July 10, 2009

Ms. Caroline Wilson  
Review and Compliance Coordinator  
South Carolina Department of Archives and History  
8301 Parklane Road  
Columbia, South Carolina 29223

Reference:  Cultural Resources Literature Review and Reconnaissance  
Survey of Approximately 1400 Acres of the Proposed  
Early Branch Industrial Park  
Hampton County, South Carolina  
S&ME Project No. 1131-09-247

Dear Ms. Wilson:

S&ME, Inc. (S&ME), on behalf of B P Barber, has completed a cultural resource literature review and reconnaissance survey of a proposed 1,415-acre industrial site located along Yemassee Highway (SC 68), approximately five miles northwest of the intersection of I-95 and State Route 68 near the community of Early Branch in Hampton County, South Carolina (Figures 1 and 2). The purpose of the survey was to assess the Project Area’s potential for containing significant cultural resources, and to make recommendations regarding additional work that may be required under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended.

This work was done in anticipation of Site Certification by the South Carolina Department of Commerce and was carried out in general accordance with S&ME Proposal Number 31-09-144 dated June 2, 2009. Mr. Bret Davis and Mr. Patrick Morgan conducted the background research data compilation and the fieldwork. Mr. Aaron Brummitt, RPA authored this report, and Jason Moser, RPA served as an in-house peer-reviewer by providing editorial comments on the report and figures.

The Project Area is located within the Middle Coastal Plain physiographic province. Topography is almost entirely level, with elevations ranging from 23–27 ft above mean sea level (AMSL). It is bounded by SC-68 to the southwest, an electrical transmission corridor to the northeast and private property boundaries to the east and west.
Vegetation in the Project Area consists primarily of planted pines throughout the tract in varying stages of growth (Figures 3-6), with mixed pines and hardwoods in the lower lying areas and around the perimeter of the tract. Soils in the Project Area consist of approximately 15 acres in the far eastern portion of the tract of moderately well-drained Goldsboro loamy sand, while the remainder of soils in the Project Area ranges from somewhat poorly-drained to very poorly-drained soils (Figure 2). The area surrounding the tract is a mix of agricultural and low-density residential properties. Based on topography, vegetation, and nature of the proposed undertaking, S&ME staff assumed that the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for direct effects covers the entire 1,415 acre tract while the APE for indirect effects is a 0.5-mile radius around the property.

BACKGROUND RESEARCH

On June 11, 2009, Patrick Morgan conducted a background literature review and records search at the South Carolina Department of Archives and History (SCDAH) in Columbia, and at the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology (SCIAA) in Columbia. The area examined was a 0.5-mile radius around the project tract (Figure 1). The records examined at SCIAA included the master archaeological site maps and relevant archaeological site forms. The records examined at SCDAH include a review of ArchSite, a GIS-based program containing the location and information about archaeological and historic resources in South Carolina. When cultural resources were noted within the 0.5-mile search radius, then additional reports and site forms available at SCIAA and SCDAH were consulted.

A review of ArchSite indicated there are three previously recorded archaeological sites and four previously recorded above ground structures (the field investigation revealed that two of these resources have since been destroyed) within a 0.5-mile radius of the Project Area (Figure 1 and Table 1). Two prior cultural resource surveys have been conducted at the edge of the Project Area within the Town of Early Branch (Tippett and Griffitts 2002; Long 2007). Tippett et al. conducted a survey of SC 68 from I-95 to Regional Industrial Park in 2002. This study did not result in identifying any previously unrecorded cultural resources. Long performed the second study A Reconnaissance Survey of the S-25-844 (Sinclair Rd) Construction and Paving Project in 2007; this survey recorded one archaeological site (38HA226). Both investigators recommended no additional work for their respective Project Areas because of the generally low sensitivity to archaeological sites in their respective APEs. The South Carolina SHPO concurred with these recommendations.

Review of early and middle twentieth century maps (Figures 7 and 8) indicates that there were 8 structures recorded within the Project Area in 1919 (Figure 7) and 9 structures in 1942 (Figure 8). Two of the structures on the 1942 map appear to be in the same location as those depicted on the 1919 map. None of these structures are depicted on the most recent USGS quadrangle (Figure 1). The majority of the buildings near the Project Area are adjacent to the railroad and paralleling roadway that forms the southwestern boundary of the Project Area. The location and alignment of roadways within the Project Area do
not remain consistent throughout the early and middle twentieth century. Available maps of earlier vintage were not of sufficient detail to formulate predictive statements about the likelihood of historic resources in the Project Area.

Table 1. Cultural Resources within a 0.5-mile radius and vicinity of the Project Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NRHP Status</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38HA220</td>
<td>19th/20th c. domestic site</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Tippett and Griffitts 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38HA221</td>
<td>19th/20th c. domestic site</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Tippett and Griffitts 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38HA226</td>
<td>Late Archaic Lithic/Ceramic Scatter</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Long 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-0035</td>
<td>McTeer Furniture Store, c.1920</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Tippett and Griffitts 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-0036</td>
<td>McTeer Grocery Store, c.1918</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Tippett and Griffitts 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-0037</td>
<td>Heape Store, c.1920</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Tippett and Griffitts 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-0038</td>
<td>unnamed house, c.1920</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Tippett and Griffitts 2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SENSITIVITY TO HISTORIC RESOURCES

In the Coastal Plain of South Carolina, various predictive models have been used to identify areas having a high potential for containing archaeological sites (e.g., Brooks and Scurry 1978; Cable 1996; Scurry 2003). Recently these models have been revised based on data from Francis Marion National Forest (O’Donoughue 2008a, 2008b). In general, the most significant variables for determining site location appear to be distance to a permanent water source, proximity to a wetland or other ecotone, slope, soil drainage characteristics, and historic settlement patterns the locations of which often followed political rather than parameters. Prehistoric sites tend to occur on relatively level areas with well drained soils that are within 200 m of a permanent water source or wetland. Historic home sites tend to be located on well drained soils near historic roadways. Based on these parameters, approximately two percent of the Project Area had a high sensitivity for containing previously unrecorded archaeological sites. The remainder of the tract had a moderate to low potential with the moderately sensitive areas being those where the historic maps depicted the location of structures dating to the early to middle twentieth century.

FIELD INVESTIGATION

On June 15-18, 2009, the archaeological field crew conducted a cultural resources reconnaissance survey of the approximate 1,400-acre Project Area. The archaeological survey was conducted primarily with shovel tests in areas deemed likely to contain archaeological sites based on landform type, soil drainage, distance to water, and the results of the background research. Pedestrian survey was undertaken along dirt roads and other areas with an exposed ground surface.
METHODS

The initial stage of the reconnaissance consisted of a pedestrian survey of the numerous dirt logging roads that dissect the Project Area, the access road that follows the northeastern boundary, and the portion of SC-68 that forms the southwestern project boundary. The field crew also excavated 100 shovel tests during the survey. Shovel tests were approximately 30 cm in diameter and excavated to culturally sterile subsoil. Soil was screened through 0.25-inch hardware mesh. Notes were kept in a weatherproof field journal and on standard S&ME site forms and digital photographs were taken of the Project Area.

In addition to the archaeological survey, a limited architectural survey was conducted to determine whether the proposed project would affect any aboveground historic properties. The field crew drove accessible public roads within a 0.5-mile radius of the Project Area.

RESULTS

A total of 100 shovel tests, ranging from 30–45 cm deep, were excavated across the project tract. The majority of shovel tests were excavated in poorly drained areas. Regardless of the soil classification, all of the soils within the project, save approximately 15 acres (Goldsboro, moderately well-drained), were somewhat poorly to very poorly-drained. A typical soil profile in the “better drained” areas consisted of approximately 25 cm of dark grayish brown (10YR 4/2) loamy fine sand (Ap horizon), followed by 12 cm (25–37 cm below surface [cmbs]) of brown (10YR 5/3) fine sandy loam, overlying 4+ cm (41–50+ cmbs) of yellowish brown clayey sand subsoil. Soils in the poorly-drained areas consisted of 30 cm of black (10YR 2/1) loamy sand (Ap horizon), followed by 13 cm (30–43 cmbs) of pale brown (10YR 6/3) sand, overlying 3+ cm (41–46+ cmbs) of brown (7.5YR 5/4) sandy clay subsoil (Figures 9-10). The field crew did not identify any archaeological sites, isolated finds, or other indications of historic properties within the Project Area during this reconnaissance. Because of past land use, namely timbering, the historic location of roadways within the tract was not readily apparent. However the field crew attempted to align the shovel test transects to cover the areas where the twentieth century maps indicated the presence of structures.

The field crew also conducted a limited architectural survey to determine whether the proposed project would affect any aboveground historic properties. Accessible public roads within and adjacent to the Project Area were driven, and existing structures that were not previously recorded were examined for National Register eligibility. As a result of the survey, four previously recorded historic structures were noted within the proposed APE. Structures 0035-0038 were previously identified by Tippet et al 2002 (Figures 10-13). Structures 0035 (McTeer Furniture Store) and 0037 (Heape Store) were still standing though not currently in use. Structures 0036 and 0038, the McTeer Grocery Store and an unnamed house respectively are destroyed. The former grocery store (0036) was razed and cleared while remains of the unnamed house (0038) still exist (Figure 1 and Table 1).
CONCLUSION

This cultural resources reconnaissance survey identified no archaeological sites or above-ground historic resources within the Project Area. In addition, the vast majority of the Project Area has poorly-drained soils that are not conducive to human habitation, and therefore have a low potential to contain archaeological sites. The small “well-drained” area has been plow-disturbed to the subsoil. The Project Area has also been impacted by timbering practices. Based on these factors, there is little likelihood that the Project Area contains significant archaeological sites and we recommend no additional archaeological investigations. In addition, the architectural survey did not record any additional historic structures more than 50 years old within the 0.5 mile radius surrounding the Project Area. As a result, it is S&ME’s opinion that no historic properties will be affected by future development of the Project Area and that no additional cultural resource investigations should be necessary.

CLOSING

S&ME appreciates the opportunity to provide you with this report. If you have questions about the report, please do not hesitate to contact Aaron Brummit at (843) 884-0005 or via e-mail at abrummitt@smeinc.com.

Sincerely,

S&ME, Inc.

Aaron Brummit, M.A., RPA  
Principal Investigator

James L. Killingsworth, CHMM  
Senior Reviewer, Vice President

c: Brad Sanderson, P.E. B P Barber
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Figure 3. Field conditions in western portion of the Project Area, facing south.

Figure 4. Field Conditions in central portion of the Project Area, facing south.
Figure 5. Field Conditions in the central portion of the Project Area, facing southwest.

Figure 6. Field Conditions in the northern portion of the Project Area, facing north.
Figure 7. Approximate boundaries of the Project Area plotted on the 1919 Cummings Quadrangle (USGS 15 minute series).

Figure 8. Approximate boundaries of the Project Area plotted on the 1942 Cummings Quadrangle (USGS 15 minute series).
Figure 9. Poorly drained soils found throughout most of the Project Area within planted pines as represented by shovel testing.

Figure 10. The typical profile of soils found within the Project Area as represented by shovel testing.
Figure 11. Structure 0035 – McTeer Furniture Store, facing south.

Figure 12. Former location of Structure 0036 – McTeer Grocery Store, facing northwest.
Figure 13. Location of Structure 0037 – Heape Store (possibly a later building), facing west.

Figure 14. Structure 0038 – Unnamed structure (destroyed), facing southwest.