms were deserted anyhow" (quoted in Kuhn and Bedell 2011:86). By November 1935, 115 tracts of land had been purchased from residents and approximately 150 farm families in the park area were relocated (Kuhn and Bedell 2011:87; Curtis 2006). This became the Chopawamsic RDA. In 1940, the property was transferred to the jurisdiction of the U.S. National Park System.

During World War II, entry into the park was restricted to the military. During this time, the nation's first Office of Strategic Services (OSS) converted the park into a training area (NPS n.d.). In 1948, the name of Chopawamsic changed to Prince William Forest Park (Kuhn and Bedell 2011:102).

Meanwhile, mapping and early aerials show that the land around the project area remained rural and mostly undeveloped throughout the early-twentieth century (Figures 5-11 through 5-13).

Powell's Creek, in the northern half of the project area is depicted as marshy at this location. The project area was crossed by several minor roads and though most of the area was wooded, there was a cleared portion of land in the southern half at which a dwelling is depicted at the border of the project area. This would be the property of Franklin Jennings.



Figure 5-11: Detail of the 1927 topographic map, *Quantico, VA*, depicting the project area. Source: USGS



Figure 5-12: Detail of a 1937 aerial depicting the project area. Source: Prince William County Mapper



Figure 5-13: Detail of the 1940 topographic map, *Quantico*, *VA*, depicting the project area. Source: USGS

SITES 44PW2104 AND 44PW2105

Land encompassing Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105 remained in the Jennings family until 1921. The 1920 federal census listed Franklin and Mary Jennings in Dumfries at this time (USCB 1920). At the age of 84, Franklin was no longer occupied as a farmer. In 1921, the couple sold the 156½ acres to M.F. and M.J. Davis for \$1,500 (PWCDB 75:354). Given that initials were used for their names, it is unclear who these individuals were though they may have been Marin F. Davis and Mary J. Davis, a white retired farmer whose real estate was valued at \$4,000 in 1930 (USCB 1930). The 1930 census and later deed indicate that the Davises did not occupy the parcel but rented it to Pat Spitzer (PWCDB 110:307). Pat Spitzer was not located in the federal census.

A detail of the 1937 aerial depicts fields surrounding Site 44PW2104 though Site 44PW2105 is within a wooded area (Figure 5-14). The property remained in the hands of the Davis family until 1943 when they sold it to John Hudson and Ruth A. Smith (PWCDB 110:307).



Figure 5-14: Detail of a 1937 aerial depicting Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105. Source: Prince William County Mapper

NEW DOMINION (1945 – PRESENT)

Following World War II, a distinct change in the development of Prince William County occurred. The prevalence of the automobile and the shift towards urban centers marked the end for many of the smaller crossroads communities throughout Prince William County and the nation as a whole. In the decade after World War II, hundreds of rural post offices across the nation were closed marking the end of the small villages they were located within (Scheel 1993).

Although the small rural communities throughout the county were dwindling, the overall population of Prince William County began to grow drastically, reaching more than 22,000 residents by 1950 (USCB). This represented a growth of nearly 100 percent over the population at the turn of the century. The proximity of the county to Washington, D.C. was largely responsible for this growth, as more and more people were employed by the federal government and other businesses in the city. By 1950, the agricultural economy of Prince William County was declining as it became a "bedroom community" of Washington D.C. Additionally, new government regulations on milk were created leading to a marketed decrease in production in the county as smaller dairies became unprofitable and closed (Karnes 1998:23).

As part of the transition, residential suburbs began to sprout up, particularly in the eastern portion of the county. In 1956, the U.S. Congress passed legislation creating the Highway Trust Fund; this was the beginning of the development of the Interstate Highway System. Construction of Interstate 95 began in 1958 to relieve congested Route 1 and connect the major cities of the east coast. A 1954 aerial depicts the project area as forested and in the vicinity of an increased number

of transmission lines (Figure 5-15). The clearing and house that had been previously depicted in the southern portion of the project area, now appears to be overgrown. The 1966 topographic map, *Quantico*, illustrated the newly constructed I-95 along the eastern border of the project area (Figure 5-16).

With the shifting economy and growing prevalence of the automobile, C.D. Hylton foresaw the demand for suburban living and had purchased land in the vicinity of Woodbridge. Marumsco Village, northeast of the project area, was the first large-scale development by Hylton (Post WWII Population Growth n.d.). This would eventually spread over much of the region. The community of Montclair, west of the project area, was first established in 1969. As suburbanization grew in eastern Prince William and elsewhere, the county's population soared from 22,612 residents in 1950 to 482,204 in 2020 (USCB).

With this growth and change in the environment, a large commercial mall, Potomac Mills, was built in a pasture beside I-95 in the county in 1985 approximately two miles north of the project area (Netherton et al. 2004:51). Growth could be seen in subdivisions with large homes on small lots, apartment buildings, commercial strip malls, schools, churches, office buildings and businesses. In 1984, Potomac Landfill opened south of the project area. Despite persistent problems and violations on the site, in the early twenty-first century it became the primary location for the disposal of construction material in that part of fast-growing Northern Virginia (Grymes n.d.).

Topographic maps and aerials depict the encroachment of development on the project area (Figures 5-17 and 5-18). In the 1980s, a weigh station for trucks and rest stop for travelers on I-95 were constructed between the interstate and the project area. In the early twenty-first century housing developments continued inching closer to the project area and additional businesses were erected at the southern end of the project area along Dumfries Road (Route 234).



Figure 5-15: Detail of a 1954 aerial depicting the project area. Source: Prince William County Mapper



Figure 5-16: Detail of the 1966 topographic map, *Quantico, VA*, depicting the project area. Source: USGS



Figure 5-17: Detail of the 1983 topographic map, *Quantico, VA*, depicting the project area. Source: USGS



Figure 5-18: Detail of a 2006 aerial depicting the project area. Source: Google Earth

PROPERTY OWNERSHIP

The following table traces the ownership of land encompasses Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105.

Date	Grantor	Grantee	Source	Notes
8/31/2017	Barrie M. Peterson (Trustee), DG&P, LP, Van Buren Rd. Property LLC	Southgate Business Center, LLC	Inst. # 201708010066714	54.6193 acres
12/12/1986	Janet K. Townsend (widow)	Barrie M. Petersonn (Trustee)	DB 1438:1975	54.6193 acres
12/19/1966	Warren W. and Blanch L. Kilby	R.M. and Janet K. Townsend	DB 413:644	156.5 acres (minus 5 parcels)
1/2/1945	John Hudson and Ruth Audrey Smith	Warren W. and Blanch L. Kilby	DB 114:428	155 acres
5/24/1943	M.F. Davis and M.J. Davis	John Hudson and Ruth A. Smith	DB 110:307	155 acres. Property is given except the dwellings and other buildings and gardens. Property will be given fully at end of rental period of Pat Spitzer.
4/15/1921	Franklin and Mary L. Jennings	M.F. and M.J. Davis	DB 75:354	\$1,500 for 156.5 acres

Table 5-1:	Chain-of-title	for land encom	passing Sites	44PW2104 and	44PW2105.
	chain of the	or rand cheom	Pubbing bitte	III (/ #10 I und	

Date	Grantor	Grantee	Source	Notes
2/14/1883	Charles E. Nicol (Commissioner)	Franklin Jennings	DB 34:237	\$424 for 156.5 acres sold as result of Chancery Suit, Nevett v. Clagett
5/15/1867	John M. Green and Amelia M. Green (wife, of Jefferson County, WV) and Christopher C. Claggett and Emily Claggett (wife, of Prince William County)		DB 26:507	Partition of 424 acres
10/15/1851	George H. Cockrell and Sarah Ann Cockrell (wife) and John Thomas and Sarah Thomas (wife)	John M. Green and Christopher C. Claggett	DB 21:414	\$800 for 424 acres
Unknown	Sarah E. Hays (niece and heir of Sarah Ewell) and others	John Thomas	Referenced in DB 21:414 (DB 17:124 missing)	
5/4/1784	BertrandEwell, CharlesCharlesEwell, SolomonSolomonEwell, ElizabethElizabethMurry, HannahJesseEwell, and ThomasJesseEwelland ThomasChapman Chapman (PWC), Thomas Thornton Clark (of Stafford), and Ann Taylor (of Lancaster)(Legateesin last will of Thomas Winder Ewell)	Sarah Ewell	DB W:16	Shortly before death of Thomas Winder Ewell, Thomas had intended to amend his will and bequeath his property to his sister, Sarah Ewell
4/13/1780	Bertrand Ewell (of Dumfries)	Thomas Winder Ewell (of	DB U:186	5000 pounds for several tracts
GAP - Missi	ng deed from John Can	Dumfries)	vell	

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

6. PHASE I EXPECTED RESULTS

A number of factors must be considered in determining the types of sites that can reasonably be expected to be found in the course of an archaeological testing program. Environmental data such as geology and hydrology along with historic data including transportation routes and proximity to settled areas can provide indications about general use and settlement. In addition to background research, data on previously identified sites can shed light on the types of resources one might expect to find. The following section summarizes the types of cultural resources expected to be present within the project area following a review of these factors.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Prior to modern disturbances the character and type of soil would have had a direct effect on the kind of vegetation and hydrology of the area and on the potential for human habitation and usage. There is a strong correlation between settlement density and soil fertility. A well-known study of settlement patterns in relation to soil types (Lukezic 1990) indicates that historic settlement is closely correlated with the location of prime farmland, and Native Americans during the late prehistoric period also appear to have had preferences for specific site locations and soil types (Rountree and Turner 2002:69).

The project APE topography is characterized by a number of ridges overlooking larger order creeks and their associated tributaries. Most of the soils on the property are not classified as prime farmland. The many finger ridges in the APE create several elevated landforms surrounded by well-defined slopes and wetland. Only about 6% of the project area is poorly drained.

MAP PROJECTED SITES

Historic documents, maps, and literature provided some evidence on the likelihood for the project area to contain prehistoric or historic archaeological sites. As illustrated earlier in the cultural context section of this report, Civil War era mapping of the region show the project area as largely wooded with some small open fields to the north. By the late nineteenth and early twentieth century mapping and aerial imagery shows cleared land in the vicinity of the Jennings property, which is located in the project area APE. A cluster of structures is visible in the same location on a 1937 aerial and on subsequent maps and appear to be gone by the 1950s.

PREVIOUSLY RECORDED SITES

While documentary sources have bias and often are limited in their attention to detail, information on previous surveys and recorded resources in the vicinity of the project area, as well as regional settlement models offer additional information and perspective on the project area's potential to contain intact significant archaeological deposits.

Review of the VDHR VCRIS records identified seven previously recorded archaeological resources mapped either within or immediately adjacent to the project area APE. Six of these resources are prehistoric and one is classified as nineteenth century trash scatter.

PREHISTORIC SITE POTENTIAL

The project area is made up of numerous landforms surrounded by slopes and low-lying areas. It is located near Powells Creek, a larger order stream with associated wetlands. Given the presence of previously recorded small prehistoric lithic scatters and the size of the landforms and dissected nature of the terrain, the potential for large-scale settlements is not likely in this project area APE. There is, however, a moderate to high potential for smaller resource procurement sites to be present on the ends of landforms likely in the form of lithic scatters.

HISTORIC SITE POTENTIAL

Structures are evident in the project area on historic maps since the early twentieth century, therefore, the potential for post-Civil War historic sites to be present is high. Based on the lack of mapping and historical data, the potential for pre-Civil War historic sites to be present is considered low.

7. PHASE I FIELD SURVEY RESULTS

In October and November 2021 and March and April 2022, D+A conducted a Phase I and Phase II cultural resource survey of the ± 37.2 hectare (± 91.8 acre) Van Buren Road Extension project area APE in Prince William County, Virginia. In addition to a pedestrian survey of the project area APE, subsurface testing was conducted to determine the presence of archaeological resources. A reconnaissance level architectural survey was also conducted for any resources 50 years of age for older located within or immediately adjacent to the project area APE. The work was completed in accordance with VDHR's guidelines for conducting historic resources survey in Virginia. The results of the Phase I survey are summarized below.

ARCHITECTURAL FIELD RESULTS

Reconnaissance level architectural survey revealed that there are no buildings or structures 50 years of age or older either located within or adjacent to the project area APE. As such, no further architectural survey or documentation was undertaken as part of the project.

PHASE I ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELD RESULTS

Prior to initiating archaeological testing of the project area APE, a systematic pedestrian survey was undertaken in order to assess existing conditions and the potential for archaeological deposits or other historic landscape features to be present. Following the pedestrian survey, a plan for systematically testing the project area was implemented. The results of both the pedestrian and subsurface testing are provided below.

PEDESTRIAN SURVEY

At the outset of the field effort a pedestrian survey was conducted throughout the project area APE. The Van Buren Road Extension project area lies in Prince William County, Virginia, bounded between the northern crossing of Van Buren Road and Cardinal Drive and the southern crossing of Dumfries Road (Route 234) (Figure 7-1, Figure 7-2). It is bounded on the west by a housing development, an undeveloped parcel, wetlands and a drainage. The east is bounded by a housing development, Interstate I-95, the Dale City Truck-Only Safety Rest Area, and commercial development. A transmission line right-of-way (ROW) bisects the project area APE.



Figure 7-1: Northern boundary of project area. Photo taken facing east.



Figure 7-2: Southern boundary of project area. Also an example of the housing developments bordering the project area. Photo taken facing west.

Evidence of local residents using the property for refuse disposal for at least the past 50 years is also present, with numerous items such as bottles, furniture, cinderblocks, pallets, tires, and plastics dispersed throughout the property, but especially in the south quadrant of the project area, where the area was unable to be excavated due to the density of trash (Figure 7-3). The center of the project area exhibits significant treefall and several large artificial pits with mid-twentieth century trash and metal were noted. The northern quadrant of the property is highly developed, with housing development, modern roadways, and water utility lines prevalent throughout. A retention basin is also found near the housing development (Figure 7-4). The high level of commercial, residential, and highway development has drastically affected the landforms bordering these developments in the project area APE.



Figure 7-3: Example of the high density of trash found in the southern portion of the project area.



Figure 7-4: Retention basin found near the northern housing development.

The vegetation in undeveloped portions of the project areas APE typically consists of open mature hardwood forest with undergrowth that varies between mixed grasses and vines (Figure 7-5).

An open area of tall grasses interspersed with a few young cedar trees surrounds and encompasses in the southern half of the project area APE. The northern and southern boundaries with the housing developments contain mixed species of grass (Figure 7-6). Terrain consists of several steeply sloped landforms with numerous small fingers and knolls bordered by slopes leading to low-lying wetlands, drainages, and Interstate I-95. Powell's Creek and an unnamed tributary of Dewey's Creek run through the project area, accompanied by steep slopes flanking both sides of their respective banks (Figure 7-7).



Figure 7-5: Typical vegetation found in the project area.



Figure 7-6: Typical vegetation found in the northern and southern boundaries of the project area. Photo taken facing southwest.



Figure 7-7: View of Powell's Creek looking upstream.

SUBSURFACE TESTING

Following the pedestrian survey, a plan for systematically testing the project area APE was implemented. The project area was divided into ten areas based on terrain and disturbance labeled A through F in the order they were surveyed (Figure 7-8). Full grids of shovel tests at 15-meter (50-foot) intervals were placed in every area except Areas E and F, where judgmental shovel tests were excavated in areas where slope, disturbance, and wetlands limited testing. Shovel tests were excavated on elevated landforms with well drained soils, where surface evidence indicated the potential for intact archaeological deposits to be present. Shovel tests were not excavated on slopes greater than 15% and in areas where surface evidence of significant disturbance or debris were observed. A total of 574 shovel tests were excavated in the project area, along with some eighteenth and nineteenth century material. Large amounts of modern and mid to late twentieth century refuse was found in the southern portion of the project area and was not collected. The results of shovel testing are discussed below by area.



Figure 7-8: Composite map of project area with shovel test locations and identified sites.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

AREA A AND AREA B

These two areas are located at the far northern end of the project area APE. They consist of a long narrow landform bounded by slopes that contain a fence marking an adjacent neighborhood (Figure 7-9). The areas are bordered on the east by Cardinal Drive Parkway and on the south by a residential neighborhood and Interstate I-95. Areas A and B are separated by a steep slope that leads down to an unnamed tributary of Powell's Creek (Figure 7-10, Figure 7-11). Both areas appeared heavily disturbed, with patches of worn, gravelly surfaces, man-made landforms and disturbed topsoil with pebble inclusions and blocks of solid stone. Vegetation consisted of mixed grasses in Area A and hardwood in stretches of Area B with an undergrowth of smaller hardwood, mixed grasses and shrubs (Figures 7-12 through 7-14).



Figure 7-9: Gentle slope leading to fence that forms the western boundary in Area A and part of Area B. Photo taken from Pl4 facing southwest.



Figure 7-10: Slope marking boundary between Areas A and B. Photo taken facing west.



Figure 7-11: View of Powell's Creek. Photo taken facing northwest.



Figure 7-12: Typical vegetation seen in Area A. Photo taken facing west.



Figure 7-13: Typical vegetation seen in Area B. Photo taken from PL6, facing north.



Figure 7-14: Raised landform in the middle of Area A. Photo taken from PL2, facing south.

Two grids of shovel tests were excavated in Area A; Grid A1 and Grid A2. In Grid A1, a total of 50 shovel tests were laid out at 15-meter (50-foot) intervals in 18 transects labeled A through S (excluding I), 17 of which could not be excavated due to disturbances associated with a modern road, slope, water utilities, and a drainage (Figure 7-15). No cultural material was recovered, and no surface features were observed.

In Grid A2, a total of 12 shovel tests were laid out at 15-meter (50-foot) intervals in 3 transects labeled A through C, three of which could not be excavated due to a modern road and drainage. No cultural material was recovered, and no surface features were observed.

In Area B, a total of 42 shovel tests were laid out at 15-meter (50-foot) intervals in 16 transects labeled A through Q (excluding I), eight of which could not be excavated due to slope and wetlands. One shovel test was positive for cultural material with one piece of prehistoric debitage. Radials shovel tests were negative for additional cultural material.



Figure 7-15: Shovel test plan of Areas A and B.



THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Soils in the transects were variable in both composition and depth, confirming the level of disturbance across the area. Depths of topsoil ranged from 10 to 30cm. A typical profile representative of the natural stratigraphy in Area A consisted of 10YR 4/3 brown silty loam topsoil over 10 YR 5/4 yellowish brown silty clay subsoil (Figure 7-16). The disturbed soil came in two variations, with the raised and level landforms typically consisting of 7.5 YR 5/3 brown silty clay over a 5 YR 5/8 yellowish red clay with gravel inclusions and the other variation a 2.5 Y 5/3 light olive brown silty loam with gravel inclusions over 2.5 Y 6/4 light yellowish brown compacted silty clay (Figure 7-17, Figure 7-18).





Figure 7-16: Soil profile of Shovel Test B2 in Area B.





Figure 7-17: Soil profile of Shovel Test M 1.5 in Area B



Figure 7-18: Soil profile of Shovel Test C3 in Grid A1

AREA C

This area is in the central and eastern portion of the project area and encompasses approximately a quarter of the project area APE. It consists of a collection of sloped landforms and finger ridges that run from its northern/northeastern boundary with Area B at Powell's Creek to its southern boundary, which is formed by a transmission line right-of-way that crosses the project area APE (Figure 7-19, Figure 7-20). The area is bordered to the west by undeveloped woodlands and housing development with slopes leading down to a drainage (Figure 7-21). The eastern boundary is formed by sloping terrain that leads down to Interstate I-95 (Figure 7-22).



Figure 7-19: Slope leading down to the northern boundary of Area C. Photo taken facing north.


Figure 7-20: Transmission line ROW that forms the western boundary of Area C. Photo taken facing north.



Figure 7-21: Western boundary of Grid B2 that leads to drainage/floodplain. Photo taken facing west.



Figure 7-22: Part of landform in Area C4 near-level with Interstate I-95. Photo taken facing east.

Area C has a noticeable level of disturbance with numerous instances of observed treefall, ruts, and push piles. The presence of wetlands also contributed to general unevenness of the overall area. Vegetation typically consisted of hardwood trees with underbrush of mixed grasses and young holly trees (Figure 7-23). The only visible surface feature was a road trace seen in Grid C5 (Figure 7-24).



Figure 7-23: Typical vegetation seen in Area C along with an example of the disturbances typically seen in the area.



Figure 7-24: Road trace that bisects floodplain in Grid C2. Photo taken from PL10 facing north.

Area C was divided into five separate grids based on terrain to test the series of finger ridges that overlook the drainages to the northwest (Figure 7-25).



Figure 7-25: Shovel test plan of Area C.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

In Grid C1, a total of 42 shovel tests were laid out at 15-meter (50-foot) intervals in six transects labeled A through G, five of which were not excavated due to the road trace and slope (Figure 7-26). No cultural material was recovered from any of the excavated shovel tests, and no surface features, aside from the road trace, were observed.

In Grid C2, a total of 53 shovel tests laid out at 15-meter (50-foot) intervals in 17 transects labeled A through R (excluding I), 13 of which could not be excavated due to slope, drainage, and wetlands. No cultural material was recovered from any of the excavated shovel tests, and no surface features were observed.

In Grid C3, a total of 17 shovel tests laid out at 15-meter (50-foot) intervals in four transects labeled A through D, two of which could not be excavated due to slope. No cultural material was recovered from any of the excavated shovel tests, and no surface features were observed.



Figure 7-26: Shovel test map of Grids C1, C2, and C3.

In Grid C4, a total of 13 shovel tests laid out at 15-meter (50-foot) intervals in three transects labeled A through C (Figure 7-27). No cultural material was recovered from any of the excavated shovel tests, and no surface features were observed.

In Grid C5, a total of 118 shovel tests laid out at 15-meter (50-foot) intervals in 17 transects labeled A through R (excluding I), two of which could not be excavated due to wetlands, a modern road and slope. No cultural material was recovered from any of the excavated shovel tests, and no historic surface features were observed.



Figure 7-27: Shovel test map of Grids C4 and C5.

Soils in the Area C generally exhibited a two-stratum profile of topsoil over subsoil. Typical stratigraphy consisted of 10YR 4/3 brown rocky sandy loam topsoil over 10YR 5/4 yellowish brown compacted sandy clay subsoil (B horizon) (Figure 7-28). Another typical soil profile consisted of 10YR 4/3 brown silty loam topsoil over 10YR 5/6 yellowish brown sandy clay subsoil (B horizon) (Figure 7-29). Stratigraphy near the artificial landform adjacent to Interstate I-95 generally exhibited a two-stratum profile of topsoil over subsoil. Typical stratigraphy consisted of 5YR 4/2 dark reddish gray sandy loam topsoil over 7.5 YR 4/4 brown sandy clay mottled with 7.5 YR 4/6 strong sandy clay (B horizon). (Figure 7-30).





Figure 7-28: Soil profile of Shovel Test N1 in Grid C2.





Figure 7-29: Soil profile of Shovel Test F2 in Grid C1





Figure 7-30: Soil profile of Shovel Test B1 in Grid C3

<u>Area D</u>

This area is in the central and southern portions of the project area APE. It is a large and narrow landform with varying topography consisting of flat terrain, gentle slopes running north to south and sharper slopes on its eastern and western boundaries. The northern boundary of Area D is the transmission line right-of-way that marks the southern boundary of Area C, while the southern boundary of Area D is marked by an unnamed creek at the base of a steep slope. The eastern boundary of the area runs along the truck rest area in the northern half and Interstate I-95 in the southern half (Figure 7-31). The western boundary consists of undeveloped woodlands with steep slopes and wetlands leading to residential development further west (Figure 7-32).



Figure 7-31: Slope leading down to truck rest area roadway. Photo taken facing east.



Figure 7-32: Delineated wetlands along the western boundary of Grid D1. Photo taken facing northeast.

Area D contained visible evidence of pushpiles, ruts, raised landforms from highway construction, trash filled artificial pits, pedestrian trails, and treefalls. Vegetation in the area overall consisted of mature hardwood with mixed species of grass and undergrowth (Figure 7-33). Several historic features were observed in Area D including twentieth century debris scatter throughout, as well as scatter stone and other structural debris (Figure 7-34, Figure 7-35, Figure 7-36).



Figure 7-33: Typical vegetation seen in Area D. Photo taken from PL 16 facing south.



Figure 7-34: Example of the significant disturbance found in Grid D2 in Area D. Photo taken facing east.



Figure 7-35: Structural stone debris in pushpiles found in Grid D2. Photo taken facing south.



Figure 7-36: Machine-cut brick likely from collapsed chimney fall and other debris pushed together.

Area D was subdivided into five grids for systematic shovel testing based on terrain

In Grid D1, a total of 64 shovel tests were laid out at 15-meter (50-foot) intervals in 10 transects labeled A through K (excluding I), 11 of which could not be excavated due to a modern road, construction disturbance, slope, and wetlands (Figure 7-37). A total of three shovel tests were positive for cultural material, which included an iron tee pipe fitting and prehistoric debitage.

In Grid D2, a total of 108 shovel tests were laid out at 15-meter (50-foot) intervals in 23 transects labeled -L through K (excluding I), five of which could not be excavated due to a modern road and slope. A total of six shovel tests were positive for cultural material with a total of 24 artifacts recovered including refined earthenware, redware, stoneware, aqua and dark green bottle glass, colorless vessel glass, aqua window glass, and a prosser button (Figure 7-38). These positive shovel tests were located in an area where the terrain was relatively flat and visible evidence of structural debris (i.e. push piles with metal, timber framing, and brick) along with patches of ornamental flowers were observed. The area also corresponds with the location of the Jennings property, which was identified during historic research of the property and is visible on early twentieth-century topographic maps and the 1937 arial. Given the presence of cultural material and the spatial relationship of the positive shovel tests with the Jennings property, the find was designated an archaeological site and assigned the number 44PW2104.

In Grid D3, a total of 63 shovel tests were laid out at 15-meter (50-foot) intervals in eight transects labeled A through H, 14 of which could not be excavated due to slope. A total of four positive shovel tests were recorded and 41 artifacts recovered. The artifacts include refined earthenware and stoneware sherds, colorless, olive green, and dark green vessel glass shards, aqua glass fragments, mortar, charcoal, prehistoric debitage, and oyster shell (Figure 7-39).

A feature was discovered inside shovel test E5 that contained set brick and mortar and three out of the four positive shovel tests were located within 30 meters (100 feet) of this feature. The area of the positive shovel tests was wooded and south of the area with visible evidence of occupation, which was designated 44PW2104. Given the location of these positive shovel tests in relation to Site 44PW2104 and the Jennings property as shown on the 1937 aerial, the finds were interpreted as a likely outbuilding of the Jennings and was designated an archaeological site and assigned the number of 44PW2105.

In Grid D4, a total of 36 shovel tests were laid out at 15-meter (50-foot) intervals in six transects labeled A through F, three of which could not be excavated due to slope. A total of two shovel tests were positive for cultural material, which consisted of nine pieces prehistoric debitage (shatter, secondary and tertiary flakes) (Figure 7-40). These positive shovel tests were designated as Site 44PW 2102.

In Grid D5, a total of 17 shovel tests were laid out at 15-meter (50-foot) intervals in six transects labeled A through G. No cultural material was recovered from any of the excavated shovel tests, and no historic surface features were observed.



Figure 7-37: Shovel test plan of Area D

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



Figure 7-38: Representative artifacts recovered from 44PW2104



Figure 7-39: Representative artifacts recovered from 44PW2105.



Figure 7-40: Artifacts recovered from 44PW2102.

Soils in the Area D generally exhibited a two-stratum profile of plowzone over subsoil. Typical stratigraphy consisted of 10YR 4/4 dark yellowish brown silty loam plowzone (Ap horizon) over 10YR 4/6 strong dark yellowish brown silty clay subsoil (B horizon) (Figure 7-41). In shovel test pit E5 in Grid D3, a potential feature was found containing a 7.5 YR 4/3 brown silty clay loam plowzone over a 7.5 YR 3/2 dark brown silty clay fill over a 7.5 YR 3/4 dark brown clay subsoil (Figure 7-42).





Figure 7-41: Soil profile of Shovel Test F3 in Grid D4





Figure 7-42: Soil profile of Shovel Test E5 and feature in Grid D3

<u>Area E</u>

This area is located in the southwestern portion of the project area APE and consists of two distinct landforms: The eastern landform slopes steeply down to an unnamed creek, which forms the boundary of Area F (Figure 7-43). The western landform is steeply sloped and is bordered by several hotels and a housing development to its west (Figure 7-44).



Figure 7-43: End of eastern landform sloping downwards to the unnamed creek that forms the boundary between E and F. Photo taken facing north.



Figure 7-44: Intersection of Van Buren Rd and Copper Mill Dr that marks the southern boundary of Area E and the project area.

Area E contained large concentrations of modern debris, trash, and push piles along the northern and southern ridges of the eastern landform that borders the hotels and a housing development respectively (Figure 7-45). The western landform also contained significant concentrations of debris and push piles. Vegetation consisted of varying concentrations of hardwoods with minimal undergrowth of mixed grasses (Figure 7-46). Periwinkle was also found running along the lower edge of the southern ridge of the eastern landform (Figure 7-47). Further inspection of the periwinkle did not reveal any additional evidence suggesting that burials were present. There were no depressions, fieldstones, or other markers suggesting a cemetery. Further the location of the periwinkle at the base of slope with a north facing aspect suggests that the ground cover is likely associated with twentieth century domestic activity and not burials.



Figure 7-45: Trash, pushpiles, and debris commonly seen in the eastern landform of Area E. Photo taken facing west.



Figure 7-46: Typical vegetation seen in Area E. Taken from Judgmental 2 facing northwest.



Figure 7-47: Periwinkle found running along the lower edge of the southern ridge in the eastern landform. Photo taken facing east.

A total of 36 shovel tests were laid out at 15-meter (50-foot) intervals in seven transects labeled A through G, one of which was not excavated due to push piles (Figure 7-48). Two shovel tests were positive for cultural material consisting of five pieces of prehistoric debitage (tertiary flakes) and a possible unfinished blade or scraper (Figure 7-49). These positive shovel tests were designated Site 44PW2103.



Figure 7-48: Shovel test plan of Area E.



Figure 7-49: Artifacts recovered from 44PW2103.

Soils in Area E generally exhibited a two-stratum profile of topsoil over subsoil. Typical stratigraphy consisted of 7.5 YR 4/3 brown rocky sandy loam topsoil over 7.5 YR 5/4 yellowish brown compacted sandy clay subsoil (B horizon) (Figure 7-49). In the highly disturbed southwestern corner of Area E, the soil exhibited a three-stratum profile of topsoil over fill over subsoil. Typical stratigraphy consisted of 10 YR 4/2 silty loam over a 10YR 5/4 yellowish brown silty clay loam E horizon over 7.5 YR 4/6 R yellowish brown compacted silty clay subsoil (B horizon) (Figure 7-50).





Figure 7-50: Soil profile of F2 in Area E.





Figure 7-51: Soil profile of Judgmental 1 in Area E.

<u>Area F</u>

This area is located on a steeply sloped landform bordered on both sides by an unnamed creek (Figure 7-52). It is bounded to the north by a housing development and slope, while its southern boundary is indicated by the end of the project area APE.



Figure 7-52: Slope leading down to the unnamed creek forming the boundary between Areas F and D.

This area contains moderate disturbance due to the adjacent housing development. The artificial disturbances include plastic webbing associated with turf or bank stabilization material on ground surfaces around its western boundary likely to limit erosion, a neighborhood walking trail along the northern boundary, and push piles (Figure 7-53). Vegetation consists of patches of young cedar trees with tall grasses and large patches of briars as the undergrowth (Figure 7-54).



Figure 7-53: Example of protective netting seen near housing development.



Figure 7-54: Example of vegetation seen around the grid in Area F. Photo taken facing north.

A total of 21 shovel tests were laid out at 15-meter (50-foot) intervals in 5 transects labeled A through E, two of which could not be excavated due to push piles and vegetation (Figure 7-55). No cultural material was recovered from any of the excavated shovel tests, and no historic surface features were observed.



Figure 7-55: STP Map of Area F.

Soils in Area F generally exhibited a two-stratum profile of topsoil over subsoil. Typical stratigraphy consisted of 10YR 4/3 brown rocky silty loam topsoil over 10YR 5/4 yellowish brown compacted silty loam subsoil (B horizon).





Figure 7-56: Soil profile of Judgmental 5.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

8. PHASE I CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In October and November 2021, D+A conducted a Phase I cultural resource survey of the ± 37.2 hectare (± 91.8 acre) Van Buren Road Extension project area in Prince William County, Virginia. The project area is located east of Montclair, Virginia, and is bounded on the north by Cardinal Drive, on the east by Interstate-95, on the south by Dumfries Road (Route 234), and on the west by adjacent wooded parcels and residential development. The project extends the existing Van Buren Road on the south side of Cardinal Drive to Route 234. For the purposes of cultural resource survey, the project's direct APE was defined as the limits of proposed ground disturbance associated with construction of the project to include stormwater management facilities. The project's indirect APE includes the area immediately adjacent to the proposed project.

No previously recorded architectural resources were located within or immediately adjacent to the project area APE and reconnaissance level architectural survey did not result in the identification of any buildings or structures either within or immediately adjacent to the project area APE 50 years of age or older. *As such, it is D+A's recommendation that no further architectural survey is warranted.*

Background research indicated that seven previously recorded archaeological sites (six small prehistoric lithic scatters and one nineteenth century trash scatter) were mapped either within or immediately adjacent to the project APE. Historic documents, maps, and aerial images also indicated that William Jennings, a former freed slave, owned and occupied property within the project area APE on a part time basis during the last quarter of the nineteenth century and into the second quarter of the twentieth century. Mr. Jennings also owned and occupied property in the District of Columbia.

Following systematic pedestrian survey of the project area APE full grids of shovel tests at 15meter (50-foot) intervals were placed in areas with the potential to contain intact archaeological deposits. These included upland landforms with well drained soils and slopes of less than 15%. Areas with slope greater than 15%, were water saturated at the time of the survey, delineated wetlands, or exhibited evidence of severe subsurface disturbances were not tested. While soils in the project area APE are well drained, over 40% of the project area is sloped 15% or more with some areas exhibiting steep and pronounced slopes of 40% or more.

A total of 574 shovel tests were excavated in the project area APE. Twentieth century cultural material was recovered from shovel testing along with some eighteenth and nineteenth century material. Large amounts of modern and mid to late twentieth century refuse was encountered in the northern and southern portions of the project area and was not collected. Subsurface shovel testing resulted in the identification of four previously unrecorded sites; 44PW2102, 44PW2103, 44PW2104, and 44PW2105.

Site 44PW2104 is a late nineteenth-century domestic site, which appears to be associated with William Jennings, who was a freed slave that owned and occupied the property from 1883 until 1921. Given the presence of cultural material dating from the time period the property was occupied by Mr. Jennings and observed structural debris and two possible pits associated with

buildings or structures, it is D+A's recommendation that Site 44PW2104 is potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP and that site avoidance or Phase II evaluation be undertaken.

Site 44PW2105 is a small site with fewer and slightly earlier domestic material. Given the location of the site in relation to Site 44PW2104 and the Jennings property as shown on the 1937 aerial, the finds were interpreted as a likely outbuilding of the Jennings and associated with their overall agricultural complex. Given the potential association with the Jennings property *it is* D+A's recommendation that Site 44PW2105 is potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP and that site avoidance or Phase II evaluation be undertaken.

Sites 44PW2102 and 44PW2103, both consist of small amounts of prehistoric lithic material recovered from a limited number of shovel tests. The lack of diagnostic artifacts at either site, coupled with the limited amount of material, limits the potential of either of these sites to contribute new or important information about the prehistory of the area and or region. *It is therefore* D+A's recommendation that Sites 44PW2102 and 44PW2103 are not considered potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP and no further work is warranted for these sites.

None the seven previously recorded sites were reidentified during the current Phase I survey. For those resources located in the northern segment of the project area APE where adjacent residential development and improvements have occurred, it is very likely that construction has destroyed the identified resources. It is also possible and likely that recordation of site data from early surveys resulted in mismapping or misprojecting site locations or that the sites are located closer to the edge of landforms and outside of the current project area APE. It is therefore D+A's opinion that no further consideration is warranted for those previously recorded sites located within or adjacent to the project area APE as they could not be reidentified.

9. PHASE II EVALUATION OF SITES 44PW2104 AND 44PW2105

SITE 44PW2104

CLOSE INTERVAL SHOVEL TESTING

Close interval shovel testing of Site 44PW2104 was conducted at 7.5-meter (25-foot) intervals across the limits of the site as defined during Phase I testing. The original Phase I grid was reidentified, and the Area D2 grid was filled in at 25-foot intervals, excepting the radials already excavated. A total of 132 shovel tests were excavated during Phase II testing of Site 44PW2104. Of these, 40 were positive for cultural material, 92 were negative for cultural material and two were not excavated due to slope (Figure 9-1).

A total of 194 artifacts were recovered from Phase II close interval testing. Of these, glass was the most prominent artifact type recovered followed by refined earthenware. Recovered artifacts consisted of whiteware, pearlware, ironstone, bottle and windowpane glass, nails (cut and wire), and glass lantern fragments. Overall, the assemblage is consistent both in terms of content and variety with domestic occupation of the site. The distribution of positive shovel tests and recovered material suggests that the areas of greatest activity were to the south and southeast of the two surface depressions that were observed in the western portion of the site. Shovel tests in this area contained primarily vessel glass and refined earthenware.

Soils documented throughout the close interval shovel testing were very similar and were generally consistent in composition though not in depth, with topsoil (A) typically ranging from 12 to 35 cm below surface. A typical profile representative of Site 44PW2104 stratigraphy consisted of a 10YR 4/4 dark yellowish brown silty loam topsoil over a 10YR 4/6 dark yellowish brown silty clay.



Figure 9-1: Plan of close interval shovel testing and artifact distributions at Site 44PW2104 during Phase I and II excavations.

UNIT EXCAVATION

Close interval shovel testing resulted in clearer spatial patterning of artifacts, which were grouped near the western and southwest corner of Site 44PW2104. A total of nine test units were laid out and excavated (Figure 9-2). Units were excavated in areas with the greatest artifact concentrations and where, based on surface inspection and visible materials, structures were once located. All test units were oriented magnetically northwest-southeast, measured 1-meter (3.2 feet) square, and were numbered sequentially. Excavation results for each unit are discussed individually below.

FIELD SURVEY RESULTS



Figure 9-2: Detail view of artifact distribution and excavation unit placement within the limits of Site 44PW2104.

Test Unit 1

Test Unit 1 was 3 meters (9.10 feet) south of the eastern most observed surface depression. Vegetation around this unit consisted of hardwood trees with mixed species of small undergrowth and grass.

Stratigraphy within the unit consisted of two layers. A thin layer of decayed organics was excavated as part of Stratum I, which consisted of approximately 25 cm (9.8 in) of 10YR 4/2 dark grayish brown silty loam topsoil. Stratum I came down to a Subsoil consisting of 10YR 5/6 yellowish brown silty clay. The clear and sharp transition between topsoil and subsoil indicates that soils in the area of Unit 1 have been cut and are likely reflecting clearing of the site, which is further evidenced by pushpiles with structural debris located to the southwest. No cultural features were identified in Unit 1 (Figure 9-3, Figure 9-4, Figure 9-5, and Figure 9-6). The unit was

excavated approximately twenty centimeters past subsoil to conclusively determine that it was not a false subsoil with underlying cultural deposits.

A total of 212 artifacts were recovered from Unit 1, 15 from the surface and 197 from Stratum I. A summary of the recovered materials is provided in Table 9-1. Most of the recovered material is unidentified iron fragments (n=86) and colorless vessel glass (n=50) with no diagnostic characteristics. A thin flat metal semicircular object buried partially within and outside of the unit was uncovered, but not removed in its entirety. The object is thin metal, appears to be circular, and may be associated with a metal barrel or bucket lid.



Figure 9-3: Plan view of base of excavation in Unit 1.


Figure 9-4: Profile of north wall of Test Unit 1 at base of excavation.



Figure 9-5: Profile of east wall of Test Unit 1 at base of excavation featuring scrap metal embedded in the wall.



Figure 9-6: Profile drawing of east wall of Unit 1

Material	Artifact Type	Color	Quantity
Glass	Vessel, paneled	Colorless	4
Glass	Bottle	Colorless	2
Brick	Whole		1
Glass	Fragment	Colorless	2
Glass	Bottle	Colorless	1
Iron	Flat fragment		5
Refined earthenware	Whiteware		5
Refined earthenware	Ironstone		1
Glass	Bottle	Colorless	4
Glass	Vessel	Colorless	50
Glass	Vessel	Brown	2
Glass	Vessel	Green	1
Glass	Vessel	Aqua	5
Lead alloy	Salt shaker top		1
Quartz	Flake, primary		1
Bone	Mammal		1
Brick	Fragment		4
Glass	Window	Aqua	10
Iron	Nail, Machine cut		4

Table 9-1: Table of artifacts recovered from Unit 1, Surface and Stratum I.

Material	Artifact Type	Color	Quantity
Iron	Nail, wire		1
Iron	Nail, unidentifiable		14
Mortar	Fragment		2
Alloy	Unidentifiable		1
Coal	Fragment		1
Iron	Sheet metal		1
Iron	Fragment		86
Synthetic	Plastic, translucent with perforated edge		1
Wood	Lumber fragment		1

Test Unit 2 was located 2 meters (6.6 feet) north of shovel test DE 2. Vegetation around this unit consisted of hardwood trees with mixed species of small undergrowth and grass. Stratigraphy within the unit consisted of two layers. Stratum I consisted of approximately 37.5 cm (14.8 in) of 10 YR 4/2 dark grayish brown silty clay loam topsoil. Stratum I came down to a Subsoil consisting of 10 YR 5/6 yellowish brown silty clay (Figure 9-7, Figure 9-8, and Figure 9-9). Similar to Unit 1, Unit 2 exhibited a clear and sharp transition between topsoil and subsoil indicating that the soil disturbance noted in Unit 1 continued to the east. No cultural features were identified in Unit 2. The unit was excavated approximately an additional 10 centimeters past subsoil to conclusively determine that there was it was not a false subsoil with underlying cultural deposits. This additional excavation of the unit yielded no additional cultural material and a sterile subsoil.

A total of 111 artifacts were recovered from Unit 2, all from Stratum I. A summary of the recovered materials is provided in

Table 9-2. Artifacts consisted primarily of various forms of glass dating from the last half of the nineteenth century up through the first half of the twentieth century with window glass (n=29) and lime putty (n=20) being the most prominent.



Figure 9-7: Plan view of Unit 2 base of excavation.



Figure 9-8: Profile view of north wall Unit 2 at base of excavation.



Figure 9-9: Profile drawing of Unit 2 north wall.

Material	Artifact Type	Color	Quantity
Refined	Creamware		1
earthenware			
Refined	Whiteware		4
earthenware			
Refined	Whiteware, handpainted	Blue	2
earthenware			
Refined	Whiteware, dipped	Blue	1
earthenware			
Refined	Whiteware, overglaze decal	Green, pink	2
earthenware	TT 1		1
Refined	Unidentifiable		1
earthenware		D	1
Coarse	lile	Brown	1
Doroclain	Piggue		4
Porcelain	Bisque		4
Porcelain	Hard paste		2
Stoneware	Gray finish		1
Glass	Vessel	Solarized	3
Glass	Vessel	Aqua	5
Glass	Vessel, pressed diamond pattern	Solarized	1
Glass	Bottle	Solarized	1
Glass	Milk glass lid liner	White	1
Glass	Vessel	Light green	1
Glass	Vessel	Blue	1
Glass	Vessel	Brown	1
Glass	Vessel	Colorless	8
Glass	Melted	Colorless	1
Shell	Oyster		2
Brick	Fragment		4
Glass	Window	Aqua	29
Iron	Nail, machine cut		2
Iron	Nail, wire		2
Iron	Nail, unidentifiable		7
Lime	Putty		20
Mortar	Fragment		1
Iron	Rod		1
Iron	Loop		1

Table 9-2: Table of artifacts recovered from Unit 2, Stratum I.

Test Unit 3 was located southeast of Test Unit 1 approximately 3 meters north of Shovel Test (-C) (-D) 3. Vegetation around this unit consisted of hardwood trees with mixed species of small undergrowth and grass.

Stratigraphy within the unit consisted of two layers. Stratum I consisted of approximately 35 cm (13.8 in) of 10YR 4/2 dark grayish brown silty clay loam topsoil. Stratum I came down to a subsoil consisting of 10YR 5/6 yellowish brown silty clay. (Figure 9-10, Figure 9-11, and Figure 9-12). As illustrated in Figure 9-11, subsoil was encountered higher in the western, eastern, and southern quadrants of the unit, largely because of a slight ground level depression, which is observable in the northern unit profile. Excavation continued into subsoil and was stopped approximately ten centimeters into subsoil in the western, eastern, and southern quadrants of the unit once it was determined that it was true subsoil that contained no underlying cultural deposits. No cultural features were identified in Unit 3. As observed in the western and eastern profiles of the unit in Figure 9-11, the transition between topsoil and subsoil exhibited the same clear and sharp break indicative of a continuation of the soil cutting documented in Units 1 and 2 to the northwest.

A total of 164 artifacts were recovered, all from Stratum I. A summary of recovered materials is provided in

Table 9-3. Historic materials ranged in date from the last half of the nineteenth century up through the mid twentieth century.



Figure 9-10: Plan view of base of excavation of Unit 3



Figure 9-11: Profile of north wall of Unit 3 (left) at base of excavation.



Figure 9-12: Profile drawing of north wall of Unit 3 base of excavation.

Material	Artifact Type	Color	Quantity
Clay	Pipe stem		2
Refined	Whiteware		18
Earthenware			
Refined	Whiteware		2
Earthenware			
Refined	Ironstone		1
Earthenware			
Refined	Whiteware, transferprint overglaze	Green	1
Earthenware			
Refined	Pearlware, handpainted	Blue	1
Earthenware			
Refined	Unidentifiable	Dark Green	1
Earthenware			
Coarse	Unidentifiable	Blue	1
Earthenware			
Glass	Vessel	Colorless	46
Glass	Vessel	Solarized	2
Glass	Vessel	Pink	1

Table 9-3: Table of artifacts recovered	l from Unit 3	3, Stratum I.
---	---------------	---------------

Material	Artifact Type	Color	Quantity
Glass	Vessel	Green	1
Glass	Vessel	Dark Green	1
Glass	Jar	Colorless	3
Glass	Vessel	Colorless	1
Glass	Vessel	Aqua	6
Glass	Jar	Aqua	3
Glass	Bottle	Brown	7
Glass	Vessel	Gray	2
Glass	Vessel	Colorless	5
Glass	Vessel	Aqua	1
Glass	Vessel	Aqua	1
Glass	Jar	Colorless	1
Glass	Milk glass, lid liner	White	1
Bone	Mammal		3
Brick	Fragment		4
Glass	Window	Colorless	6
Glass	Window	Aqua	7
Glass	Window	Light green	1
Iron	Nail, machine cut		9
Iron	Nail, wire		3
Iron	Nail, unidentifiable		7
Iron	Bolt		1
Porcelain	Hard paste		3
Porcelain	Bisque		1
Stoneware	Unidentifiable	Brown	1
Glass	Milk	White	8
Iron	Fragment		1
Porcellaneous	Vessel		1
Synthetic	Vial cap		1

Test Unit 4 was located at shovel test pit (-C) (-D) 2, with the shovel test pit located at the northeast corner of the unit. Vegetation around this unit consisted of hardwood trees with mixed species of small undergrowth and grass.

Stratigraphy within the unit consisted of two layers. Stratum I consisted of approximately 29.5 cm (11.6 in) of 10YR 4/3 brown silty clay loam topsoil. Stratum I came down to subsoil consisting of 10YR 5/6 yellowish brown silty clay mottled with light charcoal inclusions totaling to about 5% of the stratum (Figure 9-13, Figure 9-14, and Figure 9-15). The transition between topsoil (Stratum 1) and subsoil (Stratum II) was more gradual and typical of a natural soil transition (A/B). No cultural features were identified in Unit 4.

A total of 152 artifacts were recovered, with 10 from the surface and 142 from Stratum I. A summary of the recovered materials is provided in

Table 9-4. Historic materials ranged in date from the last half of the nineteenth century up through the mid twentieth century. Colorless vessel glass (n=45) was the most prominent artifact type recovered.



Figure 9-13: Plan view of base of excavation of Unit 4.



Figure 9-14: Profile view of north wall of Unit 4, base of excavation.



Figure 9-15: Profile drawing of north wall of Unit 4 base of excavation.

Material	Artifact Type	Color	Quantity
Refined	Cut Sponge decoration	Blue	1
Earthenware	1 0		
Glass	Vessel	Light blue	1
Glass	Vessel	Solarized	1
Glass	Vessel	Colorless	3
Iron	Lightswitch cover		1
Iron	Barbed wire		3
Alloy	Clothing rivet	Silver	1
Iron	Mattress springs		1
Refined	Whiteware, flow blue	Blue	1
Earthenware	,		
Refined	Whiteware, sponge	Blue	1
Earthenware			
Refined	Whiteware		18
Earthenware			
Refined	Whiteware, molded		1
Earthenware	-		
Refined	Ironstone		1
Earthenware			1
Forthonworo	Creamware		1
Pefined	Vallowwara		1
Farthenware	1 enow wate		1
Refined	Whiteware Rim Decoration	Brown	1
Earthenware		Diown	-
Porcelain	Japanese, Geisha Girl	Red	1
Stoneware	Gray salt glaze		1
Glass	Vessel, pressed diamond pattern		1
Glass	Vessel	Blue	7
Glass	Vessel	Brown	1
Glass	Bottle	Dark Green	1
Glass	Vessel	Colorless	12
Glass	Vessel	Solarized	3
Glass	Bottle	Green	5
Glass	Vessel	Aqua	8
Glass	Bottle	Colorless	1
Glass	Vessel	Colorless	33
Glass	Vessel	Amher	1
Bone	Mammal		2
Brick	Fragment		6
Glass	Window	Aque	5
Glass	Window	Colorlaga	2
Iron	Nail machine out	COLOTIESS	2
11011	Ivan, machine cut		2

 Table 9-4: Table of artifacts recovered from Unit 4, Surface and Stratum I.

Material	Artifact Type	Color	Quantity
Iron	Nail, unidentifiable		9
Iron	Nail, Wire		5
Mortar	Fragment		1
Iron	Hexagonal nut		1
Iron	Plate and nail		1
Iron	Double Sided Wood Screw		1
String	Fragment		1
Synthetic	Plastic	Blue, Black	1
UID Synthetic	Fragment		1
Glass	Lantern	Colorless	2

Test Unit 5 was located between shovel tests F4 and F5 and G4 and G5. Vegetation around this unit consisted of hardwood trees with mixed species of small undergrowth and grass.

Stratigraphy within the unit consisted of topsoil overlying subsoil. Stratum I consisted of approximately 27 cm (10.6 in) of 10YR 4/3 brown silty clay loam topsoil. Stratum I came down to subsoil consisting of 10YR 5/6 yellowish brown silty clay (Figure 9-16, Figure 9-17, and Figure 9-18). Although the transition from topsoil to subsoil was more natural in Unit 5, excavation continued into subsoil between 4 and 6cm to document that observed apparent subsoil was not overlying a buried cultural stratum.

A total of 30 artifacts were recovered from Unit 5, all from Stratum I. A summary of the recovered artifacts is provided in Table 9-5. Historic materials ranged in date from the last half of the nineteenth century up through the mid twentieth century.



Figure 9-16: Plan view of base of excavation of Unit 5.



Figure 9-17: Profile view of Unit 5 base of excavation.

FIELD SURVEY RESULTS



Figure 9-18: Profile drawing of the north wall of Unit 5 base of excavation.

Material	Artifact Type	Color	Quantity
Refined	Whiteware, transferprint	Red	1
Earthenware			
Refined	Whiteware		3
Earthenware			
Stoneware	Gray salt glaze		1
Stoneware	Bristol glaze with Albany slip		1
Glass	Vessel	Colorless	3
Glass	Bottle, pharmaceutical	Colorless	6
Brick	Fragment		1
Glass	Window	Aqua	1
Iron	Nail or wire fragments, unidentifiable		4
Glass	Vessel	Colorless	1
Iron	Spring		7
Iron	Fragment		1

Fable 9-5: Table of	artifacts recovered fr	om Unit 5, Stratum 1.
----------------------------	------------------------	-----------------------

Test Unit 6

Test Unit 6 was located at shovel test pit (-B) (-C) 1, with the shovel test located at the unit's northeast corner. Vegetation around this unit consisted of hardwood trees with mixed species of small undergrowth and grass.

Excavation of Unit 6 revealed two soil layers. Stratum I consisted of approximately 30 cm (11.8 in) of 10YR 4/3 brown silty clay loam topsoil. Stratum I came down to subsoil consisting of 10YR 5/6 yellowish brown silty clay. The transition between topsoil (Stratum 1) and subsoil (Stratum II) was gradual and representative of a more natural soil transition. Excavation continued into subsoil for approximately an additional 6 to 8cm in order to confirm that the apparent subsoil was not covering a buried cultural stratum. No cultural features were identified in Unit 6, although some evidence of root disturbance was observed in the subsoil (Figure 9-19, Figure 9-20, and Figure 9-21).

A total of 19 artifacts were recovered from Unit 6, all from Stratum 1. A summary of the materials recovered from Unit 6 is provided in Table 9-6. Historic materials ranged in date from the last half of the nineteenth century up through the mid twentieth century. Colorless vessel glass (n=6) was the most prominent artifact type recovered.



Figure 9-19: Plan view of Unit 6 base of excavation.



Figure 9-20: Profile view of north wall of Unit 6 at base of excavation.



Figure 9-21: Profile drawing of north wall of Unit 6 at base of excavation.

Material	Artifact Type	Color	Quantity
Refined	Whiteware, transferprint	Blue	1
Earthenware			
Refined	Whiteware		1
Earthenware			
Stoneware	Bristol glaze with Albany slip	Brown	1
Glass	Milk glass lid liner		1
Glass	Vessel	Colorless	1
Glass	Vessel	Colorless	5
Glass	Bottle	Aqua	1
Glass	Vessel	Light blue	2
Glass	Vessel, pharmaceutical.	Aqua	2
Brick	Fragment		1
Glass	Window	Aqua	2
Iron	Nail, unidentifiable		1

Table 9-6: Artifacts recovered from Unit 6, Stratum I.

Test Unit 7 was located at shovel test pit (-C) 0.5, with the shovel test located at the unit's northeast corner. Vegetation around this unit consisted of hardwood trees with mixed species of small undergrowth and grass.

Stratigraphy within the unit consisted of topsoil overlying subsoil. Stratum I consisted of approximately 28 cm (11 in) of 10YR 3/1 very dark gray silty clay loam. Stratum I came down to subsoil consisting of 10YR 6/3 pale brown silty clay. The topsoil in Unit 7 is noticeably darker than topsoil in Units 6 and 5 but is similar in color and texture to topsoil in Units 1, 2, and 3. There is no evidence that the soil contains coal, ash, or petroleum residue. The coarse texture of the soil observed in the unit profile is the result of a significant root mat and root network, which were drawn to the organic soils. As is often the case soil discoloration is the result of increased decay of organic matter. In this case, the dark topsoil encountered is likely due to the presence of decayed wood and other organic building material that was either piled or left in place after collapse of one of the structures noted to be present on the site in the first half of the twentieth century. No cultural features were identified in Unit 7 (Figure 9-22, Figure 9-23, and Figure 9-24), and Stratum I is not interpreted as a cultural occupation stratum but rather the result of post occupation building deterioration. The clear and definitive break between the Stratum I topsoil and subsoil is further evidence that the area and associated structures were mechanically cleared following their abandonment.

A total of 93 artifacts were recovered from Unit 7, all from Stratum I. The recovered materials are summarized in Table 9-7. Historic materials ranged in date from the last half of the nineteenth century up through the mid twentieth century. Wire nails (n=43) were the most prominent artifact type recovered.



Figure 9-22: Plan view of Unit 7 at base of excavation.



Figure 9-23: Profile view of north wall of Test Unit 7 at base of excavation.

FIELD SURVEY RESULTS



Figure 9-24: Profile drawing of north wall of Unit 7 at base of excavation.

Material	Artifact Type	Color	Quantity
Iron	Iron strap or belt buckle		1
Refined	Whiteware		4
Earthenware			
Refined	Whiteware, transferprint	Green	2
Earthenware			
Refined	Ironstone		6
Earthenware			
Glass	Bottle	Solarized	1
Glass	Bottle	Aqua	1
Glass	Vessel	Solarized	1
Glass	Vessel	Colorless	7
Glass	Vessel	Aqua	3
Glass	Vessel	Colorless	1
Glass	Bottle	Colorless	1
Bone	Mammal		1
Brick	Fragment		5
Glass	Window	Aqua	4
Iron	Nail, machine cut		5
Iron	Nail, wire		43
Iron	Nail, unidentifiable		4
Iron	Fragment		3

Table 9.7	Table of	artifacts	recovered	from	Unit 7	Stratum	ſ
1 abic 2-7.	I able of	arthacts	recovered	nom	Unit /	, Stratum I	۲.

Test Unit 8 was approximately 22.8 meters (75 feet west) of Test Unit 2 and 7.5 meters (25 feet) east of the western most observed surface depression. Vegetation around this unit consisted of hardwood trees with mixed species of small undergrowth and grass.

Stratigraphy within the unit consisted of two layers. Stratum I consisted of approximately 25 cm (9.8 in) of 10YR 4/3 brown silty clay loam topsoil. Stratum I came down to a compact subsoil consisting of 10YR 5/6 yellowish brown silty clay. In profile, the noticeable and distinct break between topsoil and subsoil does not reflect a natural soil transition and is consistent with other soil profiles suggesting that area was mechanically graded. A slight slump in the soil profile is consistent with a stump hole and evidence of root disturbance was observed in the subsoil along with poorly defined gray soil (Figure 9-25, Figure 9-26, and Figure 9-27). No cultural features were identified and approximately 5 additional centimeters of subsoil were excavated in order to confirm that subsoil was not sealing an underlying cultural occupation stratum or feature.

A total of 22 artifacts were recovered from Unit 8, all from Stratum I. A summary of the recovered artifacts is provided in Table 9-8. Historic materials ranged in date from the last half of the nineteenth century up through the mid twentieth century.



Figure 9-25: Plan view of Unit 8 base of excavation.



Figure 9-26: Profile view of north wall Unit 8 base of excavation.



Figure 9-27: Profile drawing of north wall Unit 8 base of excavation.

Material	Artifact Type	Color	Quantity
Refined	Whiteware		2
Earthenware			
Glass	Vessel	Light green	1
Glass	Vessel	Aqua	2
Glass	Vessel	Colorless	2
Glass	Vessel	Solarized	1
Glass	Vessel	Green	1
Brick	Fragment		3
Glass	Window	Aqua	2
Iron	Nail, machine cut		1
Iron	Fragment		6
Synthetic	Plastic		1

 Table 9-8: Table of the artifacts recovered from Unit 8, Stratum I.

Test Unit 9 was located at shovel test (-D) (-E) 2.5, with the shovel test located in the unit's northeast corner and was approximately 30 meters (100 feet) east of Test Unit 3. Vegetation around this unit consisted of hardwood trees with mixed species of small undergrowth and grass.

Stratigraphy within the unit consisted of two layers. Stratum I consisted of approximately 30cm (11.8 in) of 10YR 4/2 dark grayish brown silty loam topsoil. Stratum I came down to subsoil consisting of 10YR 6/4 light yellowish-brown clay. (Figure 9-28, Figure 9-29, and Figure 9-30). Natural root disturbance was identified in the southern wall, consisting of a 10YR 4/2 dark grayish brown silty loam, which is consistent with the root disturbed soils identified in Unit 8. No artifacts were observed inside the potential feature and following further examination and cleaning the discoloration was determined to be associated with natural root disturbance. Excavation was stopped approximately twenty centimeters into subsoil once it was determined that it was true subsoil that contained no underlying cultural deposits. As with other units discussed above the break between topsoil and subsoil is clear and distinct and not reflective of a natural soil transition, supporting the interpretation that impacts to the areas soils have occurred and are consistent with site clearing post occupation.

A total of 26 artifacts were recovered from Unit 9, all from Stratum I. A summary of the recovered artifacts is provided in Table 9-9. Recovered materials consisted primarily of glass and ceramics with use popularity dates ranging from the last half of the nineteenth century up through the first half of the twentieth century.



Figure 9-28: Plan view of Unit 9 base of excavation.



Figure 9-29: Profile view of south wall Unit 9 base of excavation.



Figure 9-30: Profile drawing of south wall Unit 9 base of excavation.

Material	Artifact Type	Color	Quantity
Refined	Whiteware, banded		1
Earthenware			
Refined	Creamware		2
Earthenware			
Refined	Whiteware, transferprint	Blue	1
Earthenware			
Refined	Whiteware, transferprint	Red	1
Earthenware			
Refined	Whiteware, shell edge	Blue	1
Earthenware			
Refined	Whiteware		7
Earthenware			
Refined	Ironstone		2
Earthenware			
Refined	Ironstone, molded		1
Earthenware			
Glass	Milk glass lid liner	White	1
Glass	Bottle	Dark Green	1
Shell	Oyster		2
Brick	Fragment		1
Glass	Window	Aqua	2
Iron	Nail, machine cut		2
Iron	Flattened hook		1

 Table 9-9: Table of the artifacts recovered from Unit 9, Stratum I.

ARTIFACT ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

A total of 1,047 artifacts were recovered from shovel testing and unit excavation at Site 44PW2104. Units 1 and 3 contained the largest number of recovered artifacts (n=237 and n=152 respectively) and both were associated with the easternmost observed surface depression, potentially formed from the removal of structures or wells.

An analysis of recovered artifacts by material type reveals that glass (n=482) was the predominant artifact type followed by iron (n=302) then refined earthenware (n=131) (Figure 9-32). Refined earthenware represented the largest category of recovered ceramics and consisted of undecorated whitewares (n=131), Ironstone (n=10), Creamware (n=3), Pearlware (n=3), shell edge (n=1), cut sponge decoration (n=1), yellow ware (n=1), and unidentifiable (n=3) (Figure 9-33). Iron artifacts (n=302) consisted primarily of unidentified iron fragments (n=112) followed by wire nails(n=59), unidentifiable nails (n=57), and machine-cut nails (n=36) (Figure 9-31, Figure 9-31, Figure 9-32, Figure 9-33, and Figure 9-34).



Figure 9-31: Representative artifacts recovered from Site 44PW2104 during Phase II evaluation survey.



Figure 9-32: Chart of artifacts by material type for Site 44PW2104.



Figure 9-33: Chart of refined earthenware from Site 44PW2104 by type.



Figure 9-34: Chart of iron artifacts recovered from Site 44PW2104 by type.

The most prevalent artifact type recovered from Site 44PW2104 was glass (n-482, 46%) with vessel glass (n=308, 64%) representing the largest identifiable category. Of recovered glass, colorless glass was the largest category (n=263, 55%) represented, although a wide variety of glass colors were represented consistent with the early twentieth century use and occupation of the site (Figure 9-35 and Figure 9-36).



Figure 9-35: Chart of glass recovered from Site 44PW2104 by type.



Figure 9-36: Chart of glass recovered from Site 44PW2104 by color.

The overall variety of materials recovered is representative of domestic use and occupation of the site during the last half of the nineteenth century through the early twentieth century. Artifacts associated with foodways (glass and ceramic vessel forms) dominated the assemblage followed by architectural artifacts (e.g. nails). Uses classified as other were also notable and consisted largely of corroded materials whose form and function could not be determined along with other forms such as machine parts, and unidentifiable iron fragments (Figure 9-37).



Figure 9-37: Chart of artifacts by use classification for Site 44PW2104.

Most recovered artifacts did not have clear or definitive manufacture and use dates. Only a small number of materials were clearly diagnostic in this regard. Overall, the artifact assemblage supports occupation and use of the property from the last half of the nineteenth century up through the early twentieth century. Based on a very limited number of diagnostic artifacts, Site 44PW2104's terminus post quem is 1956.

SITE STRATIGRAPHY

Shovel testing and unit excavation at Site 44PW2104 documented a two strata soil sequence across the entirety of the site located within the project APE. A silty clay loam topsoil of varying depths overlying a sterile silty clay subsoil was typical. Topsoil depths ranged from ± 25 cm (9.8 in) to ± 35 cm (13.7 in) across the site. While soil texture and color were relatively consistent across the site, there were some discrete areas where topsoils were noticeably darker, which as discussed in the unit descriptions above, is attributed to decaying organic material most likely building material from collapsed structures. This interpretation is further supported by the recovery of a large number of wire nails (n=43) representing 46% of the total number of artifacts recovered from Unit 7. Soil profiles in all units, with the exceptions of Units 4, 5, and 6, exhibited a clear and distinct break between topsoil and subsoil indicative of soil movement likely associated with clearing of the buildings and structures post occupation. All artifacts were recovered from topsoil contexts with no stratigraphic or chronological separation and no evidence of subsurface cultural features were identified. Intentional excavation into subsoil confirmed that no buried cultural deposits existed below documented subsoil depths.

SITE 44PW2105

CLOSE INTERVAL SHOVEL TESTING

Close interval shovel testing of Site 44PW2105 was conducted at 7.5-meter (25-foot) intervals across the limits of the site as defined during Phase I testing. The original Phase I grid was reidentified, and the Area D3 grid was filled in at 25-foot intervals, excepting the radials already excavated. A total of 80 additional shovel tests were excavated during Phase II testing of Site 44PW2105. A total of 11 shovel tests were positive for cultural material, nine of which defined the limits of Site 44PW2105 (Figure 9-38). Shovel tests not excavated were the result of slope.

A total of 19 artifacts were recovered from Phase II close interval testing. Of these, brick was the most prominent artifact type recovered followed by refined earthenware. Recovered artifacts consisted of whiteware, pearlware, stoneware, and windowpane glass, and brick fragments. Overall, the assemblage is consistent both in terms of content and variety with domestic occupation of the site and what was recovered during the Phase I survey. The distribution of positive shovel tests and recovered material suggests that the areas of greatest activity were concentrated around the potential feature found in shovel test E5 during the Phase I investigation. Shovel tests in this area contained primarily vessel glass and refined earthenware.

Soils documented throughout the close interval shovel testing were generally consistent in composition though not in depth, with topsoil ranging from 12 cm (12 in) to 45 cm (17.7 in) below surface. A typical shovel test soil profile representative of Site 44PW2105 stratigraphy consisted of a 10YR 5/4 yellowish brown silty clay loam over a 7.5YR 4/6 strong brown silty clay subsoil. Some shovel tests exhibited a three-layer soil profile, although the majority of shovel tests consisted of the two-layer soil profile.

Metal Detection

Targeted metal detection was conducted in conjunction with close interval testing at Site 44PW2105, to further establish the boundaries of the site and concentrations of cultural material. Metal detection consisted of sweeps of 1 meter (3 feet) to either side of transects placed between shovel test transects. Metal detection resulted in two positive hits and contained a total of 4 artifacts, including an unidentifiable iron fragment, unidentifiable iron nail, a machine cut nail, and one whiteware sherd (Figure 9-38).



Figure 9-38: Plan view of Phase I and close interval testing at Site 44PW2105.

UNIT EXCAVATION

Close interval shovel testing resulted in clearer spatial patterning of artifacts, which were grouped in the southern portion of the site near where a potential feature was identified in shovel test E5 during Phase I testing. A total of seven test units were laid out and excavated (Figure 9-39). Units were excavated in areas with the greatest artifact concentrations and based on Phase I survey results potential features may be present. All test units were oriented magnetically northwestsoutheast, measured 1-meter (3.2 feet) square, and were numbered sequentially. At the time of excavation, recent weather conditions attributed to less-than-ideal conditions with both shovel tests and units filling with water prior to completion of excavation and documentation. Ground water, as well as water from tree roots continuously leaked water into excavation units. In addition, the high clay content of the soils contributed to the difficulty in clearing and presenting clean soil profiles. Excavation results for each unit are discussed individually below.



Figure 9-39: Plan of close interval shovel testing, artifact concentrations, and excavation unit placement at Site 44PW2105.

Test Unit 1 was located between shovel tests E5 and E 5.5. Vegetation around this unit consisted of hardwood trees with mixed species of small undergrowth and grass.

Stratigraphy within the unit consisted of three layers. Stratum I consisted of approximately 16 cm (6.2 in) of 2.5Y 4/4 olive brown silty clay loam topsoil. Stratum I came down to a cultural occupation layer ranging from ± 12 cm (4.7) to ± 38 cm (14.9 in) in depth and consisting of 10YR 5/4 silty yellowish brown silty clay with brick and oyster shell inclusions (Figure 9-40, Figure 9-41, Figure 9-42, and Figure 9-43). Stratum II came down to subsoil consisting of 7.5YR 4/6 silty clay on the eastern side of the unit. An approximate 10 additional centimeters were excavated into

subsoil to determine whether the subsoil was false or sealed underlying cultural deposits. Soils from Stratum II continued in the northwestern quadrant of the unit and excavation was terminated due to the depth of the unit and documented continuation of Stratum II in this area of the unit.

A total of 170 artifacts were recovered from Unit 1, predominately from Stratum II. A summary of the recovered materials is provided in Table 9-10. Artifacts consisted of refined earthenware, stoneware, porcelain, bone, brick, and oyster shell. The diagnostic ceramics primarily date to the second and third quarter of the eighteenth century and reflect domestic occupation and use.



Figure 9-40: Plan view of Unit 1 base of excavation.



Figure 9-41: Plan view drawing of Unit 1 base of excavation.


Figure 9-42: Profile view of north wall Unit 1 at base of excavation.



Figure 9-43: Profile drawing of Unit 1 north wall.

Material	Artifact Type	Color	Quantity
Copper Alloy	Button, stamped, alpha shank		1
Refined	Pearlware, handpainted	Dark blue	3
Earthenware			
Refined	Creamware		20
Earthenware			
Refined	Creamware, edge decorated	Green	1
Earthenware			
Refined	Whiteware		2
Earthenware			
Refined	Whiteware, handpainted	Blue	2
Earthenware			
Refined	Tin glazed		1
Earthenware			
Refined	Tin glazed, handpainted	Blue	1
Earthenware			
Refined	Tin glazed, handpainted	Purple, blue	1
Earthenware			

T 11 0 10	TT 1 1 641			e TT •4	1 04 4	T 1 TT
Table 9-10:	Table of th	ie artifacts	recovered	from Unit	1, Stratum	is I and II.

Material	Artifact Type	Color	Quantity
Coarse	North Devon	Green	1
Earthenware			
Coarse	Redware, black lead glaze	Black	2
Earthenware			
Coarse	Redware		1
Earthenware			
Porcelain	Chinese export, overglaze	White	1
Porcelain	Chinese export	Blue	2
Stoneware	White salt glaze, Barley and Basket pattern	White	1
Stoneware	Westerwald	Dark blue	2
Stoneware	White salt glaze, edge decorated		1
Stoneware	White salt glaze, scratch blue	Blue	1
Glass	Bottle	Dark green	19
Bone	Mammal		9
Shell	Oyster		41
Brick	Fragment		35
Daub	Handmade		1
Glass	Window		11
Iron	Nail, machine cut		2
Iron	Nail, machine cut with hand applied heads		2
Iron	Nail, unidentifiable		5
Iron	Wire		1

Test Unit 2 was located at shovel test E 4.6, approximately 22.8 meters (75 feet) northwest of Test Unit 1. Vegetation around this unit consisted of hardwood trees with mixed species of small undergrowth and grass.

Stratigraphy within the unit consisted of two layers. Stratum I consisted of approximately 33 cm (13 in) of 2.5Y 4/4 olive brown silty clay loam topsoil. A darker organic rich layer of decayed leaf material was excavated as part of Stratum I topsoil. Stratum I came down to subsoil consisting of 10YR 5/4 yellowish brown silty clay (Figure 9-44, Figure 9-45, and Figure 9-46). No cultural features were identified in Unit 2. Excavation was stopped twenty centimeters into subsoil once it was determined that it was true subsoil that contained no underlying cultural deposits. The soil profile in Unit 2 represented a natural soil transition topsoil and subsoil indicating that the stratigraphy in Unit 2 was natural and unplowed or disturbed.

A total of 7 artifacts were recovered from Unit 2, all from Stratum I. A summary of the recovered materials is provided in Table 9-11. Artifacts consisted refined earthenware, porcelain, green bottle glass, and iron primarily dating from the last half of the eighteenth century up through the first quarter of the nineteenth century.



Figure 9-44: Plan view of Unit 2 base of excavation.



Figure 9-45: Profile view of north wall Unit 2 at base of excavation.



Figure 9-46: Profile drawing of Unit 2 north wall.

|--|

Material	Artifact Type	Color	Quantity
Refined	Dipped-ware, banded	Blue, white	1
Earthenware			

Material	Artifact Type	Color	Quantity
Refined	Whiteware	White	3
Earthenware			
Porcelain	Chinese export, overglaze handpainted	White	1
Glass	Bottle	Dark Green	1
Iron	Nail, unidentifiable		1

Test Unit 3 was created as a westward expansion of Test Unit 1 to further expose and document the cultural occupation layer encountered during excavation of Unit 1. Vegetation around this unit consisted of hardwood trees with mixed species of small undergrowth and grass.

Stratigraphy within the unit consisted of three layers. Stratum I consisted of approximately 6cm (2.3 in) of 10YR 5/2 grayish brown silty clay loam topsoil with an organic rich leaf layer on top. Stratum I came down to a variable depth cultural occupation layer with a stratigraphy of 10YR 6/3 pale brown silty clay with significant brick inclusions. Depths of Stratum II ranged from 12cm (4.7 in) to 22 cm (8.6 in). Stratum II is underlaid by a feature layer consisting of a stratigraphy of 10YR 4/4 dark yellowish brown silty loam mottled with 10% charcoal, 20% brick, and 35% oyster shell inclusions (**Error! Reference source not found.**, Figure 9-48, Figure 9-49, and Figure 9-50). Subsoil was not reached due to termination of excavation at the oyster shell layer. The layer of oyster shell covered the eastern and northern two-thirds of the unit. Brick inclusions were greater in concentration in the southern part of the unit with a significant amount brick material protruding from the southern wall of the unit.

A total of 69 artifacts were recovered from Unit 3, predominately from Stratum II. A summary of the recovered materials is provided in Table 9-12. Artifacts consisted primarily of brick, oyster shell, refined earthenware, glass, and nails with diagnostic material dating to the second and third quarters of the eighteenth century.



Figure 9-47: Plan view of Unit 3 base of excavation.



Figure 9-48: Plan view drawing of Unit 3 base of excavation.



Figure 9-49: Profile view of south wall Unit 3 at base of excavation.



Figure 9-50: Profile drawing of Unit 3 north wall.

Material	Artifact Type	Color	Quantity
Refined	Creamware		5
Earthenware			
Refined	Whiteware		2
Earthenware			
Refined	Unidentifiable	Brown	2
Earthenware			

Table 9-12: Table of the artifacts recovered predominately from Unit 3, Stratum II.

Material	Artifact Type	Color	Quantity
Refined	Tin glaze		1
Earthenware			
Coarse	Redware, black lead glaze	Black	1
Earthenware			
Porcelain	Chinese export	Blue, Red	1
Stoneware	White salt glazed		1
Glass	Bottle	Dark Green	9
Glass	Bottle	Green	2
Shell	Oyster		12
Brick	Bat		3
Brick	Fragment		8
Glass	Window	Aqua	3
Iron	Nail, machine cut		5
Iron	Nail, machine cut with hand applied heads		2
Iron	Nail, unidentifiable		4
Mortar	Fragment		2
Iron	Fragment		6

Test Unit 4 was located 3 meters (9.1 feet) west of Test Units 1 and 3. Test Unit 4 was created to determine the western limits of the cultural deposits identified in Test Units 1 and 3. Vegetation around this unit consisted of hardwood trees with mixed species of small undergrowth and grass.

Stratigraphy within the unit consisted of two layers. Stratum I consisted of approximately 15cm cm (5.9 in) of 10 YR 5/4 yellowish brown silty clay loam topsoil. A darker organic rich layer of decayed leaf material was excavated as part of Stratum I topsoil. Stratum I came down to subsoil consisting of 10 YR 4/6 dark yellowish brown silty clay (Figure 9-51, Figure 9-52, and Figure 9-53). No cultural features were identified in Unit 4.

A total of 61 artifacts were recovered from Unit 4, predominately from Stratum II. A summary of the recovered materials is provided in Table 9-13. Artifacts consisted primarily of refined earthenware, stoneware, porcelain, glass, and brick with diagnostic material dating from the last half of the eighteenth century and first quarter of the nineteenth century.



Figure 9-51: Plan view of Unit 4 base of excavation.



Figure 9-52: Profile view of north wall Unit 4 at base of excavation.



Figure 9-53: Profile drawing of Unit 4 north wall.

Material	Artifact Type	Color	Quantity
Copper Alloy	Button, stamped, alpha shank		1
Refined	Creamware		9
Earthenware			
Refined	Whiteware		9
Earthenware			

Table 9-13: Table of the artifacts recovered predominately from Unit 4, Stratum II.

Material	Artifact Type	Color	Quantity
Refined	Unidentifiable		2
Earthenware			
Refined	Unidentifiable	Yellow, brown	1
Earthenware			
Refined	Whiteware, handpainted	Blue	2
Earthenware			
Refined	Dipped	Blue	1
Earthenware			
Coarse	Redware, black lead glaze	Black	3
Earthenware			
Porcelain	Chinese export	Blue	1
Stoneware	Brown salt glaze	Brown	1
Glass	Bottle	Dark green	2
Brick	Fragment		2
Iron	Nail, machine cut with hand applied head		1
Iron	Nail, machine cut		10
Mortar	Fragment		3
Glass	Fragment	Green	3
Glass	Fragment	Aqua	3
Iron	Fragment		7

Test Unit 5 was located as a southern expansion of Unit 3. Vegetation around this unit consisted of hardwood trees with mixed species of small undergrowth and grass.

Stratigraphy within the unit consisted of three layers. Stratum I consisted of approximately 10cm (3.9 in) of 10YR 4/2 dark grayish brown silty clay loam topsoil. Stratum I came down to a cultural occupation layer consisting of 10YR 5/4 dark yellowish brown silty clay mottled with brick inclusions of varying depth ranging from 20cm (7.8 in) in the northern half of the unit to approximately 10cm (3.9 in) in the southern half of the unit. Stratum II came down to a feature layer in the eastern half of Unit 5 that consisted of 10YR 4/4 silty loam with stone, brick, and rubble inclusions. Excavation was terminated in the eastern half of the unit before reaching subsoil due to the feature layer being exposed. In the southwestern quadrant of the unit, Stratum II came down to subsoil consisting of 7.5YR 4/6 strong brown silty clay.

Stone and brick rubble with sand mortar were identified in the eastern half of Unit 5 and enclosed a darker soil matrix (10YR 4/4 silty loam). Neither the stone nor brick appear to be articulated and look to be more a result of demolition activity or a possible chimney fall. The dark soil matrix located in the eastern half of the unit is interpreted as feature fill associated with cultural activity. The size of the stones suggests a structural function and possibly represent foundation or chimney base material. The brick was handmade with whole brick and brick bats represented. The feature soil contained oyster shell, brick, charcoal flecks, and ceramic sherds. Based on alignment, it appears that oyster shell deposits are a continuation of those identified in Unit 3 (Figure 9-52, Figure 9-54, Figure 9-55, Figure 9-56, Figure 9-57, and Figure 9-58).

A total of 57 artifacts were recovered from Unit 5, predominately from Stratum II. A summary of the recovered materials is provided in Table 9-14. Artifacts consisted primarily of refined earthenware, stoneware, green bottle glass, brick and mortar. Approximately 7.7kg (17lbs) of brick and mortar fragments were recovered from Stratum II, weighed, and discarded. Diagnostic materials dated to the second, third, and fourth quarters of the eighteenth century.



Figure 9-54: Plan view of Unit 5 base of excavation.



Figure 9-55: Plan view drawing of Unit 5 base of excavation.



Figure 9-56: Profile view of east wall Unit 5 at base of excavation.



Figure 9-57: Profile drawing of Unit 5 east wall.



Figure 9-58: View of south wall Unit 5 at base of excavation



Figure 9-59: View of west wall Unit 5 at base of excavation

Material	Artifact Type	Color	Quantity
Refined	Creamware		6
Earthenware			
Refined	Creamware, Royal rim		1
Earthenware			
Refined	Creamware		1
Earthenware			
Refined	Creamware		1
Earthenware			
Refined	Pearlware, handpainted	Blue	4
Earthenware			
Refined	Pearlware		4
Earthenware			
Refined	Unidentifiable		3
Earthenware			
Coarse	Staffordshire slipware	Brown,	4
Earthenware		yellow	
Coarse	Redware, clear lead glaze		1
Earthenware			
Porcelain	Chinese export		1
Porcelain	Chinese export		1
Stoneware	White salt glaze, scratch blue	Blue	4
Stoneware	White salt glaze		1

Table 9-14: Table of the artifacts recovered from Unit 5, Stratum I.

Material	Artifact Type	Color	Quantity
Stoneware	Brown salt glaze		1
Stoneware	Brown salt glaze		1
Bone	Utensil handle		1
Glass	Bottle	Dark green	5
Glass	Bottle	Dark green	1
Glass	Bottle	Dark green	3
Glass	Vessel	Colorless	2
Glass	Vessel	Colorless	1
Iron	Nail, machine cut		2
Iron	Nail, machine cut		1
Iron	Nail, unidentifiable		2
Iron	Fragment		2
Mortar	Sand based		1
Stone	Paving stone		1
Glass	Fragment	Aqua	1

Test Unit 6 was located southeast of and diagonally adjacent to Unit 5 and was excavated to determine if there was a continuation of the feature layer found in Unit 5. Vegetation around this unit consisted of hardwood trees with mixed species of small undergrowth and grass.

Stratigraphy within the unit consisted of three layers. Stratum I consisted of approximately 10 cm (3.9 in) of 10 YR 4/2 dark grayish brown silty clay loam topsoil. Stratum I came down to a cultural occupation layer consisting of 10YR 5/4 dark yellowish brown silty clay mottled with brick inclusions with an average depth of 20 cm (7.8 in). Stratum II came down to a feature layer that consisted of 10YR 4/4 silty loam with stone, brick, and rubble inclusions. Excavation was terminated before reaching subsoil due to the feature layer being exposed.

A layer of brick rubble was encountered at the base of Stratum II the cultural occupation layer. The brick was similar in color and dimensions to those encountered in Unit 5 and suggests a continuation of the rubble deposit found in Unit 5. None of the brick appeared articulated and its placement and orientation further supports the interpretation of demolition or chimney fall material, similar to that identified in Unit 5. In addition to brick bats and fragments, whole brick was also present. The brick did appear to by lying on a fill deposit similar to that encountered in the adjacent unit (Unit 5) (Figure 9-58, Figure 9-60, Figure 9-61, Figure 9-62, Figure 9-63, Figure 9-64, and Figure 9-65).

A total of 80 artifacts were recovered from Unit 6, predominately from Stratum II. A summary of the recovered materials is provided in Table 9-15. Artifacts consisted primarily of refined earthenware, glass, and brick. Approximately 11.7kg (26lbs) of brick and mortar fragments were collected from Stratum II, weighed, and discarded. Diagnostic material dated from the second quarter of the eighteenth century up through the first quarter of the nineteenth century.



Figure 9-60: Plan view of Unit 6 base of excavation.



Figure 9-61: Plan view drawing of Unit 6 at base of excavation



Figure 9-62:Profile view of north wall Unit 6 at base of excavation



Figure 9-63: Profile drawing of north wall Unit 6 at base of excavation



Figure 9-64: Profile view of east wall Unit 6 at base of excavation



Figure 9-65: Profile view of south wall Unit 6 at base of excavation



Figure 9-66: Profile view of west wall Unit 6 at base of excavation

Material	Artifact Type	Color	Quantity
Clay	Pipe bowl		1
Refined	Creamware		3
Earthenware			
Refined	Whiteware		4
Earthenware			
Refined	Whiteware, handpainted	Blue	1
Earthenware			
Refined	Whiteware, handpainted	Green	1
Earthenware			
Refined	Whiteware, Polychrome	Blue, brown,	1
Earthenware		green	
Refined	Creamware, Dipped, Variegated decoration	White, Black,	3
Earthenware		Brown	
Coarse	Staffordshire slipware		1
Earthenware			
Coarse	Staffordshire slipware	Yellow, Brown	1
Earthenware			
Coarse	Staffordshire slipware	Brown, white	1
Earthenware			
Glass	Vessel	Colorless	1
Glass	Milk glass, vessel		1
Glass	Bottle	Dark green	11
Brick	Fragment		6
Glass	Window	Aqua	1
Iron	Nail, machine cut with hand applied head		3
Iron	Nail, unidentifiable		1
Mortar	Fragment		36
Iron	Fragment		3

11 0 15 5 11 6 41

Test Unit 7 was a northern expansion of Unit 3, which was excavated to define the edge of the ovster layer deposit seen throughout Unit 3. Vegetation around this unit consisted of hardwood trees with mixed species of small undergrowth and grass.

Stratigraphy within the unit consisted of two layers. Stratum I consisted of approximately 18 cm (7 in) of 2.5Y 4/4 olive brown silty clay loam topsoil. Stratum I came down to a subsoil consisting of 7.5YR 4/6 strong brown silty clay in the northern half of unit (Figure 9-65, Figure 9-67, and Figure 9-69). The cultural occupation layer was encountered along the southern side of the unit and the soil matrix surrounding oyster shell consisted of consisting of 10YR 5/4 yellowish brown silty clay mottled with 10% charcoal inclusions, which was not visible in the unit wall profile. In areas where the oyster shell deposit was not present, excavation was stopped ten centimeters into subsoil once it was determined that it was true subsoil that contained no underlying cultural deposits.

A total of 33 artifacts were recovered from Unit 7, all from Stratum I. A summary of the recovered materials is provided in Table 9-16. Artifacts consisted primarily of refined earthenware, stoneware, glass, bone, oyster shell, and brick. Approximately 5.8kg (13lbs) of brick and mortar fragments (approximately 80% of which were mortar) were collected from Stratum I, weighed and discarded. Diagnostic material dated from the second quarter of the eighteenth century up through the first quarter of the nineteenth century.



Figure 9-67: Plan view of Unit 7 base of excavation.



Figure 9-68: Profile drawing of Unit 7 north wall.



Figure 9-69: Plan view drawing of Unit 7 base of excavation

Material	Artifact	Color	Quantity
Refined	Pearlware		2
Earthenware			
Refined	Tin-glazed, red-bodied		1
Earthenware			

Table 9-16: Table of the artifacts recovered from Unit 7, Stratum	I.
---	----

Material	Artifact	Color	Quantity
Refined	Creamware		4
Earthenware			
Refined	Tin-glazed		1
Earthenware			
Refined	Whiteware		1
Earthenware			
Coarse	Staffordshire slipware	Brown, yellow	1
Earthenware			
Coarse	Redware, black lead glaze		1
Earthenware			
Porcelain	Chinese export, underglaze handpainted		1
Stoneware	White salt glaze		1
Glass	Bottle	Dark Green	8
Glass	Bottle	Aqua	2
Bone	Mammal		1
Shell	Oyster		6
Glass	Window	Aqua	1
Iron	Nail, unidentifiable		2

ARTIFACT ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

A total of 324 artifacts were recovered from shovel testing and unit excavation at Site 44PW2105 with Units 1 and 6 containing the largest number of recovered artifacts (n=170 and n-=80 respectively).

An analysis of recovered artifacts by material type reveals that refined earthenware (n=122) was the predominant artifact type followed by glass (n=108), brick (n=69), and iron (n=66) (Figure 9-32). Refined earthenware represented the largest category of recovered ceramics and consisted of creamware (n=57), whiteware (n=31), pearlware (n=14), tin glaze (n=6), dipped ware (n=2) and unidentifiable (n=12) (Figure 9-708 and Figure 9-7169).



Figure 9-70: representative artifacts recovered from Site 44PW2105 during Phase II evaluation survey.



Figure 9-71: Chart of artifacts by material type for Site 44PW2105.

The most prevalent artifact type recovered from Site 44PW2105 was refined earthenware (n=122, 22%) with creamware (n=57, 47%) representing the largest identifiable category. Pearlware (n=14 11%) represented the third largest identifiable category and along with creamware is consistent with the late eighteenth early nineteenth century occupation of the site (Figure 9-72). The other varieties of refined earthenware found were less diagnostic in determining the time period of the occupation of the site.





The variety of coarse earthenware (n=18, 3%) found in Site 44PW2105 is another category of ceramics that is consistent with mid eighteenth to early nineteenth century occupation of the site. Staffordshire slipware (n=8, 44%) represented the largest identifiable category, followed by black lead glaze redware (n=7, 39%), and represent in equal amounts by clear lead glaze redware (n=1, 6%), unglazed redware (n=1, 6%), and North Devon slipware (n =1, 6%) (Figure 9-73).



Figure 9-73: Chart of coarse earthenware recovered from Site 44PW2105 by type.

The second most prevalent artifact type recovered from Site 44PW2105 was glass (n=108, 20%) with bottle glass (n=266, 58%) representing the largest identifiable category (Figure 9-74). Of recovered glass, dark green glass (n=61, 56%) was the largest category represented, followed by aqua glass (n=25, 23%). The predominance of dark green and aqua glass over colorless glass (n= 16, 15%) is consistent with the mid eighteenth to early nineteenth century occupation of the site (Figure 9-75).



Figure 9-74: Chart of glass recovered from Site 44PW2105 by type.



Figure 9-75: Chart of glass recovered from Site 44PW2105 by color.

The fourth most prevent artifact type recovered from Site 44PW2105 was iron (n=66, 12%), with machine cut nails (n=22, 33%) representing the largest category, followed by unidentifiable iron fragments (n=19, 29%), unidentifiable nails (n=15, 23%), and machine cut nails with hand-applied heads (n=8, 12%) (Figure 9-76). The prevalence of machine cut nails, however, and complete absence of identifiable wrought nails is inconsistent with a mid-eighteenth to early nineteenth century occupation of the site as suggested by other diagnostic artifacts recovered. It is possible that a later nineteenth century or early twentieth century agricultural building or shed associated with Site 44PW2104 was constructed in this location and left little in the way of an archaeological signature other than nails. The complete absence of wrought nails is unusual when all other recovered artifacts have use popularity dates consistent with eighteenth century use and occupation of the site.



Figure 9-76: Chart of iron by type recovered from Site 44PW2105

The overall variety of materials recovered is representative of domestic use and occupation of the site during the mid-eighteenth and early nineteenth century. Artifacts associated with foodways (glass and ceramic vessel forms) dominated the assemblage followed by architectural artifacts (e.g. nails, brick, and mortar). Faunal material recovered (oyster shell, animal bone) also supports the domestic use and occupation of the site. Uses classified as other were also notable and consisted largely of glass too fragmented to identify and corroded materials whose form and function could not be determined. Based on a very limited number of diagnostic artifacts, Site 44PW2105's terminus post quem is 1830.

SITE STRATIGRAPHY

Shovel test and unit excavation at Site 44PW2105 revealed an unplowed soil sequence with a sealed cultural occupation layer present in all units except for Unit 2, which was the northern most excavated unit in the site. The cultural occupation layer contained eighteenth-century artifacts, as well as unarticulated structural stone and brick, and significant concentrations of oyster shell. The brick and stone are likely the result of a chimney of structural collapse. The presence of buried cultural deposits strongly suggests the presence of intact significant cultural deposits associated with a small eighteenth-century domestic site located at the end of a small finger ridge. The lack of plowing and subsequent soil disturbances further adds to the information potential of the site.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

10. PHASE II CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

From March through April 2022, D+A completed Phase II evaluation survey of Site 44PW2104 and 44PW2105, located in the Van Buren Road Extension project area APE. The two sites were identified during Phase I survey of the project area APE and were recommended potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP. The goal of the Phase II evaluation was to determine the overall significance and eligibility of Sites 44PW2104 and 44PW2105 for listing in the NRHP. This was accomplished through a combination of detailed historic research and field investigations consisting of the excavation of close interval shovel test pits and test units.

SITE 44PW2104

Site 44PW2104 is a late nineteenth early twentieth-century domestic site associated with William Jennings, who was a freed slave that owned and occupied the property from 1883 until 1921. Mr. Jennings' father was also a freed slave and worked for President James Madison in the White Phase II evaluation survey of Site 44PW2104 resulted in defined site boundaries House. encompassing ± -0.47 hectares (± -1.16 acres) within the proposed project APE. The recovery of artifacts up to the western boundary of the project APE suggests that potential exists for the site to continue further west beyond the present study and project limits. Shovel testing and unit excavation revealed that the site area within the APE had been impacted by the demolition of and removal of buildings and structures, which appeared to be standing as late as the early 1940s. Artifacts recovered consisted of late nineteenth to early twentieth century ceramics and glass, all recovered from Stratum I topsoil with no stratigraphic or chronological separation. Site soils in six of the nine excavated units revealed sharp transitions between topsoil and subsoil indicative of soil removal across a large portion of the site. The absence of evidence of subsurface archaeological features or any evidence of a surviving cultural occupation layer severely limits the overall potential of that portion of the site located within the project APE to contain intact significant archaeological deposits with research potential. Pushpiles containing building demolition debris located off to the side of the site further supports the interpretation that the area was scraped during building and structure demolition. Unit excavation around two depressions located within the site did not reveal any evidence of structural use and their presence appears to be more a result of timber removal or tree fall than use and occupation of the site. Given the documented presence of disturbed and cut soils and the absence of significant intact subsurface archaeological features or deposits within the project APE, the potential for that portion of Site 44PW2104 that is located within the APE to possess new or important archaeological data that can contribute to a greater understanding of the site's and/or region's history beyond what the documentary record has already provided is limited. As such, it is D+A's recommendation that the portion of Site 44PW2104 that is in the project APE is not eligible for listing in the NRHP under criterion D. No further archaeological work is recommended for Site 44PW2104 within the APE.

SITE 44PW2105

Phase II evaluation revealed that Site 44PW2105 is a mid-eighteenth-century domestic site, not an agricultural building as originally interpreted, and was likely associated with John Canterbury, who appears to have owned and occupied the property until 1760, at which time the land was sold to Bertrand Ewell who did not reside on the property. Phase II evaluation testing of Site 44PW2105

resulted in defined site boundaries encompassing +/-0.26 hectares (+/-0.65 acres). Based on Phase I and Phase II testing, it appears that the entirety of Site 44PW2105 is located within the project APE. Shovel testing and unit excavation revealed the presence of an intact cultural layer containing brick and stone structural rubble, oyster shell deposits, and eighteenth-century artifacts in intact soils across much of the site. Artifacts recovered include Westerwald stoneware, white salt glaze stoneware, North Devonshire plain and slip decorated wares, Delftware, dark green bottle glass bases, case bottle glass, and bone handled cutlery. The variety and use popularity dates of the recovered artifacts support a domestic occupation dating to the mid-eighteenth century. Given the presence of significant archaeological deposits with intact soils and structural remains, *it is D+A's opinion that Site 44PW2105 contains important archaeological data that can contribute to a greater understanding of domestic occupation at the site and in the region in the mid-eighteenth century. As such, it is D+A's recommendation that Site 44PW2105 is eligible for listing in the NRHP under criterion D and site avoidance or controlled site burial is recommended.*

11. REFERENCES

- n.d. Batestown. *Visit Prince William Virginia*. Electronic Document, <u>https://www.visitpwc.com/listing/batestown/1951/</u>.
- n.d. *First Mount Zion Baptist Church*. Electronic Document, <u>https://firstmountzionbc.org/fmzbc-history/</u>.
- 2012 History of U.S. 1: The Potomac Path. *The Dixie Pig*. 9 December 2012. Originally published in Mt. Vernon Gazette. Electronic Document, <u>http://scottsurovell.blogspot.com/2012/12/history-of-us-1-potomac-path.html</u>.
- n.d. *Little Union Baptist Church*. Electronic Document, <u>https://little-union.org/our-ministries/about-us</u>.
- n.d. Post-WWII Population Growth. *Prince William County Virginia*. Electronic Document, <u>http://www.pwcgov.org/government/dept/doit/gis/Pages/Post-WWII-Population-</u> <u>Growth.aspx#nxbfgr</u>. Accessed 23 July 2019.
- n.d. Southern Campaign American Revolution Pension Statements & Rosters. Electronic Document, <u>https:/revwarapps.org</u>. Accessed 27 April 2022.

Aaron, Larry G.

2009 Pittsylvania County Virginia: A Brief History. The History Press, Charleston, SC.

Anderson, David G.

- 2001 Climate and Culture Change in Prehistoric and Early Historic Eastern North America. *Archaeology of Eastern North America.* 29, 143-186.
- 1990 The Paleoindian Colonization of the Eastern North America: A View from the Southeastern United States. *Early Paleoindian Economics of Eastern North America*. Edited by K.B. Tankersley and B.L. Isaac. Research in Economic Anthropology, supplement 5. JAI Press, Greenwich, CT.

Anderson, David G., Lisa D. O'Steen, and Kenneth Sassaman

1996 Environmental and Chronological Considerations. *The Paleoindian and Early Archaic Southeast*. Edited by David G. Anderson and Kenneth E. Sassaman. 3-15. The University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa, AL.

Anderson, D.G. and G.T. Hanson

1998 Early Archaic Settlement in the Southeastern United States: A Case Study from the Savannah River. *American Antiquity*, 53:262-286.

Arford-Horne, Kelly, Bradley Krueger, Scott Seibel, and Jeff Winstel

2014 Study of the January 3, 1862 Battle of Cockpit Point Prince William County, Virginia. Prepared by URS Corporation for Prince William County. May 2015. Electronic Document, <u>https://eservice.pwcgov.org/planning/documents/CockpitPoint/CockpitPointBattlefield_F</u> inal_Report.pdf.

Barber, Michael B., J. Mark Wittkofski, and Michael F. Barber

1992 An Archaeological Overview of Stafford County, Virginia. Preservation Technologies, Roanoke, VA.

Bedell, John

2004 *"Few Know That Such a Place Exists" Land and People in the Prince William Forest Park.* Prepared for National Park Service by The Louis Berger Group, Inc. April 2004.

Binford, Lewis R.

1980 Willow Smoke and Dogs' Tails: Hunter-Gatherer Settlement Systems and Archaeological Site Formation. *American Antiquity*, 45.

Brown, George B.

1994 A History of Prince William County. Historic Prince William, Inc., Prince William, VA.

Brown, Wm. H.

1901 *Map of Prince William County, Virginia: compiled from U.S. Geological Survey and other data and corrected with the assistance of reliable residents of the county.* A. B. Graham Photo. Lith, Washington, D.C. Map retrieved from the Library of Congress. https://www.loc.gov/item/2006700181/.

Chapman, Jefferson, and Andrea Brewer Shea

1981 The Archaeobotanical Record: Early Archaic Period to Contact in the Lower Little Tennessee River Valley. *Tennessee Anthropologist* VI(1):61-84.

Claggett, Stephen R. and John S. Cable

1982 *The Haw River Sites: Archaeological Investigations at Two Stratified Sites in the North Carolina Piedmont.* Report R-2386. Commonwealth Associates, Inc., Jackson, MI.

Connery, William S.

2011 Civil War Northern Virginia 1861. The History Press, Charleston, SC.

Coxe, John

1915 Bloody Night Affair at Colchester, VA. *Confederate Veteran*. Vol. 23, No. 1, January 1915.

Curtis, Donald E.

2006 *The Curtis Collection: A Personal View of Prince William County History.* Prince William County Historical Commission, Prince William County, VA.
Custer, Jay F.

1990 Early and Middle Archaic Cultures of Virginia: Cultural Change and Continuity. *Early and Middle Archaic Research in Virginia: A Synthesis.* Edited by Theodore R. Reinhart and Mary Ellen N. Hodges, pp. 1-60. Council of Virginia Archaeologists and the Archaeological Society of Virginia. The Dietz Press, Richmond, VA.

Daniel, I. Randolph, Jr.

1996 Raw Material Availability and Early Archaic Settlement in the Southeast. *The Paleoindian and Early Archaic Southeast*. Edited by David G. Anderson and Kenneth E. Sassaman. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa, AL.

Delcourt, H., and P. Delcourt

1981 Vegetation Maps for Eastern North America: 40,000 Years B.P. to Present. *Geobotany: an Integrating Experience*. Edited by R. Romans, pp. 123-66. Plenum Press, New York, NY.

Dent, Richard J., Jr.

Du Bois, W.E.B.

2007 *Black Reconstruction in America*. Oxford University Press, Inc., New York, NY. Originally published 1935.

Egloff, Keith T. and Stephen R. Potter

1982 Indian Ceramics from Coastal Plan Virginia. *Archaeology of Eastern North America* 10:95-117.

Egloff, Keith and Deborah Woodward

1992 *First People: The Early Indians of Virginia*. University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.

Ewelll, James H.

1990 The Ewells in America and Some Allied Families, 1635-1990. Paradox Co., Layton, UT.

Faden, William, and Charles Cornwallis

1787 The marches of Lord Cornwallis in the Southern Provinces, now States of North America; comprehending the two Carolinas, with Virginia and Maryland, and the Delaware counties. London. Map retrieved from the Library of Congress. https://www.loc.gov/item/74692779/.

Fanning, Kay

2000 Cabin Branch Pyrite Mine Historic District. *National Register of Historic Places Registration Form.* Prepared by the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers for NPS National Capital Region. 16 October 2000. Manuscript on file at the Virginia Department of Historic Resources.

¹⁹⁹⁵ Chesapeake Prehistory Old Traditions, New Directions. Plenum Press, New York, NY.

Fleming, Lieut. Col. Charles A., Capt. Robin L. Austin, and Capt. Charles A. Braley, III

2008 *Quantico: Crossroads of the Marine Corps*. History and Museum Division Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, Washington, D.C. Electronic Document, <u>https://www.marines.mil/portals/1/Publications/Quantico_Crossroads%20of%20the%20</u> <u>Marine%20Corps_1.pdf?ver=2012-10-11-164057-763</u>.

Foner, Eric

2014 *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution 1863-1877.* Perennial Classics, New York, NY.

Frazier, William T., Nancy Born, and Susan Smead

1989 Brentsville Historic District. *National Register of Historic Places Inventory Form.* Prepared by Frazier and Associates. Manuscript on file at the Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Richmond.

Fry, Joshua, Peter Jefferson, and Thomas Jefferys

1755 A map of the most inhabited part of Virginia containing the whole province of Maryland: with part of Pensilvania, New Jersey and North Carolina. Thos. Jefferys, London. Map retrieved from the Library of Congress. https://www.loc.gov/item/74693089/.

Google Earth

2006 USGS aerial. 38°35'52.36"N, 77°18'58.33"W. Historical imagery layers, 1990-2015, 20 February 2006. Accessed 21 September 2021.

Griffin, James B.

1952 Culture Periods in Eastern United States Archaeology. *Archeology of Eastern United States.* Edited by James B. Griffin, 352-64. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

Grymes, Charles A.

n.d. Landfills in Virginia. *Virginia Places*. Electronic Document, <u>http://www.virginiaplaces.org/waste/landfill.html</u>.

Hampton, Wade

- 1862a Report of Brig. Gen. Wade Hampton, C.S. Army, commanding Cavalry Brigade. 15 December 1862. *The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*. Series I, Vol. XXI, Page 690 Government Printing Press, Washington, 1888.
- 1862b Report of Brig. Gen. Wade Hampton, C.S. Army, 22 December 1862. The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies. Series I, Vol. XXI, Page 695. Government Printing Press, Washington, 1888.
- 1863 Report of Brig. Gen. Wade Hampton, C.S. Army, commanding Cavalry Brigade. 5 January 1863. The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies. Series I, Vol. XXI, Page 735. Government Printing Press, Washington, 1888.

Hantman, Jeffrey L., and Michael J. Klein

1992 Middle and Late Woodland Archaeology in Piedmont Virginia. *Middle and Late Woodland Research in Virginia: a Synthesis.* Edited by Theodore R. Reinhart and Mary Ellen N. Hodges, pp. 137-164. Special Publication No. 29 of the Archeological Society of Virginia.

Harrison, Fairfax

1924 Landmarks of Old Prince William. Vol. 1. The Old Dominion Press, Richmond, VA.

Hill, Phillip J., Kelly Cooper, Mark Tweedie, and Michael Roller

2005 A Phase I Archeological Survey of the Vint Hill Assemblage (Avendale): A 125-acre+ Assemblage of Properties Located on Vint Hill Road (Route 215) in Prince William County, Virginia. Prepared by Archeological Testing and Consulting, Inc., Silver Spring, MD.

Justice, Noel D.

1995 Stone Age Spear and Arrow Points of the Midcontinental Eastern United States. Indiana University Press, Bloomington, IN.

Karnes, Debrarae

1998 *The History of the Prince William County Waterfront*. 8 December 1998. Electronic Document, <u>http://www.pwcgov.org/government/dept/planning/documents/000586.pdf</u>.

Klein, Michael J., and Thomas Klatka

1991 Late Archaic and Early Woodland Demography and Settlement Patterns. Late Archaic and Early Woodland Research in Virginia: a Synthesis. Edited by Theodore R. Reinhart and Mary Ellen N. Hodges, pp. 139-183. Special Publication No. 23 of the Archeological Society of Virginia.

Kuhn, Patti and John Bedell

2011 Prince William Forest Park Historic District. *National Register of Historic Places Registration Form.* 21 October 2011. Prepared by The Louis Berger Group, Inc. Manuscript on file at the Virginia Department of Historic Resources.

Kulikoff, Allan

1986 *Tobacco and Slaves: The Development of Southern Cultures in the Chesapeake, 1680-1800.* University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, NC.

Longacre, Edward G.

2003 *Gentleman and Soldier: A Biography of Wade Hampton III.* Rutledge Hill Press, Nashville, TN.

Lukezic, Craig

1990 Soils and Settlement Location in Eighteenth-Century Colonial Tidewater Virginia. *Historical Archaeology* 24(1).

Martin, Joseph

 1836 A New and Comprehensive Gazetteer of Virginia, and the District of Columbia: Containing a Copious Collection of Biographical, Statistical, Political, Commercial, Religious, Moral, and Miscellaneous Information, Collected and Compiled from the Most Respectable, and Chiefly from Original Sources. Moseley & Tompkins, Charlottesville, VA.

Mason, Greg (transcribed)

2010 Virginia Proprietors Office, List of Landholders 1762. Prince William County, Virginia.

Mason, Greg, Editor

- n.d.a Rent Roll from Michaelmass 1738 to Michaelmass 1739. Prince William County, Virginia, manuscripts in the Huntington Library, 1 microfilm reel (366 frames); RELIC Microfilm 975.527 Pri. Electronic Document at Prince William County Library, The Relic Room. Accessed 27 April 2022.
- n.d.b A Rentall for the County of Prince William for the Year 1760. Prince William County, Virginia, manuscripts in the Huntington Library, San Marino, California. Misc.
 Microfilm, Brock Collection, Accession 41008, Misc. Reel 4623, Library of Virginia.
 Electronic Document, at Prince William County Library, The Relic Room. Accessed 26 April 2022.

McAvoy, J.M.

1992 Nottaway River Survey, Part I. Clovis Settlement Patters: The 30-Year Study of a Late Ice Age Hunting Culture on the Southern Interior Coastal Plain of Virginia. Special Publication No. 28 of the Archeological Society of Virginia. The Dietz Press, Richmond, VA.

McAvoy, J.M and L.D. McAvoy

1997 Archaeological Investigations of the Site 44SX202, Cactus Hill, Sussex County, Virginia. VDHR Research Report Series No. 8, VDHR, Richmond

McCartney, Martha

2002 The Cultural Resource Assessment of the Willis Hill Parcel, Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park, Volume I: Historical Context and Cultural Resources Associated with the WillisHill Property. James Madison University Archaeological Research, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Harrisonburg.

McLearen, Douglas C.

1992 Virginia's Middle Woodland Period: A Regional Perspective. *Middle and Late Woodland Research in Virginia: A Synthesis*. Edited by Theodore R. Reinhart and Mary Ellen N. Hodges, 39-64. Council of Virginia Archaeologists and the Archaeological Society of Virginia. The Dietz Press, Richmond, VA.

McLearen, Douglas C. and L. Daniel Mouer

1989 Middle Woodland II Typology and Chronology in the Lower James River Valley of Virginia. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Middle Atlantic Archaeological Conference, Rehoboth Beach, DE.

Meltzer, David J.

1988 Late Pleistocene Human Adaptations in Eastern North America. *Journal of World Prehistory*, 2: 1-52.

Moore, John Hammond

1976 *Albemarle: Jefferson's County, 1727-1976.* University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.

Morton, Susan Rogers

19- Weaver Place. *Works Progress Administration of Virginia Historical Inventory*. 16 November 19-. Digital manuscript on file at the Library of Virginia.

Mouer, L. Daniel

1991 The Formative Transition in Virginia. *Late Archaic and Early Woodland Research in Virginia: A Synthesis.* Edited by Theodore R. Reinhart and Mary Ellen N. Hodges, pp. 1-88. Council of Virginia Archaeologists and the Archaeological Society of Virginia. The Dietz Press, Richmond, VA.

National Park Service

n.d. Office of Strategic Services (1942-45). *Prince William Forest*. Electronic Document, <u>http://www.nps.gov/prwi/historyculture/oss.htm</u>.

Netherton, Nan, Ruth Preston Rose, and Ross Netherton

2004 In the Path of History. Higher Education Publications, Inc., Falls Church, VA.

Olsen, Bill

n.d. Bacon Race History: Washington, Rochambeau Wagon Route. History of the Cannon Bluff Area, prepared by the Cannon Bluff Home Owner's Association.

Palmer, William P., ed.

1881 Calendar of Virginia State Papers and Other Manuscripts, From April 1, 1781 to December 31, 1781. Preserved in the Capitol at Richmond. Sherwin McRae, Richmond, VA.

Payne-Jackson, Arvilla and Sue Ann Taylor

n.d. African American History (1830-1936). *Prince William Forest*. Electronic Document, <u>https://www.nps.gov/prwi/learn/historyculture/african-american.htm</u>.

Potter, Stephen

1993 *Commoners, Tribute, and Chiefs: The Development of Algonquian Culture in the Potomac Valley.* University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville, VA. Price, R. Butler

1862 Reports of Col. R. Butler Price, Second Pennsylvania Cavalry, commanding Cavalry Brigade. 30 December 1862. *The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*. Series I, Vol. XXI, Page 708. Washington: Government Printing Press, 1888.

Prince William County Chancery

1882 #1882-012, Chancery Cause: N.B. Nevitt vs. Thomas J. Claggett et al. Digital case on file at the Library of Virginia.

Prince William County Mapper

- 1937 Aerial photograph viewable in GIS XM, online interactive geographical information system mapping.
- 1954 Aerial photograph viewable in GIS XM, online interactive geographical information system mapping.
- Prince William County Historical Commission (PWCHC)
- 1999 New School Baptist Church. Roadside Marker.
- 2012 History of Prince William County. Electronic Document, <u>http://www.pwcgov.org/.../12a--</u> Budget--02--Introduction--00B--History.pdf

Prince William County Land Tax Books (PWCLTB) Various Years Tax Records. On file at the Library of Virginia.

Prince William County Survey and Warrant

1742 John Canterbury. Survey 21 Dec. 1742, Warrant 15 Febr. 1739/1740. Digital manuscript on file at the Library of Virginia.

Roach, Edward

- 2003 The Civil War and the Quantico Valley. *Prince William Forest Park*. October 2003.
- 2002 Tsenacommacah on the Eve of Jamestown. *Prince William Forest Park*. Electronic Document, <u>http://www.nps.gov/prwi/planyourvisit/upload/Algonquian.pdf</u>.

Rountree, Helen C and Randolph Turner

2002 *Before and After Jamestown: Virginia's Powhatans and Their Predecessors.* University Press of Florida. Gainesville, FL.

Salmon, Emily J., ed.

1983 A Hornbook of Virginia History. 3rd edition. Virginia State Library, Richmond, VA.

Salmon, John S.

2001 The Official Virginia Civil War Battlefield Guide. Stackpole Books, Mechanicsburg, PA.

Scheel, Eugene M.

2000 African-American Heritage Prince William County. October 2000

1993 History of the Villages and Towns of Prince William County. *Historic Prince William*. Electronic Document, <u>https://historicprincewilliam.org/county-history/structures/history-of-villages-and-towns.html</u>. Originally published May 1993.

Small, William F.

1861 Sketch of Virginia and the Rebel Camps and Batteries in front of Gen. Jos. Hooker's Division in Charles County, Maryland, made from Prof. Lowe's Balloon for the Commander in Chief, Dec. 8 1861 by Col. Wm. F. Small, 26th Reg. PA. Map on file, Library of Congress. Map retrieved from Study of the January 3, 1862 Battle of Cockpit Point Prince William County, Virginia by URS Corporation, May 2015. Electronic Document,

<u>https://eservice.pwcgov.org/planning/documents/CockpitPoint/CockpitPointBattlefield_F</u> <u>inal_Report.pdf</u>.

Smith, John and William Hole

1624 *Virginia.* London. Map retrieved from the Library of Congress, <u>https://www.loc.gov/item/99446115/</u>.

Stephenson, Robert L.

1963 *The Accokeek Creek Site: A Middle Atlantic Seaboard Culture Sequence.* Anthropological Papers, Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan, No. 20, Ann Arbor.

Stewart, R. Michael

1992 Observations on the Middle Woodland Period of Virginia: A Middle Atlantic Region Perspective. *Middle and Late Woodland Research in Virginia: A Synthesis*. Edited by Theodore R. Reinhart and Mary Ellen N. Hodges, pp. 1-38. Council of Virginia Archaeologists and the Archaeological Society of Virginia. The Dietz Press, Richmond, VA.

Taylor, Elizabeth Dowling

2012 A Slave in the White House: Paul Jennings and the Madisons. Palgrave Macmillan, New York, NY.

Townsend, Jan

2011 The Civil War in Prince William County. Sponsored by the Prince William County Historical Commission. Edited and expanded by James Burgess.

Turner, E. Randolph, III

1989 Paleoindian Settlement Patterns and Population Distribution in Virginia. Paleoindian Research in Virginia: A Synthesis. Edited by J.M. Wittkofski and T.R. Reinhart, 53-70. Special Publication No. 19 of the Archaeology Society of Virginia. The Dietz Press, Richmond, VA. Turner, Ronald Ray

2006 Prince William County Virginia Clerk's Loose Papers Volume VIII Selected Transcripts 1897-1915.

United States Census Bureau Various Years Federal Census.

United States Committee on Public Information (USCPI)

1919 Quantico Land, Commandeered for Marine Corps Base, Valued at \$456,774, in Report of Board Just Approved by Mr. Daniels. *Official U.S. Bulletin*. University of Michigan.

United States Army of the Potomac, Engineer Department, J. F. Gedney, and United States Army of the Potomac, Office of Surveys and Maps

1863 *Miscellaneous lithographed proof sheets of areas in Virginia: field surveys compiled and printed by the Engineer Department, Army of the Potomac.* Engineer Dept., Army of the Potomac, Washington, D.C. Map retrieved from the Library of Congress. <u>https://www.loc.gov/item/2003683055/</u>.

United States Corps of Topographical Engineers, Irvin McDowell, and J. Schedler

1862 *Map of n. eastern Virginia and vicinity of Washington*. Washington, D.C. Map retrieved from the Library of Congress. <u>https://www.loc.gov/item/91685686/</u>.

United States Geological Survey (USGS)

- 1927 *Quantico, VA Quadrangle*. Topographical Map, Scale 1:62500.
- 1940 *Quantico, VA Quadrangle*. Topographical Map, Scale 1:62500.
- 1966 *Quantico, VA Quadrangle*. 7.5 Minute Series Topographical Map, Scale 1:24000.
- 1983 Quantico, VA Quadrangle. 7.5 Minute Series Topographical Map, Scale 1:24000.

Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR)

2017 *Guidelines for Conducting Historic Resources Survey in Virginia*. Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Richmond, VA.

Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission (VHLC)

1980 Bailey House (site) Survey Form. December 1980. Manuscript on file at the Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Richmond, VA.

Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission Staff (VHLCS)

1983 Occoquan Historic District. *National Register of Historic Places Inventory – Nomination Form.* August 1983. Manuscript on file at the Virginia Department of Historic Resources.

Ward, H. Trawick and R.P. Stephen Davis Jr.

1999 *Time Before History: The Archaeology of North Carolina*. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, NC.

Wendland, Wayne M. and Reid A. Bryson

1974 Dating Climatic Episodes of the Holocene. Quaternary Research, 4: 9-24.

Wieder, Laurie C., ed.

1998 Prince William: A Past to Preserve. Prince William County Historical Commission.

Wohlhueter, Bob

2006 Dettingen Parish, Prince William County, Virginia: A Look at the Lives of the Vestrymen and Ministers 1745-1785. Bob Wohlhueter, Fredericksburg, VA.

Wood, John

1820 *Prince William County.* Digital image on file at the Library of Virginia.

Writers' Program of the Work Projects Administration (WPA)

1941 *Prince William: The Story of Its People and Its Places.* Whittet & Shepperson, Richmond, VA.

Yarnell, Richard A.

1976 Early Plant Husbandry in Eastern North America. *Culture Change and Continuity*. Edited by C. Cleland, 265-273. Elsevier Science & Technology Books, Orlando, FL.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX A: RESUMES

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

DAVID H. DUTTON Managing Partner



Dutton + Associates

CULTURAL RESOURCE SURVEY, PLANNING, AND MANAGEMENT



Education

Master of Arts, 1990 Archaeological Studies Boston University Boston, Massachusetts

Bachelor of Science, 1986 Anthropology and Sociology Virginia Commonwealth University Richmond, Virginia

Appointments

Historic Advisory Committee, Woodrow Wilson Bridge Design Competition, 1998

Dept. of the Army Counterpart Regulations Task Force, NCSHPO, 1999

Virginia Department of Historic Resources Archaeology Advisory Group, 2000

Historic Preservation Committee Chesterfield County, Virginia 2011

Dominion Historic, Scenic, and Cultural Advisory Group, 2017 Mr. Dutton has over 25 years of professional historic preservation experience throughout the East Coast, with a focus on Section 106 coordination and review. He directed the Virginia Department of Historic Resources Division of Project Review where he managed all federal and state environmental reviews, rehabilitation tax credit project certification, historic preservation easements, covenants, and archaeological permits. Prior to his work at the state, Mr. Dutton served as a project review archaeologist for the President's Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. His geographic responsibility was the southeastern United States.

Mr. Dutton has managed the successful completion of multiple cultural resource projects for public and private clients including identification, evaluation, and data recovery efforts for archaeological and architectural properties, HABS documentation, Battlefield Cultural Heritage Plans, Interpretive Concept Plans, and Integrated Cultural Resource Management Plans (ICRMP). In addition, he has negotiated successful agreements under Section 106 for a wide variety of projects. Specific examples include a memorandum of agreement for the Dominion Surry-Skiffes-Whealton transmission line project and a programmatic agreement for the closure of Fort Monroe, a National Historic Landmark District.

Mr. Dutton brings clients both experience and expertise ensuring cultural resource requirements are successfully and efficiently integrated into project planning and construction.

1115 CROWDER DRIVE, MIDLOTHIAN, VIRGINIA 23113 · TEL804.897.1960

DAVID H. DUTTON Managing Partner

Professional Experience

Dutton + **Associates, LLC**, Managing Partner, Richmond, Virginia, 2005 – Present. Directs the firm's technical services which include review of projects pursuant to federal and state historic preservation regulations, cultural resource plan development, field investigations, laboratory processing and analyses, and report preparation.

American Civil War Center *at Historic Tredegar*, Chief Operating Officer, Richmond, Virginia, 2002 – 2006. Managed the Tredegar Iron Works site, the financial performance of the Foundation and construction of the Foundation's new exhibition facility and exhibit *In the Cause of Liberty*.

Cultural Resources Inc., President and Principal Investigator, Williamsburg, Virginia, 1999 – 2002. Managed the firm's financial and technical performance. Directed and authored several cultural resource management studies including identification, evaluation, and data recovery efforts.

Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Director, Division of Project Review; Richmond, Virginia, 1994-1999. Managed all federal and state review and compliance programs; generated policies, specifications, and standards; directed the state historic preservation easement program; interfaced with federal and state executives, elected officials, developers, architects, and engineers on project development and implementation; managed the review and certification of plans for federal and state rehabilitation tax credits; and commented on proposed federal and state legislation and regulations as well as on national and regional historic preservation issues.

Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Archaeologist Planner; Richmond, Virginia, 1992-1994. Planned, coordinated, and supervised the statewide program in archaeological preservation planning; developed and implemented historic preservation plans; and managed, monitored, and evaluated grantee performance for departmental grants awarded in preservation planning.

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Historic Preservation Specialist, Staff Archaeologist; Washington, D.C. 1989 – 1992. Reviewed federal projects under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for the southeast United States; consulted with Congressional offices, federal and state agencies, local governments, and members of the general public; developed and reviewed historic property management plans; and assisted in development of federal policy for the identification and treatment of historic property.

Example Projects and Publications

2007 Project Management of cultural resource team for King William Reservoir Archaeological Services Contract.

2008 Programmatic Agreement for the Closure of Fort Monroe and the Management of Historic Properties. 2017 Regulatory assistance for the Surry-Skiffes-Whealton Transmission Line Project, Surry and James City Counties and the City of Newport News.

2017 Regulatory assistance for the Atlantic Coast Pipeline project, North Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, and Penssylvania.

1115 CROWDER DRIVE, MIDLOTHIAN, VIRGINIA 23113 · TEL804.897.1960

ROBERT J. TAYLOR, JR

Senior Architectural Historian

$\frac{D}{A}$

Dutton + Associates



Education

Master of Arts, 2009 Historic Preservation Savannah College of Art and Design Savannah, Georgia

Bachelor of Arts, 2005 Historic Preservation University of Mary Washington Fredericksburg, Virginia

Awards

Eagle Scout, 2001

Mr. Taylor holds a B.A. in Historic Preservation from University of Mary Washington and a M.A. in Historic Preservation from Savannah College of Art and Design. He has over 10 years of Cultural Resource Management Experience and has taken part in projects in Virginia, North Carolina, Maryland, Delaware, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Florida, and California.

His experience in Cultural Resource Management includes working on both Architectural and Archaeological projects while participating in all phases of compliance from project initiation and development to completion. His work includes conducting field surveys, researching and documenting historic resources, completing site file forms, writing reports, preparing NRHP evaluations and documentation for individual resources and historic districts, compiling HABS/HAER documentation packages, preparing Cell Tower compliance packages, and conducting archaeological testing. He has a thorough understanding of the laws and regulations that govern cultural resources and has assisted with a number of Cultural Resource Management Plans, Programmatic Agreements, and Memorandum of Agreements. Outside of CRM, he has worked for the Thomas Jefferson's Monticello Foundation where he was a field archaeologist and assisted with the long-term, Plantation Survey Project on Monticello Mountain. Mr. Taylor's primary interests lie in Architectural Forensics and the study of building evolution.

As Senior Architectural Historian for Dutton + Associates, Mr. Taylor manages and conducts all aspects of historic and architectural resource projects and studies.

1115 CROWDER DRIVE, MIDLOTHIAN, VIRGINIA 23113 TEL804.897.1960

D

ROBERT J. TAYLOR, JR

Senior Architectural Historian

Professional Experience

Dutton + Associates, LLC, Architectural Historian, Richmond, Virginia, March 2009-present.

Manages architectural history studies, provides regulatory and compliance consultation, conducts Historic Resources Surveys, prepares NRHP nominations, HABS/HAER packages, site forms, and other documentation packages; performs research and context development, and authors project reports.

Thomas Jefferson Monticello Foundation, Field Archaeologist, Charlottesville, Virginia, Winter 2008- 2009. Conducted archaeological testing, assisted with site research, performed lab work

Janus Research, Inc, Architectural Historian, Tampa, Florida, August 2005- May 2008.

Conducted field surveys, Prepared NRHP and HABS/HAER documentation packages, authored Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Reports

Example Projects and Publications

Transmission Line Projects

Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of the Cunningham to Elmont 500 kV Transmission Line, Multiple Counties Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of the TL47 230kV Transmission Line Rebuild, Multiple Counties SCC Pre-Application Study for the Gainesville-Haymarket Substation and Transmission Line, Prince William Co Cultural Resources Survey of the Bearwallow-Faraday Transmission Line Rebuild Project, Tazewell County Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of the Dominion Line 567 Wilcox Wharf to Windmill Point Rebuild Project, Charles City and Prince George County Phase I Survey of the Chase City-Kerr Dam, Line 137 and 138, Mecklenburg County SCC Pre-Application Study of the Mount Storm-Valley Rebuild Project, Rockingham County Phase I Survey of the Hayes-Yorktown 230kV Transmission Line, Gloucester County

Substation Projects SCC Pre-Application Study of the Elklick Substation Expansion, Fairfax Co SCC Pre-Application Study of the Roundtable Substation, Fairfax County Phase I Survey of the Possum Point Project, Prince William County

Wind Power Projects Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of the Rocky Forge Wind Project, Botetourt County Solar Projects

Phase I Survey of the Briel Solar Farm, Henrico Co Phase I Survey of the Puller Solar Project, Middlesex County

Phase I Survey of the Whitehouse Solar Project, Louisa County

Phase I Survey of the Hosier Road Solar Project, Suffolk County

Phase I Survey of the Twitty Creek Solar Project, Charlotte County

Other

Phase III Investigations of the Spring Hill Plantation Site for the Dominion Reymet Road Expansion Project, Chesterfield County HALS Photography for the Skiffe's Creek 500kV Transmission Line Project, Charles City County

1115 CROWDER DRIVE, MIDLOTHIAN, VIRGINIA 23113 · TEL804.897-1960



ULTURAL RESOURCE SURVEY, PLANNING, AND MANAGEMENT



Education

Master of Science, 2004 Historic Preservation University of Pennsylvania Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Bachelor of Arts, 1999 Historic Preservation Mary Washington College Fredericksburg, Virginia Ms. Friedberg holds a M.S. in Historic Preservation, concentrating in Architectural Conservation, from University of Pennsylvania and a B.A. in Historic Preservation from Mary Washington College. She has worked in historic preservation and conservation since 1999 and has taken part in projects in Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Washington, D.C., South Carolina, Georgia, Connecticut, New York, Illinois, Ohio, and Tennessee.

Her experience in Cultural Resource Management includes conducting field surveys, researching and documenting historic resources, preparing National Register of Historic Places nominations, performing archival research, assisting in Federal Tax Credit projects, and completing material analyses of historic mortar and paint.

Prior to working at Dutton + Associates, she was employed as a conservator. This allowed her to conduct multiple conditions assessments of architecture, monuments, and sculptures as well as provide treatment recommendations and project specifications. She has also physically worked on the conservation of stone, metal, and decorative painting. At the completion of each project she provided thorough documentation of each process undertaken.

As an Architectural Historian for Dutton + Associates, Ms. Friedberg collaborates on all aspects of historic and architectural projects including performing field work, conducting project research, and authoring project reports.

1115 CROWDER DRIVE, MIDLOTHIAN, VIRGINIA 23113 TEL 804.897.1960

Architectural Historian

Professional Experience

D

Dutton + Associates, LLC, Architectural Historian, Midlothian, Virginia, 2013-Present Conducts historic resources surveys, performs background research, develops historic contexts, writes National Register nominations, and authors and formats project reports

Kreilick Conservation, LLC, Conservator, Oreland, Pennsylvania, 2006-2012 Completed conditions assessments and treatment recommendations for stone and metal projects, conserved stone and metal architectural elements, monuments, and sculptures, and authored conservation reports.

Powers & Company, Inc., Preservation Associates, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 2002-2006 Conducted historic resources surveys, performed background research, assisted with Federal Historic Preservation Tax Credit projects, completed mortar and historic paint analyses, completed conditions assessments and recommendations for buildings, produced reports for large scale restoration projects, and created project specifications.

Albert Michaels Conservation, Inc., Conservation Technician, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 2001-2002

Conserved decorative paintings and refinished ornate wood, and authored conservation reports.

KCI Technologies, Inc., Cultural Resource Specialist, Hunt Valley, Maryland, 2000-2001 Conducted historic resources surveys, performed background research, and authored project reports.

Restoration Concepts, Restoration Intern, Burlington, Vermont, 1999 Assisted in the restoration of a building.

Example Projects

National Register of Historic Places Nominations

- > Tower Building, Richmond
- > Lee Medical Building, Richmond
- > Fuqua Farm, Chesterfield

Preliminary Information Forms

- > North Thompson Street Historic District, Richmond
- > Virginia Avenue Elementary School, Petersburg

Interpretive Signs

- Skiffes Creek Interpretive Signs, multiple counties
- > Spring Hill Plantation Interpretive Signs, Chesterfield Co.

Viewshed Analyses

- > Viewshed Assessment for Fort Evans, Loudoun Co.
- > Viewshed Analysis for Ellerslie, Surry Co.

Military Analyses and Landscape Studies

> Phase IA Assessment and Military Terrain Analysis of the Plantation Woods Property, Spotsylvania Co.

- > Phase I, Viewshed Assessment, and Military Terrain Analysis for the Potato Run Mitigation Bank, Culpeper Co.
- > Assessment of Two Core Areas of the Battle of Buckland Mills, Prince William Co.

Cultural Resource Survey and Compliance Reports

- Cultural Context and Thematic Study for the Proposed Revitalize RVA Project, Richmond
- > Assessment of Fulton Gas Works, Richmond
- Documentary Study of the Cromley Row Project Area, Alexandria
- > Study of Washington Boundary Ditches, Fairfax Co.
- Intensive Level Survey for Warehouse No. 3 of the Richmond Intermediate Terminal, Richmond
- Economic Context of Middlesex County and the Palmer House, Middlesex Co.
- > Phase I Survey for the Remington-Gordonsville Transmission Line Rebuild Project, multiple counties
- > Phase II Archaeological Evaluation of Site 44LD1244,
- Loudoun Co.

1115 CROWDER DRIVE, MIDLOTHIAN, VIRGINIA 23113 • TEL 804.897.1960

APPENDIX B: PHASE I ARTIFACT INVENTORY

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Provenience	Stratigraphy	Main Material, Subtype, Decoration and Color	Qty.	Part	Notes
Area B					
M1	I	Flake, tertiary. Quartz	1	Flake	
Area D1					
D3	I	Tee pipe fitting, iron with interior threading	1	Whole	
V1	Ι	Flake, tertiary. Quartz	1	Flake	
V1.5	Ι	Flake, tertiary. Quartz	1	Flake	
Area D2					
(-C)2	I	Refined earthenware, whiteware rim	1	Rim	
(-C)2	I	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	Body	
(-C)2	Ι	Glass, solarized vessel	1	Body	
(-D)-1	Ι	Stoneware, gray salt glaze	Stoneware, gray salt glaze 1 Base		Orange interior wash
(-D)1	Ι	Prosser button, four hole	1	Whole	13.4mm diameter
(-D)1	Ι	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	Body	
(-D)1	Ι	Aqua bottle base with1Baseimpressed circle at center		Base	
(-D)1	Ι	Aqua bottle base with 1 Base impressed circle at center, embossed "IV"		Base	
(-D)1	Ι	Glass, colorless vessel rim with parallell embossed lines circling lip	1	Rim	
(-D)1	Ι	Glass, colorless fragment. Thin.	2	Fragment	Possibly lantern or stemware.
(-D)1	Ι	Glass, aqua window	6	Pane	
(-D)3	Ι	Glass, dark green bottle	1	Body	
(-E)-1.5	Ι	Refined earthenware, ironstone	1	Base	Shallow footring
(-E)-1.5	Ι	Redware, red-brown lead glaze	1	Body	
(-E)4	Ι	Stoneware, gray salt glaze	1	Body	
(-E)(-F)-1	I	Refined earthenware, whiteware with handpainted blue rim and surface decoration	2	Rim	Both pieces mend
(-E)(-F)-1	Ι	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	Fragment	
Area D3					
E4	I	Lithic, culturally modified stone. Quartz	1	Fragment	Possibly projectile point tip. Large flake scars.
E5	П	Stoneware, gray-white salt glaze with blue embossed decoration on exterior	1	Base	Partial body.
E5	Π	Stoneware, gray-white salt glaze	2	Body	

Provenience	Stratigraphy	Main Material, Subtype, Decoration and Color	Qty.	Part	Notes
E5	II	Refined earthenware, pearlware with blue design	1	Body	
E5	П	Refined earthenware, unglazed	1	Body	
E5	П	Stoneware, brown salt glaze with impressed rouletted bands on exterior	1	Body	
E5	П	Glass, dark green vessel	1	Body	
E5	II	Glass, olive green	1	Body	
E5	Π	Oyster shell	2	Fragment	68g
E5	Π	Mortar	7	Fragment	16g
E5	П	Brick	6	Fragment	53g
E5	II	Charcoal	3	Fragment	3g
E5.5	I	Glass, aqua fragment	2	Fragment	Flat, possibly square bottle or window.
F2	I	Glass, colorless vessel	10	Body	Machine made with visble mold seam on side.
F2	Ι	Glass, colorless vessel, embossed with partial lettering. Illegible	1	Body	
F2	Ι	Glass, colorless vessel, embossed "2434-1 B 52"	1	Base	Machine made with visble mold seam on side with no pontil mark.
Area D4					
EF5	П	Shatter, quartz	5	Fragment	
F5	Ι	Flake, tertiary. Quartz	2	Flake	Pressure flake
F5	Ι	Flake, secondary. Quartzite	2	Flake	
Area E					
E-3.5	I	Flake, tertiary. Quartz	1	Flake	
E5	Ι	Flake, tertiary. Quartz	3	Flake	
E5	Ι	Lithic, small quartz tool or scraper.	1	Whole	
E5	Ι	Lithic, quartz blade with unfinished base	1	Whole	

APPENDIX C: PHASE II ARTIFACT INVENTORY

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Provenience	Stratigraphy	Main Material	Subtype and Decoration	Qty.	Part	Color	Notes
44PW2104, Phase II							
(-A)1.5	1	Glass	Window	1	Pane	Aqua	
(-B)0.5	1	Glass	Window	1	Pane	Colorless	
(-B)0.5	1	Iron	Nail, machine cut	1	Whole		
(-В)-1.5	1	Stoneware	Tan glaze	1	Body		
(-B)-1.5	1	Glass	Bottle, soft drink	1	Body	Light green	Molded panels, likely Coca Cola
(-B)-1.5	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Colorless	
(-B)(-C)(-1)	1	Stoneware	Brown glaze	1	Body		Utilitarian, matte finish
(-B)(-C)(-1)	1	Iron	Nail, machine cut	1	Head, shank		
(-В)(-С) 0.5	1	Brick	Fragment	1	Fragment		
(-B)(-C) 0.5	I	Brick	Fragment	1	Fragment		burnt
(-B)(-C) 0.5	1	Iron	Curved fragment	1	Fragment		
(-B)(-C)1	1	Refined earthenware	Whiteware	1	Base		Shallow base ring
(-B)(-C)1	1	Glass	Vessel	2	Body	Colorless	
(-B)(-C)1	1	Glass	Vessel	2	Finish	Aqua	Exterior threading
(-B)(-C)1	Ι	Brick	Fragment	1	Fragment		
(-B)(-C)1.5	1	Refined earthenware	Pearlware	1	Body		
(-B)(-C)1.5	I	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Solarized	
(-B)(-C)1.5	T	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Colorless	
(-B)(-C)1.5	T	Glass	Window	1	Pane	Colorless	
(-B)(-C)1.5	I	Glass	Fragment	1	Fragment	Aqua	
(-B)(-C)1.5	T	Synthetic	Black plastic	1	Fragment		
(-B)(-C)1.5	1	Synthetic	Plastic, Shotgun Shell wad	1	Fragment		
(-B)(-C)2	1	Glass	Window	1	Pane	Aqua	
(-B)(-C)2	1	Glass	Window	1	Pane	Aqua	Yellow tinted glass, 7mm thick.
(-B)(-C)2	1	Iron	Nail, unidentifiable	1	Whole		10cm long
(-B)(-C)2	1	Iron	Fragment	4	Fragment		Likely nail pieces.
(-B)(-C)3.5	1	Iron	Nail, unidentifiable	1	Head, shank		
(-C)0.5	1	Iron	Nail, machine cut	2	Whole		
(-C)0.5	T	Iron	Nail, wire	6	Whole		
(-C)0.5	1	Iron	Nail, unidentifiable	4	Shank		

Provenience	Stratigraphy	Main Material	Subtype and Decoration	Qty.	Part	Color	Notes
(-C)0.5	1	Iron	Fragment	4	Fragment		Flat iron fragments
(-C)0.5	1	Iron	Fragment	1	Fragment		Corroding off of black material, unidentifiable.
(-C)0.5	I	Glass	Milk glass lid liner	1	Fragment	White	
(-C)0.5	I	Glass	Vessel	3	Fragment	Colorless	
(-C)0.5	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Base	Solarized	
(-C)0.5	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Aqua	
(-C)0.5	I	Glass	Window	1	Pane	Aqua	
(-C)0.5	1	Bone	Mammal	1	Fragment		
(-C)(-1.5)	I	Refined earthenware	Whiteware	1	Body		Mends with following two entries
(-C)(-1.5)	1	Refined earthenware	Whiteware	1	Rim		Mends with prior and following entry
(-C)(-1.5)	1	Refined earthenware	Whiteware	1	Base		Mends with previous two entries
(-C)(-1.5)	1	Refined earthenware	Whiteware	1	Rim		
(-C)(-1.5)	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Aqua	One with embossed design, possibly Ball Mason Jar.
(-C)(-1.5)	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Dark Green	
(-C)(-1.5)	1	Glass	Vessel	12	Body	Colorless	
(-C)(-1.5)	1	Glass	Vessel	4	Base	Colorless	Embossed "OWENS ILLINOIS GLASS" on heel, and "L-1" on base
(-C)(-1.5)	I	Glass	Window	5	Pane	Aqua	
(-C)(-1.5)	I	Lime	Putty	1	Fragment		
(-C)1.5	1	Glass	Vessel	3	Body	Light blue	
(-C)1.5	I	Glass	Vessel	3	Body	Colorless	
(-C)1.5	I	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Solarized	
(-C)1.5	I	Glass	Vessel	2	Body	Brown	
(-C)1.5	I	Glass	Window	2	Pane	Aqua	
(-C)1.5	1	Iron	Nail, machine cut	1	Whole		
(-C)1.5	1	Iron	Nail, machine cut	1	Shank		
(-C)1.5	1	Iron	Nail, unidentifiable	2	Fragment		
(-C)1.5	1	Synthetic	Clay Shooting Disc	1	Fragment	Yellow	

Provenience	Stratigraphy	Main Material	Subtype and Decoration	Qty.	Part	Color	Notes
(-C)2	I	Refined earthenware	Whiteware	1	Rim		Phase I Shovel Test Pit.
(-C)2	1	Refined earthenware	Whiteware	1	Body		Phase I Shovel Test Pit.
(-C)2	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Solarized	Phase I Shovel Test Pit.
(-C)2.5	1	Brick	Fragment	1	Fragment		
(-C)2.5	1	Iron	Nail, unidentifiable	1	Head, shank		
(-C)2.5	I	Wood	Charred	3	Fragment		
(-C)(-D)-1.5	1	Iron	Nail, unidentifiable	1	Head, shank		
(-C)(-D)-1	I	Iron	Nail, machine	1	Head,		
(-C)(-D)-1	1	Iron	cut Nail, machine	1	shank Shank		
(-C)(-D)1	1	Refined Farthenware	Ironstone	1	Body		
(-C)(-D)1	1	Iron	Cast, unknown use	1	Fragment		Cast into waved shape, possibly stove part or machinery component.
(-C)(-D)1.5	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	1	Rim		
(-C)(-D)1.5	1	Glass	Milk glass, vessel	1	Rim	White	
(-C)(-D)1.5	1	Glass	Vessel	2	Body	Colorless	
(-C)(-D)1.5	I	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Aqua	
(-C)(-D)1.5	1	Brick	Fragment	1	Fragment		
(-C)(-D)2	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Shoulder	Colorless	
(-C)(-D)2	1	Iron	Nail, wire	1	Whole		
(-C)(-D)2	1	Iron	Barbed wire	3	Fragment		
(-D)-1.5	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Shoulder	Aqua	
(-D)-1	1	Stoneware	Gray Salt Glaze	1	Base		Orange interior wash. Phase I Shovel Test Pit.
(-D)1	I	Porcelain	Prosser button	1	Whole		Four Hole. 13.4mm diameter. Phase I Shovel Test Pit.
(-D)1	1	Refined earthenware	Whiteware	1	Body		Phase I Shovel Test Pit.
(-D)1	1	Glass	Bottle	1	Base	Aqua	Impressed circle at center. Phase I Shovel Test Pit.
(-D)1	1	Glass	Bottle	1	Base	Aqua	Impressed circle at center, embossed "IV".

Provenience	Stratigraphy	Main Material	Subtype and Decoration	Qty.	Part	Color	Notes
							Phase I Shovel Test Pit.
(-D)1	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Rim	Colorless	Parallel embossed lines circling lip. Phase I Shovel Test Pit.
(-D)1	1	Glass	Lantern	2	Fragment	Colorless	Thin. Lantern or Stemware. Phase I Shovel Test Pit.
(-D)1	1	Glass	Window	6	Pane	Aqua	Phase I Shovel Test Pit.
(-D)1.5	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	1	Body		
(-D)1.5	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Colorless	
(-D)1.5	I	Glass	Window	1	Pane	Aqua	
(-D)2.5	1	Refined earthenware	Whiteware	1	Body		
(-D)2.5	1	Refined earthenware	Unidentifiable	1	Body		Buff
(-D)2.5	I	Iron	Nail, machine cut	1	Whole		
(-D)2.5	T	Brick	Fragment	4	Fragment		
(-D)3	I	Glass	Bottle	1	Body	Dark Green	Phase I Shovel Test Pit.
(-D)3.5	1	Refined earthenware	Whiteware	1	Body		
(-D)3.5	1	Iron	Nail, unidentifiable	1	Shank		
(-D)(-E)0.5	1	Glass	Vessel	4	Body	Colorless	
(-D)(-E)0.5	1	Glass	Fragment	1	Fragment	Aqua	
(-D)(-E)1	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	1	Body		
(-D)(-E)1	1	Glass	Vessel	4	Body	Colorless	
(-D)(-E)1	1	Glass	Lantern	3	Fragment	Colorless	
(-D)(-E)1	1	Glass	Window	1	Pane	Aqua	
(-D)(-E)1	1	Iron	Nail, wire	1	Shank		
(-D)(-E)1.5	1	Refined earthenware	Whiteware	1	Body		
(-D)(-E)1.5	1	Stoneware	Gray and Brown salt glaze	1	Body		
(-D)(-E)1.5	1	Glass	Milk glass	1	Fragment	White	
(-D)(-E)1.5	1	Brick	Fragment	1	Fragment		
(-D)(-E)1.5	1	Iron	Nail, machine cut	1	Whole		
(-D)(-E)1.5	1	Iron	Nail, unidentifiable	1	Fragment		
(-D)(-E)2	1	Refined earthenware	Ironstone	1	Rim		
(-D)(-E)2	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Colorless	

Provenience	Stratigraphy	Main Material	Subtype and Decoration	Qty.	Part	Color	Notes
(-D)(-E)2	1	Clay	Pipe stem	1	Stem		5/64ths bore diameter
(-D)(-E)2	1	Mortar	Fragment	1	Fragment		
		Refined					Molded blue
(-D)(-E)2.5	1	Earthenware	Shell Edge	1	Rim	Blue	shell edge
(-D)(-E)3	1	Earthenware	whiteware	1	воцу		
(-E)-1.5	1	Refined Earthenware	Ironstone	1	Base		Shallow footring. Phase I Shovel Test Pit.
(-E)-1.5	1	Coarse earthenware	Redware	1	Body		Red-brown lead glaze. Phase I Shovel Test Pit.
(-E)4	1	Stoneware	Gray Salt Glaze	1	Body		Phase I Shovel Test Pit.
(-E)(-F)0.5	I	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Aqua	
(-E)(-F)-1	1	Refined earthenware	Whiteware, Hand painted	2	Rim	Blue	Hand painted blue rim and surface decoration. Phase I Shovel Test Pit.
(-E)(-F)-1	I	Refined earthenware	Whiteware	1	Fragment		Phase I Shovel Test Pit.
(-E)(-F)1	1	Refined earthenware	Whiteware	1	Body		
(-E)(-F)1	I	Glass	Window	1	Pane	Aqua	
(-E)(-F)1	I	Brick	Fragment	1	Fragment		
(-E)(-F)1	1	Iron	Fragment	1	Fragment		Likely nail
(-E)(-F)1	1	Iron	Fragment	4	Fragment		Flat iron fragments
(-E)(-F)1	1	Iron	Machinery fragment	1	Fragment		Large machinery part, possibly mechanical hinge. Three screws run through flattened portion.
(-E)(-F)1.5	1	Iron	Nail, unidentifiable	2	Shank		
(-E)(-F)1.5	1	Brick	Fragment	1	Fragment		
(-E)(-F)2	1	Brick	Fragment	1	Fragment		
(-E)(-F)2.5	1	Iron	Nail, unidentifiable	1	Fragment		
(-E)(-F)3	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	1	Body		
(-E)(-F)4	I	Glass	Fragment	6	Fragment	Blue	Pale, mid shade blue.
(-E)(-F)4	I	Glass	Fragment	1	Fragment	Colorless	
(-E)(-F)4	1	Brick	Fragment	1	Fragment		

Provenience	Stratigraphy	Main Material	Subtype and Decoration	Qty.	Part	Color	Notes
(-F) 0.5	1	Iron	Nail, Wire	1	Whole		
			Nail, Machine				
(-F) 0.5	1	Iron Defined	cut	1	Whole		
(-+)2.5	1	Earthenware	Peariware	1	воау		
(-F)2.5	I	Iron	Fragment	1	Fragment		Likely nail or barbed wire fragment
(-F)(-G)0.5	I	Refined Farthenware	Whiteware	1	Body		
(-F)(-G)2	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	1	Rim		
(-F)(-G)5	1	Glass	Bottle, pharmaceutical	1	Base	Aqua	Rectangular paneled bottle. Approximately 28mm wide.
(-G)(-H)3	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	1	Body		
Unit 1	Surface	Glass	Vessel, paneled	1	Whole	Colorless	Dodecagon paneled vessel, straight sides.
Unit 1	Surface	Glass	Vessel, paneled	2	Body	Colorless	Part of Duraglas vessel.
Unit 1	Surface	Glass	Vessel, paneled	1	Base	Colorless	Duraglas, date code indicates production date of 1947.
Unit 1	Surface	Glass	Bottle	1	Finish	Colorless	Exterior threaded finish
Unit 1	Surface	Glass	Bottle	1	Neck	Colorless	
Unit 1	Surface	Brick	Whole	1	Whole		
Unit 1	Surface	Glass	Fragment	2	Fragment	Colorless	
Unit 1	Surface	Glass	Bottle	1	Whole	Colorless	Two part mold seam with vacuum scar on base. Marks illegible.
Unit 1	Surface	Iron	Flat fragment	5	Fragment		Lightly corrugated on one piece.
Unit 1	1	Refined earthenware	Whiteware	3	Rim		
Unit 1	1	Refined earthenware	Whiteware	2	Body		
Unit 1	1	Refined earthenware	Ironstone	1	Body		
Unit 1	Ī	Glass	Bottle	1	Neck	Colorless	Threaded top, paneled embossing near finish. Mold seam runs to lip.

Provenience	Stratigraphy	Main Material	Subtype and Decoration	Qty.	Part	Color	Notes
Unit 1	1	Glass	Bottle	3	Finish	Colorless	Mold seam runs to lip, all pieces mend.
Unit 1	1	Glass	Vessel	2	Base	Colorless	Stippled base. One embossed "ONE QUART"
Unit 1	I	Glass	Vessel	1	Finish	Colorless	Wide mouth vessel.
Unit 1	I	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Colorless	Embossed "QUART"
Unit 1	I	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Colorless	Molded decorative dots on exterior.
Unit 1	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Colorless	Molded leaf and grapes on exterior.
Unit 1	I	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Colorless	Molded triangles on exterior.
Unit 1	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Colorless	Molded ridge design on exterior.
Unit 1	I	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Colorless	Paneled
Unit 1	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Finish	Colorless	Flat tooled finish, wide mouth vessel. Paneled.
Unit 1	I	Glass	Vessel	40	Body	Colorless	
Unit 1	T	Glass	Vessel	2	Body	Brown	
Unit 1	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Green	Volume notations embossed, showing "1/2"
Unit 1	Ι	Glass	Vessel	5	Body	Aqua	Melted
Unit 1	I	Lead alloy	Salt shaker top	1	Fragment		
Unit 1	1	Quartz	Flake, primary	1	Fragment		
Unit 1	I	Bone	Mammal	1	Fragment		
Unit 1	1	Brick	Fragment	4	Fragment		
Unit 1	1	Glass	Window	10	Pane	Aqua	
Unit 1	I	Iron	Nail, Machine cut	3	Whole		
Unit 1	1	Iron	Nail, Machine cut	1	Shank		
Unit 1	1	Iron	Nail, wire	1	Whole		Short bracket nail
Unit 1	1	Iron	Nail, unidentifiable	7	Head, shank		
Unit 1	1	Iron	Nail <i>,</i> unidentifiable	7	Fragment		
Unit 1	1	Mortar	Fragment	2	Fragment		
Unit 1	I	Alloy	Unidentifiable	1	Fragment		Black metal, molded.

Provenience	Stratigraphy	Main Material	Subtype and Decoration	Qty.	Part	Color	Notes
Unit 1	1	Coal	Fragment	1	Fragment		
Unit 1	1	Iron	Sheet metal	1	Fragment		
Unit 1	1	Iron	Fragment	1	Fragment		Likely bottlecap
Unit 1	1	Iron	Fragment	85	Fragment		Flat fragment, possibly roofing
Unit 1	1	Synthetic	Plastic, translucent with perforated edge	1	Fragment		
Unit 1	I	Wood	Lumber fragment	1	Fragment		30cm long, broken.
Unit 2	I	Refined earthenware	Creamware	1	Body		
Unit 2	I	Refined earthenware	Whiteware	4	Body		
Unit 2	1	Refined earthenware	Whiteware, hand painted	2	Body	Blue	
Unit 2	1	Refined earthenware	Whiteware, dipped	1	Body	Blue	
Unit 2	1	Refined earthenware	Whiteware, overglaze decal	2	Rim	Green, pink	Floral overglaze, applied decal decoration.
Unit 2	I	Refined earthenware	Unidentifiable	1	Rim		Burned
Unit 2	1	Coarse earthenware	Tile	1	Fragment	Brown	
Unit 2	I	Porcelain	Bisque	4	Fragment		Two discolored
Unit 2	1	Porcelain	Hard paste	1	Rim		Undecorated. Likely Japanese porcelain.
Unit 2	1	Porcelain	Hard paste	1	Body		Undecorated. Likely Japanese porcelain.
Unit 2	1	Stoneware	Gray finish	1	Body		
Unit 2	1	Glass	Vessel	3	Body	Solarized	
Unit 2	I	Glass	Vessel	5	Body	Aqua	One partially melted.
Unit 2	1	Glass	Vessel, pressed diamond pattern	1	Body	Solarized	
Unit 2	1	Glass	Bottle	1	Neck <i>,</i> finish	Solarized	Cork closure, seam runs to top of lip
Unit 2	1	Glass	Milk glass lid liner	1	Fragment	White	
Unit 2	I	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Light green	Likely Coca Cola
Unit 2	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Base	Blue	
Unit 2	I	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Brown	
Unit 2	1	Glass	Vessel	8	Body	Colorless	

Provenience	Stratigraphy	Main Material	Subtype and Decoration	Qty.	Part	Color	Notes
Unit 2	1	Glass	Melted	1	Fragment	Colorless	Melted
Unit 2	1	Shell	Oyster	2	Fragment		
Unit 2	1	Brick	Fragment	4	Fragment		
Unit 2	1	Glass	Window	29	Pane	Aqua	
Unit 2	1	Iron	Nail, machine cut	2	Whole		
Unit 2	1	Iron	Nail, wire	2	Head, shank		
Unit 2	1	Iron	Nail, unidentifiable	7	Fragment		
Unit 2	1	Lime	Putty	20	Fragment		Mortar fragments attached.
Unit 2	I	Mortar	Fragment	1	Fragment		
Unit 2	T	Iron	Rod	1	Fragment		12cm long
Unit 2	1	Iron	Loop	1	Fragment		Flattened iron loop. Attachment or machinery part.
Unit 3	1	Clay	Pipe stem	1	Stem		5/64th bore diameter
Unit 3	1	Clay	Pipe stem	1	Stem		4/64th bore diameter
Unit 3	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	11	Body		
Unit 3	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	1	Rim		Flat extruding rim
Unit 3	I	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	1	Rim		Molded rim with dot design
Unit 3	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	3	Rim		
Unit 3	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	2	Base		
Unit 3	1	Refined Earthenware	Ironstone	1	Body		
Unit 3		Refined Earthenware	Whiteware, transfer print overglaze	1	Body	Green	Possibly decal. Three leaves remaining, remainder is ghost.
Unit 3	1	Refined Earthenware	Pearlware, hand painted	1	Base	Blue	Possibly flow blue decoration.
Unit 3	1	Refined Earthenware	Unidentifiable	1	Body	Dark Green	Possibly Majolica. Dark green glaze.
Unit 3	1	Coarse Earthenware	Unidentifiable	1	Body	Blue	Molded design on exterior with white and blue gradient glaze.
Unit 3	1	Glass	Vessel	46	Body	Colorless	
Unit 3	1	Glass	Vessel	2	Body	Solarized	

Provenience	Stratigraphy	Main Material	Subtype and Decoration	Qty.	Part	Color	Notes
Unit 3	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Pink	
Unit 3	I	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Green	Likely beer or soft drink bottle
Unit 3	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Dark Green	
Unit 3	I	Glass	Jar	3	Finish	Colorless	
Unit 3	I	Glass	Vessel	1	Base	Colorless	
Unit 3	I	Glass	Vessel	6	Body	Aqua	
Unit 3	I	Glass	Jar	1	Finish	Aqua	
Unit 3	1	Glass	Jar	2	Body	Aqua	Embossed "ECTSON", part of PERFECT MASON
Unit 3	1	Glass	Bottle	7	Body	Brown	One embossed "FEDERAL"
Unit 3	1	Glass	Vessel	2	Body	Gray	
Unit 3	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Colorless	Embossed "6fl"
Unit 3	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Colorless	Embossed "ONE"
Unit 3	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Base	Aqua	
Unit 3	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Fragment	Aqua	Embossed lettering, illegible.
Unit 3	1	Glass	Vessel	3	Body	Colorless	Embossed lettering with exterior stippling. Illegible. Likely soft drink bottle.
Unit 3	1	Glass	Jar	1	Base	Colorless	Embossed "BALL" with basal stippling.
Unit 3	1	Glass	Milk glass lid liner	1	Fragment	White	
Unit 3	I	Bone	Mammal	3	Fragment		
Unit 3	T	Brick	Fragment	4	Fragment		
Unit 3	Ι	Glass	Window	6	Pane	Colorless	
Unit 3	I	Glass	Window	7	Pane	Aqua	
Unit 3	I	Glass	Window	1	Pane	Light green	
Unit 3	1	Iron	Nail, machine cut	5	Whole		
Unit 3	1	Iron	Nail, machine cut	4	Head, shank		
Unit 3	1	Iron	Nail, wire	3	Whole		
Unit 3	I	Iron	Nail, unidentifiable	7	Whole		
Unit 3	1	Iron	Bolt	1	Whole		17.5cm long
Unit 3		Porcelain	Hard paste	2	Base		Embossed exterior.

Provenience	Stratigraphy	Main Material	Subtype and Decoration	Qty.	Part	Color	Notes
							Unidentifiable
Unit 3	1	Porcelain	Hard paste	1	Fragment		pattern.
Unit 3	1	Porcelain	Bisque	1	Fragment		
Unit 3	1	Stoneware	Unidentifiable	1	Fragment	Brown	Rounded fragment, brown glaze.
Unit 3	I	Glass	Milk glass	8	Fragment	White	Painted exterior, green tint.
Unit 3	1	Iron	Fragment	1	Fragment		Flat fragment
Unit 3	I	Porcelaneous	Vessel	1	Base, body, rim		
Unit 3	1	Synthetic	Vial cap	1	Fragment		Metal screw cap with rubberized plastic attachment.
Unit 4	Surface	Refined Earthenware	Cut Sponge decoration	1	Body	Blue	
Unit 4	Surface	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Light blue	
Unit 4	Surface	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Solarized	
Unit 4	Surface	Glass	Vessel	3	Body	Colorless	
Unit 4	Surface	Iron	Light switch cover	1	Whole		Push-button style. Two holes with screw fasteners at corners.
Unit 4	Surface	Iron	Barbed wire	3	Fragment		
Unit 4	1	Alloy	Clothing rivet	1	Whole	Silver	
Unit 4	1	Iron	Mattress springs	1	Fragment		
Unit 4	1	Refined	Whiteware,	1	Body	Blue	
Unit 4	1	Earthenware Refined	flow blue Whiteware,	1	Body	Blue	
Unit 4	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	10	Body		
Unit 4	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	1	Base		Prominent foot ring
Unit 4	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	1	Base		Shallow foot ring
Unit 4	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware, molded	1	Body		Molded floral decoration.
Unit 4	1	Earthenware	Ironstone	1	Body		
Unit 4	I	Refined Earthenware	Creamware	1	Body		
Unit 4	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	4	Body		
Unit 4	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	1	Body		Burned

Provenience	Stratigraphy	Main Material	Subtype and Decoration	Qty.	Part	Color	Notes
Unit 4	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	1	Body		Possibly heated
Unit 4	1	Refined Earthenware	Yellowware	1	Body		White banded
Unit 4	I	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware, Rim Decoration	1	Rim	Brown	Banded and Floral Rim decoration
Unit 4	1	Porcelain	Japanese, Geisha Girl	1	Body	Red	Overglaze Painted Japanese Porcelain, Geisha Girl Porcelain
Unit 4	I	Stoneware	Gray salt glaze	1	Body		
Unit 4	I	Glass	Vessel, pressed diamond pattern	1	Body	Colorless	Drinking vessel
Unit 4	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Blue	Partial embossing. Likely Ball Mason Jar.
Unit 4	1	Glass	Vessel	6	Body	Blue	
Unit 4	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Brown	
Unit 4	I	Glass	Bottle	1	Body	Dark Green	Olive
Unit 4	I	Glass	Vessel	1	Finish	Colorless	Wide mouth
Unit 4	1	Glass	Vessel	11	Body	Colorless	
Unit 4	I	Glass	Vessel	3	Fragment	Solarized	
Unit 4	1	Glass	Bottle	5	Fragment	Green	"ER" embossed on one fragment. Possible
Unit 4	1	Glass	Vessel	8	Fragment	Aqua	embossing UID on one fragment
Unit 4	1	Glass	Bottle	1	Fragment	Colorless	Dr. Pepper (1pt.)
Unit 4	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Finish	Colorless	
					_		"14" embossed on one in addition to UID
Unit 4		Glass	Vessel	20	Base	Colorless	one fragment has a protruding detail
		Class	Vessel	20	Eragmont	Colorless	Geometric molding decoration on interior of curve, embossed "A" procent
	1	Class	Vessel	2	Fragment	Colorias	present
	1	Glass	vesser	6	Fragment	Ampless	
Unit 4		Bone	Mammal	1	Fragment	Amber	
Unit 4		Brick	Fragment	1	Fragment		
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			-			
Provenience	Stratigraphy	Main Material	Subtype and Decoration	Qty.	Part	Color	Notes
-------------	--------------	------------------------	-----------------------------------	------	-------------------------	-------------	---
		D : 1		_			Two are possibly
Unit 4		Brick	Fragment	5	Fragment Pane	Δαμα	heated
		Class			Farment	Anna	
Unit 4		Glass	Window	1	Fragment	Aqua	
Unit 4		Glass	Window Nail machine	2	Fragment	Coloriess	One 14cm in
onit 4			cut	2	Whole		length, the other is 7cm.
Unit 4	1	Iron	Nail, unidentifiable	3	Whole		
Unit 4	1	Iron	Nail, unidentifiable	6	Fragment		
Unit 4	1	Iron	Nail, Wire	2	Whole		
Unit 4	1	Iron	Nail, Wire	1	Shank		
Lipit 4		Iron	Nail Wire	2	Head,		
Unit 4	1	Mortar	Fragment	1	Fragment		Sand Based
Linit 4	1	Iron	Hexagonal nut	1	Whole		
Unit 4		Iron	Plate and nail	1	Fragment		
Unit 4	1	Iron	Double Sided Wood Screw	1	Whole		
Unit 4	I	String	Fragment	1	Fragment		
Unit 4	1	Synthetic	Plastic	1	Fragment	Blue, Black	
							may be a part of the mattress in
Unit 4		UID Synthetic	Fragment	1	Fragment		same context
Unit 4		Glass	Lantern Whiteware	2	Fragment	Red	
0		Earthenware	transfer print	-	bouy	neu	
Unit 5	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	2	Body		
Unit 5	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	1	Base		Shallow base ring
Unit 5	1	Stoneware	Gray salt glaze	1	Body		
Unit 5	1	Stoneware	Bristol glaze with Albany slip	1	Body		
Unit 5	1	Glass	Vessel	2	Body	Colorless	
Unit 5	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Finish	Colorless	Likely jar
Unit 5	1	Glass	Bottle, pharmaceutical	4	Body	Colorless	Small paneled bottle.
Unit 5	1	Glass	Bottle, pharmaceutical	1	Base	Colorless	
Unit 5	1	Glass	Bottle, pharmaceutical	1	Neck <i>,</i> finish	Colorless	Cork top, mold seam runs to top of lip.
Unit 5	I	Brick	Fragment	1	Fragment		
Unit 5	Ι	Glass	Window	1	pane	Aqua	

Provenience	Stratigraphy	Main Material	Subtype and Decoration	Qty.	Part	Color	Notes
Unit 5	1	Iron	Nail or wire fragments, unidentifiable	4	Fragment		
Unit 5	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Colorless	Molded brick pattern. Possibly decorative.
Unit 5	I	Iron	Spring	7	Fragment		Broken
Unit 5	1	Iron	Fragment	1	Fragment		Flat iron fragment
Unit 6	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware, transfer print	1	Body	Blue	
Unit 6	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	1	Body		No decoration, little crazing.
Unit 6	1	Stoneware	Bristol glaze with Albany slip	1	Body	Brown	
Unit 6	1	Glass	Milk glass lid liner	1	Fragment	Milk	
Unit 6	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Finish	Colorless	
Unit 6	1	Glass	Vessel	5	Body	Colorless	
Unit 6		Glass	Bottle	1	Neck, finish	Aqua	Cork finish. Mold seam stops at neck.
Unit 6	I	Glass	Vessel	2	Body	Light blue	
Unit 6	1	Glass	Vessel, pharmaceutical.	2	Body	Aqua	Small paneled bottle.
Unit 6	1	Brick	Fragment	1	Fragment		
Unit 6	1	Glass	Window	2	Pane	Aqua	
Unit 6	1	Iron	Nail, unidentifiable	1	Whole		
Unit 7	1	Iron	Iron strap or belt buckle	1	Whole		3.5cm by 3 cm wide.
Unit 7	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	4	Body		
Unit 7	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware, transfer print	1	Body	Green	Green floral transfer print.
Unit 7	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware, transfer print	1	Base	Green	Green floral transfer print.
Unit 7	1	Refined Earthenware	Ironstone	3	Body		
Unit 7	1	Refined Earthenware	Ironstone	3	Rim		
Unit 7	1	Glass	Bottle	1	Neck <i>,</i> finish	Solarized	Tooled ring finish. No visible mold seam
Unit 7	1	Glass	Bottle	1	Neck, finish	Aqua	Flat tooled finish. Mold seam stops partway up neck.
Unit 7	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Solarized	
Unit 7	1	Glass	Vessel	7	Body	Colorless	
Unit 7	Ι	Glass	Vessel	2	Body	Aqua	

Provenience	Stratigraphy	Main Material	Subtype and Decoration	Qty.	Part	Color	Notes
Unit 7	I	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Aqua	Bubbles throughout
Unit 7	I	Glass	Vessel	1	Finish	Colorless	Wide mouth, likely jar. Threaded.
Unit 7	1	Glass	Bottle	1	Body	Colorless	Embossed "RICHMO". Paneled Bottle.
Unit 7	1	Bone	Mammal	1	Fragment		
Unit 7	T	Brick	Fragment	5	Fragment		
Unit 7	1	Glass	Window	4	Pane	Aqua	
Unit 7	1	Iron	Nail, machine cut	4	Whole		
Unit 7	1	Iron	Nail, machine cut	1	Whole		13cm long
Unit 7	1	Iron	Nail, wire	39	Whole		
Unit 7	1	Iron	Nail, unidentifiable	4	Shank		
Unit 7	1	Iron	Nail, wire	4	Whole		Thin bracket nails.
Unit 7	I	Iron	Fragment	3	Fragment		Flat fragments
Unit 8	I	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	2	Body		
Unit 8	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Base	Light green	
Unit 8	1	Glass	Vessel	2	Body	Aqua	
Unit 8	I	Glass	Vessel	2	Body	Colorless	
Unit 8	I	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Solarized	
Unit 8	I	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Green	Bright green, likely beer or soft drink bottle.
Unit 8	I	Brick	Fragment	3	Fragment		
Unit 8	I	Glass	Window	2	Pane	Aqua	
Unit 8	1	Iron	Nail, machine cut	1	Whole		
Unit 8	1	Iron	Fragment	6	Fragment		
Unit 8	T	Synthetic	Plastic	1	Fragment		
Unit 9	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware, banded	1	Body		
Unit 9	1	Refined Earthenware	Creamware	2	Body		
Unit 9	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware, transfer print	1	Body	Blue	Chinoiserie or later pattern style
Unit 9	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware, transfer print	1	Body	Red	
Unit 9	I	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware, shell edge	1	Body	Blue	

Provenience	Stratigraphy	Main Material	Subtype and Decoration	Qty.	Part	Color	Notes
Unit 9	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	6	Body		Burned
Unit 9	I	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	1	Rim		
Unit 9	1	Refined Earthenware	Ironstone	2	Body		
Unit 9	I	Refined Earthenware	Ironstone, molded	1	Body		Molded flower relief on exterior.
Unit 9	I	Glass	Milk glass lid liner	1	Fragment	White	Melted
Unit 9	I	Glass	Bottle	1	Body	Dark Green	
Unit 9	1	Shell	Oyster	2	Fragment		
Unit 9	I	Brick	Fragment	1	Fragment		
Unit 9	I	Glass	Window	2	Pane	Aqua	
Unit 9	1	Iron	Nail, machine cut	2	Whole		
Unit 9	1	Iron	Flattened hook	1	Fragment		Unknown use
44PW2105, Phase II							
Metal Detector Hit 1	1	Iron	Fragment	1	Fragment		12.3mm thick, potential cannonball fragment or machinery part.
Metal Detector Hit 4		Iron	Unidentifiable	1	Fragment		Possibly part of nail
Metal Detector Hit 4	1	Iron	Nail, machine cut	1	Head, shank		
Metal Detector Hit		Refined	Whiteware	1	Pody	White	
4 CD1.5	1	Quartz	Flake, tertiary	3	Fragment	white	
		Brick	Fragment	3	Fragment		
05.5	1	Quartz	Lithic, culturally modified	1	Fragment		Possibly projectile point tip. Large flake scars. Phase I
E4	1	Brick	Fragmont	1	Eragmont		Shovel Test Pit.
E4.5	1	Stonowara	Gray white calt		Paca		
E5	П	Stoneware	glaze, blue embossed decoration		Dase		Partial Body. Phase I Shovel Test Pit.
E5	п	Stoneware	Gray-white salt glaze	2	Body		
E5	п	Refined Earthenware	Pearlware	1	Body	Blue	Phase I Shovel Test Pit.

Provenience	Stratigraphy	Main Material	Subtype and Decoration	Qty.	Part	Color	Notes
F5	п	Refined Farthenware	Unidentifiable	1	Body		Phase I Shovel Test Pit
		Stoneware	Brown salt glaze	1	Body		Impressed rouletted bands on exterior. Phase I Shovel
		Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Dark Green	Phase I Shovel
5		Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Dark Green	Olive Green, Phase I Shovel
E5 E5		Shell	Oyster	2	Fragment		Phase I Shovel
E5		Mortar	Fragment	7	Fragment		Phase I Shovel
E5		Brick	Fragment	6	Fragment		Phase I Shovel Test Pit.
E5	Ш	Charcoal	Fragment	3	Fragment		Phase I Shovel Test Pit.
E5.5	1	Glass	Fragment	2	Fragment	Aqua	Flat, possibly square bottle or window. Phase I Shovel Test Pit.
E6	1	Refined Earthenware	Unidentifiable	1	Body		
E6	1	Iron	cut	1	Whole		
E6	1	Brick	Handmade	2	Fragment		
EF4.5	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	2	Body		
EF4.5	1	Glass	Window	1	Pane	Aqua	
EF4.5	1	Brick	Fragment	3	Fragment		One piece glazed on one side
EF5	1	Refined Earthenware	Unidentifiable, decorated edge	1	Rim	Green	Likely shell edge.
EF5	1	Refined Earthenware	Unidentifiable, hand painted	1	Body	Brown, blue	Possibly polychrome
F2	1	Glass	Vessel	10	Body	Colorless	Machine made with visible mold seam on side. Phase I Shovel Test Pit.
F2	1	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Colorless	Embossed with partial lettering, illegible Phase I Shovel Test Pit
		Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Colorless	Embossed "2434- 2 B 52". Phase I
F2		Refined	Creamwara	2	Body		Shovel Test Pit.
F5.5	1	Earthenware	Cicaniwale	5	bouy		

Provenience	Stratigraphy	Main Material	Subtype and Decoration	Qty.	Part	Color	Notes
F5.5		Stoneware	White salt glazed	1	Body		Molded band
Unit 1	II	Copper Alloy	Button, stamped, alpha shank	1	Whole		Rouletted decoration.
Unit 1	П	Refined Earthenware	Pearlware, hand painted	1	Rim	Dark blue	Unidentifiable design
Unit 1	Ш	Refined Earthenware	Pearlware, hand painted	1	Body	Dark blue	Hand painted butterfly or moth
Unit 1	11	Refined Earthenware	Pearlware, hand painted	1	Body	Dark blue	Hand painted line with feathered edge.
Unit 1	11	Refined Earthenware	Creamware	17	Body		
Unit 1	11	Refined Earthenware	Creamware	1	Rim		
Unit 1	11	Refined Earthenware	Creamware	1	Base		
Unit 1	11	Refined Earthenware	Creamware	1	Lip		
Unit 1	П	Refined Earthenware	Creamware, edge decorated	1	Body	Green	
Unit 1	П	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	2	Body		
Unit 1	11	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware, hand painted	2	Body	Blue	Heavily discolored, unidentifiable pattern.
Unit 1	Ш	Refined Earthenware	Tin glaze	1	Body		
Unit 1	П	Refined Earthenware	Tin glaze, hand	1	Rim	Blue	
Unit 1	II	Refined Earthenware	Tin glaze, hand painted	1	Body	Purple, blue	Mix of underglaze and overglaze detailing present.
Unit 1	11	Coarse Earthenware	North Devon	1	Body	Green	No gravel temper
Unit 1	11	Coarse Earthenware	Redware, black lead glaze	1	Body	Black	
Unit 1	Ш	Coarse Earthenware	Redware, black lead glaze	1	Base	Black	Thick black glaze.
Unit 1	11	Coarse Earthenware	Redware	1	Body		Unglazed, wheel thrown
Unit 1		Porcelain	Chinese export, overglaze	1	Body	White	Overglaze ghost of floral decoration remaining.
Unit 1	11	Porcelain	Chinese export	1	Rim	Blue	Hand painted blue overglaze with gold rim.
Unit 1	II	Porcelain	Chinese export	1	Rim	Blue	Underglaze hand painted.

Provenience	Stratigraphy	Main Material	Subtype and Decoration	Qty.	Part	Color	Notes
Unit 1	II	Stoneware	White salt glaze, Barley and Basket pattern	1	Rim	White	
Unit 1	II	Stoneware	Westerwald	2	Body	Dark blue	Incised decoration with cobalt blue coloration
Unit 1	11	Stoneware	White salt glaze, edge decorated	1	Rim		Molded wave design
Unit 1	II	Stoneware	White salt glaze, scratch blue	1	Body	Blue	Two parallel lines molded and painted.
Unit 1	П	Glass	Bottle	2	Body	Dark green	
Unit 1	П	Glass	Bottle	15	Body	Dark green	
Unit 1	11	Glass	Bottle	1	Base	Dark green	Edge of base, mends to kick
Unit 1	П	Glass	Bottle	1	Base	Dark green	Kick, 41mm deep.
Unit 1	П	Bone	Mammal	2	Fragment		Part of long bone
Unit 1	П	Bone	Mammal	7	Fragment		
Unit 1	П	Shell	Oyster	41	Fragment		
Unit 1	П	Brick	Fragment	35	Fragment		
Unit 1	П	Daub	Handmade	1	Fragment		
Unit 1	П	Glass	Window	11	Pane	Aqua	
Unit 1	11	Iron	Nail, machine cut	2	Whole		
Unit 1	II	Iron	Nail, machine cut with hand applied head	2	Whole		
Unit 1	II	Iron	Nail, unidentifiable	2	Whole		
Unit 1	11	Iron	Nail, unidentifiable	3	Fragment		
Unit 1	Ш	Iron	Wire	1	Fragment		
Unit 2	1	Refined Earthenware	Dipped-ware, banded	1	Body	Blue, white	
Unit 2	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	3	Body	White	
Unit 2		Porcelain	Chinese export, overglaze hand painted	1	Body	White	Overglaze floral decoration, predominantly missing
Unit 2		Glass	Bottle	1	Body	Dark Green	Olive glass
Unit 2	1	Iron	Nail, unidentifiable	1	Fragment		ente Biass
Unit 3	1	Refined Earthenware	Creamware	5	Body		

Provenience	Stratigraphy	Main Material	Subtype and Decoration	Qty.	Part	Color	Notes
Linit 2	п	Refined Farthenware	Whiteware	2	Body		
Unit 3		Refined Earthenware	Unidentifiable	2	Body	Brown	Brown and white lead glaze
Unit 3		Refined Earthenware	Tin glaze	1	Body		
Unit 3	11	Earthenware	lead glaze	1	Body	Black	
Unit 3	11	Porcelain	Chinese export	1	Rim	Blue. Red	Underglaze blue hand painting, red overglaze hand painting.
11-24-2	П	Channen	White salt		Deatha	,	
Unit 3		Stoneware	glazed	1	воду		Light patina on
Unit 3		Glass	Bottle	2	Body	Dark green	interior and edges
Unit 3	П	Glass	Bottle	5	Body	Dark Green	
Unit 3	11	Glass	Bottle	2	Body	Green	
Unit 3		Glass	Bottle	1	Neck	Dark Green	
Unit 3		Glass	Bottle	1	Finish	Dark Green	Short cracked off finish, Likely case bottle.
Unit 3	П	Shell	Oyster	12	Fragment		
Unit 3	П	Brick	Bat	3	Bat		
Unit 3	П	Brick	Fragment	8	Fragment		
Unit 3	П	Glass	Window	3	Pane	Aqua	
Unit 3	11	Iron	Nail, machine cut	4	Whole		
Unit 3	11	Iron	Nail, machine	1	Head, shank		
Linit 2	11	Iron	Nail, machine cut with hand	2	Whole		
Unit 3	11	Iron	Nail, unidentifiable	4	Fragment		
Unit 3	П	Mortar	Fragment	2	Fragment		
Linit 3	II	Iron	Fragment	2	Fragment		Round fragment, possibly nail bead
		Iron	Fragment	3	Fragment		Flattened
Unit 3					-		fragment, deformed.
Unit 3	П	Iron	Fragment	1	Fragment		Loop, possibly clasp or latch
		Copper Alloy	Button, stamped, alpha	1	Whole		14.2mm
Unit 4	1	Refined	shank	0	Body		diameter.
Unit 4	1	Earthenware	Creaniware	0	bouy		

Provenience	Stratigraphy	Main Material	Subtype and Decoration	Qty.	Part	Color	Notes
Unit 4	I	Refined Earthenware	Creamware	1	Rim		
Unit 4	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	9	Body		
Unit 4	1	Refined Earthenware	Unidentifiable	2	Body		Glaze missing.
Unit 4		Refined Earthenware	Unidentifiable	1	Body	Yellow, brown	Possibly tortoiseshell or clouded ware
Unit 4	1	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware, hand painted	2	Body	Blue	Hand painted blue line
Unit 4	1	Refined Earthenware	Dipped	1	Body	Blue	Banded
Unit 4	1	Coarse Earthenware	Redware, black lead glaze	3	Body	Black	
Unit 4	1	Porcelain	Chinese export	1	Rim	Blue	
Unit 4	1	Stoneware	Brown salt glaze	1	Body	Brown	
Unit 4	1	Glass	Bottle	2	Body	Dark green	
Unit 4	1	Brick	Fragment	2	Fragment		
Unit 4		Iron	Nail, machine cut with hand applied head	1	Head, shank		
Unit 4	1	Iron	Nail, machine	3	Whole		
Unit 4	1	Iron	Nail, machine cut	7	Fragment		
Unit 4	1	Mortar	Fragment	3	Fragment		
Unit 4	1	Glass	Fragment	3	Fragment	Green	
Unit 4	1	Glass	Fragment	3	Fragment	Aqua	
Unit 4	1	Iron	Fragment	7	Fragment		
Unit 5	11	Refined Earthenware	Creamware	6	Body		
Unit 5	11	Refined Earthenware	Creamware, Royal rim	1	Rim		
Unit 5	П	Refined Earthenware	Creamware	1	Rim		
Unit 5	11	Refined Earthenware	Creamware	1	Base		Shallow base ring
Unit 5	11	Refined Earthenware	Pearlware, hand painted	4	Body	Blue	
Unit 5	11	Refined Earthenware	Pearlware	4	Body		
Unit 5	11	Refined Earthenware	Unidentifiable	3	Body		
Unit 5	11	Coarse Earthenware	Staffordshire slipware	4	Body	Brown, yellow	
Unit 5	11	Coarse Earthenware	Redware, clear lead glaze	1	Rim		Banded white slip decoration

Provenience	Stratigraphy	Main Material	Subtype and Decoration	Qty.	Part	Color	Notes
Unit 5	П	Porcelain	Chinese export	1	Base		Footring is unglazed
Unit 5	П	Porcelain	Chinese export	1	Body		
Unit 5	II	Stoneware	White salt glaze, scratch blue	4	Body	Blue	
Unit 5	11	Stoneware	White salt glaze	1	Rim		Shallow cup or bowl
Unit 5	11	Stoneware	Brown salt glaze	1	Body		
Unit 5	11	Stoneware	Brown salt glaze	1	Body		Possibly English Brown.
Unit 5	11	Bone	Utensil handle	1	Fragment		Incised crosshatch decoration
Unit 5	П	Glass	Bottle	5	Body	Dark green	
Unit 5	11	Glass	Bottle	1	Body	Dark green	Thicker than other fragments (7.1mm)
Unit 5	11	Glass	Bottle	3	Body	Dark green	Heavy patina on all sides.
Unit 5	П	Glass	Vessel	2	Body	Colorless	
Unit 5	11	Glass	Vessel	1	Rim	Colorless	Molded horizontal lines on exterior.
Unit 5	II	Iron	Nail, machine cut	2	Whole		Unidentifiable head
Unit 5	11	Iron	Nail, machine cut	1	Shank		
Unit 5	11	Iron	Nail, unidentifiable	2	Whole		
Unit 5	П	Iron	Fragment	2	Fragment		Unidentifiable
Unit 5	П	Mortar	Sand based	1	Fragment		
Unit 5	П	Stone	Paving stone	1	Fragment		
Unit 5	11	Glass	Fragment	1	Fragment	Aqua	Dark aqua, possibly window glass
Unit 6	П	Clay	Pipe bowl	1	Bowl		
Unit 6	11	Refined Earthenware	Creamware	3	Body		
Unit 6	11	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware	4	Body		
Unit 6	11	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware, hand painted	1	Body	Blue	
Unit 6	11	Refined Earthenware	Whiteware, hand painted	1	Body	Green	Likely floral design.
Unit 6		Refined Earthenware	Whiteware, Polychrome	1	Body	Blue, brown, green	

Provenience	Stratigraphy	Main Material	Subtype and Decoration	Qty.	Part	Color	Notes
	II	Refined Earthenware	Creamware, Dipped, Variegated	1	Body	White, Black, Brown	
	11	Refined Earthenware	Creamware, Dipped, Variegated	2	Rim	White, Black, Brown	
Unit 6	11	Coarse Earthenware	decoration Staffordshire slipware	1	Body		
Unit 6	11	Coarse Earthenware	Staffordshire slipware	1	Rim	Yellow, Brown	Trailed decoration
Unit 6	11	Coarse Earthenware	Staffordshire slipware	1	Rim	Brown, white	"Piecrust" impressions around rim. Flat form.
Unit 6	П	Glass	Vessel	1	Body	Colorless	
Unit 6	11	Glass	Milk glass, vessel	1	Body	Milk	
Unit 6	11	Glass	Bottle	1	Base	Dark green	Deep base ring, partial kick.
Unit 6	11	Glass	Bottle	10	Body	Dark green	One with heavy patina.
Unit 6	11	Brick	Fragment	6	Fragment		Three pieces glazed.
Unit 6	11	Glass	Window	1	Window	Aqua	
Unit 6	II	Iron	Nail, machine cut with hand applied head	3	Whole		
Unit 6	11	Iron	Nail, unidentifiable	1	Whole		
Unit 6	П	Mortar	Fragment	36	Fragment		
Unit 6	П	Iron	Fragment	3	Fragment		
Unit 7	1	Refined Earthenware	Pearlware	1	Body		
Unit 7	1	Refined Earthenware	Pearlware	1	Body		Blue botanical pattern, possibly hand painted
Unit 7	1	Refined Earthenware	Tin-glaze, red- bodied	1	Rim		Could also be buff-bodied
Unit 7	1	Refined Earthenware	Creamware	1	Base		foot ring
Unit 7	1	Refined Earthenware	Creamware	3	Body		thin
Unit 7	1	Earthenware	Tin glaze	1	Body		soft bodied
Unit 7	1	Earthenware	Whiteware	1	Body		North Midlands
Unit 7	1	Coarse Earthenware	Staffordshire slipware	1	Rim	Brown, yellow	Staffordshire slipware, likely

Provenience	Stratigraphy	Main Material	Subtype and Decoration	Qty.	Part	Color	Notes
							trailed, reddish body interior
		Coarse	Redware, black				Interior and
Unit 7	1	Earthenware	lead glaze	1	Body		exterior glaze
lleit 7		Dercelain	Chinese export, underglaze	1	Dasa		Unidentifiable blue decoration, foot ring, small
	1	POICEIaiii	nanu painteu	1	Dase		
Unit 7	1	Stoneware	White salt glaze	1	Body		
Unit 7	I	Glass	Bottle	2	Fragment	Dark Green	Olive glass
Unit 7	1	Glass	Bottle	1	Rim	Dark Green	Olive glass
Unit 7	1	Glass	Bottle	1	Base	Dark Green	Olive glass
Unit 7	1	Glass	Bottle	4	Fragment	Dark green	Case bottle
Unit 7	1	Glass	Bottle	2	Fragment	Aqua	Case bottle, dark aqua
Unit 7	1	Bone	Mammal	1	Fragment		Part of long bone with joint head
Unit 7	1	Shell	Oyster	6	Fragment		
Unit 7	1	Glass	Window	1	Pane	Aqua	
Unit 7	1	Iron	Nail, unidentifiable	1	Whole		
Unit 7	1	Iron	unidentifiable	1	неаd, shank		

APPENDIX D: V-CRIS FORMS

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

DHR ID: 44PW2102

Date Generated: July 06, 2022

 Site Name:
 No Data
 Site Evaluation Status

 Site Classification:
 Terrestrial, open air
 Not Evaluated

 Year(s):
 No Data
 Not Evaluated

 Site Type(s):
 Artifact scatter
 Not Evaluated

 Other DHR ID:
 No Data
 Site 3

Locational Information	
USGS Quad:	QUANTICO
County/Independent City:	Prince William (County)
Physiographic Province:	Coastal Plain
Elevation:	177
Aspect:	Facing Southeast
Drainage:	Potomac
Slope:	0 - 2
Acreage:	0.120
Landform:	Ridge Finger
Ownership Status:	Local Govt
Government Entity Name:	No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Snapshot

Category:	Indeterminate
Site Type:	Artifact scatter
Cultural Affiliation:	Native American
Cultural Affiliation Details:	No Data
DHR Time Period:	Pre-Contact
Start Year:	No Data
End Year:	No Data
Comments:	No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography		
biologi apity.		
No Data		
Informant Data:		
No Data		

Archaeological site data is protected under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA 1979).

DHR ID: 44PW2102

CRM Events		
Event Type: Survey:Phase I		
Project Staff/Notes		
David Dutton Christine Muron Hope Smith		
Project Review File Number:	No Data	
Sponsoring Organization:	No Data	
Organization/Company:	Dutton + As	ssociates, LLC
Investigator:	Hope Smith	
Survey Date:	10/20/2021	
Survey Description:		
A systematic phase I survey of the proj investigations, a pedestrian survey of th or material and identify areas with the identified during the reconnaissance, pl feature locations, permanent landmarks on the map to permit easy re-identificat high probability sections, with shovel t percent, and areas in statutory wellands foot) intervals along transects spaced 1 mesh screen and all shovel tests were a excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests two negative shovel tests in each direct	ect area was performed which i le project area was conducted to solential for intact subsurface a lotographs were taken of the gg i, topographic and vegetation va- ion of the resources. Following est placement avoided in areas- or water saturated solis at the to 5 meters (50 feet) apart. The so pproximately 0.38 meters (15 i is were bracketed with radial st ion were documented.	ncluded pedestrian survey and subsurface shovel testing. At the outset of field o document existing conditions and to note surface evidence of cultural activity rchaeological resources. For any newly encountered archaeological resources meral vicinity and of any visible features. A field map was prepared showing wriation, as well as sources of disturbance. Sufficient information was included the pedestrian survey, systematic shovel testing was conducted throughout the of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 ime of the survey. Shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) nches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of novel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until
Current Land Use Forest	Date of Use 4/1/2022 12:00:00 AM	Comments No Data
Threats to Resource:	Transportati	ion Expansion
Site Conditions:	0-24% of Si	te Destroyed
Survey Strategies:	Subsurface	Testing
Specimens Collected:	Yes	
Specimens Observed, Not Collected:	No	
Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:		
Four quartz flakes and quartz shatter		
Summary of Specimens Observed, Not C	Collected :	
No Data		
Current Curation Repository:	D+A	
Permanent Curation Repository:	Prince Willi	am County
Field Notes:	Yes	
Field Notes Repository:	D+A	
Photographic Media:	Digital	
Survey Reports:	Yes	
Survey Report Information:		
Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of th of Field Sites 1 and 2	e ±37.2-Hectare (±91.8-Acre) \	an Buren Road Extension Project Area and Phase II Archaeological Evaluation
Survey Report Repository:	D+A	
DHR Library Reference Number:	No Data	
Significance Statement:	Given the li beyond what	mited number of artifacts recovered, the site has little information potential thas already been recovered, and documented.
Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations	: Recommend	ded Not Eligible
Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendatio	as, : No Data	
Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations:	No Data	

Archaeological site data is protected under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA 1979).

DHR ID: 44PW2103

Date Generated: July 06, 2022

 Site Name:
 No.Data
 Site Evaluation Status

 Site Classification:
 Terrestrial, open air
 Not Evaluated

 Year (s):
 No Data
 Not Evaluated

 Site Type (s):
 Artifact scatter
 Not Evaluated

 Other DHR ID:
 No Data
 Site 4

Locational Information

Snapshot

USGS Quad:	QUANTICO
County/Independent City:	Prince William (County)
Physiographic Province:	No Data
Elevation:	134
Aspect:	Facing Southwest
Drainage:	Potomac
Slope:	0 - 2
Acreage:	0.250
Landform:	Ridge Finger
Ownership Status:	Local Govt
Government Entity Name:	No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category:	Indeterminate
Site Type:	Artifact scatter
Cultural Affiliation:	Native American
Cultural Affiliation Details:	No Data
DHR Time Period:	Pre-Contact
Start Year:	No Data
End Year:	No Data
Comments:	No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:	
No Data	
Informant Data:	
No Data	

Archaeological site data is protected under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA 1979).

DHR ID: 44PW2103

RM Events		
Event Type: Survey:Phase I		
Project Staff/Notes:		
David Dutton Christine Muron Hope Smith		
Project Review File Number:	No Data	
Sponsoring Organization:	No Data	
Organization/Company:	Dutton + As	ssociates, LLC
Investigator:	Hope Smith	
Survey Date:	10/20/2021	
Survey Description:		
A systematic phase I survey of the proje investigations, a ped survey of the or material and identify areas with the p identified during the reconnaissance, ph feature locations, permaent landmarks on the map to permit easy re-identificat high probability sections, with shovel to percent, and areas in statutory wetlands foot) intervals along transects spaced 15 mesh screen and all shovel tests were ag excavation. Isolated positive shovel test two negative shovel tests in each direct	ct area was performed which i to tential for intact subsurface a otographs were taken of the g topographic and vegetation v on of the resources. Following st placement avoided in areas or water saturated soils at the i meters (50 feet) apart. The so proximately 0.38 meters (15 i s were bracketed with radial sl on were documented.	occurrent existing conditions and to note surface vidence of cultural activity chaeological resources. For any newly encountered archaeological resources meral vicinity and of any visible features. A field map was prepared showing wriation, as well as sources of disturbance. Sufficient information was included the pedestrian survey, systematic shovel testing was conducted throughout the of document edd or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 inter of the survey. Shovel tests were excavated at a maximum of 15-meter (50- il excavated from all shovel tests were passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) nches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of novel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until
Current Land Use Forest	Date of Use 4/1/2022 12:00:00 AM	Comments No Data
Threats to Resource:	Transportat	ion Expansion
Site Conditions:	0-24% of S	te Destroyed
Survey Strategies:	Subsurface	Testing
Specimens Collected:	Yes	
Specimens Observed, Not Collected:	No	
Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:		
A total of six artifacts were recovered in	cluding quartz flakes, a small	scraper, and an unfinished blade base.
Summary of Specimens Observed, Not C	ollected:	
No Data		
Current Curation Repository:	D+A	
Permanent Curation Repository:	Prince Will	am County
Field Notes:	Yes	
Field Notes Repository:	D+A	
Photographic Media:	Digital	
Survey Reports:	Yes	
Survey Report Information:		
Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the of Field Sites 1 and 2	±37.2-Hectare (±91.8-Acre)	an Buren Road Extension Project Area and Phase II Archaeological Evaluation
Survey Report Repository:	D+A	
DHR Library Reference Number:	No Data	
Significance Statement:	Given the li beyond what	mited number of artifacts recovered, the site has little information potential at has already been recovered. and documented.
Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations:	Recomment	ded Not Eligible
Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendation	s, : No Data	5-72.
Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations:	No Data	

Archaeological site data is protected under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA 1979).

DHR ID: 44PW2104

Date Generated: July 06, 2022

Snapshot		Date Generated: July	y 0
Site Name:	No Data	Site Evaluation Status	
Site Classification:	Terrestrial, open air		
Year(s):	No Data	Not Evaluated	
Site Type(s):	Dwelling, single		
Other DHR ID:	No Data		
Temporary Designation:	Site 1		

Locational Information	
USGS Quad:	QUANTICO
County/Independent City:	Prince William (County)
Physiographic Province:	No Data
Elevation:	220
Aspect:	No Data
Drainage:	Potomac
Slope:	2-6
Acreage:	1.160
Landform:	Ridge Top
Ownership Status:	Local Govt
Government Entity Name:	No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category:	Domestic
Site Type:	Dwelling, single
Cultural Affiliation:	African American
Cultural Affiliation Details:	No Data
DHR Time Period:	Reconstruction and Growth, World War I to World War II
Start Year:	No Data
End Year:	No Data
Comments:	No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:	
No Data	
Informant Data:	
No Data	

Archaeological site data is protected under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA 1979).

DHR ID: 44PW2104

RM Events				
vent Type: Survey:Phase I				
Project Staff/Notes:				
David Dutton Christine Muron Hone Smith				
Project Paview File Number:	No Deta			
Sponsoring Organization:	No Data			
Organization/Company	Duttee + Accessister LLC			
Investigator:	Unne Smith			
Survey Date:	10/20/2021			
Survey Date:	10/20/2021			
or material and identify areas with the pu- identified during the reconnaissance, phr feature locations, permanent landmarks, on the map to permit easy re-identification high probability sections, with shovel tes percent, and areas in statutory wetlands of foot) intervals along transects spaced 15 mesh screen and all shovel tests were app excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests two negative shovel tests in each directit	ential for intact subsurface archaeological resources. For any newly encountered archaeological resources ' ographs were taken of the general vicinity and of any visible features. A field map was prepared showing opographic and vegetation variation, as well as sources of disturbance. Sufficient information was included n of the resources. Following the pedestrian survey, systematic shovel testing was conducted throughout the placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 r water saturated soils at the time of the survey. Shovel tests were excavated at a maximum of 15-meter (50 neters (50 feet) apart. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) roximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until n were documented.			
Current Land Use Forest	Date of Use Comments 4/1/2022 12:00:00 AM No Data			
Threats to Resource:	Transportation Expansion			
Site Conditions:	50-74% of Site Destroyed			
Survey Strategies:	Historic Map Projection, Observation, Subsurface Testing			
Specimens Collected:	Yes			
Specimens Observed, Not Collected:	Yes			
Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:				
Artifacts recovered included whiteware, unidentified iron fragments, brick, and p of the site.	ronstone, stoneware, clear vessel glass, milk glass, green and amber bottle glass, wire and cut nails, astic. Artifact us er popularity dates indicate a late nineteenth to early twentieth century occupation and use			
Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Co	lected :			
Brick, sheet metal and other structural de	bris.			
Current Curation Repository:	D+A			
Permanent Curation Repository:	Prince William County			
Field Notes:	Yes			
Field Notes Repository:	D+A			
Photographic Media:	Digital			
Survey Reports:	Yes			
Survey Report Information:				
Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the of Field Sites 1 and 2	+37.2-Hectare (±91.8-Acre) Van Buren Road Extension Project Area and Phase II Archaeological Evaluation			
Survey Report Repository:	D+A			
DHR Library Reference Number:	No Data			
Significance Statement:	Given the documented presence of archaeological materials and site history, the site may possess new or important archaeological data that can contribute to a greater understanding of the site's and/or region's history beyond what the documentary record has already provided.	Given the documented presence of archaeological materials and site history, the site may possess new or important archaeological data that can contribute to a greater understanding of the site's and/or region's history beyond what the documentary record has already provided.		
Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations:	Recommended Potentially Eligible	Recommended Potentially Eligible		
Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendation	;; D			
	Mr. Date			

Archaeological site data is protected under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA 1979).

Snapshot

DHR ID: 44PW2105

Date Generated: July 06, 2022

 Site Name:
 No Data
 Site Evaluation Status

 Site Classification:
 Terrestrial, open air
 No Data

 Year(s):
 No Data
 Not Evaluated

 Site Type(s):
 Dwelling, single
 Not Evaluated

 Other DHR ID:
 No Data
 Site 2

Locational Information	
USGS Quad:	QUANTICO
County/Independent City:	Prince William (County)
Physiographic Province:	Coastal Plain
Elevation:	186
Aspect:	Facing East
Drainage:	Potomac
Slope:	0-2
Acreage:	0.450
Landform:	Ridge Finger
Ownership Status:	Local Govt
Government Entity Name:	No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category:	Domestic
Site Type:	Dwelling, single
Cultural Affiliation:	Indeterminate
Cultural Affiliation Details:	No Data
DHR Time Period:	Early National Period
Start Year:	No Data
End Year:	No Data
Comments:	No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:	
No Data	
Informant Data:	
No Data	

Archaeological site data is protected under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA 1979).

DHR ID: 44PW2105

CRM Events				
Event Type: Survey:Phase I				
Project Staff/Notes:				
David Dutton Christine Muron Hope Smith				
Project Review File Number:	No Data	Data		
Sponsoring Organization:	No Data	o Data		
Organization/Company:	Dutton + A	Dutton + Associates, LLC		
Investigator:	Hope Smith	1		
Survey Date:	10/20/2021			
Survey Description:				
A systematic phase I survey of the projec investigations, a pedestrian survey of the or material and identify areas with the po- identified during the reconnaissance, pho feature locations, permanent landmarks, on the map to permit casy re-identificati high probability sections, with shovel tes percent, and areas in statutory wetlands o foot) intervals along transects spaced 15 mesh screen and all shovel tests were app excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests two negative shovel tests in each directio	t area was performed which project area was conducted 1 tential for intact subsurface to tographs were taken of the g topographic and vegetation v on of the resources. Followim, to placement avoided in areas r water saturated soils at the meters (50 feet) apart. The sc voximately 0.38 meters (15 i were bracketed with radial s n were documented.	included pedestrian survey and subsurface shovel testing. At the outset of field o document existing conditions and to note surface evidence of cultural activity archaeological resources. For any newly encountered archaeological resources eneral vicinity and of any visible features. A field map was prepared showing aritation, as well as sources of disturbance. Sufficient information was included g the pedestrian survey, systematic shovel testing was conducted throughout the of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 time of the survey. Shovel tests were excavated at a maximum of 15-meter (50- oil excavated from all shovel test was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) nches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of hovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until		
Current Land Use Forest	Date of Use 4/1/2022 12:00:00 AM	Comments No Data		
Threats to Resource:	Transportat	ion Expansion		
Site Conditions:	0-24% of Site Destroyed			
Survey Strategies:	Subsurface Testing			
Specimens Collected:	Yes			
Specimens Observed, Not Collected:	No	No		
Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:				
Shovel testing revealed the presence of b	rick, oyster shell, white salt g	glaze stoneware, North Devonshire, and dark green bottle glass.		
Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Co No Data	llected:			
Current Curation Repository:	D+A			
Permanent Curation Repository:	Prince Will	iam County		
Field Notes:	Yes			
Field Notes Repository:	D+A			
Photographic Media:	Digital			
Survey Reports:	Yes			
Survey Report Information:				
Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the of Field Sites 1 and 2	±37.2-Hectare (±91.8-Acre)	Van Buren Road Extension Project Area and Phase II Archaeological Evaluation		
Survey Report Repository:	D+A			
DHR Library Reference Number:	No Data			
Significance Statement:	Given the p the site has site and reg	Given the presence of intact soils and eighteenth-century artifacts with no later materials, the site has the potential to contain new information about the history and prehistory of the site and region.		
Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations:	Recommen	ded Potentially Eligible		
Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendations	ommendations, : D			
Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations:	rrveyor's NR Criteria Considerations: No Data			

Archaeological site data is protected under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA 1979).