

5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter offers conclusions and recommendations based on the results of the Phase I archaeological fieldwork. This presentation is divided into two field programs: the 2004 to 2007 program and the 2008 to 2009 program. The 2004 to 2007 fieldwork corresponds to the work conducted in Parcels 1 to 5 that was directed by Scott Emory (A.D. Marble & Company 2005b) and to the work conducted in Parcels 6 and 7 that was directed by Michael Lenert (A.D. Marble & Company 2008a). The 2007 to 2009 fieldwork corresponds to the work conducted in Parcels 8 to 26 that was directed by Michael Lenert (A.D. Marble & Company 2009).

5.1 2004 to 2007 Phase I Fieldwork Conclusions and Recommendations

This section reviews the conclusions and recommendations stemming from the Phase IB survey conducted prior to 2007. This section draws heavily from the Phase IB archaeology report by Emory (A.D. Marble & Company 2005b).

In general, the archaeological survey documented soil horizons in the project APE are indicative of a historic plowed agricultural setting impacted by increased development from twentieth-century residential growth in the community of Little Heaven. The excavations exposed a loamy sand plowzone horizon overlying an E/B- or B-horizon subsoil in actively plowed fields, and an Ap/A-horizon over a B-horizon subsoil in the developed residential portions of the APE. Episodes of fill and the construction of subsurface utilities were noted in the residential portions of the APE. A possible bay-basin in Area 2-1 provides evidence of natural landform features within the APE despite extensive plowing of the landscape.

Cultural materials recovered in the project APE provide evidence of the precontact and historic occupation in the project area, although the material assemblage strongly favors the historic period of occupation. An isolated scatter of tested cobbles, lithic debitage, and FCR recovered on the surface of the ground in Areas 1-1 and 2-1; and a single jasper flake found in the plowzone horizon of Area 2-3, reflect lithic procurement, stone tool production or maintenance, and other activities of Native Americans in the project area. However, no subsurface features linked to Native American occupation were uncovered in Area 2-3. Additionally, the diffuse distribution

of the precontact collection in Areas 1-1 and 2-1 does not offer any indication that subsurface deposits associated with Native American features exist in these areas. The absence of projectile points or pottery in the APE hinders assigning a temporal association for the Native American artifact assemblage, but at a minimum these remains suggest a Woodland II period of occupation.

Conversely, cultural debris associated with the historic domestic occupation in the project area was found throughout the APE. In general, the artifact collection reflects an early-nineteenth- to early-twentieth-century temporal association, although a few late-eighteenth-century ceramic sherds were found in the APE. Similarly, the glass assemblage illustrates mid- to late-nineteenth-through twentieth-century bottle and vessel glass, with occasional fragments of heavily patinated olive bottle glass, suggesting a late-eighteenth- to early-nineteenth-century component in the collection. These temporal and functional associations are not unexpected, as the residents in the rural agricultural nineteenth-century cross-roads community would maintain utilitarian crockery, decorated wares, glassware, jars, and other items as part of a household inventory. Twentieth-century development of Little Heaven introduced automobile parts, building materials, and other modern refuse into the artifact collection, illustrating the transition from a rural agricultural cross-roads community to a community focused on commercial enterprise along SR 1.

Residential and commercial portions of the APE, such as Areas 2-4, 2-5, 2-6, 2-7, Parcel 4, and Area 5-2, yielded an assortment of modern refuse associated with the mid- to late-twentieth-century domestic occupation and commercial enterprises mixed with a scatter of historic ceramics, glass, and architectural debris. Artifact classes such as automobile parts, plastic-coated electrical wire, aluminum can fragments, and concrete rubble are not unexpected given the age and architectural composition of the buildings in the APE and the multiple uses of the yard areas surrounding the residences. A lead bale seal recovered in Area 4-2 provided an unusual, eighteenth-century artifact associated with commercial shipping, but the disturbed context of this find offers little information to suggest the origin of this find or its relationship to the project area. These artifact classes were recovered from fill deposits and the Ap/A-horizon, and the assemblage produced no significant distribution patterns to suggest that a midden or other subsurface feature was present in the APE. The absence of any subsurface features associated

with historic or precontact occupation in these developed areas of the APE further substantiates this observation.

Six distinct artifact concentrations containing early-nineteenth- through early-twentieth-century cultural materials were recorded within the project APE during the 2003 to 2007 fieldwork. In Area 1-2, a concentration of building rubble and domestic refuse was identified in a 30.5-m by 61-m area along the northern limits of the lot. This concentration corresponds to the location of Gray Farm (Chapel View Farm), CRS No. K-2738. The Locus Identification Form for CRS No. K-2738 lists the house in this resource as constructed ca. 1910, while a barn on the property dates to the early eighteenth century and was likely part of the adjacent farm complex to the north listed as W. Townsend. Architectural refuse recovered from the test excavations included lumber fragments, tar shingle fragments, cut and wire nails, window glass, and other building refuse contemporaneous to building materials used in early-twentieth-century construction. These materials likely represent the demolition and infilling of the house foundation. A section of stone or concrete exposed at 98 cmbs in STP N700 E400 is possibly part of the house foundation, given its location.

It is recommended that a Phase II archaeological investigation be conducted for the Chapel View Farm. Based on the information collected in the Phase IB survey, foundation remains of the residence may still be present on the property. While architectural artifacts weighed heavily in the artifact assemblage of Area 1-2, ceramic and glass counts increased toward the northern edge of Area 1-2 into Area 1-1, suggesting that intact yard deposits may be present in the wooded divide separating Areas 1-1 and 1-2, as well as into the southern limits of Area 1-1. Additional subsurface archaeological investigation would be necessary to delineate the concentration identified in Area 1-1 and expose any foundation remains or other features present in the ground.

A second artifact concentration of nineteenth- through early-twentieth-century domestic and architectural refuse was documented in Area 2-8. This cluster of cultural materials corresponds to the location of a residence listed as J. Grier on mid-nineteenth-century maps of the project area. A Phase II level archaeological investigation is recommended in Area 2-8 to better define the limits of the artifact concentration and determine if any subsurface features associated with

the Grier structure are present in the APE. It is unclear from the background research and the artifact assemblage whether the APE contains the remains of a tenant house or the main residence of J. Grier. A detailed archaeological investigation may provide new information to substantiate and define the social and economic status of the property occupants.

Areas 2-1 and 2-3 exhibit historic artifact concentrations found some distance from known structures. In Area 2-1, an historic artifact concentration was noted in the center and northern sections of the lot. Small concentrations of historic period refuse were noted in the southern and central portions of Area 2-3. While plowing would disperse ceramics, glass, and other refuse over a landform, the high number of artifacts in a small area suggest that these remains came from a domestic occupation situated in, or adjacent to, the APE in Areas 2-1 and 2-3. Additional archaeological excavations are warranted to determine if subsurface deposits associated with a residence exist in the APE for Areas 2-1 and 2-3.

The historic artifact assemblage recovered in Area 5-3 also merits additional archaeological investigation. The small assortment of nineteenth- through early-twentieth-century decorated whiteware sherds, glass, coal, and architectural debris is possibly part of a midden deposit associated with the J. Faley residence. While no foundation remains, wells, or other subsurface features were noted in Area 5-3, the artifact collection has the potential to provide data concerning social and economic status of domestic occupation in the project area. Intensive archaeological excavations will be necessary to further define the spatial limits of the archaeological resource.

The artifact cluster in Parcel 7 represents the sixth distinct artifact concentration of nineteenth- to early-twentieth-century cultural materials recorded in the project APE. It is recommended that a Phase II archaeological investigation be conducted for this historic artifact concentration. Based on the information collected in the Phase IB study, the physical remains of a structure (or perhaps its less visible counterpart, a dark soil stain associated with the outlines of a post-and-beam or sill-type foundation) may be present beneath the surface of Parcel 7. While architectural-use artifacts are essentially absent in the artifact concentration, historic mapping

and USGS mapping suggest the presence of a buried structure that existed minimally from 1868 to 1956.

No further archaeological investigations are necessary in Areas 2-11, 2-10, 2-9, 2-7, 2-6, 2-5, 2-4, 2-2, 4-2, 4-1, 5-2, and 5-1. The archaeological survey identified historic and modern materials in the plowzone and fill deposits, but no significant artifact concentrations or subsurface features were identified in these areas. Historic maps of the project area indicate that these sections of the APE were likely plowed fields or wooded ground in the nineteenth century and were not developed until the early to mid-twentieth century. Testing in Area 5-1 yielded a small number of nineteenth- and twentieth-century artifacts in the plowzone horizon along the eastern edge of the APE, which was interpreted as part of an artifact scatter associated with the W. Gray residence (CRS No. K-2731). Additional archaeological testing of this scatter would not likely produce any significant information concerning the W. Gray residence, as the Phase IB survey recovered a general assortment of ceramics, glass, coal, and other materials that offer limited analysis potential, and no subsurface features were documented to suggest that outbuildings or other intact deposits are present within the APE.

5.2 2008 to 2009 Phase I Fieldwork Conclusions and Recommendations

This section draws heavily on the Management Summary report prepared by Michael Lenert in early 2009 (A.D. Marble & Company 2009). Conclusions of the findings from individual parcels were embedded in Section 4.0. Here, recommendations for additional work in three of the parcels investigated after 2007 are emphasized.

A.D. Marble & Company investigated Parcels 8 to 26 in fall 2008 and winter 2009. One precontact archaeological site may have been identified in Parcel 8. Two historic archaeological sites and one precontact site may have been identified in Parcel 18. One historic-era archaeological site may have been identified in Parcel 25, and one historic archaeological site and one precontact archaeological site may have been identified in Parcel 26. Therefore, A.D. Marble & Company recommends that DelDOT and the DESHPO consider Phase II investigations in these parcels (i.e., Parcel 18, Parcel 25, and Parcel 26). It is presumed that the additional investigations of Parcels 18, 25, and 26 would better define the vertical and horizontal

limits of each potential site and assist in identifying the presence or absence of subsurface features. No further work is recommended for Parcel 8 because it has been dismissed from project construction plans.

5.3 Summary

Together with the recommendations stemming from the earlier Phase IB archaeological investigations of Parcels 1 to 7 (A.D. Marble & Company 2005b; 2008a; 2009), a total of nine parcels bear the potential to contain significant archaeological resources (Table 5-1; Figure 4-38).

Table 5-1. Recommendations for Additional Survey.

Parcel	Location	Estimated Area	Reason for Phase II recommendation
Recommendations Stemming from 2004 to 2007 Phase IB Investigations (Parcels 1 to 7)			
1-1	Northwest portion of Barratt's Chapel Rd and SR 1 intersection	100 by 200 ft, 0.45 ac	Building rubble and domestic refuse, possibly associated w/ early-twentieth-century Gray Farm (Chapel View Farm, CRS No. K-2738) or w/ late-eighteenth-century barn of W. Townsend
2-1	East side of SR 1, 1,800 ft north of Skeeter Neck Rd (south)	150 by 350 ft, 1.20 ac	Late-eighteenth- to early-twentieth-century architectural and domestic refuse, possibly associated w/ nearby unknown residence
2-3	East side of SR 1, adjacent to north of 2-1	35 by 50 ft, 0.08 ac and 150 by 50 ft, 0.17 ac	<u>Two</u> areas: late- eighteenth- to early-twentieth-century architectural and domestic refuse
2-8	Northeast corner of Skeeter Neck Rd (south) and SR 1 intersection	200 by 200 ft, 0.91 ac	Nineteenth- to early-twentieth-century architectural and domestic refuse, likely associated w/ Grier residence
5-3	Southeast corner of Skeeter Neck Rd (north) and SR 1 intersection	75 by 150 ft, 0.25 ac	Nineteenth- to twentieth-century architectural and domestic refuse, possibly associated w/ Faley residence
7	Crotch of Clapham Rd and SR 1	250 by 150 ft, 0.86 ac	Late nineteenth- to early-twentieth-century domestic debris, associated w/ unknown structure
Recommendations Stemming from Additional Phase IB Investigations (Parcels 8 to 26)			
18	Northwest corner of Barratt's Chapel Rd and SR 1 intersection	3 sites combined: approximately 5.0 ac.	<u>Three</u> areas: late-eighteenth-century domestic refuse on south-central margin of parcel, association unknown; nineteenth-century domestic refuse in north-central portion of parcel, possibly associated with nineteenth-century W. Townsend occupation; precontact-era materials in east-central portion of parcel
25	Southeast corner of (Lower) Skeeter Neck Rd and SR 1	200 by 200 ft, 0.91 ac.	Late-eighteenth to mid-nineteenth-century domestic refuse concentration in north-central and northeastern portions of parcel; possibly associated w/ Grier farmstead (located opposite the parcel) or with unknown (earlier?) occupation in parcel
26	East of SR 1, large parcel abutting wetland	Two sites combined: approximately 1.5 ac.	<u>Two</u> areas: nineteenth-century domestic refuse in eastern portion; precontact-era materials in northeast corner of parcel

Based on the artifact concentrations and nature of the associated materials, A.D. Marble & Company believes that attempts to discover subsurface features beneath each concentration should be considered based on the age and/or types of artifacts recovered. Concentrations of precontact artifacts in Parcels 18 and 26 may indicate the presence of hearth and/or storage pit features below the plowed surface. The eighteenth- and nineteenth-century artifact concentrations in Parcels 1-1, 2-1, 2-3 [two areas], 2-8, 5-3, 7, 18 [two areas], 25, and 26] may indicate the presence of unrecorded structures related to early historic occupations in each of the three parcels. It is the opinion of A.D. Marble & Company archaeology staff that no significant archaeological resources were identified in the remaining parcels and that no further work is warranted for those parcels. The recommendations herein are based on inferences drawn from artifact spatial patterning. Ultimately, DeIDOT and DESHPO, not A.D. Marble & Company, will decide if additional investigations are warranted in any of the parcels in the Little Heaven project area.