It's time to shuffle off to Buffalo…for the 2007 CNEHA Annual Meeting!

October 26-28, 2007

Paper titles and abstracts will be accepted through July 6. For those who will be in the field this summer, please consider presenting preliminary results, so we can learn more about current fieldwork!

See the Call for Papers, Conference Registration form, and registration for the Hyatt Regency Hotel at http://www.buffalostate.edu/depts/artconservation/CNEHA.htm or link via the CNEHA web site.

Questions? Contact co-chairs Elizabeth Peña (penaes@buffalostate.edu) and Sue Maguire (smaguire@buffalo.edu).

UPDATE--Northeast Historical Archaeology

Reported by: David B. Landon

By the time you are reading this newsletter you should have a copy of Volume 35 (2006) of the journal. I hope you find the time to read through the wide variety of articles in between summer projects. Here at the journal office we are about to begin our summer fieldwork, so please be patient if you are trying to contact us.

The next issue of the journal is a thematic issue very close to my heart, based on the work at Sylvester Manor. Work on this issue is well underway and it should be published in 2007, bringing the journal up to date. A summary of the contexts is included below.

Northeast Historical Archaeology Volume 36: The Historical Archaeology of Sylvester Manor, edited by Katherine Howlett Hayes and Stephen A. Mrozowski.

“The Archaeology of Sylvester Manor,” by Stephen A. Mrozowski, Katherine Howlett Hayes, and Anne P. Hancock.

“From Youghco to Black John: Ethnohistory of Sylvester Manor, ca. 1600-1735,” by Katherine Lee Priddy.

“Field Excavations at Sylvester Manor,” by Katherine Howlett Hayes.

“Geophysical Explorations at Sylvester Manor,” by Kenneth L. Kvamme.

“The Use of Soil Micromorphology at Sylvester Manor,”

Northeast Historical Archaeology seeks manuscripts dealing with historical archaeology in the Northeast region, including field reports, artifact studies, and analytical presentations (e.g., physical anthropology, palynology, faunal analysis, etc.). We also welcome commentary and opinion pieces. To submit a manuscript or request preparation of manuscript guidelines, write to David B. Landon, Anthropology Department, University of Massachusetts Boston, 100 Morrissey Boulevard, Boston, MA 02125. david.landon@umb.edu
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“The Laboratory Excavation of a Soil Block from Sylvester Manor,” by Dennis Piechota.

“Material Culture and Multi-Cultural Interactions at Sylvester Manor,” by Jack Gary.

“Cider, Wheat, Maize, and Firewood: Paleoethnobotany at Sylvester Manor,” by Heather Trigg and Ashley Leasure.

“Zooarchaeological Evidence for Animal Husbandry and Foodways at Sylvester Manor,” by Sarah Sportman, Craig Cipolla, and David Landon.

“Conclusion: Meditations on the Archaeology of a Northern Plantation,” by Stephen A. Mrozowski, Katherine Howlett Hayes, Heather Trigg, Jack Gary, David Landon, and Dennis Piechota.

Enjoy the summer!

Newsletter Editor’s Report

Reported by: David Starbuck, Newsletter Editor

Please send news for the next issue of the CNEHA Newsletter by September 15 to the appropriate provincial or state editor.

Provincial Editors:

ATLANTIC CANADA: Rob Ferguson, Parks Canada, Upper Water Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 1S9. rob.ferguson@pc.gc.ca

ONTARIO: Suzanne Plousos, Parks Canada, 111 Water St. E, Cornwall, ON K6H 6S3. suzanne.plousos@pc.gc.ca

QUEBEC: Monique Elie, 840 Sir Adolphe Routhier, Quebec, Quebec G1S 3P3. monique.elie@pc.gc.ca

State Editors:

CONNECTICUT: Cece Saunders, Historical Perspectives, P.O. Box 3037, Westport, CT 06880-9998. HPIX2@aol.com

DELAWARE: Lu Ann De Cunzo, Dept. of Anthropology, University of Delaware, Newark, DEL 19716. decunzo@udel.edu

MAINE: Leon Cranmer, Maine Historic Preservation Commission, State House Station 65, Augusta, ME 04333. leon.cranmer@maine.gov

MARYLAND: Silas D. Hurry, Research and Collections, Historic St. Mary’s City, P.O. Box 39, St. Mary’s City, MD 20686. sdhurry@smcm.edu

MASSACHUSETTS: Linda M. Ziegenbein, Anthropology Department, University of Massachusetts, 215 Machmer Hall, Amherst, MA 01003. lziegenb@anthro.umass.edu
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NEW JERSEY: Lynn Rakos, US Army Corps of Engineers, CENAN-PL-EA, 26 Federal Plaza, New York, NY 10278. rakos@nan02.usace.army.mil


NEW YORK STATE: Lois Feister, New York State Bureau of Historic Sites, Peebles Island, Waterford, NY 12188. lmfh@aol.com

PENNSYLVANIA: Wade Catts, John Milner Associates, 535 North Church Street, West Chester, PA 19380. wcatts@johnmilnerassociates.com
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Minutes of the Annual Business Meeting of the Council for Northeast Historical Archaeology

Sunday, October 22, 2006

Marriott Hotel, Tarrytown, New York

Meeting called to order by Karen Metheny at 7:46 am.


Motion to accept the Minutes of the 2005 Annual Business Meeting.

Moved by: Mary Beaudry

2nd: Elizabeth Pena

Carried

OLD BUSINESS

1. Treasurer’s Report

Sara Mascia reported that CNEHA is in good financial shape with income at $19,639 and expenses at $10,928, to date. As of Oct. 6, our balance is $16,477.

Joe Last reported that the Canadian account balance was
$6,603 on January 31st. Paying for the journal brought it down to $3,981, which would still be enough to pay for another volume.

Motion to accept Treasurer’s Report
Moved by: Mary Beaudry
2nd: Eva MacDonald
Carried

2. Membership Reports
Joe Last: Canadian membership stands at 78, which is down 6 from last year but still not too bad. The majority of Canadian members are from Ontario. We need to do further outreach to the Maritimes, otherwise, we are holding our own.
Ed Morin: We are down 42 memberships from last year. This figure is mostly attributable to undeliverable mail. Ed tracked down a number of these members, many who are students in flux. He will continue to try to track down others. As of Oct 1, 2006, overall membership stands at 406.

Institutional: Meta Janowitz
Institutional Membership is down to 28, while Business memberships have shrunk to 4.

Motion to accept Membership Reports
Moved by: Richard Veit
2nd: David Landon
Carried

PUBLICATION REPORTS
3. Newsletter Report: David Starbuck
David Starbuck reported that he has served as newsletter editor for the last 20 years. He introduced Dennis Howe who takes David’s editing and turns it into the final version we receive. David also introduced the local editors in attendance and asked that they stand and be acknowledged. No. 65 should be out in a few weeks. Only one real change to announce: Barbara Heath has stepped down as the Virginia state editor. She will be replaced by David Brown.

4. Journal Report: David Landon
The latest Dutch volume was a long and collaborative project. It is a real pleasure to see it completed. Vol. 35 (2006) is in production and should be out early in 2007. Content includes general papers and an update of the 1986 bibliography. We have been alternating between general paper and thematic volumes; the 2007 volume will be the thematic Sylvester Manor project. Rich Veit, Liz Peña and David have been investigating how to make our journal available electronically. They have been working with the professional abstractor, CLIO, on a setup to host our journals starting with the 2000 volume. This is a very exciting new venture for CNEHA. The Journal office has been doing well financially; brisk sales of our poster attract people to our journals and back issues; we will have between $5,000 and $6,000 in sales this year. David acknowledged Virginia Sheehan, who assists with French translations. At UMASS Boston, Ashley Peña has served as editorial assistant; Karen Metheny added that the Holland Society was unable to commit financially to the Dutch volume. A search committee has been formed to find a new editor as David will be stepping down after the 2007 volume is completed.

CNEHA Web site – Silas Hurry was acknowledged for all of his contributions; additional content will be added re articles from newsletter and a list of members (without addresses).

5. PROGRAM AND MEETINGS
a) 2006 – CNEHA 40th Anniversary Hudson River Valley: Nancy Brighton and Sara Mascia
Preliminary numbers: 109 registered; 9 on West Point Academy and Garrison tour; 15 on West Point Foundry tour; 9 faunal workshop; 7 farmstead workshop; 50 banquet; great retrospective on CNEHA’s 40 years was compiled by Rich Veit and Kate Dinnel; Karen provided a great introduction on the founders; everyone was thanked for coming. Karen thanked Nancy Brighton and Sara Mascia for all their efforts towards making this a very special meeting.

b) 2007 Buffalo, NY: Liz Peña
All 2007 meeting materials and updates will be posted on the CNEHA website.

c) 2008 St. Mary’s City, MD: We met here nine years ago; since then, many new interpretive exhibits and reconstructions have occurred; potential attractions/tours/receptions/workshops include: Maryland Archaeological Conservation Laboratory, St. Mary’s City, 17th century material culture, the Chesapeake area, a new museum incorporating the 1638 St. John’s site; reconstructions of the Brick Chapel, the Printhouse and Smith’s Ordinary; a new installation at the Van Sweringen site, and much more. Silas Hurry will be organizing this meeting.

d) 2009 Québec City: Allison Bain, Reginald Auger and William Moss will comprise the organizing committee.

e) 2010 Pennsylvania ? Virginia ?

6. POSTERS: Ed Morin
A 17th century poster is in the works. Karen thanked URS for sponsoring these posters, the proceeds of which go to the editorial office

7. AWARDS: Sara Mascia
25-year membership pins will be mailed out next week. The awards committee will be meeting to work on the award of service for 2007. CNEHA has created an informal award category to recognize individuals or groups who have made
significant contributions to the Council. This award is entitled “Friend of CNEHA.” Karen recognized URS Corporation for producing our posters and allowing our springboard meeting to be held at their Penn Plaza, New York City location for the past five years; Richard Hunter’s many generous acts and contributions to the Trenton conference were also acknowledged.

8. OLD BUSINESS
Karen issued a call for back issues of old newsletters, files, and anything related to the Council, especially from the early years. Contact her if you have any of these.

Ed Morin was presented with his 25-year membership certificate.

9. 2006 ELECTION RESULTS: Meta Janowitz and Gerry Scharfenberger
Four incumbents were reelected: Sara Mascia, Joe Last, Karen Metheny, and Kate Dinnel; Ann-Eliza Lewis was also elected. New officers were not elected as motion was made at Friday’s fall board meeting to keep the incumbents in their present positions: Chair: Karen Beschere-Metheny; Treasurer: Sara Mascia; Executive Vice-Chair for Canada: Joe Last.

10: RESOLUTION OF THANKS TO OUT-GOING BOARD MEMBER: Rich Veit
Whereas, the term of office of a certain valued member of the Executive board of the Council for Northeast Historical Archaeology is expiring, the Council acknowledges her many contributions to the organization and expresses its heartfelt thanks to Dr. Joan Geismar. Joan served the Council well and faithfully. Her assistance will be missed. Therefore, be it resolved, that the Council expresses its unreserved appreciation for its outgoing member.

Moved by: Rich Veit
2nd: Ed Morin
Carried

11. RESOLUTION OF THANKS FOR CONFERENCE ORGANIZERS: Joe Last
Whereas, the 2006 CNEHA conference has been a resounding success and very befitting as a celebration of CNEHA’s 40th Birthday,
Whereas, Tarrytown, New York, has proven to be a most wonderful venue for such a conference,
Whereas, we have all enjoyed stimulating and informative workshops and treks through wet and leafy woodlands,
Whereas, we have taken pleasure in learning about the area’s buildings and monuments, histories and enterprises,
Whereas, The Philipsburg Manor Upper Mills Historic Site and the Old Dutch Church Burying Ground have provided warm and friendly settings for toasts, and talks and stories,
Whereas, the entire conference has been conducive to the dissemination of knowledge, thoughtful presentations, and a stimulating exchange of ideas,
Whereas, the Amerman Hall of the Reformed Church of the Tarrytowns provided an intimate atmosphere, capturing the spirit of CNEHA’s earlier times,
Now therefore, let it be resolved that the Council for Northeast Historical Archaeology wishes to express its appreciation and gratitude for all of the hard work, long hours, anxious moments, and excellent effort of the conference organizers:
To the volunteers, Tina Fortugno, Suzanne Ploussos, Nancy Dickinson, and especially Nick Panasiuk, who heroically helped with registration, logistics and behind-the-scenes organization;
To workshop presenters David Landon and Douglas Mackay for their expertise and efforts;
To tour guides Travis Beckwith, Nancy Brighton, Michael Deegan, Patrick Martin, Sara Mascia, Elizabeth Norris and Tim Scarlett for sharing their knowledge and passion of the area;
To the following sponsors for their very generous financial and other contributions:
Dr. Joan Geismar, R. Christopher Goodwin Associates Inc., Hartgen Archeological Associates Inc., Historical Perspectives Inc., Hunter Research, and URS Corporation;
To Katherine Dinnel and Richard Viet along with Paul Huey and Karen Metheny for their warm, respectful and entertaining retrospective of CNEHA’s First 40 Years,
To Nancy Brighton for coordination of the Student Paper Competition – again;
To Sara Mascia for organizing the Book Room;
To Cece Saunders for organizing the raffle, and to all who donated prizes;
And of course, a resounding round of applause for the chief organizers of this wonderful informative and most enjoyable conference - Nancy Brighton and Sara Mascia!!

Moved by: Ed Morin
2nd: Lu Ann De Cunzo
Carried

MOTION TO ADJOURN MEETING
Moved by: Ed Morin
2nd: Nancy Brighton
Carried

Meeting adjourned at 8:52 am.

Respectfully submitted by:
Ellen Blaubergs, Secretary
As an archaeological curator and collections manager I confront many unsettling issues, but one of the more troubling ones lately is rapidly dwindling space to store collections. The Massachusetts Historical Commission, which is both the office of the SHPO and the State Archaeologist, has a small curation facility and we have made it a priority to curate primarily “at risk” collections. For the most part these are collections from early CRM excavations conducted by firms that no longer exist.1 Over the last year we have been using funds from an ISTEA grant to process the collections, catalog them in a modern database system with a barcode tracking system, and repackage them according to current curatorial standards. As we repackage the collections, they have grown and of course we have taken in more collections, and we find ourselves at nearly 100% capacity.

A seemingly quick way to free some space is to deaccession items of limited research potential. This is an uncomfortable action, however, because it permanently alters a collection’s composition and may adversely affect its long-term research value. Curators are accustomed to making decisions to allocate scarce funds to one collection or artifact over another, but I find choosing to deaccession a part of a collection particularly difficult because it specifically challenges the original archaeologist’s research design and makes a permanent decision that will set limits on the research options of a collection. This flies in the face of our curation mission which is focused on preserving collections for future research and which constantly reinforces the importance of maintaining an entire collection and all its components. Nonetheless, the MHC has begun a review process to identify categories of data for evaluation and deaccession. In Massachusetts, artifacts excavated under a State Archaeologist’s permit are the property of the Commonwealth and their disposition is under the purview of the State Archaeologist. Identifying categories of high volume, low research potential data for possible deaccession seemed a logical course to follow as a partial solution to our space concerns. This essay traces our decision making for one particular class: unprocessed soil samples.

Unprocessed soil occupies a notable percentage of our storage area (as much as 5%). It seemed logical that simply processing the samples according to the original research design might be a reasonable approach that would preserve the data within the soil without the bulk of the soil itself. Simple processes such as flotation or fine- or water-screening could easily be carried out at MHC’s lab. If other soil studies had been planned, perhaps we could keep smaller samples to process as funding permitted. I would even argue that this didn’t qualify as deaccessioning, just efficient collections management.

As our first case study, we chose to work with a collection from a large transportation corridor in greater Boston with 9 sites that underwent data recovery level investigations. There were no prehistoric sites in the project area. The historical sites include a foundry, a tannery, a railroad complex, and domestic sites, each dating primarily to the 19th and early 20th centuries. The collection contained 18 standard-sized, archival boxes of unprocessed soil. We realized early on one faulty assumption. We had thought that the soil was collected with a particular study in mind, but soon realized that most samples were collected simply for “future research.” Other issues quickly arose. First, despite extensive field notes, we did not have detailed field documentation describing sampling and collecting methods except for a brief mention that soil samples were retained from each stratum and a note from one site indicated that some of the soil samples were screened prior to sample collection. There was no other information on the collection procedure nor did the research design discuss the types of analysis that would be appropriate. Furthermore, close examination of the samples’ provenience data showed that we did not have samples from every stratum. With no sample lists to compare the collection against, it was impossible to discern whether these samples had been lost since excavation, processed, or never collected. Further complicating the situation, the samples had an uncertain post-excavation history. The unprocessed samples were stored in various conditions for more than 20 years, the majority of that time in the non-climate-controlled attic of a historic house. Many of the samples were in thin, non-archival, zip-close bags; others were in large garbage bags held closed by a hand-tied knot. The contents of many had spilled and mixed with other samples. Literature regarding the curation requirements and stability of soil is not prevalent. According to SHA’s website “conservation recommendations for the immediate stabilization and long-term storage of [soil] samples have not been tested in laboratory conditions, although there are studies on-going. It is assumed that stable (low) temperature and relative humidity are required to prevent chemical traces in soil samples from long-term degradation.” The Department of Defense has concluded that soil samples often require immediate conservation and stabilization.

We had a large collection of poorly stored soil, collected with no clear documentation of method or purpose. Was this sufficient argument to simply throw the samples away? Probably not. But we did need a procedure for handling these samples. The Department of Defense has issued a clear policy that
became the model for MHC (DOD, n.d.). The Department of Defense suggests that if possible the original excavator’s plan should be carried out. If that is not possible then a reasonable research design should be developed or, as a last resort, the soil from samples should receive at least the same minimal treatment given to most of the soil excavated at a site. That is, if the excavators used _-_ mesh to screen most soils, those collected for samples should at least be screened through similar mesh and the recovered artifacts processed according to standard protocols. This is a reasonable solution. At MHC this boiled down to a few critical questions:

1. Is the original PI’s research design available? (Do we know how and why the soil was collected?)
2. If the answer to #1 is yes, does the original research design still hold merit in light of subsequent research since the excavation took place?
3. Do the samples retain sufficient integrity to complete the original studies planned by the excavators? (I.e., were they stored in a fashion that guarantees that no contamination has occurred or to guarantee chemical stability over time?) And if so, how long will this integrity last?

If the answer to all of these questions is “yes,” then there is likely value to continuing to curate the samples and the issues become determining the proper way to curate the samples to maintain their integrity until we can carry out the original intentions, and the appropriate volume to save. (I.e., can we make the collections a little smaller?). If the answer to any of the questions is no, however, there is considerable gray area to navigate.

With the collection described above, the most damaging issue was the shaky curation history of the samples, which would leave many conclusions based on analysis of these samples open to considerable professional criticism. We decided that despite the original research potential no chemical studies, flotation, or pollen extraction would be worthwhile. We researched each provenience for which we had a sample and prioritized the samples according to whether they came from significant features or cultural levels. Samples taken from outside of the site area as controls and those from non-significant proveniences were set aside with the thought that they might be discarded without further analysis. For the remaining samples we decided to simply screen them through _-_ inch mesh. It did not appear to us that any of these sites would benefit from a fine screening, although we look forward to other sites where this may be fruitful. And because the samples had been stored for so long and were thoroughly dry we simply screened them all including those from “non-significant” proveniences. It took about a day of lab time to screen the samples and another day to catalog the results. The artifacts recovered in this process included small fragments of window glass, bottle glass, ceramics, brick, nails, and slag—nothing that will significantly alter the interpretations of the sites. All of the soil from the sites therefore has received equivalent baseline treatment.

MHC’s policy on soil samples will continue to evolve. In those instances where the samples have been well prepared, well documented, and well curated we may continue to curate the soil, but will limit the volume to no more than one liter per sample. In the more likely situation where the collection procedure is under-documented and the curation history is shaky, we will focus our attention on determining appropriate screening for the soil to recover whatever artifactual material we can. Depending on soil volume and staffing levels we will determine on a case-by-case basis whether to screen all saved soil or only those samples from significant proveniences. Any soil samples that we decide to continue to curate are double-bagged in 4 mil-thick zip-close bags. Each is cataloged in our database and receives a bag tag with a barcode. The bag tag is placed between the two bags and not directly in the soil. All bags are also labeled on the outside with a permanent marker in case it is separated from its tag. We will continue to evaluate samples for flotation, chemical studies, and pollen and phytolith extraction but, until it is demonstrated conclusively that soil samples are generally stable and require little climate control, I do not think it is worthwhile to invest in analyses that will not be able to stand up to peer review based on questionable source data.

I have written this column in part to encourage constructive criticism of our procedure and to encourage people to share their experiences. Unprocessed soil samples are likely the least glamorous collection category; in volume, however, they have considerable impact. In some of our collections processing the soil could decrease the size of a collection by as much as 10%--this is a significant space gain. While there may be a strong argument that data are lost in the procedure we have outlined, I feel that on balance the overall data loss if we have to turn away an entire collection in favor of the soil from another is considerably greater and well worth the risk.

Please e-mail me comments, your policy on soil samples, or other information. If there is sufficient response, I will compile your comments and conclusions for a future column. The next category up for evaluation is iron slag. I’d be interested in any comments or suggests on the management of this as well.
Ann-eliza.lewis@sec.state.ma.us

The remainder of the Commonwealth’s extensive archaeological collections is stored at approved repositories.

References
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John and Priscilla Alden Family Sites National Historic Landmark Nomination, Duxbury, Massachusetts.

[Submitted by Edward L. Bell, Massachusetts Historical Commission]

Since 2001, Tom McCarthy (History Department, US Naval Academy, Annapolis) has been conducting research to prepare a National Historic Landmark (NHL) nomination for the John and Priscilla Alden Site Family Sites, in Duxbury, Massachusetts. The nomination includes the ca. 1630 Original Alden Homestead Site, partially excavated in 1960 by pioneering, self-taught, historical archaeologist Roland Wells Robbins (1908-1987). His 1969 publication, Pilgrim John Alden’s Progress: Archaeological Excavations in Duxbury (Plymouth: The Pilgrim Society), has been cited by a bevy of scholars to understand findings from other 17th-century sites throughout New England, and for comparisons with sites in the Chesapeake region. The Original Alden Homestead Site has provided crucial comparative data, particularly for the interpretation of “First Period” architecture and for studies about redware. Artifacts from Robbins’ dig were part of the major 1982 exhibition, “New England Begins,” at the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. A series of reexaminations of the artifact collections has been undertaken by several well-regarded historical archaeologists, but not comprehensively to integrate Robbins’ meticulous field documentation curated at the Henley Library at the Thoreau Institute at Walden Woods, in Lincoln, MA. The curated archaeological collections, and additional artifacts and features from as-yet-unexcavated areas at the site, have enormous potential to provide comparative data to inform pressing, nationally important research questions about history, life experiences, and material culture in early 17th-century North America.

Many New England historical archaeologists have contributed information to McCarthy that assists to establish the significance of the historic property and its associated archaeological collections. McCarthy’s contacts include Emerson (Tad) W. Baker (Salem State College), Mary C. Beaudry (Boston University), Edward L. Bell (Massachusetts Historical Commission), Craig S. Chartier (Massachusetts Archaeological Professionals), Karin J. Goldstein (Plimoth Plantation), Daniel P. Lynch (Soil Sight), Mitchell T. Mulholland (Archaeological Services at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst), and Robbins’ biographer Donald W. Linebaugh (University of Maryland). Notably, one of the property’s areas of significance is its association with Roland Wells Robbins. The property reflects a formative period in the history of historical archaeology in New England, and conveys Robbins’ activities within the reconstruction, restoration, and recreation trends in US historic preservation. The final NHL nomination will be a useful research overview of relevant scholarly research in the history, archaeology, and architecture of 17th-century New England homestead sites; of the prospects of retroactive archaeological collections research projects; and, following Linebaugh’s thorough biographical research, of Robbins’ role as a well-known practitioner during an incipient period in the development of New England historical archaeology. The nomination will be considered by the Landmarks Committee of the National Park System Advisory Board later this year.

Connecticut

The Institute for American Indian Studies

The Institute for American Indian Studies received a planning grant from the Connecticut Humanities Council to produce a web site on Connecticut Archaeology. The target audience will be educators, students, and the interested public. It will feature significant archaeology sites from Paleo-Indian times up to World War II that have enhanced the state’s cultural heritage by providing information not found in local history books. The web site will show that archaeology can be a powerful learning tool for meeting the social studies standards of the CT Department of Education. Images and interrelated text will also demonstrate the importance of site preservation and provide links to other archaeology sites in the region. The web site is slated to be up and running by the end of 2008.

Marine Railways of Southeast Connecticut

[Submitted by Michael Raber, Raber Associates]

Marine railways were a critical component of Connecticut’s maritime economy from ca.1825-1970, providing cost-effective repair facilities for all sizes of vessels. The state’s underdocumented, overlooked marine railways—all of which were built on tidal waters—are a vanishing resource, with few in operation and many demolished. The great majority of these facilities were in the southeast part of the state, especially between the Thames and Pawcatuck drainages. To begin
planning for possible protection of these resources and to enhance public education, Raber Associates conducted a survey in this region between 2003 and 2006 to identify remaining marine railways and evaluate their historical significance. By placing these resources in the context of the history of marine engineering, regional economy, and local development, the survey was intended to enhance public sensitivity to historic waterfront resources along Long Island Sound and its waterways, as well as to develop recommendations for possible resource protection measures including creating State Archaeological Preserves and nominating properties to the National Register of Historic Places.

The survey included extensive archival and field investigations, and indicated there were at least seventy-six marine railways or railway dry docks built in the study region at forty-nine sites or yards ca. 1825-1966. Of these, only five remain intact and operable, and another seven to nine retain remains ranging from tracks and slips to nearly complete but non-operating installations. Three of the operable sites date to the early 20th century, but have been heavily rebuilt during the last quarter century. As examples of a once-prominent form of maritime repair facility, most of the twelve to fourteen surviving sites have some significance for information on vernacular design of foundation, slip, track, cradle, bracing, and/or hauling components. At least three of the sites are eligible for listing, or have been listed, on the National Register of Historic Places. At present, evaluations of significance are based on general design types identified from site inspections, personal communications, and some background literature pertinent to Connecticut examples. There appear to be no national or regional statements of significance for marine railways. Only eight have received any attention in documentation made to standards of the Historic American Engineering Record, three of which were at naval bases, and only five have been studied or photographed in much detail to these standards. Preliminary review of information on marine railways in other American states, as available primarily from the Internet, indicates an unknown but potentially large number remains in operation.

**Fireworks in Wallingford**

In April of 2007, Heritage Consultants completed an archaeological survey of the Quinnipiac Linear Trail Project in Wallingford, Connecticut. This project was completed for the Connecticut Department of Transportation and the Town of Wallingford. During fieldwork, which involved a survey of “Fireworks Island,” the remains of a large toppled dam, a large raceway, portions of two large stone retaining walls, and the remains of a large gate that was used to control the flow of water through the raceway were recorded. Documentary research demonstrated that these items are associated with the former Backes Fireworks Factory. The Backes Company was a successful fireworks manufacturer that was incorporated in 1904, though it had existed since the nineteenth century. By 1913, it exported its “Star brand” products as far away as Australia and South America, and had cornered the market on toy cap, torpedo, and firecracker production. It was estimated that the company produced approximately 90 percent of the total output of fireworks in the United States. The earliest fireworks manufactured on Fireworks Island were made by hand using potassium chlorate, phosphorus, antimony and gums, and were simply round caps that had to be set off using a “cane.” During World War II, the company devoted its resources to the production of signal flares of various types, and it received an Army-Navy “E” production award in 1944. After the war, the company returned to making fireworks, but as a 1943 Time magazine article suggests, the Backes Company was having financial difficulties that led to its eventual bankruptcy in the 1960s.

In addition to architectural remains, the archaeological survey of the former factory site resulted in the identification of numerous artifacts associated with the former fireworks facility. These included 13 large grinding stones and stone fragments; some of these grinding stones measured up to approximately 30 inches in diameter by 8 inches in thickness. While most were of the type that rotated horizontally, several contained deep grooves around their circumference, suggesting that they served as vertical roller-type grinding or crushing stones. It is very likely that these objects were used to refine and prepare the various ingredients for the fireworks produced by the Backes Fireworks Company. In addition, Heritage Consultants recovered other artifacts related to the former Backes Fireworks Company and possibly by the earlier G.I. Mix Company, which was a producer of Britannia and tin wares. These included cone-shaped plugs used to seal gunpowder casks, iron tools, glass artifacts, industrial-sized stoneware vessel sherds, architectural debris, and a single Britannia spoon blank. These items were recovered from beneath recent fill deposits associated with the razing of the former fireworks factory, and appear to have originated from intact soil horizons. Analysis of the artifacts suggests that most are related to the Backes Company Fireworks Factory. The identified grinding stones and fragments, as well as the large stoneware sherds (one of which appeared to be a very large strainer type vessel), are consistent with their use for crushing and refining the additives in the fireworks used to make the various colors upon explosion. Similarly, the cone-shaped plugs were used to seal potential explosive casks of gunpowder stored within the factory. The iron tools and architectural elements are typical items that would have been associated with the factory. The only exception is the presence of the Britannia spoon blank. As various histories of the area note, the northern tip of Fireworks Island also was the location of the “G.I. Mix Britannia Factory,” which existed in that location prior to the establishment of the Backes Fireworks Company. The recovered spoon blank likely is associated with that former industrial occupation. The identified archaeological deposits and architectural elements were assigned archaeological site number 148-8, and the
Town of Wallingford is currently working with Heritage Consultants and the Office of Connecticut State Archaeology to develop either a museum-type exhibit at the town hall or an outdoor display associated with the proposed walking trail. The Town recognizes the historic importance of the site area and is seeking to preserve it, as well as make members of the public aware of its unique qualities and its contribution to the cultural heritage of Wallingford.

The Connecticut State Museum
The Connecticut State Museum of Natural History and Connecticut Archaeology Center has opened a new permanent exhibit, Human’s Nature: Looking Closer at the relationships between People and the Environment. As home to the Office of State Archaeology and the Connecticut Archaeology Center, the Museum’s goal is to tell a story that integrates Connecticut’s natural history with its cultural history. Through a series of short, multi-media presentations, State Archaeologist Nick Bellantoni guides museum visitors through several story-stations, where he introduces scientists, educators, and historians who offer their unique perspectives on the intimate connection between our natural history and our cultural history. The Center’s web site is www.cac.uconn.edu. For further information on the archaeological collections and research opportunities at the new Center, please contact Nick Bellantoni, nicholas.bellantoni@uconn.edu.

Maryland
Reported by: Silas D. Hurry

Calvert County
Dr. Patricia Samford has been appointed as the Director of the Maryland Archaeological Conservation (MAC) Laboratory at Jefferson Patterson Park and Museum (JPPM). Formerly the Regional Manager of four historic sites in North Carolina, Dr. Samford received her doctorate from UNC-Chapel Hill. Her interests include African American archaeology, museum interpretation, education and administration. Edward Chaney, formerly the Director of Research and Collections at the MAC Lab, has been appointed as the Deputy Director. Betty Seifert, formerly the Deputy Director of the MAC Lab, has been appointed to be the Curator of JPPM, with oversight of the Patterson House, gardens and JPPM collections. Barbara Brundage has been appointed as JPPM’s Administrator of Education, and she brings a depth of experience in archaeological, environmental and military interpretation and education. Kathy Concannon has been hired part-time as the MAC Lab’s Educator, to develop public educational programs.

Anne Arundel County
The Lost Towns Project is gearing up for an exciting year as they prepare to move into a new dedicated archaeological laboratory at the Londontown Historic Site in Edgewater, MD. The new 1,050 sq ft. Lab, located within the new museum complex at Londontown, will offer more space for staff and volunteers, a dedicated conservation room, new equipment, more storage space, and a more public space for the Lost Towns Project to share the County’s cultural resources with the public. It is every lab director’s dream. Special thanks to David Gadsby, John Kille, and Cara Fama, all of whom were critical to planning this new Lab, under Al Luckenbach’s direction.

The new lab will also provide space for training the summer 2007 class of interns. This season, the Lost Towns Project is expected to have 12 college and graduate level interns, most acquiring credit for their efforts. Lauren Schisik leads the Lost Towns team internship program and is always accepting applications for upcoming semesters. The interns will work alongside the Lost Towns Project as they look forward to exploring a few newly discovered sites this season. Jane Cox will oversee investigations at the Java Plantation on the Rhode River, a spectacular 18th century ruin, with an earlier 17th century component waiting to be explored. John Kille will lead the efforts to delve into the newly discovered 17th century home site of Samuel Chew Sr., in southern Anne Arundel County near Herring Bay.

The Lost Towns team recently completed the 2nd year of a three-year investigation of the northern shores of the Rhode River drainage just south of Annapolis, Maryland. The Maryland Historic Trust’s non-capital grant program has supported this effort for three years. The first year of survey took a multifaceted approach to identifying, relocating and assessing the full scope of archaeological resources within a limited geographic region, resulting in the discovery of 22 new sites—more than doubling the number of known sites in the area. Revisiting dozens of archaeological sites that are on the books, but have not been visited or updated in more than three decades, assisted the MHT in gathering updated and more accurate information for the State’s archaeological sites files. The project also resulted in a comprehensive cultural context for prehistoric and historic sites that focused upon the region.

In the second year, the Lost Towns team conducted Phase II investigations at 5 sites (three prehistoric and two historic) to better capture a full range of cultural occupations in this area, and to determine their eligibility for the National Register. In the final year, the Lost Towns team will conduct more intensive research-oriented investigations at 18AN1285- a late-Middle to Late Woodland oyster procurement and processing camp site that represents a critical transition period in the prehistoric context of the region.

The Lost Towns team also will conduct intensive excavations at the colonial-era Java site (18AN339), which preliminary studies indicate was occupied by the last quarter of the 17th century by the Sparrow family. This early occupation does not appear to have been destroyed by the intensive colonial and federal period use of the plantation. The most striking feature on the site today is a looming ruin of an 18th cen-
tury five-part Georgian mansion, built ca. 1747 by Nicholas Maccubbin—wealthy merchant and brother-in-law to Charles Carroll. The undisturbed 400-plus-acre site also promises to lend new insights into the experience of indentured and enslaved people, as at one point in the 18th century, more than 80 slaves lived and worked on the plantation. An exciting component of the work at the Java site, the opportunity for educational programming, will be offered in coordination with the neighboring Smithsonian Environmental Research Center. The Lost Towns Project plans to assist the SERC in expanding their natural and environmental programming to include hands-on programming with a cultural and historical focus.

The Lost Towns Project recently discovered a house site on property owned by Samuel Chew Sr., one of six documented lot owners in the ca. 1660s town of Herrington, near present-day Deale in southern Anne Arundel County, Maryland. This work follows the successful discovery of portions of Herrington during phase I and II investigations conducted between 2001 and 2004.

Samuel Chew Sr. was a planter and merchant who also served in the highest levels of legislative and provincial government in the Maryland Colony, notably as a member of Lord Baltimore’s Provincial Council. Recognized as an important leader of the Herring Creek Quaker community, Chew’s home was used for regular meetings during the second half of the 17th century.

Historical research reveals five generations of “Samuel Chew” owned the property known as ‘Chews Right.’ The house site under investigation is believed to be one of two Chew houses depicted as nautical landing marks on a detailed inset from the 1735 Map of the Chesepeack. by Walter Hoxton, which was made into an engraving by Anthony Smith in 1776. These highly visible structures once helped guide 18th-century vessels in their approach to Herring Bay.

The Lost Towns Project will continue testing at the Chew family house site this season, which has already yielded diagnostic artifacts reflecting the long occupation of the house, including Dutch yellow brick, yellow-glazed Border Ware, Rhenish stoneware, and Delftware, Chinese porcelain, creamware, and pearlware. Efforts are now underway to determine the dimensions of the building’s stone and mortar foundation, a portion of which is exposed.

West Virginia
Reported by: William D. Updike

Historical and Archaeological Research at Glenwood
[Submitted by William D. Updike MS, RPA and Flora Church PhD, RPA, Cultural Resource Analysts, Inc.]

In 2006 the Humanities Department of the Marshall University Graduate College received a grant from the West Virginia Humanities Council to begin a multi-disciplinary research project focused on Glenwood, an ante-bellum Charleston, West Virginia residence. As part of this research, Cultural Resource Analysts, Inc. of Hurricane, West Virginia, was contracted to analyze an assemblage of historic artifacts recovered beneath the floor of the slave quarters/kitchen during renovations in 1980.

Glenwood was constructed 1850-1852 for James Madison Laidley (1809-1896). He arrived in Charleston as a young man, founding a newspaper, The Western Register, in 1829. Laidley was heavily invested in the burgeoning Kanawha Valley salt industry during the early nineteenth century, and served in the Virginia Legislature in 1848-1849. In 1850 Laidley purchased 366 acres one mile west of the mouth of the Elk River. Glenwood is a two-story, gable-roofed brick residence of the vernacular Greek Revival style. George W. Summers purchased Glenwood and the 366 acres in 1857.

George W. Summers (1804-1868) served in the Virginia Legislature in 1830-1831, and 1834-1835. Summers was elected as the U.S. Representative from Virginia, 1841-45. Summers further served in the Virginia Convention of 1850 where his oratory skills won acclaim in debating taxation and representation as viewed by western Virginians. In 1851 Summers was unsuccessful in an election bid for Governor of Virginia, largely due to his being labeled as an abolitionist. Summers won election as Judge in 1852, serving in that capacity until 1858. In 1861, while living at Glenwood, Summers served in the Washington Peace Conference of 1861 in attempt to avoid the imminent dissolution of the union. Summers additionally represented Kanawha County in the Virginia succession convention, where he voted against succession.

During and immediately after the Civil War Summers continued his legal practice and managing his farm. Upon his death in 1868, Glenwood and the surrounding 366-acre farm passed to Lewis Summers II, George’s only surviving son. Lewis was not interested in managing the farm; rather, he sold all but 2 acres including the house to developers, creating the West Side of Charleston. Descendants of the Summers family continued to reside at Glenwood until the 1970s when Lucy Quarrier deeded the house and grounds to the West Virginia College of Graduate Studies Foundation. The former slave quarters/kitchen is a two-story brick structure located to the rear, north, of Glenwood. The structure has gable end chimneys and contains four interior rooms with a central stair hall. In 1980 the quarters was renovated to adapt the structure into offices for the West Virginia College of Graduate Studies.

Paul D. Marshall Associates, Inc. conducted the archaeological investigations in 1980. During the course of renovations a number of historic period artifacts were observed within two features extending into the subsoil, one being located immediately in front of the kitchen hearth, and the other being located along an exterior wall at the opposite end of the structure.
Unfortunately, a specific breakdown of the artifacts recovered from each feature was not completed in the Paul Marshall report; however, the report notes that Feature #1 contained “…marbles, buttons, ceramic arms or legs from a ceramic doll, and some animal bone.” The report further notes, “This feature was directly below the common room where families would gather, children played and household tasks such as sewing were performed.” Feature #2 was noted as containing: “…ceramics, glass, considerable bone, silver, etc.” The feature “…was located directly below the kitchen to the left of the fireplace”.

2007 Artifact Analysis

In January 2007, Cultural Resource Analysts undertook an analysis of the artifacts recovered during the 1980 excavations. The excavation of the two features resulted in the recovery of 1,020, the majority of which were animal bone (n=531) and ceramics and container glass (n=349).

Looking at the assemblage as a whole, temporally diagnostic artifacts recovered from the Glenwood Quarters suggest manufacturing ranges from the 1830s to 1900. Combining this data with archival information suggests that the deposits could not have been made prior to 1852, when the site was first occupied. The lack of early nineteenth century historic artifacts further suggests that the site was not occupied prior to the mid-nineteenth century. At the other end of the temporal spectrum artifacts common to sites dating from the latter quarter of the nineteenth century are absent, suggesting that deposition under the floor ceased prior to 1880, and quite possibly as early as the 1860s.

Concerning dietary contributions represented by the faunal remains from the site, several observations may be made. Domestic species from Glenwood included cattle, swine, sheep/goat, turkey, duck, and chicken. Thus, it seems likely that the large mammal material (n=165 or 31.1 percent of the site assemblage) can most likely be attributed to domestic swine and/or sheep/goat. By MNI, swine occur at a ratio of 2:1 to sheep/goat and at a ratio of 3:1 to cattle, indicating that swine resources were more commonly consumed by the household. The relatively low presence of sheep/goat suggests that this resource was not a mainstay of subsistence. Very large mammal remains most likely represent cattle. Cattle may have been kept primarily for milk production and secondarily for beef.

For this sample, it is clear that high utility meat cuts, such as hams and less frequently, beef roasts, were being utilized by site occupants. It is not possible, at this point, based upon the limited nature of the excavations, to determine more precisely how the faunal remains may reflect the diet of the occupants of the main house as opposed to the servants’ or slave quarters.

Based on the feature descriptions and the artifact assemblage, Features #1 and #2 are best classified as subfloor pits. These pits are commonly found in structures dating from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and frequently occupied and utilized by African-American slaves in Virginia, Kentucky, South Carolina, and Tennessee. Additionally, subfloor pits have been found in log cabins and outbuildings occupied by Europeans of all economic strata in Appalachia. To date, the subfloor pits under the Glenwood Quarters are the only examples excavated in the Kanawha Valley. Combining the chronology of the assemblage with the feature type it is possible to suggest that the subfloor pits were excavated and utilized by slaves or servants working for either the Laidley or Summers family. As the assemblage does not contain artifacts from the last quarter of the nineteenth century, deposition ended very near the time slavery ended in the Kanawha Valley in 1863.

The analysis of artifacts and faunal remains from the Glenwood Quarters provide an entry point for future archaeological and historical research at Glenwood. Questions that this analysis raises include: Who were the Glenwood slaves? Why did deposition under the floor of the quarters cease? Given the age of the deposits, slaves(servants of Laidley or Summers could have made the deposits. Did Summers end the practice once his family moved to Glenwood? Was it that Summers’ slaves/servants left Glenwood at the end of slavery and therefore no one was living in the Quarter after the 1860s? Was the Summers family knowledgeable about then-current thought on sanitation and refuse disposal and ceased the practice of waste disposal in close proximity to their home? Answers for these questions may lie in archival information housed at Glenwood, or in archaeological investigations of yard areas, or a combination of both.

Recovering the Past at Blennerhassett Island Using Geophysical Survey, 2006

[Submitted by Jarrod Burks, Ohio Valley Archaeology, Inc., Columbus, Ohio]

For a brief moment in history, beginning in 1800, the island estate home of Margaret and Harmon Blennerhassett was an icon of civilization on the American frontier. It probably was hard for those descending the Ohio River at this time to miss the gargantuan-sized house and its brilliant white paint. All who traveled by Blennerhassett Island, just downstream from Parkersburg, West Virginia, and Belpre, Ohio, must have admired the idyllic setting. But a mere six years after moving in to their mansion, the Blennerhassetts were gone, having fled to points south after allegations of treason. Five years later the mansion burned to the ground.

Today, the Blennerhassett mansion has been rebuilt and visitors to the Blennerhassett Island State Historical Park can get a sense of what it must have been like at the turn of the nineteenth century to call on the Blennerhassetts for afternoon tea. However, there are many pieces of the Blennerhassett puzzle that have yet to be found on the island. In addition to the mansion, the Blennerhassett estate had a large formal garden, a smaller kitchen garden, a number of orchards, a dairy farm, and a small town’s worth of white-washed cabins where their servants and employees lived. So,
where are all of these other components of the Blennerhassett’s very own “garden of Eden?”

In 2006, Ohio Valley Archaeology, Inc. was contracted by the Blennerhassett Historical Foundation to use geophysical survey in the search for three missing components of the Blennerhassett estate: (1) the James Blockhouse, where the Blennerhassetts lived from 1798 to 1800 while their mansion was under construction, (2) the servants’ cabins, and (3) the formal path/carriageway that ran from the house, across the north lawn, to the river bank, where a stairway took visitors down to the river’s edge.

Figure 2 is a map showing the geophysical data, in this case magnetic gradient data, on top of an aerial photo from 1996. Numerous magnetic anomalies of interest, including some unexpected things, were found in the areas surveyed. Many magnetic anomalies were found in the James Blockhouse area, which is in the vicinity of the old Neale House (ca.1832/33). Some of these anomalies are no doubt related to activities originating with the Neale House’s occupants. However, at least two areas contain anomalies that are good candidates for being related to the James Blockhouse (Figure 2). Farther to the east in the survey area a number of probable prehistoric pit features were also found. Soil coring of a select number of anomalies in the Blockhouse area confirmed that many are subsurface features.

The surveys in the mansion area are a combination of new data from 2006 and older data collected by Berle Clay in 2002 (Clay’s survey area is in the middle of the Mansion Area survey block). The mansion area survey was continued in 2006 in the hopes of finding the remains of the servant’s quarters and the formal path/carriageway. Unfortunately, no obvious signs of the servant’s quarters, and their supporting features and trash, were found during the magnetic survey. However, a large, undocumented building foundation was found just behind the Putnam-Houser house, a structure moved to the island in the 1980s. This new building is L-shaped and it is about 22 meters (72 ft) long and 13 meters (42 ft) wide at its widest. The long axis of the foundation is turned about 45 degrees to the main axes of the mansion. Could this be one of the barns, perhaps the dairy barn, of the Blennerhassetts? No sign of this new building is present on any of the aerial photographs of the island as far back as 1931/32, nor does this building appear on the 1881 map of the island made by Schubert. Limited coring for the foundation revealed that it is brick and that the building probably burned down—burning was present.

Magnetic survey in the north yard of the mansion failed to find any indication of the formal path/carriageway leading from the house to the river. However, select 20x20 meter blocks of electrical resistance data did encounter an undocumented two-track road in front of the mansion’s north dependency. This road, which parallels the mansion’s east-west axis, may have been used after the mansion was gone—early aerial photographs show a tree line that roughly matches the location of the road. Importantly, these results show that future resistance surveys might be useful for locating the formal path/carriageway and other paths and roads on the island that have long since vanished.

Despite not finding definitive evidence of the targeted features of the 2006 geophysical survey at the Blennerhassett estate—the blockhouse, the servant’s quarters, and the formal path/carriageway to the river—quite a number of important prehistoric and historic archaeological remains were found. These findings clearly indicate the utility of geophysical survey in settings like the Blennerhassett Island State Historical Park and they show that much of the Blennerhassett estate, and the remains of other occupations, yet remain beneath the sod and walnut trees of Blennerhassett Island.

National Park Service Historic Archaeology Study
[Submitted by David Fuerst, National Park Service]

The National Park Service is conducting the first systematic inventory of historic archaeological resources in the New River Gorge National River and Gauley River National Recreation Area of southern West Virginia. The work is being done by David Pollack and Lori Stahlgren through a cooperative agreement with the University of Kentucky William S. Webb Museum. The fieldwork phase was conducted in the fall of 2005 and spring of 2006 in Fayette,
Raleigh, Nicholas, and Summers Counties, and included archival research and reconnaissance of 50 coal mining, lumbering, railroad, and early agricultural resources. The project’s goals follow recommendations of two historic resource studies (Unrau 1996; Workman et al. 2005) and other planning reports. The final report will be available in August 2007.

**Royal Coal and Kaymoor Coal Mining Town**
West Virginia public television’s “Outlook” program recently aired shows on the history of two coal mining towns in the New River Gorge National River of southern West Virginia. Royal dates to the late 19th-early 20th century and was the first coal mine built in Raleigh County. The coal mining town at Kaymoor was built shortly after Royal twenty or so miles downstream in Fayette County, and operated into the 1950s. Both coal mines were built by James Kay who emigrated from Scotland. The shows were produced by Aaron Shackleford and feature park ranger Frank Sellers roaming through the ruins of the towns and their industrial areas. Contact the park’s archaeologist and historian, David N. Fuerst, at (304) 465-6530 or david_fuerst@nps.gov to obtain digital files of the historic archaeology study and shows.

**Newfoundland & Labrador**
Reported by: Rob Ferguson

**Archaeological Assessments in Labrador and Newfoundland**
[Submitted by Roy Skanes, Associate, Jacques Whitford Environment]

**Labrador:**
Minaskuat Limited Partnership archaeologists Fred Schwarz and Roy Skanes carried out a number of Stage 1 and Stage 2 Historic Resources Assessments in Labrador in 2006, including two Stage 1 HRAs on sections of the Trans-Labrador Highway Phase III (Happy Valley-Goose Bay to Cartwright Junction) for the Department of Transportation and Works, and a Stage 1 HRA related to IOC’s proposed tailings confinement area at Wabush Lake. No findings of historic resources significance were identified during either of these studies.

Large-scale projects in Labrador included Stage 1 and Stage 2 Assessments for LabMag GP Inc. of a proposed mine site in the Schefferville area, the associated slurry pipeline...
Assessment led to the recording of thirteen new precontact sites on Menihek Lakes and the Ashuanipi, along with a variety of ethnographic and contemporary sites throughout the Study Area.

In addition, historic resources assessment work on the Churchill River for Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro resumed in 2006. Stage 1 assessment of proposed transmission line corridors between Gull Island and the Strait of Belle Isle, and between Muskrat Falls and Gull Island, resulted in the recording of numerous ethnographic and contemporary sites. Stage 2 HRA of the proposed Muskrat Falls Reservoir component of the Lower Churchill Hydroelectric Generation Project led to the discovery of seven new precontact sites and one historic site (almost certainly 19th century) between Gull Rapids and Muskrat Falls.

**Newfoundland:**
Archaeologist Roy Skanes of Jacques Whitford Environment completed a Stage 1 assessment of the site selected for development of a natural gas tank farm at Grassy Point, Placentia Bay. Other than a number of areas used as vegetable gardens in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, no other sites were recorded within the Study Area.

Roy Skanes also completed two other Stage 1 Assessments on the Island in 2006—one at Norris Point for a proposed housing development and one at Come By Chance Point, Placentia Bay, for a proposed oil refinery. With the exception of two vegetable gardens of possibly 19th century origin recorded in relation to the oil refinery project, neither of which will be impacted by development, no materials of historic resources significance were identified.

Other research completed in 2006 includes excavations at Trinity for a proposed cooperage reconstruction project. Trinity Historical Society is planning to construct a replica of a cooperage that extant historic sources indicate functioned as an essential component of the Lester, Garland and Ryan mercantile enterprises for approximately 120 years—that is, from ca. 1800 to the early 20th century. It is proposed that the reconstruction be situated in a meadow to the north of the Ryan’s Shop and, when completed, it will be operated by the Society as a living history exhibit.

Following a review of preliminary project details by the provincial Department of Tourism, Culture and Recreation (upon whose land the building will be constructed), a number of conditions were put in place. Key among these was that the design of the new structure should be historically accurate and in keeping with the time period as regards its overall appearance, dimensions and the types of building materials and construction technology used. As well, given that an early painting of the Lester Premises suggested that a smaller cooperage may have been erected in the meadow sometime in the 1760s, and that remains thought to be associated with the larger 19th century building were identified in the 1990s and registered as archaeological site DcAi-31, the Provincial Archaeology Office required that a Stage 1 Assessment of the property be carried out prior to commencement of any ground disturbing activities.

In the fall of 2006, the fieldwork component of the Stage 1 Assessment was conducted at Trinity for the proposed cooperage project. The primary objectives of the research were to:

A) test two locations in the meadow - Option A and Option
B - to determine which would be the most feasible location for construction; and
B) gather - through targeted excavations of DcAi-31 - information regarding construction and operation of the 19th century cooperage to help ensure that the design and interpretive strategy for the proposed building are consistent with the requirements put in place by government.

The results of research from the north end of the site indicate that the hearth area of the 19th century cooperage where barrel fabrication would have taken place was in a relatively good state of preservation, was larger than expected, measuring approximately 5 m x 3 m, had a stone foundation and, as anticipated, was paved with brick. Excavations to the south of the hearth toward the Ryan’s Shop revealed that, while the entire building was likely supported on a rough-made stone foundation, large segments of it were missing. Nevertheless, it was established that the overall dimensions of the cooperage were in the order of 13 m x 7.5 m.

Also recorded at the north end of the site, extending beneath the stone foundation of the 19th century hearth, was what appears to be other building remains, consisting of stone and brickwork. Based on the limited excavation and recording completed at that location, it is difficult to provide a conclusive interpretation at this point. Nevertheless, a tentative suggestion is possible.

As discussed above, it appears that a cooperage (or some type of structure) was in place at this general location on the Lester Premises by the 1760s. An original oil painting from that period suggests that the building was relatively small, had a chimney at one end (and therefore an interior hearth), and was oriented perpendicular to the larger, more recent structure. Based on the limited data compiled to date, it is possible that the remains unearthed in 2006 extending beneath the 19th century hearth are associated with this earlier, mid-18th century cooperage. Further field research is required to confirm this possibility and to acquire additional information related to its overall nature and extent.
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In 1607, England sent forth two colonies to settle Virginia, as the English then called all of the North American coast between Florida and Canada. The Jamestown Colony was established in southern Virginia and became famous as the first permanent English settlement in America. The other colony was planted at the mouth of the Kennebec River in northern Virginia. This settlement was the Popham Colony, but it is not as well known as its sister colony because it lasted only a little over a year before it was abandoned and the colonists sailed back to England.

The Popham colonists built and lived in Fort St. George. The fort was relocated in 1994 and from 1997 to 2005 portions of it were excavated by an archaeological team sponsored by the Maine State Museum. Because the site had been occupied only for a year and because it had not been disturbed for the following two centuries it became a sealed capsule that revealed much about the architecture and artifacts of an initial English colony during that crucial first year of existence. The results of the excavations are reported on this 400th anniversary of the colony in a new monograph entitled Fort St. George (published jointly by the Maine State Museum, Maine Historic Preservation Commission, and Maine Archaeological Society, Augusta, 2007).

MISSING MEMBERS
Reported by Ed Morin
(4/24/2007)

Christel Baldia
Ann Bianchetti
Ed Button
Carolyn Carlson Rank
Sarah Chesney
Alaric Faulkner
Christopher Fennell
Anne Garber
Terri Keffert
Maureen S. Kick
Hadley Kruczek-Aaron
William Lees
Heather Lindsay
Kimberly Morrell
Elizabeth Newman
Eric Proebsting
Christine Reiser
Pam Richardson
Paul Schuster
Application for Membership
The Council for Northeast Historical Archaeology

Name/Nom:________________________________________________________________
Adresse/Adresse:__________________________________________________________
Telephone:______________________EMail:____________________________________

Mail to: or poster a l'adresse ci-dessous:
Sara Mascia                                   Joseph Last
Treasurer, CNEHA                              PO Box 1961
16 Colby Lane                                  Cornwall, Ontario
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510                    Canada K6H6N7

Membership covers the calendar year January 1 to December 31, 2006. Please renew early to reduce our costs.

Rates                                               US $                  CDN $
___Individual/ordinaire                        30.00             35.00
___Student/etudiant                             20.00             23.00
___Joint*/conjoint*                              35.00             40.00
___Fellow**/Associe**                           45.00             50.00
___Life/a vie                                   600.00           675.00
___Business/enterprise                          50.00             60.00
___Non-Profit Organization/organisme sans but lucraif

*For two people at the same mailing address. / Pour deux personnes de la meme adresse postale. Elles ne recoivent qu'un exemplaire des publications.

**For those who feel a primary commitment to Northeast Historical Archaeology and wish to support the Council's activities at a higher voluntary membership rate. / Pour ceux qui s'interessement a l'archeologie historique du Nord-est americain et qui veulent aider a soutenir l'action du Conseil en versant une cotisation plus elevee.