

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Phase I and II testing at the Lisbon Tract identified two archaeological sites (Figure 18). Area A is the location of a late nineteenth to twentieth century historic farmstead known historically as Lisbon, Lisbourne, or Lisbona. Archaeological evidence of the farmstead consists of a scatter of historic artifacts in the site area, four concrete foundations for outbuildings, and remnants of ditches and fences. Unfortunately, no evidence of a dwelling was found, no subsurface features were located, and no artifacts from the seventeenth or eighteenth century occupations of Lisbon were recovered.

The Delaware historical archaeological management plan (De Cunzo and Catts 1990:192-196) and the historic context for the 1830 to 1940 period for agriculture in Delaware (De Cunzo and Garcia 1992:298-300) provide guidelines for evaluating the potential and significance of nineteenth and twentieth century rural sites like Lisbon. In general these sites will produce significant data if they have sufficiently high artifact densities to generate spatial distribution maps, well-preserved sub-surface features, and general good contextual integrity. The historical site on the Lisbon Tract has none of these characteristics. The historical documentation for the site is adequate, but the archaeological integrity of the site is poor. Lisbon seems to have been a long-term occupation, but no evidence of a dwelling(s) was encountered.

The outbuilding remains were in good condition, but not in association with the rest of the farmstead. The lack of features, low artifact density, and the lack of faunal remains contribute to make Area A a site with no historical significance. Based on the results of the Phase I and II survey, and due to the generally poor quality and integrity of the historic remains, Area A of Lisbon is not considered to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, and no further work is recommended for the site.

Area B of the Lisbon Tract consists of a prehistoric site located in the plowed field west of Area A. Phase I testing in this area identified a concentration of prehistoric artifacts, possibly associated with 7K-D-26, which is located further to the west along the St. Jones Creek. Although no prehistoric features were identified, some prehistoric artifacts were recovered from subsoil contexts, suggesting that intact features could be present at the site. Based on the recovered artifacts and its location, Area B may be either a Woodland I micro-band base camp associated with the larger base camps in the vicinity, or a small procurement site.

Due to the proximity of Area B to 7K-D-26 (less than 100 meters to the west), the Carey Farm Site (less than one kilometer to the north), and the St. Jones Site (less than one kilometer to the south), it is likely that Area B could provide useful information about the prehistory of the region. The St. Jones Site (7K-D-1) was a mortuary site excavated in the 1960's. Approximately 50 burials and 250 artifacts were recovered from the salvage excavations. In one area a cache of 170 bifaces, mostly of Flint Ridge chalcedony, were discovered (deValinger 1970; Stewart 1970; Custer 1984a:121; Thomas 1976). Significantly, no habitation site seems to have been directly associated with the cemetery, although micro-band camps were located around the site. Area B could be one of these micro-band camps.

The Carey Farm Site (7K-D-3), identified by Custer as a macro-band base camp, is the type site for the Carey Farm Complex during the Woodland I Period (Custer 1984a). A portion of this National Register Site was located south of Route 10, but was destroyed by residential development. The portion of the Carey Farm Site north of Route 10 has recently been excavated due to State Route 1 construction, and produced hundreds of prehistoric features and thousands of Woodland I artifacts, including Fox Creek projectile points, Mockley and Hell Island ceramics, bifaces, cores, scrapers, cobble tools, flake tools, and debitage. The potential for Area B of the Lisbon Tract to contain similar features and artifacts is high, and it is recommended that Phase II testing be conducted at the site to determine precise site limits and integrity, if proposed construction extends into that area.

In sum, this survey's methods met the goals of the project. No changes in DESHPO guidelines or biases in their recommendations, planning goals, or research guidelines are necessitated by the results of this survey.