

6.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A.D. Marble & Company identified five archaeological sites (four historic, one precontact) during the Phase I archaeological survey of the SR 1 South Frederica Grade Separated Intersection project APE (Figure 19). The farmstead sites generally date to the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; the precontact site dates to the Woodland I period.

One site (SR 1 – North End West Side Precontact Site) is a small, approximately 0.25-ac Woodland I-era precontact site that is located on the west side of SR 1 near the northern end of the APE and overlooks an unnamed tributary of the Murderkill River. The assemblage contains cord-marked ceramic sherds and steatite vessel fragments. The second site (SR 12 – East Side Historic Site; CRS# K-04952) is an approximately 7-ac, mid- to late-nineteenth-century to early-twentieth-century historic farmstead site located on the east side of SR 12 in the north-central portion of the APE. Numerous brick fragments, coal slag, and primarily nineteenth-century sherds of ironstone, whiteware, and porcelain are present in the site assemblage. Historic mapping and photography document the presence of a structure and outbuildings at this location in the early twentieth century.

The third site (SR 1 – East Field Historic Site) is an approximately 5-ac historic site containing evidence for late-eighteenth- to early-twentieth-century historic and isolated finds (N=3) associated with Woodland-I precontact occupations. This site is located in an agricultural field east of SR 1 in the southeastern portion of the APE. It contained temporally diagnostic materials including creamware, pearlware, whiteware, porcelain, ironstone, and yellowware sherds along with a precontact-era hammerstone and two broken projectile points. The fourth site (Milford Neck Road – East Field Historic Site) is an approximately 10-ac historic site primarily containing nineteenth-century artifacts that include pearlware, whiteware, and ironstone sherds. The site is located in an agricultural field in the southeastern corner of the intersection of Milford Neck Road and the entrance to the sewage disposal plant. The fifth site (SR 12 – East Side Transect; CRS# K-04954) is located on the edge of a former farmstead property on the east side of SR 12. Mid- to late-nineteenth-century materials comprise the assemblage of this site. Historic

and precontact artifacts are present elsewhere in the APE, but these occur in a more spatially diffuse pattern and appear to constitute isolated finds and historic-era field scatter.

Based on the Phase I results, it appears that each site has the potential to provide new information about nineteenth- to early-twentieth-century domestic and agrarian occupations and Woodland I occupations in Kent County. Therefore, Phase II significance evaluations are recommended for all five sites in order to determine the sites' integrities and their potential for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (Table 2).

Table 3. Archaeological Sites and Recommendations.

Test Area	Site Name	CRS#	Recommendation
Milford Neck Road – East Field Historic Site	Milford Neck – Treatment Plant Road Site	-	Phase II significance evaluation of 19 th ./e. 20 th -century historic occupation; possible farmstead
SR 12 – East Side Transect	To be defined by name provided in CRS form	K-04954	Phase II significance evaluation of 19 th ./e. 20 th -century historic occupation; possible farmstead
SR 12 – East Side Historic Site	Oliver B. Hammond Site	K-04952	Phase II significance evaluation of 19 th ./e. 20 th -century historic occupation; farmstead
SR 1 – North End West Side Precontact Site	-	-	Phase II significance evaluation of Woodland I occupations
SR 1 – East Field Historic Site	-	-	Phase II significance evaluation of 18 th to e. 20 th -century historic occupation; possible farmstead

The Phase I investigation was conducted via sound methods: a predictive model, background research, STPs, TUs, and pedestrian survey. Although only high precontact and historic probability areas were surveyed, it is interesting that one site (the SR 1 – East Field Historic Site) was found in an area where the predictive model did not anticipate finding a historic archaeological property. In the end, the model predicted site locations with an 80 percent accuracy rate. This is comparable to a large-scale project in an upland-agricultural setting in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, that employed similar predictive model variables and arrived at a success rate of finding sites in high probability areas 78 percent of the time (Lenert 2010).

It is the opinion of A.D. Marble & Company that each site may be treated with relatively similar Phase II investigation methods involving additional background research, the excavation of close-interval STPs and TUs, and the use of mechanical stripping if subsurface features are not

identified during the STP and TU excavation stages at each site. The use of geophysical remote sensing is recommended as a cost- and time-saving measure to identify possible features in agricultural field contexts containing large, dense historic artifact concentrations that lack historic documentation for the presence of historic occupations. Namely, geophysical remote sensing might be most efficiently and effectively employed at the SR 1 – East Field Historic Site. It is anticipated that detailed work plans for additional investigation of any of the sites identified during the Phase I survey would be prepared under the close supervision and guidance of DelDOT/DESHPO.

DelDOT/DESHPO may determine that additional sites were identified during the investigation. Their determinations, if different from those herein, will be incorporated into the final draft of this Phase I report. However, based on inferences drawn from the results of the Phase I investigation, A.D. Marble & Company currently recommends further study (Phase II archaeological resource evaluations) of the five archaeological sites identified during the investigation. This additional study will establish the National-Register eligibility of each site. It is the opinion of A.D. Marble & Company archaeology staff that no potentially significant archaeological resources were identified elsewhere and that no further work is warranted at any other locations in the APE.