

## 3. Existing Conditions and Environmental Consequences

### 3.10 Cultural Resources

Cultural resources include archaeological sites, isolated artifacts, historic architectural resources, historic districts, and traditional cultural properties (TCPs). A cultural resources survey was completed to identify and evaluate cultural resources that may be affected by the proposed Carolina Crossroads I-20/26/126 Corridor Improvement Project (Carolina Crossroads). The results of this survey and an assessment of project effects on cultural resources are summarized within this chapter. Additional detail can be found in Appendix M: Cultural Resources Survey Report.<sup>1</sup>

Cultural Resources include archaeological sites, artifacts, and historic architectural resources.

#### 3.10.1 CHANGES TO THE CHAPTER SINCE THE DEIS

Since the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), this chapter has been revised to update the impacts for the Refined Recommended Preferred Alternative (RPA). Additional information relative to Tribal consultation correspondence received since the DEIS has also been added. No additional field investigations were needed since the revised design work for the Refined RPA was within the original cultural resources area of potential effect (APE). Therefore, there are no changes to historic property impacts due to the revisions made to the Refined RPA.

#### 3.10.2 HOW ARE CULTURAL RESOURCES PROTECTED?

##### 3.10.2.1 National Historic Preservation Act

Due to the project being a federal undertaking, FHWA must comply with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations. The NHPA was enacted in 1966 to acknowledge the nation's heritage, the growing loss of historic and prehistoric resources to modern development, the public benefits of historic preservation, and the federal government's role in preserving the physical remains of history. Section 106 of the NHPA requires federal agencies that fund, permit, or are otherwise involved in an undertaking (for example, as a landowner) to consider the impacts that the undertaking would have on historic architectural and archaeological resources. To assist agencies in complying with Section 106, implementing regulations were established at 36 CFR 800. Subpart B of these regulations describes a process for federal agencies to follow when complying with the requirements of Section 106 of the NHPA. This process is commonly referred to as the Section 106 process. The Section 106 process is completed in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the federally recognized Native American tribes.

##### 3.10.2.2 Department of Transportation Act of 1966, Section 4(f), as Amended

Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (as amended by SAFETEA-LU, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users) gives special consideration to

<sup>1</sup> SCDOT. 2017. "A Cultural Resource Survey of the Proposed Improvements to the Carolina Crossroads Corridor". Prepared by Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc. Ryan O. Sipe, David Adair, and Michael Miller.

## 3. Existing Conditions and Environmental Consequences

architectural and archaeological resources that are either listed on or eligible for listing on the NRHP and affected by transportation projects. Section 4(f) only applies to projects undertaken by U.S. DOT agencies, including FHWA. The Determinations of Eligibility and Findings of Effect established through the Section 106 process are used to address historic properties in the Section 4(f) evaluation, but Section 106 and Section 4(f) are separate acts with separate requirements. Section 4(f) is discussed in detail in Section 3.11: Section 4(f).

### 3.10.3 HOW WERE CULTURAL RESOURCES IDENTIFIED?

#### 3.10.3.1 Literature and Records Search

A literature review and records search was undertaken prior to the field survey. Background research was conducted to identify all previously recorded cultural resources located within the APE of the proposed project. This background research also helped to develop a cultural and historic context to evaluate newly recorded resources identified within the APE of the proposed project during the cultural resource field survey. ArchSite,<sup>2</sup> the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) property files, the South Carolina Statewide Survey's Inventory of Historic Properties, and cultural resources survey reports maintained by the South Carolina Department of Archives and History (SCDAH) were examined to identify previously recorded cultural resources and those that are listed in or determined eligible for listing in the NRHP located within 0.5-mile of the defined APE. In addition, requests for information were sent to Indian tribal governments during project scoping, including the Catawba Indian Nation, Cherokee Nation, Eastern Band of Cherokee, and the United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee Indians in Oklahoma. While none had information to provide, each was interested in being further consulted as the project progressed.

**Area of potential effect**  
The geographic area or areas within which an undertaking [proposed project] may directly or indirectly cause changes in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist.

Richland County tax assessor's records<sup>3</sup> were reviewed as were the Lexington County Assessor's records<sup>4</sup> to obtain estimated dates of construction for all buildings and structures located within the APE of the proposed project. The South Carolina Historic Bridge Survey<sup>5</sup> was consulted for NRHP eligibility recommendations for the bridge structures 50 years of age or older located within the APE. Additional research in the appropriate Register of Deeds office was conducted to discover the names of the families or individuals and the extent of the land historically associated with buildings or structures that appeared to possess historical significance.

In addition, historical topographic maps in the United States Geological Survey (USGS) historical topographic map collection<sup>6</sup> were reviewed along with Nationwide Environmental Title Research (NETR) historical aerial

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.scarchsite.org/>. [The online geographic information system maintained by the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology \(SCIAA\) and the SCDAH.](#)

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.richlandmaps.com/>

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.lex-co.sc.gov/departments/DeptAH/PGIS/Pages/OnlineMapping.aspx>

<sup>5</sup> SCDOT. 2015. South Carolina Historic Bridge Survey. Prepared by TranSystems.

<sup>6</sup> <https://ngmdb.usgs.gov/topoview/>

# 3. Existing Conditions and Environmental Consequences



photography<sup>7</sup> to identify potential locations of historic sites, to 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.

## 3.10.3.2 Archaeological Field Survey

The archaeological survey was completed in accordance with the South Carolina Standards and Guidelines for Archaeological Investigations (SCSGAI).<sup>8</sup> 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. Shovel testing was conducted at 30-meter intervals throughout the survey area and at 15-meter intervals during the delineation of positive shovel tests. Additional detail can be found in Appendix M: Cultural Resources Survey Report.<sup>9</sup>

## 3.10.3.3 Architectural Survey

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 Properties<sup>10</sup> and the National Register Bulletin 24, Guidelines for Local Surveys: A Basis for Preservation Planning.<sup>11</sup> 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 (to assess potential viewshed impacts). Additional detail can be found in Appendix M: Cultural Resources Survey Report.<sup>12</sup>

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 South Carolina Statewide Survey of Historic Properties 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.

---

<sup>7</sup> <https://historicaerials.com>

<sup>8</sup> Council of South Carolina Professional Archaeologists, South Carolina Department of Archives and History, and South Carolina Institute of Anthropology and Archaeology (COSCAPA). 2015. "South Carolina Standards and Guidelines for Archaeological Investigations". State Historic Preservation Office, Review and Compliance Branch, Columbia, South Carolina.

<sup>9</sup> SCDOT. 2017. "A Cultural Resource Survey of the Proposed Improvements to the Carolina Crossroads Corridor". Prepared by Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc. Ryan O. Sipe, David Adair, and Michael Miller.

<sup>10</sup> South Carolina Department of Archives and History (SCDAH). 2011. "Survey Manual: South Carolina Statewide Survey of Historic Properties". South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina.

<sup>11</sup> 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.

<sup>12</sup> SCDOT. 2017. "A Cultural Resource Survey of the Proposed Improvements to the Carolina Crossroads Corridor". Prepared by Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc. Ryan O. Sipe, David Adair, and Michael Miller.

## 3. Existing Conditions and Environmental Consequences

### 3.10.3.4 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 or 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.
- 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.

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.<sup>13</sup>

### 3.10.4 WHAT HISTORIC RESOURCES WERE FOUND DURING THE SURVEY?

The intensive architectural resources field survey took place in June and July 2015, with follow-up in October 2017 to survey areas where the project study area had expanded due to the refinement and evaluation of project alternatives. 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.

As a result of the review of existing information on previously identified historic architectural resources, two properties listed in the NRHP were identified within 0.5-mile of the defined project study area of the proposed project, but both are located outside the project 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, 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 were identified within the defined project study area of the proposed project.

---

<sup>13</sup> Savage, Beth L., 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 Resource Division, Washington, D.C.

### 3. Existing Conditions and Environmental Consequences



The review of existing information also revealed that 12 previously identified survey sites were located within approximately 0.5-mile, but outside of, the defined project study area of the proposed project. These resources were previously evaluated and determined Not Eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.<sup>14, 15</sup> The resources are described in Table 3.10-1.

**Table 3.10-1 Previously Identified Architectural Resources within Vicinity of 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 (Richland County)	ca. 1935	House	Not eligible
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

<sup>14</sup> SCDOT. 2010. "Cultural Resources Survey of the SC-1280 and S-674 Intersection Improvement Project, Richland County, South Carolina". Prepared by Brockington and Associates, Charleston, South Carolina; David Baluha, Charlie Phillips, and Paige Wagoner.

<sup>15</sup> SCDOT. 2002. "Upper Richland County Historical and Architectural Inventory". Prepared by Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc., Smyrna, Georgia. Jennifer Marin, Nicholas G. Theos, and Sarah A. Woodward.

### 3. Existing Conditions and Environmental Consequences



Resource name/number	Address	Date	Resource type/use	NRHP status
243-6331	525 Piney Woods Road (Richland County)	1939	House	Not eligible

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. The historic architectural resources field survey identified 28 architectural resources 50 years of age or older within or near the defined project study area of the proposed project. Nine of these resources were identified in Lexington County and 19 of these resource were identified in Richland County. 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. The newly identified architectural resources are listed in Table 3.10-2 below.

**Table 3.10-2 Newly Identified Architectural Resources within Project Study Area**

Resource number*	Address	Date	Resource type/use	NRHP status	Project effect
<b>106-0877</b>	2500 Sunset Boulevard (Lexington County)	ca. 1965	Sunset Boulevard Baptist Church	Not eligible	N/A
<b>106-0878</b>	Between I-26 and the Saluda River north of Sunset Boulevard (Lexington County)	1965-1974	Westover Acres subdivision	Not eligible	N/A
<b>106-0879</b>	Terrace View Drive and Holly Hill Drive east of I-26 (Lexington County)	1965-2012	Saluda Hills subdivision	Not eligible	N/A
<b>106-6465</b>	710 Gracern Road (Richland County)	1961	Commercial	Not eligible	N/A
<b>106-6466</b>	910 Gracern Road (Richland County)	1967	Commercial	Not eligible	N/A
<b>106-6394</b>	East side of I-126 south of Arrowwood Road (Richland County)	1950-1991	Arrowwood South subdivision	Not eligible	N/A
<b>106-6393</b>	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
<b>106-6392</b>	East side of I-126 south of Bush River Road on Latonea Drive (Richland County)	1950-1973	Latonea subdivision	Not eligible	N/A

### 3. Existing Conditions and Environmental Consequences



Resource number*	Address	Date	Resource type/use	NRHP status	Project effect
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)	1958-1963	Belmont Estates subdivision	Not eligible	N/A
106-0880	421 Zimalcrest Drive (Lexington County)	ca. 1965	South Carolina Education Association building	Not eligible	N/A
106-0881	North side of I-20 between Columbia Newberry and Laurens Railroad and I-26 (Lexington County)	1965-1973	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	1110 Kinley Road (Richland County)	ca. 1980-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

### 3. Existing Conditions and Environmental Consequences

Resource 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

\* 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.

#### 3.10.5 WHAT ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES WERE FOUND DURING THE SURVEY?

The archaeological survey was conducted in April and May of 2015 with additional fieldwork conducted in October and December of 2017 to cover areas added to the APE during alternatives analysis. As a result of the survey, nine previously recorded archaeological sites were revisited, one previously undocumented site was recorded, and three isolated finds were documented. Each of these resources is discussed in the sections that follow.

##### 3.10.5.1 Previously Recorded Archaeological Sites

**Site 38RD59**, the remnants of the Saluda Canal, was originally recorded during an archaeological survey of the Columbia Zoological Park conducted in 1972.<sup>16</sup> 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 nineteenth 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

<sup>16</sup> 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.



### 3. Existing Conditions and Environmental Consequences



of the railroad in the middle years of the nineteenth century. The Saluda Canal ceased operations around 1837.<sup>17, 18, 19</sup>

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 was 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. The original recorded boundaries for the site in the data maintained by the SCIAA simply consist of an oval measuring 70 by 25 meters (230 by 82 feet) that is oriented on a northeast-southwest axis near the center of the zoo property. Based on Ryan<sup>20</sup> it seems these boundaries may reflect the location of a trench employed to provide a profile of the canal. 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.<sup>21</sup>

While Ryan's 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.<sup>22</sup> 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, 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. 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. EPEI archaeologists mapped extant portions of the canal located within the project area with Trimble GeoXT GPS units. The EPEI team 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, presently under construction along the north bank of the Saluda River near the Carolina Crossroads Improvements project study area. Limited shovel testing was conducted in the vicinity of the canal, but no artifacts were identified during the investigation.

<sup>17</sup> Hollis, Daniel W. 1968. "Costly Delusion: Inland Navigation in the South Carolina Piedmont". *Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association*, pp. 29-43.

<sup>18</sup> 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.

<sup>19</sup> 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.

<sup>20</sup> 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.

<sup>21</sup> *ibid*

<sup>22</sup> 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.

### 3. Existing Conditions and Environmental Consequences

The newly documented canal segments within the project area are similar in appearance to the segments documented in 1972 by Ryan within the Columbia Zoological Park, but in general somewhat narrow and deeper, averaging around five meters (16.4 feet) wide and one or one and a half meters (3.28 or 4.92 feet) deep. 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 the project area also serves as a creek bed at this time, as water flows from a drainage pipe into the canal near its northwestern end, eventually emptying into the Saluda River through a blowout in the canal wall. The only substantive feature noted within the present project area was a stone wall stretching for approximately 46



**Figure 3.10-1 Typical view of the Saluda Canal, facing west**

meters (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 a “guard wall” designed to protect the head of the canal from washout during flood events. Figures 3.10-1 and 3.10-2 present views of the Saluda Canal.

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 Cultural Resources Survey Report (Appendix M) provides a complete NRHP evaluation of the resource. 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. The Saluda Canal is considered eligible under Criterion A for its association with the early

### 3. Existing Conditions and Environmental Consequences

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 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.



Figure 3.10-2 Typical view of the Saluda Canal, facing east.

### 3. Existing Conditions and Environmental Consequences

The Saluda Canal (Site 38RD59) represents the only cultural resource within the APE for the proposed Carolina Crossroads Improvement Project that has been recommended as eligible for NRHP listing as a result of this fieldwork. The RPA and the Refined RPA alignment for this portion of the proposed project has been designed so that no portion of the proposed ramps or other structures would span the portion of the Saluda Canal within the project APE. As designed, the closest structural elements associated with the RPA and the Refined RPA for the project would be constructed approximately 32 feet to the north of the Saluda Canal. Based on this, the proposed undertaking would have no adverse effect to the NRHP-eligible resource.

**Site 38RD133** is a multi-component prehistoric site on a broad landform overlooking the confluence of a creek with an unnamed tributary. The site was originally recorded in 1976, and it was determined at that time that it may be eligible for the NRHP. However, the site has since been heavily impacted by development, and the area is now characterized by commercial development in the form of office complexes and much of the site is paved over. Only a 150-x-30 meter portion of the southern tip of the site intersects with the Carolina Crossroads APE. This portion of the site corresponds with the manicured entrances to an office complex and two additional office buildings. No artifactual remains were identified within the portion of the site that intersects with the Carolina Crossroads APE 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 is unknown.

**Site 38RD277** consists of 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. Because it was originally recorded as an archaeological site it was addressed during the archaeological portion of this investigation. The trestle was recorded in 1982, but no formal NRHP evaluation was given for the structure.<sup>23</sup> As a result of the revisit during the present investigation, it is clear that the trestle recorded as 38RD277 is no longer present at this location. The resource was described as a substantial brick structure built



Figure 3.10-3 View of Site 38RD277, facing east

<sup>23</sup> 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.

### 3. Existing Conditions and Environmental Consequences



over the unnamed creek.<sup>24</sup> Currently, the trestle at this location is made of a steel span with a wood plank floor atop a poured concrete frame. Based on this, it is clear that the resource originally recorded as 38RD277 has been destroyed and no further archaeological or historic architectural documentation is necessary. Figure 3.10-3 presents a view of Site 38RD277.

**Site 38RD287** represents a scatter of structural material associated with a twentieth century house site located in a quadrant of the I-26 interchange with Lake Murray Boulevard. The site was recorded in 1983 as part of the Harbison Interchange Borrow Pit project and was described 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. Currently, the site is beneath the heavily modified landscape associated with the on/off ramp for I-26 at Lake Murray Boulevard. No deposits associated with this resource that would alter the site's original recommendation of ineligible for NRHP listing were identified during the current survey. No further archaeological consideration is recommended for Site 38RD287.

**Site 38LX20**, or the Wactor Site, was recorded in 1961 on the southern banks of the Saluda River. Site 38LX20 was revisited during the present survey and investigators dug two shovel tests within the portion of the original boundaries that intersect with the Carolina Crossroads APE. Both of these tests were negative; however, three shovel tests approximately 45 meters south of the original boundaries were positive. The site is primarily located within the existing right-of-way (ROW). Based on the limited and non-diverse artifact assemblage, 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. This portion of the site is recommended as non-contributing to the site's NRHP eligibility status under Criterion D. The western boundary of the site could not be established during the current investigation due to the limits of the survey area. As such, the overall eligibility status of Site 38LX20 is recommended as unknown. No further work is recommended for the portion of Site 38LX20 within the current survey boundaries.

**Site 38LX212** is located on a prominent bluff that forms the southern bank of the Saluda River where it bends sharply to the southeast, just east of I-26. The site was revisited in 1980 as part of the Archaeological Survey of the proposed Carolina Crossroads project conducted by the South Carolina Department of Highways and Public Transportation.<sup>25</sup> The NRHP recommendation listed on ArchSite 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 and the site itself lies beneath several houses. A portion of the western half of the site intersects with the present survey area. This portion of the site was heavily disturbed by the construction of five existing houses, a swimming pool, and a paved road. Shovel testing was conducted to the immediate west of the site boundary, in the ROW for I-26 North. All tests were negative. Based on the revisit, it is clear that the portion of Site 38LX212 within the survey area was heavily impacted and likely destroyed by residential development. It is recommended 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. The remainder of the site also appears to be heavily disturbed and likely destroyed; however, its overall eligibility status is unknown. No further

<sup>24</sup> *ibid*

<sup>25</sup> Trinkley, Michael. 1980. *Archaeological Survey of the I-20/26-126 Project*. South Carolina Department of Transportation, Columbia, South Carolina.

### 3. Existing Conditions and Environmental Consequences



archaeological investigation is recommended for the portion of this resource that intersects with the survey boundaries.

**Site 38LX235** is located on the south side of Bush River Road, to the west of the on-ramp onto I-20 east. It was recorded in 1980, but the original site form did not provide an NRHP recommendation. The area encompassing Site 38LX235 has been heavily developed since its initial recordation. Currently, the site is located beneath a paved road and the parking lot of a restaurant. Only the northernmost tip of the site, an area measuring 32 square meters, intersects with the project boundaries. 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, as it was all paved over. The site has been presumably destroyed by the construction of the paved road; 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 is unknown. No further archaeological investigation is warranted for the small portion of Site 38LX235 which intersects with the survey area.

**Site 38LX236** is located in a quadrant of the I-20 interchange with Bush River Road. The site was originally recorded in 1980 as a prehistoric and historic artifact scatter on a series of knolls overlooking the floodplain of the Saluda River. The original site form described the site as having been destroyed by the off ramp on the east side of I-20 and noted that the material was recovered from a bulldozed and scraped. There was no formal recommendation regarding the NRHP eligibility of the site during this initial visit; however, the site form recommended no further work. Presently, the northern locus of Site 38LX236 corresponds with the heavily disturbed ground that separates the I-20 off ramp from the mainline highway. 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 site has likely been destroyed or obscured by further development of the interchange that occurred after the resource was originally recorded. Based on this investigation, no deposits or features associated with this site were encountered that would alter the original implied recommendation of ineligible for NRHP listing. No further archaeological consideration is recommended for Site 38LX236.

**Site 38LX238** is located on a prominent landform south of the Saluda River. The site was originally recorded in 1980 as a collection of prehistoric lithics that were not attributed to any specific time period. The site was revisited during the present investigation. Currently, the site is located on either side of a paved road in a small wooded area near I-26, largely within a power line corridor. 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. The eastern boundary of the site could not be firmly established, however, due to the limits of the survey area. The assemblage from 38LX238 represents a scatter of lithic debitage that is not diagnostic of any specific period of prehistory. The site 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 is unknown. No further work is recommended for the portion of 38LX238 within the current study corridor.

## 3. Existing Conditions and Environmental Consequences

### 3.10.5.2 Newly Recorded Archaeological Sites

Site 38LX655 was identified on the eastbound side of I-26 situated on a small ridge nose overlooking a creek to the south of the Saluda River. The site covers the crest of the landform overlooking the creek, a landscape characterized by dense vegetation in the south half of the site and a cleared power line corridor in the north. 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. Diagnostic artifacts recovered from the site date to the Middle Archaic period ca. 5400 – 3500 B.C., and the Late Archaic period ca. 2000 B.C. – 1000 B.C.<sup>26</sup>

Site 38LX655 presented a high artifact concentration and the most potential for intact deposits identified during the Carolina Crossroads survey. Thom’s Creek phase ceramics and a Morrow Mountain Type I PP/K provided a tight temporal framework for the site. A possible feature was identified in a shovel test, 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. Ultimately, based on the additional testing, it was determined that Site 38LX655 represents a small, low density scatter of lithic debitage and prehistoric sherds. Based on this limited assemblage and the disturbed nature of the deposits, the probability for this resource to yield significant new data about the cultural 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.

### 3.10.6 WHAT ARE THE POTENTIAL IMPACTS TO CULTURAL RESOURCES?

The Saluda Canal (Site 38RD59) represents the only cultural resource within the APE for the proposed Carolina Crossroads Improvement Project that has been recommended as eligible for NRHP listing as a result of this fieldwork. The RPA and the Refined RPA alignment for this portion of the proposed project has been designed so that no portion of the proposed ramps or other structures would span the portion of the Saluda Canal within the project APE. As designed, the closest structural elements associated with the Refined RPA would be constructed approximately 32 feet to the north of the Saluda Canal. Based on this, the proposed undertaking would have no adverse effect to the NRHP-eligible resource.

### 3.10.7 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION WITH FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES

The NHPA requires federal agencies involved in an undertaking that could affect resources of religious or cultural significance to federally recognized Native American tribes to consult with those tribes when the location of the federal undertaking is within an area of traditional use for the tribe, when the location is on tribal land, or where such properties might be affected regardless of the undertaking’s location. Consultation under 36 CFR 800 is to occur at a government-to-government level in recognition of the sovereign status of the tribes. In the case of the Carolina Crossroads project, this means that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) must take the lead in consulting with the tribes. The goal of the consultation is to identify resources of importance to the affected

<sup>26</sup> 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.

### 3. Existing Conditions and Environmental Consequences

---

tribes, to assess the nature and extent of the impact on the characteristics of the resources that make them important, and to work through a collaborative process to identify acceptable measures for avoiding, minimizing, or mitigating significant impacts to the resources.

On March 23, 2018, the South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT) transmitted electronic copies of the draft cultural resources survey report to the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, United Keetowah Band of Cherokee Indians, Muscogee (Creek) Nation, and a physical copy of the report to the Catawba Indian Nation on behalf of FHWA. On March 26, 2018, the FHWA transmitted an electronic copy of the draft cultural resources survey report to the Cherokee Nation. On March 25, 2018, the United Keetowah Band of Cherokee Indians acknowledged receipt of the report. On April 23, 2018, the Cherokee Nation contacted the FHWA and asked that the link to the electronic copy of the draft report be resent; the link was resent to the Cherokee Nation on April 24, 2018.

The Catawba Indian Nation returned a signed concurrence letter to the SCDOT on April 4, 2018 (Appendix B).

The Cherokee Nation returned a signed concurrence letter to the FHWA on April 26, 2018. The Cherokee Nation concurred with the work plan provided for Site 38RD59 (Saluda Canal) (Appendix B). They requested that an archaeological professional be present during any ground disturbing activities related to Site 38LX212. The Cherokee Nation also requested that Sites 38RD140, 38RD1175, and 38RD1176 are protected from indirect effects, including borrow sites and equipment staging. Therefore, an archaeological professional would be present during any ground disturbing activities related to Site 38LX212. Additionally, Sites 38RD140, 38RD1175, and 38RD1176 would be protected from indirect effects, including borrow sites and equipment staging.

The Muscogee (Creek) Nation emailed the SCDOT on April 27, 2018, and concurred on the findings of no historic or traditional cultural properties affected (Appendix B).

On May 4, 2018, the SCDOT transmitted electronic copies of the final cultural resources survey report to the FHWA, Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, the Muscogee (Creek) Nation, and SHPO on behalf of FHWA. Also on May 4, 2018, the SCDOT mailed an electronic copy (on a flash drive) to the United Keetowah Band of Cherokee Indians. The Muscogee (Creek) Nation emailed the SCDOT on May 17, 2018, and concurred on the findings of no historic or traditional cultural properties affected (Appendix B). The United Keetowah Band of Cherokee Indians returned a signed concurrence letter to the SCDOT on August 29, 2018 (Appendix B). They included standard caveats for inadvertent discoveries and post-review discoveries during construction activities. On May 18, 2018, the SCDOT mailed a physical copy of the final cultural resources survey report to the Catawba Indian Nation. On May 22, 2018, the FHWA transmitted an electronic copy of the final cultural resources survey report to the Cherokee Nation.

The Catawba Indian Nation returned a signed concurrence letter to the SCDOT on May 30, 2018 (Appendix B). Additionally, the Catawba Indian Nation sent a concurrence letter on the DEIS to the FHWA on August 20, 2018, noting that they had no immediate concerns with regard to traditional cultural properties, sacred sites or Native American archaeological sites within the boundaries of the proposed project areas (Appendix B).



## 3. Existing Conditions and Environmental Consequences

### 3.10.8 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION WITH THE SHPO

On March 23, 2018, the SCDOT transmitted a physical copy of the report to the SHPO on behalf of FHWA. The SCDOT received initial comments from the SHPO via e-mail on April 4, 2018. The SCDOT sent a link to the electronic copy of the revised draft to the SHPO on April 26, 2018 and received additional comments on April 27, 2018. The SCDOT sent a link to the electronic copy of the revised draft to the SHPO on May 4, 2018 and the SHPO concurred on the findings of no historic properties affected on May 4, 2018 (Appendix B). On May 18, 2018, the SCDOT mailed a physical copy of the final cultural resources survey report to the SHPO and the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology (SCIAA).

### 3.10.9 WHAT MITIGATION MEASURES WOULD BE TAKEN TO PROTECT CULTURAL RESOURCES?

Mitigation measures for impacts to architectural resources are not proposed since the proposed project would not result in impacts to these resources.

The Cherokee Nation requested that an archaeological professional be present during any ground disturbing activities related to Site 38LX212. The Cherokee Nation also requested that Sites 38RD140, 38RD1175, and 38RD1176 are protected from indirect effects, including borrow sites and equipment staging.

During the construction phase of the project, the contractor and subcontractors would notify their workers to watch for the presence of any prehistoric or historic remains, including but not limited to arrowheads, pottery, ceramics, flakes, bones, graves, gravestones, or brick concentrations. If any such remains are encountered, the Resident Construction Engineer (RCE) would be immediately notified and all work in the vicinity of the discovered materials and site work would cease until the SCDOT Archaeologist directs otherwise.

The Saluda Canal (Site 38RD59) would be clearly plotted on all construction plans along with an appropriate buffer of 25 feet. This zone would be clearly marked in the field using orange fencing during construction, and all ground disturbance and construction staging activities would be conducted outside of this buffer in order to avoid all possible impacts to the resource.

### 3. Existing Conditions and Environmental Consequences

---



This page intentionally left blank.