

important information is presented and boilerplate sections are eliminated. Given the limited findings of the current project (i.e., one prehistoric isolate and two historic sites), an abbreviated format report was considered appropriate.

The present report foreshadows the types of data fields that might be included with a future GIS-based, fully electronic report. Ideally, each symbol on an electronic version of Figure 2 would be linked to a series of data sets. If an engineer or compliance officer was concerned with the area covered by Sheet 4, they would simply click on the Sheet 4 icon in the map directory. This would provide information on the previously recorded Keene School site and the area previously cleared for Section 106 compliance (Table 1), the four residences depicted on maps from 1849, 1868, and 1881 (Table 2), the survey methods by test area (Table 3), the results by test area (Table 4), and the management recommendation for all archaeological resources on Sheet 4 (Table 5). In an electronic version, an interested researcher could also click directly on a specific test area, an isolated find or site, a previously recorded site, or a cartographically indicated location of historic activity.

### **1.2.1 Research Design**

This narrow, linear corridor study was undertaken to provide data to address generic research issues of prehistoric adaptation and settlement (essentially placing components on the landscape), historic settlement between rural hubs (Glasgow and Bear), and post-depositional processes. The Area of Potential Effect (APE) is generally rated low to moderate for prehistoric site potential by the Custer (1986) mapping, and only occasional, limited-activity use probably occurred during the prehistoric period. The historic maps indicated several loci of historic activity, but their survival in the heavily developed corridor was to be addressed.

### **1.2.2 Environmental Setting**

The present report format does not include an environmental context for the study. Previous nearby studies and appropriate state contexts have provided reconstructions of past environments and present conditions in this section of the county (Brown *et al.* 1990; Catts and Custer 1990; Custer 1986; Custer and Cunningham 1986; Custer *et al.* 1986;

**Table 1.**  
**Previously Recorded Sites and Previously Cleared Areas**

Sheet	Sites	Previously Cleared Areas
Sheet 1	7NC-D-113A (not eligible) 7NC-D-113B (not eligible)	New S.R. 896 corridor was cleared (Lothrop <i>et al.</i> 1987)
Sheet 2	7NC-D-110 (not eligible?) 7NC-D-130C (not eligible) 7NC-D-130B partial (not eligible)	New S.R. 896 corridor was cleared (Lothrop <i>et al.</i> 1987)
Sheet 3	7NC-D-130A (eligible/mitigated) 7NC-D-130B partial (not eligible)	New S.R. 896 corridor was cleared (Lothrop <i>et al.</i> 1987)
Sheet 4	7NC-D-212 (mitigated)	Keene School Road (Parsons Engineering Science 1999) and Keene School Tract (Bowen <i>et al.</i> 2001) cleared
Sheet 5	None	None
Sheet 6	None	None
Sheet 7	None	None
Sheet 8	7NC-D-188 (destroyed)	Church Road cleared (Traver and Thomas 2001)
Sheet 9	None	East side of Walther Road cleared (Thomas 2001a)
Sheet 10	None	S.R. 7 Corridor cleared
Sheet 11	None	None

Note: The previous research consulted included: Lothrop *et al.* (1987), Shaffer *et al.* (1988), Petraglia and Knepper (1995), Thomas (2001a, 2001b), Hoseth *et al.* (1994), Catts and Custer (1990), Custer and Cunningham (1986), Custer (1986), Brown *et al.* (1990), Custer and De Santis (1986), Custer *et al.* (1986), De Cunzo and Catts (1990), De Cunzo and Garcia (1992).

**Table 2.**  
**Cartographically Indicated Locations of Historic Activity**

Location	Reference(s)	Disposition
Sheet 1 None		
Sheet 2 Location 1	1868	Discovered and excavated as site 7NC-D-110.
Sheet 3 None		

**Table 2.  
Cartographically Indicated Locations of Historic Activity  
(Continued)**

<b>Location</b>	<b>Reference(s)</b>	<b>Disposition</b>
Sheet 4 Location 2 Location 3 Location 4 Location 5	1868 (J. Frazer), 1881 1868 (J. Frazer), 1881 1849 (A. Harman), 1868 (A. Harman, Lone Cottage) 1849, 1868 (D.B. Ferris), 1881	No evidence in APE. No evidence in APE. No evidence in APE. Destroyed by modern development.
Sheet 5 Location 6 Location 7 Location 8	1849, 1868, 1881 1849, 1868 1849, 1868 (R. McCauley), 1881	Destroyed for stormwater pond. Outside archaeological APE. Destroyed by modern development.
Sheet 6 None		
Sheet 7 Location 9 Location 10 Location 11 Location 12 Location 13 Location 14	1849 (Underwood), 1868 (J.D. Titter, Spring Grove), 1881 1868, 1881 1868, 1881 1849, 1868 (C.M. Whitaker), 1881 1849 (M. Enos), 1868 1868 (W.H. Reynolds), 1881	Outside archaeological APE. No evidence in APE. No evidence in APE. Discovered this survey, Site 1. Destroyed by modern development. Destroyed by modern development.
Sheet 8 Location 15 Location 16 Location 17 Location 18	1849 (J. Moore), 1868 (H.K.) 1849 (J. Bryant), 1868 1849 (W. Silver), 1868, 1881 1868 (G.B.R.), 1881 (Geo. H. Rodney)	Structure previously recorded as N-12861, and associated site as 7NC-D-188, destroyed for parking lot. No evidence in APE. Standing structure (S&L 22), access denied for archaeology in side yard. Standing structure (N-5803). Outside archaeological APE.
Sheet 9 Location 19	1849 (C. Bole), 1868 (G.G. Bowl, Bush Hill), 1881 (L. Bowles, Bush Hill)	No evidence found in Test Area 1.
Sheet 10 Location 20 Location 21 Location 22	1868 1849 (H. Hugg), 1868 (Mrs. M. Hugg) 1849 (Bear Inn), 1868 (J. Cooper, Est.)	Destroyed by modern development. Destroyed by modern development. Destroyed by modern development.
Sheet 11 None		

Notes: The map references are Rea and Price (1849), Beers (1868), and Hopkins (1881).

**Table 3.  
Methods by Sheet and Test Area**

Sheet/Test Area	Methods
Sheet 1 Untestable	Verified disturbed through geomorphology reconnaissance.
Sheet 2 Untestable Test Area 20 (partial) Test Area 9 Test Area 10 Test Area 18 Test Area 19 Test Area 8 (partial)	Verified disturbed through geomorphology reconnaissance. Surface survey. 10 STPs. 2 STPs. 4 STPs. 4 STPs. Surface survey.
Sheet 3 Untestable Test Area 20 (partial)	Verified disturbed through geomorphology reconnaissance. Surface survey.
Sheet 4 Untestable Test Area 8 (partial) Test Area 7 Test Area 6 Test Area 5 Test Area 12	Verified disturbed through geomorphology reconnaissance. Surface survey. 2 STPs. Surface survey. Surface survey. 2 STPs.
Sheet 5 Untestable Test Area 21 Test Area 17	Verified disturbed and wet through geomorphology reconnaissance. 3 STPs. 1 STP.
Sheet 6 Untestable	Verified disturbed and wet through geomorphology reconnaissance.
Sheet 7 Untestable Test Area 13 Test Area 15 Test Area 16	Verified disturbed and wet through geomorphology reconnaissance. 2 STPs. Surface survey. House depression and well (Site 1) recorded outside APE. 4 STPs. Access denied on fairway/greens/tees of active golf course.
Sheet 8 Untestable Location 17 Test Area 3 (partial)	Verified disturbed through geomorphology reconnaissance. Access not attempted for side yard, due to contentious landowner. Surface survey.
Sheet 9 Untestable Test Area 3 (partial) Test Area 2  Test Area 1	Verified disturbed through geomorphology reconnaissance. Surface survey. Surface survey, 8 STPs, oral history, archival research for Site 2, Pyle Tenant House site. Surface survey, 3 STPs.

**Table 3.  
Methods by Sheet and Test Area  
(Continued)**

Sheet/Test Area	Methods
Sheet 10 Untestable Test Area 14	Verified disturbed through geomorphology reconnaissance. 5 STPs.
Sheet 11 Untestable	Verified disturbed through geomorphology reconnaissance.

**Table 4.  
Results of the Phase I Archaeological Survey**

Sheet/Test Area	Site or Isolated Find	Description
Sheet 1 None	None	None.
Sheet 2 Test Area 9	None	No artifacts from 10 STPs. Typical profile has an Ap horizon of 10YR 4/3 brown silt loam (0-15 cm) over a Bt horizon of 10YR 6/8 brownish yellow silt loam.
Sheet 2 Test Area 10	None	No artifacts from 2 STPs. Landform severely eroded. Profile has Ap horizon of 10YR 4/3 brown silt loam (0-20 cm) over Bt horizon of 10YR 5/6 yellowish brown silt loam.
Sheets 2 and 3 Test Area 20	None	70% surface visibility. 2 possible FCR fragments, 1 small brick fragment, and one sherd of lead-glazed earthenware.
Sheet 2 Test Area 18	None	Three small brick fragments and one sherd of plain whiteware from disturbed Ap horizon in STP N100 E85. Profile has Ap horizon of 10YR 4/3 brown silt loam (0-20 cm) over Bt horizon of 10YR 5/6 yellowish brown silt loam.
Sheet 2 Test Area 19	None	1 lead-glazed earthenware sherd in Ap horizon in STP N100 E130, and 2 whiteware sherds and a late porcelain sherd in Ap horizon of STP N100 E115. Profile has Ap horizon of 10YR 4/3 brown silt loam (0-24 cm) over Bt horizon of 7.5YR 5/6 strong brown silt loam.
Sheets 2 and 4 Test Area 8	None	80% surface visibility.
Sheet 4 Test Area 7	Possible site outside APE, entry wall in APE.	No artifacts from 2 STPs. Profile has Ap horizon of 10YR 4/3 brown silt loam (0-20 cm) over Bt horizon of 10YR 6/8 brownish yellow silt loam. Vegetation suggests house site outside of APE. Wall is addressed in historic resources report.

**Table 4.**  
**Results of the Phase I Archaeological Survey**  
**(Continued)**

Sheet/Test Area	Site or Isolated Find	Description
Sheet 4 Test Area 6	<b>Isolated Find #1</b>	70% surface visibility. 1 quartz biface fragment (not temporally diagnostic). <b>Go to Table 5.</b>
Sheet 4 Test Area 5	None	60% surface visibility. 3 sherds of lead-glazed earthenware.
Sheet 4 Test Area 12	None	No artifacts from 2 STPs. Profile has Ap horizon of 10YR 3/2 very dark grayish brown silt loam (0-18 cm) over Bt horizon of mottled 10YR 6/8 brownish yellow and 10YR 7/2 light gray sandy clay loam.
Sheet 5 Test Area 17	None	No artifacts in single STP. Profile has A horizon of 10YR 4/3 brown silt loam with small pebbles (0-3 cm) over a Bt horizon of 10YR 5/6 yellowish brown silt loam.
Sheet 5 Test Area 21	None	No artifacts in 3 STPs. Profiles have Ap horizon of 10YR 3/2 very dark grayish brown silt loam (0-20 cm) over Bt horizon of 10YR 7/2 light gray sandy loam.
Sheet 6 None	None	None.
Sheet 7 Test Area 13	None	On edge of wetland. No artifacts from 2 STPs. The profile has an A horizon of 10YR 4/2 dark grayish brown silt loam over a Bt horizon of gleyed 5BG 4/1 dark greenish gray silty clay loam.
Sheet 7 Test Area 15	<b>Site 1</b> (outside APE). None in APE	60% surface visibility along margin of APE. Site 1 is represented by house cellar depression, well, landscaping wall, and planted trees. House shown in this location on maps of 1849, 1868, and 1881. <b>Go to Table 5.</b>
Sheet 7 Test Area 16	None	Access denied on fairway, greens, tees. No artifacts in 4 STPs. Typical profile has Ap horizon of 10YR 4/3 brown silt loam (0-20 cm) over a Bt horizon of 10YR 5/6 yellowish brown silt loam.
Sheets 8 and 9 Test Area 3	None	75% surface visibility.
Sheet 9 Test Area 2	<b>Site 2, Pyle Tenant House site</b> (predominately outside APE)	75% surface visibility in field. Site 2 is a 20th century tenant house site. Foundation, well, privy remnant, fence, and bottle dumps present. A typical profile had a disturbed Ap horizon of 10YR 4/3 brown silt loam (0-20 cm) over a Bt horizon of 7.5YR 4/6 strong brown sandy loam. <b>Go to Table 5.</b>

**Table 4.**  
**Results of the Phase I Archaeological Survey**  
**(Continued)**

Sheet/Test Area	Site or Isolated Find	Description
Sheet 9 Test Area 1	None	No artifacts from 3 STPs. Profile has an Ap horizon of 10YR 4/3 brown silt loam (0-21 cm) over a Bt horizon of 10YR 5/6 yellowish brown silt loam. 70% surface visibility
Sheet 10 Test Area 14	None	No artifacts from 5 STPs. Typical profile has Ap horizon of 10YR 4/3 brown silt loam (0-20 cm) over Bt horizon of 10YR 5/6 yellowish brown silty clay loam.
Sheet 11 None	None	None.

Note: Occasional finds of historic artifacts in plowed fields are attributed to field fertilizing, and such artifacts are not considered a site or isolated find.

**Table 5.**  
**Recommendations**

Sheet	Sites	Eligibility Recommendation
Sheet 1	7NC-D-113A 7NC-D-113B	SHPO previously concurred that these are both not eligible. No further work.
Sheet 2	7NC-D-110 7NC-D-130C 7NC-D-130B partial	SHPO previously concurred that these are both not eligible. No further work. SHPO previously concurred that 130B is not eligible.
Sheet 3	7NC-D-130A 7NC-D-130B partial	SHPO previously concurred that 130A has been mitigated and that 130B is not eligible. No further work.
Sheet 4	7NC-D-212  Isolated Find #1	SHPO concurred that the Phase III study completed for this site has mitigated the adverse effects. No further work. Not eligible. No further work.
Sheet 5	None	None.
Sheet 6	None	None.
Sheet 7	Site 1	Site not evaluated because it is outside the APE. Avoidance is planned under current design. No further work. <b>See Appendix C: CRS Forms, Sites 1 and 2.</b>
Sheet 8	7NC-D-188 and Location 15 (N-12861)	Site and structure no longer exist. Not eligible. No further work.
Sheet 9	Site 2, Pyle Tenant site	Site recommended not eligible for NRHP. No further work. <b>See Appendix A: Eligibility Evaluation, Pyle Tenant site, and Appendix C: CRS Forms, Sites 1 and 2.</b>
Sheet 10	None	None.
Sheet 11	None	None.