

**CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY OF THE
BC AND RT TRACT,
ONslow COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA**



CHICORA RESEARCH CONTRIBUTION 527

CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY OF THE BC AND RT TRACT, ONSLOW COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA

Prepared By:
Michael Trinkley, Ph.D., RPA
and
Nicole Southerland

Prepared For:
Mr. Raiford Trask
BC and RT, LLC
1202 Eastwood Rd.
Wilmington, NC 28403

CHICORA RESEARCH CONTRIBUTION 527



Chicora Foundation, Inc.
PO Box 8664
Columbia, SC 29202-8664
803/787-6910
www.chicora.org

June 15, 2010

This report is printed on permanent paper ∞

©2010 by Chicora Foundation, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted, or transcribed in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without prior permission of Chicora Foundation, Inc. except for brief quotations used in reviews. Full credit must be given to the authors, publisher, and project sponsor.

ABSTRACT

This study reports on an intensive cultural resources survey of an approximately 15 acre tract in Onslow County, South Carolina. The work was conducted to assist Mr. Raiford Trask and BC and CT, LLC in complying with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the regulations codified in 36CFR800.

The tract is to be used by BC and RT, LLC for the construction of a housing development. The topography is low and flat with poorly drained soils on about 60% of the property; the remainder consists of well drained soils.

The proposed undertaking will require the clearing of the tract, followed by construction of various infrastructure elements, such as roads, stormwater drainage, and utilities. Individual lot construction will involve grading, additional utility construction, and subsequent building of structures. These activities have the potential to affect archaeological and historical sites and this survey was conducted to identify and assess archaeological and historical sites that may be in the project tract. For this study an area of potential effect (APE) 0.5 mile around the proposed project was assumed.

An investigation of the archaeological site files at the Raleigh, North Carolina Office of State Archaeology failed to identify any previous sites recorded in the APE. In addition, the maps at the North Carolina Architectural Branch were consulted to see if any National Register of Historic Places sites were in the vicinity of the project area. One site, the Yopps Meeting House (0586) is located about 750 feet east of the current project tract. This is a c.1890 church that was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1999.

The archaeological survey of the tract incorporated shovel testing at 100-foot intervals

north along transects that were placed at 100-foot intervals along NC 172. All shovel test fill was screened through ¼-inch mesh with a total of 82 shovel tests excavated within the tract.

As a result of these investigations no sites were identified. This is likely the result of poorly drained soils and the distance from a permanent water source.

A survey of public roads within a 0.5 mile of the proposed undertaking was conducted in an effort to identify any architectural sites over 50 years old that also retained their integrity. No such sites were found. The previously identified NRHP structure was revisited and rephotographed. The Yopps Meeting House (0586) is 750 feet from the proposed project tract.

Finally, it is possible that archaeological remains may be encountered in the project area during clearing activities. Crews should be advised to report any discoveries of concentrations of artifacts (such as bottles, ceramics, or projectile points) or brick rubble to the project engineer, who should in turn report the material to the State Historic Preservation Office or to Chicora Foundation (the process of dealing with late discoveries is discussed in 36CFR800.13(b)(3)). No construction should take place in the vicinity of these late discoveries until they have been examined by an archaeologist and, if necessary, have been processed according to 36CFR800.13(b)(3).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures		iv
Introduction		1
Natural Environment		5
<i>Physiography</i>	5	
<i>Geology and Soils</i>	5	
<i>Floristics</i>	6	
<i>Climate</i>	6	
Prehistoric and Historic Synopsis		9
<i>Previous Research</i>	9	
<i>Prehistoric Overview</i>	9	
<i>Historic Synopsis</i>	11	
Research Methods and Findings		15
<i>Archaeological Field Methods and Findings</i>	15	
<i>Architectural Survey</i>	16	
<i>Site Evaluation and Findings</i>	16	
Conclusions		19
Sources Cited		21

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure

1. Project vicinity in Onslow County	1
2. Project tract and previously identified NRHP property	2
3. View of second growth pine forest on the survey tract	5
4. Survey area along NC 172	6
5. Generalized cultural sequence for North Carolina	10
6. Portion of Mouzon's 1775 map of North and South Carolina showing the project vicinity	12
7. Portion of the 1920s Rural Delivery Routes in Onslow County showing the project area	12
8. Portion of the 1921 Onslow County Soil Survey showing the project area	13
9. Portion of a 1938 State Highway and Works Commission map of Onslow County	13
10. Portion of a 1953 State Highway and Works Commission map of Onslow County	14
11. Project tract with transects	15
12. Shovel testing in the project area	16
13. View of the c.1890 Yopps Meeting House	17
14. View from the Yopps Meeting House toward the current survey tract	17
15. View of a cemetery on the Yopps NRHP property with a wooded lot immediately adjacent	18


INTRODUCTION


This investigation was conducted by Dr. Michael Trinkley of Chicora Foundation, Inc. for Mr. Raiford Trask of BC and RT, LLC. The work was conducted to assist the client in complying with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the regulations codified in 36CFR800.

The project site consists of approximately 15 acres of land proposed to be used for a multi-family neighborhood located in southern Onslow County in the town of Sneads Ferry (Figure 1). The tract is located on the west side of NC 172, about a mile south of Camp Lejeune.

The tract, as previously mentioned, is intended to be used primarily for a multi-family housing. This will entail the construction of infrastructure, such as roads, stormwater drainage, and utilities, as well as the construction of residences. These activities will include clearing of timber, grubbing, grading, which may cause significant damage to any archaeological resources present.

There will also be some short-term construction related affects, such as increased noise, construction traffic on NC 172, and increased dust levels. There will also be some





north.

possible long-term secondary affects, such as increased traffic, changes in property values, or additional development spurred by this undertaking.

This study, however, does not consider any future impact of the project, including increased or expanded development of this portion of Onslow County. This study also does not report on any property immediately adjacent to the current survey area to the east or to the

We were requested by Mr. Trask of BC and RT, LLC to provide a proposal for the survey. The proposal was accepted on May 25, 2010 and subsequent background investigations began on June 1, 2010.

These investigations incorporated a review of the site files at the North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office and the Office of State Archaeology. As a result of that work, no

INTRODUCTION

archaeological sites were identified in the 0.5 mile APE. Examination of architectural sites at the North Carolina Architectural Branch, however, identified one site – a National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) property known as the Yopps Meeting House (0586). This c.1890 church and two cemeteries was placed on the NRHP in 1999 and is located about 750 feet from the project area.

Archival and historical research incorporated a review of secondary sources available in the Chicora Foundation files.

The archaeological survey was conducted on June 2, 2010 by Ms. Nicole Southerland, Ms. Debi Hacker, and Mr. Tom Leimone under the direction of Dr. Michael Trinkley. No archaeological sites were identified on the survey tract.

The architectural survey of the APE, designed to identify any structures over 50 years in age which retain their integrity revealed no structures other than the NRHP property (0586) in the 0.5 mile APE. A comprehensive architectural survey has been completed for Onslow County.

This report details the investigation of the project area undertaken by Chicora Foundation and the results of that investigation.

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Physiography

The project tract is situated in southern Onslow County, in the town of Sneads Ferry, about 1.3 miles south of the New River, which feeds into the Atlantic Ocean. The level topography in the region is interrupted by only occasional marsh sloughs and small wetland depressions.

In general, the topography of the study tract is level, with only a slight elevation change toward the northern end of the property where it drops in elevation toward an unnamed branch of the New River.

Onslow County is bounded to the west by Pender and Duplin counties, to the north by Jones County, to the east by Carteret County, and to the east by the Atlantic Ocean. It lies within the Coastal Plain, which is made up of flat sandy plains separated by swamps, marshes, and lakes (Stuckey 1965). This is also an area known for small barrier islands, which lie near the mainland, creating narrow, shallow sounds (Marshall 1986:5).

Elevations may range from sea level to about 100 feet above mean sea level in the Lower Coastal Plain. In the project area the elevation is generally level, staying between 35 and 40 feet above mean sea level (AMSL). A noticeable characteristic of this physiographic area is how gradually the flat lands seem to grade into freshwater marshes, savannahs, or swamps.

Geology and Soils

The geology of the Lower Coastal Plain has been well described by Cooke (1936) who notes that from the Cape Fear River in North Carolina to Winyah Bay in South Carolina, the

coast forms a “great arc scooped out by waves” (Cooke 1936:4). This area has been described by Brown (1975) as being an arcuate strand. In this area salt marshes are poorly developed or absent and few tidal inlets breach the coast (Smith 1933:20-21). The situation is the result of an erosional history about 100,000 years ago. In general, however, the geology of the Lower Coastal Plain is less complex than that of other sections of the state.



Figure 3. View of the second growth pine forest on the survey tract.

As previously mentioned, the area is dominated by fluvial deposits of unconsolidated sands and clays. Rocks are almost totally absent from the area. The project tract has two soil series located within the boundary – Baymeade fine sand and Leon fine sand.

Baymeade soils, which represent about 40% of the project area, are well drained with an A



Figure 4. Survey area along NC 172 (project tract to the right).

horizon of dark gray (10YR4/1) fine sand to 0.2 foot in depth over a light gray (10YR7/2) fine sand to about 1.0 foot in depth. Leon soils, accounting for about 60% of the project tract, are poorly to very poorly drained and have an A horizon of

either black (10YR2/1) or light gray (10YR7/1) sand to 0.3 foot over a gray (10YR6/1) sand to about 0.8 foot in depth.

Floristics

Braun (1950) describes this part of coastal North Carolina as belonging to the Southeastern Evergreen Forest Region. Within this designation, the project tract most closely resembles the Loblolly Pine and Pine-Hardwoods Forest (Braun 1950:286). Braun notes that this community of trees occupies the moist and fertile soils of the Coastal Plain (Braun 1950:288). Several hardwood varieties are also included in the group, including oak, hickory, sweet gum, sour gum, red maple, ash, and holly (Braun 1950:289).

The current project area appears to have been a field historically, but now has been allowed to grow up in a second growth pine forest. Numerous varieties of scrub were also found within the project area.

Climate

Elevation, latitude, and distance from the coast work together to affect the climate of North Carolina, although Onslow County is clearly dominated by its maritime location. Much of the weather is controlled by the proximity of the Gulf Stream, about 50 miles offshore. In addition, the more westerly mountains block or moderate many of the cold air masses that flow across the state from west to east. Even the very cold air masses that cross the mountains are warmed by compression before their descent on the Coast.

As a result, Onslow County is characterized by mild winters and hot, humid summers (U.S. Army Engineer District 1975:34). In the middle of summer, coastal North Carolina has an average monthly temperature of 80°F while in the coolest time of year, the average temperature is about 45°F (U.S. Army Engineer District 1975:34). While hard

freezes are rare along the coast, the relative humidity is high, ranging from 70 to 75% (U.S. Army Engineer District 1975:34).

The average rainfall for coastal North Carolina is between 44 and 56 inches annually with most of the rainfall occurring between July and September (U.S. Army Engineer District 1975:36). It is also during these summer months when hurricane activity can greatly affect the coast. Between 1910 and 1966, at least 43 hurricanes affected the North Carolina coast (Carney and Hardy 1967). Hurricanes have the potential to greatly alter the environment by creating or destroying inlets or causing extensive flooding.

PREHISTORIC AND HISTORIC SYNOPSIS

Previous Research

Much of the archaeological work performed in lower Onslow County has been on either the coastline or sea islands. One nearby survey sought to make a record of previously recorded sites along stump sound with the closest sites about 0.75 mile northeast of the current project area (Marshall 1986). While this report did not perform any testing, it did provide a brief synthesis of each site and provides a good representation of where sites may be found elsewhere in Onslow County.

Other nearby projects include Jones et al. (1997), which provides a good synthesis of the Woodland Period in coastal North Carolina and Seibel and Russ (2006).

Prehistoric Overview

The Paleoindian period, lasting from 12,000 to 8,000 B.C., is evidenced by basally thinned, side-notched projectile points; fluted, lanceolate projectile points; side scrapers; end scrapers; and drills (Coe 1964; Michie 1977; Williams 1968). The Paleoindian occupation, while widespread, does not appear to have been intensive. Artifacts are most frequently found along major river drainages, which Michie interprets to support the concept of an economy "oriented towards the exploitation of now extinct mega-fauna" (Michie 1977:124).

Unfortunately, little is known about Paleoindian subsistence strategies, settlement systems, or social organization. Generally, archaeologists agree that the Paleoindian groups were at a band level of society (see Service 1966), were nomadic, and were both hunters and foragers. While population density, based on the isolated finds, is thought to have been low,

Walthall suggests that toward the end of the period, "there was an increase in population density and in territoriality and that a number of new resource areas were beginning to be exploited" (Walthall 1980:30).

The Archaic period, which dates from 8000 to 2000 B.C., does not form a sharp break with the Paleoindian period, but is a slow transition characterized by a modern climate an increase in the diversity of material culture. Associated with this is a reliance on a broad spectrum of small mammals, although the white tailed deer was likely the most commonly exploited mammal. Archaic period assemblages, characterized by corner-notched and broad stemmed projectile points, are fairly common, perhaps because the swamps and drainages offered especially attractive ecotones.

In the Coastal Plain of the North Carolina, there is an increase in the quantity of Early Archaic remains, probably associated with an increase in population and associated increase in the intensity of occupation. While Hardaway and Dalton points are typically found as isolated specimens along riverine environments, remains from the following Palmer phase are not only more common, but are also found in both riverine and interriverine settings. Kirks are likewise common in the coastal plain (Goodyear et al. 1979).

The two primary Middle Archaic phases found in the coastal plain are the Morrow Mountain and Guilford (the Stanly and Halifax complexes identified by Coe (1964) are rarely encountered). Our best information on the Middle Archaic comes from sites investigated west of the Appalachian Mountains, such as the work in the Little Tennessee River Valley. The work at Middle Archaic river valley sites, with their evidence of a

CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY OF THE BC AND RT TRACT




Figure 5. Generalized cultural sequence for North Carolina.

diverse floral and faunal subsistence base, seems to stand in stark contrast to Caldwell's Middle Archaic "Old Quartz Industry" of Georgia and South Carolina, where axes, choppers, and ground and polished stone tools are very rare.

The Late Archaic is characterized by the appearance of large, square stemmed Savannah River projectile points (Coe 1964). These people continued the intensive exploitation of the uplands much like earlier Archaic groups. The bulk of our data for this period, however, comes from work in the Uwharrie region of North Carolina.

definition, with the introduction of fired clay pottery about 2000 B.C. along the North Carolina coast. It should be noted that many researchers call the period from about 2500 to 1000 B.C. the Late Archaic because of a perceived continuation of the Archaic lifestyle in spite of the manufacture of pottery. Regardless of terminology, the period from 2500 to 1000 B.C. is well documented on the coast and is characterized by Stallings (fiber-tempered) pottery. The subsistence economy during this early period was based primarily on deer hunting and fishing, with supplemental inclusions of small mammals, birds, reptiles, and shellfish.

The Woodland period begins, by

Like the Stallings settlement pattern,

Thom's Creek sites are found in a variety of environmental zones and take on several forms. Thom's Creek sites are found throughout the South Carolina Coastal Zone, Coastal Plain, and up to the Fall Line. The sites are found into the North Carolina Coastal Plain, but less is known about the makers of Thom's Creek in this area (Jones et al. 1997). Some work has been performed in nearby Brunswick County to the south (South 1976).

In the Southern Coastal Plain of North Carolina, during the Early Woodland, the name New River is given to the ceramics (Jones et al. 1997). These wares have decorations of cord marked, fabric impressed, plain, simple stamped, and net impressed (Loftfield 1975). Some people suggest that the inhabitants of the Early Woodland along the coast lived in a similar manner (i.e. fishing, hunting, and gathering) to those of the Late Archaic (Jones et al. 1997).

It is during the Middle Woodland (extending to about AD1000), some suggest, that cultures appear to adapt more to the estuarine lifestyle (Loftfield 1987). During this time, both the Hanover and Cape Fear series of pottery are most commonly found.

Hanover pottery includes surface decorations of cord marked, fabric impressed, and plain (Jones et al. 1997). The large grog temper distinguishes this series from others in the area (Jones et al. 1997). On the other hand, Cape Fear wares are tempered with coarse sand and feature fabric impressed or cord marked surfaces (Jones et al. 1997).

It is also during this period when sand burial mounds are found in the southern coastal region (Jones et al. 1997). Work has been performed on mounds in Brunswick (South 1966), Robeson (Wetmore 1969, 1978), and New Hanover (Ward 1980) counties.

By the Late Woodland (AD 1000 to contact) sedentism is more obvious with evidence of house designs, village sizes, and an internal

organization relying on coastal resources (Seibel and Russ 2006). Work at several Late Woodland sites have identified permanent structures (see, for example, Loftfield 1979, 1985 and Loftfield and Jones 1995) and evidence of horticulture (see Loftfield 1979 and Gardner 1990).

The common ceramic during this time is the Oak Island series, which has been identified as either being shell-tempered (South 1976) or limestone-tempered (Herbert and Mathis 1996).

Another characteristic of the Late Woodland is the use of burial ossuaries (Seibel and Russ 2006 and Jones et al. 1997). Some of the ossuaries in Onslow County have contained up to 150 individuals (Loftfield and Watson 1990, Ward 1982).

Historic Synopsis

It is thought that the first European explorer to the North Carolina Coast was the Italian Giovanni da Verrazano in 1524 (Powell 1989). At that time, the area would have been inhabited Siouan speakers and the Carolina Algonkians (Phelps 1983). Sir Walter Raleigh had also sent explorers around the same time, so some scholars have explored the option that they may have been first to the Carolina Coast (Marshall 1986).

A few years later, Spanish explorers under the command of Lucas Vasques de Ayllon explored the Carolina coast and by the 1550s it was common to see ships, mostly wrecked, along the Outer Banks (Powell 1989). Ultimately, it would be Walter Raleigh in the 1580s who colonized the lands and claimed the land in the name of Queen Elizabeth (Seibel and Russ 2006).

It was in 1710 that the lands of modern day Onslow County was settled (Marshall 1986). The English settled the area who came from Jamestown, Virginia in search of new areas to inhabit (Seibel and Russ 2006). The early eighteenth century along the Carolina coast saw the development of ferries, roads, naval stores,




Figure 6. Portion of Mouzon's 1775 map of North and South Carolina showing the project vicinity.

and agriculture (Marshall 1986). The fertile land in the area made it desirable for the settlers. This created an increase in population, seemingly overnight. For example, in the 1720s, 35 families were settled along the waterways of the Onslow County area (Brown 1960). By 1734, this number had almost tripled, with over 100 families recorded in the area (Watson 1995). With this growth in population, new counties were needed and in 1734, Onslow County (named for Sir Arthur Onslow, Speaker of the House of British Commons) was created from parts of New Hanover County (Sharpe 1954; Brown 1960).

With the numerous waterways found throughout Onslow County, it's no wonder that trade and transportation flourished along these avenues. Most towns and settlements were found along the many rivers, streams, and creeks found throughout the county. During the Colonial Period, more roads were added throughout the county (Seibel and Russ 2006). In 1728, the area's first licensed ferry was in operation (later known as Snead's Ferry) over the New River (Seibel and Russ 2006).

In the eighteenth century, the two largest

sources of income along the coast were cultivation (including wheat, rice, indigo, and tobacco) and the naval industry (fishing and shipbuilding) (Powell 1989; Sharpe 1954). Another thriving industry was the construction of naval stores (Marshall 1986). The numerous pine forests in the area produced resources such as tar, pitch, and turpentine, as well as creating lumber (Seibel and Russ 2006).

Mouzon's 1775 map of North and South Carolina (Figure 6) shows numerous settlements in the Snead's Ferry area. Since most of the settlements are located along the waterways, inland where the current project area is located, appears to be unsettled.

Cotton became an important cash crop during the Antebellum, creating an increase in slave labor (Seibel and Russ 2006). In 1850, Onslow County ginned 21,200 pounds of cotton (DeBow 1854). While not the most prosperous county in North Carolina, Onslow County's slave population accounted for nearly 40% of the total county population (Sharpe 1958). In 1850, there were 5,003 whites, 3,108 slaves, and 172 freedmen in Onslow County (DeBow 1854). Rice also




Figure 7. Portion of the 1920s Rural Delivery Routes in Onslow County showing the project area.




Figure 8. Portion of the 1921 Onslow County Soil Survey showing the project area.

became an important staple in Onslow County with 40,000 pounds produced in 1860 (Taylor 1969[1926]).

During the Civil War, Onslow County was directly impacted. Nearby New Bern, in Craven County to the north, was fortified and garrisoned by Confederate troops (Brady et al. 2001). In March of 1862, Union troops commanded by General Ambrose Burnside, began to shell New Bern and the fortifications around the city (Seibel and Russ 2006). New Bern fell to Union troops on March 14 where General Burnside rebuilt the fortification around the city as a Union base (Brady et al. 2001). The city remained a Union base for the remainder of the war. From this vantage, Union troops were able to control most of the North Carolina coast, with Onslow County being repeatedly raided (Watson 1995).

The Civil War devastated the economy of the county, as well as much of the south. The planter system of slave labor was replaced by

tenant farming and sharecropping (Powell 1989). The average size and value of farms fell significantly during this time. Despite this, transportation improvements were being developed that would connect the coast to elsewhere in the state (Seibel and Russ 2006).

Agriculture remained an important industry for the coast with tobacco becoming the new cash crop (Marshall 1986). The once thriving naval store industry became more obsolete, however the lumber industry was still full swing (Seibel and Russ 2006). In 1896, Onslow's soil was described as being favorable for the growth of cotton, corn, peas, potatoes, and peanuts (State Board of Agriculture 1896:377). At this time, Onslow County had 320,439 acres of land for agricultural use, valued at \$975,493 for a population of 7,392 whites and 2,911 blacks (State Board of Agriculture 1896:377).

By the 1920s, Onslow County's top cash crop was tobacco (Watson 1995). The map




Figure 9. Portion of a 1938 State Highway and Works Commission map of Onslow County showing the project area.

showing the Rural Delivery Routes in Onslow County from the 1920s (Figure 7) shows the project area with no settlements on the property. Several structures are located nearby, however, including the Yopps Meeting House to the east. The 1921 Soil Survey of Onslow County (Figure 8) shows a similar view. Again, no structures are found in the project area.

A 1938 State Highway and Works Commission Map for Onslow County (Figure 9), again shows Yopps Meeting House, but no structures in the project area. In 1941 Camp Lejeune, a U.S. Marine Corps base in Onslow County, was opened (Onslow County Historical Association 1983). The 1953 State Highway and Works Commission Map of Onslow County (Figure 10) shows the Yopps Meeting House, but by this time, no structures are shown on the map.

The base proved to create in increase of commerce in Onslow County since by 1979, more than half the population of Onslow County consisted of military personnel and their families (Watson 1995). In fact, a May 2010 statistics report for Onslow County shows that the Department of Defense is the Number 1 employer in the county (http://www.onslowcountync.gov/uploadedFiles/Planning_and_Development/Planning/Data_Center/DataCenter.pdf).




Figure 10. Portion of a 1953 State Highway and Works Commission map of Onslow County showing the project area.

RESEARCH METHODS AND FINDINGS

Archaeological Field Methods and Findings

The initially proposed field techniques involved the placement of shovel tests at 100 foot intervals along transects placed at 100 foot intervals.

All soil would be screened through $\frac{1}{4}$ - inch mesh, with each test numbered sequentially by transect. Each test would measure about 1 foot square and would normally be taken to a depth of at least 1 foot or until sterile subsoil was encountered. All cultural remains would be collected, except for mortar and brick, which would be quantitatively noted in the field and discarded. Notes would be maintained for profiles at any sites encountered. A total number of 82 shovel tests were excavated along 17 transects.

Should sites (defined by the presence of two or more artifacts from either surface survey or shovel tests within a 50 feet area) be identified, further tests would be used to obtain data on site boundaries, artifact quantity and diversity, site integrity, and temporal affiliation. These tests would be placed at 25 to 50 feet intervals in a simple cruciform pattern until two consecutive negative shovel tests were encountered. The information required for completion of North Carolina site forms would be collected and photographs would be taken, if warranted in the opinion of the field investigators.

These proposed techniques were implemented with no significant modifications. Transects were set up along NC 172 from northeast to southwest. Shovel tests were excavated to the north along these lines.




Figure 11. Project tract with transects.

Sites would be evaluated for further work based on the eligibility criteria for the National Register of Historic Places. Chicora Foundation only provides an opinion of National Register eligibility and the final determination is made by the lead agency in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer at the North Carolina Division of Archives and History.

Analysis of

collections would follow professionally accepted standards with a level of intensity suitable to the quantity and quality of the remains. However, the archaeological survey of the project area failed to identify any remains. This is most likely because of the large amounts of poorly drained soils and the distance from a permanent water source.

Architectural Survey

As previously discussed, we elected to use a 0.5 mile area of potential effect (APE). The architectural survey would record buildings, sites, structures, and objects that appeared to have been constructed before 1950 and which retained their integrity. Those which have undergone such extensive modifications to preclude their eligibility were not recorded.

For each identified resource, an architectural survey form would be completed and at least two representative photographs would be taken. Permanent control numbers would be assigned by the N.C. State Historic Preservation Office at the conclusion of the study. The site forms for the resources identified during this study would then be submitted to the North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office.

Site Evaluation and Findings

Archaeological sites would be evaluated for further work based on the eligibility criteria for the National Register of Historic Places. Chicora Foundation only provides an opinion of National Register eligibility and the final determination is made by the lead federal agency, in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer at the North Carolina Division of Archives and History.

The criteria for eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places is described by 36CFR60.4, which states:

the quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and

a. that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

b. that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

c. that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high



Figure 12. Shovel testing in the project area.

artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

d. that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

National Register Bulletin 36 (Townsend et al. 1993) provides an evaluative process that contains five steps for forming a clearly defined explicit rationale for either the site's eligibility or lack of eligibility. Briefly, these steps are:

- identification of the site's data sets or categories of archaeological information such as ceramics, lithics, subsistence remains, architectural remains, or sub-surface features;
- identification of the historic context applicable to the site,

providing a framework for the



Figure 13. View of the c.1890 Yopps Meeting House.

evaluative process;

- identification of the important research questions the site might be able to address, given the data sets and the context;
- evaluation of the site's archaeological integrity to ensure that the data sets were sufficiently well preserved to address the research questions; and
- identification of important research questions among all of those which might be asked and answered at the site.



Figure 14. View from the Yopps Meeting House toward the current survey tract - notice dense woods.

This approach, of course, has been developed for use documenting eligibility of sites being actually nominated to the National Register of Historic Places where the evaluative process must stand alone, with relatively little

reference to other documentation and where typically only one site is being considered. As a result, some aspects of the evaluative process have been summarized, but we have tried to focus on each archaeological site's ability to address significant research topics within the context of its available data sets.

need to be assessed for its potential impact to the NRHP site.

Only one site was identified within the 0.5 mile APE around the project area - the Yopps Meeting House (0586). The church was listed on the National Register under Criterion A - social history and association with a broad pattern in the history of religion and Criterion C - distinctive funerary art, including hand carved wooden head and foot boards (see the NRHP nomination form 1999). Contributing elements to the National Register property include the c.1890 meeting house and two cemeteries (one for whites and one for blacks) dating from 1842.

The NRHP property is about 750 feet northeast of the current project tract along NC 172. At the current time, the property separating the survey tract and Yopps Meeting House is wooded and will provide a sufficient visual buffer between the two. While construction activities have the potential to increase short term impacts such as traffic, dust, and noise, the wooded lot should provide enough of a buffer to minimize these activities.



Figure 15. View of a cemetery (fence at the rear of photo) on the Yopps NRHP property with a wooded lot immediately adjacent.

It should be noted that a gas station has been recently constructed within direct sight of the Yopps property, so the NRHP site has already been visually impacted by construction activities.

While the current project area will only minimally affect the NRHP property, any possible development of the lot between the BC and RT Tract and the Yopps Meeting House property will

CONCLUSIONS

This study involved the examination of a 15 acre tract for a residential development in Onslow County. This work, conducted for Mr. Raiford Trask of BC and RT, LLC examined archaeological sites and cultural resources found on the proposed project area and is intended to assist this company in complying with their historic preservation responsibilities.

As a result of this investigation, no archaeological sites were found in the survey area. This is likely the result of the poorly drained soils and distance from a permanent water source.

A survey of public roads within 0.5 mile of the project area in order to identify NRHP properties identified one site - Yopps Meeting House (0586). The project area is sufficiently shielded by at least 750 feet of woods, so the current undertaking should produce minimal noise levels and almost no visual impact to the

NRHP property. Any additional development consideration for the wooded lot between the BC and RT Tract and the Yopps Meeting House property would require additional assessments to determine short and long term impacts.

It is possible that archaeological remains may be encountered during construction activities. As always, contractors should be advised to report any discoveries of concentrations of artifacts (such as bottles, ceramics, or projectile points) or brick rubble to the project engineer, who should in turn report the material to the State Historic Preservation Office, or Chicora Foundation (the process of dealing with late discoveries is discussed in 36CFR800.13(b)(3)). No further land altering activities should take place in the vicinity of these discoveries until they have been examined by an archaeologist and, if necessary, have been processed according to 36CFR800.13(b)(3).

SOURCES CITED

- Brady, Ellen M., Susan E. Bamann, and Loretta Lautzenheiser
 2001 *Archaeological Survey of Proposed Extension, Siler City Water Supply Reservoir, Chatham County, North Carolina*. Ms. On file, Office of State Archaeology, Raleigh.
- Braun, E. Lucy
 1950 *Deciduous Forests of Eastern North America*. The Free Press, New York.
- Brown, J. Parsons
 1960 *The Commonwealth of Onslow: A History*. O.G. Dunn, New Bern, North Carolina.
- Brown, Paul J.
 1975 *Coastal Morphology of South Carolina*. Unpublished M.S. Thesis, Department of Geology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Carney, C.B. and A.V. Hardy
 1967 *North Carolina Hurricanes: A Listing of Tropical Cyclones Which Have Affected the State*. U.S. Department of Commerce, Raleigh.
- Coe, Joffre L.
 1964 The Formative Cultures of the Carolina Piedmont. *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 54(5).
- Cooke, C. Wythe
 1936 *Geology of the Coastal Plain of South Carolina*. Bulletin 867. U.S. Geological Survey, Washington, D.C.
- DeBow, J.D.B.
 1854 *Statistical View of the United States*. A.O.P. Nicholson, Washington.
- Gardner, Paul S.
 1990 *Excavations at the Amity Site: Final Report of the Pomeiooc Project: 1984-1989*. Archaeological Research Report No. 7, Archaeology Laboratory, East Carolina University, Greenville, North Carolina.
- Goodyear, Albert C., John H. House, and Neal W. Ackerly
 1979 *Laurens-Anderson: An Archaeological Study of the Inter-Riverine Piedmont*. Anthropological Studies 4, Occasional Papers of the Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Herbert, Joseph M., and Mark A. Mathis
 1996 An Appraisal and Re-evaluation of the Prehistoric Pottery Sequence of Southern Coastal North Carolina. In *Indian Pottery from the Carolinas: Observations from the March 1995 Ceramic Workshop at Hobcaw Barony*, edited by David G. Anderson, John S. Cable, Neils Taylor, and Chris Judge. Council of South Carolina Professional Archaeologists, Columbia.

CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY OF THE BC AND RT TRACT

- Jones, David C., Christopher Espenshade, and Linda Kennedy
 1997 *Archaeological Investigations at 31ON190, Cape Island, Onslow County, North Carolina*. Garrow and Associates, Atlanta.
- Loftfield, Thomas C.
 1975 *A Brief and True Report: An Archaeological Interpretation of the Southern Coast of North Carolina*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
 1979 *31ON33, A Late Woodland Seasonal Village*. Ms. on file, Interagency Archaeological Services Division, National Park Service, Atlanta.
 1985 *Archaeological Testing and Excavations at 31ON196, Permuda Island*. Permuda, Inc., Sneads Ferry, North Carolina.
 1987 *Excavations at 31ON305, The Flynt Site at Sneads Ferry, North Carolina*. University of North Carolina, Wilmington.
- Loftfield, Thomas C. and David C. Jones
 1995 *Late Woodland Architecture on the North Carolina Coast: Structural Meaning and Environmental Adaptation*. *Southeastern Archaeology* 14(2):120-135.
- Loftfield, Thomas C. and C. Bryan Watson
 1990 *Ossuary Interments and Algonkian Expansion on the North Carolina Coast*. *Southeastern Archaeology* 9(2): 116-123).
- Marshall, Rhea
 1986 *A Compilation of Materials Relating to the Proposed Stump Sound Archaeological District, Onslow County, North Carolina*. Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem.
- Michie, James L.
 1977 *The Late Pleistocene Human Occupation of South Carolina*. Unpublished Honor's Thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Onslow County Historical Association
 1983 *The Heritage of Onslow County*. The Onslow County Historical Association, Jacksonville.
- Phelps, David A.
 1983 *Archaeology of the North Carolina Coast and Coastal Plain: Problems and Hypotheses*. In *The Prehistory of North Carolina: An Archaeological Symposium*, edited by Mark A. Mathis and Jeffrey J. Crow, pp. 1-52. North Carolina Division of Archives and History, Department of Cultural Resources, Raleigh.
- Powell, William S.
 1989 *North Carolina Through Four Centuries*. The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.
- Seibel, Scott and Terri Russ
 2006 *An Intensive Cultural Resource Assessment: New River Landing, Onslow County, North Carolina*. Environmental Services, Inc., Raleigh.
- Service, E.M.
 1966 *The Hunters*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.

SOURCES CITED

- Sharpe, Bill, editor
 1954 *A New Geography of North Carolina*. Vol. 1. Sharpe Publishing Co., Raleigh.
- 1958 *North Carolina: A Description by Counties*. Warren Publishing Company, Raleigh, North Carolina.
- Smith, Lynwood
 1933 *Physiography of South Carolina*. Unpublished M.S. Thesis, Department of Geology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- South, Stanley A.
 1966 Exploratory Excavations at the McFayden Mound, Brunswick County, North Carolina. *Southern Indian Studies* 18:68-87.
- 1976 An Archaeological Survey of Southeastern North Carolina. *South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology Notebook* 93.
- State Board of Agriculture
 1896 *North Carolina and its Resources*. M.I. & J.C. Stewart Printers, Winston.
- Stuckey, Jasper
 1965 *North Carolina: Its Geology and Mineral Resources*. North Carolina Department of Conservation and Development, Raleigh.
- Taylor, Rosser Howard
 1969[1926] *Shareholding in North Carolina: An Economic View*. Negro Universities Press, New York.
- Townsend, Jan, John H. Sprinkle, Jr., and John Knoerl
 1993 *Guidelines for Evaluating and Registering Historical Archaeological Sites and Districts*. Bulletin 36. National Park Service, National Register of Historic Places, Washington, D.C.
- U.S. Army Engineer District
 1975 *Maintenance of Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, North Carolina*. Wilmington.
- Walthall, John A.
 1980 *Prehistoric Indians of the Southeast: Archaeology of Alabama*. University of Alabama Press, University.
- Ward, Trawick
 1980 Archaeological Investigations of the Cold Morning Site. *Southern Indian Studies* 32:5-39.
- 1982 *Archaeological Salvage of the Jarretts Point Ossuary, ON304*. MS. On file, Office of State Archaeology, Raleigh.
- 1983 Whites Creek: The Second Time Around. *South Carolina Antiquities* 15:63-65.
- Watson, Alan D.
 1995 *Onslow County: A Brief History*. North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources, Raleigh.
- Wetmore, Ruth
 1969 *Report on Preliminary Investigations at the Parham Mound, Robeson County, North Carolina*. Ms. on file, Department of Social Sciences, St. Andrews College, Laurinburg, North Carolina.

- 1978 Report on Excavations at the Buie Mound, Robeson County, North Carolina. *Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology Notebook* 10:30-71.

Williams, Stephen B., editor

- 1968 *The Waring Papers: The Collected Works of Antonio J. Waring, Jr.* Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology 58.

**Archaeological
Investigations**

Historical Research

Preservation

Education

Interpretation

Heritage Marketing

**Museum Support
Programs**



Chicora Foundation, Inc.
PO Box 8664 • 861 Arbutus Drive
Columbia, SC 29202-8664
Tel: 803-787-6910
Fax: 803-787-6910
Email: Chicora@earthlink.net
www.chicora.org