


APPENDIX J

Cultural Resource Survey Report and Coordination

Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of Approximately 12 Miles of Improvements Along I-85

Cherokee County, South Carolina



New South Associates, Inc.

Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of Approximately 12 Miles of Improvements Along I-85

Cherokee County, South Carolina

Report submitted to:

ICA Engineering, Inc. • 501 Huger Street • Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Report prepared by:

New South Associates, Inc. • 722-A Blanding Street • Columbia, South Carolina 29201

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Natalie Adams Pope". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Natalie" and last name "Pope" being more prominent than the middle name "Adams".

Natalie Adams Pope – Principal Investigator

Natalie Adams Pope – Archaeologist and Co-Author

Laura Kate Schnitzer – Archaeologist and Co-Author

Rebecca Shepherd – Archaeologist and Co-author

Patrick Sullivan – Historian and Co-Author

Katie Dykens – Historian and Co-Author

October 10, 2016 • **Draft Report**
New South Associates Technical Report 2589

ABSTRACT

New South Associates, Inc. was tasked with a cultural resources survey of approximately 12 miles of proposed improvements along I-85 in Cherokee County, South Carolina. The survey was conducted at the request of ICA Engineering as part of the South Carolina Department of Transportation's (SCDOT) plans to improve this section of highway.

During the survey, 22 architectural resources, two archaeological sites, and one isolated find were identified. One architectural resource, Resource U/21/0258, is recommended eligible for listing on the NRHP under Criterion C on the local level for its association with noted architect Louis H. Asbury and excellent integrity. Due to its location along the edge of the APE and beyond the extent of the project area, no effect to this resource is anticipated. All other resources are recommended not eligible.

Page Intentionally Left Blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF FIGURES	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
 I. INTRODUCTION.....	 1
 II. ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT	 5
 III. CULTURAL CONTEXT	 7
PREHISTORIC CONTEXT	7
Paleoindian Period	7
Archaic Period (9,900-3,000 B.P.).....	8
Woodland Period (3,000-800 B.P.).....	9
Mississippian Period (450 B.P.-A.D. 1000)	11
European Contact.....	11
HISTORIC CONTEXT	12
 IV. METHODS.....	 19
BACKGROUND RESEARCH.....	19
HISTORIC RESOURCE SURVEY METHODS	19
ARCHAEOLOGY METHODS	20
LABORATORY ANALYSIS AND CURATION	20
NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES (NRHP) EVALUATION	20
 V. SURVEY RESULTS	 23
ARCHITECTURAL SURVEY.....	23
415 Milliken/Frontage Road (U/21/0247 and U/21/0247.01)	24
137 Crawford Road (U/21/0248).....	28
980 Blacksburg Highway (U/21/0249 and U/21/0249.01)	30
316 Henson Road (U/21/0250, U/21/0250.01, and U/21/0250.02)	33
147 WhiteS Farm Road (U/21/0251).....	36
1123 Holly Grove Road (U/21/0252, U/21/0252.01, and U/21/0252.02)	38
653 Tribal Road (U/21/0253 and U/21/0253.01).....	41
569 Tribal Road (U/21/0254, U/21/0254.01, U/21/0254.02, and U/21/0254.03)	41
548 Tribal Road (U/21/0255).....	47
1137-1209 Holly Ridge Road (U/21/0256)	49
173 Mulberry Road (U/21/0257 and U/21/0257.01)	52
2509 East Cherokee Street (U/21/0258 and U/21/0258.01)	55
242 Lakeview Drive (U/21/0259).....	60
238 Lakeview Drive (U/21/0260).....	60

212 Lakeview Drive (U/21/0261).....	63
2618 E. Cherokee St/U.S. Highway 29 (U/21/0262).....	63
119 Lakeview Drive (U/21/0263).....	66
514 Tribal Road (U/21/0264).....	68
Sizemore Acres Ln (U/21/0265).....	68
109 Sizemore Acres Lane (U/21/0266)	71
1153 North Mountain Street (U/21/0267).....	73
Southern Railroad (U/21/0268).....	73
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY	77
Site 38CK199.....	77
Site 38CK200.....	79
Isolated Find.....	79
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	81
REFERENCES CITED	83
APPENDIX A: STATE SITE FORMS	

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.	Project Location Map.....	2
Figure 2.	Project Area Shown on the 1820 Moore Map.....	14
Figure 3.	Map of the Iron Ore and Limestone Regions of York and Spartanburg Districts.	15
Figure 4.	Location of Newly Identified Cultural Resources within the APE.....	25
Figure 5.	415 Milliken/Frontage Road (U/21/0247 and U/21/0247.01).....	26
Figure 6.	415 Milliken/Frontage Road (U/21/0247 and U/21/ 0247.01).....	27
Figure 7.	137 Crawford Road (U/21/0248)	29
Figure 8.	980 Blacksburg Highway (U/21/0249)	31
Figure 9.	Outbuilding at 980 Blacksburg Highway (U/21/0249.01), View to West.....	32
Figure 10.	316 Henson Road (U/21/0250)	34
Figure 11.	Outbuildings at 316 Henson Road (U/21/0250.01 and U/21/0250.02).....	35
Figure 12.	147 Whites Farm Road (U/21/0251).....	37
Figure 13.	1123 Holly Grove Road (U/21/0252)	39
Figure 14.	Outbuildings at 1123 Holly Grove Road (U/21/0252.01 and U/21/0252.02).....	40
Figure 15.	653 Tribal Road (U/21/0253).....	42
Figure 16.	653 Tribal Road (U/21/0253 and U/21/0253.01).....	43
Figure 17.	569 Tribal Road (U/21/0254).....	45
Figure 18.	Outbuildings at 569 Tribal Road (U/21/0254.01, U/21/ 0254.02, and U/21/0254.03)	46
Figure 19.	548 Tribal Road (U/21/0255).....	48
Figure 20.	Holly Ridge Road District (U/21/0256).....	50
Figure 21.	Holly Ridge Road District (U/21/0256).....	51
Figure 22.	173 Mulberry Road (U/21/0257)	53
Figure 23.	173 Mulberry Road (U/21/0257 and U/21/ 0257.01).....	54
Figure 24.	2509 East Cherokee Street (U/21/0258)	56
Figure 25.	2509 East Cherokee Street (U/21/0258 and U/21/0258.01).....	58
Figure 26.	242 Lakeview Drive (U/21/0259)	61
Figure 27.	238 Lakeview Drive (U/21/0260)	62
Figure 28.	212 Lakeview Drive (U/21/0261)	64
Figure 29.	2618 E. Cherokee Street/U.S. Highway 29 (U/21/0262)	65
Figure 30.	119 Lakeview Drive (U/21/0263)	67
Figure 31.	514 Tribal Road (U/21/0264).....	69
Figure 32.	Sizemore Acres Lane (U/21/0265).....	70
Figure 33.	109 Sizemore Acres Lane (U/21/0266).....	72
Figure 34.	1153 North Mountain Street (U/21/0267).....	74
Figure 35.	Map of Southern Railroad Passing Through the Project Area	75
Figure 36.	Southern Railroad (U/21/0268).....	76
Figure 37.	Site Map of 38CK199 and View of Partial Walls.....	78
Figure 38.	Site Map of 38CK200 and View of Chimney and Partial Walls	80

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Newly Identified Cultural Resources within the APE.....23

I. INTRODUCTION


New South Associates, Inc. conducted a cultural resources survey for proposed improvements along a section of I-85 in Cherokee County, South Carolina. Proposed improvements will begin from approximately one mile north of SC 18 (Exit 96) (near the Gaffney Ferry Road entrance slip ramp) to the South Carolina/North Carolina State Line (Figure 1). The project includes adding a travel lane in each direction, improving various interchanges and exit ramps, and replacing overpass bridges.

The study area corridor is measured 75 feet outside of the existing right-of-way along the mainline/frontage road, including the median. In addition, four interchanges were surveyed and are described below:

- Area around S-83 (Blacksburg Highway) interchange with I-85 will extend 2,100 feet west and 1,500 feet east from the center of the median of I-85 along S-83 and 2,300 feet south and 800 feet north from the centerline of S-83;
- Area around SC 5/198 (North Mountain Street) interchange with I-85 shall extend 3,200 feet west and 2,000 feet east of the center of the median of I-85 along SC 5/198 and 1,400 feet south and 3,000 feet south and 1,500 feet north from the centerline of SC 5/198;
- Area around S-99 (Tribal Road) interchange with I-85 shall extend 2,000 feet west and 2,000 feet east from the center of the median of I-85 along S-99 and 1,800 feet south and 2,400 feet north from the centerline of S-99; and
- Area around U.S. 29 (East Cherokee Street) interchange with I-85 shall extend 1,600 feet west and 2,300 feet east from the center of the median of I-85 and 300 feet south and 1,500 feet north from the centerline of U.S. 29.

The project's Area of Potential Effect (APE) is defined as 300 feet beyond the area of direct effects as described above, and as illustrated in Figure 1. It also includes the viewshed. The archaeological survey focused only on the area of direct effects while the architectural survey examined the entire APE. It should be noted that while the improvements cross the Broad River floodplain, road improvement plans do not expect any disturbance in the floodplain areas. Therefore, deep testing to locate any deposits beyond the reach of a shovel was not performed.

Figure 1.
Project Location Map



Source: USGS 7.5 Minute Topographic Quadrangle Map, Blacksburg, SC 1982

The project consisted of background research, archaeological field survey, historic resources survey, and assessment of all archaeological resources and buildings and structures over 50 years of age for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The survey was conducted in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended and in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation* and the *South Carolina Standards and Guidelines for Archaeological Research*. It also followed the South Carolina Department of Transportation's (SCDOT) on-call Scope of Services guidance.

Natalie Adams Pope served as Principal Investigator. Brad Botwick and Laura Kate Schnitzer served as Field Directors. Patrick Sullivan served as Architectural Historian. In September 2016 the project area was expanded and an additional survey was conducted. Rebecca Shepherd served as Field Director for the expansion. Katie Dykens served as Architectural Historian.

This report describes the objectives, methods, and results of this survey, and is organized into seven chapters, including this introduction. Chapter II reviews the environmental setting, while Chapter III discusses the cultural context. Survey methods are presented in Chapter IV. Results of the archaeology and historic resource surveys are provided in Chapter V, while conclusions and recommendations are presented in Chapter VI. State Site Forms are attached in Appendix A.

Page Intentionally Left Blank

II. ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT

The South Carolina Piedmont slopes gradually eastward from the foot of the mountains to the Fall Line, which marks the inner boundary of the Coastal Plain. The typical topography is a series of gently rolling areas interrupted by steeper valleys of larger creeks. There are relatively few sharp breaks in the topography of the lower Piedmont except along major river valleys. Numerous small streams that drain into these rivers interweave these ridges and valleys (Barry 1980:57).

The project area lies in the Inner Piedmont geologic belt. The Inner Piedmont belt is composed of highly metamorphosed gneisses, schists, amphibolites, and some ultramafic bodies containing dunite and peridotite. Because of the uplift experienced by the inner Piedmont belt is estimated to have been from 8-15 miles, granite that formed miles underground has been brought into view at the surface. Both Caesar's Head and Table Rock are plutons that have been exposed in this belt (Murphy 1995:54; Plate 2). Topography in the area consists primarily of rolling hills, while flat areas occur along the Broad River and Buffalo Creek floodplains. Elevations range from 550 feet above mean sea level (amsl) in the Broad River floodplain to 880 feet amsl near the state line.

Only within the last few decades have local soils received proper attention after years of poor management and exploitative land use. Continuous row cropping removed the nutrients and resulted in severe erosion during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. By the 1930s, the South Carolina Piedmont was one of the most severely eroded areas in the United States, with large tracts rendered unsuitable for cultivation (Kovacik and Winberry 1987:40). Trimble (1974) stated that 200 years of agriculture have had a profound effect on the Piedmont. He suggested that over a foot of soil has been lost in much of the area over the past hundred years. In 1934, Lowry (1934) found most of the Piedmont area to be characterized by moderate sheet erosion and occasional gullies, although a few areas were found to have severe sheet erosion.

Piedmont soils are dominantly Ultisols, but there are scattered occurrences of Alfisols. Both have clayey subsoils, but Alfisols are brownish to reddish in color and normally have higher concentrations of calcium, magnesium, potassium, and other minerals. The Piedmont topography provides for good surface drainage, but internal soil drainage is poor because the Ultisols and Alfisols have a compact and clayey texture. Therefore, rainfall does not readily percolate through the soil and runoff potential is considerable, creating a high risk of erosion. The Alfisols are considered adequate for field crops in some areas. Most of the Piedmont, however, is now devoted to pasture or forest (Kovacik and Winberry 1987:41).

West of the Broad River, soils in the project area are part of the Tatum Association, while those east of the river are part of the Cecil-Madison Association. Soils in the floodplain are classified as Mixed Alluvial Lands. In the Tatum Association, Tatum soils make up about 70 percent of the area, while Nason and Manteo soils make up 10 percent each. Other minor soils types make up the remaining soils. In the Cecil-Madison Association, Cecil soils consist of 43 percent of the area, while Madison soils make up 32 percent. Appling soils consist of seven percent and six percent is Mixed Alluvial Land. Within the area classified as Mixed Alluvial Lands, soils that are not mixed include Congaree (11 percent), Wickham (7 percent), Chewalcla (6 percent), and other more minor types (Jones 1962:4–8).

The Broad River intersects the project area near its western end. More than 95 percent of Cherokee County is drained by this river and its branches (Jones 1962:1). The river originates in the mountains of Buncombe County, North Carolina and flows south-southeasterly until it merges with the Saluda River to form the Congaree River near Columbia, South Carolina. The Congaree River merges with the Santee River at the south end of Richland County, where it forms the Santee River that drains into the Atlantic Ocean. Buffalo Creek is the only named creek that intersects the project area. It parallels the corridor east of the Broad River and crosses it just east of Highway 5.

The climate of the Piedmont is temperate. The winters are mild and summers are warm. Weather in the fall, winter, and spring is controlled largely by the west to east movement of fronts, cyclones, and air masses. Air mass exchanges are infrequent in the summer, and maritime tropical air persists in the area for extended periods. Although rainfall is ample, the vicinity of the project area is one of the comparatively dry areas of the state, with about 48 inches of rain annually (Jones 1962:2).

Today, the Piedmont forests generally belong to the Oak-Hickory formation (Braun 1950). However, a high degree of habitat diversity in relation to water and soil composition has led to the recognition of several general community types. The most characteristic association is the white oak-black oak-red oak association. Associated species vary from hickory, loblolly and shortleaf pine, black gum to sweet gum. Understory vegetation consists of saplings, as well as flowering dogwoods and sourwoods.

River tributaries, and small streams subject to occasional flooding, are dominated by beech, ash, hickories, and birch, with willow oaks, redbud, hophornbeam, and muscledwood as understory. There is often a narrow band along the water's edge that consists of willows and alders. Where alluvial soils have been deposited, the vegetation is similar to floodplains of the Coastal Plain, though not as extensive. Dominants are sweet gum, water oak, and white ash with various pines occasionally intermixed. Tulip poplars may dominate in slightly drier areas. Understory and smaller trees are red maple, box elder, papaw, and spicebush (Barry 1980:57–61).

III. CULTURAL CONTEXT

PREHISTORIC CONTEXT

PALEOINDIAN PERIOD

The earliest human occupation in the region is referred to as the Paleoindian period. Although the date of the earliest occupation has not been fully resolved, and is still a matter of spirited debate, archaeological evidence suggests an occupation date range from approximately 12,000 to over 50,000 B.P. (Adovasio et al. 1977; Goodyear 2005). This is archaeologically expressed by the presence of fluted and unfluted lanceolate projectile points, such as: Clovis, Suwannee/Simpson, and Dalton; side scrapers; end scrapers; and drills (Coe 1952; Michie 1977; Goodyear 1982). The Clovis occupation in the Southeast is believed to span 11,500-11,000 B.P. In the 500 years that followed, the Clovis was replaced by smaller fluted points and unfluted lanceolates, such as the Simpson and Suwanee types. The last phase to represent Paleoindian occupation is the Dalton horizon, dating to the period 10,500-9,900 B.P. (Goodyear 1982). Most of the reported Paleoindian sites consist of surficial finds of lanceolate points, with very few having any well-preserved contexts.

The traditional view of Paleoindian settlement posits a highly mobile strategy affiliated with the exploitation of megafauna, a view that persists into some current models of settlement. However, Anderson et al. (1994) proposed that Paleoindian colonists found key areas and used them as "staging areas" for subsequent population expansion. While evidence for the exploitation of Pleistocene megafauna in South Carolina has been documented (Goodyear et al. 1989), it is unclear just how dependent Paleoindians were on these resources.

The possible existence of a pre-Paleoindian (or pre-Clovis) horizon in the New World has been a hotly debated topic for some time. The uneasy consensus among North American archeologists is that the initial human colonization of the continent started not long before 13,000 B.P., and was accomplished by Paleoindian populations manufacturing fluted projectile points of the Clovis style (Anderson 1990; Haynes 1980; Haynes et al. 1984; Kelly and Todd 1988).

Albert Goodyear of the University of South Carolina has reported a pre-Clovis assemblage at the Topper site located along the middle Savannah River Valley near Aiken, South Carolina. Radiocarbon dates of more than 50,000 B.P. were obtained from a possible hearth area. If the dates are correct and are associated with human occupation, then the site provides evidence that

destroys the previously held belief that humans first inhabited this portion of North America around 13,000 B.P. Excavations below a Clovis layer, through a red paleosol zone exposed white Pleistocene alluvial sands, which are believed to be the normal pre-Clovis zone for Topper. This was excavated down to the Pleistocene terrace. Within this layer, small flakes, some with bend break fractures, were recovered. These are believed to be pre-Clovis chert processing piles. In one area of the site, six chert artifacts (small blades, endscraper, and sidescrapers) were found around a large boulder that had been used as an anvil (Goodyear 2005).

ARCHAIC PERIOD (9,900-3,000 B.P)

The Early Archaic period (9,900-8,000 B.P.) is typically regarded as an adaptation to post-Pleistocene environmental warming (Griffin 1967; Smith 1986). As opposed to the forms present during the Paleoindian period, Early Archaic points are notched. Sites during this period are defined by the presence of Taylor side-notched points, Palmer/Kirk corner-notched, and bifurcate forms (Coe 1964; Chapman 1985; Michie 1977; Goodyear et al. 1979). These point types are much more abundant than the previously discussed Paleoindian types, indicating that an extensive regional Native American population was in place by the tenth millennium B.P.

Based on research conducted at two sites in North Carolina's Haw River Valley, Claggett and Cable (1982) proposed that changes in technology from the Paleoindian to the Early Archaic reflect changes in settlement organization in response to post-Pleistocene warming. They argued that the resource structure would have become increasingly homogeneous throughout the Early Archaic. The settlement strategy emphasized residential mobility rather than logistic mobility, which would be manifested in an increase in expedient tools or situational technology. Supporting data for this model were later corroborated by Anderson and Schuldenrein (1983), who examined Early Archaic assemblages from various areas of the South Atlantic Slope.

The Middle Archaic period (8,000-5,000 B.P.) is characterized by stemmed points, including Kirk Stemmed, Stanly, Morrow Mountain, and the lanceolate Guilford. Typically, the Morrow Mountain and Guilford types are better represented in the South Carolina record. Sassaman (1983) suggested that Middle Archaic people were very mobile, perhaps moving residences every few weeks, which fits Binford's (1980) definition of a foraging society. Binford proposed that foragers had high levels of residential mobility, moving camps often to take advantage of dispersed, but similar resource patches. He believed that differences in environmental structure could be traced to large-scale climatic factors and further noted that a collector system could arise under any condition that limited the ability of hunter-gatherers to relocate residences. During his work in the Haw River area of North Carolina, Cable (1982) argued that postglacial warming at the end of the Pleistocene led to increased vegetational homogeneity, which

encouraged foraging. Sassaman's (1983) "Adaptive Flexibility" model suggests that this homogeneity allowed for a high degree of social flexibility, enabling them to pick up and move when needed. This mobility did not allow them to transport much material, and this alleviated the need for elaborate or specialized tools to procure and process resources at locations far from camp.

The Late Archaic period (5,000-3,000 B.P.) has been described as a time of increased settlement permanence, population growth, subsistence intensification, and technological innovation (Smith 1986). The Savannah River Stemmed projectile point characterizes the period, as well as the technological development of fiber-tempered pottery known as Stallings (Stoltman 1974). Stallings pottery (5,000-3,100 B.P.) and the later sand tempered Thom's Creek series (4,000-2,900 B.P.), which share many formal and stylistic similarities, have a great deal of chronological overlap. The first use of freshwater shellfish in the region corresponds with the development of fiber-tempered pottery in the Coastal Plain (about 4,500 B.P.); however, shellfish procurement and pottery use did not occur above the Fall Line until after 3,700 B.P.—and fresh-water shell midden sites are only found in the Savannah River Valley. Piedmont and Fall Line inhabitants used soapstone cooking tools (heating stones, and later, bowls), which explains the late adoption of pottery (Sassaman 1993; Sassaman et al. 1990). No fiber-tempered pottery has been found northwest of Columbia (Benson 2006).

WOODLAND PERIOD (3,000-800 B.P.)

The Woodland period in central South Carolina and surrounding regions spans the time interval between 3,000 and 800 B.P. and is divided into "Early" (3,000-2,600 B.P.), "Middle" (2,600-1,200 B.P.), and "Late" (1,200-800 B.P.) sub periods. In most regions of the Southeast, the Late Archaic-Woodland transition is seen as encompassing continuity with patterns of sedentism intensification gradually building in magnitude (Steponaitis 1986:378–379). These patterns consisted of an increased emphasis on gardening and exploitation of seeds, greater adjustments toward sedentary life ways, and elaboration on mortuary ritual and political control.

Perhaps the most significant development distinguishing the early portion of the Woodland period from the Late Archaic is the full-blown emergence of what has been referred to as the Eastern Agricultural Complex. This complex was composed of indigenous species of seed-producing commensal weeds including sunflower, sump weed, goosefoot, may grass, knot weed, small barley, and giant ragweed. The former three exhibit signs of domestication by the terminal phases of the Late Archaic, while the others appear to have been intentionally transported and cultivated in Late Archaic and Woodland contexts. Bottle gourd and squash represented very early Mexican introductions and along with the Eastern seed complex, formed the basis of the

Early Woodland gardening subsystem. Maize was a relatively late entrant into the eastern Woodland groups, with an initial date of appearance of about 1,700 B.P. (Yarnell and Black 1985).

Large triangular projectile points exhibiting concave bases including Badin Crude Triangular, Yadkin Large Triangular, Transylvania Triangular, and Garden Creek Triangular (Coe 1964; Keel 1976; Wauchope 1966) styles are diagnostic of the Woodland period, as are smaller square-stemmed styles including Swannanoa Stemmed, Plott Short Stemmed, or Gypsy Stemmed (Keel 1976; Oliver 1985).

Ceramic types of the Woodland Period are not well understood in the project area. In general, Early and Middle Woodland styles of the Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina Piedmont include Kellogg, Dunlap, Deptford/Cartersville, and Badin/Yadkin series (Anderson and Joseph 1988; Trinkley 1989; Wauchope 1966). According to Anderson and Joseph (1988:708), “virtually nothing is currently known about the Early Woodland period in the South Carolina piedmont, although a continuation of typical coastal plain sequences has been documented as far inland as the fall line.”

The Middle Woodland period is characterized by an intensification of long-distance trade. Horticulture is thought to have assumed increasing importance, and the cultivation of maize may have been initiated at this time, although it did not gain prominence until the subsequent Late Woodland and Mississippian periods. Ceramic artifacts dating to this period include Connestee ceramics, which can be identified by their thin-walled vessels that have a fine sandy paste and plain, simple stamped, or brushed surface treatments (Keel 1976). Also found during this period is the Yadkin series of the North Carolina Piedmont, which include coarse sand- or crushed quartz-tempered cord- and fabric impressed surface treatments, as well as check-stamped ceramics (Coe 1964).

Late Woodland occupations are marked by increasing sedentism and improvements in food storage and preparation technologies and the development of complex tribal and chiefdom level political forms. Throughout much of the Piedmont, the Late Woodland period marks the later stages of the Yadkin-Uwharrie sequence proposed by Coe (1964). Uwharrie ceramics include Plain, Brushed, Cord-Marked, Net-Impressed, Fabric- Impressed, Simple-Stamped, and Curvilinear Complicated-Stamped types and are tempered with sand, quartz, and sometimes other crushed mineral inclusions. Anderson and Joseph (1988:246) suggest that at least in the upper Savannah River drainage, Cartersville and Connestee ceramics may extend later in time than previously thought, which may account for the paucity of identified Late Woodland sites in the area of the state.

MISSISSIPPIAN PERIOD (450 B.P.-A.D. 1000)

Sometime between about A.D. 1100 and 1200, local ceramic assemblages in western and central North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia begin to show evidence of participation in the South Appalachian Mississippian tradition (Ferguson 1971). The initial phase of "Mississippianization," the Savannah phase, extended over a large geographical area including southeastern Tennessee, western and south-central North Carolina, and most of South Carolina and Georgia. Throughout this area, ceramic assemblages are linked together by a distinctive style of complicated stamped pottery generically described as Savannah Complicated Stamped. Design styles of this type tend to vary somewhat between localities.

Central and northern South Carolina has never been adequately interpreted within this framework. On the central coast, the associated culture or style has been referred to as Jeremy or Jeremy-Pee Dee to emphasize its similarities with the Pee Dee variant of south-central North Carolina (Anderson 1982; Cable et al. 1991; Trinkley 1980). It is probable that a closer fit will someday be made with the Mississippian assemblages of the Wateree (Mulberry Mound) and Upper Santee (Scotts Lake) valleys (DePratter and Judge 1986).

The Wateree sequence is still developing, but it provides at least an outline of ceramic patterns in the central interior region of South Carolina during the Mississippian period. DePratter and Judge (1986) have organized the material from Mulberry Mound into five ceramic phases based on variation in rim decoration. The earliest phases, the Belmont Neck and Adamson phases, seem to contain ceramics more typical Savannah types, while the following Town Creek phase ceramics at Mulberry represents a transitional Savannah-Irene or Lamar phase. The Mulberry phase correlates with early-to-middle Lamar period. John Cable examined a collection of ceramic from the Wateree Mound complex in 1998 and concluded that more work was necessary to refine the chronology. Since the Mulberry Mound Site has been correlated fairly firmly with the DeSoto town of Cofitachequi, it can be assumed that the Mulberry phase ceramics associate with the Protohistoric period.

EUROPEAN CONTACT

The town and chiefdom of Cofitachequi is located on the Wateree River near the present town of Camden. Hernando de Soto visited this chiefdom in 1540, but members of the 1526 Ayllon expedition might have preceded him (Swanton 1922:31). Juan Pardo and his forces visited the town in 1566. Two years later, Pardo established a small fort there, which was overrun by local Indians that same year. Another small Spanish expedition traveled through the area in 1627-1628, and the only Indian place name mentioned is Cofitachequi (DePratter 1989).

In 1670, Henry Woodward trekked from newly established Charleston to Cofitachequi in an effort to seek peace with the chiefs he encountered on the way. Woodward referred to the Cofitachequi chief as "emperor", and there were reported to be 1,000 bowmen at his disposal. Woodward convinced the emperor to visit Charles Town, which he did in September of that year. He again visited the English settlement two years later (Cheves 1897:194, 201, 388). Only one other reference to Cofitachequi has been found that postdates 1672. That reference, which dates to 1681, only mentions the town in passing (DePratter 1989). When John Lawton passed through the Cofitachequi area in the early 1700s, he made no mention of the place. At that time, the local occupants consisted of a new group of people known as the Congarees (Lawson 1709:34).

The Congarees took part in the disastrous Yamassee War of 1715, after which over half of them were captured and sent to the West Indies as slaves (Swanton 1946:93). The others retreated westward and were subsumed under the Catawba Nation, then situated along the Catawba River and its tributaries near present day Fort Mill. After this point, the Catawba Nation occupied an area along the Catawba River from about Twelve Mile Creek to the south up to an area just above Nations Ford. Settlement also strung along the lower reaches of Sugar Creek in North Carolina (Baker 1975). This area is located approximately 40 miles east of the project area.

Moore (2002) discussed at length the similarities between Mississippian Lamar ceramic traditions and those of the early Catawba, which suggests a continuity in development. Early Spanish expeditions in the sixteenth-century encountered complex chiefdoms throughout western North Carolina, and it is possible that these groups were directly related to ethnohistoric accounts of the Catawba Indians.

HISTORIC CONTEXT

The current state of South Carolina is only a fraction of its original size. Began as the province of Carolina in 1665, the area was granted by King Charles II of England to the Lords Proprietors. At that time, Carolina covered a land area stretching from the just above present-day Daytona Beach, Florida up to the southern border of the Virginia, and in an extremely vast east-west direction from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean (Edgar 1998:1). In 1729, North and South Carolina became separate British colonies. However, the location of the dividing line remained in dispute for a number of years. Early South Carolina records refer to the area as Craven County, while North Carolina records designate the area as being either Mecklenburg or Tryon County.

While the county was eventually named for the Cherokee Indians in 1897, this area of South Carolina represented the hunting grounds of both the Cherokee and Catawba Indians. The first European settlers in what is now known as Cherokee County were Scots-Irish Presbyterians.

Rising rent and land prices in Pennsylvania drove them southward down the Great Wagon Road, and they began arriving in the Upcountry during the 1740s and settled in present-area during the 1750s (Moss 1972:269–271).


During the Revolutionary War, families throughout the piedmont region of South Carolina were strongly divided in opinion regarding independence or loyalty to England. A number of skirmish and battles took place in the backcountry. Closest to the project area is Kings Mountain, which is located approximately seven miles to the southeast. The South Carolina backcountry became a Patriot stronghold after the defeat of Major Patrick Ferguson and the destruction or capture of his entire military force in northern York County at the Battle of Kings Mountain in October of 1780 (Swisher 2007). In Cherokee County, the battle of Cowpens (January 17, 1781) was an important victory for revolutionary forces. There, Brigadier General Daniel Morgan won a decisive victory over British Colonel Banastre Tarleton. The victory was considered a turning point in the recapture of South Carolina from the British.

In 1785, what is now Cherokee County, included part of newly formed districts called Spartanburg, Union, and York. The bulk of the project area is located in what was York District, while the area west of the Broad River was part of Union District. After the war, South Carolina Piedmont relied heavily on the production of cotton after the invention of the cotton gin by Eli Whitney in 1793. In 1810 the York District had increased in population to more than 10,000, of which over 3,000 were slaves.

The Moore map of 1820 shows the project area at that time (Mills 1980). I-85 crosses the Broad River between Buffalo Creek and a ferry crossing. That ferry crossing appears to be located where SC 18 crosses the river. Dare's Ferry is shown below Buffalo Creek and appears to be located near where the Southern Railroad crosses the river. No other features are shown (Figure 2).


Iron making was also an important endeavor in this area at the end of the Colonial area and into the nineteenth century. By 1856, eight furnaces were operating in the upper Piedmont. Four were located in the "Old Iron District" of Spartanburg and located on the Broad River near Blacksburg. These furnaces were small and unsophisticated and they relied on local and limited iron deposits. They did not operate much beyond the end of the Civil War because the railroads provided better and cheaper access to iron from northern foundries (Kovacik and Winberry 1987:98–99). Figure 3 shows the location of iron ore and limestone deposits mapped in the area by M. Tuomey in 1848. While the project area is located just outside of these deposits, it is likely this industry had an effect on the people that lived in that area.

Figure 2.
Project Area Map Shown on the 1820 Moore Map



Source: Mills Atlas of South Carolina, 1825; Reprinted 1980

Figure 3.



Source: Tuomey 1848

By 1850, York District included 15,000 residents, over 40 percent of who were slaves. On the eve of the Civil War, the county's population had grown to approximately 21,500, with almost half of the population enslaved labor, most involved in the production of cotton. While not as intensively grown as elsewhere in the piedmont, by 1860 York County was producing between 0.40 and 0.60 bales per capita on relatively small farms less than 400 acres in size (Kovacik and Winberry 1987:100–102). Only one minor battle was fought in the York District, the battle for the Catawba Bridge at Nations Ford in 1865.

The years after the Civil War were difficult for the residents of the area. Besides the task of rebuilding all that had been destroyed or neglected during the time of war, most planters and farmers had to establish new agricultural practices as a result of Reconstruction. Wage labor was the only avenue open to free blacks immediately after the Civil War, and it continued to be one way of making a living farming through the twentieth century. The former slaves were still overseen by white or black foremen and continued to work in groups known as “squads.” While the plantation settlement system continued to be nucleated, the “squad system” did require some modification of settlement since the laborers were divided into semiautonomous groups. These groups were often extended families of 2-10 workers who often occupied settlements close to agricultural fields (Orser et al. 1987). Former slaves were not fond of this arrangement since it was not significantly different than the labor arrangement they had while enslaved.

Sharecropping, where laborers receive half of a crop in return for their labor, developed quickly after the war and might have been the most widespread type of tenancy practiced. Other types of tenancy developed in which a tenant provided work, stock, and tools thus garnering a larger share of the crop than a traditional sharecropper might. In another scenario, a tenant could rent land and pay his rent in cash or produce. As sharecropping and share renting became more common, the spatial organization of plantations changed to more dispersed settlements. Labor arrangements are described in detail below. In instances where the tenant only provided labor, it is likely settlements were located in proximity to the plantation’s core where work animals and tools were located. The greater contribution provided by the tenant (labor, tools, animals, etc.), the more likely that settlements would be dispersed and more autonomous (Prunty 1955).

Cherokee County was formed from parts of Spartanburg, Union, and York counties in 1897 with Gaffney as its county seat. By the beginning of the twentieth century, Cherokee County was averaging 11,932 bales of cotton per year. By 1907, there were three cotton seed oil mills located in Blacksburg, Gaffney, and Wilkinsville. At this time, they also had six cotton mills – four in Gaffney, one in Blacksburg, and one in Cherokee Falls (Watson 1908).

Peach production has been an important part of Cherokee County's history, particularly after the introduction of the railroad when peaches could be shipped long distances. The production of peaches softened the blow of the Depression and its aftermath. In 1910, 1,572 bushels were produced and by 1930 6,000 bushels were produced. Construction of I-85 through Cherokee County began in 1959. With the growth of the interstate system throughout the region in the 1960s, efforts were made to diversify the economy. While the textile industry continued to grow, new industries developed including trucking, food processing, industrial metalwork, truck and dairy farming, and woodworking (Roots and Recall 2016).

Page Intentionally Left Blank

IV. METHODS

BACKGROUND RESEARCH

Background research was performed in order to identify previously recorded cultural resources in the vicinity of the APE and to develop a general cultural and historical overview to properly evaluate resources evaluated during the field survey.

New South Associates reviewed Archsite, the digital site files and GIS database maintained by South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology (SCIAA) and the South Carolina Department of Archives and History (SCDAH) to identify previously recorded resources or those listed on, or eligible for listing on, the NRHP within the APE. In addition, historic maps were reviewed to determine the location of potential historic resources and to develop a general view of the development of the area over time. Cultural Resource survey and evaluation reports were reviewed as needed, and secondary history books concerning the Cherokee County area were also consulted.

HISTORIC RESOURCE SURVEY METHODS

The architectural historian conducted a survey of the entire APE. Any building, structure, or cemetery greater than 50 years of age within the APE was documented onto South Carolina State Survey Forms, photographed, and assessed for its NRHP eligibility. The goal of the Phase I survey was to identify and assess all resources constructed prior to 1965 within the APE, which is the area of direct effect and the viewshed. These resources were identified and surveyed in accordance with the South Carolina State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) *Survey Manual: South Carolina Statewide Survey of Historic Places* (South Carolina Department of Archives and History 2013a) and each was digitally photographed.

Due to the presence of mid- to late twentieth-century residences located within the APE, the surveyor followed the May 2013 SHPO document *Guidelines for Surveying Post-World War II Neighborhoods and Residences* (South Carolina Department of Archives and History 2013b), in addition to the SHPO *Survey Manual*. Much of the residential architecture in the project area was constructed during the post-World War II era and includes Minimum Traditional and Ranch House types. Some properties have reached the 50-year threshold for eligibility while others are just under 50 years of age. Per the SHPO guidelines, Minimal Traditional and Ranch House types constructed after World War II identified in groups of five or less, and not found to be excellent examples of the building type or architectural style, were not photographed or recorded on a survey card.

ARCHAEOLOGY METHODS

A four-person crew, including the project archaeologist and three field assistants, conducted the survey. The survey was accomplished using the standards outlined in the *South Carolina Standards and Guidelines for Archaeological Investigations (Council of South Carolina Professional Archaeologists et al. 2013)*. All areas were surveyed using 30-meter interval tests. Shovel tests were excavated when there was no surface exposure. Areas with surface exposure were eroded to red clay subsoil and were only visually examined. Each shovel test was approximately 30 centimeters in size and excavated until cultural sterile subsoil was encountered. Soils were screened through 0.25-inch mesh hardware cloth to ensure systematic artifact recovery. When sites were encountered, shovel tests were excavated at 10-meter intervals in a grid pattern until two sterile shovel tests or wetlands were reached in order to establish site size and better understand site structure. Wet and inundated survey areas were not shovel tested. For the purposes of this survey an archaeological site was defined as an area yielding three or more historic or prehistoric artifacts within a 30-meter radius and/or an area with visible or historically recorded cultural features (e.g., shell middens, cemeteries, chimney falls, brick walls, piers, earthworks, etc.). An isolated find was defined as no more than two historic or prehistoric artifacts found within a 30-meter radius.

Field notes were maintained for all shovel tests excavated. When artifacts were found, they were bagged by provenience. A water resistant identification tag was placed, along with the artifacts, in a clean plastic bag. A sketch map was made for each find, showing the locations of positive and negative shovel tests, landscape, and cultural features.

LABORATORY ANALYSIS AND CURATION

All recovered artifacts were transported to the Stone Mountain, Georgia laboratory facilities of New South Associates, where they were washed, cataloged, and analyzed. Analysis included cleaning, identifying, cataloging, and curation preparation. Distinct provenience numbers were assigned to each shovel test and surface collection point. Artifacts from each provenience were divided by class and type, and assigned a catalog number.

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES (NRHP) EVALUATION

Cultural resources are evaluated based on criteria for NRHP eligibility specified in the Department of Interior Regulations 36 CFR Part 60: National Register of Historic Places. Cultural resources can be defined as significant if they “possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association,” and if they are 50 years of age or older and:

- A) are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad pattern of history;
- B) are associated with the lives of persons significant in the past;
- C) embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master, possess high artistic values, or represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or,
- D) have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Criteria A, B and C are usually applied to architectural resources. Archaeological sites are generally evaluated relative to Criterion D. In order to evaluate a resource under Criterion D, the *National Register Bulletin Guidelines for Evaluation and Registering Archeological Properties* (Little et al. 2000) lists five primary steps to follow:

1. Identify the property's data set(s) or categories of archaeological, historical, or ecological information;
2. Identify the historic context(s), that is, the appropriate historical and archaeological framework in which to evaluate the property;
3. Identify the important research question(s) that the property's data sets can be expected to address;
4. Taking archaeological integrity into consideration, evaluate the data sets in terms of their potential and known ability to answer research questions; and
5. Identify the important information that an archaeological study of the property has yielded or is likely to yield.

Page Intentionally Left Blank

V. SURVEY RESULTS

Twenty-two architectural resources, two archaeological sites, and one isolated archaeological find were identified during the survey. They are discussed in detail below.

ARCHITECTURAL SURVEY

Despite the presence of the heavily traveled interstate in the area, the APE along I-85 between unincorporated Blacksburg, South Carolina and the North Carolina state border retains a rural character in most areas that is punctuated by late twentieth-century automobile-oriented development along the roads near or at the highway exits. Background research for previously recorded resources was conducted using the Archsite GIS database available from SCIAA and SCDAH. No previously recorded architectural resources were identified within the APE or within a 0.5-mile radius of the APE. A total of 12 newly identified resources greater than 50 years of age and located within the project APE were surveyed and evaluated for NRHP eligibility (Figure 4, Table 1).

Table 1. Newly Identified Cultural Resources within the APE


Site No.	Address	Historic Name	Historic Use	Build Date	NRHP Eligibility
Blacksburg South Quadrangle (no. 40)					
0247	415 Milliken/Frontage Road	Broad River Truck Stop	Commercial/restaurant	c.1965	Not Eligible
0247.01	415 Milliken/Frontage Road	Broad River Truck Stop	Commercial/gas station	c.1965	Not Eligible
Blacksburg North Quadrangle (no. 41)					
0248	137 Crawford Road		Residential	c.1900	Not Eligible
0249	980 Blacksburg Highway		Residential	c.1950	Not Eligible
0249.01	980 Blacksburg Highway		Outbuilding/shed	c.1950	Not Eligible
0250	316 Henson Road		Residential	c.1930	Not Eligible
0250.01	316 Henson Road		Outbuilding/well house	c.1950	Not Eligible
0250.02	316 Henson Road		Outbuilding/shed	c.1950	Not Eligible
0251	147 Whites Farm Road	Thomas, Neely and Minerva, house	Residential	c.1900	Not Eligible
0265	Sizemore Acres Lane		Residential	c. 1965	Not Eligible
0266	109 Sizemore Acres Lane		Residential	c. 1965	Not Eligible
0267	1153 North Mountain Street		Residential	c.1890	Not Eligible
Grover Quadrangle (no. 211)					
0252	1123 Holly Grove Road		Residential	c.1940	Not Eligible

Table 1. Newly Identified Cultural Resources within the APE

Site No.	Address	Historic Name	Historic Use	Build Date	NRHP Eligibility
0252.01	1123 Holly Grove Road		Outbuilding/well house	c.1960	Not Eligible
0252.02	1123 Holly Grove Road		Outbuilding/shed	c.1960	Not Eligible
0253	653 Tribal Road		Residential	c.1900	Not Eligible
0253.01	653 Tribal Road		Outbuilding/shed	c.1940	Not Eligible
0254	569 Tribal Road		Residential	c.1890	Not Eligible
0254.01	569 Tribal Road		Outbuilding/shed	c.1940	Not Eligible
0254.02	569 Tribal Road		Outbuilding/shed	c.1940	Not Eligible
0254.03	569 Tribal Road		Outbuilding/barn	c.1940	Not Eligible
0255	548 Tribal Road		Residential	c.1950	Not Eligible
0256	1137-1209 Holly Ridge Road		Residential District	c.1950-1965	No Eligible
0257	173 Mulberry Road		Residential	c.1925	Not Eligible
0257.01	173 Mulberry Road		Outbuilding/well house	c.1925	Not Eligible
0258	2509 E. Cherokee St/U.S. Highway 29	Hambright House	Residential	1921	Eligible, Local Level Criterion C
0258.01	2509 E. Cherokee St/U.S. Highway 29		Outbuilding/shed	c.1965	Not Eligible
0259	242 Lakeview Drive		Residential	c. 1965	Not Eligible
0260	238 Lakeview Drive		Residential	c. 1965	Not Eligible
0261	212 Lakeview Drive		Residential	c. 1965	Not Eligible
0262	2618 E. Cherokee St/U.S. Highway 29		Residential	c. 1965	Not Eligible
0263	119 Lakeview Drive		Residential	c. 1965	Not Eligible
0264	514 Tribal Road		Residential	c. 1965	Not Eligible
0268	Southern Railroad		Transportation	c. 1873	Not Eligible

415 MILLIKEN/FRONTAGE ROAD (U/21/0247 AND U/21/0247.01)

Resources U/21/0247 and U/21/0247.01 are a former restaurant and gas station located at 415 Milliken (Frontage) Road on the south side of I-85, just off the highway at Exit 98 (Figure 5A-B and 6A-B). According to the current owner of the Broad River Truck and Trailer Repair business and other local residents, the buildings were originally constructed circa 1965 as the Broad River Truck Stop. The restaurant apparently remained in operation until the 1980s or early 1990s and the property was filmed in a scene of the 1983 3-D cult trucker movie “Hit the Road Running” (Bill Pennington, personal communication, February 2016). Various subsequent owners have used the former restaurant building as an automobile repair shop up to the present. The former gas station is currently vacant.



Source: USGS 7.5 Minute Topographic Quadrangle Map, Blacksburg, South Carolina 1983

Figure 4.
Location of Newly Identified Cultural Resources within the APE

Figure 5.
415 Milliken/Frontage Road (U/21/0247 and U/21/0247.01)



A. Restaurant (U/21/0247), View to East



B. Gas Station (U/21/0247.01), View to Southwest

Figure 6.
415 Milliken/Frontage Road (U/21/0247 and U/21/0247.01)



A. Restaurant and Mobile Home, View to East/Northeast



B. Gas Station and Canopy, View to Southwest

The restaurant building (U/21/0247) is located at the western edge of the large surface parking lot. The one-story, linear plan building has a slab-on-grade foundation, concrete masonry unit (CMU) block construction, and shallow-pitched side gable roof clad with ribbed sheet metal. The building has a red brick veneer exterior with vertical wood panel siding present in the gable ends. The building has a single entrance, glass and aluminum door. Pairs of large fixed windows with metal awnings flank the entrance door on the façade. A single fixed window is also present at the on the north side of the building. A small, flat-roofed frame shed addition extends from the north side of the building. The addition appears to date from the original period of development. It is covered with wood weatherboard siding with a wide reveal.

The vacant gas station (U/21/0247.01) is located at the southern edge of the parking lot, further to the west of the restaurant. Like the restaurant building, the former gas station has a linear footprint, CMU construction with a red brick veneer exterior and a side-gable roof. The roof is covered with asphalt shingles. Asbestos shingles are present in the gable ends and the sides of the building have painted CMU exteriors. The two window openings flanking the single entrance door are covered with plywood.

A residential mobile home has been installed on the site at the southern edge of the parking lot between the former restaurant and gas station. A non-historic gasoline pump canopy is located in front (north) of the gas station. A freestanding metal car canopy is located adjacent to the gas station. The front of the six-acre lot is covered with a gravel-and-asphalt-paved surface parking lot. A small clearing and trees are located behind the buildings at the rear of the parcel.

Despite their longtime commercial use, Resources U/21/0247 and U/21/0247.01 at 415 Milliken Road are not known to be associated with a significant historic events or a person important to the past of the local area. Therefore, the resources were not evaluated under Criteria A or B. Resources U/21/0247 and U/21/0247.01 were evaluated for significance at the local level under Criterion C for architecture and do not appear to be eligible for the NRHP. While the resources appear to retain integrity in the areas of location, setting, design, materials and workmanship, the changes in use over time have diminished their association and feeling as a mid-century, roadside restaurant and gas station establishment. Furthermore, the buildings do not embody the distinctive features of a commercial building type or a noteworthy method of construction. They are not representative of a significant architectural style and have few character-defining design or material features. Therefore, the resources are not recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP.

137 CRAWFORD ROAD (U/21/0248)

Resource U/21/0248 is a single-family dwelling located on a 19-acre, wooded parcel at 137 Crawford Road, just north of the I-85 (Figure 7A-B). The presence of a visibly prominent no trespassing sign and dense vegetation surrounding the building made access for documentation and

Figure 7.
137 Crawford Road (U/21/0248)



A. Façade, View to Southeast



B. Detail of Porch, View to South

photography difficult. The one-and-a-half story, frame house appears to have been constructed circa 1900. It has an irregular plan with a filled-in, brick pier foundation, weatherboard siding, and a cross-gable roof covered with ribbed sheet metal. A wrap around porch is present along the east side of the façade. Battered wood columns on brick piers support the extended porch roof. A brick chimney is present on the rear roof slope. Identified window types include an original six-over-six sash unit on the projecting front gable. An aluminum sliding glass door serves as the front door from the porch area. According to aerial photographs, an addition has been built at the rear of the building.

Resource U/21/0248 is not known to be associated with a significant historic event, an important individual, or group of people, and was therefore not evaluated under Criteria A or B. It was evaluated for significance at the local level under Criterion C for architecture and does not appear to be NRHP eligible. The residential property is not distinctive in its design, materials, or method of construction. The house resides on its original place of construction and appears to date from the early twentieth century, therefore retaining its integrity of location and feeling. Changes in setting due to the construction of the nearby interstate highway and overgrown quality of the lot, combined with the numerous alterations of the building and replacement of features has caused the resource to lose its integrity of setting, design, materials, workmanship, and association as a rural farm house.

980 BLACKSBURG HIGHWAY (U/21/0249 AND U/21/0249.01)

Resources U/21/0249 and U/21/0249.01 are a single-family dwelling and small outbuilding built circa 1950 and located at 980 Blacksburg Highway, on the east side of the road (Figure 8A-B). The one-story, CMU-constructed Bungalow has a rectangular plan, continuous CMU foundation, and front gable roof covered with asphalt shingles. A full-width, engaged porch lines the residence's asymmetrical façade. Three evenly spaced metal poles support the porch roof. Imitation weatherboard vinyl siding is present in the roof gable end. A brick chimney is located on the north roof slope. The original front entrance door has been replaced with a modern fiberglass unit with a centered, and large, oval window. A large fixed window is present on the north side of the façade. Other identifiable window types include original two-over-two sash units and vinyl replacement sash and sliding windows on the north and south walls of the building.

The single-pen, CMU-constructed shed outbuilding is located on the north side of the house at the rear of the lot (Figure 9). It has a shallow-pitched, front gable roof and a plywood door and surround. Wood shiplap siding is present in the gable end. A relatively new poured concrete driveway and parking pad occupies the southern edge of the parcel. A small, wood frame disability ramp connects the parking area to the front porch.

Figure 8.
980 Blacksburg Highway (U/21/0249)



A. South Oblique, View to Northeast



B. North Oblique, View to Southeast

Figure 9.
Outbuilding at 980 Blacksburg Highway (U/21/0249.01), View to West



Resources U/21/0249 and U/21/0249.01 at 380 Blacksburg Highway are not known to be associated with a significant historic event or a person important to the area's past and therefore were not evaluated under Criteria A or B. The house was evaluated for significance at the local level under Criterion C for architecture and does not appear to be eligible for the NRHP. While the CMU Bungalow dwelling retains integrity in all areas, it does not feature distinctive architectural design elements or a noteworthy method of construction. The house retains its integrity of location, setting, feeling as a late-period Bungalow house type, and association as a residential property. Its integrity of design, materials, and workmanship has been diminished due to the replacement of some original windows and the front door. Therefore, the house is recommended not eligible for listing in the NRHP.

316 HENSON ROAD (U/21/0250, U/21/0250.01, AND U/21/0250.02)

Resources U/21/0250, U/21/0250.01, and U/21/0250.02 are a multi-family dwelling, well house and garage or shed outbuilding located at 316 Henson Road, on the south side of the right-of-way. The buildings reside on an approximate 42-acre lot. The one-and-a-half story residence (U/21/0250) is a frame duplex with no identifiable house type or architectural style (Figure 10A-B). It has a rectangular plan with a brick pier with infill foundation, asbestos shingle siding, and cross-gable roof covered with asphalt shingles at the front of the structure and standing seam sheet metal on the rear addition. One-story shed roof additions with weatherboard siding line the larger rear addition on the east and west sides. The raised, partial width front porch has a front gable extended roof supported by four battered wood columns. The porch has a CMU foundation and is accessed by a small flight of concrete stairs. Brick chimneys are located on the east wall and at the rear roof slope on the west side. The two front doors are wood paneled with nine-fixed lights. Common window types include the original two-over-two wood sash units and smaller, one-over-one aluminum windows. The building appears to be vacant.

The small CMU-constructed well house (U/21/0250.01) is located to the immediate west of the main building. The one-story, front gable wood frame shed (U/21/0250.02) is located further to the west (Figure 11A-B). It has a corrugated metal roof. A larger, non-historic wood shed is located at the rear of the lot between the house and smaller historic shed.

Research has not demonstrated that Resources U/21/0250, U/21/0250.01, and U/21/0250.02 have a documented association with important events or a person who is important to Blacksburg or Cherokee County's past. Therefore, this property was not evaluated under Criteria A or B. The property was evaluated under Criterion C for architecture and does not appear to be eligible for the NRHP. The dwelling does not embody the distinctive characteristics of a significant house type, style or method of construction nor does it employ any noteworthy building materials. While it retains integrity of location, it no longer has integrity of setting, design, materials or workmanship. The development of I-85 to the immediate north has diminished the area's once

Figure 10.
316 Henson Road (U/21/0250)



A. Façade, View to South



B. West Side, View to Southeast

Figure 11.
Outbuildings at 316 Henson Road (U/21/0250.01 and U/21/0250.02)



A. U/21/0250.01, View to Southeast



B. U/21/0250.02, View to West

rural setting. Unsympathetic additions to the side and rear of the house have altered the building's original form and caused a loss of historic fabric. The property has lost its feeling and association as a duplex residence within a larger rural farmstead. It now sits vacant with its outbuildings in a state of deterioration and overgrown with vegetation.

147 WHITES FARM ROAD (U/21/0251)

Resource U/21/0251 is a single-family dwelling located on a 10-acre parcel at 147 Whites Farm Road. Neely Thomas and Minerva Moore Thomas, who died in June 2015 at the age of 103 years, were the longtime owners of the property according to their son, and current owner, Wayne Thomas. Mr. Thomas was not sure when the house was built or its subsequent developmental history. Based on field assessment and consultation of historic topographic maps, it appears that the original core of the building was built as a Gable Front and Wing house type in circa 1900. The front porch and gabled rear additions may have been added circa 1920. It is estimated that the smaller rear shed roof additions and the covered carport were built circa 1950.

The one-and-a-half-story frame residence has an irregular plan, stone pier-with-fill foundation, white painted wood weatherboard siding, and cross-gable roof covered with corrugated metal (Figure 12A-B). The screened-in front porch has a front gable roof with exposed rafter tails and supported by battered wood columns on brick pier supports. Wood shingles and Craftsman style triangular knee braces are present in the gable end. The partial remnant of a stone and concrete chimney is present on the east wing of the house. Two other brick chimneys occupy the ridgelines of the original gable front and a rear circa 1920 gable addition. Observable window types include four-over-four, wood double-hung sash units, three-over-one sash, six-over-six, and one-over-one modern replacement windows.

Despite its proximity to I-85, the area has a general rural setting. The house faces north and resides on a hill overlooking Whites Farm Road. It has an approximate 90-foot setback from the right-of-way and is surrounded by a ring of mature oak trees. A concrete driveway from Whites Farm Road lines the western line of the property and curves toward the carport at the rear of the house.

Resource U/21/0251 at 147 Whites Farm Road is not known to be associated with a significant historic event and was therefore not evaluated under Criterion A. Despite its longtime association with the Neely and Minerva Thomas, research has not produced any documentation of their important contributions at the local or state levels. Therefore, the house was not evaluated under Criterion B. The resource was evaluated for significance at the local level under Criterion C for architecture and does not appear to be NRHP eligible. The property retains integrity in the areas of location, setting, feeling, and association with the Thomas family; however, the integrity of design appears to have been lost. While many of the additions and alterations to the residence are themselves 50 years of age or older, they have overwhelmed the

Figure 12.
147 Whites Farm Road (U/21/0251)



A. East Oblique, View to South



B. West Oblique, View to East

original design of the building and it can no longer convey significance as recognizable house type or style. Other changes, including the removal of the original chimney on the east wing and replacement windows have had an adverse impact on the materials and workmanship. Because the resource no longer embodies the distinctive characteristics of a house type, period, and method of construction, Resource U/21/0251 is not recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP.

1123 HOLLY GROVE ROAD (U/21/0252, U/21/0252.01, AND U/21/0252.02)

Resources U/21/0252, U/21/0252.01, and U/21/0252.02 are a single-family residence, well house, and shed located at 1123 Holly Grove Road (SR S-11-52), just west of the intersection with Whites Farm Road. The one-story, wood frame Bungalow house type was built circa 1940. The dwelling (U/21/0252) has a simple linear plan, brick-pier-with-infill foundation, shiplap wood siding, and a front gable roof with exposed rafters and asphalt shingles (Figure 13A-B). A brick chimney is located on the eastern slope of the roof. The partial width front entrance porch has a front gable drop roof covered with ribbed sheet metal. Three square wood columns on brick piers support the porch roof. The front windows are six-over-six wood sash units and appear to be original to the house. A mix of replacement two-over-two wood sash windows and more recent vinyl units are present on the sides and rear of the building. The rear (north) side is also clad with synthetic vinyl siding. Single entrance doors are present at the façade and back of the house.

A brick masonry well house (U/21/0252.01) with a shed roof is located in the northeast corner of the rear yard. A larger, wood frame, multi-door shed/barn outbuilding (U/21/0252.02) with a long linear plan and standing-seam metal side gable roof is located just to the west. Both outbuildings appear to post-date the construction of the residence and were built circa 1960 (Figure 14A-B). The ruins of a third, wood frame outbuilding are located closer to the house.

Resource U/21/0252 has a wooded rural setting on Holly Grove Road. Evergreen shrubbery lines the foundation of the house. Mature shade trees are located near the front (south) rear (north) and sides of the three-and-a-half-acre parcel. The remainder of the lot is cleared cut grass.

The dwelling and associated outbuildings at 1123 Holly Grove Road (SR S-11-52) are not known to be associated with a significant historic event or a person important to the area's past and were therefore not evaluated under Criteria A or B. The house was evaluated for significance at the local level under Criterion C for architecture and does not appear to be eligible for the NRHP. The small frame house (U/21/0252) retains integrity of location, setting, feeling and association as an early twentieth-century residence, but is not a distinctive example of the Bungalow house type. It also does not reflect the aesthetic of an architectural style and has few character-defining design or material features. Furthermore, the replacement of original windows with non-sympathetic units has caused the property to lose its integrity of design, materials, and workmanship. Therefore, Resources U/21/0252, U/21/0252.01, U/21/0252.02 are recommended not eligible for listing in the NRHP.

Figure 13.
1123 Holly Grove Road (U/21/0252)



A. West Oblique, View to Northeast



B. East Oblique, View to Northwest

Figure 14.
Outbuildings at 1123 Holly Grove Road (U/21/0252.01 and U/21/0252.02)



A. U/21/0252.01, View to Northeast



B. U/21/0252.02, View to North

653 TRIBAL ROAD (U/21/0253 AND U/21/0253.01)

Resources U/21/0253 and U/21/0253.01 are a circa 1900 single-family dwelling and associated outbuilding located at 653 Tribal Road, on the west side of the road across from the Holly Ridge Baptist Church. The residence is a one-and-a-half story, wood frame house with an irregular plan and asymmetrical facade. It was originally built as a Gable Front and Wing house type and has no architectural style (Figure 15A-B). Gable additions have been built on the south and rear (west) sides of the building. The house has a brick-pier-with-infill foundation, a painted weatherboard exterior, and cross gable roof covered with ribbed sheet metal. Two red brick chimneys are located on the roof slopes of the original front gable and rear gable addition. The screened, wraparound front porch has a CMU foundation and drop roof supported by five turned wood columns. The porch extends around the north side of the house along the rear gable addition. Points of egress were identified on the front porch, the façade of the south gable addition, and on the north side of the rear gable addition. Observable window types included historic two-over-two double hung sash. The house appears to be vacant and in the early stages of deterioration. Overgrown foundation shrubbery has begun to cover the façade and north sides of the building.

The ruins of a frame outbuilding are located behind the house. Further to the east is a wood frame, single crib shed, constructed circa 1940 that is also in a deteriorated state (U/21/0253.01). The shed is clad with unpainted weatherboard with a front gable roof covered with ribbed sheet metal. The front double doors are open and the building is unsecured to the elements (Figure 16).

Resources U/21/0253 and U/21/0253.01 are not known to be associated with a significant historic event or a person important to the area's past and were therefore not evaluated under Criteria A or B. The house was evaluated for significance at the local level under Criterion C for architecture and does not appear to be eligible for the NRHP. The resources retain integrity of location, setting, feeling and association as an early twentieth century residence and outbuilding. Resource U/21/0253 was originally constructed as a Gable Front and Wing house type; however, subsequent additions have significantly altered the original plan. The house is no longer a representative example of a significant house type, method of construction, or style. Other alterations include the replacement of the original porch foundation with CMU block. Also, the house and outbuilding are in a deteriorated state. As a result of these changes, Resources U/21/0253 and U/21/0253.01 no longer retain integrity of design, materials, and workmanship and are not recommended eligible for the NRHP.

569 TRIBAL ROAD (U/21/0254, U/21/0254.01, U/21/0254.02, AND U/21/0254.03)

Resources U/21/0254, U/21/0254.01, U/21/0254.02, and U/21/0254.03 consist of a single-family house and three outbuildings located at 569 Tribal Road, just north of the SR-S-11-52 intersection. The buildings are located on the west side of the road. The dwelling (U/21/0254) is

Figure 15.
653 Tribal Road (U/21/0253)



A. Façade, View to West



B. South Oblique, View to Northwest

Figure 16.
653 Tribal Road (U/21/0253 and U/21/0253.01)



A. U/21/0253 North Oblique, View to Southwest



B. U/21/0253.01, View to Northwest

a one-and-a-half story Queen Anne Cottage house type constructed circa 1890 (Figure 17A-B). It has a rectangular central mass-plan set on a brick-pier-with-infill foundation and a steeply pitched hipped roof with a gable roof front dormer. Paired square windows with three vertical lights are set in the dormer gable. A rear gable roof wing appears to have been added circa 1950. The original house and rear addition are both clad with painted weatherboard siding. A partial width porch with a drop ceiling lines the house façade. The front porch structure has a brick foundation, wood flooring, and is supported by squared wood columns on brick piers. An extended roof porch with wrought iron supports runs along the north side of the rear addition. A small shed roof porch covers a secondary entrance area on the south side of the house. All roof structures, save the front porch and small south porch roofs, are covered with galvanized sheet metal shingles. The other porches are covered with ribbed sheet metal. Brick chimneys occupy the north and south roof slopes of the front mass and the ridgeline of the rear addition. In addition to the dormer windows, other prominent window types include three-over-one double hung sash units along the façade and north sides of the house, one-over-one replacement sash windows, a tripartite replacement window on the north side of the house, and six-over-six sash window at the rear gable addition. Windows along the façade and north sides are framed with black ornamental louvered shutters.

Three frame outbuildings that appear to date from the 1940s are located at the rear (west) and south of the main house (Figure 18A-B). Resource U/21/0254.01 is a one-story, single crib shed with a front gable roof covered with ribbed sheet metal. It faces east and has painted shiplap siding and a single wood entrance door on the façade. Resource U/21/0254.02 is located behind U/21/254.01. It is a two-story, double crib barn with flanking portal sheds and a side gable roof clad with ribbed sheet metal. The barn exterior is clad in painted weatherboard with a wide reveal. A wood enclosure covers the northern most shed portal. Resource U/21/0254.03 is a one-and-a-half-story, single crib shed with a front gable roof and enclosed shed on the north side. The building is clad in painted weatherboard and the roof is covered with standing seam metal. Two open entrance doors are located on the building façade. A larger bay opening is also present on the north wall.

The main house and three outbuildings are located on a 14-acre cleared parcel. A non-historic shed and trampoline are also located in the backyard. Mature hardwoods are sporadically located around the house and at the perimeter of the parcel; however, most of the property is open grass field. A gravel driveway curves from Tribal Road to the rear corner of the house. Due to the close proximity of I-85, the once agricultural setting along Tribal Road has more recently given way to more auto-oriented commercial development as evidenced by the Shelton Fireworks outlet, which was built across the street in the early 2000s.

Contextual research of Blacksburg and greater Cherokee County has not produced any association of Resources U/21/0254, U/21/0254.01, U/21/0254.02, and U/21/0254.03 with historic events or the contributions of significant individuals. Therefore, the resources were not

Figure 17.
569 Tribal Road (U/21/0254)



A. North Oblique, View to Southwest



B. South Oblique, View to Northwest

Figure 18.
Outbuildings at 569 Tribal Road (U/21/0254.01, U/21/0254.02, and U/21/0254.03)



A. U/21/0254.01 and U/21/0254.02, View to West



B. U/21/0254.03, View to Southwest

evaluated under Criteria A or B. The dwelling and associated outbuildings do not appear to be eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C for architecture. The resources retain integrity of location; however, the integrity of the once rural setting has been lost with the construction of the I-85 interchange to the south and subsequent large-scale commercial development on the opposite side of Tribal Road. Although the dwelling is a representative example of the Queen Anne Cottage house type, it does not appear to be distinctive in this regard. The building's integrity of design, materials, and workmanship has also been somewhat diminished with the replacement of original windows with non-sympathetic units. Despite these alterations, the property still has integrity of feeling and association for being late nineteenth/early twentieth-century family farmstead. Nevertheless, it is not recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP.

548 TRIBAL ROAD (U/21/0255)

Resource U/21/0255 is a single-family dwelling located at 548 Tribal Road, on the east side of the right-of-way, just south of the I-85 interchange and the Love's Travel Stop. The one-story frame residence appears to have been constructed circa 1950. It has a brick and CMU foundation, wood weatherboard siding, and a steeply pitched side-gable roof covered with standing seam metal. A raised, partial width front porch, with a drop shed roof and simple wood supports, lines the south end of the façade. An enclosed porch addition with a drop-shed roof is also present at the rear of the house. All of the windows are metal or vinyl sash units and are not original to the house (Figure 19A-B).

The house resides on a one-acre lot and has a deep, 145-foot setback from Tribal Road. It is accessed by car via a gravel driveway. Various non-historic outbuildings are located behind the main house. Hardwood trees shade the front of the building and provide a screen along the northern parcel boundary.

The dwelling at 548 Tribal Road is not known to be associated with a significant historic event or a person important to the area's past and was therefore not evaluated under Criteria A or B. The house was evaluated for significance at the local level under Criterion C for architecture and does not appear to be eligible for the NRHP. The resource is not a representative example of a significant house type, method of construction, or architectural style. While it retains integrity of location, Resource U/21/0255 no longer has integrity of setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. The former rural character along Tribal Road has been lost with the construction of I-85 and subsequent development of the large-scale Love's Travel Stop facility to the immediate north. The house has withstood numerous material and design changes including the removal of original doors and windows and the enclosure of original window openings. As a result of these changes, Resource U/21/0255 no longer conveys feeling and association as a mid-century residential property. Therefore, the house is recommended not eligible for listing in the NRHP.

Figure 19.
548 Tribal Road (U/21/0255)



A. Façade and South Side, View to Northeast



B. Rear (East) and South Side, View to North/Northwest

1137-1209 HOLLY RIDGE ROAD (U/21/0256)

Resource U/21/0256 was recorded as a district that contains seven, one-story houses located along the east side of Holly Ridge Road (SR S-11-65) near the intersection with Roark Road (SR S-11-375). The seven houses (1137-1209 Holly Ridge Road) are a mix of two Minimal Traditional houses and five Ranch houses built between circa 1950 and circa 1965 (Figures 20A-B and 21A-B). All dwellings are present on a 1971 aerial photograph of the north Blacksburg vicinity.

The five Ranch houses have linear plans with continuous CMU and brick veneer foundations, brick veneer exteriors (red and tan brick), with side gable, cross gable, and gable-on-hip roofs. The Minimal Traditional house at 1137 Holly Ridge Road has frame construction, a brick foundation, synthetic vinyl siding, and a cross gable roof. The other recorded Minimal Traditional House at 1203 Holly Ridge Road has a red brick veneer exterior and cross gable roof. Some houses (1137 and 1203 Holly Ridge Road) retain their original wood sash windows, while others (1149, 1169, and 1179 Holly Ridge Road) have replacement vinyl units. One house, at 1155 Holly Ridge Road, has a large rear addition.

Most houses have between an 85-90-foot setback from the street and concrete or gravel driveways. The house at 1209 Holly Ridge Road has a deep setback, approximately 450-feet, and is slightly angled on its site. The front yards vary between open lawns or are covered with mature tree growth. All of the rear yards are open with outbuildings and large hardwood trees. The setting along Holly Ridge Road has rural character. The west side of the road contains more recent single-family residential development.

Resource U/21/0256 is not known to be associated with a significant person who has made important contributions to the area's past and was therefore not evaluated under Criterion B. The proposed district was evaluated under Criteria A and C in areas of community planning and development and architecture and does not appear to be eligible for listing in the NRHP.

Historic map research shows that the seven houses in the proposed district were the only ones built in the vicinity along Holly Ridge Road prior to 1971. These properties were not part of a larger trend of residential suburban development in the area during the postwar period. The majority of current dwellings date from the last 10-20 years. Therefore, Resource U/21/0256 does not appear to be eligible under Criterion A.

Resource U/21/0256 no longer retains integrity to convey significance in the area of architecture as a district that is united by design and historic development. The six, single-family dwelling within the proposed district have not been moved and retain their integrity of location. Modern infill development on the west side of Holly Ridge Road has caused the property to lose its integrity of setting. Due to alterations and the removal of historic fabric on a few of the houses, the district

Figure 20.
Holly Ridge Road District (U/21/0256)



A. View of 1169 (Right) and 1155 (Left) Holly Ridge Road, View to North



B. View of 1149 (Right) and 1137 (Left) Holly Ridge Road, View to North

Figure 21.
Holly Ridge Road District (U/21/0256)



A. View of 1179 Holly Ridge Road, View to North



B. 1203 Holly Ridge Road, View to East

no longer retains integrity of design, materials, and workmanship. While the resource retains integrity of association through the continued residential use of the houses, the cumulative loss of other aspects of integrity have caused the district to lose feeling as a postwar residential rural development.

173 MULBERRY ROAD (U/21/0257 AND U/21/0257.01)

Resources U/21/0257 and U/21/0257.1 are a circa 1925 single-family house and associated outbuilding located at 173 Mulberry Road (SR S-11-227) on the north side of the road (Figure 22A-B). The one-story residence is a Bungalow house type with a rectangular plan and asymmetrical façade. It is constructed of rusticated face concrete block and has a hipped roof with moderately overhanging eaves and exposed rafters. The roof is covered with ribbed sheet metal. A thin brick chimney occupies the center roof ridge. A raised front patio with a concrete block foundation provides access to the front entrance door. The wood panel door has four lights, a screen door, and appears to be original to the building. Two wood six-over-six sash windows flank the door. Similar units are located on the west side of the building; however, many of the windows openings are devoid of sashes.

A one-story CMU and rusticated face concrete block constructed outbuilding is located directly behind the primary residence (Figure 23A-B). The outbuilding is in an extreme state of disrepair and covered with overgrown vegetation. The roof has collapsed and the walls are cracked and buckling.

Resources U/21/0257 and U/21/0257.1 have a shallow, 32-foot setback from Mulberry Road and share the 3.25-acre parcel with a nearby circa 2000 residence and two non-historic outbuildings. Mature oak and pecan trees shade the circa 1925 house and outbuilding at the front (south) and rear (north). Save for a few newly planted arbor vitae, the remainder of the parcel is open lawn.

Resources U/21/0257 and U/21/0257.01 are not known to be associated with a significant historic event or a person important to the area's past and were therefore not evaluated under Criteria A or B. The house was evaluated for significance at the local level under Criterion C for architecture and does not appear to be eligible for the NRHP. The dwelling appears to have an irregular Bungalow floor plan but lacks many of the character-defining features of the type, including the integral porch. Although the concrete block is a noteworthy material, the house lacks an identifiable architectural style and does not represent a distinctive method of construction. The house and outbuilding retain their integrity of location; however, the integrity of setting has been adversely affected with the construction of the modern house in close proximity. Furthermore, the loss of original windows and the deteriorated condition of the outbuilding has caused the property to lose its integrity of materials, which in turn has diminished its integrity of design and workmanship. Although the house still conveys the feeling

Figure 22.
173 Mulberry Road (U/21/0257)



A. Façade, View to North



B. West Oblique, View to Northeast

Figure 23.
173 Mulberry Road (U/21/0257 and U/21/0257.01)



A. East Oblique, View to Northwest



B. Outbuilding, View to West

of an early twentieth-century residential property, it is now vacant and no longer has an association with the original or successive homeowners. Based on this lack of architectural distinction and loss of integrity, Resources U/21/0257 and U/21/0257.01 are not recommended eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

2509 EAST CHEROKEE STREET (U/21/0258 AND U/21/0258.01)

Resources U/21/0258 and U/21/0258.1 are a large residence and shed located at 2509 East Cherokee Street (U.S. Highway 29), just south of the I-85 intersection. The house faces east, on a wooded hill overlooking the road. According to the current owner, Pastor Rick Robison with the Meeting Place Church, the Hambright family originally built the house on their 3,000-acre farm in 1921. The Meeting Place Church purchased the house in 1996 and converted a non-historic former chicken house on the property (located to the north and west of the house) into a church with a surface parking lot. The house is still used as a residence for Mr. Robison and his family (Rick Robison, personal communication, February 2016). The shed outbuilding behind the house appears to date from circa 1965.

The two-story, wood frame dwelling does not conform to any identifiable house type or style (Figure 24A-B). It has an irregular plan that appears to consist of a central hall with rooms on both sides and a kitchen at the rear of the building. The eclectic architectural design contains a mixture of both Colonial Revival and Prairie stylistic features that are expressed through: the symmetrical relationship of solids and voids on the façade and side elevations; hipped roof with wide, overhanging eaves and exposed rafters; prominent stature of the corbeled brick chimneys; and multiple one-story porches and wings (McAlester 2013:552–564). The building is set on a continuous brick foundation with a white painted weatherboard exterior. The hipped roof is covered with asphalt shingles and the house has four brick chimneys. Three are located on the roof slopes of the building core. A fourth, smaller chimney is located on the rear eave wall. The front entrance porch is supported by two, large square brick supports. A side porch on the southeast corner of the building has similar brick supports and is enclosed with weatherboard siding and screens. Exterior access to the screened porch is via three concrete stairs and a screen door at the rear of the porch. Both front porches have shallow hipped roofs. The rear door now functions as the primary entrance. It has a raised brick foundation and is covered by a hipped porch with squared wood column supports. Most windows are six-over-one wood sash units and are outfitted with storm window coverings. A fourth doorway and four smaller one-over-one sash windows are located in an enclosed area at the northwest corner of the building. The windows may be arranged in single and paired configurations and flanked by paneled vinyl shutters.

Figure 24.
2509 East Cherokee Street (U/21/0258)



A. East Oblique, View to Northwest



B. Outbuilding, View to West

The circa 1965 one-story shed outbuilding is located behind (west) of the house and is constructed of unpainted CMU (Figure 25). It has a rectangular plan and front gable roof covered with ribbed sheet metal. Wood shiplap siding is located in the gable ends. A CMU chimney vent stack is located at the rear of the roof ridge. Mismatched wood double doors are located at the south end of the façade. A glass block window is present at the rear, northwest corner.

The property resides on a wooded hillside overlooking East Cherokee Street to the east. A non-historic poultry house that has been converted into a church is located to the immediate north and west of the residence and shed. A curving asphalt driveway extends from the right-of-way before splitting to provide vehicular access to the church parking lot and rear of the house. A commercial sign for the church is located adjacent to the driveway in close proximity to East Cherokee Street. A thicket of trees obscures views of the front and south sides of the house from the road. An original curving driveway that once ran in front of the house has since been removed.

The once rural setting of the property has become more suburban in character over the past 30-40 years as a result of the construction of I-85 and increased population growth within the county. Relatively recent commercial and residential development has occurred to the north and south of the resource on U.S. Highway 29 and across the road along nearby Lakeview Drive. In addition to the residential and commercial development, a 54-acre granite and asphalt quarry, which is owned and operated by the Sloan Construction Company, borders the resource to the immediate south and west.

Resource U/21/0258 was built in 1921 as the Hambright family farmstead on nearly 3,000 acres. Despite this history, there is no known association of the property with any significant agricultural developments in the area during the mid-to-late twentieth century; therefore, the resource was not evaluated under Criterion A.

While the Hambright family's history in the Antioch community of Blacksburg extends back to the early settlement of Cherokee County, the site in question was constructed in 1921, after the era in which the Hambright family was historically significant. Research has not produced any information about the property that demonstrates an association with an individual, or group of individuals who are important to the area's past. Therefore, it was not evaluated under Criterion B.

Figure 25.
2509 East Cherokee Street (U/21/0258 and U/21/0258.01)



A. South Oblique, View to Northeast



B. Shed Outbuilding, View to West

The house and outbuilding were evaluated for significance at the local level under Criterion C for architecture. The outbuilding does not appear to be eligible for the NRHP. The eclectically designed residence however, is the work of noted architect Louis H. Asbury, and does possess significance for its early twentieth-century architecture. Asbury was considered to be the first native-born professionally trained architect in North Carolina and was the first architect to be elected to the American Institute of Architects in North Carolina in 1908 (Bushong and Bishir 2009). Asbury was a prolific full-time architect who was known for his works in the Colonial Revival and Tudor Revival styles. He designed buildings throughout North Carolina and the Piedmont but his work had a particular effect on the built environment of Charlotte, North Carolina, where he based his practice (Bushong and Bishir 2009). At least seven buildings have been nominated to the NRHP due at least in part to having been designed by Asbury (Mattson and Alexander 2009). One such property, the Bishop John C. Kilgo House in Charlotte, is nominated solely for its association with Asbury. Like Resource U/21/0258, the Bishop John C. Kilgo House combines elements of Colonial Revival and Craftsman-style architecture to create a unique but coherent style (Mattson and Alexander 2009). It was constructed in 1915, six years before the Hambright family farmstead. Asbury practiced architecture for almost 50 years, having been active from 1908 to 1956. He worked in many styles and designed buildings ranging from Tudor Revival houses to large Neoclassical civic buildings (Bushong and Bishir 2009). He designed the Hambright family farmstead in 1921, towards the beginning of his long career, but already a seasoned architect at the peak of his popularity.

The house and outbuilding have integrity of location. However, the integrity of their original setting as part of a rural estate has been somewhat compromised. The original 3,000-acre farm has been reduced to a 6.5-acre parcel that includes a large church building, signage, and a surface parking located to the immediate north of the house and outbuilding. While significant alterations to the property have occurred including the loss of its agricultural acreage, the house and outbuilding retain integrity of location and the overall feel of the house as an early twentieth-century residential property is not lost. Much of the encroaching commercial development is shielded from the viewshed of the property by the mature tree growth, which surrounds the house. Many of these trees appear to date from the era of significance and may have been planted or retained when the house was built. The location of the house atop a hill also provides a visual buffer from the surrounding modern development. The house itself retains a great deal of integrity in both the exterior and interior of the building, with much of the original doors and windows as well as hardware, molding, and decorative tile remaining. The sympathetic addition of a screened porch on the southeast corner of the building appears to be the only alteration that has occurred. Resource U/21/0258 is recommended as eligible for inclusion on the NRHP under Criterion C on the local level for its association with noted architect Louis H. Asbury and excellent integrity. Due to its location along the edge of the APE and beyond the extent of the project area, no effect to this resource is anticipated.

242 LAKEVIEW DRIVE (U/21/0259)

Resource U/21/0259 is a circa 1965 Compact Ranch House located at 242 Lakeview Drive (Figure 26). The one-story single family residence is clad in brick veneer and has a laterally-gabled composition shingle roof which extends over a portion of the front (south) elevation to create an unsupported shed roof porch. Fenestration beneath the porch includes a tripartite picture window with one-over-one vinyl double-hung sash window side pieces, a wood panel door with three small horizontal windows, and a set of tripled one-over-one vinyl double-hung sash windows. A smaller one-over-one vinyl double-hung sash window lies to the west of the porch. A carport with turned wood supports lies to the east.

Resource U/21/0259 lies on Lakeview Drive, which is a curvilinear two-lane residential road that contains single family houses and manufactured homes sited on fairly large lots. Resource U/21/0259 has a generous setback and a landscaped grass lawn along with various ornamental shrubs and deciduous trees. Resource U/21/0259 is not known to be associated with any significant historic events or persons and was therefore not evaluated under Criteria A and B. The resource was evaluated for significance at the local level under Criterion C for architecture. Although it is a Ranch House, it does not feature distinctive architectural design elements or a noteworthy method of construction. It was found not to embody the distinctive characteristics of a house type, period, or method of construction, and therefore is not recommended as eligible under Criterion C.

238 LAKEVIEW DRIVE (U/21/0260)

Resource U/21/0260 is a circa 1965 Compact Ranch House located at 238 Lakeview Drive (Figure 27). It is a single-family residence that is clad in brick veneer with a laterally-gabled composition shingle roof. The resource is L-shaped in plan, with a recessed doorway roughly in the center of the front (south) elevation. The main roofline extends to create a shed roof porch with wood column supports over the west half of the front elevation. The porch extends over the recessed modern wood door as well as a section of the house with vertical wood siding which contains two one-over-one aluminum-frame double-hung sash windows. A carport lies to the far west. The front L lies to the east of the entrance, with two sets of paired one-over-one vinyl double-hung sash windows with wood shutters.

Resource U/21/0260 lies on Lakeview Drive, which is a curvilinear two-lane residential road that contains single family houses and manufactured homes sited on fairly large lots. Resource U/21/0260 has a generous setback and a grass lawn along with mature coniferous and deciduous trees. Resource U/21/0260 is not known to be associated with any significant historic events or persons and was therefore not evaluated under Criteria A and B. The resource was evaluated for significance at the local level under Criterion C for architecture. Although it is a Ranch House, it

Figure 26.
242 Lakeview Drive (U/21/0259)



A. South Elevation



B. Southeast
Oblique



C. Southwest
Oblique

Figure 27.
238 Lakeview Drive (U/21/0260)



A. South Elevation



B. Southeast
Oblique



C. Southwest
Oblique

does not feature distinctive architectural design elements or a noteworthy method of construction, and its integrity has been affected by a modern window replacement. It was found not to embody the distinctive characteristics of a house type, period, or method of construction, and therefore is not recommended as eligible under Criterion C.

212 LAKEVIEW DRIVE (U/21/0261)

Resource U/21/0261 is a circa 1965 Compact Ranch House located at 212 Lakeview Drive (Figure 28). The single-family residence is clad in brick veneer and synthetic siding and has a laterally-gabled composition shingle roof. The wood front door has three small horizontal windows and is recessed roughly in the center of the front (south) elevation. To the west of the door are one single and one paired set of one-over-one vinyl double-hung sash windows. To the east lies a tripartite vinyl bay window and a carport with aluminum supports. A brick and concrete patio with an aluminum railing runs from the front door to the carport. The building is sited on an incline and has a raised basement on the west side of the building. The basement is clad in brick veneer which extends to form wainscoting that runs around the whole building.

Resource U/21/0261 lies on Lakeview Drive, which is a curvilinear two-lane residential road that contains single family houses and manufactured homes sited on fairly large lots. Resource U/21/0261 has a generous setback and is sited on a corner lot. It has a grass lawn along with ornamental shrubs and deciduous trees. Resource U/21/0261 is not known to be associated with any significant historic events or persons and was therefore not evaluated under Criteria A and B. The resource was evaluated for significance at the local level under Criterion C for architecture. Although it is a Ranch House, it does not feature distinctive architectural design elements or a noteworthy method of construction, and its integrity has been affected by modern window replacement. It was found not to embody the distinctive characteristics of a house type, period, or method of construction, and therefore is not recommended as eligible under Criterion C.

2618 E. CHEROKEE ST/U.S. HIGHWAY 29 (U/21/0262)

Resource U/21/0262 is a circa 1965 Compact Ranch House located at 2618 E. Cherokee St/U.S. Highway 29 (Figure 29). The single-family residence is clad in brick veneer and synthetic siding and has a laterally-gabled composition shingle roof. The main roofline extends to create a shed roof porch over the north half of the front (west) elevation. The porch is supported by decorative cast aluminum supports and the walkway to the recessed wood panel front door has an aluminum railing with matching balusters. To the east of the front door lie two single one-over-one vinyl double hung sash windows of differing sizes. To the west of the door lie two sets of paired one-over-one vinyl double-hung sash windows. All windows have wood panel shutters. A carport on the far west side of the building has been enclosed and is clad in synthetic siding. An external brick chimney has been added to the west elevation as well.

Figure 28.
212 Lakeview Drive (U/21/0261)



A. South Elevation



B. Southeast Oblique

Figure 29.
2618 E. Cherokee Street/U.S. Highway 29 (U/21/0262)



A. West Elevation



B. Northwest
Oblique



C. Southwest
Oblique

Resource U/21/0262 is situated near the corner of E. Cherokee Street and Frontage Road, which leads to I-85. This is a busy commercial intersection with convenience stores as well as vacant buildings that formerly housed gambling facilities. Resource U/21/0262 is sited on a somewhat narrow and deep lot with a grass lawn, ornamental shrubs, and a windbreak of coniferous trees to the rear. Resource U/21/0262 is not known to be associated with any significant historic events or persons and was therefore not evaluated under Criteria A and B. The resource was evaluated for significance at the local level under Criterion C for architecture. Although it is a Ranch House, it does not feature distinctive architectural design elements or a noteworthy method of construction, and its integrity has been affected by the unsympathetic enclosure of its carport and the replacement of its original windows. It was found not to embody the distinctive characteristics of a house type, period, or method of construction, and therefore is not recommended as eligible under Criterion C.

119 LAKEVIEW DRIVE (U/21/0263)

Resource U/21/0263 is a circa 1965 Linear Ranch House located at 119 Lakeview Drive (Figure 30). The single-family residence is clad in brick veneer and has a laterally-gabled composition shingle roof. There is a shallow, windowless L on the east side of the front (south) elevation. The rest of the front elevation is recessed, and all fenestration lies beneath a shed roofed porch created by overhanging eaves and supported by slender wood columns. The wood panel door lies roughly in the center of the main body of the house. A set of paired eight-over-eight vinyl double-hung sash windows and a single ten-over-ten vinyl double-hung sash window lie to the east of the door.

To the west of the door are a set of tripled and a set of doubled eight-over-eight vinyl double-hung sash windows. An internal brick chimney with a decorative aluminum flashing rises from behind the tripled windows. A carport sits to the far west.

Resource U/21/0263 is located on Lakeview Drive, which is a curvilinear two-lane residential road that contains single family houses and manufactured homes. It is directly adjacent to the T intersection of Lakeview Drive and Wendy Drive, which extends to the southeast and primarily houses manufactured homes on large lots. Resource U/21/0263 is sited on a large lot with a grass lawn, mature deciduous trees, and manicured ornamental shrubs. Resource U/21/0263 is not known to be associated with any significant historic events or persons and was therefore not evaluated under Criteria A and B. The resource was evaluated for significance at the local level under Criterion C for architecture. Although it is a Ranch House, it does not feature distinctive architectural design elements or a noteworthy method of construction, and its integrity has been affected by the replacement of its original windows. It was found not to embody the distinctive characteristics of a house type, period, or method of construction, and therefore is not recommended as eligible under Criterion C.

Figure 30.
119 Lakeview Drive (U/21/0263)



A. South Elevation



B. Southeast
Oblique



C. Southwest
Oblique

514 TRIBAL ROAD (U/21/0264)

Resource U/21/0264 is a circa 1965 Compact Ranch House located at 514 Tribal Road (Figure 31). The single-family residence is clad in brick veneer and has a laterally-gabled composition shingle roof. The front elevation faces west. A front-gabled porch with vertical wood siding in the pediment extends over a wood panel door and fixed picture window. The porch has square wooden supports. TO the north of the porch are a single and paired set of one-over-one vinyl double-hung sash windows set in a decorative panel of weatherboard siding. A large two-story garage addition lies to the south of the house. It is front-gabled with two garage doors on the first floor and two aluminum one-over-one double-hung sash windows on the second floor. It is connected to the house via a hyphen with a set of paired one-over-one aluminum frame double-hung sash windows.

Resource U/21/0264 is located on Tribal Road, which in this section is a sparsely settled two-lane road with primarily commercial and industrial development. Resource U/21/0264 is sited on an oversized lot with landscaping that includes a split rail fence, a number of deciduous trees and shrubs, and a flower garden. Resource U/21/0264 is not known to be associated with any significant historic events or persons and was therefore not evaluated under Criteria A and B. The resource was evaluated for significance at the local level under Criterion C for architecture. Although it is a Ranch House, it does not feature distinctive architectural design elements or a noteworthy method of construction, and its integrity has been affected by a significant addition which more than doubles the size of the building. It was found not to embody the distinctive characteristics of a house type, period, or method of construction, and therefore is not recommended as eligible under Criterion C.

SIZEMORE ACRES LN (U/21/0265)

Resource U/21/0265 is a circa 1965 Linear Ranch House located at the corner of Sizemore Acres Lane and North Mountain Street (Figure 32). The single-family residence is clad in brick veneer and has a laterally-gabled composition shingle roof. There is a shallow, windowless L on the south side of the front (west) elevation. The rest of the front elevation is recessed, and all fenestration lies beneath an unsupported shed roof porch created by overhanging eaves. Brick stairs with a wood railing and turned wood balusters lead to the recessed front entrance. The wood panel door has three small windows. To the south of the entrance are two two-over-two wood frame double-hung sash windows. To the north of the entrance are a wood frame tripartite picture window and a set pf paired two-over-two wood frame double-hung sash windows. A carport lies on the north elevation with aluminum supports.

Figure 31.
514 Tribal Road (U/21/0264)



A. West Elevation



B. Northwest Oblique


Figure 32.
Sizemore Acres Lane (U/21/0265)



A. Northwest
Oblique



B. North Elevation



C. West Elevation

Resource U/21/0265 is located on a corner lot on Sizemore Acres Lane, a small one-lane road that rises at a steep grade from busy North Mountain Street. Resource U/21/0265 is accessed from Sizemore Acres Lane via the carport on the north elevation, but roughly faces North Mountain Street. Due to the topography, Resource U/21/0265 is at least 20 feet above the level of North Mountain Street, and the large setback is filled with deciduous trees and some grass. There are ornamental shrubs and bushes as well. Resource U/21/0265 is not known to be associated with any significant historic events or persons and was therefore not evaluated under Criteria A and B. The resource was evaluated for significance at the local level under Criterion C for architecture. Although it is a Ranch House, it does not feature distinctive architectural design elements or a noteworthy method of construction. It was found not to embody the distinctive characteristics of a house type, period, or method of construction, and therefore is not recommended as eligible under Criterion C.

109 SIZEMORE ACRES LANE (U/21/0266)

Resource U/21/0266 is a circa 1965 Compact Ranch House located at 109 Sizemore Acres Lane (Figure 33). The single-family residence is clad in brick veneer and has a laterally-gabled composition shingle roof. Its front elevation faces south. A front-gabled porch extends over the wood panel door and a set of paired one-over-one aluminum frame double-hung sash windows. The porch has aluminum supports and synthetic siding in the pediment. Brick steps lead to a brick and concrete patio beneath the porch with an aluminum railing. To the east of the entrance lies a one car garage. To the west are two one-over-one aluminum frame double-hung sash windows. All windows have louvered shutters. The house is sited on an incline and there is a raised basement on the west side of the house.

Resource U/21/0266 is located on Sizemore Acres Lane, a small one-lane road that rises at a steep grade from busy North Mountain Street. It is one of under five houses on the lane, each separated by a wooded buffer. Resource U/21/0266 has a large grass lawn and ornamental flowering shrubs in addition to the buffer of coniferous and deciduous trees. Resource U/21/0266 is not known to be associated with any significant historic events or persons and was therefore not evaluated under Criteria A and B. The resource was evaluated for significance at the local level under Criterion C for architecture. Although it is a Ranch House, it does not feature distinctive architectural design elements or a noteworthy method of construction. It was found not to embody the distinctive characteristics of a house type, period, or method of construction, and therefore is not recommended as eligible under Criterion C.

Figure 33.
109 Sizemore Acres Lane (U/21/0266)



A. South Elevation



B. Southeast Oblique

1153 NORTH MOUNTAIN STREET (U/21/0267)

Resource U/21/0267 is a circa 1890 Georgian Cottage located at 1153 North Mountain Street (SC 198) (Figure 34). The one-story single-family residence is clad in smooth stucco and has a steeply pitched composition shingle hipped roof. The historic core of the front (north) elevation is covered by an added shed roofed screened porch. The front elevation is symmetrical with a central three pane half-light door flanked by paired three-over-one wood frame double-hung sash windows. Two internal brick chimneys rise symmetrically from the center of the house behind the paired windows. A historic addition has been made to the east elevation of the building. The addition extends from the line of the porch to the rear of the house, and has one set of three-over-one wood frame double-hung sash windows on the front elevation as well as two sets on the east elevation. A shed roofed side porch has also been added to the east elevation. The additions are clad in German novelty siding and the original hipped roof is extended to cover them.

Resource U/21/0267 is located on North Mountain Street (SC 198), which in this section is a two-lane road with sparse single-family homes and agricultural property. Resource U/21/0267 is located on a large parcel of land along with a circa 1980 two-story CMU residential duplex. Resource U/21/0267 appears to be vacant. It is surrounded by a sparse grass lawn and mature deciduous trees along with unmanicured ornamental shrubs. Resource U/21/0267 is not known to be associated with any significant historic events or persons and was therefore not evaluated under Criteria A and B. The resource was evaluated for significance at the local level under Criterion C for architecture. Although it is a Georgian Cottage, its integrity has been diminished by multiple additions that alter the overall character of the building. It was found not to embody the distinctive characteristics of a house type, period, or method of construction, and therefore is not recommended as eligible under Criterion C.

SOUTHERN RAILROAD (U/21/0268)

Resource U/21/0268 is a circa 1873 section of track belonging to the Southern Railroad which runs through the project area for roughly two miles (Figures 35-36). This section of track was originally part of the Atlanta & Richmond Air Line which ran through South Carolina from the North Carolina state line at Kings Mountain west into Georgia, passing through Blacksburg as well as Spartanburg and Greenville on the way. In 1877, bankruptcy forced the reorganization of the railroad as the Atlanta & Charlotte Air Line Railway, and by 1894 it has been acquired by the Southern Railway, which operated it as the Atlanta Line (Lewis 2016). Today, this section of track is a standard gauge track in active use, and makes crossings with Tribal Road, I-85, and E. Cherokee Street within the project area. The majority of Resource U/21/0268 as it runs through the project area is a single-track linear line, although it splits into a double-track linear line as it exits the project area to the southwest by Tribal Road. There is an additional siding track that dead ends directly southwest of the intersection with I-85 at an industrial complex.

Figure 34.
1153 North Mountain Street (U/21/0267)



A. North Elevation




B. Northeast
Oblique



C. Northwest
Oblique

Figure 35.
Path of Southern Railroad (U/21/0268) through Project Area



Source: USGS 7.5 Minute Topographic Quadrangle Map, Blacksburg, SC 1982

Figure 36.
Southern Railroad (U/21/0268)



A. View South at
North Carolina
Border



B. View South
from Tribal Road
Intersection



C. Track Detail

Resource U/21/0268 is an example of a common rail line type in South Carolina. It was not found to embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, and does not possess significance for its engineering or materials. It is recommended not eligible for inclusion on the NRHP under Criterion C. It was evaluated under Criterion A due to its association with patterns of development in both commerce and transportation. It was not found to rise to the level of significance necessary for inclusion on the NRHP due to either of these associations, particularly given that there are no additional historic elements, which would help communicate the association of this resource with those patterns of development within the APE. It is not known to be associated with any significant person and therefore was not evaluated under Criterion B.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY

No previously recorded archaeological sites occur within the project area. Archaeological fieldwork completed for this study included systematic shovel testing in all parts of the APE that were not excessively sloped, poorly drained, or obviously disturbed to an extent that they could not contain intact archaeological deposits. Shovel tests were placed at 30-meter (100-ft.) intervals and were excavated by hand until culturally sterile subsoil was encountered. In the sections of the survey area covering terraces of the Broad River, however, shovel tests were excavated to 1.0 meter (3.3 ft.) deep.


Along the entire length of the corridor and at interchanges, disturbance was significant. The most common cause of disturbance was prior construction of I-85 and adjacent surface roads. These resulted in broad areas of cut and fill through the natural grade. Small portions of the roadside survey areas were also disturbed by residential and commercial development. At interchanges, substantial disturbance from commercial development along with cutting and filling from access ramp and overpass construction was observed.

Two archaeological sites and one isolated find were identified within the survey corridor. All of these resources are recommended not eligible.

SITE 38CK199

Site 38CK199 reflects a gas/service station probably dating to the second half of the twentieth century (Figure 37). Site 38CK199 is located along the north shoulder of I-85, approximately 780 meters northeast of the Broad River crossing. The site is oriented toward I-85 and might have originally been associated with U.S. 29, which lay along the same orientation until the late 1950s-early 1960s. The site encompasses partly standing brick walls of two buildings, one of which contains a cement-slab floor and a pair of restrooms built of formed cement and possibly retrofitted to the structure. Additional features include two cement pump islands. Shovel testing

Figure 37.
Site Map of 38CK199 and View of Partial Walls



indicated graded surfaces within the survey corridor and did not produce any artifacts. Surface inspection, however, revealed several beverage containers that were identified as modern (probably last quarter of the twentieth century) along with brick rubble. These were not collected.

The site appears to date to the second half of the nineteenth century, and almost certainly was in use during the last third of the century, based on surface artifacts. The site appears to have been graded and does not contain archaeological deposits dating to a historic occupation. Given its relatively recent age and lack of archaeological data, this site is recommended not eligible for the NRHP.

SITE 38CK200


The second site (38CK200) is a partially demolished brick house in the southwest quadrant of the I-85/SC 5 interchange (Figure 38). The house is located approximately 500 meters south of the center of the interchange, and occupies a graded ridgetop east of SC 5 to the east. The site's landform appears to consist of a graded and filled ridge spur that slopes steeply on the north, south, and west sides. A chimney and portions of three walls remained standing at the site, and were constructed of machine-made brick. They appeared to date to the second half of the twentieth century, and could be less than 50 years old. No additional features were observed on the surface. Moreover, subsoil was noted at the surface in the immediate vicinity of the house, indicating significant grading and/or erosion had taken place. Beyond the house's immediate vicinity, excessive slopes and paved road surfaces prevented shovel testing.

The site appears to be significantly disturbed, possibly due to grading prior to construction. Inspection of exposed ground surfaces in the immediate vicinity of the house ruins indicated no topsoil or archaeological deposits. The steep slopes surrounding the house on three sites suggest a low potential for intact cultural features or deposits. Because of these conditions, Site 38CK200 is judged to have a poor archaeological research potential and is recommended not eligible for the NRHP under any of the four criteria.

ISOLATED FIND

One isolated find (IF1) was also recorded in the southwest quadrant of the I-85/SC 5 interchange. The find consists of a single wire nail recovered from a judgmental shovel test down the slope from 38CK200. A total of five shovel tests were excavated to delineate the resource, but no additional materials were recovered and no features observed. Modern trash and coaxial cable were noted on the surface, however. Based on proximity and slope, it is likely the nail was displaced downhill from 38CK200 or was included in the modern dumping. By definition, isolated finds are not eligible for the NRHP.

Figure 38.
Site Map of 38CK200 and View of Chimney and Partial Walls



VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

As a result of the cultural resources survey of the I-85 widening in Cherokee County, 22 architectural resources, two archaeological sites, and one isolated find were recorded and evaluated. One architectural resource, Resource U/21/0258, is recommended eligible for listing on the NRHP under Criterion C on the local level for its association with noted architect Louis H. Asbury and excellent integrity. Due to its location along the edge of the APE and beyond the extent of the project area, no effect to this resource is anticipated. All other resources are recommended not eligible.

It should be noted that while the improvements cross the Broad River floodplain, road improvement plans do not expect any disturbance in the floodplain areas. Therefore, deep testing to locate any deposits beyond the reach of a shovel was not performed and is not recommended.

Page Intentionally Left Blank

REFERENCES CITED

Adams, Natalie P., Mark T. Swanson, J.W. Joseph, Leslie Raymer, and Lisa D. O'Steen

- 2005 *The Free Cabin Site (9RT1036): Archaeological Examination of a Postbellum Tenant Occupation Near Hepzibah, Richmond County, Georgia*. Report submitted to GDOT and Earth Tech, Atlanta, Georgia. Report available from New South Associates, Inc., Stone Mountain, Georgia.

Adovasio, James M., Jack Donahue, Joel D. Gunn, and Robert Stuckernath

- 1977 Meadowcroft Rockshelter: Retrospect 1976. *Pennsylvania Archaeologist* 47:2-3.

Anderson, David G.

- 1982 The Mattassee Lake Ceramic Artifact Assemblage. In *Mattassee Lakes: Archaeological Investigations Along the Lower Santee River in the Coastal Plain of South Carolina*, by David G. Anderson, C.E. Cantley, and A.L. Novick, pp. 207-322. Special Publication. Atlanta Interagency Archaeological Services Division, Atlanta, Georgia.

- 1990 The Paleoindian Colonization of Eastern North America: A View from the Southeastern United States. In *Early Paleoindian Economies of Eastern North America*, edited by Barry Isaac and Kenneth Tankersley, pp. 163-216. *Journal of Economic Anthropology* Supplement 5.

Anderson, David G. and J.W. Joseph

- 1988 *Prehistory and History Along the Upper Savannah River: Technical Synthesis of Cultural Resource Investigations, Richard B. Russell Multiple Resource Area*. Report prepared for the National Park Service. Russell Papers. Report available from New South Associates, Inc., Stone Mountain, Georgia. Garrow and Associates, Inc., Atlanta, Georgia.

Anderson, David G., R. Jerald Ledbetter, Daniel T. Elliott, Dennis B. Blanton, Glen T. Hanson, and Frankie Snow

- 1994 Paleoindian and Early Archaic in the Lower Southeast: A View from Georgia. In *Ocmulgee Archaeology, 1936-1986*, pp. 55-70. University of Georgia Press, Athens, Georgia.

Anderson, David and Joseph Schuldenrein

- 1983 Early Archaic Settlement on the Southeastern Atlantic Slope: A View from the Rucker's Bottom Site, Elbert County, Georgia. *North American Archaeologist* 4.

Baker, Steven

- 1975 *The Historic Catawba Peoples: Exploratory Perspectives in Ethnohistory and Archaeology*. Department of History University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina.

Barry, John M.

- 1980 *Natural Vegetation of South Carolina*. University of South Carolina Press, Columbia, South Carolina.

Benson, Robert

- 2006 *Cultural Resources Overview of the Sumter National Forest*. United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service.

Binford, Lewis R.

- 1980 Willow Smoke and Dogs' Tails: Hunter-Gatherer Settlement Systems and Archaeological Site Formation. *American Antiquity* 45(1):4–20.

Braun, E. Lucy

- 1950 *Deciduous Forests of Eastern North America*. Blakiston, New York, New York.

Bushong, William, and Catherine Bishir

- 2009 Asbury, Lewis H. (1877-1975). *North Carolina Architects and Builders: A Biographical Dictionary*. North Carolina State University.

Cable, John S.

- 1982 Organizational Variability in Piedmont Hunter-Gatherer Lithic Assemblages. In *The Haw River Sites: Archaeological Investigations at Two Stratified Sites in the North Carolina Piedmont*, edited by Stephen R. Claggett and John S. Cable, pp. 637–688. Commonwealth and Associates, Inc., Jackson, Michigan.

Cable, John S., David Lawrence, and Leslie Raymer

- 1991 *Archaeological Test Excavations on the Northeastern Perimeter of the Buck Hall Site (38CH644), Buck Hall Recreation Area, Francis Marion National Forest, South Carolina*. Report available from New South Associates, Inc., Stone Mountain, Georgia.

Chapman, Jefferson

- 1985 Archaeology and the Archaic Period in the Southern Ridge-and-Valley Province. In *Structure and Process in Southeastern Archaeology*, edited by Roy S Dickens and H. Trawick Ward, pp. 137–153. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa, Alabama.

Cheves, Langdon, ed.

- 1897 *The Shaftsbury Papers and Other Records Relating to Carolina and the First Settlement on the Ashley River Prior to the Year 1767*. Collections of the South Carolina Historical Society V. Charleston, SC.

Claggett, Stephen R. and John S. Cable

- 1982 *The Haw River Sites: Archaeological Investigations at Two Stratified Sites in the North Carolina Piedmont*. Commonwealth Associates, Pennsylvania State University.

Coe, Joffre L.

- 1952 Cultural Sequence of the Carolina Piedmont. In *Archaeology of the Eastern United States*, edited by James B. Griffin. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois.
- 1964 The Formative Cultures of the Carolina Piedmont. *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*. New Series 54(5):1–130.

Council of South Carolina Professional Archaeologists, South Carolina Department of Archives and History, State Historic Preservation Office, and South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology

- 2013 *South Carolina Standards and Guidelines for Archaeological Investigations*. South Carolina Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina.

DePratter, Chester B.

- 1989 Cofitachequi: Ethnohistorical and Archaeological Evidence. In *Essays in Honor of Robert L. Stephenson*, edited by Albert C. Goodyear and Glen T. Hanson, pp. 133–156. Anthropological Studies 9. Occasional Papers of the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

DePratter, Chester B. and Christopher Judge

- 1986 A Provisional Late Prehistoric and Early Historic Ceramic Sequence for the Wateree Valley, South Carolina. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of Archaeological Society of South Carolina.

Edgar, Walter

- 1998 *South Carolina: A History*. University of South Carolina Press, Columbia, South Carolina.

Ferguson, Leland G.

- 1971 South Appalachian Mississippian. Dissertation, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Goodyear, Albert C.

- 1982 The Chronological Position of the Dalton Horizon in the Southeastern United States. *American Antiquity* 47:382–395.
- 2005 Evidence of Pre-Clovis Sties in the Eastern United States. In *Paleoamerican Origins: Beyond Clovis*, pp. 103–112. Texas A & M University Press, College Station, Texas.

Goodyear, Albert C., John H. House, and Neil W. Ackerly

- 1979 *Laurens-Anderson: An Archaeological Study of the Interriverine Piedmont*. Anthropological Studies 4. Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina.

Goodyear, Albert C., James L. Michie, and Tommy Charles

- 1989 The Earliest South Carolinians. In *Studies in South Carolina Archaeology in Honor of Robert L. Stephenson*, edited by Albert C. Goodyear and Glen T. Hanson. Anthropological Studies 9. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina.

Griffin, James B.

- 1967 Eastern North America Archaeology: A Summary. *Science* 156(3772):175–191.

Haynes, C. Vance

- 1980 Paleo-Indian Charcoal from Meadowcroft Rockshelter: Is Contamination a Problem? *American Antiquity* 45(3):582–587.

Haynes, C. Vance, D.J. Donahue, A.J.T. Jull, and T.H. Zabel

- 1984 Application of Accelerator Dating to Fluted Point Paleoindian Sites. *Archaeology of Eastern North America* 12:184–191.

Jones, William

- 1962 *Soil Survey of Cherokee County, South Carolina*. Soil Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

Keel, Bennie C.

- 1976 *Cherokee Archaeology: A Study of the Appalachian Summit*. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville, Tennessee.

Kelly, Robert L. and Lawrence C. Todd

- 1988 Coming into the Country: Early Paleoindian Hunting and Mobility. *American Antiquity* 53(2):231–244.

Kovacik, Charles F. and John J. Winberry

- 1987 *South Carolina: The Making of a Landscape*. University of South Carolina Press, Columbia, South Carolina.

Lawson, John

- 1709 *A New Voyage to Carolina*. Republished 1967. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Lewis, J.D.

- 2007 South Carolina - Railroads. *South Carolina - Railroads*. Electronic document, <http://www.carolana.com/sc/transportation/railroads/>, accessed September 13, 2016.

Little, Barbara J., Erika Martin Seibert, John H. Sprinkle Jr., and John Knoerl

- 2000 *National Register Bulletin: Guidelines for Evaluating and Registering Archeological Properties*. National Register of Historic Places, National Park Service, Washington, D.C.

Lowry, M.W.

- 1934 *Reconnaissance Erosion Survey of the State of South Carolina*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Washington, D.C.

Mattson, Richard, and Frances Alexander

- 2009 National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form: Bishop John C. Kilgo House. United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service.

McAlester, Virginia Savage

- 2013 *A Field Guide to American Houses*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, New York.

Michie, James L.

- 1977 The Late Pleistocene Human Occupation of South Carolina. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

Mills, Robert

- 1980 *Mills' Atlas: Atlas of the State of South Carolina, 1825*. Southern Historical Press, Greenville, South Carolina.

Moore, David

- 2002 *Catawba Valley Mississippian: Ceramics, Chronology, and Catawba Indians*. The University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa, Alabama.

Moss, Bobby Gilmer

- 1972 *The Old Iron District; a study of the development of Cherokee County--1750-1897*. Printed by Jacobs Press, Clinton, South Carolina.

Murphy, Carolyn

- 1995 *Carolina Rocks! The Geology of South Carolina*. Sandlapper Publishing Co., Orangeburg, South Carolina

Oliver, Billy A.

- 1985 Tradition and Typology: Basic Elements of the Carolina Projectile Point Sequence. In *Structure and Process in Southeastern Archaeology*, edited by Roy S. Dickens and H. Trawick Ward, pp. 195–211. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa, Alabama.

Orser, Charles E. Jr., Annette M. Nedola, and James L. Roark

- 1987 *Exploring the Rustic Life: Multidisciplinary Research at Millwood Plantation, A Large Piedmont Plantation in Abbeville County, South Carolina, and Elbert County, Georgia*. Prepared for Archeological Services Division, National Park Service, Southeast Region, Atlanta, Georgia. Contract number CX 5000-0-4042.

Funded by Savannah District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Savannah, Georgia. Report available from Mid-American Research Center, Loyola University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.

Prunty, Merle

- 1955 The Renaissance of the Southern Plantation. *The Geographical Review* 45.

Roots and Recall

- 2016 Cherokee County - History. *Roots and Recall*. Electronic document, <http://www.rootsandrecall.com/cherokee/history/>, accessed June 23, 2016.

Sassaman, Kenneth E.

- 1983 Middle and Late Archaic Settlement in the South Carolina Piedmont. Unpublished Master of Arts Thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina.
- 1993 *Early Pottery in the Southeast: Tradition and Innovation in Cooking Technology*. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa, Alabama.

Sassaman, Kenneth E., Mark J. Brooks, Glen T. Hanson, and David G. Anderson

- 1990 *Native American Prehistory of the Middle Savannah River Valley: A Synthesis of Archaeological Investigations on the Savannah River Site, Aiken and Barnwell Counties, South Carolina*. Savannah River Archaeological Research Papers 1. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina.

Smith, Bruce D.

- 1986 The Archaeology of the Southeastern United States: From Dalton to DeSoto (10,000 B.P.-500 B.P.). In *Advances in World Archaeology*, edited by Fred Wendorf and Angela E. Close, 5: pp. 1-92. Academic Press, New York, New York.

South Carolina Department of Archives and History

- 2013a *Survey Manual: South Carolina Statewide Survey of Historic Places*. Report available from the South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina.
- 2013b *Guidelines for Surveying Post-World War II Neighborhoods and Residences*. Report available from the South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina.

Steponaitis, Vincas P.

- 1986 Prehistoric Archaeology in the Southeastern United States, 1970-1985. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15:363–404.

Stoltman, James B.

- 1974 *Groton Plantation: An Archaeological Study of a South Carolina Locality*. Monographs of the Peabody Museum 1. Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Swanton, John R.

- 1922 Early History of the Creek Indians and their Neighbors. *Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin* 73.
- 1946 *Indians of the Southeastern United States*. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 137., Washington D.C.

Swisher, James

- 2007 *The Revolutionary War in the Southern Backcountry*. Pelican Publishing, Gretna, Louisiana.

Trimble, Stanley W.

- 1974 *Man-Induced Soil Erosion on the Southern Piedmont 1700-1970*. Context. Soil Conservation Society of America, Ankeny, Iowa.

Trinkley, Michael

- 1980 Investigation of the Woodland Period Along the South Carolina Coast. PhD dissertation, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.
- 1989 An Archaeological Overview of the South Carolina Woodland Period: It's The Same Old Riddle. In *Studies in South Carolina Archaeology: Essays in Honor of Robert L. Stephenson*, edited by Albert C. Goodyear III and Glen T. Hanson, pp. 73–87. Anthropological Studies 9. Occasional Papers of the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

Tuomey, M.

- 1848 *The Geology of South Carolina*. A.S. Johnston, Columbia, South Carolina.

Watson, Ebbie Julian

- 1908 *Handbook of South Carolina: Resources, Institutions and Industries of The State.*
 II. A Summary of the Statistics of Agriculture, Manufactures, Geography,
 Climate, Geology and Physiography, Minerals and Mining, Educations,
 Transplortation, Commerce, Government, Etc., Etc. The State Department of
 Agriculture, Commerce and Immigration, Columbia, South Carolina.

Wauchope, Robert L.

- 1966 *Archaeological Survey of Northern Georgia.* Society for American Archaeology,
 Memoir 21. University of Utah Printing Service, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Yarnell, Richard A. and M. Jean Black

- 1985 Temporal Trends Indicated by a Survey of Archaic and Woodland Plant Food
 Remains from Southeastern North America. *Southeastern Archaeology* 4:93–106.

Page Intentionally Left Blank

APPENDIX A: STATE SITE FORMS

Page Intentionally Left Blank

SOUTH CAROLINA INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
SITE INVENTORY RECORD
(68-1 Rev. 2015)

STATE: SC COUNTY: Cherokee SITE NUMBER: 38CK199
Recorded By: Brad Botwick Affiliation: New South Assoc. Date (MM/DD/YYYY): 06/13/16

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Site name: FS1 Project: 4750 I-85 Cherokee County
2. USGS Quadrangle: Blacksburg South Date: 1982 Scale: 1:24000
3. UTM: Zone 17 Easting 448057 Northing 3886616 Reference Datum/Year NAD 27
4. Other map reference: _____
5. Descriptive site type (see handbook):
Prehistoric _____ Historic structure remnant
6. Archaeological investigation: Survey Y Testing _____ Excavation _____
7. Property owner: Unknown Phone number: _____
8. Address: Unknown
9. Other site designations: _____
10. National Register of Historic Places recommendation: Eligible _____ Not Eligible Y Additional work _____
11. Level of significance: National _____ State _____ Local _____
12. Justification: _____

-----Office Use Only-----

Determined eligible: _____ Determined not eligible: _____ Date: _____
On NRHP: _____ Date Listed: _____

B. ENVIRONMENT AND LOCATION

1. General physiographic province: Piedmont
2. Landform location: side slope Site elevation (above MSL): 615 (in feet)
3. On site soil type: eroded sandy loam/fill Soil classification: Wickham Association
4. Major river system: Santee Nearest river/stream: Broad River
5. Current vegetation: Pine/coniferous _____ Hardwood _____ Mixed pine/hardwood Y Old Field _____
Grass/pasture _____ Agricultural/crops _____ Wetlands/freshwater _____
Wetlands/saltwater _____ Other _____ Comments _____
6. Description of groundcover: moderate (pine straw/leaf litter)

C. SITE CHARACTERISTICS

1. Estimated site dimensions: 45 meters by 20 meters
2. Site depth: 0-20 cm.
3. Cultural features (type and number): brick wall remnants of two structures, two cement pump islands
4. Presence of: Midden _____ Floral remains _____ Faunal remains _____ Shell _____ Charcoal _____
5. Human skeletal remains: Unknown Preservation _____
6. General site description:

FS1 reflects a gas/service station of indeterminate date, although it likely reflects the second half of the twentieth century. The site is oriented toward I-85 and might have originally been associated with U.S. 29, which lay along the same orientation until the later 1950s-early 1960s. The site encompasses partly standing brick walls of two buildings, one of which contains a cement-slab floor and a pair of restrooms built of formed cement and possibly retrofitted to the structure. Additional features include two cement pump islands. Shovel testing indicated graded ground surfaces within the survey corridor and did not produce any artifacts. Surface inspection, however, revealed several beverage containers that were identified as modern (ca. last quarter of the 20th century) along with brick rubble. These were not collected. Given that the site appears to lack archaeological deposits dating to a historic occupation, this site is recommended not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

7. Verbal description of location:

The site is located along the north shoulder of I-85, approximately 780 meters northeast of the Broad River crossing.

-----INCLUDE SITE MAP(S) AT END OF FORM-----

Site Number 38CK199

Page 2

D. ARCHAEOLOGICAL COMPONENT

Paleo Indian	_____	Late Woodland	_____	16th Century	_____
Early Archaic	_____	Any Woodland	_____	17th Century	_____
Middle Archaic	_____	Mississippian	_____	18th Century	_____
Late Archaic	_____	Late Prehistoric	_____	19th Century	_____
Any Archaic	_____	Contact Era Prehistoric	_____	20th Century	<u>Y</u>
Early Woodland	_____	Unknown Prehistoric	_____	Unknown historic	_____
Middle Woodland	_____				

E. DATA RECOVERED

-----**INCLUDE INVENTORY AT END OF FORM**----- total number of artifacts: None

F. DATA RECOVERY METHODS

1. Ground surface visibility: 0% _____ 1-25% Y 26-50% _____ 51-75% _____ 76-100% _____2. Number of person hours spent collecting (total hours X total people): 8

3. Description of surface collection methods:

Type: grid collection	_____	Extent: complete	_____
grab collection	_____	selective	_____
controlled sampling	_____	no collection made	<u>Y</u>
other (specify):	_____		

4. Description of testing methods:

Method	Systematic	Number	Size	Depth
Auger	_____	_____	_____	_____
Posthole	_____	_____	_____	_____
Shovel	_____	<u>12</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>25</u>
Other	_____	_____	_____	_____

5. Description of excavation units:

Number	Size	Depth	Comment:
_____	_____	_____ cm	

Put additional sizes in comments.

G. MANAGEMENT INFORMATION

1. Present land use:

Agricultural	_____	Forest	_____
Fallow	_____	Residential, low density	_____
Residential, high density	_____	Commercial	<u>Y</u>
Industrial	_____	Other (specify)	<u>Y</u>
		abandoned	_____

2. Present condition/integrity of site:

Type	<u>damaged</u>	Extent	<u>heavy</u>	Nature of Damage	erosion	_____
					cultivation	_____
					logging	_____
					development	_____
					vandalism	_____
					inundation	_____
					other (specify)	<u>Y</u>
						<u>razing/demolition</u>

3. Potential impacts and threats to site:

Potential Threat:	<u>Y</u>	Nature of Threat	erosion	_____	Impact Zone	<u>indirect</u>
			cultivation	_____		
			logging	_____		
			development	<u>Y road widening</u>		
			vandalism	_____		
			inundation	_____		
			other (specify)	_____		

Site number 38CK199

Page 3

4. Recommendations for further work:

Survey _____ Testing _____ Excavation _____ Archival _____ None Y Other: _____

Comments:

5. References: Historic/archival documentation Y

Archaeological documentation Y

6. Additional management information/comments:

7. Location of existing collections: New South Assoc. (temporarily)

8. Location of photographs: New South Assoc. (temporarily)

9. Location of special samples:

Type of special samples:

Signature of observer:

Date: 06/13/16



INITIAL THE FOLLOWING-----


I have compared the map location to the GPS coordinates: _____NP_____

I have included a site map: _____NP_____

I have included an artifact inventory: _____N/A_____

Please combine your site map and artifact tables with the Site Form in a single PDF, placing them at the end of the document. The PDF should be emailed to dertingk@mailbox.sc.edu or delivered using www.wetransfer.com. Shapefiles/geodatabases are welcome additions to the submission.

in
en
38
mi
38
de
50
19
ea
44
U
C
ou
44
U
C
hi
1,4
NA
no
D
N
or
is
be
m
re
ce
to
si
ap
a
J
T
Lin



clear markers



street map




image



topo

N 35.12296
E 081.56988



Rite in the Rain

SOUTH CAROLINA INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
SITE INVENTORY RECORD
(68-1 Rev. 2015)

STATE: SC COUNTY: Cherokee SITE NUMBER: 38CK200
Recorded By: LK Schnitzer Affiliation: New South Assoc. Date (MM/DD/YYYY): 06/13/16

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Site name: FS2 Project: 4750 I-85 Cherokee County
2. USGS Quadrangle: Blacksburg North Date: 1982 Scale: 1:24000
3. UTM: Zone 17 Easting 453569 Northing 3888172 Reference Datum/Year WGS1984
4. Other map reference: _____
5. Descriptive site type (see handbook):
Prehistoric _____ Historic homesite remnant
6. Archaeological investigation: Survey Y Testing _____ Excavation _____
7. Property owner: Unknown Phone number: _____
8. Address: Unknown
9. Other site designations: _____
10. National Register of Historic Places recommendation: Eligible _____ Not Eligible Y Additional work _____
11. Level of significance: National _____ State _____ Local _____
12. Justification: _____

-----Office Use Only-----

Determined eligible: _____ Determined not eligible: _____ Date: _____
On NRHP: _____ Date Listed: _____

B. ENVIRONMENT AND LOCATION

1. General physiographic province: Piedmont
2. Landform location: side slope Site elevation (above MSL): 870 (in feet)
3. On site soil type: silty/clay/loam, severely eroded Soil classification: Tatum Association, 15%-35% slope
4. Major river system: Santee Nearest river/stream: Buffalo Creek
5. Current vegetation: Pine/coniferous _____ Hardwood _____ Mixed pine/hardwood _____ Old Field _____
Grass/pasture Y Agricultural/crops _____ Wetlands/freshwater _____
Wetlands/saltwater _____ Other _____ Comments _____
6. Description of groundcover: heavy (kudzu/demolition debris)

C. SITE CHARACTERISTICS

1. Estimated site dimensions: 20 meters by 8.5 meters
2. Site depth: 0 cm.
3. Cultural features (type and number):
foundation, partially standing brick walls, and chimney of a 20th century house
4. Presence of: Midden _____ Floral remains _____ Faunal remains _____ Shell _____ Charcoal _____
5. Human skeletal remains: Unknown Preservation _____
6. General site description:

FS2 is a partially demolished brick house situated on a ridgetop, between a steep slope face to the west and SC 5 to the east. A chimney and portions of three walls remain standing. The extant portion of the house is constructed of machine-made brick and appears to date to the second half of the twentieth century, and may be modern. No additional features were observed. No shovel tests were excavated due to excessive slope in the west, paved road in the east, and subsoil at surface in the immediate house vicinity. Modern trash from roadside dumping and utility line construction was observed in the area. FS2 is not eligible for the NRHP under any of the four criteria. New South recommends no further work at this site.

7. Verbal description of location:

FS2 is located in the southwest quadrant of the I-85/SC 5 interchange. It is approximately 500 meters south of the center of the interchange.

-----INCLUDE SITE MAP(S) AT END OF FORM-----

D. ARCHAEOLOGICAL COMPONENT

Paleo Indian	_____	Late Woodland	_____	16th Century	_____
Early Archaic	_____	Any Woodland	_____	17th Century	_____
Middle Archaic	_____	Mississippian	_____	18th Century	_____
Late Archaic	_____	Late Prehistoric	_____	19th Century	_____
Any Archaic	_____	Contact Era Prehistoric	_____	20th Century	<u>Y</u>
Early Woodland	_____	Unknown Prehistoric	_____	Unknown historic	_____
Middle Woodland	_____				

E. DATA RECOVERED

-----**INCLUDE INVENTORY AT END OF FORM**----- total number of artifacts: None

F. DATA RECOVERY METHODS

1. Ground surface visibility: 0% _____ 1-25% Y 26-50% _____ 51-75% _____ 76-100% _____

2. Number of person hours spent collecting (total hours X total people): _____

3. Description of surface collection methods:

Type: grid collection	_____	Extent: complete	_____
grab collection	_____	selective	_____
controlled sampling	_____	no collection made	<u>Y</u>
other (specify):	_____		

4. Description of testing methods:

Method	Number	Size	Depth
Auger	_____	_____	_____
Posthole	_____	_____	_____
Shovel	_____	_____	_____
Other	_____	_____	_____

5. Description of excavation units:

Number	Size	Depth	Comment:
_____	_____	_____	_____

Put additional sizes in comments.

G. MANAGEMENT INFORMATION

1. Present land use:

Agricultural	_____	Forest	_____
Fallow	_____	Residential, low density	_____
Residential, high density	_____	Commercial	_____
Industrial	_____	Other (specify)	<u>Y</u>
		abandoned	_____

2. Present condition/integrity of site:

Type	<u>damaged</u>	Extent	<u>heavy</u>	Nature of Damage	erosion	_____
					cultivation	_____
					logging	_____
					development	_____
					vandalism	_____
					inundation	_____
					other (specify)	<u>Y</u>
					razing/demolitions	_____

3. Potential impacts and threats to site:

Potential Threat:	<u>Y</u>	Nature of Threat	erosion	_____	Impact Zone	<u>indeterminate</u>
			cultivation	_____		
			logging	_____		
			development	<u>Y road widening</u>		
			vandalism	_____		
			inundation	_____		
			other (specify)	_____		

Site number 38CK200

Page 3

4. Recommendations for further work:

Survey _____ Testing _____ Excavation _____ Archival _____ None Y Other: _____

Comments:

5. References: Historic/archival documentation Y

Archaeological documentation Y

6. Additional management information/comments:

7. Location of existing collections: New South Assoc. (temporarily)

8. Location of photographs: New South Assoc. (temporarily)

9. Location of special samples:

Type of special samples:

Signature of observer:

Date: 06/13/16



INITIAL THE FOLLOWING-----


I have compared the map location to the GPS coordinates: ____NP____

I have included a site map: ____NP____

I have included an artifact inventory: ____N/A____

Please combine your site map and artifact tables with the Site Form in a single PDF, placing them at the end of the document. The PDF should be emailed to dertingk@mailbox.sc.edu or delivered using www.wetransfer.com. Shapefiles/geodatabases are welcome additions to the submission.

in
en
38
mi
38
de
50
19
ea
45
U
C
ou
45
U
C
hi
1,
NA
2,
NA
no
D
N
or
is
be
m
re
co
to
si
ap
a
J
T
Lin



clear markers



street map



image



topo

