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1.0 INTRODUCTION
Brockington and Associates, Inc., undertook survey and testing investigations at archaeological site 38BU2260, a National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) potentially eligible property located on the Port Royal Harbour Redevelopment Tract in Beaufort County, South Carolina, in October 2007 and January 2008. These investigations were conducted in compliance with state and federal laws and regulations concerning the management of historic properties (i.e., archaeological sites, buildings, structures, objects, or districts listed on or eligible for the NRHP) affected by development activities in the Coastal Zone of South Carolina. Compliance is administered through the regulatory programs of the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) (33 CFR 325) and the South Carolina Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (OCRM) (15 CFR 930).

The Port Royal Harbour Redevelopment Tract is located south of Port Royal, South Carolina, and north of Battery Creek. The tract is bounded to the north and west by SC Route 281/802 and the town of Port Royal and to the south and east by Battery Creek. This tract also includes the South Carolina Railroad Easement Corridor. Figure 1 displays the location of the project tract, including 38BU2260, on the Beaufort, SC and Parris Island, SC 7.5-minute quadrangles.

Survey investigations conducted in October 2007 identified two isolated finds (Isolate 1 and Isolate 2) and one multicomponent site (38BU2260). Based on the results of survey investigations, Brockington recommended site 38BU2260 potentially eligible for the NRHP. Results of the survey indicated that proposed ground-disturbing activities at 38BU2260 should be avoided until appropriate archaeological testing was conducted. Consultation with our client, Port Royal Harbour, LLC, resulted in a plan for testing at 38BU2260, and subsequent fieldwork was conducted in January 2008. Testing investigations determined site 38BU2260 not eligible for the NRHP. No further management of this site is recommended.

This Management Summary describes the survey and testing activities completed within the site. A brief history of the site and its occupational record is provided, with descriptions of the fieldwork following. A detailed Draft Technical Report is being prepared and will be submitted to the South Carolina State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) within one month. The report will document the work conducted throughout the Port Royal Harbour Redevelopment Tract, including 38BU2260.

2.0 A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE PORT ROYAL TRACT
The island of Port Royal and her two sister islands, St. Helena and Lady's Island, form the heart of the Sea Island region around the town of Beaufort. The Port Royal area was a frontier for two centuries, beginning in the early sixteenth century where European and Native American cultures met, traded, and eventually clashed. The area was first settled by the French and then the Spanish. The British arrived in the seventeenth century and but did not form a permanent settlement at that time (Rowland et al. 1996). Although the British established Beaufort in 1712, the Yamasee Indian War and a chaotic frontier prevented active settlement until the late 1720s. In the 1730s the colony erected a tabby fortification east of the project tract on the Beaufort River to project the town. During the colonial period, the area became an indigo and rice cultural region centered on Beaufort and nearby Savannah, Georgia. In the late eighteenth century, as indigo production declined, cotton was added as a major crop (Rowland et al. 1996). Although major rice production stopped in 1865, cotton continued until the early twentieth century. Additionally, forestry products and truck farming became major agricultural pursuits in the twentieth century.

The project tract was part of a 1,420-acre grant to John Pinney in 1702 (South Carolina Proprietary Grant Book 38:416). He sold 300 acres along Battery Creek to James Watson in 1711 (Charleston County Deed Book 2R:217). The bulk of the project tract is inside the old Watson tract. Watson may have made the tract his residence after the 1730s. He conveyed the tract to William Elliott, and the land remained in the Elliott family, who called it Battery Plantation, until just prior to the Civil War (Charleston County Will Book TT:1774-1778:595; Mary B. Elliot Journal quoted in Johnson 1930:71).

During the Civil War, the US Navy established a major blockade point for the South Atlantic Squadron
Figure 1. Location of the Port Royal Harbour Redevelopment Tract and all identified cultural resources (USGS 1979 Beaufort and 1979 Parris Island, SC quadrangles).
at Beaufort. Additionally, during the war Battery Plantation was sold for back taxes to Sumner W. Bennett, a Northerner who came with Federal troops to Beaufort (Beaufort County Deed Book B:5). After the war the tract was acquired by Daniel F. Appleton, who additionally acquired most of the old Pinney tract and subdivided it into lots to create the town of Port Royal. Also in 1867, Appleton conveyed a pre–Civil War railroad line easement through Battery Plantation to the Port Royal Railroad Company (BCDB 7:451). The railroad line linked Port Royal Island with Augusta, Georgia, and was completed in 1873 (Pollitzer 2006). In 1878 the line merged into the Central Georgia Railroad system, and in 1896 it became the Charleston and Western Carolina Railroad (CWC) (BCDB 13:539). Figure 2 presents an 1873 map of part of the town of Port Royal showing the location of Battery Plantation.

Appleton laid out the town of Port Royal and sold lots to local residents. These owners later conveyed many of the lots west of the railroad line and at the south end of the tract to the railroad or the South Carolina State Ports Authority (SPA). In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries a number of industries, including a coaling station, located storage or shipping facilities and offices along the southwestern part of the tract. In 1957 CWC deeded most of its land near the termination of the railroad to SPA for use in the new Port of Beaufort (Pollitzer 2006). CWC was absorbed by the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad in 1959. SPA used the project tract as a port until the State Assembly closed it in 2005. Figure 3 presents the location of the project tract showing the railroad line and the buildings located near the tip of Port Royal Island.

3.0 FIELD INVESTIGATIONS

All of 38BU2260 lies within the Port Royal Harbour Redevelopment Tract (see Figure 1). During survey investigations, project archaeologists defined the boundaries of site 38BU2260 and Isolates 1 and 2. After investigation, we assessed the NRHP eligibility of 38BU2260 with respect to Criterion D (information potential) and recommend 38BU2260 potentially eligible for the NRHP (Sherfy and Luce n.d.). Intensive testing at 38BU2260 was recommended in order to further define the boundaries of each site component.

The testing plan was designed to provide information regarding the function of Post-Contact artifacts located in the southwestern and southeastern portions of the site and to uncover intact deposits related to Late Archaic/Woodland occupations along the bluff edge. Ralph Bailey serves as Principal Investigator. Emily Jateff and Jon Marcoux served as Field Directors. All phases of our fieldwork are described in detail below.

3.1 RESULTS OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY INVESTIGATIONS

Investigators surveyed the 51-acre Port Royal Harbour Redevelopment Tract through visual inspection and the systematic excavation of shovel tests at 30-meter intervals. Investigators excavated a total of 212 shovel tests (18 in Area A, 192 in Area B, and 2 in Area C) across the project tract (Figure 4). Visual pedestrian surveys were performed for Areas C and D; no shovel tests were excavated in Area D. Shovel tests excavated in Area C did not produce artifacts. Each shovel test measured approximately 30 centimeters in diameter and was excavated until reaching culturally sterile soil, the depth of which varied across the project tract. Fill from these tests was screened through ¼-inch mesh hardware cloth. Soils were generally quite fine and well drained; the sterile subsoil was usually reached by approximately 80 cm below surface (bs). The maximum depth of sterile subsoil reached in several shovel tests was approximately 130 cm bs.

Investigators identified two isolated finds (Isolates 1 and 2) and one multicomponent site (38BU2260) during the cultural resources survey of the Port Royal Harbour Redevelopment Tract. Isolates 1 and 2 are located in Area A, the northwestern portion of the tract. Investigators excavated shovel tests at 7.5-meter intervals around the initial finds (around the two positive shovel tests) in an attempt to recover additional artifacts and define the artifact cluster. Isolate 1 consists of one Stallings sherd and one residual. Isolate 2 consists of one plain sand-tempered sherd. Due to the low frequency of material at these locations and the lack of cultural features, we recommend Isolates 1 and 2 not eligible for the NRHP. Further management consideration of these isolated finds is not warranted.
Figure 2. An 1873 map of the town of Port Royal showing the lands owned by CWC as well as the railroad line with the project tract superimposed (Beaufort County Plat Book 5:32).
Figure 3. US War Department quadrangle showing the project tract on the southwestern edge of Port Royal (US War Department 1920 Fort Fremont, SC quadrangle).
Figure 4. Overview of Port Royal Harbour Redevelopment Tract by areas of archaeological investigation (Areas A–D).
### 3.1.1 Site 38BU2260

**Cultural Affiliation:** Ceramic Late Archaic/Woodland; mid- to late 19th century/20th century  
**Site Type:** Pre-Contact ceramic scatter; Post-Contact industrial scatter  
**Overall Site Dimensions:** 285 meters N/S by 330 meters E/W  
**Soil Type:** Wando and Seabrook fine sands  
**Elevation:** 7 meters amsl  
**Nearest Water Source:** Battery Creek  
**Present Vegetation:** Mixed pine/hardwood; wetlands/saltwater  
**NRHP Status:** Potentially eligible

Cultural resources survey of the Port Royal Harbour Redevelopment Tract identified one new archaeological site (38BU2260). Project archaeologists were unable to excavate outside the tract boundaries; therefore, this site is delineated by 15th Street and Ritter Circle to the north, Edinburgh and Columbia avenues to the east, 13th Street to the South, and Battery Creek to the west. The site measures 285 meters north/south by 330 meters east/west, covering the area previously described as Area B. The site is located in a moderately wooded area and is bisected by a small path leading to the railroad easement corridor (see Figures 2-4 for the location of the railroad). We observed several live oak trees along the outskirts of the tract. The understory is dense along the roads and moderate closer to the wetland edge. In the eastern portion of the site, a thick coal lens was recorded at approximately 10–30 cm bs. Surface and sub-coal soil levels were very disturbed and indicate heavy use of this site during the modern era. Modern trash and fire pits were observed throughout this section of the tract (Figure 5). This disturbance continues to approximately 70–80 cm bs, mixed with and below the observed historic materials. Two consecutive negative shovel tests define the site boundaries. Site dimensions and shovel test locations are presented in Figure 6.

Two areas of surface-scattered materials, both Post-Contact, were noted during survey. One surface feature, located next to Provenience 52, appears to be a small collapsed wooden structure; nails, brick, and window glass were noted on the surface. The other collection of surface features is located in the far southeastern portion of the tract and consists of two toppled brick foundations (see Figure 5), one concrete slab, and a standing water pump station with associated electric block. Additionally, we observed one brick pile south and east of the footers.

### 3.1.2 Close-Interval Shovel Testing

Following initial survey of the Port Royal Harbour Redevelopment Tract, close-interval shovel testing at identified site 38BU2260 was proposed in order to gather additional data regarding Pre- and Post-Contact occupations at this location. Close-interval (7.5-meter-interval) shovel testing was conducted at 38BU2260 on January 7–10, 2008. An additional 434 shovel tests were excavated, 126 of which contained archaeological materials. Shovel test excavation techniques, dimensions, and noted soils were as recorded during initial survey investigations at this site.

### 3.1.3 Survey-Phase Artifacts

Survey investigations at 38BU2260 recovered a total of 659 identifiable artifacts. Pre-Contact diagnostic artifacts were concentrated in the middle portion of the site and can be attributed primarily to the Ceramic Late Archaic (2500–1500 BC) period, although two Deptford-series sherds from the Early/Middle Woodland (1000 BC–AD 700) period were also recovered. Plain, eroded, and residual Pre-Contact sherds; lithics; oyster shell (3.3 kg); and faunal remains (1.85 g) also were present. Ceramic Late Archaic artifacts were deeply buried (70–80 cm bs). Post-Contact artifacts were recovered from along the bluff edge and within the eastern portion of the tract. Limited recovery of artifacts tentatively dated to the Civil War (one Federal Navy button and one spent lead shot) were recovered within and adjacent to a borrow pit located along the bluff edge. The remaining Post-Contact artifacts are primarily industrial in origin. Diagnostic artifacts include mid- to late-nineteenth-century ceramics, bottle and window glass, two plastic buttons, one tin toy car, one lock plate, one cotter pin, one hanging hook, and numerous artifacts related to machinery and/or construction (spikes, screws, washers, nuts, etc.) or railroad maintenance (railroad spikes). Nondiagnostic artifacts include scatters of brick, mortar, slate, tin fragments, coal slag, unidentifiable iron fragments, and coal. All Post-Contact artifacts occurred within 0–80 cm bs of the present ground surface, with
Figure 5. Brick foundation (toppled), facing south (top), and depression and modern trash (chairs) within southeastern portion of tract (bottom).
Figure 6. Plan of survey and testing excavations conducted at 38BU2260.
The highest artifact recovery found from 20–40 cm bs. The artifacts recovered from shovel test investigations generated datasets that allowed us to plan the location of test units in areas of the site to investigate specific areas that appear to show distinct temporal differences between artifact groups and types.

Using Surfer 8 software, we mapped the distributions of prehistoric and historic ceramics, nails, oyster shell, coal, and Stallings sherds. Figures 7–9 present distribution maps showing artifact densities throughout 38BU2260. Figure 7 presents data for Pre-Contact occupations at 38BU2260, and Figures 8 and 9 present data for Post-Contact occupations of the site. These density maps revealed the locales with highest artifact density within the site. These data were used to determine placement of test units at 38BU2260.

3.2 RESULTS OF THE TESTING INVESTIGATIONS

After the results of the shovel-testing phase, we excavated 15 square meters (m²) to examine more closely the artifact densities and distributions at the site and to determine if cultural features are present. We excavated 20, 50-by-50-cm test units and five 1-by-1-meter test units (Test Units 201–205) across the site. The 50-by-50-cm units were placed within the areas of highest concentration of Pre-Contact artifacts. Ten 50-by-50-cm units (including Proveniences 359–367) were located within the southwestern portion of the site and adjacent to Test Unit 201; five 50-by-50-cm units (including Proveniences 350–353) were located adjacent to a shell locus identified within the northwestern portion of the site (near Test Unit 204). The final five 50-by-50-cm units (Proveniences 354–358) were located in a concentration of Pre-Contact artifacts located near Edinburgh Avenue (in the northeastern portion of the site).

Following excavation of 50-by-50-cm units, five 1-by-1-meter test units were placed to provide information regarding Pre- and Post-Contact occupations at 38BU2260. We excavated Unit 201 (Pre-Contact) and 202 (Post-Contact) in the southwestern portion of the site, Unit 203 (Post-Contact) and 204 (Pre-Contact) in the northwestern portion of the site, and Unit 205 in the Post-Contact concentration in the southeastern portion of the site (see Figures 10–14). All units were excavated in 10-cm levels within natural levels. No features were noted within any excavated test units. Table 1 shows the placement of units, and Table 2 shows unit soil types by strata.

3.2.1 Test Unit 201

Test Unit 201 was placed within the southwestern concentration of Ceramic Late Archaic artifacts (Stallings series) (see Figure 10). Level 1 consisted of a 10YR3/3 dark brown fine sandy loam (0–30 cm bs), followed by a 30–45 cm bs transition level of 10YR3/2 very dark grayish-brown sand mottled with 10YR4/6 dark yellowish-brown sand and 10YR5/6 yellowish-brown sand, with a 10YR5/6 (45–100 cm bs) yellowish-brown fine sandy loam subsoil below.

3.2.2 Test Unit 202

Test Unit 202 was located adjacent to a small scatter of building materials (brick, wood, and window glass) noted during survey investigations (see Figure 11). This scatter is presumed to represent the location of a prior standing structure. Stratigraphic levels were 10YR3/2 very dark grayish-brown sand (0–30 cm bs), 10YR3/4 dark yellowish-brown sand (30–50 cm bs), and 10YR5/8 yellowish-brown fine sand (50–100 cm bs).

3.2.3 Test Unit 203

Test Unit 203 was excavated within a concentration of Post-Contact artifacts. This concentration was the only location at 38BU2260 that produced sufficient counts of domestic artifacts (glass, ceramics, etc.) to suggest the presence of a nonindustrial structure (see Figure 12). Soils noted within this unit were 10YR2/2 dark gray-brown sandy loam (10–34 cm bs), 10YR4/3 brown sand (34–65 cm bs), 10YR7/1 light gray fine silty sand (65–95 cm bs), and 10YR8/1 white silty sand subsoil (95–100 cm bs).

3.2.4 Test Unit 204

Test Unit 204 was placed adjacent to a noted shell midden within the northwestern portion of the site (see Figure 13). The purpose of this test unit was to determine the association of this shell midden with Post-Contact, Late Archaic, or Woodland occupations at 38BU2260. Noted soils included 10YR3/3 dark brown
Figure 7. Distribution of Pre-Contact artifacts at 38BU2260.
Figure 8. Distribution of Post-Contact ceramics and glass at 38BU2260.
Figure 9. Distribution of Post-Contact brick, coal, and nails at 38BU2260.
Figure 10. Profile of Test Unit 201.
Figure 11. Profile of Test Unit 202.
Figure 12. Profile of Test Unit 203.
Figure 13. Profile of Test Unit 204.
Figure 14. Profile of Test Unit 205.
fine loamy sand mixed with dense shell (15–30 cm bs), 10YR4/6 dark yellowish-brown fine sandy loam (30–45 cm bs), and 10YR5/6 yellowish-brown sandy loam mottled with 10YR4/6 dark yellowish-brown sand and 10YR6/3 pale brown sand (45–60 cm bs). Subsequent soil levels included 10YR6/3 pale brown fine loamy sand (60–80 cm bs) and 10YR6/3 pale brown fine sandy loam mottled with 10YR5/8 yellowish-brown sand. Iron staining and concretions were present within the lowest stratigraphic level.

3.2.5 Test Unit 205
Test Unit 205 was excavated within a concentration of nails located slightly east of the structural surface features (brick foundations and concrete slab) (see Figure 14). A pump station, shown in Figure 15, is located southwest of Test Unit 205. Excavation of this unit attempted to identify subsurface features related to occupation of this structure during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Level 1 soils were 10YR4/3 brown sandy loam mixed with coal and cinder (8–25 cm bs) followed by 10YR6/6 yellowish-brown fine sand (25–100 cm bs).
3.2.6 Testing-Phase Artifacts

Rough counts of materials recovered during testing investigations at 38BU2260 account for an additional 275 identifiable artifacts. Distribution of artifacts by excavation area presents patterns of Pre- and Post-Contact use of this site. Artifacts recovered from Test Unit 201 and Proveniences 359–367 are predominantly associated with the late Archaic period. Artifacts include 37 sherds attributed to the Stallings phase, oyster shell (approximately 100 g), and limited amounts of lithic materials (split rock and heat-treated chert shatter). These artifacts were recovered from Levels 3–6 in the 50-by-50-cm units and Levels 6–8 in Test Unit 201. Post-Contact artifact recovery within this area included limited nails, brick, and one railroad spike. Artifacts recovered from Proveniences 354–358 are also associated with Late Archaic occupations at this site. Recovered artifacts include five sherds from the Stallings phase, located within Levels 4 and 5. Additional materials recovered from these units include whiteware, bottle glass, and oyster shell, all recovered from Levels 1–3. The Stallings-phase sherds are all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Type by Stratum</th>
<th>Test Unit 201</th>
<th>Test Unit 202</th>
<th>Test Unit 203</th>
<th>Test Unit 204</th>
<th>Test Unit 205</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stratum I</td>
<td>10YR3/3 dark brown fine sandy loam</td>
<td>10YR3/2 very dark grayish-brown sand</td>
<td>10YR2/2 dark gray-brown sandy loam</td>
<td>10YR3/3 dark brown fine sandy loam, mottled with dense shell</td>
<td>10YR4/3 brown sandy loam, mottled with coal and cinder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10YR3/2 very dark grayish-brown sand mottled with 10YR4/6 dark yellowish-brown sand and 10YR5/6 yellowish-brown sand</td>
<td>10YR3/4 dark yellowish-brown sand</td>
<td>10YR4/3 brown sand</td>
<td>10YR4/6 dark yellowish-brown fine sandy loam</td>
<td>10YR6/6 yellowish-brown fine sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratum II</td>
<td>10YR5/6 yellowish-brown fine sandy loam</td>
<td>10YR5/8 yellowish-brown fine sand</td>
<td>10YR7/1 light gray fine silty sand</td>
<td>10YR5/6 yellowish-brown sandy loam</td>
<td>10YR6/6 yellowish-brown fine sandy loam, mottled with 10YR4/6 dark yellowish-brown fine sandy loam and 10YR6/3 pale brown sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratum III</td>
<td>10YR8/1 white silty sand</td>
<td>10YR6/3 pale brown fine sandy loam</td>
<td></td>
<td>10YR6/3 pale brown fine sandy loam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratum IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10YR6/3 pale brown fine sandy loam, mottled with 10YR5/8 yellowish-brown sand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratum V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
plain, fiber-tempered wares, exhibiting some sooting on
the surface and abrasion marks (a result of forming and/
or polishing bone tools). One basal sherd, representing
a flat-bottomed bowl, was also recovered.

The placement of Test Units 202 and 205 was an
attempt to recover additional data regarding the
function of the observed structures within these
portions of the site. Artifacts recovered from Test
Unit 202 include 35 fragments of assorted bottle glass
(primarily clear, brown, or green), 18 nails, one window
hinge, one railroad spike, and one small pharmaceutical
bottle. All Post-Contact artifacts were recovered from
Levels 1–3. Levels 4 and 5 produced six Stallings-series
sherds, demonstrating a horizontal link between the
Stallings-phase artifacts recovered to the north and
south of this unit. Artifact recovery from Test Unit 205
was extremely limited and consisted of brick (~500 g),
three nails, and 11 fragments of brown bottle glass. The
absence of domestic artifacts within Test Units 202 and
205 suggests an industrial function for these structures.
This portion of the tract was owned by a succession of
railroad companies from 1867 to 1957. It is likely that
the identified surface features can be associated with
railroad-related activities.

Test Unit 203, also presumed to be associated primarily
with Post-Contact occupations, produced no Pre-
Contact artifacts. Recovered materials included seven
undecorated whiteware sherds, 27 nails, 64 fragments of
bottle glass (clear, green, and brown), one metal screw-
top jar lid, one jet jewelry stone, and two railroad spikes.
Approximately 250 g of brick fragments, 75 g of oyster
shell, and 20 g of faunal material were also identified.
This location is the only example of nonindustrial Post-
Contact artifact recovery within 38BU2260. Information
gathered from local inhabitants of this community
stated that a watchmaker’s residence was once located
on this tract. However, no archival evidence to support
the presence of a watchmaker’s residence at 38BU2260
has been found to date.

Proveniences 350–353 and Test Unit 204 were placed
to provide information about the observed shell midden
in this location. Proveniences 350 and 351 were located
next to Unit 204; Proveniences 352 and 353 were located
at the southern end of the shell midden. Not surprisingly,
artifact recovery from Test Unit 204 and Proveniences 350 and 351 consisted almost entirely of oyster shell (~4.5 kg). One residual sherd (sand tempered) and one cultural rock were recovered within Level 2. Additional artifacts include one piece of heat-treated chert shatter from Level 7. The lack of diagnostic artifacts makes it difficult to assign a temporal period to the observed shell midden. However, limited recovery of Woodland-era artifacts (Deptford phase) from this location during survey investigations and the presence of a single sand-tempered residual, partnered with the stratigraphic location of the shell (Levels 1–4), suggest an association with Woodland-period occupations of this site rather than Late Archaic. Proveniences 352 and 353 did not recover Pre-Contact materials; artifacts recovered include 11 fragments of bottle glass, 16 nails, and 250 g of brick. Therefore, these proveniences are more likely to be associated with occupations represented by Test Unit 203.

4.0 SUMMARY

Survey and testing investigations at 38BU2260 identified at least four different and distinct components of this site: two railroad-associated structures from the 1867–1957 period, a Ceramic Late Archaic occupation, a possible Woodland-period shell midden, and a late-nineteenth- to early-twentieth-century scatter, possibly interpreted as a watchmaker's residence. Surface structures noted within the southeastern and southwestern portions of the tract were investigated via test unit investigation (Test Units 202 and 205). No subsurface features were noted within these test units. Artifact recovery indicates a nondomestic function for the observed structures. The location of structures seems to indicate that they are associated with railroad activities on the tract. The southeastern portion of the tract exhibits heavy soil disturbance as a result of modern site use. Archival research will attempt to refine structure function based on documentary evidence. However, archaeological investigation is unlikely to provide further information related to railroad-era occupations at this location. Therefore, further investigation of these portions of the site is not warranted.

Archival research has yet to identify the presence of a domestic structure on this portion of the Port Royal Harbour Redevelopment Tract. Information gathered from local informants suggested the presence of a watchmaker's residence on the tract. Archival research will attempt to recover further information. Archaeological investigations noted a late-nineteenth- to early-twentieth-century scatter of domestic and nondomestic artifacts within the northwestern portion of the tract (around Test Unit 203). This area may be the location of a domestic occupation, although no structural elements were noted during survey and testing excavations. Further archaeological investigation of this portion of the site is not recommended.

Archaeological investigation noted a shell midden within the far northwestern portion of the site. Subsequent testing of this area attempted to assign a temporal association for the shell midden. Excavation of Test Unit 204 identified the shell midden from 15–30 cm bs. Limited recovery of Deptford-phase artifacts from the surrounding area may date this shell midden to the Woodland period. No diagnostic artifacts were identified from this test unit, and no solid association can be determined at this time. No Stallings-phase artifacts were recovered from within this area. Therefore, it seems likely that the shell midden is not associated with Late Archaic occupations at 38BU2260. The forthcoming draft report of investigations will attempt to refine interpretation of this portion of the site; however, further investigation of this shell midden is not recommended.

A total of 48 Stallings-phase sherds were recovered within the central portion of 38BU2260. The dimensions of this area are approximately 225 meters north/south by 45 meters east/west and include the railroad corridor. The presence of the railroad corridor accounts for some disturbance between the two major “pockets” of 15–20 Stallings-phase artifacts (between Provenience 367 and Test Unit 202 and between Provenience 24 and 89). The majority of recovered sherds are plain, although some exhibit sooting and abrasion marks. The presence of abraded sherds indicates that occupants of this site were producing and smoothing bone tools on site, although the low frequency of sherds suggests a limited occupation rather than a permanent or semipermanent one. Excavations identified no subsurface features or evidence of an occupation horizon associated with
a Late Archaic settlement at this site. Artifacts were clustered within Levels 3–6 within units and from 70–80 cm bs within shovel test excavations. Without evidence of soil horizons, it is difficult to interpret an identifiable occupation layer for the Late Archaic period at 38BU2260. Therefore, this portion of the site is unlikely to provide additional information about Late Archaic occupations at 38BU2260.

Survey and testing excavations of the Port Royal Harbour Redevelopment Tract are now complete. The kinds of materials recovered from the shovel tests and units throughout the site will provide information that will allow us to interpret the multifunctional occupations at 38BU2260. The Draft Technical Report will address the observed occupations in detail. Additional archaeological investigations of site 38BU2260 are unlikely to provide additional information regarding these occupations. Therefore, we recommend site 38BU2260 not eligible for the NRHP.
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