A Legend Passes:

Ivor Noël Hume, famed archaeologist, dies at 89.


Famed archaeologist Ivor Noël Hume, who established historical archaeology within the discipline, passed away at his home Saturday surrounded by family. He was 89 years old.

Noël Hume will be remembered for his contributions to archaeology, but his family wants to make sure no one forgets the impact he made beyond his craft. “He was a lot more than just a master of his craft,” his stepdaughter Kristen Welch said. “I will remember him for being the only dad that I’ve ever known. I will remember his unbelievable ability to find humor in anything, and will remember him for his unbelievable way of saying the most amazing things in three words or less.”

Born in London, Noël Hume made his name in the U.S. as Colonial Williamsburg’s chief archaeologist, a position he held for three decades, from his move to the area in the 1950s. He was a research associate for the Smithsonian Institution and in 1964 took the helm of Colonial Williamsburg’s Department of Archaeology. Among his long list of recognitions was being named an Officer of the British Empire by Queen Elizabeth II in 1992. One of his most notable discoveries was of a 1600s settlement at Carter’s Grove, unearthed in the 1970s. Nick Luccketti, an archaeologist with
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(continued from Page 1) the James River Institute and First Colony Foundation, helped with that excavation. “He was brilliant,” Luccketti said. “Everyone in the preservation community should be grateful that he chose our field to spend his life in. He would have been brilliant at any career path that he may have chosen, so we were fortunate to have him as part of the archaeological community.”

Born in 1927, Noël Hume studied in England at Framlingham College and St. Lawrence College, and served with the Indian Army in World War II. His archaeology career took off when he was hired at London’s Guildhall Museum in 1949, before he moved to Colonial Williamsburg in 1957. Luccketti kept in touch with Noël Hume, always asking for his advice over the years. They worked together again investigating the “Lost Colony” on Roanoke Island in North Carolina after Noël Hume retired from Colonial Williamsburg.

Noël Hume’s legacy goes far beyond mid-Atlantic archaeology circles, Luccketti said “He’s the Babe Ruth of historical archaeology,” Luccketti said. “But the principals he espoused in his books about how to conduct proper archaeology pertained to the discipline as a whole.” And as for books, Noël Hume wrote dozens of them. A curator for the Jamestown-Yorktown Foundation, Bly Straube said his writing was eloquent, and he had a knack for making history and research understandable to everyone.

“He made it so accessible to the general public — history, archaeology,” Straube said. “We all tried to emulate him in that way.” He is the reason Straube pursued a career in the field. As a young, “wannabe archaeologist” in 1973, she wrote him a letter — and he wrote back. “He’s the kind of person where you are amazed that you’re living in the same space and time with him, he’s a legend,” Straube said.

Noël Hume’s first wife Audrey was also an archeologist and curator and worked alongside him at Colonial Williamsburg. The couple never had any children, and after her death in 1993, he married Carol Grazier. “His darling Carol was the love of his life,” Welch said, paraphrasing a line from one of his books. “When he and my mother got married, all of a sudden he had four children.” At the time of his death, Noël Hume had four stepchildren and nine grandchildren, one of whom considered him her best friend. The two were so close that when Brandin Welch got engaged, she planned the wedding in five weeks so her grandfather could attend.

She said it will go on as planned on Feb. 25; he wouldn’t have wanted her to change her plans now. At the ceremony, in the seat reserved for Noël Hume, will sit his picture instead. “I took him fishing out on his dock about four or five months ago and I have this picture of him standing in the kitchen with his bright white tennis shoes, standing so tall, holding a fishing pole with the biggest smile on his face,” Brandin Welch said. She and her mother, Kristen, both lived locally, which meant they visited often. Kristen Welch was with Noël Hume when he died. “One of the things he told me in the last final days was that he finally had a family,” Kristen Welch said.
Eric E. Voigt

March 9, 1953 – January 14, 2017

Submitted by Kay Simpson, Ph.D., RPA, Director of Operations - Virginia Office/Business Development ksimpson@crai-ky.com

Eric Edmund Voigt, age 63, of Girard, PA and formerly of Charles City, VA passed away unexpectedly on Saturday, January 14, 2017. He was born in St. Louis, MO on March 9, 1953 a son of John Edmund and the late Mary Louise Voigt.

Eric received a Bachelor's of Arts in Anthropology in 1984 and an MA in Anthropology in 1992 from the University Missouri. Eric was the Director of Archeology and Heritage Resources Management at Louis Berger. He had a long and active career as an archeologist, working in the US Midwest, England, American Samoa and throughout the Eastern US.

He was a prodigious reader, an avid gardener, and had a deep and abiding passion for American History. He was known for his overflowing kindness and generosity, his wit and ever present humor, his intelligence, and his love for his dog Lleyton. Eric found true love and happiness with his wife and soulmate Mary Ann. He was deeply devoted to his children and grandchildren. He will be missed by many.

He is survived by his wife of 7 years, Mary Ann Owoc; his sons, Andrew Edmund Price Voigt and his wife Chrissy, Graham John Alexander Voigt and his wife, Chelsea. His grandchildren: Braden, Benjamin, Mason and Arya Voigt; his father John E. and his wife, Fern Marie; a brother, Mark M. Voigt and his wife Jane; and sister, Kimberly Voigt Hart and her husband, John. He is further survived by his niece, Kate Voigt, and nephews, Conor Voigt and John David Hart II.

A Celebration of Life will be held at Mercyhurst University’s Christ the King Chapel, 501 E. 38th St. Erie, PA 16546 on Saturday, February 18th at 11 am with Rev. Steve Hart officiating. Memorials may be made to the Second Harvest Food Bank of Northwest Pennsylvania, 1507 Grimm Dr. Erie, PA 16501 or James River Association, 4833 Old Main St. Richmond, VA 23231. Funeral arrangements entrusted to Burton Funeral Home, 525 Main St. East, Girard, PA 16417. Condolences may be sent to www.Burtonfuneralhome.com
FROM THE DESK OF THE STATE ARCHAEOLOGIST

Michael B. Barber, Ph.D., RPA (Submitted February 25, 2017)

State Archaeologist, Virginia Department of Historic Resources (DHR).

Below are listed a summary of projects and activities with which DHR is involved. These are highlights which may be of interest to COVA members. For further detail, please contact Mike Barber at mike.barber@dhr.virginia.gov.

Threatened Sites

The Threatened Sites Committee met in early November after the annual ASV meeting. On the agenda for that meeting was a determination of need for more formal guidelines, discussion on how to deal with sea level rise, and an upgrade of application forms.

Projects which are currently under agreement include: Linville Mound (44RM0281) with JMU, Hatch Site (44PG0051) with W&M, Pamunkey Reservation Survey with WMCAR, Gloucester Point GIS Project with Data, Great Neck ethnobotanical Analysis with Justine McKnight, and Curles Neck Assessment with University of Tennessee – Knoxville.

Mike Clem and Mike Barber met with developers on-site at the Magnolia Site in Suffolk, Virginia. The site will be developed and DHR was offered a three week window to salvage data. A research design and logistical planning are underway and work will begin directly after the MAAC meeting and run from March 20 through April 8, 2017. Selected ASV volunteers are being solicited to provide a crew.

Hatch Site – Rehousing continues at DHR where ASV volunteers (Tuesday – Thursday) implementing the work. DHR continues to cooperate with W&M where all records have been digitized and 40 boxes of artifacts transferred to W&M for cataloguing. Initial catalogue will focus on establishing chronology of features. A grant has been submitted to US Fish and Wildlife Services for continuation of study and DHR funding to continue the work through next summer.

Great Neck – Mike Clem has completed the ceramic analysis which is dominated by Mockley ceramics. Mike Barber has analyzed the bone tools finding connections to Addington Site in Virginia Beach and Maycock’s Point in Prince George County. Elizabeth Moore, with aid of ASV Chapters, continues zooarchaeological analysis with a focus on float heavy fraction. Justine McKnight has completed the ethnobotanical analysis with no unexpected outcomes. Earlier C14 dates placed the occupation at between AD 250 – 460.
Archaeology Lab Week: Part II

Dee DeRoche coordinated DHR’s first Winter Certification Lab Week designed for students in the Archaeological Technician Program. It took place on January 30 – February 3, 2017. A total of 18 participants heard presentations on Lab Procedures (D. DeRoche), Site Form Recordation (J. Smith), Metal Conservation (K. Ridgway), CRM Laws and Ethics (J. Wilson and G. Bearns), and Lithic Technology (M. Barber). They also rehoused artifacts from the Hatch collection and consolidated other collections to make better use of limited shelf space in collections storage.

Projects under Way

Werowocomoco – The site is now owned by NPS. DHR is working with NPS on obtaining the York River oyster leases just off shore. This will provide added protection to the site. In addition, an MOU between NPS and DHR is being developed in order to outline expectations with regard to artifact curation and display.

Rappahannock River Survey - DHR working with St. Mary’s College of Maryland on a grant for archaeological survey of a segment of the Rappahannock River which will focus on land-owner/collectors’ interviews. Some field survey will be including but limited in nature.

Pamunkey Reservation Survey – A DHR survey, funded by the Train Positive Control Fund and DHR Threatened Sites, will begin in late winter for the Pamunkey Reservation. The survey is not a 106 project but will rely on tribal knowledge to record sites important to the Pamunkey. One of the foci will be a shoreline survey to locate any resources threatened by sea level rise.

Hurricane Sandy Surveys – Final report for the Eastern Shore survey from Chesapeake Watershed Archaeological Research has been accepted by DHR. Report documents the re-survey of both the Atlantic and Bayside of Accomack and Northampton Counties. The new survey compares the current site conditions with the original survey completed 15 years ago. In the interim, sea level rise and tidal erosion have completed destroyed ca. 30 sites with ca. 30 new sites recorded through the affects of new erosion. An interim report from Longwood Institute for Archaeology has been received as well for a sample survey of four Western Shore counties. This report documents a sophisticated model for predicting site locations and site threat.

2017 Spring Field School – The 2017 Field School will be back on Eastern Shore from May 9 – May 21, 2017. Once again, it will be oriented towards the needs of the ASV/DHR/COVA Certification Program. Two sites will be tested. Limited work will be implemented at the Pear Valley Yeoman’s Cottage in Northampton County, an 18th century single room with loft structure. The work at Pear Valley will focus on the delineation of outbuildings and associated historic landscape which will aid the Northampton Historic Preservation Society in enhancing their site management and interpretive plan.

The second site will be at Eyreville located in Northampton County on the Chesapeake Bay. The site of an extant 18th century plantation house, the archaeological resource lies to the west on a grassed terrace. Artifacts were noted when the land-owner was pulling stumps. These included rose head nails, a Nuremburg casting counter, 2 Irish Farthings, Dutch yellow bricks, Dutch Smoking pipes, kaolin pipe stems, domestic pipe stems, tin-glazed ware, blue and grey ware, gin and wine bottle fragments, nails, oyster shell, etc. The site occupation to date is in the 17th century.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>AWARD</th>
<th>RECIPIENT</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td>Sandra Speiden</td>
<td>Preservation of the Thunderbird Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td>Virginia Sherman &amp; Steve Gunnels</td>
<td>Preserving the Morgan Jones Kiln Site &amp; others in Westmoreland Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td>Virginia Foundation for the Humanities</td>
<td>Providing grants for the interpretation of historic resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td>Richmond County Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>Assessment of Richmond County historic resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td>Busch Properties</td>
<td>Site stewardship of Kingsmill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td>City of Manassas</td>
<td>Preservation of the Jennie Dean Industrial School Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>Robert Hicks</td>
<td>Development of Preservation Programs for Law Enforcement Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>William Childress</td>
<td>Support of excavations at the Leesville Lake Site in Bedford Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td>City of Alexandria</td>
<td>Long-term commitment to preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>Edith Sprouse</td>
<td>Contributions to historical research in Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td>International Paper Company</td>
<td>Stewardship of the Cactus Hill Site, Sussex Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>No Award</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td>Stockner Excavation Co.</td>
<td>Assisting with Carroll Co. Courthouse archaeology investigations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>Charles Hill Carter, III</td>
<td>Site stewardship of Shirley Plantation, Charles City Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td>Loudon County Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>Commitment to archaeology in the development process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>No Award</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td>Mount Vernon Ladies' Association</td>
<td>Ongoing preservation leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>William Cropper</td>
<td>Donation of Kittewan to the ASV, Charles City Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td>Brentsville Historic Centre Trust</td>
<td>Preservation of the Brentsville Courthouse complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>William Glahn</td>
<td>Site stewardship of New London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td>Hopewell City Council</td>
<td>Long-term commitment to preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>Troy &amp; Theresa Stavens</td>
<td>Site stewardship of Warner Hall, Gloucester Co.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2006 & 2007: There were no Hoffman and Sherman Awards

| 2008 | Sherman | Alan Crockett | |
| 2009 | Hoffman | Ziai Family Limited Partnership | Donating 20 acres in Loudoun Co. to Archaeological Conservancy |
| 2009 | Sherman | Dot O’Connor | Long-term commitment to the Poplar Forest archaeology program |
| 2010 | Hoffman | Wintergreen Nature Foundation | Founding the Wintergreen Archaeological Survey (WAS) |
| 2010 | Sherman | Becky Garber | Commitment to Virginia archaeology |
| 2011 | Hoffman | Mount Vernon Neighborhood Friends | Commitment to Mount Vernon area archaeology |
| 2011 | Sherman | Anita Dodd | Long-term commitment to Stafford Co. archaeology |
| 2012 | Hoffman | Menokin Foundation | Preservation and study of Menokin Plantation, Richmond Co. |
| 2012 | Sherman | Robert Steig | Support of archaeology/long-term planning in the Berryville area |
| 2013 | Hoffman | City of Fredericksburg | Sponsorship of archaeological projects as a planning tool |
| 2013 | Sherman | Bill Olson | Support cemetery research/maintenance in Prince William Co. |
| 2013 | Sherman | Joyce Stevens | Support of archaeological studies on her property in Alexandria |
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*Please note that full reports from each committee will appear in the next issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>AWARD</th>
<th>RECIPIENT</th>
<th>COMMENTS (please email the editor if you know the missing entries)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td>Central Virginia History Researchers</td>
<td>Public outreach and preservation efforts on the Sammons homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>Ms. Hanna Brooks Burruss</td>
<td>Preservation efforts at the Prince Edward Soapstone Quarry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td>Mathews County Historical Society</td>
<td>Preservation efforts across Mathews County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>Dr. James Whittenburg</td>
<td>Mentoring generations of historical archaeologists in Virginia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td>VA Beach Resort &amp; Hotel Conference Center</td>
<td>Support of archaeological studies at Great Neck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>Eve Gregory</td>
<td>Donation of the artifacts and associated records from the Hatch Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td>James Monroe’s Highland</td>
<td>Commitment to historical research, public outreach, and advocacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>Dr. Gary Brown</td>
<td>Continued support of DHR/ASV/UUSDA-Forest Service field school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Hoffman Award was created in 1990. The Sherman Award was created in 1996.
The past several months have seen some changes in nomenclature for Fairfax County archaeologists. The Cultural Resource Management and Protection Branch has been re-designated the Archaeology and Collections Branch (ACB). Similarly, as we continue to conduct investigations outside of the Old Colchester Park and Preserve, it seemed only fitting to substitute the word, “County” in place of “Colchester” for the Archaeological Research Team; but, it remains CART for short.

Patriot Park North (Lincoln Lewis Vannoy Site)

Among the active projects in the county, we continue working at Patriot Park North, in the greater Centreville area. The Park Authority plans to develop the park into a youth baseball complex. During the multi-disciplinary team walkover, the ACB representative noted that twentieth century siding on a (barely) standing farmhouse structure obscured a much earlier log core. Following Fairfax County Park policy, CART conducted a Phase I identification survey of the proposed development area. Unsurprisingly, a concentration of artifacts dating from the early- to mid-nineteenth through mid-twentieth century artifacts occurred in direct association with the standing, log-cored structure. However, the archaeologists also identified a concentration of earlier, late-eighteenth through early-nineteenth century, materials approximately 100 meters from the later period locus.

CART undertook a Phase II-level archaeological evaluation of the site, concentrating within the two loci of activity identified during the initial survey. This investigation consisted of the excavation of 1m x 1m test units. Within Locus 1, the area associated with the extant log-cored structure, only a limited number of units were excavated. Given the very deteriorated state of the structure, no excavations occurred within the building footprint. Exterior units yielded additional early-nineteenth through twentieth century artifacts, but no cultural features. At some point in the future, when the structure has been adequately stabilized, additional excavations will be conducted within the structural footprint. We anticipate a greater likelihood of encountering cultural features in these interior units.

At Locus 2, the concentration of earlier artifacts, early test units exposed a soil stain angled at roughly 90 degrees. Excavation of a block of thirty-seven test units and revealed two seemingly conjoined, roughly rectangular stains. These features have been interpreted as cellar or subfloor pits. Two other excavation blocks, as well as individual units, have been excavated within Locus 2 exposing more features including another subfloor pit. Artifacts recovered from Locus 2 consisted almost entirely of late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth century materials such as white salt-glazed stoneware, Staffordshire slipware, English brown stoneware, Colonoware, creamware, and pearlware. The recovery of Colonoware, as well as a small number of glass beads, and the identification of subfloor pits increases the possibility that Locus 2 represents a slave and/or servant’s quarter that predates the log-cored structure at Locus 1.

Figure 1. View of Log construction under/behind more recent modifications – Locus 1.
We continue to expose features at Locus 2 in the anticipation of additional investigation. These investigations will strive to better understand the temporal and cultural context of the occupation at this location. Similarly, when the structure at Locus 1 has been dismantled or otherwise stabilized, we intend to excavate within the structural footprint. It is believed that intact features may exist that speak to the original period of construction as well as its first inhabitants.

**Ellanor C. Lawrence Park, Outbuilding Analysis**

Jean Cascardi, staff archaeologist with Fairfax County, is conducting MA thesis research on a site at Ellanor C. Lawrence Park. She is a graduate student pursuing an MA in Cultural Resource Management at Adams State University in Alamosa, Colorado. She is conducting further archaeological research on an outbuilding that was first excavated by Fairfax County in the 1980s. Oral tradition suggests that the outbuilding associated with the Walney House was once used as domestic quarters for enslaved African-Americans. Jean is reanalyzing materials from the initial excavation and conducting additional excavation.

She recruited 18 volunteers to assist with the excavation at Ellanor C. Lawrence Park (ECLP). Over the weekend of February 4 and 5, 2017, the team excavated a total of 12 one by one meter units and recovered hundreds of artifacts. Currently, these artifacts are being processed at the James Lee Community Center in Falls Church, Virginia. Artifact processing and analysis over the next few weeks will allow Jean to interpret her findings and determine the date and function of the building, which will culminate in the completion of a Master’s thesis.

**Fairfax County artifacts in new Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History exhibit.**

Beads that were recovered from the county’s Lyndham Hill archaeological site are part of the exhibit *Objects of Wonder* now open at the museum in Washington, D.C. The Smithsonian says the exhibit examines “how scientists use Smithsonian collections to enlighten and illuminate our understanding of nature and human culture.”

Archaeologists from the firm Wetlands Studies excavated the beads. Wetland Studies, Fairfax County Park Authority Archaeologist Aimee Wells, and volunteers from the agency’s Archaeology and Collections Branch then sorted the Lyndham Hill materials through water screening to find the beads that are on display. Bead expert Laurie Burgess, Smithsonian’s Associate Chair of the Department of Anthropology in the National Museum of Natural History, helped archaeologists analyze the beads. Burgess then invited county archaeologists to exhibit them. The beads are from a slave dwelling in Fairfax County.

“These beads are ‘objects of wonder’ because they allow a glimpse into the lives of enslaved women through the archaeological record,” Wells said. They are “an example of artifacts that are incredibly small, but also are evocative and informative as we try to learn about the people of the past.” Normally, beads such as those on display in this exhibit might be too small to find using standard archaeological field techniques. Best practices, however, have shown that in feature contexts, so-called “Small Finds” can be recovered when soils are water screened through fine window mesh. The *Objects of Wonder* exhibit runs through 2019.

**Lake Accotink Corduroy Road**

On June 8, 2016 the FCPA ACB was called out to Lake Accotink Park, where construction was being conducted on the main asphalt road leading to the park’s visitor center. When tearing out portions of the asphalt road several logs had been uncovered and removed as construction continued. As excavations continued the crew noticed that the logs were...
(continued from Page 9) continuing down the road and the ACB was contacted to assess the exposed feature. June 9-10 the ACB worked to uncover the exposed portions of what appeared to be the remains of a corduroy road. The ACB worked to clear remaining asphalt and soil from around the feature, then documented the exposed remains using a total station, photography, and hand drawn maps.

Lahey Lost Valley

In 2014, the Resident Curator Program Ordinance (Chapter 125) was incorporated into The Code of the County of Fairfax establishing a resident curator program for Fairfax County (FCPA 2015). The resident curator program entails an individual or group to serve as curator of a Fairfax County historic property. The curator will then serve to relieve some of the public costs associated with preservation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of Fairfax County’s historic properties. Lahey Lost Valley, a park in Fairfax County, was selected for placement on the resident curator list. Lahey Lost Valley Park is an undeveloped park containing two structures: an 18th century brick structure and a nineteenth century structure repurposed as an artist’s studio in the twentieth century. Prior to Lahey Lost Valley being open to bid on by potential resident curators, the FCPA ACB conducted archaeological investigations over the park.

Brief History of Lahey Lost Valley Park

In 1730, a former indentured servant, William Gunnell was granted 966 acres of land east of Difficult Valley stream, north of the current Lawyer’s Road in Vienna (FCPA 2002). Williams final will stated that 800 acres of his Difficult Run tract be split between his two sons William and Henry (FCWB B-1). William’s will goes on to state that the property containing “the plantation and houses whereon my son Henry now lives” be part of Henry’s inherited land (FCWB B-1).

The last will and testament (February 20, 1792) of Henry Gunnell, William’s son, divides his land between his sons but leaves the land containing the plantation and house to his wife Catherine (FCWB: F-1). Henry’s will deeded property to his first three sons, John, Robert, and Thomas then stated that following Catherine’s death her share of properties be divided among his younger three sons: William, Henry, Jr. and James Gunnell (FCWB F1). Henry Jr. then purchased shares of his father’s estate from his brothers, William and James, living on the property with his wife, Sarah (FCDB O2, FCDB XI).

In 1821, Henry Jr. then deeded the property that he had inherited and purchased from his two brothers to his son, William Henry (FCDB M1). Henry Jr.’s widow fought this, renouncing the will and requesting a re-division of the property (FCL G2). In court Sarah was granted this request and the property was split with Sarah receiving 145 acres and the “mansion house” as a dower that had previously been deeded to William Henry (FCL G2: 51-53). By 1843 William Henry owned the property containing Lahey Lost Valley Park. William Henry and his wife, Mary Lewis Moore, placed this land, their slaves, and personal property in a trust to pay off debts accrued by William Henry (FCL H3). In 1856 following Mary Lewis Moore’s death the plantation was divided again, split among William Henry and Mary Lewis Moore’s children (FCL Y3). William and Mary’s child, Margaretta Gunnell, received Lot 1 including 45 acres, the brick house, and the outbuildings as seen on a plat from 1857 (Figure 9)(FCL Y3).

Margaretta owned the property until 1907 when she deeded the home and 75 acres of land to her daughter Laura Jackson Elgin (FCDB W6). Laura sold the property in 1940 to two artists, Richard and Carlotta Lahey (FCDB K14). The Lahey’s moved onto the property, relocating and repurposing a 19th century addition to the home into an artist's cottage (FCPA 2002). In 1999, Carlotta Lahey donated these structures along with 22.6605 acres of the property to Fairfax County to create Lahey Lost Valley Park (FCPA 2002).

FCPA ACB’s Work at Lahey Lost Valley

The FCPA ACB completed Phase I investigations at Lahey Lost Valley Park in early 2017. Shovel test pits were excavated at a 15m interval across the park with 144 tests positive for cultural materials and 335 testing negative for cultural materials. Cultural remains recovered from these investigations included historic and prehistoric materials. The remains of a springhouse just south of the brick structure on the property was also documented at this time (seen intact in foreground of image below). Also, the boundaries of a family burial grounds were recorded. Further work in anticipated for the new future to delineate the burial grounds present on the property and evaluate cultural resources recorded during initial investigations.

FCPA Archaeology and Collections Branch at Colvin Run Mill

In March of 2016, the FCPA ACB conducted archaeological work around the miller’s house at Fairfax County’s Colvin Run Mill Historic Site (CRMHS) (44FX0958). These investigations were carried out to determine the presence/absence of cultural resources around the miller’s house that could potentially be impacted by the installation of an ADA-compliant ramp. The Colvin Run Mill Historic Site is encompassed by the Colvin Run Mill Historic District, one of
Fairfax County’s thirteen historic districts. The mill is listed on the Virginia Landmarks Register and is also on the National Register of Historic Places.

**Brief Colvin Run Mill History**

The land that Colvin Run Mill is situated on was part of the 5,560 acres granted to John Colville in 1739 (JMA 2012). In 1740/41 Colville transferred the land to William Fairfax which was later inherited in 1753 by William’s son, Bryan Fairfax (JMA 2012). In 1763, Bryan sold a portion of this tract to future President George Washington (JMA 2012). After Washington’s death this land became the property of his wife, Martha Washington. When Martha died soon after George in 1802 the land was put up for sale by her executors (JMA 2012). William Sheppard purchased Washington’s 275 acre tract in 1803 (JMA 2008). The first mention of a mill existing on the property was in 1809 when Sheppard advertised in the *Alexandria Gazette* to rent “a valuable mill” (FCPA 2008). In 1811 when Sheppard sold the property to Philip Carper of Maryland the mill complex contained a “mill, house, dam, and race” (FCPA 2008).

The mill was sold by Carper in 1841 to John Powell who hired professional millers to operate the mill (FCPA 2008). From 1840-1860 other structures grew up around the mill including a blacksmith shop, general store, and sawmill (FCPA 2008). In 1872, Powell filed for bankruptcy and the mill was again put up for sale, purchased by Addison Millard in 1883 (FCPA 2008). Millard successfully renovated and modernized the mill, operating the facility with the aid of his large family until 1934. From 1934-1965 the mill was owned by Bernard Bailey (FCPA 2008). By the 1950s the mill had significantly deteriorated and Fairfax County residents had become interested in enlisting county aid in preservation and restoration efforts. In 1965, Fairfax County obtained 36-acres including the mill, miller’s house, barn, three sheds, and remains of the mill dam with plans to preserve and restore the landmark (FCPA 2008). After a period of research restoration efforts began in 1968 (FCPA 2008).

**FCPA ACB’s Work at Colvin Run Mill**

The FCPA ACB’s fieldwork at Colvin Run Mill was completed in two stages. The first stage involved investigations to determine the cultural resources present around the miller’s house and was completed through shovel test pit excavations over the area of potential effect (APE). A second stage was initiated following this stage to evaluate existing resources and was completed through the excavation of four 3.28ft (1m) by 3.28ft (1m) test units. In the APE no cultural features were recorded but during fieldwork 602 artifacts were uncovered including the recovery of several interesting personal domestic items. One such item, a porcelain doll arm recovered from testing could also be connected to the children growing up in the miller’s house. Concerning Victorian-era childhood, “china” doll parts are among the most common artifacts documented from American historical sites (Hume 1969). Addison and Emma Millard had 20 children and this doll fragment may have once been part of a Millard child’s doll.

Another personal item recovered was a slate pencil. Producing writing slate was a large industry in Wales in the 19th century and used often as a substitute for paper (JPPM 2016). By the second half of the 18th century slate was being sold by stationers and was used for educational purposes in the 19th century (JPPM 2016). Slate pencils, such as the one recovered during SWAT’s investigations around the miller’s house, would have been used to write on slate. Sayings such as “wiping the slate clean” and “starting with a clean slate” are referencing the use of slate. It is likely that the slate pencil recovered from testing was used by children who grew up at Colvin Run Mill.

**County Archaeologist Receives Lifetime Achievement Award**

Dr. Elizabeth Crowell, manager of the Fairfax County Park Authority’s Archaeology and Collections Branch, was recently honored with the (continued on Page 12)
With support from the Threatened Sites program, Eric Schweickart, Mark Freeman, Sierra Roark and Barbara Heath at UTK have continued working with the collections from Curles Neck (44HE388) excavated under the direction of Dan Mouer from 1985 to 1997. We developed a geodatabase describing the spatial extent of and relationship between each surface collection area, square of excavated plow zone, trench, and feature. Spatial information extracted from digitized data (summaries of excavation units, scanned field notes, site maps, and individual feature maps) was uploaded into ESRI ArcGIS (version 10.2.2). While most of the excavated contexts are represented in this geodatabase, some information is missing and will need to be collected from individual field records.

Using voice recognition software, we converted hand-written artifact code sheets from 1992 to digital Excel files, and “reverse-engineered” the codes, combining them with digitized finds lists from 1993 to 1996. Metadata was added to reports and images and previous essays by Mouer were adapted to create short interpretive summaries for each occupation phase of the site, serving as finding aids on the project website. The small subset of artifacts held at the VDHR relating to the site were inventoried, and 5% of the artifact collection held in the warehouse at Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU) were rebagged. Project outcomes will be available at http://add.utk.edu/Curles/curles.html.

Sierra Roark using voice recognition software to translate numeric code sheets to digital files. These files were then converted to database records.
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Coan Hall

The 2016 UTK field school continued to work at Coan Hall, the circa 1640 house first built for John Mottrom and occupied by his descendants into the early 18th century in Northumberland County, Virginia. Gradiometer and ground penetrating radar survey located the well-preserved foundations of the 18th-century house that replaced Mottrom’s home, and provided evidence of probable outbuildings and linear features associated with the early plantation landscape and/or the Indian occupation of Sekakoan. Excavations focused on exploring features associated with the western room of the earth-fast house, and ground-truthing the geophysical results.

A large, brick-lined cellar underlies the western room of the house. Beneath a thick deposit of oyster shells, we uncovered a layer of plaster sealing deep deposits of brick, mortar, and building stone that are likely associated with the dismantling of the central chimney. An extensive program of waterscreening and flotation has yielded abundant botanical remains, including charred wood, seeds, pits and nutshell, and numerous animal bones. Stephanie Hacker conducted the paleoethnobotanical analysis, with results indicating the presence of corn, wheat, blueberry, apple, peach, black walnut and a variety of edible wild herbs.

The earliest historic feature at the site is a large, oval pit, measuring 9.5 ft. x 6.5 ft. A single architectural posthole and mold have been found north of the pit, and geophysical evidence indicates the location of additional posts in the area. Whether the pit was inside or outside of a structure is currently not known. Excavation of a sample of the pit’s fill contained a mix of architectural debris, domestic items, and food remains. The high proportion of local to imported pipes and the early dates of ceramics recovered from the fill, support a mid-17th-century date for the abandonment of the pit. The recovery of highly fragmented, burned and calcined animal bone, fish scales, oyster shell and two sizes of lead shot from sediment high in ash content suggests that the fill may have originated from meat processing and cooking activities associated with the plantation kitchen. Fragments of ridged mussel shell are ubiquitous in the top two layers of pit fill. Mussels were consumed as food; however, Indians also used these shells to make beads. To date, no beads have been recovered, but the shell, combined with the hand-made local pipes (some are also mold mold), contact-era Indian pottery, colonoware, and worked European flint indicate a significant Indian influence on the material culture of the household. No European cultigens have been identified in the botanical samples analyzed thus far.

Researchers from UTK will return to the site in late May and June of 2017, with work focusing again on the manor house. Our goals for 2017 include completing the excavation of the portion of the cellar that we have worked on since 2015, excavating post holes associated with the structure, and recording architectural elements through photogrammetry. If time permits, we will also continue excavations of the oval pit, look for additional evidence of the kitchen, and trace features associated with the landscape. If you’re interested in visiting the site or volunteering, please contact me at bheath2@utk.edu.
Dr. Randy Lichtenberger

Mead’s Tavern

In 2016 Hurt and Proffitt completed a Phase I Archaeological Survey of the Mead’s Tavern property in New London, Virginia. This survey was conducted on behalf of Liberty University, which has purchased the tavern with plans to restore and interpret the property.

The Mead’s Tavern archaeological site (44CP0244) is associated with one of Central Virginia’s most significant examples of standing architecture. The 1763 tavern (VDHR # 015-0120), though modified from its original form, lies at what was once the heart of the bustling Revolutionary Era town of New London. The tavern was situated on Lot 6, on the main road and directly across a side street from the county courthouse and jail complex. The tavern is the last of some 80 or more buildings that occupied New London during its Revolutionary heyday.

The survey was designed to identify cultural artifacts and features related to Mead’s Tavern, to define site boundaries and to begin to evaluate site integrity. Archaeologists employed subsurface testing since the entire site was covered in grass. To accomplish this, H&P excavated Test Units measuring 2ft. x 2ft. square across the entire property on a 20 foot regular grid pattern.

The Phase I survey resulted in the excavation of 85 TU’s across the nearly one acre lot. Remarkably, all 85 TU’s were positive for the presence of historic artifacts, reflecting heavy and continuous use throughout the site’s more than two and a half century history. More significantly, the site possesses several apparently intact cultural features. Among these features are the possible locations of several ancillary structures that may date from the late colonial to early national periods. Future archaeology may be completed in conjunction with a recently launched architectural study of the tavern.

Field school students from UT Knoxville and Lynchburg College volunteering at the tavern.

Excerpt of 1805 Mutual Assurance Society Plat depicting the tavern and lost outbuildings.

TU 3 artifact assemblage in the field.
Mark Kostro

Archaeological Evidence for a Front Porch on Raleigh Tavern

For five months between Memorial Day and Halloween, Colonial Williamsburg’s archaeologists and field school students from the College of William & Mary were busy systematically probing the ground in front of the Raleigh Tavern for evidence of a late eighteenth front porch that linked the iconic tavern to Duke of Gloucester Street. The original Raleigh Tavern was built in the early eighteenth century, but was destroyed in a catastrophic fire in 1859. The Raleigh Tavern familiar to today’s visitors to Colonial Williamsburg is a reconstruction built in the early years of the town’s restoration and sits atop the eighteenth-century foundations of the original. Previous documentary research determined the likely presence of a porch on the Raleigh in the eighteenth century, but what that porch looked like has long been an open question. With an eye toward reconstructing the porch in 2017, it was hoped that a reexamination of the site might yield useful new information toward informing the porch’s design.

As with any investigation, our ability to address these research questions is constrained by survival of archaeological evidence. In front of Raleigh Tavern, utility excavations, landscaping, and the 1930 reconstruction of the current tavern, all had significant impacts on the site’s eighteenth century archaeological record. Frustrated for most of the field season by the many disturbances, the team’s persistence paid off when in the early fall they exposed a well-preserved series of eighteenth-century brick piers, almost certainly porch supports, stretching across the tavern’s front.

The first two brick piers uncovered were located to the east of the tavern’s front stoop. Both piers were originally exposed in 1929 just prior to the tavern’s original reconstruction, and are recorded on a detailed plan map prepared by architect Thomas Waterman. But for whatever reason, Waterman did not indicate the piers’ age which led to the long-held assumption that the piers were not colonial, and is among the reasons why the porch was not included in the original reconstruction. Evidence from the 2016 excavations, however, clearly established the piers were built in the middle decades of eighteenth-century. Additional brick piers of the same age and form were located at the tavern’s west end, between the front stoop and the cellar bulkhead, indicating a long porch than spanned most of the buildings street-facing elevation.

The archaeological evidence unearthed in summer 2016 was subsequently compared with still-standing eighteenth century structures with porches surveyed by Colonial Williamsburg’s architectural historians. The archaeological and architectural evidence, along with the documentary evidence, was then used by the foundation’s designers, architects and engineers to develop detailed plans for a porch reconstruction that begins this month (March 2017).
Shell Bead Production Analysis at the Carter Robinson Site (44LE0010)

The Carter Robinson site (44LE10), a middle Mississippian village and mound site in Lee County, contains extensive evidence of shell bead production (Figure 1). Recently, I have started an intensive analysis of the shell beads, shell waste, drills, and flake tools from Structure 1 at the site to better understand the shell bead production process within households. Excavation of the primary shell bead production area in Structure 1 was done in 2007 and 2008 with the University of Kentucky, and funded in part by the University of Kentucky and the National Geographic Exploration grant; further excavations of Structure 1 was done in 2013 through Radford University. The analysis of these materials is funded by the University of Mississippi College of Liberal Arts Faculty Research Grant.

The goals of this project are to identify shell bead procurement and production processes in order to better understand the distribution and variation present in Mississippian craft production and exchange. Specifically, the social relationships within and between households may be apparent in the distribution of the production debris. These same relationships likely framed the distribution and consumption of these goods, so an examination of their production can shed light on the economic trajectory of shell beads during the late prehistoric period. Ultimately, Structure 1’s shell and lithic remains will be analyzed as part of this larger project, which will include shell and lithic remains from at least one other structure, cannel coal bead and pendant production from a third structure, and the distribution of shell, cannel coal, and lithic tools and drills across the site.

Shell bead production debris recovered from Structure 1 includes 42 shell beads, 2 shell pendants, 4 bead blanks, 73 grams of cut bivalve shell, 2.4 kg of gastropod shell, 78 drills, and 12 drill blanks (Plate 1). Most of this was found in or near a small burned feature. In 2013, a 4x3 meter block was opened north of and adjacent to Structure 1 (Figure 2; Plate 2). Over 90 features and 9600 artifacts were identified and recovered in this Structure 1 extension area. Analysis of the features, mostly posts, is currently underway. Shell artifacts recovered from the extension include 203 grams of shell debris, 20 beads, 3 drills, 11 drill fragments, and multiple flake tools.

Methodology

Most studies, especially in the Southeast, have focused on sourcing shell rather than on bead production (e.g. Claassen and Sigmann 1993). Francis (1986:27-30) identifies between 6 -7 methods for creating shell beads, drawing from cross-cultural ethnographic sources. Table 1 shows the different methods and archaeological signatures of shell bead production and the types of stone tools used in each type of
method. Identifying production of shell beads necessitates quantifying and analyzing the beads themselves, the tools used to make the beads, and the shell debris.

In order to identify the type of shell bead production method used at Carter Robinson, I examined the beads, the debris, and the lithics, which included drills and flake tools. Beads were identified as to type (i.e., barrel, seed, etc.) and species if possible; also, the degree of completion was noted.

Lithic material found in context with the beads and shell debris included over 80 drills. This is a large number of drills for any site, but especially for a small site located on the Mississippian frontier. A review of the literature on lithics associated with shell bead production indicates that the drills recovered at Carter Robinson differed from the more well-known Mississippian drills from Cahokia. These microdrills are described by Milner (2002:86) as “short, narrow spalls, virtually all of which were fashioned from high-quality white chert [and] served as bits for bow drills.” Carter Robinson drills are a formal curated technology—worked on 3 or 4 sides rather than bifaced, and similar in form to projectile points. Drills were quantified using drill type forms identified by Roberts (1987) and by ( ). A closer examination of other lithic materials found in context with the shell and drills identified distinctive types of flake tools. These were identified using basic lithic production analyses.

The third data set used to better identify production was shell material. This included weighing and counting shell debris, identifying to species if possible, identifying shell forms, quantifying where the shell was impacted during production, and examining the shell for evidence of modification (i.e., sawing, grinding, cutting, perforation, etc.).

(continued on Page 18)
Preliminary Results

Three test units (of a total of 12 excavated in 2013) have been analyzed so far; each contains three levels, providing data on temporal changes. In addition, three test units from earlier excavations were reopened in 2013 and fully excavated, and artifacts from these were also analyzed. Nine features have been analyzed to date; of these, 6 contain significant amounts of shell and lithic material. Below I report on the quantity and type of shell, evidence of manufacturing type, lithic tools, and features; other analyses are ongoing.

Quantity and Type of Shell

Most of the shell (88%) is concentrated in the central area of the six analyzed test units. Two forms of gastropod shell (turriculate and turbinate) were recovered; turriculate was more common. Large spire shells are also present, as are bivalve shells, but in smaller quantities. In TU N1035 E1001, ten specimens of pyriform gastropod shell were also recovered.

Over time, the total amount of gastropod increased slightly, while the amount of bivalve shell remained about the same, and the amount of large spire shells and turbinate shells decreased over time. Overall, there is more shell present over time, but this is not a significant increase, and there is less diversity in shell type present over time. These data support earlier analyses (Meyers 2011) that shell bead production began during the middle period of site occupation and increased over time. The decreased diversity over time suggests production may have become more standardized, but could also indicate a change in access to shell type.

Manufacturing Methods of Shell Beads

There is evidence for four types of production on the shell: whorl cuts, base cuts, whorl and base cuts and majority columella (that is, most of the whorl or body is gone). There is some difference in the type of production by test unit, suggesting there may be different stages in production, but more analyses are needed. In comparing evidence of production using Murphy’s chart, four types are present. Two of these, sawing and grinding, are identified by Murphy; two others are likely related, and consist of perforating and then snapping off pieces of shell, likely from the whorl. Sawing and grinding are more common in two test units. Over time, sawing became more common, but all four types persist.

Lithic Tool Type, Distribution, and Change over Time

A total of six flake tool types were identified in these test units: knife, multipurpose tool (MPT), spokeshave, graver, denticulate, and blank forms. There is some spatial variation in location of tools, further evidence that stages of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Perforation</th>
<th>Wear</th>
<th>Tool Type</th>
<th>Shell Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gouging</td>
<td>Jagged, uneven perforation; requires polishing</td>
<td>Minimal—external scratch marks</td>
<td>Drill-like point</td>
<td>Thin walled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drilling</td>
<td>Neat circular perforations</td>
<td>Concentric striations; pitting</td>
<td>Handheld drill/gouger/awl</td>
<td>Medium to thick walled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammering</td>
<td>Jagged edged perforation</td>
<td>Some pitting</td>
<td>Hammerstone and robust drill piece (3-4 faces)</td>
<td>Large and thick walled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawing</td>
<td>Deep groove with long and uneven opening</td>
<td>Directional striations</td>
<td>Tool with sharp, slightly serrated edge</td>
<td>Thick walled with smooth surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratching</td>
<td>Neat/symmetrical perforations</td>
<td>Scratched furrows on surface; multidirectional striations</td>
<td>Hand-held drill/gouger/awl</td>
<td>Thin walled and rough surfaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinding/abrating</td>
<td>Larger perforation; crisp and neat edge</td>
<td>Large area of surface wear; fat area with small parallel striations that radiate out</td>
<td>Sandstone or other abrasive rock</td>
<td>Thicker and rough walled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued from Page 17)
production are present in this small area, but more analysis is needed. Over time, there is an increase in diversity in tool forms, and gravers are used later in the occupation.

Features and Shell Quantity

Some of the features analyzed provide additional information about shell production. Feature 129 was a burned circular feature filled with red clay and ash and it overlaid and extended into a midden, suggesting it dates to the second part of occupation. Compared to the other two features in this area, it contained more shell and debris, evidence of shell working, and flake tools, suggesting it was specific to shell production. Other features present include two postholes (149 and 152), although F. 152 has more shell than some other postholes. Features 180 contains more bivalve shell more tools. Both features have a lot of base cuts to the shell, suggesting specific type of production was occurring here.

Conclusion

These preliminary analyses suggest that the shell and lithic tools at the site have the potential to provide a lot of information about shell bead production during the middle Mississippian period in this region. Shell bead production began during the middle of site occupation, about the same time that ceramics at the site begin to change, combining Mississippian and Radford tempers and surface decoration. Elsewhere I have suggested this indicates a change occurred at the site in its relationship with local groups and within the site, specifically with regards to chiefly power (Meyers 2017). Shell production continued into the later part of occupation. Shell type diversity decreased, and although the same perforation techniques were used throughout site occupation, the parts of shell that are worked change over time. Lithic tools became more diverse as well. These data suggest that a preference for, or access to, diverse shell forms decreased while at the same time, lithic tool specialization increased; manufacturing techniques stayed about the same.

Some features, particularly Feature 129 and possibly Feature 180, may have been specific shell production features, based on the quantity and diversity of manufacturing techniques present. Nearby features (149 and 152) may be related to production but so far it is not clear how. Together with the other data, this suggests that certain areas were the focus of shell bead production; other areas may have been finishing areas, which would be further indicated by the presence of polishing stones or abraders. Both such items have been recovered in this area, but are still being analyzed.

This is a first and preliminary step to better understanding the multiple stages of shell bead production. This work suggests that shell bead production needs to be examined in a more exact way, in context with lithic materials used to make the beads and the shell waste debris from making the beads. Through a close analysis of production, we can get a better understanding of the social relationships that framed the production, distribution, and consumption of these items.

Additional excavations in Structure 1 to look for more evidence of shell bead production are planned for the 2017 University of Mississippi Archaeology Field School, May 30-June 24th. Interested students in the 6-credit field school can contact Maureen Meyers at memeyer1@olemiss.edu. Students interested in studying shell bead production, lithic tools, Mississippian frontier economies and exchange, and Mississippian households are encouraged to visit http://socanth.olemiss.edu for information about the 2-year funded master’s program in anthropology at the University of Mississippi.
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**Lee County Website** ([www.thel酋countystory.com](http://www.thel酋countystory.com))

Martha Grace Mize, an honors student in the Sally McDonnell Barksdale Honors College at the University of Mississippi, recently completed and successfully defended her honors thesis entitled “History and Heritage Made Accessible: the Lee County, Virginia Story.” As part of this thesis, she wrote a complete history of Lee County; conducted a survey of county residents and educators to identify what they considered important about their heritage and history, and created a website that highlights the history of the county.

This website is a new online heritage resource for the community. It contains information on local organizations supporting the project, including Wilderness Road State Park, Lee County Tourism office, J.R. Hoe and Sons, the Lee County Quilters, and the Virginia Department of Historic Resources. There are pages for each of the towns in Lee County, with space for residents to continue filling in historic information about their areas. Another section is dedicated to Lee County Quilters, and contains photos and stories about quilts passed down through families in the community. A field school blog for the archaeological excavations at the Carter Robinson site, along with information on artifacts from the site, is also included. In addition, information on proper treatment of archaeological sites, the VDHR, and the ARK resources is also present.

This project was supported in part by a 2015 COVA grant. The website will be turned over to the Wilderness Road State Park for maintenance, and local groups will have the ability to continually add to the website.
The Department of Historic Preservation at the University of Mary Washington is entering into its third year of the archaeological research program at Sherwood Forest Plantation (44ST615) in Stafford County, Virginia. Sherwood Forest was continually occupied throughout the antebellum, Civil War, and postbellum periods, and into the late 20th century—all eras that we encounter archaeologically on this stratified, multi-component site. We are still in the initial stages of surveying the property, which includes several standing historic structures such as the antebellum mansion, a framed duplex slave quarter, a brick kitchen/laundry quarter, several 19th- and 20th-century agricultural buildings, and a 1930s dairying complex.

During the school year, students in various archaeology classes spend some of their weekends at Sherwood Forest shovel testing the property, right now with a focus on the plantation's curtilage. One of our main goals in this survey is to identify the locations of antebellum outbuildings no longer standing on the landscape—particularly several slave quarters discussed in period documents and in oral history. Through the combination of the STP program during the year and test unit excavations during the summer by the annual archaeological field school, we have identified one postbellum earthfast structure and one small building with a stone foundation; neither of these are believed to be the slave quarters discussed in the primary sources. While not the buildings we were hoping for, they do contribute to our larger research goal of understanding changes to the landscape at Sherwood Forest throughout its 170 year occupation.

The largest feature we have encountered thus far is a midden associated with the Union Army encampments at Sherwood Forest from December 1862 through June 1863. The property is actively being looted by metal detectorists (including digging up several of my grid nails!); luckily, the midden has, as of yet, not been disturbed (likely due to the 1/2 foot of soil and 20th-century debris from 1930s landscaping sitting on top of the feature). As a result of the active relic hunting, a large focus of the 2016 summer field school was to excavate as much of this feature as possible, with the help of Archeological Society of Virginia volunteers and certification students. Over the past several months, five UMW students have thrown themselves into the Civil War history of Sherwood Forest and have cataloged and analyzed artifacts from this feature. Students have analyzed the ceramics, glass, buttons and other clothing items, and military artifacts from this feature. This research by students resulted in several conference papers at the 2017 Middle Atlantic Archaeological Conference in Virginia Beach, and the 2016 Archeological Society of Virginia meeting in Williamsburg, including a paper by Elyse Adams, who won the ASV student paper competition in October.

(continued on Page 22)
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(continued from Page 21) Last summer, Kara Saffos, a recent UMW graduate, began research into the African American residents at Sherwood Forest with the support of a CoVA grant. Kara conducted this research through several trips to the Library of Virginia and the Fredericksburg Circuit Court to look at birth and death records, court cases, and tax records, and by examining several decades of census records. She identified the names of 12 of the 50 enslaved individuals held in bondage by the Fitzhugh family on their Stafford County plantation in the 1860s. She also traced the histories of several postbellum tenant families. Kara was able to combine her research on the late-19th- and early-20th-century tenants at Sherwood Forest with an analysis of a 1920s-1950s trash pit feature behind the standing slave quarter excavated in 2016. The results of her study illustrate workforce and landscape changes that took place at Sherwood Forest associated with the rise of scientific agriculture in the southern United States in the 20th century. Particularly interesting, she found that there was a major shift in the race of the farm laborers from African American workers in the late-19th century/early-20th century to white workers in the 1930s/1940s when Sherwood Forest changed not only owners, but from a traditional agricultural farm to a high-tech dairying operation. Kara presented her initial results at ASV last year, and a more in-depth paper at MAAC in March 2017.

As I write this (March 2017), we are expanding our shovel testing program across the curtilage with students in the introduction to archaeology course. This summer, we will continue to explore the two buildings previously identified as well as continue to excavate the Union Army midden. We will be hosting another ASV certification field school (volunteers also welcome), in addition to the annual UMW field school (which is open to students from other institutions). Please feel free to contact me if you would like to visit the site this summer, or for additional information (lmcmi6lq@umw.edu).

Dovetail Cultural Resource Group

D. Brad Hatch and Kerry S. González

Archaeology of Enslaved People and Civil War Soldiers at Pratt Park in Stafford County, Virginia

In August 2016, Dovetail conducted archaeological excavations at John Lee Pratt Park on behalf of Stafford County. During these investigations, archaeologists uncovered and excavated a late-eighteenth-century trash pit likely associated with enslaved laborers on the Chatham plantation property as well as trash pits from a Civil War-era encampment occupied between 1862 and 1863.

Although no longer officially associated with Chatham, the land on which Pratt Park is now located was once owned by William Fitzhugh of Chatham Plantation and likely served as an agricultural field and home to enslaved laborers before becoming the temporary home to thousands of Union soldiers during the Civil War.

Hundreds of artifacts were recovered from the late-eighteenth century trash pit that provide important information on the lives of the enslaved people during the early Fitzhugh ownership of Chatham. Among these artifacts was a lead cloth, or bale, seal. These lead seals were attached to bolts of cloth starting in the Middle Ages, and perhaps as early as the Roman period, to indicate the quality of textiles (Endrei and Egan...
Generally, archaeologists in the new world have identified two types of lead cloth seals. One type of seal consisted of four sections attached by lead strips that was often used to indicate the payment of excise duties (Noël Hume 1991:269). The other, more common, type of lead seal consisted of a round loop and lug attached by a small lead strip. When used, the lugs on the seals were clamped over the loops using a tool that could impress marks into the lead. These two-part seals could have been used to indicate the payment of excise duties, but also often carried the marks of the cloth merchants.

The cloth seal recovered from the trash pit at Pratt Park is of the two-part variety, bearing the mark of cloth merchants from England. Although worn and fragmented, this cloth seal was complete enough to decipher the phrase “John and Jeremiah Naylor & Co. Wakefield,” along the loop portion (Photo 1). Additionally, the lug of the seal was marked with a sailing ship. John and Jeremiah Naylor were cloth merchants from Wakefield in West Yorkshire, England. This part of England was a major cloth producing area in the eighteenth century, and the Naylors were in operation from 1775 to 1829 (Daniels 1980:106–109). Other artifacts recovered from the trash pit suggest that this cloth seal likely dates from the first 25 years of the Naylor’s textile business.

The presence of this artifact in a trash pit associated with enslaved plantation laborers at Chatham helps to reveal the degree of access to consumer goods available to enslaved people in eighteenth-century Stafford County and the choices they made in selecting those goods. While goods, such as cloth, could have been handed down or pilfered from the manor house, it is much more likely that they were purchased by the enslaved people living at this site, perhaps from stores in nearby Fredericksburg or Falmouth. One of these stores could have been the one owned by William Allason in Falmouth, whose store ledgers indicate that he sold goods to enslaved members of the community (Martin 2008:191; Thompson 1931). Allason’s store was in operation from 1760 until the 1770s and could have been the source of the cloth represented by the lead seal.

Enslaved consumption from local stores during the late-eighteenth century was not uncommon in Virginia and much research has been conducted on enslaved consumption patterns and preferences from both archaeological and historical perspectives (Breen 2013; Heath 2004; Galle 2006; Martin 2008:173–193). Some of the most popular items purchased by enslaved people included alcohol, sweeteners, textiles, and various household goods (Heath 2004). Other artifacts from the trash pit, including a wine glass stem and a fashionable creamware plate (Photo 2), indicate that the enslaved people at Chatham had access to these types of fashionable goods and actively sought them out. The consumer engagement among the enslaved at Chatham provided them with a more active role in shaping their material lives and identities, in addition to broadening their social networks, despite their segregation and isolation on farm quarters. These often unassuming objects excavated from enslaved contexts, like the cloth seal at Pratt Park, are able to tell the stories of everyday resistance and persistence despite the horrors and oppression of slavery.

Two cathedral-style pickle bottles recovered from the Civil War-era trash pits are a fairly common type of bottle found on Civil War campsites (Photo 3). These bottles were often used to hold foods that had been preserved through drying, smoking, pickling, etc. (Society for Historical Archaeology [SHA] 2016). This process, developed by M. Nicolas Appert, began during the Napoleonic War era as a means to help the military store foods for longer periods of time (SHA 2016). Appert’s process, formalized in 1809, began with direct heat which killed the bacteria in the food. This was followed up by the installation of an airtight seal over the mouth of the vessel to avoid additional contamination. Oddly, scientists of the time, Appert included, did not fully understand how or why the process of heating and sealing of a container preserved perishables for long periods of time; they just knew it worked (SHA 2016).

(continued on Page 24)
The ornate, pint-sized bottles shown here exhibit a wide mouth, which allowed for bulky and large foods, such as pickles, to be packed and removed easily. The design of the bottle features beautiful elongated cathedral windows; it is a reflection of the Gothic Revival style en vogue during the mid-nineteenth century in America (SHA 2016). This revival not only affected the style of bottles of the time but architecture as well. Houses reflective of Gothic Revival style often feature steeply pitched roofs with a central cross gable lined with decorated vergeboards (ornate trimwork lining the roof eaves), a one-story entry or full-width porch, and windows with Gothic detailing, including drip molds, pointed arch (lancet), or false shaping (McAlester 2013:267–268). Clearly it was a popular motif and one that extended to even the most seemingly ordinary of objects—the humble pickle jar.

While two distinct and temporally specific artifact types are discussed above, the remaining assemblage from the archaeological investigations at Pratt Park is certainly noteworthy. In total, 1,372 artifacts were recovered, primarily from the late-eighteenth century trash/borrow pit and the Civil War-era trash pits. These items consist of a variety of ceramics, architectural materials and personal items such as wound headed straight pins, a knee buckle, percussion caps, and Minié balls, as well as several prehistoric artifacts including a Holmes, Halifax, and Levanna projectile points.

The archaeology conducted at Pratt Park represents over 150 years of occupation. The artifacts were used by individuals in radically different situations, but both groups faced enormous challenges in their respective traumatic times. Their artifacts directly reflect their attempts to grasp an element of normalcy and elegance in their extraordinarily tumultuous worlds.

Thomas Jefferson’s Poplar Forest

Dr. Eric Proebsting, Department of Archaeology and Landscapes

Testing the Trees of Poplar Forest

For the past three years, Poplar Forest has partnered with Rider University to explore the environmental history of the property using dendrochronology. This effort has taken place as part of the research surrounding a 2.2 mile Parkway, which will cross five of the property’s Jefferson-era fields as it makes its way across portions of the historic plantation. This collaborative research has taken place under the direction of Drs. Daniel Druckenbrod and Eric Proebsting, and has included contributions by undergraduate students from Rider University and Lynchburg College.

To date, over 100 samples have been studied, including 76 cores taken from standing trees, 28 sections taken from historic building timbers, and 2 slices saved from historic tulip poplars that were removed from the property over the past decades. An initial summary of this work was presented as a co-authored paper at last year’s annual meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology (Proebsting and Druckenbrod...
This includes evidence related to past episodes of forest succession and climatic events, which both effected and were affected by those who have lived and labored at Poplar Forest over the past 250 years.

More recently, six cores were taken from the iconic tulip poplar trees located in front of Jefferson’s retreat house (Figure 1). This includes five trees that stand on the north lawn of the house within Jefferson’s ornamental grounds. In addition, a small grove of historic tulip poplar trees was tested, which is located roughly 400ft northeast of the main house. Dating these historic trees was difficult, due to the fact that tulip poplars often become hollow at the center due to natural processes of wind and water-related damage over time. Nevertheless, results strongly suggest that these trees were saplings when the retreat was being built in the early 1800s, with the longest tree-ring record extending back as early as 1806 (Figure 2) (Druckenbrod 2017:5). This is significant, given that work began on the retreat house in this same year, suggesting that these trees could have been planted, or purposely selected for the ornamental grounds from the regrowth that may have occurred across this former agricultural field.

Future research will continue to build on these efforts to develop a detailed environmental history of the property. Efforts are currently underway to research and digitize historic land records, which includes using ArcGIS to build a spatial database of witness trees recorded on colonial land patents available for Poplar Forest and surrounding plantations. Additional trees will also be sampled and studied as construction begins on the Parkway in the months to come. This will include efforts to strengthen existing tree-ring chronologies for specific species, and continue to extend these chronologies back to the early 18th-century. Together this will allow us to gain a deeper understanding of the ecological dynamics that were present within the native forest and how these dynamics changed over the decades following colonial settlement.

References
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The Hatch site is an extremely significant Native site located in Prince George County, Virginia. Currently under the care of the federal Fish and Wildlife Service, Hatch sits on the James River National Wildlife Refuge. The site is located just south of the James on the East bank of Powell Creek, one of the river’s many smaller tributaries. This location, in a marshy area along a tidal portion of the James, presents an ideal location for fisher-foragers and hunter-gatherers to aggregate. The archaeological evidence from Hatch indicates that this was likely the case.

Extensive excavations at Hatch, led by Lefty Gregory in the 1970s and 80s, produced a wealth of information concerning the thousands of years of use by the indigenous inhabitants of the region. While Mr. Gregory took extremely careful notes and led impeccable excavations of the site’s numerous features, very little research has been done on this extremely important site. With the passing of Mr. Gregory in 2015, most of the artifacts were donated to the Virginia Department of Historic Resources. There are more than 450 boxes of artifacts and records that must be inventoried and examined so that future study can be conducted on this incredibly rich collection. Anthropology students at William and Mary, under the direction of Dr. Martin Gallivan, have digitized the field records, created a detailed context table and are in the process of making a digital map of the site and a detailed artifact inventory. Focusing our inventory efforts on the features, we have identified approximately 1,000 of them spanning the Middle Woodland period into the early Contact period.

As the digital map of the site’s features is created, their nature and relationship to each other comes into better focus. There are quite a few, and many of them overlap and intrude on others, but with careful examination, it is possible to make sense of them. Feature types include over 100 dog burials, primary human interments, and large (3-6 m. diameter) pits containing dense amounts of food remains. Additionally, there are at least three Late Woodland longhouse patterns, what appears to be a palisade ditch feature, and two early seventeenth-century earthfast structures. As inventory efforts are still in the early stages, only about five percent of the feature contexts have been completed. Among these, roughly half contained pottery types known to date to the Middle Woodland period. The other half contained large amounts of the fabric impressed, shell tempered Townsend series, a Late Woodland variety. Other Late Woodland types encountered in features include the simple stamped Roanoke and Gaston varieties. Most of the features inventoried contained a variety of ceramics. The Middle Woodland features contained abundant Mockley as well as sand- and lithic-tempered varieties. All the standard surface treatments are also represented. At least ten features contain Abbott Zoned Incised ceramic, an intricately decorated type that may have had a ritual
function. It appears that Hatch was a Middle Woodland aggregation site that became a center of mortuary ritual and ceremonial practices associated with dog burials by the Late Woodland period. For the moment, the nature of the two early colonial structures remains elusive. It is thought however, that Hatch was the location of Weyanoke Old Towne, a place where indigenous people and English colonists exchanged material culture and ideas.

While this project is still in its early stages, progress is being made and more information about Hatch becomes available every day. This is undoubtedly among the most significant sites in the Commonwealth of Virginia. The information it contains is irreplaceable and we are certainly glad that it was impeccably excavated all those years ago. Knowing that the federal government owns the land means that unexcavated portions of the site will remain preserved for future research, and now that the state owns the collection we can rest assured it will be properly cared for. The potential for future research is immeasurable. By digitizing the records and inventorying the collection at William and Mary, we hope to make it easier for future researchers to understand the deep history of Virginia Algonquians. Evidence of thousands of years of human history in the mid-Atlantic rests in boxes at DHR. The importance of this cannot be overstated.
George Washington’s Ferry Farm

Laura Galke

Extensive, block excavations at the childhood home of George Washington in Stafford Virginia are steadily revealing how the Washingtons organized their home and its surrounding yard during the mid-1700s. These excavations are supported by The George Washington Foundation, which maintains a visitor’s center with exhibits and multiple public programs on site. The Washington family homelot during father Augustine Washington’s time included a large frame structure with multiple chimneys situated upon a high bluff overlooking the Rappahannock River below. The layout of the house, and its situation on a high bluff, was deliberate. The central passage facilitated the movement of cool breezes. The house was originally constructed by the Strother family around 1728. The home was quite large for its time, placing the Washingtons in the top six percent of Virginia colonists.

George’s mother, Mary, managed this property after the death of her husband, between 1743 and 1772. Mounting evidence indicates that she participated in the region-wide paradigm - among British colonists - of constructing her landscape by appropriate English standards of organization. The Washingtons’ home and yard, a highly-visible landmark from both the Rappahannock River and the town of Fredericksburg, was a testament to the family’s success. The Virginia Gazette routinely referred to the ferry adjacent to the Washington home as the “…ferry by Mrs. Washingtons….” This indicates that this homelot represented a regional landmark, and this audience of travelers and visitors provided the family with an opportunity to showcase their understanding of how to organize the landscape and plantation.

Like many Virginians, the Washingtons were obsessed with displaying and enacting their refinement in a variety of highly visible ways. This is demonstrated by their many teawares, fancy stemwares, fine dining utensils, fashionable attire – including a variety of fashion-conscious buckles - and their commitment to wearing gentlemanly wigs (215 curlers and counting). The George Washington Foundation is currently recreating the impressive Washington home on the site where it originally stood at Ferry Farm. The Foundation hosts a variety of public events at Ferry Farm and Kenmore, including educational children’s camps, iPad tours, school programs, and theatre. For more information, visit our website at www.kenmore.org.
Monticello Department of Archaeology
Crystal L. Ptacek and Beatrix Arendt

Excavations at Monticello’s Mulberry Row Stone Stable

The Monticello archaeology field crew, led by Field Research Manager Crystal Ptacek, has made exciting discoveries in the South Pavilion and the adjacent South Wing that connects the Wing to the mansion. They have unearthed evidence that will advance our understanding of the changing design and use of these spaces and inform our new restoration and interpretation initiatives. The excavations are part of the Mountaintop Project, a multi-year effort dedicated to revealing Jefferson’s Monticello and the enslaved and free people who lived and worked there.

The South Pavilion, completed in 1770, is the oldest standing structure on the Mountaintop. It housed the original kitchen on the ground floor and served as Jefferson’s living quarters on the top floor. When Jefferson’s enslaved and free workmen completed construction of South Wing around 1809, they filled the ground-floor room with three feet of dirt so that the new floor level matched the level in the Wing. The South Wing served to house domestic and work spaces previously located along Mulberry Row. The ground-floor room in the Pavilion became a wash house. We aimed to understand these construction efforts and discern what, if any, archaeological remains had survived an initial round of restoration in the 1940s and two rounds of visitor restroom construction.

Despite Jefferson’s sketches and writings, the layout of the South Pavilion Kitchen is uncertain. One of Jefferson’s earliest sketches for the Kitchen included stew stoves and a dresser (Figure 1). Stew stoves were the 18th-century equivalent of cooktops. They were found only in the kitchens of people with economic means, social ambition, and skilled cooks needed to prepare meals influenced in the French fashion. Kitchen dressers were sideboards or tables on which food was prepared. Jefferson also drew a central fireplace and stairs in the corner opposite of the stew stoves. However, Jefferson often drew versions of his architectural ideas but never put them into practice. Thus, archaeology is uniquely positioned to confirm whether the stew stoves and dresser were installed and whether a central fireplace and stairs existed.
Our initial excavation strategy was to dig a row of five-foot quadrats across the north wall of the Pavilion to expose the original kitchen floor. We removed the modern tile floor and poured concrete subfloor of the restroom, then the fill in a series of trenches for pipes that served the restroom, then the brick and concrete subfloor that restoration architect Milton Grigg had installed in the 1940s as part of a first restoration of the space, then the fill in a large hole that Grigg had dug in the northwest corner in search of the original floor, and finally the dirt that Jefferson’s workmen had dumped into the Kitchen in 1809 (Figure 2).

We found a diverse mixture of 18th- and 19th-century artifacts in Grigg’s backfill include sherds of Chinese porcelain, rusticated canaryware, blue shell edge pearlware, yellowware, ironstone, Jackfield-type, and creamware; bone, shell, Prosser, and copper alloy buttons; green wine bottle glass; handmade brick; mortar; window glass; straight pins; a thimble; nails; beads; two bone toothbrush heads; and a slate pencil (Figures 3-5). The presence of gastroliths, small stones or pieces of ceramics swallowed by chickens to aid digestion, and large amounts of faunal material suggest Grigg brought sediment into the Pavilion from the Kitchen Yard. However, fewer artifacts are found in sediment not disturbed by Grigg’s excavations, indicating this fill came from the excavation of the South Wing which raised the ground level three feet.

Despite the modern pipe-trench intrusions, we located the remains of a fireplace in the northwest corner of the room by finding several important architectural features. Gaps in the brick wall, called racking, indicate where the chimney keyed into the wall of the Pavilion, and an angled brick shows where the arch of the fireplace rested. We also found ash, charcoal, and burned bricks in the back of the fireplace, evidence of some of the last fires that burned in the space. We discovered iron gudgeons, anchors for the iron crane from which pots would have been suspended over the fireplace, still attached to the wall of the Pavilion (Figure 6). Lastly, we found the original brick floor of the Kitchen, which is black from charcoal and 40 years of use.

Along the northern wall of the South Pavilion, we found remains of the stew stoves in the location that Jefferson sketched (Figures 7-10). Stew stoves were about waist-high, made of brick, and had a grate onto which a cook would put hot coals. On top of the grate was space for an iron trivet, which would hold a pot. While it is unclear exactly what year he installed the stoves at Monticello, Jefferson may have seen them while he was traveling abroad in France in the 1780s as well as in the Governor’s Palace in...
Williamsburg, Virginia, in the 1760s and 70s. This find is particularly exciting because these stoves represent some of the earliest stew stoves in British North America! We also confirmed that this corner is where the dresser attached to the wall. We found gaps in the plaster and slats in the brickwork where shelves connected to the wall.

The construction of the South Wing in 1808 resulted in important changes to the South Pavilion. A Wash Room replaced the Kitchen when it was moved to the newly built South Wing and the first floor of the South Pavilion was buried with three feet of fill. The original Pavilion door along the south wall was converted into a window, and the door moved to the east wall. A large window that opened to the new Dairy in the South Wing was bricked up to the left of the door. The fireplace in the northwest corner was removed and then buried, replaced by a central fireplace which served to heat kettles of water for the Wash Room.

Our archaeological work extended into the South Wing, where we investigated the space occupied by a dairy and two heated rooms occupied by enslaved domestic servants. Jefferson’s grandson Thomas Jefferson Randolph told 19th-century biographer Henry Randall that one of the rooms was home to Sally Hemings. We sought to find evidence of room partitions, dairying equipment, or subfloor pits. Unfortunately, excavations revealed that, with a couple of exceptions, any Jefferson-period features were destroyed by the installation of the men’s and women’s restrooms in the 1940s and 1960s. However, we found one of the original fireplace hearths in one of the heated rooms (Figure 12), along with a single row of bricks for the original floor.

The coolest architectural feature we discovered in the South Wing was a portion of a flight of stairs from the 1770s (Figure 13). These stairs were originally located outside of the South Pavilion and led from the Kitchen on the first level of the Pavilion up to the West Lawn. When Jefferson moved to Monticello in 1770, he occupied the upper room of the Pavilion, which was a free-standing building. The lower level was finished as a kitchen. After Jefferson moved out of the South Pavilion to the main house around 1778, the Pavilion still functioned as the kitchen, and the enslaved cooks used these steps to access the West Lawn and bring prepared food to the main house dining room. While pipes from the 1940s and 1960s intrude, many steps were found in-situ and appear to continue down to the level of the original kitchen floor. The staircase is an important architectural trace of the first Monticello.
(continued from Page 31) Stay tuned as the archaeology field and lab teams work together over the coming months to catalog and analyze the thousands of artifacts recovered in the excavations. You can follow our work on our "Archaeology at Monticello" Facebook page.

---

**Department of Historic Resources: Archaeological Archives or...**

**Adventures in Archaeology Data: Reports from the Field, er, Desk**

**Jolene Smith, Archaeology Inventory Manager**

I’ve been busy at DHR this past year regarding all things data. In August, I launched the proof-of-concept [Archaeology for Everyone](#) website, elements of which will hopefully be integrated formally into DHR web content and archival practice soon. I worked with Collections staff to create a new database for our physical inventory, including a barcoded ID for each box. Things are coming together nicely and it’s already much easier to locate and track archaeological collections in DHR’s inventory. VCRIS enhancements are ongoing, as usual. We hope to be integrating digital images into the system in the near future, so stay tuned. A focus area for me over the past year has been to learn about and develop policy and procedure for digital preservation. We’ve got thousands of digitized files in our collections here, and more are “born digital” every day. Properly curating these media and liberating the data for other researchers are top priorities. I’ve also been exploring new ways to use Virginia archaeological data to answer questions about climate change and survey priority, as well as to answer more specific research questions and understand big-picture trends in CRM archaeology over time. I’m planning a future how-to workshop on producing high quality archaeological data, so watch for more details.
Department of Historic Resources: Conservation

Katherine Ridgway, Conservator

Frequently the workload of the archaeological conservation lab is driven by requests for artifacts for research and exhibit or by artifacts arriving from a field school. This past year has been unusual in that many of the lab priorities have involved orphaned collections. When Leverette “Lefty” Gregory passed away he left behind a surfeit of artifacts and data. His attention to detail and affinity for the written record make these collections relevant and useful even decades after the sites were closed and the last trowel packed up. The Virginia Department of Historic Resources has been lucky enough to be chosen as the repository for two of these sites and their records.

First to arrive was the Hatch site (44PG0051) with over 400 boxes of artifacts and many reams of notes and maps. Found in these boxes are artifacts that were treated many decades ago and need retreatment and other artifacts that were never treated at all. It is not unusual to have a collection of so many artifacts where some are not treated due to limited time, money, or research value. It is unusual to find block lifted artifacts there were never finished being excavated. In a box of Hatch site artifacts, volunteers rehousing the collection found a turtle shell that was still associated with the dirt it was found in. Over time the shell had cracked and broken apart as it and the dirt dried. This left bits of shell in a heap around a perfectly preserved shell shaped lump of dirt (Figure 1). After many months this shell has been conserved and can now be used for research and display.

The second collection comes from the Kirby/Topping site (44YO0098), a slightly smaller, but no less interesting group of artifacts. It too has artifacts that need treatment or were treated at the time and now need retreatment. This collection also had faunal remains that were still in their original block lift. This block lift had been place in a sand bucket to make it easier and safer to transport. It only just arrived in the lab in late February and it currently awaits my attention to remove it from the block lift. The remains are of a goose skull (Figure 2) and the bones are so thin and fragile that this will likely be a long and delicate process.

Continuing with the “orphaned collection” theme, I was asked to co-author a paper for a book that the Society for Historical Archaeology is putting together. Emily Williams, Senior Archaeological Conservator for the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation asked if I might help her with an article for the book New Life for Old Collections. Our paper is entitled Balancing Access, Research, and Preservation: conservation concerns for old collections. This book will draw together articles about the value and use of orphaned archaeological collections and I have high hopes for it being very interesting and useful for all archaeological repositories and any other institution with archaeological collections. Keep an eye out for this title in the future and keep your orphaned collections in mind when you are planning research and other collections activities, they may be old, but they have a lot to offer!
Germanna

Dr. Eric Larsen, Germanna Foundation Archaeologist

Excavation Update

After 20 years of inactivity, archaeological excavations have restarted around the Enchanted Castle Site, Orange County, Virginia. The Germanna Foundation worked over the course of 2015 to stabilize the Enchanted Castle ruins. Last summer, the Foundation was able to undertake a 10 week excavation season with hopes of finding more of the 1714 Fort Germanna palisade.

A portion of what is believed to be the 1714 palisade was found in 1993. The small segment was interrupted at both ends by hyphens associated with Alexander Spotswood’s Germanna mansion. Historic descriptions of the Fort suggest it was 5 sided with each side’s length measuring 300 feet. Such a finished structure encloses 154,843 square feet or around 3.55 acres. The 2016 field season hoped to find more of the palisade and better orient the significant feature on maps.

Excavation staff included Amelia Chisholm (Asst Field Director), Marissa Kulis, Emily Lew, Rachel Manning, and Zoë Rahsman (Interns), along with the help of 9 VCU Field School Students (Figure 1). With this team, Germanna Archaeology broke new ground at the site with test units placed to the north and south of the previously identified palisade trench (Figure 2). Students participated by laying out units, stratigraphic excavation, recovery of artifacts, record keeping, and interpretation. Interns got the chance to further hone their skills and help with volunteers and students. It was an exciting start to a new phase of archaeology at the Fort Germanna/Enchanted Castle Site.

Three units were placed on the north side of Spotswood’s mansion, in the area that would have been the front yard. These units clearly showed recent disturbance. The entirety of this north yard had been significantly impacted by a septic drainage field put in place ca. 1980. The septic field was needed for a caretaker’s cabin brought to the site near the beginnings of archaeology for the Enchanted Castle. We had a record of the work from Orange County on hand, but the included sketch map for the drainage field was unclear. The archaeology has helped us clarified the extents. Unfortunately, the drain field would have destroyed or significantly obscured evidence of the 1714 palisade if it once crossed this area.

With finding the drain field, the bulk of our efforts were turned to units south of the Enchanted Castle, just beyond its Southwest Dependency. If the 1714 Fort extended this direction, we hoped we would be able to pick up the continuation of the trench. This portion of the site showed less recent impact.

In this southern excavation area, we were able to identify the edge of an agricultural field associated with the Gordon Family’s near 100 year occupation of the site. The presence and absence of plowscars suggest the Gordon’s knew the location of the Enchanted Castle ruins and shaped their fields around them. Below this plowzone, we encountered postholes, and a portion of a squared off pit feature. The postholes remain isolated finds as our sampling...
strategy to find the linear palisade trench did not account for discreet post holes. Similarly, the pit feature remains partially exposed and undefined. As we neared the end of the field season we identified a distinct context, dating to the early 18th century. In it, we recovered fragments of slate shingle that once roofed Spotswood’s mansion, wrought nails, window lead, and a good sized sherd of a crimped edged, Staffordshire slipware platter (Figure 3).

No evidence of the palisade was found in the twelve units we place to the south; however, we’ve not yet exhausted all possibilities. While we’ve not found more of the 1714 Fort, we have uncovered new details that help expand our understanding of the greater Germanna landscape.

The Germanna Foundation and Germanna Archaeology will return to the Fort Germanna/Enchanted Castle Site in 2017. Another VCU field school is scheduled for this summer. We’ll continue our attempts to find more of the Fort, but will also work to better define the features encountered last year. Our first step toward an archaeology of a greater Germanna landscape has helped us better define the resources. A better handle on the resources will help archaeologist expand the story around the Enchanted Castle.

A Request for Assistance!

Check Stamped Ceramics in Coastal Virginia

Randolph Turner

Recently, I identified two examples of Native American shell tempered check stamped sherds from test excavations just completed in the vicinity of the Adam Thoroughgood House in Virginia Beach. They were found in a context clearly dating to the Late Woodland/protohistoric periods. After more than 40 years of archaeological work in coastal Virginia I personally have seen only one other similar example, in a private collection coming from a site adjacent to the Pamunkey River and near West Point. While I am familiar with sand or sand/crushed quartz tempered check stamped sherds reported by Evans (A Ceramic Study of Virginia Archaeology, by Clifford Evans, 1955) for the Potts site in New Kent County, their context suggests a much earlier date, likely related to the Deptford check stamped ceramics found in coastal North Carolina and further south (see, e.g., Woodland Potters and Archaeological Ceramics of the North Carolina Coast, by Joseph Herbert, 2009). Plus, their temper graphically distinguishes them from the three shell tempered examples I have seen. The same is true of rare examples of check stamped ceramics from elsewhere in Virginia, from the southern piedmont into southwest Virginia.

If anyone has run across shell tempered check stamped sherds from coastal Virginia or knows of any references for such sherds for the region I would greatly appreciate hearing from you. I can be reached at erturner48@cox.net.
Jamestowne Rediscovery

Beyond the Pale

Ending a two-year excavation, the Jamestown Rediscovery team finished excavating a cellar building located on the northeast corner of the 1607 fortification. Found in 2014, the building is located on the north corner of the 1608 extension of James Fort, an area into what would eventually expand and become James Town. It is thought that the cellar – nearly seven feet deep – was excavated sometime after 1608 and was eventually filled in the second quarter of the 17th century. Although relatively (in comparison to other James Fort features) devoid of artifacts, the cellar did contain book hardware, bone dice, trade beads, and fragments of armor. The paucity of artifacts along with the military character of the artifacts supports the theory that this was a defensive structure.

Located in the bottom of the cellar was a 5-foot by 5-foot square well shaft extending an additional six feet to the water table. Like the cellar fill, there were few artifacts and the shaft appeared to have been filled in quickly and abandoned. The walls of the well were unlined and the shaft may have started to collapse threatening to compromise the integrity of the cellar and was filled in. Given the early date of the building as part of the extension, the well may be one of the earliest attempts to gain access to water by the fledgling colony.

Just south of the building, along the north side of the Memorial Church, the team (along with the 2016 UVA Summer Field Institute) conducted open area excavations with the hopes of recovering evidence of the 1617 and 1640’s churches. In this north yard of the church, the team uncovered several graves and one probable structure beneath the foundations of the 1617 church.

First Settlers

The Jamestown Rediscovery team, in partnership with the Smithsonian Institute’s forensic anthropology unit, has studied Jamestown’s inhabitants and their lifeways over the past two decades. The discovery of cannibalism, four of the founding members of the colony, and a cemetery of over thirty of the original 1607 colonists have been the focal point of research over the last decade. This past year marks a new direction for the project with the formulation of the First Settlers Project, an attempt to increase our knowledge of colonial diet and health in the first quarter of the 17th century.

Partnering with Virginia Commonwealth University’s Biological Engineering Department and Paleo Research Inc., the team hopes to understand diet and microbiome of the fledgling colony as the English adapted to their new environment. The VCU team is focusing on the plaque and dental history of the subjects, and the PRI group will be looking specifically at the microbiome of the individuals through the collection of pollen, phytolith, and analysis of proteins and lipids present in the soil or dentition of the Jamestown colonists. The results gained from the First Settlers Project will add to the continually growing data set that the team has been building since its inception in 1994.
Beyond the Pale (ale)

A tangential project that Jamestown Rediscovery is working on is a Jamestown Beer. Also in partnership with the VCU bio-engineering team, the goal is to have a beer in production by the 400th anniversary of the first legislative body that met in the Church in 1619. Yes, the development of democracy in America involved beer. When government was in session, the assembly needed beer. America’s first English brewery – NPS Structure 110 – is located only a few hundred yards from James Fort, along the edge of the Pitch and Tar Swamp, and was there to serve swelling populations when government was in town.

To make a beer, four ingredients are needed: water, malt, hops, and yeast. The recently excavated 1608 well (explained above) provided the water profile to create this historic brew. William and Mary’s Geology department has provided guidance in testing the chemistry of the Jamestown water. The results were excellent and the water is both potable and has an excellent mineral content for brewing. The JR-VCU team successfully recovered 400-year-old yeast from the site (from the well feature explained above) and wild yeast from a persimmon tree next to the reconstructed fort. The VCU labs have been isolating, propagating, and DNA sequencing the yeast strains.

To produce the beer, the group has engaged Hardywood Brewery in Richmond, VA. Hardywood has been working with VCU’s bio-engineering team and embraced the project as a challenge. Currently, three batches are in the testing phase and a full production beer is expected for the 400th anniversary in 2019.

James Madison Environmental Archaeology Lab

Dr. Carole Nash, Department of Integrated Science and Technology

Since 1999, JMU faculty and students have enjoyed a working relationship with Shenandoah National Park, under the auspices of a Memorandum of Understanding that sanctions Section 106 compliance projects, curatorial backlog projects, basic research, assistance with interpretive programs, and outreach. Over 75 students have been gainfully employed through the funds provided by SNP; in turn, course projects completed by students for course credit further leverage the funds. In 2016, projects took us to every district of the Park, on sites ranging from the Middle Archaic to the 1940s. Of note are the discovery of the remnants of a 19th century timber crib check dam (44AU0908) in Riprap Hollow (South District), possibly associated with the Crimora Manganese Mine Complex; testing at the Archaic and Woodland Meadows School Gap Site (44PA0274) with the Groundwork Urban Archaeology Corps; and primary research on the Belmont Site (44WR0442), a 19th century vineyard and winery near Dickey Ridge. Research continues into the question of spatial patterning of Native American sites in the vicinity of waterfalls.
Unearthing Artifacts of Paper—An Update on the ASV Archives and Library

Dr. E. Randolph Turner, III

Just over five years ago I volunteered to then ASV president Dan Kegley to help out in the ASV library as a retirement project. What I faced at the ASV’s Kittiewan headquarters was a library in disarray due to recent water damage, with most of the various donated materials in an adjacent attic area with even worse damage there from a leaking roof and hundreds of silverfish that seemed to thrive in the dramatic shifts in seasonal temperature from below freezing in the winter to over 100 degrees in the summer. And most critically, despite a couple of earlier and well-meaning attempts, we had no inventory of our holding, largely because of the collection’s massive size of over 10,000 items. All of this was perhaps a blessing in disguise since we could start from scratch which is just what we did.

Currently overseeing the ASV archives and library are Joey Moldenhauer, Molly Kerr, and myself. Since 2011, we have established operating procedures along with accession and deaccession policies. We have accepted major donations to the library from the Virginia Department of Historic Resources and the families of Cindy Dauses and Ed Bottoms. And we, in turn, have begun deaccessioning materials not germane to the ASV’s missions, with donations made so far to libraries at the Virginia Museum of Natural History and the University of Maryland.

The primary focus of the library is on Virginia archaeology, history, and ethnohistory, with a secondary focus on related holdings for eastern North America. The library also includes representative items for comparative purposes on archaeology and historic preservation elsewhere. Currently, our inventory includes over 5,000 entries, approximately one-half of our holdings. Virtually all Virginia items have been inventoried, with much of the remaining material (which will be completed over the upcoming three to five years) being regional newsletters and journals from across eastern North America. While we do not have regular hours, we do encourage folks to use the library by appointment.

As work progressed with the library, it quickly became apparent that though the ASV had archival material on its history, there never had been an explicit effort to establish and maintain a formal archives. That now has changed. While significant gaps exist, we are slowly collecting and inventoring records for the ASV covering all of our statewide and chapter activities. Our most prized possession are the minutes for the ASV’s first meetings dating back to 1940. The organization was then known as the Virginia Indian Relic Collectors Club with the name changed a year later to "Archaeological Society of Virginia" and with the second "a" in "Archaeological" later crossed off in pencil to change the word to the society's current spelling of "Archeological." When and how this change actually occurred is an interesting question in itself, with sadly those that could provide an answer now deceased.

(continued on Page 40)
It is precisely for that reason that we are soliciting additions to our archives, so that we don't lose more of our history as members age and die. With an inventory of exiting materials at our Kittiewan headquarters, we now know where we have gaps, whether they be in annual meeting programs, chapter newsletters, or even photographs of ASV activities. Recently, a former ASV president, Jack Hranicky, donated materials from the time of his presidency. Included were a number of photographs from the 1979 ASV annual meeting at the Lake Wright Conference Center in Norfolk, including one photo illustrated here of Mike Barber giving a presentation with Ted Reinhart seated to the left. And on a personal note, when I started my Ph.D. fieldwork in the summer of 1973, one of the first things I did was make an appointment with Howard MacCord at the Virginia State Library to introduce myself. Recently, I ran across Howard's daily calendar for his years at the State Library, and much to my pleasant surprise there was a June 21, 1973 entry "Randy Turner here." Sadly, such items are the exception, not the rule, with major gaps existing in our archives.

Recognizing such archival gaps, I ask COVA member to look through their archaeological files and photographs, and if you have any materials related to ASV activities that you might wish to donate, please let me know. I will quickly let you know in turn what we have and where our specific gaps are. And, for a copy of the most current library inventory or if you wish to set up an appointment to visit the library, feel free to contact me at erturner48@cox.net.

Prince William County Planning Office

Justin S. Patton, County Archaeologist

Prince William County recently completed the Bristoe Station and Kettle Run Battlefields Preservation Study. It is available for download at: http://www.pwcfgov.org/government/dept/planning/pages/special-planning-projects.aspx. If you want a copy of the non-ARPA version email Justin Patton at jspatton@pwcfgov.org. The purpose of this study was to document both the Bristoe Station and the Kettle Run Battlefields and recommend preservation goals and strategies. Prince William County was awarded a grant through the American Battlefield Protection Program, a division of the National Park Service (NPS), to complete this study. Both battlefields are located near the intersection of Bristow Road and the Norfolk Southern Railway tracks.
Department of Historic Resources: Archaeological Collections

Dee DeRoche, Chief Curator

The past year has been a memorable one for Collections. The number of boxes coming in has been more than four times the usual yearly average (141) submitted for care and management in perpetuity at DHR. In addition to the expected collections from Section 106 review projects investigated by CRM firms and material from our own DHR field schools, we received two large legacy collections, nearly 500 boxes from the Hatch site (44PG0051) last June and in February the Kirby/Topping (44YO0098) collection of 150 boxes.

These recent acquisitions provide much valuable information about Virginia’s past, including fresh artifacts for interpretive display and seemingly endless topics for further research. Upgrading the storage containers to archival standards and labeling of these collections are giving Certification Program students the opportunity to accrue lab hours while becoming familiar with artifacts of the Woodland, Contact, and Colonial periods. DHR staff is very grateful for this help with the necessary rehousing. We were able to offer two Lab Workshop Weeks this year, the traditional early August session and another at the end of January. This continuing partnership is advantageous to the Cert Program and to the state’s archaeological collections.

These additions have been a mixed blessing, however. Storage space is limited and creative measures are being introduced to accommodate the growing collection. A complete box inventory, begun last spring by a team of hourly workers and completed by Collections Technician Andrew Foster, identified partially filled boxes. By replacing less than full Hollingers with half-width boxes, more shelf space is being made available. Small, wheeled shelving units are being used to take advantage of oddly configured spaces and to hold over-size artifacts. We are also investigating deaccessioning possibilities for non-archaeological objects, redundant artifacts, and poorly documented collections.

Make an appointment to visit Collections soon to see these changes, offer storage solution suggestions from your experience, and discover ways to use our new and old collections to your advantage.
Dr. Clarence Geier, Retired, Department of Anthropology

I'm still retired! But in my spare time I have been pursuing a number of projects. By the time this newsletter is published in 2017 the joint COVA/ASV/VDHR publication *The Historical Archaeology of Virginia From Initial Settlement to the Present: Overview and New Directions* should be available. As editor and author/co-author of three chapters, I encourage everyone to buy at least one copy [Remember, Christmas is only 10 months away!]

Beyond that and while doing some part time teaching, I have been actively involved in trying to publish some of the more significant field projects I and my students at JMU have been involved with since 1975. This has brought back a lot of memories, good and bad, of people, places and things; and has made me feel very old when I consider the number of "kids" that worked with me who are now married and have children. [By the way for anyone interested, I have some great pictures of Mike Barber, Carole Nash, Doug Sanford and others. Many suitable for blackmail]

Two papers, one printed and one accepted by the ASV for the Quarterly Bulletin involve field work conducted at Civil War Era campsites; the first a Union camp in place in Stafford County over the winter following the Battle of Fredericksburg (published), and a second involving a small encampment of Louisiana troops dating to the winter of 1861/1863 outside of Leesburg, and following the Battle of Ball’s Bluff.

Martha McCartney and I are working on updating a field project that we were involved with in 1983/1984. Working with VDHT we were involved with the excavation of two sets of earthfast 17th-early 18th century structures constructed on the lands of Henrico Parish Glebe at Varina. While designed to support a series of clerics of the Church of England, the glebe was the initial home (1665-1694) of the Rev. James Blair who was directly involved with securing the funding and political support needed for the construction of the College of William and Mary. In 1869, while still resident on the glebe, Blair was appointed Commissary of Virginia or the head of the Anglican Church in the Commonwealth. Blair would become the first president of the new college at Williamsburg. A second cleric of note is the Rev. William Stith who served the parish from 1736 to 1751. In 1752 he was appointed the third president of the College of William and Mary. This project which has been accepted as a special publication by the ASV while centering on the excavations conducted in the mid 1980s opens the door to a significant discussion of the place of the Church of England in the settlement and politics of the emerging Virginia Colony.

(continued on Page 42)
In October 2016 (during the week of Halloween, no less), JRIA archaeologists excavated the partial remains of an unidentified young adult male in a grave under the historic St. John’s Church in the City of Richmond. St. John’s Church Foundation had contracted with JRIA to monitor excavation work associated with the replacement of the underpinning along the north wall of the ca. 1829 wing of the church (Figure 1). In the course of monitoring, JRIA archaeologists identified three unmarked human burials and a possible fourth; three small post molds which likely represented the remains of wooden grave markers; and a scaffold hole probably associated with the reconstruction of the bell tower in either 1866 or 1905 (Figure 2).

One of the burials could not be avoided by construction, so JRIA excavated the human remains under a permit issued by the Department of Historic Resources (DHR). The rounded rectangular grave shaft was approximately 4 feet deep and contained the partial skeletal remains of a white male approximately 23 to 25 years of age,

(continued from Page 41) Last, for the moment, I am continuing my interest in the mid-19th century settlement and military activity in the Shenandoah Valley. I and Dr. Joseph Whitehorne, are collaborating with the Shenandoah Valley Battlefield Foundation to create a digital book on an important military landscape south of Strasbug, Virginia, called Fisher’s Hill. The book will tie together a number of historical archaeology projects and previous historic research in discussing and illustrating the unique natural features of the area; its historic settlement of area; and the roles they jointly played in the Civil War history of the Shenandoah Valley.
according to the analysis subsequently conducted by Dr. Douglas Owsley and his colleagues in the Department of Anthropology at the National Museum of National History, Smithsonian Institution (Figure 3). The burial had been severely truncated by a 1960s foundation all the way down to the skeleton, of which two bones were mortared into the foundation wall. Evidence from the excavated portion of the grave shaft suggests that the individual was buried in a flat-lidded, hexagonal coffin constructed with at least some machine-cut, machine-headed nails, which provide a terminus post quem for the burial of 1805. The individual apparently was buried in typical English grave clothes of a shirt, sheet, and cap with a jaw strap pinned to these clothes by a series of copper alloy straight pins, several of which were recovered from the burial with more suggested by copper staining on the jaw bone. At the time of his burial, this man was wearing some form of copper alloy chain-link necklace of which one complete and one partial chain link were recovered, while others were suggested by copper staining around the bones of the upper collarbone, shoulder blades and neck.

Based on the coffin nails and the documented date of construction (verified by dendrochronology) of the extension under which the burial was located, the individual likely was interred between 1805 and 1829. Given the incomplete nature of the parish burial records, however, it is impossible to identify him with any certainty. The use of traditional English grave clothes, as well as a flat-lidded hexagonal coffin, conforms to a standard burial practice developed throughout the seventeenth century and in widespread use during the eighteenth century. The lack of evidence for clothing hardware, such as buttons, is interesting given the trend towards burial in the individual’s own clothes which emerged during the eighteenth century. Many of the notable changes in burial practices of the nineteenth century, including mass-produced coffin hardware, also appear to be absent in this burial. Overall, the characteristics of this early nineteenth-century burial are typical of much earlier burial practices.

It is likely that this young man was an individual of some status. Burial with jewelry, or any other form of grave good, is rare in English and early American burials, and chain links, in particular, were costly. The skeletal remains themselves also paint the picture of a wealthy individual. His extensive dental caries indicate a diet high in sugar, a luxury item available predominately to the wealthy. Meanwhile, the Schmorl’s nodes evident on the vertebrae, without corresponding evidence of heavy lifting in the long bones, may be attributable to extended horseback riding rather than physical labor.

As a result of this project, JRIA inventoried the archaeological component of the St. John’s Church lot as Site 44HE1189. Significantly, JRIA also recovered a modest but varied assemblage of prehistoric Native American artifacts (primarily Middle Archaic) that suggests why this area was known historically as “Indian Town Hill.”

JRIA would like to thank St. John’s Church Foundation Executive Director Sarah Whiting and Amy Swartz, Director of Programs and Preservation, for their support throughout the project. And is grateful, as always, to Joanna Wilson Green of the DHR for her timely and thoughtful assistance coordinating the burial permit. The detailed results of the project are available in JRIA’s report, which has been submitted to the DHR: Allison M. Connor, E. Randolph Turner, III, Matthew R. Laird, and Sean Romo, Archaeological Mitigation of Improvements to the 1829 Wing at St. John’s Church, Richmond, Virginia. James River Institute for Archaeology, Inc., Williamsburg, Virginia (February 2017).
The Archaeological Conservancy (www.archaeologicalconservancy.org)

David A. Brown (nope...I don’t work for them, but I believe in what they do...so I wrote this)

All of us have likely heard of The Archaeological Conservancy. We’ve seen the magazine, or come across an advertisement for one of their tours, or potentially even lead a tour or two for them. We know they do good work, preserving significant sites across the United States. If you’re lucky, you’ve also met their local representative Andy Stout, Eastern Regional Director (tac_east@verizon.net), and his co-worker and Eastern Regional Field Representative, Kelley Berliner (tac_kberliner@verizon.net). And yet you might not know that they need your help.

If you’re like me, you might wonder what you can do to help. Many of us want to see the sites that we find, and certain sites in particular, protected for future generations to study and enjoy. We may not think that we have a role to play in this, but I can tell you from personal experience that you most certainly can make a difference. And great organizations like The Archaeological Conservancy are counting on your help. So here is what you can do:

1. If you want to learn more about HOW to preserve an archaeological site, email Andy. He’s a great guy, happy to email you back and explain how the organization does things. They preserve all types of sites including historic and prehistoric, Native American, colonial European, enslaved African, fortifications, quarries, church sites, and nearly any type of site you can argue is significant. From there, you can look to the sites you care about most and ask yourself “how can I help preserve these?”

2. If you already have a site in mind, Andy and Kelley can help you with the specifics. Together, you can gather the information necessary to evaluate if the site is suitable for preservation and potential acquisition by The Archaeological Conservancy. Not every site fits their criteria, but as preservationists, they can often suggest another organization in your region that might be better suited to help...if they can’t help you directly.

3. If you don’t have a site in mind, or the time or energy to commit to finding a preserving a site, consider becoming a member of The Archaeological Conservancy. Your membership and donation does a lot of good by not only helping them acquire and preserve properties, but also share the amazing discoveries made by archaeologists across the country.

The Archaeological Conservancy has several properties they have acquired and preserved in Virginia. I was lucky enough to work with them on the preservation of an early 18th-century church site in Richmond County: The Upper Lunenberg Parish Church. I’ve also worked on the multi-component Heretick Site in the Hopewell vicinity as an undergraduate, and now that property is owned by The Archaeological Conservancy. Arguably, their most significant site preserved in Virginia to date is the Prince Edward Soapstone Quarry, which led to the donors receiving the Sherman Award in 2014 (see Page 7 of this issue).

But there are many more sites out there that are in need of preservation, and I encourage all of COVA’s members to help The Archaeological Conservancy to identify new prospects worthy of our concerted time and effort. We are all busier than we can handle, and one more task on top of everything else can seem daunting. But preserving sites is (or should be, in my opinion) one of the most important tasks we can take on as archaeologists. And if we push, and push hard, we can make a difference in preserving our shared heritage. So take a moment, that’s all I ask, and think about that amazing site you hope is never destroyed. Think about how unpredictable the future is and how tragic the loss of that site might be. And then write a quick email to Andy and ask him how you can help. It is worth your time.

Andy Stout, Eastern Regional Director
The Archaeological Conservancy
22 South Market St., Suite 2A, Frederick, MD 21701
(ph) 301.682.6359, (cell) 240.285.2617, (fax) 301.682.7073
www.americanarchaeology.org
What is Old is New Again: The 1986 Department of Historic Resources Archaeological Survey of Albemarle County, Virginia

J. Mark Wittkofski

An archaeological survey was conducted from January until August of 1986 under the direction of J. Mark Wittkofski, a staff archaeologist with the Department. The study located 74 new sites. A draft report of the findings was completed in 1986. However, most of the discovered sites were not added to the State’s archaeological inventory (VCRIS) until 2015 (nearly 30 years after the survey!). A new review of the draft report, field notes and artifacts allowed for a more thorough document to be finalized by the author in 2016.

The project was designed to investigate several large non-contiguous tracts of land and to search for previously unrecorded archaeological sites. Properties selected for investigation would be those not necessarily under immediate threat of development, but which contain suitable characteristics well suited for development.

Albemarle County was selected for this initial survey based on four reasons. First, the County was experiencing rapid growth in areas beyond the Charlottesville urban core. Second, the DHR had recently completed an intensive architectural inventory that recorded more than 1,000 resources. Third, previous archaeological investigations had left large parts of the County unstudied. And lastly, Albemarle County’s geography provided characteristics of both Piedmont and the Blue Ridge Physiographic Provinces.

The 1986 DHR archaeological survey chose to use the transect method of survey. Sample areas were selected based similar variables of elevation, slope, distance to drainage and soil permeability and productivity. However, one additional environmental variable was given equal, if not slightly greater weight in predicting moderate to high potential for site locations. That variable was the presence of a south-facing slope. According to geologist Dr. Gerald Johnson, of the College of William and Mary, for areas east of the Blue Ridge Mountains, in east-west valleys, the north-facing slope will always be steeper. Therefore, archaeological occupation sites should be more likely present on south-facing slopes since they are less steep. Also, the temperature of the soil on south-facing slopes allow for a more intense freezing and thawing which results in the rapid movement of particles (colluvium) thereby covering over some sites. And lastly, the south-facing slopes tend to have more varied vegetation with deciduous trees and deeper root systems. The north-facing slopes generally contain bushes and briars not conducive for long-term settlement (Johnson 1982: personal communication).

Therefore, it was decided to limit the archaeological survey project to:

- Three of the least investigated regions
- Large properties where permission to survey had been obtained
- Properties that contained a variety of land forms which would be representative for other areas within the County, and
- Areas that were deemed likely to contain intact and significant archaeological resources

Three large farms each with 600 or more acres were selected for the study: Hatton Grange Farm, Redlands Farm, and Bundoran Farm. These farms were non-contiguous to one another but were located within the central and southern parts of the County. The portions of Hatton Grange selected for study were bottomland/floodplain of the James River. Redlands Farm provided bottomland of the Hardware River, upper terraces, hillsides, hilltops, and ridges, saddles, small creeks and springs, and even portions of Carter Mountain. Bundoran Farm offered a gap situation between Israel Mountain and Long Arm Mountain as well as providing access to the smaller Tom Mountain, headwaters of the Hardware River, numerous springs and creeks, rolling hills and side slopes.

(continued on Page 46)
Hatton Grange is a large dairy/beef cattle farm bordering the James River in southern Albemarle County (Figures 13-14). The farm consists of a number of smaller farms that have been incorporated into a much larger property (during the 1970s). The 1986 archaeological survey was restricted to an examination of the northern bank bottomland/floodplain of the James River that extends a length of several miles. This floodplain contained many well-developed levees and terraces. Some areas displayed evidence of previous flooding such as scoured holes, erosional cuts and fills, and heavy deposits of sand and silt. Hatton Grange comprises the largest single-owner of James River property in Albemarle County. Elevations of the farm available for survey ranged from 270 feet to 300 feet above sea level.

A major flood in November 1985 caused a bit of havoc to James River floodplains and Hatton Grange was not an exception. Several large scour holes exceeding 15 feet in depth were excavated by river water. Two previously recorded sites: 44AB038 and 44AB039 showed signs of considerable flooding damage including a loss of topsoil, large scour holes and artifacts strewn on the surface.

About seven miles north was Redlands Farm near Carters Bridge, the second farm to be investigated. This property is especially significant as it has been within the same family line since the house was built in 1798. The southern and western portions of the farm border the Hardware River, at a point just above where the South and North Forks intersect. Elevations on this property range from 380 feet to 1,080 feet above sea level.

The property on which Redlands stands was granted to John Carter of Corotoman in 1730 (eldest son of Robert King Carter), and consisted of some 9,350 acres in Albemarle County. Robert Carter inherited the land his grandfather had patented and began to build Redlands some time before 1798. Both the brick and timber were prepared on site. The house’s construction shows the influence of nearby neighbor Thomas Jefferson. Robert Carter and his young bride, Mary Eliza Coles, lived in a small cottage, which has since disappeared from the landscape while the new house was being built. Carter died only one year following the completion of his home. In 1830, his widow divided the property among her four sons. The youngest son, Robert, got the Redlands residence. The Georgian house has remained in the Carter family to this day (DHR National Register Nomination form, 1968). It was hoped this farm would contain significant historical resources that might be representative of the development of an Albemarle County plantation during the latter 18th through 20th centuries. Additionally, prehistoric sites found might help better interpret settlement patterns along the Hardware River drainage.

The final property selected for survey was Bundoran Farm located near Israel Gap and north of Covesville in west-central Albemarle County and about six miles northwest of Redlands Farm. This farm was a large, working plantation, primarily oriented toward polled Hereford cattle. The farm contained more than 2,500 acres of foothills (i.e., smaller mountains), rolling hills and meadows included in the property. The headwaters of the Hardware River drain from the Israel and Long Arm Mountains that comprise the western border of Bundoran Farm. Elevations of this farm range from 700 feet to 1,420 feet above sea level.

Field investigations for the 1986 archaeological survey were divided into three separate methods: Surface Collections, Transect Shovel Test Pits Excavation, and Visual Observation, Mapping and Description.

Given that vegetation (pastures and forests) made up most of the survey properties, most of the sites found were found by the excavation of Shovel Test Pit (STPs) within transects. For this project STPs were spaced 25 meters apart in transects of areas determined to have moderate to high potential for containing archaeological sites as per the Research Design. The interval spacing for this survey was selected prior to the adoption of the DHR’s guidelines that require a maximum spacing of 20 meters. Twenty-eight of the 36 transects surveyed located previously unknown sites. All artifacts, field notes, artifact plots, maps, photographs, and associated documentation have been filed with the DHR.

A few of the surveyed sites (44AB0284 to 44AB0291) were given site numbers in the late 1980s in conjunction with an archaeological study by the College of William and Mary. Artifacts recovered by the 1986 archaeological survey were...
counted, categorized, and described by the author in 2015-16 using regional typologies and published reports as well as the Study Collection at DHR.

As noted earlier 74 sites were identified. Forty-seven were found within STPs excavated in transects. The remaining 27 sites were recorded from visual and/or surface surveys and informant interviews.

Many extensive prehistoric sites were found along the James River floodplain at Hatton Grange and include sites occupied throughout 8,000 years of prehistory. Several new sites appear to be excellent candidates for proto-historic villages and may have involved trade with Native American groups to the east, west and throughout the region. Exotic lithic materials may have been part of the trade and exchange network or simply show the existence of utilizing other non-native resources while hunting and gathering.

The prehistoric sites at Redlands Farm were primarily limited to the plow-disturbed soils. However, exciting finds related to the slave and indentured populations working at the Redlands plantation show great research potential. Six separate Slave Quarters were identified (five as ruins, one extant slightly modified and still occupied by the farm manager) as was a large slave cemetery containing at least 19 marked plots, four with inscriptions. Future research could consider the development of the plantation, spatial and temporal distributions of the material culture use and consumption, life ways of the slave population as well as later freed slaves, their use of space, diets, and the evolution of slave and vernacular architecture. In addition, historical and archaeological research into the continuous occupation by the Carter family of this historic property could reveal important information regarding the interactions among the property owners and their indentured servants as well as the evolution of the property.

At Bundoran Farm the new site discoveries will offer a chance to better understand interior prehistoric settlement patterns, subsistence, exploitation of natural resources, and trade patterns. Several of these upland sites contained buried cultural horizons, unexpected for this locality. Additional study could help unlock the answers to questions about the Native Americans who chose to live here.

This study has provided a great amount of new data concerning the archaeological resources of Albemarle County. Twenty sites found have characteristics that could result in their being determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. An additional 26 sites found appear to warrant additional testing as they might also have intact deposits and be eligible.

These new data should help to refine questions of prehistoric settlement as well as provide more information concerning the development of an historic plantation. Follow-up research looking further into these important sites will benefit not only researchers working in Albemarle County, but also will provide valuable data on prehistoric and historic sites throughout the Mid-Atlantic region. A more detailed report is planned for a future edition of the ASV’s Quarterly Bulletin.
Virginia Museum of Natural History Archaeology Lab

Dr. Elizabeth Moore, VMNH Assistant Director of Science and Curator of Archaeology

Elizabeth Moore and a dedicated corps of volunteers, interns, students, and technicians have been focusing this winter on a couple of projects that combine research and outreach. Although state budget cuts have had an impact on the museum, we continue to focus on conducting research, caring for our collections, educating the public, and finding ways to increase the accessibility of our collections and our data. I’m going to focus here on just two of the projects we’ve been tackling.

Crowdsourcing Science

With support from the Threatened Sites fund, we have been analyzing the faunal material from the Great Neck site, 44VB7. Excavations led by DHR in 2015 and 2016 yielded a diverse assemblage from a series of features that included pits, shallow basins, and a shell midden. Because all of the soils from the features were processed through flotation, the assemblage contains an impressive volume of microfauna as well as the larger materials (oyster shell, deer bone, turtle carapace, etc.) typically found on coastal sites.

One of the challenges of analyzing this material has been the sheer volume of flotation samples to be sorted; flotation of the shell midden alone yielded approximately 10 gallons of faunal material, most of it less than 5 mm in size. Many members of the Archeological Society of Virginia (ASV) expressed an interest in helping sort flotation samples but live too far away from Martinsville to participate. Our solution? Crowdsourcing Science.

When sorting the Great Neck shell midden sample, there are 20 or 30 common specimens or categories of specimens that can be readily recognized even by people who have never done this sort of work before – fish vertebra, crab claws, shells of various types, limpets, drum teeth, etc. We developed a flotation sorting kit and a process for training members of ASV chapters interested in helping with this project. Each kit contains a bag of flotation material to be sorted, a box containing identified and labeled common specimens to be used as a reference, and an assortment of bags and tags for storing sorted materials.

Elizabeth gave a presentation to each chapter interested in participating in the Crowdsourcing Science project that gave information about the site, the recent excavations, and the fauna found in the assemblage. The presentation was followed with attendees sorting material and learning about the specimens they were seeing. At the end of the evening, the chapter president took responsibility for the sample and the kit and agreed to arrange opportunities for chapter members to continue sorting the sample that
would then be returned to VMNH for incorporation into the analysis. Seven ASV chapters have participated in this project.

**Online Accessibility**

One key measure of our success at VMNH is the accessibility of our collections to others including researchers, students, and the general public. Exhibits and outreach programs are typical ways that the public accesses our collections. Researchers visit the collections, both the archaeological assemblages and the zooarchaeology reference collection of modern skeletons used for making identifications.

While working with the Great Neck assemblage this year, it was clear that this assemblage contains a lot of items that many archaeologists rarely see or, when they do see them, cannot identify. As a way of making our collections more accessible to all of our audiences combined with creating a tool that other archaeologists could use to assist with faunal identifications, we have created a new website at www.vmnharchaeology.org.

In addition to information about the museum and some of our upcoming events, the site contains photographs of selected specimens from archaeological assemblages. Right now, there are only two sites represented but there will be more to come. There are several very good web sites that have images of bones, both 2D and 3D, to aid with identification. Our intent is not to duplicate those efforts, but rather provide images of specimens that are rarely seen on other web sites, or that are more common in archaeological sites in the Middle Atlantic region and therefore of use to regional archaeologists. While there is no replacement for a reference collection of skeletal material when making bone identifications, photographs can at least give you an idea of what you have before you visit a collection to make final identifications.

One of the great things about being part of a natural history museum is having access to a variety of collections other than those in your own department. Prior to his passing, our invertebrate curator, Dr. Richard Hoffman, helped me assemble a set of freshwater molluscs found in Virginia to aid with identifications. This set includes at least one of each of the bivalve species from the state and a subset of the gastropods. Kathy Fell, one of our dedicated volunteers, photographed a specimen from each of those species and that set of photographs is on the web site. Many archaeologists are familiar with two or three specimens of freshwater mussels but there are actually dozens. No you can visit our website and see what they are.
Chris Egghart

Analysis of the Robert Ogle Projectile Point Collection

The Robert Ogle Collection was compiled from surface sites along the Nottoway River Fall Zone in Sussex County, Virginia. Excluding triangles, the collection contains over 3,000 identifiable projectile points. The majority were recovered from five large sites in the vicinity of Nottoway River-Stony Creek confluence. Mr. Ogle carefully recorded the location where points were found and segregated them accordingly, thus providing opportunity for meaningful archaeological analyses. While residing in Maryland, Robert Ogle donated his collection to the Anne Arundel County, Lost Towns Project. It was subsequently transferred to the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR).

A number of different analytical approaches were engaged in study of the collection. Frequency distributions of diagnostic point types were charted against the physical and environmental site settings to reveal settlement shifts or potential changing resource focus through time. An unexpected finding was the presence of types characteristic of the Northeast. This is seen as evidence for in-migration to the Carolina Sounds region. The analyses also revealed highly differential occurrence of temporally overlapping point types. This raises the specter of contemporaneous, yet culturally distinct groups avoiding another’s occupation sites while vying for the rich but geographically constrained resources of the Nottoway River Fall Zone. Full analysis and discussion of settlement data evidenced in the collection has recently been published in the ASV Quarterly Bulletin 71:2 (Egghart and Manson 2016).

Another approach used time-weighted point counts as proxies for relative population during the Archaic period. The first half of the Middle Archaic showed a significant decline in time-weighted point counts in relation to the Early Archaic. The second half of the Middle Archaic exhibited an explosive, six-fold increase. The rise in time-weighted point counts for the Late Archaic was modest by comparison. Full results of the population study appear in the Journal of Middle Archaic Archaeology Vol. 32 (Egghart 2016).

An effort is underway to utilize part of the Ogle inventory as a reference collection at VDHR. Present in the collection are 41 previously described projectile point types. Nomenclature and type definition is fully aligned with the point descriptions on the VDHR website (Egloff 2016). Plans call for a representative sample (10-12) of each type to be kept in open top, five by five-inch archival specimen boxes. A total of 50 open top boxes will be housed in a single artifact drawer, allowing for easy access by interested researchers. Rather than displaying the most visually appealing specimens, the intent is to show the full size range, morphological variation, lithic preference, and patterns of rejuvenation/reuse exhibited by each type. Also accessible in the reference collection will be full representative samples of tool forms, lithic specimens, as well as unique and special finds. Interested parties not familiar Virginia material culture will have an opportunity to learn to identifying specific types. A single box will contain representative specimens typifying each point type in the collection. These can be examined practice typed while being compared to the reference collection assemblages.

Although the Ogle Collection has a Carolina Sounds Drainage provenance, the wide range of regional and extra-regional types found within make it directly relevant to the archaeological study not just of southeast Virginia and southern Piedmont but also most of Virginia east of the Blue Ridge.
Egghart, C. P.  

Egghart, C.P. and C. N. Manson  

Egloff, K.T.  

**Virginia Department of Historic Resources**

**Mark Freeman, Stories Past**

*New Native American Ceramics Module available through the DHR website*

During the past 100 years more than sixty Native American ceramic wares have been defined for Virginia. These ceramic wares are routinely used by lay people and researchers alike in Virginia and surrounding states. Based on extensive research by Keith Egloff, and developed by Mark Freeman, a new Native American Ceramics module will soon be available through the Virginia Department of Historic Resource Archaeology page (http://dhr.virginia.gov/arch_DHR/archaeo_index.htm). Similar in scope to the existing Projectile Points and Lithic Types (http://www.dhr.virginia.gov/arch_DHR/archaeo_lpc.htm) the module presents information on chronology, distribution, decoration and morphology, as well as a discussion on where the type shows up in the literature. Users of the module can sort by region (Coastal Plain, Piedmont, Shenandoah, and Southwest Virginia), time period (Early Woodland, Middle Woodland, Late Woodland, and European Contact), temper and surface decoration. Each type has a number of images, including profile views. The module is created entirely in HTML and should be viewable on all devices.
The three websites pictured here were created by COVA members with your research needs in mind. Not only do they deal with three of the most fascinating objects in any archaeological assemblage, but they incorporate crowdsourcing to take that fascination and to build a community of contributors. Each site (see their web address in the search bar above each) provides a great introduction to what we know about the objects in general, a newsletter that disseminates new information (so you don’t have to keep going back to the site to see what’s different), and a searchable database that you can use and cite. One of the most useful parts of these sites are the maps that highlight where the objects were found. Spatial data is key to understanding how these objects were made, used, traded, and discarded throughout human history, and each new contributor (that’s you!) can add to the conversation, making this a “living” database.
On October 15, 2016 the Jamestown-Yorktown Foundation opened the American Revolution Museum at Yorktown. This is a much larger and completely rethought successor to the old Yorktown Victory Center. Archaeology played an important part in developing the story line of the gallery and guided our selection of artifacts to display. Archaeological artifacts comprise over 15% of all of the artifacts on exhibit there. Nearly all these artifacts were drawn from the DHR collection, and we want to thank the staff of DHR for all of the help they have given us on this project. The “Betsy” Yorktown shipwreck artifacts form the largest single group of DHR artifacts on display, and we have re-housed them in ways that make them much more visible than they were in the past. As might be expected, our section on slavery is full of artifacts from Virginia sites. Here is a picture of some of them on display with the Foundation’s portrait of Ayuba Suleiman Diallo, who was enslaved in Maryland during the colonial era.
COVA GRANTS 2018

For Preservation, Public Education, and Research

For a ninth year we are soliciting members to submit proposals for projects to be considered for funding under the COVA grant program. Project topics must fall within one of the three main categories that traditionally have made up the core of COVA’s mandate: Preservation, Public Education, and Research. Projects that have as broad a reach as possible (i.e. are aimed more at state-wide issues rather than focusing on site-specific activities) are strongly encouraged. The membership is anticipated to authorize the expenditure of up to $1000 total in 2018, with a maximum award of $500 to any individual applicant. The review process is competitive, and COVA reserves the right to award less than the allotted amount.

To apply, submit a 2-3 page prospectus, to include the names and specific qualifications of the project participants, a complete budget, proposed work schedule, and detailed portrayal of the final product and its value to Virginia archaeology. To qualify, the project must be led by a full COVA member in good standing at the time the application is submitted. COVA grant monies need not be the sole source of funding for projects.

The deadline for receiving proposals is in April each year. The successful applicant(s) will be announced via the COVA email list shortly thereafter.

After completion of the project, the recipient will present their findings at the next COVA meeting outlining their project, findings, and the impact of the COVA grant on the project. Attach the proposal to an e-mail addressed to: Derek Wheeler, Chair, COVA Budget Committee, dwheeler@monticello.org.

Grant awards by year, recipient, and project title

2011
Charles Niel Manson - Page Valley Jasper Survey
Christopher Shephard - The Gingaskin Archaeological Survey

2012 - No grants given.

2013
Randy Lichtenberger/Keith Adams - Mead’s Tavern Artifact Analysis
Bernard Means - Virtual Zooarchaeology of Virginia
Charles Niel Manson - Research on Bone Shuckers found on shell midden sites

2014 - No grants given.

2015
Ellen Chapman - Rehabilitating the Virginia State Penitentiary Archive
Maureen Meyers/ Nikki Matson - Archaeology Education Outreach in Southwestern Virginia
Maureen Meyers/ Martha Grace Lowry Mize - Virtual Ecomuseum in Lee County

2016
Lauren K. McMillan - Genealogical Research in Preparation for Oral History Interviews for the Sherwood Forest Plantation Project

2017
Ellen Chapman - transcribing 35 interviews from mainly Richmond archaeologists, museum professionals, preservationists, and “truthful history activists.”
Martha Grace Lowry Mize, under the supervision of Maureen Meyers—for web site hosting fees for theleecountystory.com.
To: COVA and its membership Date: November 20, 2017

From: David Brown, Newsletter Editor,
      The Fairfield Foundation (dave@fairfieldfoundation.org)

Subject: Editing these newsletters

On the occasion of this, my final newsletter, reaching publication I thought it appropriate to pass along a few thoughts on my tenure as editor and some encouragement for future editors. I’d like to make this next part both humorous and poignant, but I’ll settle for it being useful - either as a guide to avoid pitfalls, or a warning against taking this position in the first place (my apologies to the next editor: Eric Proebsting).

First - the obvious. The newsletter is an important way to disseminate information from COVA to its membership. I selfishly took on the editor’s role because I wanted the excuse that I could reach out to archaeologists across Virginia and ask them to send me summaries of their work. I’d have the chance to read it all, perhaps see a few things before anyone else did, and geek out about how many new and interesting things we were all discovering. What I realize now, as we look to our various social media platforms, that are far more efficient at communicating this information to others (at least short-form information), is that the newsletter is also an important archive of the work our organizations do and a time capsule of sorts, highlighting our research interests and the way we embrace (or sometimes push aside) the most pressing themes of the moment. As an historian, I wonder what someone might say about us a century from now as they read this. As an anthropologist, I wonder how we might reflect on this idea and make the most of this moment.

Next - a quick comment or three on “the process.” I’ve learned a few very important lessons as editor and I don’t think these are going to change anytime soon.

1. If you send a single email to the entirety of the COVA membership asking them to submit their current research for inclusion, you will average a 5%-10% return. If you send a single email to each member, even if it is the same text with only the greeting changed, you will get an 80%-85% return. Don’t over think this...just bite the bullet and accept it.

2. There are upwards of 27 individual research updates in this issue. A few are devoid of images, most have 2-4, and some had between 10 and 15. Variation is good. Don’t sweat the disparity, but rather embrace the fact that the easier it is to get them to submit, the better it is for everyone.

3. Holy Crap there are more than 27 individual research updates in this issue. You wonder why it takes so long to get this newsletter put together? That’s one, very significant reason. Maybe don’t push so hard to get those last five updates and just get the newsletter off to the proverbial presses a little sooner. Nobody is keeping track of these things.....there are no records to be broken or trophies to be handed out at the end of your tenure.

Lastly, the newsletter should reflect you. I’d like to think that the contributions from others will ultimately reflect the overall state of COVA. But this should also be a reflection of the editor, at least in the little ways. So, take me for example. I’d like to think that I’m well intentioned, desirous of including as many viewpoints and as much information as possible, and I appreciate having a platform to express myself. I am also my own worst enemy. I’m tragically late, obsessive about details, and think that everyone should read this front to back, chapter and verse. I accept these things, I am proud of these things, and while I have enjoyed being editor, I’m even more excited to see how Eric and the newsletter editors that follow put their own spin on this.

Sincerely, Dr. David A. Brown
Attend CoVA’s Meetings!

The **Winter** meeting will be held in Falls Church (Fairfax County) on February 16th. The Spring meeting will be held in Gloucester at the Center for Archaeology, Preservation and Education (the CAPE!) on May 18th. Please mark your calendars and check [cova-inc.org](http://cova-inc.org) for information on the details.

### CALENDAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 16, 2018</td>
<td>COVA WINTER MEETING—Falls Church, VA</td>
<td>cova-inc.org</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 18, 2018</td>
<td>COVA SPRING MEETING—Gloucester, VA</td>
<td>cova-inc.org</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 2018</td>
<td>COVA SUMMER MEETING—TBD, VA</td>
<td>cova-inc.org</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 10-12, 2017</td>
<td>CNEHA ANNUAL MEETING— Portsmouth, NH</td>
<td>Cneha.org</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 2018</td>
<td>CNEHA ANNUAL MEETING— TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 8-11, 2017</td>
<td>SEAC ANNUAL MEETING—Tulsa, OK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 14-17, 2018</td>
<td>SEAC ANNUAL MEETING—Augusta, GA</td>
<td>southeasternarchaeology.org</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 29-December 3, 2017</td>
<td>AAA ANNUAL MEETING— Washington D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 14-18, 2018</td>
<td>AAA ANNUAL MEETING— San Jose, CA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.americananthro.org/AttendEvents/">http://www.americananthro.org/AttendEvents/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 3-6, 2018</td>
<td>SHA ANNUAL MEETING—New Orleans, LA</td>
<td>sha.org</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 16-18, 2018</td>
<td>MAAC ANNUAL MEETING— Virginia Beach, VA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.maaemidatlanticarchaeology.org/">http://www.maaemidatlanticarchaeology.org/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11-15, 2018</td>
<td>SAA ANNUAL MEETING— Washington D.C.</td>
<td>saa.org</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 2018</td>
<td>ASV ANNUAL MEETING—TBD, VA</td>
<td>asv-archeology.org</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1-4, 2018</td>
<td>ESAF ANNUAL MEETING—Watertown, NY</td>
<td>esaf-archeology.org</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Virginia Archaeologist is published twice a year in the spring and fall. The success of this publication depends on contributions from Virginia’s archaeological community. Deadline for submissions for the Fall issue is September 30 and the Spring issue is April 30. Please send news items, announcements, publications/book reviews or current research to: [eric@poplarforest.org](mailto:eric@poplarforest.org)

Thank You