SIGNIFICANCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Dover Bypass corridor contains a wealth of archaeological information. In general, the archaeological significance of the work to date falls into three categories. First, it provided the first integrated set of archaeological data from a portion of a single drainage system thus contributing to our understanding of settlement patterns. Secondly, several sites (7K-F-55, 7K-F-54, 7K-F-46, and 7K-F-56) provided the first detailed look at artifact complexes undisturbed by plowing or land clearing. This type of site, of which there are a few more possible along the Bypass, (7K-F-50, 7K-F-53, 7K-F-57, 7K-C-17 and 7K-C-71) has revealed information on above ground features and artifact relationships that have been destroyed at cleared sites. These sites are important types of prehistoric cultural resources and ~~several~~ may be worthy of National Register nomination. Third, the excavations and surface collections to date have furnished a large body of data capable of answering a wide range of questions about Delaware's prehistory.

Archaeological materials are non-renewable resources and any realistic means of non-salvage impact mitigation must be explored. In the interests of resource management and archaeological data preservation, we would suggest the following non-salvage mitigation procedure. There are fiften sites within the Right-of-Way corridor from Frederica to Route 13. By relocating the closest R.O.W. edge so that it is at least 200 meters from the edge of the marsh surrounding Spring Creek and Double Run, the number of severely impacted sites is reduced to five (7K-F-12, 7K-F-45A, 7K-F-45, 7K-F-53, and 7K-F-50). These are stream crossing sites and could not be avoided by a simple shift in R.O.W. In addition to the relocation of impacted sites, the large and potentially costly salvage projects at 7K-F-55, 7K-F-46, 7K-F-56, and 7K-F-54 would be avoided. Those wooded areas impacted at 7K-F-53 and 7K-F-50 are relatively small.

Sites located from Route 13 to Route 100 differ in size and intensity from those along Spring Creek and Double Run. Generally, the northern half sites display less intense occupation and are distributed at each site such that an alignment

shift of 100 meters from the edge of the flood plain along Almshouse Branch and Cahoon Branch would avoid most of the archaeological material at 7K-C-57 and 7K-C-17. Again, it would be difficult to avoid the stream crossing sites (such as 7K-C-32, 7K-C-33, 7K-C-71 and 7K-C-72) so that the most reasonable mitigation in these areas would be salvage with a minimum of land clearing and/or ground disturbance outside the R.O.W., in order not to disturb the remaining portions of the sites.

In the event that impact mitigation by Right-of-Way realignment is not a viable alternative, an extensive and costly program must be undertaken.

All of the Dover Bypass sites are worthy of further archaeological investigation in order to assess their potential for National Register nomination. From the viewpoint of archaeological data conservation through salvage, two basic approaches are recommended. All wooded sites, or designated portions thereof, should be extensively excavated in a controlled manner prior to any land disturbance in preparation for highway construction. The following sites should be included in this program: 7K-F-55, 7K-F-54, 7K-F-46 and 7K-F-56 (Datum 1, 2 and 3). These sites have demonstrated their potential in providing archaeological material undisturbed by modern farming activities. Sites 7K-F-53, 7K-F-50, 7K-C-57, 7K-C-72 and 7K-C-71 may also contain such materials and a testing program to determine this should be conducted prior to woods clearance. It should be noted at this time that permission for test excavation was not granted on the Yerkie or Walker properties. These areas should be tested immediately upon R.O.W. acquisition in order to determine potential site location, boundaries and significance. After extensive excavation in these areas, the woodlands may then be removed. Random surface collection should then be conducted before grading operations commence. The graded areas should then be flat-shoveled and all remaining features plotted and excavated.

Four sites (7K-F-55, 7K-F-45A, 7K-F-45 and 7K-F-12) were collected by 10 meter block control system. These sites should be collected one additional time before construction operations. The top-soil should then be removed and the sub-soil flat-shoveled in a search for sub-surface features. Any such features would be mapped and

excavated. In those areas outside of the controlled surface collection and in all other cleared areas along the R.O.W., at least one additional uncontrolled surface collection, under good looking conditions, should be made prior to top-soil removal. After such removal, flat shoveling, mapping and feature excavation completes the salvage.

In addition, a monitoring system should be established whereby an archaeologist would be on hand for all stripping operations both within known sites and in areas where no cultural material was found on the surface. Funds should be available to furnish a crew for the recovery of any additional finds. An archaeologist should also be available during key phases of the construction process such as during "mucking" or bridge construction.

The above impact mitigation procedures pertain only to those areas directly impacted by the highway right-of-way. Other areas of direct impact, such as construction easements, equipment lay down locations and borrow pits must also be surveyed as soon as they are known. This should be done as far in advance of construction as is possible. The major indirect effect of the proposed highway is that it may encourage development along its route, particularly near the interchanges. This action would adversely impact the remains of those salvaged sites in addition to threatening adjacent sites. A possible site protection procedure in this case may be to allow some type of zoning protection to those partially destroyed sites and those immediately adjacent.Another possibility would be the protection of immediately adjacent sites through land acquisition along with the R.O.W. In any case, the long term indirect impacts of the proposed project may do more harm to the cultural resources of the study corridor than the highway itself.