AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY FOR THE PROPOSED KY 378 BRIDGE REPLACEMENT OVER FROZEN CREEK IN BREATHITT COUNTY, KENTUCKY (ITEM NO. 10-1110.00)





by Thomas H. McAlpine, Jr., RPA 989402 and Alexandra D. Bybee, RPA 11813

Prepared for



Prepared by



Kentucky Vest Virginia Wyoming Indiana Louisiana Tennessee Virginia

Contract Publication Series 17-509

AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY FOR THE PROPOSED KY 378 BRIDGE REPLACEMENT OVER FROZEN CREEK IN BREATHITT COUNTY, KENTUCKY (ITEM NO. 10-1110.00)

by Thomas H. McAlpine, Jr., RPA 989402 and Alexandra D. Bybee, RPA 11813

With a contribution by Heather D. Barras

Prepared for

Danny Peake, Assistant Director Kentucky Transportation Cabinet 200 Mero Street Frankfort, Kentucky 40622 Phone: (502) 564-7250 Fax: (502) 564-5655

Prepared by

Cultural Resource Analysts, Inc. 151 Walton Avenue Lexington, Kentucky 40508 Phone: (859) 252-4737 Fax: (859) 254-3747 Email: cmniquette@crai-ky.com CRA Project No.: K17K029

Charles M. Niquette, RPA 10710 Co-Principal Investigator

Alexander The

Alexandra D. Bybee, RPA 11813 Co-Principal Investigator

February 9, 2018

Lead Agency: Federal Highway Administration Kentucky Transportation Cabinet Item No.: 10-1110.00 Statewide Contract No.: PON2 1600003838, Letter Agreement No.: 2016-9-6 OSA Project Registration No.: FY18_9472

ABSTRACT

On January 15, 2018, Cultural Resource Analysts, Inc., personnel conducted an archaeological survey for the proposed KY 378 bridge replacement over Frozen Creek in Breathitt County, Kentucky (Item No. 10-1110.00). The survey was conducted at the request of David Waldner of the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet. The entire project area, which is approximately 1.1 ha (2.7 acres) in size, was subjected to intensive pedestrian survey supplemented with screened shovel testing and bucket auguring.

Prior to the survey, a records review was conducted at the Office of State Archaeology. The review indicated that two previous professional archaeological surveys had been conducted, and one archaeological site had been recorded, within 2.0 km (1.2 mi) of the project area. Neither of the survey areas or the site was located within the current project area. The current survey resulted in the identification of two historic isolated finds and a rock retaining wall. Neither of the isolated finds or the rock retaining wall are recommended for further work or inclusion onto the National Register of Historic Places. No archaeological sites listed on, or eligible for inclusion onto, the National Register of Historic Places will be affected by the proposed construction; therefore, archaeological clearance is recommended.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	I
LIST OF FIGURES	
LIST OF TABLES	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT AREA	4
III. PREVIOUS RESEARCH	9
IV. METHODS	13
V. RESULTS	14
VI. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND TREATMENT	15
REFERENCES CITED	16

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Map of Kentucky showing the location of Breathitt County.	1
Figure 2. Location of project area on topographic quadrangle	2
Figure 3. Project area plan map	3
Figure 4. Grass covered field, facing southwest.	4
Figure 5. Slope and manufactured rock-outcrop at south end of project area, facing southwest	5
Figure 6. Rock retaining wall and house at north end of project area, facing north.	5
Figure 7. Bridge replacement construction plans showing location of rock retaining wall.	6
Figure 8. 1941 map depicting MS 1.	11
Figure 9. 1951 map depicting MS 1–3.	12
Figure 10. Location of MS 2 and 3, facing southeast.	13
Figure 11. Overview of IF 1, facing northeast.	15
Figure 12. Overview of IF 2, facing southwest.	16

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Summary of Selected Information for Previously Recorded Archaeological Sites in Breathitt County,	
Kentucky. Data Obtained from OSA and May Contain Coding Errors.	10

I. INTRODUCTION

n January 15, 2018, Cultural Resource Analysts, Inc. (CRA), personnel conducted an archaeological survey for the proposed KY 378 bridge replacement over Frozen Creek in Breathitt County, Kentucky (Item No. 10-1110.00) (Figure 1). The survey was conducted at the request of David Waldner of the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC). Thomas H. McAlpine, Jr. and Karen Clark conducted the survey, which required 20 work hours to complete. Office of State Archaeology (OSA) Geographic Information Systems (GIS) data was requested by CRA on December 11, 2017, and was returned on December 22, 2017. The results were researched by Heather D. Barras of CRA at the OSA on January 10, 2018. The OSA project registration number is FY18 9472.



Figure 1. Map of Kentucky showing the location of Breathitt County.

Project Description

This is a federally funded project to replace the bridge over Frozen Creek in the community of Sewell (Figures 2 and 3). The new bridge will be constructed on a new alignment west of the existing bridge. The entire project area is approximately 1.1 ha (2.7 acres) in size.

Purpose of Study

This study was conducted to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. This transportation project is federally funded, and therefore considered an undertaking subject to Section 106 review. The purpose of this survey was to assess any potential effects the construction might have on identified cultural resources. To do this, we followed these objectives:

- identify prehistoric and historic archaeological sites located within the project area
- determine, to the extent possible, the age and cultural affiliation of sites
- establish the vertical and horizontal boundaries of sites
- establish the degree of site integrity and potential for intact cultural deposits to be present.

For the purposes of this assessment, a site was defined as "any location where human behavior has resulted in the deposition of artifacts, or other evidence of purposive behavior at least 50 years of age" (Sanders 2006:2).

The following is a description of the project area, previous research of the area, field and laboratory methods, materials recovered, and results of this study. It conforms to the *Specifications for Conducting Fieldwork and Preparing Cultural Resource Assessment Reports* (Sanders 2006). All cultural materials, field notes, records, and photographs will be curated at CRA.

Summary of Findings

Prior to the survey, a records review was conducted at the OSA. The review indicated that two previous professional archaeological surveys had been conducted, and one archaeological site had been recorded, within 2.0 km (1.2 mi) of the project area. Neither of the survey areas nor the site were located within the current project area.

The entire project area was subjected to intensive pedestrian survey supplemented with screened shovel testing and bucket auguring. As a result of the survey, two historic isolated finds (IF 1 and 2) and a rock retaining wall were recorded. Neither of the isolated finds or the rock retaining wall are recommended for further work or inclusion onto the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). No archaeological sites listed on, or eligible for inclusion onto, the NRHP will be affected by the proposed construction; therefore, archaeological clearance is recommended.



Figure 2. Location of project area on topographic quadrangle.



Figure 3. Project area plan map.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT AREA

The project area is located along KY 378, approximately 1.12 km (.70 mi) north KY 1812 (see Figures 2 and 3). It is approximately 1.1 ha (2.7 acres) in size. Elevations in the project area range from 219 m (720 ft) above mean sea level (AMSL) along Frozen Creek to approximately 244 m (800 ft) AMSL at the highest point of the slope south of Frozen Creek. The Kentucky River and its tributaries drain the project area.

The project area consisted mostly of grass fields (Figure 4). The various grasses completely covered the ground surface, providing no visibility. Recent snowfall covered the grass. At the south and north edges of the project area was steep slope and a manufactured rock-outcrop

from road construction (Figure 5). Frozen Creek extended through the south end of the project area. Within the project area, at the north edge, was a rock retaining wall (Figure 6). It was made from rectangular pieces of cut sandstone, and measured approximately 1 m (3 ft) in height (five courses) and approximately 22 m (72 ft) in length. In the center of the wall was a wooden staircase with cut sandstone along the sides. The retaining wall was associated with the house outside the project area that will be discussed in Section 3 as Map Structure (MS) 1. As the house is older than 50 years, it is possible that the rock retaining wall is older than 50 years. Based on the construction plans provided by the client (Figure 7), the wall will not be affected by the bridge replacement.

Portions of the project area had been disturbed previously through the road and driveway construction. Placement of a water line along KY 378 also contributed to disturbance.



Figure 4. Grass covered field, facing southwest.



Figure 5. Slope and manufactured rock-outcrop at south end of project area, facing southwest.



Figure 6. Rock retaining wall and house at north end of project area, facing north.



Figure 7. Bridge replacement construction plans showing location of rock retaining wall.

One soil series (Grigsby) and two soil complexes (Shelocta-Gilpin-Kimper and Shelocta-Handshoe-Fedscreek) have been mapped in the project area. The soil series are classified by the amount of time it has taken them to form and the landscape position they are found on (Birkeland 1984; Soil Survey Staff 1999). This information can provide a relative age of the soils and can express the potential for buried archaeological deposits within them (Stafford 2004). The soil order and group classifications for each soil series are used to assist with determining this potential.

The Grigsby series consists of very deep, well drained soils that formed in mixed alluvium on floodplains. They are found on low stream terraces, floodplains, natural levees, and the tread and riser landforms adjacent to major streams and rivers. A typical Grigsby profile shows an Ap horizon of brown (10YR 4/3) loam extending to 18 cm (7 in) below ground surface (bgs). Below that is a Bw1 horizon of dark yellowish brown (10YR 4/4) loam with few pebbles, coal fragments, and sandstone and siltstone fragments extending to 94 cm (37 in) bgs. Below that is a Bw2 horizon of dark yellowish brown (10YR 4/4) loam with few sandstone fragments extending to 122 cm (48 in) bgs. Below that is a C horizon of dark yellowish brown (10YR 4/4) fine sandy loam with thin light yellowish brown (10YR 6/4) strata of loamy fine sand extending to 152 cm (60 in) bgs (Soil Survey Staff 2018). The Grigsby series is classified as an Inceptisol, which mav have deeplv buried/intact archaeological deposits, depending on the landform on which they formed (Soil Survey Staff 1999).

The Shelocta-Gilpin-Kimper complex is made from an indistinguishable mixing of the Shelocta, Gilpin, and Kimper soil series. The Shelocta series consists of deep and very deep, well drained soils formed in mixed colluvium and residuum from shale, siltstone, and sandstone. They are found on gently sloping to very steep upland areas, footslopes, and benches. A typical Shelocta profile shows an Ap horizon of dark grayish brown (10YR 4/2) silt loam with 5 percent rock fragments extending to 25 cm (10 in) bgs. Below that is a Bt1 horizon of yellowish brown (10YR 5/6) silt loam with 10 percent rock

fragments extending to 51 cm (20 in) bgs (Soil Survey Staff 2018). The Shelocta series is classified as an Ultisol, which only has archaeological deposits on or near the ground surface (Soil Survey Staff 1999). The Gilpin series consists of moderately deep, well drained soils that formed from residuum from interbedded gray and brown acid siltstone, shale, and sandstone. They are found on the summit, shoulder, or backslope of upland hills. A typical Gilpin profile shows an Ap horizon of dark gravish brown (10YR 4/2) channery silt loam with 20 percent fragments of siltstone and shale extending to 20 cm (8 in) bgs. Below that is a Bt1 horizon of vellowish brown (10YR 5/4) channery silt loam with 25 percent fragments of siltstone and shale extending to 33 cm (13 in) bgs. Below that is a Bt2 horizon of yellowish brown (10YR 5/6) channery silt loam with 30 percent fragments of siltstone and shale extending to 61 cm (24 in) bgs (Soil Survey Staff 2018). The Gilpin series is classified as an Ultisol, which only has archaeological deposits on or near the ground surface (Soil Survey Staff 1999). The Kimper series consists of deep and very deep, well drained soils that formed in loamy colluvium or colluvium and residuum weathered from sandstone, siltstone, and shale. They are found in coves and on footslopes and benches of mountainsides. A typical Kimper profile shows an A horizon of very dark brown (10YR 2/2) very channery loam with 40 percent sandstone fragments extending to 20 cm (8 in) bgs. Below that is a BA horizon of brown (10YR 4/3) channery loam with 30 percent sandstone fragments extending to 33 cm (13 in) bgs. Below that is a Bw1 horizon of yellowish brown (10YR 5/4) channery loam with 25 percent sandstone fragments extending to 69 cm (27 in) bgs (Soil Survey Staff 2018). The Kimper series is classified as an Inceptisol, which may have deeply buried/intact archaeological deposits, depending on the landform on which they formed (Soil Survey Staff 1999).

The Shelocta-Handshoe-Fedscreek complex is made from an indistinguishable mixing of the Shelocta, Handshoe, and Fedscreek soil series. The Handshoe series consists of very deep, well drained soils that formed from sandstone, shale, and siltstone colluvium. They are found on the sideslopes or headslopes of mountains. A typical Handshoe profile shows an Oi horizon of slightly decomposed hardwood leaf litter extending to 5 cm (2 in) bgs. Below that is an A horizon of dark gravish brown (10YR 4/2) very channery loam with 45 percent sandstone channers extending to 23 cm (9 in) bgs. Below that is an E horizon of vellowish brown (10YR 5/4) very channery loam with 35 percent sandstone channers extending to 41 cm (16 in) bgs. Below that is a Bw1 horizon of yellowish brown (10YR 5/6) very channery sandy loam with 40 percent sandstone channers and 20 percent sandstone flagstones extending to 86 cm (34 in) bgs (Soil Survey Staff 2018). The Handshoe series is classified as an Inceptisol, have deeply buried/intact which may archaeological deposits, depending on the landform on which they formed (Soil Survey Staff 1999). The Fedscreek series consists of deep and very deep, well drained soils that formed from sandstone and siltstone colluvium. They are found on the backslopes, footslopes, and toeslopes of hills and mountains. A typical Fedscreek profile shows an Oi horizon of slightly decomposed hardwood leaf litter extending to 3 cm (1 in) bgs. Below that is a BA horizon of brown (10YR 4/3) channery loam with 15 percent sandstone fragments extending to 13 cm (5 in) bgs. Below that is a BA horizon of yellowish brown (10YR 5/4) channery silt loam with 15 percent sandstone fragments extending to 23 cm (9 in) bgs. Below that is a Bw1 horizon of vellowish brown (10YR 5/6) channery loam with 15 percent sandstone fragments extending to 43 cm (17 in) bgs. Below that is a Bw2 horizon of vellowish brown (10YR 5/6) channery loam with 20 percent sandstone fragments extending to 79 cm (31 in) bgs (Soil Survey Staff 2018). The Fedscreek series is classified as an Inceptisol, which may have deeply buried/intact archaeological deposits, depending on the landform on which they formed (Soil Survey Staff 1999).

Shovel tests were only excavated in the areas mapped as Grigsby soils, as the areas mapped as the soil complexes were sloped and heavily disturbed by road construction. Three shovel test soil profiles were recorded. The first profile showed a brown (10YR 4/3) sandy loam extending to 24 cm (9 in), overlaying a light yellowish brown (2.5Y6/3) sandy clay loam with iron inclusions. The second profile showed a light olive brown (2.5Y 5/3) sandy loam with iron, sandstone, and coal inclusions to at least 50 cm (20 in) bgs. The third profile showed a brown (10YR 5/3) sandy loam with sandstone fragments that extended to 43 cm (17 in) bgs, overlaying a yellowish brown (10YR 5/4) sandy loam. Though there are some similarities (i.e., 10YR 4/3, Zone I in the first profile; sandstone and coal fragments found in most shovel tests), none of the recorded profiles are consistent with the Grigsby series. The area has likely been impacted by historic and modern alluvium and road construction. Historic artifacts were found in two of the shovel tests.

Two bucket augers (BA) were also excavated in the areas mapped as Grigsby soils. The profile for BA 1 displayed three zones. Zone I was a dark vellowish brown (10YR 4/6) sand that extended to 40 cm (16 in) bgs. Zone II was a dark yellowish brown (10YR 4/6) sandy clay loam that extended to 50 cm (20 in) bgs. Zone III was a dark yellowish brown (10YR 4/6) sand that was terminated at 110 cm (43 in) bgs. BA 1 was terminated because it was deep into a high energy depositional horizon, with little chance of finding in-situ cultural material. The profile for BA 2 displayed four zones. Zone I was a yellowish brown (10YR 5/4) sand with sandstone and coal fragments that extended to 30 cm (12 in) bgs. Zone II was a brown (10YR 5/4) clay loam that extended to 90 cm (35 in) bgs. Zone III was a dark yellowish brown (10YR 4/4) sandy clay loam with many fine light brownish grav (2.5Y 6/2)mottles and charcoal flecking that extended to 110 cm (43 in) bgs. Zone IV was a yellowish brown (10YR 4/4) sandy clay loam with many medium light brownish gray (2.5Y 6/2) mottles and an increase in sand content that was terminated at the water able at 130 cm (51 in) bgs. BA 2 is more consistent with the Grigsby series than the other profiles, though the soils observed in the bucket augers had been disturbed by historic and modern alluvium. No artifacts were found in the bucket augers.

III. PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Drior to initiating fieldwork, a search of records maintained by the NRHP (available online at: http://nrhp.focus.nps.gov/natreghome.do?searcht ype=natreghome) and the OSA (FY18 9472) was conducted to: 1) determine if the project area had been previously surveyed for archaeological resources; 2) identify any previously recorded archaeological sites that were situated within the project area; 3) provide information concerning what archaeological resources could be expected within the project area; and 4) provide a context for any archaeological resources recovered within the project area. A search of the NRHP records indicated that no archaeological sites listed on the NRHP were situated within the current project area or within a 2.0 km (1.2 mi) radius of the project area. The OSA file search was conducted between December 11, 2017, and January 10, 2018. The work at OSA consisted of a review of professional survey reports and records of archaeological sites for an area encompassing a 2 km radius of the project footprint. further characterize То the archaeological resources in the general area, the OSA archaeological site database for the county was reviewed and synthesized. The review of professional survey reports and archaeological site data in the county provided basic information on the types of archaeological resources that were likely to occur within the project area and the landforms that were most likely to contain these resources. The results are discussed below.

Previous Archaeological Surveys

Heather D. Barras

OSA records revealed that two previous professional archaeological surveys have been conducted within a 2.0 km radius of the project area. One archaeological site has been recorded in this area also (15Br261). Neither of the previous survey areas or the site were located within the project area for the proposed KY 378 Frozen Creek bridge replacement project. The 2.0 km (1.2 mi) radius included areas within the Jackson (United States Geological Survey [USGS] 1978) and Landsaw (USGS 1971) topographic quadrangles.

Between September 15 and 18, 2003, ASC personnel conducted Group. Inc., an archaeological survey of proposed waste/fill disposal sites for the proposed KY 15 road improvements and realignment in Breathitt County, Kentucky (Rahe and Striker 2004). The survey was conducted at the request of Marty Marchaterre of T.H.E. Engineers, Inc., on behalf of the KYTC (Item Numbers 10-270.8 and 10-270.9). Fourteen discrete areas totaling approximately 70.85 ha (175.09 acres) were investigated by pedestrian survey supplemented with screened shovel probes. No archaeological sites were identified and project clearance was recommended.

On August 22, 2012, CRA personnel completed an archaeological survey for the proposed Frozen Creek Waterline Extension project in Breathitt County, Kentucky (Arnold 2012). At the request of Nesbitt Engineering, Inc., on behalf of the Breathitt County Water District, approximately .6 ha (1.6 acres) were investigated via pedestrian survey supplemented with screened shovel testing. No archaeological resources were documented and cultural resource clearance was recommended.

Site 15Br261 did not have an associated report, but the site form found in the OSA records indicated it was recorded by Jesse Robinson of Great Rivers Archaeological Services on June 7, 2016 as a historic farm/residence dating to the twentieth century. A limited number of artifacts were collected from the site and no standing structures were present. The site was not considered eligible for NRHP inclusion and no further work was recommended (Versluis and Robinson 2016).

Archaeological Site Data

According to available data, 256 archaeological sites have been recorded in Breathitt County (Table 1). The most common site type found in Breathitt County is rockshelters (n = 80; 31.25 percent). Other site types in the county include open habitations without mounds (n = 60; 23.44 percent), historic farms/residences (n = 34; 13.28 percent), undetermined (n = 34;

Table 1. Summary of Selected Information for Previously Recorded Archaeological Sites in Breathitt County, Kentucky. Data Obtained from OSA and May Contain Coding Errors.

Site Type:	Ν	%
Cemetery	8	3.13
Earth Mound	2	0.78
Historic Farm/Residence	34	13.28
Industrial	10	3.91
Open Habitation with Mounds	10	3.91
Open Habitation without Mounds	60	23.44
Other	4	1.56
Other Special Activity Area	5	1.95
Petroglyph/Pictograph	1	0.39
Quarry	7	2.73
Rockshelter	80	31.25
Stone Mound	1	0.39
Undetermined	34	13.28
Total	256	100
Time Periods Represented	Ν	%
Paleoindian	1	0.35
Archaic	2	0.7
Woodland	4	1.4
Late Prehistoric	7	2.45
Indeterminate Prehistoric	158	55.24
Historic	109	38.11
Unspecified	5	1.75
Total	286*	100
Landform	Ν	%
Dissected Uplands	57	22.27
Floodplain	70	27.34
Hillside	90	35.16
Other	4	1.56
Terrace	28	10.94
Unspecified	7	2.73
Total	256	100

13.28 percent), industrial (n = 10; 3.91 percent), open habitations with mounds (n = 10; 3.91 percent), cemeteries (n = 8; 3.13 percent), quarries (n = 7; 2.73 percent), other special activity areas (n = 5; 1.95 percent), other (n = 4; 1.56 percent), earth mounds (n = 2; .78 percent), a petroglyph/pictograph (n = 1; .39 percent), and a stone mound (n = 1; .39 percent).

These sites are found on a variety of landforms, including hillsides (n = 90; 35.16 percent), floodplains (n = 70; 27.34 percent), dissected uplands (n = 57; 22.27 percent), terraces (n = 28; 10.94 percent), unspecified (n = 7; 2.73 percent), and other (n = 4; 1.56 percent).

These sites cover a variety of time periods, including Paleoindian (n = 1; .35 percent), Archaic (n = 2; .70 percent), Woodland (n = 4; 1.40 percent), Late Prehistoric (n = 7; 2.45 percent), Indeterminate Prehistoric (n = 158; 55.24 percent), Historic (n = 109; 38.11 percent), and unspecified (n = 5; 1.75 percent).

Map Data

In addition to the file search, a review of available maps was initiated to help identify potential historic properties (structures) or historic archaeological site locations within the proposed project area. The following maps were reviewed:

1899 Salyersville, Kentucky, 30-minute series topographic quadrangle (USGS);

1941 Highway and Transportation Map of Breathitt County, Kentucky (Kentucky Department of Highways [KDOH]);

1951 General Highway Map of Breathitt County, Kentucky (Kentucky State Highway Department [KSHD]);

1951a Jackson, Kentucky, 7.5-minute series topographic quadrangle (USGS);

1951b Landsaw, Kentucky, 7.5-minute series topographic quadrangle (USGS); and

1959 General Highway Map of Breathitt County, Kentucky (KDOH).

The maps indicate that three map structures (MS 1-3) were located at the north edge of the project boundary. MS 1 is first depicted outside the northern boundary of the project area on the 1941 map (KDOH 1941) (Figure 8), and then again on the 1951 Landsaw quadrangle (USGS 1951b) (Figure 9). It is also depicted on the 1951 highway map (KSHD 1951), but not on any of the other reviewed maps. During the survey, a house was present at the location of MS 1 (see Figure 6), at the start of Ray Banks Road. According to Mr. Ray Banks, a nearby resident, the house was built prior to 1945, therefore it could be the same structure depicted on the 1941 map. Due to the slope and the location of the project boundary, no shovel tests could be excavated between the house and the roads. Two shovel tests south of Ray Banks Road and KY 378 contained historic artifacts. These shovel tests represent isolated finds (IF 1 and 2), and will be discussed further in Section 5. MS 1 is located outside the project area and will not be affected by the proposed bridge replacement.



Figure 8. 1941 map depicting MS 1.



MS 2 and 3 are only depicted on the 1951 Landsaw quadrangle (USGS 1951b) (Figure 9), outside or along the northern boundary of the project area. During the survey, no structural remains were identified in these areas (Figure 10). Due to the slope, roads, buried utilities, and driveways, no shovel tests could be excavated along the northern edge of the project boundary where the structures may have been located. No artifacts were identified on the surface in this area.

Survey Predictions

Considering the known distribution of sites in the county, the available information on site types recorded, and the nature of the present project area, certain predictions were possible regarding the kinds of sites that might be encountered within the project area. Historic farms/residences were the primary site type expected due to the map structures near the project area. A prehistoric site was also expected due to the floodplain within the project area.

IV. METHODS

Field Methods

The project area consisted of approximately 1.1 ha (2.7 acres) of grass covered field and slope along KY 378 (see Figures 2 and 3). The project boundaries were determined using maps provided by the client and an iPad Mini tablet coupled with Garmin GLO Bluetooth global positioning system (GPS) receiver capable of real-time 2–3 m (7–10 ft) horizontal accuracy.

The entire project area was subjected to intensive pedestrian survey supplemented with screened shovel testing and bucket augering. The grass covered field was shovel tested at 20 m (66 ft) intervals. Each shovel test measured no less than 35 cm (14 in) in diameter and was excavated well into subsoil, or to at least 50 cm (20 in) bgs. The contents of each shovel test were screened through .64 cm (.25 in) mesh hardware cloth, and the sides and bottoms of each shovel test were examined for cultural material and features. When a positive shovel test was identified, radials were excavated at 10 m (33 ft) intervals in



Figure 10. Location of MS 2 and 3, facing southeast.

cardinal directions, within the project area, until two negative shovel tests were excavated in a row or until the project boundary was reached. The slope was visually inspected for natural benches and geological overhangs, though none were identified. Dirt roads and all exposed areas were walked and visually examined for indications of cultural material and features, though none were identified.

Two bucket augers were excavated in the grass covered field. Each bucket auger was 8 cm (3 in) in diameter and excavated deep into high energy deposits or to the water table. The contents of each bucket auger were screened through .64 cm (.25 in) mesh hardware cloth. All zones were recorded and no artifacts were recovered from any of the bucket augers.

Laboratory Methods

All cultural material recovered from the project was transported to CRA for processing and analysis. Initial processing of the recovered artifacts involved washing all artifacts and assigning catalog numbers. All cultural materials, field notes, records, and photographs will be curated at CRA.

V. RESULTS

During the course of the current survey, IFs 1 and 2 were documented. A description of each is presented below, and the location of each is depicted on Figure 3.

Isolated Finds (IF)

This class of cultural resource consisted of historic artifacts found in two shovel tests with no other cultural material found nearby. For each isolated find, shovel testing and/or surface reconnaissance was conducted to locate any possible associated artifacts.

IF 1

UTM: Zone 17 N

Elevation: 223 m (730 ft) AMSL

Distance to nearest water: 45 m (148 ft)

Direction to nearest water: south

Type and extent of previous disturbance: historic/modern alluvium and road construction, extent unknown

Topography: floodplain

Vegetation: various grasses

Ground Surface Visibility: zero percent

Aspect: flat

Description: IF 1 consists of a single sherd of milk glass canning jar lid liner, which dates from 1869 to 1950 (Toulouse 1969:350, 1977:91, 96). The artifact was identified during shovel testing of a grass covered field (Figure 11). The artifact was found in the first 20 cm (8 in) (Zone I) of the shovel test. Radial shovel tests were excavated at 10 m (33 ft) intervals in the immediate vicinity of the find, but no additional cultural material was encountered. The shovel test is approximately 67 m (221 ft) southeast of MS 1, an extant structure that has been present since at least 1945, and the artifact may be related to it or the other map structures that were at one time near MS 1. IF 1 is recommended as not eligible for inclusion onto the NRHP.

IF 2

UTM: Zone 17 N

Elevation: 223 m (730 ft) AMSL

Distance to nearest water: 61 m (201 ft)

Direction to nearest water: south

Type and extent of previous disturbance: historic/modern alluvium and road construction, extent unknown

Topography: floodplain

Vegetation: various grasses

Ground Surface Visibility: zero percent

Aspect: flat

Description: IF 2 consisted of three artifacts: a seam remnant of a natural fiber bag and two stoneware sherds. The bag remnant was commonly used for containing granular food items and was not assigned a specific date. Both the stoneware sherds had Albany slip glaze on the interior and exterior surfaces, which dates them from 1820 to 1925 (Greer 1999; Ketchum 1983).



Figure 11. Overview of IF 1, facing northeast.

One sherd is a rim from a crock and the other is a body sherd from an unidentified vessel. The artifacts were identified during shovel testing of a grass covered field (Figure 12). The artifacts were found in the first 40 cm (16 in) (Zone I) of one shovel test. Radial shovel tests were excavated at 10 m (33 ft) intervals in the immediate vicinity of the find, but no additional cultural material was encountered. The shovel test is approximately 27 m (89 ft) south of MS 1, an extant structure that has been present since at least 1945, and the artifacts may be related to it or the other map structures that were at one time near MS 1. IF 2 is recommended as not eligible for inclusion onto the NRHP.

VI. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND TREATMENT

Note that a principal investigator or field investigator cannot grant clearance to a project. Although the decision to grant or withhold clearance is based, at least in part, on the recommendations made by the field investigator, clearance may be obtained only through an administrative decision made by the lead agency in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (the Kentucky Heritage Council [KHC]).

The current survey resulted in the identification of two historic isolated finds and a rock retaining wall. Neither of the isolated finds or the rock retaining wall are recommended for further work or inclusion onto the NRHP. No archaeological sites listed on, or eligible for inclusion onto, the NRHP will be affected by the proposed construction; therefore, archaeological clearance is recommended.

If any previously unrecorded archaeological materials are encountered during construction activities, the KHC should be notified immediately at (502) 564-6662. If human skeletal material is discovered, construction activities should cease, and the KHC, the local coroner, and the local law enforcement agency must be notified, as described in KRS 72.020.



Figure 12. Overview of IF 2, facing southwest.

REFERENCES CITED

Arnold, George C.

2012 A Cultural Resource Survey of the Proposed Breathitt County Water Distric Frozen Creek Waterline Extension Project in Breathitt County, Kentucky. Contract Publication Series 12-281. Cultural Resource Analysts, Inc., Lexington, Kentucky.

Birkeland, Peter W.

1984 Soils and Geomorphology. Oxford University Press, New York.

Greer, Georgeanna H.

1999 American Stonewares: The Art & Craft of Utilitarian Potters. 3rd Ed. Schiffer Publishing, Atglen, Pennsylvania.

Kentucky Department of Highways

1941 Highway and Transportation Map of Breathitt County, Kentucky. Prepared in association with the Federal Works Agency, Public Works Administration.

- 1959 General Highway Map of Breathitt County, Kentucky. Prepared by the Kentucky Division of Planning in cooperation with the United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads.
- Kentucky State Highway Department 1951 General Highway Map of Breathitt County, Kentucky. Prepared by the State-Wide Highway Planning Survey in cooperation with the United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads.
- Ketchum, William C., Jr. 1983 Pottery and Porcelain. Alfred A. Knopf, New York.
- Rahe, Richard, and Michael Striker 2004 Phase I Archaeological Survey for Proposed Waste Disposal Areas along KY 15, Breathitt County, Kentucky. ASC Group, Inc., Columbus, Ohio. Manuscript

on file, Office of State Archaeology, University of Kentucky, Lexington.

Sanders, Thomas N. (editor)

2006 Specifications for Conducting Fieldwork and Preparing Cultural Resource Assessment Reports. Second revised ed. Kentucky State Historic Preservation Office, Kentucky Heritage Council, Frankfort.

Soil Survey Staff

- 1999 Soil Taxonomy, A Basic System of Soil Classification for Making and Interpreting Soil Surveys. 2nd ed. Agricultural Handbook Number 436. United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service, Soil Survey Division, Washington, D.C.
- 2018 National Resources Conservation Service. United States Department of Agriculture, available online at https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/A pp/HomePage.htm. Accessed January 16, 2018.
- Stafford, C. Russell
- 2004 Modeling Soil-Geomorphic Associations and Archaic Stratigraphic Sequences in the Lower Ohio River Valley. Journal of Archaeological Science 31:1053–1067.
- Toulouse, Julian H.
 - 1969 *Fruit Jars*. Thomas Nelson and Sons, Camden, New Jersey, and Everybody's Press, Hanover, Pennsylvania.
 - 1977 Fruit Jars, A Collector's Manual with Prices. Everybody's Press, Inc., Hanover, Pennsylvania.

Versluis, Vincent and Jesse Robinson

2016 A Phase I Archaeological Survey of Approximately 346 Acres in the Proposed North Fork Stream and Wetland Mitigation Site (LRL #2015-00322) Near the Community of Vancleve, Breathitt County, Kentucky. Manuscript not on file.

United States Geological Survey

1899 Salyersville, Kentucky 30-minute series topographic quadrangle. United States Department of the Interior, Washinton, D.C.

- 1951a Jackson, Kentucky 7.5-minute series topographic quadrangle. United States Department of the Interior, Washinton, D.C.
- 1951b Landsaw, Kentucky 7.5-minute series topographic quadrangle. United States Department of the Interior, Washinton, D.C.
- 1971 Landsaw, Kentucky 7.5-minute series topographic quadrangle. United States Department of the Interior, Washinton, D.C.
- 1978 Jackson, Kentucky 7.5-minute series topographic quadrangle. United States Department of the Interior, Washinton, D.C