


# Appendix L—Cultural Resources Technical Report

## Part 1



## A Cultural Resource Survey of the Proposed Improvements to the Carolina Crossroads Corridor

*Carolina Crossroads*

*I-20/26/126 Corridor Project*

*Lexington and Richland Counties, South Carolina*

*Final Report May 2018*







# A Cultural Resource Survey of the Proposed Improvements to the Carolina Crossroads Corridor

Carolina Crossroads

I-20/26/126 Corridor Improvements

Lexington and Richland Counties, South Carolina

Final Report May 2018

Prepared for  
South Carolina Department of Transportation,  
and the Federal Highway Administration

Prepared by

Ryan Sipe, RPA

and

David Adair

Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.

with contributions by

Michael Miller, Bill Jurgelski (SCDOT), and Tracy Martin (SCDOT)



# Table of Contents

<b>Table of Contents.....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2 Environmental and Cultural Context .....</b>	<b>12</b>
2.1 Environmental Setting .....	12
2.1.1 Physical setting .....	12
2.1.2 Physiography and geology.....	12
2.1.3 Hydrology .....	12
2.1.4 Soils.....	13
2.2 Cultural Setting.....	15
2.2.1 Introduction.....	15
2.2.2 Paleoindian period.....	15
2.2.3 Archaic Period.....	16
2.2.4 Woodland period.....	17
2.2.5 Mississippian period .....	18
2.2.6 Historic overview .....	19
2.3 Previous Archaeological Investigations .....	30
<b>3 Methods of Investigation .....</b>	<b>35</b>
3.1 Literature and Records Search .....	35
3.2 Archaeological Field Survey.....	35
3.2.1 Shovel testing .....	36
3.2.2 50-x-50 centimeter excavation units.....	36
3.3 Laboratory Methods.....	36
3.3.1 Artifact Processing and analysis .....	36
3.3.2 Curation .....	37
3.4 Architectural Survey .....	38
3.4.1 Architectural survey methodology.....	38
3.5 Assessing NRHP eligibility.....	39
<b>4 Archaeological Survey Results and Analysis.....</b>	<b>41</b>
4.1 Introduction.....	41
4.2 Previously Recorded Archaeological Sites.....	49
4.2.1 38RD59 – The Saluda Canal .....	49
4.2.2 38RD133 .....	57
4.2.3 38RD277 .....	60
4.2.4 38RD287 .....	61
4.2.5 38LX20 – The Wactor Site.....	63

4.2.6	38LX212 .....	66
4.2.7	38LX235 .....	70
4.2.8	38LX236 .....	73
4.2.9	38LX238 .....	76
4.3	Newly Recorded Archaeological Sites .....	80
4.3.1	38LX655 .....	80
4.4	Isolated Finds.....	86
4.4.1	IF 1 .....	86
4.4.2	IF 2 .....	86
4.4.3	IF 3 .....	86
<b>5</b>	<b>Architectural Survey Results .....</b>	<b>87</b>
5.1	Previous Architectural Investigations.....	87
5.2	Newly Recorded Architectural Resources .....	89
5.3	Resource Descriptions and Evaluations.....	96
5.3.1	Resource 106-0877 (2500 Sunset Boulevard) .....	99
5.3.2	Resource 106-0878 (Between I-26 and the Saluda River north of Sunset Boulevard).....	103
5.3.3	Resource 106-0879 (Terrace View Drive and Holly Hill Drive) .....	108
5.3.4	Resource 106-6465 (710 Gracern Road) .....	111
5.3.5	Resource 106-6466 (910 Gracern Road) .....	113
5.3.6	Resource 106-6394 (East of I-126 south of Arrowwood Road).....	115
5.3.7	Resource 106-6393 (East side of I-126 south of Bush River Road along Lawand Drive, Arrowwood Road, and Lancewood Road).....	120
5.3.8	Resource 106-6392 (East side of I-126 south of Bush River Road along Latonea Drive) .....	124
5.3.9	Resource 106-6395 (830 Bush River Road) .....	128
5.3.10	Resource 106-6396 (859 Bush River Road) .....	130
5.3.11	Resource 106-6397 (1504 Morninghill Drive) .....	132
5.3.12	Resource 106-6398 (Southeast Quadrant of the I-20 and I-26 Interchange).....	133
5.3.13	Resource 106-6399 (South Side of I-20 Between I-26 and Broad River Road).....	138
5.3.14	Resource 106-0880 (421 Zimalcrest Drive) .....	142
5.3.15	Resource 106-0881 (North of I-20 Between Columbia, Newberry and Laurens Railroad and I-26) 144	
5.3.16	Resource 106-6400 (West Side of I-26 South of St. Andrews Road) .....	148
5.3.17	Resource 106-6401 (3102 Greenore Drive).....	152
5.3.18	Resource 243-0882 (128 Steward Drive).....	154
5.3.19	Resource 243-0883 (129 Steward Drive).....	155
5.3.20	Resource 243-0884 (130 Steward Drive).....	156
5.3.21	Resource 243-0885 (301 Paris Road).....	157
5.3.22	Resource 243-6402 (100 Gaillard Street) .....	159
5.3.23	Resource 243-6403 (37 Bluebird Trail) .....	161



5.3.24	Resource 243-6404 (1013 North Wingard Road) .....	162
5.3.25	Resource 243-6467 (200 Roof Lowman Road) .....	163
5.3.26	Resource 106-6405 (North Side of I-20 West of Broad River Road) .....	166
5.3.27	Resource 106-6406 (2420 Broad River Road).....	171
5.3.28	Resource 106-6407 (1311 Marley Drive).....	171
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusions and Recommendations .....</b>	<b>175</b>
6.1	Archaeological Resources.....	175
6.2	Historic Architectural Resources .....	176
<b>7</b>	<b>References .....</b>	<b>177</b>

## List of Tables

Table 2.1.	Soils within the Survey Area. ....	13
Table 2.2.	Previously Recorded Archaeological Sites Within the Survey Area.....	33
Table 4.1.	Artifacts Recovered from Shovel Tests at Site 38LX20.....	64
Table 4.2.	Artifacts Recovered from Shovel Tests at 38LX238.....	78
Table 4.1.	Artifacts Recovered from Shovel Tests at 38LX655.....	83
Table 4.2.	Artifacts Recovered from Test Units at 38LX655.....	84
Table 5.1.	Previously Identified Architectural Resources within the Vicinity of the Proposed Project. ....	88
Table 5.2.	Newly Identified Architectural Resources within Project Study Area. ....	96

## List of Figures

Figure 1.1.	Location map. ....	10
Figure 2.1a.	Previously recorded archaeological sites in the vicinity of the survey area.....	31
Figure 2.1b.	Previously recorded archaeological sites in the vicinity of the survey area. ....	32
Figure 4.1A.	Shovel Test Results.....	42
Figure 4.1B.	Shovel Test Results (continued). ....	43
Figure 4.1C.	Shovel Test Results (continued). ....	44
Figure 4.1D.	Shovel Test Results (continued).....	45
Figure 4.1E.	Shovel Test Results (continued). ....	46
Figure 4.1F.	Shovel Test Results (continued).....	47
Figure 4.1G.	Shovel Test Results (continued).....	48
Figure 4.2A.	38RD59 Site Map (West Half).....	51
Figure 4.2B.	38RD59 Site Map (East Half) .....	52
Figure 4.3A.	Ca. 1820 Plat Map showing the west half of the Saluda Canal. Source: South Carolina State Archives. .....	53
Figure 4.3B.	Ca. 1820 Plat Map showing the east half of the Saluda Canal. Source: South Carolina State Archives. .....	53

Figure 4.4. Photograph of a portion of the Saluda Canal near its western end. Facing North. ....	54
Figure 4.5. Rock wall at the northwestern end of the canal within the Carolina Crossroads project area, facing north. ....	56
Figure 4.6. Photograph of 38RD133, facing west. ....	58
Figure 4.7. 38RD133 Site Map ....	59
Figure 4.8. Photograph of current railroad trestle at 38RD277, facing east. ....	61
Figure 4.9. 38RD287 Site Map ....	62
Figure 4.10. Photograph of 38RD287, facing northwest. ....	63
Figure 4.11. 38LX20 Site Map ....	65
Figure 4.12. Photograph of Site 38LX20, facing east. ....	66
Figure 4.13. Photograph of 38LX212, facing west. ....	67
Figure 4.14. 38LX212 Site Map. ....	69
Figure 4.15. Photograph of 38LX235, facing west. ....	71
Figure 4.16. 38LX235 Site Map. ....	72
Figure 4.17. Photograph of Site 38LX236, facing southwest. ....	74
Figure 4.18. 38LX236 Site Map. ....	75
Figure 4.19. Photograph of 38LX238, facing east. ....	76
Figure 4.20. 38LX238 Site Map. ....	77
Figure 4.21. Photograph of Site 38LX655, facing southwest. ....	80
Figure 4.22. 38LX655 Site Map. ....	82
Figure 5.1A. Architectural Resource Map. ....	91
Figure 5.1B. Architectural Resource Map (continued). ....	92
Figure 5.1C. Architectural Resource Map (continued). ....	93
Figure 5.1D. Architectural Resource Map (continued). ....	94
Figure 5.1E. Architectural Resource Map (continued). ....	95
Figure 5.2: Resource 106-0877 (2500 Sunset Boulevard) - View of the façade of the original building facing north. ....	101
Figure 5.3: Resource 106-0877 (2500 Sunset Boulevard) – View of the rear elevation of the original building, facing south. ....	101
Figure 5.4: Resource 106-0877 (2500 Sunset Boulevard) – View of the façade of the addition to the west side elevation of the original building, facing south. Non-historic sanctuary building is on right half of photograph. ....	102
Figure 5.5: Resource 106-0877 (2500 Sunset Boulevard) - View of the west side elevation of the addition to the west side of the original building, facing southeast. ....	102
Figure 5.6: Resource 106-0878 (Westover Acres Subdivision). ....	105
Figure 5.7: Resource 106-0878.01 (Westover Acres Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 1814 Robin Crest Drive, facing southeast. ....	106
Figure 5.8: Resource 106-0878.02 (Westover Acres Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 1836 Terrace View Drive, facing northwest. ....	106

Figure 5.9: Resource 106-0878.03 (Westover Acres Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 2460 Robin Crest Drive, facing west.....	107
Figure 5.10: Resource 106-0878.04 (Westover Acres Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 2448 Robin Crest Drive, facing west.....	107
Figure 5.11: Resource 106-0879 (Saluda Hills Subdivision).....	109
Figure 5.12: Resource 106-0879.01 (Saluda Hills Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 1701 Terrace View Drive, facing south.....	110
Figure 5.13: Resource 106-0879.02 (Saluda Hills Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 1700 Terrace View Drive, facing north.....	110
Figure 5.14: Resource 106-0879.03 (Saluda Hills Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 1720 Terrace View Drive, facing north.....	111
Figure 5.15: Resource 106-6465 (710 Gracern Road) – Oblique view of the façade and west side elevation, facing northeast.....	112
Figure 5.16: Resource 106-6465 (710 Gracern Road) – Oblique view of the façade and west side elevation, facing northwest.....	113
Figure 5.17: Resource 106-6466 (910 Gracern Road) – View of the façade and west side elevation, facing northwest.....	114
Figure 5.18: Resource 106-6466 (910 Gracern Road) – View of the south side elevation of original portion of resource and façade of later addition, facing east.....	114
Figure 5.19: Resource 106-6394 (Arrowwood South Subdivision).....	117
Figure 5.20: Resource 106-6394.01 (Arrowwood South Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 900 Brantley Street, facing northeast.....	118
Figure 5.21: Resource 106-6394.02 (Arrowwood South Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 915 Brantley Street, facing northeast.....	118
Figure 5.22: Resource 106-6394.03 (Arrowwood South Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 734 Janice Drive, facing northeast.....	119
Figure 5.23: Resource 106-6394.04 (Arrowwood South Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 748 Janice Drive, facing northeast.....	119
Figure 5.24: Resource 106-6393 (Arrowwood Subdivision).....	121
Figure 5.25: Resource 106-6393.01 (Arrowwood Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 419 Arrowwood Road, facing west.....	122
Figure 5.26: Resource 106-6393.02 (Arrowwood Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 130 Arrowwood Road, facing east.....	122
Figure 5.27: Resource 106-6393.03 (Arrowwood Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 231 Lancewood Road, facing west.....	123
Figure 5.28: Resource 106-6393.04 (Arrowwood Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 225 Redbud Drive, facing north.....	123
Figure 5.29: Resource 106-6392 (Latonea Subdivision).....	125
Figure 5.30: Resource 106-6392.01 (Latonea Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 205 Latonea Drive, facing south.....	126

Figure 5.31: Resource 106-6392.02 (Latonea Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 208 Latonea Drive, facing west. ....	126
Figure 5.32: Resource 106-6392.03 (Latonea Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 235 Latonea Drive, facing east. ....	127
Figure 5.33: Resource 106-6392.04 (Latonea Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 245 Latonea Drive, facing east. ....	127
Figure 5.34: Resource 106-6395 (830 Bush River Road) – View of the façade, facing southeast.....	129
Figure 5.35: Resource 106-6395 (830 Bush River Road) – View of the east side elevation, facing west.....	129
Figure 5.36: Resource 106-6396 (859 Bush River Road) – View of the facade, facing northeast.....	131
Figure 5.37: Resource 106-6396 (859 Bush River Road) – View of the east side elevation, facing northwest.....	131
Figure 5.38: Resource 106-6397 (1504 Morninghill Drive) – Oblique view of the west and south side elevation, facing northeast.....	132
Figure 5.39: Resource 106-6398 (Skyview Terrace Subdivision).....	135
Figure 5.40: Resource 106-6398.01 (Skyview Terrace Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 1711 Morninghill Drive, facing west.....	136
Figure 5.41: Resource 106-6398.02 (Skyview Terrace Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 1815 Morninghill Drive, facing west.....	136
Figure 5.41: Resource 106-6398.03 (Skyview Terrace Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 1525 Luster Lane, facing west. ....	137
Figure 5.42: Resource 106-6398.04 (Skyview Terrace Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 1710 Luster Lane, facing east. ....	137
Figure 5.43: Resource 106-6399 (Belmont Estates Subdivision).....	139
Figure 5.44: Resource 106-6399.01 (Belmont Estates Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 1115 Glen Oaks Road, facing east. ....	140
Figure 5.45: Resource 106-6399.02 (Belmont Estates Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 853 Statler Road, facing west.....	140
Figure 5.46: Resource 106-6399.03 (Belmont Estates Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 1036 Statler Road, facing east.....	141
Figure 5.47: Resource 106-6399.04 (Belmont Estates Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 847 Statler Road, facing west.....	141
Figure 5.48: Resource 106-0880 (421 Zimalcrest Drive) – View of the facade, facing northeast.....	143
Figure 5.49: Resource 106-0880 (421 Zimalcrest Drive) – View of the facade, facing northeast.....	143
Figure 5.50: Resource 106-0881 (Woodland Hills Subdivision).....	145
Figure 5.51: Resource 106-0881.01 (Woodland Hills Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 402 Westlawn Road, facing southeast. ....	146
Figure 5.52: Resource 106-0881.02 (Woodland Hills Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 519 Westlawn Road, facing west. ....	146
Figure 5.53: Resource 106-0881.03 (Woodland Hills Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 518 Westlawn Road, facing east. ....	147

Figure 5.54: Resource 106-0881.04 (Woodland Hills Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 509 Woodland Hills West Road, facing west.....	147
Figure 5.55: Resource 106-6400 (Chartwell Subdivision).....	149
Figure 5.56: Resource 106-6400.01 (Chartwell Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 116 Chartwell Road, facing southeast.....	150
Figure 5.57: Resource 106-6400.02 (Chartwell Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 124 Chartwell Road, facing southeast.....	150
Figure 5.58: Resource 106-6400.03 (Chartwell Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 158 Chartwell Road, facing north.....	151
Figure 5.59: Resource 106-6400.04 (Chartwell Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 240 Chartwell Road, facing south.....	151
Figure 5.60: Resource 106-6401 (3102 Greenore Drive) – View of the south elevation, facing northwest. ....	153
Figure 5.61: Resource 106-6401 (3102 Greenore Drive) – View of the west elevation, facing east. ....	153
Figure 5.62: Resource 243-0882 (128 Steward Drive) – View of the west elevation, facing south. ....	155
Figure 5.63: Resource 243-0883 (129 Steward Drive) – Oblique view of the facade, facing northwest. ....	156
Figure 5.65: Resource 243-0885 (301 Paris Road) – View of the façade, facing south.....	158
Figure 5.66: Resource 243-0885 (301 Paris Road) – Oblique view of the rear and east side elevation, facing northwest. ....	159
Figure 5.67: Resource 243-6402 (1110 Kinley Road) – View of non-historic church and in-ground cremains burial area, facing northeast. ....	160
Figure 5.68: Resource 243-6402 (100 Gaillard Street) – Representative view of non-historic cemetery monuments, facing northwest.....	160
Figure 5.69: Resource 243-6403 (37 Bluebird Trail) – View of the façade, facing southwest. ....	161
Figure 5.70: Resource 243-6404 (1013 North Wingard Road) – View of the façade, facing northeast.....	162
Figure 5.71: Resource 243-6404 (1013 North Wingard Road) – Oblique view of the rear and west side elevation, facing south. ....	163
Figure 5.72: Resource 243-6467 (200 Roof Lowman Road) – View of the façade, facing north. ....	164
Figure 5.73: Resource 243-6467 (200 Roof Lowman Road) – View of the west side elevation, facing east. ....	165
Figure 5.74: Resource 243-6467.01 (200 Roof Lowman Road) – View of barn associated with resource, facing east. ....	165
Figure 5.75: Resource 243-6467.02 (200 Roof Lowman Road) – View of outbuilding associated with the resource, facing northwest.....	166
Figure 5.76: Resource 106-6405 (Stucawa Subdivision or Cherokee Gardens). ....	168
Figure 5.77: Resource 106-6405.01 (Cherokee Gardens Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 203 Stucawa Drive, facing west.....	169
Figure 5.78: Resource 106-6405.02 (Cherokee Gardens Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 203 Chippewa Drive, facing west. ....	169
Figure 5.79: Resource 106-6405.03 (Cherokee Gardens Subdivision) – View of the church located at 216 Stucawa Drive, facing southwest. ....	170



Figure 5.80: Resource 106-6405.04 (Cherokee Gardens Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 235 Chippewa Drive, facing southwest. ....	170
Figure 5.81: Resource 106-6406 (2420 Broad River Road) – Oblique view of the façade and south side elevation, facing northeast.....	172
Figure 5.82: Resource 106-6407 (1311 Marley Drive) – View of the façade, facing north. ....	173
Figure 5.83: Resource 106-6407 (1311 Marley Drive) – View of the east side elevation, facing west. ....	173
Figure 5.84: Resource 106-6407 (1311 Marley Drive) – Oblique view of the rear elevation, facing southwest. .	174

## Appendices

### **Appendix A—Artifact Catalog**

### **Appendix B—South Carolina Site Inventory Record Forms**

### **Appendix C— 50-x-50 cm Test Unit Profiles at 38LX655**

### **Appendix D—Resumes of Principal Investigators**

### **Appendix E—Eminent Domain Notice for Landowners**

### **Appendix F – SCDOT’s Saluda Canal Report**

## 1 Introduction




From April 13 through May 22, 2015, Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc. (EPEI) conducted a cultural resource survey of the proposed Carolina Crossroads improvement corridor in Lexington and Richland counties, South Carolina. The results of this investigation were presented in the form of a management summary submitted in November 2015. The management summary was prepared to serve the development of the project during the Phase I stage (establishment of existing baseline conditions) with the intention of submitting a complete report detailing findings and recommendations as part of the Phase II (alternatives analysis and potential impact analysis) stage of the project. During the alternatives analysis, an expanded survey area was established in July 2017 and EPEI cultural resource staff conducted fieldwork within the expanded corridor from October 18 through 25, 2017 and an additional field visit in December 2017 in order to address changes to the proposed alternatives in the vicinity of Beatty Road. Supplemental fieldwork was also conducted by SCDOT archaeologists in February 2018 to provide additional documentation for the Saluda Canal, 38RD59. The Carolina Crossroads Project corridor includes sections of I-20, from the Saluda River to the Broad River, I-26, from US 378 to Broad River Road, and I-126, from Colonial Life Boulevard to I-26 (Figure 1.1).

The Area of Potential Effect (APE) for this project encompasses I-20 between the Saluda River and the Broad River, I-26 between US 378 (Sunset Boulevard) and a point north of the I-26 and US 76/176 (Broad River Road) Interchange, and I-126 between Greystone Boulevard and I-26 in Lexington and Richland counties. The project study area encompasses the APE for the proposed undertaking including the existing SCDOT right-of-way (ROW) and extends a minimum of 100 feet beyond the existing SCDOT ROW along the main lines described above and on secondary roads for a distance of 1,000 feet in each direction at interchanges. The project study area also encompasses a minimum of 100 feet beyond the existing SCDOT ROW on secondary roads. Frontage roads along the identified interstate corridors are also included in the project study area. The project study area is depicted in Figure 1.1. The I-20/26/126 corridor, or Carolina Crossroads, is a vital link in South Carolina, serving residents, commuters, travelers, and commerce. Due to nearby residential and commercial development, proximity to downtown Columbia, traffic volumes, and the overall geometric layout, including 12 interchange points, the Carolina Crossroads has become one of the most congested interstate sections in South Carolina. The primary purpose of the proposed Carolina Crossroads Corridor Project is to improve mobility and reduce congestion within the corridor.





C:\Users\spipe\Desktop\EPRI Files\Temp GA Projects\Carolina Crossroads\Figure 1.1.mxd | Last Updated: 10/30/2017



**Legend**  
 Cultural Resource Study Area

**Figure 1.1**  
**Project Location Map**



This page intentionally left blank.



The cultural resource survey was conducted in compliance with the provisions and stipulations of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. § 470) and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. § 474). The EPEI staff assigned to the project meet the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualification Standards set forth in 36 CFR Part 61. The Principal Investigator in charge of EPEI's archaeological resources survey and co-author of this report was Ryan Sipe. The investigator in charge of EPEI's historic architectural resources survey was David Adair, who served as project historian and co-author of this report.

The following chapters report the findings of the 2015 and 2017 archaeological and historic architectural resource survey efforts. Chapter 2 provides necessary context by detailing the environmental and cultural settings of the project study area. Methods of investigation are described in Chapter 3, including literature review and background research, field methods, and criteria employed for evaluating the NRHP eligibility of identified resources. Chapter 4 presents the archaeological survey results and NRHP recommendations for all investigated resources. Chapter 5 presents the historic architectural resources survey results, including a summary of previously identified resources located within the APE, descriptions of newly-identified resources located within the APE, resource photographs, and discussions of resource significance and integrity as it pertains to NRHP eligibility evaluations. Finally, the report's findings are summarized and resource management recommendations are made in Chapter 6. Appendix A contains the complete artifact catalog of all material collected during the archaeological survey, Appendix B provides an updated copy of all pertinent South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology (SCIAA) Site Inventory Record forms, Appendix C provides photographs and profile drawings of 50-x-50 centimeter test units dug during the investigation, and Appendix D includes the resumes of both Principal Investigators. Appendix E presents a copy of the Eminent Domain Notice provided to all landowners during the survey. Lastly, the full results of the supplemental fieldwork conducted by the SCDOT is presented in Appendix F as *SCDOT's Saluda Canal Report*.

## 2 Environmental and Cultural Context

### 2.1 Environmental Setting

#### 2.1.1 PHYSICAL SETTING

The survey area spans approximately 16 miles through Lexington and Richland counties, South Carolina. This corridor passes through the western portions of the Cities of Columbia and West Columbia, and includes settings best characterized as commercial and residential, with only sparse pockets of undeveloped forest land. More specifically, the survey area spans the distance between the communities of Irmo in Lexington County and St. Andrews in Richland County, both of which are located north of the Saluda River and west of the Broad River. The survey area also crosses the Saluda River to include portions of West Columbia (see Figure 1.1).

The northwestern portion of the survey area between the interchanges with Dutch Fork Road and Piney Grove Road is characterized by heavy commercial development, including the shopping centers associated with the Harbison Mall. The central portion of the survey area includes the Carolina Crossroads interchange itself and includes areas of retail development as well as large office parks. This section of the project is also flanked by broad expanses of residential neighborhoods. The southern portion of the survey area, which includes the stretch of I-126 west of the Broad River and the arms of I-20 and I-26 that cross the Saluda River, are characterized by light commercial development and dense residential development.

#### 2.1.2 PHYSIOGRAPHY AND GEOLOGY

The survey area is located within the central Midlands region of the state just north of the Fall Line, which falls within the Piedmont Province of South Carolina. This physiographic province stretches from Maryland to central Alabama and makes up approximately one-third of South Carolina's total land area. The province was initially formed when landmass created by volcanic activity at sea subsequently collided with the continental margin through tectonic activity. This collision caused buckling and deformations to the original igneous and sedimentary deposits and formed the present day exposures of metamorphic rock (Barry 1980:14–15). Elevations within the Piedmont Province range from 91 meters (300 feet) in the Fall Zone to 366 meters (1,200 feet) near the Blue Ridge Province (Kovacik and Winberry 1987).

#### 2.1.3 HYDROLOGY

The project area is located at the confluence of the Broad and Saluda Rivers, where they combine to form the Congaree River (see Figure 1.1). These rivers represent some of the largest river systems in the Santee River watershed and played an important role in the historical development of the area. The Broad River, which forms the eastern terminus of the survey corridor, originates in the Blue Ridge Mountains of eastern

Buncombe County, North Carolina and flows southeastward throughout northwest South Carolina to Columbia, where it joins with the Saluda River to form the Congaree River. Likewise, the Saluda River flows southeast from its origin, just northwest of the City of Greenville, to its confluence with the Broad River at Columbia. This river system was heavily modified to form Lake Murray, just northwest of the survey area. Ultimately, both of these rivers join with the Wateree River to flow into the Santee River near the Sumter/Clarendon County border.

## 2.1.4 SOILS

There are 27 distinct soil types within the survey area. These include Altavista silt loam, Cecil fine sandy loam and urban land complex, Chenneby silty clay loam, Congaree silt loam, Craven fine sandy loam, Dothan loamy sand and urban land complex, Enon silt loam, Faceville sandy loam, Georgeville very fine sandy loam, Goldsboro sandy loam, Herndon silt loam and urban land complex, Johnston soils, Mecklenburg silt loam, Nason silt loam, Orangeburg loamy sand and urban land complex, Pelion loamy sand, Pickens slaty silt loam, Rains sandy loam, Smithboro loam, State sandy loam, Tatum silt loam, Toccoa loam, Udorthents, and Wedowee loamy sand. Details of these soil types along with their percentage present in the project area are presented in Table 2.1.

**Table 2.1. Soils within the Survey Area.**

Soil Series	Soil Type	Percent Slope	Rating	Percent of APE
Altavista	silt loam	0 to 2	Moderately well drained	3.30%
Cecil	fine sandy loam	2 to 6	Well drained	1.80%
Cecil	fine sandy loam	6 to 10	Well drained	2.40%
Cecil	fine sandy loam	10 to 15	Well drained	0.90%
Cecil	Urban land complex	8 to 15		1.40%
Chastain	silty clay loam		Poorly drained	0.50%
Chenneby	silty clay loam		Somewhat poorly drained	0.10%
Chenneby	soils		Somewhat poorly drained	0.30%
Congaree	loam		Somewhat poorly drained	1.00%
Congaree	silt loam		Well drained	0.70%
Craven	fine sandy loam	0 to 2	Moderately well drained	0.30%
Dothan	loamy sand	2 to 6	Well drained	4.70%
Dothan	Urban land complex	0 to 6	Well drained	0.70%
Enon	silt loam	2 to 6	Well drained	5.20%
Enoree	silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	0 to 2	Poorly drained	0.70%
Faceville	sandy loam	2 to 6	Well drained	0.20%
Georgeville	silt loam	2 to 6	Well drained	1.70%

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey

Soil Series	Soil Type	Percent Slope	Rating	Percent of APE
Georgeville	silt loam	6 to 10	Well drained	5.70%
Georgeville	very fine sandy loam	2 to 6	Well drained	0.80%
Georgeville	very fine sandy loam	6 to 10	Well drained	2.10%
Georgeville	very fine sandy loam	10 to 15	Well drained	1.60%
Goldsboro	sandy loam	0 to 2	Moderately well drained	0.20%
Herndon	silt loam	2 to 6	Well drained	9.30%
Herndon	silt loam	6 to 10	Well drained	2.10%
Herndon	Urban land complex	2 to 6	Well drained	1.80%
Johnston	soils		Very poorly drained	0.60%
Mecklenburg	silt loam	6 to 10	Well drained	0.80%
Nason	complex	10 to 30	Well drained	0.10%
Nason	silt loam	6 to 15	Well drained	6.00%
Nason	silt loam	2 to 6	Well drained	5.00%
Nason	silt loam	6 to 10	Well drained	1.10%
Orange	loam	0 to 4	Somewhat poorly drained	3.60%
Orangeburg	loamy sand	2 to 6	Well drained	2.70%
Orangeburg	loamy sand	6 to 10	Well drained	1.10%
Orangeburg	Urban land complex	2 to 6	Well drained	8.30%
Orangeburg	Urban land complex	6 to 15	Well drained	1.20%
Pelion	loamy sand	6 to 10	Moderately well drained	0.20%
Pickens	slaty silt loam	6 to 15	Somewhat excessively drained	0.60%
Rains	sandy loam		Poorly drained	2.00%
Smithboro	loam		Somewhat poorly drained	1.40%
State	sandy loam	0 to 2	Well drained	5.60%
Tatum	silt loam	15 to 25	Well drained	4.40%
Toccoa	loam		Moderately well drained	0.70%
Udorthents	ents		Moderately well drained	0.40%
Water				1.30%
Wedowee	loamy sand	2 to 6	Well drained	0.00%
Wedowee	loamy sand	10 to 30	Well drained	3.30%

## 2.2 Cultural Setting

### 2.2.1 INTRODUCTION

Human occupation of the South Carolina Midlands dates back to at least 12,000 years ago, a legacy which is reflected in thousands of archaeological sites. Five broad chronological periods are typically used to characterize the Native American history of South Carolina. Each of these are based on distinct cultural and technological developments that can be recognized in the archaeological record. These periods are Paleoindian, Archaic, Woodland, Mississippian, and Historic and span from at least 10,000 B.C. to the present day. A full review of the culture history for the South Carolina Midlands is provided below.

### 2.2.2 PALEOINDIAN PERIOD

It is during the Paleoindian period that human occupation of the New World began. At present, it is uncertain when the first human populations permanently settled the western hemisphere, although most scholars believe it was sometime between 20,000 and 13,000 years ago, in the last stages of the Pleistocene glaciation. Reliable dates as early as ca. 11,800 B.C. have been obtained from a Paleoindian site in Monte Verde, Chile (Dillehay 1989). The end of the Paleoindian period coincides with the Pleistocene/Holocene transition and, in most areas of the southeastern United States, is given an arbitrary terminal date of 8,000 B.C. In South Carolina and the rest of the Southeast, the Paleoindian period is typically divided into three broad categories, Early, Middle, and Late or Transitional, based, in part, on the occurrence of specific projectile point types (Anderson et al. 1990).

Traditional characterizations of Paleoindians portrayed them as nomadic hunters of Pleistocene megafauna, such as mammoth, mastodon, and bison; however, these descriptions were based on data from archaeological sites in the western United States. Recent reevaluations, based on data from the Southeast (Clausen et al. 1979; Sassaman et al. 1990) and the Northeast (Cushman 1982), suggests that these groups relied on a broader diet that included small mammals and plants. These new interpretations further suggest that settlement patterns were probably less mobile or nomadic than traditionally thought.

The Paleoindian Period also corresponds with the accepted temporal boundaries of the Clovis tradition, which is identified through the presence of characteristic fluted projectile points such as the Clovis and Cumberland types (Anderson et al. 1990). One of the most important Paleoindian sites in South Carolina is the Topper Site, 38AL23, which is located on the Savannah River in Allendale County. The site is situated on an alluvial terrace and was used as a quarry/production location for a variety of stone tools (Goodyear et al. 2007; Miller 2007, 2010). The site has proven instrumental in studying the Paleoindian Period in the southeast and has also established important discussions regarding pre-Clovis occupations in the Americas.



### 2.2.3 ARCHAIC PERIOD

The environment of the Archaic Period was characterized by a warmer climate and rising sea levels. Human populations tended to increase during this period, and regional environmentally specific adaptations resulted in distinct material assemblages (Smith 1986). Subsistence strategies were varied during this period but generally focused on the procurement of smaller game, fish, and wild plants, as the mega-fauna of the Pleistocene were no longer available. This temporal span is typically subdivided into Early, Middle, and Late periods based on distinct point typologies.

The Early Archaic period (8,000 – 5,000 B.C.) was a time of climate change as climate patterns within the southeastern U.S. became warmer and moister. The melting continental glaciers also created higher sea levels and increased precipitation and led to the development of oak-dominated forest vegetation throughout the southeast (Delcourt and Delcourt 1987). This developing new environment led to changes in human adaptations that are visible in the archaeological record. Most notably, these changes to the archaeological record include the development of regionally specific material cultures reflective of specialized lifeways (Anderson and Hanson 1988). The repeated use of new and specific environments, such as rock shelters and inter-riverine terraces and ridge tops, suggest a less mobile lifestyle that may be a direct result of post-Pleistocene warming (Claggett and Cable 1982). Anderson and Hanson (1988) posit that Early Archaic groups in South Carolina lived in small band level groups and practiced a seasonal settlement model within major river drainages. Coastal Plain locales were used as spring foraging camps and logistical camps, while the bands within a river drainage would aggregate at the Fall Line during the winter (Anderson and Hanson 1988). Material culture specific to the Early Archaic period in coastal South Carolina includes characteristic side notched and corner notched projectile point/knives (pp/k) such as the Hardaway side-notched, Palmer corner-notched, and Kirk corner-notched. Toward the end of the Early Archaic period, the corner and side-notched types give way to a bifurcate tradition, such as the Hardaway-Palmer point (Chapman 1975).

The Middle Archaic period (5,000 – 3,000 B.C.) saw increased regional adaptation and a shift toward a foraging lifestyle, as climate trends allowed for a more homogenous environment. Sassaman (1983) proposed a settlement model based on “adaptive flexibility” in which Middle Archaic societies could practice a fairly high level of social mobility to take advantage of dispersed but similar resource patches. Based on this, the material signatures of such societies show a lack of specialized tools for varied resources. While these groups practiced social mobility, the seasonal territories continued to be regionally specific. This can be seen in a shift from the use of cryptocrystalline rock to coarser, locally available lithic material found in the Coastal Plain (Milner 2004). These assemblages are typically recognized by characteristic stemmed projectile points such as the Kirk serrated and Kirk stemmed points and later Stanly Stemmed points.

During the Late Archaic period (3,000 – 1,000 B.C.), the regional specific adaptation trends continued to develop and an emphasis on sedentism developed throughout the southeast. Evidence of long term habitation can be seen in the form of large middens of oyster shell which have accumulated along the South Carolina coastline (Smith 1986). The Late Archaic period also saw the emergence of fired clay pottery in Coastal Plain locations throughout the southeast. This early pottery type was known as Stallings pottery and is recognized by its distinctive fiber tempered paste (Simpkins and Scoville 1986). Stallings vessel forms included shallow bowls, wide-mouthed bowls, and jars that were constructed by hand molding, as opposed to the coiling method employed in later ceramic types (Trinkley 1986; Sassaman 1993). Surface treatments for Stallings pottery included punctation, finger pinching, and elaborate incising. Other examples of Late Archaic material culture include characteristic stemmed projectile points such as the Savannah River stemmed and the Otarre projectile points (Griffin 1943; Stoltman 1974).

#### 2.2.4 WOODLAND PERIOD

As a general theme, many of the advances seen in the Late Archaic intensified during the Woodland Period. Pottery, a somewhat geographically isolated phenomenon during the Late Archaic, became common throughout the Eastern United States, and variations became regionally specific (Milner 2004). Based on site size, frequency, and complexity, it is posited that populations increased during the Early and Middle Woodland Periods and the emphasis on sedentism became even more pronounced. As with the Archaic Period, discussions of the Woodland Period are typically broken up into Early (1,000 B.C. – 300 B.C.), Middle (300 B.C. – A.D. 800), and Late (A.D. 800 – 1650) time frames based on diagnostic artifacts.

The beginning of the Early Woodland Period is somewhat disputed and some researchers believe the division between the Late Archaic and Early Woodland Period is blurred (Trinkley 1990). This blurred distinction is made even more confusing by the transitional ceramic tradition of Thom's Creek pottery (Trinkley 1980). Long considered an early Woodland type, Thom's Creek assemblages appear very similar to Stallings wares including the same vessel forms and surface treatments. The only difference is the use of sand instead of fiber as the tempering agent (Griffin 1943). While this was seen as an evolution from the Stallings series, this pottery has been found to be contemporaneous with Stallings based on radiocarbon dates obtained from the Spanish Mount site in Charleston County (Trinkley 1980). Conversely, dates from the Lighthouse Point Shell Ring in the same county have placed these assemblages comfortably within the Early Woodland Period. Refuge pottery represents another Early Woodland tradition. This ceramic type is recognized by a compact, sandy or gritty paste, often with hastily applied simple stamping, dentate stamping, or seemingly random punctations (Williams 1968). Refuge pottery is frequently described as very similar to Thom's Creek types; however, investigations at large Refuge sites have indicated that there are significant changes in settlement patterning (Colquhoun et al. 1980; Brooks et al. 1989). Deptford series pottery represents a widespread tradition seen throughout the southeast and begins during the latter portion of the Early Woodland. These ceramic types are recognized by a fine

to coarse sandy paste with surface treatments including plain, check stamped, simple stamped, cord marked, and complicated stamped (Williams 1968).

The Middle Woodland is marked by the appearance of quartz and grit tempered pottery types such as the Pigeon and Cartersville series ceramics. Pigeon type ceramics are typically decorated with check stamped, simple stamped, or brushed surface treatments applied to quartz tempered paste. Cartersville pottery is usually recognized by a grit or sand tempered paste with cord marking and sometimes simple or check stamped surface decoration. The Cartersville type is thought to be related to the widespread Deptford series of ceramics, typically seen throughout the Coastal Plain in the southeastern U.S. (Anderson and Schuldenrein 1985). Later in the Middle Woodland, Connestee pottery becomes common in this region. This pottery type is characterized by a thin-walled design comprised of sand tempered paste, and is typically decorated with brushed, simple stamped, or cord marked designs (Keel 1976).

The Late Woodland Period, in many ways, represents a continuation of the Middle Woodland with the continued preponderance of grit and sand tempered wares. Both Cartersville and Deptford ceramics continue into the Late Woodland Period; however, they begin to noticeably decline (Anderson and Schuldenrein 1985). Sassaman et al. (1990) notes that Late Woodland assemblages in this region are often difficult to distinguish from the preceding Middle Woodland and subsequent Mississippian occupations. As such, the Late Woodland is often interpreted as a transitional period between the Woodland and Mississippian lifeways. This includes the intensification of sedentism, horticulture, and social inequality; all characteristic signatures of the Mississippian lifestyle that followed.

### 2.2.5 MISSISSIPPIAN PERIOD

Increased population density, sedentary habitation, and increasingly stratified social structure eventually led to the rise of the politically centralized southeastern Mississippian chiefdoms. This period is typically thought to begin around A.D. 1000 in coastal areas and continues until European contact. The hallmarks of the Mississippian period in the southeast include intensive maize agriculture, sedentary villages and towns, ceremonial architecture (such as earthen platform mounds), and political stratification among individuals and settlements.

The Mississippian period saw the rise of chiefdoms, which were made up of hierarchically ranked villages. Ferguson (1971) established a model of Mississippian settlement patterns composed of political centers surrounded by smaller villages and farmsteads. These political centers tended to be approximately 160 kilometers apart, often with buffers of unoccupied territory between them (Hally 1993). Mississippian centers have typically been found along most major river systems throughout the southeast. Examples of these centers in the region include the Belmont and Mulberry sites along the Wateree River; Santee/Fort Watson/Scotts Lake on the Santee River; the Irene site on the Savannah River, near Savannah; Hollywood, Lawton, Red Lake, and Mason's Plantation in the central Savannah Valley; and Town Creek along the Pee Dee River in North Carolina (Anderson 1994).

Artifactual indicators of the Mississippian period typically include small triangular projectile points, ground stone tools, and polished stone objects. Exotic items crafted from stone, bone, shell, mica, and copper are also associated with Mississippian assemblages and are often interpreted as symbols of status and authority. Regional ceramic variants are also indicative of the Mississippian period. In the Midlands portion of South Carolina, the Mississippian ceramic phases associated with the Wateree Valley appear to be most relevant. These include the Belmont Neck phase (ca A.D. 1100-1175), which is identified by complicated stamped vessels with notched rims; the Pee Dee phase (ca A.D. 1175-1450), which is typified by punctated designs and punctated applied rosettes below the rim; and the Mullberry phase (ca A.D. 1450-1600), which is recognized by its segmented applique rim strips and vertical ticks on the shoulders of vessels (DePratter and Judge 1986). There is also a fourth phase associated with protohistoric settlements known as the Wateree phase (ca A.D. 1600-1680). This pottery style is recognized by thick vessel walls, poorly executed stamping, and wide applique rim strips (DePratter and Judge 1986).

## 2.2.6 HISTORIC OVERVIEW

European contact occurred early in South Carolina. Early expeditions to North America by Juan Ponce de Leon and Pedro de Salazar inspired Lucas Vasques de Ayllon, Judge of the Royal Audencia of Santo Domingo, to finance his own mission to the new continent. This led to the first known visit to the South Carolina coast by slavers Francisco Gordillo and Pedro de Quejo, who sailed from the Bahamas to the Santee River-Winyah Bay area in 1521. Ayllon was so encouraged by this successful endeavor that he set out to settle the area with an expedition he led personally. Ayllon and as many as 600 settlers first landed at the Santee River in 1526, but then moved to another unknown location within Native American territory to found the settlement of San Miguel de Gualdape (Swanton 1922; Thomas 1993). Within two months of its creation, Ayllon was dead and the colony failed. While the settlement was short lived, its effects were far reaching for the native inhabitants. Spanish materials were apparently introduced to the Native American groups of the area and were traded far inland, where they were later encountered during the de Soto entrada of 1540 (Thomas 1993). The Allyon expedition also introduced European diseases, which devastated some of the interior settlements described within the de Soto chronicles. These diseases induced changes and likely population movements in the proto-historic native groups that were later described in detail by the more intensive Spanish occupation to come.

The next wave of European settlement came with the French, in 1562, to the land they called *Carolana*, in honor of Charles IX, King of France. This expedition of French Protestants, known as Huguenots, was led by Jean Ribault, who established the short-lived Charlesfort settlement on Parris Island, where he left 27 men behind before returning to France for supplies (Thomas 1993). Ribault was unable to rescue the men he left at Charlesfort due to religious upheaval in Europe. The Charlesfort colony struggled to feed itself and was only able to survive due to the generosity of aboriginal groups in the area. Ribault's lieutenant, Rene de Laudonniere details the names of powerful local chieftains, including "Audusta (Orista)," "Macou (Escumacu)," and "Oade (Guale)" whose names became European monikers for coastal

aboriginal groups as a whole (Bennet 1975). Eventually, with the help of their native allies, the Charlesfort survivors built a small ship to return to France in 1563. By the time they were rescued at sea by an English ship, the remaining Charlesfort survivors had resorted to cannibalism (Bennet 1975). The Spanish saw the failed Charlesfort colony as a direct challenge to lands they believed were rightfully theirs. When Ribault did return to North America, to found the Fort Caroline colony, Spain's champion, Pedro Menendez de Aviles, was not far behind. Menendez eventually defeated the French at Fort Caroline and established St. Augustine and a series of outposts along the Georgia Coast. For the capital of his Florida colony, Menendez returned to Parris Island and founded Santa Elena on top of the original Charlesfort colony in 1566. Santa Elena served as Spain's colonial capital in North America until 1587 when it was abandoned due to conflicts with the aboriginal population and its colonial rivals, France and England (Thomas 1993).

Conflicts in Europe led to a virtual stalemate for the colonial occupation of Carolina and the region remained as a northern frontier of the Spanish La Florida colony for almost a century. Sir Robert Heath, attorney general for King Charles I of England, was granted the "Province of Carolina" in 1629 (Edgar 1998). This broadly defined territory included the modern states of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee and Mississippi. The settlement of this land was never realized, however, due largely to broader conflicts such as the English Civil War. The charter was eventually declared invalid and a new one was established in 1663 granting Carolina to eight "Lords Proprietors" in return for the financial and political backing of the restored English monarchy (Edgar 1998).

The original Lords Proprietors included Edward Hyde, First Earl of Clarendon; George Monck, First Duke of Albemarle; William Craven, First Earl of Craven; John Berkeley, First Baron Berkeley of Stratton; Anthony Ashley Cooper, First Earl of Shaftesbury; Sir George Carteret; Sir William Berkeley; and Sir John Colleton (Edgar 1998). Of this group, Lord Shaftesbury seemed to take the most active interest in the Carolina Colony. He and his secretary, the philosopher John Locke, drafted the Constitutions of Carolina which established a government for the colony that was heavily based on the work of English political scientist, James Harrington. This government was to consist of a Governor coupled with a strong council heavily influenced by the Lords Proprietors themselves (Edgar 1998).

The first permanent English settlements in the Carolina colony were actually established in 1653, ten years prior to the official charter. These were established by emigrants from the Virginia Colony, New England, and Bermuda who settled at the mouths of the Chowan and Roanoke Rivers in the northeastern corner of present day North Carolina (Edgar 1998). These settlements were organized under the name Albermarle County after the official charter. The Lords Proprietors set out to establish their colonial capital in 1670 and sent 150 colonists to a location south of the Albermarle settlements, near a natural harbor. It was here they established "Charles Towne," in honor of Charles II of England, the restored monarch who granted the Carolina Charter (Edgar 1998). Charles Towne thrived due to its natural harbor and expanding trade with the West Indies. While Charles Towne was the principal seat of government in the Carolina colony, the northern settlements often operated independently due to their remote location. As a result,

they maintained a separate assembly and deputy governor for the northern half of the colony. This laid the groundwork for the eventual separation of the colony in 1729 when half of the Lords Proprietors sold their interests to the Crown and two Royal Colonies were established: North Carolina and South Carolina (Edgar 1998).

In the early eighteenth century, South Carolina's first Royal Governor, Robert Johnson, sought to create a buffer zone between Charleston and the often-hostile settlements of the Cherokee nation. To do this, he promoted the settlement of South Carolina's western frontier, or backcountry, which includes the lands often referred to today as the Upcountry and Midlands (Edgar 2008). Johnson arranged a fund to lure European Protestants to the colony stating that each family would receive free land based on the number of people, including indentured servants and slaves, and a parish would be created for every 100 families settling in an area. Each parish would also gain two representatives in the state assembly. At first, frontier settlement was slow and only the hardest of families settled in the backcountry as this was primarily occupied by the often hostile Cherokee and Catawba nations (Edgar 1998). Between 1730 and 1759, nine formal townships were established within the South Carolina back country. These were each laid out to correspond with the major navigable rivers and included Purrysburg and New Windsor, on the Savannah River; Orangeburg, on the North Edisto River; Amelia, near the confluence of the Congaree and Santee Rivers; Fredricksburg on the Wateree River; Williamsburg, on the Black River; Queensborough on the Pee Dee River; Kingston on the Waccamaw River; and Saxe Gotha on the Congaree River in present-day Lexington County (Edgar 1998). Many of these early townships were characterized by the distinct ethnic identities of their original settlers. In the case of the Midlands, the settlements of Saxe Gotha, Amelia, and Orangeburg were originally established by German protestants, fleeing persecution in Europe (Edgar 1998).

Settlement rapidly increased when the land that includes Spartanburg County was ceded to the colony of South Carolina as part of a 1755 treaty with the Cherokee (Foster and Montgomery 1998). From this treaty, the land for 13 of the modern counties that make up South Carolina's Upcountry were acquired. The terms of the treaty required that the Cherokee be paid 100 English pounds and that they would remain on the land west of the Enoree River. During this time, the English Colonies were embroiled in the French and Indian War, a North American theater for the Seven Years War in Europe between Britain and France. The grisly defeat of British colonial forces under Edward Braddock in western Pennsylvania frightened many of the Scotch-Irish settlers who settled there in the early eighteenth century. With Braddock's defeat, many of these settlers felt they would be open to attack from the French and, more likely, Native Americans. The large expanses of newly opened South Carolina backcountry was a tempting refuge and many of these families moved from Pennsylvania to South Carolina to settle the new land.

With the Cherokee threat pacified, settlement in the Upcountry increased greatly and with the increased population came increased crime. Robbery and violence became commonplace and, like the Cherokee raids, this lawlessness only served as a reminder to the Upcountry residents of their isolation from the



colony's government in Charleston (Foster and Montgomery 1998). Vigilante justice became commonplace and soon an organized group of several thousand men formed and called themselves the Regulators. At first, this group focused on retrieving stolen property from outlaws in the area but soon became the most powerful organization in the area. The Regulators eventually began using violence as a means of control of the populace and enforcing their own agenda among residents of the Upcountry that did not necessarily reflect colonial law (Dykeman 1978). In an ironic twist, a new group of vigilantes rose up to resist the Regulators and dubbed themselves the Moderators (Foster and Montgomery 1998). These vigilante groups led to even more violence across the frontier as the two groups vied for control of the Upcountry.

By 1769, the Governor realized that the only way to extend colonial law into the frontier was to extend colonial infrastructure to the Upcountry and he established a system of circuit courts throughout the frontier. These courts effectively divided the South Carolina colony into seven districts including the Charleston, Georgetown, Beaufort, Orangeburg, Camden, Cheraw, and Ninety-Six Districts. Present day Lexington and Richland Counties fell within the Orangeburg and Camden districts, which were separated by the Congaree River (SCDAH 2015). The first sessions of these new courts were held in 1772 (Foster and Montgomery 1998).

### 2.2.6.1 American Revolution

South Carolinians were among the most vocal critics of the royal, colonial tax policy designed to pay for mid-eighteenth-century conflicts like the French and Indian War (Gordon 2003). These unpopular measures fueled agitators such as Thomas Lynch, John Rutledge, and Christopher Gadsden, who had already begun pro-independence campaigns in South Carolina. When the 1767 Townsend Act sparked the famous Boston Tea Party, Charlestonians mirrored the gesture by dumping a shipment of tea into the Cooper River. By 1774, independence movements in the American colonies had gained enough momentum to lead to the First Continental Congress, held in Philadelphia. This included representatives of all of the colonies except Georgia, and included five South Carolinians. One of South Carolina's delegates was Henry Middleton, who served as the body's presiding officer for part of the congress. Middleton, like many other South Carolina Patriots, was from the wealthy Charleston planter class. Many in the Upcountry, however, were Loyalists as its population was focused on subsistence farming. They found the prospect of being ruled by a wealthy aristocracy in Charleston worse than the current colonial situation with England. This division set the stage for much of the conflict that was to come in South Carolina during the American Revolution and made it the location of some of the bloodiest battlegrounds of the war and much of U.S. history (Gordon 2003).

With the outbreak of violence and the beginning of military action, the Royal Governor of South Carolina disbanded the Royal Assembly and fled Charleston for a warship anchored in the harbor. The low country Patriots responded with the creation of a temporary government to rule the colony, known as the General



Assembly of South Carolina, and John Rutledge was elected as its “president.” Judge William Henry Drayton and Reverend William Tennent were sent into the backcountry to rally support for the revolutionary cause; however, these efforts were largely unsuccessful (Gordon 2003). The first of these meetings was held in the Dutch Fork settlement in the old Saxe Gotha township. It was here that Drayton noted that the German settlers were “not with us” (Edgar 1998). Drayton was able to raise the support of a small group of Upcountry residents in the northern portion of the Ninety-Six district which would eventually become Spartanburg County. A man named John Thomas was among the most vocal of these supporters and organized a militia of Upcountry Patriots which became known as the Spartan Regiment, after the famed Greek warriors (Foster and Montgomery 1998). It is believed this regiment represents the origin of the “Spartan” place name which was later assigned to the county.

The first acts of open insurrection in South Carolina began in the Spring of 1775, when a group designated by the General Assembly intercepted British dispatches authorizing the use of force. These dispatches were in response to the violence that had erupted at Lexington and Concord two days before. News of these developments led the Assembly to create a Council of Safety which organized three standing regiments of troops (in addition to existing militia). The Council also organized raids of gunpowder and weapons stores in Charleston and even the interception of British gunpowder shipments headed for Savannah and St. Augustine (Gordon 2003).

Conflicts between the Upcountry Loyalists and low country Patriots also started as early as 1775 (Gordon 2003). During its attempts to consolidate supplies, the Council sent a small detachment of mounted rangers to seize the gunpowder stores at the small Upcountry outpost, Fort Charlotte. The fort was almost abandoned and was taken without incident; however, after the gunpowder was secured, a large portion of the force changed sides at the urging of the unit’s second in command, Moses Kirkland. Kirkland rallied Loyalists from the nearby community of Ninety-Six (modern day Greenwood County) to take control of the commandeered supplies and arrest the rangers’ commanding officer, Major James Mayson (Gordon 2003). Mayson and the gunpowder were held in the courthouse at Ninety-Six and loyalist residents formally charged him with stealing property of the Crown.

The community of Ninety-Six became a symbol of the Upcountry’s loyalist stance and in November of 1775, the first known casualties of the Revolution in South Carolina occurred there when 500 Patriots were besieged in a makeshift fortification around a barn near Old Savage Field in Ninety-Six. The Patriots attempted to fortify the town and make use of the fortified barn that was constructed during conflicts with the Cherokee. The Patriots were intercepted and besieged by a group of 1,500 loyalist fighters, under Patrick Cunningham and Joseph Robinson. Fighting was disorganized and casualties were low, but it marked the first known deaths as a result of the ideological divide between the Upcountry and low country (Gordon 2003). As the siege continued into a second day, both sides realized their tenuous positions and a truce was made in which both sides withdrew.

In December of 1775, the Council of Safety sent a larger force of 2,500 men into the backcountry to bring the loyalist militia to justice (Gordon 2003). This expedition represented the largest military force ever seen in that region and was nicknamed the Snow Campaign, due to its winter timeframe. As the Snow Campaign marched into the Upcountry, loyalist sympathizers surrendered their arms to the Whig militia. Patrick Cunningham would not surrender and retreated into Cherokee country, making common cause with an enemy his group once sought protection from (Gordon 2003). The campaign caught up to Cunningham's camp in a canebrake in the bottomlands of the Reedy River. A firefight ensued and at least 6 of Cunningham's men were killed and an estimated 130 were captured. Cunningham and a small band of loyal followers retreated further into Cherokee country to cement a loyalist alliance with the Cherokee nation (Gordon 2003). The Cunningham family went on to form a notorious Tory militia under their cousin William "Bloody Bill" Cunningham that terrorized the Upcountry during the Revolution.

During these early conflicts between neighbors, South Carolina's Royal Governor, Lord William Campbell, was still anchored in Charleston harbor on the warship Tabor and had gained support of another ship, the Cherokee. Merchants in Charleston still provided supplies to these vessels despite the rising tensions. The governor of North Carolina also joined the group, as he too fled his colony. Led by Campbell, this small force of British vessels began coastal raids on plantations and offered slaves freedom from their bondage and transportation to a spot on Sullivan's Island (Gordon 2003). Formed by wealthy planters, the Council of Safety was infuriated by the maneuver and insisted all slaves removed from plantations be returned to their masters as runaways. When Campbell refused this request, the council forbade merchants from supplying the vessels and sent a company of rangers, experienced in guerilla tactics, to the location of the fugitive slave community of Sullivan's Island, which also served as the watering station for the British ships (Gordon 2003). The rangers surprised the crew of the British ships and exchanged fire, killing several former slaves and capturing a large contingent of slaves and loyalist crew members before the remainder could retreat to the British ships. As a result of this encounter, Campbell and his men were unable to resupply in South Carolina and were forced to flee the area completely, effectively leaving the colony in the hands of the colonists.

The year 1776 brought British reprisal to the insurrections started the year before in South Carolina and the other colonies. One of Britain's first objectives in quelling its colonies was to establish a base on Sullivan's Island that could control Charleston, one of only five true cities (defined as having a population over 10,000) in the colonies and an important port, without a costly invasion of the city itself (Gordon 2003). In June 1776, the crown sent a squadron of around 12 warships under the command of Commodore Peter Parker as well as troop transports, which contained a landing force of 2,500 redcoats under Major General Henry Clinton and his second in command, Lord Charles Cornwallis, to assault Charleston Harbor and establish an outpost at Sullivan's Island. The strategic importance of Sullivan's Island did not go unrecognized by the General Assembly, and the location had already been fortified by the construction of a palmetto log and sand fort and a defense force of three infantry regiments, two rifle regiments, and a

small artillery regiment under Colonel William Moultrie. Parker placed his ships in position with his largest Man-of-War class ships, the Bristol and the Experiment, firing full broadsides toward the fort. The palmetto and sand construction of the fort absorbed most of the damage from the cannon assaults. One of Parker's mortar ships, the Thunder, also misfired, causing its mortar to be unseated, effectively removing it from the fight. Bolstered by these failures, Moultrie ordered all of the fort's artillery to be aimed at the two Man-of-Wars. The cannons fired chain shot into the rigging of the massive ships and severely damaged their masts and wounded Commodore Parker. Parker sent the smaller ships, Sphinx, Syren, and Actaeon, around to flank the fort and fire directly at its firing positions; however, these ships eventually ran aground on an uncharted sand bar (Gordon 2003).

The battle thus turned into a stalemate with the fort exchanging constant cannon fire with the Bristol and Experiment, and the latter taking the brunt of the damage. At one point during the battle, the crescent moon flag flying over the fort was knocked down by British cannon fire. Seeing this as a possible threat to morale, Sergeant William Jasper, an Upcountry resident who hailed from the region that would become Spartanburg County, climbed on to the battlements and held the flag up for all to see until a new flag stand could be fashioned. This is said to have rallied the troops to continue the grinding battle that would last until 9 PM that evening, when darkness prevented accurate firing. The next morning the British squadron retreated, having taken extensive damage and yet having done almost no damage to the fort. Soon after the failed attempt to take Sullivan's Island, the Declaration of Independence was signed in Philadelphia. The British southern campaign was put on hold and the squadron was sent north to join the campaign against New York (Gordon 2003).

After the failed assault on Charleston harbor, the British Army put the southern campaign on hold for about three years. This was far from the end of fighting in South Carolina, however, as aggressions turned back to militia based warfare among loyalist and Whig forces, as well as open conflict with the Cherokee nation. The Cherokee formally allied with the British during the American Revolution and Cherokee raids on frontier homesteads in the Upcountry became commonplace. Loyalist settlers were instructed to erect wooden poles covered in white cloth as an indicator for the Cherokee to leave them alone and focus attacks on patriot sympathizers (Foster and Montgomery 1998). As a result of this violence, the South Carolina General Assembly raised a militia under Andrew Pickens and James Williams to assault the Cherokee. This successful campaign against Cherokee towns eventually led to a 1777 treaty with the Cherokee that ceded their remaining lands in South Carolina to the colonial government (Gordon 2003).

With the successes at Sullivan's Island and the defeat of the Cherokee, South Carolina looked like a beacon of hope in a war that was going poorly elsewhere. This all changed, however, in 1779 when the British returned to Charleston under General Clinton. The British siege of Charleston was part of a larger campaign known as the "Southern Strategy" designed to force Washington to divide his forces to fight northern and southern campaigns. Clinton landed his expeditionary force on John's Island, where it took James Island and cut the city off from possible relief. The siege of Charleston had begun.

The Continental forces in Charleston were led by General Benjamin Lincoln, who had been appointed commander of the Southern army by Washington in 1778. Lincoln was initially sent south as part of the French-led siege of Savannah, which failed to recapture the city from the British. After the Savannah campaign, Lincoln retreated to Charleston where he would face the other side of siege warfare from Clinton's British forces for two months. Given Charleston's lack of defenses, Lincoln surrendered the city to Clinton in May 1780. With this surrender, the entire southern force of the Continental army was captured and effectively removed from the war. The patriot cause in South Carolina was left to the militia. Furthermore, the end of the siege freed up Clinton's army to establish control over the coast by establishing outposts at Beaufort and Georgetown. He also bolstered his forces by freeing slaves from local plantations and enlisting them. It is estimated that one-quarter of the enslaved population of South Carolina escaped to the British side during the war (Ramsay 1858).

During the siege of Charleston, several notable leaders of the patriot cause were able to avoid capture. This included the patriot Governor, John Rutledge, who traveled around the state drumming up support and pleading with the Continental Congress to send additional military aid to South Carolina. They agreed and sent a new army of continentals under General Horatio Gates to Camden. Another notable escapee was a militia officer named Francis Marion, who had been injured in a previous engagement and was not in town during the surrender. Marion met with General Gates in Camden and he and his militia were ordered to scout the British and destroy boats, bridges, and other items as necessary. In August of 1780, the British attacked Gates' position and Camden and his forces were defeated and forced to retreat northward leaving South Carolina without continental support once again. Left to their own defense, Governor Rutledge gave Francis Marion command of South Carolina's militia forces and they became the only viable patriot army in the south. Marion began a series of guerilla attacks to harass the British forces that continued until Nathanael Greene was put in command of the Southern campaign later that year. Marion's guerilla attacks earned him the nickname "Swamp Fox" among his contemporaries.

In October 1780, General Washington named Nathanael Greene as commander of the Southern Department of the Continental Forces, an army that consisted of only 2,307 men on paper and only 1,482 present (Pratt 2007). Greene sent General Daniel Morgan, who earned fame at the Battle of Saratoga, and a detachment of 600 men, to secure the Upcountry between the Broad and Pacolet rivers and protect the civilians in the area. He reached the Pacolet River by Christmas 1780 and joined forces with a South Carolina militia group under Andrew Pickens. The commander of the British forces in Charleston, Lord Cornwallis, received word of Morgan's arrival and incorrectly believed his troops were sent to assault the fort at Ninety-Six. Cornwallis sent Lieutenant Colonel Banastre Tarleton west to intercept the new continental force in the region. Tarleton eventually realized that Morgan was not at Ninety-Six and soon set out after him and the two forces met at a spot known for cattle grazing known as "Cowpens" in what is now northwest Cherokee County. Morgan outmaneuvered Tarleton's forces in what has often been referred to as the best planned engagement of the Revolutionary War and defeated them. When the dust

settled, Tarleton had suffered an 86 percent casualty rate. Out of 1,500 men, 110 were killed and 712 were captured by Morgan. These men included many of Cornwallis' elite veteran troops, which severely hobbled the British army in the south. Not only did this victory damage the British effort, but it also increased morale for the patriot effort. This defeat led Cornwallis to personally pursue Nathanael Greene into North Carolina where he won a pyrrhic victory at Guildford Court House that damaged his army to the point that it could be trapped and defeated at the Battle of Yorktown almost a year after Cowpens, which marked the end of the war.

#### 2.2.6.2 Early Federal

Charleston was occupied by the British until December of 1782. The new, officially recognized State of South Carolina met in Jacksonboro, a small town in modern day Colleton County, to organize its new state government (Foster and Montgomery 1998). This made Jacksonboro the first provisional capital of South Carolina (Foster and Montgomery 1998). The General Assembly first set up a commission to divide the large districts of the state into smaller counties in order to provide more effective infrastructure. The large Camden district was divided into counties resembling those of the present day. These included York, Chester, Fairfield, Lancaster, Richland, Claremont, and Clarendon counties. The Orangeburg district was divided into Lexington, Winston, Orange, and Lewisburg counties. The commission also selected a new central location to become the state capital. They chose the location of a former frontier fort and ferry on the Congaree River and named the new city "Columbia," a reference to the poetic name often given to the Americas.

#### 2.2.6.3 Richland County

Richland County was formed from the larger Camden district in 1785 as part of the larger efforts to establish a functional government in the newly formed state of South Carolina. The county was aptly named "Rich Land" as a simple reference to its fertile agricultural potential; however, it was sparsely inhabited at the time. In 1786, the newly formed state government voted to establish a completely new city to serve as the capital of South Carolina. The state assembly chose a location within Richland County, as it represented the geographic center of the state. This represented a shift in power from the low country planter elite, known for the production of rice, to the upland portions of the state, which were growing in influence as the agricultural focus of the South shifted to cotton (Edgar 1998). While no city technically existed at this location at the time, the original county courthouse was established at Horrel Hill, approximately 12 miles outside of the city of Columbia (Edgar 1998). A group of city commissioners soon laid out the beginnings of the new city and established a town of 400 blocks within a two-square mile section of uplands along the Broad and Congaree Rivers.

The new City of Columbia grew quickly, both as the new state capital, but also due to the shifting focus toward cotton agriculture which began to take over the Upcountry. Columbia's location at a major confluence within the Santee River watershed aided its development considerably. With the completion

of the Santee Canal in 1800, an inland water route was effectively established connecting the Upcountry directly to the port at Charleston. Once that connection was made, the new cash crop, cotton, could be efficiently transported by boat all the way to the state's main port (Kapsch 2010). Being located where the Saluda and Broad Rivers converge to form the Congaree, this meant that the vast majority of this cotton would have to come right through the City of Columbia. There were still limitations to effective barge travel, however, as Columbia was located on the Fall Line and these rivers formed dangerous shoals as they passed from the Piedmont into the Coastal Plain. This was recognized as a major limiting factor in the development of the state as Savannah was consistently out competing Charleston as a leading port for the export of cotton (Kapsch 2010). As a result of this, the state of South Carolina secured funds to embark on a monumental canal system around 1818 that would allow river barges to navigate the fall line obstructions. In the vicinity of Columbia, this included the construction of the Saluda Canal, which would allow boats to pass around Beard's and Senn's Falls, on the Saluda River on their way to the Congaree; and also, the Columbia Canal, which allowed the shoals of the Broad River to be skirted by river boats. These canals were constructed between 1818 and 1823. Portions of the Saluda Canal were investigated during the present survey and are described in Chapter 4. The unfortunate irony of South Carolina's canals was that by the time they were completed enough to be effectively used, railroads had begun taking hold across the state and provided a much more efficient means of transport (Kapsch 2010). By 1860, Columbia's railroad network effectively connected the port city of Charleston to the Piedmont cities of Greenville, Charlotte, and Spartanburg. Both as the state Capital and an important transportation hub, Columbia became one of the most influential cities in the South.

In December of 1860, South Carolina became the first of the southern states to secede from the Union and by February 1861, it joined the newly formed Confederate States of America. The state also provided the impetus for the Civil War, when Confederate soldiers opened fire on Union troops at Fort Sumter. While South Carolina helped start the Civil War, its capital at Columbia saw relatively little military action until 1865. After the fall of Atlanta and Savannah to Sherman's troops, Columbia became one of the most important administrative and industrial centers in the region, which also made it an effective new target. While South Carolina realized this, administrative delays prevented the construction of military defenses to the city until January of 1865. South Carolina's military engineer intended to encircle the city with earthen fortifications; however, these were not completed in time (Franz 2013). After taking Savannah, Sherman sent troops across the Savannah River toward Charleston to confuse the Confederate forces, but moved the majority of his force toward Columbia and caught the defenders unprepared. The Confederate defenders attempted to block Sherman on the western shores of the Saluda River; however, they were forced to retreat into the city of Columbia and burned the bridge crossing in the process. Sherman then established artillery positions on the west side of the Saluda and began shelling the city. Confederate soldiers allegedly began burning much of the city of Columbia, including records, stores, and equipment in order to prevent their eventual capture by Sherman's troops. The Civil War largely ended for South



Carolina in February of 1865 when Sherman took the City of Columbia and left it under military rule with an occupation force of Union soldiers. An occupation force remained in the city until 1876 (Edgar 1998).

While the Civil War and destruction of much of the city proved quite limiting to the development of Columbia and Richland County, the city soon recovered and became a transportation hub during the 1880s and small communities formed throughout the area at newly established railroad depots (Franz 2013). While cotton agriculture fell dramatically throughout the area, the new industrial development of Columbia and other large fall line cities turned toward textile production. Much of the river front along the Congaree became devoted to these efforts and sections of the Columbia Canal were retooled to generate hydroelectric power for these textile mills.

The twentieth century brought the U.S. Army to Columbia, when General Douglas MacArthur announced that a new training center would be built just east of Columbia in 1917. This became known as Camp Jackson, in honor of Andrew Jackson, and eventually grew into Fort Jackson on the eve of World War II (Edgar 2006).

#### 2.2.6.4 Lexington County

Like Richland County, Lexington County was divided out of its larger colonial district in 1783. This land was once part of the Saxe Gotha township; however, its name was changed to Lexington, in honor of the famous Revolutionary War battle fought in Massachusetts. The original courthouse was established at the small settlement of Granby (present-day Cayce), on the southern bank of the Congaree River. This settlement grew out of a colonial trading post that was founded in the 1760s and eventually became home to Fort Granby, a loyalist stronghold during the Revolution. The town of Granby was an important settlement on the Congaree River during the late colonial period; however, once Columbia was established as the new state capital in 1786, this small outpost on the south side of the river began to decline in importance. The rise of cotton agriculture also played a large role in the settlement of the interior portions of Lexington County. The Granby area of the Congaree River was also frequently flooded and as the focus of the county shifted inward, a new site was selected for a county seat. By 1818, the new town of Lexington Courthouse (later Lexington) became the new county seat (Carolana.com 2017).

As with Richland County, Lexington County saw little military action during the early parts of the Civil War. One skirmish was documented at Two Leagues Crossroads near the town on Lexington in February of 1865 as part of Sherman's march towards Columbia. Sherman's forces also shelled the city of Columbia from the west bank of the Congaree before crossing the river (Edgar 1998).

After the Civil War, much of Lexington County still remained rural and focused on agriculture; however, the cotton market was not as reliable as before and long standing economic, social, and political norms were drastically changed. As a result, landowners divided large plantations into farms to be cultivated by tenant farmers or sharecroppers (Edgar 1998).






As in Richland County, Lexington County was among the early pioneers of hydroelectric power. In 1930, the Lexington Water Power Company completed their hydroelectric plant at Dreher Shoals on the Saluda River. They used an earthen dam 1.5 miles in length to restrict the flow of the river and created Lake Murray in the process (Kovacik and Winberry 1987).

## 2.3 Previous Archaeological Investigations

Prior to the commencement of fieldwork, the State Site Files at SCIAA were consulted in order to identify previously recorded archaeological resources within the survey area. Eight sites, including three in Richland County, 38RD133, 38RD277, and 38RD287, and four in Lexington County, 38LX20, 38LX212, 38LX235, 38LX236, and 38LX238, were recorded within the present survey corridor. One additional site, 38RD59, was recorded outside of the survey area; however, it was determined to extend into the present corridor as a result of this investigation. All of these resources were revisited and are presented in detail in Chapter 4. Expanding the search to a 1-kilometer radius revealed that 43 archaeological sites have been recorded within the vicinity of the survey area, including 25 in Richland County and 18 in Lexington County (Figure 2.1). These resources are presented in Table 2.2 below.

C:\Users\jsipe\Desktop\EPEI Files\Temp GA Projects\Carolina Crossroads\Figure 2.1A.mxd | Last Updated: 03.16.2018



**Legend**

 Cultural Resource Study Area




**Previously Recorded Sites**





-  Potentially Eligible
-  Prob. Not Eligible
-  unknown

**Figure 2.1A**  
**Previously Recorded**  
**Archaeological Sites**



C:\Users\jsipe\Desktop\EP\EP\Files\Temp GA Projects\Carolina Crossroads\Figure 2.1B.mxd | Last Updated: 03.16.2018



- Legend**
-  Cultural Resource Study Area
  - Previously Recorded Sites**
    -  Additional Work
    -  Not Eligible
    -  Prob. Not Eligible
    -  unknown

**Figure 2.1B**  
**Previously Recorded**  
**Archaeological Sites**



**Table 2.2. Previously Recorded Archaeological Sites Within the Survey Area.**

Site Number	Site Name	Site Type	Eligibility
38RD0125		Mississippian, unknown	unknown
38RD0003		Unknown prehistoric	unknown
38RD0020		Unknown prehistoric	unknown
38RD0021		Unknown prehistoric	unknown
38RD0022		Unknown prehistoric	Not Eligible
38RD0023		Unknown prehistoric	unknown
38RD0056		Unknown prehistoric	unknown
38RD0058	Saluda River Bridge	19th Century Bridge	Eligible
38RD0059	Saluda Canal	19th Century Canal	Additional Work
38RD0060		Early Woodland, Unknown Prehistoric	unknown
38RD0082		Archaic, Woodland	Probably Not Eligible
38RD0100		Paleo, Archaic, unknown prehistoric	unknown
38RD0133		Unknown prehistoric	unknown
38RD0140		Unknown prehistoric	Not Eligible
38RD0141		Possible Archaic	Not Eligible
38RD0142		Possible Archaic	Not Eligible
38RD0276		Early Archaic, unknown prehistoric	Not Eligible
38RD0277		Unknown prehistoric, unknown historic	unknown
38RD0287		20th Century	Prob. Not Eligible
38RD0400		Unknown prehistoric	Probably Not Eligible
38RD1071		Unknown prehistoric, 19th/20th Century	Not Eligible
38RD1072		20th Century	Not Eligible
38RD1175		19th/20th Century	Potentially Eligible
38RD1176		Hist. Cemetery	Potentially Eligible
38RD1340	Lorick Family Cemetery	Hist. Cemetery	Additional Work
38LX0234		Unknown lithic scatter	Probably Not Eligible
38LX0004		Unknown prehistoric, 19th century	Potentially Eligible
38LX0007		Unknown	Probably Not Eligible
38LX0020	Wactor Site	Prehistoric scatter	unknown
38LX0025		Prehistoric scatter	unknown

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey

Site Number	Site Name	Site Type	Eligibility
38LX0041	Godley Site	Late Archaic, Early Woodland	Probably Not Eligible
38LX0042		Late Archaic, Early Woodland	Potentially Eligible
38LX0120		Unknown	unknown
38LX0212		Unknown prehistoric	Additional Work
38LX0219		Unknown prehistoric	Probably Not Eligible
38LX0220		19th/20th Century	Probably Not Eligible
38LX0235		Early Archaic	Probably Not Eligible
38LX0236		pre/19th Century	Probably Not Eligible
38LX0238		Unknown prehistoric	Not Eligible
38LX0265		Unknown prehistoric, 19th/20th Century	Probably Not Eligible
38LX0266		Archaic	Probably Not Eligible
38LX0282		19th/20th Century	Probably Not Eligible
38LX0287		19th/20th Century	Probably Not Eligible
38LX0119	Site A	Unknown (Part of a Site File Recording Error)	unknown
38LX0454		19th Century	Potentially Eligible
38LX0585		20th Century	Potentially Eligible
38LX0118	Collection survey	Unknown (Part of a Site File Recording Error)	Potentially Eligible



## 3 Methods of Investigation

### 3.1 Literature and Records Search

A literature review and records search were undertaken prior to the field survey. Background research was conducted to identify all previously recorded archaeological and architectural resources located within the APE of the proposed project and to develop a cultural and historic context to evaluate newly recorded resources. ArchSite (<http://www.scarchsite.org/>), the online geographic information system (GIS) maintained by the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology (SCIAA) and the South Carolina Department of Archives and History (SCDAH), the NRHP property files, the South Carolina Statewide Survey's Inventory of Historic Properties, and cultural resources survey reports maintained by the SCDAH were examined to identify previously recorded cultural resources listed in or determined eligible for listing in the NRHP located within 1 kilometer of the defined APE.

Lexington and Richland County tax assessor's records were reviewed online in order to obtain estimated dates of construction for all buildings and structures located within the APE of the proposed project. In addition, historic topographic maps in the United States Geological Survey (USGS) historic topographic map collection were reviewed on the USGS website and historic aerial photographs were reviewed on the Nationwide Environmental Title Research (NETR) website to identify potential locations of historic sites, understand the development of the project area over time, and to aid in the evaluation of individual resources identified during the historic resources field survey.

### 3.2 Archaeological Field Survey

The archaeological survey was completed in accordance with the South Carolina Standards and Guidelines for Archaeological Investigations (SCSGAI) (COSCAPA et al. 2013). Survey for this project utilized visual inspection, systematic shovel testing, and controlled excavation of 50 x 50-centimeter units where appropriate to locate, map, investigate, and evaluate archaeological sites. The archaeological field survey was accomplished by coverage of the proposed APE for the Carolina Crossroads Improvement Corridor. Shovel testing was conducted at 30-meter intervals throughout the survey area and at 15-meter intervals during the delineation of positive shovel tests.

Standards and terminology for archaeological survey are defined in the SCSGAI (COSCAPA et al. 2013). This document defines an archaeological site as "an area yielding three or more historic or prehistoric artifacts within a 30-meter radius and/or an area with visible or historically recorded cultural features" (COSCAPA et al. 2013). SCSGAI defines an isolated find as "no more than two historic or prehistoric artifacts found within a 30-meter radius."

### 3.2.1 SHOVEL TESTING

Throughout the survey area, shovel tests were excavated at 30-meter intervals parallel with the highway corridor or along transects spaced up to 30 meters apart. All shovel tests were at least 30 centimeters in diameter and excavated to sterile clay subsoil or at least 80 centimeters below ground surface. Excavated soil was screened with .25 inch (.64 centimeter) hardware cloth in order to identify artifacts. Recovery of cultural material 50 years or older constituted a positive test, and artifacts were bagged and labeled for later washing, identification, and analysis in the laboratory. For all excavations, including negative tests, soil colors, textures and strata depths were recorded, and any soil disturbances were noted.

Around positive shovel tests, delineation procedures halved the survey testing interval. The boundaries within the survey area were delineated by excavation of shovel tests at 15-meter intervals along transects spaced 15 meters apart. Delineation was ceased when site boundaries were established or an impediment to testing (e.g., a road or standing water) or the survey limits were reached. In standard shovel test survey practice, two consecutive negative shovel tests at 15-meter intervals in each of the four cardinal directions constituted a complete delineation. All sites were mapped; boundaries were defined for all recorded surface finds or features, and shovel test locations were plotted. Survey was discontinued when survey area limits were reached, and thus actual site boundaries were not determined for parts of some sites. Landform termination, such as drainages and roads, were used to designate a site boundary, when appropriate.

### 3.2.2 50-X-50 CENTIMETER EXCAVATION UNITS

In one instance, Site 38LX655, it was determined that additional information beyond the initial shovel test results was required to evaluate the NRHP eligibility of the resource. Through consultation with archaeologists at SCDOT, a testing plan consisting of 50-x-50-centimeter units dug in areas of high artifact concentration was established for the site. Each test unit was dug in arbitrary 10-centimeter levels until sterile clay hardpan was reached. All artifacts were bagged separately by level and the stratigraphic sequence of each test unit was mapped and photographed.

## 3.3 Laboratory Methods

All cultural material collected in the field was returned to the EPEI laboratory in Columbia for processing and analysis. Artifacts were washed, classified, and temporarily curated at the EPEI lab in Smyrna, Georgia. The results of the artifact analysis are located in Appendix A.

### 3.3.1 ARTIFACT PROCESSING AND ANALYSIS

Following the completion of fieldwork, all artifacts were sent to EPEI's archaeology lab for processing and analysis. Artifacts arrived from the field accompanied by the bag list, containing provenience information

recorded in the field for each bag. Bag list information was added to the database and provenience numbers were assigned. All artifacts were cleaned and placed in drying racks with mesh bottoms.

After initial processing, all artifacts were sorted and cataloged. Artifacts from each provenience lot were sorted by material and type into analytical categories. Material was further analyzed to identify more specific typological characteristics, with the aim of obtaining relative dates. Previously defined types were used, when possible, to facilitate chronological and cultural association and intrasite comparisons.

Precontact material was initially sorted into material categories of lithics, ceramics, and other. Once in these material groups, artifacts were further analyzed in order to place them in categories so that individual cultural or technological trends could be observed. Lithic analysis included the typology developed by Sullivan and Rozen (1985) and formal tool identification was based on Coe (1964), Whatley (2002), and Cambron and Hulse (1975). Ceramics were identified by tempering agents and surface treatment, using Anderson et al. (1996), SCPottery.com (2015), Wauchope (1966), and Williams and Thompson (1999) to identify diagnostic ceramic designs.

Historic artifacts were initially sorted into material categories of ceramics, glass, metal, and other. Once in these categories, artifacts were further classified by attributes such as manufacturing method, morphological attributes, color, and maker's mark. One goal of historic artifact analysis is the refinement of chronology. Extensive previous archaeological and historical research has developed relative dates for ceramics (Brown 1982; Burrison 1995; Miller 1980; Noel Hume 1969; Sussman 1997), glass (Jones and Sullivan 1985; Society for Historic Archaeology 2013), window glass (Day 2001), nails (Orser et al. 1987), as well as many other artifact classes used in the current study (South 1977). In general, these dates help guide the establishment of site chronology, and assume that the pattern of manufacture, use, and discard of artifacts identified in previous research has universal application.

### 3.3.2 CURATION

Upon the approval of the final report, artifacts will be placed in 4-millimeter polyethylene bags for curation; metal specimens will be placed within a microenvironment. Modern material and unstable metal specimens will be discarded prior to the submission of the collection to the curation facility. All documents will be printed on acid free paper and digital data will be stored on archival preservation disks.

Notes, photographs, maps, and other records, including artifacts collected during the project will be temporarily curated at EPEI's office in Smyrna, Georgia. Following acceptance of the final report, copies of the final report and all project materials will be curated at the State Curation Facility maintained by SCIAA in Columbia, South Carolina.

## 3.4 Architectural Survey

### 3.4.1 ARCHITECTURAL SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The intensive architectural resources field survey took place in June and July 2015, with follow-up in September 2017 to survey areas where the project study area had expanded due to the refinement and evaluation of multiple project alternatives. David Adair served as project historian and the Principal Investigator for historic architectural resources. The intensive architectural resources survey was designed to record and evaluate all historic architectural resources (buildings, structures, objects, designed landscapes, and/or sites with above-ground components) in the project study area. Field survey methods complied with the *Survey Manual: South Carolina Statewide Survey of Historic Places* (SCDAH 2015) and the *National Register Bulletin 24, Guidelines for Local Surveys: A Basis for Preservation Planning* (Parker 1985). The architectural resources survey area generally corresponded to the project study area, but was expanded, where necessary, to include architectural resources located outside the project study area, but within the viewshed of the proposed project.

The project study area encompasses I-20 between the Saluda River and the Broad River, I-26 between US 378 (Sunset Boulevard) and a point north of the I-26 and US 76/176 (Broad River Road) Interchange; and I-126 between Greystone Boulevard and I-26 in Lexington and Richland Counties. The study area would encompass existing SCDOT right-of-way (ROW) and extend a minimum of 100' beyond the existing SCDOT ROW along the main lines described above and on secondary roads for a distance of 1000' in each direction at interchanges. The study area includes a minimum of 100' beyond the existing SCDOT ROW along secondary roads as well. Frontage Roads along the identified interstate corridors are also included in the project study area. The project study area is depicted on Figures 1.1A and 1.1B and Figures 2.1A–2.1D).

In accordance with the scope of work and standard SCDAH statewide survey practice, the project historian drove all roads within and adjacent to the project study area and conducted a pedestrian inspection of all potential historic architectural resources. The principal criterion used by the South Carolina Statewide Survey (SCSS) to define historic architectural resources is a 50-year minimum age. Classes of architectural resources that may be documented intensively and included in the SCSS include (SCDAH 2015: 9-10):

- Architectural resources representative of a particular style, form of craftsmanship, method of construction, or building type.
- Properties associated with significant events or broad patterns in history.
- Properties that convey evidence of the community's historical patterns of development.
- Historic cemeteries and burial grounds.



- Historic landscapes such as parks, gardens, and agricultural fields.
- Properties associated with the lives or activities of persons significant in local, state, or national history. For such properties, the historical relationship between the significant person and the property should be identified.
- Sites where ruins, foundations, or remnants of historically significant structures are present.

The integrity of a historic architectural resource is a primary consideration for inclusion in the SCSS, as well as on the NRHP. In order to retain integrity, a resource must “retain features that enable it to convey its historic identity and character” (SCDAH 2015:9-10).

While in the field, the project historian evaluated the integrity of each identified historic architectural resource. Resources exhibiting poor integrity were not recorded. All historic architectural resources located within or adjacent to the project study area that retained sufficient integrity to be included in the SCSS were recorded. Several digital photographs were taken of each resource, the immediate setting of each resource was documented with digital photographs, and onsite interviews were conducted when possible. The location of each historic architectural resource was recorded on USGS topographic maps and a SCSS Intensive Survey site form was prepared for each historic architectural resource in digital format using the Microsoft Access 2013 database application.

References consulted for architectural style and architectural type descriptions include Blumenson (1977), Longstreth (1987), McAlester and McAlester (1998), Poppeliers et al. (1998), and Whiffen (1981).

The survey and evaluation of mid-twentieth century residences and neighborhoods was conducted in accordance with *Guidelines for Surveying Post-World War II Neighborhoods and Residences* (SCDAH 2013). It is for that reason that representative examples of each type of residence within neighborhoods are included in this report.

### 3.5 Assessing NRHP eligibility

The NRHP significance criteria in 36 CFR 60.4 define eligible cultural resources as buildings, structures, objects, sites, and districts that have integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association and that meet one or more of the following criteria.

- Criterion A: Association with events that have significantly contributed to the broad patterns of history;
- Criterion B: Association with persons significant in the past;
- Criterion C: Possession of the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction; exemplification of the work of a master architect, engineer, or artist; embodiment

of high artistic values; or evidence of a significant and discernible entity whose components may lack distinction on their own; and

- Criterion D: Ability to yield information significant to prehistory or history.

A resource may be eligible under one or more of these criteria. Criteria A, B, and C are most frequently applied to historic buildings, structures, non-archaeological sites, objects, and districts. Criterion D is most often, but not exclusively, used to evaluate archaeological sites. A general guideline of 50 years of age is used to define “historic” in the NRHP evaluation process, but more recent resources may be considered if they display “exceptional” significance.

In accordance with the *National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* (Savage and Pope 1998), for a resource to be recommended eligible for inclusion in the NRHP it must be associated with an important historic context in local, regional (state), or national history and it must possess the integrity necessary to reflect and represent its historic context. The seven aspects of integrity are location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association (36 CFR 60.4; Savage and Pope, 1998) and one or more of these may be applicable depending on the nature of the resource under evaluation.

In evaluating archaeological site integrity, Joseph et al. (2004:221–223) condense aspects of integrity into three attributes: space, time, and occupation. Integrity of space represents the horizontal integrity of the site, defined as “the ability of a site to express its historic layout and design” (Joseph et al. 2004:221). Time “refers to a site’s ability to yield data that can be segregated on a temporal basis” (Joseph et al. 2004:222). Single component sites, stratified deposits, or closed context cultural features offer significant temporal integrity. The final attribute, occupation, suggests a site retains integrity if remains from different occupations are so well preserved as to be distinguishable from each other (Joseph et al. 2004:222). The above definitions of significance and integrity were used to assess eligibility for the field sites encountered during the survey.

## 4 Archaeological Survey Results and Analysis


### 4.1 Introduction

The survey area includes the APE established for potential construction and ground disturbing activities along with the maximum extent of potential required ROW and easement as it stands for Phase I of the project. This combined area is referred to as the survey area throughout this document. Typically, the survey area for the Carolina Crossroads project was a corridor approximately 520 feet wide (260 feet from each side of the highway centerline); however, this size varied around interchanges and in areas with variable service roads. The archaeological survey was completed in accordance with the SCSGAI (COSCAPA 2013).

During the archaeological survey, EPEI excavated a total of 2,327 shovel tests including 28 that were positive. An additional 109 shovel test locations could not be excavated due to the presence of parking lots, paved roads, excessive slope, or existing structures. These locations were identified as “No Digs.”

As a result of the survey, nine previously recorded archaeological sites, 38RD287, 38RD133, 38LX235, 38LX236, 38RD277, 38LX20, 38LX212 and 38LX238 were revisited, one previously undocumented site, 38LX655, was recorded, and three isolated finds (IF), IF 1, IF 2, and IF 3 were documented (Figures 4.1A-G). Each of these resources is discussed in the sections that follow.





0 210 420  
Meters  
1 inch = 1,303 feet  
@ 11 x 17 inches  
Projection: UTM Zone 17 N  
North American Datum of 1983



- Legend**
- Shovel Tests**
- Negative
  - Archaeological Site
  - Cultural Resource Study Area

**Figure 4.1A**  
**Shovel Test Results**





C:\Users\jsipe\Desktop\EP\EP\Files\Temp GA Projects\Carolina Crossroads\Figure 4.1B.mxd | Last Updated: 03.16.2018





0 210 420  
Meters  
1 inch = 1,303 feet  
@ 11 x 17 inches  
Projection: UTM Zone 17 N  
North American Datum of 1983

- Legend**
- Negative
  - ∅ No Dig
  - Archaeological Site
  - Cultural Resource Study Area

**Figure 4.1B**  
**Shovel Test Results**

1/6/18







- Legend**
- Negative
  - ∅ No Dig
  - Positive
- Saluda Canal**
- Observed Canal
  - Potential Dam Location
  - - - Projected Canal
  - Archaeological Site
  - Newly Recorded Archaeological Site
  - Cultural Resource Study Area

**Figure 4.1C**  
**Shovel Test Results**

1/6/18










0 210 420  
Meters  
1 inch = 1,303 feet  
@ 11 x 17 inches  
Projection: UTM Zone 17 N  
North American Datum of 1983

- Legend**
- Negative
  - ∅ No Dig
  - Positive
- Saluda Canal**
- Observed Canal
  - Potential Dam Location
  - - - Projected Canal
  - Archaeological Site
  - Newly Recorded Archaeological Site
  - Cultural Resource Study Area

**Figure 4.1D**  
**Shovel Test Results**

1/5/18





**Legend**

- Negative
- ∅ No Dig
- Positive
- ◻ Isolated Find



**Saluda Canal**

- Observed Canal
- Potential Dam Location
- Archaeological Sites
- Newly Recorded Archaeological Site
- ◻ Cultural Resource Study Area

**Figure 4.1E**  
**Shovel Test Results**

1/5/18







0 210 420  
Meters  
1 inch = 1,303 feet  
@ 11 x 17 inches  
Projection: UTM Zone 17 N  
North American Datum of 1983

- Legend**
- Shovel\_Tests**
- Result**
- Negative
  - ∅ No Dig
- Saluda Canal**
- Observed Canal
  - Archaeological Site
  - Cultural Resource Study Area

**Figure 4.1F**  
**Shovel Test Results**







**Legend**

**Shovel\_Tests**

**Result**

- Negative
- ∅ No Dig
- Positive
- ◻ Isolated Find

**Saluda Canal**

- Observed Canal
- Potential Dam Location
- - - Projected Canal
- Archaeological Site
- ◻ Cultural Resource Study Area

**Figure 4.1G**  
**Shovel Test Results**

10/30/17



## 4.2 Previously Recorded Archaeological Sites

### 4.2.1 38RD59 – THE SALUDA CANAL

Site 38RD59, the remains of the Saluda Canal, was originally recorded during an archaeological survey of the Columbia Zoological Park conducted in 1972 (Ryan 1972). Constructed between 1819 and 1821 along the north bank of the Saluda River, the canal was designed to allow boats to bypass what is now known as the Saluda Rapids, which stretch for about two miles along the river, just above its entry into the Broad River. The canal was one of several built in South Carolina during the early 19th century to bypass rapids and river obstructions with the goal of creating an inland navigation network. All of the canals were rendered obsolete by the development of the railroad in the middle years of the 19th century. The Saluda canal ceased operations around 1837 (Hollis 1968; Meriwether 1936; Kohn and Glen 1938).

Although recorded as an archaeological site in 1972, today the canal would more appropriately be recorded and evaluated as an architectural resource. However, because it was originally recorded as an archaeological site a decision made to retain this designation during the current survey. No NRHP recommendation was made for the canal when it was initially documented, but additional work on the site was recommended (Ryan 1972: 58). No additional work on the site appears to have been done though. Presently, the River Alliance is constructing a new section of the Three Rivers Greenway walking trail immediately adjacent to the Saluda River and just south of the Saluda Canal.

The original recorded boundaries for the site in the data maintained by SCIAA simply consist of an oval measuring 70 by 25 meters that is oriented on a northeast-southwest axis near the center of the zoo property (see Figure 2.1B). Based on Ryan (1972) it seems these boundaries may reflect the location of a trench employed to provide a profile of the canal (Profile A). Although only a small portion of the canal was recorded as a site during the 1972 survey, Ryan did provide a map showing the location of the canal beyond the site boundaries, including extant portions and the approximate location of sections that were believed to have been destroyed by modern development. However, on this map the head of the canal is placed approximately 1.4 miles southeast of its actual location, an error that was probably caused by a misinterpretation of historical descriptions and the fact that the work was done before the development of modern GIS software and other mapping tools (Ryan 1972: 19).

Ryan described the section of the canal within the zoo as a “slight depression flanked by two parallel earthen embankments, which mark the edge of the canal” (Ryan 1972:18). Based on backhoe trenches cut across the canal, he determined that the portion of the structure within the zoo property was around 10 meters wide and about 40 centimeters deep, and probably never held more than more than 3 to 3.5 feet of water (Ryan 1972:18,55).



While Ryan’s (1972) work was limited to the Riverbanks Zoo property and the original boundaries of the resource were extremely small, the Saluda Canal was known to have spanned a distance of over two miles

(Kahn and Glenn 1938: 12). Based on survey work conducted by EPEI archaeologists for the present study, and additional investigations conducted by SCDOT archaeologists as an adjunct to this study (see Appendix F), approximately 932 feet of extant canal bed, a stone wall or berm apparently associated with the head of the canal, and a rock debris pile apparently associated with the construction of the canal were found to be located within the project study area. As a result of the supplemental work conducted by SCDOT archaeologists, canal segments totaling 4315 feet were identified, and 14 features associated with or in close proximity to the canal were documented (Figures 4.2A and 4.2B). The project study area also intersects a second area that is interpreted to have been the location of a section of the canal, but the canal bed in this place has been destroyed by modern development (see Figure 4.2A).

The Report of the Superintendent of Public Works to the Legislature of South Carolina for the Year 1823 includes a succinct description the Saluda Canal as it existed shortly after its completion:

*This canal begins at the dam [no longer extant] constructed at the head of Sen's [falls or rapids] and passes Beard's shoals, and enters the Broad River just above the Broad river dam [no longer extant]. It is 2 miles 47 chains [3102 feet] long, and has 34 feet fall; which is overcome by four stone locks, and is protected at the head by a guard lock of the same material. There are on it one dam entirely across the river, 4 culverts, 2 waste wiers [sic], and one bridge. The line of canaling was extremely difficult, much of it having been excavated in the hardest granite our country affords. It was commenced in 1819, and finished in 1821 (Kahn and Glenn 1938: 304-305).*

The course of the canal and the location of many of the features associated with it are graphically illustrated on a two-part plat map likely drawn around 1820, although no exact date is given (Figures 4.3A and 4.3B). This map, augmented with Lidar Imagery and mid-20th century aerial photographs on which portions of the canal are visible provided a strong basis for locating previously undocumented segments of the canal. EPEI archaeologists also met with Mike Dawson of the River Alliance during the present survey, who indicated the known portions of the canal within the vicinity of the Three Rivers Greenway project. During this tour, and during subsequent investigations EPEI and SCDOT archaeologists mapped the extant locations of the canal with Trimble GeoXT GPS units.



### Legend


- RA1/RA5 Realigned Ramp
- Potential Dam Location
- Observed Canal
- Projected Canal
- Probable Blowout
- 38RD59
- Possible Quarries
- Cultural Resource Study Area

**Figure 4.2A**  
**38RD59 Site Map**  
**(West Half)**

4/25/18







0 75 150  
Meters  
1 inch = 462 feet  
@ 11 x 17 inches  
Projection: UTM Zone 17 N  
North American Datum of 1983

- Legend**
- Observed Canal
  - Projected Canal
  - Possible Quarries
  - 38RD59
  - Cultural Resource Study Area

**Figure 4.2B**  
**38RD59 Site Map (East Half)**

3/16/18






Figure 4.3A. Ca. 1820 Plat Map showing the west half of the Saluda Canal. Source: South Carolina State Archives.




Figure 4.3B. Ca. 1820 Plat Map showing the east half of the Saluda Canal. Source: South Carolina State Archives.



As a result of these efforts two long segments and several smaller segments of the canal were mapped. The newly documented canal segments are for the most part consistent in appearance to the segments documented in 1972 within the Columbia Zoological park (Ryan 1972), but in general somewhat narrow and deeper, averaging around five meters wide and one or one and a half meters deep (Figure 4.4). In the northwestern portion of the canal, which was excavated through a granite outcropping, sheared or cleaved stone is found in many sections of the canal walls. Some of these rocks retain the remnants of the small circular holes drilled in the stones to fracture or dislodge them through the use of chisels or explosives. Much of the canal in this area also serves as a creek bed at this time, as water flows from a drainage pipe into the canal near it's northwestern end, eventually emptying into the Saluda River through a blowout in the canal wall.



**Figure 4.4. Photograph of a portion of the Saluda Canal near its western end. Facing North.**

No sign of the canal head or entrance from the Saluda River was discovered, nor was any trace of the dam described as being near the head of the canal found, and it is probable that these entities were the victim of floods and erosion, or, in the case of the dam, possible dismantlement. The dam is described in a contemporary account as being four feet high and built of stone and timber (Kohn and Glenn 1938: 11); thus, its archaeological footprint would not be as substantial as that of larger dams made only of stone. Despite the lack of physical evidence for the location of the canal head, both cartographic evidence and contemporary verbal descriptions place it at or very near the location where it is mapped herein (see Figure 4.2A).

Features found associated with the canal included a stone culvert, stone bridge remains, and stone retaining wall segments, along with stone/debris piles of uncertain purpose. The locations of some of the features recorded during the survey are shown on the ca. 1820 plat map reproduced as Figures 4.3A and 4.3B above. GPS points taken at the location of these features correspond quite closely to the feature locations shown on the georeferenced plat, which lends credence to the map as an accurate depiction of the canal route. In another case a culvert shown on the map was not located on the ground, but a scatter of cut/shaped stone was found close to the indicated location, suggesting that the feature had once been present but had been destroyed. And some features were found on the ground that were not shown on the map, suggesting that they may have been constructed after the map was made. A georeferenced plat showing these features is included in the full canal write up provided as Appendix F.

Four deep depressions or pits interpreted to be the location of rock quarries were noted in close proximity to the canal, but it was not possible to determine if these quarries were used to obtain stone for the construction of canal features, or for some other purpose, such as the construction of the nearby railroad line (see Figure 4.2A).

All of the locks once located at the southeastern end of the canal near its entrance into the Broad River are believed to have been destroyed by the construction of I-126. A feature that may comprise a “guard lock,” designed to protect the canal in times of rising water, was noted in the northwestern portion of the canal, but further investigation would be necessary to determine the exact function of this feature. A feature labeled as a guard lock is also shown on the ca. 1820 plat map, but at a different location from the feature interpreted as a possible guard lock in the field. Stone rubble was noted at the location of the guard lock as plotted on the 1820 plat.

The only substantive feature noted within the present project area was a stone wall stretching for approximately 150 feet parallel to and in between the canal bed and the river, immediately adjacent to the Three Rivers Greenway. The function of this wall and its exact relation to the canal is unclear, but it may have been “guard wall” designed to protect the head of the canal from washout during flood events (Figure 4.5). A second feature consisting of a stone debris pile that probably consists of stone blasted or removed from the canal was also noted within the project area limits.





**Figure 4.5. Rock wall at the northwestern end of the canal within the Carolina Crossroads project area, facing north.**

Limited shovel testing was conducted in the vicinity of the canal, but no artifacts were identified during the investigation.

Although the canal has been impacted by the development of the railroad and highway systems of Columbia, it is still a recognizable landscape feature associated with the Saluda Canal system. As such, the resource was recorded as a revisit to Site 38RD59, the boundaries of which were amended to include the newly observed sections of the Saluda Canal and its presumed location in areas that have been subjected to modern disturbance. The canal was also evaluated for NRHP inclusion. The Saluda Canal is recommended eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criteria A, C, and D in the areas of commerce, engineering, and transportation during a period of significance of 1815 through 1840. The Saluda Canal is considered eligible under Criterion A for its association with the early nineteenth century efforts by the State of South Carolina to provide an inexpensive and efficient method of transportation through the creation of a system of canals and navigable rivers and for its association with the development and growth of the City of Columbia. Prior to the emergence of rail transport as the preferred means of moving passengers and goods, the canals in the Columbia region were a key factor in the development of Columbia as the state's largest cotton shipping point in the interior and a major commercial center. The

Saluda Canal is considered eligible under Criterion C as an early nineteenth century canal structure that exhibits engineering techniques from the period. Although portions of the canal have been lost, several segments of the facility totaling roughly one third of its original length remain to convey the size and scale of the structure, and a number of stone features associated with the facility are still extant. The Saluda Canal is considered eligible under Criterion D for the potential to obtain detailed information on the construction of the canal bed, culverts, a possible guard lock, and other engineering features and provide a better and more complete understanding of the construction of early nineteenth century canal structures in the Columbia region and across the state of South Carolina.

The preferred alignments for this portion of the proposed Carolina Crossroads Improvement Project have been designed so that no portion of the proposed ramps or other structures will span the portion of the Saluda Canal within project APE. As designed, the closest structural elements associated with the preferred alternatives for the project, RA1 and RA5 Optimized, will be constructed approximately 32 feet to the north of the Saluda Canal (see Figure 4.2a). Based on this, the proposed undertaking will have no adverse effect to the NRHP eligible resource. The Saluda Canal, 38RD59, will be clearly plotted on all construction plans along with an appropriate buffer of 25 feet. This zone will be clearly marked in the field using orange fencing during construction and all ground disturbance and construction staging activities will be conducted outside of this buffer in order to avoid all possible impacts to the resource.

#### 4.2.2 38RD133

Site 38RD133 is a multi-component prehistoric site on [REDACTED] (see Figure 4.1). The site was originally recorded by Donald Sutherland in 1976 based on a collection of material recovered by a man named Mr. Zimmerman while plowing his fields in the vicinity of the site. The site location represents the reported area where the material was found; however, Sutherland points out that he observed no in situ material at the actual location due to overgrown vegetation. He did make note of Mr. Zimmerman's collection and identified around 75 projectile point/knives (PP/Ks) including Palmer, Guilford, Savannah River, and Yadkin types. The collection also contained one full-grooved Archaic axe and one celt among other ground stone implements. Sutherland noted that the site may be eligible for the NRHP based on the lengthy timespan represented by the diagnostic artifacts Mr. Zimmerman recovered. He also noted that the site was threatened by proposed development in the area.

Since its initial recordation, Site 38RD133 has been heavily impacted by development. The boundaries of the site recorded in the State Site File measure 260-x-240 meters and are plotted [REDACTED] Currently, this area is characterized by commercial development in the form of office complexes. The boundaries of the site encompass portions of six separate office complexes, all of which are largely paved over. Only a 150-x-30 meter portion of the southern tip of Site 38RD133 intersects with the survey area (Figure 4.4). This




portion of the site corresponds with the [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Fourteen shovel tests were dug at 15-meter intervals in this area in order to investigate for intact deposits associated with Site 38RD133 (Figure 4.5). All tests were negative and revealed shallow, disturbed soil profiles consistent with other graded roadbeds observed during this investigation. A representative soil profile revealed approximately 15 centimeters of yellowish brown (10YR 5/8) loamy sand atop a strong brown (7.5Y 4/5) clay hardpan. Shovel tests were terminated at the clay hardpan.



Figure 4.6. Photograph of 38RD133, facing west.



1 inch = 500 feet  
@ 8.5 x 11 inches

Projection: UTM 17 North  
North American Datum of 1983

### Legend

○ Negative

∅ No Dig

38RD133

**Figure 4.7**  
**38RD133 Site Map**

10/2017

Sheet 1 of 1



As a result of the background research and archaeological investigation, it appears that Site 38RD133 represents a sizable prehistoric site that was occupied throughout the Archaic Period. The site has since been heavily impacted by modern development and is believed to be largely destroyed or buried beneath office complexes. No artifactual remains were identified within the portion of the site that intersects with the Carolina Crossroads survey area and, therefore, it is recommended that this portion of the site be considered as noncontributing to its NRHP eligibility status under Criterion D. As it was located outside of the current survey area, no testing was conducted throughout the remainder of 38RD133 and the overall eligibility status of this resource must remain unknown. Further work may be necessary to investigate this resource if impacts are planned to the north of the current survey area; however, this area is also heavily disturbed and only a few pockets of testable soil remain within the recorded boundaries of the site. No further work is recommended for the portion of the site within the current survey boundaries.

#### 4.2.3 38RD277

Site 38RD277 represents a railroad trestle that was recorded over an unnamed tributary of the Saluda River just north of the I-26 Bridge over the Saluda River (see Figure 4.1C). This resource is more appropriately considered a historic or architectural resource; however, because it was originally recorded as an archaeological site it was addressed during the archaeological portion of this investigation. The trestle was recorded during the 1982 survey of the *Kinley-Rawls Creek Alternative Revision: Saluda River Sewer Line Segment* and was described as a brick trestle with a plank floor that was constructed around 1890 (Tippitt 1982). The report for this project states that this portion of railroad was constructed to connect Columbia with Prosperity, a town approximately 30 miles northwest of Columbia (Tippitt 1982). No formal NRHP evaluation was given for the structure by Tippitt; however, it was concluded that the proposed sewer line would have no effect on the resource.

EPEI staff revisited this resource during the present investigation. As a result of this revisit, it is clear that the trestle recorded as 38RD277 is no longer present at this location. The resource described by Tippitt (1982) was a substantial brick structure built over the unnamed creek. Currently, the trestle at this location is made of a steel span with a wood plank floor atop a poured concrete frame (Figure 4.6). Based on this, it is clear that the resource originally recorded at 38RD277 has been destroyed and no further archaeological or historic architectural documentation is necessary.







**Figure 4.8. Photograph of current railroad trestle at 38RD277, facing east.**

#### 4.2.4 38RD287

This site represents a scatter of structural material associated with a twentieth century house site located [REDACTED] (see Figure 4.1A). The site was recorded in 1983 as part of the Harbison Interchange Borrow Pit project and was recorded as a scatter of brick, metal roofing, and glass found adjacent to a wire fence. The site was recommended as not eligible for NRHP listing and it was mentioned that it would be destroyed by the proposed borrow pit for the construction of the Harbison Road interchange.

EPEI archaeologists revisited the location of Site 38RD287 during the present investigation. Currently, the site is beneath the heavily modified landscape associated with [REDACTED] (Figure 4.7). This area was characterized by a large depression that likely represents the proposed borrow pit described on the 1983 site form (Figure 4.8). As a result of the heavy disturbance and modification to the area, no shovel tests were dug to investigate this resource. No artifacts were noted during the revisit and the site is presumed to have been destroyed during previous construction activities. As a result of the survey, EPEI did not identify any deposits associated with this resource that would alter the site's original recommendation of ineligible for NRHP listing. No further archaeological consideration is recommended for Site 38RD287.

C:\Users\Arina\Desktop\FPE Files\Temp CA Projects\Carolina Crossroads\Figure 4.9: RD287.mxd 1 Last Updated: 03.18.2018



Meters

1 inch = 333 feet  
@ 8.5 x 11 inches

Projection: UTM 17 North  
North American Datum of 1983

**Legend**

- Negative
- 38RD287

**Figure 4.9**  
**38RD287 Site Map**





**Figure 4.10. Photograph of 38RD287, facing northwest.**

#### 4.2.5 38LX20 – THE WACTOR SITE

The Wactor Site, 38LX20, was recorded in November of 1961 by Dr. William Edwards, a resident of the area in which the site was found. The site form notes that Dr. Edwards' collection included points, sherds, shells, and fossils reportedly collected from an approximately 100-x-45-meter area [REDACTED] (see Figure 4.1D). The exact location of these original collection boundaries is unknown (Stephenson 1972:113) due to the incomplete map on the original site form; however, the original site boundaries established for this resource are presented in Figure 4.9.

EPEI archaeologists revisited Site 38LX20 during the present survey and dug two shovel tests within the portion of the original boundaries that intersected with the Carolina Crossroads survey area. Both of these tests were negative; however, three shovel tests approximately 45 meters south of the original boundaries were positive. These positive tests were situated on a ridge saddle that overlooks a wetland which drains to the Saluda River. Eleven shovel tests were dug to determine the boundaries of this resource including three that were positive. The northern and southern boundaries of the site were



established by two consecutive negative shovel tests, while a tributary that parallels the on-ramp from I-126 onto I-26 south forms its eastern boundary. Delineation was not performed to the west of Site 38LX20 due to the boundary of the current survey area. This portion of the site was also heavily disturbed by a gravel access road. The site is primarily located within the existing ROW. Housing developments lay south of the site and the land is currently used as an [REDACTED]



[REDACTED] Figure 4.10 provides a representative view of the site.

Artifacts were recovered from between 0 and 40 centimeters below surface and density ranged between 1 and 5 artifacts per positive shovel test. The typical soil profile at 38LX20 consists of Stratum I (0-22 centimeters), a brown (10YR 4/3) loam, Stratum II (22-34 centimeters), a grayish brown (10YR 5/2) clay loam, and Stratum III (34-40 centimeters), a gray (10YR 5/1) wet clay. Tests were terminated at around 40 centimeters below surface when wet clay was encountered. There were 7 artifacts recovered from shovel tests at 38LX20. A total of 6 quartz flake fragments and 1 quartz thinning flake were collected (Table 4.1).

**Table 4.1. Artifacts Recovered from Shovel Tests at Site 38LX20.**

Artifact Description	TR3BST7.5	TR3ST7	TR3ST7.5	Grand Total
<b>Precontact</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>quartz</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>
quartz flake fragment	5	1		6
quartz thinning flake			1	1
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>

Archaeological investigation at 38LX20 indicates that this resource represents a small prehistoric lithic scatter that cannot be associated with a specific temporal span. The limited assemblage also makes it difficult to identify a function for this resource other than a short-term, prehistoric activity area. Based on the presence of quartz flakes, it seems that, at a minimum, this site represents the location of limited lithic reduction or tool maintenance. Given the assemblage reportedly collected from this vicinity in the early 1960s, it seems that other activities may have occurred here as well. Based on the limited and non-diverse assemblage observed by EPEI archaeologists, the portion of Site 38LX20 that was investigated within the survey area cannot be assigned to a specific temporal range or designated a known site function. It is unlikely that this portion of the site will yield significant new data regarding the culture history of the region. EPEI recommends that this portion of the site be recommended as noncontributing to the site's NRHP eligibility status under Criterion D. The western boundary of the site could not be established during the current survey due to the limits of the survey area. As such, the overall eligibility status of Site 38LX20 is recommended as unknown. Should impacts be planned near the undefined boundary of the site, additional work may be necessary to establish its western boundary. No further work is recommended for the portion of Site 38LX20 within the current survey boundaries.



0 10 20  
Meters

1 inch = 125 feet  
@ 8.5 x 11 inches

Projection: UTM 17 North  
North American Datum of 1983

**Legend**

- Negative
- ∅ No Dig
- Positive
- Drainage Ditch
- Trail Road
- 2 ft Contour Interval
- Original Boundaries
- 38LX20
- APE

**Figure 4.11**  
**38LX20 Site Map**

10/2017

Sheet 1 of 1







**Figure 4.12.** Photograph of Site 38LX20, facing east.

#### 4.2.6 38LX212

Site 38LX212 is located on a [REDACTED] (see Figure 4.1D). The site was first visited by Jim Michie in the early 1960s, but local residents had known of the site since the 1930s. The landowner and informant to Michie, Mr. Hook, revealed that the site had been plowed extensively and that he had a sizeable collection of bifaces and PP/Ks collected from the site. Michie dug a single test pit which revealed several flakes during his visit. Michie's visit was recorded on an official state site inventory record form in 1979 in which he recommended additional testing for the site. The site was revisited by Michael Trinkley in 1980 as part of the Archaeological Survey of the I-20/26/126 project conducted by the South Carolina Department of Highways and Public Transportation. During this revisit, Trinkley conducted a pedestrian inspection of the area and a formal shovel test survey of the landform (Trinkley 1980). As a result, the boundaries of Site 38LX212 were established as 190-x-140 meters, a size which corresponded with the extent of the landform. Trinkley collected an assemblage that included a high incidence of rhyolite lithic debitage but also quartz and Coastal Plain chert material. Two check stamped sherds were also identified. Trinkley records that the site was occupied during the Archaic, presumably based on one of the stemmed biface fragments reported during his investigation. The pottery also seems to indicate a later occupation of the site during the Woodland or Mississippian periods. No evaluation was provided by Trinkley (1980). In other reports presenting the results of nearby Cultural Resource Management (CRM) projects (e.g.

(Poplin 2000; Norton 2002)), the NRHP eligibility status of Site 38LX212 is listed as “not evaluated;” however, the NRHP recommendation listed on ArchSite, the online geographic information system maintained by SCIAA and SCDAH, is “needs additional work.” This likely reflects the lack of a previous evaluation.

Since its initial investigation, the landform encompassing Site 38LX212 has been heavily developed (Figure 4.11) and the site itself lies beneath [REDACTED] (Figure 4.12). A portion of the western half of the site intersected with the present survey area. This portion of the site was completely disturbed by the construction of [REDACTED]. Shovel testing was conducted to the immediate west of the site boundary, in [REDACTED]. This area represented the western slope of the landform upon which 38LX212 was situated. Six shovel tests were dug along this steeply sloped area in order to confirm that the boundaries of the site were limited to the crest of the landform (Figure 4.12). All tests were negative. A representative soil profile from these negative tests adjacent to the site revealed brown (10YR 5/3) loamy sand to a depth of around 20 centimeters at which point gray (10YR 5/1) clay subsoil was encountered.



**Figure 4.13. Photograph of 38LX212, facing west.**

Based on the revisit, it is clear that the portion of Site 38LX212 within the survey area has been heavily impacted if not destroyed by residential development. EPEI archaeologists encountered no cultural material associated with the site and recommend that the portion of Site 38LX212 within the project boundaries should be considered non-contributing to the site’s NRHP eligibility status under Criterion D.



#### Phase I Cultural Resource Survey

---

The remainder of the site also appears to be heavily disturbed and likely destroyed; however, its overall eligibility status must remain unknown. No further archaeological investigation is recommended for the portion of this resource that intersects with the survey boundaries.



C:\Users\Arina\Desktop\EPRI Files\Temp CA Projects\Carolina Crossroads\Figure 4.14 - 38LX212.mxd | Last Updated: 03-18-2018



1 inch = 208 feet  
@ 8.5 x 11 inches

Projection: UTM 17 North  
North American Datum of 1983

### Legend

- Negative
- 2 ft Contour Interval
- 38LX212
- Nearby Archaeological Site
- APE

**Figure 4.14**  
**38LX212 Site Map**

10/2017

Sheet 1 of 1





#### 4.2.7 38LX235


Site 38LX235 is located on [REDACTED] (Figure 4.1C). It was recorded by Albert Goodyear in 1980 as a lithic scatter identified on a dirt road [REDACTED]. Goodyear noted that the scatter contained a coastal plain chert scraper and one rhyolite stemmed PP/K along with quartz debitage. He noted that the site likely dated to the Early Archaic based on the stemmed PP/K and that the area was heavily eroded. The original site form did not provide an NRHP recommendation; however, Goodyear did note that the site was too disturbed for shovel testing.

The area encompassing Site 38LX235 has been heavily developed since its initial recordation. Currently, the site is located beneath the [REDACTED] (Figure 4.13). Only the northernmost tip of the site, an area measuring 32 square meters, intersects with the project boundaries (Figure 4.14). The site was revisited during the current survey and no intact portion of the site was accessible, either within the survey area or its entire site boundaries.

Based on the previous archaeological investigation at 38LX235, the site likely represents limited lithic reduction activities dating to the Early Archaic Period. No recommendations were made regarding its NRHP eligibility status; however, it was described as eroded and disturbed, indicating that its likelihood of contributing significant new data to the culture history of the region is low. Presently, the site is located beneath [REDACTED] and was presumably destroyed by its construction. However, as testing within the site boundaries was not possible due to its inaccessible status beneath current development, the overall NRHP eligibility of this resource must remain unknown. No further archaeological investigation is warranted for the small portion of Site 38LX235 which intersects with the survey area.



Figure 4.15. Photograph of 38LX235, facing west.



1 inch = 167 feet  
@ 8.5 x 11 inches

Projection: UTM 17 North  
North American Datum of 1983

### Legend

- Negative
- ∅ No Dig
- 38LX235
- APE

**Figure 4.16**  
**38LX235 Map**



#### 4.2.8 38LX236

Site 38LX236 is located in the [REDACTED] (see Figure 4.1C). The site was originally recorded in January of 1980 by Albert Goodyear as a prehistoric and historic artifact scatter on a [REDACTED]. He described the site as having been destroyed by the [REDACTED] and noted that the material was recovered from a bulldozed and scraped area along [REDACTED] was built. This likely explains the divided nature of the site boundaries, as the on-ramp already separated the deposits when he recorded them. Goodyear noted that the majority of the material identified at the site was from multiple prehistoric components; however, he believed the bulk of it could be attributed to a Middle and Late Archaic occupation due to the high incidence of fire cracked rock. Historic material was also recovered in the form of creamware, pearlware, whiteware and one kaolin pipe stem fragment. There was no formal recommendation regarding the NRHP eligibility of the site during this initial visit; however, Goodyear did recommend no further work was necessary. Other reports in the vicinity (e.g. Norton 2002) have noted the site and described its NRHP eligibility status as “probably not eligible.” For the purposes of this discussion, it is inferred that Goodyear’s recommendation of no further work represents a recommendation of ineligible for NRHP listing.

The site was revisited by EPEI archaeologists during the current survey. Presently, the northern locus of Site 38LX236 corresponds with the heavily disturbed ground that separates the [REDACTED]. Much of this area was graded and artificially raised in order to construct the I-20 on-ramp as well (Figure 4.15). This portion of the site was subjected to pedestrian survey and judgmental shovel testing. No artifacts were identified and subsurface testing revealed that the area was severely disturbed. The southern locus of the site corresponds with the off-ramp itself and a heavily wooded area east of the off ramp. Thirteen shovel tests were dug at 15-meter intervals throughout the portion of the site within the wooded area (Figure 4.16). All tests were negative and revealed disturbed profiles. The site has likely been destroyed or obscured by further development of the interchange occurring after Goodyear’s original site form. A representative soil profile from shovel testing within the boundaries of 38LX236 revealed brown (10YR 5/3) loamy sand to a depth of around 30 centimeters, at which point strong brown (7.5Y 4/5) clay subsoil was encountered.



Based on the original site form and the EPEI revisit, it seems that Site 38LX236 was heavily impacted and then subsequently destroyed or buried by the development of the [REDACTED] at this location. Goodyear’s initial recommendations for no further work implies that the site was probably not eligible for NRHP listing and the EPEI revisit indicates that there are no longer identifiable deposits associated with this site to evaluate. Based on this investigation, no deposits or features associated with this site were encountered that would alter Goodyear’s implied recommendation of ineligible for NRHP listing. No further archaeological consideration is recommended for Site 38LX236.





Figure 4.17. Photograph of Site 38LX236, facing southwest.

C:\Users\Veina\Desktop\FPE\FPE Files\Temp CA Projects\Carolina Crossroads\Figure 4.18 - 38LX236.mxd | Last Updated: 03-18-2018



0 30 60  
Meters

1 inch = 250 feet  
@ 8.5 x 11 inches

Projection: UTM 17 North  
North American Datum of 1983

**Legend**

- Negative
- ∅ No Dig
- 38LX236
- APE

**Figure 4.18**  
**38LX236 Site Map**

10/2017

Sheet 1 of 1





#### 4.2.9 38LX238

Site 38LX238 is located on a prominent landform [REDACTED] (see Figure 4.1G). The site was originally recorded in 1980 as a collection of prehistoric lithics that were not attributed to any specific time period. EPEI archaeologists revisited the site during the present investigation. Currently, the site is located on either side of [REDACTED] in a small wooded area east of I-26. The majority of the site falls within a power line corridor, which, along with the construction of [REDACTED], has greatly disturbed the area (Figure 4.20).






**Figure 4.19. Photograph of 38LX238, facing east.**

The boundaries of Site 38LX238 measured 66-x-40 meters when it was originally recorded; however, shovel testing and pedestrian survey conducted during the current investigation have expanded these boundaries to 193-x-50 meters in size (Figure 4.18). The eastern boundary of the site could not be firmly established, however, due to the limits of the survey area. Shovel tests were dug at 15-meter intervals and surface collection was undertaken in highly eroded areas within the power line corridor.



C:\Users\Veina\Desktop\FPE\FPE Temp\_GA Projects\Carolina Crossroads\Figure 4.20 - LX238.mxd | Last Updated: 03-18-2018



1 inch = 104 feet  
@ 8.5 x 11 inches

Projection: UTM 17 North  
North American Datum of 1983

### Legend

- Negative
- ∅ No Dig
- Positive
- Powerline
- 38LX238 Known Boundary
- 38LX238 Unknown Boundary
- 2 ft Contour Interval
- ⊞ Surface Scatter
- - - Previous Site Boundary
- APE

**Figure 4.20**  
**38LX238 Site Map**

10/2017

Sheet 1 of 1





## Phase I Cultural Resource Survey

Artifacts were recovered from the surface and between 0 and 40 centimeters below surface. Density ranged between 1 and 9 artifacts per positive shovel test. The typical soil profile at 38LX238 consists of Stratum I (0-21 centimeters), a dark yellow brown (10YR 4/6) loam, Stratum II (21-31 centimeters), a yellow brown (10YR 5/6) clay loam, and Stratum III (31-35 centimeters), a yellow brown (10YR 5/8) clay with large angular gravel. Tests were terminated at around 35 centimeters below surface when angular gravel and clay were encountered.

There were 41 artifacts recovered from 10 shovel tests and 40 artifacts from the surface at 38LX238 (Table 4.2). A total of 77 of the 81 artifacts were made of quartz. There were also 3 flake fragments of non-local material (metavolcanic [n=1], Coastal Plain chert [n=2]), and one fragment of a historic brown glazed ironstone. Quartz flake fragments dominated the assemblage (n=59) followed by shatter (n=12) and a core reduction flake. Utilized flakes of quartz (n=3) came from both surface and excavated contexts. Knapping techniques used to reduce quartz cobbles often produce numerous flake fragments and few intact or whole flakes. One core rejuvenation flake was found during surface collection. This unique type of flake shows the remnants of previous flake removals, as well as, the “top” of the core. Quartz cores often need to be rejuvenated and a single flake (core rejuvenation) that removed the “top” of the core is ideal for creating a surface for further reduction. Based on the size and density of the quartz debitage and the low number of non-local materials (n=3) identified at 38LX238, the collection of quartz for tool production was the primary function of this site. As stated by House and Wogaman (1978), occurrences of solid, uniform, relatively unweathered quartz often associated with prehistoric quarry and workshop debris of this material are frequently encountered throughout the South Carolina Piedmont but do not seem to be present on every ridge.

**Table 4.2. Artifacts Recovered from Shovel Tests at 38LX238.**

Artifact Description	TR5AST111.5	TR5AST112.5	TR5AST115	TR5AST115.5	TR5ST111.5	TR5ST112	TR5ST112.5	TR5ST113	TR5ST113.5	TR5ST115	Surface	Grand Total
<b>Historic</b>											<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>ironstone</b>											<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
ironstone, unclassified brown glaze											1	1
<b>Prehistoric</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>Coastal Plain chert</b>									<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
Coastal Plain chert flake fragment									1		1	2

Artifact Description	TR5AST111.5	TR5AST112.5	TR5AST115	TR5AST115.5	TR5ST111.5	TR5ST112	TR5ST112.5	TR5ST113	TR5ST113.5	TR5ST115	Surface	Grand Total
<b>quartz</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>77</b>
quartz core rejuvenation flake											1	1
quartz cortical flake			1									1
quartz flake fragment	1	1	8	2		9	2	7	4	3	22	59
quartz reduction flake								1				1
quartz shatter											12	12
quartz utilized blade flake											1	1
quartz utilized flake					1						1	2
<b>unclassified metavolcanic</b>											<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
metavolcanic flake fragment											1	1
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>81</b>

The assemblage from 38LX238 represents a scatter of lithic debitage that is not diagnostic of any specific period of prehistory. The debitage suggests the area was used as a reduction site for early stage cores and bifaces; the location of the utilized outcrop is unknown and water-worn cortex was not present on any of the debitage. House and Wogaman (1978) suggest that small quarry/workshops associated with residual vein quartz occurrences in the soil mantle occur in a density on the order of one to several per square kilometer throughout the Piedmont. Site 38LX238 may represent one of these quarry/reduction sites. The construction of the power line corridor and an access road have greatly disturbed the deposits represented at this site. While the site was heavily utilized for reduction tasks it is unlikely to yield significant new data regarding the occupations represented at the site due to the level of disturbance. Based on this, the portion of the site within the survey area is recommended as noncontributing to the site's eligibility status under Criterion D. Because the eastern boundary of the resource could not be firmly established through shovel testing, the overall eligibility of Site 38LX238 must remain unknown. Further delineation may be necessary to establish this boundary, should impacts be planned to the area just east of the site. No further work is recommended for the portion of 38LX238 within the current study corridor.

## 4.3 Newly Recorded Archaeological Sites

### 4.3.1 38LX655

Site 38LX655 was identified on the [REDACTED] (see Figure 4.1G). The site covers the crest of the landform overlooking [REDACTED], a landscape characterized by dense vegetation in the south half of the site and a cleared power line corridor in the north (Figure 4.19). The site is entirely within the survey area on privately owned land. Housing developments surround the parcels to the north, south and west while the site is bound to the east by I-26.





**Figure 4.21. Photograph of Site 38LX655, facing southwest.**

Initial testing of the area determined the site measures 100 by 45 meters oriented along a roughly northeast to southwest axis based on 12 positive shovel tests dug at 15-meter intervals (Figure 4.20). The northern, western, and southern boundaries of the resource were established by negative shovel testing, while the eastern boundary of the site was formed by the graded slope adjacent to I-26. Artifacts were recovered from between 0 and 30 centimeters below surface and density ranged between 1 and 16 artifacts per positive shovel test. The typical soil profile at 38LX655 consists of Stratum I (0-12 centimeters), a yellow brown (10YR 5/6) loamy sand, Stratum II (12-26 centimeters), a yellow brown (10YR

5/8) sand, and Stratum III (26-30 centimeters), a yellow brown (10YR 5/8) sand with a noticeable increase in angular gravel. Tests were terminated at around 30 centimeters below surface when large angular gravel and cobbles were encountered along with red clay hardpan.

A total of 54 artifacts were recovered from shovel tests at 38LX655 (Table 4.3), including lithic debitage (n=49), Thom's Creek Reed Drag and Jab Punctate ceramics (n=2), an unclassified sand tempered sherd, a flake tool, and a PP/K. The diagnostic artifacts recovered during shovel testing include a Morrow Mountain Type I PP/K that dates to the Middle Archaic, 5400 – 3500 B.C., and Thom's Creek Phase ceramics dating to the Late Archaic period ca. 2000 B.C. – 1000 B.C. (Trinkley 1980; Coe 1964). Thom's Creek Reed Drag and Jab Punctate was formally defined as a variety of Thom's Creek Reed Punctate by Trinkley (1980); the non-fiber tempered ware is best identified by the punctations, made with split reeds, applied in rows parallel to the rim. These diagnostics suggest that the site was occupied during the Middle and Late Archaic. The remaining artifacts found during shovel testing at 38LX655 consisted mostly of quartz debitage (n=35) and shatter (n=2), rhyolite debitage (n=2), and small resharpening flakes of Coastal Plain chert (n=2), as well as two fragments of modern brick.



1 inch = 67 feet  
@ 8.5 x 11 inches

Projection: UTM 17 North  
North American Datum of 1983

### Legend

- Negative
- No Dig
- Positive
- 50 x 50 cm Test
- Access Road
- Powerline
- 2 ft Contour Interval
- 38LX655
- APE

**Figure 4.22**  
**38LX655 Map**

10/2017

Sheet 1 of 1





Table 4.1. Artifacts Recovered from Shovel Tests at 38LX655.

Artifact Description	TR3AST26	TR3AST26.5	TR3AST27	TR3AST27.5	TR3AST28	TR3AST28.5	TR3AST29	TR3BST26.5	TR3BST27	TR3ST27	TR3ST27.5	TR3ST28	TR3ST28.5	Grand Total
<b>Historic</b>								2						2
brick								2						2
brick								2						2
<b>Prehistoric</b>	2		2	3	16	2	1	13	3	1	2	1	6	52
<b>Coastal Plain chert</b>			1	1										2
Coastal Plain chert flake fragment			1											1
Coastal Plain chert thinning flake					1									1
<b>grit temper</b>						1							1	2
grit temper Thom's Creek						1							1	2
<b>orthoquartzite</b>								2						2
orthoquartzite flake fragment								2						2
<b>quartz</b>	2		1	1	12	1	1	11	2	1	2	1	4	39
quartz flake fragment	2		1		10		1	10	2	1	2	1	4	34
quartz reduction flake						1								1
quartz Shatter					2									2
quartz utilized flake				1				1						2
<b>Rhyolite</b>					1				1				1	3
Rhyolite flake fragment					1								1	2
Morrow Mountain PP/K Type II									1					1
<b>sand temper</b>					1									1
sand temper undecorated					1									1
<b>unclassified metavolcanic</b>				2	1									3
metavolcanic flake fragment				2	1									3
<b>Grand Total</b>	2		2	3	16	2	1	15	3	1	2	1	6	54

Site 38LX655 presented a high artifact concentration and the most potential for intact deposits identified during the Carolina Crossroads survey, and the Thom's Creek phase ceramics and Morrow Mountain Type I PP/K provided a tight temporal framework for the site. A possible feature was identified in shovel test number 3A-28, where a thin layer of dark colored soil was noted between Levels 1 and 2. These factors warranted additional testing in order to evaluate the NRHP eligibility status of the site. SCDOT archaeologists provided key methodological recommendations and suggested a testing plan that consisted of 3, 50-x-50 cm excavation units placed near or adjoining shovel tests with high artifact counts and Thom's Creek ceramics (see Figure 4.20).

The 50 by 50 cm test units provided a better understanding of the soil profile at 38LX655. The profile for each unit was recorded (see Appendix A) to document the stratigraphy of the site. A total of 53 artifacts were recovered from the 50-x-50 cm units which allowed a more insightful interpretation of the relationship between context and horizontal integrity. Test Unit (TU) 1 was placed west of STP 3-28.5 adjoining the wall of the shovel test; this placement was due to a rim sherd of Thom's Creek pottery that was found in situ in the west wall and piece plotted during shovel testing. TU 2 investigated the possible feature identified in the east wall of STP 3A-28. Placed on the east side of the STP, TU 2 was excavated in 10 cm levels. Stratum I gave way to a clay lens in Stratum II. Excavation of the clay lens uncovered a dark fill layer that covered the whole floor of the unit. It was determined to be a modern buried A horizon; plastic debris was found in the dark fill comprising this zone between Stratum II and III. Stratum III was noted as sandy with dense gravel and was sterile. TU 3 was placed west of STP 3A-28.5 and adjoined the wall of this shovel test. Artifacts spanned Strata I, II, and III with the highest concentration in Stratum I. A large undecorated Thom's Creek Reed Drag and Jab Punctate rim sherd was found in Stratum II at 15 cmbs. Artifacts found in the deepest strata appear to be associated with modern disturbance to the site.

Artifacts recovered from test units at Site 38LX655 (Table 4.4) were predominantly lithic (n=51). Large sherds of Thom's Creek Reed Drag and Jab Punctate (n=1) and Thom's Creek Plain ceramics (n=1) made up the rest of the assemblage. Debitage consisted of quartz (n=35), metavolcanics (n=10), Coastal Plain chert (n=3), and quartzite (n=1). Two quartz hammerstone fragments that show heavy pitting on the dorsal surface were recovered from TU 2.

**Table 4.2. Artifacts Recovered from Test Units at 38LX655.**

Row Labels	TU1 L1	TU 1L2	TU 2L1	TU2 L2	TU2 L3	TU3 L1	TU3 L2	TU3 L3	Grand Total
<b>Prehistoric</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>Coastal Plain chert</b>				<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>		<b>3</b>
Coastal Plain chert flake fragment				1			1		2
Coastal Plain chert thinning flake					1				1

## Phase I Cultural Resource Survey

Row Labels	TU1 L1	TU 1L2	TU 2L1	TU2 L2	TU2 L3	TU3 L1	TU3 L2	TU3 L3	Grand Total
<b>grit temper</b>							<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
grit temper Thom's Creek							1	1	2
<b>quartz</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>37</b>
quartz flake fragment	5	8	1	5	5	6	4	1	35
quartz hammerstone fragments					2				2
<b>quartzite</b>				<b>1</b>					<b>1</b>
quartzite thinning flake				1					1
<b>Rhyolite</b>				<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>				<b>8</b>
Rhyolite flake fragment					2				2
rhyolite thinning flake				6					6
<b>unclassified metavolcanic</b>	<b>1</b>						<b>1</b>		<b>2</b>
metavolcanic flake fragment							1		1
metavolcanic thinning flake	1								1
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>53</b>

The combined data from shovel tests and test units shows that the debitage is characteristic of late stage reduction activities and retooling. Non-local lithic materials, metavolcanics and Coastal Plain chert, made up 26% of the lithic debitage assemblage but the weight of non-local lithics is only 14.6 g while the local quartz debitage weighs 93.1 g. The small overall size and weight of non-local stone is significant and demonstrates that retooling may have been one activity practiced at the site. The heavily resharpened and exhausted Morrow Mountain PP/K also supports this notion for site use. Occupations of the site may have only been short term with a focus on certain material resource exploitation activities. The rim sherds of Thom's Creek phase ceramics (n=4) suggest that the site was utilized on several occasions and may point to its seasonal use and role in the mobility strategy employed by the Middle to Late Archaic occupants. All artifacts recovered came from a likely mixed context as evidenced by the disturbance of TU 2 and the modern brick found with the Morrow Mountain Type I PP/K. Deflation of the soil surface, erosion, and bioturbation likely add to the modern disturbance of Site 38LX655. The lack of cultural features and questionable horizontal integrity makes this resource an unlikely source of sound archaeological data.

Ultimately, Site 38LX655 represents a small, low density scatter of lithic debitage and prehistoric sherds. Diagnostic Thom's Creek Reed Drag and Jab Punctate and Plain rim sherds, a Morrow Mountain PP/K and lithic debitage were encountered in disturbed contexts. Based on this limited assemblage and the disturbed nature of the deposits, the probability for this resource to yield significant new data to the

culture history of the area is low. Site 38LX655 is recommended as not eligible for NRHP listing under Criterion D. No further archaeological investigation is warranted for this resource.

## 4.4 Isolated Finds

### 4.4.1 IF 1

Isolated Find (IF) 1 was located in the southern portion of the survey area on a subtle rise overlooking the [REDACTED]. Specifically, IF 1 was identified southwest of the southbound [REDACTED] (Figure 4.1C). The find represents a single fragment of the face of a small porcelain figure that was encountered within a shovel test adjacent to the on-ramp. Delineation of IF 1 consisted of two consecutive negative shovel tests dug to the north, south, and west of the original positive. No additional deposits were found. Delineation to the east of the positive test was not possible due to the location of the existing I-26 on-ramp. Based on the isolated nature of the artifact, IF 1 has no potential to yield significant new data regarding the culture history of the area. Moreover, isolated finds are, by definition, not eligible for NRHP listing. No further work is recommended.

### 4.4.2 IF 2

IF 2 was identified south of I-20, on a small landform that separates the [REDACTED] (Figure 4.1C). The find consists of two quartz flake fragments that were found in two shovel tests spaced 15 meters apart. Delineation testing consisted of two consecutive negative shovel tests dug to the east, west, and south of the original positives. Delineation testing to the north was not possible due to the existing I-20 corridor. While IF 2 consisted of two artifacts from two separate shovel tests, the SCSGAI defines an isolated find as “no more than two historic or prehistoric artifacts found within a 30-meter radius” (COSCAPA 2013: 4). Based on this, IF 2 is unlikely to provide significant new data to the culture history of the area. Isolated finds are, by definition, not eligible for NRHP listing. No further work is recommended.

### 4.4.3 IF 3

IF 3 was identified south of the eastbound side of [REDACTED] (see Figure 4.1D). The find was identified on the surface of a cleared powerline easement that parallels the highway adjacent to the [REDACTED]. It consisted of a single quartz flake fragment and an undecorated piece of whiteware. Delineation testing consisted of shovel tests dug at 15-meter intervals at cardinal directions from the original find; however, no further artifacts were encountered. Based on the isolated nature of the artifact, IF 3 has no potential to yield significant new data regarding the culture history of the area. Moreover, isolated finds are, by definition, not eligible for NRHP listing. No further work is recommended.

## 5 Architectural Survey Results

### 5.1 Previous Architectural Investigations

A literature review and records search was undertaken prior to the historic architectural resources field survey. Background research was conducted to identify all previously-recorded architectural resources located within the defined study area of the proposed project and to develop a cultural and historic context to evaluate newly-recorded resources identified within the defined study area of the proposed project during the historic architectural resources field survey. ArchSite (<http://archsite.cas.sc.edu/ArchSite/>), the online geographic information system maintained by the South Carolina Institute of Anthropology and Archaeology (SCIAA) and the South Carolina Department of Archives and History (SCDAH), the NRHP property files, the South Carolina Statewide Survey's Inventory of Historic Properties, and cultural resources survey reports maintained by the SCDAH were examined to identify previously-recorded historic resources and historic resources listed in or determined eligible for listing in the NRHP located within 0.5 mile of the defined APE.

The Columbia North, SC, topographic maps dated 1948 and 1972 and the Irmo, SC, topographic maps dated 1948 and 1973 in the United States Geological Survey (USGS) historic topographic map collection were reviewed on the <http://historicalmaps.arcgis.com/usgs/> website and aerial photography dated 1971 was reviewed on the NETR online <http://historicalaerials.com> website to identify locations of potential historic sites 50 years of age or older located within the defined study area, to develop an understanding of the development of the project area over time, and to aid in the evaluation of individual resources identified during the historic architectural resources field survey. Additional background research on resources determined to be approximately 50 years of age or older was conducted using records in the Lexington County and Richland County Assessor's offices and the Lexington County and Richland County Register of Deeds offices. The South Carolina Historic Bridge Survey conducted by TranSystems for SCDOT was consulted to obtain the NRHP eligibility recommendations for the bridge structures 50 years of age or older located within the defined study area of the proposed project (Lichtenstein Consulting Services 2005).

As a result of the review of existing information on previously identified historic architectural resources, two (2) properties listed in the NRHP were identified within 0.5 kilometer of the defined study area of the proposed project, but both are located outside the study area and APE of the proposed project. The NRHP-listed properties are the Saluda Factory Historic District, which encompasses areas on both banks of the Saluda River, located southeast of the junction of I-26 and I-126 in Lexington County; and the Pine Grove Rosenwald School, also identified as South Carolina survey site 243-5009, located at 937 Piney Woods Road in Richland County. No proposed NRHP nominations, National Historic Landmarks, or bridges determined eligible for inclusion in the NRHP in the updated South Carolina Historic Bridge Survey were identified within the defined study area of the proposed project.



## Phase I Cultural Resource Survey

The review of existing information also revealed that twelve (12) previously identified survey sites (106-4994, 106-4995, 106-4996, 106-4997, 106-4998, 106-4999, 243-5003, 243-5005, 243-5008, 243-5011, 243-5012, and 243-6331) are located within approximately 0.5 kilometer, but outside of, the defined study area of the proposed project. Site 243-6331 was identified and evaluated in the *S-1280 and S-674 Intersection Improvements Project* cultural resources survey report (Baluha et al. 2010) and all the remaining sites were identified in the *Upper Richland County, South Carolina, Historical and Architectural Survey* (Martin et al. 2002). These resources were evaluated and determined Not Eligible for inclusion in the NRHP in the respective reports. The resources are described in Table 5.1 below and their locations are depicted on Figures 5.1A – 5.1E. Two of these resources, site 243-5008 and site 243-5011, are no longer extant and the remainder are located outside the APE of the proposed project.

**Table 5.1. Previously Identified Architectural Resources within the Vicinity of the Proposed Project.**

Resource Name/Number	Address	Date	Resource Type/Use	NRHP Status
Saluda Factory Historic District	Bounded by Columbia Newberry and Laurens Railroad, Saluda River, Mohawk Drive, and Saluda Hills Subdivision	1834-1884	Saluda Factory Historic District	<b>LISTED</b>
106-4994	2819 Broad River Road (Richland County)	ca. 1945	House	Not Eligible
106-4995	2803 Broad River Road (Richland County)	ca. 1945	House	Not Eligible
106-4996	2801 Broad River Road (Richland County)	ca. 1930	House	Not Eligible
106-4997	3120 Broad River Road (Richland County)	ca. 1940	House	Not Eligible
106-4998	3201 Broad River Road (Richland County)	ca. 1940	House	Not Eligible
106-4999	3207 Broad River Road	ca. 1935	House	Not Eligible

	(Richland County)			
243-5003	7200 Broad River Road (Richland County)	ca. 1895	House	Not Eligible
243-5005	835 Kennerly Road (Richland County)	ca. 1930	St. Paul AME Church	Not Eligible
243-5008 <b>No Longer Extant</b>	Fire Tower Road (Richland County)	ca 1930	Ballentine Fire Tower	Not Eligible
Pine Grove Rosenwald School (243-5009)	937 Piney Woods Road (Richland County)	1923- 1924	Pine Grove Rosenwald School	<b>LISTED</b>
243-5011 <b>No Longer Extant</b>	8001 Broad River Road (Richland County)	ca 1935	House	Not Eligible
243-5012	10000 Broad River Road (Richland County)	1951	Bethlehem Lutheran Church	Not Eligible
243-6331	525 Piney Woods Road (Richland County)	1939	House	Not Eligible




## 5.2 Newly Recorded Architectural Resources

Aerial photographs dated 1971 available on the <http://www.historicaerials.com> website and the USGS Columbia North, SC topographic maps dated 1947 and 1972, and the Irmo, SC topographic maps dated 1946 and 1971 available on the <http://historicalmaps.arcgis.com/usgs/> website, were reviewed to identify buildings and structures approximately 50 years of age or older located within the defined study area of the proposed project. Additional background research on resources determined to be 50 years of age or older was conducted using records in the Lexington County and Richland County Assessor's offices and the respective Register of Deeds offices.

Following the review of existing information on previously-identified historic properties and the completion of background research, a historic architectural resources field survey of the defined project study area was conducted in June and July 2015. Because of the refinement and evaluation of multiple project alternatives, the project study area was subsequently expanded and additional historic architectural resources field survey was conducted in September 2017. The historic architectural resources field survey identified twenty-eight (28) architectural resources 50 years of age or older within or near the defined study area of the proposed project in Lexington and Richland Counties. None of the newly-identified historic architectural resources are recommended eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. The newly identified architectural resources are listed in Table 5.2 below, which provides a NRHP eligibility recommendation. The project study area and the locations of the newly identified historic architectural resources are depicted on Figures 5.1A - 5.1E.



C:\Users\spipe\Desktop\EPRI Files\Temp GA Projects\Carolina Crossroads\Figure 5.1A.mxd | Last Updated: 11.03.2017



- Legend**
- Historic Resource
  - Historic Neighborhood
  - Survey Area

**Figure 5.1A**  
**Architectural Resource**  
**Map**


10/2017







C:\Users\sp\p\Desktop\EP\Files\Temp GA Projects\Carolina Crossroads\Figure 5.1B.mxd | Last Updated: 11/03/2017












C:\Users\spipe\Desktop\EPRI Files\Temp GA Projects\Carolina Crossroads\Figure 5.1C.mxd | Last Updated: 11.03.2017



- Legend**
- Historic Resource
  - Historic Neighborhood
  - Survey Area

**Figure 5.1C**  
**Architectural Resource**  
**Map**

10/2017










C:\Users\spipe\Desktop\LEP\Files\Temp GA Projects\Carolina Crossroads\Figure 5.1D.mxd | Last Updated: 11.03.2017










C:\Users\spipe\Desktop\LEP\Files\Temp GA Projects\Carolina Crossroads\Figure 5.1E.mxd | Last Updated: 11.03.2017







## 5.3 Resource Descriptions and Evaluations

The newly identified architectural resources located in Lexington County and Richland County are listed in Table 5.2 below. The table provides the assigned South Carolina Survey Site (SCSS) number for the resource, the location, the date of construction, the resource type, and a NRHP eligibility recommendation. The location of each resource is depicted on Figures 5.1A - 5.1E. A detailed description and NRHP eligibility evaluation for each resource along with representative photographs for each resource follows the table.

**Table 5.2. Newly Identified Architectural Resources within Project Study Area.**

Resource Name/Number	Address	Date	Resource Type/Use	NRHP Status	Project Effect
106-0877	2500 Sunset Boulevard (Lexington County)	ca. 1940	Sunset Boulevard Baptist Church	Not Eligible	N/A
106-0878	Between I-26 and the Saluda River north of Sunset Boulevard (Lexington County)	1965-1974	Westover Acres Subdivision	Not Eligible	N/A
106-0879	Terrace View Drive and Holly Hill Drive east of I-26 (Lexington County)	1965-2012	Saluda Hills Subdivision	Not Eligible	N/A
106-6465	710 Gracern Road (Richland County)	1961	Commercial	Not Eligible	N/A
106-6466	910 Gracern Road (Richland County)	1967	Commercial	Not Eligible	N/A
106-6394	East side of I-126 south of Arrowwood Road (Richland County)	1950-1991	Arrowwood South Subdivision	Not Eligible	N/A

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey

Resource Name/Number	Address	Date	Resource Type/Use	NRHP Status	Project Effect
106-6393	East side of I-126 south of Bush River Road on Lawand Drive and Arrowwood Road  (Richland County)	1948-1970	Arrowwood Subdivision	Not Eligible	N/A
106-6392	East side of I-126 south of Bush River Road on Latonea Drive  (Richland County)	1950-1973	Latonea Subdivision	Not Eligible	N/A
106-6395	830 Bush River Road  (Richland County)	1962	Oblong Box Service Station	Not Eligible	N/A
106-6396	859 Bush River Road  (Richland County)	1964	Commercial	Not Eligible	N/A
106-6397	1504 Morninghill Drive  (Richland County)	1965	Commercial	Not Eligible	N/A
106-6398	Southwest Quadrant of the I-20 and I-26 Interchange on Fairhaven Drive, Luster Lane and Morninghill Drive  (Richland County)	1956-1975	Skyview Terrace Subdivision	Not Eligible	N/A
106-6399	South side of I-20 between I-26 and Broad River Road  (Richland County)	1958-1976	Belmont Estates Subdivision	Not Eligible	N/A
106-0880	421 Zimalcrest Drive  (Lexington County)	ca. 1969	South Carolina Education Association Building	Not Eligible	N/A

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey

Resource Name/Number	Address	Date	Resource Type/Use	NRHP Status	Project Effect
106-0881	North side of I-20 between Columbia Newberry and Laurens Railroad and I-26  (Lexington County)	1965-1974	Woodland Hills Subdivision	Not Eligible	N/A
106-6400	West side of I-26 south of St. Andrews Road on Chartwell Road  (Richland County)	1961-1982	Chartwell Subdivision	Not Eligible	N/A
106-6401	3102 Greenore Drive  (Richland County)	1965	Commercial	Not Eligible	N/A
243-0882	128 Steward Drive  (Lexington County)	1965	Side-Gabled Residence	Not Eligible	N/A
243-0883	129 Steward Drive  (Lexington County)	1959	Compact Ranch	Not Eligible	N/A
243-0884	130 Steward Drive  (Lexington County)	1940	Front-Gabled Bungalow	Not Eligible	N/A
243-0885	301 Paris Road  (Lexington County)	1940	Cross-Gabled Cottage	Not Eligible	N/A
243-6402	100 Gaillard Street  (Richland County)	ca. 1989-present	Episcopal Church of St. Simon and St. Jude Cemetery	Not Eligible	N/A
243-6403	37 Bluebird Trail  (Richland County)	1940	Side-Gabled Residence	Not Eligible	N/A

Resource Name/Number	Address	Date	Resource Type/Use	NRHP Status	Project Effect
243-6404	1013 North Wingard Road (Richland County)	1940	Front-Gabled Bungalow	Not Eligible	N/A
243-6467	200 Roof Lowman Road (Richland County)	1952	Farmstead	Not Eligible	N/A
106-6405	North side of I-20 west of Broad River Road on Stucawa Drive and Chippewa Drive (Richland County)	1948-1969	Stucawa Subdivision (Cherokee Gardens)	Not Eligible	N/A
106-6406	2420 Broad River Road (Richland County)	1950	Commercial	Not Eligible	N/A
106-6407	1311 Marley Drive (Richland County)	1945	School	Not Eligible	N/A

### 5.3.1 RESOURCE 106-0877 (2500 SUNSET BOULEVARD)

Resource 106-0877, the Sunset Boulevard Baptist Church) is located at 2500 Sunset Boulevard on the north side of the roadway in the northeast corner of the intersection of Sunset Boulevard and Oakwood Drive in West Columbia in Lexington County (refer to Figure 5.1D). The Lexington County Assessor's record does not have an estimated date of construction for the resource. Based on a review of historic aerial photography and topographic maps, and an evaluation of the resource's form and construction materials, Resource 106-0877 appears to have been constructed ca. 1940. The oldest portion of the resource was rectangular and faced south toward Sunset Boulevard (US 378). The original portion of the building has a side-gabled asphalt shingle roof; running bond brick exterior siding; a large interior roof surface brick chimney; original wood-framed 3/1-light double-hung sash windows; and original wood-framed 2/2-light double-hung sash windows. A small side-gabled addition has been constructed on the east side elevation of the original building and a massive front-gabled addition has been constructed on the west side elevation of the original building. The addition on the west side elevation is of concrete block load-bearing wall construction with a front-gabled asphalt shingle roof and original metal-framed 2/2-light double-hung sash windows. A non-historic sanctuary building was constructed between the resource and Sunset



Boulevard ca 1980. The brick veneer was likely added to the resource at the time the sanctuary was constructed as that material appears consistent across the elements of the campus.

There is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically significant. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. The resource was evaluated under Criterion A and does not appear eligible for inclusion in the NRHP in the areas of ethnic heritage, religion, or social history. The property is not known to be associated with a specific event or a broad pattern of events in the history of religion, and there are no indications that the congregation played an important role in the social, cultural, economic, or political history of the area. Furthermore, the property has been so altered by the construction of non-historic alterations and additions and has lost integrity in the areas of setting, design, materials, workmanship, and feeling and cannot convey significance were any such associations identified. Therefore, Resource 106-0877 is recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criterion A in the areas of ethnic heritage, religion, and social history. The resource was also evaluated under Criterion C and does not appear eligible for inclusion in the NRHP in the area of architecture. The resource does not represent a recognized architectural type or style and does not otherwise appear to represent a significant trend in South Carolina's architectural history. Additionally, due to the alterations and additions and loss of integrity in the areas of setting, design, materials, workmanship, and feeling and cannot convey significance in the area of architecture. Therefore, Resource 106-0877 is recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C in the area of architecture.



Figure 5.2: Resource 106-0877 (2500 Sunset Boulevard) - View of the façade of the original building facing north.



Figure 5.3: Resource 106-0877 (2500 Sunset Boulevard) – View of the rear elevation of the original building, facing south.



**Figure 5.4: Resource 106-0877 (2500 Sunset Boulevard) – View of the façade of the addition to the west side elevation of the original building, facing south. Non-historic sanctuary building is on right half of photograph.**



**Figure 5.5: Resource 106-0877 (2500 Sunset Boulevard) - View of the west side elevation of the addition to the west side of the original building, facing southeast.**



### 5.3.2 RESOURCE 106-0878 (BETWEEN I-26 AND THE SALUDA RIVER NORTH OF SUNSET BOULEVARD)

Resource 106-0878, the Westover Acres Subdivision, is located between I-26 to the west and the Saluda River to the east, north of Sunset Boulevard (US 378) in West Columbia in Lexington County (refer to Figure 5.1D and see Figure 5.6). A review of estimated dates of construction in Lexington County Assessor's records for properties in the neighborhood revealed that houses within the neighborhood were constructed from 1965 to 1974. A review of the Columbia North, SC, topographic map dated 1972 and aerial photography dated 1971 available on the [www.historicaerials.com](http://www.historicaerials.com) website supported the Assessor's dates of construction. The subdivision developed in two separate clusters located on high ground east and west of each other. The lower ground between the two earlier clusters was the last area to be developed and has resulted in the geographic center of the neighborhood having the most recently constructed properties. The western cluster contains approximately 170 lots and the eastern cluster contains approximately 120 lots. The streets in the western section are primarily oriented east-west and the streets in the eastern section are primarily oriented north-south. Most of the lots in both sections are approximately 0.4-acre in size with a small number of lots in each section up to double the standard size. The area between the earlier clusters was developed with several east-west connector roads and several streets that terminate in cul de sacs. These two later developments are named Westwood Hills (north) and Saluda Chase (south).

The residences from the subdivision's earliest period are primarily one-story Ranch houses with integral carports and garages with a high percentage of Split Level houses with integral carports and garages also present and equally distributed. Most of the houses are plain without stylistic features. The areas developed later include two-story houses of no defined academic type with Colonial Revival stylistic features and later examples of the earlier types. Brick is the predominant exterior siding material on houses from all periods of construction. Roof forms are side-gabled, cross-gabled, hipped, cross-hipped, and complex. The lot sizes and building setbacks within the subdivision are nearly uniform. No schools, churches, community buildings or parkland were incorporated into the original development, but a school and athletic complex were constructed south of the subdivision ca 1998.

The resource is not known to be associated with a significant activity or event and there is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically significant. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion A or B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. Two later developments were constructed between the earlier clusters and have resulted in the geographic center of the large residential area having the most recently constructed properties. There are no

community buildings or parkland associated with the subdivision. The individual properties within the subdivision are undistinguished examples of the traditional linear Ranch and Split-Level types, and there are no significant or noteworthy landscape or design features of the subdivision beyond generally uniform lot size and building setback. Therefore, Resource 106-0878 is recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criteria A and C in the areas of community planning and development, architecture, and landscape architecture.






Figure 5.6: Resource 106-0878 (Westover Acres Subdivision).





**Figure 5.7: Resource 106-0878.01 (Westover Acres Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 1814 Robin Crest Drive, facing southeast.**



**Figure 5.8: Resource 106-0878.02 (Westover Acres Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 1836 Terrace View Drive, facing northwest.**





**Figure 5.9: Resource 106-0878.03 (Westover Acres Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 2460 Robin Crest Drive, facing west.**



**Figure 5.10: Resource 106-0878.04 (Westover Acres Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 2448 Robin Crest Drive, facing west.**

### 5.3.3 RESOURCE 106-0879 (TERRACE VIEW DRIVE AND HOLLY HILL DRIVE)

Resource 106-0879, the Saluda Hills Subdivision, is located on two roads (Terrace View Drive and Holly Hill Drive) adjacent to and immediately north of the western section of the Westover Acres Subdivision east of I-26 in West Columbia in Lexington County (refer to Figure 5.1D and see Figure 5.11). A review of estimated dates of construction in Lexington County Assessor's records for properties in the neighborhood revealed that houses within the neighborhood were constructed from 1965 to 2012. A review of the Columbia North, SC, topographic map dated 1972 and aerial photography dated 1971 available on the [www.historicaerials.com](http://www.historicaerials.com) website supported the Assessor's dates of construction. Of the 55 lots within the subdivision, approximately one third have residences that are less than fifty years of age and these later residences are in all areas of the development and between residences constructed decades earlier. The two primary streets in the development are parallel and oriented generally east-west.

The residences from the subdivision's earliest period are primarily one-story Ranch houses with integral carports and garages. A small number of Split Level houses with integral carports and garages are also present. Most of the houses are plain without stylistic features. The later residences represent a variety of one- and two-story building types. Brick is the predominant exterior siding material on houses from all periods of construction. Roof forms are side-gabled, cross-gabled, hipped, cross-hipped, and complex. The lot sizes and building setbacks within the subdivision are nearly uniform. No schools, churches, community buildings or parkland were incorporated into the development.

The resource is not known to be associated with a significant activity or event and there is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically significant. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion A or B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. The relatively small 55-lot subdivision is formed by residences located on both sides of two parallel east-west roads and there are no community buildings or parkland associated with the subdivision. The individual properties within the subdivision are undistinguished examples of the traditional linear Ranch and Split-Level types, and there are no significant or noteworthy landscape or design features of the subdivision beyond generally uniform lot size and building setback. Therefore, Resource 106-0879 is recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criteria A and C in the areas of community planning and development, architecture, and landscape architecture.





Figure 5.11: Resource 106-0879 (Saluda Hills Subdivision).





**Figure 5.12: Resource 106-0879.01 (Saluda Hills Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 1701 Terrace View Drive, facing south.**



**Figure 5.13: Resource 106-0879.02 (Saluda Hills Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 1700 Terrace View Drive, facing north.**



**Figure 5.14: Resource 106-0879.03 (Saluda Hills Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 1720 Terrace View Drive, facing north.**

### 5.3.4 RESOURCE 106-6465 (710 GRACERN ROAD)

Resource 106-6465 is located at 710 Gracern Road on the north side of the roadway approximately 250 feet northwest of the intersection of Gracern Road and Stoneridge Drive in Columbia in Richland County (refer to Figure 5.1A). The Richland County Assessor's record has a 1961 date of construction for the resource. Based on a review of historic aerial photography and topographic maps, and an evaluation of the resource's form and construction materials, this date of construction is considered reliable. The resource is a one-story, asymmetric, commercial warehouse building of steel frame construction. The building consists of a large rectangular warehouse with an adjacent smaller rectangular office on the east side elevation. The resource features a front-gabled metal roof over the warehouse portion and a metal shed roof over the office portion; concrete floor on the interior; running bond brick exterior on the façade; metal exterior siding on the west side elevation of the warehouse with large vehicle entrance; and synthetic exterior siding on the east side elevation of the office. A gable-roofed porch supported by three metal posts; metal-framed single- and double-leaf doors, display windows, and transom lights; and vinyl awning signage are present on the façade.



## Phase I Cultural Resource Survey

The resource is not known to be associated with a significant activity or event and there is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically significant. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion A or B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. The resource does not represent a recognized architectural type or style and does not otherwise appear to represent a significant trend in South Carolina's architectural history. Therefore, Resource 106-6465 is recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C in the area of architecture.



Figure 5.15: Resource 106-6465 (710 Gracern Road) – Oblique view of the façade and west side elevation, facing northeast.



**Figure 5.16: Resource 106-6465 (710 Gracern Road) – Oblique view of the façade and west side elevation, facing northwest.**

### 5.3.5 RESOURCE 106-6466 (910 GRACERN ROAD)

Resource 106-6466 is located at 910 Gracern Road on the north side of the roadway approximately 700 feet southeast of the intersection of Gracern Road and Arrowwood Road in Columbia in Richland County (refer to Figure 5.1A). The Richland County Assessor's record has a 1967 date of construction for the resource. Based on a review of historic aerial photography and topographic maps, and an evaluation of the resource's form and construction materials, this date of construction is considered accurate. The resource is a one-story, asymmetric, office building of concrete block load-bearing wall construction. The building features a flat tar-and-gravel roof; concrete block exterior on three sides with running bond brick veneer on the façade; large metal-framed 2-light display windows on the façade; and large glass block wall segments on the façade. A recessed flat-roofed addition was constructed on the west side elevation ca 1984. The later addition has brick veneer siding on all elevations.





**Figure 5.17: Resource 106-6466 (910 Gracern Road) – View of the façade and west side elevation, facing northwest.**



**Figure 5.18: Resource 106-6466 (910 Gracern Road) – View of the south side elevation of original portion of resource and façade of later addition, facing east.**

The resource is not known to be associated with a significant activity or event and there is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically significant. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion A or B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. The resource does not represent a recognized architectural type or style and does not otherwise appear to represent a significant trend in South Carolina's architectural history. Additionally, due to a non-historic addition on the west side elevation, the resource does not retain integrity in the area of design. Therefore, Resource 106-6466 is recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C in the area of architecture.

### 5.3.6 RESOURCE 106-6394 (EAST OF I-126 SOUTH OF ARROWWOOD ROAD)

Resource 106-6394, the Arrowwood South Subdivision, is located east of I-126 and primarily south of Arrowwood Road in Richland County (refer to Figure 5.1C and see Figure 5.19). The limits of the City of Columbia are delineated in an irregular way around this large residential development and large sections of the development are located outside the city limits. The neighborhood is sprawling and irregularly shaped, and is comprised of two separate residential developments: Arrowwood and Arrowwood Heights. Arrowwood is comprised of buildings on both sides of Arrowwood Road south of Brantley Street. Arrowwood Heights is comprised of buildings on both sides of Arrowwood Road north of Brantley Street and buildings along both sides of Brantley Street, Janice Drive, Betsy Drive, and connecting crossroads. A review of estimated dates of construction in Richland County Assessor's records for properties in the neighborhood revealed that houses within the neighborhood were constructed from 1950 to 1991. A review of the Columbia North, SC, topographic map dated 1972 and aerial photography dated 1971 available on the [www.historicaerials.com](http://www.historicaerials.com) website supported the Assessor's dates of construction. Of the 107 lots within the subdivision, the clear majority were constructed prior to 1963. The 14 residences less than 50 years of age within the neighborhood are located on both sides of Betsy Drive south of the power line corridor.

The residences are primarily one-story Ranch houses with integral carports and garages. A small number of Split Level houses with integral carports and garages are also present. Most of the houses are plain without stylistic features. Brick is the predominant exterior siding material on houses from all periods of construction. Roof forms are side-gabled, cross-gabled, hipped, cross-hipped, and complex. The lot sizes and building setbacks within the subdivision are nearly uniform. No schools, churches, community buildings or parkland were incorporated into the development.

The resource is not known to be associated with a significant activity or event and there is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically significant. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion A or B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. The sprawling 107-lot subdivision is formed by three separate linear segments that are the union of two separately platted residential developments. There are no community buildings or parkland associated with the subdivision and it was not fully developed until the last decade of the twentieth century. The individual properties within the subdivision are undistinguished examples of the traditional linear Ranch and Split-Level types, and there are no significant or noteworthy landscape or design features of the subdivision beyond generally uniform lot size and building setback. Therefore, Resource 106-6394 is recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criteria A and C in the areas of community planning and development, architecture, and landscape architecture.






Figure 5.19: Resource 106-6394 (Arrowwood South Subdivision).





**Figure 5.20: Resource 106-6394.01 (Arrowwood South Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 900 Brantley Street, facing northeast.**



**Figure 5.21: Resource 106-6394.02 (Arrowwood South Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 915 Brantley Street, facing northeast.**





**Figure 5.22: Resource 106-6394.03 (Arrowwood South Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 734 Janice Drive, facing northeast.**



**Figure 5.23: Resource 106-6394.04 (Arrowwood South Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 748 Janice Drive, facing northeast.**

### 5.3.7 RESOURCE 106-6393 (EAST SIDE OF I-126 SOUTH OF BUSH RIVER ROAD ALONG LAWAND DRIVE, ARROWWOOD ROAD, AND LANCEWOOD ROAD)

Resource 106-6393, the Arrowwood Subdivision, is located east of I-126 south of Bush River Road along Lawand Drive, Arrowwood Road, and Lancewood Road in Richland County (refer to Figure 5.1C and 5.24). The city limits of the City of Columbia are delineated on an irregular way around this residential development and large sections of the development are located outside the city limits. A review of estimated dates of construction in Richland County Assessor's records for properties in the neighborhood revealed that houses within the neighborhood were constructed from 1948 to 1970. A review of the Columbia North, SC, topographic map dated 1972 and aerial photography dated 1971 available on the [www.historicaerials.com](http://www.historicaerials.com) website supported the Assessor's dates of construction. Of the 65 lots within the subdivision, only two have residences less than 50 years of age. The subdivision is comprised of properties located along both side of two irregular north-south roads: Lawand Drive, Arrowwood Road, Lancewood Road.

The residences within the subdivision represent a wide variety of mid twentieth century residential building types that include side-gabled cottages, minimal traditional, Ranches, and Split Levels. Most of the houses are plain without stylistic features. Brick is the predominant exterior siding material on houses from all periods of construction. Roof forms are side-gabled, cross-gabled, hipped, cross-hipped, and complex. The lots within district vary dramatically in shape and size, and the building setbacks also vary considerably. No schools, churches, community buildings or parkland were incorporated into the development.

The resource is not known to be associated with a significant activity or event and there is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically significant. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion A or B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. The 65-lot subdivision is of plain design and consists of irregularly-sized lots along both sides of three relatively parallel roads and there were no community buildings or parkland associated with the subdivision. The individual properties within the subdivision are undistinguished examples of the traditional linear Ranch and Split-Level types, and there are no significant or noteworthy landscape or design features of the subdivision beyond generally uniform lot size and building setback. Therefore, Resource 106-6393 is recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criteria A and C in the areas of community planning and development, architecture, and landscape architecture.





Figure 5.24: Resource 106-6393 (Arrowwood Subdivision).





**Figure 5.25: Resource 106-6393.01 (Arrowwood Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 419 Arrowwood Road, facing west.**



**Figure 5.26: Resource 106-6393.02 (Arrowwood Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 130 Arrowwood Road, facing east.**





**Figure 5.27: Resource 106-6393.03 (Arrowwood Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 231 Lancewood Road, facing west.**



**Figure 5.28: Resource 106-6393.04 (Arrowwood Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 225 Redbud Drive, facing north.**

### 5.3.8 RESOURCE 106-6392 (EAST SIDE OF I-126 SOUTH OF BUSH RIVER ROAD ALONG LATONEA DRIVE)

Resource 106-6392, the Latonea Subdivision, is located on the east side of I-126 south of Bush River Road along Latonea Drive in Richland County outside the city limits of Columbia (refer to Figure 5.1C and Figure 5.29). A review of estimated dates of construction in Richland County Assessor's records for properties in the neighborhood revealed that houses within the neighborhood were constructed from 1950 to 1973. A review of the Columbia North, SC, topographic map dated 1972 and aerial photography dated 1971 available on the [www.historicaerials.com](http://www.historicaerials.com) website supported the Assessor's dates of construction. Of the 21 lots within the subdivision, one lot was never developed, 18 are over 50 years of age, and all but 4 were constructed in the 1960s. The subdivision consists of residences constructed along both sides of a single circuitous north-south road: Latonea Drive.

The residences are primarily one-story Ranch houses with integral carports and garages. A small number of Split Level houses with integral carports and garages are also present. Most of the houses are plain without stylistic features, but there is a notable contemporary style residence that was constructed in 1963. Brick is the predominant exterior siding material on houses from all periods of construction. Roof forms are side-gabled, cross-gabled, hipped, cross-hipped, and complex. The lot sizes and building setbacks within the subdivision vary greatly. No schools, churches, community buildings or parkland were incorporated into the development.

The resource is not known to be associated with a significant activity or event and there is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically significant. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion A or B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. The 21-lot subdivision is very small, the layout consists residences constructed on both sides of a circuitous north-south road, there were no community buildings or parkland associated with the subdivision. The individual properties within the subdivision are undistinguished examples of the mid-twentieth century side-gable cottages, minimal traditional residences, traditional linear Ranch and Split-Level types, and there are no significant or noteworthy landscape or design features of the subdivision. Therefore, Resource 106-6392 is recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criteria A and C in the areas of community planning and development, architecture, and landscape architecture.






Figure 5.29: Resource 106-6392 (Latonea Subdivision).





**Figure 5.30: Resource 106-6392.01 (Latonea Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 205 Latonea Drive, facing south.**



**Figure 5.31: Resource 106-6392.02 (Latonea Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 208 Latonea Drive, facing west.**





**Figure 5.32: Resource 106-6392.03 (Latonea Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 235 Latonea Drive, facing east.**



**Figure 5.33: Resource 106-6392.04 (Latonea Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 245 Latonea Drive, facing east.**

### 5.3.9 RESOURCE 106-6395 (830 BUSH RIVER ROAD)

Resource 106-6395 is located at 830 Bush River Road in the southeast corner of the intersection of Bush River Road and Morninghill Drive outside the city limits of Columbia in Richland County (refer to Figure 5.1C). The Richland County Assessor's record has a 1962 date of construction for the resource. Based on a review of historic aerial photography and topographic maps, and an evaluation of the resource's form and construction materials, this date of construction is considered reliable. The resource is a one-story, asymmetric, convenience store of concrete block load-bearing wall and steel frame construction. The building features a flat tar-and-gravel roof; concrete block and metal sheet exterior; and a metal-framed glass door and metal-framed display windows on the façade. The resource has been significantly altered by the enclosure of many original windows and the application of a continuous decorative canopy at the roofline around all sides of the building. The resource is located on a paved asphalt lot and is oriented toward the northeast corner of the parcel to face the intersection of Bush River Road and Morninghill Drive and not directly toward either road.

The resource is not known to be associated with a significant activity or event and there is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically significant. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion A or B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. Due to exterior alterations, the resource has lost integrity in the areas of design, materials, workmanship, and feeling and cannot convey significance in the area of architecture. Therefore, Resource 106-6395 is recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C in the area of architecture.





Figure 5.34: Resource 106-6395 (830 Bush River Road) – View of the façade, facing southeast.



Figure 5.35: Resource 106-6395 (830 Bush River Road) – View of the east side elevation, facing west.



### 5.3.10 RESOURCE 106-6396 (859 BUSH RIVER ROAD)

Resource 106-6396 is located at 859 Bush River Road in the northeast corner of the intersection of Bush River Road and Morninghill Drive outside the city limits of Columbia in Richland County (refer to Figure 5.1C). The Richland County Assessor's record has a 1964 date of construction for the resource. Based on a review of historic aerial photography and topographic maps, and an evaluation of the resource's form and construction materials, this date of construction is considered reliable. The resource is a one-story, asymmetric, commercial building of concrete block load-bearing wall construction. The building features a flat tar-and-gravel roof; concrete block exterior; and metal-framed single- and double-leaf glass doors and metal-framed display windows on the façade. The resource is located on a paved asphalt lot and is oriented toward the northeast corner of the parcel to face the intersection of Bush River Road and Morninghill Drive and not directly toward either road.

The resource is not known to be associated with a significant activity or event and there is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically significant. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion A or B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. The resource does not represent a recognized architectural type or style and does not otherwise appear to represent a significant trend in South Carolina's architectural history. Therefore, Resource 106-6396 is recommended Not Eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C in the area of architecture.



Figure 5.36: Resource 106-6396 (859 Bush River Road) – View of the facade, facing northeast.



Figure 5.37: Resource 106-6396 (859 Bush River Road) – View of the east side elevation, facing northwest.

### 5.3.11 RESOURCE 106-6397 (1504 MORNINGHILL DRIVE)

Resource 106-6397 is located at 1504 Morninghill Drive on the east side of the roadway in the northeast corner of the intersection of Sunset Boulevard and Oakwood Drive outside the city limits of Columbia in Richland County (refer to Figure 5.1C). The Richland County Assessor's record has a 1965 date of construction for the resource. Based on a review of historic aerial photography and topographic maps, and an evaluation of the resource's form and construction materials, this date of construction is considered reliable. The resource is a tall, one-story, rectangular office building of frame construction with little, if any, original construction material still evident. The building has a flat tar-and-gravel roof atop a massive steel mansard-like roof structure; running bond brick exterior; metal-framed 9- and 15-light windows; and steel slab doors. These materials are non-historic replacements. The resource is located on a paved asphalt lot and is oriented with the narrow end parallel to Morninghill Drive.



**Figure 5.38: Resource 106-6397 (1504 Morninghill Drive) – Oblique view of the west and south side elevation, facing northeast.**

The resource is not known to be associated with a significant activity or event and there is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically



significant. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion A or B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. Due to significant exterior alterations; the resource has lost integrity in the areas of design, materials, workmanship and feeling and cannot convey significance in the area of architecture. Therefore, Resource 106-6397 is recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C in the area of architecture.

### 5.3.12 RESOURCE 106-6398 (SOUTHEAST QUADRANT OF THE I-20 AND I-26 INTERCHANGE)

Resource 106-6398, the Skyview Terrace Subdivision, is located in the southeast quadrant of the I-20 and I-26 interchange along Fairhaven Drive, Luster Lane, and Morninghill Drive outside the city limits of Columbia in Richland County (refer to Figure 5.1C and Figure 5.39). A review of estimated dates of construction in Richland County Assessor's records for properties in the neighborhood revealed that houses within the neighborhood were constructed from 1956 to 1975. A review of the Columbia North, SC, topographic map dated 1972 and aerial photography dated 1971 available on the [www.historicaerials.com](http://www.historicaerials.com) website supported the Assessor's dates of construction. The subdivision contains approximately 140 lots and is comprised of residences located along both side of three roughly parallel north-south roads: Fairhaven Drive, Luster Land, and Morninghill Drive. Most of the lots are rectangular and vary from 0.3 to 0.4 acre in size, and a small number of residences are sited across two adjacent lots.

The residences within the subdivision are primarily one-story Ranch houses with integral carports and garages with a small number of Split Level houses with integral carports and garages also present and equally distributed. Most of the houses are plain without stylistic features. Brick is the predominant exterior siding material on houses from all periods of construction. Roof forms are side-gabled, cross-gabled, hippped, cross-hippped, and complex. The lot sizes and building setbacks within the subdivision are nearly uniform. No schools, churches, community buildings or parkland were incorporated into the development.

The resource is not known to be associated with a significant activity or event and there is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically significant. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion A or B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. The 140-lot subdivision is formed by three roughly parallel north-south roads and there are no community buildings or parkland associated with the subdivision. The individual properties within the subdivision are



undistinguished examples of the traditional linear Ranch and Split-Level types, and there are no significant or noteworthy landscape or design features of the subdivision beyond generally uniform lot size and building setback. Therefore, Resource 106-6398 is recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criteria A and C in the areas of community planning and development, architecture, and landscape architecture.



Figure 5.39: Resource 106-6398 (Skyview Terrace Subdivision).





**Figure 5.40: Resource 106-6398.01 (Skyview Terrace Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 1711 Morninghill Drive, facing west.**



**Figure 5.41: Resource 106-6398.02 (Skyview Terrace Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 1815 Morninghill Drive, facing west.**





**Figure 5.41: Resource 106-6398.03 (Skyview Terrace Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 1525 Luster Lane, facing west.**



**Figure 5.42: Resource 106-6398.04 (Skyview Terrace Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 1710 Luster Lane, facing east.**



### 5.3.13 RESOURCE 106-6399 (SOUTH SIDE OF I-20 BETWEEN I-26 AND BROAD RIVER ROAD)

Resource 106-6399, the Belmont Estates Subdivision, is located south of I-20 between I-26 and Broad River Road outside the city limits of Columbia in Richland County (refer to Figure 5.1C and Figure 5.43). A review of estimated dates of construction in Richland County Assessor's records for properties in the neighborhood revealed that houses within the neighborhood were constructed from 1958-1976. A review of the Columbia North, SC, topographic map dated 1972 and aerial photography dated 1971 available on the [www.historicaerials.com](http://www.historicaerials.com) website supported the Assessor's dates of construction. The subdivision contains approximately 130 lots and is comprised of residences located along both side of a large loop created by Bakersfield Road to the south and Staler Road to the east, west, and north, and along both sides of four north-south connector roads within the loop. Most of the lots vary from 0.3 to 0.4 acre in size and there is great variety in the shape of the lots.

The residences within the subdivision are exclusively traditional one-story Ranch houses with integral carports and garages, and Split-Level houses with integral carports. Most of the houses are plain without stylistic features, but there are examples with Colonial Revival stylistic features. Brick is the predominant exterior siding material and roof forms are side-gabled, cross-gabled, hipped, cross-hipped, and complex. The lot sizes are fairly uniform, but the lot shapes vary. The building setbacks are generally uniform. No schools, churches, community buildings or parkland were incorporated into the development, but commercial development on the western edge of the neighborhood near Dutch Square Mall dates to the same period as the subdivision.

The resource is not known to be associated with a significant activity or event and there is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically significant. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion A or B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. The 130-lot subdivision is formed by two roads that form a loop with three north-south connector roads that link the north and south sides of the loop. There are no community buildings or parkland associated with the subdivision. The individual properties within the subdivision are undistinguished examples of the traditional linear Ranch and Split-Level types, and there are no significant or noteworthy landscape or design features of the subdivision beyond generally uniform lot size and building setback. Therefore, Resource 106-6399 is recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criteria A and C in the areas of community planning and development, architecture, and landscape architecture.



Figure 5.43: Resource 106-6399 (Belmont Estates Subdivision).





**Figure 5.44: Resource 106-6399.01 (Belmont Estates Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 1115 Glen Oaks Road, facing east.**



**Figure 5.45: Resource 106-6399.02 (Belmont Estates Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 853 Statler Road, facing west.**





**Figure 5.46: Resource 106-6399.03 (Belmont Estates Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 1036 Statler Road, facing east.**



**Figure 5.47: Resource 106-6399.04 (Belmont Estates Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 847 Statler Road, facing west.**



#### 5.3.14 RESOURCE 106-0880 (421 ZIMALCREST DRIVE)

Resource 106-0880 is located at 421 Zimalcrest Drive on the south side of the roadway immediately south of the I-20 and I-26 cloverleaf interchange in Lexington County (refer to Figure 5.1C). The Lexington County Assessor's record does not have an estimated date of construction for the resource. Based on a review of historic topographic maps and an evaluation of the resource's form and construction materials, Resource 106-0880 appears to have been constructed ca. 1969. The building serves as the offices of the South Carolina Education Association and is a three-part building comprised of a one-story auditorium and office element, a two-story office element, and a square-shaped connector between those east and west wings. The auditorium and office element is rectangular with the narrow side parallel to Zimalcrest Drive. The two-story office element is rectangular with the long side parallel to Zimalcrest Drive. Each of the three elements has running bond brick exterior, plain concrete frieze ornamentation, and large metal-framed, multi-light windows with integral hopper windows.

The resource is not known to be associated with a significant activity or event and there is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically significant. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion A or B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. The resource does not represent a recognized architectural type or style and does not otherwise appear to represent a significant trend in South Carolina's architectural history. Therefore, Resource 106-0880 is recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C in the area of architecture.



Figure 5.48: Resource 106-0880 (421 Zimalcrest Drive) – View of the facade, facing northeast.



Figure 5.49: Resource 106-0880 (421 Zimalcrest Drive) – View of the facade, facing northeast.

### 5.3.15 RESOURCE 106-0881 (NORTH OF I-20 BETWEEN COLUMBIA, NEWBERRY AND LAURENS RAILROAD AND I-26)

Resource 106-0881, the Woodland Hills Subdivision, located north of I-20 between the Columbia, Newberry and Laurens Railroad and I-26 in Lexington County (refer to Figure 5.1C and Figure 5.50). A review of estimated dates of construction in Lexington County Assessor's records for properties in the neighborhood revealed that houses within the neighborhood were constructed from 1965 to 1974 with most of residences constructed after 1967 and less than 50 years of age. A review of the Columbia North, SC, topographic map dated 1972 and aerial photography dated 1971 available on the [www.historicaerials.com](http://www.historicaerials.com) website supported the Assessor's dates of construction. The subdivision encompasses an area of approximately 230 acres and contains approximately 350 residences. There are both straight and curvilinear streets in the development, but no two are rigidly parallel and none are aligned with the cardinal directions.

The minority of residences in the subdivision that are 50 years of age or older are primarily one-story Ranch houses with integral carports and garages, and Split-Level houses with integral carports and garages. Most of the houses are plain without stylistic features, but there are residences with Colonial Revival stylistic features present. Brick is the predominate exterior siding material present on these buildings. The residences less than 50 years of age include other undefined late twentieth century building types and two-story residences, and clapboard and synthetic exterior sidings are often combined with brick in the later examples. Roof forms are side-gabled, cross-gabled, hipped, cross-hipped, and complex. The lot sizes across the entire subdivision mostly range from 0.3 to 0.4 acre, but there is variety in the shape of the lots. The building setbacks within the subdivision are nearly uniform. No schools, churches, community buildings or parkland were incorporated into the development.

The resource is not known to be associated with a significant activity or event and there is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically significant. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion A or B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. The majority of the approximately 350 residences within the subdivision are less than 50 years of age and those residences that are 50 years of age or older are undistinguished examples of the traditional linear Ranch and Split-Level types. Also, there are no schools, churches, community buildings or parkland incorporated into the development, and there are no significant or noteworthy landscape or design features of the subdivision beyond generally uniform lot size and building setback. Therefore, Resource 106-0881 is recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criteria A and C in the areas of community planning and development, architecture, and landscape architecture.






Figure 5.50: Resource 106-0881 (Woodland Hills Subdivision).





**Figure 5.51: Resource 106-0881.01 (Woodland Hills Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 402 Westlawn Road, facing southeast.**



**Figure 5.52: Resource 106-0881.02 (Woodland Hills Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 519 Westlawn Road, facing west.**





**Figure 5.53: Resource 106-0881.03 (Woodland Hills Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 518 Westlawn Road, facing east.**



**Figure 5.54: Resource 106-0881.04 (Woodland Hills Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 509 Woodland Hills West Road, facing west.**

### 5.3.16 RESOURCE 106-6400 (WEST SIDE OF I-26 SOUTH OF ST. ANDREWS ROAD)

Resource 106-6400, the Chartwell Subdivision, is located on the south side of St. Andrews Road approximately 900 feet west of I-26 in Richland County (refer to Figure 5.1C and Figure 5.55). A review of estimated dates of construction in Richland County Assessor's records for properties in the neighborhood revealed that houses within the neighborhood were constructed from 1961 to 1982. A review of the Columbia North, SC, topographic map dated 1972 and aerial photography dated 1971 available on the [www.historicaerials.com](http://www.historicaerials.com) website supported the Assessor's dates of construction. The clear majority of the residences in the subdivision are over 50 years of age and were constructed in the early 1960s. The residences less than 50 years of age are dispersed on lots in the southern half of the neighborhood. The subdivision contains approximately 77 parcels located on both sides of Chartwell Road. Chartwell Road extends southeast, roughly perpendicular, from the south side of St. Andrews Road and then completes an irregular, nearly-oval circuit with two small road segments that extend a short distance south of the loop road. Most of the lots in the subdivision are 100 feet wide and 150 feet deep and 0.34 acre in area.

The residences over 50 years of age are one-story traditional Ranch houses with integral carports and garages, and Split-Level houses with integral carports and garages. Most of these houses are plain without stylistic features. The residences constructed later include both Ranches and unidentified one-story late twentieth century residential types. Brick is the predominant exterior siding material on houses from all periods of construction. Roof forms are side-gabled, cross-gabled, hipped, cross-hipped, and complex. The lot sizes and building setbacks within the subdivision are nearly uniform. No schools, churches, community buildings or parkland were incorporated into the development.

The resource is not known to be associated with a significant activity or event and there is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically significant. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion A or B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. The 77-lot subdivision is formed by a single loop road with short segments extending out from that loop and there are no community buildings or parkland associated with the subdivision. The individual properties within the subdivision are undistinguished examples of the traditional linear Ranch and Split-Level types, and there are no significant or noteworthy landscape or design features of the subdivision beyond generally uniform lot size and building setback. Therefore, Resource 106-6400 is recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criteria A and C in the areas of community planning and development, architecture, and landscape architecture.





Figure 5.55: Resource 106-6400 (Chartwell Subdivision).





**Figure 5.56: Resource 106-6400.01 (Chartwell Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 116 Chartwell Road, facing southeast.**



**Figure 5.57: Resource 106-6400.02 (Chartwell Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 124 Chartwell Road, facing southeast.**





**Figure 5.58: Resource 106-6400.03 (Chartwell Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 158 Chartwell Road, facing north.**



**Figure 5.59: Resource 106-6400.04 (Chartwell Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 240 Chartwell Road, facing south.**

### 5.3.17 RESOURCE 106-6401 (3102 GREENORE DRIVE)

Resource 106-6401 is located at 3102 Greenore Drive in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of Greenore Drive and St. Andrews Road in Richland County (refer to Figure 5.1B). The Richland County Assessor's record has a 1965 date of construction for the resource. Based on a review of historic aerial photography and topographic maps, this date of construction is considered reliable. The resource is a one-story, asymmetric, L-shaped building currently used for commercial purposes that was originally a single-family residential property. It is suspected that the building was originally a Ranch type that has had additions constructed on the original façade (west) and rear (east) elevation. The building features a complex hipped asphalt shingle roof with wide eaves; running bond brick exterior with a soldier course below the eaves on the original portion of the building; a small brick interior roof surface chimney on the rear elevation; 2/2-light horizontal double-hung sash windows. A large shed-roofed addition of frame construction with synthetic exterior siding has been constructed on the rear elevation and projecting gable-roofed addition of frame construction has been constructed on the façade. An apparent carport on the south side elevation has been enclosed.

The resource is not known to be associated with a significant activity or event and there is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically significant. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion A or B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. The resource no longer represents a recognized architectural type and due to substantial alterations and additions the resources has lost integrity in the areas of design, materials, workmanship, and feeling and cannot convey significance in the area of architecture. Therefore, Resource 106-6401 is recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C in the area of architecture.





Figure 5.60: Resource 106-6401 (3102 Greenore Drive) – View of the south elevation, facing northwest.



Figure 5.61: Resource 106-6401 (3102 Greenore Drive) – View of the west elevation, facing east.

### 5.3.18 RESOURCE 243-0882 (128 STEWARD DRIVE)

Resource 243-0882 is located at 128 Steward Drive on the south side of the roadway approximately 410 feet east of the intersection of Steward Drive and Fernandina Road in Lexington County (refer to Figure 5.1B). The Lexington County Assessor's record has a 1965 date of construction for the resource. Based on a review of historic aerial photography and topographic map, the resource appears to have been moved to its present location ca 1980. The resource is a one-story, asymmetric, side-gabled residence of frame construction that does not represent a recognized architectural type or style. The house features a continuous concrete block foundation; side-gabled asphalt shingle roof; drop wood exterior siding; wood-framed 2/2-light horizontal double-hung sash windows; metal-framed awning windows; and a massive concrete block slab chimney. A non-historic shed-roofed porch has been added to the façade. In addition to being moved, significant alterations and additions appear to have been made to the resource based on the large patches visible in two separate areas of the roof surface and the large wall section on the façade that lacks a window or door.

The resource is not known to be associated with a significant activity or event and there is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically significant. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion A or B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. The resource does not represent a recognized architectural type or style and does not otherwise appear to represent a significant trend in South Carolina's architectural history. Additionally, due to the suspected alterations to the resource, it does not retain integrity in the areas of design, materials, workmanship, and feeling and cannot convey significance in the area of architecture. Therefore, Resource 243-0882 is recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C in the area of architecture.





**Figure 5.62: Resource 243-0882 (128 Steward Drive) – View of the west elevation, facing south.**

### 5.3.19 RESOURCE 243-0883 (129 STEWARD DRIVE)

Resource 243-0882 is located at 129 Steward Drive on the north side of the roadway approximately 375 feet east of the intersection of Steward Drive and Fernandina Road in Lexington County (refer to Figure 5.1B). The Lexington County Assessor's record has a 1959 date of construction for the resource. This date of construction was supported by the review of historic aerial photography and topographic maps, and an evaluation of the resource's form and construction materials. The resource is a one-story, asymmetric, cross-hipped residence of masonry load-bearing wall construction. The house features a cross-hipped asphalt shingle roof with wide eaves; a small brick interior roof surface chimney on the rear elevation; stucco over masonry exterior siding with brick siding around the door on the façade; a small projecting hipped-roof porch on the façade; and a carport on the east side elevation. The porch has two square support posts and the floor is a poured concrete slab. The windows have brick sills and most of the original windows have been replaced with non-historic 1/1-light double-hung sash windows. There is a large square-shape three-part picture window to the west side of the doorway on the façade.





**Figure 5.63: Resource 243-0883 (129 Steward Drive) – Oblique view of the facade, facing northwest.**

The resource is not known to be associated with a significant activity or event and there is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically significant. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion A or B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. The resource does not represent a recognized architectural type or style and does not otherwise appear to represent a significant trend in South Carolina's architectural history. Additionally, due to the replacement of most of the original windows, the integrity of the resource in the areas materials, workmanship, and feeling has been diminished. Therefore, Resource 243-0883 is recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C in the area of architecture.

### 5.3.20 RESOURCE 243-0884 (130 STEWARD DRIVE)

Resource 243-0884 is located at 130 Steward Drive on the south side of the roadway approximately 320 feet east of the intersection of Steward Drive and Fernandina Road in Lexington County (refer to Figure 5.1B). The Lexington County Assessor's record has a 1940 date of construction for the resource. Based on a review of historic aerial photography and topographic maps, and an evaluation of the resource's form and construction materials, this date of construction is considered reliable. The resource is a one-story, asymmetric, front-gabled bungalow of concrete block load-bearing wall construction with a gable-roofed addition on the west side elevation. The house lacks stylistic features and has a cross-gabled asphalt shingle roof with narrow eaves; concrete block exterior; a

small brick interior roof surface chimney; a partial-width, projecting, gable-roofed porch on the façade with decorative metal posts; and 2/2-light double-hung sash windows.

The resource is not known to be associated with a significant activity or event and there is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically significant. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion A or B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. The resource does not represent a good and representative example of its architectural type and Resource 243-0884 is recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C in the area of architecture.



**Figure 5.64: Resource 243-0884 (130 Steward Drive) – Oblique view of the façade and east side elevation, facing southwest.**

### 5.3.21 RESOURCE 243-0885 (301 PARIS ROAD)

Resource 243-0885 is located at 301 Paris Road on the south side of the roadway in the southwest corner of the intersection of Paris Road and Oakwood Drive in Lexington County (refer to Figure 5.1B). The Lexington County Assessor's record has a 1940 date of construction for the resource. Based on a review of historic aerial photography and topographic maps, and an evaluation of the resource's form and construction materials, this date of construction is considered reliable. The resource is a one-story, asymmetric, residence of concrete block



load-bearing wall construction. The house features a complex cross-gable-and-hipped asphalt shingle roof with narrow eaves; concrete block exterior; an interior ridgeline concrete block chimney; a partial-width, projecting, gable-roofed porch on the façade with decorative metal posts on the façade; a metal canopy porch on the east side elevation; and a mix of wood-framed 6/6-light double-hung sash windows and metal-framed 3-light awning windows. Most of the windows have brick sills. The awning windows are located on the walls of an enclosed porch on the east side elevation that has been enclosed with wood panel siding. A large rectangular fixed-light picture window is also located on the façade.

The resource is not known to be associated with a significant activity or event and there is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically significant. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion A or B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. The resource does not represent a recognized architectural type or style and does not otherwise appear to represent a significant trend in South Carolina's architectural history. Additionally, due to the enclosure of former porch on the east side elevation, the installation of awning windows into the walls of the enclosed porch, and the addition of a metal canopy porch, the resource has diminished integrity in the areas of design, materials, and workmanship and cannot convey significance in the area of architecture. Therefore, Resource 243-0885 is recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C in the area of architecture.



Figure 5.65: Resource 243-0885 (301 Paris Road) – View of the façade, facing south.





Figure 5.66: Resource 243-0885 (301 Paris Road) – Oblique view of the rear and east side elevation, facing northwest.

### 5.3.22 RESOURCE 243-6402 (100 GAILLARD STREET)

Resource 243-6402 is located at 100 Gaillard Street in the northwest corner of the intersection of Gaillard Street and Evergreen Drive partially within the city limits of Irmo in Richland County (refer to Figure 5.1A). The resource is a non-historic cemetery located on the campus of the Episcopal Church of St. Simon and St. Jude. The Richland County Assessor's record has a 1989 date of construction for the church building. The small number of monuments within the cemetery (less than a dozen were observed during the field survey) date from the early 1990s to the present. The monuments are widely dispersed in a grassed and wooded portion of the church campus on a separate legal parcel from that upon which the church building is located. There is no evident organizational plan in the siting of the interments, no walkways, no fences or ornamental vegetation in the area of the burials. The monuments are limited to headstone and lawn types. An ash garden organized in a Celtic cross design plan is located adjacent to the south elevation of the church building.

The resource is not known to be associated with a significant activity or event and there is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically significant. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion A or B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. The monuments in the cemetery are not historic (20 years of age for the oldest), the monuments are simple and plain examples to two common cemetery monument types, and there are no significant landscape or other design features associated with the cemetery. Therefore, Resource

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey

243-6402 is recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C in the areas of architecture or landscape architecture.



Figure 5.67: Resource 243-6402 (1110 Kinley Road) – View of non-historic church and in-ground cremains burial area, facing northeast.



Figure 5.68: Resource 243-6402 (100 Gaillard Street) – Representative view of non-historic cemetery monuments, facing northwest.



### 5.3.23 RESOURCE 243-6403 (37 BLUEBIRD TRAIL)

Resource 243-6403 is located at 37 Bluebird Trail on the west side of the roadway approximately 570 feet northwest of the intersection of Bluebird Trail and Columbiana Drive in Irmo in Richland County (refer to Figure 5.1A). The Richland County Assessor's record has a 1940 date of construction for the resource. Based on a review of historic aerial photography and topographic maps, and an evaluation of the resource's form and construction materials, this date of construction is considered reliable. The resource is a one-story, asymmetric, side-gabled residence of concrete block load-bearing wall construction. The house features a side-gabled asphalt shingle; concrete block exterior; a large concrete block exterior end wall chimney on the west side elevation; a small partial-width shed-roofed screened porch on the façade; and 1/1-light double-hung sash windows. The windows have brick sills.

The resource is not known to be associated with a significant activity or event and there is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically significant. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion A or B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. The resource does not represent a recognized architectural type or style and does not otherwise appear to represent a significant trend in South Carolina's architectural history. Therefore, Resource 243-6403 is recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C in the area of architecture.



Figure 5.69: Resource 243-6403 (37 Bluebird Trail) – View of the façade, facing southwest.



### 5.3.24 RESOURCE 243-6404 (1013 NORTH WINGARD ROAD)

Resource 243-6404 is located at 1013 North Wingard Road in the southwest corner of the intersection of Wingard Road and Western Lane outside the city limits of Irmo in Richland County (refer to Figure 5.1A). The Richland County Assessor's record has a 1940 date of construction for the resource. Based on a review of historic aerial photography and topographic maps, and an evaluation of the resource's form and construction materials, this date of construction is considered reliable. The resource is a one-story, asymmetric, front-gabled bungalow without stylistic features. The house features a cross-gabled asphalt shingle roof with narrow eaves; running bond brick exterior siding; a massive brick exterior chimney on the north side elevation and a small interior roof surface brick chimney on the south side; a partial-width, extended and integral porch on the façade with four massive brick columns; and a mix of 6/6-light double-hung sash, 2/2-light double-hung sash, and 2-light awning windows.



Figure 5.70: Resource 243-6404 (1013 North Wingard Road) – View of the façade, facing northeast.



**Figure 5.71: Resource 243-6404 (1013 North Wingard Road) – Oblique view of the rear and west side elevation, facing south.**

The resource is not known to be associated with a significant activity or event and there is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically significant. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion A or B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. The resource is a late and undistinguished example of its architectural type and Resource 243-6404 is recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C in the area of architecture.

### 5.3.25 RESOURCE 243-6467 (200 ROOF LOWMAN ROAD)

Resource 243-6467 is located at 200 Roof Lowman Road on the north side of the roadway immediately adjacent to I-26 in Irmo in Richland County (refer to Figure 5.1A). The resource is a mid-twentieth century farmstead with a house, a barn, and several additional agricultural and domestic outbuildings. The Richland County Assessor's record has a 1951 date of construction for the house. Most of the associated outbuildings appear to have been constructed at the same time or soon thereafter. The date of construction for the building and structures was supported by the review of historic aerial photography and topographic maps. The house is a one-story, asymmetric, front-gabled bungalow. The house features a front-gabled asphalt shingle roof with narrow eaves; running bond brick exterior siding; a massive brick interior roof surface chimney on the west side, a large exterior brick chimney on the east side elevation, and a large brick interior roof surface chimney on the east side; an



enclosed wrap-around porch on the façade and the south end of the west side elevation; and 1/1-light double-hung sash windows. Each of the windows has a metal canopy awning. The enclosed porch has several bays of jalousie windows. The barn is obscured with vegetation, but appears to be a three-portal type of wood frame construction with a tall gabled roof and lower stepped shed roofs on each side. The roof and exterior siding are both metal sheet. A second substantial outbuilding is of similar size and design to the barn, but the inner walls are of concrete block construction and the outer walls are a mix of drop wood and metal sheet.

The resource is not known to be associated with a significant activity or event and there is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically significant. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion A or B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. The house and outbuildings are late and undistinguished examples of their architectural types and do not otherwise appear to represent a significant trend in South Carolina's architectural history. Therefore, Resource 243-6467 is recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C in the area of architecture.



Figure 5.72: Resource 243-6467 (200 Roof Lowman Road) – View of the façade, facing north.





Figure 5.73: Resource 243-6467 (200 Roof Lowman Road) – View of the west side elevation, facing east.



Figure 5.74: Resource 243-6467.01 (200 Roof Lowman Road) – View of barn associated with resource, facing east.





**Figure 5.75: Resource 243-6467.02 (200 Roof Lowman Road) – View of outbuilding associated with the resource, facing northwest.**

### 5.3.26 RESOURCE 106-6405 (NORTH SIDE OF I-20 WEST OF BROAD RIVER ROAD)

Resource 106-6405, the Stucawa Subdivision, now identified as Cherokee Gardens, is located on the north side of I-20 west of Broad River Road in Richland County (refer to Figure 5.1A and Figure 5.75). A review of estimated dates of construction in Richland County Assessor's records for properties in the neighborhood revealed that houses within the neighborhood were constructed from 1948 to 1969. A review of the Columbia North, SC, topographic map dated 1972 and aerial photography dated 1971 available on the [www.historicaerials.com](http://www.historicaerials.com) website supported the Assessor's dates of construction. The subdivision contains approximately 55 parcels with residences located on both sides of two roughly parallel north-south roads: Stucawa Drive and Chippewa Drive. The roads both extend southward from Seminole Road and are connected at their southern termini by Chicopee Drive. The residential lot size within the subdivision varies from approximately 0.45 acre to 0.95 acre and the size of the houses on the lots varies greatly, but the house size is not dictated by the lot size. The setback of the houses on the lots is quite uniform, but several houses on corner lots are oriented toward the corners of intersections instead of being constructed parallel to one of the streets. A church constructed in 1960 is located in the subdivision in the southeast corner of the intersection of Stucawa Drive and Seminole Drive.

The residences from the subdivision's earliest period are side-gabled cottages of frame construction with a variety of exterior siding materials. There are houses with brick veneer, clapboard, drop wood, aluminum, and vinyl exterior siding. Residences from the later period are substantially larger and Ranch-like in appearance. Most of

the houses have brick chimneys and are plain without stylistic features. Roof forms are side-gabled, cross-gabled, and complex. The church located within the subdivision is front-gabled with a projecting gabled entry foyer with double-leaf wood doors and a large multi-light transom. The church has running bond brick exterior, ornamental buttresses on the east and west side elevations, and 1/1-light double-hung sash vinyl replacement windows.

The resource is not known to be associated with a significant activity or event and there is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically significant. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion A or B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. The residences and church in the subdivision are undistinguished examples of common architectural building types and there is inconsistency in lot size, building size, and building orientation within the subdivision. Therefore, Resource 106-6405 is recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criteria A and C in the areas of community planning and development, architecture, and landscape architecture.





Figure 5.76: Resource 106-6405 (Stucawa Subdivision or Cherokee Gardens).





**Figure 5.77: Resource 106-6405.01 (Cherokee Gardens Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 203 Stucawa Drive, facing west.**



**Figure 5.78: Resource 106-6405.02 (Cherokee Gardens Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 203 Chippewa Drive, facing west.**





**Figure 5.79: Resource 106-6405.03 (Cherokee Gardens Subdivision) – View of the church located at 216 Stucawa Drive, facing southwest.**



**Figure 5.80: Resource 106-6405.04 (Cherokee Gardens Subdivision) – Representative view of property within the subdivision located at 235 Chippewa Drive, facing southwest.**



### 5.3.27 RESOURCE 106-6406 (2420 BROAD RIVER ROAD)

Resource 106-6406 is located at 2420 Broad River Road on the east side of the roadway approximately 240 feet north of the intersection of Broad River Road and Marley Drive in Richland County (refer to Figure 5.1A). The Richland County Assessor's record has a 1950 date of construction for the resource. This date of construction was supported by the review of historic aerial photography and topographic maps, and an evaluation of the resource's form and construction materials. The resource is a one-story, asymmetric commercial building. The building features a continuous concrete block foundation; synthetic plank exterior siding; a flat tar-and-gravel roof with lower metal shed roofs on the north and south side elevation; and a metal vehicle door, two entrances, and two square 2-light display windows on the façade. The building has been substantially altered and its original appearance is no longer evident. The original siding has been replaced, original windows have been replaced and enclosed and the size and location of doorways on the façade has been changed.

The resource is not known to be associated with a significant activity or event and there is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically significant. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion A or B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. Due to the exterior alterations that have obscured the original appearance of the resource, it has lost integrity in the areas of design, materials, workmanship, and feeling and cannot convey significance in the area of architecture. Therefore, Resource 106-6405 is recommended **Not Eligible** for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C in the area of architecture.

### 5.3.28 RESOURCE 106-6407 (1311 MARLEY DRIVE)

Resource 106-6407 is located at 1311 Marley Drive on the north side of the roadway approximately 375 feet east of the intersection of Marley Drive and Broad River Road in Richland County (refer to Figure 5.1A). The resource is a former school complex consisting of a large rectangular classroom wing on the east end that is oriented parallel to Marley Drive; a large rectangular gymnasium wing on the west end that is oriented perpendicular to Marley Drive; and a small connecting hallway and entrance located between the two. The property is now occupied by the Interfaith Hospitality Church.

The Richland County Assessor's record has a 1945 date of construction for the resource. The buildings that comprise the resource are not extant on a 1943 aerial photograph, but both buildings are visible on an aerial photograph dated 1959-1960 by Puckett Aerial Surveys Inc. for the US Department of Agriculture Commodity Stabilization Service reviewed on the <http://digital.tcl.sc.edu/cdm/search/collection/scai/searchterm/richland/field/title/order/title> website. The 1945 date of construction is considered accurate based on the review of historic aerial photography and background research on the property. The school does not appear on a 1948 or 1965 USGS topographic map, but it appears on the next available USGS topographic map dated 1972. The school is labeled "Jr. Academy" on that 1972 topographic map. The current occupant of the property could provide no information on the development history of the resource. The owner of a single-family residential property located north of the resource reported that the

## Phase I Cultural Resource Survey

school was a Seventh Day Adventist (SDA) Academy at the time he moved into his house over 50 years ago. A brief profile of the Columbia Adventist Academy on the <https://www.privateschoolreview.com/columbia-adventist-academy-profile> website indicates that the school has been in continuous operation since World War II. The school has historically served elementary-aged students (currently operates for grades 1-8), so the “Jr. Academy” label on the 1972 topographic map appears to it be a mix of the grades served and the name. The Columbia Adventist Academy moved to a location in Lexington County on the north side of I-20 west of the Saluda River ca. 1972 and is now in a complex with the Columbia First Seventh Day Adventist Church. A site visit to the current location of the Columbia Adventist Academy was conducted in order to obtain a complete development history of the original property, but the school was closed at the time of the site visit. Voice messages were subsequently left at the posted office phone number, but those messages were not returned.

The classroom wing is one story in height with a flat roof; painted brick exterior; a glass-enclosed hallway addition across the full width of the rear elevation; a tall brick interior roof surface chimney; and a ribbon of wide rectangular windows on the façade that is interrupted by an off-center random ashlar bay. The gymnasium is two stories in height with painted running bond brick exterior and a false parapet on the façade; painted running bond brick exterior on the other three elevations; and a gabled roof. No windows were observed. The connecting hallway appears to be a much later addition and has a shed asphalt shingle roof and metal framed double-leaf doors and side lights.



**Figure 5.81: Resource 106-6406 (2420 Broad River Road) – Oblique view of the façade and south side elevation, facing northeast.**



Figure 5.82: Resource 106-6407 (1311 Marley Drive) – View of the façade, facing north.



Figure 5.83: Resource 106-6407 (1311 Marley Drive) – View of the east side elevation, facing west.





**Figure 5.84: Resource 106-6407 (1311 Marley Drive) – Oblique view of the rear elevation, facing southwest.**

The resource is not known to be associated with a significant activity or event and there is not a known connection between the resource and any individual whose activities or achievements are historically significant. The resource was a parochial school. It was not a Richland County public and it was not an Equalization School. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion A or B. Also, there are no indications that the resource is likely to yield information on important research questions in history or prehistory. The resource does not appear to have the potential to be the principal source of important information. Therefore, there was no basis for evaluating the resource under Criterion D. The integrity of the resource has been diminished in the areas of design, materials, workmanship and feeling. The size of the original window openings on the façade has been significantly reduced by the installation of masonry on the upper third of the original window openings and the connecting hallway between the original separate buildings and the full-width addition on the rear elevation have been constructed with materials that are incompatible with the original masonry. Because of the diminished integrity in the areas of design, materials, workmanship, and feeling the resource cannot convey significance in the area of architecture. Therefore, Resource 106-6407 is recommended Not Eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C in the area of architecture.

## 6 Conclusions and Recommendations

### 6.1 Archaeological Resources

In April and May of 2015, with follow up work in September and December 2017, EPEI conducted a Phase I archaeological resource survey to record and evaluate all archaeological resources within the APE for the proposed I-20/26/126 improvement corridor known as the Carolina Crossroads project (see Figure 1.1). SCDOT archaeologists also conducted supplemental research for the Saluda Canal, 38RD59, the results of which are presented in their entirety in Appendix F. As a result of this survey, EPEI revisited nine previously recorded archaeological resources, Sites 38RD59, 38RD133, 38RD277, 38RD287, 38LX20, 38LX212, 38LX235, 38LX236, and 38LX238, and recorded one previously undocumented site, 38LX655, and three isolates, IF 1, IF 2, and IF 3 (Figure 4.1A-G). Sites 38RD277, 38RD287, 38LX236, and 38LX655 were determined to be ineligible for NRHP listing under all Criteria. No further archaeological investigation is recommended for these resources. The portions of Sites 38RD133, 38LX20, 38LX212, 38LX235, and 38LX238 that intersect with the survey area were determined to be noncontributing to the NRHP eligibility status of the resources; however, other portions of these sites extended outside of the current survey boundaries or could not be tested. As such, the overall eligibility status of these sites is recommended as unevaluated. No further investigation is recommended for the portions of these resources located within the current survey boundaries; however, should plans change, additional investigation may be necessary to investigate previously undocumented portions of the sites.

Site 38RD59, the Saluda Canal, represents an extension of the 19<sup>th</sup> century canal documented by Ryan (1972) during his survey of the Riverbanks Zoo property. Today, this resource would more appropriately be recorded and evaluated as an architectural resource; however, because it was originally recorded as an archaeological site, it was evaluated as a revisit. The Saluda Canal is recommended eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criteria A, C, and D in the areas of commerce, engineering, and transportation during a period of significance of 1815 through 1840. The Saluda Canal is considered eligible under Criterion A for its association with the early nineteenth century efforts by the State of South Carolina to provide an inexpensive and efficient method of transportation through the creation of a system of canals and navigable rivers and for its association with the development and growth of the city of Columbia. The Saluda Canal is considered eligible under Criterion C as an early nineteenth century canal structure that exhibits engineering techniques from the period. The Saluda Canal is considered eligible under Criterion D for the potential to obtain detailed information on the construction of the canal bed, tow paths, culverts, and other engineering features and a better and more complete understanding of the construction of early nineteenth century canal structures in the Columbia region and across the state of South Carolina. The preferred alignments for this portion of the proposed Carolina Crossroads Improvement Project have been designed so that no portion of the proposed ramps or other structures will span the portion of the Saluda Canal within project APE. As designed, the closest structural elements associated with the preferred alternatives for the project, RA1 and RA5 Optimized, will be constructed approximately 32 feet to the north of the Saluda Canal (see Figure 4.2a). Based on this, the proposed undertaking will have no adverse effect to the NRHP eligible resource. The Saluda Canal, 38RD59, will be clearly plotted on all construction plans along with an appropriate buffer of 25

feet. This zone will be clearly marked in the field using orange fencing during construction and all ground disturbance and construction staging activities will be conducted outside of this buffer in order to avoid all possible impacts to the resource.

## 6.2 Historic Architectural Resources

In June and July 2015, with follow-up in September 2017, EPEI conducted historic architectural resources field surveys to record and evaluate all historic architectural resources in the project study area.

Two (2) NRHP listed properties, the Saluda Factory Historic District and the Pine Grove Rosenwald School, were identified within the vicinity of the proposed project, but outside the project study area and APE. Twelve (12) previously identified architectural resources (106-4994, 106-4995, 106-4996, 106-4997, 106-4998, 106-4999, 243-5003, 243-5005, 243-5008, 243-5011, 243-5012, and 243-6331) were also identified within 0.5 kilometer of the project study area. These resources were previously determined Not Eligible for inclusion in the NRHP or requiring further evaluation, but two are no longer extant and the remainder have been determined to be located outside of the defined study area and APE of the proposed project. No extant bridge structures 50 years old or older were identified within the defined study area or APE of the proposed project in Lexington County or Richland County in the South Carolina Historic Bridge Survey.

The historic architectural resources field survey identified twenty-eight (28) architectural resources 50 years of age or older within or near the defined study area of the proposed project. Nine (9) of these resources were identified in Lexington County (106-0877 through 106-0881 and 243-0882 through 243-0885) and nineteen (19) of these resource were identified in Richland County (106-6392 through 106-6407, 106-6465, 106-6466, and 243-6467). Breaks in the numerical sequence of SCS site numbers within the project segments were the result of additional resources being identified within the expanded project study area drawn to encompass additional design alternatives. No architectural resources identified within the APE of the proposed project in Lexington County or Richland County are recommended eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.



## 7 References

Anderson, David G.

1994 *The Savannah River Chiefdoms: Political Change in the Late Prehistoric Southeast*. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa, Alabama.

Anderson, David G., and Glen T. Hanson

1988 Early Archaic Settlement in the Southeastern United States: A Case Study from the Savannah River Valley. *American Antiquity* 53(2): 262–286.

Anderson, David G., Christopher Judge, Niels Taylor, and Jane Eastman

1996 *Indian Pottery of Carolinas*. Council of South Carolina Professional Archaeologists, Columbia, South Carolina.

Anderson, David G., R. Jerald Ledbetter, and Lisa D. O'Steen

1990 *Paleoindian Period Archaeology of Georgia*. University of Georgia Laboratory of Archaeology Series 28. University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia.

Anderson, David G., and Joseph Schuldenrein

1985 *Prehistoric Human Ecology Along the Upper Savannah River: Excavations at the Rucker's Bottom, Abbeville, and Bullard Site Groups*. Russell Papers. Archaeological Services Division, National Park Service, Atlanta, Georgia.

Baluha, David, Charlie Phillips, and Paige Wagoner

2010 *Cultural Resources Survey of the SC-1280 and S-674 Intersection Improvement Project, Richland County, South Carolina*. Brockington and Associates, Charleston, South Carolina.

Barry, John M.

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

Bennet, Charles

1975 *Three Voyages*. University Presses of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

Brown, Ann R.

1982 *Historic Ceramic Typology with Principal Dates of Manufacture and Descriptive Characteristics for Identification*. Delaware Department of Transportation Archaeology Series. Dover, Delaware.

Burrison, John A.

1995 *Brother in Clay: The Story of Georgia Folk Pottery*. The University of Georgia Press, Athens, Georgia.

Cambron, James W., and David C. Hulse

1975 *Handbook of Alabama Archaeology: Part I, Point Types*. Archaeological Research Association of Alabama, Birmingham, Alabama.

Carolana.com

2017 Lexington, South Carolina. *Carolana.com*.

Chapman, J.

1975 *The Rose Island Site and the Bifurcate Point Tradition*. Department of Anthropology, University of Tennessee.

Claggett, S.R., and J.S. Cable

1982 *The Haw River Sites: Archaeological Investigations at Two Stratified Sites in the North Carolina Piedmont*. Commonwealth and Associated, Inc., Tarboro, North Carolina.

Clausen, C.J., A.D. Cohen, Cesare Emiliani, J.A. Holman, and J.J. Stipp

1979 Little Salt Spring, Florida: A Unique Underwater Site. *Science* 203: 603–614.

Coe, Joffre L.

1964 *The Formative Cultures of the Carolina Piedmont*. Vol. 54. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 5. American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

COSCAPA, South Carolina Department of Archives and History (SCDAH), and South Carolina Institute of Anthropology and Archaeology (SCIAA)

2013 *South Carolina Standards and Guidelines for Archaeological Investigations*. State Historic Preservation Office, Review and Compliance Branch, Columbia, South Carolina.

Cushman, Kathleen A.

1982 Floral Remains from Meadowcroft Rockshelter, Washington County, Southwestern Pennsylvania. In *Meadowcroft: Collected Papers on the Archaeology of Meadowcroft Rockshelter and Cross Creek Drainage*, edited by Ronald C. Carlisle and James M. Adovasio, pp. 207–220. University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Day, Grant L.

2001 Window Glass Dating: When was McConnell's Homestead Built? In *Paper presented at the 4th Annual*. Little Rock, Arkansas.

Delcourt, P.A., and H.R. Delcourt

1987 *Long-term Forest Dynamics of the Temperate Zone: A Case Study of Late-Quaternary Forests in Eastern North America*. Springer-Verlag, New York.

DePratter, Chester B., and Christopher Judge

1986 A Provisional Late Prehistoric and Early Historic Ceramic Sequence for the Wateree Valley, South Carolina. In *Annual Conference of the*. Columbia, South Carolina.

Dillehay, Tom D.

1989 *Monte Verde: A Late Pleistocene Settlement in Chile*. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

Dykeman, Wilma

1978 *With Fire and Sword: the Battle of Kings Mountain, 1780*. National Park Service, Washington, D.C.

Edgar, Walter B.

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

Ferguson, Leland G.

1971 Aouth Appalachian Mississippian. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of



Anthropology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Foster, Vernon, and Walter S. Montgomery

1998 *Spartanburg: Facts, Reminiscences, Folklore*. The Reprint Company, Spartanburg, South Carolina.

Franz, David

2013 *An Archaeological Resource Survey of SCE&G's Lake Murray-Lyles 230kV Line (Segments 1 and 3)*. Brockington and Associates, Charleston, South Carolina.

Goodyear, Albert C., Shane Miller, and Ashley M. Smallwood

2007 Introducing Clovis at the Topper Site, 38AL23, Allendale County, South Carolina. In *The 72nd Annual Meeting*. Austin, Texas.

Gordon, John W.

2003 *South Carolina and the American Revolution: A Battlefield History*. University of South Carolina Press, Columbia, South Carolina.

Griffin, James B.

1943 Ceramic Collections from Two South Carolina Sites. *Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts, and Letters* 30: 465–478.

Hally, David J.

1993 The Territorial Size of Mississippian Chiefdoms. In *Archaeology of Eastern North America*, edited by James B. Stoltman. Papers in Honor of Stephen Williams Archaeological Report No. 25. Mississippi Department of Archives and History, Jackson, Mississippi.

Hollis, Daniel W.

1968 Costly Delusion: Inland Navigation in the South Carolina Piedmont. *Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association*, pp. 29-43.

House, John H., and Ronald W. Wogaman

1978 *Windy Ridge: A Prehistoric Site in the Inter-Riverine Piedmont in South Carolina*.

Anthropological Studies Book 2. Columbia, South Carolina.

Jones, Oliver, and Catherine Sullivan

1985 *The Parks Canada Glass Glossary for the Description of Containers, Tableware, Closures, and Flat Glass*. Minister of Supply Services, Ottawa, Canada.

Joseph, Joseph W., Theresa M. Hamby, and Catherine S. Long

2004 *Historical Archaeology in Georgia*. University of Georgia Laboratory of Archaeology Series. Athens, Georgia.

Kapsch, Robert

2010 *Historic Canals and Waterways of South Carolina*. University of South Carolina Press, Columbia, South Carolina.

Keel, Bennie C.

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

Kohn, David and Bess Glenn (Editors)

1938 *Internal Improvements in South Carolina, 1817 – 1838, from the Reports of the Superintendent of Public Works and from Contemporary Pamphlets, Newspaper Clippings, Letters, Petitions, and Maps*. Privately Printed, Washington D.C.

Kovacik, Charles F., and John J. Winberry

1987 *South Carolina: A Geography*. Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado.

Lichtenstein Consulting Services

2005 *South Carolina Historic Bridge Survey*. South Carolina Department of Transportation, Columbia, South Carolina.

Longstreth, Richard

1987 *The Buildings of Main Street: A Guide to American Commercial Architecture*. The Preservation Press, Washington, D.C.

Martin, Jennifer, Nicholas G. Theos, and Sarah A. Woodward

2002 *Upper Richland County Historical and Architectural Inventory*. Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc., Smyrna, Georgia.

Meriwether, Robert L.

1936 Inland Navigation in South Carolina and Traffic on the Columbia Canal. *Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association*, pp. 18-28.

McAlester, Virginia, and Lee McAlester

1998 *A Field Guide to American Houses*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York.

Miller, George L.

1980 Classification and Economic Scaling of 19th Century Ceramics. *Historical Archaeology* 14: 1-14.

Miller, Shane D.

2007 Site Formation Processes in an Upland Paleoindian Site: The 2006-2007 Topper Firebreak Excavations. Unpublished Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee.

2010 *Clovis Excavations at Topper 2005-2007: Examining Site Formation Processes at an Upland Paleoindian Site along the Middle Savannah River*. Occasional Papers, Southeastern Paleoamerican Survey 1. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, Columbia, South Carolina.

Milner, George R.

2004 *The Moundbuilders: Ancient Peoples of Eastern North America*. Thams and Hudson, London, England.

Noel Hume, Ivor

1969 *Pottery and Porcelain in Colonial Williamsburg's Archaeological Collections*. Archaeological Series. Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia.



Norton, Holly

2002 *An Intensive Archaeological and Architectural Survey of Road S-273 (Bush River Road), from Intersection with Ashland Road to Kingsbridge Road, Lexington County*. South Carolina Department of Transportation, Columbia, South Carolina.

Orser, Charles E., Annete M. Nekola, and James L. Roard

1987 *Exploring the Rustic Life, Volume II: Multidisciplinary Research at Millwood Plantation, A Large Plantation in Abbeville County, South Carolina and Elbert County, Georgia*. Russel Papers. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Savannah District, Atlanta, Georgia.

Parker, Patricia L.

1985 *National Register Bulletin 24: Guidelines for Local Surveys: A Basis for Preservation Planning*. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Interagency Resources Division, Washington, D.C.

Poplin, Eric C.

2000 *A Cultural Resources Overview of the Three Rivers Greenway Project Lexington and Richland Counties, South Carolina*. Brockington and Associates, Columbia, South Carolina. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology.

Poppeliers, John C., Allen Chambers, and Nancy B. Schwartz

1998 *What Style is It? A Guide to American Architecture*. Preservation Press, Washington, D.C.

Pratt, Fletcher

2007 *Eleven Generals: Studies in American Command*. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Ramsay, David

1858 *Ramsay's History of South Carolina: From its First Settlement in 1670 to the Year 1808*. W.J. Duffie, Newberry, South Carolina.

Ryan, Thomas M.

1972 *Archaeological Survey of the Columbia Zoological Park, Richland and Lexington*

*Counties, South Carolina*. Research Manuscript Series 37. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, Columbia, South Carolina.

Sassaman, Kenneth E.

1983 Middle and Late Archaic Settlement in the South Carolina Piedmont. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina.

1993 *Early Pottery in the Southeast: Tradition and Innovation in Cooking Technology*. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa, Alabama.

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

1990 Native American Prehistory of the Middle Savannah River Valley. In *Savannah River Archaeological Research Papers No. 1*. Occasional Papers of the Savannah River Archaeological Research Program 1. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, Columbia, South Carolina.

Savage, Beth, and Sarah Dillard Pope

1998 *National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Interagency Resources Division, Washington, D.C.

SCPottery

2015 Welcome | Guide to Native American Pottery of South Carolina. *SCPottery*.

Simpkins, Dan, and D. Scoville

1986 Isolation and Identification of Spanish Moss Fiber from a Sample of Stallings and Orange Series Ceramics. *American Antiquity* 51: 102–117.

Smith, Bruce D.

1986 The Archaeology of the Southeastern United States: from Dalton to DeSoto, 10,500-500 B.P. In *Advances in World Archaeology*, edited by F. Wendorf and A. Close, pp. 1–91. Academic Press, New York.

Society for Historic Archaeology

2013 Historic Bottle Website - Homepage.

South Carolina Department of Archives and History (SCDAH)

2013 *Guidelines for Surveying Post-World War II Neighborhoods and Residences*. Columbia, South Carolina.

2015 *Survey Manual – South Carolina Statewide Survey of Historic Properties*. Columbia, South Carolina.

South, Stanley

1977 *Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology*. Academic Press, New York.

Stephenson, Robert L.

1972 *A Basic Inventory of Archaeological Sites in South Carolina*. Research Manuscript Series 136. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, Columbia, South Carolina.

Stoltman, James B

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

Sullivan, Alan P. III, and Kenneth C. Rozen

1985 Debitage Analysis and Archaeological Interpretation. *American Antiquity* 50: 755–779.

Sussman, Lynn

1997 Mocha, Banded, Cat's Eye and Other Factory-Made Slipware. In *Studies in Northeast Historical Archaeology*. Monograph Series of the Council for Northeast Historical Archaeology 1.

Swanton, John R.

1922 *The Guale Indians and the Yamasee in Early History of the Creek Indians and their Neighbors*. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 73. Smithsonian Institution Press.



Thomas, David Hurst

1993 *Historic Indian Period Archaeology of the Georgia Coastal Zone*. University of Georgia Laboratory of Archaeology Series Report No. 31. University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia.

Tippit, V. Ann

1982 *An Archaeological Survey of the Kinley-Rawls Creek Alternative Revision: Saluda River Sewerline Segment*. Research Manuscript Series 186. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, Columbia, South Carolina.

Trinkley, Michael B.

1980 Investigation of the Woodland Period along the South Carolina Coast. Unpublished Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

1986 *Indian and Freedman Occupation at the Fish Haul Site (38BU805), Beaufort County, South Carolina*. Research Series 7. Chicora Foundation, Columbia, South Carolina.

1990 *An Archaeological Context for the South Carolina Woodland Period*. Research Series 22. Chicora Foundation, Columbia, South Carolina.

Wauchope, Robert

1966 *Archaeological Survey of Northern Georgia with a Test of Some Cultural Hypotheses*. Memoirs of the Society for American Archaeology 21. Society for American Archaeology, Washington, D.C.

Whatley, John S.

2002 An Overview of Georgia Projectile Points and Selected Cutting Tools. *Early Georgia* 30(2).

Williams, Mark, and Victor Thompson

1999 A Guide to Georgia Indian Pottery Types. *Early Georgia* 27(1).

Williams, S.B.(editor).

1968 *The Waring Papers: The Collected Works of Antonio J. Waring, Jr.* Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology 58. Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Cambridge.