3.0 METHODS

Portions of the cultural resources research for the S.R. 15 (Canterbury Road) Improvements project were accomplished by Skelly and Loy, Inc. (Appendix A), and McCormick Taylor & Associates, Inc. personnel. This report combines the data from both firms. Background research for the project included the examination of the Delaware archaeological site files, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) files, the historic resources inventory files, reports documenting previously conducted cultural resource studies, relevant state-wide historic contexts, and historic as-built roadway plans housed at the Delaware State Historic Preservation and DelDOT offices. Further background research was conducted in the Recorder of Deeds office at the Kent County Courthouse, the Delaware Public Archives, the University of Delaware Morris Library, and the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh.

The potential for prehistoric resources in the project APE is low according to Custer (n.d.). In addition, no previously identified prehistoric period archaeological resources are located within 2.0 km (1.2 mi) of the project APE, and the landowner stated that he had never found any type of prehistoric period artifacts on his property (Mr. Ralph Fry, personal communication 2002). Background research revealed that no NRHP-eligible or -listed resources are located within the project APE; however, two historic properties, K-4941 and K-4942 are located within an 0.8 km (0.5 mi) radius of the project APE. Resource K-4930 is located approximately 1.0 km (0.6 mi) from the project APE. These three resources are agricultural complexes which had extant standing structures at the time that they were inventoried; however, the structures associated with K-4930 have been since razed. None of these three previously identified resources appear to have any historic geographic or use associations with the current S.R. 15 (Canterbury Road) project APE. Inventory forms for these resources include basic descriptions of the resources but no eligibility determinations (Appendix B).

Background research also indicates that historically, the project area has been rural with agricultural fields and detached, single-family residences. According to a 1955 history of Delaware (Eckman 1955:208), "A new trend for Lower Delaware is seen in the building of homes in the nearby open country that previously would have been built in Milford itself." Historic as-built plan view maps for roads in the vicinity of the project area, surveyed by DelDOT (Delaware State Highway Department 1923, 1937, 1938), indicate that the project area exhibited an undeveloped rural character throughout these years. Specific historic uses of the project area, as indicated on historic

maps (Byles 1859; Beers 1868; U.S. Postal Service 1911), included at least two structures located in the northwest corner area of the present S.R. 15 (Canterbury Road)/S.R. 14 intersection (Figure 4) and later a nursery at the same corner (Mr. Ralph Fry, personal communication 2002). The extant tree line present just west of and paralleling S.R. 15 (Canterbury Road) is a remnant of this nursery (Mr. Ralph Fry, personal communication 2002). In addition to the two structures at the corner of S.R. 15 (Canterbury Road)/S.R. 14, a U.S. Postal Service map (1911) indicates that a single structure was present on the west side of S.R. 15 just slightly south of the existing Airport Road (K407)/S.R. 15 (Canterbury Road) intersection. There is no indication on the map as to this structure's function before destruction.

The historic resources located within the project APE were evaluated according to the criteria set forth in National Register Bulletin 15: *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* (National Park Service 1990) and National Register Bulletin 46: *Historic Residential Suburbs: Guidelines for Evaluation and Documentation for the National Register of Historic Places* (Ames and McClelland 2002). Furthermore, the historic resource survey and evaluation was performed in accordance with guidelines, priorities, and contexts found in the *Delaware Historic Context Master Reference and Summary* (Herman *et al.* 1989) and the *Delaware Comprehensive Historic Preservation Plan* (Ames *et al.* 1989).

A geomorphological reconnaissance of the project APE was conducted in order to determine the presence or absence of *in situ* soils, microrelief, the depth of potential cultural deposits, and any areas of modern disturbance. Expedient hand excavated auger borings were taken across the project APE and the results were described by the project geomorphologist (Photographs 9 and 10).

Based on the results of the background research, which showed that at least three structures had been present in the project APE historically, and the geomorphological reconnaissance, which showed that *in situ*, albeit plowed soils exist in the project APE, archaeological testing was warranted. A Phase I archaeological survey was undertaken to locate any potential prehistoric period artifacts, and to determine if subsurface remains of the historic period structures or associated features and/or artifacts were present. The Phase I archaeological survey of the project APE consisted of pedestrian reconnaissance and subsurface testing of the project APE.

Pedestrian reconnaissance was used in the plowed agricultural fields and the wooded area where the majority of the ground surface was visible. The agricultural fields had recently (prior week) been plowed and disced and were planted in wheat, which had not yet broken the ground

SOURCE: BEERS 1868

DELAWARE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

IMPROVEMENTS
S.R. 15 (CANTERBURY ROAD), K447 TO K407
MILFORD HUNDRED
KENT COUNTY

1868 MAP OF PROJECT AREA

FIGURE - 4
NOT TO SCALE

SKELLY and LOY Inc.
CONSULTANTS IN
ENVIRONMENT - ENERGY
ENGINEERING - PLANNING

Photograph 9. Geomorphologist conducting auger boring near the south end of the project APE.

Photograph 10. Geomorphologist examining soils retrieved from an auger boring.

surface when the survey took place. In the week subsequent to the plowing and planting, the area experienced both a snow storm and several days of rain which were sufficient to wash items at the modern ground surface of adhering sediments. Surface survey was conducted along transects spaced at 5.0 m (16.4 ft) intervals. Only modern roadside litter was identified during the pedestrian reconnaissance.

Subsurface testing in the grassy area consisted of the excavation of STPs. The STPs were excavated in arbitrary 10.0 cm (3.9 in) levels within natural strata to a minimum depth of 10.0 cm (3.9 in) into the subsoil (Photographs 11 and 12). All of the sediments recovered from each STP were screened through 0.64 cm (0.25 in) mesh hardware cloth. Information regarding soil texture and color, depth of any cultural material recovered, and any soil disturbances was recorded on Skelly and Loy's standard excavation forms. No artifacts were recovered from the excavated STPs. Field notes were kept by the Principal Investigator, while STP and test unit notes were kept by the field crew members. Field data were recorded on standardized field forms and were supplemented with notes made on the project maps, as warranted. The fieldwork was also documented with digital photography.

The historic structures field survey was conducted in December 2002. The field survey identified and mapped all of the above-ground historic resources (built prior to 1960) in the project APE. Each resource was photographed using 35 mm black and white film. Those resources that met the age criterion were assigned a cultural resource survey number and mapped on the base aerials housed at the State Historic Preservation Office in Dover. Cultural Resource Survey (CRS) forms were completed for each surveyed resource.

Photograph 11. Work in progress, excavating STP 1.

Photograph 12. STP 6 stratigraphic profile after excavation, facing north.