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MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

The William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research (WMCAR) conducted supplemental archaeological survey of the area of potential effect (APE) for the proposed Department of Game and Inland Fisheries (DGIF) Headquarters on a portion of the Virginia Commonwealth University’s (VCU) Rice Center property in Charles City County, Virginia, between April 5–7, 2006. On April 10–11, WMCAR conducted supplemental archaeological survey of the proposed VCU Inger and Walter Rice Life Sciences Research Pier Facility. These investigations were conducted in accordance with an agreement with the VCU – Facilities Management. The goal of this research was to provide specific information about the nature and distribution of archaeological resources within the proposed project area, including preliminary assessments of potential eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) for sites identified through the survey.

The Rice Center is located on the James River, in southcentral Charles City County, Virginia. The proposed DGIF headquarters are to be built to the east of Charles Lake and south of Route 5 (John Tyler Memorial Highway). Development of the proposed Rice Center Pier Facility includes construction of a gravel road from an existing road to the north bank of the James River, west of the former confluence of Kimmages Creek.

Supplemental archaeological survey of the DGIF Headquarters project area included complete pedestrian survey involving both surface examination and systematic shovel testing at 15-m (50-ft.) intervals. Approximately 0.77 ha (1.9 acres) was surveyed during the present study. In addition, the surface within the APE was swept with a metal detector in 15-m (50-ft.) intervals. Of 49 shovel tests excavated, two (4%) were positive, resulting in the identification of one archaeological location. The metal detector survey resulted in the identification of 18 positive targets, grouped into 14 archaeological locations. In addition, surface features outside the APE were identified as Civil War–era earthworks. At least one of the positive metal detector targets relates to that surface feature. Based on shovel test and metal detector survey results, no sites and 15 archaeological locations were identified within the project APE. One site (44CC401) was identified outside the APE.

Supplemental archaeological survey of the Pier Facility project area consisted of excavation of two 1-x-1-m (3.3-x-3.3-ft.) test units in the vicinity of positive shovel tests excavated during the prior (March 2005) fieldwork. In addition, nine judgmental shovel tests were excavated in order to identify the extent of Site 44CC402.

Site 44CC401, identified outside the DGIF project APE, consists of a line of earthworks. This earthen fortification likely dates to the July and August 1862 Union Army encampment at Harrison’s Landing. The portion of the earthworks adjacent to the site trend northeast to southwest, and according to maps from the period, the line originally ran from the James River at Kimmage’s Landing to the vicinity of Westover Church. Site 44CC401 could provide significant information regarding the Military/Defense theme during the Civil War (1860–1865) on the Upper Coastal Plain of Virginia (DHR 2001). Thus, Site 44CC401 is considered potentially eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D. The site may also be eligible under Criteria A and B.

Site 44CC402 is a prehistoric site of unknown age. The site measures at minimum 80 m east-west x 45 m north-south (262 x 148 ft.). Materials recovered from the site combined with its apparent size suggest that the site represents either a series of small temporary camps or a larger, more permanent occupation. As such, Site 44CC402 has the potential to provide significant information about settlement and subsistence themes during prehistory in the Upper Coastal Plain of Virginia (DHR 2003). Therefore, Site 44CC402 is considered potentially eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D; Criteria A–C are considered not applicable. The small portion of the site that falls within the APE for the pier access road has been disturbed by construction and demolition of a structure that once stood in the vicinity, however. The proposed project will have no significant impact on the archaeological resources within the APE. No further work is recommended.

By definition, archaeological locations not eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A–D.
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1: Project Background

INTRODUCTION
The William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research (WMCAR) conducted supplemental archaeological survey of the area of potential effect (APE) for the proposed Department of Game and Inland Fisheries (DGIF) Headquarters (Virginia Department of Historic Resources [VDHR] File No. 2004-0595) on a portion of the Virginia Commonwealth University’s (VCU) Rice Center property in Charles City County, Virginia, between April 5–7, 2006. On April 10–11, WMCAR conducted supplemental archaeological survey of the proposed VCU Inger and Walter Rice Life Sciences Research Pier Facility (VDHR File No. 2004-0139). These investigations were conducted in accordance with an agreement with the VCU–Facilities Management. The goal of this research was to provide specific information concerning the nature and distribution of archaeological resources within the proposed project area, including preliminary assessments of potential eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) for any sites identified through the survey.

The investigation was carried out under the general supervision of WMCAR Interim Director Joe B. Jones. Project Archaeologist Elizabeth J. Monroe was responsible for organization and implementation of the archaeological field program and preparation of the final report. Dr. Monroe was assisted in the field by WMCAR staff members Courtney Birkett, Albert Cheung, Shelli Lander, Brown Mims, and Bethany Young. Deborah L. Davenport supervised laboratory processing and historic artifact analysis. Prehistoric artifacts were analyzed by Kevin Goodrich and Shelli Lander. The final report was produced by David W. Lewes, and final illustrations were prepared by Eric A. Agin. All project-related documentation is stored at the WMCAR in Williamsburg, Virginia, referenced under project number 06-08.

DESCRIPTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING OF THE PROJECT AREA
The project area is located in Charles City County, Virginia, on land owned by Virginia Commonwealth University (Figure 1). There are two distinct project areas associated with this supplemental survey effort. The northern project area is associated with the proposed construction of a Department of Game and Inland Fisheries (DGIF) Region I Headquarters (Figure 2). The southern project area is associated with the construction of the Inger and Walter Rice Center (Rice Center) for Environmental Life Sciences Research Pier Facility. Both project areas are located in the Coastal Plain Province of Virginia. The area of potential effect

Figure 1. Project area location.
(APE) for the DGIF headquarters is located on a wooded upland south of Route 5 and east of Charles Lake. The mixed-hardwood trees that cover the APE are mature indicating that the area has not been logged recently. The Rice Center Pier Facility is located on the northern bank of the James River, west of its former confluence with Kimmages Creek (now Charles Lake). The portion of the Pier Facility APE that required supplemental survey was the vicinity of a proposed gravel access road at the top of the bluff overlooking the James River. Until recently a twentieth-century structure stood in the vicinity, and the area is largely open with a few mature hardwoods dotting the landscape. The project area is home to numerous species of terrestrial mammals typical of the eastern woodlands, such as deer, squirrel, and raccoon. In addition to songbirds, woodpeckers, and wild turkey, water-adapted bird species, such as herons, are also common.

Figure 2. Project area and environs (U.S. Geological Survey [USGS] 1999).
The survey expectations set forth in this chapter were generated from review and inspection of archival/cartographic resources, archaeological site records, and past reports of professional archaeological work relevant to the project area stored at the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (DHR) and the WMCAR. Site records for all sites within 1.6-km (1-mi.) radius of the project area were reviewed to help generate archaeological expectations for the supplemental field survey. Analysis and review of secondary sources available at the WMCAR and the Earl Gregg Swem Library of the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg provided expectations regarding historical archaeological resources for the project area. The DHR site file inventory records, augmented by the WMCAR's long-term research conducted at the nearby Shirley and Sherwood Forest plantations and the original fieldwork conducted for this project by VCU archaeologists, also proved very useful for providing expectations regarding both prehistoric and historic archaeological resources for the project area. The review of archaeological site files via DHR's Data Sharing System (DSS) indicated that 6 previously recorded archaeological sites are located within a 1.6-km (1-mi.) radius of the proposed project area, including two that are located within the project area (Figure 3 and Table 1).

PREVIOUS RESEARCH NEAR THE PROJECT AREA

According to an undated manuscript on file at the DHR, archaeologist C. G. Holland visited the vicinity of the Rice Center at least twice, and made collections at two locations adjacent to what is now Old Ferry Road (Holland n.d.). It is unclear when the visits were made, but it seems likely that both visits pre-date the construction of the Benjamin Harrison Bridge in 1967 (Tyler 1990:56). He designated the western collection area as CC1a, and the eastern area (a road cut) as CC1b. The two areas were subsequently designated as 44CC268 and 44CC269, respectively. The western site, 44CC268, has been interpreted as a Woodland site based on Holland’s recovery of ceramics. No ceramics were recovered from Site 44CC269; it has been designated as belonging to an unknown period of prehistory. It is likely that the two areas are actually one site that was divided by the ferry access road, however. Howard MacCord recorded two sites in the vicinity of Kimmages Wharf. Site 44CC4, also known as the Camp Weyanoke Site, is described as a small village occupied from the Archaic through Woodland eras. It occupies a former terrace that has eroded and is now a beach that is submerged at high tide (Buchanan 1966). MacCord and Gary Faison excavated several test units in August of 1963. The results of the excavation indicate that wave action has mixed what may once have been separate deposits or occupations. Collections of artifacts exposed on the beach were made in 1964 and 1965. Site 44CC11 was identified and tested by William T. Buchanan and recorded by Howard MacCord. Based on the form on file with DHR, the site consists of 61 cm (2 ft.) of shell midden containing prehistoric ceramics, lithics, and refuse. Site 44CC16, located east of 44CC4, is a 15-m- (50-ft.-) square deposit of
Figure 3. Previously identified archaeological sites within a 1.6-km radius of the project area (USGS 1999).
late seventeenth-century refuse. The site may be associated with nearby Berkeley Plantation (018-0001). Site 44CC400 was recently identified during a survey for the proposed Capital Trails Bicycle Path (Mullin and Rupnik 2006). Located adjacent to Route 5, the site consists of eighteenth- through nineteenth-century occupation. In addition to a domestic occupation, a portion of Benjamin Harrison’s eighteenth-century mill race was identified. This feature was subsequently used during the Civil War as an earthen fortification.

In addition to the work mentioned above, archaeologists from VCU have conducted research on the Rice Center property. In the spring of 2003, an archaeological field methods course began at the Rice Center and, according to a report on file with VCU – Facilities Management, has continued each succeeding semester (Bennett 2005a). A reconnaissance survey was conducted east of the southernmost portion of the Civil War earthworks, on the eastern side of Charles Lake/Kimmages Creek. Sixty-five 1.5-×-1.5-ft. squares were excavated by volunteers and VCU students. The earthworks themselves were assessed for preservation and construction methods by the excavation of a series of 5-×-5-ft. test units. All artifacts were cleaned, labeled, and cataloged. The results of the excavations indicate that one or more prehistoric sites are located east of lake/creek, with occupations dating as early as the Middle Archaic (Bennett 2005a, 2005b). In addition, a posthole and a pit dating to the seventeenth century were identified adjacent to the earthworks, suggesting a structure once stood in the vicinity. Additional testing, both test units and shovel testing, was conducted near the features, but no other features were identified. Few Civil War–era artifacts were recovered, despite the excellent preservation of the earthworks.

In September of 2004, archaeologists from VCU conducted a survey of the Rice Center Pier Facility project area (Bennett 2005a). Twenty-six shovel tests were excavated at 7.5-m (25-ft.) intervals along the center line of a proposed access road, of which thirteen were positive. Artifacts recovered included prehistoric lithic artifacts indicative of a site, and modern construction materials likely associated with a twentieth-century structure that once stood in the vicinity. No features were identified, and the survey report suggests that the materials recovered were from redeposited contexts.

In March 2005, archaeologists from VCU conducted a survey of the DGIF project area. Shovel testing was conducted at 30-m (100-ft.) intervals. A total of 61 shovel test pits was excavated, of which one was positive for a single quartzite flake.

Upon review, the DHR determined that these efforts did not meet guidelines for conducting archaeological survey in Virginia. In a letter dated December 19, 2005, DHR noted that in addition to failure to secure a permit for archaeological work on state lands, the following guidelines were not met as reflected in the two reports that were prepared to summarize the survey work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Recorded by/Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44CC4</td>
<td>Archaic–Woodland</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>H. MacCord/1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44CC11</td>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>Shell midden</td>
<td>H. MacCord/1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44CC16</td>
<td>4th qtr 17th century</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>W. Buchanan/n.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44CC268</td>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>J. M. Wittkofski, VCRA/1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44CC269</td>
<td>Prehistoric: unknown</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>J. M. Wittkofski, VCRA/1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44CC400</td>
<td>Late 18th–19th century</td>
<td>Domestic/mill/earthworks</td>
<td>J. Mullin, Louis Berger/2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1. Summary of previously identified archaeological sites within a 1.6-km (1.0-mi.) radius of the project corridor.*
Mapping of survey area (precise survey location must be presented on USGS topographic maps; site plan)

Project maps showing positive and negative shovel tests that can be easily tied into real space

Discussion of previous work, showing location of surveys and recorded sites

Survey interval (50-foot is recommended)

Description of soil stratigraphy with interpretation of integrity

Horizontal and vertical provenience of recovered artifacts

Designation of archaeological sites based on artifact distribution

Analysis and discussion of recovered artifacts

Presentation (two copies of bound, archival quality reports must be submitted for review)

The DHR also recommended that any future archaeological efforts at the Rice Center be coordinated with them, as well as with the Virginia Council on Indians and the Chickahominy and Eastern Chickahominy Indian Tribes. Following an on-site meeting in January 2006 between representatives of VCU—Facilities and DHR and submission of project maps for each project, DHR made the following recommendations in a letter dated February 28, 2006. Regarding the fieldwork conducted in the vicinity of the Rice Center Pier Facility, DHR was hesitant to concur with survey recommendations attributing the recovered cultural materials to colluvial redeposition and therefore recommended that two 3.3-x-3.3-ft. (1-x-1-m) test units be excavated in the vicinity of the Shovel Tests 113 and 105/106 in order to assess stratigraphy. In addition, DHR noted the need for formal recordation of the prehistoric site identified during the original survey, which would be necessary for assignment of a state archaeological site number. In the case of the DGIF Headquarters Facility project area, DHR recommended that, in addition to addressing the comments from December 19, 2005, original shovel test data should be augmented with a systematic metal detector survey of the project area and detailed mapping of the project area in relation to nearby Civil War earthworks.

PREHISTORIC CONTEXT

In the absence of any written documentation, our knowledge of cultures in North America prior to European colonization is based solely on the results of archaeological research. Archaeologists divide prehistory on the Eastern Seaboard into three general stages based on interpreted changes in past lifeways and cultural adaptations. These stages include the Paleoindian stage from about 10,000 B.C. to 8000 B.C., the Archaic stage from about 8000 B.C. to 1200 B.C., and the Woodland stage from about 1200 B.C. to European contact and colonization in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The Archaic and Woodland stages are further subdivided into early, middle, and late periods, which also reflect changes in cultural adaptations that are manifested by, among other things, changes in predominant diagnostic artifact types. The following sections summarize the general character of each of these stages and periods, associated diagnostic artifacts, and basic site types that could be expected to occur within the survey area and environs.

Paleoindian Stage (prior to 8000 B.C.)

Paleoindian refers to the period of initial human colonization and settlement that corresponds in large part to the end of the last Ice Age, or Pleistocene. The cultural groups of this stage are characterized as a mobile population of hunting bands exploiting large game animals over a large but fixed area. Conventional wisdom held that these groups relied heavily on hunting such megafauna as mammoth and mastodon. Archaeological research over the past 10–15 years, however, has shown that much of the Paleoindian diet comprised plant foods, small and medium-sized game, and fish. Indeed, as the climate changed at the end of the Pleistocene, the numbers of megafauna had likely
dwindled by the time of initial Paleoindian occupation to the extent that a mammoth or mastodon hunt was a very rare event.

According to site forms on file with the DHR, Paleoindian components have not been identified from any of the recorded sites in the vicinity of the project area. Evidence of such sites are known to occur in the general area through occasional finds of fluted projectile points, however (McAvoy 1979). Two such components are reported from sites on nearby Eppes Island. One model of Paleoindian settlement holds that principal sites of these groups will occur mainly at sources of high quality knappable stone, the closest example being the Williamson Site in Dinwiddie County (Gardner 1983; McAvoy 1992; McCary 1951). At the same time, it is to be expected that less prominent sites will occur more widely where smaller, task-oriented groups were ranging outward from the primary residential sites. The Rice Center property has a moderate potential for traces of these kinds of activities. It is important to add that new radiocarbon evidence from the Cactus Hill Site (44SX202) in Sussex County may extend the date for human occupation in the region as far back as 13,000 to 15,000 BC (McAvoy and McAvoy 1997). The likelihood of encountering components of this age at Shirley Plantation is considered to be low.

**Archaic Stage (8000–1000 B.C.)**

The Archaic Stage corresponds to the early and middle portions of the Holocene, the period of general climatic amelioration following the last Ice Age. The cultural record of this time tracks a trend of increasingly localized adaptation to gradually changing conditions, including a net population increase. Archaic components are very common in the nearby Shirley vicinity (Reinhart 1984), having been reported from 34% (n=33) of all sites within one mile of the property. Numerous sites simply recorded with “prehistoric” components indicate that the actual number of Archaic habitations is probably even higher.

During the **Early Archaic** period (8000–6500 BC) there appears to have been considerable continuity of patterns established during the preceding Paleoindian stage (Custer 1989, 1990; Dent 1995). Mobility remained a critical aspect of the overall adaptive strategy but subsistence pursuits show signs of increased generalization. Many basic tool types remain a part of the standard tool kit and a preference for higher quality stone is still widely observed. Alterations to the earlier pattern consist of technological developments such as notched projectile points and more common use of groundstone tools. The locations chosen for settlements become more diversified at this time. The potential is moderate to high for identification of additional Early Archaic sites at the Rice Center.

In the **Middle Archaic** period (6500–3000 BC) the generalized adaptive strategy that began to emerge in the preceding period appears to have been more fully embraced (Custer 1990; Dent 1995). Consequently, Middle Archaic sites are known to occur very widely in both upland and streamside settings. The typical site is quite small and artifacts indicate a relatively limited set of activities and short term occupations; larger sites often represent palimpsests of these brief camp sites. Minimal selectivity of stone types for tools is noted at this time. Diagnostic artifacts include Morrow Mountain and Guilford projectile points (Coe 1964). Much remains to be learned of this period. Based on information from the nearby Shirley plantation, the potential for finding additional evidence from this period at the Rice Center is moderate to high.

The **Late Archaic** period (3000–1000 BC) is distinguished by important new changes in adaptive strategies (Dent 1995; McLearen 1991). Subsistence and settlement patterns become increasingly intensified as specific, high-return food resources are aggressively exploited at optimal times. Hallmarks of this change are increasing degrees of sedentism, or settlement permanence, and technological innovations including production of
soapstone vessels and common use of heavy groundstone axes. Acquisition of suitable materials for such tools fostered development of far-flung trade networks. Locally, large flaked stone tools are commonly made from quartzite cobbles. Residential sites are often found along major waterways or near expansive wetlands. It is likely that population pressure, among other factors, influenced a pattern of increasingly bounded group territories. Late Archaic habitations are numerous in the Shirley Plantation area. The likelihood for Late Archaic components at the Rice Center is high.

**Woodland Stage (1000 B.C. – A.D. 1600)**

The onset of the Woodland Stage is traditionally distinguished by the addition of ceramic containers to indigenous technologies. Other characteristics may be noted, but there is little evidence of abrupt change from the latest Archaic to the earliest Woodland patterns. Over several millennia, however, considerable cultural shifts do occur that effectively define three subdivisions of this stage. Woodland Stage components are the most common of all in the Shirley Plantation area (Reinhart 1984).

The *Early Woodland* period (1000–300 BC) marks the culmination of trends most obviously initiated during the Late Archaic and for this reason it is often referred to as the “transitional period” (McLearen 1991; Mouer 1991). For a few centuries, but in somewhat restricted areas, the pattern of settlement and subsistence intensification reached a peak. Relatively permanently occupied sites were established and they are marked for the first time by below-ground food storage facilities. The Rice Center falls just outside an area of intensive Early Woodland activity in the region straddling the fall line of the James River. The first, rather experimental ceramic containers appear at this time alongside soapstone vessels. Smaller projectile points are suggestive of new hunting technologies. Slate and greenstone gorgets, and occasional blades of exotic stone, indicate that exchange networks were functioning. No Early Woodland components have been documented at sites either on or within one mile of Shirley Plantation, making expectations of their future identification rather low at the Rice Center.

With the *Middle Woodland* period (300 BC – AD 1000) there is a marked reversal of the temporary decline in component frequency accompanying the Early Woodland (Blanton 1992; Stewart 1992). Middle Woodland occupations are very common throughout the region and are readily distinguished by an abundance of ceramic vessel fragments. Much of the pottery diagnostic of this period was made by mixing small particles of sand or grit into the clay, and the surfaces were finished with impressions of cordage or netting. These characteristics define the common Popes Creek, Prince George, and Varina ceramic types (Egloff and Potter 1982). Toward the end of the period, crushed shell replaces sand and grit as a tempering agent and this new type is called Mockley ware. Patterns of settlement and subsistence in the Middle Woodland tend to retreat to a less-intensified pattern, as indicated by more widely dispersed, often small sites with a lower degree of permanence. Evidence of food storage facilities is rare on area sites. Exceptional sites with midden accumulations indicative of more sustained occupation are occasionally recorded in the area. One example is at Maycocks Point several miles downstream from the Rice Center, in Prince George County. Four Middle Woodland components are documented at Shirley Plantation. The potential is high for encountering additional Middle Woodland components on the Rice Center property.

The *Late Woodland* period (AD 1000–1600) is defined by a new strategy of intensification that involves increasing reliance upon domesticated plant foods such as maize (Dent 1995; Turner 1992). Settlements are increasingly occupied on a more permanent basis and most of the population is concentrated in fewer but larger settlements. In effect, a cultural pattern evolved that is defined by a relatively permanent village existence, sharper distinctions between social classes, and a mixed
economy wherein traditional hunting and gathering is augmented by agriculture. Group territories become more restricted and the occurrence of pali-saded communities indicates that hostilities with other communities could present a threat. As this pattern emerged during the Late Woodland local social groups were organized into simple chiefdoms. By late in the sixteenth century an increasing number of local chiefdoms were organized by the well known Indian leader Powhatan into an expansive paramount chiefdom sprawling over much of the Tidewater region (Gallivan 2003). The local chief-dom encompassing the area of the Rice Center was known as Weyanock (Rountree 1989, 1990; Turner and Opperman n.d.) (Figure 4). This group claimed territory on both sides of the James River and the principal settlement appears to have been located quite close to the Rice Center, if not within its boundaries. Late Woodland occupations are identifiable mainly from the presence of shell- and lithic-tempered ceramics, the earliest known as Townsend bearing fabric impressed surfaces and the latest known as Gaston or Roanoke having simple stamped surfaces. It is not uncommon for Late Woodland sites in the area to have accumulations of midden, indicative of prolonged occupation. Three sites with components of this period are known on Shirley Plantation. Discoveries of Late Woodland components at the Rice Center should be anticipated.

**HISTORICAL CONTEXT**

Historical research for this project was conducted at the Earl Gregg Swem Library of the College of William and Mary and at the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation Library, Williamsburg, Virginia. Facsimiles of period maps from both the Virginia State Archives and Library and the Virginia Historical Society were also consulted. Reports of previous work at the Rice Center were relied upon for the specific contextual information (Bennett 2005a and 2005b).

**Settlement to Society (1607–1750)**

After the initial settlement at Jamestown Island in 1607, it was not until several decades later that further development and settlement into Virginia’s inland frontier began. Charles City County was first formed in 1634, becoming one of the eight original shires or counties of the Virginia colony (Hunter 1988, Tyler 1990). Originally, the county (or shire) spanned the James, but in 1702 Prince George county was created and in 1720 the county reached its current size, bounded on the east and north by the Chickahominy River, on the south by the James, and by Henrico County on the west (R. Coski 1989:35). The earliest European inhabitants of Charles City County included a small group of gentlemen, tenants, and indentured servants who settled at Berkeley Hundred, now the Rice Center (Bennett 2005a, Dowdy 1957). Nearly a third of their number died on March 22, 1622, during the Native American uprising; others later succumbed to their wounds. The rest moved to better fortified locations. In addition, a number of ambitious settlements were established upstream, including on at West and Sherley Hundred (now Shirley Plantation), under the command of Sir Thomas Dale. Unlike the settlement at Berkeley Hundred, West and Sherley Hundred took no casualties. Although Indians still posed a threat to English colonists during the mid-seventeenth century, by 1650, settlement in the colony’s interior and along the James River and York River drainages was well established (Steen and McCartney 1990). Jamestown remained the principal urban center for the Virginia colony during the early years of settlement; however, by the mid-seventeenth century the population was rapidly growing and expanding into inland regions. Many people sought the prime agricultural land along the James River. Large planters as well as small to middling farmers were seeking these viable lands beyond the reaches of Jamestown.

One of the principal factors in the colony’s growth and development was agriculture. Tobacco
Figure 4. Depiction of the project area on John Smith’s (1624 [1606]) map of Virginia.
became an extremely important and valuable crop during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century in Virginia. It served as a major impetus in the seating of several large plantations throughout the Lower Tidewater region including the area of Charles City County. This tobacco-based economy eventually led to the beginnings of the plantation system. Dispersed population was caused by the nature of tobacco cultivation and the exhausting effect it had on the soils, therefore causing the population to be scattered throughout the county.

Due to the shift in population to these larger separate plantations mainly along the James River, the importance of Jamestown diminished. Finally, in 1699, the capital was moved to Middle Plantation, which was divided into town lots and named Williamsburg (Steen and McCartney 1990). Except for a few large plantations on the James River in neighboring James City County, Charles City County for the most part was relatively sparsely populated during the early eighteenth century. Land along the James River was highly valued for agriculture throughout the early eighteenth century, when large plantations held most of the patents of this prime real estate. Plantations and farms along the banks of the James River also had good access to commercial shipping (Hunter 1988:19). By the early eighteenth century, more permanent settlement along the Chickahominy River, the eastern boundary of Charles City County, had begun. In 1692, Benjamin Harrison II bought some property along the James River, most of which remained in his family until the twentieth century (Bennett 2005a). Part of that land is the Rice Center today.

*Colony to Nation (1750–1789)*

As in the previous period, farming was the predominant occupation of Charles City County. There were a small number of industrial enterprises, as well. The Harrison family of Berkeley ran a shipyard on their property until the Revolutionary War brought an end to many shipping businesses (Tyler 1990:91). There were saw- and gristmills as well; a gristmill dating from 1735 still stands at Edgewood Plantation, on Route 5 (Tyler 1990:60).

Tax records from 1783 indicate that the population of the County consisted of 325 adult (over 21) white males and 2,841 slaves (1,354 older than 16 and 1,487 younger than 16 years of age) (Tyler 1990:61). The plantation system of agriculture required a great deal of labor, although few whites had more than 10 slaves. Most slaves were held by a small number of large landholders.

Citizens of Charles City supported the American cause; several companies of militia were formed in the County and Shirley Plantation served as a supply depot (Tyler 1990:92). Benedict Arnold, in command of 900 troops, landed at Westover Plantation in January of 1781, and marched to Richmond. In the space of six days, his troops plundered the capital, raided Charles City Courthouse (throwing the gathered militia into disarray), and looted Berkeley Plantation (Tyler 1990:87–89). General Cornwallis spent time in the county, as well, also landing at Westover.

*Early National Period (1789–1830)*

During the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, Charles City County experienced the economic decline that was being felt throughout most of the Lower Tidewater (Jones and Downing 1991). As a result, “political influence, wealth, and population all shifted farther inland following the relocation of Virginia’s capital from Williamsburg to Richmond in 1781” (Jones and Downing 1991:9). For the most part, the small to middling white farmers and tenants remained on their small acreage in Charles City County, trying to produce small amounts of crops and goods in order to realize some profits. As was the case throughout the entire state of Virginia in the 1780s, “the majority of adult white males were not landowners . . . Virginia society included a majority of men who were either tenants on land owned by others or who worked as laborers” (Main 1954:243). Although the majority of small farmers remained in Charles
City County after the Revolution, many people moved further west to areas of Virginia where the soils were not yet heavily exploited. The larger farms and plantations, once thriving centers of tobacco cultivation, were subdivided. Crop diversification into corn and wheat growing was necessary in order for these plantations to survive. Tobacco continued to be grown in some areas despite the soil depletion and declining productivity that had been occurring for almost a century. During this period, “some farmers also turned to raising beef and dairy cattle as well” (Brown and Bragdon 1986:195). Wheat prices plummeted during the early nineteenth century because the international demand for wheat had declined with the reestablishment of peace in Europe. The introduction of the Hessian fly also devastated much of Virginia’s wheat crop during the early nineteenth century (Brown and Bragdon 1986:199).

In 1791 the portion of the Berkeley plantation that includes the Rice Center was sold to the Tyler family (Bennett 2005a). It is likely that the property was used for agricultural purposes.

**Antebellum Period (1830–1860)**

During the antebellum period, agriculture was the predominant economic activity in the area for both small and larger planters in Charles City County. Milling was the only significant industry in the area. Although some mills were established in Charles City County in the eighteenth century, they were more abundant by the mid-nineteenth century. Milling operations included sawmills and flour mills as well as other grain mills. Mills were generally located near to efficient transportation routes. Most of the goods produced at the Charles City County mills were then shipped to larger urban areas for sale in a larger market. As noted for neighboring James City County during the mid-nineteenth century, “Manufacturing . . . never played a major role in the early nineteenth-century economy, at least not to the extent that it changed the economic base of other areas in this era of beginning industrialization. Yet, small enterprises often related to the processing of agricultural produce, arose to satisfy the needs of the local population” (Brown and Bragdon 1986:207). Lumbering and to a lesser degree commercial fishing, was an important component of the Charles City County economy (J. Coski 1989:70).

The County’s free blacks comprised 15 percent of the population in 1860 (J. Coski 1989:70–71). They lived in small communities in the central part of the county, in the vicinity of Elam Baptist Church and the community of “Free Town,” north of Westover (Figure 5). While some were farmers, many were laborers who were highly valued in a society dependent on the plantation system of agriculture.

**Civil War (1861–1865)**

Charles City County saw its share of action during the Civil War. In addition to a number of skirmishes, Federal troops stationed in Williamsburg captured the Confederate garrison stationed at Charles City Courthouse in December 1863, and set fire to all but the Court House itself (J. Coski 1989:69). The County’s proximity to Richmond, the Confederate capital, made it a crossroads if not a strategically important position. In June of 1864, General U. S. Grant moved his army to the south side of the James in preparation for the siege of Petersburg. The supply train was said to be 35 mi. long (Tyler 1990:106). General Sheridan escorted a train of 900 wagons through Charles City County in late June, 1864. On June 25, he arrived in Weyanoke, east of the Rice Center property, with three cavalry divisions, on his way to Petersburg.

Perhaps the best documented use of the Rice Center property occurred during this period. In 1862, following a series of battles known as the Seven Days Battles, Union General George McClellan retreated to Harrison’s Landing, where he encamped with approximately 80,000 troops (Bennett 2005a, Tyler 1990:100). The army set up camp on July 2, 1862, and remained for six
weeks. Union Army maps depict the impressive line of earthen fortifications, described by George L. Kilmer of the 27th New York Volunteers, as “an intrenched line several miles in extent” (Kilmer in Tyler 1990:100) (Figure 6). The line parallel to Kimmages Creek was considered “unassailable” by U. S. Army Brigadier General John G. Barnard, who was Chief Engineer of Operations from May 23, 1861 to August 15, 1862 (Barnard 1863). In a report dated January 26, 1863, Barnard noted that the far side, or right bank of the creek was an open field, while the left bank was wooded “which covered our movements and concealed our positions” (Barnard in Official Records:122). The creek itself was in a deep ravine.

The Union troops arrived at Harrison’s Landing in the rain, setting up their tents on unharvested wheat, with the ground too soft to hold the tent pegs (J. Coski 1989:74). Kilmer wrote:

The withdrawal of Gen. McClellan’s army from Malvern Hill, a position that seemed to be impregnable, was a surprise to the men in the ranks, and for the first time in the campaign they became discouraged. During July 2nd rain fell copiously, and when the columns arrived at Harrison’s Landing the fields were soaked and the soil was quickly reduced to paste by the men and trains.

Figure 5. Depiction of the project area on a Confederate map of Charles City County (Gilmer 1863).
The infantry and the division wagons and batteries were drawn up in an immense field of wheat near the Harrison mansion called Berkeley. The grain was trampled into the soil, or laid down so as to serve under the tents as protection from the wet ground. Neither wood nor boards were to be had and the army was exceedingly uncomfortable. ... The rain continued all night and the flimsy wheat floors were soon floating in pools of water; besides the soil would not hold the tent-pins, and in the morning the tents were nearly all down, exposing the men whose beds were sinking deeper and deeper into the mud in the pelting rain. (quoted in Tyler 1990:100)

The Reverend S. L. Gracey, chaplain to the Sixth Pennsylvania Cavalry, wrote that the brief stay at Harrison’s Landing was plagued with “stinging flies,” “clouds of dust and sand,” and “Chickahominy fever” (Gracey 1868). President Lincoln visited McClellan on July 8 in order to encourage him to return to the field, but the Union troops remained in Charles City County until mid-August, when they returned to Washington, D.C., prior to Second Manassas (Bull Run) (Bennett 2005a, J. Coski 1989:74).

Figure 6. Portion of Union map showing Harrison’s Landing fortifications (Davis et al. 1983:Plate 19).
Reconstruction and Growth (1865–1917)
Following the Civil War, Charles City County along with the rest of the Tidewater began to recoup from the losses suffered during the war. For the most part, Charles City County remained a rural county with agriculture as its economic base. The industrialization and growth in other areas of the state had very little impact on the County.

The greatest change in Charles City County during the post-war period was in agriculture. Farmers could no longer use slave labor and had to rely on other sources of labor. Share-cropping filled the labor vacuum, and in some ways extended the plantation system into the twentieth century (Dowdy 1957:316–318). In addition, improvements to transportation meant that crops could more easily be shipped to urban areas. “The railroad, an efficient transportation system introduced into this area in 1881, made cash-crop farming a viable source of income once again” (Brown and Bragdon 1986:242).

World War I to World War II (1917–1945)
Although many changes had occurred in James City County by the turn of the century, the county remained rural and agricultural. Rapid changes were taking place on the lower peninsula with the sudden growth and expansion of military installations and the shipbuilding areas. Nevertheless, James City County farmers were still producing the cash crops that were transported via the railroad and steamers to other sections of the state and country for sale on a larger market. While the Charles City County economy was still largely agrarian, the twentieth century saw the rise of logging, still an important industry (Tyler 1990:61).

The portion of the Rice Center that lies west of Kimmages Creek was purchased in 1928 by King Fulton for the purpose of establishing a hunting and fishing club (Bennett 2005a). The creek was dammed, creating Charles Lake. The club failed almost immediately and the property was sold the Powell family. In 1935 the land was transferred to the YMCA for use as a summer camp. A number of buildings, including a lodge and dining hall, were constructed.

New Dominion (1945–present)
Improvements to infrastructure, such as the completion of the Benjamin Harrison Bridge in 1967, has led to some development, but Charles City County remains largely rural in nature (Tyler 1990). Some of its main economic forces include logging, agriculture, and tourism. At the YMCA camp, renovations were made to the lodge and the dam in the 1950s and 1960s, and additional buildings (cabins, a bath house) and a pool were built (Bennet 2005a). Prehistoric artifacts were discovered during this phase of construction, and the camp name was changed to Camp Weyanoke, to honor the Native American group presumed to be associated with the artifacts. The YMCA property was purchased by Ambassador Walter Rice in 1977; it was given to VCU in 2000.
Survey Objectives and Methods

The supplemental fieldwork at the proposed DGIF headquarters, following recommendations of the DHR, included complete pedestrian survey involving both surface examination and systematic shovel testing. Shovel testing was conducted within the APE intervals of 15 m (50 ft.) in undisturbed areas with slopes of 10 percent or less. The soil from each shovel test was screened through 0.64-cm (0.25-in.) mesh to ensure the adequate recovery of artifacts. Representative soil profiles were recorded on standardized forms using Munsell color and U.S. Department of Agriculture descriptive terminology (Kollmorgen Instruments Corporation 1992). A total of approximately 0.77 ha (1.9 acres) was surveyed during the present study.

Due to the proximity of the APE to known Civil War–era surface features, shovel testing was augmented by the use of a metal detector. The surface within the APE was swept with a metal detector in 15-m (50-ft.) intervals. Each transect ran parallel to Route 5, and was a minimum of 5 m (16 ft.) wide. Metal detector targets were checked, and unambiguously modern materials (e.g., metal beverage containers) were discarded in the field. Positive targets were mapped and collected for analysis. Following the identification and excavation of the individual targets, the immediate vicinity of positive targets was again swept with the metal detector to ensure that all metallic artifacts had been recovered.

Supplemental archaeological survey of the Rice Center Pier Facility project area consisted of excavation of two 1-x-1-m (3.3-x-3.3-ft.) test units in the vicinity of positive shovel tests excavated during the prior (March 2005) fieldwork. In addition, nine judgmental shovel tests were excavated in order to identify the extent of Site 44CC402 for the purposes of acquiring a sufficient amount of basic descriptive information to record the site and assign a state inventory number. The soil from each test unit and shovel test was screened through 0.64-cm (0.25-in.) mesh to ensure the adequate recovery of artifacts. Representative soil profiles were drawn on metric grid paper using Munsell color and U.S. Department of Agriculture descriptive terminology (Kollmorgen Instruments Corporation 1992) and photographed.

All recovered artifacts were returned to the WMCAR laboratory for washing, identification, and cataloging. All artifacts were prepared for curation according to the standards of the DHR. An inventory was produced using a standard descriptive typology for artifacts (Appendix A). The WMCAR has developed a hierarchical coding system that operates using Microsoft Access relational database software. With this system, artifacts are coded on standard datasheets for entry into a data file. Using this file, overall inventories and particularistic data reports can be generated for inclusion in reports or for routine analysis.

Definitions

Archaeological surveys require simultaneous consideration of both human behavioral patterns and cultural resource management concerns. Technically, a strict definition of archaeological resources would require that all traces of human activity be designated as a site, a clearly impractical situation. Therefore, this field survey utilized two designa-
tions for the archaeological resources encountered during the survey—site and location. Although somewhat arbitrary in construct and application, these definitions represent a workable though not infallible compromise.

An archaeological site is defined as any apparent location of human activity not limited to the simple loss, or casual or single-episode discard of artifacts. A site has sufficient archaeological evidence to indicate that further testing would produce interpretable archaeological data. In contrast, a location is defined as an area marked by surface indications and little else, and/or the recovery of artifacts that are clearly redeposited, or the result of casual or single-episode discard. Examples of locations are an isolated projectile point find or a very low density scatter of nonstructural historic artifacts. Locations are also defined as isolated finds of lithic material of questionable cultural origin, such as possible fire-cracked rock or debitage. In addition, areas containing archaeological material less than 50 years old are also recorded as locations.

In application, both of these definitions require a certain degree of judgment in the field and consideration of a number of variables. Contextual factors such as prior disturbance and secondary deposition must be taken into account. The representativeness of the sample, as measured by such factors as the degree of surface exposure and shovel test interval, must also be considered when determining the nature of an archaeological resource.

**Survey Results**

A total of 49 shovel tests was excavated at the DGIF project area, of which two (4%) were positive, resulting in the identification of one archaeological location (Figure 7). The metal detector survey resulted in the identification of 18 positive targets, grouped into 14 archaeological locations. In addition, surface features outside of the APE were identified as Civil War-era earthworks (44CC401). At least one of the positive metal detector targets relates to that surface feature: an unfired lead minie ball recovered from Metal Detector Target (MD) 15. Previous work at the Rice Center Pier Facility identified one archaeological site (55CC402).

The results and recommendations for the archaeological sites and locations are summarized below.

**Archaeological Locations Identified within the DGIF Project Area**

Fifteen archaeological locations were identified within the project area during the survey. **Location 1** consists of a fragment of fire-cracked rock and one fragment of debitage recovered from Shovel Tests 38 and 45, respectively (see Figure 7). The artifacts were recovered from Stratum I, which at the DGIF project area typically consists of a 10-cm- (0.33-ft.-) thick yellowish brown (10YR5/4) loamy clay (Figure 8). Stratum II, a brownish yellow (10YR6/6) loamy clay, is subsoil. In spite of the excavation of five additional radial shovel tests, no other artifacts were recovered.

The remaining archaeological locations are all positive metal detector targets, occasionally in clusters. As with Location 1, all artifacts were recovered from Stratum I. **Location 2** consists of one wrought nail, 69 indeterminate iron can fragments, and one copper alloy button with a paste jewel setting and iron back. All artifacts were recovered from MD-14, and the can fragments were observed within and beneath the leaf mat (see Figure 7). The button likely dates to the nineteenth century (Figure 9). The wrought nail may be older. **Location 3** consists of a single Remington copper alloy 12-gauge shotgun shell recovered from MD-13. The shotgun shell dates to the twentieth century. **Location 4** consists of a single iron bolt and washer recovered from MD-12. **Location 5** consists of a single cut nail recovered from MD-11. **Location 6** consists of a single wire nail recovered from MD-16. **Location 7** consists of two adjacent positive
Figure 7. Department of Game and Inland Fisheries project area, site and locations identified during survey.
metal detector targets: MD-17 contained an iron horseshoe with a toe clip, that dates no earlier than the mid-nineteenth century but could date to a more recent period (see Figure 9); MD-18 consists of a length of rusted chain and an iron bridle bit cheekpiece fragment. Location 8 consists of an accumulation of metal fragments, including two iron wagon box rod attachment plates, a possible iron wagon bow staple, 13 iron screws, one iron bolt with a nut and washers, two indeterminate iron fragments, and one unfired .575 caliber lead minie ball recovered from MD-15 (see Figure 9). These materials were recovered from an area measuring approximately 0.5 m (1.6 ft.) in diameter. The single minie ball, which dates to the mid-nineteenth century, may be related to the nearby Civil War-era earthworks, although such items are common in Charles City County (Harwood 2001). Location 9 consists of two adjacent positive metal detector targets: MD-9 contained three indeterminate iron can–like fragments and MD-10 contained a single iron bar fragment. Location 10 consists of three fragments of iron strapping recovered from MD-8. Location 11 consists of one indeterminate iron chunk recovered from MD-7. Location 12 consists of one fragment of iron strapping recovered from MD-2. Location 13 consists of one cut nail recovered from MD-3. Location 14 consists of three adjacent positive metal detector targets: MD-4 and MD-5 each contained a toothed or serrated iron bar resembling a wire fence-stretcher or come-along; MD-6 was positive for an iron bolt with a nut and washers. The come-along may relate to logging activities in the vicinity; numerous large-diameter (approx. 1 m [3 ft.]) tree stumps are present within the mature stand of hardwoods that cover the DGIF APE, attesting to an episode of logging in the distant past. Location 15 consists of an iron screw recovered from MD-1.

In spite of screening sediments in the immediate vicinity of each target and additional metal detector sweeps following the recovery of the targets, no other artifacts were identified. Based on their isolated contexts, the artifacts recovered from MD targets 1–18 are considered to represent either incidental loss or casual discard, thereby constituting archaeological locations.

Archaeological Site Identified outside the DGIF Project Area

Site 44CC401 is a section of Civil War-era earthworks dating to General McClellan’s July and August 1862 encampment at Harrison’s Landing, and is located outside of the DGIF project APE (Figure 10). The linear surface feature stretches from Route 5 to the southwest, and is composed of at least two distinct sets of works. The 80-m-(262-ft.-) long line adjacent to the project APE is composed of a single low bank and interior ditch (Figure 11). To the southwest of the APE, the earthworks are higher, with an outer moat-like ditch. The feature is interrupted by Route 5; the low embankment and ditch are visible in the road cut on the north side of the road. No subsurface testing was conducted on the earthworks.

Cartographic data indicate that this section of earthen fortification is part of a much larger line that stretched from the James River to Westover Church (see Figures 5 and 6). As mentioned above, VCU archaeologists have tested a portion of the earthworks on Rice Center property, at the southern end of the line. They found that the embank-
ment was in good condition, but few Civil War-era artifacts were recovered.

Archaeological Site Identified within the Rice Center Pier Facility Project Area

Site 44CC402 is prehistoric campsite located on a bluff overlooking the James River. Two test units and nine judgmental shovel tests were excavated in the vicinity of the site (Figure 12). Based on shovel test results, the site appears to measure at minimum 45 m north-south × 80 m east-west (148 × 262 ft.). A twentieth-century structure once stood in the vicinity, but has since been destroyed. Remnants of a concrete sidewalk and a swingset remain.

Test Unit 1 was placed on relatively level ground on top of the landform and adjacent to VCU-Shovel Test 113. Stratum I consists of a 46-cm-(1.5-ft.-) thick strong brown (7.5YR5/8) coarse sand fill with mottles of brown (10YR4/3) and dark grayish brown (2.5Y4/2) clay (Figure 13). Subsoil is an olive yellow (2.5Y6/6) clay. A modern utility trench was identified in the base of the test unit. No artifacts were recovered from the test unit.

The stratigraphy of Test Unit 2, located on a slope adjacent to VCU-Shovel Test 106, consists of three strata above subsoil (Figure 14). Stratum I is modern redeposited fill (a yellowish brown [10YR5/4] clay with mottles of yellowish brown [10YR5/6] and dark grayish brown [10YR4/2] clay), that ranges from 25 to 33 cm (0.82–1.08 ft.) in thickness. Stratum II, a buried A horizon, is a 10–16-cm- (0.33–0.52-ft.-) thick stratum of brown (10YR4/3) fine silty sand, with minor pebble inclusions. Stratum III ranges from to 10 to 22 cm (0.33–0.72 ft.) in thickness, and is a yellowish brown (10YR4/4) silty sand with cobble
and pebble inclusions. Subsoil is a yellowish brown (10YR5/8) sandy clay with a few pebbles. No features were identified in Test Unit 2.

Modern light bulb fragments (n=4) and colorless bottle glass fragments (n=2) were recovered from Stratum II, and a complete Stage 1 quartz biface was recovered from Stratum III. The ground surface in the vicinity of Test Unit 2 slopes at approximately 38%, suggesting that the materials recovered are likely the result of either colluvial deposition or casual trash discard. The modern debris is likely peripheral scatter from that recent occupation.

Judgmental shovel tests excavated outside of the access road APE produced a small quantity of prehistoric lithic artifact and modern debris. Three fragments of fire-cracked rock, six secondary/thinning flakes (four noncortical, two with up to 74% cortex), five tertiary/retouch flakes, and four flake fragments/shatter. All but one lithic artifact were of quartzite; one tertiary flake was quartz. In addition, Shovel Test 9 produced five wire nails, a coarse
Figure 11. Site 44CC401, views of earthwork (top - large bank, looking south; center - large bank, looking southwest; bottom - single bank in ditch communicating trench, looking northeast).
I - Strong brown (7.5YR5/8) coarse sand with mottles of brown (10YR4/3) and dark grayish brown (2.5Y4/2) clay (fill)
II - Olive yellow (2.5Y6/6) clay (subsoil)

*Figure 13. Site 44CC402, Test Unit 1, north profile.*

I - Yellowish brown (10YR5/4) clay with mottles of yellowish brown (10YR5/6) and dark grayish brown (10YR4/2) clay (fill)
II - Brown (10YR4/3) fine silty sand, with minor pebble inclusions
III - Yellowish brown (10YR4/4) silty sand with cobble and pebble inclusions
IV - Yellowish brown (10YR5/8) sandy clay with a few pebbles (subsoil)

*Figure 14. Site 44CC402, Test Unit 2, north profile.*
earthenware flower pot sherd, two fragments of burned refined earthenware (either ironstone or whiteware), and seven fragments of molten glass.

SURVEY EFFECTIVENESS

The primary purpose of this archaeological identification survey is to provide the VCU–Facilities Management Department with a statement of the nature and distribution of archaeological resources within the proposed DGIF headquarters and Rice Pier Facility project areas, Charles City County, Virginia. The effectiveness of any such survey is contingent upon and limited by the methods employed. A limitation of the survey was that most of the project area had substantial ground cover, and subsurface testing was therefore necessary. As an effort to control for biases inherent in shovel testing, fill from the shovel tests was screened through 0.64-cm (0.25-in.) wire mesh. In addition, metal detecting was used to augment the search for Civil War era occupations at the DGIF project area. Despite the limitations of the survey, it is felt that it has met its intended goals within the proposed project areas.

RESEARCH SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary, a total of 49 shovel tests were excavated systematically to provide adequate survey coverage of the proposed DGIF headquarters project area. Of these, 2 (4%) were positive for artifacts resulting in the identification of one archaeological location. Systematic metal detection resulted in the identification of 18 positive MD targets grouped into 14 archaeological locations. Based on surface indications, one archaeological site (44CC401) was identified outside of the DGIF project APE. The excavation of two 1-×-1-m (3.3×-3.3-ft.) test units and nine judgmental shovel tests resulted in the identification of one archaeological site (44CC402) at the Rice Center Pier Facility project area (Table 2).

Site 44CC401 consists of a line of Civil War era earthworks dating to General McClellan's July

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>COMPONENTS</th>
<th>OPINION ON NRHP ELIGIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site 44CC401</td>
<td>Earthworks</td>
<td>Civil War, 1862</td>
<td>Potentially eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 44CC402</td>
<td>Camp</td>
<td>Prehistoric: unknown</td>
<td>Potentially eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 1</td>
<td>Casual discard</td>
<td>Prehistoric: unknown</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 2</td>
<td>Casual discard</td>
<td>Historic: unknown, 19th century</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 3</td>
<td>Isolated find</td>
<td>20th century</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 4</td>
<td>Isolated find</td>
<td>Historic: unknown</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 5</td>
<td>Isolated find</td>
<td>Historic: unknown</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 6</td>
<td>Isolated find</td>
<td>Historic: unknown</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 7</td>
<td>Casual discard</td>
<td>Mid-19th–20th century</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 8</td>
<td>Casual discard</td>
<td>Mid-19th century</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 9</td>
<td>Casual discard</td>
<td>Historic: unknown</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 10</td>
<td>Casual discard</td>
<td>Historic: unknown</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 11</td>
<td>Isolated find</td>
<td>Historic: unknown</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 12</td>
<td>Isolated find</td>
<td>Historic: unknown</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 13</td>
<td>Isolated find</td>
<td>Historic: unknown</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 14</td>
<td>Casual discard</td>
<td>Mid-19th–20th century</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 15</td>
<td>Isolated find</td>
<td>Historic: unknown</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Summary of archaeological resources identified during survey.
and August 1862 encampment at Harrison’s Landing. A single bank with an interior ditch lies minimally 13.5 m (44 ft.) west of the DGIF project APE. The line continues for an unsurveyed distance to both the southwest and the northeast (north of the Route 5 road cut). Cartographic data indicate that the line originally stretched from the James River at its confluence with Kimmages Creek, to the vicinity of Westover Church.

While no subsurface testing was conducted of the earthworks during the current field effort, visual inspection combined with information from investigations conducted by VCU archaeologists on a southern section of the line indicate that the earthworks are in good condition (Bennett 2005a). In spite of extensive shovel testing and metal detecting within the nearby DGIF project APE, no evidence of an encampment was identified. A single minie ball was recovered, as was one button that may date to the nineteenth century. One horse-shoe that may date as early as the mid-nineteenth century was also recovered. These materials are scattered items likely casually discarded or lost, and their occurrence as isolated finds scattered over a relatively large area is not indicative of an encampment occupation (see archaeological location descriptions in this chapter). Historical documentation and cartographic data suggest that the main Union encampment was centered on the open fields adjacent to Berkeley and Westover Plantations, located between 3 and 5.5 km (2–3.5 mi.) south and east of the APE, respectively. Recollections from the period describe the troops setting up their tents in unharvested wheat fields (Kilmer in Tyler 1990:100). In contrast, the vicinity of Kimmages Creek was described as heavily wooded at that time, which added to the security and strategic advantage of the Union forces (see Figure 5).

It is likely that Site 44CC401 could provide significant information regarding the Military/Defense theme during the Civil War (1860–1865) on the Upper Coastal Plain of Virginia (DHR 2003). Thus, Site 44CC401 is considered potentially eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D. The site may also be eligible under Criteria A and B. Site 44CC401 should be avoided. Current plans for the DGIF Region I Headquarters indicate that the site is well outside of the project APE. Should plans change, and the site cannot be avoided, additional work may be necessary to determine the site’s eligibility for the NRHP.

Based on test unit and shovel test results from the current survey, Site 44CC402 is a prehistoric site of unknown age. The site measures at minimum 80 m east-west × 45 m north-south (262 × 148 ft.). The materials recovered from the site combined with its apparent size suggest that the site represents either a series of small temporary camps, or a larger, more permanent occupation. As such, Site 44CC402 has the potential to provide significant information about settlement and subsistence themes during prehistory in the Upper Coastal Plain of Virginia (DHR 2003). Therefore, Site 44CC402 is considered potentially eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D; Criteria A–C are considered not applicable. The small portion of the site that falls within the APE for the Pier Facility access road has been disturbed by construction and demolition of a structure that once stood in the vicinity, however. The proposed project will have no significant impact on the archaeological resources within the APE. No further work is recommended.

Artifacts recovered from Locations 1–15 represent either items of casual discard or isolated finds. Such discarded or isolated finds constitute archaeological locations with very limited to no integrity or research potential. By definition, archaeological locations are considered not eligible for the NRHP.
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### Rice Center Survey Prehistoric Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provenience</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Subclass 1</th>
<th>Subclass 2</th>
<th>Raw Material</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44CC402</td>
<td>ST 01</td>
<td>Debitage</td>
<td>2ndary/Thinning Flake</td>
<td>1 - 74% Cortex</td>
<td>Quartzite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44CC402</td>
<td>ST 01</td>
<td>Debitage</td>
<td>Flake Frag/Shatter</td>
<td>Noncortical</td>
<td>Quartzite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44CC402</td>
<td>ST 01</td>
<td>Debitage</td>
<td>Tertiary/Retouch Flake</td>
<td>Noncortical</td>
<td>Quartzite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44CC402</td>
<td>ST 02</td>
<td>Debitage</td>
<td>2ndary/Thinning Flake</td>
<td>Noncortical</td>
<td>Quartzite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44CC402</td>
<td>ST 03</td>
<td>Debitage</td>
<td>Tertiary/Retouch Flake</td>
<td>Noncortical</td>
<td>Quartzite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44CC402</td>
<td>ST 05</td>
<td>Debitage</td>
<td>2ndary/Thinning Flake</td>
<td>Noncortical</td>
<td>Quartzite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44CC402</td>
<td>ST 07</td>
<td>Debitage</td>
<td>2ndary/Thinning Flake</td>
<td>1 - 74% Cortex</td>
<td>Quartzite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44CC402</td>
<td>ST 07</td>
<td>Debitage</td>
<td>Flake Frag/Shatter</td>
<td>Noncortical</td>
<td>Quartzite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44CC402</td>
<td>ST 07</td>
<td>Debitage</td>
<td>Tertiary/Retouch Flake</td>
<td>Noncortical</td>
<td>Quartzite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44CC402</td>
<td>ST 08</td>
<td>Debitage</td>
<td>Tertiary/Retouch Flake</td>
<td>Noncortical</td>
<td>Quartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44CC402</td>
<td>ST 08</td>
<td>Fire-Cracked Rock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44CC402</td>
<td>TU 02 L III</td>
<td>Biface</td>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Quartz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provenience ST 01 Total: 5  
Provenience ST 02 Total: 3  
Provenience ST 03 Total: 1  
Provenience ST 05 Total: 1  
Provenience ST 07 Total: 4  
Provenience ST 08 Total: 4  
Provenience TU 02 L III Total: 1  
Provenience 44CC402 Total: 19  
Project Total: 19
## Rice Center Survey Historic Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provenience</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Datable Attribute</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44CC402</td>
<td>ST 09</td>
<td>Agriculture/Horticulture</td>
<td>Flower pot</td>
<td>Coarse Earthenware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44CC402</td>
<td>ST 09</td>
<td>Ceramic Tableware</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Refined Earthenware</td>
<td>ironstone/whiteware; burned</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44CC402</td>
<td>ST 09</td>
<td>Misc. Ceramics/Glass</td>
<td>Unidentifiable glassware</td>
<td>burned; 20th c.</td>
<td>Molten</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44CC402</td>
<td>ST 09</td>
<td>Nails</td>
<td>Nail(s)</td>
<td>Wire</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44CC402</td>
<td>TU 02 L II</td>
<td>Lighting Devices</td>
<td>Light bulb</td>
<td>Colorless glass</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44CC402</td>
<td>TU 02 L II</td>
<td>Misc. Ceramics/Glass</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>Colorless glass</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provenience ST 09 Total: 15
Provenience TU 02 L II Total: 6
Provenience 44CC402 Total: 21
Project Total: 21
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provenience</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Subclass 1</th>
<th>Subclass 2</th>
<th>Raw Material</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOC 01</td>
<td>ST 038</td>
<td>Fire-Cracked Rock</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quartz</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 01</td>
<td>ST 045</td>
<td>Debitage</td>
<td>Tertiary/Retouch Flake</td>
<td>Quartzite</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provenience ST 038 Total: 0
Provenience ST 045 Total: 1
Provenience LOC 01 Total: 1
Project Total: 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provenience</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Datable Attribute</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOC 03</td>
<td>Ammunition/Artillery</td>
<td>Shotgun shell</td>
<td>Copper Alloy</td>
<td>Remington 12 gauge</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 04</td>
<td>Misc. Hardware</td>
<td>Bolt</td>
<td>Ferrous</td>
<td>w/washer</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 05</td>
<td>Nails</td>
<td>Nail(s)</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 06</td>
<td>Nails</td>
<td>Nail(s)</td>
<td>Wire</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 07</td>
<td>Stable/Barn</td>
<td>Horseshoe</td>
<td>Ferrous</td>
<td>w/ toe clip (no earlier than mid-19th c.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 08</td>
<td>Firearm</td>
<td>Bullet</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Minie ball, unfired; .575</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 08</td>
<td>Misc. Hardware</td>
<td>Bolt</td>
<td>Ferrous</td>
<td>w/nut and washers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 08</td>
<td>Misc. Hardware</td>
<td>Screw</td>
<td>Ferrous</td>
<td>indeterminate fragments</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 08</td>
<td>Misc. Material</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Ferrous</td>
<td>indeterminate fragments</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 08</td>
<td>Stable/Barn</td>
<td>Wagon part</td>
<td>Ferrous</td>
<td>box rod attachment plates</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 09</td>
<td>Misc. Items</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ferrous</td>
<td>indeterminate can-like fragments</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 09</td>
<td>Misc. Material</td>
<td>Bar</td>
<td>Ferrous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 10</td>
<td>Misc. Material</td>
<td>Strapping</td>
<td>Ferrous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 11</td>
<td>Misc. Items</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Ferrous</td>
<td>indeterminate chunk</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Dept. of Game and Inland Fisheries HQ Survey Historic Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provenience</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Datable Attribute</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOC 12</td>
<td>MD 002</td>
<td>Misc. Material</td>
<td>Strapping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 13</td>
<td>MD 003</td>
<td>Nails</td>
<td>Nail(s)</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 14</td>
<td>MD 004</td>
<td>Misc. Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 14</td>
<td>MD 005</td>
<td>Misc. Items</td>
<td>Ferrous</td>
<td>wire fence stretcher/come along-like</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 14</td>
<td>MD 006</td>
<td>Misc. Hardware</td>
<td>Bolt</td>
<td>w/nut and washers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 15</td>
<td>MD 001</td>
<td>Misc. Hardware</td>
<td>Screw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS 02</td>
<td>MD 014</td>
<td>Fasteners</td>
<td>Button</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS 02</td>
<td>MD 014</td>
<td>Misc. Items</td>
<td>Ferrous</td>
<td>indeterminate can-like fragments</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS 02</td>
<td>MD 014</td>
<td>Nails</td>
<td>Nail(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provenience MD 002 Total: 1
Provenience LOC 12 Total: 1
Provenience MD 003 Total: 1
Provenience LOC 13 Total: 1
Provenience MD 004 Total: 1
Provenience MD 005 Total: 1
Provenience MD 006 Total: 1
Provenience LOC 14 Total: 3
Provenience MD 001 Total: 1
Provenience LOC 15 Total: 1
Provenience MD 014 Total: 71
Provenience LOS 02 Total: 71
Project Total: 112
Appendix B:
Archaeological Site Inventory Forms
DHR ID#: 44CC0401

City/County: Charles City
VDHR Site Number: 44CC0401
Other VDHR Number:
Site Name: Harrison's Landing Earthworks
Temporary Designation: 44Cxx1

CULTURAL/TEMPORAL AFFILIATION

Cultural Designation Temporal Designation
Indeterminate 19th Century: 2nd/3rd quarter

Site Class: Terrestrial, open air

THEMATIC CONTEXTS/SITE FUNCTIONS

Sequence Number: 1
Category for thematic context: Military/Defense
Example: Earthworks
Comments/Remarks: This is a section of earthworks dating to General McClellan's July-August 1862 encampment at Harrison's Landing.

Specialized Contexts:

USGS Quadrangle(s): WESTOVER
Loran: Restrict UTM Data?
Center UTM (for less than 10 acres): /*

Boundary UTM (for 10 acres or more):
18/4134295/304690
18/4134275/304670
18/4134250/304650

Physiographic Province: Coastal Plain
Aspect: Flat
Drainage: James River
Drainage:
Landform: ridge top
Elevation: 30.00
Slope: 
Site Soils: Newflat silt loam
Adjacent Soils: Nevark-Remlik complex
Nearest Water Source: Charles Lake (Kimmages Creek)
Distance: 290

INDIVIDUAL/ORGANIZATION/AGENCY INFORMATION

Individual Category Codes: Owner of property
Honorif: First: Unknown Last: Unknown Suffix: Title:

Company/Agency: Address: City: State: Zip:
Phone/Ext: 000-000-0000 000-000-0000

Notes: Site is on property owned by Virginia Commonwealth University
Ownership type: Public - State
Gov't Agency: State University and College System
SITE CHARACTERISTICS

Site Dimensions: 260 feet by 25 feet  Acreage: 0.15
Survey Strategy: Historic Map Projection; Observation
Site Condition: Less than 25% of Site Destroyed; Surface Features
Survey Description: Site was mapped but not tested.

CURRENT LAND USE

CURRENT LAND USE # 1

Land Use: Education  Dates of Use: 2006/04/05  Example: Forest
Comments/Remarks: Site is located on portion of the Virginia Commonwealth University--Rice Center.

SPECIMENS, FIELDNOTES, DEPOSITORIES

Specimens Obtained?  Specimens Depository:
Assemblage Description: Specimens Reported? No
Assemblage description--reported:  Depository: WMCAR
Field Notes Reported? Yes

CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT EVENTS

Date: 2006/04/05
Cultural Resource Management Event: Phase I Survey
Organization or Person
First Last Elizabeth Monroe--WMCAR  Id # Associated with Event:
CRM Event Notes or Comments: Site lies outside of APE for proposed Department of Game and Inland Fisheries Headquarters.

PHOTOGRAPHIC DOCUMENTATION AND DEPOSITORY

Sequence Number: 1  Photographic Documentation? Depository:
Type of Photos: none

REPORTS, DEPOSITORY AND REFERENCES

Sequence #: 1  Report (s) ? Yes  Depository: WMCAR
Reference for reports and publications: Supplemental Archaeological Survey of the Proposed Inger and Walter Rice Center for Environmental Life Sciences Research Pier Facility and Department of Game and Inland Fisheries Region I Headquarters Facility, Charles City County, Virginia. William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research, Williamsburg, VA. Report submitted to Virginia Commonwealth University -- Facilities Management, Richmond, VA.
DHR ID#: 44CC0402  Report Generated on: 5/24/2006

City/County: Charles City  
VDHR Site Number: 44CC0402  Other VDHR Number:  
Site Name:  
Temporary Designation: 44Cxxx2

CULTURAL/TEMPORAL AFFILIATION

Cultural Designation  Temporal Designation  
Native American  Prehistoric/Unknown

Site Class: Terrestrial, open air

THEMATIC CONTEXTS/SITE FUNCTIONS

Sequence Number: 1  
Category for thematic context: Domestic  
Example: Camp, temporary  
Comments/Remarks: Site consists of a low density scatter of prehistoric debris on a bluff overlooking the James River.

Specialized Contexts:

USGS Quadrangle(s): WESTOVER  
Loran: Restrict UTM Data?  
Center UTM (for less than 10 acres): 18/4133068/304599  
Boundary UTM (for 10 acres or more):

Physiographic Province: Coastal Plain  
Drainage: James River  
Landform: ridge top  
Aspect: Flat  
Elevation: 30.00  
Slope: 0-2%  
Site Soils: Nevark-Remlik complex  
Adjacent Soils: Peawick silt loam  
Nearest Water Source: James River  
Distance: 150

INDIVIDUAL/ORGANIZATION/AGENCY INFORMATION

Individual Category Codes: Owner of property  
Honorif:  
First: Unknown  
Last: Unknown  
Suffix:  
Title:  
Company/Agency:  
Address:  
City:  
State:  
Zip:  
Phone/Ext: 000-000-0000 000-000-0000

Notes: Site is located on portion of the Virginia Commonwealth University Rice Center.
Ownership type: Public - State  
Gov't Agency: State University and College System

SITE CHARACTERISTICS

Site Dimensions: 262 feet by 148 feet  
Acreage: 0.89  
Survey Strategy: Subsurface Testing  
Site Condition: Destruction of Surface and Subsurface Deposits; Unknown Portion of Site Destroyed
Survey Description: On recommendation from DHR, supplemental survey consisted of the excavation of two 1 x 1 m test units to assess site stratigraphy and research potential. In addition, nine judgmental shovel tests were excavated to locate minimum site boundaries.

CURRENT LAND USE

CURRENT LAND USE # 1
Land Use: Education    Dates of Use: 2006/04/10    Example: Road
Comments/Remarks: Site is located on portion of the Virginia Commonwealth University--Rice Center. An access road for a research pier crosses the site. A 20th-century structure (a lodge) once stood in the vicinity, but has since been destroyed.

SPECIMENS, FIELDNOTES, DEPOSITORIES

Specimens Obtained? Yes    Specimens Depository: WMCAR
VCU Dept. of Anthropology

Assemblage Description: Within the APE, modern light bulb fragments (n=4) and colorless bottle glass fragments (n=2) were recovered from Stratum II of Test Unit 2, and a complete Stage 1 quartz biface was recovered from Stratum III. Judgmental shovel tests excavated outside of the access road APE produced three fragments of fire-cracked rock, six secondary/thinning flakes (four noncortical, two with up to 74% cortex), five tertiary/retouch flakes, and four fragments of flake frag/shatter. All but one lithic artifact were of quartzite; one tertiary flake was quartz. In addition, Shovel Test 9 produced five wire nails, a coarse earthenware flower pot sherd, two fragments of burned refined earthenware (either ironstone or whiteware), and seven fragments of molten glass, all of which are likely related to the now-destroyed lodge.

Specimens Reported? Yes    Assemblage description--reported:    Deposition: WMCAR
Field Notes Reported? Yes
VCU Dept. of Anthropology

CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT EVENTS

Date: 2006/04/10    Cultural Resource Management Event: Phase I Survey

Organization or Person
First     Last
Elizabeth Monroe--WMCAR

Id # Associated with Event:

CRM Event Notes or Comments: Survey conducted in conjunction with construction of an access road and research pier for VCU.

PHOTOGRAPHIC DOCUMENTATION AND DEPOSITORY

Sequence Number: 1    Photographic Documentation?    Depository: WMCAR
Type of Photos: Black and White
Sequence Number: 2    Photographic Documentation?    Depository: WMCAR
Type of Photos: Color slide
Reference for reports and publications: Supplemental Archaeological Survey of the Proposed Inger and Walter Rice Center for Environmental Life Sciences Research Pier Facility and Department of Game and Inland Fisheries Region I Headquarters Facility, Charles City County, Virginia. William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research, Williamsburg, VA. Report submitted to Virginia Commonwealth University -- Facilities Management, Richmond, VA.