

# REGIONWIDE ARCHEOLOGICAL SURVEY PLAN

SOUTHEAST FIELD AREA  
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

• • •

Bennie C. Keel  
John E. Cornelison, Jr.  
David M. Brewer

*with contributions by*

Mark Barnes	Allen Bohnert
Dennis Finch	Guy Prentice
George Smith	Robert Wilson

• • •

Southeast Archeological Center  
National Park Service  
Tallahassee, Florida

1996

---

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

---

First, we would like to thank the former chief of SEAC, Richard D. Faust, who retired in 1994, for allowing us the time and resources to complete this plan. His guidance and supervision greatly assisted the production of a report of this magnitude. The present chief, John E. Ehrenhard, also deserves our thanks for continuing the tradition.

A special thanks goes to Mark Barnes, Archeologist with the National Register Programs Division in Atlanta, for his contributions in both the history and prehistory sections describing the cultural history of the Southeast. The information he collected and graciously shared was invaluable to the authors in preparing this plan.

We would like to thank all of the park superintendents and resource managers, as well as the State Historic Preservation Officers, regional scholars, and representatives from federal agencies and tribal governments that responded to our requests for information. Their responses have greatly enhanced the value of this document for the cultural resources management of areas both within and adjacent to NPS units within the region.

Robert Wilson, chief of SEAC's Database Section, provided the information in Chapter 3 concerning the status of the Cultural Site Inventory (CSI). We appreciate his contribution and his objective analysis of both current status and future needs.

Dennis Finch, SEAC's CSI Coordinator, Database Section, helped formulate the quadrat survey strategy for ready application to GIS. He provided the CSI data necessary to generate many of the site-specific charts and figures.

Allen Bohnert, former chief of SEAC's Collections Management Section, contributed the data in Chapter 3 concerning the status of collections. Our thanks to Allen for this information and for providing the material for Appendix 3.

We would also like to thank George Smith, chief of SEAC's Investigation and Evaluations Section, for his overall support of the planned program and for his helpful comments.

Guy Prentice contributed the archeological research sections concerning **Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area** and **Mammoth Cave National Park**.

We would like to thank Regina Leabo and Robb McGowan for the AutoCad® maps of the Southeast Field Area.

This plan would not have been possible without the administrative support we received from Janice Burke, Judy Hanson, and Wilma Clark. We would like to extend a special thanks to Judy for scanning the Preliminary Cultural Resource Management Plans (PCRMP).

Finally, a very special thank you to Virginia Horak of the Interagency Archeological Services Division, whose editorial and formatting assistance considerably improved this document.

• • •



---

# CONTENTS

---

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	2
FIGURES AND TABLES .....	6
MANAGEMENT SUMMARY .....	7
CHAPTER 1 — INTRODUCTION .....	9
DESCRIPTION OF PARK UNITS .....	9
PROJECT FORMULATION AND METHODOLOGY .....	9
CHAPTER 2 — REGIONAL OVERVIEW .....	13
GENERAL OVERVIEW .....	13
<i>Natural History</i> .....	14
<i>Caribbean Natural History</i> .....	15
PREHISTORY, HISTORY, AND MARITIME HISTORY .....	15
<i>Southeastern Prehistory</i> .....	16
<i>The Paleoindian Period</i> .....	16
<i>The Archaic Period</i> .....	17
<i>The Woodland Period</i> .....	20
<i>The Mississippian and Late Prehistoric Period</i> .....	29
PREHISTORY OF THE CARIBBEAN CULTURE AREA .....	32
<i>Paleoindian Period</i> .....	33
<i>Mesoindian Period</i> .....	33
<i>Neoindian Period</i> .....	35
HISTORY OF THE SOUTHEAST AND CARIBBEAN AREA .....	39
<i>Spanish Exploration and Settlement</i> .....	39
<i>French Exploration and Settlement</i> .....	40
<i>English Exploration and Settlement</i> .....	41
<i>Other European Exploration and Settlement</i> .....	42
<i>Physical Development</i> .....	42
<i>The American Revolution in the South</i> .....	42
<i>Explorations of the West</i> .....	43
<i>War of 1812</i> .....	44
<i>The Civil War</i> .....	45
<i>Post-Civil War</i> .....	48

MARITIME HISTORY IN THE SOUTHEAST .....	49
<i>European Colonial Exploration and Settlement</i> .....	50
<i>Development of the English Colonies</i> .....	51
<i>Miscellaneous Themes</i> .....	52
CHAPTER 3 — STATUS OF ARCHEOLOGICAL RESEARCH .....	54
INTRODUCTION .....	54
<i>A Brief History of Early NPS Archeological Research in SEFA</i> .....	54
THE SOUTHEAST ARCHEOLOGICAL CENTER (SEAC) .....	55
<i>Mission Statement</i> .....	55
PREVIOUS ARCHEOLOGICAL INVENTORY RESEARCH .....	56
PREVIOUS LARGE-SCALE SURVEYS .....	56
<i>Big Cypress National Preserve (BICY)</i> .....	56
<i>Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area (BISO)</i> .....	57
<i>Biscayne National Park (BISC)</i> .....	59
<i>Canaveral National Seashore (CANA)</i> .....	59
<i>Cape Lookout National Seashore (CALO)</i> .....	59
<i>Charles Pinckney National Historic Site (CHPI)</i> .....	60
<i>Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area (CHAT)</i> .....	60
<i>Cumberland Island National Seashore (CUIS)</i> .....	60
<i>Dry Tortugas National Park (DRTO)</i> .....	61
<i>Everglades National Park (EVER)</i> .....	61
<i>Fort Matanzas National Monument (FOMA)</i> .....	62
<i>Great Smoky Mountains National Park (GRSM)</i> .....	62
<i>Gulf Islands National Seashore (GUIS)</i> .....	62
<i>Mammoth Cave National Park (MACA)</i> .....	64
<i>Natchez Trace Parkway (NATR)</i> .....	66
<i>Obed Wild and Scenic River (OBRI)</i> .....	66
<i>Russell Cave National Monument (RUCA)</i> .....	66
<i>Timucuan Ecological and Historic Preserve (TIMU)</i> .....	66
THE REGIONAL CSI-A .....	67
<i>CSI-A Forms</i> .....	67
<i>National Register Forms</i> .....	69
<i>CSI-A Resource Base Inventory Maps</i> .....	69
<i>Bibliography of Archeological Surveys, Studies, Research, and Remote Sensing Data</i> .....	70
<i>Archeological Inventories of Park-Conducted Studies</i> .....	70
<i>Maps Keyed to Show the Level of Survey Coverage within Each Park</i> .....	70
STATUS OF REGIONAL ARCHEOLOGICAL COLLECTIONS .....	71
<i>Collection Cataloging</i> .....	71
<i>Collection Conservation and Storage</i> .....	72

---

SOLICITED COMMENTS .....	73
<i>Florida</i> .....	74
<i>Georgia</i> .....	74
<i>Mississippi</i> .....	74
<i>South Carolina</i> .....	75
<i>Tennessee</i> .....	75
<i>Virginia</i> .....	75
GENERAL COMMENTS .....	77
 CHAPTER 4 — THEMATIC FRAMEWORK AND SIGNIFICANCE .....	 78
THEMATIC FRAMEWORK AS A RESEARCH TOOL FOR EVALUATION .....	78
ASSESSMENT OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE .....	78
SEAC-IDENTIFIED RESEARCH TOPICS .....	79
 CHAPTER 5 — FIELD STRATEGIES .....	 81
SCOPE OF PROJECTS .....	81
SURVEY METHODS AND COVERAGE .....	82
<i>Archeological Overview and Assessments (AOA)</i> .....	82
<i>Non-Invasive Investigations</i> .....	82
<i>Remote Sensing Investigations</i> .....	83
<i>Invasive Investigations</i> .....	84
<i>Site Testing</i> .....	84
<i>Post Field</i> .....	84
CONCLUSION .....	85
 CHAPTER 6 — RELATED ARCHEOLOGICAL INVENTORY PROJECTS .....	 86
 CHAPTER 7 — PROJECT SEQUENCE .....	 92
THE PRIORITY SYSTEM .....	92
PROJECTS IN SEQUENTIAL ORDER .....	93
 APPENDIX 1 — PARK ACREAGE BY LEGAL TYPE .....	 104
 APPENDIX 2 — MODULAR OVERVIEW AND ASSESSMENT OUTLINE .....	 106
 APPENDIX 3 — PREVIOUS ARCHEOLOGICAL TESTING BY PARK .....	 107
 BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	 138

---

## FIGURES AND TABLES

---

### FIGURES

1. SEFA land holdings by ownership . . . . .	9
2. State and territory delineations and park locations in SEFA . . . . .	13
3. Major physiographic zones in SEFA . . . . .	14
4. SEFA parks with a Paleoindian component . . . . .	16
5. SEFA parks with an Archaic component . . . . .	18
6. Swift Creek and Napier complicated stamped pottery motifs . . . . .	20
7. SEFA parks with a Woodland component . . . . .	21
8. Bibb Plain vessel from Ocmulgee National Monument, recovered by the WPA . . . . .	30
9. SEFA parks with a Mississippian component . . . . .	31
10. Hat pin (6 inches long) recovered in the area of Canaveral National Seashore . . . . .	41
11. SEFA parks with a Revolutionary War component . . . . .	44
12. SEFA parks with a Civil War component . . . . .	46
13. Ship ring bolt from the area of Canaveral National Seashore . . . . .	51
14. Archeological resources in the Southeast by general period . . . . .	67
15. National Register status of prehistoric sites in SEFA . . . . .	68
16. National Register status of historic sites in SEFA . . . . .	68
17. Eighteenth-century Spanish wooden figurine found on the beach at Biscayne National Park . . . . .	72
18. A quadrat showing numbering sequence . . . . .	83
19. SEFA parks with European contact sites . . . . .	87
20. SEFA parks with a plantation and slavery component . . . . .	91

### TABLES

1. Number of SEFA units by type . . . . .	9
2. Park locations, settings, and geographic zones . . . . .	10–11
3. Paleoindian cultural chronology . . . . .	16
4. Archaic cultural chronology . . . . .	18
5. Woodland/Gulf Formational cultural chronology . . . . .	22
6. Mississippian cultural chronology . . . . .	30
7. Caribbean cultural chronology . . . . .	33
8. Response to requests for comments regarding this plan . . . . .	73
9. Areas to be surveyed in SEFA parks . . . . .	82
10. Atlantic Coast Cluster projects and cluster sequence . . . . .	94–97
11. Appalachian Coast Cluster projects and cluster sequence . . . . .	98–100
12. Gulf Coast Cluster projects and cluster sequence . . . . .	101–103

---

## MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

---

The overall goal of the Systemwide Archeological Inventory Program (SAIP) is to "conduct systematic, scientific research to locate, evaluate, and document archeological resources on National Park System lands" (Aubry et al. 1992:2). To accomplish this in a timely and efficient manner, each field area of the National Park Service (NPS) was asked to develop a plan of action. In response, this document—the Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan (RASP)—was created by the Southeast Archeological Center for the Southeast Field Area (SEFA) (formerly the Southeast Region or SER).

Chapter 1 contains a description of park lands and project formulation methodology. It also has information on land ownership, environmental zones, physiographic zones, and access. Databases, assembled to identify inventory and site testing projects, are also described.

Chapter 2 is a cultural overview containing the history, prehistory, and a maritime history of the Southeast.

Chapter 3 presents the current status of the archeological resources in SEFA. Additionally, it contains statements both on previous archeological research by SEAC and on the status of the Cultural Sites Inventory (CSI). Also discussed are comments solicited from the parks, State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs), scholars, other federal agencies, and federally recognized Indian tribes regarding regional archeology.

Chapter 4 contains the theoretical framework and methodologies that will be used to evaluate sites for National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) significance and to make recommendations for eligibility.

Chapter 5 describes the field techniques that will be used for inventory and site testing. The Geographic Information System (GIS) digital structure is also explained.

Chapter 6 describes four thematic associations for interregional and multipark survey

projects. These themes—selected for their general suitability to the historic development of the Southeast and for their compatibility with thematic associations in other field areas—are as follows:

- European Colonial Exploration and Settlement
- The American Revolution
- The Civil War
- American Way of Life (Slavery and Plantation Life)

Chapter 7 discusses the following seven criteria used to determine project sequence.

- Can archeological inventory projects be coordinated with the scheduled development or revision of park planning documents?
- Are there current or potential threats to the park resources from natural processes or human activities?
- Are there development or special use zones in the park?
- Is the park or a historic zone within the park listed on the National Register?
- Does the archeological inventory project address research questions, problems, topics, or priorities of state, regional, or national importance?
- Does the park lack virtually any archeological information?
- Is the archeological potential either unknown or considered to be high based on professional recommendations?

Two additional criteria were considered by the SEFA SAIP/RASP team:

- Has an Archeological Overview and Assessment (AOA) been completed, or has an AOA been requested in a project statement in the Resource Management Plan (RMP)?
- Is there ongoing archeological research or a previous SAIP/RASP commitment?

Parks were also ranked, based on their research needs, from No. 1 (meeting the most factors) to No. 64 (meeting the fewest factors). Therefore, prehistoric inventory, historic inventory, multiyear inventory, site testing (and evaluation), inventory projects already stated in the RMP, and submerged inventory projects were assigned their present sequence based on the above ranking.

Because it is more efficient and cost effective to conduct archeological inventories after completion of an AOA, a project statement to this effect was created and added for each park that did not have one listed in its RMP. Project statements were also created for evaluation studies when known and recorded sites had not been tested to the level required by *NPS-28: Cultural Resource Management Guidelines* (NPS 1985) and by the Secretary of the Interior's standards for determining National Register eligibility.

For the above reason, intrapark sequence was consistently applied as follows:

1. AOA (Project Type – AOA)
2. Inventory Projects (Project Type – AIS [Archeological Inventory Study]), including (in RMP):
  - Multiyear Inventory
  - Thematic Inventory

- Historic Inventory
- Prehistoric Inventory
- Submerged Inventory

3. Site Testing (Project Type – AES [Archeological Evaluation Study])

As a result of recent restructuring in the NPS, the Southeast Field Area (formerly the Southeast Region) has recently been divided into three clusters: the Gulf Coast, the Appalachian, and the Atlantic Coast. Although physically located within the Gulf Coast Cluster, SEAC will service all three clusters as well as Louisiana and parts of Texas and Maryland. Therefore, each project statement has been assigned a cluster sequence based on its former regional sequence. When this document was prepared, reorganization plans had not been finalized; in fact, the process is still a work in progress. Therefore, parks added to the clusters from outside the former region might not yet be reflected in this document. At the appropriate time, they will be added to the project's database and assigned a sequence number based on the criteria noted herein.

Chapter 7 also has three tables that show the proposed projects in regional and cluster sequences.

The plan concludes with the following three appendices:

1. Park Acreage by Legal Type
2. Modular Overview and Assessment (AOA) Outline
3. Previous Archeological Testing by Park

Finally, for convenience, we have listed some abbreviations and acronyms, including those for SEFA parks, on the inside back cover.

• • •



# Chapter 1

## INTRODUCTION

### DESCRIPTION OF PARK UNITS

As of February 1, 1994, the Southeast Regional Office (now SEFA) of the National Park Service (NPS) consisted of sixty-four units divided into eighteen basic types (Table 1), representing 17 percent of the total number of NPS holdings. The SEFA units consist of over 3.7 million acres (Appendix 1), or 4.8 percent of the total NPS acreage. Included in this figure are approximately 1.019 million acres of submerged lands that are owned, managed, or administered by SEFA. In addition, there are almost 242,200 acres of private inholdings (Figure 1).

Of all the parks in SEFA, only **Ocmulgee** National Monument, **Russell Cave** National Monument, and **Timucuan** Ecological and Historic Preserve are major "archeological" parks wherein significant archeological values have been expressly identified in their establishing legislation. The enabling legislation for most of the other parks in the region generally does not expressly mention archeological resources, although preservation of significant historical, cultural, and scientific resources is often addressed in the enacting legislation itself or in subsequent guidelines and/or defining rules and regulations. It should be noted, however, that virtually every SEFA unit contains archeological resources.

Table 1 — Number of SEFA units by type.

Ecological and Historic Preserve	1
National Battlefield	5
National Battlefield Park	1
National Battlefield Site	1
National Cemetery	4
National Historic Site	12
National Historical Park	2
National Historical Park and Ecological Preserve	1
National Memorial	3
National Military Park	6
National Monument	9
National Park	6
National Preserve	2
National Recreation Area	1
National River and Recreation Area	1
National Seashore	5
Parkway	3
Wild and Scenic River	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>64</b>

SEFA units are found in a variety of settings (Table 2) from the coastal zones, to swamps, rivers, piedmonts, and mountains. Settings also vary from rural, as at **Horseshoe Bend** National Military Park, to urban, as at **Martin Luther King, Jr.**, National Historic Site and **San Juan** National Historic Site.




Figure 1 — SEFA land holdings by ownership.

### PROJECT FORMULATION AND METHODOLOGY

After reviewing the Systemwide Archeological Inventory Program (SAIP) requirements (Aubry et al. 1992), the Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan (RASP) team at the Southeast Archeological Center (SEAC) chose to use the Resource Management Plans (RMPs) from the park units to guide inventory (site location), identification (site testing), and evaluation (recommendation of National Register eligibility)

Table 2 — Park locations, settings, and geographic zones.

PARK*	LOCATION	PHYSICAL SETTING	ZONE
ABLI	Rural	Foothills	Allegheny Plateaus
ANDE	Rural	Coastal Plain	Gulf Plains
ANJO	Rural	Mountainous	Appalachian Ranges
BICY	Rural	Swamp	Gulf Plains
BISC	Suburban	Coastal	Gulf Plains
BISO	Rural	Mountainous	Allegheny Plateaus
BLRI	Rural	Mountainous	Appalachian Ranges
BRCR	Rural	Mississippi Delta	Gulf Plains
BUIS	Remote	Island	Caribbean
CAHA	Suburban	Coastal	Atlantic Plains
CALO	Suburban	Coastal	Atlantic Plains
CANA	Suburban	Coastal	Atlantic Plains
CARL	Rural	Foothills	Appalachian Ranges
CASA	Urban	Coastal	Atlantic Plains
CHAT	Suburban	Riparian	Piedmont Plateaus
CHCH	Suburban	Foothills	Piedmont Plateaus
CHPI	Suburban	Coastal Plain	Atlantic Plains
CHRI	Urban	Island	Caribbean
COSW	Rural	Backswamp	Atlantic Plains
COWP	Rural	Piedmont	Piedmont Plateaus
CUGA	Rural	Mountainous	Appalachian Ranges
CUIS	Remote	Island	Atlantic Plains
DESO	Suburban	Coastal	Gulf Plains
DRTO	Remote	Island	Gulf Plains
EVER	Rural	Swamp	Gulf/Atlantic Plains
FOCA	Suburban	River Bluff	Atlantic Plains
FODC	Suburban	River Bluff	Gulf Plains
FODO	Suburban	River Bluff	Gulf Plains
FOFR	Rural	Coastal	Atlantic Plains
FOMA	Suburban	Coastal	Atlantic Plains
FOOT	Rural	Mountainous	Appalachian Ranges
FOPU	Suburban	Coastal	Atlantic Plains
FORA	Suburban	Coastal	Atlantic Plains
FOSU	Remote	Island	Atlantic Plains
GRSM	Rural	Mountainous	Appalachian Ranges
GUCO	Suburban	Piedmont	Piedmont Plateaus
GUIS	Remote	Island	Gulf Plains
HOBE	Rural	River Bluff	Piedmont Plateaus
JICA	Rural	Coastal Plain	Gulf Plains
KEMO	Suburban	Mountainous	Piedmont Plateaus
KIMO	Rural	Mountainous	Piedmont Plateaus



Table 2 — Park locations, settings, and geographic zones.

PARK*	LOCATION	PHYSICAL SETTING	ZONE
LIRI	Rural	Mountainous	Appalachian Ranges
MACA	Suburban	Mountainous	Allegheny Plateaus
MALU	Urban	Urban	Piedmont Plateaus
MOCR	Rural	Coastal Plain	Atlantic Plains
NATC	Urban	River Bluff	Gulf Plains
NATR	Suburban	Mixed	Gulf Plains
NISI	Rural	Foothills	Piedmont Plateaus
OBRI	Rural	Riparian	Allegheny Plateaus
OCMU	Suburban	Coastal Plain	Atlantic Plains
RUCA	Rural	Foothills	Allegheny Plateaus
SAJU	Urban	Urban	Caribbean
SARI	Remote	Island	Caribbean
SHIC	Rural	River Bluff	Gulf Plains
SHIL	Rural	River Bluff	Gulf Plains
STRC	Suburban	River Bluff	Allegheny Plateaus
STRI	Suburban	River Bluff	Allegheny Plateaus
TIMU	Suburban	Coastal Swamp	Atlantic Plains
TUIN	Suburban	Coastal Plain	Gulf Plains
TUPE	Suburban	Mississippi Delta	Gulf Plains
VICC	Suburban	River Bluff	Gulf Plains
VICK	Suburban	River Bluff	Gulf Plains
VIIS	Remote	Island	Caribbean
WRBR	Suburban	Coastal	Atlantic Plains

\* See inside back cover for a list of park names and their abbreviations/acronyms.

studies as required. Project statements from the park units' RMPs were placed into a database at SEAC. Once this database (PROJECTS) was constructed, all noncultural project statements were then removed.

Three additional databases were reviewed for inventory, location, identification, description, and evaluation studies. These databases were the SERRMP, a listing of regional project statements maintained by the NPS Washington Office (WASO), the RMP program database of project statements maintained by SEFA as part of the overall RMP production software, and the MYPFS (Multiyear Project Formulation System), a database of early, older project statements maintained by SEFA Administration,

Budget, and Finance. Project statements were compiled and sorted by type of study (inventory, identification, or evaluation) and then appended to the PROJECTS database. Duplicate projects were removed.

With all available cultural project statements in the PROJECTS database, the projects were reviewed to insure that the project statements were suitable for inclusion into the SAIP regionwide plan. The primary criterion for inclusion was whether the project statements would result in accomplishing the SAIP objectives of identification, inventory, evaluation, and documentation of archeological sites on SEFA park unit lands.

Where project statements reflecting SAIP

recommendations were not addressed in either the parks' RMPs or any of the above project-tracking databases, yet were identified by SEAC as necessary to meet the program's overall goals, new project statements were formulated at SEAC to fulfill those needs. These project statements were added to the PROJECTS database and coded as SEAC-generated (designated by a capital "Z" before the project number). This ensured that as these project statements are created, they will be forwarded to the individual parks for the superintendent's concurrence and as a recommended addition to the park's RMP.

Information received from regional scholars, other federal agencies, and recognized Indian tribes was reviewed and then used to insure that appropriate survey methods were selected for each park unit.

In preparation for archeological inventories,

an Archeological Overview and Assessment (AOA) will be needed for each park. A project statement for completing an AOA was created and added for each park that lacked one in its RMP. Project statements were also created for general inventories, both historic and prehistoric surveys, and evaluation studies when known and recorded sites have not undergone testing to the level required by *NPS-28: Cultural Resource Management Guidelines* (NPS 1985) and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Archeological and Historic Preservation to recommend National Register eligibility.

Regionwide project statements were also created for conversion of the regional CSI database into the servicewide Archeological Sites Management Information System (ASMIS) and for elimination of the backlog of data collection required for ASMIS.

• • •

**GENERAL OVERVIEW**

SEFA comprises eight states and two territories: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands (Figure 2). Considering the extensive area covered by SEFA, it is not surprising that

homogeneity in physiography, environment, archeology, and history is lacking. Units of the National Park system are present in all of the major physiographic provinces and ecological zones of the southeastern United States. Each unit's archeological resources need to be studied and understood in relation to the local physiography, microenvironmental zone, and history.




Figure 2 — State and territory (inset, not to scale) delineations and park locations in SEFA.

So, at the park level, there may be a need for more detailed study than provided by the following generalizations of the natural history and development of human societies in the Southeast region.

#### **NATURAL HISTORY**

The eastern and southern margins of the southeastern United States are bounded by the Continental Margin and the Coastal Plain physiographic provinces. The Allegheny Plateaus, Appalachian Ranges, and Piedmont Plateaus physiographic provinces cut diagonally in a northeast direction across the southern states from their southwestern borders along the interior of the Gulf Coastal Plain (Thornbury 1965:1-13) (Figure 3).

The geological history of the Southeast is complex and not completely understood. Notwithstanding, we know that the waterways draining the interior of the region played a major role in both prehistoric and historic times. Rivers and streams provided easy and efficient transportation for trade and commerce, as well as sustenance in the form of fish, shellfish, and migratory waterfowl, which pass through the region twice annually. With periodic deposits of fresh sediments, these watersheds improved the land for agriculture. They also provided the energy to drive the mills of the Industrial Revolution when it later spread across the area.

Both localized and widespread deposits of cryptocrystalline rocks provided Native American groups, throughout the more than 10,000 years of their exclusive occupation of the region, with the raw material for piercing, cutting, scraping, and boring tools. Likewise, deposits

(some localized) of sedimentary and metamorphic rock were sources for ground and polished tools, ornaments, and containers. In areas, such as the coastal plain and coast, where stone was rare or absent, either trade or the substitution of shell, wood, and bone filled the need for raw materials to fashion tools and other implements.

The ecological zonation of the region is a product of its climate, geology, and geomorphology.

The Temperate Deciduous Forest Biome in the southern region of the United States is characterized by three forest zones: the magnolia-maritime forests along the coast, the pine lands further inland, and the oak-hickory forests in the interior. Within each of the major forest zones, a variety of microenvironments, created by the




Figure 3 — Major physiographic zones in SEFA (inset not to scale).

interaction of local soil, relief, drainage, climate, and history, are present (Shelford 1963:1–119). The major fauna, such as deer and large fowl, were present throughout these zones. These animals were important to the first Americans as well as to later arrivals, such as the European immigrants and the African slaves. To be sure, some important species of shellfish had restricted distributions, but where these were absent, other resources were handily exploited.

The continental Southeast as a whole is characterized by a temperate climate, except for the Everglades, a small subtropical zone of southern Florida. Plant, animal, and mineral resources were abundantly distributed across the region so that no human society had to endure a particularly hostile natural environment. The abundance of this natural world is seen archeologically by the recognition that throughout the human history of the area, culture evolved smoothly both chronologically and in complexity to a surprising degree.

#### *CARIBBEAN NATURAL HISTORY*

The Caribbean is composed of two distinctive chains of islands—the Lesser and Greater Antilles. The Lesser Antilles are a line of mainly volcanic islands sweeping northward from the island of Trinidad, near the mouth of the Orinoco River in Venezuela. This island chain continues northward to the three American Virgin Islands (St. Thomas, St. John, and St. Croix), where they meet the Greater Antilles.

The Greater Antilles consist of four large islands: Puerto Rico, Hispaniola (containing Haiti and the Dominican Republic), Cuba, and Jamaica. While there is evidence of volcanism in the Greater Antilles, they are, for the most part, a submerged mountain range jutting westward into the Caribbean for over a thousand miles. To the north of Cuba and Hispaniola are the low-lying Bahamian Islands. This area, and usually the eastern coast of Venezuela, is collectively called the Caribbean Cultural Area.

Rouse (1992) states that most of the islands are within sight of each other, facilitating travel. He also states that the ocean currents flow south to north and east to west. The trade winds blowing from the northeast bring heavy rain. When an island is mountainous, the rain is dumped on the north and east side of the mountains leaving the other side dry. The rainforest-to-semiarid environment affected the overall settlement patterns on the islands. In general, the climate and vegetation are tropical. Rouse also states that the “forest contained an abundance of wild fruit and vegetables” and “saltwater fish, shellfish, and waterfowl were available along the shore” (1992:4). Other animals found included turtles and manatees. The limited variation of food resources on the different islands necessitated the development of trade networks.

#### **PREHISTORY, HISTORY, AND MARITIME HISTORY**

The subsequent sections on prehistory, history, and maritime history are discussed using the format set forth in *History and Prehistory in the National Park System and the National Historic Landmarks Program* (NPS 1987). This system divides history into thematic associations within a general historic framework or background. The goal of the system is “to cover all areas of United States history without excessive detail and minutiae” (NPS 1987:i). Information regarding particular parks is summarized from official park publications and other references as cited.

The following sections present the region's prehistory in the cultural history framework commonly taught in most Southeast university archeology courses. As appropriate, the information and topics will be tied to specific NPS National Historic Landmark (NHL) themes, as outlined in the shadow boxes. Coverage of the continental portion of the region is followed by a description of the Caribbean area.

SOUTHEASTERN PREHISTORY

The Paleoindian Period

- I. Cultural Developments: Indigenous American Populations
  - A. The Earliest Inhabitants
    - 1. The Early Peopling of North America

The current view of the Paleoindian period envisions bands of hunters entering the North American continent (circa 13,000 B.C.) by crossing a land bridge that connected eastern Siberia with Alaska. The land bridge was created during the Late Pleistocene by continent-sized glaciers, which, when created, drew water from the oceans' lowering sea levels by some 120 meters. It would appear that these same glaciers prevented these immigrants from expanding into the rest of the North American continent until about 12,000 B.C.

The best diagnostic archeological evidence for these early Paleoindian bands are long fluted stone points called Clovis points after the Clovis Site, New Mexico, where this point type was first recognized as occurring with Late Pleistocene fauna. The Paleoindians appear to have occupied most of the North American continent, including the Southeast, within just a few hundred years after 10,000 B.C. Paleoindian period artifacts have been located in **Big South Fork National River And Recreation Area**, **Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area**, **Mammoth Cave National Park**, **Ocmulgee National Monument**, and **Russell Cave National Monument** (Figure 4).

Since 1960, archeological studies of the river basin projects, as well as statewide studies of Paleoindian point finds and site distributions in the Southeast, have led to refinements in the sequencing of point types and attempts to reconstruct Paleoindian cultural activities. Excavations at Paleoindian sites, better dating techniques, and study of

the distribution of Paleoindian point types and the Late Pleistocene environment have led archeologists to develop new models for Paleoindian occupation in the Southeast—now broken down into three subperiods between 9500 and 7900 B.C. (Table 3).

Early Paleoindian	9500 – 9000 B.C.
Middle Paleoindian	9000 – 8500 B.C.
Late Paleoindian	8500 – 7900 B.C.

The first subperiod, Early Paleoindian (9500–9000 B.C.), is characterized by Clovis or Clovis-like large fluted stone points. It is believed that the distribution of these points throughout all the environmental zones in the Southeast represents the initial exploration and colonization of the region. Great mobility of the Paleoindians of this subperiod is suggested by




Figure 4 — SEFA parks with a Paleoindian component.



the finding of stone tools and debitage traded or transported by these small bands over hundreds of kilometers from their quarry source. The Southeast, at this time, consisted of three broad environmental zones, running west to east. They were cool-climate boreal forests, temperate oak-hickory-pine forests, and subtropical sandy scrub. The last area was confined to the Florida peninsula and the coastal plain in the Southeast, which extended several kilometers outward from its present location due to the lower sea level. Megafauna of the Late Pleistocene was found in these three environmental zones.

The second subperiod, the Middle Paleoindian (9000–8500 B.C.), is characterized by a number of fluted and unfluted points, both larger and smaller than Clovis points. The point types of this subperiod in the Southeast are Cumberland, Redstone, Suwannee, Beaver Lake, Quad, Coldwater, and Simpson. This subperiod is viewed as a time when the population was adapting to optimum environmental resource zones instead of randomly moving throughout the Southeast. Concentration on specific zones and resources may account for the variation in the stone points of this subperiod.

The last subperiod, the Late Paleoindian (8500–7900 B.C.), is characterized by Dalton and other side-notched-style points. The replacement of fluted point forms by nonfluted points is believed to reflect a change in the adaptive strategy, away from hunting Late Pleistocene megafauna toward a more generalized hunting of small, modern game, such as deer, and a collecting subsistence strategy within the southern pine forests as they replaced the boreal forests.

Chert deposits may have attracted Paleoindian groups of this subperiod to specific locales in order to replenish their stone tools. Such a tendency may have constrained these groups to a specific landscape, setting the stage for the intensive regional specialization that characterized the succeeding Archaic Period. It is possible that large Paleoindian sites in the Southeast are permanent or semipermanent base camps from which resources of specific territories were exploited. Trade or transportation of

stone tools appear to decrease as Late Paleoindian groups relied on local materials for their needs.

### *The Archaic Period*

- I. Cultural Developments: Indigenous American Populations
  - A. The Earliest Inhabitants
    12. Archaic Adaptations of the Mississippi Valley Region
    13. Archaic Adaptations of the Southeast (including the Cumberland Region)

William A. Ritchie (1932) first used the term "Archaic" in American archeological literature to describe the cultural material, primarily chipped stone tools, from the Lamoka Lake Site in New York. During the Works Progress Administration (WPA) excavations of the 1930s and 1940s, southeastern sites that were recognized as producing lithic materials similar to Lamoka Lake were also classified as Archaic. Today, archeologists use the term to describe a temporal and cultural period, differentiated from the earlier Paleoindian period and more recent periods on the basis of stylistic differences in stone point types, the appearance of other artifacts, and changes in economic orientation. Archaic sites have been located in **Big Cypress National Preserve**, **Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area**, **Blue Ridge Parkway**, **Cape Hatteras National Seashore**, **Cape Lookout National Seashore**, **Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area**, **Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park**, **Foot-hills Parkway**, **Great Smoky Mountains National Park**, **Horseshoe Bend National Military Park**, **Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park**, **Kings Mountain National Military Park**, **Mammoth Cave National Park**, **Natchez Trace Parkway**, **Ninety Six National Historic Site**, **Obed Wild and Scenic River**, **Ocmulgee National Monument**, **Stones River National Battlefield**, **Timucuan Ecological and Historic**




Figure 5 — SEFA parks with an Archaic component (inset of Caribbean area not to scale).

Preserve, **Virgin Islands National Park**, and **Wright Brothers National Memorial** (Figure 5).

Before 1960, the major goal of Archaic period research was to develop a relative chronology. Information derived from excavations at deeply stratified quarry, habitation, and cave sites in the Southeast—such as Russell Cave in Alabama, Indian Knoll in Kentucky, and the Hardaway and Doerschuk sites in North Carolina—was used to develop the following chronology for the Archaic period (Table 4).

The Early Archaic period (8000–6000 B.C.) was defined on the basis of chipped stone projectile-point technology and styles. This time period is associated with the final glacial retreat on the North American continent and an envi-

ronment similar to that found in the Southeast today.

Excavations at stratified Early Archaic sites near permanent water sources or along rivers have produced corner, basal, and some side-notched points, such as Palmer, Kirk, and LeCroy, which are found throughout the south-

Table 4 — Archaic cultural chronology.

Early Archaic	8000 – 6000 B.C.
Middle Archaic	6000 – 3000 B.C.
Late Archaic	3000 – 1000 B.C.



eastern United States. Other points, such as St. Albans, Kessell, Big Sandy, and Kanawah, have a limited southeastern geographical distribution. It is this introduction of new point types that differentiates the Early Archaic period from the preceding Late Paleoindian subperiod.

Like the Late Paleoindian subperiod, it was presumed that the Early Archaic culture consisted of small mobile bands exploiting defined territories, but the increase in the number of sites and the recovery of nonlocal cherts tend to support an increase in population resulting in larger numbers of bands that traded resources with each other. The proliferation in point types appeared to also represent the ongoing regional specialization first apparent in the Late Paleoindian subperiod.

The range of lithic tools included knives, perforators, drills, choppers, flake knives and scrapers, gouges, and hammerstones. In addition, wet sites—such as the Windover site near present-day Titusville, Florida, which produced exceptionally well-preserved organic materials—have produced artifacts that have enlarged this inventory. These artifacts include bone points, atlatl hooks, barbed points, fish hooks, and pins; shell adzes; wooden stakes and canoes; and fragments of cloth, clothing, and woven bags. This new information on the Early Archaic has contributed to a view of a residentially stable hunting and gathering band society that seasonally occupied base camps along major water courses and exploited lithic and food resources within individual stream drainages.

The Middle Archaic period (6000–3000 B.C.) in the Southeast is marked by a further intensification of regionalization of prehistoric cultures. A variety of new chipped stone points (for example, Stanly, Morrow Mountain, Levy, Eva, Benton, Cypress Creek, Arrendondo, White Springs, Sykes, and Newnan) and a series of ground stone tools and implements first appear in this period. These tools are used mainly for plant food processing.

The Middle Archaic appears to involve a very generalized resource exploitation strategy, which included the hunting of a variety of animals and the gathering of wild plants, such

as nuts, fruits, berries, and seeds. This period demonstrated the first occurrence of shellfish collecting within river valleys and along the seacoast. At these "base" camps are found storage pits, remains of house floors, and prepared burials—all indications of increased sedentism at certain sites. Recent radiocarbon samples in Louisiana have provided considerable evidence of a mound-building tradition in Louisiana at least by 3000 B.C. There is also a moderate increase in the amount of trade in nonlocal chert materials supposedly due to a continued growth in prehistoric population. Trade networks that focused on specialized resources developed when people began to live in sedentary base camps.

The Late Archaic period (3000–1000 B.C.) in the Southeast consisted of regional specialization using a generalized subsistence technology to efficiently exploit locally available plant and animal resources. For example, freshwater mussels from the Green River in Kentucky, provided the basis for an expanded dietary inventory that included seed crops and native and tropical cultigens, suggesting that this culture was experimenting with horticulture. Late Archaic cultures along the South Atlantic coast developed sedentary settlements based on the utilization of the saltwater oyster beds. The Late Archaic Poverty Point culture in the lower Mississippi River Valley developed large permanent towns with satellite communities. These were linked in a program of trade in exotic nonlocal lithic raw materials as well as in the production and trade of finished goods made from these materials throughout much of the eastern United States. The treatment of burials at the Green River sites—some containing exotic trade materials—may reflect the beginnings of a hierarchy of individuals whose sole responsibility was the establishment and maintenance of these trade networks.

At the end of the Late Archaic, fiber-tempered plain and decorated ceramics appeared along the South Atlantic coast. This ceramic technology spread westward to the coastal plain of Alabama and Mississippi, to the Poverty Point culture area, southward into Florida, and

eventually to most of the southeastern United States. The appearance of this new technology has traditionally been viewed as the transitional period between the Archaic hunting and gathering societies and the emergence of settled Woodland-period villages and communities whose existence depended on a combination of horticulture and hunting and gathering. Finally, the Archaic saw the beginning of a southeastern mound-building tradition that would be further elaborated on in the succeeding Woodland and Mississippian periods.

### *The Woodland Period*

- I. Cultural Developments: Indigenous American Populations
- B. Post-Archaic and Precontact Developments
  - 9. Post-Archaic Adaptations
  - 14. Hunters and Gatherers of the Eastern Woodlands
  - 15. Eastern Farmers
  - 16. Post-Archaic Adaptations of Eastern Coastal Regions
  - 20. Post-Archaic Adaptations in Riverine Zones

The term "Woodland" was introduced in the 1930s as a generic heading for prehistoric sites falling between the Archaic hunting and gathering and the temple-mound-building Mississippian cultures in the eastern United States.

By the early 1960s, Woodland sites were generally characterized as those that regularly produced pottery (Figure 6) and constructed burial mounds that contained elaborate grave goods. Although evidence was lacking, it was assumed that these burial mounds implied an agricultural-based economy to support the construction of these earthworks.

Traditional archeological interpretation of the evolution of prehistoric Native American cultures dictated that there was a clear line of division between Archaic peoples and Woodland pottery-making and agricultural peoples.

By the mid-1960s, however, it was evident that in some areas of the United States prehistoric cultural groups with a clearly Archaic cultural assemblage were making pottery without any evidence of the cultivation of domesticated crops. In fact, it appears that hunting and gathering continued as the basic subsistence economy and that true agriculture did not occur in much of the Southeast for a couple of thousand years after the introduction of pottery. Woodland sites have been located in **Andersonville** National Historic Site, **Big South Fork** National River and Recreation Area, **Blue Ridge Parkway**, **Canaveral** National Seashore, **Cape Hatteras** National Seashore, **Cape Lookout** National Seashore, **Chattahoochee River** National Recreation Area, **Chickamauga and Chattanooga** National Military Park, **Cumberland Island** National Seashore, **De Soto** National Memorial, **Everglades** National Park, **Foothills Parkway**, **Fort Frederica** National Monument, **Great Smoky Mountains** National




Figure 6 — Swift Creek and Napier complicated stamped pottery motifs (Kelly and Smith 1975).




Figure 7 — SEFA parks with a Woodland component.

Park, **Gulf Islands** National Seashore, **Horseshoe Bend** National Military Park, **Mammoth Cave** National Park, **Natchez Trace** Parkway, **Ninety Six** National Historic Site, **Ocmulgee** National Monument, **Shiloh** National Military Park and Cemetery, **Stones River** National Battlefield, **Timucuan** Ecological and Historic Preserve, **Vicksburg** National Military Park, and **Wright Brothers** National Memorial (Figure 7).

In recent years archeologists in the southeastern United States have addressed the issue of agricultural development by investigating Woodland village sites to learn more about the subsistence patterns of the period. This has sometimes led to establishing cultural chronologies that separate Archaic from Woodland

cultures with a transitional stage of cultural development, or to postulating alternative subsistence strategies for the cultures of the Early Woodland period in the Southeast.

In the Southeast, the Woodland period is now generally viewed as a cultural developmental stage or temporal unit dating from about 1000 B.C. to A.D. 1000. Rather than showing a wholesale change in material culture, archeology has shown a continuity in the development of Archaic and Woodland stone and bone tools for the acquisition, processing, storing, and preparation of animal and plant foods, leather working, textile manufacture, tool production, cultivation, and shelter construction. Some Woodland peoples continued to use Archaic-style spears and

atlats until the Late Woodland period (circa A.D. 800) when these were replaced by bow and arrow technology. The major technological change in the Woodland period, however, was the emergence of a distinct pottery-making tradition with definite vessel forms and decoration, although in the Southeast, pottery technology apparently began in the Late Archaic. There was also a culmination of an increasing sedentism, which first appeared in the Archaic, into permanently occupied villages.

Of importance was a realization that the subsistence economy of the Woodland period was essentially similar to that of the Archaic period, utilizing seasonal exploitation of wild plants and animals but with the introduction of a system of planting and tending of garden crops and the intensive collecting of starchy seeds and autumnal nuts. This set the stage for agriculture economies of the later Mississippian period. Generally, the Woodland period is divided into three subperiods (Table 5). The beginning and ending dates for these phases, however, are not consistent throughout the Southeast.

Early Woodland	1000 – 200 B.C.
Gulf Formational	2000 – 100 B.C.
Middle Woodland	200 B.C. – A.D. 500
Late Woodland	A.D. 500 – 1000

• *Early Woodland*

If one uses the traditional definition of pottery introduction being equated with a Woodland tradition, then the earliest Woodland sites would be those found along the South Atlantic coast that have produced fiber-tempered pottery dating as early as 2500 B.C.

However, these sites are essentially Late Archaic seasonally occupied coastal base camps with a material cultural assemblage equivalent to that found on Archaic sites, and differentiated

only by the addition of fiber-tempered pottery.

Researchers in the Southeast are attempting to define the beginnings of the Woodland period using not only the appearance of pottery but evidence of permanent settlements, intensive collection and/or horticulture of starchy seed plants, differentiation in social organization, and specialized activities, to name just a few topics of special interest. Most of these cultural aspects are clearly in place in parts of the Southeast by around 1000 B.C. The time period between about 2500 and 1000 B.C. should be considered a period of gradual transition from the Archaic to the Woodland.

Beginning around 2500 B.C., the Stallings Island culture established itself as a Late Archaic shellfish-collecting society that utilized the riverine and coastal environments, probably on a seasonal basis, leaving evidence of their occupation in the form of large shell middens. This cultural group used an Archaic material culture, but also created the first ceramics known in the United States. Called Stallings Island, these ceramics were named after a major shell midden site on an island in the Savannah River near Augusta, Georgia.

The Stallings Island ceramics generally contained Spanish moss as a tempering agent, and the forms consisted of simple shallow bowls and large, wide-mouthed bowls, as well as deeper jar forms. Most ceramics were plain, although some with punctated surface decoration were found. Stallings Island pottery dates from about 2500 to 1000 B.C., and ceramic finds range from the Tar River drainage in North Carolina, southward to northwest Florida.

Contemporary with Stallings Island pottery along the South Atlantic coast are other fiber-tempered wares, such as Orangeware from sites in northeast Florida and southeast coastal Georgia (1200 to 500 B.C.). Orange period sites have been located at **Canaveral** National Seashore, **Fort Matanzas** National Monument, and **Timucuan** Ecological and Historic Preserve. An unusual type of settlement pattern associated with fiber-tempered wares and found in this area are "shell rings." Nearly three dozen of these ring-shaped settlements have been identi-



fied as representative of permanent, stable village life by about 1600 B.C.

By 1000 B.C. fiber-tempered ceramic technology appears to have spread throughout much of the Deep South from the South Atlantic coast to the Okeechobee Basin area of South Florida. During the early Gulf Formational period (circa 2000 to 1000 B.C.) of Alabama, middle Tennessee, and eastern Mississippi, fiber-tempered ceramic technology was acquired as a by-product of trade between the Stallings Island and Orange cultures of the South Atlantic coast and the Poverty Point culture of the lower Mississippi River Valley. It was during the Gulf Formational period that fiber-tempered ceramics were replaced first by plain, then by fabric-impressed, and, later, by cord-marked sand-tempered Alexander ceramics.

Poverty Point sites in Louisiana and western Mississippi exhibit the first major residential settlements and monumental earthworks in the United States. Although the Poverty Point culture is not well understood in terms of social organization, it was involved in the transportation of nonlocal raw materials (for example, shell, stone, and copper) from throughout the eastern United States into the lower Mississippi River Valley to selected sites where the materials were worked into finished products and then traded. While specific information on Poverty Point subsistence, trade mechanisms, and other cultural aspects is still speculative, the sites nevertheless exhibit specific material culture, such as baked clay objects, magnetite plummets, steatite bowls, red-jasper lapidary work, fiber-tempered pottery, and microlithic stone tools.

In Arkansas, Kentucky, Tennessee, and North Carolina, fiber-tempered pottery from the 2500 to 1000 B.C. period is not usually found. This area appears to have functioned as a transitional cultural area through which ceramic influences from the Ohio River Valley and the Middle Atlantic were introduced into the Deep South. For example, northern-inspired grit-tempered plain, fabric-impressed, and cord-marked Early Woodland pottery first appeared in central and eastern Kentucky around 1000 to

800 B.C., and, by the end of the Early Woodland period (800 to 500 B.C.), it had replaced fiber-tempered wares throughout the Southeast.

With the introduction of these northern-type ceramics came isolated mortuary sites with grave offerings. Some of the best examples of earthen enclosures and burial mounds dating to the Early Woodland Adena complex (circa 500 B.C.) were identified in the Ohio River Valley of Kentucky. Early Woodland projectile-point styles from Kentucky include Kramer, Wade, Gary, and Adena. These new ceramics later appeared in the mountains of western North Carolina during the Swannanoa period (700 to 300 B.C.).

Although plant domestication occurred sporadically in the Late Archaic, even possibly as early as the terminal Middle Archaic, generalized plant domestication, or horticulture, appears in Kentucky throughout the Early Woodland with intensive collecting of starchy seeds and tubers. These appear to have included sunflower, maygrass, sumpweed, giant ragweed, and knotweed.

As already noted, the Early Woodland of central Tennessee, interior Mississippi, and Alabama, began with the introduction of fiber-tempered ceramics in the Gulf Formational period (around 2000 B.C.) from the South Atlantic coast Stallings Island and Orange cultures. By the mid-Early Woodland period, Gulf Formational cultures developed their own fiber-tempered pottery styles, such as Wheeler, which was in turn replaced by the sand-tempered Alexander series. This area also participated in long-range exchanges with other areas of the Deep South in steatite, sandstone, Tallahatta quartzite, and ceramics.

Eastern North Carolina, during the Early Woodland period (1000 to 300 B.C.), exhibits both Southeast and Middle Atlantic influences called New River and Deep Creek, respectively. The Early Woodland New River, found south of the Neuse River, appears to be a continuation of the Stallings Island, Thom's Creek, and Deptford cultures from Georgia and South Carolina. Meanwhile, north of the Neuse River, the Early Woodland Deep Creek culture produced Marcey

Creek plain and cord-marked ceramics much like those from Virginia.

The Early Woodland Deptford ceramics appear to have developed in Georgia (circa 800 B.C.) out of the Early Woodland Refuge phase (1000 to 500 B.C.) and spread north into the Carolinas and south into Florida. Deptford ceramics continued to be made and found on Middle Woodland sites in the Southeast up through about A.D. 600. Subsistence for the coast and coastal plains of Georgia and the Carolinas appears to have followed a transhumant (or seasonal) pattern of winter shellfish camps on the coast, then inland occupation during the spring and summer for deer hunting, and fall for nut gathering.

In northern Georgia the appearance of Dunlap fabric-marked ceramics (circa 1000 B.C.) marks the beginning of the Early Woodland Kellogg focus. These types of ceramics are replaced by Middle Woodland ceramics (Cartersville plain, checked, and simple stamped) after about 300 B.C.

By around 500 B.C., the Poverty Point culture was replaced by the Tchula/Tchefuncte Early Woodland culture, which existed in western Tennessee, Louisiana, southern Arkansas, western Mississippi, and coastal Alabama. The sites of this lower Mississippi River Valley culture were small village settlements. Subsistence continued to consist of intensive collecting of wild plants and animals, as with the preceding Poverty Point culture, but for the first time quantities of pottery were produced. There appears to be a de-emphasis on long-distance trade and manufacture of lithic artwork noted in the earlier Poverty Point culture. The Tchula/Tchefuncte Early Woodland culture appears to have coexisted with some Middle Woodland cultures in the lower Mississippi River Valley.

• *Middle Woodland*

The main characteristic, besides elaboration of burial practices, that distinguished the Early and Middle Woodland from Late Archaic traditions, was the gradual intensification of local and

interregional exchange of exotic materials. For many years archeologists have regarded as "classic" those Middle Woodland sites with elaborate ceremonial earthworks that contained the burial mound graves of elite individuals buried with exotic mortuary gifts obtained through an extensive trade network covering most of the eastern United States. Because of the similarity of earthworks and burial goods found at widely scattered sites in the Southeast and the area north of the Ohio River, it was assumed that a cultural continuity—sometimes referred to as the Hopewellian Interaction Sphere—existed throughout much of the eastern United States.

Within the Ohio River drainage, the Early Woodland Adena culture, with its emphasis on elaborate mortuary customs, laid the foundations for the succeeding Hopewell (or Middle Woodland) culture.

Another way of interpreting the archeological manifestations of Middle Woodland burial mounds and elaborate burial goods obtained from distant sources may be as the result of reciprocal obligations and formal gift-giving between lineages or clans that controlled specific geographical territories. In this scenario, intensive exploitation of food or raw material resources in these areas, begun in the Archaic period, would lead to lineages or clans that controlled access to certain food or raw material resources important to, if indeed not necessary to, the survival of groups outside their territory.

Access to important food or raw material resources outside a clan's territory would be insured by formalized trade between the leaders of clans of different territories. The role of the clan head in this exchange system would be recognized by the group erecting burial mounds and interring exotic goods obtained through long-distance trade with other clan heads. At the same time, the social identity of these cultural entities would be reinforced by regular burial ceremonies at earthworks where important clan leaders were buried. Such a cultural system would increase social and economic stability between the clans participating in reciprocal trade. It would also reinforce trends toward sed-

entary living and the promotion of agriculture, which, in turn, would provide a surplus of food and lead to an increase in population.

Reciprocal trade, begun in the Early Woodland, would have served as a valuable cultural mechanism to spread the Hopewell (Middle Woodland) physical manifestations of earthworks and specialized burial artifacts throughout much of the eastern United States. As distinct territorial units entered into the trading sphere, their goods would be added to a pool of reciprocal trading items, and they would have access to goods unavailable in their own territory. At least some nonorganic trade items can be identified from the study of the burial mounds of the Middle Woodland. To this trade, the Middle Woodland territories of the Southeast appear to have provided mica, quartz crystals, and chlorite from the Carolinas, and a variety of marine shells, as well as shark and alligator teeth, from the Florida Gulf Coast. In exchange, the Middle Woodland clans of the Southeast received galena from Missouri, flint from Illinois, grizzly bear teeth, obsidian and chalcedony from the Rockies, and copper from the Great Lakes. Standardization of style for the finished artifacts used in this trade may be attributed to a relatively small number of clan leaders controlling the exchange system and developing their own symbolic artifact language of what trade goods constituted a reciprocal exchange between clans.

Most of the western and central Kentucky and western Tennessee Woodland cultures appear to have participated fully in the Ohio River Valley Early and Middle Woodland trading network. These cultures exhibited common burial practices and earthwork construction from the very start. Excavations in Kentucky have recovered Havana-like or Hopewell-decorated ceramics and Copena and McFarland projectile points. Burial offerings included gorgets, stone or clay tablets, tubular and biconical pipes, galena, mica crescents, copper bracelets, and marginella beads.

In western North Carolina, the early Middle Woodland Pigeon phase (300 B.C. to A.D. 200), noted for its crushed-quartz-tempered ceramics,

was replaced by the Connestee phase (A.D. 200 to 600), which produced thin sand-tempered ware. Pigeon and Connestee components are present at **Great Smoky Mountains National Park**. The Connestee culture apparently was a major source of mica, quartz crystal, steatite, and chlorite schists for the Ohio Hopewell trade network. These were traded out for Tennessee cherts, Appalachian quartz crystals, Flint Ridge chalcedony of Ohio, and Chillico ceramics. Connestee ceramics have been found at Georgia, Ohio, Kentucky, and Tennessee sites.

Prior to about A.D. 1 most of the Deep South continued a Late Archaic style of seasonal rounds of hunting and gathering. This was supplemented by geographic specializations—such as riverine and coastal zone shellfish exploitation—and the planting and harvesting of some native plants. The Early Woodland and early Middle Woodland cultures of the Deep South are differentiated by a variety of regional ceramic styles. There appears to be limited direct contact between these cultures and Hopewell influences to the north. For example, Louisiana appears to have had contact with the Illinois River Hopewell during the Marksville times of the Middle Woodland. At the end of the Late Gulf Formational (500 to 100 B.C.), the interior area of Mississippi and Alabama adopted sand-tempered ceramics (Alexander) introduced from the north. There appeared to be some linkage between Middle Woodland cultures to the north through trade in locally available Tallahatta quartzite and Fort Payne and Camden chert. However, the subsistence activity of this culture was essentially Late Archaic in nature.

In northern Georgia, the predominant Middle Woodland ceramics are the Cartersville and Swift Creek series after about 300 B.C. The incorporation of western Georgia into the Hopewellian Interaction Sphere of Trade and the appearance of burial mounds only occurred from about A.D. 100 to 450. The exchange of materials associated with Hopewellian ceremonialism was restricted to western Georgia and did not appear to have spread, at this time, into eastern Georgia or South Carolina.

The Middle Woodland accouterments of burial mounds arrived later in the Deep South. In central Mississippi, the Miller culture (100 B.C. to A.D. 650) saw the introduction of burial mound ceremonialism, sand-tempered ceramics, and interregional trade from the Crab Orchard culture of western Kentucky and Tennessee and the Illinois Valley Hopewell. This area also received influence from the Marksville culture of the lower Mississippi River Valley. Some of the larger Miller burial mounds have produced Marksville pottery, galena, and copper ear-spools. Subsistence was based primarily on intensive seasonal hunting and gathering.

From the Early through the Middle Woodland periods, the extensive, low-lying coastal environment of the South Atlantic coast, stretching from North Carolina to northern Florida, was used by numerous Deptford hunter-gatherer bands who lived seasonally within a variety of ecosystems and took advantage of seasonally available foods.

Along the Gulf Coast, the Deptford culture continued the transhumant (or seasonal) existence throughout the Middle Woodland. Settlements in this geographical area lacked permanence of occupation, although the cultures here participated in the Hopewellian trading network to a limited extent and constructed numerous low sand burial mounds. These sand burial mounds along coastal Georgia and Florida (noted at **Canaveral National Seashore** and **Cumberland Island National Seashore**, for instance), as well as in the Carolinas, are believed to represent local lineage burial grounds rather than the resting place of an elite individual.

In northwest Florida, the Early Woodland Deptford culture evolved in place to become the Santa Rosa/Swift Creek culture. Trade items recovered from burial mounds include copper panpipes, ear ornaments, stone plummets, and stone gorgets. These show this area's incorporation within the Hopewellian Interaction Sphere by about A.D. 100.

The Marksville culture (A.D. 1 to 400) existed throughout the lower Mississippi River Valley and extended eastward along the Gulf

Coast to the Mobile Bay area, an area that now incorporates **Gulf Islands National Seashore**. Marksville culture showed marked similarity with the contemporary Hopewell culture of the Illinois River Valley, particularly in the emphasis on earthworks containing burial mounds and the interring of exotic trade goods with the dead. Among the exotic trade items recovered by excavations in both areas were copper panpipes, earspools, bracelets and beads, stone platform pipes, mica figurines, ceramic figures, galena, marine shells, freshwater pearls, and green stone celts. The quantities of exotic trade material found in Marksville sites, however, indicate only minimal contact between the two areas.

Marksville sites tend to be located on major waterways. Subsistence consisted of intensive hunting and gathering, with some suggestion of maize horticulture. Although the current view is that there was no economically important horticulture during Marksville times, it appears the Marksville culture represents an in-place cultural evolution from the Archaic through the Woodland periods with selective adoption and reinterpretation of Hopewellian ideas.

In the interior of the Deep South during the Middle Woodland period, one sees the permanent occupation of small- or medium-sized villages along major rivers (**Ocmulgee National Monument**, for example), placing these settlements in the forefront of the expanding Hopewellian trading sphere along water courses. Between A.D. 1 and 450, these interior sites joined the Middle Woodland trading sphere as shown by the construction of hundreds of low oval mounds, many containing traded material from the Ohio Valley or the southeastern seacoast.

The rest of the continental southeast was only marginally affiliated with the Hopewellian Interaction Sphere. The St. Johns culture area of east and central Florida developed its own unique culture between 1200 B.C. and A.D. 1565. This was exhibited by a number of sites in **Canaveral National Seashore**, **Castillo De San Marcos National Monument**, **Fort Matanzas National Monument**, and **Timucuan Eco-**



logical and Historic Preserve. The St. Johns culture evolved in place from the Late Archaic Orange culture. Subsistence showed little in the way of agriculture, with the majority of food coming from seasonal plant food collecting, hunting, fishing, and shellfish gathering. This basically Archaic subsistence economy was able to support prehistoric Native Americans for 2,000 years until contact with Europeans. The St. Johns culture was largely unaffected by Hopewell influences, although they did construct sand burial mounds, a few containing Hopewellian-like grave goods.

The Manasota culture (500 B.C. to A.D. 800) of the Central Peninsular Gulf Coast of Florida, like the St. Johns culture, subsisted by plant-food collecting, fishing, hunting and shellfish gathering. The Manasota culture appears, as well, to have evolved in place from the local Late Archaic culture. At the beginning of the Manasota culture (500 B.C.), burials were interred in the shell midden of the villages. By 400 B.C., however, sand mounds for the interment of the dead were constructed. Later still (around A.D. 600), elaborate imported burial gifts were interred with the dead. Finally, the Manasota culture began to construct simple burial mounds that contained Weeden Island pottery (A.D. 800).

The Lake Okeechobee/Kissimmee River basin of south central Florida saw the construction of major earthworks between 1000 B.C. and A.D. 200 for horticultural purposes rather than as true burial mounds. By A.D. 200, this area was incorporated in the Glades culture area, which today contains **Big Cypress National Preserve, Biscayne National Park, and Everglades National Park.**

Beginning around A.D. 1, the Glades culture of south and southeast Florida represents a transitional culture from the Archaic. By A.D. 800, distinctive Glades pottery, shell tools, and bone tools appeared, remaining essentially unchanged until contact with Europeans in the sixteenth century.

The Middle Woodland of the North Carolina coastal plain is represented by two cultures, the Mount Pleasant culture in the northern part

of the state and the Cape Fear culture in the southern part. Both date from about 300 B.C. to A.D. 800. Ceramics for the Mount Pleasant culture are sand and grit tempered with fabric-impressed or cord-marked surface finish. Shell-tempered ceramics from the Mid-Atlantic area also occur.

Although the Cape Fear and Mount Pleasant culture ceramics are similar, the Cape Fear culture exhibits an extensive distribution of low sand burial mounds that represent an influence out of South Carolina. Many burials contain gorgets, arrow points, conch shells, and platform pipes. This area appeared to have had only limited connection with the Hopewell Interaction Sphere. A few Mount Pleasant sherds have been recovered from **Fort Raleigh National Historic Site.**

#### • *Late Woodland*

Around A.D. 500, the archeological record reveals a sharp decline in the construction of Middle Woodland burial mounds in the Hopewellian core area of the Ohio River drainage. The decline in the construction of burial mounds is accompanied by disruption of the long-distance trade in exotic materials and interregional art styles.

Traditionally, archeologists have viewed the Late Woodland (A.D. 500 to 1000) as a time of cultural poverty. With the exception of sites along the Florida Gulf Coast, Late Woodland settlements tended to be small when compared with Middle Woodland sites. Based on our present-day perspective, few outstanding works of prehistoric art or architecture can be attributed to this time period. Careful analysis, however, shows that throughout the Southeast the Late Woodland was a dynamic period. Bow-and-arrow technology, allowing for increased hunting efficiency, became widespread. New varieties of maize, beans, and squash were introduced or gained economic importance at this time, which greatly supplemented existing native seed and root plants. Finally, although settlement size was small, there was a marked increase in the number of Late Woodland sites over Middle Woodland sites, indicating a population increase. These factors tend

to give a view of the Late Woodland as an expansive period, not one of cultural collapse.

The reasons for the perceived collapse of the Middle Woodland and the subsequent emergence of the Late Woodland are poorly understood. There are several possible explanations. The first is that populations increased beyond the point of carrying capacity of the land, and, as the trade system broke down, clans resorted to raiding rather than trading with other territories to acquire important resources. A second possibility is that a rapid replacement of the Late Archaic spear and atlatl with the newer bow-and-arrow technology quickly decimated the large game animals, interrupting the hunting component of food procurement and resulting in settlements breaking down into smaller units to subsist on local resources. A third reason is that colder climate conditions about A.D. 400 might have affected yields of gathered foods, such as nuts or starchy seeds, thereby disrupting the trade networks.

A fourth and possibly interrelated reason is that intensified horticulture became so successful that increased agricultural production may have reduced variation in food resource availability between differing areas. This reliance on horticulture, involving only a few types of plants, would have carried with it a risk where variations in rainfall or climate could cause famine or shortages.

Rather than a prehistoric interaction sphere sharing earthen architecture memorialization of the dead and the exchange of high status goods of nonlocal materials, as existed in the Middle Woodland, the Late Woodland saw the rise of numerous small-scale cultures distinctive to particular geographical areas.

In the Carolinas, the Late Woodland (A.D. 600 to 1100) was a continuation of the Middle Woodland Deptford culture. Even sand burial mounds continued to be constructed. Here the Late Woodland period is differentiated from the early Middle Woodland on the basis of the tempering and surface treatment of pottery styles.

The Late Woodland cultures in coastal North Carolina emerged about A.D. 800—two examples are the Colington (historic Carolina Algonkian)

and the Cashie (historic Carolina Tuscarora) phases. These cultures continued essentially unchanged until about A.D. 1520, when contact with Europeans in the Carolinas occurred. Shell and grit-tempered pottery, burial ossuaries, bow-and-arrow technology, palisaded villages, horticulture (involving maize, squash, sunflowers, and beans), and seasonal settlement movement to supplement horticulture with hunting and gathering typify these cultures. These cultures are present at **Fort Raleigh** National Historic Site and possibly **Cape Hatteras** National Seashore.

The Late Woodland of the piedmont and western North Carolina (A.D. 600 to 1000) is presently not as well understood as either the previous Middle Woodland culture or the South Appalachian Mississippian culture that would succeed it. Likewise, the information on Late Woodland for much of South Carolina is so scant that some researchers have postulated a depopulation of the area for much of this period until replacement by the South Appalachian Mississippian culture.

In Georgia, Alabama, east Tennessee, and northern Florida, Late Woodland sites through about A.D. 750 are identified by the occurrence of Swift Creek pottery styles. Gradually, this area evolved into the core area of the South Appalachian Mississippian culture by about A.D. 1000.

In northeast Florida, the St. Johns culture, discussed in the Middle Woodland period, continued as the Timucuan culture up to contact with Europeans in the sixteenth century with few modifications in their material culture and subsistence base. Timucuan sites have been recognized in such parks as **Canaveral** National Seashore, **Cumberland Island** National Seashore, **Fort Matanzas** National Monument, and **Timucuan** Ecological and Historic Preserve. Similarly, the Calloosahatchee Region of southwest Florida (circa A.D. 700) saw the beginning of the Calusa culture at present-day **Big Cypress** National Preserve and **Everglades** National Park. This cultural group subsisted to a large extent on maritime food resources, yet constructed large settlements and temple mounds. The Calusa culture continued as the dominant culture in south Florida through the sixteenth century.

The Weeden Island culture (A.D. 300 to 1000) developed locally in northwest Florida, probably out of the preceding Swift Creek culture, and spread throughout much of northern Florida and the Panhandle of the Gulf Coast, including areas now contained in **Gulf Islands National Seashore**. The Weeden Island culture was characterized by the construction of burial mounds containing nonlocal burial goods interred with the dead in imitation of Middle Woodland cultures. The subsistence strategies of the Weeden Island culture were initially concerned with the seasonal collecting of wild plant foods and shellfish. However, by A.D. 800 in the interior coastal plain, maize horticulture appears to account for a good portion of the food supply, allowing for expansion of the territory and elaboration of political power.

As a display of this power, the Weeden Island culture constructed some of the earliest dated flat-topped platform or temple mounds (around A.D. 400). Apparently, these early mounds were intended to serve as bases for charnel houses for the dead as opposed to merely interment mounds for the elite. Eventually, evidence appears of multiple flat-topped mounds serving as a mortuary complex, with some mounds also serving as the base for a structure for the head of a clan or lineage. In this respect, the Weeden Island flat-topped temple or charnel house mounds may be considered proto-Mississippian models for more complex societies in the Southeast after about A.D. 1000. Influenced by the Weeden Island culture, cultures in Georgia, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi also constructed flat-topped mounds during the Late Woodland period.

The lower Mississippi River Valley, consisting of eastern Arkansas, western Tennessee, Louisiana, and western Mississippi, saw the emergence of the Late Woodland Baytown culture (A.D. 300 to 700), which succeeded the Marksville culture of the Middle Woodland. Instead of major earthwork centers, the Baytown culture built dispersed settlements. Major innovations in the Baytown phase were the introduction of bow-and-arrow technology and horticulture.

In other areas of Louisiana and Arkansas arose the Late Woodland Troyville culture (A.D. 400 to 800). The Troyville people, like the earlier Marksville culture, continued building ceremonial centers, but the mounds were civic or ceremonial temples not burial mounds.

The Baytown and Troyville cultures of the lower Mississippi River Valley were followed by the Coles Creek culture in the latter part of the Late Woodland period (A.D. 700 to 1000). The Coles Creek culture area covered the entire lower Mississippi River Valley. This culture showed considerable homogeneity by an increased concern with socio-religious authority, as exemplified by the construction of temple mound complexes surrounding open plazas. Location of these sites on major waterways seemed to reflect a renewed interest in inter-regional associations of the previous Middle Woodland period.

In central Mississippi, the Miller culture continued into the Late Woodland, but, by A.D. 400, there is a cessation of burial mound construction. After A.D. 600, there is evidence of maize horticulture and bow-and-arrow technology. About A.D. 1000, the Miller culture area becomes incorporated into the succeeding Mississippian culture.

In Tennessee and Kentucky, some accretional burial mounds were still being constructed in the Late Woodland, but construction of earthwork enclosures ceased. Large projectile point types gave way to smaller forms indicative of bow-and-arrow use. Ceramics were similar to those of the Middle Woodland, but without the Hopewellian decorative motifs.

### *The Mississippian and Late Prehistoric Period*

- I. Cultural Developments: Indigenous American Populations
- B. Post-Archaic and Precontact Developments
  15. Eastern Farmers
- C. Prehistoric Archeology: Topical Facets

The 1963 NHL Theme Study characterized Mississippian cultures (then called Temple Mound cultures) (Table 6) as different from the Woodland cultures on the basis of distinctive ceramic vessel forms (Figure 8), the use of ground shell as a tempering agent in ceramics, rectangularly shaped structures, and ceremonial earthwork complexes containing flat-topped pyramidal mounds used primarily as bases for wooden temple structures. Excavations within these complexes uncovered high-status burials, sometimes containing ceremonial materials that appeared to exhibit shared iconography from site to site. It was speculated that these artifacts represented a "Southern Cult" or shared religious manifestations that linked these sites throughout much of the eastern United States. One major problem noted in this study was the uncertainty of the Mississippian culture's place of origin.

Table 6 — Mississippian cultural chronology (from Walthall 1990).

Early Mississippian	A.D. 900 – 1200
Middle Mississippian	A.D. 1200 – 1500
Late Mississippian	A.D. 1500 – 1700

Archeological investigations over the last thirty years have given us a very different picture than that characterized in the 1963 study. First, although certain ceramic forms and tempering agents and rectangularly shaped structures are still considered indicators of Mississippian period sites, there now appears to be nothing dramatically new in the way Mississippian cultures lived as opposed to the previous Woodland cultures. Mississippian sites appeared almost simultaneously throughout the Southeast around A.D. 900 and were mainly located within river floodplain environments. Mississippian period sites have been located in **Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area**, **Canaveral National Seashore**, **Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area**, **Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park**, **Con-**

**garee Swamp National Monument**, **Great Smoky Mountains National Park**, **Gulf Islands National Seashore**, **Mammoth Cave National Park**, **Natchez Trace Parkway**, **Obed Wild and Scenic River**, **Ocmulgee National Monument**, **Russell Cave National Monument**, **Shiloh National Military Park and Cemetery**, and **Vicksburg National Military Park** (Figure 9).

It is now generally believed that a form of chiefdom government operated within the Mississippian period. These chiefdoms, operating out of temple mound complexes, such as Moundville or Etowah, apparently controlled specific territories usually associated with a defined floodplain environment. Chiefs were responsible for the redistribution of food between the main and outlying communities. Whether these chiefs were able to control exchanges of goods within their territory and with other chiefdoms, employ full-time artisans and specialists, or function as both the religious and political heads are questions requiring more research.

In all probability, Mississippian chiefdoms controlled only small geographical areas and were in a constant state of change because power rested on fragile agricultural adaptations. Failure of crops due to weather or other natural




Figure 8 — Bibb Plain vessel from Ocmulgee National Monument, recovered by the WPA.






Figure 9 — SEFA parks with a Mississippian component.

forces would have imperiled population stability in the chiefdom. In the past, much was made of the idea of a "Southern Cult" or pan-Mississippian religious phenomenon, based on the finding of similar iconography on artifacts of shell, copper, and ceramic from high-status burials in large Southeastern temple mound centers. It is now realized that postulating a religion on the basis of similar types of burial artifacts may be an erroneous assumption. More likely, similarity in exotic artifacts was due to a Mississippian exchange network linking hundreds of large and small communities, which promoted the exchange of prestige goods. A

similar system probably functioned in the Middle Woodland period and accounted for the exchange of exotic goods that were similar in appearance from site to site.

The 1963 study also noted that in earlier studies radiocarbon dating was inadequate for dating Mississippian-type sites before about A.D. 900. Then it was proposed that the Mississippian culture origin was based at the great site of Cahokia near East St. Louis, Illinois, or in western Kentucky and Tennessee. Today, archaeological investigations and radiocarbon dating have identified "proto-Mississippian" sites within the Weeden Island culture area of Florida's

Gulf Coast and the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee Valleys of Alabama and Georgia, which date from the Middle to Late Woodland period (A.D. 150 to 750). Excavations have identified flat-topped or platform ceremonial, rather than burial, mound complexes similar in layout to early Mississippian period earthworks.

Another important result of the work conducted on Mississippian sites in the last thirty years has been the differentiation of the Mississippian culture into distinctive cultural areas. The Middle Mississippian area, represented by the major sites of Cahokia and Moundville, covers the central Mississippi River Valley, the lower Ohio River Valley, and most of the Mid-South area, including western and central Kentucky, western Tennessee, and northern Alabama and Mississippi. This apparent core of the classic Mississippian culture area contains large ceremonial mound and residential complexes, sometimes enclosed within earthen ditches and ramparts or a stockade line.

The lower Mississippi River Valley contains the Plaquemine Mississippian culture area in western Mississippi and eastern Louisiana. Plaquemine Mississippian earthwork sites are similar in appearance to Middle Mississippian complexes, except the former are ceremonial in nature and usually lack a residential aspect. The Emerald Mound and Holly Bluff (Lake George) sites in Mississippi are good examples of this culture.

The South Appalachian Mississippian area appears to have derived its inspiration from the Middle Mississippian culture area, as it appears to postdate Mississippian occupation from the latter area. Settlement patterns of floodplain occupation, with stockades enclosing earthen temple mounds and residential areas, such as those represented at Etowah and Ocmulgee National Monument in Georgia and Shiloh National Military Park in Tennessee, are characteristic of the South Appalachian Mississippian. Sites are distributed throughout southeastern parks in Alabama, Georgia, northern Florida, South Carolina, and central and western North Carolina and Tennessee.

Coeval Mississippian areas include the Fort

Ancient culture area of southern Ohio and eastern Kentucky, and the Caddoan Mississippian of eastern Oklahoma, eastern Texas, western Arkansas, and western Louisiana. The Fort Ancient culture emerged around A.D. 1400 as a response by local Late Woodland populations to an increasing reliance on agriculture, an increasing sedentism, and the accompanying rise in socio-political complexity associated with the Middle Mississippian culture area. The culture's settlement pattern was villages organized into a circular or elliptical configuration of structures surrounding a central plaza. The Fort Ancient culture produced ceramics distinct from Middle Mississippian wares.

The Caddoan culture appears to have emerged from the local Middle Woodland cultures in the western Louisiana area around A.D. 800. Mississippian culture traits common to the Caddo people, primarily along the Red River drainage, appear to have been derived from the Plaquemine Mississippian culture area more so than from the Middle Mississippian core area. These traits included, for example, the use of maize agriculture, burial mounds, and temple mound complexes. However, the Caddoan culture is generally viewed as a separate culture area from the Mississippian culture of the Southeast.

Other coeval Mississippian culture areas are the St. Johns culture area of northeastern Florida, the Glades and Calusa culture areas of southern Florida, and the coastal cultures of North Carolina. Many of these cultures constructed temple mounds and/or burial mounds and, to a certain extent, utilized maize agriculture. However, to a larger extent, they continued a Woodland period type of subsistence.

## PREHISTORY OF THE CARIBBEAN CULTURE AREA

A National Historic Landmark (NHL) theme study written in 1963 noted that the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the territory of the U.S. Virgin Islands were prehistorically a part of a much larger Caribbean culture area. The most recently developed cultural chronology for Puerto

- I. Cultural Developments: Indigenous American Populations
  - A. The Earliest Inhabitants
    3. The Early Peopling of the Caribbean
    14. Archaic Adaptations of the Caribbean

Rico and the Virgin Islands is derived from Oliver (1992) and Rouse (1992) (Table 7).

#### PALEOINDIAN PERIOD

The earliest recorded prehistoric site for the Caribbean cultural area is the El Jobo site in Venezuela, which has been dated as roughly contemporaneous with the Clovis period in North America. Gordon Willey (1971) assumes that this culture is an offshoot of the North American big-game hunting tradition.

Although the Lesser and Greater Antilles were home to various types of extinct Pleistocene megafauna, such as the giant ground sloth (*Megaelocsus*), no actual cultural artifacts have been identified for this time period (circa 9500 to 5000 B.C.) for the Caribbean Islands. Some authors have treated the occurrence of Pleistocene megafauna and an acknowledged lower sea level of nearly twenty meters—which could have facilitated travel between the northern coast of South America and the Antilles during this period—as positive conditions for Paleoindian occupation (Veloz Maggiolo and Ortega 1976).

The 1963 theme study did not note any pre-5000 B.C. sites for either the Greater or Lesser Antilles.

#### MESOINDIAN PERIOD

The cultures of the Mesoindian period of the Caribbean area were considered roughly equivalent to North American Archaic hunting and gathering cultures. This period was believed to begin around 5000 B.C. and ended for most of the Lesser and Greater Antilles about two thousand years ago. A people, referred to as Ciboney by the early Spanish, continued to utilize a Mesoindian life style in extreme western Cuba until historic times. Essentially, this period was characterized as representative of a hunting and gathering people, who increasingly became dependent on the littoral zones of the islands for subsistence (Willey 1976).

Table 7 — Caribbean cultural chronology (emphasis on Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands).

<b>Paleoindian</b>	9500 – 5000 B.C.
<b>Mesoindian</b>	5000 B.C. – A.D. 1
Preceramic subcultures:	
• Casimiroid	4000 – 2000 B.C.
• Ortoiroid	4000 B.C. – A.D. 200
• Krum Bay subseries	1500 – 200 B.C.
• Coroso subseries	1000 B.C. – A.D. 200
<b>Neoindian</b>	A.D. 1 – 1500
Ceramic subcultures	
• Saladoid	500 B.C. – A.D. 545
• Hacienda Grande	250 B.C. – A.D. 300
• Cuevas	A.D. 400 – 600
• Prosperity	A.D. 1 – 350
• Coral Bay-Longford	A.D. 350 – 550
• Ostionoid	A.D. 600 – 1500
• Ostionan subseries	A.D. 600 – 1200
• Elenan Ostionoid	A.D. 600 – 1200
• Monserrate	A.D. 600 – 850
• Santa Elena	A.D. 850 – 1200
• Magens Bay-Salt River 1	A.D. 600 – 1200
• Chican	A.D. 1200 – 1500
• Capá	A.D. 1200 – 1500
• Esperanza	A.D. 1200 – 1500

The first noted Mesoindian occupation in the Antilles was the Banwari culture—a small animal-hunting and shellfish-gathering phase from Trinidad (circa 5000 B.C.), which, over time, appeared to have possibly moved up the Lesser Antilles to Puerto Rico, Hispaniola, and Cuba. Most of the sites excavated from this period are related in some manner to the utilization of shellfish. However, it was acknowledged that this might be due to a sampling error since most of the past archeological work in the Antilles had concentrated on the coastal environment. The Banwari phase was noted for coastal shell midden sites. These yielded fresh water and salt water shells of *Neritina virginea* and the conch, *Melogenia*, and, predominantly, crab remains, deer bones, peccary, small mammals, and fish. The stone tools consisted of ground stone pestles, manos, grooved axes, celts, and chipped projectile points and tools. The points were also made of bone, as were needles and fishing spears (Harris 1976).

Twice during the Mesoindian period (2700 to 2000 B.C. and 1500 to 600 B.C.) the sea level dropped, altering the shellfish environments of the islands. This may explain the depopulation of the coastal area and hence a lack of sites from these periods. However, as the sea level dropped, the shellfish beds restabilized along the new shoreline, attracting the prehistoric peoples who subsisted on these. Therefore, sites for these two intervals, if they exist, may now be underwater. One site of the Mesoindian period—the Krum Bay site—has been found in the U.S. Virgin Islands.

In the islands of Cuba, Hispaniola, and Puerto Rico, where the greatest concentration of Mesoindian sites were found, these period sites tended to be coastal shell middens with artifact assemblages generally similar to the Banwari culture found on Trinidad. Dr. Irving Rouse (1970) defined the Mesoindian period for the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico as having two distinct series. The Ortoiroid is known principally from the South American mainland, but scattered finds of artifacts are found as far north as the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Mona Passage. The second series, the Casimiroid, is further subdivided

into the Courian subseries of Cuba, Haiti, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and the Redondan subseries of Cuba (Righter 1992).

The 1963 theme study proposed that "the first peoples arriving in the Greater Antilles did not filter through the Lesser Antilles to reach this goal. It seems much more probable that the smaller islands may have been by-passed and bigger islands, such as Jamaica, Puerto Rico, and Cuba, occupied first" (Haag 1963:333).

However, as noted above, any change in sea levels may have destroyed many of these early sites if occupation was oriented toward the coastal environment.

Mesoindian period sites are generally open camp sites of small shell middens found on or near the coast. The faunal material recovered consists of fresh and saltwater shellfish and remains of fish and sea and land mammals. Currently, there is no available information on these sites that indicates seasonal use of marine and land resources. Although the sites were almost entirely oriented toward the maritime environment, there appears to be a heavier reliance on land-based hunting resources in the earlier part of the Mesoindian period than in the latter part.

The Mesoindian tool assemblage consists of stone tools, such as flake points, knives, and awls. Ground stone celts, manos, and axes are also found. In addition, modified conch shells made into vessels and plates are found. It should be noted that Puerto Rican sites tended to produce more ground stone tools than similar sites in Cuba or Hispaniola.

Generally, in comparison with areas surrounding the Antilles, the Cuban material was stylistically more closely related to material from eastern Venezuela (Rouse 1970). The Hispaniola and Puerto Rican material, however, seemed to be associated with material from Central America (Alegría et al. 1955; Rouse 1970). Therefore, it is believed that origins for settling the Caribbean were multiple, as opposed to a single source of origin for the Mesoindian cultures of the Antilles. Or, there may have been a single culture with differing manifestations related to different environments.



---

*Lithic and Archaic Period*

• *Casimiroid Culture*

It has been proposed that the Casimiroid Culture originated from Lithic or Archaic period cultures from either the Yucatán or Central America. It is presumed that the people of this culture migrated by sea from the mainland to western Cuba via a mid-Caribbean chain of islands, which is now submerged. These cultures spread eastward through Hispaniola Island, where the earliest known sites of this culture are dated at around 4000 B.C. Recent investigations in a rockshelter on Mona Island have uncovered a Casimiroid-like assemblage of lithic tools, with an appropriate radiocarbon date of about 2380 B.C. Only one Puerto Rican site, the Cerrillo site in the extreme southwestern part of the island, exhibits Casimiroid-like lithic artifacts. The implications are that the Casimiroid culture came into the western end of the Greater Antilles and spread eastward only as far as extreme western Puerto Rico.

Casimiroid sites are generally noted for lithic artifacts manufactured of fine-grained flint. These include core tools, blades, burins, awls, and scrapers, in addition to anvils and hammerstones. It is believed that the sites on Mona Island and western Puerto Rico date from the Barrera-Mordán Complex (3600 to 2000 B.C.). Little information is forthcoming on subsistence of the Casimiroid culture.

• *Ortoiroid Culture*

While the Casimiroid was a lithic culture that migrated from west to east through the Antilles, a contemporary lithic culture, the Ortoiroid, was the result of migration of another lithic culture from northern South America, north up the Lesser Antilles to the Virgin Islands, and thence westward into Puerto Rico. The earliest dated Ortoiroid culture site in Puerto Rico is the Angostura site, which is dated at about 4000 B.C. Rouse has proposed a Coroso and Krum Bay subseries of lithic period sites for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, respectively.

•• *Krum Bay Subseries (1500 to 200 B.C.)*

The Krum Bay subseries artifact assemblage is characterized by fairly fine-grained basalt flake tools, hammerstones, shell picks, partially ground stone celts, and beads and pendants of stone, bone, and shell. Krum Bay sites tend to be open habitation sites located near the shore. Subsistence remains indicated that shellfish gathering, fishing, and hunting of birds and turtles were the major sources of food. The Krum Bay subseries is noted on St. Thomas and St. John (**Virgin Islands National Park**) in the U.S. Virgin Islands, the north coast of Puerto Rico, and Vieques Island (Caño Hondo site) off the southeast coast of Puerto Rico.

•• *Coroso Subseries (1000 B.C. to A.D. 200)*

The Coroso subseries was identified as a lithic or preceramic culture as early as the 1930s by Rouse. Sites tended to be located on all the coasts of Puerto Rico, in caves and at shell middens. Recent work indicates that occupation also occurred in the interior of the island. The artifact assemblage of the Coroso subseries is characterized by hammerstones, pebble choppers, flake tools, shell scrapers, shell plates, and pebble grinders. Subsistence data indicates that the early part of the Coroso culture saw a more generalized diet of turtle, crabs, fish, and shellfish, leading to a more specialized diet of shellfish in later times. Significant sites of the Coroso subseries are Cueva de María la Cruz (Loíza Cave), Cayo Cofresí, Coroso site, and Playa Blanca. Inhabitants lived on or near the coast in both open and cave sites. Burials were placed underneath shell middens by digging through them until reaching subsoil.

*NEOINDIAN PERIOD*

This period, dating from about A.D. 1 to European contact around A.D. 1500, was characterized in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands by distinct cultural periods, which were originally separated on the basis of different ceramic styles and other cultural manifestations. The first group to immi-

grate into the Antilles were the Saladoid who brought horticulture (cassava, yucca, and maize) and pottery technology to the islands. It is generally accepted that they originated in the lower Orinoco River Valley before spreading throughout the Antilles pushing the Mesoindian groups into western Cuba (Willey 1976). The Saladoid culture appears to have established itself initially in the southernmost Lesser Antilles as early as 500 B.C., and reached the area of the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico by 345 B.C.

In reviewing this earliest of pottery-making cultures in the Caribbean, the 1963 theme study noted that "the hallmark of the earliest pottery brought into Puerto Rico [and the Virgin Islands] is a style which includes a number of types that are white paint on a red background. This white-on-red may be traced to its ancestral home in northern Venezuela and probably indicates the movement of new peoples rather than the simple diffusion of new traits. However, there is little basis for believing that some of the white-on-red pottery was actually manufactured in Venezuela and imported into Puerto Rico" (Haag 1963: 333-335).

It has been postulated that between A.D. 600 and 800, another surge of migrants came out of the Orinoco area and spread throughout the Antilles (Stevens-Arroyo 1988). Called the Ostionoid culture, it is separated from the preceding Saladoid culture by its different pottery styles—which involved less painted and more incised decoration—and by the creation of ceremonial centers containing ball courts (Alegría 1983). Within the area of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, subregional cultures emerged and developed permanent settlements, some with associated ceremonial centers and ball courts. Later elaborations of the Ostionoid culture, referred to as Elenoid (A.D. 600 to 1200) and Chicoid (A.D. 1200 to 1500), were established by Rouse and Allaire (1978) on the basis of ceramic styles. These later cultures and their people were called Arawak or Taino Indians by the Spanish when contact occurred in the early sixteenth century. This Arawak culture reached its peak shortly before European contact. The Arawak culture is noted for large village sites of 1,000 to 5,000

people controlled by chiefdoms. There was heavy emphasis on the cultivation of yucca and cassava, with supplemental hunting and shellfish-gathering, and the creation of ball courts or ceremonial plazas attached to the larger settlements. Religious artifacts, such as *zemi*, or spirit stones, were often found in context with ceremonial sites, as were distinctive polychrome and incised pottery styles and fine ground stone and shell work. In the latter part of this period white-on-red ceramics disappeared, and plain ceramics with lugs shaped like human or animal heads were molded onto the rim of vessels. These features were believed to have originated in Mesoamerica and been diffused to the Caribbean through northern South America. Evidence of this culture has been found in **Virgin Islands National Park**.

Just a few hundred years prior to contact, the Arawaks had begun to be displaced from the Lesser Antilles by a new group of Orinoco River Valley migrants—the Caribs. By contact (circa A.D. 1500), the Caribs had occupied all of the Lesser Antilles, including the U.S. Virgin Islands (Righter 1992:26).

#### *Ceramic Periods*

- |   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>I. Cultural Developments: Indigenous American Populations</li><li>B. Post-Archaic and Precontact Developments</li><li>17. Caribbean Adaptations</li></ul> |
|---|

#### • *Saladoid Period*

Around the fourth century B.C., a new migration of people, whose culture exhibited traits of ceramics, agriculture, and sedentism, occurred from mainland South America northward up the Lesser Antilles (including the area now **incorporating Buck Island Reef National Monument and Virgin Islands National Park**) and west into Puerto Rico and Hispaniola. Radiocarbon dates for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands indicate that the Saladoid period, or Cedrosan subseries, lasted from about 345 B.C. to A.D. 545. The

relatively rapid movement of the Saladoid culture into the Lesser Antilles and the eastern half of the Greater Antilles appears to have displaced the earlier lithic period cultures as far as Cuba, where the Ciboney, a preceramic culture, continued to exist up until contact with Europeans in the sixteenth century.

This early ceramic period is further subdivided by ceramic styles. On Puerto Rico, the subperiods are Hacienda Grande (250 B.C. to A.D. 300) and Cuevas (A.D. 400 to 600). In the Virgin Islands they are Prosperity (A.D. 1 to 350) and Coral Bay-Longford (A.D. 350 to 550). The Saladoid ceramic styles of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands showed significant influences from the Barranoid styles of ceramics based in the lower Orinoco River Valley of Venezuela. It has been suggested that these influences were due to long-distance trade between the two areas.

Shared ceramic techniques between these two areas include vessel forms, such as zoomorphic effigy vessels, trays, and platters (some depicting animals native only to South America), jars and bowls with D-shaped strap handles, censers, and bell-shaped vessels. Saladoid potters decorated their vessels with polychrome designs in white-on-red, white-on-red with orange slip, black paint, and negative-painted designs. A smaller number of ceramics were decorated with designs that were incised into the body of the vessels.

The diagnostic lithic artifacts of the Saladoid culture in both Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are pendants shaped like raptorial birds—endemic to South America. These are made from exotic materials, such as jasper-chalcedony, amethyst, crystal quartz, fossilized wood, greenstones, carnelian, lapis lazuli, turquoise, garnet, epidote, and possibly obsidian. The distribution of these artifacts throughout the Greater and Lesser Antilles and northern South America is indicative of a Pan-Caribbean trade network of raw and manufactured goods. By about A.D. 600, however, these artifacts all but disappear.

Settlement patterns of the Saladoid culture tended to be on the flat coastal plains and alluvial valleys of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. This was probably so that the maritime food

resources and fertile soils for growing food crops—such as manioc, cassava, or yucca, and, to a lesser extent, maize—could be utilized. In the later part of the Saladoid period, there appears to have been an expansion into the mountainous interiors of the islands. Typical village patterns in Puerto Rico and adjacent islands consisted of a semi-circular series of mounded middens, frequently serving as the village cemetery, facing a central plaza. Excavations of these cemeteries show that individuals were treated equally in terms of grave goods, an indication of an egalitarian society.

#### • *Ostionoid Period*

At the time of the 1963 NHL Theme Study, the Ostionoid was viewed as a period of new migration with people coming out of the northern South American coastal area and spreading throughout the Antilles. Today, the prevailing theory among Caribbeanists is that the Saladoid culture evolved into the Ostionoid. So the Ostionoid period represents a continuation of the Saladoid period in terms of ceramic-making, agriculture, and sedentism. However, there seems to be a breakdown in cultural continuity between the Caribbean Islands and mainland South America due to the lack of trade goods—such as the Saladoid exotic stone pendants—and the concomitant rise of regional ceramic styles in both Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Another change from the preceding period is the increase in size and complexity of communities in the Ostionoid period, with the appearance of ball courts and ritualistic items, such as *zemi* stones, and a ranked hierarchy of chiefdoms that appear to have controlled specific regions.

#### •• *Ostionan Subseries*

The Ostionan subseries (A.D. 600 to 1200), like the earlier Saladoid period is defined by the distribution of specific ceramic styles. These ceramics lack the polychrome-painted decoration of the earlier period and, instead, are decorated by polished, red-painted surface, appliqué and modeled designs (usually zoomorphic) and, in the

latter part of the subseries, by horizontal bands of geometric line-and-dot incising. Based on the findings of ceramics specific to this subseries, the Ostionan is restricted geographically to the western half of Puerto Rico. Major sites include Boquerón, Calvache, Las Cucharas, Las Mesas, Llanos Tuna, Abra, Buenos Aires, Cañas, Carmen, Diego Hernandez, and Pitahaya.

Other artifacts and features associated with the Ostionan subseries are petaloid stone celts; *zemi* objects of stone, shell, and clay; the introduction of petroglyphs; and ball courts. Beginning about A.D. 600, the central plaza of the Saladoid period evolves into stone-lined enclosures, or ball courts, called *batey*. These ball courts appear to have served a multifunctional public space use.

#### •• *Elenan Ostionoid Subseries*

Contemporary with the Ostionan subseries on the western half of Puerto Rico, was the Elenan Ostionoid subseries (A.D. 600 to 1200), which was distributed over the eastern half of the island. Two ceramic styles for this subseries have been recognized in eastern Puerto Rico. The earliest is Monserrate (A.D. 600 to 850); the other is Santa Elena (A.D. 850 to 1200).

The Monserrate ceramic style is essentially a development from the earlier Cuevas style, but without elaborate decoration, such as polychrome painting. Decoration consisted of red- or black-painted geometric designs and strap handles. In the following Santa Elena period, mainly bowl forms are produced. Ceramics lose the strap handles. Painted decoration and polishing are also abandoned. Modeling and incising become the major ceramic decoration.

As with the Ostionan subseries, the larger Elenan Ostionoid subseries sites have associated ball courts. And, some sites, like Tibes, have multiple plazas and ball courts. Major sites associated with the Elenan Ostionoid subseries are Tibes, Collores, and El Bronce.

#### •• *Magens Bay-Salt River 1*

In the Virgin Islands, the Magens Bay-Salt River

subseries (A.D. 600 to 1200) is contemporary with the Puerto Rican subseries of the Ostionoid period. The subseries was partially named after the type-site located at **Salt River Bay** National Historical Park and Ecological Preserve. The ceramics, stone artifacts, *zemis*, and ball courts found in the Virgin Islands at this time show continuity with the Elenan Ostionoid subseries of eastern Puerto Rico. Major sites of this period include Tutu, Magens Bay, and Salt River Bay.

#### •• *Chican Subseries*

The last three hundred years of prehistoric occupation in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands may be traced to the Taino, a historic Native American culture encountered by the Spanish on their first voyages of discovery in the 1490s.

Around A.D. 1200, a new ceramic style, called Boca Chica, emerged in the area of southeastern Hispaniola (present-day Dominican Republic). This style is characterized by complicated vessel forms, surface polishing, relatively few red-painted vessels, and elaborate incised, modeled, and punctated designs. Trade ware of elaborately incised Boca Chica ceramics are found on Capá- and Esperanza-phase sites in western and eastern Puerto Rico, respectively. It is believed that the introduction of Chican trade wares was responsible for stylistic changes in the Capá and Esperanza culture areas, which saw the introduction of elaborate incising in their ceramics. Recent work by Rouse (1992) has postulated that settlers from the Boca Chica area of the Dominican Republic actually established a colony in the middle of the southern coast of Puerto Rico, from which they spread their cultural influence.

What is clear about this period in both Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands is the rapid population growth, indicated by the number and size of the sites. There appears to be a clustering of large sites around major ceremonial centers, such as Caguana in western Puerto Rico and Cuevas-2 in eastern Puerto Rico. This suggests that these sites were centers of religious and political power that extended over large territorial units.



•• *Esperanza*

The Esperanza phase appears to have extended eastward into the Virgin Islands (Magens Bay-Salt River 2 subseries) based on styles of ceramics and cultural attributes, such as ball courts. Some have postulated the introduction of the Carib culture—which displaced the Esperanza culture—on St. Croix island about A.D. 1450. A currently debated topic among Caribbeanists is the Carib culture. Some scholars have begun to question the traditionally held belief that the Caribs represented a new migration from South America. They are suggesting that the Caribs are the product of the evolution of Arawak speakers in the Lesser Antilles.

At first contact, the Spanish viewed Puerto Rico as being controlled by a series of Taino subchiefs, or *caciques*. These religious and political leaders of discrete geographical areas, were loosely affiliated with paramount chiefs in a ranked hierarchy organization. The Spanish noted that the Taino of Puerto Rico were engaged in resisting Carib attacks from the Virgin Islands. Ultimately, by the second decade of the sixteenth century, both Taino and Carib cultures in these areas were relatively extinct.

## HISTORY OF THE SOUTHEAST AND CARIBBEAN AREA

- |   |
|---|
| <p>II. European Colonial Exploration and Settlement</p> <p>A. Spanish Exploration and Settlement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Caribbean</li> <li>2. Southeast</li> </ol> <p>B. French Exploration and Settlement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Atlantic</li> <li>3. Mississippi Valley</li> <li>4. Gulf Coast</li> </ol> <p>C. English Exploration and Settlement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Exploration</li> <li>8. Settlement of Georgia</li> </ol> <p>D. Other European Exploration and Settlement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Scandinavian</li> </ol> |
|---|

## SPANISH EXPLORATION AND SETTLEMENT

### *Caribbean*

On October 12, 1492, Christopher Columbus landed on San Salvador Island. After exploring several other islands, he returned to Spain. On November 14, 1493, during his second voyage, Columbus anchored at Salt River Bay, St. Croix to replenish his water supply (Brewer and Hammersten 1988; Brown 1988). As the supply boat was returning to the ship, the Carib Indians began firing arrows, and several members of both sides were wounded or killed. Columbus named the area Cabo de las Flechas, or Cape of the Arrows. This site is now part of the **Salt River Bay National Historical Park and Ecological Preserve**, which commemorates Columbus's only attempted landing in what became a United States territory.

The conversion of the native population to Catholicism was only a secondary impetus for Spanish settlement in the New World. The main goal was the removal of mineral wealth. Two things were necessary to accomplish this: large fleets and forts to protect important ports. Spanish fleets moved throughout the Caribbean and the Gulf of Mexico, and evidence of Spanish wrecks and/or forts exists in at least six parks in the Southeast, including **Biscayne National Park**, **Castillo de San Marcos National Monument**, **Dry Tortugas National Park**, **Fort Matanzas National Monument**, **Gulf Islands National Seashore**, and **San Juan National Historic Site**.

### *Southeast*

The first exploration to the Southeast on record was led by the Spanish explorer Juan Ponce de León in A.D. 1513. According to historical documentation, the site of his second landing may have been in the vicinity of **Canaveral National Seashore** (Brewer 1988). Other early explorers to the Southeast were the Miruelo brothers (who discovered Pensacola Bay at present-day **Gulf Islands National Seashore**), Pánfilo de Narváez (who most certainly passed

through **Gulf Islands** National Seashore), and Hernando de Soto (whose landing occurred near and is commemorated at **De Soto** National Memorial). The goal of these expeditions was to find and acquire wealth comparable to that found in South and Central America.

Subsequently, the Spanish made three unsuccessful attempts to settle North America. These were made by Ponce de León (1521) in southwest Florida, Lucas Vásquez de Ayllón (1526) along coastal Georgia or South Carolina, and Tristán de Luna y Arellano (1559) at Pensacola Bay near present-day **Gulf Islands** National Seashore. Following these unsuccessful expeditions, the French decided to foray into North America.

#### *FRENCH EXPLORATION AND SETTLEMENT*

The French, under Jean Ribault, landed near the St. Johns River (Florida) on May 1, 1562 (Bennett 1968). Ribault then established a colony, Charlesfort, on present-day Parris Island, South Carolina. When Ribault returned to Europe, the colony at Charlesfort failed and was abandoned.

In 1564, Ribault's lieutenant René de Laudonnière established the fort of La Caroline on a bluff on the south side of the St. Johns River, which is today commemorated by **Fort Caroline** National Memorial. Upon hearing of the French incursion into Spanish territory, King Phillip II of Spain sent Pedro Menéndez de Avilés to destroy the French fort and establish a Spanish colony in its place. At about the same time, Ribault was sent from France to take command of La Caroline (Fort Caroline) and reinforce the fort with a colonial settlement. When Ribault arrived, he found the remaining soldiers prepared to return to France but heartened by the new colonists and supplies. Menéndez's fleet arrived within days of Ribault's and attacked the French fleet, but the latter escaped. The Spanish moved to the south and established a settlement near the present site of **Castillo De San Marcos** National Monument. This settlement eventually became the city of St. Augustine. Ribault took most of the French vessels, still loaded with supplies, to

attack the Spanish. A hurricane, however, scattered and wrecked his fleet to the south along the Florida coast. Menéndez knew that the winds would hinder the French and used the opportunity to attack Fort Caroline. Most of the remaining French soldiers were killed, while the women and children were captured. Menéndez later marched south and found a group of shipwreck survivors on the beach at an inlet near present-day **Fort Matanzas** National Monument. After being told that their fate would be "in the hands of God," the French surrendered, at which point Menéndez had them put to death as heretics and interlopers.

Several weeks later Menéndez heard that there was yet another group of French at the inlet to the south. After locating these men he again made the same offer. The majority of the French again surrendered and were put to death. The remaining French returned to the shipwreck site somewhere in the vicinity of present-day **Canaveral** National Seashore. Menéndez then marched his men from St. Augustine down the beach until he encountered the French survivors, who were building a ship and a fort from the shipwreck remains. Again Menéndez persuaded most of them to surrender, this time guaranteeing clemency. About twenty of Ribault's men refused to surrender, saying they would rather take their chances with the Indians. Menéndez took some of his captives south towards Cuba, while most of the prisoners were left as "guests" with an Ais Indian chief. Archeological information recently recovered at **Canaveral** National Seashore (Figure 10) indicates the possible location of the camp of the men who refused to surrender to Menéndez (Elizabeth Horvath, SEAC, personal communication 1993).

In 1568, French forces under the command of Dominique de Gourgues returned to the site of Fort Caroline, now renamed Fuerte San Mateo. De Gourgues destroyed the Spanish garrison avenging the earlier Ribault massacres.

The Spanish settlement at St. Augustine subsequently became the first permanent colony in North America. The Spanish later settled the surrounding area using the mission concept, wherein missions were established and used to






Figure 10 — Hat pin (6 inches long) recovered in the area of Canaveral National Seashore.

bring the native population under control. The capital of Spanish Florida (La Florida), however, was located at Santa Elena in modern South Carolina.

### *Atlantic*

The French also attempted to colonize the Caribbean. In 1650, they seized the island of St. Croix. They laid out towns, plantations, and forts (including one at **Christiansted** National Historic Site) only to abandon them several years later.

### *Gulf Coast*

In 1692, LaSalle claimed the Mississippi River drainage for France and established a colony. In 1699, d'Iberville documented landing on Ship Island and establishing an offshore warehouse in what is currently the Mississippi section of **Gulf Islands** National Seashore.

### *Mississippi Valley*

In the early eighteenth century, the French made a substantial attempt to colonize the lower Mississippi Valley, with French explorers paddling down the Mississippi River to claim the land for France. In 1716, the French constructed Fort Rosalie (near **Natchez** National Historical Park), which served as the nucleus of the growing town. Increasingly agitated by the French, the Natchez Indians destroyed Fort Rosalie and killed most of the male defenders. French retaliation led to the destruction of the Natchez as a tribal entity.

Following the French and Indian War

(1763) control of the Natchez area passed to the British.

### *ENGLISH EXPLORATION AND SETTLEMENT*

#### *Exploration*

In 1584, Sir Walter Raleigh secured a charter from the Queen of England to settle lands in North America. His first colony, near present-day Manteo, North Carolina, consisted of 108 colonists under the leadership of Governor Ralph Lane. The fort's site now exists within the boundary of **Fort Raleigh** National Historic Site. Indian trouble caused the colonists to abandon the colony.

Raleigh returned to North Carolina in 1587 with 110 men, women, and children. The new colony was placed under the leadership of John White. His daughter gave birth to Virginia Dare, the first European born in North America. White soon returned to England to acquire supplies for the colony. However, upon arrival in England, his ships were pressed into service against the Spanish Armada. He was unable to return until 1590, at which time he found the colony abandoned and the word "CROATOAN" carved on a post. The captain of the ship refused to spend time searching for the colony. No evidence of the fate of the "lost" colony has been recovered to date.

#### *Settlement of Georgia*

The British established their hold on the eastern coast of North America during the seventeenth century so that by 1700 there were twelve British colonies. However, fears ran high over

the Spanish presence in Florida, and it was decided that a southern colony should be established to ward off Spanish attacks. In 1732, James Oglethorpe left England with 114 people. In January 1733, they arrived at the Savannah River where they established the town of Savannah and the colony of Georgia. In an effort to defend against the Spanish, Oglethorpe established defenses at strategic positions. One of these was Fort Frederica on St. Simons Island, which is now **Fort Frederica National Monument**. Others were Fort Saint Andrew at the north end and Fort Prince William at the south end of Cumberland Island, now **Cumberland Island National Seashore**. As a result of the new colony, tensions between Spain and England increased. Oglethorpe went to England in 1737 and returned with nine companies of soldiers. In 1739, the long anticipated war began. With his soldiers and Indian allies, Oglethorpe laid siege to the Spanish town of St. Augustine. He was unable to breach the walls and returned to the Georgia colony. The Spanish then moved on Fort Frederica. They advanced to within sight of the fort but were beaten back by the British. That same large Spanish force was later ambushed and beaten on St. Simons Island at the site of Bloody Marsh. In effect, this ended Spain's northern expansion.

#### **OTHER EUROPEAN EXPLORATION AND SETTLEMENT**

##### *Scandinavian*

The only other significant European exploration and settlement in the Southeast was the Danish West Indies Company's colonization in the Virgin Islands, the remains of which can be seen at **Christiansted National Historic Site** on St. Croix, and **Virgin Islands National Park**, St. John.

#### **PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT**

The English strengthened their hold on North America by settling near major harbors, such as New York and Charleston. From these coastal

### III. Development of the English Colonies, 1688-1763

#### A. Physical Development

1. Growth of Urban Areas and Previous Settlements
2. Territorial Expansion

holdings, they ventured inland, constantly pushing the frontier back. During this time, they both traded with and fought the Indians. One significant town that grew out of this trading relationship was Ninety Six, South Carolina, now established as **Ninety Six National Historic Site**. The original inhabitants of the town believed they were 96 miles from the Cherokee village of Keowee, thus the name.

#### *THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION IN THE SOUTH*

### IV. The American Revolution

#### D. War in the South

In 1755, the French and their Indian allies went to war with England. This was the first European war where the bulk of the fighting took place outside of Europe. Although future-president George Washington was defeated in his early attacks against the French, the English were the ultimate victors when the war ended in 1763. The French ceded territory south of Canada to the English, including Natchez and Fort Rosalie (**Natchez National Historical Park**).

To pay for the French and Indian War, England increased taxes on the British colonies, thus precipitating the American Revolution. The French provided aid to the Colonials during the Revolution, which caused the French government to increase taxes on its citizens. This, in turn, helped precipitate the French Revolution. The Continental Congress signed the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, formally declaring the revolution that had begun the year before.

The exiled Loyalist governor of North

Carolina had devised a plan to regain control of his state. He planned to gather an army, march to the sea, and link up with British Naval forces. The combined army would then crush the rebellion in the South. On February 27, 1776, while en route to the sea, the governor's British Loyalists and the local Patriots met at the Battle of Moores Creek (**Moores Creek National Battlefield**). The battle was an overwhelming victory for the Patriots. The British Loyalists never reached the sea.

Unable to complete their rendezvous assignment, the British ships sailed south to Charleston, South Carolina. When the ships attempted to enter the harbor, they discovered that the Colonials had constructed a dirt-and-palmetto log fort (**Fort Moultrie**). During the ensuing battle, the British fleet suffered another defeat at the hands of the Colonials.

Following these two battles the focus of the war shifted to the north. Battles were fought over cities such as New York, Trenton, Saratoga, and Boston. By the late 1770s, the war in the north was stalemated with neither side able to gain the advantage.

The British commanders decided that the war could still be won in the south. In 1778 the British captured Savannah, Georgia, and, in 1780, Charleston, South Carolina. American forces under Horatio Gates were defeated at Camden, South Carolina. Cornwallis then took possession of Camden and Ninety Six (**Ninety Six National Historic Site**). This cleared the way for Cornwallis to pursue his goals of gathering southern Loyalists and taking the war to Virginia. He planned, then, to use his southern ports to move men and material into the interior of North and South Carolina.

In late 1780, Cornwallis advanced into North Carolina. He assigned Major Ferguson to command Loyalist troops on his left flank. Ferguson placed his army at Kings Mountain, South Carolina (**Kings Mountain National Military Park**) to await the enemy. On October 7, 1780, Ferguson's militia was defeated by Patriot militia in a battle where pleas of surrender were ignored. Hearing of the defeat, Cornwallis retreated to Winnsborough for the winter.

The remains of the American army were placed under the command of Nathaniel Greene. Greene divided his army, sending Daniel Morgan into the western Carolinas. Cornwallis countered, and dispatched Banastre Tarleton and his dragoons to destroy Morgan's army. On January 17, 1781, the two forces met at Cowpens, South Carolina (**Cowpens National Battlefield**). Morgan skillfully deployed his forces and devastatingly defeated the British.

Cornwallis followed Morgan into North Carolina. However, Greene moved north and consolidated his army. Cornwallis followed Greene into Virginia and then back into North Carolina. On March 15, 1781, the two armies met at Guilford Courthouse, North Carolina, now **Guilford Courthouse National Military Park**. The British forces won a victory but could not continue their campaign. Cornwallis retreated to Wilmington, North Carolina, and then into Virginia, only to be defeated at Yorktown.

The southern campaign broke the will of the British to continue the war. Public sentiment in England turned towards peace. While peace was not declared until 1783, for most purposes the war ended with the southern campaign. Revolutionary War units in the Southeast include **Cowpens National Battlefield**, **Fort Moultrie**, **Guilford Courthouse National Military Park**, **Kings Mountain National Military Park**, **Moores Creek National Battlefield**, and **Ninety Six National Historic Site** (Figure 11).

#### EXPLORATIONS OF THE WEST

- X. Westward Expansion of the British Colonies and the United States, 1763–1898
  - A. British and United States Explorations of the West

The desire for expansion was evident from the beginning of the Colonial era in North America. Dr. Thomas Walker and Daniel Boone were two early explorers. Walker was the first recorded European to use the Cumberland Gap (**Cumber-**




Figure 11 — SEFA parks with a Revolutionary War component.

land Gap National Historical Park) to cross the Appalachian Mountains. Boone was the first to mark the trail for settlers to follow.

The greatest expansion occurred when President Jefferson purchased the Louisiana Territory lands from France. These lands had passed from French to Spanish and back to French control since the French and Indian War. President Jefferson sent the Lewis and Clark expedition to explore the new lands to the Pacific Ocean.

Trails, such as the Cumberland Gap Trail (Cumberland Gap National Historical Park) and the Natchez Trace (Natchez Trace Parkway), became increasingly important to the

movement of supplies. Towns, as well as havens for bandits, sprang up along these trails. An interesting historical note is that Meriwether Lewis died under mysterious circumstances on the Natchez Trace some years after his famous expedition.

In 1813, the Upper Creeks (the Red Stick) began a revolt. This was brought on in large part by Anglo encroachment and broken treaties. In March 1814, Andrew Jackson and his Tennessee militia attacked and killed 800 of 1,000 revolting Red Sticks at Horseshoe Bend, Alabama (Horseshoe Bend National Military Park).

#### WAR OF 1812

Subsequent to the American Revolution, the United States of America became a significant force in naval commerce. This led the young nation into conflict with England and other

nations concerning maritime trade. These problems led to the War of 1812.

- V. Political and Military Affairs, 1783–1860
- E. War of 1812, 1812–1815

During the War of 1812, the Americans tried to annex Canada, while the British attacked major U.S. seaports. Even though the Americans lost most of the battles, they were able to secure an equitable peace. Nine months after the Battle of Horseshoe Bend, before this

treaty could take effect, American forces under Andrew Jackson defeated a numerically superior British force at New Orleans. This battle made Jackson a national hero and helped him later win the presidency.

The War of 1812 had helped exhibit the weakness of American coastal defenses. Following the war, a plan was devised that called for the construction of a system of forts at major American harbors. Known as the Third American System, it was designed under the direction of Brigadier General Simon Bernard, former military engineer for Napoleon Bonaparte. Work did not begin on the southern forts, such as Pulaski, Jefferson, Pickens, and Sumter, until the 1820s (NPS 1984a) (**Dry Tortugas National Park**, **Fort Pulaski National Monument**, **Fort Sumter National Monument**, and **Gulf Islands National Seashore**).

### THE CIVIL WAR

- VI. The Civil War
  - A. The Nation Divides, 1860–1861
  - B. War in the East
  - C. War in the West
  - D. Naval Action

#### *The Nation Divides*

Sectionalist tensions reached a fever pitch with the election of Abraham Lincoln as president. The first southern state to act was South Carolina, which had a long tradition of secessionist tendencies dating back to the American Revolution and the Nullification Crisis. The state voted to remove itself from the Union in December 1860. On December 26, fearing that his Union forces would be cut off, Major Robert Anderson moved his troops from Fort Moultrie on Sullivan's Island to Fort Sumter (**Fort Sumter National Monument**) in Charleston Harbor. After Anderson's men left, Fort Moultrie was occupied by forces under the command of Pierre Gustave Toutant Beauregard.

Tensions increased across the South where states' rights advocates clashed with Federal authorities over ownership of Federal property. In January 1861, Federal forces at Pensacola, Florida, moved into Fort Pickens (**Gulf Islands National Seashore**). State militia seized Fort Pulaski, Georgia (**Fort Pulaski National Monument**) (Figure 12).

Neither side was willing to make the first move towards war. An uneasy stalemate lasted as long as President Abraham Lincoln did not resupply or reinforce Fort Sumter (**Fort Sumter National Monument**). Lincoln, who was born in the South (**Abraham Lincoln Birthplace National Historic Site**), did not wish to see the war escalate. However, on April 6, 1861, Lincoln announced that he would provision the fort, while still hoping to avert war. The Confederate leaders felt that this was unacceptable and fired on the fort on April 12, 1861.

Union General Winfield Scott devised a plan to defeat the South. The plan, later known as the Anaconda Plan, was to blockade the southern coastline, use naval action on rivers, and conduct land battles to slowly cut the South into increasingly smaller sections.

#### *War in the East*

Thirty-four hours after the bombardment of Fort Sumter (**Fort Sumter National Monument**) began, Major Anderson surrendered to the Confederates. The fort was then occupied by Confederate troops and would remain in their possession until near the end of the war (Ward et al. 1990).

The Confederate defenders of Fort Pulaski (**Fort Pulaski National Monument**), at the mouth of the Savannah River, felt that they were safe from any Union threat. Robert E. Lee made a tour of the fort and pronounced it capable of withstanding any siege. Lee's first military assignment had been at Fort Pulaski and he was aware of its strengths. However, Lee did not take into account the effect that rifled cannon would have on masonry forts.

In November 1861, Captain Quincy Gillmore was placed in charge of the siege of Fort



Pulaski (Lattimore 1970). Gillmore's forces placed several batteries of rifled cannons on Tybee Island, Georgia, approximately one mile from Fort Pulaski. On the morning of April 11, 1862, having the other siege elements in place, the Union guns opened fire. The fire of the rifled cannons breached the brick wall in two places. Gillmore then targeted the powder magazine forcing the Confederate defenders to surrender.

### *War in the West*

West of the Appalachian Mountains, the land and river portions of the Anaconda Plan were implemented. The first strikes were at Fort Donelson (**Fort Donelson National Battlefield and Cemetery**) and Shiloh (**Shiloh National Military Park and Cemetery**), Tennessee. Both of these battles were devastating defeats for the Confederacy.

Prison exchange programs broke down as hostilities increased. The Union, realizing this was more of a hardship for the Confederacy, which was having trouble feeding and caring for its own, finally refused to exchange. Many prisoner-of-war camps were built in both the North and the South, but the most famous was Andersonville Prison in Georgia (**Andersonville National Historic Site**). The poor conditions at this prison resulted in the death of almost 25 percent of all the men ever held there. Today the park commemorates prisoners of war everywhere.

In April 1862, Confederate forces were defeated at Shiloh, Tennessee (**Shiloh National Military Park**). Shiloh was the first of many defeats that the Confederate Army defending Tennessee would face.

It was almost a year after the fall of Fort Donelson before the Union army reached Stones River near Murfreesboro, Tennessee (**Stones River National Battlefield and Cemetery**). This battle was a huge fray where the Confederate army was thrown repeatedly against the Union army in a series of uncoordinated attacks. In the end, the Confederates were defeated and forced to retreat. The commander of the Union forces, William Rosecrans, had ordered the construction of an earthen fortress at Stones River. This was the largest earthworks built during the Civil War.




Figure 12 — SEFA parks with a Civil War component.

The Union army continued its plan with the capture of Vicksburg, Mississippi (**Vicksburg National Military Park**). The Union forces, under the command of General Ulysses S. Grant, laid siege to the city of Vicksburg, which surrendered on July 4, 1863, after receiving word that Lee had retreated at Gettysburg. This completed the Union hold on the Mississippi River.

The same two armies clashed again at Chickamauga, Georgia, and Chattanooga, Tennessee (**Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park**) in June 1863. With the railhead at Chattanooga secure, the Union army began its move south while the Confederates fought a series of delaying actions north of Atlanta, Georgia. Each time the Confederates stopped to defend themselves, the Union army flanked them. However, at Kennesaw Mountain (**Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park**), they could not break the Confederate line. The Confederates were forced to draw closer still to Atlanta. The Union army entered Atlanta on September 2, 1864, and imposed another defeat on their opponents.

From Atlanta, General William T. Sherman cut a path of destruction to Savannah. He then turned north and captured Columbia, the capital of South Carolina. The fall of Columbia brought about the surrender of Fort Sumter (**Fort Sumter National Monument**), where the war had begun.

### *Naval Action*

Naval activity during the Civil War can be divided into three types: blockading, blockade-running, and river action. The blockade of southern ports was a major strategy of the Anaconda Plan.

The need for coaling stations for the blockade fleet led to much of the early action in the war, such as the siege of Fort Pulaski, Georgia (**Fort Pulaski National Monument**). Ironclads, following the design of the *U.S.S. Monitor*, eventually rendered much of the Confederate fleet obsolete. Since the Confederate navy was of little consequence, the Union was free to move its Monitor-class vessels up and down the coastline. During one such movement,

while being towed, the *U.S.S. Monitor* sank off the coast of Cape Hatteras.

The first significant use of Union gunboats was made at Fort Henry and Fort Donelson, Tennessee (**Fort Donelson National Battlefield and Cemetery**). The Confederate high command knew they would have to defend the Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers. The ideal location for a fort was in Kentucky, north of the Tennessee state line, where the two rivers merge. However, since both sides initially accepted the neutrality of Kentucky, the Confederates were obligated to build two forts in Tennessee, where the rivers were over thirteen miles apart. These forts were Henry on the Tennessee River and Donelson on the Cumberland River (Peterson 1968).

The Confederacy began constructing earthworks at Forts Henry and Donelson in the fall of 1861. Both earthworks were to be constructed so as to best defend against both naval and infantry forces. However, progress on the earthworks was slow due to the shortage of slave laborers, who were already occupied at the undermanned iron works in the area. Although additional slave labor from northern Alabama was employed, the fortifications were still not completed by February 1862. As hostilities increased, the neutrality of Kentucky was eventually violated. Retaining the two forts then became extremely important since the side that controlled the rivers would control all of Kentucky and western Tennessee, and consequently have open waterways on which to move troops and supplies.

On February 2, 1862, General Grant began the movement of forces toward an engagement with troops at Forts Henry and Donelson. The fleet, commanded by Flag Officer Andrew H. Foote, and two infantry divisions attacked and captured Fort Henry. During the attack some 2,500 men from Fort Henry escaped to Fort Donelson. After Foote's successful venture at Fort Henry, Grant's army began marching toward Fort Donelson.

Fort Donelson was commanded by Brigadier General John B. Floyd. Under his command were Brigadier Generals Gideon Pillow and Simon B. Buckner and a cavalry commanded by Colonel Nathan Bedford Forrest. Grant began attacking

Fort Donelson in small engagements on February 12, but a full-scale attack was postponed because Foote's gunboats had not yet arrived. Waiting for the gunboats and reinforcements, Grant made camp. On February 13, Foote engaged the water batteries with little success. The Confederate water batteries, however, crippled three ironclads and wounded Foote. The Union naval boats were forced to withdraw, many of them floating down the Cumberland out of control.

Following this battle, Floyd realized that the Confederate forces at Fort Donelson were needed to join General Albert Johnston's forces for the defense of Nashville. Pillow's infantry, some 10,000 men, and Forrest's cavalry attacked the Union's right flank commanded by General John A. McClernand. Not expecting an attack, McClernand's forces were pushed back after seven hours of battle, thus opening the road to Nashville for the Confederates. The Confederate forces then pulled back into their rifle pits while Union Brigadier General C. F. Smith's division was sent against their forces at Eddyville Road. After several counterattacks by the Confederate forces, Smith was able to gain the rifle pits and control the road. When the plan to free the Confederate forces failed, Floyd and Pillow decided it was too late to escape. During the night, the Confederate generals met at the Dover Hotel to discuss their precarious situation. They decided to discuss terms of surrender with the Union commanders. Forrest refused to surrender his cavalry to the Union army and escaped that night across Lick Creek with both his cavalry and other men who chose not to surrender. Floyd and Pillow also escaped, fleeing to Nashville, leaving Buckner in command of the Confederate forces.

The following morning, General Buckner met with General Lew Wallace, a subordinate of General Grant, at the Dover Hotel and discussed terms of surrender. Grant had given orders that only an unconditional surrender would be accepted. On February 16, 1862, some 14,000 Confederate soldiers surrendered to Grant's command. It was at that time that Grant got the nickname "Unconditional Surrender" Grant.

By July 1, 1862, all of the area vital to the control of the Mississippi River was in Union

hands except for Vicksburg, Mississippi (**Vicksburg** National Military Park). The Confederate defenders placed artillery on the high bluffs above the river. While the Union gunboats were in position to attack the fortress, Grant's soldiers were not prepared to lay siege until May 18, 1863 (NPS 1986). The Confederate forces held out for a month and a half and only surrendered Vicksburg on July 4, 1863, following the news that Lee was defeated at Gettysburg.

#### *POST-CIVIL WAR*

- VII. Political and Military Affairs, 1865–1939
  - A. The Reconstruction Era, 1865–1877
  - D. America Becomes a World Power, 1865–1914
  - H. The Great Depression and the New Deal, 1929–1941

Following the assassination of President Abraham Lincoln, Andrew Johnson (commemorated at **Andrew Johnson** National Historic Site) became the seventeenth president of the United States (1865–1869). During his escape from Washington, Lincoln's killer John Wilkes Booth broke his leg, which was later set by the unwitting Dr. Samuel Mudd. For this act, Mudd was sent to prison. A significant portion of his sentence was served at Fort Jefferson (**Dry Tortugas** National Park).

The emancipation of the slaves radically changed the country. Before the Civil War, many southern towns were accented by lavish mansions, such as Melrose at **Natchez** National Historical Park and Grey Columns at **Tuskegee Institute** National Historic Site. While these mansions survived the war, their subsequent history could not be more diverse. Melrose mansion was retained in private ownership, while Grey Columns became part of a school for ex-slaves when, in 1881, the citizens of Tuskegee, Alabama, decided to provide blacks with a normal school using the former mansion. Booker T. Washington, a graduate of Hampton Institute in

Virginia, accepted the position as its first president and set an immediate precedent for the leadership in black education.

*America Becomes a World Power*

Following the Civil War the United States became a world power. This is primarily reflected in the modifications of the coastal defense system. The system that proved to be inadequate during the Civil War was upgraded beginning in the 1890s in response to pressures leading to the Spanish-American War. Forts, such as Fort Moultrie (**Fort Sumter** National Monument) and Fort Pickens (**Gulf Islands** National Seashore) were modified using enormous amounts of iron and concrete. Breechloading retractable guns replaced the muzzle loaders. Modifications of armaments continued through the two world wars. However, as with every weapon system, coastal defense batteries and forts were eventually rendered obsolete by airplanes, radar, satellites, and other electronic countermeasures.

*The Great Depression and the New Deal*

The Great Depression and the New Deal had a profound effect on parks in the Southeast. As a part of the New Deal, the Works Progress Administration (WPA) and the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) were created. The CCC worked in many parks, restoring them to their perceived appearance. Under the WPA, buildings, roads, trails, and housing units were constructed. Under the direction of professional archeologists, WPA/CCC members also conducted systematic archeological excavations at many large prehistoric sites within the region (**Ocmulgee** National Monument). Virtually all parks established prior to 1940 hosted CCC activities.

**MARITIME HISTORY IN THE SOUTHEAST**

Although no Pleistocene archeological sites are yet recognized for the coastal seashores and other maritime parks, the presence of peat deposits

dating to this period and underlying inshore barrier islands at **Canaveral** National Seashore, **Cape Hatteras** National Seashore, **Cape Lookout** National Seashore, **Cumberland Island** National Seashore, **Fort Matanzas** National Monument, **Gulf Islands** National Seashore, and **Timucuan** Ecological and Historic Preserve reflect the potential for studies concerning the early peopling of North America. Submerged peat deposits that contain well-preserved cultural resources are also evident and to be anticipated at **Big Cypress** National Preserve and **Everglades** National Park.

- I. Cultural Developments: Indigenous American Populations
  - A. The Earliest Inhabitants
    - 3. The Early Peopling of the Caribbean
    - 14. Archaic Adaptations of the Caribbean
  - B. Post-Archaic and Precontact Developments
    - 16. Post-Archaic Adaptations of Eastern Coastal Regions
    - 17. Caribbean Adaptations
  - C. Prehistoric Archeology: Topical Facets
    - 20. Submerged Prehistoric Period Archeological Resources
  - D. Ethnohistory of Indigenous American Populations
    - 1. Native Cultural Adaptations at Contact
      - j. Native Adaptations to Southeastern Environments
      - k. Native Adaptations to Caribbean Environments
    - 2. Establishing Intercultural Relations
      - k. Helping Foreigners Survive: Providing Food, Clothing, and Shelter
    - 3. Varieties of Early Conflict, Conquest, or Accommodation
      - d. Changing Settlement Types
      - 7) Maritime Trade Centers

Prehistoric maritime exploration, probably from South America, resulted in the settling of the Virgin Islands among the northern Leeward Islands, with the initial occupation of the Greater Antilles estimated to have taken place as early as 5000 B.C. (Rouse and Allaire 1978:465). In his 1960 survey of St. John, (**Virgin Islands National Park**), Frederick Sleight noted that most of the prehistoric settlements were in the northwest section of the island (1962).

The development of specialized maritime, riverine, and other adaptations in select areas allowed for establishment of a sedentary way of life that was not specifically agriculturally based. Many maritime communities developed as a result of the use of specialized fishing and hunting techniques or a combination of both. A combination of maritime and agricultural practices formed the foundation for cultural developments in the Caribbean and along the southeast coast of the United States. Examples of these cultures have been found in archeological contexts throughout the Southeast, including at **Big Cypress National Preserve**, **Biscayne National Park**, **Canaveral National Seashore**, **Cumberland Island National Seashore**, **Everglades National Park**, **Fort Matanzas National Monument**, **Gulf Islands National Seashore**, **Timucuan Ecological and Historic Preserve**, and **Virgin Islands National Park**. These sites are usually manifested as shell middens or mounds reflecting the remains of local shellfish exploitation.

Protected bay and cove prehistoric site types are also found at **Buck Island Reef National Monument** and **Salt River Bay National Historical Park and Ecological Preserve**. Elsewhere in the region, the potential for prehistoric maritime exploration and early settlement has been considered for **Dry Tortugas National Park** (Cockrell 1989).

Maritime cultural adaptations of the native populations throughout the Southeast were recorded by early explorers, including Columbus, LeMoynes, Ribault, Laudonnière, and d'Iberville, among others. National Parks in the region that have either archeological sites or historic accounts describing contact period maritime cultural adaptations include **Canaveral National**

**Seashore**, **Cumberland Island National Seashore**, **Gulf Islands National Seashore**, **Salt River Bay National Historical Park and Ecological Preserve**, and **Timucuan Ecological and Historic Preserve**.

At **Canaveral National Seashore**, an archeological site, which appears to be a survivors' camp of the ill-fated Ribault fleet of 1565, was recently investigated by SEAC (Elizabeth Horvath, SEAC, personal communication 1993). Metal-working remains appear to indicate an extended occupation by a small European group living among the native population, which reflects the establishment of intercultural relations. A beach-face survey at the park is one of the first scheduled SAIP/RASP projects and will hopefully locate associated Ribault fleet material.

#### *EUROPEAN COLONIAL EXPLORATION AND SETTLEMENT*

- II. European Colonial Exploration and Settlement
  - A. Spanish Exploration and Settlement
    - 1. Caribbean
    - 2. Southeast
  - B. French Exploration and Settlement
    - 1. Atlantic
    - 4. Gulf Coast
  - C. English Exploration and Settlement
    - 1. Exploration
    - 7. Settlement of the Carolinas
    - 8. Settlement of Georgia
  - D. Other European Exploration and Settlement
    - 1. Scandinavian

European maritime colonial exploration and settlement is thematically represented throughout the Southeast, especially at most coastal parks. In northeast Florida, the research needs for examining Spanish and French exploration and contact of the sixteenth century have been addressed in *A Design for Historic and Archeological Research of the 16th Century European Encounter in the National Parks of Northeast Florida* (Keel and Brewer 1991).



Spanish and French maritime exploration and settlement is represented at the following Southeast parks for the stated reasons:

- **San Juan** National Historic Site, where the oldest masonry fortifications in the territorial limits of the United States were begun by the Spaniards in the sixteenth century to protect a strategic harbor guarding the sea lanes to the New World;
- **Biscayne** National Park, which contains one of the best-preserved shipwrecks of the 1733 *Flota* disaster;
- **Canaveral** National Seashore, where, considering the presence of the survivors' camp site noted earlier, one or more of the known Ribault fleet wrecksites may yet exist within the park's boundaries (Figure 13);
- **Gulf Islands** National Seashore, where some remains of the DeLuna fleet of 1559 may yet exist within the park boundary at Pensacola Bay.
- **Cumberland Island** National Seashore, where maritime archeological remains may exist in the inland waters, reflecting the establishment of early Spanish mission settlements; and
- **Virgin Islands** National Park, where Danish sugar plantations were supplied and cargoes carried off by mercantile shipping.




Figure 13 — Ship ring bolt from the area of Canaveral National Seashore.

At **Biscayne** National Park, there exist the remains of an English warship of the Caribbean Squadron, the *HMS Fowey*, sunk in 1748. This site has received considerable study over the past decade. Indications are that at least one other British vessel of the same general period, as yet identified but unstudied, exists in the northern section of the park. Economic and social ways of life are also exemplified in the park at the site of the merchant vessel *Hubbard* (or *Ledbury*). This ship, laden with a cargo of ceramic tablewares, wrecked in either 1769 or 1772, depending on the correct identification of the vessel.

At **Gulf Islands** National Seashore, the French establishment of a Gulf Coast military and territorial presence at the beginning of the eighteenth century is exemplified by the archeo-

#### DEVELOPMENT OF THE ENGLISH COLONIES

The maritime aspects of the development of the English colonies are evident throughout the Southeast. Incorporating the golden age of piracy, this period saw the English settlement of both **Cape Hatteras** and **Cape Lookout** National Seashores, as well as the founding of English fortified coastal towns in Georgia, such as **Fort Frederica** National Monument and the as-yet undiscovered Forts St. Andrew and Prince William at **Cumberland Island** National Seashore.

- III. Development of the English Colonies, 1688–1763
  - A. Physical Development
    - 2. Territorial Expansion
  - C. Military Affairs
    - 1. French
    - 2. Spanish
  - D. Social and Economic Affairs
    - 2. Economic Affairs and Ways of Life

logical evidence of the French warehouse site at Ship Island. The significant anchorage off the northeast end of the island served the French for over a decade and may contain remnants of that early incursion.

- IV. The American Revolution
  - D. War in the South
  - F. The Naval War

Concerning maritime activities associated with the Revolutionary War, there are several parks in the region that manifest an archeological presence, including **Fort Sumter** National Monument. The original Fort Moultrie withstood the battering guns of the British fleet under Sir Peter Parker on June 28, 1776, returning fire and sinking several vessels. At **Moore's Creek** National Battlefield, the scene of the opening engagement in the South—the bridge site that crosses the navigable waterway there—may yet reveal evidence of the brief but fierce engagement, which dashed British hopes for a quick southern victory. Elsewhere, in 1781, as an ally of France (but not the American colonies) against the British, the Spanish sent an Armada of sixty-four ships against the British at Pensacola Bay, which quickly fell. This invasion likely has left some archeological remains in the waters of **Gulf Islands** National Seashore at Pensacola.

- V. Political and Military Affairs, 1783–1860
  - K. The Army and Navy
- VI. The Civil War
  - D. Naval Action

The development of the coastal fort system relied heavily on the efforts of both military and merchant shipping. Construction alone entailed the movement of massive amounts of materials and men, with the inevitable losses that occur with bad weather and perilous navigation. At **Dry Tortugas** National Park, several "construction"

wrecks are documented. Other sites are expected to be located here as well as in other coastal system-related parks in the Southeast, such as **Fort Pulaski** National Monument, **Fort Sumter** National Monument, and Forts Pickens, McRae, and Massachusetts in **Gulf Islands** National Seashore, where construction and supply vessels wrecked or foundered.

The Civil War affected the naval activities of coastal areas all across the Southeast, whether involved in blockading (and running those blockades), ship-to-shore engagements, or major assaults. Parks in the region that contain known or potential resources reflecting Civil War maritime history include **Fort Sumter** National Monument, where the initial assault on and removal of Union forces precipitated the War Between the States. Ships running past the Union forces, which blockaded Charleston Harbor, and those that continuously fired upon Fort Sumter also may have left archeological remains. At **Gulf Islands** National Seashore, ship-to-shore engagements, as well as major landings, occurred throughout the war at both the Florida and Mississippi units. Also notable are the remains of the U.S.S. **Cairo** at **Vicksburg** National Military Park, Mississippi—a reminder of the riverine naval actions during the war, such as those that took place on the Mississippi River at Fort Donelson and on the Tennessee River at Pittsburg Landing (**Shiloh** National Military Park).

#### *MISCELLANEOUS THEMES*

Other thematic associations are exemplified by many of the more recent (i.e., post-Civil War) shipwrecks known to exist in southeast coastal parks. In **Biscayne** National Park for instance, the extractive industries of sponging and lobster trapping have left substantial remains that reflect the livelihood of the first settlers to south Florida. Another extractive industry of considerable impact to the development and settlement of south Florida was the business, both legitimate and otherwise, of wrecking, whereby stranded and imperiled ships and their cargoes were brought back into commerce by the efforts of professional salvors of the late nineteenth and early twentieth

centuries. Also extant in the park, and representing a unique type of housing construction, are the still-standing structures known as Stiltsville, soon to become relics of a past way of life.

- XII. Business
  - A. Extractive or Mining Industries
    - 5. Fishing
    - 6. Other [Wrecking]
  - C. Construction and Housing
    - 2. Private
  - F. Insurance
    - 1. Fire and Marine
  - L. Shipping and Transportation
- XIV. Transportation
  - B. Ships, Boats, Lighthouses, and Other Structures
- XV. Communication
  - B. Mail Service (Overland, Water, and Air Routes)
- XXX. American Ways of Life
  - J. Occupational and Economic Classes [Wreckers]

Although it has not yet become an issue, at some point the insurance theme—involving questions of marine insurance, ownership, and the development of the marine insurance industry—

may come into play concerning historic wrecks within the boundaries of Southeast parks.

Shipping and transportation are represented by all merchant and cargo vessels wrecked within park waters. At **Biscayne** National Park, several sites come to mind, such as the wrecksites of the steamboat *St. Lucie*—the locally famous mail packet and coastal transport wrecked in the historic hurricane of 1906—and the *Lugana* and the *Alicia*—two of the last vessels ever worked by Southeast Florida wreckers. Many cargo vessels are known to lie within the boundaries of **Cape Hatteras** National Seashore and **Cape Lookout** National Seashore, and at least one large lumber vessel lies within the waters of **Gulf Islands** National Seashore. At **Dry Tortugas** National Park, near Fort Jefferson, the remains of the 1907 Windjammer wreck, the *Killean*, still lie exposed at low water. Thanks to the mapping done by the Submerged Cultural Resources Unit (SCRU), this wrecksite provides an especially exhilarating interpretive dive for visitors who are trained in diving. This is just a sampling of maritime historic contexts known to exist in SEFA parks. Surveys to be carried out as part of this Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan will undoubtedly provide further data to support these thematic associations, as well as evaluate their overall significance.

...

---

## Chapter 3

# STATUS OF ARCHEOLOGICAL RESEARCH

---

### INTRODUCTION

#### *A BRIEF HISTORY OF EARLY NPS ARCHEOLOGICAL RESEARCH IN SEFA*

Prior to the establishment of SEAC, archeological investigations in the region were generally limited to development-related activities rather than to any coherent research inventory program that focused on gathering information for the database. Archeological research programs for in-park purposes had always been constrained because of the NPS's overall responsibility at the time to deal archeologically with reservoir construction activities and other land modification programs on federal lands. This program constraint was an indication of SEFA's operational budget for archeology in fiscal year 1966, where 68 percent of the budget funded archeological contracts for survey or data recovery in reservoir projects, while 32 percent went toward administering that year's program and planning future reservoir salvage.

However, beginning in the 1960s, a series of developments greatly contributed to the evolution of archeological resource management in the region. First, an improved organizational basis was established as the result of interaction between the Washington Office (WASO) directorate, the Southeast Regional Office (SERO) directorate, and the Chief Archeologist, WASO. This resulted in the establishment of SEAC at **Ocmulgee National Monument**. (An overview of the archeological center's establishment can be found in Logan and Calabrese's *National Park Service Archeological Programs: An Historical Overview* (1976)). This move to establish archeological centers had its origins in a management goal to expand NPS capability to carry out comprehensive research in support of all management programs. Ocmulgee was selected as the site of SEAC for several reasons, in-

cluding availability of space and location of regional archeological collections. Undoubtedly, tradition also influenced the decision, for as early as the 1930s and 1940s it was believed that Ocmulgee should be a research center

Chief Archeologist Corbett implemented the organizational change by combining the Southeast regional archeologist's position and three other positions to form SEAC's principal staff. One central objective was to place program execution and review activities closer to the archeological resource base, then identified as the vast accumulation of park-related archeological information that had been warehoused at Ocmulgee for a number of years under an unwritten consensus that the park was to serve as a regional repository. At that time Ocmulgee housed records and collections from **Arkansas Post National Memorial**, **Castillo de San Marcos National Monument**, **Everglades National Park**, **Fort Matanzas National Monument**, **Guilford Courthouse National Military Park**, **Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park**, **Natchez Trace Parkway**, **Ocmulgee National Monument**, **Russell Cave National Monument**, and **Virgin Islands National Park**.

In rapid succession, several other developments followed this organizational change.

- Policy initiatives from historic preservation legislation sharpened the focus on a need for systematic in-park archeological programs and increased funding.
- In response to the need to have the center near adequate research facilities and depositories, SEAC was relocated to Florida State University in Tallahassee.
- External program responsibilities were separated from internal requirements. They were separately funded and eventually

transferred to another agency, thus allowing undivided emphasis to be placed on in-park archeological needs.

- As part of an overall NPS shift in philosophy, SEAC adopted a management-by-objectives system.
- Regional management decided, at an early date, that SEAC would be responsible for in-park archeology in the region regardless of whether the client was Denver Service Center, the park, or the regional office. This decision made possible the coordination of archeological endeavors as one program and improved the scheduling, delivery, and quality of products.
- It was agreed that archeological programs would emphasize the inventory and evaluation of resources in newly acquired areas and, at the same time, begin to inventory and evaluate existing areas whose archeological resources were then virtually unknown.

#### THE SOUTHEAST ARCHEOLOGICAL CENTER (SEAC)

During the 28 years since its creation, SEAC—a division of the regional office, now called the Southeast Field Area—has provided information, recommendations, and project execution at both park and regional levels to support the management of a variety of cultural resources that, by definition, are archeological (Faust 1986).

Over this period, SEAC evolved into a base-funded review and production unit that utilizes varying amounts of yearly project funds to gradually complete yearly program goals that contribute to the accomplishment of SEAC's main objectives.

#### MISSION STATEMENT

SEAC's mission is to facilitate long-term protection of archeological resources in the parks of the Southeast and to preserve and utilize archeological information from these parks. This mission will be carried out by the effective utilization of human and material resources in contributing to sound cultural resource management decisions, plans, and programs. For the past ten years, SEAC has been and will continue to be guided by the following objectives:

- to provide cultural resource inventories;
- to review proposed management, planning, and construction undertakings in order to insure an adequate recognition of cultural resource values and to identify any implications of conflicts with the undertakings;
- to provide appropriate archeological research in undertakings that may have an adverse effect on cultural resources;
- to provide cultural data recovery programs, field inspections, surveys, and reports that conform to recognized service, departmental, and professional standards in order to provide quality archeological resource information and recommendations to managers and planners;
- to achieve high-quality standards for the design, execution, and reporting of archeological undertakings;
- to provide for the development, research, and/or application of effective methodology or techniques for information management; and
- to maintain an information base of objects and data archeologically recovered from the National Parks in the Southeast and to provide for the effective utilization and curation of archeological research collections, archives, and information bases.



## PREVIOUS ARCHEOLOGICAL INVENTORY RESEARCH

During the past 28 years, SEAC has accessioned over 1,150 projects. Appendix 3 contains a park by park listing of all archeological projects completed by SEAC over the past two decades. The bulk of these projects are archeological clearances done to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended in 1980. One hundred-sixteen of the total projects (10 percent) are identification, location, and/or survey studies.

The combined result of these past efforts has led to a situation where large numbers of sites have been located but not documented or evaluated to the level required by current standards as outlined in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Archeological and Historic Preservation and in *NPS-28: Cultural Resource Management Guidelines* (1985).

Two actions are required to correct this deficiency. The first is to review project-accessioned records to determine if the requisite information is present. If present, then regional CSI forms, servicewide ASMIS forms, state site forms, and archeological base maps will be completed; a determination of significance will be made; and National Register nomination forms will be prepared and submitted when appropriate. If the required information is not present, the second corrective action—site identification and testing—will be used. For this reason a site testing project statement was written for each park. Site testing will minimally consist of relocating and recording the location of the site (using GPS), determining site limits, determining cultural and temporal affiliation, and assessing National Register significance.

Several large inventory projects have been conducted by SEAC, but the majority of sites were not assessed by current standards. The recordation of sites during the **Big Cypress National Preserve**, **Canaveral National Seashore**, and **Everglades National Park** surveys, for instance, often did not include such information as datum, site limits, and discovery methodology. Many of these data are needed to

evaluate site significance. Actions 1 and 2 will be implemented to correct the surveys.

Large-scale systematic surveys that meet the most current standards have been conducted at **Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area**, **Mammoth Cave National Park**, and **Timucuan Ecological and Historic Preserve**. These surveys will be current when CSI (ASMIS) forms are completed for each site.

## PREVIOUS LARGE-SCALE SURVEYS

Summaries of previous major surveys undertaken in the region follow. These generally consist of identification studies as opposed to compliance-based activities. (In other words, the primary goal of these surveys was to identify sites instead of surveying areas proposed for development.) They reflect work carried out by both NPS and contract archeologists. Other than the most recent (post-1985) surveys at Big South Fork, Mammoth Cave, and Timucuan, they have resulted in an inventory of site locations with varying levels of documentation, most of which only minimally meet current registration criteria. Whether certain areas will be resurveyed or simply site tested/evaluated depends on whether their data sets meet the current Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Archeological and Historic Preservation and NPS cultural resource management guidelines (NPS 1985).

### *BIG CYPRESS NATIONAL PRESERVE (BICY)*

Until recently there had been little professional attention directed towards sites within the Big Cypress Preserve. One of the earliest surveys was conducted in 1930 by Roy Nash. He recorded the location of Seminole camps, many of which are within the preserve boundaries (1931).

SEAC conducted five seasons (1977–1981) of archeological survey as part of the cultural resource inventory. The following four survey methods were used: aerial photography interpretation, informants, field investigation, and

published maps. During the survey, 386 sites were located (Ehrenhard and Taylor 1980; Ehrenhard, Carr, and Taylor 1978, 1979; Ehrenhard, Taylor, and Komara 1978). Of these, nineteen were considered regionally significant.

#### ***BIG SOUTH FORK NATIONAL RIVER AND RECREATION AREA (BISO)***

The first systematic archeological investigations in the Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area were conducted by SEAC under the direction of Robert C. Wilson. Wilson and his crew initiated fieldwork in the fall of 1978 and completed it in the fall of 1979. The work was divided into two stages.

The first stage was devoted to survey within proposed development areas. This consisted of excavating shovel tests at 50-meter intervals in some upland and terrace areas and conducting pedestrian surveys with 25-by-25-centimeter subsurface testing at rockshelters along blufflines.

The second stage was devoted primarily to surveys along 1,500-meter-long transects in areas outside the proposed development tracts. During the investigation of these transects, shovel tests were placed at 25-meter intervals in the uplands and bottomlands. Inspection of bluffline overhangs for evidence of occupation was also conducted within the transect areas.

During the two stages of the project, eighteen proposed development areas were surveyed, and eleven transect areas (tracts) were traversed. A total of 145 sites were recorded during the Stage 1 investigations, and fifty-six sites were recorded during Stage 2. Sixty-three other sites located outside the development and transect areas were also investigated by the SEAC crew.

Several months after SEAC staff members initiated archeological surveys in the park, employees of Ocean Data Systems (ODS) were subcontracted by master planners Miller, Wihry, and Lee to perform a natural resource survey of the park area. This included ground inspections, flying aerial transects, and twenty-one hours of helicopter survey along blufflines. The helicop-

ter survey was the most productive means of identifying natural resources of which over 2,000 were recorded using this method. A grand total of 3,245 natural features were identified by ODS, of which approximately 50 percent were listed as bluffline shelters. Of these, only ninety-eight have been identified as archeological sites on the basis of reported cultural materials. The ODS survey also identified twenty-six open air sites, and a few other kinds of archeological resources, such as cemeteries, mines, and bridges.

Environmental Consultants, Inc. (ECI) conducted a historic resource study of the park from 1980 to 1982 (Hutchinson et al. 1982). The work was directed by Steven K. Hutchinson, who oversaw ECI's inventory and evaluation of 273 building locations identified on the basis of 1950s USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle maps and a 1934 Kentucky topographic map. Hutchinson and his associates located a total of forty-nine standing structures during their investigation of the 273 sites.

Following the initial work conducted by SEAC, ODS, and ECI, the Army Corps of Engineers contracted with the University of Tennessee, Knoxville (UTK) to conduct additional archeological survey and testing in selected park development areas and within a 300-meter-wide band around them. Members of UTK conducted their investigations from October 1981 to June 1983 (Ferguson et al. 1982, 1984; Ferguson et al. 1986). Their field methods in bluffline areas consisted primarily of systematic pedestrian survey and visual inspection of ground surfaces in traverses that followed the contours of the blufflines. In the upland and bottomland areas, systematic pedestrian survey and visual inspection of ground surfaces were conducted following transects spaced at roughly 30- to 40-meter intervals in order to find "highly visible sites" (Ferguson et al. 1986:71). Systematic shovel testing was conducted only in areas where inspection for archeological materials had already identified sites. The purpose of shovel testing was to enhance a site's spatial definition.

During the course of their investigations,

UTK personnel surveyed 1,641.8 hectares (4,035.5 acres) within eight development areas and visited 340 sites (Ferguson et al. 1986:iii). Of these, 248 (72 percent) contained prehistoric components and ninety-five (28 percent) had historic components. Of the prehistoric sites, 154 were rockshelters, sixty-eight were upland sites, and twenty-six were terrace sites.

During the summer of 1991, SEAC staff members conducted the second year of archeological field investigations at BISO as part of the Big South Fork Archeological Resource Survey project (BISOARS). The major focus of the 1991 field season was on surveying the upland areas (referred to as "Adjacent Lands" in the BISO enabling legislation) as well as the terraces and floodplains in the bottom areas of the gorge.

Survey in the upland areas consisted of pedestrian survey along existing roads where ground-surface visibility permitted the identification of prehistoric and historic artifact scatters. Determination of site limits and stratigraphic integrity following site discovery was accomplished by shovel testing and visual ground inspection. A total of 66.8 kilometers (41.4 miles) of upland roadways were pedestrian surveyed and thirty-four open-air sites were studied during this phase of the 1991 investigations. Thirty-four new sites were identified during the various upland road surveys.

Survey in the terrace and floodplain areas consisted of pedestrian survey along gorge bottomland roads and trails in order to locate previously unreported sites. A total of 39.6 kilometers (24.6 miles) of bottomland trails were surveyed, and fifteen open-air sites were visited during this phase. Seven of the sites were previously unreported prehistoric artifact scatters, two of which also contained historic components. The rest of the sites visited during the bottomland survey had been previously reported.

The major foci of the 1992 BISOARS field season were (1) surveying Laurel Hill Road as a means of testing the prehistoric site prediction model that had been developed from the previous year's research, (2) shovel testing and

deep-probing bottomland open-air sites discovered during the 1991 BISOARS field season, and (3) surveying the bluffline areas of the gorge (Prentice 1993a).

Survey along Laurel Hill Road consisted of pedestrian survey along sections of the road where ground surface visibility permitted the identification of prehistoric and historic artifact scatters. Determination of site limits and stratigraphic integrity following site discovery was accomplished by shovel testing and visual ground inspection. A total of 9.6 kilometers (6 miles) of upland roadways were pedestrian surveyed and twelve open-air sites were investigated during the 1992 phase. Eleven of the open-air sites were new discoveries; the twelfth site (875.010) was discovered in 1991 (Prentice 1992). Two new rockshelter sites were also recorded during the road survey. Of the eleven newly discovered open-air upland sites located along Laurel Hill Road, seven were isolated prehistoric lithic scatters, three contained both prehistoric and historic components, and one "site" was an isolated prehistoric find discovered at a modern deer hunting camp.

Investigations in the terrace and floodplain areas consisted of shovel testing and deep-probing to determine site limits and stratigraphy for eight open-air sites previously discovered along bottomland roads and trails (Prentice 1993a). Ten new rockshelter sites were recorded as a result of the survey of Joe Branch Hollow. One of the sites was located outside the park (Prentice 1993a). During the survey of Middle Creek Hollow, a total of fifteen newly recorded rockshelter sites were investigated (Prentice 1993a).

Based on the previous work conducted in the park and historic cartographic information, a total of 1,045 historic and prehistoric sites are currently identified on the Archeological Resources Inventory, but several of these are located outside park boundaries. Most of the known prehistoric sites in the park occur within the development areas and indirect impact areas designated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Most of the historic sites were first identified on the basis of USGS maps.

### **BISCAYNE NATIONAL PARK (BISC)**

In 1975, SEAC conducted a general underwater archeological survey of the park. This magnetometer survey focused on the area immediately offshore from the islands and the fringes of the outer reef. This was a nonsystematic, biased survey based on information of known and suspected shipwreck sites and potential areas provided by local divers and historic references. Although a final report was not produced, the site data compiled provided the baseline information on the submerged resources within the park. For its day, this was considered state of the art.

In 1973, under contract from SEAC, A. James McGregor, then a graduate student under William H. Sears of Florida Atlantic University, conducted a terrestrial archeological identification study (Sears and McGregor 1974). The basic hypothesis was that prehistoric sites would be located on the bay sides of islands. Through "surface survey" (presumably visual reconnaissance survey) eleven sites were located. Limited recovery and testing took place at several of the sites. This site survey has provided the baseline data for the park's prehistoric resources.

In 1984, SEAC conducted a systematic underwater survey codirected by Ken Wild and David Brewer (1985) as part of an underwater archeological field school in conjunction with Florida State University's Academic Diving Program and Department of Anthropology. Fourteen survey blocks consisting of more than 4,000 acres (1,575 hectares) were surveyed using a magnetometer. Twenty-one submerged sites and one terrestrial shipwreck were investigated, fourteen of which were newly identified resources. Two of the sites, the *Hubbard/Ledbury* (BISC-2) and the alleged *Populo* (BISC-23), underwent limited site testing.

### **CANAVERAL NATIONAL SEASHORE (CANA)**

In 1965–1966, George A. Long, then a candidate for a Master's degree in Anthropology at the University of Florida and under the direction

of Charles H. Fairbanks, carried out a study of the archeological and historical resources of the Kennedy Space Center. A large section of the northern NASA jurisdictional area lies within the Canaveral National Seashore boundaries, and, therefore, the survey conducted by Long covered a great deal of park property in both Volusia and Brevard Counties. Sites were visited by Long, and brief descriptions, as well as locational data, were recorded. As a reference document, the report is extremely helpful for determining the status of site integrities as they existed in 1966. The final report for this work, *Indian and Historic Sites Report, John F. Kennedy Space Center, NASA* (1967) is on file at the Kennedy Space Center Public Affairs Office.

In 1975, John E. Ehrenhard of SEAC carried out a cultural resource inventory of Canaveral National Seashore, which had been established that year. The project was undertaken, in compliance with Executive Order 11593, to provide the park with data for the draft General Management Plan. The survey method consisted of aerial photography interpretation and surface reconnaissance. Although the survey relied heavily upon former surveys, and sixty-two sites were recorded within the boundaries of CANA, only twenty-five previously unrecorded sites were located. Recommendations were made for seven prehistoric and three historic sites, as well as an archeological district, to be nominated to the National Register of Historic Places. No archeological testing was carried out at the sites surveyed. Furthermore, locational data, as listed in the final report *Canaveral National Seashore: Assessment of Archeological and Historical Resources* (Ehrenhard 1976a), was later considered problematical by Griffin and Miller (1978:161–164).

### **CAPE LOOKOUT NATIONAL SEASHORE (CALO)**

In 1976 SEAC conducted a survey of this park unit (Ehrenhard 1976b). The survey method consisted of a visual survey of the ground surface. Fifteen sites were recorded during this survey.



**CHARLES PINCKNEY NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE  
(CHPI)**

In 1987, Brockington and Associates conducted a survey of the 28-acre tract. The area around the main house was posthole tested, while the remainder of the property was shovel tested (Brockington 1987). Colonial era artifacts were located near the main house. In addition, the archeological remains of slave cabins were found in the southwest corner of the property.

In 1992, two SEAC crews, one of which was operating under the National Archeological Survey Initiative (now SAIP/RASP), surveyed the northeast quadrant of Snee Farm (SEAC/RASP 1993). Shovel testing, probing, and manual excavations were conducted. Metal detectors and GPR were used as part of the survey methodology. During this survey the remains of several structures were exposed.

**CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER NATIONAL  
RECREATION AREA (CHAT)**

The first scientifically oriented survey was directed by Robert Wauchope under the auspices of the Works Progress Administration, the Society for Georgia Archaeology, and the University of Georgia. The survey began in 1938 and terminated with Wauchope's departure to North Carolina in 1940. The data was published much later (Wauchope 1966), by which time many of the sites had been destroyed by urban expansion or intensive land use. During the course of Wauchope's field work, large-scale geodetic maps were unavailable and access roads were poorly marked or unidentified by standard names. Consequently, later workers have had difficulty in locating the 1939-1940 sites in any given area.

From 1940 until 1959, no scientific archeology was undertaken in the general area. In 1959, the Department of Anthropology, University of Georgia, agreed to conduct a small salvage operation above the hydroelectric dam in the Morgan Falls Basin on the Chattahoochee River to recover data and materials that might be destroyed upon raising the height of the dam

and the level of Bull Sluice backwater. The archeologist Clemens de Baillou, under the general direction of A. R. Kelly, published his findings soon after completing the work (1962).

In 1974, Christopher Hamilton of SEAC conducted a survey of portions of the Chattahoochee River floodplain between Buford Dam and the Georgia Highway 20 bridge. This area was resurveyed during the cultural resource inventory of the proposed Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area corridor, begun in 1979 by Ellen Ehrenhard, also of SEAC. This most recent investigation consisted of one season of surface survey and some subsurface testing followed by a season of testing and evaluation to determine archeological significance. The final report on these two seasons was prepared by field archeologists Patricia D. O'Grady and Charles B. Poe (1980) under the supervision of the project archeologist. The project was suspended after the 1980 season because of land acquisition difficulties. Seventy archeological sites were recorded.

**CUMBERLAND ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE  
(CUIS)**

In 1950, Lewis Larson conducted a walking survey of the island and used some of the material that was found for his Master's thesis.

In 1974 and 1975, SEAC conducted a cultural inventory of the coast adjacent to Cumberland Island (Deuschle and Wilson 1975). The survey consisted of locating sites and some surface collecting. A number of historic sites in the town of St. Marys were also listed in the report.

In 1975, SEAC conducted a broad cultural inventory survey of the complete island (Ehrenhard 1976c). This consisted of a systematic walking reconnaissance and the "ground-truthing" of infrared aerial photographs. Field parties would string out at approximately 100-meter intervals, led by a guiding compass leader, with sites recorded on 7.5-minute quadrangle maps as encountered. Excavations were carried out with reference to an arbitrary grid system. Individual base lines were established and



marked at 50-meter intervals. Tests minimally consisted of a single 1.5-meter square. In situations that were historical in nature, specific historical data were used to aid in interpretation (Ehrenhard 1976c:38-40).

There are fifty-seven prehistoric and historic archeological sites within the boundaries of Cumberland Island National Seashore. The prehistoric sites date as far back as 5,000 years and are usually located along the intersection of marsh and high ground along the western border of the island, whereas the historic resources are spread throughout the island, usually near water. The sixteenth-century Spanish missions were the first historic occupations. These effectively ended the prehistoric aboriginal cultures. The island has been occupied continually since that time. The majority of these archeological sites have been protected from the ocean side by a well-developed dune system; however, on the river side, the major threat to sites is erosion from boat traffic and, in the case of the Deptford Tabby House (NPS 9 CAM 44), from excessive vegetation (Ehrenhard 1982).

#### *DRY TORTUGAS NATIONAL PARK (DRTO)*

In 1970 and 1971, the Division of Archeology, WASO, conducted the first NPS systematic underwater survey, which consisted of:

- 1) a study of USGS aerial photography and a visual survey of shallow water; and
- 2) a magnetometer survey near shoals, reefs, and channels whereby three tracts of 1,000 by 4,000 feet and two tracts of 2,000 by 6,000 feet were "magged" at a 75-foot interval.

Twelve shipwrecks and four artifact scatters were located.

In 1974, Wilburn "Sonny" Cockrell, the State Underwater Archeologist under contract to SEAC, conducted a survey. One of his goals was to use metal-sensing, diver observation, and other methods to survey areas not covered by earlier surveys. He located two unknown ship-

wrecks in areas previously surveyed.

In 1992, 1993, and 1994, the Submerged Cultural Resource Unit (SCRU) conducted additional systematic magnetometer/fathometer surveys at Fort Jefferson as part of the prototypic development of an interrelated GPS/GIS survey system. Although funded by the National Archeological Survey Initiative (now SAIP), no interim reports of these surveys have been made to date to either SEAC or SEFA.

#### *EVERGLADES NATIONAL PARK (EVER)*

The Everglades area received its first archeological attention from C. B. Moore, who navigated the entire southwest coast in 1904, but apparently spent little time within the present park boundary. He did report a site on Lostman's Key, however.

Ales Hrdlicka, with the Smithsonian Institution, made a remarkably detailed site survey of the lower west coast of Florida in 1918. He presented a rather thorough list of sites, including Johnson Hammock. He also listed several sites in the Cape Sable area.

Following the establishment of the park, an informal cooperative research program was established with the University of Florida. Four annual midyear expeditions and a number of smaller ones yielded valuable data.

- In January and February 1949, John M. Goggin tested sites near Bear Lake and on Shark River.
- In 1950, Goggin's Lostman's River Expedition No. 1 surveyed that river and tested Onion Key.
- In 1951, the Lostman's River Expedition No. 2 continued the river survey and tested Johnson Hammock and Hamilton Garden Patch.
- The 1952 expedition worked on the Cape Sable area. Also, tests were conducted at the Lundsford Site, Cape Sable Beach Site, and Cape Sable No. 2.

During January 1964, an overall survey of the archeological resources of Everglades National Park was begun under the direction of John W. Griffin, SERO. The Lostman's River area on the south to the north boundary of the park in Collier County was covered. Twenty-one sites were visited. Three sites were tested: Walter Hamilton Place, Hamilton Garden Patch, and Onion Key.

In 1965, another archeological survey, calling for "archeological base mapping" of known sites in Everglades National Park, was initiated through a contract between the park and Florida Atlantic University. Primarily a literature search, only some minor site visits were made. This project was carried out under the direction of William H. Sears. It resulted in the location of seven previously unknown (unrecorded) sites and in the recording of locations for seventy-four other sites within the park. An archeological base map (with photo mosaics and overlays) and a report for the survey was also compiled (Sears 1965, 1966).

During the 1973 fiscal year, the relocation and determination of the nature of the submerged remains of the Seminole War period Fort Poinsett on Cape Sable were undertaken. Acquisition and analysis of multispectral imagery and color aerial photography were employed in the study. The location of the fort's remains was compared to the present shoreline, earlier aerial photographs, and historic and modern maps to determine rates and forms of beach and shoreline erosion or recession in the site areas. This research project was conducted for NPS by the Florida Resources and Environmental Analysis Center, Florida State University.

The 1982-1984 survey of Everglades National Park was carried out by SEAC. Results have been presented in three volumes (Ehrenhard et al. 1982; Taylor 1984, 1985a, b). The first phase of the survey began with a review of all previous Florida Master Site File records. Eighty-seven of the 168 site records were confirmed and described within the park. Thirty-five other sites are believed to exist in the park, but could not be relocated due to insufficient information. In all, the survey added 104 new

sites. Since that time another ninety-two sites have been added bringing the total sites to 196.

#### *FORT MATANZAS NATIONAL MONUMENT (FOMA)*

In 1966, Stephen Gluckman of St. Johns River Junior College conducted the first systematic survey at Castillo de San Marcos National Monument. The survey method consisted of visual inspections of the ground surface while walking parallel transects. Five sites were located ranging in time from Orange period to Modern.

In 1975, Kathleen Deagan, under contract by the Park Service, did extensive survey and testing on Rattlesnake and Anastasia Islands. The goal was to survey, locate, and test archeological resources within the monument. An attempt was made to survey all of the land that had been dry in 1765. The testing consisted of foot survey, soil auger testing, and trenching. Evidence of prehistoric and historic occupations was located.

#### *GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK (GRSM)*

Between 1936 and 1941, George A. McPherson located and recorded sites in the Great Smoky Mountains National Park region. This resulted in the recording of 132 loci and eighty-six prehistoric sites.

In 1975, Quentin R. Bass (Bass et al. 1976) of the University of Tennessee began a multi-year survey of the park. Forty-three new sites were recorded and forty-one recorded sites were revisited.

#### *GULF ISLANDS NATIONAL SEASHORE (GUIS)*

In 1973, Louis D. Tesar conducted an intensive archeological survey of the newly acquired lands making up the Gulf Islands National Seashore. Tesar, with Florida State University's Anthropology Department, conducted the survey for the NPS under contract number CX5000-3-1438. The results of the survey are reported in

three volumes. The first volume contains the activities within Santa Rosa Island, Perdido Key, and the Naval Live Oaks portions of the seashore, all within Florida. The second volume deals with the work conducted in the Mississippi portions of the park. These include Davis Bayou and East and West Ship Islands along with Fort Massachusetts. The third volume deals with the park holdings at Fort Barrancas in the Naval Air Station area. All three volumes contained well-documented descriptions of the archeological activities as well as in-depth historical research pertaining to each of the three areas (Tesar 1973a).

Along with the discovery and reporting of cultural resources on land, Tesar also reported on a number of submerged, semisubmerged, and coastal archeological sites, many of which were being both directly and indirectly impacted by erosion. Within the Florida sections of the park, eight shipwreck sites were located and recorded. These sites were found on land in the intertidal zones and in the shallows of the gulf and bay (See Tesar 1973a, b, c, d, e) (SEAC Acc. 318).

Also in 1973, a preliminary underwater archeological survey of the offshore lands of the Santa Rosa and Perdido Key areas of the Gulf Islands National Seashore was carried out. Under the direction of George Fischer, SEAC, research activities were carried out during July and August of that year. The principal focus of the study "was to determine the extent and nature of submerged cultural remains in the waters surrounding Gulf Islands National Seashore" (Lenihan 1974:34). Given the limited time and funding of the activities, the scope of work concentrated on a preliminary survey of possible historic submerged resources.

The main mechanism for the recovery of data centered upon the use of a Varian Model 4937A Marine Proton Precession Magnetometer, operated by Martin Meylach of Meylach Magnetic Search Systems. Transect lanes were established on a visual system and courses ran along a thin strip off and around the western end of Santa Rosa Island and the eastern portion of Perdido Key. Control for the transect lanes was maintained by the establishment of a series

of lines at 70-foot intervals from the beach to the offshore bar (Lenihan 1974:35). Dive crews were assigned to investigate the areas of magnetic anomaly occurrences to locate any extant structural remains and related material deposits, and to determine the degree of sedimentation and the state of site integrity and preservation.

The results of the survey found "the area to be quite rich in cultural material, primarily shipwrecks, although a small number of bricks were also found at one location which was felt by the archeologist to be the site of the mid-nineteenth century Fort McRee" (Lenihan 1974:36-37). A total of eighteen apparent wreck sites were located, although, in most cases, the materials inducing the magnetic anomalies "were covered by sand to such an extent that it was not possible to get at the materials without extensive excavation" (Fischer 1974:3-4).

A. Wayne Prokopetz, working under the direction of Hale Smith of Florida State University, conducted an archeological survey of the east end of Perdido Key. The work was done under contract number CX5000-4-1676 from July to August 1974. Due to the changing nature of the barrier beach, it was assumed that many sites would have either been destroyed or buried. Prokopetz found only one aboriginal site, the Redfish Point Site (8ES112). The site was represented only by a surface scatter of sherds. It covered approximately four acres, with no subsurface component. From the types of ceramics recovered, Prokopetz determined it was a Fort Walton period site. A World War I gun site (8ES113) was also located west of the presumed site of Fort McRee. No evidence of the fort could be located, although Prokopetz mentioned that there had been several (unsubstantiated) reports of local divers finding materials that may be related to the fort in the channel of Pensacola Bay (Prokopetz 1974).

In August 1979, Florida State University's Scientific Diving Techniques class conducted two simultaneous projects within the boundaries of Gulf Islands National Seashore. Both of the projects were done by students under the supervision of Gregg Stanton of the FSU Academic Diving Program and George Fischer of the

NPS. The first project was directed by Ed Deren. This involved a magnetometer survey of the eastern tip of Perdido Key for the relocation of four magnetic anomaly occurrences discovered during Fischer's 1973 survey. Another objective was to try to verify magnetometer-found anomalies with data from hand-held metal detecting equipment and visual inspection by divers. A third objective was "to tie in possible sites to a surface map with surveying equipment" (Deren 1979:3). The survey methodology involved the use of a magnetometer supplied by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, towed behind a 17-foot AquaSport. Since no excavation was authorized, no subsurface work was done, and all activities consisted of visual and metal detection verification. The results of the study produced the location of one anchor at the site of one of the 1973 anomalies and the location of two anomalies on the south side of Perdido Key at points where two recorded wreck sites are currently charted.

In 1992, a SEAC crew, operating under the National Archeological Survey Initiative, surveyed twenty areas in the Fort Pickens unit (Wright 1993). Shovel tests, metal detectors, and GPR were used. During this survey three sites were located. None were considered eligible for nomination to the National Register.

#### *MAMMOTH CAVE NATIONAL PARK (MACA)*

Following the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act in 1966, the National Environmental Policy Act in 1969, and Executive Order No. 11593 in 1971, NPS began implementing governmental law and policy regarding cultural resources within the parks. By 1973, NPS had established procedures for the inventory and evaluation of these cultural resources.

At about the same time that the NPS was first coming to grips with the management of its cultural resources, two surveys of archeological sites in the Mammoth Cave area were initiated. The first was known as the Hominy Hole survey conducted by Vernon White, a folklorist-sociologist on the faculty at Western Kentucky University. The second, the Green River Surface

survey, was conducted by Kenneth Carstens, a graduate student of Patty Jo Watson.

The Hominy Hole survey was begun in 1970 and completed in 1977 (White 1980:1). Survey work within the park was conducted under the auspices of Antiquities Act Permit No. 72-KY-014, which was issued on April 20, 1972 to Clifton D. Bryant, Chairman of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Western Kentucky University (WKU), to be used by Jack M. Schock (archeologist at WKU) and Vernon White. The primary purpose of the survey was to investigate the archeological distribution of grinding holes (sometimes referred to as hominy holes) often found at the larger sandstone rockshelters located in the Western Coal Field area. White investigated a total of 223 sites (White 1980:3), seven of which are located within the boundaries of Mammoth Cave National Park.

In April 1974 two of Schock's students, Frank Hoover and Mike Wells, also conducted a pedestrian survey along the Green River between Big Hollow and a point approximately one-half mile north of Dennison Ferry under the aegis of Permit 72-KY-014 (Hoover and Wells 1978). Hoover and Wells did not locate any artifactual materials indicative of a prehistoric site, but they did identify the presence of twenty-two piles of stones on the northern rim of a mesa-like hill directly northeast of Dennison Ferry. Hoover and Wells suggested that these may be burial locations, but their placement around the perimeter of the hill suggests, instead, that they may be the result of historic field stone clearing activities. The "site" was given state site number 15Ht300 by WKU.

In January 1974, Watson and Carstens initiated the Green River Surface Survey to locate and study the prehistoric sites of the Mammoth Cave/Upper Green River area (Carstens 1980:22; Watson and Carstens 1975:2). During the course of their investigations, conducted intermittently over the next eight years and often in response to park needs to assess impacts to archeological sites, Watson and Carstens visited and recorded the locations of sixty-seven cultural sites within the park bound-



aries (excluding Mammoth Cave) (Carstens 1974, 1980; Carstens and Jennings 1977; Watson and Carstens 1975, 1982). Forty-eight of these sites were rockshelters, two were caves, two were quarries, and fifteen were open sites (two bottomland, thirteen upland) (Carstens 1974, 1980; Watson and Carstens 1975, 1982).

During November and December 1980, Christine Beditz was enlisted to survey the rockshelter areas around the Childress Farm tract. During her survey, Beditz recorded the locations of 134 overhangs of which twenty-eight are listed on the CSI as archeological sites. Nine of these rockshelters had been previously reported by Beditz (1979), Carstens (1975), and Poe (1979). Of the 28 sites included in Beditz's 1981 report, twenty produced cultural materials and eight produced faunal materials, which Beditz interpreted as being of cultural origin.

As we have seen, due to park management objectives, most of the archeological studies sponsored by NPS prior to 1987 focused on surveying the areas of the park containing the highly visible and vulnerable rockshelters and caves. The NPS later came to recognize that their focus on the rockshelters and caves had given archeologists an invaluable glimpse into certain aspects of prehistoric life, but had left the archeological community with a large information gap in respect to the open air sites that were known to exist in the area.

To rectify this bias, the NPS initiated the Mammoth Cave National Park Archeological Inventory Project (MCNPAIP) in order to develop a more complete inventory of the types and the conditions of the prehistoric cultural resources in the park and to gain a better understanding of the factors that have affected the selection, use, and abandonment of these sites. The project was directed by Guy Prentice, an archeologist with SEAC. The NPS also simultaneously funded a survey of the standing historical structures located within the park. This historical structures survey was conducted by Kelly Lally in cooperation with the Kentucky SHPO. The National Register of Historic Places, Washington, is now cooperating with the

SHPO in the evaluation of these historical resources. The MCNPAIP survey has provided site information and GIS data to the National Register of Historic Places to assist in their evaluations (Prentice 1993b). In addition to these two recent surveys, members of the Cave Research Foundation, principally Phil DiBlasi, have studied and continue to study the locations of rockshelters and caves in Mammoth Cave National Park.

In June 1987, Guy Prentice initiated the first of three planned field seasons under the auspices of the MCNPAIP (Prentice 1988). The second field season was begun in late February 1988 and completed in early June of the same year. The third field season began November 1988 and ended March 31, 1989.

During the 1987 season, the MCNPAIP crew identified thirty new sites (including isolated artifacts) and visited four sites previously identified by the fieldwork of Nelson, Schwartz, and Carstens (Prentice 1988). All the sites except one, Sunday Hike Rockshelter (MACA-90), were open air sites located in the uplands and bottomlands. Test excavations were conducted at two of the upland sites, Holton Ridge (MACA-121) and Dennison Ridge (MACA-133). Four units encompassing sixteen square meters were excavated at MACA-121; three units encompassing six square meters were excavated at MACA-133. No subsurface features were found at either of these historically plowed sites.

In the spring of 1988, the MCNPAIP crew returned to Mammoth Cave. During this second field season, they recorded fifty-nine new sites and visited thirty-one previously known sites. The majority of these were rockshelters and were investigated during the bluffline survey portion of the project. Some shovel tests were conducted, however, at a number of upland and floodplain sites to determine site boundary limits and as part of the random shovel testing procedure initiated in the first field season. Two test excavations encompassing eight square meters were conducted at one upland site, Turnhole Ridge No. 2 (MACA-135). No subsurface features were found at the site.



In the fall of 1988, the third MCNPAIP field season was initiated. It culminated in the spring of 1989. During this phase, the emphasis was on conducting test excavations at ten prehistoric sites in the park. Another major focus was to conduct shovel test surveys in the northeastern and southwestern portions of the park. Based on the artifactual materials recovered in thirteen of the 274 shovel tests excavated during this season, four sites were identified. A small portion of the third season was also spent conducting pedestrian surveys in three bluffline areas. As a result, six new rockshelter sites and one historic residential site were recorded.

During the entire three seasons of the MCNPAIP, a total of 1,594 shovel tests were excavated at 25-meter intervals in twenty-eight randomly selected shovel test blocks encompassing 78.04 hectares in the uplands (ridges and valleys) and 30.30 hectares in the bottomlands. A total of twenty-eight sites and six isolated finds were identified within the twenty-eight shovel test blocks. The MCNPAIP pedestrian surveys of randomly selected units along the blufflines encompassed 1,359 hectares, or 16 percent of the total 8,665 hectares of bluffline area in the park, and resulted in the recording of 418 overhang locations within the survey areas. Forty-four of these overhangs produced prehistoric cultural materials and were classified as prehistoric rockshelter sites. Two overhangs were classified as historic rockshelter sites. Seven rockshelters had both prehistoric and historic components.

Combined with the previous survey work of Watson and Carstens (3,522.34 ha.) and Beditz and Poe (1,168.74 ha.), 4,951.79 hectares of the park have been surveyed by pedestrian survey and shovel/posthole testing. Although 4,951.79 hectares of survey area represents a significant portion (24 percent) of the 20,567.25 hectares of land in the park, large portions of the park (76 percent) remain unexamined, especially the Dry Prong drainage area and that portion of the park located within Hart County north of the Green River. It should also be noted that, during the MCNPAIP, twenty-four

new sites (twenty rockshelters, one chert quarry, and three open air sites) were discovered in areas of the park that had been previously surveyed. It is likely that additional unidentified sites exist within surveyed areas.

#### *NATCHEZ TRACE PARKWAY (NATR)*

One of the first surveys in what was to become park land was conducted by Jesse Jennings in 1940 (1946). Large tracts of land were surveyed along the proposed Natchez Trace Parkway route in Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee.

SEAC, in cooperation with the Federal Highways Administration, has conducted archeological surveys near Jackson and Natchez, Mississippi (Atkinson 1992a, b). The methodology consisted of visual survey and shovel testing. Following the testing, fifty-three sites were tested for National Register significance.

#### *OBED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER (OBRI)*

In 1977, SEAC conducted a survey of thirteen proposed visitor access or use areas (Thomson 1979). Ten prehistoric sites were located.

#### *RUSSELL CAVE NATIONAL MONUMENT (RUCA)*

While many excavations have taken place at Russell Cave (Brown 1951; Miller 1956) and at the Cotton Patch Mound (Wilson 1963), the first systematic survey of the property was conducted by SEAC's NASI team in 1992 (Prentice 1994) and consisted of trenching and auger testing. This confirmed that there were multicomponent occupations outside the cave area.

#### *TIMUCUAN ECOLOGICAL AND HISTORIC PRESERVE (TIMU)*

Under a cooperative agreement with SEAC, the University of Florida surveyed the park (Russo 1993). Survey methods included walk-over, surface collecting, probing, shovel testing, and excavation units. Seventy-seven prehistoric and nineteen historic sites were recorded.

## THE REGIONAL CSI-A

The Cultural Sites Inventory (CSI) is one of the five servicewide cultural resource information repositories that serve as important references for planning and management. The CSI contains information on archeological and ethnographic resources. It describes and documents the location, significance, threats, and management requirements for archeological and ethnographic resources.

SEAC maintains the region's archeological CSI and provides pertinent copies to each SEFA park. In 1982, SEAC began to develop a computer database that captures much of the information required on the CSI form defined in the *NPS-28: Cultural Resource Management Guidelines* (NPS 1985). By 1985, all park units had received CSI-A forms for each of their park's archeological resources. They also received park CSI-A summary reports and copies of archeological resource base inventory maps, mostly on USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle maps.

The Database Section of SEAC is currently translating as much as possible of the 1985/1987 CSI-A data into the Archeological Sites Management Information System (ASMIS). Over 6,000 archeological resources have already been recorded in the regional CSI-A database.

The Database Section has also developed several regional, phased project statements that will eliminate the backlog for converting the regional CSI-A to the NPS ASMIS database. Some of the backlog may be converted during the preparation of AOAs while reviewing past project accessions for each park. In addition, SEAC is working with SEFA staff in providing CSI numbers associated with structures for the revision of the region's List of Classified Structures (LCS) inventory.

Currently, there are 6,584 archeological resources listed in SEAC's regional CSI-A database, including 4,545 sites, 1,113 buildings, 901 structures, and twenty-five areas. Temporally, these are broken down into 2,575 prehistoric resources, thirty-three protohistoric resources, and 4,303 historic resources. Included in these figures are 227 prehistoric structures, two




Figure 14 — Archeological resources in the Southeast by general period.

protohistoric structures, 687 historic structures, and 1,110 historic buildings (Figure 14).

Of the 6,584 archeological resources, fifty have been determined eligible, 194 are administratively listed, 1,144 are listed, 217 have been nominated, and five have been determined ineligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (Figures 15 and 16). Only thirty-seven archeological resources have been determined National Historic Landmarks, and only one archeological resource has been proposed as a World Heritage site.

There are 4,970 unevaluated archeological resources currently in the region. (Since resources can be listed on all three registers, the sum of the resources will total more than 6,584. These figures have not been updated according to the latest WASO guidelines, which will increase the number of unevaluated resources.)

## CSI FORMS

### Current Status

SEAC stores these forms by park unit. The first file for each park contains the most current copy available of the LCS and parkwide CSI summary reports. Individual files for each archeological resource listed in the database follow. Currently this file contains the 1985/1987 form and, if available, the 1992 regional CSI forms. The **Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area** and **Mammoth Cave Na-**




Figure 15 — National Register status of prehistoric sites in SEFA.




Figure 16— National Register status of historic sites in SEFA.

tional Park files also contain copies of state site forms and any archeological statements dealing with their resources.

#### *Project Needs*

- There is a need to collect information for each archeological resource from various sources and build individual resource files. Much of this information may be found in the SEAC project accession files.
- Only 2,519 resources have official state site numbers. Many archeological resources have never had state site forms completed; at least 4,043 sites are lacking this documentation.
- There is a backlog of over 6,000 archeological resources entered in the region's CSI-A that must be converted and updated to ASMIS standards. This is to be accomplished in three phases.
- SEAC has over 20,000 photographs and 20,800 color slides that relate to many of the archeological resources in the region. Copies of site photographs need to be obtained for the individual site files.

#### *NATIONAL REGISTER FORMS*

##### *Current Status*

SEAC currently has 120 National Register forms and one National Landmark form. Many of these forms are draft copies. Some forms have been revised by park staff. SEAC has a copy of the National Register database for NPS resources. However, this is not up-to-date. There are a few archeological resources in SEFA that are listed on the National Register but do not show up in this database because the forms were completed by other agencies before the resources were acquired by the NPS.

##### *Project Needs*

- SEAC needs to work with park staff, SEFA staff, and National Register staff to acquire additional information and copies of the revised, current National Register Nomination forms, National Historic Landmark forms, and World Heritage forms for the parks in the region.
- SEAC also needs to work with these parties to update the National Register database to include newly acquired National Register sites on the NPS list.

#### *CSI-A RESOURCE BASE INVENTORY MAPS*

##### *Current Status*

All parks have USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle base maps showing site locations. SEAC is currently processing USGS Digital Line Graph (DLG), Digital Elevation Model (DEM), and U.S. Department of Commerce TIGER Census data to produce the basic background needed for developing computer-generated archeological resource base inventory maps. This data can also be used for GIS theme development.

##### *Project Needs*

- SEAC staff must develop park baseline data from the DLG, DEM, and TIGER data files to be used as a backdrop for display of various cultural resources themes.
- SEAC needs to acquire accurate park boundaries and data delimiting park management zones.
- Data from the CSI-A and the LCS should be developed into a standard set of cultural resource management themes for the archeological base maps.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SURVEYS, STUDIES, RESEARCH, AND REMOTE SENSING DATA**

***Current Status***

SEAC maintains a library, which, in part, is comprised of park survey and research reports. Many of these documents have been entered into the Cultural Resources Bibliography (CRBIB). Recently, SEAC staff have entered the card catalog for the SEAC library into a ProCite® bibliography database.

SEAC has limited remote sensing data comprised of aerial photography and satellite imagery for the parks in the Southeast. The aerial photographs are currently filed in SEAC's archives by park. The satellite imagery is stored on tape and optical compact disc. Original data tapes are archived by the GIS Division, National Biological Survey, Denver. Other remote sensing data records, such as magnetometer tapes and resistivity data records, are also stored at SEAC by project accession. Aerial photographs are on file for:

BICY	EVER	MOCR
BISO	GUIS	RUCA
CHAT	MACA	TIMU
CUIS		

Satellite imagery is on file for BISO and MACA.

***Project Needs***

- SEAC should continue to provide data for updating the CRBIB database.
- SEAC needs to maintain the ProCite® bibliography database as new reports are written and use it in producing park Archeological Overviews and Assessments. Also, park files should be reviewed to recover and put on file uncataloged trip reports.
- Coastal parks in SEFA have been flown over, under contract, by NASA's U-2 plane.

Color-enhanced infrared photographs and Thematic Mapper data have also been taken. SEAC needs to acquire copies of these data.

- SEAC needs to acquire National High Altitude Aerial Photography (NHAP) for park units not flown over by NASA.
- SEAC needs to acquire the early air photographs for each park unit. Some of these photos are in the National Archives, others are on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Salt Lake City, Utah.

**ARCHEOLOGICAL INVENTORIES OF PARK-CONDUCTED STUDIES**

***Current Status***

Records from all archeological projects conducted in SEFA parks are archived at SEAC. Projects are given a SEAC accession number. Currently, these accessions are being cross-referenced to park accession numbers. They are also being inventoried, and recorded in a ProCite® database and cataloged into the Automated National Catalog System (ANCS) under *History*.

***Project Needs***

- There is a need to continue to process the archeological project records and catalog them into ANCS.
- Project data should be synthesized for use in park AOAs.

**MAPS KEYED TO SHOW THE LEVEL OF SURVEY COVERAGE WITHIN EACH PARK INCLUDING UNSURVEYED AREAS**

***Current Status***

Currently, only two parks have maps showing survey coverage. These are MACA and BISO.



The remaining parks have yet to have survey coverage maps developed. Much information remains in SEAC's accession records for projects conducted at the parks.

#### *Project Needs*

- Past AOAs have not included survey coverage maps. As new overview and assessments are programmed, survey coverage maps should be generated. These maps will also be produced as part of any archeological resources base map or GIS theme development for a park.

### STATUS OF REGIONAL ARCHEOLOGICAL COLLECTIONS

SEAC is the central repository for archeological collections from Southeast Field Area parks. As a repository, SEAC provides day-to-day management of archeological collections located at SEAC, assistance with the management of park archeological collections that are not located at SEAC, and technical guidance on all archeological collection matters regionwide, including cataloging, conservation, and storage.

#### *COLLECTION CATALOGING*

Archeological collections, including artifacts, specimens, and related project archival documents, are cataloged into the Automated National Cataloging System (ANCS). This is the servicewide system adopted for cataloging all NPS museum collections, including those pertaining to history, geology, paleontology, biology, ethnography, and archeology. It is linked to other servicewide databases, such as the LCS and CSI-A, through specific ANCS data fields that capture LCS or CSI-A numbers assigned to the resources recorded by these databases.

The ANCS includes data necessary for basic collection accountability purposes, such as catalog and accession numbers, location, type of material, condition, number of items, and object name. Data useful for archeological and inter-

pretive purposes, such as object data, site name/number, within-site provenience, cultural affiliation, and additional descriptive information, are also captured. Since the ANCS does not provide data standards for much of the descriptive information needed by archeological researchers, SEAC has developed and implemented regionwide archeological collection data standards. SEAC's *Cataloging Manual for Archeological Collections* (1992) provides a standard system for capturing both analytical and collection management data. The SEAC-developed Southeast Archeological Catalog System (SACS) program is then used to manipulate data and convert them to the ANCS.

Archeological collections comprise the single largest component of the service's museum collections. In SEFA, approximately 75 percent (about 5,600,000 objects) of the total regional museum collection is classified as archeological. Additionally, about 25 percent (some 250,000 items) of the region's archival collection is directly related to archeological field projects and analysis of collections. All collections are accessioned by SEAC. However, over 300,000 artifacts and documents are located at eighteen non-NPS repositories in the Midwest and East.

Southeastern NPS archeological collections include materials that represent Paleoindian through modern historic periods. A wide array of cultural affiliations are also present, from early historic Spanish, French, Danish, and British, and American Indian, to twentieth-century modern American material.

#### *Archeological Catalog Records*

SEAC maintains the ANCS and SACS databases for park archeological collections. ANCS data and printed catalog records (Form 10-254) are distributed to parks, who in turn send a database and one printed ANCS catalog record for each item to the NPS National Catalog.

#### *Project Needs*

- Approximately 700,000 of the region's archeological items are cataloged into the

ANCS. Of approximately 4,900,000 uncataloged objects, over 3,700,000 are included in the regional and servicewide backlog cataloging initiative, presently scheduled to be completed by the year 2011. Over 80 percent of this material resulted from 1930s WPA projects. It should be noted that the backlog cataloging initiative was a direct result of a 1985 Office of the Inspector General's audit, which declared the service's museum collection management program as a material weakness. Cataloging the remainder of the region's uncataloged archeological material is in-progress and covered by the 1987 NPS special directive, *Conservation of Archeological Resources*. This special directive required "that the initial costs to catalog, stabilize, and store collections are [to be] included in the costs of the project that generates the collections."

- Because many artifacts and specimens are not yet cataloged into the ANCS or the SACS, much collection or object information is not readily accessible for research, management, or educational purposes. Thus SEAC is presently processing and cataloging both backlogged and recent collections. This work can be planned to support or furnish data for SAIP/RASP projects whenever possible. However, limited resources and other mandates, such as the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), may have priority.
- Archival collection cataloging is a high priority, and much of the material has been arranged and described. Documents generated by projects that may have NAGPRA or current research relationships are emphasized. However, little systematic work has been completed for maps and photographic images. While these are accessible at the accession or project level, at present many of the maps and photographs are not readily accessible at the image or object level. This work can also be coordinated with SAIP/RASP projects whenever possible.



Figure 17 — Eighteenth-century Spanish wooden figurine found on the beach at Biscayne National Park.

#### *COLLECTION CONSERVATION AND STORAGE*

Artifacts and specimens stored at SEAC are being arranged by project (i.e., accession number), type of artifact, and then by type of storage system. Bulk material is bagged, then placed on shelving units. More fragile or diagnostic materials (for example, Figure 17) are routinely placed in standard closed museum specimen cabinets.

Storage deficiencies have been systematically identified and documented through a Special Directive 80-1 checklist, most recently completed in 1992. Needs identified on this checklist have been incorporated into the regional plan for the Museum Collection Preser-

vation and Program initiative. This program initiative, like backlog cataloging, stems from the Office of the Inspector General's 1985 audit report.

Most of the archeological objects in the collection are fragments of larger objects. Many are relatively stable, given the nature of the materials comprising them (stone, ceramic) and the environment from which they were recovered. Other objects or material types are unstable. They may be fraught with inherent vice (either ferrous or certain synthetic material), or the post-recovery conditions to which they were subjected may have encouraged deterioration. Others are unstable due to the environment from which they were recovered—submerged shipwrecks, for example. Stable objects are subject to further damage through poor handling or improper storage methods and conditions.

**Project Needs**

- Plans are also underway to relocate to SEAC many of the archeological collections presently at non-NPS repositories. This effort may be coordinated with SAIP/RASP projects, depending on the existence of more pressing priorities. Upgraded storage methods and materials, along with improved organization, will facilitate access, reducing possible damage to nearby objects. Similarly, improved storage of maps and photographs will facilitate access to these objects.
- The archeological collection has not undergone a systematic conservation needs assessment. Unstable objects have been encountered during cataloging and collection reorganization activities. While this ad hoc approach has resulted in treatment and preservation of some objects, a comprehensive conservation survey is needed, as was identified on the Special Directive 80-1 checklist regional plan mentioned.

**SOLICITED COMMENTS**

In preparing this plan, comments were solicited from the parks, SHPOs, scholars, federal agencies, and federally recognized Indian tribes. Their responses pertained to gaps or weaknesses in the scientific knowledge about prehistory and history; research problems or questions; or topics in need of further archeological study. Contact and response levels are shown in Table 8. State-specific comments are provided in the following sections. Various park planning documents, archeological reports and collections, and databases were also reviewed and evaluated.

This information was used to identify park-specific archeological needs and formed the basis for developing projects designed to conduct systematic, scientific research to locate, evaluate, and document archeological resources on NPS lands in SEFA. This is further discussed in Chapters 5, 6, and 7. Park-specific projects are presented in Chapter 7 (Tables 10, 11, and 12). In general, archeological needs will be identified in the AOA prepared for each park prior to undertaking fieldwork. Field studies will address identifying and evaluating both historic and prehistoric resources. Park-specific recommendations provided by reviewers will be incorporated into research designs prepared for individual archeological projects.

Table 8 — Response to requests for comments regarding this plan.

	Contacted	Responded	%
Federal agencies	18	3	16
Tribal governments	9	1	11
Park units	64	59	92
Scholars	36	19	52
SHPOs	9	3	33
TOTALS	136	85	62

## **FLORIDA**

Cooperative survey level efforts in several of the National Park units [in Florida] might contribute to correct deficiencies in the archeological inventory. The first is to assess the present condition and determine the boundaries of recorded coastal sites so that the effects of erosion due to hurricanes and other storms can be assessed and priorities established for salvage projects if and when such efforts become necessary or desirable. In addition, storms, such as the two we have experienced during the past months, may have exposed new features at recorded sites or evidence of previously unknown sites in coastal National Park units, which could be added to the inventory. (Jaquelyn Piper, personal communication 1993)

## **GEORGIA**

Generally all sites [should] be critically mapped and all existing archeological information be placed on these maps as a basis for identifying other needs and priorities. In addition, full bibliographies and other kinds of resource inventories (e.g., photo and map) should exist for each site. With this kind of information it should be possible to initiate most archeological site planning, both management and development.

A broader spectrum of prehistoric sites [should] be acquired for the public. Within the state, NPS manages a Mississippi period site (Ocmulgee) while the Georgia Department of Natural Resources manages three other prehistoric sites (Etowah [Mississippian], Kolomoki [Late Middle Woodland, but also a pyramidal mound site], and Fort Mountain [Woodland]). It would be desirable to interpret an Archaic site and a Middle Woodland site. Because these sites do not regularly have obvious features, such as mounds or other structural elements, techniques for interpreting with open excavations need to be developed. (Lewis Larson, personal communication 1993)

## **MISSISSIPPI**

All of the National Park units in the state should be assessed for site stability (Robert Thorne, personal communication 1993).

Beginning with the removal process in 1837, the Chickasaw Nation has expressed its concerns with the remains of those the tribe left behind. In fact, before leaving their homelands of Mississippi, the Chickasaw Nation set aside certain parcels of land dedicated to the gravesites of tribal ancestors. As part of the removal agreement, those parcels of land were to be maintained as gravesites, in perpetuity, to assure adequate protection, respect, and dignity for those graves. In the time since the removal of the tribe, many of those gravesites have been lost through erosion, expansion and development, and fading memories.

Since the early 1980s, when the Mississippi state government afforded some means of protection to Indian burial sites, the state government has become active in the preservation of as many of those sites as possible. Given the distance between the tribe's new and old homelands, it is only in the last few years that the tribe itself has been able to become effective. Tribal Law 5-003, adopted by the Chickasaw Tribal Legislature on July 15, 1988, grants authority to the governor of the Chickasaw Nation for the preservation of gravesites and related archeological finds. This tribal law, one of the first of its kind in the United States, calls for specific measures and provides for some general ones as well.

This law is very specific in its definition of "remains" and "artifacts," and makes provisions for the governor to recover and/or protect all remains, artifacts, and other items of Chickasaw Indians that have been removed from original sites of burials, rituals, or domesticity. The law grants the governor with all powers of enforcement of the law and further instructs him to utilize "all legal and just means inherent in the sovereign powers of the Chickasaw Nation" in affording protection to those remains, sites, and artifacts.



The governor is required by the law to recover any and all items and to promptly arrange for the appropriate interment of the remains and disposition of artifacts, to be consistent with the accepted Chickasaw tribal traditions, customs, and religion. While broad in scope, the law has only been applied on those few and rare occasions when discoveries of such sites have been brought to the tribe's attention. Although the time since the adoption of the law has been very short, it is expected that discoveries of Chickasaw sites will dramatically increase in the years ahead as north-eastern Mississippi continues to prosper and develop.

Desires on the part of the Chickasaw Nation are simple, yet broad and effective in scope. Any time human remains are discovered, which are logically and believably of Chickasaw origin, the tribe holds fast to its belief that those remains, including any and all funeral items found, be completely reinterred in a manner suitable to comply with the manner in which they were originally buried. Any other artifacts found or discovered should be returned to the tribe for proper handling. Certain allowances can be made for the return of those artifacts and may be negotiated in each instance on a case-by-case basis.

In all instances of discoveries of archeological significance, it is the strong desire of the tribe to be notified before any major disturbance of the site is achieved. In compliance with various state laws and with certain pending federal legislation, it is in the tribe's lawful right to intervene in any situation in which the tribe has not been properly and adequately notified. The Chickasaw Nation hopes to be afforded time for consultation in each instance of discovery and welcomes the opportunity to negotiate with all involved.

While the Chickasaw Nation does have strong feelings about any sort of disturbance done to a gravesite, it nevertheless understands the importance of archeological and historical study. It is therefore the desire of the tribe to afford sufficient cooperation with reliable and competent organizations for certain forms of

study to be performed at sites of significant findings.

The tribe will not allow the examinations of human remains that involve any but noninvasive research techniques. Further stipulations require that no human remains or funeral items be placed on display for other than research reasons, and that all items used for research be completely and reverently reinterred in as complete and accurate a manner as possible. (Anoatubby, personal communication 1989)

#### *SOUTH CAROLINA*

Steve Smith suggests that since five of your seven parks are military, maybe you could consider a coordinated theme to integrate them into a more regional history or military feeling (Bruce Rippeteau, personal communication 1993).

#### *TENNESSEE*

Given the current rudimentary level of knowledge of the prehistory of West Tennessee, survey findings in almost any portion of this area could yield information of significance (David Wolfe, personal communication 1993).

#### *VIRGINIA*

##### *Augusta County*

Accretional burial mounds occur here (the Lewis Creek Mound Culture), with three examples east of the Blue Ridge. Are others to be found in the stream valleys draining the Parkway? Surveys [are] needed.

Exact places where Governor Spottswode and his "Knights of the Golden Horseshoe" crossed the Blue Ridge and camped are unknown. To pinpoint these places would be worthy goals for NPS in the Park.

Joint efforts with the U.S. Forest Service should seek evidence of the earliest Euro-American settlements in and on the Blue Ridge to include community facilities, such as mills, churches, and taverns.



Crozet's railroad tunnel connecting Augusta and Albemarle Counties was a major engineering feat for its day. Evidence of the workers' habitations, shops, and roadways should exist archeologically, and these should be found and marked.

#### *Rockbridge County*

In the James River Valley, the Blue Ridge seems to divide major Indian cultures—Monacans to the east in the Piedmont, and unknown Indians in the Great Valley and headwaters areas. Did these Indians interact in the Blue Ridge area? If so, how?

During the late eighteenth and much of the nineteenth centuries, iron smelting was "big business" in the areas of Buena Vista and Glasgow and south into Botetourt County. What role did the Blue Ridge play? [What was the] source of workers and their homes?

In the area of Glasgow and Balcony Falls, considerable work was done on the James River-Kanawha Canal in the early nineteenth century. There should be much evidence of stone quarrying, workers' habitations, and related facilities in the Blue Ridge Parkway area. These should be found and marked, perhaps with interpretive signs. Dr. William Trout in Richmond may already have these pinpointed and recorded.

#### *Bedford County*

In the upland valley at the Peaks of Otter, evidences of repeated camping episodes by Indians were found in past construction and in limited (1964) archeological work by John Griffin. Additional work is needed there, as well as in other upland valleys to seek similar hunting-foraging-camping areas and sites.

#### *Botetourt County*

Iron-working and canal-building activities during the nineteenth century surely produced many archeological sites in and adjoining the

Blue Ridge, and these should be found, identified, and marked.

#### *Roanoke County*

Railroading in the Roanoke area has been a major economic effort since the Civil War. The crossing of the Blue Ridge by the east-west railroads near the Parkway should be developed as a theme by NPS, with archeological evidence sought along the ROW for habitations and shops, for instance.

During the Late Woodland times, the Dan River Culture expanded north into the upper James River and westward into the New River areas. It is likely that the expansion took place in the Roanoke area, with the access to the James River by way of Tinker and Looney Creek Valleys. Evidence for group or small-party movements should be sought in camps along the upper Staunton (Roanoke) River Valley near the Blue Ridge.

#### *Floyd County*

The valley of Little River and its head streams are unknown archeologically. Needed is information on Indian cultures found in the valleys draining the western slopes of the Blue Ridge.

#### *Franklin County*

The valleys of the Blackwater River drain the eastern slopes of the Blue Ridge, but are almost unknown archeologically. Needed is information on Indian cultures in those valleys.

Alan Briceland in 1987 suggests that a major crossing of the Blue Ridge in the seventeenth century was through Adney Gap, now only a minor crossing point. It is possible that the crossing was still in use by Indians in the French and Indian War period, accounting for "Captain Terry's Fort on the Blackwater" near present-day Callaway. If Adney Gap was much-used, it should have evidence which could be found today. The proof of such use is needed.

*Carroll County (and Patrick County on the east)*

The Late Woodland Dan River Culture has a long history east of the Blue Ridge, with a shorter one in the New River drainage. Possible expansion routes for the culture from east to west could well have been the valleys of Mayo River and the upper Dan River. Archeology in the area is poorly known, and considerable research into sites there is sorely needed. In particular, intense surveys are needed in and near Fancy Gap and in the adjoining valleys. (Howard MacCord, personal communication 1993)

GENERAL COMMENTS

Other suggested archeological research topics are as follows:

- a history of Native American tribes in SEFA and a compilation of items of cultural patrimony associated with those tribes;
- early land use in the Southeast; and
- the archeological potential on Air Force land, and an inventory of curation facilities meeting the 36 CFR Part 79 standards. (Gary Vest, personal communication 1993)

• • •

---

## Chapter 4

### THEMATIC FRAMEWORK AND SIGNIFICANCE

---

#### THEMATIC FRAMEWORK AS A RESEARCH TOOL FOR EVALUATION

The SAIP/RASP team at SEAC will use the thematic framework set forth in *History and Prehistory in the National Park System and the National Historic Landmarks Program* (NPS 1987) in determining primary research topics. Projects will be generally divided on the basis of the thirty-four first-level themes. Subthemes and facets of the framework can be used as more refined research topics; however, they will be organized by their first-level heading. The use of this framework will allow researchers to cover all areas of United States history and prehistory using guidelines outlined in the *National Register Bulletin 16A: Guidelines for Completing National Register of Historic Places Forms, How to Complete the National Register Registration Form* (NPS 1991a:51). It will also allow researchers to assess the significance of the resources by historic contexts at the local, park, state, regional, national, and international level, since

*decisions concerning the significance, historic integrity, documentation, and treatment of properties can be made reliably only when the resource is evaluated within its historic context. The historic context serves as the framework within which the National Register Criteria are applied to specific properties or property types.* (NPS 1991b:1)

The first level themes to be used are:

1. Cultural Developments: Indigenous American Populations
2. European Colonial Exploration and Settlement
3. Development of the English Colonies, 1688–1763

4. The American Revolution
5. Political and Military Affairs, 1783–1860
6. The Civil War
7. Political and Military Affairs, 1865–1939
8. World War II
9. Political and Military Affairs after 1945
10. Westward Expansion of the British Colonies and the United States, 1763–1898
11. Agriculture
12. Business
13. Science
14. Transportation
15. Communication
16. Architecture
17. Landscape Architecture
18. Technology (Engineering and Invention)
19. Literature
20. Theater
21. Motion Pictures
22. Music
23. Dance
24. Painting and Sculpture
25. Prints and Photography
26. Decorative and Folk Art
27. Education
28. The Law
29. Intellectual Currents
30. American Ways of Life
31. Social and Humanitarian Movements
32. Conservation of Natural Resources
33. Historic Preservation
34. Recreation

#### ASSESSMENT OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE

A recommended determination of significance will be made for each site recorded during inventory surveys and for each known but un-evaluated site chosen for testing in compliance with federal requirements and Executive Order

11593. The method for determining significance will be based on Guidelines for Evaluating and Stating Significance as outlined in the *National Register Bulletin 16A* (NPS 1991a:47) and the *National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* (NPS 1991b), where a series of factoring questions are considered in determining how to apply the following criteria:

- A) Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- B) Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- C) Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.
- D) Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

#### SEAC-IDENTIFIED RESEARCH TOPICS

The following research topics have been identified by SEAC's Regionwide Archeological Survey Program team to guide research design formulation. These topics will also be used as part of the framework to consider the National Register criteria listed above. When each site is visited, it will be evaluated in terms of its potential to provide information relating to these and other research questions. The list provided herein is not designed to be all inclusive, but should outline minimum requirements for assessing archeological and anthropological significance. In light of these considerations and after consultation with the regional archeologist, National Register nomination forms will be prepared for sites recommended for eligibility.

#### *Acculturation*

The initialization, process, and effects of inter-cultural contact, such as European exploration, intertribal diffusion, and assimilation.

#### *Conflict*

Evidence of organized human conflict, such as forts, warships, earthworks, large weapon and caches.

#### *Cultural Affiliation*

The presence of diagnostic artifacts at each site will be assigned to a specific cultural group or groups. This evidence could include typed aboriginal ceramics, weapons, and building styles.

#### *Environment*

What are or were the unique characteristics of the local or regional ecology that attracted those who occupied the site?

#### *Function*

Evidence indicating the site has a unique or special function to be interpreted in the region or park unit.

#### *Multicomponent*

Evidence of site occupation during two or more temporal/cultural periods.

#### *Origins of People*

Evidence of the previous origins of the people that occupied a site. Where did they come from?

#### *Site Type*

Evidence that the site is of a type not common in the region/park unit.

#### *Spatial*

Evidence that the site has a special configuration and/or is locationally significant, or that a group of sites reflects certain patterning.

#### *Subsistence*

Evidence for the collecting, growing, storage, processing, and/or transporting of special food resources.

***Technology***

Evidence of technological innovation or markers.

***Temporal***

Diagnostic artifacts or ecofacts are discovered that will allow this and other sites to be assigned to a specific temporal period.

***Threats***

Evidence that the site is being destroyed by

natural processes, looting, vandalism, or proposed construction, or where newly recognized processes are made evident.

***Trade Networks***

Evidence of trade activity, such as exotic artifacts, trading posts, merchant vessel cargoes, which may answer questions of place of manufacture and origin, contact, and economic processes.

• • •



---

## Chapter 5

### FIELD STRATEGIES

---

#### SCOPE OF PROJECTS

The goal of the Systemwide Archeological Inventory Program (SAIP) is to "conduct systematic, scientific research to locate, evaluate, and document archeological resources on National Park System lands" (Aubry et al. 1992:2). This section of the regionwide archeological survey plan establishes most of the strategies that will be used to locate, identify, evaluate, and document archeological resources in SEFA parks. Following a brief overview, each step will be described in detail.

The process for locating, evaluating, and documenting archeological sites will begin with the AOA. Specific project statements will then generate a research design describing a methodology that is acceptable to the regional archeologist and that complies with professional standards. This research design will also include a description of the appropriate curation of archeological objects and the timetable for completion of a technical report. The process ends when the site is recorded in the SEAC GIS Archeological Base Map System, the regional CSI-A, the ASMIS database, and the appropriate state site file; when artifacts have been analyzed, catalogued, conserved (when appropriate), and curated; and when documentation has been completed and curated. National Register forms will be initiated when appropriate, again based on recommendations by the regional archeologist.

In order to reach this goal, several strategies have been developed to approach the field investigations. The most basic of these is the use of logical groups. Park units will be divided into cultural and/or time periods, according to the establishing legislation and/or the presence of known resources (Civil War, Spanish period, Contact period, Prehistoric, etc). Survey methods will then be developed, depending on

both the resource type and environmental factors. Collecting data using a standard thematic framework will allow the data to be assimilated and viewed in a regional or national context. These cultural groups will then be extended to include resources in other regions, under other federal jurisdiction, and under state jurisdiction whenever possible.

Another strategy is to use the quadrat (or quadtree) system. Each park will be divided in 200-by-200-meter quadrats (9.88 or approximately ten acres) based on real-world Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) coordinates. The quadrat will serve as the basic survey unit used for SAIP/RASP investigations because it is ideal for converting field data into digital cartographic data and can be either split into smaller subunits (20-, 50-, or 100-meter squares) or aggrandized into larger one-kilometer-square units. The number of quadrats to be surveyed will be based on the size of the park unit. Survey quadrats will be selected, based on GIS interpretation for known and suspected site locations, to include areas deemed appropriate for prioritization through consultation with the regional archeologist and the SHPO, to be supplemented by random or stratified survey quadrats for unspecified areas. The superintendent may also request areas for survey based on park management needs (development, construction, interpretation, etc.).

Two general survey project statements were written for each park, one historic and one prehistoric. These were written separately to reflect the differing survey methodologies necessary. In addition, separate project statements for site testing (and evaluation) are proposed. While each of the above mentioned is designed as a stand-alone project, every attempt will be made to undertake projects concurrently to maximize resources.

**SURVEY METHODS AND COVERAGE**

**ARCHEOLOGICAL OVERVIEW AND ASSESSMENTS (AOA)**

Prior to any field investigations, an AOA will be compiled for each park. The outline for this document will follow the general recommendations given in *NPS-28: Cultural Resource Management Guidelines* (NPS 1985), as well as the guidelines presented in *The Management of Archeological Resources: The Airlie House Report* (McGimsey and Davis 1977). SEAC has included additional categories of information to reflect NPS regional and park RMP needs (Appendix 2). The AOA will provide a compendium of known site summaries for the park upon review of all known site files (including both state site files and the CSI-A). In preparing AOAs, previous investigations will be reviewed for areas already surveyed and for their levels of investigation. These will be assessed as to adequacy in light of presently required standards. A comprehensive bibliography of historic and archeological work will allow quick literature searches for subsequent individual survey and evaluation projects. Electronic base maps of previous archeological investigations, historic plats, cultural events (battle maps, town maps, etc.), vegetation, topography, and soils will also be created and reviewed for archeological information needs. Besides being a compilation of current archeological knowledge for a park unit, the AOA should create preliminary site location predictive models, which will then be tested in the field. Part of the AOA data-capture process will result in completion of state site file forms and will reduce the backlog in converting and updating the regional CSI-A to ASMIS through the first two phases for elimination of this backlog.

**NON-INVASIVE INVESTIGATIONS**

A separate and specific literature search should also precede field operations and be keyed to the specific environmental area and/or resources under investigation. This would entail a review of aerial photos, historic basemaps, GIS data, archeological reports, and earlier fieldnotes.

Since parks in SEFA range from one acre to over one million acres, in many cases a 100 percent survey of every park would be impractical, if not impossible. It was decided, therefore, that to meet anticipated survey goals, the percentage of area surveyed for a park would be based inversely on total acreage (Table 9). Therefore, as the amount of acreage increases, the percent of required survey decreases. For example, a 1 percent sample area of a 110,000-acre park would be surveyed, whereas a ten-acre area would undergo a 100 percent survey.

As stated before, 200-meter-square quadrats will be utilized for mapping, survey, and survey sampling. These will be based on the UTM grid system and tied in by GPS to a predetermined datum. Quadrat size can then be tied into metric units and directly plotted onto 7.5-minute USGS quad maps, using AutoCad®, Atlas GIS®, Surfer®, or many other electronic computer-assisted mapping programs.

Table 9 — Areas to be surveyed in SEFA parks (derived by multiplying park acreage by survey percentage).

Acreage	%	Min. Area	Max. Area	No. of Units
<1-50	100	1.00	27.15	12
51-100	75	55.79	64.89	4
101-500	50	58.14	237.86	13
501-2,500	25	134.17	510.00	8
2,501-10,000	10	288.44	926.47	8
10,001-100,000	3	420.00	2,578.64	13
>100,000	1	1,229.60	13,989.38	6




Figure 18 — A quadrat showing numbering sequence.

Although recognizing the limitations in some environments (blufflines for example), the use of a standard 200-by-200-meter survey quadrat (Figure 18) is proposed for the following reasons:

- It is divisible into 20-meter squares for remote sensing and shovel testing, and, where positive tests are encountered, sites would be further delineated by ten-meter tests between squares.
- It can be easily aggregated into 1,000-meter squares, or hectares, and congregated into larger inclusive areas.
- The size (200-meter-square) can generally be investigated by a two-person team in a

five, eight-hour-day week (for most SEFA parks), and these time/person figures can be quickly generated for budget formulation.

- It can be "recursively subdivided with the areas of both the same shape and orientation" (Taylor 1991:88).

#### REMOTE SENSING INVESTIGATIONS

Remote sensing techniques will be used extensively prior to any ground disturbance. These will include resistivity, magnetometry, metal-detecting, GPR, and electromagnetic conductivity, as well as any new applications that become available. Multiple technologies will be used concurrently when possible to test against each and combine synergistically the resultant data.

For example, GPR, metal detectors, resistivity, and conductivity may all be used on the same site (Bevan 1993). For submerged surveys, magnetometry, side-scan sonar, and sub-bottom profiling are considered standard and should be tied into the quadrat system for inclusion into any GIS.

Other semi-invasive investigations, besides surface reconnaissance and/or collection, might include soil analysis (both chemical and physical), probing, or selective core sampling.

#### *INVASIVE INVESTIGATIONS*

Invasive field investigative techniques include shovel tests (generally 50 centimeters square or diameter to one-meter deep, or to culturally sterile levels), hand-auguring or posthole-testing (generally from four to six inches in diameter to a depth of one-meter, or sterile), and power-takeoff auguring (which may be from 12 to 16 inches in diameter and several meters deep). Appropriate professional standards (contracting, for instance) will sometimes require a specific and consistent minimum level of testing, such as 50-by-50 centimeters by one meter. In a submerged context, the use of dredges, airlifts, and possibly reverse-dredge blowers may be used for uncovering anomalies generated by the remote sensing just described, although this would be to determine the nature of the anomaly only as opposed to their use in more refined site investigative techniques.

Based on data from remote sensing and shovel testing to determine presence/absence (above), and once a site is accurately located and delimited (by dropping down to a ten-meter or less grid), the area and boundary of the site will be mapped and recorded. SAIP/RASP forms and templates, which conform to the *Southeast Regional Archeological Survey Program Field and Laboratory Procedures Manual* (SEAC/RASP 1995), will be used. Specific survey project research designs will allow flexibility to handle different environmental and other situations (rock-shelters, blufflines, submerged, etc.). Since the goal is to get all areas surveyed to some standard level, multiple site

discovery techniques are encouraged and should be considered at all levels of investigation to meet the needs of ground cover, topography, and site types.

#### *SITE TESTING*

Once a site is delineated and recorded, raw artifact counts will be made and entered into a computer mapping program. Distribution maps will be created indicating various artifact concentrations. Based on this information, test units will be selected within the site. Where disturbed overburden has been noted (plowzone), it may be stripped off to locate site features. Intensive site testing would then be based on the results of the above general site locational strategy, and will generally involve a minimum of two, one-by-two-meter test units per site to determine such questions as stratigraphy, depth of cultural deposits, and site integrity. Larger sites may undergo further testing based on the potential for answering other, specific research questions.

Any new sites that appear significant will then be further evaluated for National Register eligibility after consultation with the regional archeologist and the SHPO, as will any previously known and recorded sites in the survey area that require further testing and evaluation.

#### *POST FIELD*

##### *Curation*

Following the field portion of each survey, all artifacts recovered will be analyzed, recorded, catalogued, and curated using the guidelines set forth in the *Cataloging Manual for Archeological Objects*, volumes I, II, and III (NPS 1990) and *Museum Handbook, Museum Records, Part II* (NPS 1984b). Catalog data will be entered into the NPS's National Catalog of Museum Objects using the Automated National Catalog System (ANCS). Conservation, treatment, or stabilization needs recognized during fieldwork, as well as artifact analysis or other project-related activities, will be completed prior to final placement of the collection in storage.

Procedures are to be carried out in consultation with SEAC's curator and/or designated staff.

### *Predictive Modeling*

All data collected will be incorporated into the SEAC GIS system. They can then be compared to environmental data, such as topography, slope, aspect, elevation, distance to nearest water, distance to nearest permanent water, permanence of nearest water, elevation above nearest water, primary vegetation cover, soil types, site size, site type, and temporal affiliation of known sites in the area. Using the collected data, it should be possible to produce accurate predictive models of similar site locations without further extensive, intensive, and expensive field survey (Padgett and Heisler 1979). Then these models can be tested for accuracy, efficiency, and economy.

### CONCLUSION

In order to maximize the coverage in a park unit, current technologies should be used as much as possible. These should include, but not be limited to, detailed examination of historic

basemaps using computer aided drafting and design (CAD) technologies, GIS (as described herein), aerial photography, satellite imaging, magnetometer, GPR, GPS, resistivity, metal detectors, laser transits, and other technologies that become available as this program proceeds.

When subsurface testing is required, methodologies should conform to the standards set forth in *NPS-28: Cultural Resource Management Guidelines* (NPS 1985). Every effort will also be made to meet SHPO requirements.

Every effort will be made to conduct joint ventures with non-NPS parties, such as other federal agencies, states, and Indian tribal governments. Examples of joint ventures under consideration for future surveys include discussions with **Canaveral** National Seashore, John F. Kennedy Space Center, and Merritt Island National Wildlife Refuge. "Another might group **Dry Tortugas** National Park and **Biscayne** National Park with John Pennekamp Coral Reef State Park, Long Key and Bahia Honda state recreation areas, and the three national wildlife refuges and the national marine sanctuary in the Florida Keys" (Aubry 1994). As discussed, cultural resources will be grouped and examined as a logical unit whenever possible.

• • •



---

## Chapter 6

### RELATED ARCHEOLOGICAL INVENTORY PROJECTS

---

Several proposed archeological inventory projects can be grouped by prehistoric or historic context in order to economically and efficiently combine survey efforts within the region as well as across regions. The following thematic groupings are suggested for combining many of these inventory projects. For ease of reference, the numbering of thematic groupings follows that of *History and Prehistory in the National Park System and the National Historic Landmarks Program* (NPS 1987).

Southeast Field Area parks that contain known and/or potential archeological resources reflecting these thematic associations are listed by project. Discussions with other regions and other cultural resource centers, including SCRU, are ongoing and concern the planning and logistics of interregional survey efforts.

The following projects are listed according to the thematic association under which they are grouped. The specific priority and order of implementation will depend on these and other factors, such as development construction priorities and special funding. The priority for project implementation is, by necessity, fluid, although three- to five-year projections will be submitted and adhered to whenever possible.

#### I. Cultural Developments: Indigenous American Populations

These themes cover related activities of precontact Native American populations in the southeastern United States, based on known and probable cultural resources identified within the region. Project statements involving generalized prehistoric survey efforts have been generated for all parks that exhibit prehistoric resources and/or potential. Many if not most of these will cross regional boundaries and will require interregional coordination. Examples of research questions involv-

ing intra- and interregional park efforts might be settlement patterns and social organization, trade networks, border regions, and acculturation. All sixty-four prehistoric projects are included in Chapter 7, Tables 10, 11, and 12.

#### A. The Earliest Inhabitants

13. Archaic Adaptations of the Southeast

#### B. Post-Archaic and Precontact Development

14. Hunters and Gatherers of the Eastern Woodlands
15. Eastern Farmers
16. Post-Archaic Adaptations of Eastern Coastal Regions
20. Post-Archaic Adaptations in Riverine Zones
22. Physical Anthropology of the American Indian

#### C. Prehistoric Archeology: Topical Facets

1. Prehistoric Architecture/Shelter/Housing
  2. Prehistoric Technology
  3. Prehistoric Social and Political Organizations
  6. Prehistoric Communication
  7. Prehistoric Diet/Health
  8. Prehistoric Economics/Trade
  9. Prehistoric Warfare
  10. Prehistoric Religion, Ideology, and Ceremonialism
  11. Prehistoric Social Differentiation
  12. Prehistoric Settlement and Settlement Patterns
  15. Prehistoric Transportation and Travel
  16. Prehistoric Agriculture/Plant Domestication/Horticulture
  18. Prehistoric Demographics
  20. Submerged Prehistoric Period Archeological Resources
-

21. Major Contributions to the Development of Cultural Histories
22. Major Contributions to the Development of the Science of Archeology

## II. European Colonial Exploration and Settlement

These themes cover the related activities of European nations as colonial powers within the present territory of the United States (Figure 19). Spanish exploration includes the movements and effects of several early forays throughout the Southeast and would include parks located in Florida, the Virgin

Islands, and Puerto Rico. French exploration and settlement would involve comparative studies between the initial sixteenth-century exploration of Florida and the seventeenth-century settlement of the Mississippi Valley and English exploration and settlement, which centered on the Carolinas and Georgia.

### A. Spanish Exploration and Settlement

CANA-Z004	Survey park beach face
CANA-Z008	Complete survey/test Armstrong site
CANA-Z017	Test/evaluate known sites




Figure 19 — SEFA parks with European contact sites (inset of Caribbean area not to scale).



C. English Exploration and Settlement

FORA-Z013	Produce AOA
FORA-C001	Conduct systematic subsurface survey of FORA
CALO-Z053	Produce AOA
FOFR-Z056	Comprehensive historic archeological survey
FORA-Z061	Comprehensive historic archeological survey
FOFR-Z104	Test/evaluate known sites
FORA-Z114	Test/evaluate known sites
CALO-Z115	Inventory submerged archeological resources
CALO-Z136	Comprehensive historic archeological survey
FOFR-Z161	Prepare AOA
FOFR-C011	Conduct archeological study of backlot elements
FOFR-C006	Conduct archeological survey of reburied artifacts
FORA-C004	Conduct additional archeological testing
CALO-Z184	Test/evaluate known sites

IV. The American Revolution

The thematic associations covering the American Revolution “embrace the political and military conflict between the ‘thirteen United States of America’ and Great Britain, 1763–1783” (NPS 1987:I-8). The following project statements reflect inventory studies to identify and evaluate archeological sites representing this conflict in parks throughout SEFA, primarily those in the states of Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina. Interregional survey projects are especially recommended for this historic context study, and discussions are ongoing with NPS archeological centers along the Eastern Seaboard to cooperate on this.

NISI-Z005	Produce AOA
NISI-Z006	Survey/test Gouedy and village complexes
GUCO-Z011	Produce AOA

NISI-Z018	Comprehensive historic archeological survey
NISI-C003	Identify Lee's siege trenches at Holmes Fort
KIMO-Z046	Develop AOA
COWP-Z047	Comprehensive historic archeological survey
NISI-Z064	Test/evaluate known sites
GUCO-Z071	Comprehensive historic archeological survey
KIMO-Z082	Comprehensive historic archeological survey
GUCO-Z092	Test/evaluate known sites
COWP-Z118	Prepare AOA
KIMO-Z128	Test/evaluate known sites
COWP-C010	Inadequate archeological survey
COWP-Z178	Test/evaluate known sites
KIMO-C001	Conduct total survey of archeological sites

VI. The Civil War

Thematic associations of the Civil War focus on “the epic struggle between the North and the South that eliminated both slavery and the right of secession as a consequential political theory” (NPS 1987:I-9). The following project statements reflect inventory studies to identify and evaluate archeological sites associated with this conflict in parks throughout SEFA. Survey projects across regions are especially recommended for this historic context study. Discussions with other NPS regional archeological centers along the Eastern Seaboard, especially the National Capital and Mid-Atlantic regions, are ongoing.

FOPU-Z003	Produce AOA
KEMO-Z012	Conduct AOA
DRTO-Z016	Prepare AOA
CHCH-Z020	Test/evaluate known sites
FOPU-Z021	Comprehensive historic archeological survey
ANDE-Z024	Produce AOA
ANDE-Z025	Comprehensive historic archeological survey
FOPU-Z028	Survey to locate Forts Greene and George








Figure 20 — SEFA parks with a plantation and slavery component (inset of Caribbean area not to scale).

TUIN-C016 Test grounds for location of outbuildings at the Oaks

TUIN-Z236 Comprehensive historic archeological survey  
TUIN-Z166 Test/evaluate known sites

...

---

## Chapter 7

### PROJECT SEQUENCE

---

#### THE PRIORITY SYSTEM

As described previously, current project statements were collected from several sources. Very few project statements listed in the parks' RMPs requested the production of an AOA. Since an AOA is the logical starting point of any inventory project, SEAC has produced project statements for all the park units without one. All SEAC-generated project statements—which will be sent for review and approval to park superintendents and senior staff before being incorporated into their RMPs—are designated by a "Z" after the park acronym, before the project number.

All park project statements were ranked on the basis of the seven factors defined in the "Systemwide Program Priorities" section of the *Systemwide Archeological Inventory Program* (Aubry et al. 1992:12–15). They are as follows:

1. Scheduling is coordinated in conjunction with development or revision of park planning documents as a priority.
2. Park areas suffering from, or threatened by, natural processes or human activities receive priority.
3. Development and special use zones are assigned a high priority.
4. Historic zones within a park and parks listed in the National Register of Historic Places are assigned a high priority.
5. "Archeological inventory projects that address research questions, problems, topics, or priorities of state, regional, or national importance" are given a high priority.
6. Parks lacking virtually any information

about the presence or absence of resources should have a high priority.

7. Priority status should take into account the archeological potential based on professional recommendations.

Two additional factors were added by the SEFA SAIP/RASP team. They are as follows:

8. The ranking should consider if an AOA has been completed that defines a specific need, or a if project statement in the RMP has requested an AOA.
9. Ongoing archeological research and/or a previous NASI (SAIP/RASP) commitment are to be considered.

Parks were also ranked, based on their research needs, from No. 1 (meeting the most factors) to No. 64 (meeting the fewest factors). Therefore prehistoric inventory, historic inventory, multiyear inventory, site testing (and evaluation), inventory projects already stated in the RMP, and submerged inventory projects were assigned their present sequence based on the above ranking.

Intrapark priority ranking was consistently applied as follows:

1. AOA (Type—AOA)
2. Inventory Projects (Type—AIS) including
  - Inventory (in RMP)
  - Multi-Year Inventory
  - Thematic Inventory
  - Historic Inventory
  - Prehistoric Inventory
  - Submerged Inventory
3. Site Testing (Type—AES)

For scheduling purposes, the first priority for any park is the AOA. This should be completed for a park prior to the beginning of any type of inventory project. From this document, a final determination of survey needs can be made. Second-priority projects are all inventory projects, including multiyear projects, since they involve extensive planning. A multiyear project may subsume all thematic inventory, historic inventory, prehistoric inventory, submerged inventory, inventory projects (listed in RMP), and site testing projects. Third-priority projects are site testing and evaluation projects, since these will involve National Register site integrity and significance level investigations and will include not just previously known and recorded sites but those newly discovered as a result of the above mentioned investigations.

This priority system was used to determine the sequential order in which the projects will be accomplished by the SAIP team. However, it should be noted that the sequential order is fluid and will be changed based on funding, staffing, research needs, park needs, and dictates from the regional archeologist or NPS management.

#### PROJECTS IN SEQUENTIAL ORDER

The Southeast Region has recently been renamed the Southeast Field Area and divided into three clusters: the Gulf Coast, the Appalachian, and the Atlantic Coast. Because of its location, SEAC is administratively assigned to the Gulf Coast Cluster; however, it will service

all three clusters as well as Louisiana and parts of Texas and Maryland.

Because of this organization, each project statement has been assigned a cluster sequence based on its regional sequence. It should be noted that the reorganization of the region had not been finalized as this document was being written. Therefore, parks that are added to the clusters from outside of SEFA will not be reflected in this document. They will be added to the projects database and assigned a sequence based on the criteria described in the previous section.

Tables 10, 11, and 12 Summarize all the projects in proposed regional and cluster sequential order.

Project numbers with a "C" following the hyphenation were taken from the RMP databases; those that begin with "Z" were SEAC-generated, based on the above priorities in conjunction with the goals and objectives of the SAIP program. Projects in the SEFA sequence and Cluster sequence columns of Tables 10, 11, and 12 with a number other than "0" following the decimal point (e.g., 17.1 and 17.2) have been determined to be earlier versions of project statements that are redundant, having already been completed and not having the resources specified, or having been subsumed under a broader category as a result of this plan. They are included, nonetheless, to show that they were not rejected out of hand and have been considered and included wherever possible.

Appendix 3 shows all previous archeological testing on a park-by-park basis.

*Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan, Southeast Field Area*

Project #	Title	Type *	SEFA Sequence	Cluster Sequence	Estimated Cost (\$)
CHPI-Z259	SAIP Remote-Sensing Survey	AIS	2.0	1.0	Completed
MOCR-Z001	Produce AOA	AOA	4.0	2.0	In progress
MOCR-Z002	Survey Park Development Zone	AIS	5.0	3.0	In progress
MOCR-Z014	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	5.1	3.1	In progress
MOCR-Z015	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	5.2	3.2	In progress
FOPU-Z003	Produce AOA	AOA	6.0	4.0	In progress
CANA-Z004	Survey Park Beach Face	AIS	7.0	5.0	In progress
FOPU-Z033	Survey to Locate Graves of Immortal 600 (12-14)	AIS	9.0	6.0	In progress
CANA-Z008	Complete Survey and Test Armstrong Site	AES	10.0	7.0	In progress
CHPI-Z007	Produce AOA	AOA	14.0	8.0	14,984
HOBE-C013	Produce AOA	AOA	15.0	9.0	24,330
CUIS-Z063	Conduct Magnetometer Survey of Beach/Dunes	AIS	17.0	10.0	30,000
ANDE-Z024	Produce AOA	AOA	18.0	11.0	14,984
HOBE-Z083	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Prehistoric)	AIS	20.0	12.0	68,000
HOBE-Z075	Conduct Historic Archeological Survey	AIS	20.1	12.1	**
FORA-Z013	Produce AOA	AOA	22.0	13.0	20,032
TIMU-Z010	Survey Kingsley Plantation	AES	28.0	14.0	109,830
KEMO-Z012	Produce AOA	AOA	30.0	15.0	20,032
FOPU-Z021	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	31.0	16.0	75,000
FOPU-Z022	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	31.1	16.1	**
FORA-C001	Conduct Systematic Subsurface Survey of FORA	AIS	32.0	17.0	105,429
FORA-Z061	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	32.1	17.1	**
FORA-C004	Conduct Additional Archeological Testing	AES	32.2	17.2	**
CANA-Z017	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	35.0	18.0	80,000
CANA-Z250	Conduct Specific Tests at Major Archeological Sites	AES	35.1	18.1	**
ANDE-Z025	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	37.0	19.0	42,000
ANDE-Z026	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	37.1	19.1	**
ANDE-C024	Archeological Investigation of Prison Site	AIS	37.2	19.2	**
FOPU-Z028	Survey to Locate Fort Greene and George	AIS	41.0	20.0	20,000
KEMO-C014	Complete Archeological Assessment/Survey	AIS	43.0	21.0	200,272
KEMO-Z079	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	43.1	21.1	**
FOPU-Z039	Survey to Locate Prehistoric Sites	AIS	52.0	22.0	24,000
TIMU-Z098	Conduct Historic Archeological Survey	AIS	53.0	23.0	56,000
JICA-Z190	Produce AOA	AOA	55.0	24.0	14,984
CHPI-Z042	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	56.0	25.0	56,000
CHPI-Z043	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	56.1	25.1	**
CANA-Z044	Survey Offshore Lands and Park Lands in Mosquito Lagoon	AIS	57.0	26.0	164,623
CAHA-Z065	Produce AOA	AOA	61.0	27.0	24,329
CALO-Z053	Produce AOA	AOA	65.0	28.0	24,329
HOBE-Z119	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	67.0	29.0	78,000

Project #	Title	Type *	SEFA Sequence	Cluster Sequence	Estimated Cost (\$)
HOBE-Z055	Conduct Archeological Investigations of Newyaucau	AES	67.1	29.1	**
HOBE-Z059	Conduct Archeological Investigations of Barricade	AES	67.2	29.2	**
HOBE-Z069	Conduct Archeological Investigations of Tohopeka	AES	67.3	29.3	**
FOFR-Z161	Produce AOA	AOA	68.0	30.0	14,984
FOFR-Z056	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	69.0	31.0	55,000
FOFR-C011	Conduct Archeological Study of Backlot Elements	AES	69.1	31.1	**
FOFR-Z057	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	70.0	32.0	25,000
MOCR-Z060	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	72.0	33.0	22,000
FORA-Z062	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	74.0	34.0	20,000
CAHA-Z049	Survey Submerged Park Lands	AIS	76.0	35.0	162,490
FOSU-Z068	Produce AOA	AOA	77.0	36.0	24,329
FOSU-Z066	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	78.0	37.0	25,000
FOSU-Z067	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	78.1	37.1	**
FOPU-Z070	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	79.0	38.0	18,750
CAHA-Z133	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	82.0	39.0	150,000
CAHA-C027	Relocate Bodie Is LS/CG Station Complex	AIS	82.1	39.1	**
CAHA-C028	Identify Sites Associated with Life Saving	AIS	82.2	39.2	**
CHPI-Z073	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	83.0	40.0	5,500
KEMO-Z080	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	89.0	41.0	65,000
FOSU-Z085	Survey Submerged Park Lands	AIS	91.0	42.0	62,579
FOSU-Z088	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	93.0	43.0	7,500
CASA-Z120	Produce AOA	AOA	96.0	44.0	24,329
CASA-Z146	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	98.0	45.0	22,000
CASA-C027	Inventory Archeological Sites - FOMA	AIS	98.1	45.1	**
CASA-Z151	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	100.0	46.0	10,000
TIMU-Z040	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	104.0	47.0	30,000
ANDE-C023	Prehistoric Site Test Excavations	AES	106.0	48.0	21,000
TIMU-Z103	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Prehistoric)	AIS	109.0	49.0	150,000
TIMU-C002	Conduct Archeological Survey Work/Analysis	AIS	109.1	49.1	**
TIMU-C016	Conduct Archeological Survey of Remain Areas/Add to CSI	AIS	109.2	49.2	**
FOFR-Z104	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	110.0	50.0	7,500
FOMA-Z175	Produce AOA	AOA	114.0	51.0	14,984
COSW-Z113	Produce AOA	AOA	117.0	52.0	20,032
FORA-Z114	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	118.0	53.0	7,500
CALO-Z115	Survey Submerged Park Lands	AIS	119.0	54.0	162,490
CHAT-Z124	Produce AOA	AOA	125.0	55.0	24,329
CUIS-Z127	Produce AOA	AOA	127.0	56.0	24,329
CUIS-Z167	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	131.0	57.0	150,000
CUIS-C013	Conduct Archeological Survey of Ft. Saint Andrew	AIS	131.1	57.1	**
CUIS-C005	Conduct Archeological Survey of Ft. Prince William	AIS	131.2	57.2	**



*Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan, Southeast Field Area*

Project #	Title	Type *	SEFA Sequence	Cluster Sequence	Estimated Cost (\$)
CUIS-Z171	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	133.0	58.0	60,000
COSW-Z165	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Prehistoric)	AIS	135.0	58.0	150,000
COSW-Z159	Conduct Historic Archeological Survey	AIS	135.1	58.1	**
COSW-C001	Prepare a Comprehensive Archeological Survey	AIS	135.2	58.2	**
CALO-Z136	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	138.0	59.0	150,000
CAHA-Z137	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	139.0	60.0	30,000
CASA-Z138	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	140.0	61.0	5,500
CANA-Z143	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Prehistoric)	AIS	142.0	62.0	150,000
CANA-C015	Conduct Archeological Inventory	AIS	142.1	62.1	**
CALO-Z140	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	143.0	63.0	45,000
ANDE-Z141	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	144.0	64.0	10,500
CANA-Z139	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	146.0	65.0	45,000
CHAT-Z156	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Prehistoric)	AIS	151.0	66.0	100,000
CHAT-C004	Complete Archeological Survey and Site Evaluation	AIS	151.1	66.1	**
CHAT-Z150	Conduct Historic Archeological Survey	IS	154.0	67.0	33,000
FOCA-Z163	Produce AOA	AOA	159.0	68.0	14,984
TUIN-Z224	Produce AOA	AOA	160.0	69.0	20,032
CUIS-Z236	Survey Submerged Park Lands	AIS	161.0	70.0	125,000
WRBR-Z172	Produce AOA	AOA	164.0	71.0	14,984
FOMA-Z182	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	166.0	72.0	38,000
FOMA-C000	Archeological Survey to Locate French/Spanish Massacre Site	AES	170.0	73.0	25,000
FOCA-Z179	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	171.0	74.0	30,000
FOCA-Z183	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	171.1	74.1	**
FOMA-Z189	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	173.0	75.0	20,000
FOSU-C019	Identify Archeological Resources-Moultrie I, II, and III	AIS	174.0	76.0	33,000
CALO-Z184	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	175.0	77.0	30,000
FOMA-Z109	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	182.0	78.0	9,500
CAHA-Z190	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	183.0	79.0	30,000
JICA-Z194	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	184.0	80.0	15,000
JICA-C015	Archeological Assessment and Inventory	AIS	184.1	80.1	**
JICA-Z203	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	184.2	80.2	**
KEMO-Z196	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	189.0	81.0	16,250
MALU-Z198	Produce AOA	AOA	191.0	82.0	14,984
MALU-Z202	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	196.0	83.0	22,000
MALU-Z212	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	196.1	83.1	**
JICA-Z204	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	197.0	84.0	3,750
CUIS-Z209	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	199.0	85.0	30,000
CUIS-C008	Conduct Archeological Site Assessment	AES	199.1	85.1	10,000
CUIS-Z251	Conduct Archeological Test at Rayfield (NPS 9 CAM 45)	AES	199.2	85.2	10,000
CUIS-Z252	Conduct Archeological Testing at Deptford Tabby House	AES	199.3	85.3	10,000

Table 10 — Atlantic Coast Cluster projects and cluster sequence.

Project #	Title	Type *	SEFA Sequence	Cluster Sequence	Estimated Cost (\$)
CUIS-C017	Conduct Archeological Testing at Stafford Chimneys	AES	199.4	85.4	10,000
CUIS-C010	Conduct Archeological Assessment at NPS 9 CAM 24	AES	199.5	85.5	10,000
CUIS-C009	Conduct Archeological Assessment NPS 9 CAM 19-20 Zone A	AES	199.6	85.6	10,000
OCMU-Z210	Produce AOA	AOA	200.0	86.0	24,329
FOCA-Z217	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	206.0	87.0	7,500
MALU-Z220	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	210.0	88.0	5,500
TUIN-Z236	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	214.0	89.0	25,000
TUIN-Z237	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	214.1	89.1	**
TUIN-C016	Test Grounds for Location of Outbuildings the Oaks	AIS	214.2	89.2	**
COSW-Z234	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	224.0	90.0	30,000
WRBR-Z247	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	225.0	91.0	42,000
WRBR-Z248	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	225.1	91.1	**
TUIN-Z166	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	226.0	92.0	6,250
WRBR-Z235	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	236.0	93.0	1,050
CHAT-Z249	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	237.0	94.0	20,000
OCMU-Z256	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Prehistoric)	AIS	239.0	95.0	48,000
OCMU-C005	Complete Archeological Survey and Inventory	AIS	239.1	95.1	**
OCMU-Z254	Conduct Historic Archeological Survey	AIS	240.0	96.0	22,000
OCMU-Z253	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	241.0	97.0	**

- \* AIS = Archeological Inventory Study
- AOA = Archeological Overview and Assessment
- AES = Archeological Evaluation Study

- \*\* Project does not have a cost estimate because it will be subsumed by a project with a lower sequence number. For example, 5.1's cost estimates are included in the budget for 5.0. All cost estimates are in 1995 dollars.

*Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan, Southeast Field Area*

Project #	Title	Type *	SEFA Sequence	Cluster Sequence	Estimated Cost (\$)
RUCA-Z258	SAIP Survey	AIS	1.0	1.0	Completed
NISI-Z005	Produce AOA	AOA	8.0	2.0	In progress
STRI-Z255	General Archeological Survey	AIS	12.0	3.0	In progress
STRI-C008	Archeological Identification and Evaluation	AIS	12.1	3.1	In progress
STRI-Z094	Conduct Historic Archeological Survey	AIS	12.2	3.2	In progress
CARL-Z009	Produce AOA	AOA	13.0	4.0	In progress
BISO-Z121	Conduct Historic Archeological Survey	AIS	16.0	5.0	40,000
GUCO-Z011	Produce AOA	AOA	19.0	6.0	20,032
BISO-Z121	Conduct Historic Archeological Survey	AIS	23.0	7.0	40,000
NISI-Z006	Survey and Test Gouedy and Village Complexes	AES	25.0	8.0	60,000
NISI-C003	Identify Lee's Siege Trenches at Holmes Fort	AIS	25.1	8.1	**
CHCH-Z036	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	26.0	9.0	125,000
CHCH-C007	Archeological Survey of Tennessee Units	AIS	26.1	9.1	**
CHCH-C012	Archeological Inventory of Chickamauga Battlefield	AIS	26.2	9.2	**
BLRI-C080	Conduct Archeological Survey Inventory	AIS	27.0	10.0	300,000
BLRI-Z131	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	27.1	10.1	**
BLRI-Z125	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	27.2	10.2	**
BLRI-C121	Conduct Preliminary Assessment of New Area	AIS	27.3	10.3	**
NISI-Z019	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	29.0	11.0	98,000
LIRI-Z087	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Prehistoric)	AIS	34.0	12.0	140,000
LIRI-Z086	Conduct Historic Archeological Survey	AIS	36.0	13.0	25,000
NISI-Z018	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	38.0	14.0	89,000
MACA-Z208	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Prehistoric)	AIS	42.0	15.0	500,000
BISO-C001	Conduct Archeological Survey	AIS	44.0	16.0	67,000
BISO-C027	Plan Survey Deferred Area	AIS	44.1	16.1	**
BISO-Z126	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Prehistoric)	AIS	44.2	16.2	**
CHCH-Z037	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	49.0	17.0	100,000
CHCH-Z020	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	50.0	18.0	45,000
GRSM-Z041	Produce AOA	AOA	54.0	19.0	24,329
KIMO-Z046	Produce AOA	AOA	59.0	20.0	14,984
COWP-Z118	Produce AOA	AOA	60.0	21.0	20,032
FODO-Z157	Produce AOA	AOA	63.0	22.0	20,032
FODO-Z051	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	64.0	23.0	42,000
FODO-C005	Complete Archeological Assessment	AIS	64.1	23.1	**
BLRI-Z054	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	66.0	24.0	60,000
BLRI-C081	Survey Historic Archeological-Rock Castle Gorge/Basin-Cove	AES	66.1	24.1	**
NISI-Z064	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	75.0	25.0	12,000
GUCO-Z071	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	80.0	26.0	35,000
GUCO-Z072	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	81.0	27.0	15,000
BISO-Z074	Produce AOA	AOA	84.0	28.0	24,329

Table 11 — Appalachian Coast Cluster projects and cluster sequence.

Project #	Title	Type *	SEFA Sequence	Cluster Sequence	Estimated Cost (\$)
KIMO-Z082	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	85.0	29.0	70,000
KIMO-Z076	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	85.1	29.1	**
CARL-Z142	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	86.0	30.0	40,000
CARL-Z147	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	86.1	30.1	**
CARL-C017	Archeological Survey of Park Property	AIS	86.2	30.2	**
LIRI-Z023	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	92.0	31.0	24,000
RUCA-Z089	Produce AOA	AOA	94.0	32.0	20,032
GUCO-Z092	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	97.0	33.0	8,750
ABLI-Z093	Produce AOA	AOA	99.0	34.0	14,984
ANJO-Z097	Produce AOA	AOA	103.0	35.0	14,984
STRI-Z129	Produce AOA	AOA	105.0	36.0	20,032
ABLI-Z102	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	108.0	37.0	30,000
ABLI-Z107	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	108.1	37.1	**
ANJO-Z106	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	112.0	38.0	15,000
ANJO-Z112	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	112.1	38.1	**
COWP-Z047	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	121.0	39.0	48,000
COWP-Z048	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	121.1	39.1	**
COWP-C010	Inadequate Archeological Survey	AIS	121.2	39.2	**
CUGA-Z123	Produce AOA	AOA	124.0	40.0	24,329
KIMO-Z128	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	128.0	41.0	16,250
KIMO-C001	Conduct Total Survey of Archeological Sites	AIS	128.1	41.1	**
STRI-Z099	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	129.0	42.0	15,000
CUGA-Z164	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	141.0	43.0	150,000
CUGA-Z168	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	141.1	43.1	**
CUGA-C001	Inadequate Archaeological Inventory	AIS	141.2	43.2	**
CARL-Z077	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	145.0	44.0	10,000
FODO-Z052	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	155.0	45.0	12,000
FODO-Z158	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	156.0	46.0	12,000
STRI-Z162	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	158.0	47.0	10,500
STRI-C024	Archeological Survey of Blanton House Site	AES	158.1	47.1	**
COWP-Z178	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	169.0	48.0	30,000
FOOT-Z185	Produce AOA	AOA	176.0	49.0	14,984
BISO-Z187	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	178.0	50.0	60,000
GRSM-Z195	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Prehistoric)	AIS	179.0	51.0	300,000
GRSM-C018	Conduct Archeological Survey of Park	AIS	179.1	51.1	**
GRSM-Z188	Conduct Historic Archeological Survey	AIS	180.0	52.0	100,000
GRSM-C014	Plot Cemetery Graves Archeology	AIS	181.1	52.1	**
FOOT-Z192	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Prehistoric)	AIS	186.0	53.0	50,000
ABLI-Z193	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	188.0	54.0	7,500
ANJO-Z197	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	190.0	55.0	3,750

*Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan, Southeast Field Area*

Table 11 — Appalachian Coast Cluster projects and cluster sequence.

Project #	Title	Type *	SEFA Sequence	Cluster Sequence	Estimated Cost (\$)
MACA-Z199	Conduct Historic Archeological Survey	AIS	192.0	56.0	30,000
MACA-C023	Develop Archeology Project	AIS	192.1	56.1	**
OBRI-Z206	Produce AOA	AOA	198.0	57.0	20,032
OBRI-Z219	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Prehistoric)	AIS	204.0	58.0	75,000
OBRI-C001	Conduct Archeological Survey	AIS	204.1	58.1	**
OBRI-Z215	Conduct Historic Archeological Survey	AIS	208.0	59.0	19,000
MACA-Z029	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	209.0	60.0	30,000
FOOT-Z221	Conduct Historic Archeological Survey	AIS	211.0	61.0	10,000
RUCA-Z226	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Prehistoric)	AIS	212.0	62.0	42,000
RUCA-C001	Archeological Survey of Park	AIS	212.1	62.1	**
RUCA-Z222	Conduct Historic Archeological Survey	AIS	217.0	63.0	12,000
FOOT-Z227	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	218.0	64.0	9,000
GRSM-Z231	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	222.0	65.0	60,000
RUCA-Z240	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	229.0	66.0	10,500
OBRI-Z246	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	235.0	67.0	18,750
CUGA-Z205	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	238.0	68.0	30,000

- \* AIS = Archeological Inventory Study
- AOA = Archeological Overview and Assessment
- AES = Archeological Evaluation Study

\*\* Project does not have a cost estimate because it will be subsumed by a project with a lower sequence number. For example, 5.1's cost estimates are included in the budget for 5.0. All cost estimates are in 1995 dollars.



Project #	Title	Type *	SEFA Sequence	Cluster Sequence	Estimated Cost (\$)
GUIS-Z260	SAIP Survey	AIS	3.0	1.0	Completed
BICY-Z000	Develop Archeological Monitoring Program	AIS	11.0	2.0	5,000
GUIS-Z257	Conduct Historic Archeological Survey	AIS	21.0	3.0	30,000
BISC-C00	Produce AOA	AOA	24.0	4.0	24,329
DRTO-Z016	Produce AOA	AOA	33.0	5.0	24,239
BICY-Z101	Produce AOA	AOA	39.0	6.0	24,329
GUIS-Z027	Survey Submerged Park Lands Florida	AIS	40.0	7.0	148,761
BRCR-Z078	Produce AOA	AOA	45.0	8.0	14,984
VIIS-Z032	Inventory Submerged Archeological Resources	AIS	46.0	9.0	116,374
SHIL-Z034	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	47.0	10.0	90,000
NATR-Z035	Produce AOA	AOA	48.0	11.0	24,329
BUIS-Z038	Produce AOA	AOA	51.0	12.0	14,984
VIIS-Z245	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Prehistoric)	AIS	58.0	13.0	75,000
VIIS-C042	Conduct Archeological Study	AIS	58.1	13.1	**
GUIS-Z050	Survey Submerged Park Lands Mississippi	AIS	62.0	14.0	148,761
EVER-Z152	Produce AOA	AOA	71.0	15.0	24,239
CHRI-C020	Produce AOA	AOA	73.0	16.0	20,032
BRCR-Z030	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	87.0	17.0	5,000
BRCR-Z031	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	87.1	17.1	**
GUIS-Z084	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	88.0	18.0	60,000
EVER-Z180	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Prehistoric)	AIS	90.0	19.0	500,000
EVER-Z058	Survey High Priority Submerged Park Lands	AIS	90.1	19.1	303,570
EVER-C025	Archeological Inventory of East Everglades	AIS	90.2	19.2	**
NATC-C056	Produce AOA	AOA	95.0	20.0	20,032
SHIL-Z232	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	101.0	21.0	70,000
SHIL-C008	Survey Locate and Preserve Historic Housesites	AIS	101.1	21.1	**
SAJU-Z096	Produce AOA	AOA	102.0	22.0	24,329
BRCR-Z100	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	107.0	23.0	500
BISC-Z105	Complete Survey and Evaluation of Submerged Lands	AIS	111.0	24.0	357,437
VICK-Z108	Produce AOA	AOA	113.0	25.0	24,329
BUIS-Z110	Survey Submerged Lands Within Monument Boundary	AIS	115.0	26.0	139,649
BICY-C004	Cultural Resources Survey and Inventory of BICY Addition Area	AIS	116.0	27.0	300,000
BICY-Z117	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Prehistoric)	AIS	116.1	27.1	**
BICY-Z111	Conduct Historic Archeological Survey	AIS	116.2	27.2	**
BISC-Z116	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	120.0	28.0	300,000
BISC-Z122	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	123.0	29.0	60,000
BUIS-Z134	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Prehistoric)	AIS	130.0	30.0	48,000
NATC-Z090	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	132.0	31.0	25,000
NATC-C001	Archeological Survey of Park Property	AIS	134.0	32.0	15,000
NATC-Z091	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	134.1	32.1	**

*Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan, Southeast Field Area*

Table 12 — Gulf Coast Cluster projects and cluster sequence.

Project #	Title	Type *	SEFA Sequence	Cluster Sequence	Estimated Cost (\$)
BUIS-Z130	Conduct Historic Archeological Survey	AIS	136.0	33.0	22,000
BUIS-Z135	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	137.0	34.0	12,000
SARI-Z144	Produce AOA	AOA	147.0	35.0	20,032
DESO-Z145	Produce AOA	AOA	148.0	36.0	14,984
TUPE-Z228	Produce AOA	AOA	149.0	37.0	20,032
DRTO-Z149	Survey High Priority Submerged Park Lands	AIS	150.0	38.0	303,570
CHRI-Z154	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	152.0	39.0	25,000
CHRI-Z160	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	153.0	40.0	12,000
CHRI-Z153	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	157.0	41.0	6,250
VICK-Z241	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	162.0	42.0	60,000
VICK-C067	Conduct Archeological Survey to Zone for Compliance	AIS	162.1	42.1	**
DESO-Z170	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	163.0	43.0	25,000
DESO-C003	Complete Archeological Survey	AIS	163.1	43.1	**
DESO-Z174	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	163.2	43.2	**
DRTO-Z173	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	165.0	44.0	35,000
DRTO-Z177	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	165.1	44.1	**
EVER-Z176	Conduct Historic Archeological Survey	AIS	167.0	45.0	100,000
EVER-Z081	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	172.0	46.0	100,000
BICY-Z181	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	177.0	47.0	60,000
GUIS-Z191	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	185.0	48.0	300,000
CHRI-C021	Conduct Investigation to Locate Foundation	AIS	187.0	49.0	20,000
GUIS-Z200	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	193.0	50.0	80,000
BISC-Z201	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	194.0	51.0	60,000
NATC-Z132	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	195.0	52.0	6,250
NATR-Z216	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Prehistoric)	AIS	201.0	53.0	150,000
NATR-C001	Complete Archeological Survey and Inventory	AIS	201.1	53.1	**
DRTO-Z213	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	202.0	54.0	60,000
SAJU-Z225	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	203.0	55.0	25,000
NATR-Z211	Conduct Historic Archeological Survey	AIS	205.0	56.0	38,000
SARI-Z229	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	207.0	57.0	48,000
NATR-Z223	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	213.0	58.0	30,000
NATR-C048	Conduct Grinders Inn Archeological Survey	AES	213.1	58.1	**
SHIL-Z095	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	215.0	59.0	25,000
SAJU-Z230	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	216.0	60.0	10,000
TUPE-Z238	Conduct Thematic Archeological Survey (Historic)	AIS	219.0	61.0	12,000
TUPE-Z239	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	219.1	61.1	**
SARI-Z218	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	220.0	62.0	12,000
DRTO-Z186	Comprehensive Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	221.0	63.0	**
SAJU-Z214	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	222.0	64.0	6,250
SARI-Z233	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	223.0	65.0	14,000

Table 12 — Gulf Coast Cluster projects and cluster sequence.

Project #	Title	Type *	SEFA Sequence	Cluster Sequence	Estimated Cost (\$)
TUPE-Z148	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	227.0	66.0	2,000
NATR-C051	Survey and Excavate Chickasaw Village Area	AES	228.0	67.0	**
VICK-Z242	Conduct Prehistoric Archeological Survey	AIS	230.0	68.0	20,000
VICK-Z169	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	231.0	69.0	15,000
DESO-Z243	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	232.0	70.0	6,250
VIIS-Z244	Conduct Historic Archeological Survey	AIS	233.0	71.0	30,000
VIIS-Z045	Test and Evaluate Known Sites	AES	234.0	72.0	24,000

- \* AIS = Archeological Inventory Study
- AOA = Archeological Overview and Assessment
- AES = Archeological Evaluation Study

- \*\* Project does not have a cost estimate because it will be subsumed by a project with a lower sequence number. For example, 5.1's cost estimates are included in the budget for 5.0. All cost estimates are in 1995 dollars.

• • •

## Appendix 1

### PARK ACREAGE BY LEGAL TYPE

Park*	Fee	Less than Fee	Other	Private	Total
ABLI	116.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	116.50
ANDE	479.88	1.00	7.89	5.84	494.61
ANJO	16.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.68
BICY	542,014.76	0.00	54,338.66	119,646.58	716,000.00
BISO	107,364.81	0.00	15,683.80	1,951.39	125,000.00
BISC	169,403.01	0.00	2,625.30	896.42	172,924.73
BLRI	77,032.61	2,022.91	1,049.18	7,677.31	87,782.01
BRCR	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
BUIS	880.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	880.00
CANA	57,626.69	0.00	0.00	35.00	57,661.69
CAHA	30,318.88	0.00	0.00	0.55	30,319.43
CALO	13,930.22	11,243.40	3,048.16	21.58	28,243.36
CARL	263.52	0.00	0.00	0.00	263.52
CASA	20.18	0.00	0.33	0.00	20.51
CHPI	21.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	21.35
CHAT	4,006.43	2.75	2,711.72	2,539.01	9,259.91
CHCH	8,067.63	21.62	0.00	16.79	8,106.04
CHRI	26.24	0.00	0.91	0.00	27.15
COSW	19,940.45	0.00	0.00	2,259.55	22,200.00
COWP	788.71	0.00	48.82	4.03	841.56
CUGA	20,252.61	48.03	0.00	11.50	20,312.14
CUIS	18,698.41	1.63	13,819.75	3,895.30	36,415.09
DESO	24.78	0.00	0.00	2.06	26.84
DRTO	61,480.00	0.00	3,220.00	0.00	64,700.00
EVER	1,444,480.20	0.00	1,774.77	60,244.43	1,506,499.40
FOCA	133.08	0.00	0.07	5.24	138.39
FODC	15.34	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.34
FODO	524.55	0.00	0.00	11.80	536.35
FOFR	211.47	0.00	0.00	4.88	216.35
FOMA	227.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	227.76
FOOT	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	960.00
FOPU	5,365.13	0.00	257.97	0.00	5,623.10
FORA	245.25	0.00	21.84	245.84	512.93

*Appendix I— Park Acreage by Legal Type*

Park*	Fee	Less than Fee	Other	Private	Total
FOSU	163.12	31.25	0.00	0.23	194.60
GRSM	520,003.78	0.00	0.00	265.66	520,269.44
GUCO	220.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	220.25
GUIS	99,263.54	0.38	35,641.90	718.69	135,624.51
HOBE	2,040.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,040.00
JICA	1.45	0.00	9.99	59.10	70.54
KEMO	2,879.98	0.00	4.54	0.00	2,884.52
KIMO	3,945.29	0.00	0.00	0.00	3,945.29
LIRI	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	14,000.00
MACA	51,880.57	0.00	814.75	12.20	52,707.52
MALU	4.72	0.06	5.23	13.17	23.18
MOCR	84.12	2.40	0.00	0.00	86.52
NATC	79.21	0.00	5.30	23.78	108.29
NATR	45,748.75	5,901.98	32.58	56.62	51,739.93
NISI	989.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	989.14
OBRI	2,042.98	1,066.00	326.40	1,631.56	5,066.94
OCMU	701.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	701.54
RUCA	310.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	310.45
SARI	0.00	0.00	683.41	228.59	912.00
SAJU	53.20	0.00	21.93	0.00	75.13
SHIC	10.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.05
SHIL	3,907.82	0.00	51.00	4.00	3,962.82
STRC	20.09	0.00	0.00	0.00	20.09
STRI	380.28	0.00	25.86	295.80	701.94
TIMU	1,387.25	1,330.00	16,572.82	26,709.93	46,000.00
TUPE	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
TUIN	7.30	1.02	0.00	49.30	57.62
VICC	116.28	0.00	0.00	0.00	116.28
VICK	1,607.27	5.78	7.66	4.56	1,625.27
VIIS	12,906.57	3.00	134.07	1,645.23	14,688.87
WRBR	424.77	0.00	6.63	0.00	431.40
TOTAL**	3,335,158.90	21,683.21	152,953.24	231,193.52	3,755,948.87

\* See back inside cover for park names and the acronyms/abbreviations.

\*\* Because the legal types of the acreage at FOOT (960 acres) and LIRI (14,000 acres) were not available, the acreage for these two units is not included in any of the column totals for the four legal types. Thus, 14,960 acres must be added to the total of these four columns to arrive at the grand total.



---

## Appendix 2

### MODULAR OVERVIEW AND ASSESSMENT OUTLINE

---

#### SECTION 1

- Management Summary
- Table of Contents
- List of Figures
- List of Tables
- Acknowledgments

#### SECTION 2

- Introduction

#### SECTION 3

- Effective Environment
- Physiography
- Climate
- Soils and Geology
- Flora and Fauna

#### SECTION 4

- Prehistoric Overview

#### SECTION 5

- Historic Overview

#### SECTION 6

- Chronological List of Archeological Research

#### SECTION 7

- Assessment of Research to Date

#### SECTION 8

- Accession Files and Archival Materials

#### SECTION 9

- Research Potential

#### SECTION 10

- Archeological and Cultural Resource Management Issues
  - Documentation Issues
  - Treatment Issues
  - Monitoring Issues

#### SECTION 11

- Bibliography

#### SECTION 12

- Appendices
- Enabling Legislation

#### SECTION 13

- List of Archeological Sites (Detachable)

#### SECTION 14

- Project Statements and Budgets (Detachable)

...

## Appendix 3

### PREVIOUS ARCHEOLOGICAL TESTING BY PARK

This appendix is derived from a database maintained by SEAC's Curation Section. Information concerning archeological surveys (inventory), clearance, site testing, and monitoring is included.

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
ABLI	SEAC-00795	1988	ABLI-00031	Archeological monitoring of a sewer line installation	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
ANDE	SEAC-00204	1976	ANDE-00429	Archeological investigations for a maintenance building	Richard D. Faust, SEAC
	SEAC-00981	1992	ANDE-00409	Archeological investigations for a new drain line	John E. Cornelison, SEAC
	SEAC-01116	1993	ANDE-00481	Archeological investigations for the visitor center and road	John E. Cornelison, SEAC
	SEAC-00317	1978	ANDE-00062	Archeological investigations of park resources	Ellen Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00583	1982	ANDE-00432	Archeological investigations of Section P and Gunboat Street extension	Ellen Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00651	1983	ANDE-00433	Archeological investigations of surplus property Tract 01-142	Teresa L. Paglione, SEAC
	SEAC-00827	1989	ANDE-00322	Archeological investigations of the north gate	Guy L. Prentice, SEAC
	SEAC-00749	1987	ANDE-00366	Archeological investigations of the northeast corner	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-00862	1990	ANDE-00355	Archeological investigations of the southeast corner	Guy L. Prentice, SEAC
	SEAC-00814	1988	ANDE-00436	Archeological monitoring at the Sextant's House	Andrea C. Repp, SEAC
	SEAC-00715	1985	ANDE-00434	Archeological monitoring of the Providence Spring parking area	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-00727	1986	ANDE-00435	Archeological monitoring of the septic system at the POW Museum	Allen Cooper, SEAC
	SEAC-00905	1991	ANDE-00379	Archeological survey for cook house location	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00853	1990	ANDE-00378	Archeological survey for the visitor center and road	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00366	1981	ANDE-00430	Archeological test excavations in the stockade	Lewis Larson and Morgan R. Crook, Jr., West Georgia College
	SEAC-00708	1985	ANDE-00166	Soil resistivity survey of hospital site	Rochelle A. Marrinan, FSU
ANJO	SEAC-00320	1978	ANJO-00173	Archeological investigations at the Andrew Johnson house	Patricia O'Grady, Gary Knudsen, and James W. Stoutamire, FSU

*Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan, Southeast Field Area*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
BICY	SEAC-00315	1978	BICY-00004	Archeological survey at Big Cypress	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00541	1981		New site location data	Park Staff
	SEAC-00619	1982	BICY-00008	Sub-surface testing of remote sensing anomalies, 1981	Randy V. Bellomo, FSU
BISC	SEAC-00371	1981	BISC-00058	Archeological identification study, 1973	William H. Sears, Florida Atlantic Univ.
	SEAC-00665	1984	BISC-00062	Archeological investigation of the Populo wreck (BISC-UW-23)	George Fischer, SEAC, and John Broward, FSU
	SEAC-00589	1982	BISC-00059	Archeological investigations at site BISC-UW-22 (Glauber-Biggers)	George Fischer, SEAC
	SEAC-00998	1992		Archeological investigations of Totten Key mounds, 8DA3439 (1984)	Robert C. Taylor, SEAC
	SEAC-01117	1993	BISC-00072	Archeological investigations prior to Hurricane Andrew damage repair	George S. Smith and David M. Brewer, SEAC
	SEAC-00362	1980	BISC-00054	Archeological survey and evaluation of BISC-UW-20 (Fowey)	George Fischer, SEAC
	SEAC-00641	1983	BISC-00055	Archeological testing of BISC-UW-20 (Fowey)	George Fischer, SEAC
	SEAC-01129	1994		Elliot Key Complex telephone line clearance	David Brewer, SEAC
	SEAC-01106	1993	BISC-00071	Fowey documentation project	Larry Murphy, Submerged Cultural Resource Unit, SWR
	SEAC-00196	1976	BISC-00053	General archeological survey	George Fischer, SEAC
	SEAC-00704	1985	BISC-00063	General site survey of the Pillar Dollar Wreck (BISC-UW-35)	John Broward, FSU
	SEAC-00369	1981	BISC-00056	Land reconnaissance at Elliot Key, 1944	John M. Goggin, Florida State Museum
	SEAC-00370	1981	BISC-00057	Magnetometer survey, 1976	Martin Meylach, Meylach Magnetic Search System
	SEAC-00675	1984	BISC-00052	Underwater archeological survey	George Fischer, SEAC
	SEAC-00750	1987	BISC-00064	Underwater investigation of BISC-UW-35 (Pillar Dollar Site)	George Fischer, SEAC, and Michael Pomeroy, FSU
BISO	SEAC-00933	1991	BISO-00026	1988 Station Camp testing project by Duvall and Associates	William Bass, Chair, Dept. of Anthropology, Univ. of Tennessee
	SEAC-00932	1991	BISO-00025	Archeological investigations and testing of BISO, 1981-1983	William Bass, Chair, Dept. of Anthropology, Univ. of Tennessee
	SEAC-00722	1986	BISO-00029	Archeological investigations at BISO-294, BISO-265 and BISO-211	Richard D. Faust and Robert C. Wilson, SEAC
	SEAC-00978	1991	BISO-00027	Archeological investigations at Honey Creek Overlook	Tom DesJean, BISO Archeologist
	SEAC-00740	1986	BISO-00021	Archeological monitoring of vandalized sites	Tom DesJean, BISO Archeologist

*Appendix 3— Previous Archeological Testing by Park*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
BISO (cont.)	SEAC-00931	1991	BISO-00024	Archeological Phase III testing of site 40ST6 by SSI, 1981	William Bass, Chair, Dept. of Anthropology, Univ. of Tennessee
	SEAC-00323	1978	BISO-00020	Archeological reconnaissance survey of BISO, Phase I	Robert C. Wilson, SEAC
	SEAC-00875	1990	BISO-00022	Big South Fork Archeological Project	Guy L. Prentice, SEAC
	SEAC-00892	1990	BISO-00023	Historic Site Survey, U.S. Army COE contract #DAC W 62-81-C-0013	Stephen K. Hutchinson, Environment Consultants, Inc.
	SEAC-01108	1993		Natural and cultural resource inventory, 1978–1979	Ocean Data Systems, Inc.
BLRI	SEAC-00374	1981	BLRI-00412	Archeological clearance for road construction, 1977	Robert S. Carr, SEAC
	SEAC-00791	1988	BLRI-00420	Archeological investigation of rock chimney fall site	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-00925	1991	BLRI-00401	Archeological investigations along the proposed Roanoke River Pkwy.	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00638	1983	BLRI-00415	Archeological investigations at Boone's Fork Trail	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-01035	1992	BLRI-00422	Archeological investigations at Chestnut Creek Rockshelter	John E. Cornelison, SEAC
	SEAC-01094	1993	BLRI-00424	Archeological investigations at Fischer Peak	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00609	1982	BLRI-00414	Archeological investigations at Grandfather Mt. and Linville Falls	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00373	1981	BLRI-00146	Archeological investigations at Peaks of Otter, 1964	John W. Griffin, NPS, and John H. Reeves, Virginia Military Institute
	SEAC-00375	1981	BLRI-00434	Archeological investigations for a folk arts center, 1975	John T. Dorwin, Western Carolina Univ.
	SEAC-01089	1993		Archeological investigations for a road at Roanoke River Parkway	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00864	1990	BLRI-00399	Archeological investigations for Craggy Pinnacle overlook and trail	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00787	1988	BLRI-00419	Archeological investigations for proposed folk music center	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-01114	1993	BLRI-00427	Archeological investigations for septic systems at two locations	John E. Cornelison, SEAC
	SEAC-00378	1981		Archeological investigations of the Mons Site, Peaks of Otter, 1940	David I. Bushnell, Smithsonian Institution
	SEAC-00785	1987	BLRI-00431	Archeological investigations of the Mountain-to-Sea Trail	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-01034	1992	BLRI-00421	Archeological investigations to replace absorption field	John E. Cornelison, SEAC
	SEAC-00372	1981	BLRI-00411	Archeological monitoring of road construction, 1976	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC

*Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan, Southeast Field Area*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
BLRI (cont.)	SEAC-00780	1987	BLRI-00418	Archeological survey and testing for the Linn Cove septic drainfield	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00992	1992		Archeological survey for a Buncombe County sewer line	C. Michael Baker, Hall & Baker Archeological Consultants
	SEAC-00377	1981	BLRI-00413	Archeological survey for Doughton Park sewer line, 1979	Harvard Ayers and Ed Peters, Appalachian State Univ.
	SEAC-00307	1977	BLRI-00426	Archeological survey for proposed construction projects	Ellen Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00822	1989	BLRI-00393	Archeological survey of Bass Lake, Cone Manor, North Carolina	Robert C. Wilson, SEAC
	SEAC-00700	1985	BLRI-00417	Archeological survey of Grandfather Mt. and Linville Falls Trails	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-00197	1976	BLRI-00425	Archeological survey of multiple sites	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00662	1984	BLRI-00416	Archeological survey of section 2H, Wilson Creek	Maurice W. Williams, SEAC
	SEAC-00889	1990	BLRI-00400	Archeological survey of the Fisher Peak Music Center	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00823	1989	BLRI-00394	Archeological survey of Trout Lake, Cone Manor, North Carolina	Robert C. Wilson, SEAC
	SEAC-01109	1993	BLRI-00432	General site survey	Helen Phillips, BLRI
	SEAC-01131	1994		Mountain-to-Sea Trail clearance	David Brewer, SEAC
BUIS	SEAC-00198	1976	BUIS-00027	Archeological survey of Buck Island	George Fischer, SEAC
CAHA	SEAC-00945	1991		Archeological clearance for construction at Frisco Campground	Douglas T. Potter, SEAC
	SEAC-00387	1981		Archeological investigation to establish culture sequence	William Haag, Louisiana State Univ.
	SEAC-00673	1984		Archeological investigations at CAHA	Jackson W. Moore
	SEAC-00955	1991	CAHA-00120	Archeological investigations at multiple sites	Douglas T. Potter, SEAC
	SEAC-01015	1992	CAHA-00121	Archeological investigations at multiple sites	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00385	1981	CAHA-00124	Archeological investigations for multiple construction projects	George Fischer, SEAC
	SEAC-00390	1981		Archeological investigations for multiple construction projects	George Fischer, SEAC
	SEAC-01040	1992	CAHA-00123	Archeological investigations of beach eroded artifacts	David M. Brewer, SEAC
	SEAC-00869	1990		Archeological investigations of proposed construction projects	David G. Anderson, IAS
	SEAC-00988	1992		Archeological investigations of proposed construction projects	David G. Anderson, IAS
	SEAC-00595	1982		Archeological recommendations for proposed construction projects	George Fischer, SEAC



*Appendix 3— Previous Archeological Testing by Park*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
CAHA (cont.)	SEAC-00386	1981	CAHA-00125	Archeological resources at Cape Hatteras	T. Thompson, North Carolina Division of Archives
	SEAC-00904	1991	CAHA-00115	Archeological survey for park housing	Susan Hammersten, SEAC
	SEAC-00753	1987		Archeological survey of Little Kinnakeet Life Saving Station	Linda Carnes, Univ. of North Carolina
	SEAC-00389	1981		Historical Management Plan, 1968	F. J. Rousch and C. E. Hatch, Jr., NPS Division of History
	SEAC-00952	1991		Material from park, to be evaluated for donation	Bebe B. Woody, Cultural Resource Management Specialist, CAHA
	SEAC-00696	1985		Preliminary assessment of environmentally exposed shipwreck remains	James P. Delgado, East Carolina Univ.
CALO	SEAC-00391	1981		Archeological investigations at Cape Lookout, 1938	Joffre L. Coe and Harry Davis, Univ. of North Carolina
	SEAC-00392	1981		Archeological investigations at Cape Lookout, 1963	Tucker Littleton, Univ. of North Carolina
	SEAC-00393	1981		Archeological investigations at Cape Lookout, 1964	Tucker Littleton, Bennie C. Keel, and Brian Egloff, Univ. of North Carolina
	SEAC-00202	1976	CALO-00065	Investigations of archeological and historical resources	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
CANA	SEAC-01004	1992	CANA-00046	Archeological clearance and monitoring of Eldora Hotel demolition	David M. Brewer, SEAC
	SEAC-00677	1984	CANA-00051	Archeological clearance for Camera Pad Road construction	Robert Taylor, SEAC
	SEAC-00995	1992	CANA-00023	Archeological clearance for mosquito control dikes, Pardon Island	David M. Brewer and Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00379	1981		Archeological excavations at what is now CANA	M. W. Stirling, Smithsonian Institute
	SEAC-00351	1980		Archeological investigations at Canaveral	George A. Long, Kennedy Space Center
	SEAC-00349	1980		Archeological investigations at Castle Windy	Ripley R. Bullen, Florida State Museum
	SEAC-00963	1991	CANA-00022	Archeological investigations at Max Hoeck Dike Road	David M. Brewer, SEAC
	SEAC-01082	1993	CANA-00058	Archeological investigations at Seminole Rest	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00793	1988	CANA-00029	Archeological investigations at Seminole Rest parking lot	Robert C. Wilson, SEAC
	SEAC-00891	1990	CANA-00021	Archeological investigations at the Armstrong site (CANA-73)	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
SEAC-00834	1989	CANA-00034	Archeological investigations at Turtle Mound and Castle Windy	Robert C. Wilson, SEAC	

*Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan, Southeast Field Area*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
CANA (cont.)	SEAC-00895	1990	CANA-00041	Archeological investigations for garage and wayside exhibits, North District	David M. Brewer, SEAC
	SEAC-00776	1987	CANA-00028	Archeological investigations for the Apollo boatramp, North District	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00646	1983	CANA-00012	Archeological investigations for the Apollo Road project	Rochelle A. Marrinan, FSU
	SEAC-00886	1990	CANA-00040	Archeological investigations for three comfort stations	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00345	1980		Archeological investigations in the area of what is now CANA	Ripley R. Bullen, Florida State Museum
	SEAC-00835	1989	CANA-00035	Archeological investigations of Playalinda Road, South District	Stephen C. Bryne, SEAC
	SEAC-01038	1992	CANA-00024	Archeological investigations of the Eldora Statehouse parking lot	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00860	1990	CANA-00037	Archeological monitoring of Apollo boatramp; Castle Windy disturbance	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00365	1980	CANA-00042	Archeological monitoring of boardwalk construction at Turtle Mound	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-01005	1992	CANA-00047	Archeological reconnaissance of the Silver Palm site	David M. Brewer, SEAC
	SEAC-00383	1981		Archeological survey of sand mounds on the St. Johns River	C. B. Moore
	SEAC-00384	1981		Archeological survey of the St. Johns and Indian Rivers	J. Francis LeBaron, Smithsonian Institution
	SEAC-00382	1981		Archeological survey of Volusia County	John M. Goggin, Yale Univ.
	SEAC-00191	1976	CANA-00001	Archeological survey project	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-01006	1992	CANA-00048	Ground Penetrating Radar demonstration at Seminole Rest, 8VO124	David M. Brewer, SEAC
	SEAC-01127	1994		Magnetometer survey of Beach-Face	David Brewer, SEAC
	SEAC-00797	1988	CANA-00030	Park technical assistance and archeological monitoring of four sites	Robert C. Wilson, SEAC
SEAC-00880	1990	CANA-00039	Park technical assistance for archeological monitoring, CANA-63	Robert C. Wilson, SEAC	
CARL	SEAC-00195	1976	CARL-00211	Archeological investigations at CARL	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-00205	1976	CARL-00212	Archeological investigations at CARL	Steve Shephard, SEAC
	SEAC-00333	1979	CARL-00213	Archeological investigations at CARL	Dennis Finch, SEAC
	SEAC-00394	1981	CARL-00214	Archeological investigations at four houses	John T. Dorwin, Western Carolina Univ.
	SEAC-00985	1992	CARL-00216	Archeological survey for a proposed water storage tank, 1979	John W. Walker, SEAC
CASA	SEAC-00400	1981		Archeological excavation of the Cubo Line, 1963	John W. Griffin, NPS

*Appendix 3— Previous Archeological Testing by Park*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
CASA (cont.)	SEAC-00399	1981		Archeological excavation of the Pozo Well, 1973	Thomas Padgett, SEAC
	SEAC-00557	1981		Archeological excavations at the Castillo, 1979	Kathleen A. Deagan, Florida State University
	SEAC-00523	1981	CASA-00112	Archeological excavations at the smithy, 1961	R. Steinbach, Historic St. Augustine Preservation Board
	SEAC-00968	1991	CASA-00242	Archeological investigations for a new telephone line	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00397	1981	CASA-00044	Archeological investigations in the courtyard, 1953	J. C. Harrington, NPS
	SEAC-00398	1981	CASA-00109	Archeological investigations in the sally port and guard rooms, 1960	Albert C. Manucy, NPS
	SEAC-00395	1981		Archeological investigations of the fort's foundation, 1941	Thor Borresen, NPS Historian
	SEAC-00401	1981		Archeological investigations related to Highway A1A, 1959	Albert C. Manucy, NPS
	SEAC-00396	1981		Archeological investigations to trace the city moat palisade, 1937	W. J. Winter, St. Augustine Historical Society
	SEAC-00789	1988		Archeological monitoring of excavations for underground utilities	Stanley C. Bond, Historic St. Augustine Preservation Board
	SEAC-00934	1991		Archeological monitoring of geological test bore holes in terrapin	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00825	1989	CASA-00246	Archeological monitoring of subsurface testing of bastion walls	Bruce L. Manzano, SEAC
	SEAC-00574	1981	CASA-00225	Underwater archeological survey, 1978	Joan Koch, FSU
CHAT	SEAC-00779	1987	CHAT-00005	Archeological investigations at 9GW16	Harry Scheele, IAS
	SEAC-00404	1981		Archeological investigations of Chattahoochee River corridor, 1974	Christopher E. Hamilton, FSU
	SEAC-00699	1985	CHAT-00004	Archeological investigations of three tracts of surplus property	Jackson W. Moore, SEAC
	SEAC-00659	1983	CHAT-00003	Archeological survey of Roberts Drive entrance road, Island Ford	Greg Komara and Jackson Moore, SEAC
	SEAC-01136	1994		Archeological Testing of Vickery Creek Parking Lot	David G. Anderson, SEAC (IAS, Atlanta)
	SEAC-00337	1979	CHAT-00001	Cultural Resource Inventory, 1979-1980	Ellen Ehrenhard, SEAC
CHCH	SEAC-00327	1979		Archeological assessment of CHCH, 1975	Jeffrey Brown, Univ. of Tennessee, Chattanooga
	SEAC-00524	1981		Archeological excavations at the Cravens House, 1975	Jeffrey Brown, Univ. of Tennessee, Chattanooga
	SEAC-00996	1992		Archeological investigations at Gordon Lee Plantation	Jeffrey Brown, Univ. of Tennessee, Chattanooga

*Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan, Southeast Field Area*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
CHCH (cont.)	SEAC-00997	1992		Archeological investigations at the Mark Thrash House site	Mary A. Wilson, Univ. of Tennessee, Chattanooga
	SEAC-00810	1988		Archeological investigations for a walkway and patio at Point Park	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00873	1990		Archeological investigations for parking areas and wayside exhibits	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00525	1981		Archeological monitoring of pipe line construction, 1979	Jeffrey Brown, Univ. of Tennessee Chattanooga
	SEAC-01060	1992		Archeological survey and monitoring of Highway 27 relocation	John E. Cornelison, SEAC
	SEAC-00911	1991		Archeological survey for three highway corridor proposals	Robert F. Entorf, Archeologist, Georgia Dept. of Transportation
	SEAC-00526	1981		Archeological survey of Highway 27 relocation alternatives, 1977	Jeffrey Brown, Univ. of Tennessee, Chattanooga
	SEAC-00710	1985		Archeological survey of Pistol Range Hollow	Nicholas Honerkamp, Univ. of Tennessee, Chattanooga
	SEAC-00821	1989		Archeological testing for the proposed visitor center addition	Robert C. Wilson, SEAC
	SEAC-01045	1992		Archeological testing of proposed Highway 27	George S. Smith, SEAC
	SEAC-00676	1984		Archeological testing of visitor center, parking lot and Lookout Mt.	Richard E. Johnson, SEAC
	SEAC-00991	1992		Assessment of damage to archeological resources, Lookout Mt. Unit	Guy Prentice, SEAC
	SEAC-01081	1993		Assessment of damage to the cultural resources, ARPA investigation	Guy L. Prentice, SEAC
SEAC-00679	1984		Dyer House/Field School at CHCH	Jeffrey Brown, Univ. of Tennessee, Chattanooga	
CHPI	SEAC-00915	1991	CHPI-00002	Archeological investigations at historic Snee Farm	Julia King, Friends of Historic Snee Farm
	SEAC-00943	1991	CHPI-00004	Archeological investigations for a new water line and fence	Bennie C. Keel, SEAC
	SEAC-00906	1991	CHPI-00001	Archeological monitoring of a new water main at Snee Farm	Guy L. Prentice, SEAC
	SEAC-00923	1991	CHPI-00003	Archeological monitoring of asbestos removal	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00972	1991	CHPI-00005	Cultural resource survey of Snee Farm, 38CH917	Brockington & Associates, Atlanta, Georgia
	SEAC-00983	1992	CHPI-00006	Tree fall assessment at Snee Farm, 1989	David M. Brewer, SEAC
CHRI	SEAC-00819	1989		Archeological investigations for a restroom	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC

*Appendix 3— Previous Archeological Testing by Park*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
CHRI (cont.)	SEAC-00813	1988		Archeological investigations for trash can holders	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00845	1989		Archeological investigations for underground utilities	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
COSW	SEAC-00882	1990		Archeological investigations for a boardwalk	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00346	1980		Archeological survey of various sites in Congaree Swamp, 1978	Robert Stephenson, Univ. of South Carolina
COWP	SEAC-00584	1982	COWP-00025	Archeological investigations at the Richard Scrogg's House, 1979	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-00745	1985	COWP-00026	Archeological investigations of four land tracts	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-00406	1981	COWP-00024	Archeological survey at Cowpens, 1974	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-00363	1980	COWP-00023	Archeological survey for construction	Dennis Finch, SEAC
CUGA	SEAC-00733	1986	CUGA-00275	Archeological assessment of newly acquired properties	Robert Taylor, SEAC
	SEAC-01047	1992	CUGA-00273	Archeological investigations at a historic house and lithic scatter	John E. Cornelison, SEAC
	SEAC-00407	1981	MULTIPLE	Archeological investigations at the iron foundry site, 1957	Jackson W. Moore, NPS Archeologist
	SEAC-00786	1987	CUGA-00272	Archeological investigations at the Watts Brothers site, 40 Ce 6	Guy L. Prentice, SEAC
	SEAC-00894	1990	CUGA-00264	Archeological investigations for a possible historic weapons cache	George Smith, SEAC
	SEAC-00792	1988	CUGA-00257	Archeological investigations for a road and parking lot	Roy W. Reaves, SEAC
	SEAC-00916	1991	CUGA-00267	Archeological investigations for the realignment of US Route 58	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00844	1989	CUGA-00262	Archeological investigations for the tunnel project, phase II	Stephen C. Bryne, SEAC
	SEAC-00885	1990	CUGA-00268	Archeological monitoring of a water line installation	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00874	1990	CUGA-00276	Archeological testing for the proposed waterline and footbridge	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00527	1981	CUGA-00274	Assessment of archeological resources	John W. Walker, SEAC
CUIS	SEAC-00568	1981		Archeological clearance at Dungeness Cemetery, 1977	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00630	1983	CUIS-00362	Archeological drawings made at the Stafford Golf House, 1978	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00409	1981	CUIS-00349	Archeological excavation of slave cabins, 1969	Charles H. Fairbanks and Robert Ascher, Univ. of Florida



*Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan, Southeast Field Area*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
CUIS (cont.)	SEAC-00599	1982	CUIS-00359	Archeological investigation at Garden Point and Dungeness Dock, 1980	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00413	1981	CUIS-00353	Archeological investigation for deep well drilling, 1979	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-01063	1992	CUIS-00375	Archeological investigation of an eroding burial at 9 CAM 6	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00575	1981	CUIS-00357	Archeological investigation of reported artifact concentration, 1975	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00412	1981	CUIS-00352	Archeological investigation of the Johnston Reservation, 1975	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00592	1982	CUIS-00358	Archeological investigations at 9 CAM 4 and 9 CAM 22	Rochelle A. Marrinan, FSU
	SEAC-00632	1983	CUIS-00363	Archeological investigations at Rayfield Slave Cabin, 1978	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00620	1982	CUIS-00361	Archeological investigations at the Dungeness Ice House, 1978	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00563	1981	CUIS-00356	Archeological investigations at the Dungeness wharf and dump	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00414	1981	CUIS-00354	Archeological investigations at the Nightingale Campground, 1980	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00674	1984	CUIS-00365	Archeological investigations for a waterline to Dungeness Ice House	Jackson W. Moore and Richard D. Faust, SEAC
	SEAC-01080	1993	CUIS-00376	Archeological investigations for Dungeness Seawall	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00982	1992	CUIS-00344	Archeological investigations for Plum Orchard drain system and seawall	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-01051	1992	CUIS-00372	Archeological investigations for the Bachlott House parking lot	John E. Cornelison, SEAC
	SEAC-01052	1992	CUIS-00371	Archeological investigations of the Millers Dock Property	Rolland Swain, Supt.
	SEAC-00615	1982	CUIS-00360	Archeological monitoring of main road waterline	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00737	1986	CUIS-00368	Archeological site monitoring project	Robert C. Wilson, SEAC
	SEAC-00812	1988	CUIS-00370	Archeological site monitoring project	Robert C. Wilson, SEAC
	SEAC-00354	1980	CUIS-00347	Archeological survey of Cumberland Island, 1970	Jerald T. Milanich, Univ. of Florida
	SEAC-01012	1992	CUIS-00373	Archeological survey of Cumberland Island, 1973	Donald L. Crusoe, SEAC
SEAC-00408	1981	CUIS-00348	Archeological survey of mounds on northeast Cumberland Island, 1897	C. B. Moore	
SEAC-01017	1992	CUIS-00374	Archeological survey of the Johnston property, 1974	Donald L. Crusoe, SEAC	
SEAC-00685	1984	CUIS-00366	Archeological testing of radioactive anomaly at Ft. Williams, 1983	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC	

*Appendix 3— Previous Archeological Testing by Park*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
CUIS (cont.)	SEAC-00872	1990	CUIS-00369	Brickhill Bluff site stabilization experiment	David M. Brewer, SEAC
	SEAC-00188	1975	CUIS-00253	Cultural Resource Inventory	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-01137	1994		Global Positioning System Site Location Survey	David Brewer, SEAC
	SEAC-01130	1994	CUIS-00377	Sea Camp Septic System Clearance	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00410	1981	CUIS-00350	Walking survey of Cumberland Island, 1950	Lewis Larson
DESO	SEAC-00824	1989	DESO-00014	Archeological investigations of boardwalk right-of-way	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00417	1981	DESO-00016	Archeological monitoring for a sewer line	George Fischer, SEAC
	SEAC-00881	1990	DESO-00017	Archeological testing for maintenance facility	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
DRTO	SEAC-01039	1992		Archeological investigations at multiple sites, 1971	George Fischer, SEAC
	SEAC-00888	1990	FOJE-00011	Archeological mapping project of FOJE-UW-03	Larry Nordby, Submerged Cultural Resource Unit, NPS
	SEAC-00954	1991	DRTO-00031	Archeological monitoring for a septic system	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00434	1981		Archeological monitoring of construction	Steven R. Richards, SEAC
	SEAC-01077	1993		Archeological monitoring of telephone and cable lines	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00649	1983		Archeological testing of historic shipwrecks, 1974	W. A. Cockrell, Florida Div. of Hist. Resources
	SEAC-00433	1981		Archeological testing on historic shipwrecks	Carl J. Clausen and W. A. Cockrell, Florida Bureau of Historic Sites
	SEAC-00432	1981		Remote sensing for shipwreck survey	A. D. Marmelstein, Earth Satellite Corporation
	SEAC-01085	1993		Remote sensing support for historic shipwreck surveys, 1974	A. D. Marmelstein, Earth Satellite Corporation
	SEAC-01140	1994		SAIP Survey	Larry Murphy, Submerged Cultural Resources Unit, SWR
	SEAC-00594	1982		Underwater archeological investigations of FOJE-UW-9, Rosario site	George Fischer, SEAC
	SEAC-00580	1982		Underwater archeological survey of FOJE-UW-08 and FOJE-UW-09, 1981	George Fischer, SEAC
EVER	SEAC-00170	1970	EVER-00240	Archeological investigations at East Cape Sable and surrounding area	Richard Klukas, EVER

*Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan, Southeast Field Area*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
EVER (cont.)	SEAC-00149	1969	EVER-00133	Archeological excavations at Bear Lake site, 08 Mo 33	John Griffin, NPS
	SEAC-00150	1969	EVER-00108	Archeological investigations at EVER prior to 1970	Richard Stokes and John Griffin, NPS
	SEAC-00352	1980		Archeological investigations at EVER, 1950	John M. Goggin, Florida State Museum
	SEAC-00420	1981	EVER-00352	Archeological investigations for a pit toilet on Sand Fly Key	John Galvin and Bill Truesdell, NPS
	SEAC-00711	1985		Archeological investigations for Shark Valley road construction	Robert Taylor, SEAC
	SEAC-00163	1970		Archeological investigations prior to 1970	Richard Stokes and John Griffin, NPS
	SEAC-00532	1981		Archeological survey of proposed Buttonwood Canal marina, 1976	Steve Deutschle, NPS
	SEAC-00423	1981		Archeological survey prior to construction, 1979	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00544	1981	EVER-00358	Archeology and Environment in South Florida, 1971	John W. Griffin, Historic St. Augustine Preservation Board
	SEAC-00590	1982		Cultural resource inventory, archeological sites	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00528	1981	EVER-00357	Remote sensing investigation of Ft. Poinsett, 1973	Roland Wood and F. Stapor, FSU
FOCA	SEAC-00426	1981		Archeological investigation of Shipyard Island, 1973	Steven D. Ruple, Univ. of Florida
	SEAC-00424	1981	MULTIPLE	Archeological investigations at Fort Caroline, 1952	Charles H. Fairbanks, NPS Archeologist
	SEAC-00652	1983	FOCA-00281	Archeological investigations of St. Johns Bluff at Ribault Column	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-00425	1981	FOCA-00280	Archeological investigations on Shipyard Island (8 DU 111), 1973	Charles H. Fairbanks, Univ. of Florida
	SEAC-00726	1986	FOCA-00284	Archeological monitoring of drainfield excavation at residence B-4	Robert Taylor, SEAC
	SEAC-00635	1983	FOCA-00282	Archeological monitoring of drainfield excavations	Ellen Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00545	1981		Investigations to assess archeological significance of land, 1953	William H. Sears, Florida State Museum
	SEAC-00743	1986	FOCA-00283	Monitoring of a fenceline at Spanish Pond	Suzanne Lewis, Supt.
FODO	SEAC-00427	1981	FODO-00085	Archeological excavation of the lower water battery, 40 SW 190	William W. Lockett, Junior Historian, SHIL
	SEAC-00343	1980	FODO-00026	Archeological excavation of water batteries, 1968 (40 SW 190)	Lee H. Hanson, NPS
	SEAC-00897	1991	FODO-00088	Archeological testing of area around Confederate Monument, 40 SW 190	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC

*Appendix 3— Previous Archeological Testing by Park*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
FODO (cont.)	SEAC-00643	1983	FODO-00087	Archeological testing of water battery #7, 40 SW 190	Judy L. Hellmich, SEAC
	SEAC-01011	1992	FODO-00084	Investigations for possible graves, earthworks and historic roads	John E. Cornelison, SEAC
	SEAC-00614	1982	FODO-00086	Remote sensing investigations to identify limestone feature	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
FOFR	SEAC-00199	1976	FOFR-00043	Archeological excavation of Hird Lot 12N, 1975	Nickolas Honerkamp, Univ. of Florida
	SEAC-00165	1970	FOFR-00006	Archeological investigations at the fort, 1947 through 1953	Charles H. Fairbanks, NPS Archeologist
	SEAC-00617	1982	MULTIPLE	Archeological investigations at the fort, 1956 through 1958	Joel Shiner, NPS Archeologist
	SEAC-00901	1991	FOFR-00053	Archeological investigations for a garden, boardwalk and fences	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00870	1990	FOFR-00052	Archeological investigations for water and sewer lines	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00429	1981	FOFR-00051	Archeological investigations of Lot 31 South, 1978	Nicholas Honerkamp, Univ. of Florida
	SEAC-00694	1985		Archeological investigations of the riverbank area	Nicholas Honerkamp, Univ. of Tennessee
	SEAC-00633	1983		Archeological investigations to locate southwest bastion, town wall	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-01119	1994		Archeological investigations to recover buried artifacts	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-01003	1992	MULTIPLE	Archeological investigations, 1958 and 1959	Albert Manucy and Jackson Moore, NPS
	SEAC-00986	1992		Archeological monitoring of distribution trench excavations, 1980	Marian E. Saffer, Univ. of Florida
	SEAC-00734	1986		Archeological monitoring of underground electric line, 1985	Allen Cooper and John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-00428	1981		Archeological monitoring of waterline system, 1976	James W. Thomson, SEAC
SEAC-00593	1982		Underwater archeological survey of the Frederica River, 1980	Leslie L. Parker, FSU/ADP, and George Fischer, SEAC	
FOMA	SEAC-00436	1981	FOMA-00006	Archeological assessment of logs eroding from the beach, 1976	Christopher E. Hamilton, SEAC
	SEAC-00306	1977	FOMA-00004	Archeological investigations at the fort and nearby middens, 1975	Kathleen A. Deagan, FSU
	SEAC-00840	1989		Archeological investigations at the proposed visitor center restroom	Stephen C. Bryne, SEAC
	SEAC-00820	1989	FOMA-00011	Archeological investigations at the proposed visitor center restroom	Robert C. Wilson, SEAC
	SEAC-01037	1992	FOMA-00003	Archeological investigations for a sewer line, 8 SJ 3225	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00969	1991	CASA-00243	Archeological investigations for parking, boardwalk and Bally bldg.	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC

*Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan, Southeast Field Area*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
FOMA (cont.)	SEAC-00729	1986		Archeological investigations of east midden on Rattlesnake Island	Rochelle A. Marrinan, FSU
	SEAC-00567	1981	CASA-00223	Archeological investigations of fort stabilization, 1980	Kathleen A. Deagan, FSU
	SEAC-00321	1978	FOMA-00005	Archeological investigations of the fort interior, 1978	Kathleen A. Deagan, FSU
	SEAC-00451	1981	FOMA-00009	Archeological investigations prior to fort stabilization, 1979	Kathleen A. Deagan, FSU
	SEAC-00450	1981	FOMA-00008	Archeological monitoring of fort stabilization, 1980	Maurice Williams, SEAC
	SEAC-00570	1981	FOMA-00010	Archeological monitoring of fort stabilization, 1980	Dana C. Linck, Denver Service Center
	SEAC-00836	1989	FOMA-00001	Archeological monitoring of restroom footings, 8 SJ 3225	Stanley Bond, Historic St. Augustine Preservation Board
	SEAC-00435	1981		Archeological survey of Fort Matanzas National Monument, 1966	Stephen J. Gluckman, St. Johns River Junior College
FOMO	SEAC-00355	1980	FOSU-00183	Archeological excavation at Fort Moultrie, 1974	Stanley South, Univ. of South Carolina
	SEAC-00448	1981		Archeological excavation of the well, 1976	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-00446	1981	FOSU-00170	Archeological investigations at multiple sites, 1974	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00157	1969	FOSU-00710	Archeological investigations of Osceola's Grave site, 1968	John Griffin, SEAC
	SEAC-00445	1981		Archeological monitoring of a drainage line, 1978	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00837	1989	FOSU-00682	Archeological monitoring of drainfield construction	David M. Brewer, SEAC
	SEAC-00778	1987		Archeological monitoring of the Dockside II tourboat facility	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00953	1991	FOSU-00701	Archeological monitoring of the sally port drainage system	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00447	1981		Archeological monitoring of trench excavation on Middle Street, 1976	A. Wayne Prokopetz, SEAC
	SEAC-00818	1988	FOSU-00672	Archeological testing of Dockside II	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00826	1989	FOSU-00712	Archeological testing of drainfield	Robert C. Wilson, SEAC
	SEAC-00553	1981		Soil resistivity study of Ft. Moultrie, 1975	John D. Combes, Univ. of South Carolina
FOOT	SEAC-00640	1983	GRSM-01349	Archeological investigations between Hollow and Carr Gaps	Glen Doran, FSU
	SEAC-00460	1981	GRSM-01341	Archeological investigations for proposed Foothills Parkway, 1974	George Fielder, Jr., Univ. of Tennessee
	SEAC-00531	1981		Archeological investigations for proposed Foothills Parkway, 1974	George Fielder, Jr., Univ. of Tennessee
	SEAC-00702	1985	GRSM-01351	Archeological investigations of Patterson Hollow and Carr Gap	John W. Walker, SEAC



*Appendix 3— Previous Archeological Testing by Park*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
FOOT (cont.)	SEAC-00865	1990	GRSM-01348	Archeological investigations of Section 8D and 8D1	Stephen C. Bryne, SEAC
	SEAC-00716	1983	GRSM-01352	Archeological investigations of Section E	John W. Walker, SEAC
FOPU	SEAC-01142	1994		Archeological Remote Sensing Survey	John Cornelison, SEAC
	SEAC-00437	1981		Archeological survey of Cockspur Island	John W. Griffin and Supt. R. B. Lattimore, NPS
FORA	SEAC-00890	1990	FORA-00048	Archeological clearance of electric line right-of-way	Bennie C. Keel, SEAC
	SEAC-00439	1981		Archeological excavation of 13 trenches in fort and nearby mound	Talcott Williams
	SEAC-00443	1981	FORA-00033	Archeological excavations in the fort	J. C. Harrington, NPS
	SEAC-01125	1994		Archeological investigations for a new fuel facility, 1993	Bennie C. Keel, SEAC
	SEAC-00956	1991	FORA-00054	Archeological investigations for construction of restroom buildings	Douglas T. Potter, SEAC
	SEAC-01107	1993	FORA-00055	Archeological investigations for telephone cable and drainage system	Dan Penton, SEAC
	SEAC-00946	1991	FORA-00045	Archeological investigations for telephone cable installation	Douglas T. Potter, SEAC
	SEAC-00755	1987	FORA-00043	Archeological investigations for the Roanoke Island Art Center	David S. Phelps, East Carolina Univ.
	SEAC-01126	1994		Archeological investigations for ticket booth construction	Bennie C. Keel, SEAC
	SEAC-00442	1981	FORA-00003	Archeological investigations of the fort, 1947, 1948 and 1950	J. C. Harrington, NPS
	SEAC-00608	1982	FORA-00049	Archeological investigations to locate the Lost Colony, 1982-1983	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00927	1991	FORA-00046	Archeological monitoring of sewer line installation	Bennie C. Keel, SEAC
	SEAC-01016	1992		Archeological monitoring of the sewer system	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00438	1981	FORA-00024	Archeological reconnaissance of the Elizabethan Garden area	J. C. Harrington, Garden Club of North Carolina
	SEAC-00913	1991	FORA-00044	Archeological survey for park housing	Susan Hammersten, SEAC
	SEAC-00707	1985	FORA-00053	Archeological testing of recorded anomalies	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-00552	1981		Early description of the ruins of the fort	Edward C. Bruce
SEAC-00440	1981	FORA-00050	Investigations to record aboriginal sites and locate 'Lost Colony'	William Haag, Louisiana State Univ.	
FOSU	SEAC-00842	1989		Archeological assessment of damage from Hurricane Hugo at FOSU	David M. Brewer, SEAC

*Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan, Southeast Field Area*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
FOSU (cont.)	SEAC-00449	1981		Archeological excavation of Battery Huger, 1951-1959	William W. Lockett, Supt., and Horace J. Sheely Jr., NPS
	SEAC-00611	1982		Archeological monitoring at Ft. Johnson and Ft. Sumter	Bobby Joe Taylor and John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-00777	1987		Archeological monitoring of U.S. Navy SEFES antenna installation	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
GRSM	SEAC-00459	1981	GRSM-01340	Archeological clearance for bridge construction, 1977	Chad Braley and John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00453	1981	GRSM-01335	Archeological clearance for road work, 1978	Robert C. Wilson, SEAC
	SEAC-00458	1981	GRSM-01339	Archeological clearance for waterline construction, 1979	Chris Beditz and John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00926	1991	GRSM-01355	Archeological investigation of trails in Cades Cove	Guy L. Prentice, SEAC
	SEAC-01048	1992	GRSM-01364	Archeological investigations at Oconaluftee	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00794	1988	GRSM-01010	Archeological investigations for Cades Cove horse trail	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00719	1985	GRSM-01353	Archeological investigations for construction at Mingus Mill	Allen Cooper, SEAC
	SEAC-00848	1989	GRSM-01347	Archeological investigations for construction at multiple sites	Stephen C. Bryne, SEAC
	SEAC-00866	1990	GRSM-01354	Archeological investigations for development at Big Creek	Stephen C. Bryne, SEAC
	SEAC-00929	1991	GRSM-01252	Archeological investigations for Oconaluftee water and sewer project	Elizabeth Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00456	1981	GRSM-01337	Archeological investigations for Oconaluftee Job Corps Center, 1978	Marsha A. Chance, SEAC
	SEAC-01084	1993		Archeological investigations for parking lot reconstruction at mill	Tina Rust, SEAC
	SEAC-00817	1988	GRSM-01345	Archeological investigations of the Oconaluftee Trail	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00799	1988	GRSM-01344	Archeological monitoring at Cataloochee School and Palmer Chapel	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00839	1989	GRSM-01346	Archeological monitoring of the Abrams Falls parking lot	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00935	1991	GRSM-01343	Archeological survey for proposed construction at McCarter's Stable	Tom DesJean, SEAC
	SEAC-00340	1980	GRSM-01334	Archeological survey for proposed sewer line	Charles B. Poe, SEAC
	SEAC-00200	1976	GRSM-01333	Archeological survey of Blue Ridge Parkway Extension	Ellen Murphy, SEAC
	SEAC-00578	1981		Archeological survey of Deep Creek and tunnel area, 1980	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00455	1981		Archeological survey of the park, 1975	Quentin R. Bass, Univ. of Tennessee

*Appendix 3— Previous Archeological Testing by Park*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
GRSM (cont.)	SEAC-00457	1981	GRSM-01338	Archeological survey work in park, 1977	Charles Faulkner, Univ. of Tennessee
	SEAC-01083	1992	GRSM-01427	Archeological testing at Oconaluftee, GRSM-113	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00601	1982	GRSM-01342	Archeological testing for administrative building site, 1980	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00701	1985	GRSM-01350	Archeological testing of proposed utility line route to Cades Cove	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-01143	1994		Preliminary Archeological Evaluation of 3 Sites	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
GUCO	SEAC-00554	1981	GUCO-00053	Archeological investigation of 18th and 19th century houses, 1974	Joffre L. Coe and Trawick Ward, Univ. of North Carolina
	SEAC-00461	1981	GUCO-00050	Archeological investigations at Guilford Courthouse, 1968	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-00811	1988	GUCO-00052	Archeological investigations for fence installation	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00555	1981	GUCO-00054	Archeological investigations for road/parking lot relocation, 1972	Joffre L. Coe, Univ. of North Carolina
	SEAC-01090	1993		Archeological investigations for utility lines for a VIP trailer	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00838	1989	GUCO-00051	Archeological monitoring of fence installation	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
GUIS	SEAC-00573	1981	GUIS-00506	Archeological assessment of damage from firebreak construction	Bruce Piatek, SEAC
	SEAC-00647	1983	GUIS-00549	Archeological clearance at Ft. Pickens Historic District	Glen Doran, FSU
	SEAC-00648	1983	GUIS-00550	Archeological clearance at Naval Live Oaks	Glen Doran, FSU
	SEAC-00466	1981	GUIS-00545	Archeological clearance for YCC construction, 1977	George Fischer, SEAC
	SEAC-00364	1980	GUIS-00503	Archeological excavation and testing of selected sites	James W. Stoutamire and Clifton Huston, FSU
	SEAC-00331	1979	GUIS-00502	Archeological excavation at Santa Rosa Pensacola (8 Es 22)	Hale G. Smith, FSU
	SEAC-00463	1981		Archeological excavations at 8 Sr 8, 1968	David S. Phelps, FSU
	SEAC-00577	1981	GUIS-00577	Archeological excavations at Casemates 54-57, Fort Pickens, 1976	James W. Thomson, SEAC
	SEAC-00334	1979	GUIS-00542	Archeological excavations at Fort Pickens, Bastion D	James W. Thomson, SEAC
	SEAC-00672	1984	GUIS-00552	Archeological investigation of a shipwreck at Pensacola, 1982	W. A. Cockrell, Florida DAHRM
	SEAC-00189	1975	GUIS-00497	Archeological investigations at Drawbridge Well and Advanced Redoubt	John W. Walker, SEAC

*Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan, Southeast Field Area*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
GUIS (cont.)	SEAC-00849	1990	GUIS-M0062	Archeological investigations at East Ship Island, French Warehouse	Susan Hammersten, SEAC
	SEAC-00325	1978	GUIS-00501	Archeological investigations at multiple sites	James W. Stoutamire and Chad Braley, FSU
	SEAC-00192	1976	GUIS-00499	Archeological investigations at Naval Live Oaks Reservation	A. Wayne Prokopetz, SEAC
	SEAC-00806	1988	GUIS-M0058	Archeological investigations at the French Warehouse site	Robert C. Wilson, SEAC
	SEAC-00775	1987	GUIS-M0063	Archeological investigations for a boardwalk at Ft. Massachusetts	David Saunders and Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00723	1986	GUIS-00554	Archeological investigations for a fire station	Robert C. Wilson, SEAC
	SEAC-01122	1994		Archeological investigations for a sewer system	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00730	1986	GUIS-00379	Archeological investigations for a visitor center, 8 Sr 8	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-01088	1993		Archeological investigations for an electric line	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00465	1981		Archeological investigations of area adjacent to Ft. Barrancas	David Swindel, Florida State Archives
	SEAC-00732	1986	GUIS-00391	Archeological investigations of area where Human Remains were found	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-00721	1986	GUIS-M0049	Archeological investigations of eroding site on East Ship Island	Robert C. Wilson, SEAC
	SEAC-00833	1989	GUIS-00561	Archeological investigations of Fort Pickens electric line, 8 Es 70	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00744	1986	GUIS-00415	Archeological monitoring at 8 Sr 69	Allen Cooper, SEAC
	SEAC-00572	1981	GUIS-00505	Archeological monitoring at Glacis Fort Barrancas, 1980	Bruce Piatek, SEAC
	SEAC-00984	1992	GUIS-00567	Archeological monitoring at Santa Rosa Island E. day use area, 1980	Dana C. Linck, Denver Service Center
	SEAC-00752	1987	GUIS-00559	Archeological monitoring ground, visitor's center trail and utility	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00312	1977	GUIS-00540	Archeological monitoring of a waterline at Ft. Pickens Glacis	Christopher E. Hamilton, SEAC
	SEAC-00338	1979	GUIS-00378	Archeological monitoring of construction projects	Bruce Piatek, SEAC
	SEAC-00190	1975	GUIS-00498	Archeological monitoring of Ft. Barrancas stabilization project	A. Wayne Prokopetz and George Fischer, SEAC
	SEAC-00739	1986	GUIS-00556	Archeological monitoring of Naval Live Oaks group camping area	Allen Cooper, SEAC
	SEAC-00746	1987	GUIS-00557	Archeological monitoring of utility lines at visitor center	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00738	1986	GUIS-00555	Archeological monitoring of visitor center, 08 Sr 08	Allen Cooper, SEAC
SEAC-00893	1990	GUIS-00563	Archeological monitoring of walkway and trench	George Smith, SEAC	

*Appendix 3— Previous Archeological Testing by Park*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
GUIS (cont.)	SEAC-00462	1981	GUIS-00544	Archeological site assessment, 1972	A. Wayne Prokopetz and George Fischer, SEAC
	SEAC-00318	1978	MULTIPLE	Archeological survey of GUIS, Contract #CX500031438	Louis Tesar, FSU
	SEAC-00344	1980	GUIS-00543	Archeological survey of Perdido Key, 1974	A. Wayne Prokopetz, FSU
	SEAC-00491	1981	GUIS-00504	Archeological surveys and excavations at numerous sites, 1957-1970s	William and Yulee Lazarus, Temple Mound Museum
	SEAC-00605	1982	GUIS-M0061	Archeological testing for Davis Bayou entrance road	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-01049	1992	GUIS-00569	Inventory and evaluation of Naval Live Oaks/GUIS, NASI	John R. Wright, SEAC
	SEAC-00754	1967		Investigations at 8 SR 8, 1966 and 1967	S. S. Williams
	SEAC-00658	1983	GUIS-00551	Magnetometer survey at Ft. Pickens, 1973	George Fischer, SEAC
	SEAC-00464	1981	GUIS-00565	Magnetometer survey, 1973	Martin Meylach, Earth Satellite Corporation
	SEAC-00173	1971	GUIS-00564	Northwest Florida Coast Survey, 1940	Gordon R. Willey, Columbia Univ.
	SEAC-01086	1993		Remote sensing for historic shipwreck survey, 1973	A. D. Marmelstein, Earth Satellite Corporation
	SEAC-00314	1973	GUIS-00541	Underwater archeological survey of the offshore islands, Florida	George Fischer, SEAC
	SEAC-00680	1984	GUIS-00553	Underwater search for prehistoric remains and GUIS-UW-18 and 19, 1979	Greg Stanton, FSU
	HOBE	SEAC-00330	1979	HOBE-00133	Archeological excavation at two Upper Creek sites
SEAC-00468		1981	HOBE-00134	Archeological investigations at Tohopeka and Nuyaka villages	Charles H. Fairbanks, FSU
SEAC-01014		1992	HOBE-00132	Archeological investigations for an underground telephone line	John E. Cornelison, SEAC
SEAC-00900		1991	HOBE-00137	Archeological investigations for the construction of park housing	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
SEAC-00469		1981	HOBE-00135	Historic documentation on Indian Breastwork	George C. MacKenzie, NPS
KEMO	SEAC-00561	1981		Archeological excavation of Confederate fortifications, 1939	B. C. Yates, Supt. and Charles H. Fairbanks, NPS
	SEAC-00725	1986		Archeological investigations at Kolb Farm Battle site	Allen Cooper and John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-00957	1991		Archeological investigations for a proposed sidewalk	Douglas T. Potter, SEAC
	SEAC-00910	1991	KEMO-00270	Archeological investigations for widening of Dallas Highway, 1990	Robert F. Entorf, Archeologist, Georgia Dept. of Transportation



*Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan, Southeast Field Area*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
KEMO (cont.)	SEAC-00713	1985		Archeological investigations of retaining wall on Powder Springs Rd.	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-00909	1991	KEMO-00269	Archeological investigations of tract along Dallas Highway, 1987	Robert F. Entorf, Archeologist, Georgia Dept. of Transportation
	SEAC-01028	1992		Archeological investigations of vandalism of a stone mound	Guy L. Prentice, SEAC
	SEAC-00989	1992		Archeological monitoring of Burnt Hickory Road parking lot, 1990	David G. Anderson, IAS
	SEAC-00471	1981		Archeological survey of Kennesaw Mountain Battlefield, 1975	David J. Hally, Univ. of Georgia
	SEAC-00703	1985		Archeological testing of area for widening of Powder Springs Road	Jackson W. Moore, SEAC
	SEAC-00735	1986		Archeological testing of the proposed handicapped access trail	Allen Cooper, SEAC
KIMO	SEAC-00353	1980	KIMO-00063	Archeological investigations at King's Moutain, 1973	Robert Stephenson, Univ. of South Carolina
	SEAC-00472	1981	KIMO-00062	Archeological investigations for a drainage system, 1977	George Fischer, SEAC
MACA	SEAC-00654	1983	MACA-00198	Archeological excavation of Chief City section	George Fischer, SEAC
	SEAC-00756	1987	MACA-00158	Archeological Inventory Project, Season 1	Guy L. Prentice, SEAC
	SEAC-00790	1988	MACA-00158	Archeological Inventory Project, Season 2	Guy L. Prentice, SEAC
	SEAC-00816	1988	MACA-00158	Archeological Inventory Project, Season 3	Guy L. Prentice, SEAC
	SEAC-00475	1981		Archeological investigation	Clifton D. Bryant, Western Kentucky Univ.
	SEAC-00522	1981		Archeological investigations	Patty Jo Watson and K.C. Carstens, Cave Research Foundation
	SEAC-01020	1992	MACA-00239	Archeological investigations at Joppa Church and Sand Cave trail	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00846	1989		Archeological investigations at multiple sites	Stephen C. Bryne, SEAC
	SEAC-01036	1992	MACA-00242	Archeological investigations at multiple sites	John Wright, SEAC
	SEAC-00809	1988	MACA-00158	Archeological investigations at Old Guide's Cemetery, MACA-62	Guy L. Prentice, SEAC
	SEAC-01064	1992	MACA-00277	Archeological investigations for a parking lot, 1981	Chris Beditz, SEAC
	SEAC-01069	1993	MACA-00269	Archeological investigations for amphitheater trails and sewer line	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-01121	1994	MACA-00280	Archeological investigations for bat gates at various caves	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC

*Appendix 3— Previous Archeological Testing by Park*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
MACA (cont.)	SEAC-00329	1979	MACA-00196	Archeological investigations of four alternate Job Corps sites	Alan Dorian and Chris Beditz, SEAC
	SEAC-01057	1992		Archeological investigations of Soil Conservation Service testing	Tom Des Jean, BISO Archeologist
	SEAC-00339	1980	MACA-00197	Archeological investigations of the Childress Farm/Job Corps Center	Charles B. Poe, SEAC
	SEAC-00976	1991	MACA-00202	Archeological investigations of the wastewater and telephone systems	Guy L. Prentice and Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00347	1980		Archeological investigations up to 1980	Patti Jo Watson, Washington Univ.
	SEAC-00480	1981		Archeological survey including site in park	W. S. Webb and W. D. Funkhouser, Univ. of Kentucky
	SEAC-00484	1981		Archeological survey of proposed horse trail	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-01065	1992	MACA-00276	Assessment of damage to archeological resources, MACA-18	Guy Prentice, SEAC
	SEAC-00558	1981		Cave explorations in Edmonson County	Gerald Fowke, Smithsonian Institution
	SEAC-00476	1981		Discovery of Salts Cave mummy Little Alice	T. E. Lee, J. L. Lee and W. D. Cutliff
	SEAC-00683	1984		Preliminary archeological investigations	Jack M. Schock, Univ. of Western Kentucky
	SEAC-00477	1981		Purchase of midden debris from Salt Cave, 1895	Col. Bennett Young
	SEAC-00479	1981	MACA-00004	Recovered Lost John of Mummy Lodge	Alonzo Pond
	SEAC-00863	1990	MACA-00231	Sand Cave pull Off, bike trail, overlooks, etc.	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00920	1991	MACA-00199	Survey and Testing at Longs Cave plus several other sites	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00564	1981	MACA-00136	Survey and testing of rockshelter/blufflines at Childress Farm	Lindsay M. Beditz, SEAC
SEAC-00481	1981		Survey of four alternative locations for Job Corps Center	D. C. Comer, Denver Service Center	
MOCR	SEAC-00209	1977	MOCR-00021	Archeological investigations at Grady Monument, 1974	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-00637	1983	MOCR-00028	Archeological investigations for a water line	Teresa Paglione, SEAC
	SEAC-00796	1988	MOCR-00031	Archeological investigations for footbridge and trail construction	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00489	1981	MOCR-00025	Archeological investigations of earthworks and road, 1974	Timothy A. Thompson, North Carolina Dept. of Cultural Resources
	SEAC-00671	1984	MOCR-00030	Archeological investigations of newly acquired property	Greg Komara, SEAC

*Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan, Southeast Field Area*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
MOCR (cont.)	SEAC-01059	1992	MOCR-00032	Archeological monitoring of bridge replacement	John R. Wright, SEAC
	SEAC-00488	1981	MOCR-00024	Archeological survey for relocation of Highway 210, 1973	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-00487	1981	MOCR-00023	Archeological survey of park with metal detector, 1958	John W. Griffin, NPS
	SEAC-00490	1981	MOCR-00026	Archeological testing of earthworks, 1938	Thor Borreson, NPS
	SEAC-00486	1981	MOCR-00022	Investigations in southeast corner of the earthworks, 1939	Clyde King, Supt.
	SEAC-00621	1982		Metal detector survey at Patriot earthworks, 1958	John W. Griffin, NPS
	SEAC-01132	1994	MOCR-00034	NASI Survey	John Cornelison, SEAC
	SEAC-00650	1983	MOCR-00029	Underwater archeological investigations of the bridge	George Fischer, SEAC
NATC	SEAC-01024	1992	NATC-00011	Archeological investigations at the Melrose Mansion	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-00973	1991	NATC-00010	Archeological investigations at the William Johnson House	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-01071	1993	NATC-00019	Archeological investigations for electric line installation	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-00961	1991	NATC-00007	Archeological investigations for proposed construction at Melrose	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-01110	1993		Archeological monitoring at Melrose Mansion	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-01062	1992		Archeological testing for the maintenance complex	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-01056	1992	NATC-00018	Mitigation at the Dependency for restoration, Johnson House	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
NATR	SEAC-00356	1980	NATR-00209	Archeological excavation at two historic sites on Section 1D	Gary Knudsen, SEAC
	SEAC-00332	1979	NATR-00208	Archeological excavation of four Coles Creek sites, Section 3V2	Carlos A. Martinez, SEAC
	SEAC-00494	1981	NATR-00217	Archeological excavations at Emerald Mound, 1972	Jeffery P. Brain, Harvard Univ.
	SEAC-01133	1994		Archeological investigation of Choctaw Agency Site	John O'Hear, Mississippi State Univ.
	SEAC-00626	1983	NATR-00186	Archeological investigation of the Snowball site	Carlos A. Martinez, SEAC
	SEAC-00766	1987		Archeological investigations at Blackburn Cemetery	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-01098	1993	NATR-00201	Archeological investigations at Chickasaw Village	Carlos A. Martinez, SEAC
	SEAC-01032	1992	NATR-00014	Archeological investigations at Gordon Site	John L. Cotter, NATR
	SEAC-01103	1993		Archeological investigations at Meriwether-Lewis Monument	James R. Atkinson, SEAC

*Appendix 3— Previous Archeological Testing by Park*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
NATR (cont.)	SEAC-00682	1984		Archeological investigations at Perkins Creek and Greenfield sites	Ian Brown, Harvard Univ.
	SEAC-01018	1992	NATR-00099	Archeological investigations at the Boyd site	Charles F. Bohannon, NPS Archeologist
	SEAC-00761	1987	NATR-00189	Archeological investigations at the Gordon Ferry site	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-00774	1987	NATR-00196	Archeological investigations for a proposed farm access road	Carlos A. Martinez, SEAC
	SEAC-01102	1993		Archeological investigations for an underground communication cable	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-01087	1993	NATR-00214	Archeological investigations for borrow pit construction	Jay Johnson, Robert Thorne, and Carey B. Oakley
	SEAC-01111	1993		Archeological investigations for handicapped access to Sunken Trace	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-00760	1987	NATR-00188	Archeological investigations for the Kosciusko Information Center	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-00770	1987	NATR-00194	Archeological investigations of a site at Jourdon Creek picnic area	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-01031	1992	NATR-00097	Archeological investigations of Fireplace Mound and Rose's Bluff	Charles F. Bohannon, NPS archeologist
	SEAC-01072	1993		Archeological investigations of Herring access easement, MP 269.4	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-00607	1982	NATR-00211	Archeological investigations of Mud Island Creek	Jay K. Johnson, Univ. of Mississippi
	SEAC-01068	1993		Archeological investigations of the Leeson exchange tract	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-00495	1981	NATR-00218	Archeological investigations on 3X section of the Trace	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00765	1987	NATR-00193	Archeological investigations on Section 1C	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-01097	1993	NATR-00200	Archeological investigations on Section 1D	n/a
	SEAC-00773	1987	NATR-00195	Archeological investigations on Section 2D3	Carlos A. Martinez, SEAC
	SEAC-01095	1993	NATR-00199	Archeological investigations on Section 3A	Carlos A. Martinez, SEAC
	SEAC-00831	1989	NATR-00197	Archeological investigations on Section 3M1	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-00759	1987	NATR-00187	Archeological investigations on Section 3V1	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-00763	1987	NATR-00191	Archeological investigations to locate the Duck River Cantonment	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-00764	1987	NATR-00192	Archeological monitoring of a utility ditch at the Gordon House	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-01101	1993		Archeological monitoring of a waterline installation	James R. Atkinson, SEAC

*Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan, Southeast Field Area*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
NATR (cont.)	SEAC-01070	1993		Archeological monitoring of phone line installation, MP 445	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-01141	1994		Archeological Monitoring of Section 3P	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-01066	1992		Archeological monitoring of telephone cable installation	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-00208	1977	NATR-00206	Archeological survey and test excavations	Christopher E. Hamilton and Shawn Bonath, SEAC
	SEAC-01105	1993		Archeological survey for Mt. Locust wheelchair access	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-01144	1994		Archeological Survey for Road Realignment at Milepost 422.2	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-00579	1981	NATR-00221	Archeological test excavations at the Gordon site (M Je 1)	Carlos A. Martinez, SEAC
	SEAC-00958	1991	NATR-00182	Archeological testing at the Anderson House, Hickman County, Tenn.	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-00691	1984	NATR-00167	Archeological testing of T Hk 29	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-00618	1982	NATR-00212	Colbert Ferry archeological survey	Jay Johnson and Bettye Broyles, Univ. of Mississippi
	SEAC-00627	1983		Construction monitoring of section 3A	Carlos A. Martinez, SEAC
	SEAC-00493	1981	NATR-00216	Field inspection of 2D5, Bear Creek Mound	Carlos A. Martinez, SEAC
	SEAC-00762	1987	NATR-00190	General surface collection at Emerald Mound, 22 AD 504	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-00639	1983		Gordon House resistivity survey and testing	Rochelle A. Marrinan, FSU
	SEAC-00556	1981	NATR-00220	Location and investigation of Ft. Dearborn	Sam O. Brooks, James H. Stone, and W. C. Wright, Mississippi Archives
	SEAC-00186	1975	NATR-00177	Material collected during 1975 highway survey	A. Wayne Prokopetz, SEAC
	SEAC-00174	1972	NATR-00104	Material from excavations at Pharr Mound	Charles F. Bohannon, NPS archeologist
	SEAC-00625	1983		Miscellaneous monitoring on the NATR	Carlos A. Martinez, SEAC
	SEAC-00636	1983		Mud Island Creek overlook, site 3V2	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-00600	1982	NATR-00222	Power line crossing survey, Attala County, Mississippi	Carlos A. Martinez and David McCullough, SEAC
SEAC-00497	1981	NATR-00210	Rock Creek Archeological Project	Drexel A. Peterson, Memphis State Univ.	
SEAC-00645	1983		Rock Creek Archeological Project	Gerald P. Smith, Memphis State Univ.	
SEAC-00603	1982		S.C.S. Dam 46A, Lee County, Mississippi	Lee H. Hanson, Soil Conservation Service	



*Appendix 3— Previous Archeological Testing by Park*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
NATR (cont.)	SEAC-00768	1987		Section 1A Monitoring and Testing T Da 1	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-00767	1987		Section 1B Monitoring and Testing T Wm 37, 40 Wm 84	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-00807	1988		Section 3P Survey	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-00769	1987		Section 3W testing of historic Bolls site	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-00808	1988		Section 3X Survey	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-00496	1981	NATR-00219	Shelby Bend Archeological Project	Carey B. Oakley, Univ. of Alabama
	SEAC-00642	1983		Station 188 site surface collection, Section 3V3	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-01007	1992		Sub-surface testing of remote sensing anomalies, 1981	Randy V. Bellomo, FSU
	SEAC-00757	1987		Survey and testing at Colbert Ferry Park	Jay Johnson and Bettye Broyles, Univ. of Mississippi
	SEAC-00698	1985		Survey and testing to locate site of Gordon's Duck River Ferry Stand	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-00055	1939	NATR-00205	Survey of Le 14-1, Le 14-9, Le 14-12	Jesse D. Jennings, Arthur R. Kelly, Truett Spalding
	SEAC-00871	1990	NATR-00168	Testing of sites along sections 3X and 3P	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-00326	1978	NATR-00207	Testing on Section 3B-Pharr Village, H.G. Smith Site, Mackey's Creek	James W. Stoutamire and Chad Braley, FSU
NISI	SEAC-00358	1980	NISI-00115	Archeological excavations at the jail and village, 38 GN 4, 1977	Michael Rodeffer, Back- country Arch. Services
	SEAC-00684	1984	NISI-00118	Archeological investigation of the proposed restroom and septic tank	James D. Scurry, Univ. of South Carolina
	SEAC-00360	1980		Archeological investigations at Holmes Fort, 38 GN 2	Michael Rodeffer, Back- country Arch. Services
	SEAC-00361	1980		Archeological investigations at NISI	Stanley South, Univ. of South Carolina
	SEAC-00521	1981		Archeological investigations at Star Fort	William Edwards, Univ. of South Carolina
	SEAC-00357	1980		Archeological investigations at the house on Cambridge Hill	S. G. Baker, Univ. of South Carolina
	SEAC-00359	1980	NISI-00116	Archeological investigations at the Seigeworks, 38 GN 3, 1976	Michael Rodeffer, Back- country Arch. Services
	SEAC-00628	1983	NISI-00119	Archeological investigations at the visitor center site	Ellen Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00974	1991	NISI-00105	Archeological investigations for the installation of a gas line	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00336	1979	NISI-00114	Archeological monitoring of a waterline installation, 38 GN 2	Ellen Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00309	1977	NISI-00112	Archeological survey in search of Nathanael Greene's Siege Camp	Ellen Ehrenhard, SEAC

*Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan, Southeast Field Area*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
NISI (cont.)	SEAC-00687	1984	NISI-00117	Archeological testing of remote sensing anomalies	Michael Rodeffer, Backcountry Arch. Services
	SEAC-00322	1978	NISI-00113	Cultural resource inventory	Ellen Ehrenhard, SEAC
OBRI	SEAC-00308	1977	OBRI-00011	Archeological investigations of the Obed Wild and Scenic River	James W. Thomson, SEAC
OCMU	SEAC-00598	1982	OCMU-00115	An analysis of post houses site 1 Bi 4, Macon, Ga	A. Wayne Prokopetz, FSU
	SEAC-00201	1976		Archeological excavation, Tuft Springs #1(13 Bi 25) and #2(13 Bi 19)	Gordon R. Willey, NPS
	SEAC-01002	1992	OCMU-00147	Archeological investigations at the Mound C and visitor center lots	John E. Cornelison, SEAC
	SEAC-01044	1992	OCMU-00148	Archeological investigations for fence installation at Drake's Field	John E. Cornelison, SEAC
	SEAC-00686	1984		Archeological monitoring of sewer/water line installation	Allen Cooper, SEAC
	SEAC-00623	1982		Archeological monitoring of waterproofing trench dug at earthlodge	George Fischer, SEAC
	SEAC-00815	1988		Archeological survey of fence track at Lamar	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00319	1978	OCMU-00114	Archeological testing, various sites	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-00183	1974	OCMU-00113	Artifacts from Funeral Mound Parking Lot 1 Bi 1	n/a
	SEAC-00970	1991		Assessment of condition of the Earthlodge floor	Allen S. Bohnert, SEAC
	SEAC-00550	1953		Fairchild's Landing and other Lake Seminole sites	J. R. Caldwell, WPA
	SEAC-00112	1959		Fiber Tempered, Fabric Marked Sherd	Park Staff
	SEAC-00040	1939		Flint from Flint Ridge near Newark, Ohio	R. E. Appleman
	SEAC-00137	1962	OCMU-00106	Flood Plain excavations material Big Dig 1961-1962	Jackson W. Moore, NPS
	SEAC-00549	1981		Ft. Colerain and Ft. Hawkins-Ed Price's Letterbook, Indian trade	
	SEAC-00547	1981	OCMU-00101	Jessup's Bluff (1 Bi 39)	James A. Herndon, WPA
	SEAC-00602	1970		Mound A, Lamar site vandalism	Park Staff
	SEAC-00155	1969	OCMU-00111	Mound A, Macon Plateau, 1967 excavation	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-00086	1946		Ocmulgee Fields Plain jar found west of park property	Lt. Col. Fred W. Rice
	SEAC-00924	1991	OCMU-00143	Tree fall evaluation and archeological testing	David M. Brewer, SEAC
SEAC-00788	1988		Utility line bore pit excavation monitoring	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC	

*Appendix 3— Previous Archeological Testing by Park*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
RUCA	SEAC-00499	1981	RUCA-00059	Archeological excavation at Russell Cave, 1956	Carl F. Miller, Smithsonian Institution
	SEAC-00530	1981	RUCA-00027	Archeological excavation of Cotton Patch site, 1963	Rex Wilson, NPS
	SEAC-00498	1981	RUCA-00060	Archeological excavations at Russell Cave, 1951	Paul H. Brown, Tennessee Archeological Society
	SEAC-00342	1980	RUCA-00057	Archeological investigations in Russell Cave, 1963	John W. Griffin, NPS
	SEAC-00877	1990	RUCA-00062	Archeological monitoring of erosion at cave	Robert C. Wilson and David M. Brewer, SEAC
	SEAC-01019	1992	RUCA-00055	Inventory and evaluation of RUCA, NASI	Ken Johnson, SEAC
	SEAC-00500	1981	RUCA-00058	Investigation of reported canoe in cave, 1971	John Fisher, Supt.
SAJU	SEAC-00832	1989	SAJU-00105	Archeological assessment of construction disturbance at El Morro	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00502	1981	SAJU-00110	Archeological assessment of pits dug by the park, 1976	Judith Kenyon, SEAC
	SEAC-01093	1993	SAJU-00109	Archeological data recovery at El Morro	Michelle Hayward, Pan American Consultants
	SEAC-00867	1990	SAJU-00106	Archeological investigations along the wall at El Morro	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00501	1981	SAJU-00040	Archeological investigations at El Morro, 1961	Hale G. Smith, FSU
	SEAC-00758	1987	SAJU-00104	Archeological investigations of El Morro guardhouse utilities	Roy W. Reaves, SEAC
	SEAC-01043	1992	SAJU-00107	Archeological investigations of the El Morro road project	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-01120	1994		Archeological investigations to assess damage from an oil spill	George S. Smith, SEAC
	SEAC-00503	1981	SAJU-00092	Archeological monitoring of sewer line and stabilization, 1979	Gus Pantel, Foundation of Archaeology, Anthropology and History, PR
SHIL	SEAC-00504	1981	SHIL-00002	Archeological excavation in the mound, 1898	Cornelius Cadle, Park Commissioner
	SEAC-01145	1994		Archeological Investigation	David Brewer, SEAC
	SEAC-00987	1992	SHIL-00275	Archeological investigations at Cloud Field, 1984	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-00962	1991	SHIL-00274	Archeological investigations for proposed septic system, N. Battery	James R. Atkinson, SEAC
	SEAC-00576	1981	SHIL-00273	Archeological investigations of the Hamburg Road by-pass, 1979	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00505	1981		Archeological investigations of the mound, 1915	Clarence B. Moore
	SEAC-00507	1981	SHIL-00272	Archeological investigations of the mound, 1975	Gerald Smith, Memphis State Univ.

*Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan, Southeast Field Area*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
SHIL (cont.)	SEAC-00335	1979	SHIL-00270	Archeological test excavations of Mound A, Shiloh Indian Mounds	John E. Ehrenhard, SEAC
	SEAC-00509	1981	SHIL-00178	Assessment of cultural resources, 1975	Catherine H. Blee, Denver Service Center
	SEAC-00908	1991		Assessment of damage to archeological resources	Bennie C. Keel, SEAC
	SEAC-01008	1992	SHIL-00276	Sub-surface testing of remote sensing anomalies, 1981	Randy V. Bellomo, FSU
STRI	SEAC-00896	1991	STRI-00115	Archeological investigation for a trail and two parking lots	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00709	1985	STRI-00072	Archeological investigation of the Hazen Brigade Monument	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-00993	1992	STRI-00108	Archeological investigations at Fortress Rosecrans, city property	John E. Cornelison, SEAC
	SEAC-01021	1992	STRI-00109	Archeological investigations at Fortress Rosecrans, park property	John E. Cornelison, SEAC
	SEAC-01022	1992	STRI-00111	Archeological investigations at Redoubt Brannan	John E. Cornelison, SEAC
	SEAC-00203	1976	STRI-00112	Archeological investigations at Stones River	John W. Walker, SEAC
	SEAC-00859	1990	STRI-00114	Archeological investigations for construction at the visitor center	Stephen C. Bryne, SEAC
	SEAC-00884	1990	STRI-00107	Archeological investigations for tower removal	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-01134	1994	STRI-00125	Archeological surface survey of agricultural fields	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00535	1981	STRI-00113	Assessment of cultural resources in proposed development areas	Catherine H. Blee, Denver Service Center
TIMU	SEAC-00899	1991	TIMU-00001	Archeological and historical investigations in the TIMU	Bennie C. Keel, SEAC
	SEAC-01118	1993		Archeological survey for a waterline at Kingsley Plantation	Bennie C. Keel, SEAC
TUIN	SEAC-00328	1979	TUIN-00105	Archeological investigations at Grey Columns and parking lots	Marsha Chance, SEAC
	SEAC-00310	1977	TUIN-00104	Archeological investigations at the Grey Columns	Shawn Bonath, SEAC
	SEAC-00879	1990		Archeological investigations for a maintenance facility	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00508	1981		Archeological monitoring of telephone line installation, 1978	John W. Walker, SEAC
VICK	SEAC-00980	1991	VICK-00231	Archeological investigations for a French drain system	John Cornelison, SEAC
	SEAC-00515	1981	VICK-00239	Archeological investigations for a water fountain and building, 1979	Carlos A. Martinez, SEAC
	SEAC-00514	1981	VICK-00238	Archeological survey for Mission 66 road construction, 1978	Christopher E. Hamilton, SEAC

*Appendix 3— Previous Archeological Testing by Park*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
VICK (cont.)	SEAC-00512	1981	VICK-00236	Archeological survey for trails and relocation of USS Cairo, 1975	Crawford H. Blakeman and Michael K. Collins, Mississippi State Univ.
	SEAC-00510	1981		Archeological survey prior to road construction, 1968	Lee H. Hanson, NPS Archeologist
	SEAC-00513	1981	VICK-00237	Archeological testing of Temple Mound for relocation of road, 1975	A. Wayne Prokopetz, SEAC
VIIS	SEAC-00350	1980		Acheological investigations at Krum Bay, 1962	Ripley R. Bullen, Florida State Museum
	SEAC-00519	1981		Archeological excavation of the H.M.S. Santa Monica, 1971	Alan Albright, Caribbean Research Institute
	SEAC-00802	1988	VIIS-00166	Archeological investigation for Mary Point parking lot	Roy W. Reaves, SEAC
	SEAC-00714	1985	VIIS-00156	Archeological investigations along North Shore Road	Roy W. Reaves, SEAC
	SEAC-00784	1987	VIIS-00164	Archeological investigations at Cinnamon Bay	Roy W. Reaves, SEAC
	SEAC-00805	1988	VIIS-00169	Archeological investigations at Cinnamon Bay	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-01027	1992	VIIS-00142	Archeological investigations at Cinnamon Bay	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00193	1975	VIIS-00151	Archeological investigations at Cinnamon Bay, 1970	Edward S. Rutsch, Fairleigh Dickinson Univ.
	SEAC-01026	1992	VIIS-00143	Archeological investigations at John Head Road	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00903	1991	VIIS-00182	Archeological investigations at Lameshur Plantation	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00898	1991	VIIS-00180	Archeological investigations at Lind Point	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-01104	1993		Archeological investigations at multiple sites, 1989	Tina Bassett, SEAC
	SEAC-00803	1988	VIIS-00167	Archeological investigations at Reef Bay Par Force Great House	Roy W. Reaves, SEAC
	SEAC-00781	1987	VIIS-00161	Archeological investigations at Trunk Bay	Roy W. Reaves, SEAC
	SEAC-01042	1992	VIIS-00153	Archeological investigations at Trunk Bay, Lyne House and Lameshur	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00772	1987	VIIS-00160	Archeological investigations at Viers Cistern	Roy W. Reaves, SEAC
	SEAC-00828	1989	VIIS-00170	Archeological investigations for a refrigeration unit at Trunk Bay	Tina Bassett, SEAC
	SEAC-01113	1993	VIIS-00182	Archeological investigations for a sewer system at Trunk Bay	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00520	1981		Archeological investigations for a waste disposal site, 1978	Jay B. Havisser, SEAC



*Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan, Southeast Field Area*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
VIIS (cont.)	SEAC-00857	1990	VIIS-00177	Archeological investigations for Cinnamon Bay landscaping	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00847	1989		Archeological investigations for housing at Lind Point	Elizabeth A. Horvath and Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00804	1988	VIIS-00168	Archeological investigations for installation of park signs	Roy W. Reaves, SEAC
	SEAC-00782	1987	VIIS-00162	Archeological investigations for Trunk Bay holding tank	Roy W. Reaves, SEAC
	SEAC-00516	1981		Archeological investigations in the Virgin Islands, 1917	Theodor Debooy
	SEAC-00798	1988	VIIS-00165	Archeological investigations of Annaberg Waterway, Units 1 and 2	Roy W. Reaves, SEAC
	SEAC-00856	1990	VIIS-00176	Archeological investigations of Cinnamon Bay waste water treatment	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00854	1990	VIIS-00174	Archeological investigations of Lind Point housing	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00783	1987	VIIS-00163	Archeological investigations of Mary Creek midden	Roy W. Reaves, SEAC
	SEAC-00855	1990	VIIS-00175	Archeological investigations of Mary Point housing	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00518	1981		Archeological investigations of St. John, 1960	Frederick W. Sleight, William L. Bryant Foundation.
	SEAC-00858	1990	VIIS-00178	Archeological investigations of Trunk Bay septic system	Elizabeth A. Horvath, SEAC
	SEAC-00902	1991	VIIS-00181	Archeological monitoring at Annaberg Plantation	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00741	1986	VIIS-00158	Archeological monitoring of North Shore Road construction	Kenneth S. Wild, SEAC
	SEAC-00742	1986	VIIS-00159	Archeological monitoring of North Shore Road construction, Phase I	Judy Shafer, Denver Service Center
	SEAC-00876	1990	VIIS-00179	Archeological monitoring of North Shore Road, Phase II	Judy Shafer, Denver Service Center
	SEAC-00829	1989	VIIS-00171	Archeological monitoring of septic tank installation at Little Maho	Tina Bassett, SEAC
	SEAC-00841	1989	VIIS-00173	Archeological survey for Annaberg vault toilet	Roy W. Reaves, SEAC
	SEAC-00830	1989	VIIS-00172	Archeological survey for Lameshur Cistern facilities	Tina Bassett, SEAC
	SEAC-00736	1986	VIIS-00157	Archeological survey of Lameshur Road	Roy W. Reaves, SEAC
SEAC-00348	1980		Archeological survey of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, 1952	Irving Rouse	
SEAC-01029	1992		Archeological survey of St. Johns Island, 1976	George Fischer, SEAC	
SEAC-00566	1981		Investigations of the Leinster Bay wreck by park staff, 1980	Noel J. Pachta, Supt.	

*Appendix 3— Previous Archeological Testing by Park*

Park	Accession	Date	Park Acc.	Description	Project Director
VIIS (cont.)	SEAC-00156	1969	VIIS-00034	Monitoring of utility trenches by park staff, 1964	Joe Brown, Supt.
WRBR	SEAC-00959	1991	WRBR-00230	Archeological investigations for a sidewalk extension	Douglas T. Potter, SEAC
	SEAC-00914	1991		Archeological survey for park housing	Susan Hammersten, SEAC

...

---

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

Alegría, Ricardo E.

- 1983 *Ball Courts and Ceremonial Plazas in the West Indies*. Yale University Publications in Anthropology, No. 79. New Haven.

Alegría, Ricardo E., H. B. Nicholson, and Gordon R. Willey

- 1955 The Archaic Tradition in Puerto Rico. *American Antiquity* 21(2):113-121.

Atkinson, James

- 1992a *Archeological Investigations on the 3P Section of the Natchez Trace Parkway in Mississippi, 1988, 1990, and 1991*. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

- 1992b *Archeological Investigations of the 3X Section of the Natchez Trace Parkway in Mississippi, Including Those at the St. Catherine Creek and Perkins Creek Sites*. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

Aubry, Michele C.

- 1994 Memorandum H2215(434): Review of Southeast Region's Draft Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan. Anthropology Division, National Park Service, Washington.

Aubry, Michele C., Dana Linck, Mark Lynott, Robert Mierendorf, and Kenneth Schoenberg

- 1992 *Systemwide Archeological Inventory Program*. Anthropology Division, National Park Service, Washington.

Bass, Quentin, Major C. R. McCollough, and Charles Faulkner

- 1976 *Second Interim Report on the Archaeological Survey of Great Smoky Mountains National Park*. Ms. on file, Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

Beditz, Christine

- 1979 *Archeological Reconnaissance and Testing of Alternative JCCC Sites in Mammoth Cave National Park*. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

- 1981 *Mammoth Cave National Park, Kentucky: Survey of the Childress Farm/Great Onyx Job Corp Civilian Conservation Center Property*. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

Bennett, Charles E.

- 1968 *Settlement of Florida*. University of Florida Press, Gainesville.

Bevan, Bruce

- 1993 *A Geophysical Test at Jamestown Island*. Geosight, Pitman, New Jersey.

Brewer, David M.

- 1988 *Archeological Overview and Assessment of Canaveral National Seashore*. Draft. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

Brewer, David M., and Susan Hammersten

- 1988 *Archeological Overview and Assessment, Virgin Islands National Park, St. John, U.S. Virgin Islands*. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

Brockington, Paul

- 1987 *A Cultural Resource Survey at Snee Farm, 38CH917, Charleston County, South Carolina*. Ms. on file, Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

Brown, Lenard E.

- 1988 *Christopher Columbus on Salt River Bay, St. Croix, Virgin Islands*. Ms. on file, Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

Brown, Paul

- 1951 A Cave Shelter. *Tennessee Archaeologist* 10(2):68-74, Knoxville.

Carstens, Kenneth C.

- 1974 *Archeological Surface Reconnaissance of Mammoth Cave National Park*. Master's thesis, Department of Anthropology, Washington University, St. Louis.

- 1975 Surface Archeology in Mammoth Cave National Park. Paper presented at the 40th Annual Meeting of the Society of American Archaeology, Dallas.

- 1980 *Archeological Investigation in the Central Kentucky Karst*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, Washington University, St. Louis.

Carstens, Kenneth C., and Kandis Jenings

- 1977 *Three Springs Pumphouse: An Assessment of Damage*. Ms. on file, Mammoth Cave National Park, Cave City, Kentucky.

Carstens, Kenneth C., and Patty Jo Watson

- 1975 *Archeological Resources of Mammoth Cave National Park: A Brief Summary*. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

Cockrell, Wilburn A.

- 1989 An Assessment of the Potential for Prehistoric Cultural Resources in the Dry Tortugas. In *Dry Tortugas National Park Submerged Cultural Resources Assessment*, edited by Larry Murphy, pp. 63-96. Submerged Cultural Resources Unit, National Park Service, Santa Fe.

Deagan, Kathleen

- 1975 *Thirty Years of Archeology at Frederica, Georgia: An Archeological Assessment*. Ms. on file, Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

de Baillou, Clemens

- 1962 *Archaeological Salvage in the Morgan Falls Basin*. University of Georgia Laboratory of Archaeology Series Report No. 4. University of Georgia, Athens.

Deren, Ed

- 1979 *A Magnetometer Survey for the Relocation of Underwater Shipwrecks of the Eastern Tip of Perdido Key*. Ms. on file, Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

Deutschle, Stephen, and Robert Wilson

- 1975 *Assessment of Archeological and Historic Resources of the Georgia Coast Adjacent to Cumberland Island National Seashore*. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

Ehrenhard, Ellen B.

- 1982 *Archeological Data Section: Preliminary Cultural Resource Management Plan, Cumberland Island National Seashore*. Ms. on file, Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

Ehrenhard, John

- 1976a *Canaveral National Seashore: Assessment of Archeological and Historic Resources*. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

- 1976b *Cape Lookout National Seashore: Assessment of Archeological and Historic Resources*. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

- 1976c *Cumberland Island National Seashore: Assessment of Archeological and Historic Resources*. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

Ehrenhard, John, and Robert Taylor

- 1980 *The Big Cypress National Preserve: Archeological Survey Season 3*. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

Ehrenhard, John, Robert Carr, and Robert Taylor

- 1978 *The Archeological Survey of Big Cypress National Preserve: Phase I*. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

- 1979 *The Big Cypress National Preserve: Archeological Survey Season 2*. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

Ehrenhard, John, Gregory Komara, and Robert Taylor

- 1982 *Everglades National Park Cultural Resource Inventory Interim Report Season 1*. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

Ehrenhard, John E., Robert Taylor, and Gregory Komara

- 1978 *The Big Cypress National Preserve, Archeological Survey, Season 4*. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.



Faust, Richard D.

- 1986 *Archeological Resources in the Southeast Region, Status Report and Projection of Future Requirements*, vols. I and II. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

Ferguson, Terry A., Robert A. Pace, and Jeffrey W. Gardner

- 1982 *An Archeological Survey and Testing of Proposed Construction Areas and Road Right-of-Ways in the Bandy Creek Development Site of the Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area*. Department of Anthropology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

- 1984 *An Archeological Survey and Testing of Proposed Construction Areas and Road Right-of-Ways in the Blue Heron Development Sites and Blue Heron, Devils Jump, and Leatherwood Ford Overlooks of the Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area*. Department of Anthropology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Ferguson, Terry A., Robert A. Pace, Jeffrey W. Gardner, and Robert W. Hoffman

- 1986 *An Archeological Reconnaissance and Testing of Indirect Impact Areas Within Selected Development Sites of the Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area*. Department of Anthropology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Fischer, George R.

- 1974 *An Underwater Archeological Survey Conducted on Lands Offshore of the Fort Pickens Section and the Eastern End of Perdido Key*. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

Griffin, John, and James Miller

- 1978 *Merritt Island National Wildlife Refuge Cultural Resource Assessment*. Ms. on file, NASA, Kennedy Space Center, Titusville, Florida.

Haag, William G. (editor)

- 1963 *Early Indian Farmers and Village Communities*. National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings, National Park Service, Washington.

Harris, Peter O'Brien

- 1976 *The Preceramic Period in Trinidad*. In *Proceedings of the First Puerto Rican Symposium on Archaeology*, edited by L. Robinson, pp. 524-552. Fundación Arqueológica, Antropológica e Histórica de Puerto Rico, San Juan.

Hoover, Frank, and Mike Wells

- 1978 *Untitled ms. regarding survey along the Green River in Kentucky (MACA)*. On file, Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

Hudson, Charles, Marvin Smith, and Chester DePratter

- 1984 *The Hernando de Soto Expedition: From Apalachee to Chiaha*. *Southeastern Archaeology* 3(1):65-77.

Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan, Southeast Field Area

---

Hutchinson, Steven K., Ellen A. Dugan, and Richard S. Levy

- 1982 *Inventory and Evaluation of Architectural and Engineering Resources of the Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area, Tennessee/Kentucky*. Environmental Consultants, Lexington.

Jennings, Jesse

- 1946 *Summary Archeological Survey of the Natchez Trace Parkway*. Ms. on file, Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

Keel, Bennie C., and David M. Brewer

- 1991 *A Design for Historic and Archeological Research of the 16th Century European Encounter in the National Parks of Northeast Florida*. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

Kelly, A. R., and Betty A. Smith

- 1975 *The Swift Creek Site, 9 Bi 3, Macon, Georgia*. Ms. on file, Ocmulgee National Monument, Macon.

Lattimore, Ralston B.

- 1970 *Fort Pulaski*. Government Printing Office, Washington.

Lenihan, Daniel

- 1974 Preliminary Archeological Survey of the Offshore Lands of Gulf Islands National Seashore. In *Underwater Archeology in the National Park Service*, pp. 34-40. Southwest Cultural Resources Center, National Park Service, Santa Fe.

Logan, Wilfred D., and Francis Calabrese

- 1976 National Park Service Archeological Programs: An Historical Overview. In *Proceedings of the First Conference on Scientific Research in the National Parks*, edited by Robert M. Linn, pp. 55-63. National Park Service, Washington.

Long, George

- 1967 *Indian and Historic Sites Report John F. Kennedy Space Center, NASA*. Ms. on file, Kennedy Space Center, Titusville, Florida.

McGimsey, Charles, and Hester Davis

- 1977 *The Management of Archeological Resources: The Airlie House Report*. Special Publication of the Society for American Archaeology, Washington.

Miller, Carl

- 1956 Life 8,000 Years Ago Uncovered in an Alabama Cave. *National Geographic* 10(4):542-558.

Nash, Roy

- 1931 *Report to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs Concerning Conditions Among the Seminole Indians of Florida*. U.S. Senate Resolution No. 482, Document No. 314. Government Printing Office, Washington.

NPS (National Park Service)

- 1984a *Fort Sumter: Anvil of War*. Handbook 127. Division of Publications, National Park Service, Washington.
- 1984b *Museum Handbook, Museum Records, Part II*. National Park Service, Washington.
- 1985 *NPS-28: Cultural Resource Management Guidelines*. National Park Service, Washington.
- 1986 *Vicksburg and the Opening of the Mississippi River, 1862–1863*. Division of Publications, National Park Service, Washington.
- 1987 *History and Prehistory in the National Park System and the National Historic Landmarks Program*. History Division, National Park Service, Washington.
- 1990 *Cataloging Manual for Archeological Objects*, vols. I, II, and III. National Park Service, Washington.
- 1991a *National Register Bulletin 16A: Guidelines for Completing National Register of Historic Places Forms, How to Complete the National Register Registration Form*. National Register Branch, Interagency Resources Division, National Park Service, Washington.
- 1991b *National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*. National Register Branch, Interagency Resources Division, National Park Service, Washington.

O'Grady, Patricia, and Charles Poe

- 1980 *Chattahoochee River Recreation Area. Georgia Cultural Resource Inventory Archeological Sites Final Report*. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

Oliver, José R.

- 1992 *Results of the Archaeological Testing and Data Recovery Investigations at the Lower Camp Site, Culebra Island National Wildlife Refuge, Puerto Rico*. Garrow and Associates, Atlanta.

Padgett, Thomas J., and David M. Heisler

- 1979 *Predictive Model of Archaeological Site Location in the Central Leaf River Basin Mississippi*. Mississippi Department of Archives and History, Jackson.

Peterson, Gloria

- 1968 *Administrative History, Fort Donelson National Military Park, Dover, Tennessee*. Division of History, Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation, National Park Service, Washington.

Poe, Charles

- 1979 *Mammoth Cave National Park, Childress Farm Rock-Shelter*. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

Prentice, Guy

- 1988 *Mammoth Cave Archeological Inventory Program Interim Report—1987 Investigations*. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

*Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan, Southeast Field Area*

---

- 1992 *Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area Archeological Resource Survey 1990 and 1991 Field Seasons*. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.
- 1993a *Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area Archeological Resource Survey 1992 Field Season*. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.
- 1993b *Archeological Overview and Assessment of Mammoth Cave National Park*, vol. 1. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.
- 1994 *National Archeological Survey Initiative Archeological Inventory and Evaluation at Russell Cave National Monument, Alabama*. Regionwide Archeological Survey Program Series No. 1. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.
- Prokopetz, A. Wayne  
1974 *Archeological Survey of Perdido Key, Gulf Islands National Seashore, Florida*. Florida State University, Tallahassee.
- Righter, Elizabeth  
1992 *Statewide Comprehensive Historic Preservation Plan: Prehistoric Context*. Ms. on file, Virgin Islands State Planning Office, Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas.
- Ritchie, William A.  
1932 *The Lamoka Lake Site. Researches and Transactions 7:4*. New York State Archeological Association.
- Rouse, Irving  
1970 *The Entry of Man in the West Indies*. Yale University Publication in Anthropology, No. 61. New Haven.  
1992 *The Tainos: Rise and Decline of the People Who Greeted Columbus*. Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Rouse, Irving, and Louis Allaire  
1978 *Caribbean Chronology*. In *Chronologies in the New World*, edited by C. W. Meighan and R. E. Taylor, pp. 431-481. Academic Press, New York.
- Russo, Michael  
1993 *The Timucuan and Historic Preserve Phase III Final Report*. Florida Museum of Natural History, Gainesville.
- SEAC (Southeast Archeological Center)  
1992 *Cataloging Manual For Archeological Collections*. Draft ms. on file, Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.
- SEAC/RASP (Southeast Archeological Center/Regionwide Archeological Survey Program)  
1993 *Archeological Testing and Ground Penetrating Radar Survey at Charles Pinckney National Historic Site, South Carolina*. National Archeological Survey Initiative, Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

- 1995 *Southeast Regional Archeological Survey Program Field and Laboratory Procedures Manual*. National Archeological Survey Initiative, Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.
- Sears, William H.
- 1956 *The Turner River Site, Collier County, Florida*. *The Florida Anthropologist* 9(2):47-60.
- 1965 *Archaeological Survey, Everglades National Park*. Ms. on file, Department of Anthropology, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton.
- 1966 *Everglades National Park, Archaeological Base Mapping, Part I*. Ms. on file, Department of Anthropology, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton.
- 1967 *Archeological Survey in the Cape Coral Area at the Mouth of the Caloosahatchee River*. *Florida Anthropologist* 20(3-4):93.
- Sears, William H., and A. James McGregor
- 1974 *An Archeological Survey of Biscayne National Seashore: A Report to the National Park Service Contract #CX500031634*. Ms. on file, Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.
- Shelford, Victor E.
- 1963 *The Ecology of North America*. University of Illinois Press, Urbana.
- Sleight, Frederick W.
- 1962 *Archaeological Reconnaissance of the Island of St. John, U.S. Virgin Islands*. The William L. Bryant Foundation, American Studies, Report No. 3.
- Stevens-Arroyo, Antonio M.
- 1988 *Cave of the Jugua, The Mythological World of the Tainos*. University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.
- Taylor, D. R. Fraser
- 1991 *Geographic Information Systems: The Microcomputer and Modern Cartography*. Pergamon Press, Oxford.
- Taylor, Robert C.
- 1984 *Everglades National Park Archeological Inventory and Assessment Season 2: Interim Report*. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.
- 1985a *Everglades National Park Archeological Inventory and Assessment Season 3: Interim Report*. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.
- 1985b *An Archeological Report for the Clearance of Proposed Developments and Road Improvements in the Everglades National Park*. Ms. on file, Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.
-



Tesar, Louis D.

- 1973a *Field Notes and Related Data from Archeological Survey and Testing of Gulf Islands National Seashore Part I: Florida*. Ms. on file, Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.
- 1973b *Archeological Review of Certain Lands of the Pensacola Naval Air Station*. Department of Anthropology, Florida State University, Tallahassee.
- 1973c *Archeological Survey and Testing of Gulf Islands National Seashore Part I: Florida*. Department of Anthropology, Florida State University, Tallahassee.
- 1973d *Archeological Survey and Testing of Gulf Islands National Seashore Part II: Mississippi*. Department of Anthropology, Florida State University, Tallahassee.
- 1973e *Field Notes and Related Data from Archeological Survey and Testing of Gulf Island National Seashore*. On file, Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

Thomson, James

- 1979 *Archeological Reconnaissance of the Obed Wild and Scenic River*. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

Thornbury, William D.

- 1965 *Regional Geomorphology of the United States*. John Wiley and Sons, New York.

Veloz Maggiolo, Marcio, and Elpido Ortega

- 1976 *The Preceramics of the Dominican Republic: Some New Finds and Their Possible Relationship*. In *Proceedings of the First Puerto Rican Symposium on Archeology*, edited by L. Robinson, pp. 147–201. Fundación Arqueológica, Antropológica e Histórica de Puerto Rico, San Juan.

Walthall, John

- 1990 *Prehistoric Indians of the Southeast: Archeology of Alabama and the Middle South*. The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa.

Ward, Geoffrey, Ric Burns, and Ken Burns

- 1990 *The Civil War: An Illustrated History*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York.

Watson, Patty Jo, and Kenneth C. Carstens

- 1975 *Archeological Resources of Mammoth Cave National Park: A Brief Summary*. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.
- 1982 *Archeological Survey and Testing, Mammoth Cave National Park*. Ms. on file, Mammoth Cave National Park, Cave City, Kentucky.

Wauchope, Robert

- 1966 *Archaeological Survey of Northern Georgia*. *American Antiquity* 31(5) part 2. (Memoirs of the Society for American Archaeology No. 21).

White, Vernon

- 1980 *Archeological Survey and Study of Hominy Holes in Kentucky*. Kentucky Archeological Association Bulletin 14 and 15:1-63.

Wild, Kenneth S., and David M. Brewer

- 1985 *Underwater Archeological Survey and Site Assessment of Biscayne National Park*. Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

Willey, Gordon R.

- 1971 *An Introduction to American Archaeology, Volume Two: South America*. Prentice-Hall, Princeton, New Jersey.

- 1976 The Caribbean Preceramic and Related Matters in Summary Perspective. In *Proceedings of the First Puerto Rican Symposium on Archaeology*, edited by L. Robinson. Fundación Arqueológica, Antropológica e Histórica de Puerto Rico, San Juan.

Wilson, Rex

- 1963 Maps on file, Russell Cave National Monument, Alabama. SEAC Accession File No. 530, Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

Wright, John

- 1993 *Archeological Inventory and Evaluation of Portions of the Fort Pickens Unit, Gulf Islands National Seashore, Florida*. National Archeological Survey Initiative, Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, Tallahassee.

...