

4.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

No previously recorded archaeological sites or NRHP-eligible or -listed properties are present within the Bridge 146 Retaining Wall project APE. The Bridge 146 Retaining Wall project APE lacks intact soils of appropriate age to contain precontact period archaeological remains, and nothing in the known historic documentation reviewed for this project indicates that specific historically important events or persons are associated with the land use of the lot or that they could be evidenced or elucidated by archaeological means. Based on the information presented above and the scale of the proposed construction (sloping of the lot will disturb only previously redeposited fill), archaeological investigation does not appear to be a viable means to uncover historic information about the land use of the project APE; therefore no archaeological excavation is recommended.

While "historic" deposits (fill) exist on the site, based on the results of the geomorphology studies, the historic documentary information, and the recommendation of non-eligibility for the existing residential structure, Skelly and Loy recommends that further excavation of these deposits would not provide answers to the appropriate research questions for the historic period use of this particular lot and structure. This conclusion is based on the redeposited and mixed nature of the fill, the lack of origination information for the fill, the lack of specific uses of the lot/house (S-4387) that would leave archaeological footprints, the constricted nature of the project undertaking, the lack of an association with any of the three existing or potential historic districts in the area, the lack of association with specific persons or events important to local history, the lack of architectural distinction (non-eligibility) of the structure, and the possibility that the structure has been relocated from its site of origin.

The historic structures portion of this report concludes that the Bridge 146 Retaining Wall house (S-4387) is not individually eligible for listing in the NRHP under any of the four criteria due to its lack of architectural integrity, lack of association with a master architect, lack of distinct stylistic or period architectural characteristics, altered architectural detail, lack of association with persons or events of historical importance, and lack of archaeological or further historic documentary research potential. In addition, the house (S-4387) is not considered an appropriate contributing element to any of the three nearby established or potential historic districts because it lacks geographical associations with, as well as characteristics indicative of the periods of significance

of these historic districts. Likewise, the house (S-4387) also lacks the appropriate associations for inclusion as part of the Sudler House historic property (S-199).

Based on the lack of any previously recorded precontact or historic period archaeological resources in the project APE, the non-eligibility of the house (S-4387) individually for listing in the NRHP or as a contributing element to a historic district, the property's lack of appropriate sediments to contain archaeological resources appropriate for addressing research questions about the property and house (S-4387), and the confined nature and scale of the DeIDOT project, the Bridge 146 Retaining Wall project, as currently designed, will not affect any significant archaeological resources or historic structures, and no additional archaeological or historic documentary investigations are warranted.