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Management Summary

In May 2007, Archaeological Consultants of the Carolinas, Inc., (ACC) conducted a Phase I archaeological survey of the Sawmill Creek tract in Forsyth County, North Carolina. This survey was requested by the Forsyth County Planning Board based on input they received from Ms. Leann Peagrim of the Forsyth County Historic Resources Commission.

The survey tract is approximately 160 acres in size, and is situated southeast of the city of Winston-Salem. The project tract contains several drainages and areas of moderately steep slope. These areas were investigated through pedestrian reconnaissance and excavation of judgementally placed shovel tests. This investigation focused most intensively on upland portions of the tract that contained well-drained soils, which were shovel tested at 30 meter intervals. All aspects of this investigation conformed to the North Carolina standards and guidelines for archaeological surveys.

Archival research, conducted at the Office of State Archaeology (OSA), identified one previously recorded archaeological site in the Sawmill Creek tract. This site, 31FY1120, is known as the Welch site. This site is situated in the lower tier of the Moravian Friedland community that was settled in 1773. Informants had stated that a late eighteenth century farmhouse once stood at the site location. However, Mr. Michael Hartley found only amorphous depressions and a single piece of pearlware when he recorded the site. The presence of this site and its possible relationship to the Moravian settlement in the project area is what caused Ms. Peagrim to request this investigation of the project tract.

Site 31FY1120 was relocated, and short interval (10 meter) 50 by 50 cm units were excavated to establish its boundaries and evaluate its research potential. The results of the excavations yielded one piece of whiteware dating to the early nineteenth century. This site has no further research potential and is recommended ineligible for the NRHP. One tobacco barn (31FY1158) and two isolated finds (31FY1156 and 31FY1157) were also recorded. None of these resources meets the criteria for inclusion on the NRHP and are recommended ineligible. No significant or potentially significant archaeological resources will be impacted due to the proposed development of the Sawmill Creek tract. Clearance to proceed is recommended.
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Chapter I. Introduction

In May 2007, Archaeological Consultants of the Carolinas, Inc., (ACC) conducted a Phase I archaeological survey of the Sawmill Creek tract in Forsyth County, North Carolina. This project was undertaken pursuant to Forsyth County Planning Board requirements. Ms. Leaan Peagrim of the Forsyth County Historic Resources Commission was aware of a previously recorded archaeological site possibly associated with the Moravian settlement in the area and requested that the Planning Board require an investigation of the project tract and evaluation of the previously recorded site. The objective of this survey was to identify any previously unknown archaeological resources within the project tract, to relocate the previously recorded site, and to evaluate their significance based on National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) criteria.

Project Area

The survey tract is approximately 160 acres in size, and is situated southeast of the city of Winston-Salem, just east of the confluence of Sawmill Branch and the South Fork of Muddy Creek (Figure 1). The tract itself is bordered by Sawmill Branch on the north and portions of the tract extend to Sawmill Road along its eastern edge. The southern end of the tract is irregularly shaped and follows an unnamed tributary of Sawmill Creek on one half and encompasses a ridgetop on the other half.

Methods of Investigation

This investigation was comprised of four separate tasks: Archival Research, Archaeological Field Investigations, Laboratory Analysis, and Report Production. Each of these tasks is discussed below.

Archival Research. Archival research began with a review of archaeological site forms, maps, and reports on file at the Office of State Archaeology (OSA) in Raleigh, North Carolina. This review serves to identify previously recorded resources in the project vicinity and provide data on the prehistoric and historic context of the project tract. Reports on Moravian settlement in the project vicinity were reviewed. Historic maps of Forsyth County and the project vicinity also were examined. Finally, the Forsyth County Soil Survey was consulted to determine soil types present in the project tract and the environmental characteristics of the surrounding area.

Archaeological Field Investigations. This investigation focused most intensively on upland portions of the tract that contained well-drained soils. To this end, the survey tract was divided into
Map showing the Sawmill Creek project tract and the locations of resources discussed herein (1997 Winston-Salem East, NC USGS 7.5 minute topographic quadrangle).
six priority areas based on their potential for the presence of intact archaeological deposits (see Figure 1). Shovel tests were excavated along parallel transects conducted at 30 meter intervals in these six areas. The project tract contains several drainages and areas of moderately steep slope. These areas were investigated through pedestrian reconnaissance and excavation of judgementally placed shovel tests.

Shovel tests measured approximately 30 cm in diameter and were excavated into sterile subsoil (i.e., reddish brown or orange clay). Fill from the shovel tests was screened through 1/4 inch hardware cloth. Records of each shovel test were kept in field notebooks, including information on content (e.g., presence or absence of artifacts, artifact descriptions) and context (i.e., soils color and texture descriptions, depth of definable levels, observed features). Artifacts recovered were placed in resealable bags and labeled with the appropriate location data. All excavations were backfilled on completion. Shovel test excavation was supplemented by comprehensive examination of all exposed ground surface.

For this investigation, a site was defined as an area containing three or more artifacts of a possible single occupation within a 30 meter diameter of surface exposure; or where at least two shovel tests within a 30 meter diameter are positive (i.e., contain artifacts); or where surface or subsurface cultural features are present. Artifacts and/or features less than 50 years in age would not be considered a site without a specific research or management reason. Locations with fewer than three artifacts and no features are classified as isolated finds or isolates. Although isolates are rarely considered to meet NRHP eligibility criteria, their locations and settings are documented.

Following identification of a site, close interval (10 and 15 meter) shovel testing was conducted in the site area to determine the extent of a site. Site boundaries were defined by two consecutive negative shovel tests, or, where applicable, by landform (e.g., bordering wetlands).

Site significance is based on the site’s ability to contribute to our understanding of past lifeways, and its subsequent eligibility for listing on the NRHP. Department of Interior regulations (36 CFR Part 60) establish criteria which must be met for an archaeological site or historic resource to be considered significant, or eligible for the NRHP (Townsend et al. 1993). Under these criteria, a site can be defined as significant if it retains integrity of “location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association” and if it A) is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad pattern of history; B) is associated with the lives of persons significant in the past; C) embodies distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or D) has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in history and prehistory. Archaeological sites are most frequently evaluated pursuant to Criterion D. However, some historic period archaeological sites can be considered under all four criteria.

The primary goals of this field investigation were to identify archaeological resources and evaluate their potential research value or significance. Although the determination of site significance
is made by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), whenever possible, sufficient data was gathered to allow us to make a significance recommendation. In cases where shovel testing provided insufficient information on a site’s deposits, 50 by 50 cm units were excavated. These larger units provide a slightly expanded view of the soil stratigraphy and can allow for collection of a larger artifact sample. This evaluative approach was approved by Ms. LeAnn Pegram, Forsyth County Historic Resource Commission, and Ms. Dolores Hall, Archaeological Reviewer with OSA.

Sites that exhibit little or no further research potential are recommended not eligible for the NRHP and no further investigation is proposed. Sites for which insufficient data could be obtained at the survey level are recommended potentially eligible and preservation or more in-depth investigation is advocated. It is rare for ample data to be recovered at the survey level of investigation to definitively determine that a site meets NRHP eligibility criteria. However, when this occurs, the site is recommended eligible for the NRHP. In this case, preservation of the resource would be advocated. If preservation is not possible, mitigation options (e.g., data recovery) would need to be considered.

**Laboratory Analysis.** Laboratory analysis began with the washing of all recovered artifacts. A provenience number, based on the context of the artifact (i.e., surface or subsurface), was assigned to each positive shovel test location. Within each provenience, each individual artifact or artifact class was then assigned a number. Artifacts were cataloged based on specific morphological characteristics such as material in the case of lithics, and decoration and temper type in the case of ceramics. Historic ceramics were compared to published typed descriptions and cataloged by type when possible. Artifact descriptions, counts, and weights were recorded. All diagnostic and cross-mended artifacts were labeled with a 20 percent solution of Acryloid B-72 and acid free permanent ink.

**Report Preparation.** Report preparation involved the compilation of all data gathered during the previous tasks. The following chapters provide environmental and cultural overviews for the project area. This information allows us to place identified cultural resources into a context and relate them to the prehistory or history of the area. Next, the results of the field investigation are discussed. The laboratory analysis is detailed in site discussions. Finally, a summary of the overall project is presented along with management recommendations, as appropriate.

At the conclusion of this project, all project related material, including field notes, artifacts, and project maps, will be prepared for curation based on standards set forth in 36 CFR 79 (Curation of Federally Owned and Administered Archaeological Collections: Final Rule). These standards require that all project-related material be placed in archivally stable storage bags and boxes. Upon acceptance of the final project report by the SHPO, the project material will be submitted to OSA for permanent curation.
Chapter II. Environmental and Cultural Overview

Environmental Overview

Forsyth County is located in the middle of the Piedmont physiographic region (Figure 2), which is characterized by broad, gently rolling interstream areas (McCachren 1980, Woody 1989). Steeper slopes can be found along drainages. Forsyth County has elevations ranging from 700 to 1,100 feet above sea level, but the average elevation is 875 feet (Zimmerman 1976).

The Yadkin River is the main drainage through Forsyth County and forms the boundary between Forsyth and Yadkin counties. Figure 3 shows a map of North Carolina river basins and the approximate location of the project tract. The survey tract borders Sawmill Branch, which is a tributary of the South Fork of Muddy Creek. Muddy Creek empties into the Yadkin River in Davidson County. An unnamed tributary of Sawmill Branch runs southeast through the center of the project tract.

The project area is subject to hot and humid summers with an average summer temperature of 78 degrees Fahrenheit (F). The average winter temperature is 40 degrees F. Annual precipitation averages 44 inches, the majority of which is in the form of rain (Zimmerman 1976).

There are numerous soil types in the Sawmill Creek tract. These soils are listed in Table 1 and shown in Figure 4. Appling, Cecil, Congaree, Louisburg-Wedowee, Pacolet, Vance, and Wilkes soils are all very deep and well-drained. These soil types form uplands, ridges and associated side slopes. These well-drained soils comprise approximately 76 percent of the project tract; however, much of these portions of the tract have slopes in excess of 10 percent and are noted as being eroded. Trimble (1974) notes that the Southern Piedmont, stretching from Alabama to Virginia, is one of the most severely eroded agricultural areas in the country. In North Carolina, nearly 14 cm of soil has been lost in the Piedmont due to erosion, most of which occurred due to destructive agricultural practices from European settlement (Trimble 1974). The remaining 24 percent of the tract contains poorly drained Chewacla and Wehadkee soils. Both of these soil types form in flood plains (USDA 2007).

Cultural Overview

The following discussion summarizes the various periods of Native American occupation in the western half of North Carolina, emphasizing cultural change, settlement, and site function throughout prehistory. Table 2 provides a summary of the chronological sequence of Native American occupation of the region.
Figure 2. Physiographic map showing the location of the project area.

Figure 3. River basin map showing the location of the project area.
Table 1. Summary of Soil Types in Survey Tract (USDA 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Symbol</th>
<th>Soil Type</th>
<th>Soil Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ApC</td>
<td>Appling sandy loam, 6-10 % slope</td>
<td>very deep, well-drained, forms on ridges and side slopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CeB</td>
<td>Cecil sandy loam, 2-6 % slope</td>
<td>very deep, well-drained, forms on ridges and side slopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CeC</td>
<td>Cecil sandy loam, 6-10 % slope</td>
<td>very deep, well-drained, forms on ridges and side slopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Chewauc loam</td>
<td>very deep, poorly drained, forms in flood plains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co</td>
<td>Congaree complex</td>
<td>deep, well-drained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LwE</td>
<td>Louisburg-Wedowee complex</td>
<td>very deep, well-drained, forms on summits and side slopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PaB</td>
<td>Pacolet fine sandy loam, 2-6 % slope</td>
<td>very deep, well-drained, forms on uplands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PaB2</td>
<td>Pacolet clay loam, 2-6 % slope, eroded</td>
<td>very deep, well-drained, forms on uplands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PaC2</td>
<td>Pacolet clay loam, 6-10 % slope, eroded</td>
<td>very deep, well-drained, forms on uplands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PaD2</td>
<td>Pacolet clay loam, 10-15 % slope, eroded</td>
<td>very deep, well-drained, forms on uplands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PeE2</td>
<td>Pacolet clay loam, 15-45 % slope, eroded</td>
<td>very deep, well-drained, forms on uplands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PaE3</td>
<td>Pacolet complex, 10-25 % slope, severely eroded</td>
<td>very deep, well-drained, forms on uplands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VaD</td>
<td>Vance sandy loam, 10-15 % slope</td>
<td>well-drained, forms on ridges and side slopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WeC</td>
<td>Wedowee-Couisburg complex, 6-10 % slopes</td>
<td>very deep, well-drained, forms on ridges and side slopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh</td>
<td>Wehadkee soils</td>
<td>very deep, poorly drained, forms in flood plains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC</td>
<td>Wilkes soils, 6-10 % slope</td>
<td>shallow, well-drained, form on uplands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WID</td>
<td>Wilkes soils, 10-15 % slopes</td>
<td>shallow, well-drained, form on uplands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIF</td>
<td>Wilkes soils, 15-45 % slopes</td>
<td>shallow, well-drained, form on uplands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prehistoric Period

Paleoindian Period (12000 - 8000 BC). The actual dates applied to the Paleoindian period are currently being debated. The accepted theory about the peopling of North America dates the influx of migrant bands of hunter-gatherers to approximately 12,000 years ago. This date corresponds with the exposure of a land bridge linking Siberia to the North American continent (Driver 1998; Jackson et al. 1997). Recently, however, researchers have suggested that this migration occurred as much as 15,000 to 20,000 years ago and was led by seagoing travelers (see Green et al. 1998; Steele and Powell 1993, 1994). These recent theories are supported by such discoveries as Kennewick Man, a skeleton recovered in Washington, and the Gordon Creek Woman, who was recovered from a site in northern Colorado. The Kennewick Man skeleton has been determined to be over 11,000 years old (Morell 1998; Preston 1997; and Slayman 1997). The Gordon Creek Woman has been dated to 9,700 years BC or nearly 11,700 years old (Swedlund and Anderson 1999). Other discoveries, such as the Monte Verde site in South America that has been dated to 12,500 years before present (BP) (Dillehay 1997; Meltzer et al. 1997), continue to fuel this controversy.
Figure 4. Map showing the soils present in the Sawmill Creek tract.
Table 2. Prehistoric Cultural Sequence for the Project Vicinity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paleolithic (12000-8000 BC)</td>
<td>- Hunter-gatherers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Fluted projectile points: Clovis, Dalton, Hardaway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Archaic (8000-6000 BC)</td>
<td>- Hunter-gatherers, seasonal rounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer Phase (8000-7000 BC)</td>
<td>- Notched points: Palmer, Kirk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk Phase (7000-6000 BC)</td>
<td>- Production of textiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Archaic (6000-3000 BC)</td>
<td>- Hunter-gatherers, seasonal rounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanly Phase (6000-5000 BC)</td>
<td>- Temporary camps, no substantial dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrow Mountain Phase (5000-4500 BC)</td>
<td>- Stemmed points: Stanly, Morrow Mountain, Guilford, Halifax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford Phase (4500-4000 BC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax Phase (4000-3000 BC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Archaic (3000-1000 BC)</td>
<td>- Increased site size, more permanence as evidenced by burials, hearths, and other cultural features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Stemmed projectile points: Otarre Stemmed, Savannah River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- First incidence of ceramic production 2000BC: Stallings Island Fiber Tempered (in coastal areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Woodland (1000-300 BC)</td>
<td>- Regional differences more pronounced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swannanoa Phase</td>
<td>- Swannanoa ceramics, Fabric impressed or Cord Marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Large triangular projectile points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Introduction of bow and arrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle/Late Woodland (300 BC-1100 AD)</td>
<td>- Yadkin Triangular projectile points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigeon Phase</td>
<td>- Changes in ceramic temper from sand to crushed quartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Check Stamped pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Hopewelian influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Swift Creek Complicated Stamp ceramics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connestee Phase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippian (1100-1600 AD)</td>
<td>- Palisaded villages and ceremonial centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDowell Phase</td>
<td>- Mound construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke Phase</td>
<td>- Complicated stamped ceramics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Small triangular projectile points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reliance on farming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The major artifact marker for this period is the Clovis lanceolate fluted spear point (Gardner 1974, 1989; Griffin 1967). Smaller fluted and nonfluted lanceolate spear points, such as Dalton and Hardaway point types, are characteristic of the later portion of the period (Goodyear 1982). The Hardaway point, first described by Coe (1964), is seen as a regional variant of Dalton (Oliver 1985; Ward 1983). Perkinson (1971, 1973) recorded Paleolithic fluted points in North Carolina. Fluted Clovis points have been recovered from surface contexts, but no intact Clovis sites have been reported in the Piedmont region of North Carolina (Hargrove 1998).

The Piedmont of North Carolina appears to have been more intensively occupied than the Coastal Plain by Paleoindian peoples. This is in contrast to distribution studies in South Carolina, which show more fluted points in the Coastal Plain than in the Piedmont (Goodyear et al. 1989). Stoltman (1965) mapped the occurrence of fluted point finds in the eastern United States and noted that these had a high correlation with reports of extinct mastodon finds in the region. They concluded
that Paleoindian hunters were focusing on mastodon. Other researchers (Anderson and Joseph 1988; Michie 1977; Steponaitis 1986) have noted that fluted points are most common near major rivers at areas where river valleys are constricted providing ease in fording the waterways, such as the Fall Line Zone (where mastodon and other Pleistocene game animals would be concentrated).

Most Paleoindian materials occur as isolated surface finds in the eastern United States; this indicates to many scholars that population density was extremely low during this period, and that groups were small and highly mobile (Meltzer 1988). It has been noted that group movements were probably well scheduled and that some semblance of territories was probably maintained to ensure adequate arrangements for procuring mates and maintaining population levels (Anderson and Hanson 1988). O’Steen et al. (1986) analyzed Paleoindian settlement patterns in the Oconee River valley in northeastern Georgia. O’Steen et al. (1986) noted a pattern of decreasing mobility throughout the Paleoindian period. Sites of the earliest portion of the period seem to be restricted to the flood plains, while later sites were distributed widely in the uplands, showing what O’Steen et al. (1986) interpreted as “settling in” and exploitation of a wider range of environmental subsistence resources. If this pattern holds true for the Southeast in general, it may be a result of changing environments trending toward increased deciduous forest and small mammal resources, and decreasing availability of Pleistocene megafauna; population growth could be another factor.

Archaic Period (8000 - 1000 BC). The Archaic period has been the focus of considerable research in the Southeast. Two major areas of research have dominated: (1) the development of chronological subdivisions for the period based on diagnostic artifacts, and (2) the understanding of settlement/subsistence trends for successive cultures.

Coe’s (1964) excavations at several sites in the North Carolina Piedmont provided a chronological sequence for the period based on diagnostic projectile points. Coe’s (1964) sequence for the Archaic period has been divided into three subperiods: Early (8000-6000 BC), Middle (6000-3500 BC), and Late (3500-1000 BC). Coe defined the Early Archaic subperiod based on the presence in site assemblages of Palmer and Kirk Corner Notched projectile points. More recent studies have defined other Early Archaic corner notched points, such as Taylor, Big Sandy, and Bolen types. Generally similar projectile points (e.g., LeCroy points), but with commonly serrated edges and characteristic bifurcated bases, have also been identified as being representative of the Early Archaic subperiod (Broyles 1981; Chapman 1985). The Early Archaic points of the North Carolina Piedmont are typically produced with metavolcanic material, although occasional chert, quartz, or quartzite examples have been recovered.

Claggett and Cable (1982), using a settlement/subsistence typology developed by Binford (1980), described late Paleoindian and Early Archaic populations as “logistical.” Task groups were sent out to collect and bring back resources to the residential base camp. Logistical task groups, in this definition, are seen as specialized and focused on a particular resource or set of resources.
Claggett and Cable (1982) have presented a model that describes an increase in residential mobility beginning in the Early Archaic and extending into the Middle Archaic. According to this model, the Early Archaic human groups moved away from a logistical organization toward a “foraging” organization. Foraging involved more generalized procurement of resources (e.g., animal and plant foods, lithic resources) in closer proximity to a base camp. Sassaman (1983) hypothesizes that actual group residential mobility increased during the Middle Archaic although it occurred within a more restricted range. Range restriction is generally a result of increased population in the Southeast and crowding with group territories (Sassaman 1983); this increase in population led to increased social fluidity during the Middle Archaic and a lower need for scheduled aggregation for mate exchange. In Sassaman’s view, technology during the Middle Archaic is highly expedient; this is reflected in an almost exclusive use of local resources (especially lithic material).

The transition to the Middle Archaic subperiod is defined by the appearance/introduction of Stanly points, a broad-bladed stemmed form. These were followed by Morrow Mountain points, which are characteristically manufactured from quartz, and have been recovered from numerous small sites throughout Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia. Guilford points, also often made of quartz, follow Morrow Mountain in the Middle Archaic sequence. Coe dates Halifax Side Notched points to between 4000 and 3000 BC. In 1964, Coe saw Halifax points as occurring only in the northern North Carolina Piedmont and indicating relationships of this area to the Mid-Atlantic and Northeast. Halifax points are now seen to have a wider distribution in the Southeast, and are thought to mark the transition between the Middle and Late Archaic subperiods.

The hallmark of the Late Archaic subperiod is the Savannah River Stemmed point (Coe 1964). This large, broad-bladed and stemmed point is found widely over the eastern United States. It is associated with Late Archaic occupations in the mountains and uplands as well as at coastal midden sites of the period. Also, the earliest ceramics produced in North America are associated with the Late Archaic subperiod and date to around 2000 BC. These ceramics are Stallings Island Fiber Tempered and are primarily a coastal phenomena, stretching from northern Florida to southern North Carolina.

Sites of the later phases of the Archaic are generally larger and more complex than earlier sites (Caldwell 1952; Coe 1952; Griffin 1952; Lewis and Kneberg 1959). These sites are generally in riverine settings within the Piedmont and are hypothesized to indicate greatly increased sedentism during the Late Archaic, with a focus on fish, shellfish, and flood plain resources. Small Late Archaic sites in the uplands of the Piedmont are interpreted as logistical collection and hunting camps (Anderson and Joseph 1988).

*Woodland Period (1000 BC – 1450 AD).* A transition between the preceramic Archaic cultures and the Woodland cultures has been identified by Oliver (1985). Stemmed point types continue and are represented by the Gypsy triangular point in the Early Woodland subperiod (1000 BC – 300 AD). Other cultural expressions of the Early Woodland are the ceramics and projectile points of the Badin culture. These points are generally crude triangulars while the ceramics are
heavily tempered and undecorated. Unlike Oliver, Miller (1962) saw little change in the cultural makeup of groups at the Archaic/Woodland transition other than the addition of pottery. Coe (1964), although noting a stratigraphic break between Archaic and Woodland occupations, also describes little technological or subsistence change other than ceramics.

Ceramic technology appears to have evolved from the Badin styles to those characteristic of the Yadkin Phase during the Middle Woodland subperiod (300 BC – 1000 AD). Yadkin ceramics have crushed quartz temper and are either cord marked or fabric impressed. Occasionally, Yadkin ceramics contain grog temper, suggesting the influence of coastal populations who more commonly utilized grog temper in their ceramics (Coe 1964). Yadkin phase projectile points differ from the Badin styles in that they reflect significantly better workmanship (Coe 1964) and are more suited to the newly adopted bow and arrow technology. The introduction of the bow and arrow necessitated significant changes in hunting strategies, allowing for more independent procurement of animals rather than the group hunts generally associated with spear hunting.

The Late Woodland subperiod (1000 – 1450 AD) in the study area is represented by the Uwharrie and Donnaha phases. The Uwharrie phase projectile points are small triangular forms. Uwharrie ceramics are heavily tempered with crushed quartz and predominantly net impressed with scraped interiors (Eastman 1996).

Much of what is known about the Donnaha phase comes from surveys and excavations conducted by Wake Forest University in the Great Bend area of the Yadkin River valley and was named after the Donnaha site (Ward and Davis 1999). The Donnaha site yielded ceramic, bone, stone, and shell artifacts that are seen as related to the Dan River phase sites in the Dan River valley. Settlement models for Donnaha are also similar to those proposed for the Dan River phase (Ward and Davis 1999).

Early Dan River phase settlements consisted of scattered groups of households, strung out along riverbanks. During this phase, maize was introduced. Consequently, Dan River phase sites are large villages, often situated on alluvial terraces along rivers and tributaries (Ward and Davis 1993), where productive agricultural land would be found. Ward and Davis (1993) suggest that many of the Dan River Phase settlements may have been palisaded. Archaeological sites associated specifically with the Dan River have been shown to be both more numerous and larger than contemporary sites along neighboring drainages (Eastman et al. 1997), suggesting that the Dan River floodplain was sufficiently productive to support a larger population than elsewhere in the area.

Dan River phase ceramics are tempered with crushed quartz, and exteriors are commonly net impressed (but occasionally smoothed, cord marked, brushed, or corn cob impressed). Interiors are often heavily scraped. Later Dan River phase ceramics feature the same surface treatments, but the predominant temper changes to coarse river sand, with less and less quartz used over time (Woodall 1984). Decoration on the lip, neck, and shoulder of vessels are common on later Dan River phase vessels (Ward and Davis 1993).
Historic Indian/Protohistoric Period

In the decades following the expedition of Christopher Columbus, the coast and interior portions of what would become North Carolina were explored. Much of this activity was initiated by Spain in the hope of preserving its hegemony over North America. Hernando de Soto (1539-1543) and Juan Pardo (1566-1568) led military expeditions into the western Piedmont and mountains of North Carolina during the mid-sixteenth century (Hudson 1990, 1994). One interpretation of Spanish records claims soldiers visited Indian villages near the present-day towns of Charlotte, Lincolnton, Hickory, and Maiden (Hargrove 1998). The Spanish are also reported to have built garrisons near Marion and Salisbury (Hargrove 1998). Recent work at the Berry site in Burke County may have identified the remains of the Spanish garrison of Xualla or Joara, visited by de Soto in the 1540s and Juan Pardo in the 1560s. Research is ongoing at the Berry site (David Moore, personal communication 2002). Diseases introduced by these explorers brought about dramatic changes in the population and culture of the Native Americans, causing entire villages to disappear before 1700 (Fossett 1976).

Despite these military incursions and the establishment of minor outposts, the Spanish presence in the Carolinas could not be sustained. Mounting pressure from hostile Native Americans and English privateers resulted in the withdrawal of Spanish forces to St. Augustine in 1587 (South 1980).

England’s interest in the New World was heavily promoted by Walter Raleigh. A courtier in the court of Queen Elizabeth I, Raleigh secured the financial and political support necessary to attempt the first permanent settlement of the New World by English colonists in 1585 (Powell 1989). Although his efforts failed, Raleigh’s single-minded ambition ultimately led to the establishment of the Jamestown colony in 1607 (Noël Hume 1994).

The disastrous mismanagement and resulting loss of life in Virginia during the first two decades of the colony’s existence resulted in the revocation of the Virginia Company’s charter in 1624 (Noël Hume 1994). Preoccupied with the civil war between Royalist and Parliamentarian forces in the 1640s, the authorities in Virginia showed little interest in North Carolina until the 1650s. During this period the area around the Albemarle Sound in northeastern North Carolina was inhabited by traders, hunters, trappers, rogues, and tax evaders (Powell 1989). Even then, North Carolina was becoming notorious as a refuge for the independent and self-reliant.

Historic Period

The restoration of Charles II to the throne in 1660 resulted in the distribution of rewards to those who had supported the Royalist cause during the upheaval (Powell 1989). This initiated the Proprietary colonial period in the Carolinas, which lasted from 1663 until 1729. Years of turmoil brought about by an unstable system of government culminated in war with the Tuscarora Indians. Severe fighting broke out in 1711, triggered by the death of the colony’s Surveyor General (John
Lawson) at the hands of the Tuscarora (Powell 1989). The war ended in 1712, leaving the Carolina colonies in dire financial straits. These conditions persisted until the Lords Proprietors were forced to sell their holdings in the Carolinas to the Crown in 1729 (Powell 1989).

John Lederer, a German doctor, was the first recorded European explorer to visit the project area. In 1669, Lederer was commissioned by the governor of Virginia to find a westward route to the Pacific Ocean (Cumming 1958). Lederer traveled through Virginia south to present day Camden, South Carolina. During this trip, he visited with several Native American tribes, including the Catawba and Waxhaw. The Catawba Indians are historically linked to the Catawba River Valley in North and South Carolina. Inspired by Lederer, John Lawson traveled from Charleston, South Carolina through the North Carolina Piedmont to Pamlico Sound. Lawson’s 1700-1701 excursion followed a well-established Native American trading path that passed near present day Charlotte, Concord, and Salisbury (Lefler 1967). Lawson’s journey took him through Esaw, Sugaree, Catawba, and Waxhaw territory, four tribes who would soon come into close contact with European colonists.

As the number of settlers began to multiply in the North, many began to look to the wilderness of the South and the West to build new lives. German and Scotch-Irish settlers first walked the Indian footpaths that stretched from Pennsylvania to Georgia (Whisnant 2001). In 1744, a series of treaties allowed the colonies to formally take over the trail, known then as the Warrior Path, from the Five Nations of the Iroquois (NCOAH 2004; Vosburgh 2007). From that point the passage became more heavily used and widened to accommodate scores of immigrants with their large horse drawn wagons (known as Conestoga). It took on the name of the Great Wagon Road and was used to populate the farmlands and new towns of the Carolinas and Georgia well into the 1800’s.

The Great Wagon Road cut through the Northwest corner of what was later Forsyth County. A small number of people had already started to settle the area when the Moravians arrived in 1753. The original group of five men, led by Bishop August Gottlieb Spangenberg bought a 100,000 acre tract of land from Lord Granville, one of the lord proprietors of North Carolina (Forsyth County 2007; Roots Web 2007). The tract was named Wachovia, for the Wach River in Europe near the home of the Zinzendorf family, a wealthy patron of the Moravians (Harris 1997).

The Moravians were a historically persecuted group of Christians who followed the teachings of John Hus, a Bohemian martyr who was burned at the stake in 1415. In the early 1700’s they found refuge in Saxony at the estate of Count Nicholas von Zinzendorf who promoted religious freedom. The first Moravians went to America as missionaries to Georgia in 1735 but did not spend more than five years there. More Moravian settlements were established in Pennsylvania in the 1740’s (Harris 1997).

 Shortly after the Wachovia tract was purchased, the settlements of Bethebara and Bethania were established. The whole area was located in what was then Rowan County. Bethebara was originally a fort built for the protection of the farmers while Bethania was a planned village (Harris 1997). As the community grew there was an increased need for a larger town. Salem was carefully
planned out and began to be constructed in 1765. It quickly grew as a religious center as well as a center for trade and crafts.

In 1767, Bishop John Ettwein visited the German settlement of Broad Bay, Maine. The settlers were dissatisfied with their current situation and were excited by Ettwein’s descriptions of North Carolina and the opportunities available there. Groups of the Broad Bay settlers began moving south in August 1769. Many of the settlers had immigrated from Germany together and chose to settle in adjoining farms. This cluster of farms came to be called the Broadbay Settlement. The Broadbay Settlement was named Friedland in 1771 and tracts were laid out for the location of a school, a church, and a cemetery (Hartley and Hartley 2003). The Sawmill Creek project tract is situated in the southern portion of what was the Friedland community.

In 1770, Rowan County was broken up and Wachovia became part of Surrey County. In 1789, Surrey County was divided into Stokes County which in 1849, was subsequently divided up with the southern end becoming Forsyth County. The county was named for Colonel Benjamin Forsyth, originally of Stokes County, who fell while fighting the British (Crutchfield 1986). All of the original Wachovia tract was contained within Forsyth County. In 1879, an act allowed for Salem and the non-Moravian town of Winston to be combined and in 1913 it was established as the county seat (SLNC 2005).

The inhabitants of the region were fortunate to have avoided heavy fighting in both the French and Indian War. The friendly relationship between the Moravians and the Cherokee held off major attacks during the former. Moravian records do note some raids in neighboring villages and the arrival of families from nearby communities into Bethabara for protection (SCED 2003). The area did see substantial action during the Revolutionary War however. In 1781, the Battle of Guilford Courthouse was pivotal in the Southern Campaign and was the harbinger of General Cornwallis’ defeat at Yorktown. During the Civil War troops from both the North and the South used the Great Wagon Road and were hosted by the pacifist Moravians.

After the Civil War, the size of individual land holdings decreased, as the plantation system gave way to tenancy. Although followed by a recession, the economy began to strengthen in the region by 1880. As roads and rail lines improved, textile mills, furniture factories, and tobacco farming accompanied the region into the twentieth century. A Virginian, Richard Joshua Reynolds, moved to Winston-Salem in 1875 to start a tobacco company. The industry flourished along with the production of textiles allowing for great growth and prosperity in the region.

During the twentieth century, industry in the region diversified. After 1930, falling cotton prices not only affected local farmers, but also the textile mills. After World War II, the textile industry continued to decline, but lost jobs were somewhat offset by the construction of new furniture and food processing plants.

As tobacco and textile production has declined, the financial, medical, and technical industries grew. Presently Winston-Salem is the home of the successful Wachovia and BB&T banks as well as important regional centers for medicine and the arts. Today, Forsyth County is the fourth largest county in North Carolina and Winston-Salem is the fifth largest city in the state.
Chapter III. Results of the Investigation

Archival Research Results

Archival research was conducted at the North Carolina site files located at the Office of State Archaeology (OSA) and the Department of Archives and History, Survey and Planning Branch, both in Raleigh. Seven previously recorded archaeological sites and four architectural resources were identified within a 0.5 mile radius of the Sawmill Creek tract (Table 3). However, only one of these resources, archaeological site 31FY1120, is located within the project tract.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NRHP Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31FY870</td>
<td>Lithic Artifact, Isolated Find</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31FY871</td>
<td>Middle Archaic Lithic Scatter</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31FY1119</td>
<td>Saw Mill Site, 1900 Water Powered Saw Mill</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31FY1120</td>
<td>The Welch Site, Late 18th to Early 19th Century (based on one artifact)</td>
<td>Unassessed when recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31FY1121</td>
<td>James Martin's Field Site, Prehistoric and Historic Artifact Scatter</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31FY1122</td>
<td>Martha Brock Site, Late 18th to Early 19th Century</td>
<td>Unassessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31FY1123</td>
<td>The Charles Site, Late 18th Century Artifact Scatter</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY298</td>
<td>Eighteenth Century House</td>
<td>Unassessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY299</td>
<td>Reid-Hines House</td>
<td>Unassessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY302</td>
<td>Reid House</td>
<td>Unassessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY303</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Unassessed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site 31FY1120, the Welch Site, was recorded in 2003 by Mr. Michael Hartley, a cultural historian at Old Salem. Mr. Hartley visited the site in the company of Ms. Mary Alice Vogler and Mr. James Martin, siblings who own the property. Mr. Hartley found only amorphous depressions and a single piece of pearlware on an eroded hilltop in a pasture. He noted that Mr. Martin and Ms. Vogler indicated that a house once stood at the site location but that such a setting was unusual. The project area is situated in the lower tier of the Moravian Friedland community that was settled in 1773, and most of the German settler’s houses were set on side slopes near springs (Hartley 2003). However, there is a spring downslope from the site a relatively short distance. Hartley (2003) states that the house that once stood at the site was believed to have been associated with a family named “Welch.” He gives no source for this designation. No formal National Register of Historic Places
(NRHP) was provided on the site form. This site was revisited during the current investigation, and the results of that visit and site evaluation are discussed below.

Archaeological Survey Results

This survey resulted in the comprehensive examination of the Sawmill Creek project tract. The major focus of the investigation centered around the ridge tops and saddles, areas that are deemed to have a high potential for archaeological remains. These areas were shovel tested at 30 meter intervals. The remainder of the tract was pedestrian surveyed and shovel tests were excavated at judgementally determined intervals. In addition to field survey, Mr. Bobby Southerlin, the Principal Investigator, met with the property owners, Mr. James Martin, Ms. Mary Alice Vogler, and Mr. Comer.

A total of 189 shovel tests was excavated in the tract. The degree of erosion throughout the tract was severe. Gullying was prevalent on all slopes and little top soil remained.

One archaeological site, 31FY1158, and two isolated finds, 31FY1156 and 31FY1157, were recorded, and the previously recorded archaeological site, 31FY1120, was revisited. Each of these resources is discussed in detail below.

Site 31FY1120

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Description: Artifact Scatter</th>
<th>Components: Late 18th to Early 19th Century</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Setting: Ridge Top</td>
<td>Level of Integrity: Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTM: E 575164 N 3988459</td>
<td>NRHP Recommendation: Ineligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site 31FY1120 is located in the western half of Sawmill Creek tract. The site is situated on a hill top in a pasture that is used for cultivation and grazing livestock (Figure 5). A small cluster of trees is present at the crest of the hill. This cluster of trees includes a large pear tree, a mulberry tree, and a China berry tree. The site vicinity was shovel tested at 30 meter intervals and no artifacts were recovered. The area has been severely eroded, and red clay and bedrock are visible in some areas (Figures 6 and 7). The soil noted in the excavated shovel tests consisted of reddish brown clay loam to a depth of about 5 cm. Below this depth was red rocky clay.

Prior to commencing field work, the author spoke with Ms. Leann Peagrim regarding an appropriate evaluation strategy for site 31FY1120. It was agreed that evaluation of this site should be comprised of a combination of shovel testing and excavation of slightly larger units. Consequently, a series of 10 50 by 50 cm units were excavated across the hill top. These units were excavated in three rows, 10 meters apart (Figure 8). None of these units contained more than 5 cm of top soil. One of these units, located 2 meters from the tree cluster, yielded a single piece of undecorated
Figure 5. General view of site 31FY1120.

Figure 6. View of exposed red clay in vicinity of site 31FY1120.
whiteware. Hartley, when he recorded this site, recovered a single historic ceramic from beneath the pear tree. For this reason, one of the 50 by 50 cm units was placed directly beneath the pear tree at the hill crest. This unit did not yield additional artifacts.

Ms. Vogler told the Principal Investigator that she had no memory of a house ever having been present on the hill top but she did know of an older woman in the community who had claimed to have lived in a tenant house there. The tree cluster does contain what would be considered yard trees and the presence of historic ceramics does suggest that a house once stood at this location. Mr. Martin told the Principal Investigator that in order to slow the gullyng, soil had been scraped from the hill top to form berms along the side slopes of the hill. Although he did not recall a standing house being razed, it is possible that any remnants of a structure were scraped away long ago.

Undecorated whiteware has a manufacturing date range between 1815 and 1925. Only one piece of pearlware (type unknown) was recovered from this site when it was first recorded. The manufacturing range of pearlware ceramics is from 1780 to 1840. No other artifacts or architectural features (i.e., chimney base, foundation) were identified in the site vicinity.

Over the course of two investigations, this site has yielded two artifacts. The manufacturing ranges for the two artifacts would place the occupation of this site in the early to middle nineteenth century, which could correspond to the Moravian settlement of the area. However, the limited artifact assemblage and severe degree of disturbance to the site area preclude the site's ability to address relevant research issues. This site has fulfilled its research potential at this level of investigation and is recommended ineligible for the NRHP.
Figure 8. Plan map of site 31FY1120.

Site 31FY1158

Site Description: Tobacco Barn
Site Setting: Ridge Top
UTMs: E 575164 N 3988459
Components: Late 19\textsuperscript{th} to Early 20\textsuperscript{th} Century
Level of Integrity: Poor
NRHP Recommendation: Ineligible

Site 31FY1158 consists of a collapsed structure located in the eastern half of the project tract (see Figure 1). The site is situated along a ridge top. The area is characterized by mixed hardwoods and pines and dense undergrowth. Modern garbage is scattered throughout the site area. An abandoned 1950s Dodge pick-up truck is also located in the immediate vicinity of the tobacco barn. A transmission line corridor is located west of the site.
No shovel tests were excavated in the site vicinity. Site dimensions of 9 by 11 meters were established based upon the physical dimensions of the structure and scattered architectural debris (Figure 9). Soil observed in areas surrounding this site consisted of 5 cm of reddish brown loam overlaying reddish brown loamy clay subsoil.

Figure 9. Plan map of site 31FY1158.

There are three features within the site including a tobacco barn, depression, and a concrete outline that may have been a foundation for a second structure. The tobacco barn dates to the late nineteenth to early twentieth centuries. The barn is constructed of cut logs with concrete chinking and a small metal chimney flue is present in the northwest corner of the roof. Both cut and wire nails were used in the construction of the barn (Figure 10). The foundation is constructed of brick and rock with concrete mortar (Figure 11). The roof is made of sheet metal (Figure 12). The entire structure has collapsed and the foundation is crumbling. The depression is located on the east side of the barn. The depression is approximately 1.5 meters wide, 5.3 meters long, and 30 cm deep. The concrete outline is located approximately 3 meters west southwest of the barn and has dimensions of 1.3 by 1.3 meters.

The tobacco barn has collapsed and continues to deteriorate with exposure to the elements. Tobacco barns dating to this time period are common and some have better integrity, not only structurally, but in setting as well. This resource has no further research potential and does not meet the criteria for inclusion on the NRHP. Site 31FY1158 is recommended ineligible for the NRHP.
Figure 10. View of cut nails from the tobacco barn in site 31FY1158.

Figure 11. View of the brick and concrete foundation.
Isolate 31FY1156

Isolate 31FY1156 consists of one metavolcanic flake located in the eastern half of the project tract (see Figure 1). Six supplemental short interval (10 meter) shovel tests were excavated. Soil consisted of 15 cm of dark brown loamy sand overlaying reddish brown sandy clay subsoil. The isolated find is situated on a ridge top characterized by a mixed pine and hardwood forest. No other artifacts were identified. This isolated find does not meet the requirements for inclusion on the NRHP and is recommended ineligible.

Isolate 31FY1157

Isolate 31FY1157 consists of one banded rhyolite flake located in the eastern half of the project tract (see Figure 1). No shovel tests were excavated in the site vicinity due to excellent surface visibility and the eroded nature of the soil. The isolate is situated in a small garden plot with one small row of tomatoes planted. No other artifacts were identified. This isolated find does not meet the requirements for inclusion on the NRHP and is recommended ineligible.
Summary and Conclusions

In May 2007, Archaeological Consultants of the Carolinas, Inc. (ACC), conducted an archaeological survey of the Sawmill Creek tract. During this survey, one previously recorded archaeological site, The Welch Site (31FY1120), was revisited, and one archaeological site (31FY1158) and two isolated finds (31FY1156 and 31FY1157) were recorded. All of these resources retain poor integrity and have no further research potential. These archaeological sites and the isolated find are recommended ineligible for the NRHP. As no significant archaeological sites will be impacted due to the proposed development, clearance to proceed is recommended.
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Appendix A. Artifact Catalog
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Accession Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31FY1120</td>
<td>271013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provenience Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Welch Site, 50x20 #1, Level 1, 0-5cm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalog Specimen Number</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>Undecorated Whiteware Ceramic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Accession Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31FY1156</td>
<td>271014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provenience Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Iso-1, Area 5, ST 1, 0-10,15 cmbs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalog Specimen Number</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>m1</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>Metavolcanic Flake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Accession Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31FY1157</td>
<td>271015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provenience Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Iso-2, surface</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalog Specimen Number</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>m1</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>Metavolcanic Flake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B. Resume of Primary Author
DAWN M. REID
Archaeological Consultants of the Carolinas, Inc.
8 Chase Drive
Selma, North Carolina 27576
(919) 965-0149 Fax (919) 965-0159
dawnreid@earthlink.net

EDUCATION
B.S. in Anthropology, University of California, Riverside, 1992
M.A. in Geography, University of Georgia, Athens, 1999

AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION
Client and Agency Consultations for Planning and Development
Zooarchaeology
Palynology and Sediment Particle Analysis

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP
Register of Professional Archaeologists (ROPA)
Southeastern Archaeological Conference
Archaeological Society of South Carolina
North Carolina Archaeological Society

Society for American Archaeology
Mid-Atlantic Archaeology Conference
Council of South Carolina Professional Archaeologists
North Carolina Council of Professional Archaeologists

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY
June 2003 to present  Vice President, ACC, Inc., Selma.
May 1993-July 1993;  Assistant Field Director, Naranjal, Yucatan, Mexico, University of California, Riverside, CA.
Jan. 1992-May 1992;  Field Assistant, Ca-RIV-1167, Archaeological Research Unit, Riverside, CA. Lithic Analyst,
Ca-ORA-1070, Macko Archaeological Consulting, Newport Beach, CA.
1991
Field Assistant, Castle Mountain, University of California, Riverside, CA.
Staff Archaeologist/Researcher, Eastern Information Center, Riverside, CA.
Excavator, Ca-ORA-36 and Ca-ORA-486, Archaeological Research Management,
Mission Viejo, CA.
Assistant Crew Chief, 42-KA-1568, California State University, Long Beach, CA.
Staff Archaeologist, Archaeological Research Unit, Riverside, CA.
Field Assistant, 42-KA-1568, International Technology, Irvine, CA.
Field Assistant, Ca-SDi-11068B, Gallegos and Associates, San Marcos, CA.

1989
Excavator, AZ BB:9:88 ASM, Foundation for Field Research, Tucson, AZ.

Reports and Publications

2005  Dawn Reid
Cultural Resources Examination and Reconnaissance of the Sink Tract, Forsyth County, North Carolina. ACC, Inc.

2005  Dawn Reid and Joseph Sanders
Archaeological Survey of the Hilltop Areas, Pittsboro Tract, Chatham County, North Carolina. ACC, Inc.

2005  Michael K. O’Neal, Joseph Sanders, and Dawn Reid
Archaeological Survey of Four Tracts in the Lawnes Point Development Area, Isle of Wight County, Virginia. ACC, Inc.

2005  Michael K. O’Neal, Mackensie Cornelius, and Dawn Reid
Archaeological Survey of Wetland Impact Areas in the Rivers Bend East Tract, Chesterfield County, Virginia. ACC, Inc.

2004  Bobby G. Southerlin and Dawn Reid
Archaeological Site Delineation and Evaluation of 38HR508 at the Scotty Smith Property, Horry County, South Carolina. ACC, Inc.

2004  Dawn Reid and Rachel Tibbetts
Archaeological Investigation of the Ruffin Mill Tract, Chesterfield County, Virginia. ACC, Inc.

2004  Dawn Reid and Rachel Tibbetts
Cultural Resources Survey of the Harrelson-Ellis Tract, Horry County, South Carolina. ACC, Inc.

2004  Dawn Reid, Rachel Tibbetts, and Patrick Hendrix
Cultural Resources Survey of the Hobbyville Transmission Line and Substation Tract, Spartanburg County, South Carolina. ACC, Inc.

2004  Dawn Reid, Rachel Tibbetts, and Aaron G. Brummitt
Archaeological Survey and Testing at the Cypress River Plantation Tract, Horry County, South Carolina. ACC, Inc.

2004  Dawn Reid, Rachel Tibbetts, and Aaron G. Brummitt
Phase II Testing of Sites 38HR490, 38HR496, and Supplemental Phase II Testing of Site 38HR500, Cypress River Plantation, Horry County, South Carolina. ACC, Inc.
2004  Dawn Reid, Rachel Tibbetts, and Angus C. Sawyer  
Archaeological Survey and Site Evaluation at the Lawnes Point Development Tract, Isle of Wight County, Virginia. ACC, Inc.

2004  Dawn Reid and Rachel Tibbetts  
Archaeological Investigation of the Ruffin Mill Tract, Chesterfield County, Virginia. ACC, Inc.

2004  Bobby Southerlin, Elizabeth Haywood, Michael Hendrix, and Dawn Reid  
Archaeological Survey and Evaluation at the Bright’s Creek Development Tract, Polk County, North Carolina. ACC, Inc.

2004  Dawn Reid  

2004  Dawn Reid and Rachel Tibbetts  
Archaeological Survey and Testing at the Rum Bluff Development Tract, Horry County, South Carolina. ACC, Inc.

2004  Dawn Reid and Bobby Southerlin  
Archaeological Survey and Testing at the Glen Dornoch Golf Course, Horry County, South Carolina. ACC, Inc.

2003  Dawn Reid  
Intensive Cultural Resources Survey of the Fairplay to Townville Transmission Line and Substation Tract, Anderson County, South Carolina. ACC, Inc.

2003  Dawn Reid  
Cultural Resources Survey of the Proposed Glade Valley Substation Tract, Allegheny County, North Carolina. ACC, Inc.

2003  Michael K. O’Neal, Julie Wilburn Peeler, and Dawn Reid  

2002  Dawn Reid  
Evaluation of the Proposed SCE&G Westvaco-Thomas Island 115kV Transmission Line, Charleston and Berkeley Counties, South Carolina. B & A.

2002  Michael K. O’Neal  
Phase II Testing of 44CA116, Patriot Extension Natural Gas Pipeline, Carroll County, Virginia. B & A.

2002  Dawn Reid, Pat Hendrix, Michael K. O’Neal, and Eric Poplin  
Archaeological Survey of the Palmetto Bluff Construction Road and Wastewater Effluent Plant Tract, Beaufort Count, South Carolina. B & A.

2002  Dawn Reid and Michael K. O’Neal  

2002  Dawn Reid and Michael K. O’Neal  
Concord Regional Airport Improvements: Cultural Resources Investigation of Two Tracts and Evaluation of Site 31CA195, Cabarrus County, North Carolina. B & A.
2002  Dawn Reid, Joe Sanders, and David Jenkins  
*Cultural Resources Survey of the Yemassee Transmission Line, Hampton and Jasper Counties, South Carolina.*  B & A.

2001  Dawn Reid, Bruce Harvey, Jill Olsen, and David Jenkins  
*Cultural Resources Survey of the Proposed Patriot Extension Natural Gas Pipeline Corridor, Wythe, Carroll, Floyd, Patrick, and Henry Counties, Virginia.*  B & A.

2001  Dawn Reid and Jill Olsen  
*Cultural Resources Survey of the Proposed Patriot Extension and Cogentrix Lateral Natural Gas Pipeline Corridors, Rockingham County, North Carolina.*  B & A.

2001  Dawn Reid, Bruce Harvey, Jill Olsen, Alex Sweeney, Connie Huddleston, and Susan Ritter  
*An Eighteenth Century Settlement on the Okatie River: Data Recovery at 38BU1650, Beaufort County, South Carolina.*  B & A.

2001  Bobby Southerlin, Dawn Reid, and Helen K. Mazzeo  
*Phase I (Stage IA/IB) Archaeological Survey, Fort Buchanan, Bayamon and Guaynabo, Puerto Rico.*  B & A.

2001  Dawn Reid  
*Cultural Resources Survey of the Deep Branch Tract, Horry County, South Carolina.*  B & A.

2001  David Jenkins and Dawn Reid  
*Cultural Resources Survey of the Hickory Tavern 100 kV Transmission Line and Substation, Laurens County, South Carolina.*  B & A.

2001  Dawn Reid, Michael K. O’Neal, and David Jenkins  
*Cultural Resources Survey of the Chickahominy Tract, Charles City County, Virginia.*  B & A.

2001  Dawn Reid, David Jenkins, and Michael O’Neal  
*Intensive Cultural Resources Survey of the Hartness Tract, Greenville County, South Carolina.*  B & A.

2001  Joseph Sanders and Dawn Reid  
*Cultural Resources Survey of the Five Forks Substation, Greenville County, South Carolina.*  B & A.

2001  Dawn Reid  
*Cultural Resources Survey of the Big Bay II Tract, Horry County, South Carolina.*  B & A.

2001  Dawn Reid and Joseph Sanders  
*Cultural Resources Survey of the Stalvey-Suggs I and Stalvey-Suggs II Tracts, Horry County, South Carolina.*  B & A.

2001  Dawn Reid and Helen Mazzeo  
*Cultural Resources Survey of the Low Country Day School Tract, Georgetown County, South Carolina.*  B & A.

2000  Dawn Reid  
*Cultural Resource Investigation: Proposed Widening of the River and Court Streets (SR53 and SR136) Intersection, Calhoun, Georgia.*  B & A.

2000  Dawn Reid  
*Cultural Resources Survey and Evaluation of the Proposed Deerfield/US Highway 9 Substation and Transmission line, Forsyth and Fulton Counties, Georgia.*  B & A.
2000  Bobby Southerlin, Dawn Reid, Helen K. Mazzeo, and Joseph Sanders
*Phase I Historic Resource Survey of Groundwater Contamination Remediation Areas Associated with Milan Army Ammunition Plant, Gibson and Carroll Counties, Tennessee. B & A.*

2000  Jill Olsen and Dawn Reid
*Historic Resources Survey of Seven Intersections Along US 441/SR 15, Rabun County, Georgia. B & A.*

2000  Dawn Reid
*Cultural Resources Survey and Site Evaluation at the Vinings Estates Tract, Cobb County, Georgia. B & A.*

2000  Dawn Reid
*Archaeological Survey and Site Evaluation at the Register Place Estates Tract, New Hanover County, North Carolina. B & A.*

2000  Steve Lotti and Dawn Reid
*Cultural Resources Survey of a 13 Mile Segment of US 19, Haywood and Jackson Counties, North Carolina. B & A.*

1999  Caleb Smith and Dawn Reid
*Cultural Resources Survey of the Proposed John S. Rainey Generating Station, and Natural Gas and Water Pipeline Corridors, Anderson County, South Carolina and Hart County, Georgia. B & A.*

1999  Joseph Charles and Dawn Reid
*Cultural Resources Survey of the Dowdle Mountain Tract, Macon County, North Carolina. B & A.*

1999  Dawn Reid and Bruce Harvey
*Cultural Resources Survey of the Harlee Tract, Florence County, South Carolina. B & A.*

1999  Dawn Reid and Bruce Harvey
*Cultural Resources Survey of the Royal Landing Tract, Florence County, South Carolina. B & A.*

1999  Dawn Reid and Dea Mozingo
*Archaeological Survey and Evaluation of the Mars Hill Road/State Route 53 Corridor, Oconee County, Georgia. B & A.*

1999  Dawn Reid
*Cultural Resources Survey of the Waccamaw River Tract, Horry County, South Carolina. B & A.*

1999  Dawn Reid

1999  Dawn Reid

1999  Dawn Reid
*Archaeological Survey and Testing of IHE3, George W. Andrews Lake (Freeman Bend), Henry County, Alabama. B & A.*

1999  Dawn Reid and Alex Y. Sweeney
*Cultural Resources Survey of a Proposed Combustion Turbine Generating Site, Rockingham County, North Carolina. B & A.*
1999  Dawn Reid and Joseph Charles  

1999  Dawn Reid  
Archaeological Survey and Testing of 9ER103, George W. Andrews Lake, Early County, Georgia. B & A.

1999  Dawn Reid  
Phase II Excavations at IDS48, William “Bill” Dannelly Lake, Dallas County, Alabama. B & A.

1999  Dawn Reid, Connie Huddleston, Marian Roberts, Joseph Sanders, Thomas W. Neumann, and Bobby Southerlin  
Data Recovery at 38HR243, Little River Neck, Horry County, South Carolina. B & A.

1999  Joseph Charles and Dawn Reid  
Cultural Resources Survey of the Stalvey-Suggs Tract, Horry County, South Carolina. B & A.

1998  Dawn Reid  
The Causal Relationship Between Population Increases and the Domination of Maize in the Late Prehistoric Diet and the Demographic Consequences of this Change in Subsistence Strategies in the Eastern United States. South Carolina Antiquities 30(1):236.

1998  Dawn Reid and Kip Wright  
Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of the Proposed Columbus, Georgia to Phenix City, Alabama Water Supply Pipeline. B & A.

1998  Dawn Reid  
Archaeological Survey and Testing of the Lower Canal and Coke Bottle Tracts, Horry County, South Carolina. B& A.

1998  Dawn Reid  
Archaeological Survey of the Grand Dunes West Tract, Horry County, South Carolina. B & A.

1998  Dawn Reid  
Archaeological Survey of the Proposed Widening and Reconstruction of US 441/SR 15, Rabun County, Georgia. B & A.

1998  Dawn Reid  
Cultural Resources Survey of the Hicks-McNeal Tract, Horry County, South Carolina. B & A.

1998  Dawn Reid  
Archaeological Survey and Testing of the Big Bay Tract, Horry County, South Carolina. B & A.

1998  Bobby G. Southerlin, Bruce Harvey, and Dawn Reid  
Phase I Historic Resources Survey along Luxapalila Creek and at the Remains of a Historic Mill (22LO948), Lowndes County, Mississippi. B & A.

1998  Dawn Reid and Bobby G. Southerlin  
Phase II Testing of Three Archaeological Sites (9MC267, 9MC391, and 9MC392), Townsend Bombing Range, McIntosh County, Georgia. B & A.

1998  Dawn Reid and Bobby G. Southerlin  
Cultural Resources Overview: Bartow County Water Department Property, Bartow County, Georgia. B & A.
1998  Dawn Reid and Kip Wright
Cultural Resources Survey of the Proposed Mirror Lake Residential Development, Douglas and Carroll Counties,
Georgia.  B & A.

1998  Dawn Reid and Kip Wright
Cultural Resources Survey of the Proposed Mirror Lake Golf Course, Douglas County, Georgia.  B & A.

1997  Bobby Southerlin, Dawn Reid, Connie Huddleston, Dr. Thomas Neuman, and Andrea Shea
Data Recovery Excavations at 38BU306 and 38BU789, Paleoindian and Mississippian Occupations on Spring
Island, Beaufort County, South Carolina.  B & A.

1997  Bobby G. Southerlin and Dawn Reid
Phase II Excavations at ILO28, Prairie Creek Campground, R.E. “Bob” Woodruff Lake, Lowndes County,
Alabama.  B & A.

1997  Dawn Reid
Cultural Resources Survey of the Proposed New Salem Road (Noonday Creek) Bridge Replacement, Cobb County,
Georgia.  B & A.

1997  Dawn Reid
A Study of Vertebrate and Invertebrate Faunal Remains from 38HR254, The Tidewater Site, Horry County, South
Carolina.  B & A.

1997  Dawn Reid
A Study of Vertebrate and Invertebrate Faunal Remains from 38BU306 and 38BU789, Spring Island, Beaufort
County, South Carolina.  B & A.

1997  Dawn Reid and Bobby Southerlin
A Study of Vertebrate Faunal Remains from the Rivertowne Plantation Site (38BU1585), Beaufort County, South
Carolina.  B & A.

1996  Dawn Reid and Bobby Southerlin
A Study of Vertebrate Faunal Remains from 38BU1294, Beaufort County, South Carolina.  B & A.

1996  Bobby Southerlin and Dawn Reid
A Study of Vertebrate Faunal Remains from 38BU1419, Beaufort County, South Carolina.  B & A.

1996  Bobby Southerlin and Dawn Reid
A Study of Vertebrate Faunal Remains from 38CH679-3, Charleston County, South Carolina.  B & A.

1996  Bobby G. Southerlin, William R. Jordan, and Dawn Reid
Intensive Cultural Resources Survey of the Proposed Jotla Valley Industrial Park, Macon County, North Carolina.
B & A.

1996  Dawn Reid
Caching Behavior in Northwest Georgia during the Middle Woodland Period.  Early Georgia 24(1):24-33.

1996  Dawn Reid, Marian D. Roberts, and C. S. Butler
Cultural Resources Survey of the Proposed Barrett Lakes Boulevard Improvements, Cobb County, Georgia.  B &
A.

1996  Dawn Reid, Marian D. Roberts, and Bobby G. Southerlin
Cultural Resources Survey of the Proposed George Busbee Parkway Realignment, Cobb County, Georgia.  B & A.
1996 Dawn Reid, Marian D. Roberts, Joseph Sanders, and John B. O'Donnell
*Phase I and Phase II Cultural Resources Investigations of the Proposed Reconstruction Segments along U.S. Highway 27 in Early, Clay, and Randolph Counties.* B & A.

1995 Dawn Reid, Marian D. Roberts, and Bobby G. Southerlin
*Cultural Resources Reconnaissance of a Proposed Water Treatment Plant in Bartow County, Georgia.* B & A.

1995 Bobby Southerlin, Dawn Reid, Connie Huddleston, John Foss, and Linda Kennedy
*And the Coosa Between Them: Archaeological Investigations of Sites 9FL203 and 9FL206, Floyd County, Georgia.* B & A.

1995 Bobby G. Southerlin, Dawn Reid, James Hill, Eric Poplin, and Paul Brockington
*Archaeological Testing of Ten Sites, Fort Jackson, South Carolina.* B & A.

1995 Bobby Southerlin, Marian Roberts, Dawn Reid, and Jeffrey Gardner
*Phase I Historic Resources Survey of the Memphis Public Use Area, Pickens County, Georgia.* B & A.

1995 Marian D. Roberts, Dawn Reid, and B. G. Southerlin
*Archaeological Survey and Testing of Proposed Impact Areas in the Dolphin Head Recreation Area, and an Adjacent One Acres Residential Lot, Hilton Head Island, South Carolina.* B & A.

1995 Dawn M. Reid

1995 Scott L. Fedick, Dawn Reid, and Jennifer P. Mathews

1994 Dawn Reid, and Marian Roberts
*Cultural Resources Survey and Evaluation of the Proposed Georgia Power Combustion Turbine Plant, Jackson County, Georgia.* B & A.

1994 Jeffrey W. Gardner, B. G. Southerlin, Marian Roberts, and Dawn Reid
*Intensive Cultural Resources Survey and Testing of Parcels One and Two, Columbus/Fort Benning Land Exchange, Chattahoochee and Muscogee Counties, Georgia.* B & A.

1994 B. G. Southerlin, Dawn Reid, and Jeffrey W. Gardner
*Prehistoric Burial Recovery and Archaeological Evaluation of Site 9SW70, Lake Walter F. George, Stewart County, Georgia.* B & A.

1993 Dawn M. Reid, and Mari A. Pritchard-Parker

1993 Mari A. Pritchard-Parker, and Dawn M. Reid
PAPERS PRESENTED AT PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS

1998  Dawn Reid

1997  Dawn Reid

1996  Dawn Reid

1995  Dawn Reid
       Caching Behavior in Northwest Georgia During the Middle Woodland Period. Paper presented at the Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Knoxville, Tennessee.