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Abstract

Brockington and Associates, Inc., (Brockington) conducted an intensive cultural resources survey of the US Highway 78 (US 78) Phase 3 Improvements Project in the Town of Summerville, Dorchester County, South Carolina, March 2 through 6 and May 18 through June 1, 2015. This work was conducted through Davis & Floyd for the Dorchester County Sales Tax Transportation Authority (DCTA) in advance of road improvement activities along this portion of US 78. The DCTA and Davis & Floyd sponsored these investigations to identify any historic properties (i.e., sites, buildings, structures, objects, or districts listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places [NRHP]) that may be affected by the widening of the roadway. This survey provides partial compliance with Section 4(f) of the US Department of Transportation Act of 1966, as amended (49 USC §303), and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 USC §470) (U.S. National Archives and Records Administration 1983, 1992).

The DCTA proposes to widen and improve a 2.25-mile section of US 78, beginning 1,500 feet west of its intersection with S-18-131 (North Maple Street) to its intersection with Branch Creek Trail, located in the Town of Summerville, South Carolina. The scope of the proposed improvements consists of widening US 78 to a five-lane facility with selected intersection improvements. The existing right-of-way (ROW) ranges from approximately 60 to 100 feet wide along US 78 and averages 50 feet on all side streets. New ROW will be required from an additional 10 feet on all side streets to 80 to 120 feet along US 78. The archaeological survey universe extends 100 feet to either side of the existing ROW along US 78 and 50 feet along all side roads. The architectural survey universe is 600 feet wide, extending 300 feet to either side of the present road centerline.

Brockington conducted a cultural resources survey of a 24.6-mile long section of US 78 in 2006 (Fletcher et al. 2007). That project was located along existing US 78 beginning in northeast Summerville at secondary road S-18-65 (West Richardson Avenue) and continuing northwest along the existing alignment to secondary road S-18-167 (Sugarhill Road) in St. George. Included within that 24.6-mile section are what are now known as Phases 1-3. Phase 1 has been constructed and Phase 2 is in the process of acquiring ROW. The current project is to be included within Phase 3.

Brockington conducted an intensive archaeological and architectural survey of the US 78 Phase 3 Improvements Project March 2 through 6, 2015. The Area of Potential Effect (APE) for the project includes both the archaeological and architectural survey universes but is equivalent to the architectural survey universe, which extends 300 feet to either side of the present road center line. The archaeological survey included pedestrian inspection of the entire project route and identified no cultural resources. Previous investigations identified one NRHP district and 11 historic architectural resources. During the current investigation, the architectural historian recorded 24 additional historic resources in the APE. Table A-1 summarizes these 36 resources. Listed or eligible properties in the APE include the Summerville NRHP Historic District and Resource 496 0561 (the Dorchester County Hospital). The proposed improvements project will have no adverse effect on either of these historic properties. The 34 other historic architectural resources are not eligible for the NRHP and require no additional management.

Archival research suggests the current route of US 78 extends through a portion of Oak Grove Cemetery, a cemetery associated with the former Summerville General Hospital that may contain the remains of Confederate soldiers and individuals from the 35th U.S. Colored Troops. This cemetery is reported to be located on a former 10-acre tract that extended northwest from the intersection of US 78 and North Maple Street. Unfortunately, archival research could not determine the exact location of the cemetery. For this reason, DCTA and Davis & Floyd sponsored the geophysical survey of approximately one acre of the APE near the intersection of US 78 and North Maple Street. The geophysical survey was conducted May 18 through June 1, 2015, and identified no subsurface anomalies indicative of graves. However, because of the APE’s proximity to Oak...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>NRHP Status</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>496 0008</td>
<td>Summerville Historic District</td>
<td>c. 1830-1940</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Fick and Davis 1996; Moltke-Hansen et al. 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0561</td>
<td>Dorchester County Hospital</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>500 N. Main St.</td>
<td>Eligible*</td>
<td>Fick and Davis 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0252</td>
<td>unknown SFR (destroyed)</td>
<td>c. 1915</td>
<td>413 5th N. St.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0268</td>
<td>Bungalow</td>
<td>c. 1915</td>
<td>705 N. Main St.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0269</td>
<td>cinderblock bungalow SFR</td>
<td>c. 1925</td>
<td>903 5th N. St. West</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0569**</td>
<td>Bungalow</td>
<td>c. 1925</td>
<td>312 N. Maple St.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Bailey and Harvey 2000; Fick and Davis 1996; Gantt 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0570**</td>
<td>Bungalow</td>
<td>c. 1935</td>
<td>313 N. Maple St.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Fick and Davis 1996; Gantt 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1177</td>
<td>Bungalow</td>
<td>c. 1930</td>
<td>520 N. Maple St.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Gantt 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1178</td>
<td>Bungalow</td>
<td>c. 1930</td>
<td>518 Maple St.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1179</td>
<td>Bungalow</td>
<td>c. 1940</td>
<td>506 Maple St.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1269**</td>
<td>Commercial, no type or style</td>
<td>c. 1950</td>
<td>1010 W. 5th N. St.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1270**</td>
<td>Commercial, no type or style</td>
<td>c. 1935</td>
<td>930 W. 5th N. St.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245</td>
<td>Bungalow</td>
<td>c. 1930</td>
<td>102 Pringle Ln</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1246</td>
<td>Bungalow</td>
<td>c. 1930</td>
<td>921 W. 5th N. St.</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1247</td>
<td>Bungalow</td>
<td>c. 1930</td>
<td>936 W. 5th N. St.</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1248</td>
<td>Bungalow</td>
<td>c. 1930</td>
<td>410 Bryan St.</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1249</td>
<td>Bungalow</td>
<td>c. 1930</td>
<td>314 Laurel St.</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250</td>
<td>Bungalow</td>
<td>c. 1930</td>
<td>313 W. 4th N. St.</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1251</td>
<td>Bungalow</td>
<td>c. 1930</td>
<td>513 N Magnolia St.</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252</td>
<td>Bungalow</td>
<td>c. 1930</td>
<td>108 E. 6th N. St.</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1253</td>
<td>Bungalow</td>
<td>c. 1935</td>
<td>205 W. 5th N. St.</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1254</td>
<td>Bungalow</td>
<td>c. 1930</td>
<td>601 N. Hickory St.</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1255</td>
<td>Center hall</td>
<td>c. 1915</td>
<td>514 N Magnolia St.</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1256</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional</td>
<td>c. 1950</td>
<td>614 N Pine St.</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>newly identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1257</td>
<td>Ranch</td>
<td>c. 1960</td>
<td>505 N. Laurel St.</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1258</td>
<td>Ranch</td>
<td>c. 1965</td>
<td>701 W. 5th N. St.</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1259</td>
<td>Ranch</td>
<td>c. 1960</td>
<td>500 N. Pine St.</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1260</td>
<td>Ranch</td>
<td>c. 1965</td>
<td>210 W. 6th N. St.</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1261</td>
<td>Ranch</td>
<td>c. 1965</td>
<td>208 W. 6th N. St.</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1262</td>
<td>Ranch</td>
<td>c. 1965</td>
<td>202 W. 6th N. St.</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1263</td>
<td>Commercial, one part block</td>
<td>c. 1940</td>
<td>437 N. Main St.</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1264</td>
<td>Commercial, one part block</td>
<td>c. 1940</td>
<td>445 N. Main St.</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1265</td>
<td>Gas station</td>
<td>c. 1950</td>
<td>405 E. 5th N. St.</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1266</td>
<td>Gas station</td>
<td>c. 1940</td>
<td>717 W. 5th N St.</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1267</td>
<td>Mid-century School</td>
<td>c. 1950</td>
<td>500 Bryan St.</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1268</td>
<td>Ruins</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>827-897 W. 5th N. St.</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c.:=circa
*contributes to local Summerville Historic District
**misidentified by Gantt (2009) and re-surveyed during current investigation
Grove Cemetery and the degree of ground surface and subsurface disturbance, it is still possible that unmarked graves are present in the APE that could not be detected with GPR. For this reason, Brockington recommends archaeological monitoring of construction activities if and/or when these activities occur adjacent to Oak Grove Cemetery grounds. If any graves with human remains are encountered, they should be preserved in place or removed and relocated on-site where they can be protected from future ground disturbing activities. On-site is defined as anywhere within the current boundaries of the APE. Any excavation, removal, or relocation of graves should be conducted in accordance with applicable South Carolina law.
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1.0 Introduction

Brockington conducted an intensive cultural resources survey of the US 78 Phase 3 Improvements Project in the Town of Summerville, Dorchester County, South Carolina, March 2 through 6 and May 18 through June 1, 2015. These investigations included background research, intensive archaeological and architectural surveys, and limited geophysical survey. This work was conducted through Davis & Floyd for the DCTA in advance of road improvement activities along this portion of US 78. This project is being developed and advanced by the DCTA and the South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT). Funding for the project will come primarily from DCTA; DCTA and SCDOT are investigating other potential funding sources. The DCTA and Davis & Floyd sponsored these investigations to identify any historic properties (i.e., sites, buildings, structures, objects, or districts listed on or eligible for the NRHP) that may be affected by the widening of the roadway. This survey provides partial compliance with Section 4(f) of the US Department of Transportation Act of 1966, as amended (49 USC 303), and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 USC 470).

During the current investigations, Brockington conducted a cultural resources survey of a 2.25-mile section of US 78, beginning 1,500 feet west of its intersection with S-18-131 (North Maple Street) and extending to its intersection with Branch Creek Trail, located in the Town of Summerville, South Carolina. The scope of this portion of the proposed improvements consists of widening US 78 to a five-lane facility with selected intersection improvements. This 2.25-mile section is considered to be a portion of Phase 3. For Phase 3, the DCTA proposes to widen and improve a 7.33-mile section of US 78, beginning 3,600 feet northwest of its intersection with S-22 (Orangeburg Rd/Dawson Branch Rd) and extending to its intersection with Branch Creek Trail, located in the Town of Summerville, South Carolina. The scope of the proposed improvements consists of widening US 78 to a five-lane facility with selected intersection improvements. This 7.33-mile-long US 78 Phase 3 Improvements Project was identified by the USGS 1979 Summerville, SC quadrangle.
Figure 1.1 A portion of the 2005 Dorchester County General Highway Map showing the location of the US 78 Phase 3 Improvements Project.
Figure 1.2 The location of the US 78 Phase 3 Improvements Project and all identified cultural resources and previous investigations (USGS 1990 Summerville, SC quadrangle).
Figure 1.3 The location of the US 78 Phase 3 Improvements Project on a modern aerial photograph.
This report is organized into four chapters, references cited, and one appendix. Chapter 2 describes the methods employed during this survey. Chapter 3 presents the environmental and cultural settings for the project, and also includes a summary of previous investigations in the project area. Chapter 4 presents the results of the cultural resources survey and summarizes the project. Appendix A presents the architectural survey forms.

Archival research suggests the current route of US 78 extends through a portion of Oak Grove Cemetery, a cemetery associated with the former Summerville General Hospital that may inter the remains of Confederate soldiers and individuals from the 35th U.S. Colored Troops. This cemetery is reported to be located on a former 10-acre tract that extended northwest from the intersection of US 78 and North Maple Street. Unfortunately, archival research could not determine the exact location of the cemetery. For this reason, DCTA and Davis & Floyd sponsored a geophysical survey of approximately one acre of the APE near the intersection of US 78 and North Maple Street. The geophysical survey included additional background research into the history of the cemetery and the use of Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR). The GPR survey was conducted May 18 through June 1, 2015, and identified no subsurface anomalies indicative of graves. However, because of the APE's proximity to Oak Grove Cemetery and the degree of ground surface and subsurface disturbance, it is still possible that unmarked graves are present in the APE that could not be detected with GPR. For this reason, Brockington recommends archaeological monitoring of construction activities if and/or when these activities occur adjacent to Oak Grove Cemetery grounds. If any graves with human remains are encountered, they should be preserved in place or removed and relocated on-site where they can be protected from future ground disturbing activities. On-site is defined as anywhere within the current boundaries of the APE. Any excavation, removal, or relocation of graves should be conducted in accordance with applicable South Carolina law.
2.0 Methods of Investigation

2.1 Project Objectives
The objective of the cultural resources survey of the US 78 Phase 3 Improvements Project was to locate and assess the significance of all cultural resources that may be directly or indirectly affected by proposed improvements to US 78. Tasks performed to accomplish these objectives include background research, archaeological and architectural surveys, geophysical survey, curation, and NRHP assessment. Methods employed for each of these tasks are described below.

2.2 Background Research
Archival research included a review of cultural resource management reports, deed research at local research facilities, and correspondence with local amateur historians. Archival research began with accessing ArchSite (http://archsite.cas.sc.edu/ArchSite), an online cultural resource management database sponsored by the South Carolina Department of Archives and History (SCDAH) and the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology (SCIAA). Previously recorded archaeological sites and historic architectural resources available on Archsite and historic maps were reviewed to predict the kinds and quantities of cultural resources present within the survey universe. In addition, project principals reviewed Brockington cultural resource management reports for projects conducted in the Summerville area. In addition, Principal Investigator Josh Fletcher conducted research at the SCDAH facility in Columbia. Some context and data from these reports is incorporated into Chapter 3. The project historian reviewed primary and secondary materials in the South Carolina Room of the Charleston County Public Library in Charleston.

For information on the Confederate Cemetery (Oak Grove Cemetery) the author sought the opinion of subject experts at the Summerville Dorchester Museum Confederate Cemetery Committee including Dr. Edward West and Mr. Rutherford Smith, both of Summerville. They helped him understand the level of work and research that was necessary to locate and verify the information on the Civil War cemeteries of Summerville including the former Oak Grove Cemetery, reportedly located on Maple Street.

2.3 Archaeological Survey
Archaeological survey of the project corridor followed the South Carolina Standards and Guidelines for Archaeological Investigations (COSCAPA et al. 2013). The existing ROW ranges from approximately 60 to 100 feet wide along US 78 and averages 50 feet on all side streets. New ROW will be required from an additional 10 feet on all side streets to 80 to 120 feet along US 78. The archaeological survey universe extends 100 feet to either side of the existing ROW along US 78 and 50 feet along all side roads. The architectural survey universe is 600 feet wide, extending 300 feet to either side of the present road centerline. No shovel tests were excavated in heavily disturbed areas or in wetlands. Although investigators traversed the entire archaeological survey universe, a total of only 25 shovel tests were excavated because of the degree of disturbance and the generally low and wet conditions that prevailed through the project route.

Each shovel test measured approximately one foot in diameter and was excavated into sterile subsoil. The fill from these tests was sifted through ¼-inch mesh hardware cloth. Information relating to each shovel test also was recorded in field notebooks. This information included the content and context (e.g., soil color, texture, stratification) of each test. Figure 2.1 uses recent aerial imagery to show the project route, shovel tested areas, and areas that are disturbed or low where no shovel tests were excavated.

2.4 Architectural Survey
March 2 through 6, 2015, the project architectural historian conducted an intensive architectural survey of all aboveground cultural resources within the architectural survey universe to take into account any possible visual effects of the proposed undertaking. The survey was designed to identify, record, and evaluate all historic architectural resources (buildings, structures, objects, designed landscapes, and/or sites with aboveground components) in the project area. Field survey methods complied with the Survey Manual: South Carolina Statewide Survey of Historic Places (SCDAH 2007) and National Register Bulletin 24, Guidelines for Local Surveys: A Basis for Preservation Planning (Parker 1985). In accordance
Figure 2.1 The location of shovel tested areas in the US 78 Phase 3 Improvements Project on recent aerial imagery.
Also, integrity is evaluated in the context of the local region.

While in the field the architectural historian evaluated the integrity of each identified historic architectural resource. Resources exhibiting poor integrity were not recorded. For the purpose of this project, four levels of architectural integrity were employed. These include:

**Excellent** - All original construction materials and design remain intact and unchanged.

**Good** - The majority of original construction materials remain intact and unchanged except for roofing and other renewable elements.

**Fair** - A substantial number of original architectural elements have been altered, such as the installation of aluminum, asbestos, or vinyl siding; the substitution of historic doors and windows with non-historic replacements; and the construction of non-historic additions.

**Poor** - Has been radically altered from its original design by non-historic renovations and/or additions.

The majority of the architectural resources within the survey universe date to the post-World War II period. The architectural historian consulted South Carolina State Historic Preservation Office's (SHPO) Guidelines for Surveying Post-World War II Neighborhoods and Residences (SHPO 2013) for guidance on surveying and recording resources from this period. Properties that were heavily modified, possessed little integrity or did not have character defining features were excluded from the survey. Pristine and excellent examples of resource types present were recorded.

All architectural resources in the project area were recorded on South Carolina Statewide Survey (SCSS) forms in digital format using the survey database in Microsoft Access™. At least one digital photograph, preferably showing the main and side elevations, was taken of each resource. The location of each architectural resource was recorded on USGS topographic maps. The completed forms, including the various maps and photographs, were prepared...
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 the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, possesses high artistic value, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
D. has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important to history or prehistory.

A resource may be eligible under one or more of these criteria. Criteria A, B, and C are most frequently applied to historic buildings, structures, objects, non-archaeological sites (e.g., battlefields, natural features, designed landscapes, or cemeteries), or districts. The eligibility of archaeological sites is most frequently considered with respect to Criterion D. Also, a general guide of 50 years of age is employed to define “historic” in the NRHP evaluation process. That is, all resources greater than 50 years of age may be considered. However, more recent resources may be considered if they display “exceptional” significance (Sherfy and Luce n.d.).

Following National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation (Savage and Pope 1998), evaluation of any resource requires a twofold process. First, the resource must be associated with an important historical context. If this association is demonstrated, the integrity of the resource must be evaluated to ensure that it conveys the significance of its context. The applications of both of these steps are discussed in more detail below.

Determining the association of a resource with a historical context involves five steps (Savage and Pope 1998). First, the resource must be associated with a particular facet of local, regional (state), or national history. Secondly, one must determine the significance of the identified historical facet/context with respect to the resource under evaluation. A lack of Native American archaeological sites within a project area would preclude the use of contexts associated with the Pre-Contact use of a region. The third step is to demonstrate the ability of a particular resource to illustrate the context. A resource should be a component of the locales and features created or used during the historical period in question. For example, early nineteenth-century farmhouses, the ruins of African American slave settlements from the 1820s, and/or field systems associated with particular antebellum plantations in the region would illustrate various aspects of the agricultural development of the region prior to the
Civil War. Conversely, contemporary churches or road networks may have been used during this time period but do not reflect the agricultural practices suggested by the other kinds of resources.

The fourth step involves determining the specific association of a resource with aspects of the significant historical context. Savage and Pope (1998) define how one should consider a resource under each of the four criteria of significance. Under Criterion A, a property must have existed at the time that a particular event or pattern of events occurred, and activities associated with the event(s) must have occurred at the site. In addition, this association must be of a significant nature, not just a casual occurrence (Savage and Pope 1998). Under Criterion B, the resource must be associated with historically important individuals. Again, this association must relate to the period or events that convey historical significance to the individual, not just that this person was present at this locale (Savage and Pope 1998). Under Criterion C, a resource must possess physical features or traits that reflect a style, type, period, or method of construction; display high artistic value; or represent the work of a master (an individual whose work can be distinguished from others and possesses recognizable greatness) (Savage and Pope 1998). Under Criterion D, a resource must possess sources of information that can address specific important research questions (Savage and Pope 1998). These questions must generate information that is important in reconstructing or interpreting the past (Butler 1987; Townsend et al. 1993). For archaeological sites, recoverable data must be able to address specific research questions.

After a resource is associated with a specific significant historical context, one must determine which physical features of the resource reflect its significance. One should consider the types of resources that may be associated with the context, how these resources represent the theme, and which aspects of integrity apply to the resource in question (Savage and Pope 1998). As in the antebellum agriculture example given above, a variety of resources may reflect this context (farmhouses, ruins of slave settlements, field systems, etc.). One must demonstrate how these resources reflect the context. The farmhouses represent the residences of the principal landowners who were responsible for implementing the agricultural practices that drove the economy of the South Carolina area during the antebellum period. The slave settlements housed the workers who conducted the vast majority of the daily activities necessary to plant, harvest, process, and market crops.

Once the above steps are completed and the association with a historically significant context is demonstrated, one must consider the aspects of integrity applicable to a resource. Integrity is defined in seven aspects of a resource; one or more may be applicable depending on the nature of the resource under evaluation. These aspects are location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association (36 CFR 60.4; Savage and Pope 1998). If a resource does not possess integrity with respect to these aspects, it cannot adequately reflect or represent its associated historically significant context. Therefore, it cannot be eligible for the NRHP. To be considered eligible under Criteria A and B, a resource must retain its essential physical characteristics that were present during the event(s) with which it is associated. Under Criterion C, a resource must retain enough of its physical characteristics to reflect the style, type, etc., or work of the artisan that it represents. Under Criterion D, a resource must be able to generate data that can address specific research questions that are important in reconstructing or interpreting the past.

Graves and cemeteries may also qualify for the NRHP under Criteria A, B, or C if they meet certain conditions known as Criteria Considerations A through G (Potter and Boland 1992:14-18). Under Criteria Consideration A, a grave or cemetery is eligible for the NRHP if it derives its significance from architectural or artistic distinction or historic importance. This Criteria Consideration applies primarily to cemeteries associated with a church or synagogue, or a crypt of significant artistic style or person of outstanding importance. Criteria Consideration B applies to graves or cemeteries that are relocated. Criteria Consideration C applies to a grave of a historical figure. Under Criteria Consideration D, a cemetery may be eligible for the NRHP if it derives its significance from age, distinctive design, association with historic events, or from graves of persons of transcendent importance. Criteria Consideration E refers to cemeteries or graves that are constructed in a manner that is appropriate and dignified and
as part of a master plan. Criteria Consideration F refers to commemorative properties. Cemeteries are commemorative in intent; however, the significance of a cemetery under this Criteria Consideration includes a direct association with a specific site or with a person buried there. Cemeteries that meet Criteria Consideration F are usually National Cemeteries such as Gettysburg National Cemetery or Arlington National Cemetery. Criteria Consideration G refers to cemeteries that have gained their significance in the last 50 years because of exceptional importance. With the exception of graves of historical figures, burial places nominated under Criterion D are exempt from the Criteria Considerations.
3.0 Environmental and Cultural Overview

3.1 Environmental Setting

3.1.1 Introduction
The APE extends along approximately 2.25 miles of US 78 in Summerville in southern Dorchester County, South Carolina. In general, this area is heavily developed with commercial, industrial, and residential zones. Topography across this portion of Summerville is low and undulating, with intermittent hardwood or filled swampland dissected by derelict Pleistocene sand ridges. Figures 3.1 and 3.2 present views of the APE in March 2015.

Soils vary across the span of the project corridor, with differences in soil geomorphology contingent upon topography. Table 3.1 summarizes the named soil types encountered in the project corridor. Upland portions of the project corridor contain at least five different named soil types that are generally poorly to moderately well drained with fairly shallow water tables. Lowland portions of the project corridor, including Sawmill Branch, contain at least two different named soils types that are poorly drained and feature shallow water tables. Even though Eppinette (1990) identifies at least seven named soil types in the project corridor, these investigations encountered heavily disturbed soils throughout most of the archaeological survey universe. Generally, these soils more closely resemble udorthents, or man-made fill.

3.1.2 Regional Overview
The project corridor is located in southern Dorchester County in the Lower Coastal Plain of South Carolina. This portion of Dorchester County lies within the Ashley-Cooper-Edisto drainage system. Hardwood swamps in the southern portion of the tract drain southwest through Sawmill Branch into the Ashley River; swamps in the northern portion of the tract drain northwest into Rumphs Hill Creek and into the Ashley River through the Great Cypress Swamp.

All soils in Dorchester County formed during the Pleistocene epoch (Eppinette 1990:89). During this time, as the ocean moved over the area, it left soil formations or terraces indicative of former shorelines. Six terraces have been identified in Dorchester County (Eppinette 1990:89). From the intertidal zone inland, these include the Recent, Pamlico, Talbot, Penholoway, Wicomico, and Sunderland terraces (Eppinette 1990:89-90). The project route is located on the Pamlico and Talbot terraces, ranging in elevation from 3.0 to 12.2 meters above mean sea level (amsl).

The project area has been substantially altered from its Pre-Contact and early Post-Contact settings. Widmer (1976) presents a model of late Pre-Contact- and early Post-Contact-period vegetation patterns for the southern portion of Dorchester County. Widmer’s model followed major vegetation types presented by Braun (1950), including the Southern Hardwood Swamp, the Longleaf Pine Forest, the Freshwater Marsh, and the Tidal Marsh.

Today the project corridor is dominated by large stands of planted pines and hardwood swamp. In the past, hardwood swamp and upland forest expanded across the project area. Information on floral and faunal communities for the area is summarized from general sources such as Quarterman and Keever (1962) and Shelford (1963). This ecosystem supports an active faunal community including deer and small mammals (e.g., various squirrels and mice, opossum, raccoon, fox, skunk); birds (e.g., various songbirds, ducks and wading birds, quail, turkey, doves, hawks, owls); and reptiles/amphibians (e.g., frogs, toads, lizards, snakes, turtles, alligator). Fresh- and saltwater fish are abundant in the streams and marshes of the region, and shellfish are present in large numbers in most of the tidally affected wetlands throughout the region.

Eppinette (1990:2) provides climatic data for Dorchester County. The climate of the project area is subtropical, with mild winters and long, hot, humid summers. The average daily temperature reaches a peak of 80.1°F in July although average highs are in the 90°F range from May through September. A mean high of 46.8°F characterizes the coldest winter month, January. Average annual precipitation for Dorchester County is 1.2 meters, with most rain occurring in the summer months during thunderstorms; snowfall is very rare. The growing season averages 260 days, with first and last frosts generally occurring by November 2 and April 3, respectively. Although droughts do occur, they are rare, and the
Figure 3.1 Typical views of the US 78 Phase 3 Improvements Project: eastern APE looking west (top) and western APE looking east (bottom).
Figure 3.2 Typical views of the US 78 Phase 3 Improvements Project: commercial area near US-17A intersection looking west (top) and typical residentially developed area, looking south (bottom).
human groups. Such dramatic changes affected any human groups living in the region.

The general warming trend that led to the melting of glacial ice and the rise in sea level greatly affected vegetation communities in the Southeast. During the late Wisconsin glacial period, until about 12,000 years ago, boreal forest dominated by pine and spruce covered most of the Southeast. This forest changed from coniferous trees to deciduous trees by 10,000 years ago. The new deciduous forest was dominated by northern hardwoods such as beech, hemlock, and alder with oak and hickory beginning to increase in number. With continuation of the general warming and drying trend, the oak and hickory came to dominate, along with southern species of pine. Oak and hickory appear from pollen data to have reached a peak at 5,000 to 7,000 years ago (Watts 1970, 1980; Whitehead 1965, 1973). Since then, the general climatic trend in the Southeast has been toward cooler and moister conditions, and the present Southern Mixed Hardwood Forest as defined by Quarterman and Keever (1962) became established.

Faunal communities also changed dramatically during this time. Several large mammal species (e.g., mammoth, mastodon, horse, camel, giant sloth) became extinct at the end of the glacial period, approximately 10,000 to 12,000 years ago. Pre-Contact groups that had focused on hunting these large mammals adapted their strategy to exploitation of smaller mammals, primarily deer in the Southeast.

climate in general is very supportive of agriculture. Prevailing winds are light and generally from the south and southwest, although hurricanes and other tropical storms occasionally sweep through the area, particularly in the fall months (Eppinette 1990).

Holocene Changes in the Environment

Profound changes in climate and dependent biophysical aspects of regional environments have been documented over the last 20,000 years (the time of potential human occupation of the Southeast). Major changes include a general warming trend, melting of the large ice sheets of the Wisconsin glaciation in northern North America, and the associated rise in sea level. This sea level rise was dramatic along the South Carolina coast (Brooks et al. 1989), with an increase of as much as 330 feet during the last 20,000 years. At least 10,000 years ago (the first documented presence of human groups in the region), the ocean was located 50 to 100 miles east of its present position. Unremarkable Coastal Plain flatwoods probably characterized the project area. Sea level rose steadily from that time until about 5,000 years ago, when the sea reached essentially modern levels. During the last 5,000 years, there has been a 400- to 500-year cycle of sea level fluctuations of about two meters (Brooks et al. 1989; Colquhoun et al. 1981). Figure 3.3 summarizes these more recent fluctuations in the region.

As sea level quickly rose to modern levels, it altered the gradients of major rivers and flooded near-coast river valleys, creating estuaries such as the Cooper-Ashley-Wando River mouth. These estuaries became great centers for saltwater and freshwater resources and thus population centers for human groups. Such dramatic changes affected any human groups living in the region.

The general warming trend that led to the melting of glacial ice and the rise in sea level greatly affected vegetation communities in the Southeast. During the late Wisconsin glacial period, until about 12,000 years ago, boreal forest dominated by pine and spruce covered most of the Southeast. This forest changed from coniferous trees to deciduous trees by 10,000 years ago. The new deciduous forest was dominated by northern hardwoods such as beech, hemlock, and alder with oak and hickory beginning to increase in number. With continuation of the general warming and drying trend, the oak and hickory came to dominate, along with southern species of pine. Oak and hickory appear from pollen data to have reached a peak at 5,000 to 7,000 years ago (Watts 1970, 1980; Whitehead 1965, 1973). Since then, the general climatic trend in the Southeast has been toward cooler and moister conditions, and the present Southern Mixed Hardwood Forest as defined by Quarterman and Keever (1962) became established.

Faunal communities also changed dramatically during this time. Several large mammal species (e.g., mammoth, mastodon, horse, camel, giant sloth) became extinct at the end of the glacial period, approximately 10,000 to 12,000 years ago. Pre-Contact groups that had focused on hunting these large mammals adapted their strategy to exploitation of smaller mammals, primarily deer in the Southeast.

Table 3.1 Named Soil Types Encountered in the Project Corridor (after Eppinette 1990: Plates 34 and 39).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Name/Texture</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Topography</th>
<th>Water Table (centimeters)</th>
<th>Drainage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emporia loamy fine sand</td>
<td>marine terraces</td>
<td>gently sloping</td>
<td>0-30</td>
<td>poorly drained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreston loamy sand</td>
<td>marine terraces</td>
<td>nearly level</td>
<td>61-107</td>
<td>moderately well drained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldsboro loamy sand</td>
<td>marine terraces</td>
<td>nearly level</td>
<td>61-91</td>
<td>moderately well drained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grifton fine sandy loam</td>
<td>floodplains</td>
<td>nearly level</td>
<td>15-30</td>
<td>poorly drained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izagora silt loam</td>
<td>marine terraces</td>
<td>nearly level</td>
<td>46-76</td>
<td>moderately well drained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynchburg loamy sand</td>
<td>marine terraces</td>
<td>nearly level</td>
<td>15-30</td>
<td>somewhat poorly drained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rains sandy loam</td>
<td>broad flats, shallow depressions</td>
<td>nearly level</td>
<td>0-30</td>
<td>poorly drained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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temporal periods within each stage. Readers are
directed to Goodyear and Hanson (1989) for more
detailed discussions of particular aspects of these
stages and periods in South Carolina.

The Lithic Stage

The beginning of the human oc-
cupation of North America is unclear. For most of
the twentieth century, archaeologists believed that
humans arrived on the continent near the end of the
last Pleistocene glaciation, termed the Wisconsinan
in North America, a few centuries prior to 10000
BC. The distinctive fluted projectile points and blade
tool technology of the Paleoindians (described be-
low) occurs throughout North America by this time.
During the last few decades of the twentieth century,
researchers began to encounter artifacts and depos-
its that predate the Paleoindian period at a number
of sites in North and South America. To date, these
sites are few in number. The most notable are Mead-
lowcroft Rock Shelter in Pennsylvania (Adovasio et
al. 1990; Carlisle and Adovasio 1982), Monte Verde
in Chile (Dillehay 1989, 1997; Meltzer et al. 1997),
Cactus Hill in Virginia (McAvoy and McAvoy 1997),
and most recently, the Topper/Big Pine Tree site in
Allendale County, South Carolina (Goodyear 1999).

3.2 Cultural Setting

The cultural history of North America generally is
divided into three eras: Pre-Contact, Contact, and
Post-Contact. The Pre-Contact era refers primarily
to the Native American groups and cultures that
were present for at least 10,000 to 12,000 years prior
to the arrival of Europeans. The Contact era refers to
the time of exploration and initial European settle-
ment on the continent. The Post-Contact era refers
to the time after the establishment of European
settlements, when Native American populations
usually were in rapid decline. Within these eras,
finer temporal and cultural subdivisions have been
defined to permit discussions of particular events
and the lifeways of the peoples who inhabited North
America at that time.

3.2.1 The Pre-Contact Era

In South Carolina, the Pre-Contact era is divided
into four stages (after Willey and Phillips 1958).
These include the Lithic, Archaic, Woodland, and
Mississippian. Specific technologies and strategies
for procuring resources define each of these stages,
with approximate temporal limits also in place.
Within each stage, with the exception of the Lithic
stage, there are temporal periods that are defined
on technological bases as well. A brief description
of each stage follows, including discussions of the
temporal periods within each stage. Readers are
directed to Goodyear and Hanson (1989) for more
detailed discussions of particular aspects of these
stages and periods in South Carolina.

The Lithic Stage. The beginning of the human oc-
cupation of North America is unclear. For most of
the twentieth century, archaeologists believed that
humans arrived on the continent near the end of the
last Pleistocene glaciation, termed the Wisconsinan
in North America, a few centuries prior to 10000
BC. The distinctive fluted projectile points and blade
tool technology of the Paleoindians (described be-
low) occurs throughout North America by this time.
During the last few decades of the twentieth century,
researchers began to encounter artifacts and depos-
its that predate the Paleoindian period at a number
of sites in North and South America. To date, these
sites are few in number. The most notable are Meadow-
lowcroft Rock Shelter in Pennsylvania (Adovasio et
al. 1990; Carlisle and Adovasio 1982), Monte Verde
in Chile (Dillehay 1989, 1997; Meltzer et al. 1997),
Cactus Hill in Virginia (McAvoy and McAvoy 1997),
and most recently, the Topper/Big Pine Tree site in
Allendale County, South Carolina (Goodyear 1999).
All of these sites contain artifacts in stratigraphic
locales below Paleoindian deposits. Radiocarbon
dates indicate occupations at the Meadowcroft and
Indian groups were probably small, kin-based bands of 50 or fewer persons. As the environment changed at the end of the Wisconsinan glaciation, Paleoindian groups had to adapt to new forest conditions in the Southeast and throughout North America.

**The Archaic Stage.** The Archaic stage represents the adaptation of Southeastern Native Americans to Holocene environments. By 8000 BC, the forests had changed from sub-boreal types common during the Paleoindian period to more modern types. The Archaic stage is divided into three temporal periods: Early, Middle, and Late. Distinctive projectile point types serve as markers for each of these periods. Hunting and gathering was the predominant subsistence mode throughout the Archaic periods, although incipient use of cultigens probably occurred by the Late Archaic period. Also, the terminal Archaic witnessed the introduction of a new technology, namely, the manufacture and use of pottery.

**Paleoindian Period (10000–8000 BC).** An identifiable human presence in the South Carolina Coastal Plain began about 12,000 years ago with the movement of Paleoindian hunter-gatherers into the region. Initially, the Paleoindian period is marked by the presence of distinctive fluted projectile points and other tools manufactured on stone blades. Excavations at sites throughout North America have produced datable remains that indicate that these types of stone tools were in use by about 10000 BC.

Goodyear et al. (1989) review the evidence for the Paleoindian occupation of South Carolina. Based on the distribution of the distinctive fluted spear points, they see the major sources of highly workable lithic raw materials as the principal determinant of Paleoindian site location, with a concentration of sites at the Fall Line possibly indicating a subsistence strategy of seasonal relocation between the Piedmont and Coastal Plain. Based on data from many sites excavated in western North America, Paleoindian groups generally were nomadic, with subsistence focusing on the hunting of large mammals, specifically the now-extinct mammoth, horse, camel, and giant bison. In the east, Paleoindians apparently hunted smaller animals than their western counterparts, although extinct species (such as bison, caribou, and mastodon) were routinely exploited where present. Paleoindian groups were probably small, kin-based bands of 50 or fewer persons. As the environment changed at the end of the Wisconsinan glaciation, Paleoindian groups had to adapt to new forest conditions in the Southeast and throughout North America.

Early Archaic Period (8000–6000 BC). The Early Archaic corresponds to the adaptation of native groups to Holocene conditions. The environment in coastal South Carolina during this period was still colder and moister than at present, and an oak-hickory forest was establishing itself on the Coastal Plain (Watts 1970, 1980; Whitehead 1965, 1973). The megafauna of the Pleistocene became extinct early in this period, and more typically modern woodland flora and fauna were established. The Early Archaic adaptation in the South Carolina Lower Coastal Plain is not clear, as Anderson and Logan (1981:13) report:

At the present, very little is known about Early Archaic site distribution, although there is some suggestion that sites tend to occur along river terraces, with a decrease in occurrence away from this zone.

Early Archaic finds in the Lower Coastal Plain are typically corner- or side-notched projectile points, determined to be Early Archaic through excavation of sites in other areas of the Southeast (Claggett and Cable 1982; Coe 1964). Generally, Early Archaic sites are small, indicating a high degree of mobility.

Archaic groups probably moved within a regular territory on a seasonal basis; exploitation of
wild plant and animal resources was well planned and scheduled. Anderson and Hanson (1988) developed a settlement model for the Early Archaic period (8000–6000 BC) in South Carolina involving movement of relatively small groups (bands) on a seasonal basis within major river drainages. The Charleston region is located within the range of the Saluda/Broad band. Anderson and Hanson (1988) hypothesize that Early Archaic use of the Lower Coastal Plain was limited to seasonal (springtime) foraging camps and logistic camps. Aggregation camps and winter base camps are suggested to have been near the Fall Line.

Middle and Preceramic Late Archaic Period (6000–2500 BC). The trends initiated in the Early Archaic (i.e., increased population and adaptation to local environments) continued through the Middle Archaic and Preceramic Late Archaic. Climatically, the region was still warming, and an oak-hickory forest dominated the coast until after 3000 BC, when pines became more prevalent (Watts 1970, 1980). Stemmed projectile points and ground stone artifacts characterize this period, and sites increased in size and density through the period.

Blanton and Sassaman (1989) recently reviewed the archaeological literature on the Middle Archaic period. They document an increased simplification of lithic technology during this period with increased use of expedient, situational tools. Furthermore, they argue that the use of local lithic raw materials is characteristic of the Middle and Late Archaic periods. Blanton and Sassaman (1989:68) conclude that “the data at hand suggest that Middle Archaic populations resorted to a pattern of adaptive flexibility as a response to ‘mid-Holocene environmental conditions’ such as variable precipitation, sea level rise, and differential vegetational succession.” These processes resulted in changes in the types of resources available from year to year.

Ceramic Late Archaic Period (2500–1000 BC). By the end of the Late Archaic period, two developments occurred that changed human lifeways on the South Carolina Coastal Plain. Sea level rose to within one meter of present levels and the extensive estuaries now present were established (Colquhoun et al. 1981). These estuaries were a reliable source of shellfish, and the Ceramic Late Archaic period saw the first documented emphasis on shellfish exploitation. It was also during this time that the first pottery appeared on the South Carolina coast. In the project region, this pottery is represented by the fiber-tempered Stallings series and the sand-tempered or untempered Thom’s Creek series. Decorations include punctation, incising, finger pinching, and simple stamping. The ceramic sequence for the central coast of South Carolina is presented in Table 3.2.

The best-known Ceramic Late Archaic-period sites are shell rings, which occur frequently along tidal marshes. These are usually round or oval rings of shell and other artifacts with a relatively sterile area in the center. Today, many of these rings are in tidal marsh waters. Some archaeologists have interpreted these sites as actual habitation loci adjacent to or within productive shellfish beds. More recent research suggests that these sites had some ceremonial function and represent monumental architecture along the southeast Atlantic seaboard (Saunders 2002). These sites attest to a high degree of sedentism, at least seasonally, by Ceramic Late Archaic peoples.

The Woodland Stage. The Woodland stage is marked by the widespread use of pottery, with many new and regionally diverse types appearing, and changes in the strategies and approaches to hunting and gathering. Native Americans appear to be living in smaller groups than during the preceding Ceramic Late Archaic period, but the overall population likely increased. The Woodland is divided into three temporal periods (Early, Middle, and Late), marked by distinctive pottery types. Also, there is an interval when Ceramic Late Archaic ceramic types and Early Woodland ceramic types were being manufactured at the same time, often on the same site (see Espen- shade and Brockington 1989). It is unclear at present if these coeval types represent distinct individual populations, some of whom continued to practice Archaic lifeways, or technological concepts that lingered in some areas longer than in others.

Early Woodland Period (1500 BC–AD 200). In the Early Woodland period, the region was apparently an area of interaction between widespread ceramic decorative and manufacturing traditions. The paddle-stamping tradition dominated the decora-
tive tradition to the south, and fabric impressing and cord marking dominated to the north and west (Blanton et al. 1986; Caldwell 1958; Espenshade and Brockington 1989).

The subsistence and settlement patterns of the Early Woodland period suggest population expansion and the movement of groups into areas minimally used in the earlier periods. Early and Middle Woodland sites are the most common on the South Carolina coast and generally consist of shell middens near tidal marshes along with ceramic and lithic scatters in a variety of other environmental zones. It appears that group organization during this period was based on the semipermanent occupation of shell midden sites with the short-term use of interior coastal strand sites.

*Middle Woodland Period (200 BC–AD 500).* The extreme sea level fluctuations that marked the Ceramic Late Archaic and Early Woodland periods ceased during the Middle Woodland period. The Middle Woodland period began as sea level rose from a significant low stand at 300 BC, and for the majority of the period the sea level remained within one meter of current levels (Brooks et al. 1989). The comments of Brooks et al. (1989:95) are pertinent in describing the changes in settlement:

It is apparent that a generally rising sea level, and corresponding estuarine expansion, caused an increased dispersion of some resources (e.g., small inter-tidal oyster beds in the expanding tidal creek network). This hypothesized change in the structure of the subsistence resource base may partially explain why these sites tend to be correspondingly smaller, more numerous, and more dispersed through time.

Survey and testing data from a number of sites in the region clearly indicate that Middle Woodland Period (200 BC–AD 200). The extreme sea level fluctuations that marked the Ceramic Late Archaic and Early Woodland periods...
Overall, the Late Woodland is noteworthy for its lack of check-stamped pottery. However, investigations by Poplin et al. (2002) indicate that the limestone-tempered Wando series found along the Wando and Cooper Rivers near Charleston Harbor displays all of the Middle Woodland decorative elements, including check stamping, but appears to have been manufactured between AD 700 and 1000. Excavations at the Buck Hall Site (38CH644) in the Francis Marion National Forest suggest that McClellanville and Santee ceramic types were employed between AD 500 and 900 and represent the dominant ceramic assemblages of this period (Poplin et al. 1993).

The sea level change at this time caused major shifts in settlement and subsistence patterns. The rising sea level and estuary expansion caused an increase in the dispersal of resources such as oyster beds, and thus a corresponding increase in the dispersal of sites. Semipermanent shell midden sites continue to be common in this period, although overall site frequency appears to be lower than in the Early Woodland. Instead, there appears to be an increase in short-term occupations along the tidal marshes. Espenshade et al. (1994) state that at many of the sites postdating the Early Woodland period, the intact shell deposits appear to represent short-term activity areas rather than permanent or semipermanent habitations.

The Mississippian Stage. Approximately 1,000 years ago, Native American cultures in much of the Southeast began a marked shift away from the settlement and subsistence practices common during the Woodland periods. Some settlements became quite large, often incorporating temple mounds or plazas. The use of tropical cultigens (e.g., corn and beans) became more common. Hierarchical societies developed, and technological, decorative, and presumably religious ideas spread throughout the Southeast, supplanting what had been distinct regional traditions in many areas. In coastal South Carolina, the Mississippian stage is divided into two temporal periods, Early and Late. Previous sequences for the region separated Mississippian ceramic types into three periods (Early, Middle, and Late), following sequences developed in other portions of the Southeast. However, a simpler characterization of the
technological advancements made from AD 1000 to 1500 appears more appropriate. During these centuries, the decorative techniques that characterize the Early Mississippian period slowly evolved without the appearance of distinctly new ceramic types until the Late Mississippian.

**Early Mississippian Period (AD 1100–1400).** In much of the Southeast, the Mississippian stage is marked by major mound ceremonialism, regional redistribution of goods, chiefdoms, and maize horticulture as a major subsistence activity. It is unclear how early and to what extent similar developments occurred in coastal South Carolina. The ethnohistoric record, discussed in greater detail below, certainly indicates that seasonal villages and maize horticulture were present in the area, and that significant mound centers were present in the interior Coastal Plain to the north and west (Anderson 1989; DePratter 1989; Ferguson 1971, 1975).

Distinct Mississippian ceramic phases are recognized for the region (Anderson 1989; Anderson et al. 1982). In coastal South Carolina, the Early Mississippian period is marked by the presence of Jeremy-phase (AD 1100–1400) ceramics, including Savannah Complicated Stamped, Savannah Check Stamped, and Mississippian Burnished Plain types. By the end of the Late Woodland period, cord-marked and fabric-impressed decorations are replaced by complicated-stamped decorations. Anderson (1989:115) notes that “characteristically Mississippian complicated stamped ceramics do not appear until at least AD 1100, and probably not until as late as AD 1200, over much of the South Carolina area.” Poplin et al.’s (1993) excavations at the Buck Hall Site (38CH644) produced radiocarbon dates around AD 1000 for complicated-stamped ceramics similar to the Savannah series. This represents the earliest date for complicated-stamped wares in the region and may indicate an earlier appearance of Mississippian types than previously assumed.

Sites of the period in the region include shell middens, sites with apparent multiple- and single-house shell middens, and oyster processing sites (e.g., 38CH644 [Poplin et al. 1993]). Adaptation during this period apparently saw a continuation of the generalized Woodland hunting-gathering-fishing economy, with perhaps a growing importance on horticulture and storable foodstuffs. Anderson (1989) suggests that environmental unpredictability premised the organization of hierarchical chiefdoms in the Southeast beginning in the Early Mississippian period; the redistribution of stored goods (i.e., tribute) probably played an important role in the Mississippian social system. Maize was recovered from a feature suggested to date to the Early Mississippian period from 38BK226, near St. Stephen (Anderson et al. 1982:346).

**Late Mississippian Period (AD 1400–1550).** During this period, the regional chiefdoms apparently re-aligned, shifting away from the Savannah River centers to those located in the Oconee River basin and the Wateree-Congaree basin. As in the Early Mississippian, the Charleston Harbor area apparently lacked any mound centers, although a large Mississippian settlement was present on the Ashley River that may have been a “moundless” ceremonial center (South 2002). Regardless, it appears that the region was well removed from the core of Cofitachequi, the primary chiefdom to the interior (Anderson 1989; DePratter 1989). DePratter (1989:150) specifies:

The absence of sixteenth-century mound sites in the upper Santee River valley would seem to indicate that there were no large population centers there. Any attempt to extend the limits of Cofitachequi even farther south and southeast to the coast is pure speculation that goes counter to the sparse evidence available.

Pee Dee Incised and Complicated Stamped, Irene Incised and Complicated Stamped, and Mississippian Burnished Plain ceramics mark the Late Mississippian period. Simple-stamped, cord-marked, and check-stamped pottery apparently was not produced in this period.

### 3.2.2 The Contact Era

Prior to the establishment of a permanent English settlement at Albemarle Point in 1670, the first known European forays into region occurred by the Spanish in the 1520s. Thus, the Contact era in coastal South Carolina covers the period A.D. 1526-1670. The Spanish established early, transient settlements at San Miguel de Gualdape (1526) to
the north (near Georgetown) and at Santa Elena (1566–1587) to the south (near Beaufort), but these settlements had limited impact on the study area. The French attempt at Port Royal (1562) also had little impact. The establishment of Charles Towne by the British in 1670, however, sparked a period of intensive trade with the Indians of the region and provided a base from which settlers quickly spread north and south up the coast.

Indian groups encountered by the European explorers and settlers probably were living in a manner quite similar to the late Pre-Contact Mississippian groups identified in archaeological sites throughout the Southeast. Indeed, the highly structured Indian society of Cofitachequi, formerly located in central South Carolina and visited by De Soto in 1540, represents an excellent example of the Mississippian social organizations present throughout southeastern North America during the late Pre-Contact period (Anderson 1985). However, the initial European forays into the Southeast contributed to the disintegration and collapse of the aboriginal Mississippian social structures; disease, warfare, and European slave raids all contributed to the rapid decline of regional Indian populations during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Dobyns 1983; Ramenofsky 1982; Smith 1984).

By the latter decades of the seventeenth century, Indian groups in coastal South Carolina apparently lived in small, politically and socially autonomous, semi-sedentary groups (Waddell 1980). However, Indian populations fell so dramatically that between 1700 and 1730 an estimated population of 15,000 Native Americans in North and South Carolina had fallen to less than 4,000, and most of those lived in the upper regions of the colonies. One Colonial leader wrote that “Almighty God” sent a “sickness” among the Indians, “thinning” them to “make room for the English” (Taylor 2001:235). The ethnohistoric record from coastal South Carolina suggests that Contact-era groups of the region followed a seasonal pattern that included summer aggregation in villages for planting and harvesting domesticates and dispersal into one- to three-family settlements for the remainder of the year (Rogel 1570 [in Waddell 1980:147-151]). This coastal Contact adaptation is apparently very similar to the Guale pattern of the Georgia coast, as reconstructed by Crook (1986:18). Specific accounts of the Contact groups of the region, the Sewee and the Santee, have been summarized by Waddell (1980). It appears that both groups included horticultural production within their seasonal round, but did not have permanent, year-round villages. Trinkley (1981) suggests that a late variety of Pee Dee ceramics was produced by Sewee groups in the region; this late variety may correspond to the Ashley ware initially described by South (1973; see also Anderson et al. 1982).

Waddell (1980) identified 19 distinct groups between the mouth of the Santee River and the mouth of the Savannah River in the mid-sixteenth century. Anderson and Logan (1981:29) suggest that many of these groups probably were controlled by Cofitachequi, the dominant Mississippian center/polity in South Carolina, prior to its collapse. By the seventeenth century, all were independently organized. These groups included the Coosaw, Kiawah, Etiwan, and Sewee “tribes” near the Cainhoy peninsula. The Coosaw inhabited the area to the north and west along the Ashley River. The Kiawah were apparently residing at Albemarle Point and along the lower reaches of the Ashley River in 1670, but gave their settlement to the English colonists and moved to Kiawah Island; in the early eighteenth century they moved south of the Combahee River (Swanton 1952:96). The Etiwans were settled on or near Daniel Island, but their range extended to the head of the Cooper River. The territory of the Sewee met the territory of the Etiwan high up the Cooper, and extended to the north as far as the Santee River and into the Bulls Bay area (Kovacik and Winbury 1989:60). Mortier’s (1696) map of Carolina shows the Sampa Indians between the Cooper and Wando Rivers, the Wando Indians and Sewel [sic] Indian fort east of the Wando River, and the “Kayawah” [Kiawah] on Kiawah Island but no tribes in the area of Lower Dorchester County (Mortier 1696).

### 3.2.3 The Post-Contact Era

This brief historic overview of Lower Dorchester County provides a background for any Post-Contact sites encountered during the archaeological survey of the project corridor. This summary is designed to highlight the major trends and themes to provide a framework for evaluating the significance of any
discovered cultural remains dating to the Post-Contact era.

Early Settlement and Colonial Period. An early theme in the history of South Carolina and Dorchester County is the pre-1740 or pre-rice planter era settlement patterns. As noted above, the interior of South Carolina remained largely unexplored throughout most of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. In 1670, an English settlement was established at Albemarle Point on the Ashley River and called Charles Towne. Their settlement point had been the residence of the Kiawah Indians who relocated to modern-day Kiawah Island. Charles Towne grew slowly, relying on Indian trade as a major source of income but soon served as the base for the settlement of the region by an ever-growing number of Europeans and their African slaves. Settlement initially spread along the coastal rivers and remained near the coast for many years. In 1680, the colony leaders moved the new town to the Cooper River side of Oyster Point and called it Charles Town. This became the nucleus of modern day Charleston.

By 1675, Anthony Lord Ashley Cooper and Sir John Colleton, two of the Lords Proprietors, had established settlements on the upper reaches of the Ashley and Cooper Rivers and were developing a lively Indian Trade. In the 1680s Andrew Percival established a notable trading post at the headwaters of the Ashley River, in an area still known as the Ponds, in modern day Dorchester County. Early settlement in Carolina between 1670 and 1740 was dominated by small, frequently non-slave holding farmers. An early map based on a Maurice Mathewes survey of 1685 reveals that small planters had already established a number of farms on both sides of the Ashley River up to the headwaters. Lord Ashley's settlement at St. Giles Kusso and Percival's settlement at the Ponds served as frontier settlements and exchange and trade complexes in the colony (Lesser 1995:135-36; Shaftsbury Papers 2000:456). These two settlements included fortified homes. Recent archaeological investigations have located the Lord Ashley settlement on the west bank of the river in the vicinity of Bacon's Bridge and archaeological excavations at the Ponds have also uncovered remnants of Andrew Percival's late seventeenth century settlement in Lower Dorchester County (Agha and Philips 2010; Sipes et al. 2007).

In the last years of the seventeenth century and the first years of the eighteenth, several factors changed the settlement of Lower Dorchester County. From 1696 to 1697, a group of Congregationalists settled the town of Dorchester on the north bank of the Ashley River, about five miles southwest of modern day Summerville. Beginning in the early 1700s, the Lords Proprietors began granting lands in what is now lower Dorchester County to members of the Dorchester congregation and other individuals. Many of these settlers established farms on their tracts, and these pre-1740 settlement sites have received small coverage in the historical narratives. Thus, archaeological remains may be the only method of filling in the story of land settlement in the pre-rice planter period in South Carolina history, making these early sites all the more important. Recent archaeological surveys in the region around the Ashley River have noted several of these small, pre-1740 planter homesteads (e.g., Agha et al. 2009).

Directly as a result of European War in 1702, Britain lost access to Baltic timbers and naval stores used by the Royal Navy and the merchant fleet of ships. To encourage production in the colonies, bounties were placed on these items that lasted until the 1720s. As a result, planters in South Carolina began production of naval stores throughout the settled area. Old “tar kilns” on historic plats and observed during archaeological investigations mark production areas where colonists converted pine trees into tar, pitch, rosin and spirits of turpentine. Though timber and naval stores continued to be produced in South Carolina for centuries, the end of the bounties brought an end to most commercial production of the items (Kovacik and Winbury 1989:70-71; Edgar 1998: 138-140). Timber production continued as the need for sawn lumber for both naval and construction was high throughout the colonial period and increasing afterward. Later in the late-nineteenth century and through the twentieth century and beyond, timber continued as a major product of Lower Dorchester County.

Indian Relations and the Yamasee War. The relationship between Native American groups and early colonists in South Carolina centered upon economic trade but was strained by the slave trade and colonial expansion. The early development of the Indian
Inland Rice. Beginning in the late seventeenth century and continuing until the Civil War, rice production supplanted the skin and hide trade and ranching industry as the predominant product of the region. By the end of Queen Anne's War in 1712, Carolinians had mastered the art of growing rice in inundated fields, and the value of swamp lands escalated dramatically. By 1740 Carolinians were exporting more than 30 million pounds of the product, nearly ten times the amount shipped to Britain in 1700 (Edgar 1998:140-144; Taylor 2001:237). English economist Arthur Young believed that rice was second only to sugar in the “economy of the [British] Empire,” and geographical historian D.W. Meinig has concluded that by the mid-eighteenth century, South Carolina was one of the “wealthiest and most famous American colonies” (Meinig 1986:182). Taylor (2001:237) states that prior to the American Revolution, the rice plantations of coastal South Carolina became the “rice bowl” of the British Empire. Rice became North America’s second largest export, adding a million pounds sterling annually to the empire. One historian noted that South Carolina was among the North American colonies “distinct in substance and position, a clearly discernable region; areally discrete, structured, and focused” (Taylor 2001:237). Lower Dorchester County was the scene of some of the earliest and wealthiest inland rice planters, including Joseph Blake at Newington, Henry Middleton at Middleton Place, Walter Izard at Cedar Grove, Richard Baker at Archdale Hall, Thomas Waring at Pine Hill, and Benjamin Childs at Windsor Hill (Smith 1988b).

Most of these planters had their rice lands in the Ashley River basin, but by the middle years of the eighteenth century, planters expanded into the savanna lands in the upper Stono River basin in southwestern Dorchester County. Here, using their growing understanding of the complex hydrological controls necessary for large scale rice production, they made radical changes in the natural landscape in the region (Chaplin 1993). Late eighteenth century plats reveal that vast sections of the low-lying fresh water savanna and swamp lands in southwestern Dorchester and western Charleston counties were converted into extensive rice fields with their accompanying array of miles of earthen banks, dams, ditches and drains along with acres of open water reservoirs and spill-
ways called “trunks” to permit movement of water. Families like the Izards, Elliotts, Warings, Postells and Evans owned tracts with hundreds of acres of rice fields (Smith 1988b:244-250). These families and others became extremely wealthy in the last 30 years prior to the American Revolution, largely on production and marketing of rice and indigo from their plantations. They were leaders in the colony, serving as members of church vestries, road commissions, and justices of the peace among many other duties. Their wealth permitted them to exercise these social responsibilities to the parish and “demonstrated their conviction that they possessed both the right and duty” to provide the leadership in government at the local and colony level (Waterhouse 1989:125). Inland rice production is a major theme of the Lower Dorchester area, and though the development of the later tidal system is well documented, the earlier inland method is just being examined by historians in the past few years (Agha et al. 2011; Edelson 2006; Smith 2012).

Planters continually sought to improve their fields, and interest in inland rice production declined in the late eighteenth century with the advent of tidal rice systems. In the latter eighteenth century, planters aggressively converted lands along coastal rivers into tidal rice fields, making use of the changing tides to control the flow of fresh water over their crops. Often inland rice planters abandoned their inland fields for the more productive tidal river fields. This left much of Lower Dorchester County vacant or reverting back to provision crops or ranching.

**African American Experience in the South Carolina Lowcountry.** A major historical theme in Lower Dorchester County is the African American experience. This theme permeates all others in both South Carolina and in Dorchester County, especially since African Americans were the majority of residents in the region for more than 300 years after 1700. African slaves worked on the plantations and in the early timber industry; they constructed the inland rice infrastructure and later the tidal rice system. Africans and African Americans performed all aspects of the Colonial and Antebellum economy, provided manual labor, and directed most other labor for the white owners in the region. They served in the military units of the colony and later state, most often as slaves though some as freemen, and performed in every trade from boat pilots to blacksmiths. After the Civil War, they served as legislators, businessmen and women, local community leaders, and landowners; however, for a century after emancipation, most were relegated to menial tasks and marginal lands, and after the 1890s all were subject to Jim Crow restrictive race laws. African Americans remained the primary source of manual labor in the region until well after World War II. Without exception, this theme has been one of utmost importance and one of the least examined in the story of the Lowcountry.

Even before the arrival of the English, African slaves lived in what would become South Carolina. In the sixteenth century, Spanish settlers at San Miguel de Gualdape and Santa Elena imported African slaves to work their fields. The arrival of the English and the establishment of the first permanent settlements corresponded to the growth of slavery in the colony. As the colony developed a strong agriculture-based economy, the need for slaves expanded. Most of the early African slaves came from the English West Indies; however, particularly with the rise of rice production, slave traders soon turned their attention to Western Africa. Dunn (1972) presents the history of the rise of the planter class in the English West Indies and how that class influenced the development of South Carolina and the creation of the slave-based economy. In more recent decades, Wood (1974), Greene (1988), Littlefield (1991), Berlin (1998), and Morgan (1998) have all examined how slavery influenced the development of the British colonies and the emergence of the American culture, particularly in the Lower South.

As mentioned above, the growth of the slave population of colonial South Carolina resulted in a black majority population by 1708. The black population reached as high as 66 percent until the Revolutionary War, when the backcountry opened to settlement. Wood (1974) provides a comprehensive study of the African experience in the colony up to the Stono Rebellion in the 1730s. With the settlement of Lower Dorchester County, African slaves initially participated in cattle raising and naval stores production and later built the infrastructure for the inland rice complexes. Many archaeological and historical studies have examined slave settlements on Lowcountry plantations; however, few have involved plantations in Lower Dorchester County.
George's Dorchester Parish and the land west of the Ashley River to the Edisto River is in St. Paul's Stono Parish. Though these were political subdivisions, all records were kept in Charleston until 1788. As political and ecclesiastical entities, the parishes ended with the Revolution, but they remained important land identification boundaries well into the twentieth century (Stauffer 1994). Figure 3.4 shows a portion of De Brahm's (1757) A Map of South Carolina and a Part of Georgia and depicts St. George's and St. Paul's parishes and the approximate location of the project area.

Social life for the planters of St. George's Dorchester and St. Paul's Stono parishes centered on the plantations and the local parish churches, which were social, religious, and political centers. In the 1690s the Dorchester Congregationalists built their first church (known today as White Church) near the town of Dorchester. Later, as the members of the community settled at Beech Hill, they constructed a smaller structure which they called the Beech Hill Meeting House near the intersection of modern-day US 17A and Clubhouse Crossroads (Walker 1941:282-285). Anglican communicants began work on the parish church at Dorchester in 1719 and erected a bell tower in 1752 (Smith 1988a:27-28). The St. Paul's parish church was built along the Stono River and later moved to a site 1.5 miles south of modern-day Delemars Crossroads. Later still in the 1820s, the church moved to Summerville. In the 1750s many Congregationalists left the Beech Hill and Dorchester areas and moved to modern-day Liberty County, Georgia, where they formed a community on the Newport River (Smith 1988a:20).

The Revolutionary War (1776-1783) slowed planting efforts throughout the region. A number of skirmishes and camping areas for both combatants are found in Lower Dorchester County. Near the county boundary at the Edisto River, Francis Marion and Patriot forces ambushed a British patrol in the Battle of Parkers Ferry, and fortifications were established at Bacon's Bridge, along Ladson Road and near US 78 where it crosses the Great Cypress Swamp. Most of the military action in and around Lower Dorchester County occurred as each side sought to control the Town of Dorchester. Abandoned by the American forces in 1780, its fortification and strategic position along the Ashley River...
Figure 3.4 A portion of De Brahm’s (1757) A Map of South Carolina and a Part of Georgia showing the approximate location of the project area.
compelled the British to make it an outpost until late in 1781. Fleeing British forces burned the town. The town and tabby fort were not rebuilt and the ruins remain one of state’s most significant archaeological sites of the Colonial Period. The site was long owned by the West Virginia Pulp and Paper Company, and in 1969 they donated the site to the state of South Carolina. Today it is Colonial Dorchester State Historic Site and is listed on the NRHP for its historic archaeological resources.

Both British and American forces moved around on the roads in the area including modern day Dorchester Road, Ashley River Road, County Line Road, Ladson Road, and US 78. The Great Cypress Swamp, other area lowlands providing natural hiding places for guerrillas, and plantations were frequently raided by bandits taking advantage of the lawlessness that occurred with the withdrawal of British troops at the end of 1781. In an effort to secure North Carolina, late in 1780 Lord Cornwallis moved into that state with the bulk of his army. This left South Carolina open to Patriot guerillas and a reorganized Southern Army under Nathaniel Greene. By 1781, Greene, supported by fast moving cavalry officers who knew the countryside like Francis Marion and Thomas Sumter, used a series of attacks, defeats, retreats, and continued attacks to outmaneuver the superior British forces and gradually push the British and their Loyalist allies back to Charleston (Showman 1998; Goloway 2005; Edgar 2001). Figure 3.5 shows a portion of Mouzon’s (1794) An Accurate Map of North and South Carolina with Their Indian Frontier and the approximate location of the project area.

In December 1781, Lower Dorchester County came under Patriot control, and with the British evacuation of Charleston in December 1782, the war effectually came to an end in South Carolina. The Revolution greatly impacted Lower Dorchester County, and there are numerous historic sites related to various actions that occurred there. These include Colonial Dorchester State Historic site, Bacon’s Bridge, Archdale Plantation, the British “Mud Fort” along Ladson Road, Middleton Place, County Line Road (then known as Parkers Ferry Road), and numerous others (Smith 1988b; O’Kelley 2004; 2005a; 2005b and 2006). The wealth of many of the Pre-Re- volutionary Ashley River and Goose Creek plantation owners made the area a magnet for both sides.

**Development of Antebellum Plantation System.**

After the Revolutionary War, settlement and large-scale agriculture expanded rapidly in the new State of South Carolina. Although indigo production declined, rice production expanded. The tidal rice method of production, using reclaimed salt marshes, allowed rice planters to expand their crops exponentially. Elsewhere in the upstate of South Carolina indeed throughout the American South, cotton dominated commercial crop production after the invention of the gin by Eli Whitney in the 1790s. A lack of good roads throughout the region prompted the continued use of the principal waterways (e.g., the Savannah and the Santee) as the major transportation routes (Salo 2009). Cotton planters lobbied and built canals throughout the region in an effort to move their goods faster and more cheaply to coastal markets. For example, the Santee Canal was an early attempt to open up Charleston markets to planters in the upper Santee River region.

Other localized and private efforts were made to benefit Lower Dorchester County planters. Dr. David Oliphant attempted to speed up traffic through the upper Ashley River by building a small canal through several tortuous bends on that river (Smith 1988a:225). Other localized efforts included canals dug through several of the large swamps of the region to give planters better water control and a means for floating heavy rice barrels to market down the canals to navigable streams. An example in Lower Dorchester County is the Horse Savanna Drain. This extensive drain through the swampy headwaters of Rantowles Creek was authorized as early as the 1740s and planned by the 1770s, but it was not completed until after the Revolution. Not only did it help inland planters in that region increase productivity and prevent destruction from heavy rains called “freshets,” but it reduced transportation costs by allowing the planters to float their rice barges down the drain into Rantowles Creek and down the creek to the Stono River and Charleston (Smith 2012:88-91).

During the early nineteenth century, the lack of good transportation routes from the interior prompted a group of Charleston businessmen to construct a railroad from Charleston to Hamburg (opposite Augusta) on the Savannah River. This line, extending 136 miles, was completed in 1833 and was the longest...
Figure 3.5 A portion of Mouzon's (1794) An Accurate Map of North and South Carolina with Their Indian Frontier and the approximate location of the project area.
railroad in the world at the time. The modern CSX Railroad follows the old South Carolina Railroad bed through Charleston and Dorchester counties. Towns soon developed at the stations established along the line, and further settlement of the interior portions of South Carolina greatly accelerated. In Lower Dorchester County the communities of Summerville, Ridgeville, Harleyville, and St. George grew up around the new railroad line. By 1846, the South Carolina Railroad was hauling over 100,000 bales of cotton to market in Charleston each year.

Cotton agriculture continued as the dominant industry in the region throughout the first half of the nineteenth century. As rice production declined along the Ashley, Upper Stono and Edisto river basins, cotton production increased. Some planters innovatively turned drained and dried out rice fields in the county into cotton fields. The crop became predominate in the region by the middle decades of the nineteenth century. It helped revitalize worn out rice plantations by providing a profitable crop that replaced indigo on the high lands. Sea Island or Long-Staple Cotton was the most valuable but was limited to the coastal regions and was not grown in Lower Dorchester County (Porcher and Fick 2005).

**Summerville and the South Carolina Railroad.**

The Town of Summerville is located on a ridge north of the Ashley River in modern Berkeley and Dorchester counties, South Carolina. What began as an unincorporated village straddling the St. George Dorchester and St. James Goose Creek parish line eventually transformed into a modern, independent city. The Summerville area was first inhabited in the late eighteenth century as a summer retreat for Lowcountry planters and also by the descendants of the first Congregationalist settlers at Dorchester. The town grew slowly through the early nineteenth century. St. Pauls Parish church erected a chapel of ease in Summerville in 1830; similarly, the Congregationalist Church erected a chapel in 1833 (Fick and Davis 1996). Construction of the Charleston to Hamburg line of the South Carolina Railroad brought expansion to Summerville, which was incorporated in 1847. The project route is located northeast of the South Carolina Railroad corridor in the newer part of town. Although Summerville witnessed no direct action during the Civil War, the town erected at least one hospital to service the Confederate wounded (see Chapter 4). The 1886 earthquake and subsequent fires devastated the town. However, recovery came quickly with the town's transition to a bedroom and resort community. Construction of US 78 occurred in the 1920s and helped link Summerville with Charleston and communities to the north.

**The Civil War (1860-1865).** The Civil War eliminated the slave-based production system with the abolition of slavery. Though fortifications were built by Confederate defenders of Charleston some distance up the Ashley River and to the south near the Edisto River, except for the movement of forces, the lower Dorchester County area experienced little military action until 1865. The Town of Summerville served as Confederate headquarters for the coastal regions of South Carolina, Georgia and Florida between 1863 and 1865, and two Confederate military hospitals were located there during those years. Immediately after the war, one of the hospitals served Federal troops stationed there (Hill 1998; West 2004). That hospital was part of the Pressley Plantation and was located along the South Carolina Railroad near the current APE. Both Confederate and Federal soldiers who died in that hospital were buried on part of the plantation that is inside the APE for the current project.

After Federal troops under William T. Sherman seized Columbia in February 1865, Confederate military authorities abandoned the Charleston area and fled northward. Federal raiding units moved up the Ashley River in pursuit of the Confederates and destroyed several planter residences, including Ashley Hall, Middleton Place, and Wragg Smith's home. Apparently, the units stopped at Bacon's Bridge, and thus residences on the east side of the river were generally spared destruction. Immediately after the end of hostilities and continuing through the early Reconstruction years, the Town of Summerville served as headquarters for Federal troops in the old St. Georges Dorchester part of Colleton County.

**Postbellum Adaptation.** The loss of a large labor force resulted in the reorganization of agricultural production throughout the Southern states, including South Carolina. Systems of tenant farming or
sharecropping were instituted, and production slowly increased in the years after the Civil War. This dispersal of production also resulted in the dispersal of the population, and soon numerous smaller farms appeared throughout the interior Coastal Plain. Cotton, corn, and cattle became the dominant crops of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

In 1868, a new state constitution ordered that the former districts be designated counties. Lower Dorchester County fell into Colleton County. In 1896, the state legislature created three new counties out of parts of older ones. Dorchester County was formed out of portions of Berkeley and Colleton, essentially the old St. Georges Dorchester and most of former St. Paul’s Parish were united into the county (Stauffer 1994:17). The seat, then being in the center of the new county, was the railroad community of St. George. Figure 3.6 shows the location of the project corridor on Knight’s (1900) map of Dorchester County.

After the Civil War, slavery was abolished in name, but many African Americans continued to work under slave-like conditions as tenant farmers and mine workers in the phosphate industry. Though no longer owned by whites, African Americans still had to work the fields for their livelihood. Many also worked in the growing timbering industry. In addition to working as tenant farmers, many African Americans formed new towns and communities as they were free to relocate. Unincorporated and largely segregated, African American communities like Clay Hill, Clubhouse Crossroads, Sand Hill, Slandsville, Knightsville, and Cooks Crossroads grew up in Lower Dorchester County as they did throughout the rural areas of the state.

By the mid-1890s, a large percent of the state's residents had been legally disenfranchised from the vote. Revisions to the state constitution established segregation as public policy under the theory of “separate but equal” access to public facilities (confirmed by the US Supreme Court in Plessy v. Ferguson [1896]) and ensuring, as far as whites were concerned, that “when [the races] come together, whether in politics, labor relations, or social life, whites held the upper hand” (Foner 2005:208).


Immediately following the Civil War a new industry came to the Lowcountry, phosphate mining and fertilizer production. Early mines were located on both banks of the Ashley, Stono, Cooper, and Wando River basins in the Charleston area and soon fertilizer plants were located along some of the banks, particularly the Neck area above Charleston. However, though the industry provided employment for many former slaves and invested some $5.6 million in equipment and rents in the Lowcountry region, it failed to yield sustained growth and fell victim in the early 1900s to larger fields in Tennessee and Florida (Shick and Doyle 1985; McKinley 2014).

One of the fertilizer companies was established in Lower Dorchester County and played a role in the limited industrial development of the county in the nineteenth century. By the early 1880s, the Ashley Phosphate Company built a fertilizer works at the center of their mining operations on the east bank of the Ashley River on the old Spring Farm Plantation, near Archdale in the southern corner of the county (Shuler et al. 2006). Ashley Phosphate Road follows the old company tram road that led from the plant to the South Carolina Railroad connection. The company folded after the turn of the twentieth century though the landscape of areas around the river still revealed the impact of the strip mining and phosphate runoff well into the 1990s.

Timber production continued as a major industry in the region. This resulted from the abandonment of farm lands in the early twentieth century as tenant farming began to decline and formerly cultivated fields reverted to stands of pine trees (Ko-
Figure 3.6 A portion of Knight’s (1900) map of Dorchester County showing the approximate location of the project area.
Beginning in the 1890s, large stands of longleaf timber and cypress and hardwood swamps were exploited as timber companies, using vertical integration to control everything from land to finished product bought parcels of swamp or abandoned farms to cut the huge cypress, oak, and other hardwoods along with the pine for the expanding housing market in the expanding cities of the South. This continued until the 1920s, when most hardwoods and the longleaf pine were exhausted in South Carolina (Tuten 2006:963; Earley 2004:150-171).

Even before the Great Depression, South Carolina had already entered a deep recession with falling cotton production, the scourge of the boll weevil, and exhausted timber resources along with a declining population. Beginning around World War I, large numbers of African Americans sought better employment opportunities in northern cities and left the state with their families for good. By the years of the Great Depression (1929-1940), South Carolina was one of the neediest states in the union and the Lowcountry was one of the poorest sections of the state. As one historian stated, “per-capita income was the lowest in the nation; illiteracy, highest. One-Party Democratic-politics prevailed, rural dominated urban by a ratio of three to one . . . the average citizen seldom ventured beyond his community and almost never outside his state” (Hayes 2001). The state gave President Franklin Roosevelt his biggest support with 98 percent of the popular vote in 1933 and yet proved to be one of his most persistent economic problems (Hayes 2006).

Beginning after World War I, a new kind of timber concern emerged on the scene and began changing the landscape and, in time, offered better economic opportunities. Kraft paper companies began purchasing much of the land in the lower coastal plain of South Carolina for managing forests, which involved renewing them by organized planting, especially with the short needle or “Loblolly pine” (Earley 2004:175-182). Companies like Union Bag and Paper Company in Savannah, International Paper Company in Georgetown, and West Virginia Pulp and Paper Company in North Charleston began acquiring large sections of exhausted lands in South Carolina including Dorchester County for harvesting and replanting this pine (Kovacik and Winberry 1989:187). Silviculture techniques left the land fallow for decades, allowing the pines to grow and wildlife to return. In the 1940s, the paper companies realized an opportunity to raise additional cash by leasing their lands to local hunting clubs who also served as caretakers for the land, helping to prevent forest fires. By the early 1990s, most of Lower Dorchester County still consisted of small farms and hunt clubs leasing paper company lands.

**Impact of World War II and Beyond.** World War II brought many new residents to the area. Servicemen and women were stationed at Army, Navy, and Army Air Corps bases in Charleston and North Charleston, and civil service workers by the thousands created a serious housing shortage. The area was appealing, and after the war ended, many stayed and became residents of Lower Dorchester County, traveling on improved road systems to North Charleston and Charleston to obtain better paying jobs. This continued into the 1960s with the opening of Interstate 95 and the paving of old Dorchester Road beyond the Charleston Air Force Base. During the late 1960s and early 1970s, the Town of Summerville expanded and developers built new subdivisions on former paper company lands, particularly to the south and west of the town.

By the mid-1970s, West Virginia Pulp and Paper Company, now called MeadWestvaco, began developing former silviculture lands into subdivisions like Quail Arbor, Ashborough, Ashborough East, and Briarwood. Other developers built subdivisions for new residents at Tranquil Acres on Ladson Road, Kings Grant on the Ashley, and Oak Knoll and Rose Hill in Summerville. Additionally, rural areas such as Stallsville and Knightsville grew with new residents. In the mid-1970s, the Dorchester 2 School District opened a modern high school, Summerville High School, and added additional schools to the area.

During these years residents also moved into Lower Dorchester County to work at new industrial plants being built, like the Exxon Fibers facility on US 78, Dupont’s Cooper River Plant at Bushy Park, the Robert Bosch Corporation automotive plant on Dorchester Road, the Gifford Hill Cement Company in Harleyville, the Alumax Aluminum (Alcoa) factory in Goose Creek, and the Airco-Carbon plant in Ridgeville. This trend continued in the 1980s and
1990s as subdivision creep from North Charleston and Goose Creek enlarged their city limits to include parts of Dorchester County and up to the boundary of the Town of Summerville. In the late 1990s, owners of the 4,000-acre undeveloped former Boy Scott land known as Camp Gregg along Dorchester Road announced that they were planning the Westcott Development, a planned urban development that would ultimately bring thousands of new residents to the area.

Wescott has been the largest of several urban and rural developments in Lower Dorchester County. In 2009, MeadWestvaco, formerly Westvaco, announced plans to develop nearly 80,000 acres of their Lower Dorchester and West Charleston area lands in a planned urban and rural development called East Edisto. Lower Dorchester County and the Town of Summerville have emerged as one of the fastest growing residential and business regions in South Carolina, attracting thousands of new residents. The current project is one of many efforts to enlarge the infrastructure to support this intensive growth.

### 3.3 Previous Investigations in the Project Area

Project principals with Brockington consulted the NRHP property listings at SCDAH and the state site files at SCIAA to obtain information regarding previous cultural resources investigations and to determine the locations of cultural resources located within 0.5 mile of the proposed project. This data was accessed through ArchSite (http://archsite.cas.sc.edu/ArchSite), the online cultural resource system sponsored and maintained by SCDAH and SCIAA. In addition, Principal Investigator Josh Fletcher confirmed some of this data with additional research at the SCDAH facility in Columbia. Below we summarize the cultural resources investigations that have occurred in the area and the archaeological and architectural resources located within 0.5-mile of the proposed project. To date there have been eight cultural resource investigations conducted within 0.5 mile of the project corridor; these studies are summarized below. Five of these investigations overlap portions of the APE: Bailey and Harvey (2000); Fick and Davis (1989); Fletcher et al. (2007); Frick (2004); and Roberts and Caballero (1987). Three archaeological sites (see Table 3.3), one NRHP district, and 36 historic resources (see Table 3.4) are located within 0.5 mile of the project.

#### 3.3.1 Summerville Historic District (1976, 1996)

The Summerville Historic District was listed on the NRHP on May 19, 1976 (Moltke-Hansen et al. 1975). The original nomination included 23 historic resources in the district boundary, which followed the 1847 Summerville village boundaries. During the historic resources survey of Dorchester County, Fick and Davis (1996) revisited the Summerville Historic District and recommended expansion of the district boundaries to include an additional 20 historic resources. This recommended expansion can be seen in Figure 1.2. The expanded district ends approximately 1,500 feet to the south of the project APE. Only Resource 496 0561, the NRHP-eligible Old Dorchester Hospital, is within the APE, and based on proposed construction drawings of the improvements to US 78 (see Figure 4.9) there is expected to be no adverse affect to this resource. No additional historic resources associated with the Summerville Historic District are located within the APE. The Summerville Historic District will not be affected by the proposed project.

#### 3.3.2 Archaeological Survey of the Proposed Sawmill Branch Parkway (1987)

SCDOT archaeologists Wayne Roberts and Olga Caballero conducted archaeological survey of an approximate 2.6-mile long, 150-foot wide project corridor, which extended from the intersection of US-17A and Gum Street Extension to the Carolina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Era</th>
<th>NRHP</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38DR144</td>
<td>domestic scatter</td>
<td>19th-20th century</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>Roberts and Caballero 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38DR145</td>
<td>domestic scatter</td>
<td>19th-20th century</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>Roberts and Caballero 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38DR146</td>
<td>domestic scatter</td>
<td>19th-20th century</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>Roberts and Caballero 1987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.4 Previously Recorded Architectural Resources within 0.5 mile of the APE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>NRHP Status</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summerville Historic District</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0008</td>
<td>Summerville Historic District</td>
<td>c. 1830-1940</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0205</td>
<td>unknown SFR</td>
<td>c. 1915</td>
<td>100 N. Hickory St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0224</td>
<td>unknown SFR</td>
<td>c. 1880</td>
<td>214 N. Cedar St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0225</td>
<td>unknown SFR</td>
<td>c. 1890</td>
<td>208 N. Cedar St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0226</td>
<td>unknown SFR</td>
<td>c. 1930</td>
<td>211 N. Cedar St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0227</td>
<td>unknown SFR</td>
<td>c. 1890</td>
<td>213 N. Cedar St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0228</td>
<td>SFR (Dunning House)</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>130 1st North St. West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0230</td>
<td>unknown SFR</td>
<td>c. 1900</td>
<td>123 1st North St. West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Historic Architectural Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0561</td>
<td>Dorchester County Hospital</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>500 N. Main St.</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Fick and Davis 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Stephens Reformed Episcopal Church</td>
<td></td>
<td>108 N. Palmetto St.</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0001</td>
<td>frame bungalow SFR (now Psychic Readings)</td>
<td>c. 1925</td>
<td>SSR 570, west side, 0.9 mile west of I-26</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Schneider and Fick 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0194</td>
<td>SFR (Salisbury Dairy farmhouse)</td>
<td>c. 1925</td>
<td>710 Maple St.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Fick and Davis 1996; Gantt 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salisbury Dairy outbuildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0247</td>
<td>unknown SFR (destroyed)</td>
<td>c. 1935</td>
<td>Loblolly St.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Fick and David 1996; Roberts and Caballero 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0251</td>
<td>ranch SFR (modified)</td>
<td>c. 1930</td>
<td>505 N. Hickory St.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0252</td>
<td>unknown SFR (destroyed)</td>
<td>c. 1915</td>
<td>413 5th N. St.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Fick and Davis 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0253.00</td>
<td>Merry Maid Dairy SFR</td>
<td>c. 1925</td>
<td>1003 N. Gum St.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0253.01</td>
<td>Merry Maid Dairy SFR</td>
<td>c. 1925</td>
<td>1005 N. Gum St.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0253.02</td>
<td>Merry Maid Dairy silo</td>
<td>c. 1910</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Fick and Davis 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0268</td>
<td>frame bungalow SFR (now Automoney Title Loans)</td>
<td>c. 1915</td>
<td>705 N. Main St.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0269</td>
<td>cinderblock bungalow SFR</td>
<td>c. 1925</td>
<td>903 5th N. St. West</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.4 Previously Recorded Architectural Resources within 0.5 mile of the APE (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>NRHP Status</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Other Historic Architectural Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0569</td>
<td>frame bungalow SFR</td>
<td>c. 1925</td>
<td>312 N. Maple St.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Bailey and Harvey 2000; Fick and Davis 1996; Gantt 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0570</td>
<td>unknown building (destroyed)</td>
<td>c. 1935</td>
<td>313 N. Maple St.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Fick and Davis 1996; Gantt 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0588</td>
<td>frame bungalow SFR</td>
<td>c. 1930</td>
<td>915 W. Richardson Ave.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Fick and Davis 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0594</td>
<td>frame bungalow SFR</td>
<td>c. 1920</td>
<td>1001 W. Richardson Ave.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Bailey and Harvey 2000; Fick and Davis 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0595</td>
<td>brick commercial (Spell's Grocery)</td>
<td>c. 1935</td>
<td>1000 W. Richardson Ave.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 0596</td>
<td>Brownsville Cemetery</td>
<td>c. 1880-present</td>
<td>Pigeon Bay Rd.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1176</td>
<td>international/ranch SFR</td>
<td>c 1950</td>
<td>602 N. Maple St.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Gantt 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1177</td>
<td>frame bungalow SFR</td>
<td>c 1930</td>
<td>520 N. Maple St.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1178</td>
<td>brick bungalow SFR</td>
<td>c 1930</td>
<td>518 Maple St.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1179</td>
<td>cinderblock bungalow SFR</td>
<td>c 1940</td>
<td>506 Maple St.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1269</td>
<td>Commercial, no type or style</td>
<td>c 1950</td>
<td>1010 W. 5th N. St.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1270</td>
<td>Commercial, no type or style</td>
<td>c 1935</td>
<td>930 W. 5th N. St.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>brick commercial (Summerville National Guard Armory)</td>
<td></td>
<td>301 N. Hickory St.</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Former National Guard Armory Building, Asbestos/Paint Abatement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SFR=single family residence  c.=circa

Note: Resources shown in **bold** are within architectural survey universe.
resources first identified by Fick and Davis (1996) (see Table 3.4). Another cultural resource, the route of the former Charleston to Hamburg/Augusta Railroad (built circa 1830), follows the Southern Railroad ROW along the south side of US 78. The NRHP status of the entire route of the former Charleston to Hamburg/Augusta Railroad has never been determined. Portions of this route may be eligible for the NRHP, particularly in association with contemporary buildings or other landscape elements that reflect the mid-nineteenth-century development of South Carolina. No such features remain along the portion of the rail route that parallels US 78 in the survey universe examined by Bailey and Harvey (2000). Thus, this segment of the rail route is not eligible for the NRHP. In addition, a modern railroad uses the same route as the historic railroad along this portion of US 78; the SCDOT cannot acquire portions of the railroad ROW for the proposed improvements. Thus, Bailey and Harvey (2000) concluded that the US 78 intersection improvements at Deming Way and Richardson Avenue would affect no historic properties.

3.3.3 Berkeley County Historical and Architectural Inventory (1989)
Preservation Consultants, Inc., conducted the Berkeley County historical and architectural inventory of Berkeley County (Schneider et al. 1989). These investigations identified one historic architectural resource (Resource 496 0001) within 0.5 mile of the project corridor. This survey was funded jointly by Berkeley County and SCDAH.

3.3.4 Historic Resources Survey of Dorchester County, South Carolina (1996)
Preservation Consultants, Inc., conducted a historic resources survey of Dorchester County, including the Summerville Historic District, on behalf of the SCDAH (Fick and Davis 1996). Fick and Davis (1996) identified 30 historic architectural resources located within 0.5 mile of the APE of the current project (see Figure 1.2 and Table 3.4). These include seven historic architectural resources that contribute to the Summerville NRHP District and the NRHP-eligible Dorchester County Hospital. Proposed improvements to US 78 will have no adverse effect on the Summerville Historic District, any of its contributing elements, or the Dorchester County Hospital. Seven of these resources (Resources [prefix 496] 0251, 0252, 0268, 0269, 0561, 0569, and 0570) are located within the APE (see Chapter 4).

3.3.5 Cultural Resources Survey of the US Route 78 Improvements Project (2000)
In 2000, Brockington conducted an intensive cultural resources survey of approximately three miles along US 78 near the US 78 intersections with Deming Way and Richardson Avenue (see Figure 1.2). Bailey and Harvey (2000) identified no new cultural resources but revisited five historic architectural

3.3.6 Cultural Resources Survey of the Berkeley Interstate Site (2002)
In 2002, R.S. Webb and Associates, Inc., conducted a cultural resources survey of the Berkeley Interstate Site on behalf of the SCDOT. Gantt et al. (2002) identified no cultural resources within 0.5 mile of the APE.

In 2004, SCDOT archaeologist Bonnie Frick conducted an intensive cultural resources survey of the US 78 and Maple Street intersection, which is located within the current APE. Frick (2004) recorded no cultural resources. Frick's (2004) APE subsumes the purported location of the Oak Grove cemetery, but no mention of the cemetery is made in the report.

3.3.8 Cultural Resources Survey of the Proposed US Highway 78 Improvement Project
In July and August 2006, Brockington conducted an
is considered a non-contiguous, contributing element of the local Summerville Historic District (see Chapter 4 for a more detailed description). The St. Stephens Reformed Episcopal Church (108 N. Palmetto St.) dates from ca. 1885 and is considered a non-contiguous, contributing element of the local Summerville Historic District. Architectural survey was conducted of the old National Guard Armory (301 N. Hickory St.) in advance of the proposed removal of asbestos and hazardous paint. Both the St. Stephens Reformed Episcopal Church and the old National Guard Armory building are recommended NRHP-eligible. Proposed construction activities within the APE will have no adverse effect on any of these cultural resources.

3.3.9 Cultural Resources Survey of the I-26/Sheep Island Parkway Interchange (2009)
In 2009, R.S. Webb and Associates, Inc., conducted a cultural resources survey of the I-26/Sheep Island Parkway Interchange Project on behalf of the SC-DOT (see Figure 1.2). Gantt (2009) revisited one previously identified historic architectural resource (496 0194) and identified six new historic architectural resources (Resources 1176 through 1179, 1269, and 1270) located within 0.5 mile of the APE centerline (see Table 3.4). It should be noted that Gantt (2009) incorrectly identified Resources 1269 and 1270 as Resources 496 0569 and 496 0570, which had been previously surveyed by Fick and Davis (1996). These resources were re-surveyed during the current investigation and assigned new numbers. Resources 1269 and 1270 are located on US 78 (West Fifth North Street) within the APE; Resources 1177 through 1179 are located on Maple Street within the APE (see Chapter 4).

3.3.10 Berkeley-Charleston-Dorchester Council of Governments (BCDCG) Building Surveys
The BCDCG sponsored informal surveys of three historic architectural buildings located in Summerville within 0.5 mile of the APE centerline. These include Resource 496 0561 (Dorchester County Hospital), the St. Stephens Reformed Episcopal Church, and the Old National Guard Armory. The Dorchester County Hospital was constructed in 1937, is located within the architectural APE, and

intensive cultural resources survey of the proposed US 78 (Phase 3) Improvements Project in Dorchester County, South Carolina (Fletcher et al. 2007). The footprint of this project encompasses Bailey and Harvey’s (2000) project area. The project corridor is approximately 24.6 miles long, beginning in northeast Summerville at West Richardson Avenue and continuing northwest along the existing alignment to Sugarhill Road in St. George. Fletcher et al. (2007) identified 16 new historic architectural resources (Resources 1154 through 1169), five archaeological sites (38DR343, 38DR344, 38DR345, 38DR346, and 38DR347), and five isolated finds (Isolates 1 through 5). None of these cultural resources are located within 0.5 mile of the APE.
4.0 Results of the Investigations

4.1 Introduction
Cultural resources survey of the US 78 Phase 3 Improvements Project includes intensive archaeological and architectural survey and geophysical survey of a select portion of the APE. This chapter presents the results of archaeological survey, architectural survey, and geophysical survey and provides NRHP assessments for all newly identified cultural resources located within the APE. Brockington identified no archaeological sites in the archaeological survey universe. Previous investigations within the architectural survey universe identified one NRHP-listed district and 12 historic architectural resources; these resources were revisited during the field survey and are discussed on the following pages. In addition, the architectural historian identified 24 new historic architectural resources (Resources 1245 through 1268) within the architectural survey universe.

4.2 Archaeological Survey Results
Brockington archaeologists conducted a pedestrian survey of the entire archaeological survey universe. These investigations identified no archaeological resources. Excavated shovel tests exposed disturbed soils more characteristic of udorthent soils rather than the soils noted by Eppinette (1990: Plates 34 and 39) and summarized in Table 3.1.

4.3 Architectural Survey Results
March 2 through 6, 2015, Brockington architectural historian Rachel Bragg conducted an intensive architectural survey of the survey universe. The architectural investigations consisted of a windshield survey of the project area to identify any potential historic architectural resources. The project architectural historian recorded any buildings, structures, objects, or landscapes within 300 feet of the APE centerline that are over 50 years of age and that retain sufficient integrity. All historic resources were documented using digital black-and-white photography and have been recorded on the Statewide Survey of Historic Properties Intensive Documentation Form (see Appendix A). Previous investigations identified/recorded one NRHP historic district and 11 historic architectural resources within the APE (see Figure 1.2). During the architectural survey, the architectural historian identified 24 new historic architectural resources (Resources 1245 through 1268) within the APE (see Figure 1.2). The 37 resources identified in the architectural survey universe are summarized in Table A-1 and are discussed below by architectural type. For more details on individual resources, see their respective forms in Appendix A. This alternate report format was discussed with SCDOT architectural historian David Kelly on March, 16, 2015.

4.3.1 Residential House Types

Bungalow. The most common house type identified within the architectural survey universe is the bungalow. This one-story house type features a low-pitched, gabled roof with wide overhangs that often showcase exposed roof rafters. The majority have a front-gabled roof (Resources 1177 through 1179, 1245, 1246, 1249, 1251, and 1252), while some have a side-gabled roof (Resources 496 0269, 496 0569, 1250, and 1254). There are several with a less common hipped roof construction (Resources 496 0268, 1247, 1248, and 1253) present, as well. In general, these resources sit on brick piers that have been infilled with concrete masonry units (CMU) or directly on CMUs and concrete slabs. Most maintain their composite shingle roofs, but several have replaced this with metal sheeting. Historic cladding of asbestos or wooden siding has generally been altered or exchanged for brick veneer or vinyl siding. Where historic windows are extant they are three-over-one, wooden, double hung sash. Replacements tend to be synthetic, one-over-one, double hung sash. Figure 4.1 presents a view of a typical bungalow. Note traits common to bungalows within the survey universe: one-story with a low pitched, front gabled roof, exposed rafter tails, front gabled porch supported by battered columns, and brick pier foundation with CMU in-fill.

All resources except for 496 0569 have front porches. The majority have front gabled or shed roofed porches that cover the front façade. However, entrance bay only porches and those that cover less than the full façade are also common. Resources 496
0268 and 1253 have engaged, full façade porches. Many of these appear to be altered from their original design and contain replacement material. Altered porch supports and balustrades are common. This architectural type was most commonly constructed between 1900 and 1940. The bungalow houses in this survey universe range from circa 1915-1940. All of the bungalow resources within the architectural survey universe lack integrity, specifically that of design, materials, and setting. Large scale or incompatible additions, as well as altered or replaced doors, windows, and cladding all contribute to this conclusion. In addition, they lack distinctive architectural characteristics of their type and do not convey a strong feeling of the early twentieth century period. Resources 496 0268, 496 0269, 496 0569, 1177 through 1179, and 1245 through 1254 are recommended not eligible for the NHRP. Survey forms, which contain more detailed information on the individual resources, are provided in Appendix A.

### Center Hall
Resource 1255 is the only identified center hall house type within the architectural survey universe (see Figure 4.2). It has a lateral gabled roof, clad in composite shingles, and has an engaged, full façade front porch. The extant historic windows are three-over-one, wood, double hung sash. The door and the majority of the windows and the door are replacements. Replacement windows are synthetic six-over-six, double hung sash. The foundation is not visible. The house is clad in vinyl siding. There is a side and rear addition. The roof is new, in both design and material. This center hall house lacks integrity of design, materials, and workmanship. Resource 1255 is recommended not eligible for listing on the NHRP.

### Minimal Traditional
Resource 1256 has a lateral gabled roof with enclosed gutters, sheathed in composite shingles. The façade is clad in brick and vinyl siding. Extant historic windows are vertical, two-over-two, wood, double hung sash. Many have been replaced. There is a rear shed addition. During survey, the architectural historian followed SHPO's...
(2013) Guidelines for Surveying Post-World War II Neighborhoods and Residences, and thus only surveyed the most intact minimal traditional houses within the survey universe. This resource, despite the altered porch, cladding, windows and a rear addition, was the most intact minimal traditional within the survey universe. These material alterations have compromised the integrity of design and workmanship of the resource. Resource 1256 is recommended not eligible for listing in the NHRP. Figure 4.3 provides a view of Resource 1256.

**Ranch.** Resources 1257 through 1262 are ranch houses, constructed circa 1960-1965. They are one-story, with a low, horizontal form and possess either a low pitch gabled or hipped roof. They are rectilinear in massing, with the long side oriented toward the road, and constructed on a concrete slab. Most have an attached car port. In general, the exterior cladding is brick, asbestos, or CMU. In addition to their double hung sash, metal windows, many have decorative windows: large, single-pane picture windows, corner windows, or faux-casement windows. Porches or carports are often supported by decorative wrought iron, faux-vine posts. Resources 1258 and 1260 have large-scale chimneys on their front elevation. During survey, we followed the recommendations of SHPO’s (2013) Guidelines for Surveying Post-World War II Neighborhoods and Residences and thus only recorded excellent examples of ranch houses within the survey universe. Resource 4960251 is a previously recorded ranch house but was not included here because of extensive modification. Resources 1257 through 1262 do not embody the distinctive characteristics of a type period or method of construction, nor do they convey a strong feeling of mid-twentieth-century history. Figure 4.4 presents a view of a typical ranch house in the APE. We recommend that these resources are not eligible for listing in the NHRP. Additional details on the individual ranch houses are provided in the survey forms in Appendix A.
Figure 4.3 Resource 1256, east (front) elevation, view from west (614 North Pine Street).

Figure 4.4 Resource 1257, northeast oblique, view from southwest (505 Laurel Street).
4.3.2 Commercial Building Types and Styles

Commercial—No academic type or style. Resources 1269 and 1270 are commercial buildings located south of the US 78/North Maple Street intersection. Gantt (2009) previously surveyed both of these resources, but mistakenly identified Resource 1269 as Resource 496 0569 and Resource 1270 as Resource 496 0570, which had been recorded by Fick and Davis (1996). Therefore, these two resources were re-surveyed during the current investigation.

Resource 1269 possesses no academic type or style. It features a front gabled roof, clad in composite shingles (see Figure 4.5). It was constructed circa 1950 of CMUs on a concrete slab and has a front gabled projecting porch on the front elevation. The scale and design of this resource suggests it was initially constructed for commercial purposes. It is wider and longer than other resources with a similar form and lacks windows except for two small, fixed-panes in the front elevation. The resource lacks distinctive characteristics of type, period or method of construction. This resource was likely first constructed by the Thomas family and functioned as a social club called The Duck In Club, but has since changed ownership and is now called Club NV. Resource 1269 is recommended not eligible for listing on the NHRP.

Resource 1270 lacks academic type or style. It is side gabled with fixed pane windows on the front façade. The cladding ranges from original wood siding on the side elevations to concrete on the front elevation. There is an extant chimney on the east elevation. This building may have originally been constructed as a residence. Extensive alterations of the windows, doors, and cladding have compromised the resource's integrity of design, materials, and workmanship. Resource 1270 is recommended not eligible for listing on the NHRP.

Gas stations. Resources 1265 and 1266 are gas stations. Their forms reflect this in their extended, front projecting awnings and fixed pane, storefront windows. Resource 1266 was built circa 1940 and has several rear additions to its original, CMU, cross-gabled structure. Resource 1267 was constructed circa

---

Figure 4.5 Resource 1269, northeast oblique, view from southwest (1010 West 5th North Street).
1950 and has several modern features such as fixed pane, curved glass windows. The resource is front gabled, and has two garage doors and several four-pane, vertical windows. Both resources have been significantly altered and no longer maintain their integrity of design, materials, or workmanship. Additionally, they do not possess distinct characteristics or embody their type or period. Resource 1265 and 1266 are recommended not eligible for listing in the NHRP. Figure 4.6 presents a view of Resource 1265.

**One-part commercial block.** Resources 1263 and 1264 are one-part commercial block buildings. Resource 1263 has a flat roof and Resource 1264 has a front gabled roof; both have parapets. They have large, fixed-pane windows and are clad in a brick veneer. Windows and doors have been altered. These resources do not have distinctive characteristics nor do they convey a strong feeling of the early twentieth century period. Resources 1263 and 1264 are recommended not eligible for listing in the NHRP. Figure 4.7 presents a view of Resource 1263.
4.3.3 Other Buildings

**Dorchester County Hospital.** Fick and Davis (1996) originally recorded Resource 496 0561. Resource 496 0561 is part of the locally designated historic district but not the NHRP district, although it is recommended individually eligible for individual listing on the NHRP under Criteria A (Fick and Davis 1996). It is associated with events that have made significant contributions to the broad patterns of history in the theme of health and medicine. The facility functioned as the county hospital beginning in 1937 until Dorchester County moved several departments and administrative offices into the building in the late 1980s.

Dorchester County Hospital is a complex with Greek Revival details that consists of five building segments, all of which are connected. The western segment is modern but consistent in scale, design and materials with the historic core. The segments all have laterally gabled roofs, and are clad in brick. The two main entrance building segments on the eastern and western elevations are two-stories, and the other segments are one-story. Both entrances have two-story, front gabled, pedimented entrances that are supported by four, plain, rounded columns. The historic main entrance on the eastern elevation features pilasters and a Greek Revival door surround. The modern replacement windows are synthetic and range from four-over-four to eight-over-eight, double hung sash. Figure 4.8 presents a view of Resource 496 0561.

Because of this resource’s NHRP eligibility under Criteria A, no alterations have occurred that would change this designation. The scope of the current improvements project includes disturbing the northern portion of the property by extending the US 78 right of way approximately 30 feet (Figure 4.9). It is currently a grassy barrier of newly planted trees between West Fifth North Street and a parking lot. This modern barrier does not contribute to the eligibility of the resource and project implementation would have no adverse effect on this resource. Changes to the setting of this resource have been ongoing as the Summerville area grows and additional alterations to the setting will not adversely affect the property.
Alston Middle School. Resource 1267 is the Alston Middle School. It was originally constructed in 1953 as Alston High School, serving African American students, until it closed as a high school after integration in 1970. It later reopened as an integrated middle school. It is a sprawling one-story E-shaped school with brick veneer, built on a concrete slab. Historic entrance surrounds are decorated with stone in a Roman brick pattern.

The one-story scale with multiple original entrances is consistent with post-WWII school construction trends. Large scale school construction occurred after WWII because of overcrowding of existing buildings. New theories about educational architecture influenced the design of these new schools. They tended to be built with long banks of windows to improve ventilation and natural light. They were constructed as single story buildings to make it easier and cheaper to expand and to provide students with easy access to the outside. Extant historic windows are aluminum, horizontal, two-over-two, double hung sash. Modern windows are metal, one-over-one, double hung sash. Figure 4.10 provides a view of the east elevation of Resource 1267.

SHPO (2009) describes the property of the Alston Middle School, which once housed the Alston Graded School. Constructed in 1910, the Alston Graded School was one of the first African American schools in Dorchester County. Originally located on the corner of Cedar and First North Streets, it was moved to 500 Bryan Street in 1953 and constructed as part of the Equalization School Movement.

The school has been heavily altered and no longer maintains integrity of design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling or association. Alston Middle School was evaluated under Criterion A (events) and C (architecture); however, because of its compromised integrity, it no longer retains the identity for which is could be considered significant, as an Equalization School. Dobrasko (2008:13) defines the essential physical features of Equalization schools:

- The historic window openings must be retained. The window sashes may be replaced
Figure 4.9 Map showing proposed changes to the right of way around Dorchester County Hospital (496 0561), which will have no adverse effect on the resource.
as long as the window openings are still majority glass.

- The official, formal entrance to the school should be retained and used. Properties that convey evidence of the community’s historical patterns of development

- Additions should be on the side or the rear of the building, and attached by hyphens or walkways.

As shown in Figure 4.10, the majority of the windows have been enclosed. Additionally, the school was originally constructed as three separate buildings: two classroom buildings and a gym, as shown in Figure 4.11. In 1990, a central entrance was built that removed the historic entrances and connected all the buildings into one. In ca. 2000, a large-scale addition was constructed on the north elevation. Earlier additions were constructed within the central courtyard. Therefore, the enclosure of the windows, the construction of additions on the north and west elevations, and the construction of a central entrance compromised the character defining elements of Alston Middle School, making it no longer evocative of the feeling of the period of construction or its status as an Equalization School. Resource 1264 is recommended not eligible for the NHRP.

**Ruins.** Resource 1268 is in a state of ruin. Extant portions of the building include the porch steps and supports, brick foundation piers, and wooden sill. The form of the building cannot be determined from the extant materials. The resource lacks structural integrity as well as integrity of design, setting, materials, feeling, and workmanship. Resource 1268 is recommended not eligible for listing in the NHRP.
Figure 4.11 A portion of the USGS (1958) Summerville, SC quadrangle showing the original construction of Alston Middle School as three distinct buildings.

Figure 4.12 A ca. 1970 aerial image of Alston Middle School, showing central additions, but extant historic window opening and historic entrances and orientation.
4.4 Confederate Cemetery
(Oak Grove Cemetery)

The current route of US 78 extends through lands that once contained a Civil War-era Confederate cemetery referred to as Oak Grove Cemetery. These lands extend northwest from the intersection of US 78 and Maple Street. The following discussion provides a history of Oak Grove Cemetery and describes the results of limited geophysical survey conducted in the APE near Oak Grove Cemetery.

4.4.1 Background Research and History

During the Civil War, the Confederate military established two hospitals in Summerville, Confederate General Hospitals 1 and 2. Confederate General Hospital 1, or Summerville General Hospital, was located northwest of the intersection of the South Carolina Railroad and current day North Maple Street, southwest of the APE. The Confederate military also maintained a burial ground northeast of the hospital along North Maple Street, which was formerly known as Hospital Road. In 1862, Dr. B. C. Pressley purchased Sawmill Plantation, which straddled the South Carolina Railroad about one mile northwest of Summerville, for use as a Confederate hospital (West 2014:1). Figure 4.15 shows a plat of Pressley’s Sawmill Plantation with the APE superimposed. Dr. Edward West, a Summerville pediatrician and local historian, has done extensive research on Summerville in the Civil War era. In the 1990s, Dr. West identified the location of Confederate General Hospital 1 as the “hospital tract,” formerly Tract A of Pressley’s Sawmill Plantation (see Figure 4.15). West (n.d:1) summarizes his research, “Diaries of Summerville doctors practicing in the 1860s refer to caring for sick and injured soldiers at the hospital . . . and attending their burials nearby.” Walker (1941) notes that “about ten acres of [Pressley’s Sawmill Plantation], on which many Confederate soldiers were buried, was conveyed by Mary B. Pressley, Executrix of Benjamin C. Pressley, to
Figure 4.14 Modern aerial image showing the central entrance and large scale additions on the north (constructed ca. 2000) and west elevations of the school
Figure 4.15 Post-Civil War plat of Pressley’s Sawmill Plantation, with the locations of the APE, the UDC Confederate cemetery tract, and the Hospital Tract area noted (Charleston County Plat Book B:5).
Capt. J. J. Wescoat, in 1898, and by Capt. Wescoat to the C. Irvine Walker Chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC).”

Recently, a team of local, long-time Summerville residents have collaborated to conduct deed research on the location of the burial site and have identified it as the UDC Confederate Cemetery parcel, formerly part of the Pressley Plantation tract (Summerville Dorchester Museum 2015). Based on this research, 15 to 30 Confederate soldiers (and likely as many as 30) and an unknown number of federal troops belonging to the 35th U.S. Colored Troops were buried in the cemetery (see Table 4.1).

For many years after the war, ladies of the UDC tended the cemetery, marking the graves with simple wooden headstones and Confederate iron crosses. They called the burial ground Oak Grove Cemetery. The records in the Dorchester County Register of Deeds Office confirm Walker’s summation. In October 1898, Mary B. Pressley, wife and executrix of Dr. B. C. Pressley, sold a 10-acre parcel of her husband’s former plantation to Julius J. Wescoat, who the same day conveyed it to the C. Irvine Walker Chapter of the UDC (Dorchester County Deed Book [DCDB] 1:315-316). Articles in magazines for nearly 40 years tell of the ladies efforts to purchase and maintain the gravesite (Walker 1941; West 2014:4-6). The UDC planted a grove of oaks, kept the graves in good order, and held annual Confederate Memorial Day services at the cemetery. By the early 1910s, the UDC sought a more permanent monument to the dead. In 1914, St. Paul’s Episcopal Church offered a site for a monument for the dead in their churchyard (West 2014:6). To pay for the monument, the UDC sold the cemetery plot to Arleigh E. Salvo on October 4, 1915. The deed of sale states that on February 19, 1915, the chapter passed a resolution to “authorize the sale of their ‘property’, ten acres known as the Confederate Ground or Cemetery Lot” for $100.00 to Arleigh E. Salvo (DCDB 21:547). The deed was signed by 24 members of the chapter. In 1916, Salvo conveyed the land to Alfred M. Masterman, who was likely speculating in land around the J. F. Prettyman sawmill that was operating on the old hospital site (DCDB 23:164). By that time, Hospital Road was known officially as Maple Street. During Masterman’s ownership, the State Highway Department acquired a strip of land for the new State Highway 178, later US 78. The strip of land cut off a portion of the southwest corner of the tract from the bal-

Table 4.1 Summary of Documented and Probable Graves at Oak Grove Cemetery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documented Burials</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plyler</td>
<td>died</td>
<td>6/23/1862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>died</td>
<td>6/26 or 27/1862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiram Hooten</td>
<td>died</td>
<td>8/12/1862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>buried</td>
<td>8/7/1863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John H. Howington</td>
<td>died</td>
<td>9/15/1863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brannon</td>
<td></td>
<td>8/27/1864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Edward Estill</td>
<td>died</td>
<td>10/22/1864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter S. Mullin (s)</td>
<td>died</td>
<td>11/27/1864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke</td>
<td>died</td>
<td>12/2/1864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Eady (Eddy)</td>
<td>died</td>
<td>12/14/1864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/14/1864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Leland</td>
<td>buried but body exhumed and transported by rail and buried elsewhere</td>
<td>1/4/1865, 1/7/1865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probable Burials</th>
<th>Out of State Confederate or 35th USCT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wm. J. Rhodes</td>
<td>Sgt., Company A, 61st NCVI; died</td>
<td>9/20/1863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Faskin Royster</td>
<td>Pvt., 50th NCVI; died</td>
<td>1/26/1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Gramby</td>
<td>Company I, USCT; died</td>
<td>5/1866</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Archaeologists excavated no shovel tests in the vicinity of the former Oak Grove Cemetery. However, the ground surface was thoroughly inspected. No evidence of unmarked graves or any other kind of evidence of a cemetery was encountered. This portion of the APE consists of heavily disturbed, mixed-use, commercial, industrial, and residential lands.

4.4.2 Geophysical Survey of the Oak Grove Cemetery

Introduction. Background research indicates that the current route of US 78 extends through lands formerly associated with the Oak Grove Cemetery (see Figures 4.15 and 4.16). Unfortunately, this research has not found definitive evidence for the precise location of the cemetery. Because the cemetery may have functioned as burial grounds with the former Summerville General Hospital and may contain the remains of Confederate soldiers and 35th U.S. Colored Troops, the cemetery may be eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and D and Potter and Boland's (1992) Criteria Considerations C and D. It is possible that the current US 78 proposed improvements project will have an adverse effect on the cemetery. Therefore, as part of the US 78 Phase 3 Improvements Project, DCTA and Davis & Floyd contracted Brockington to conduct geophysical survey to investigate the possibility of unmarked graves near the intersection of US 78 and North Maple Street.

Prior to these investigations, SCDOT, Davis & Floyd, and Brockington delineated the Geophysical Survey Study Area (GSSA). The Geophysical Survey Study Area (GSSA) encompasses approximately 0.56 acre north of US 78 and 0.40 acre south of US 78, extending west from North Maple Street (see Figure 4.17). Brockington conducted the geophysical survey May 18 through June 1, 2015. Archaeologist David Baluha conducted the survey with the assistance of Brockington technician Scott Kitchens. In the field, Brockington personnel differentiated areas within the GSSA to conduct an intensive GPR survey. These areas are shown in Figure 4.17 as Areas A through C. The GPR survey of the remainder of the GSSA was conducted informally by running the GPR north/south across the study area without establishing a grid. In these areas, surface ground disturbance was determined too extensive for producing effective GPR results.
Figure 4.16 A portion of a USDA (1938) aerial photograph of a part of Dorchester County showing the area around US 78 and the Confederate Cemetery (USDA, Dorchester County, February 28, 1938).
Figure 4.17 Location of the Geophysical Survey Study Area projected on recent aerial imagery.
Ground Penetrating Radar Overview. The field investigations include the use of Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR). GPR is a non-invasive method of exploring the subsurface for archaeological features such as graves (in prehistoric sites and historic cemeteries); privies; and house, palisade, fort, factory, and mill walls, floors, and foundations. It works by the transmission of electromagnetic pulses that travel as waves into the ground (Conyers 2004). The elapsed time between the transmission of the waves, the reflection off buried anomalies, and the reception back to the surface radar antenna is measured. Buried anomalies create changes in the electrical or magnetic properties of the rock, sediment, or soil, or variations in their water content that reflect the waves (Conyers 2004). In other words, any previous disturbance in the subsurface is recorded by the GPR antenna. These changes are measured in two ways, travel time and velocity. Thus, the approximate depth at which these anomalies lie can be determined.

Soil type needs to be determined before survey in order to obtain velocities and maximum penetration depth. Bentonitic clays are resistant to GPR electromagnetic signals. Even though GPR can be used in moist to wet soils, if the water table or an artificially perched water table is near the surface, shallower than presumed targets, the use of GPR is not advisable since water attenuates the GPR electromagnetic signal. The GPR cannot operate through salt water or salt water intrusion into fresh ground water. Heavy ground cover and topography can limit the effectiveness of GPR.

GPR creates images of changes in soil chemistry, texture, or hydrology, or other materials underground. It records the length of time necessary for the radar signal to bounce back from soil layers or objects. The recorded length of time is used to determine the depth of an object through a series of calculations computed by the machine. To acquire a clear image of the subsurface strata, we transmit the radar signal at set intervals over the examined space. The GPR collects the best results when the antenna remains relatively at the same distance above the ground surface. Thus, in areas where there are many irregularities on the ground surface, small trees, or dense undergrowth/ground cover, the data may be skewed.

GPR Field Methods. Data across the study area were collected using a MALA Geosciences RAMAC X3M cart system with a 250 megahertz antenna. The corners of each project area within the GSSA were marked using wooden stakes. To establish survey grids within each area, investigators pulled fiberglass measuring tapes between the southwest/southeast and the northwest/northeast corner stakes. These measuring tapes formed the north and south axis of each area. A two-foot grid was established across the APE, with transects running roughly north-south, or perpendicular to US 78. Running transects at two-foot intervals and with a north/south orientation provides opportunities to intersect potential graves at multiple points. Investigators used two nylon ropes stretched every two feet between each measuring tape to guide these investigations. Brockington personnel pushed the MALA cart system along each transect. Information specific to each transect, such as the direction, start and end points, anomalies, and disturbances, was recorded in a notebook.

We observed the signal on each traverse or transect in the examined space. Observed anomalies unexplained by surface features, roots, or other irregularities were noted. This allowed the investigator to map anomalies as they occurred and to relocate an anomaly for more thorough investigation. If an anomaly was noted in the field, additional radar images could be collected by passing over the anomaly in a different direction.

Environmental Conditions. Prior to fieldwork, Brockington evaluated environmental conditions in the GSSA to help plan the GPR survey. This evaluation was based on observed field conditions during the archaeological survey and extant soil conditions. Soil conditions were determined by using the National Resources Conservation Services’ Web Soil Survey (WSS). The WSS shows Foreston loamy fine sand soils across the entire project area. Foreston loamy fine sand soils are characterized as deep, well-drained, and sandy soils with clay subsoil greater than four feet below surface. However, given the degree of commercial development across the GSSA, it is likely that soils are a combination of Foreston and udorthent (man-made) soils.

The GSSA extends across gravel and paved parking lots associated with four different commercial
buildings (Club NV and Rosa’s Winging It south of US 78, and Hill’s Automotive LLC and Summerville Collision Center, Inc., north of US 78). These parking lots are paved with matrices of asphalt, concrete, and gravel, some of which is overgrown with grass. In addition, multiple buried utility lines (electrical, fiber optic, and water/sewer) extend through the GSSA north and south of US 78. The GSSA was mostly clear of vegetation, except for some grassy areas and a few small bushes and trees near Club NV south of US 78. Figures 4.18 through 4.20 provide views of the GSSA.

**GPR Analysis Methods.** The data were analyzed using GPR-Slice™ Version 7.0. This program allows investigators to look at individual data profiles, sets of data profiles, and a plan view of data at specified depths. Linear features show up well in a plan view of the data. Anomalies show up in profile as an upside down “U” with the top representing the general depth of the object. Iron or stone objects create a spike of intensity that travels down the entire depth of the profile. These profiles and plans were examined using various filters to draw out features. A great deal of interpretation goes into defining grave locations based on anomalies in profile. The locations are based on relative depth, length, and orientation. Ideally, graves are oriented in an east-west direction, range from three to six feet in depth, and from four to six feet in length. These orientations and lengths are buffered, larger and smaller, to allow for children or partial grave locations. These possible grave locations are not exact and are interpretations of the collected data.

**GPR Survey Results.** The GPR field investigations and analysis showed significant disturbance across most of the study area. No anomalies were identified that suggest the presence of intact graves. Figures 4.21 through 4.23 provide examples of GPR Slice™ time slice images from Areas A through C in the GSSA.

Figures 4.21 through 4.23 show subterranean features detected 2.6 to 4.6 feet below surface in Areas A through C of the GSSA. None of these features are characteristic of graves. Instead, these images show buried utilities, ranging from water/sewer lines, buried drainage pipes/culverts, and electrical/fiber optic lines. The effects of surface disturbances are also shown, with such features as concrete slabs, light poles, mud puddles, and water meters inhibiting the GPR.

**Recommendations.** Geophysical survey of the GSSA within the US 78 Phase 3 Improvements Project APE identified no subsurface anomalies characteristic of graves. However, because of the APE’s proximity to the reported location of Oak Grove Cemetery and the degree of ground surface and subsurface disturbance, it is still possible that unmarked graves are present in the APE that could not be detected with GPR. For this reason, Brockington recommends archaeological monitoring of construction activities if and/or when these activities occur adjacent to Oak Grove Cemetery grounds. If any graves with human remains are encountered, they should be preserved in place or removed and relocated on-site where they can be protected from future ground disturbing activities. On-site is defined as anywhere within the current boundaries of APE. Any excavation, removal, or relocation of graves should be conducted in accordance with applicable South Carolina law. Because no subsurface grave features were identified, Oak Grove Cemetery will not be evaluated for the NRHP. Should graves be identified during construction activities, the cemetery should be evaluated for the NRHP at that time.
Figure 4.18 Views of the GSSA: southern project area near Club NV looking east (top); southern project area near Rosa's Winging It looking west (bottom).
Figure 4.19 Views of the GSSA: northern project area near Hill’s Automotive LLC looking east (top); northern project area east of Summerville Collision Center looking west (bottom).
Figure 4.20 Views of the GSSA: gravel driveway in northern project area looking northwest (top); private yard and utilities near US 78/North Maple Street intersection looking north (bottom).
Figure 4.21 GPR Slice™ time slice image of Area A, 2.7-3.0 feet below surface.
Figure 4.22 GPR Slice™ time slice image of Area B, 4.3-4.6 feet below surface.
Figure 4.23 GPR Slice™ time slice image of Area A, 2.6-3.0 feet below surface.
4.5 Project Summary and Recommendations

Brockington conducted the cultural resources survey of the US 78 Phase 3 Improvements Project March 2 through 6 and May 18 through June 1, 2015. The APE for the project includes both the archaeological and architectural survey universes but is equivalent to the architectural survey universe, which extends 300 feet to either side of the APE center line. The archaeological survey included pedestrian inspection of the entire project route and identified no cultural resources. Previous investigations identified one NRHP district and 11 historic architectural resources. During the current investigation, the architectural historian recorded 24 additional historic resources in the APE. Listed or eligible properties in the APE include the Summerville NRHP Historic District and Resource 496 0561 (the Dorchester County Hospital). The proposed improvements project will have no adverse effect on either of these historic properties. The 34 other historic architectural resources are not eligible for the NRHP and require no additional management. Archival research suggests the current route of US 78 extends through the former Oak Grove Cemetery, a cemetery associated with the former Summerville General Hospital that may inter the remains of Confederate soldiers and individuals from the 35th U.S. Colored Troops. This cemetery is purported to be near the intersection of US 78 and North Maple Street. Brockington conducted geophysical survey of a portion of the APE adjacent to the former Oak Grove Cemetery grounds. Geophysical survey identified no subsurface anomalies indicative of graves. However, because of the APE's proximity to Oak Grove Cemetery and the degree of ground surface and subsurface disturbance it is still possible that unmarked graves are present in the APE that could not be detected with GPR. For this reason, Brockington recommends archaeological monitoring of construction activities if and/or when these activities occur adjacent to Oak Grove Cemetery grounds. If any graves with human remains are encountered, they should be preserved in place or removed and relocated on-site where they can be protected from future ground disturbing activities. On-site is defined as anywhere within the current boundaries of APE. Any excavation, removal, or relocation of graves should be conducted in accordance with applicable South Carolina law.
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Appendix A
Architectural Survey Forms
Identification
Historic
Common
Address/Location: 202 W. 6th N St

City: Summerville    County: Dorchester
Vicinity of:
Ownership: Private    Category: building
Historical Domestic    Current Domestic

National Register of Historic Places
SHPO National Register
Notes on National Register

Other Designation:

Property Description
Construction c. 1965    Commercial    Stories: 1 story
Alteration Historic Core rectangular

Roof Features
    Shape: hip
    Materials: composition shingle

Porch Features
    Shape: 
    Porch Width:

Construction frame
Exterior Walls: brick veneer
Foundation: slab construction

Significant Architectural
This brick ranch house has a staggered, hipped roof. The rear hipped portion has an engaged carport with simple posts as support. The windows are horizontal, two-over-two, double hung sash. Most are paired, but there is a triple in the front elevation. All windows are surrounded by decorative shutters.

Alterations:

Architect(s)/Builder(s):
South Carolina Statewide Survey of Historic Properties  
*Intensive Documentation Form*

**Site**  
1262

**Historical Information**

Historical Information: 

**Source of Photographs**

**Program Management**

Recorded by: Rachel Bragg  
Date Recorded: 03/04/2015
Statewide Survey of Historic Properties
State Historic Preservation Office
South Carolina Department of Archives and History
Quad Name: Summerville
8301 Parklane Rd.
Columbia, SC 29223-4905  (803) 896-6100

Intensive Documentation Form

Identification
Historic
Common
Address/Location: 437 N Main St

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Summerville</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Dorchester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vicinity of:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>Commerce/Trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Commerce/Trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Register of Historic Places
SHPO National Register
Notes on National Register

Other Designation:

Property Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>c. 1940</th>
<th>Commercial 1-part commercial block</th>
<th>Stories: 1 story</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alteration</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic Core rectangular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roof Features
- Shape: flat
- Materials: composition shingle

Porch Features
- Shape:
- Porch Width:

Construction
- frame
Exterior Walls:
- brick veneer
Foundation:
- slab construction

Significant Architectural
This one-part commercial block building has a flat roof with a decorative front parapeted porch that displays the signs for the businesses. The parapet is clad in metal, raised seem sheets and synthetic siding. It is supported by squared columns. Windows on the side elevations are one-over-one, double hung sash. The front elevation features six-over-six double hung sash windows. The building is clad in brick veneer; on the front elevation it is in a running bond pattern, the sides have an American bond pattern. The parapeted porch is a modern alteration.

Alterations:
- windows, front façade

Architect(s)/Builder(s):
Historical Information

Program Management
Recorded by: Rachel Bragg
Date Recorded: 03/04/2015
Intensive Documentation Form

Identification
Historic
Address/Location: 445 N Main St

City: Summerville  County: Dorchester

Vicinity of:
Ownership: Private

Historical Category: Commerce/Trade
Current Category: Commerce/Trade

National Register of Historic Places
SHPO National Register
Notes on National Register

Other Designation:

Property Description

Construction c. 1940 Commercial 1-part commercial block Stories: 1 story

Alteration Historic Core rectangular

Roof Features
Shape: gable, end to front
Materials: composition shingle

Porch Features
Shape: Composition shingle
Porch Width:

Construction frame
Exterior Walls: brick veneer
Foundation: slab construction

Significant Architectural
This one part commercial block building has an end to front gabled roof, with a rounded front parapet and façade. The large, fixed-pane, store front windows are covered by cloth awnings. The brick veneer in the front façade is in a header bond, while the sides are in an American bond pattern.

Alterations: windows, doors

Architect(s)/Builder(s):
Intensive Documentation Form

Site 1264

Historical Information

Historical Information:

Source of Photographs

Program Management

Recorded by: Rachel Bragg
Date Recorded: 03/04/2015
Intensive Documentation Form

Identification
Historic

Common

Address/Location: 405 E. 5th St

City: Summerville  County: Dorchester

Vicinity of:

Ownership: Private  Category: building

Historical Commerce/Trade

Current Commerce/Trade

National Register of Historic Places

SHPO National Register

Notes on National Register

Other Designation:

Property Description

Construction c. 1950  Commercial other  Stories: 1 story

Alteration Historic Core rectangular

Roof Features
Shape: gable, end to front
Materials: composition shingle

Porch Features
Shape: gable
Porch Width: over 1 bay but less than full

Construction masonry
Exterior Walls: stucco
Foundation: slab construction

Significant Architectural

This modern style gas station has a front gabled roof, with an awning that projects toward the road. The likely CMU construction is covered with stucco, providing the clean lines associated with the modern style. The front elevation has two bays, and a rounded, corner window. The building no longer functions as a gas station and pumps have been removed.

Alterations: setting

Architect(s)/Builder(s):
South Carolina Statewide Survey of Historic Properties

Intensive Documentation Form

Site 1265

Historical Information

Historical Information:

Source of

Photographs

Program Management

Recorded by: Rachel Bragg
Date Recorded: 03/04/2015
Intensive Documentation Form

Identification
Historic
Common
Address/Location: 717 W. 5th N St
City: Summerville  County: Dorchester
Vicinity of:
Ownership: Private  Category: building
Historical Commerce/Trade
Current Commerce/Trade

National Register of Historic Places
SHPO National Register
Notes on National Register
Other Designation:

Property Description
Construction c. 1940  Commercial other  Stories: 1 story
Alteration Historic Core rectangular
Roof Features
Shape: cross gable
Materials: composition shingle

Porch Features
Shape: full facade
Shape: shed

Construction masonry
Exterior Walls: other
Foundation: slab construction
Significant Architectural
The historic core of this gas station is constructed of CMUs and has a cross-gabled roof. There is a full-façade awning on the front elevation. The fixed-pane store front windows are covered with security bars and advertisements. There is a rear CMU addition and a prefabricated, metal addition. The property functions as a convenience store and car repair.

Alterations: front façade, rear additions

Architect(s)/Builder(s):
Historical Information

Historical Information:

Source of Photographs

Program Management
Recorded by: Rachel Bragg
Date Recorded: 03/04/2015
Significant Architectural

Resource 1267 is the c. 1953 Alston Middle School. Originally it was constructed in 1953 as Alston High school, serving African American students, until it closed as a high school after integration in 1970. It later reopened as an integrated middle school. It is a sprawling one-story E-shaped school with brick veneer, built on a concrete slab. Historic entrance surrounds are decorated with stone in a roman brick pattern. Extant historic windows are aluminum, horizontal, two-over-two, double hung sash. Modern windows are metal, one-over-one, double hung sash. The school has been heavily altered, and no longer maintains integrity of materials, design or workmanship. The majority of windows have been enclosed, the entrance reoriented and a new, large scale entrance added. Several additions inconsistent in scale and design with the historic core have been constructed on the north and east elevations.

Alterations:

Front and rear additions, enclosed windows, reoriented entrance.
Historical Information:
According to African American Historic Places in South Carolina, by the State Historic Preservation Office, a division of the South Carolina Department of Archives & History, the property of the Alston Middle School once housed the Alston Graded School. Constructed in 1910, it was one of the first African American schools in Dorchester County. Originally located on the corner of Cedar and 1st North Streets, it was moved to 500 Bryan Street in 1953.

Source of: African American Historic Places in South Carolina, by the State Historic Preservation Office, a division

Photographs

Program Management
Recorded by: Rachel Bragg
Date Recorded: 03/04/2015
Statewide Survey of Historic Properties
State Historic Preservation Office
South Carolina Department of Archives and History
Quad Name: Summerville
Control Number: U / 35 / 1245

Intensive Documentation Form

Identification
Historic
Common
Address/Location: 102 Pringle Ln

City: Summerville County: Dorchester
Ownership: Private Category: building

National Register of Historic Places
SHPO National Register
Notes on National Register

Other Designation:

Property Description
Construction c. 1930 Commercial Stories: 1 story
Alteration Historic Core rectangular

Roof Features
Shape: gable, lateral
Materials: composition shingle

Porch Features
Shape: shed
Porch Width: full facade

Construction frame
Exterior Walls: brick veneer
Foundation: not visible

Significant Architectural Lateral gabled bungalow duplex, with horizontal, two-over-two, and six-over-six, wooden double hung sash windows. One extant historic door is wooden with three panes over three panels. Porches cover three elevations (front and both sides). All have shed roofs, the side porches are supported with square, wooden, posts. The front porch is supported by wrought iron, faux-vine decorated posts.

Alterations: doors, brick veneer

Architect(s)/Builder(s):
Historical Information

Photographs

Program Management

Recorded by: Rachel Bragg
Date Recorded: 03/04/2015
Intensive Documentation Form

Identification
Historic
Common
Address/Location: 921 W. 5th N St

City: Summerville  County: Dorchester
Vicinity of:
Ownership: Private  Category: building
Historical Domestic  Current Domestic

National Register of Historic Places
SHPO National Register
Notes on National Register

Other Designation:

Property Description
Construction c. 1930  Commercial  Stories: 1 story
Alteration Historic Core rectangular

Roof Features
Shape: gable, end to front  Porch Features
Shape: full facade
Materials: composition shingle  Shape: gable

Construction frame
Exterior Walls: shiplap
Foundation: brick pier with fill

Significant Architectural Front gabled bungalow with Craftsman style features: battered porch support and exposed rafter tails. The porch’s foundation is brick, as are the square columns of the porch support. There is a central chimney in the apex of the roof. The foundation is brick pier, with CMU infill. The windows are wooden, three-over-one, double hung sash.

Alterations: shed roof side addition, cmu infill foundation

Architect(s)/Builder(s):
Historical Information

Photographs

Program Management
Recorded by: Rachel Bragg
Date Recorded: 03/04/2015
Intensive Documentation Form

Identification
Historic
Common
Address/Location: 936 W. 5th N St

City: Summerville  County: Dorchester
Vicinity of:
Ownership: Private  Category: building
Historical  Domestic
Current  Domestic

National Register of Historic Places
SHPO National Register
Notes on National Register

Other Designation:

Property Description
Construction  c. 1930  Commercial  Stories: 1 story
Alteration  Historic Core  square
Roof Features  
Shape: hip
Materials: composition shingle
Porch Features  
Shape Width: over 1 bay but less than full
Shape: shed
Construction  frame
Exterior Walls: stucco
Foundation: not visible

Significant Architectural  Hipped roof bungalow, with stucco cladding. The front porch has a shed roof, and the square, wood, porch posts are supported by a solid wall clad in stucco, likely constructed with CMUs. Extant historic windows are wooden, six-over-one, double hung sash.

Alterations:  stucco, some windows, and door

Architect(s)/Builder(s):
Historical Information

Photographs

Program Management

Recorded by: Rachel Bragg
Date Recorded: 03/04/2015
Identification
Historic
Common
Address/Location: 410 Bryan St

City: Summerville County: Dorchester
Vicinity of:
Ownership: Private Category: building
Historical Domestic
Current Domestic

National Register of Historic Places
SHPO National Register
Notes on National Register

Other Designation:

Property Description
Construction c. 1930 Commercial Stories: 1 story
Alteration Historic Core square
Roof Features Porch Features
Shape: hip Porch Width: over 1 bay but less than full
Materials: raised seam metal Shape: hip

Construction frame Exterior Walls: synthetic siding
Foundation: not visible

Significant Architectural Hipped roof bungalow with exposed rafter tails, and a hipped roof front porch. The porch is supported by square, brick columns. Two interior chimneys: one in the north side of the roof and one in the apex of the rear addition’s roof. Windows vary: a fixed pane, picture window, wooden, six-over-six double hung sash and metal, horizontal, three panes.

Alterations: rear addition, doors and windows

Architect(s)/Builder(s):
Historical Information

Photographs

Program Management
Recorded by: Rachel Bragg
Date Recorded: 03/04/2015
Statewide Survey of Historic Properties
State Historic Preservation Office
South Carolina Department of Archives and History

Quad Name: Summerville
Control Number: U / 35 / 1249
County No Site No

8301 Parklane Rd.
Columbia, SC 29223-4905 (803) 896-6100
Tax Map

Intensive Documentation Form

Identification
Historic
Common
Address/Location: 314 Laurel St
City: Summerville County: Dorchester
Vicinity of:
Ownership: Private Category: building
Historical Domestic
Current Commerce/Trade

National Register of Historic Places
SHPO National Register
Notes on National Register

Other Designation:

Property Description
Construction c. 1930 Commercial Stories: 1 story
Alteration Historic Core rectangular

Roof Features
Shape: gable, end to front
Materials: composition shingle

Porch Features
Shape: gable
Porch Width: over 1 bay but less than full

Construction frame
Exterior Walls: asbestos shingle
Foundation: brick

Significant Architectural
End to front gabled bungalow, with little roof overhang and a vent in the front gable. The front gabled porch covers the entrance bay and one window; it is supported with wooden, square posts. Windows are wooden, three-over-one, double hung sash. Decorative shutters surround the windows. The front door is a modern, multi-light replacement. The rear addition has a gabled roof and a second door.

Alterations: door and rear addition

Architect(s)/Builder(s):
South Carolina Statewide Survey of Historic Properties

Intensive Documentation Form

Site 1249

Historical Information

Historical Information:

Photographs

Program Management

Recorded by: Rachel Bragg
Date Recorded: 03/04/2015
Statewide Survey of Historic Properties
State Historic Preservation Office
South Carolina Department of Archives and History
Quad Name: Summerville
Control Number: U / 35 / 1250
Status County No Site No
South Carolina Department of Archives and History
Quad Name: Summerville
8301 Parklane Rd.
Columbia, SC 29223-4905 (803) 896-6100
Tax Map

Intensive Documentation Form

Identification
Historic
Common
Address/Location: 313 W. 4th N St
City: Summerville County: Dorchester
Vicinity of:
Ownership: Private Category: building
Historical Domestic
Current Domestic

National Register of Historic Places
SHPO National Register
Notes on National Register

Other Designation:

Property Description
Construction c. 1930 Commercial Stories: 1 story
Alteration Historic Core rectangular

Roof Features
Shape: gable, lateral
Materials: composition shingle

Porch Features
Shape: gable
Porch Width: entrance bay only

Construction masonry
Exterior Walls: other
Foundation: slab construction

Significant Architectural
This CMU, lateral gabled bungalow has a large, shed roofed, rear addition. There is a single chimney in the rear surface of the roof. The entrance bay, gabled, front porch is supported by wooden, square, posts. The windows are wooden, eight-over-eight, double hung sash. The front door is three light over three panels.

Alterations: rear addition

Architect(s)/Builder(s):
Historical Information

Photographs

Program Management

Recorded by:  Rachel Bragg
Date Recorded:  03/04/2015
Intensive Documentation Form

Identification
Historic
Common garage
Address/Location: 313 W. 4th N St

City: Summerville County: Dorchester
Vicinity of:
Ownership: Private Category: building
Historical Domestic Current Domestic

National Register of Historic Places
SHPO National Register
Notes on National Register

Other Designation:

Property Description
Construction c. 1950 Commercial Stories: 1 story
Alteration Historic Core rectangular

Roof Features
Shape: gable, end to front
Materials: composition shingle

Porch Features
Shape: 

Construction frame
Exterior Walls: synthetic siding
Foundation: slab construction

Significant Architectural Front gabled garage with synthetic siding and a paneled roll-up door.

Alterations:

Architect(s)/Builder(s):
Intensive Documentation Form

Site 1250.01

Historical Information

Photographs

Program Management

Recorded by: Rachel Bragg
Date Recorded: 03/04/2015
Identification
Historic
Common
Address/Location: 513 N Magnolia St

City: Summerville  County: Dorchester
Vicinity of:
Ownership: Private  Category: building
Historical Domestic  Current Domestic

National Register of Historic Places
SHPO National Register
Notes on National Register

Other Designation:

Property Description
Construction c. 1930  Commercial Stories: 1 1/2 stories
Alteration Historic Core rectangular
Roof Features
Shape: gable, end to front  Porch Features
Shape: hip
Materials: composition shingle  Shape Width: full facade
Construction frame
Exterior Walls: shiplap
Foundation: brick
Significant Architectural
This front gabled bungalow has four dormers in the roof surface, two on each side elevation. There is a large, fixed pane, picture window in the front elevation. The windows are wooden, three-over-one, double hung sash. Dormer windows are wooden, horizontal, two-over-two, double hung sash. The hipped roof, front porch is supported by clusters for three, wooden, square posts and wooden, turned balustrades. The porch and house foundation is brick.

Alterations: door, dormers

Architect(s)/Builder(s):
Historical Information

Photographs

Program Management

Recorded by: Rachel Bragg
Date Recorded: 03/04/2015
**Intensive Documentation Form**

**Identification**
Historic Common outbuilding
Address/Location: 513 N Magnolia St

City: Summerville County: Dorchester

Vicinity of:
Ownership: Private Category: building
Historical Domestic
Current Domestic

**National Register of Historic Places**
SHPO National Register
Notes on National Register

Other Designation:

**Property Description**
Construction c. 1940 Commercial
Stories: 2 stories

Alteration Historic Core square

*Roof Features*
Shape: gable, lateral
Materials: composition shingle

*Porch Features*
Shape: Composition shingle

Construction frame
Exterior Walls: shiplap
Foundation: brick

Significant Architectural This two-story, lateral gabled outbuilding appears to function as living space. The upper story has two, fixed-pane, picture windows, surrounded by two, two-over-one double hung sash windows. The lower floor has wooden, horizontal, two-over-two, double hung sash. The building is clad in wooden, shiplap siding. There is an exterior chimney on the western elevation.

Alterations:

Architect(s)/Builder(s):
Historical Information

Photographs

Program Management
Recorded by: Rachel Bragg
Date Recorded: 03/04/2015
Identification
Historic
Common
Address/Location: 108 E. 6th N St

City: Summerville  County: Dorchester

Ownership: Private  Category: building

Historical Domestic  Current Domestic

National Register of Historic Places
SHPO National Register
Notes on National Register

Other Designation:

Property Description
Construction c. 1930  Commercial
Stories: 1 story

Alteration Historic Core rectangular

Roof Features
Shape: gable, end to front
Materials: composition shingle

Porch Features
Shape: gable
Porch Width: entrance bay only

Construction frame
Exterior Walls: other
Foundation: brick

Significant Architectural
This end to front gabled bungalow, with a vent in the front and rear gable, is clad in aluminum siding. The roof has exposed rafter tails. The historic windows are metal, two-over-two, double hung sash. The gabled side and rear additions have one-over-one double hung sash windows. The exterior chimney is on the east elevation. The front porch has a gabled roof that covers the front entrance bay and is supported by its attachment to the front elevation.

Alterations: side and rear additions, siding

Architect(s)/Builder(s):
Historical Information

Photographs

Program Management
Recorded by: Rachel Bragg
Date Recorded: 03/04/2015
Statewide Survey of Historic Properties
State Historic Preservation Office
South Carolina Department of Archives and History
Quad Name: Summerville
8301 Parklane Rd.
Columbia, SC 29223-4905    (803) 896-6100

Intensive Documentation Form

Identification
Historic
Common
Address/Location: 205 W. 5th N St

City: Summerville    County: Dorchester
Vicinity of:
Ownership: Private    Category: building
Historical Domestic
Current Commerce/Trade

National Register of Historic Places
SHPO National Register
Notes on National Register

Other Designation:

Property Description
Construction c. 1935    Commercial    Stories: 1 story
Alteration Historic Core square

Roof Features
Shape: hip
Materials: raised seam metal

Porch Features
Shape: hip
Porch Width: over 1 bay but less than full
Shape: hip

Construction frame
Exterior Walls: synthetic siding
Foundation: brick pier with fill

Significant Architectural
The hipped roof of this bungalow has a steep pitch, and is almost pyramidal. It has exposed rafter tails and is clad in metal, raised seemed sheets. The exterior of the house is sheathed in synthetic, shingle style siding. The front, hipped roofed, porch is supported by wrought iron, faux-vine posts. The foundation is brick pier, with brick infill. Windows in the front elevation are wooden, two-over-two, double hung sash. Side elevations have wooden, six-over-six and two-over-two double hung sash windows. There is a single chimney in the surface of the western side of the roof. There is an addition on the western elevation that has a side gabled roof and a rear, shed roof, addition.

Alterations: rear and side additions, siding

Architect(s)/Builder(s):
South Carolina Statewide Survey of Historic Properties
*Intensive Documentation Form*

**Site 1253**

**Historical Information**

*Historical Information:*

**Photographs**

![Photograph 1](image1.jpg)

![Photograph 2](image2.jpg)

**Program Management**

Recorded by:  Rachel Bragg  
Date Recorded:  03/04/2015
Intensive Documentation Form

Identification
Historic
Common
Address/Location: 601 N. Hickory St

City: Summerville  County: Dorchester
Vicinity of:
Ownership: Private  Category: building
Historical Domestic
Current Domestic

National Register of Historic Places
SHPO National Register
Notes on National Register

Other Designation:

Property Description
Construction c. 1930  Commercial  Stories: 1 story
Alteration Historic Core  rectangular

Roof Features
Shape: cross gable  Porch Features
Shape: full facade
Materials: raised seam metal  Shape: hip

Construction frame  Exterior Walls: weatherboard
Foundation: brick pier with fill

Significant Architectural
This cross-gabled bungalow has a dormer in the front elevation. The windows are wooden, two-over-two, double hung sash. They are surrounded with decorative shutters. There are three chimneys: two in the apex of the lateral gabled roof, one is exterior, on the eastern elevation of the rear projection. The foundation is brick pier with CMU infill. The full-façade, front porch is supported by squared, wooden posts. The weatherboard siding is finished with corner boards. There is a side gabled addition on the western elevation. The rear, hipped roof addition appears to be an enclosed porch, with synthetic, one-over-one, double hung sash windows.

Alterations: side and rear additions

Architect(s)/Builder(s):
Historical Information

Photographs

Program Management
Recorded by: Rachel Bragg
Date Recorded: 03/04/2015
Identification

Historic
Common

Address/Location: 514 N Magnolia St

City: Summerville  County: Dorchester
Vicinity of:

Ownership: Private  Category: building
Historical Domestic
Current Commerce/Trade

National Register of Historic Places

SHPO National Register
Notes on National Register

Other Designation:

Property Description

Construction c. 1915  Commercial  Stories: 1 story
Alteration Historic Core  rectangular

Roof Features
Shape: gable, lateral
Materials: composition shingle

Porch Features
Shape: engaged

Construction frame
Exterior Walls: synthetic siding
Foundation: not visible

Significant Architectural
This center hall house has a lateral gabled roof, clad in composite shingles and has an engaged, full façade front porch. The extant historic windows are three-over-one, wood, double hung sash. The door and the majority of the windows and the door are replacements. Replacement windows are synthetic six-over-six, double hung sash. The foundation is not visible. The house is clad in vinyl siding. There is a side and rear addition. The roof is new, in both design and material

Alterations: rear and side addition, roof and siding

Architect(s)/Builder(s):
Historical Information

Photographs

Program Management

Recorded by: Rachel Bragg
Date Recorded: 03/04/2015
Statewide Survey of Historic Properties

Intensive Documentation Form

Identification
Historic
Common
Address/Location: 614 N Pine St

City: Summerville
County: Dorchester

Ownership: Private
Category: building

Historical Domestic
Current Domestic

National Register of Historic Places
SHPO National Register
Notes on National Register

Other Designation:

Property Description
Construction c. 1950 Commercial Stories: 1 1/2 stories

Alteration Historic Core square

Roof Features
Shape: gable, lateral
Materials: composition shingle

Porch Features
Shape: entrance bay only
Shape: gable

Construction frame
Exterior Walls: brick veneer
Foundation: slab construction

Significant Architectural
This minimal traditional house has a lateral gabled roof with enclosed gutters, sheathed in composite shingles. The façade is clad in brick and vinyl siding. Extant historic windows are vertical, two-over-two, wood, double hung sash. Many have been replaced. There is a rear, shed addition.

Alterations: cladding, porch, windows, rear addition

Architect(s)/Builder(s):
South Carolina Statewide Survey of Historic Properties

Intensive Documentation Form

Site 1256

Historical Information

Historical Information:

Photographs

Program Management

Recorded by: Rachel Bragg
Date Recorded: 03/04/2015
Intensive Documentation Form

Identification
Historic
Common

Address/Location: 505 N. Laurel St

City: Summerville  County: Dorchester
Vicinity of:
Ownership: Private  Category: building
Historical: Domestic  Current: Domestic

National Register of Historic Places
SHPO National Register
Notes on National Register

Other Designation:

Property Description

Construction  c. 1950  Commercial  Stories: 1 story
Alteration  Historic Core  rectangular

Roof Features
Shape: hip
Materials: composition shingle

Porch Features
Shape: other
Porch Width: over 1 bay but less than full

Construction  frame
Exterior Walls: asbestos shingle
Foundation: brick

Significant Architectural
This hipped roof ranch house has a central chimney in the apex of its roof. The foundation and
front porch have brick foundations. The brick porch extends from the entry bay to the
western most window on the front facade and is covered by a metal awning, supported by
decorated, wrought iron, supports. There is a fixed-pane, picture window, surrounded by two-
over-one, double hung sash windows. There is a corner window that runs from the front
elevation to the northern elevation; there are two two-over-one, double hung sash windows on
each elevation’s corner.

Alterations: door

Architect(s)/Builder(s):
South Carolina Statewide Survey of Historic Properties

Intensive Documentation Form

Site 1257

Historical Information

Historical Information:

Photographs

Program Management

Recorded by: Rachel Bragg
Date Recorded: 03/04/2015
Intensive Documentation Form

Identification
Historic
garage
Address/Location: 505 N. Laurel St

City: Summerville  County: Dorchester
Vicinity of:
Ownership: Private  Category: building
Historical Domestic
Current Domestic

National Register of Historic Places
SHPO National Register
Notes on National Register

Other Designation:

Property Description

Construction c. 1950  Commercial  Stories: 1 story
Alteration Historic Core  square

Roof Features
Shape: hip
Materials: composition shingle

Porch Features
Shape:
Porch Width:

Construction frame
Exterior Walls: asbestos shingle
Foundation: slab construction

Significant Architectural
Hipped roof, single-car garage with asbestos siding.

Alterations:

Architect(s)/Builder(s):
Historical Information

Photographs

Program Management

Recorded by: Rachel Bragg
Date Recorded: 03/04/2015
Intensive Documentation Form

Identification
Historic
Common
Address/Location: 701 W. 5th N St

City: Summerville  County: Dorchester
Vicinity of:
Ownership: Private  Category: building
Historical Domestic
Current Domestic

National Register of Historic Places
SHPO National Register
Notes on National Register

Other Designation:

Property Description
Construction c. 1965  Commercial
Stories: 1 story
Alteration Historic Core rectangular

*Roof Features*
Shape: gable, end to front
Materials: composition shingle

*Porch Features*
Shape: composition shingle
Porch Width:

Construction frame
Exterior Walls: brick veneer
Foundation: slab construction

Significant Architectural This gabled, brick ranch house has a large chimney in the southern elevation that extends to the house interior. There is a combined carport and porch that is engaged into the eastern portion of the house. It is embellished with a faux-vine wrought porch support and details. The low pitched roof has a wide overhang. The large, picture window in the southern elevation has nine lights, and it, like the other windows, is flanked by decorative shutters. The windows in the other facades are two-over-two, double hung sash.

Alterations:

Architect(s)/Builder(s):
Intensive Documentation Form

Site 1258

Historical Information

Historical Information:

Photographs

Program Management

Recorded by: Rachel Bragg
Date Recorded: 03/04/2015
**Identification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Common</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address/Location: 500 N. Pine St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Summerville</td>
<td>County: Dorchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicinity of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership: Private</td>
<td>Category: building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Domestic</td>
<td>Current Domestic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**National Register of Historic Places**

- SHPO National Register
- Notes on National Register

**Other Designation:**

**Property Description**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction c. 1960</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Stories: 1 story</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alteration Historic Core rectangular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Roof Features**

- Shape: hip
- Materials: composition shingle

**Porch Features**

- Shape: 
- Porch Width: 

**Construction**

- masonry

**Exterior Walls:**

- other

**Foundation:**

- slab construction

**Significant Architectural**

This hipped roof ranch has six-over-six, double hung windows and a picture window surrounded by two-over-two double hung windows. The door features three-lights. It is constructed on a concrete slab of CMUs. There is a shed roofed, rear, addition.

**Alterations:**

- rear addition

**Architect(s)/Builder(s):**
Historical Information

Photographs

Program Management
Recorded by: Rachel Bragg
Date Recorded: 03/04/2015
Statewide Survey of Historic Properties
State Historic Preservation Office
South Carolina Department of Archives and History
Quad Name: Summerville
8301 Parklane Rd.
Columbia, SC 29223-4905   (803) 896-6100
Intensive Documentation Form

Identification
Historic

Common
Address/Location: 210 W. 6th N St

City: Summerville       County: Dorchester
Vicinity of:
Ownership: Private       Category: building
Historical Domestic
Current Commerce/Trade

National Register of Historic Places
SHPO National Register
Notes on National Register

Other Designation:

Property Description
Construction c. 1965 Commercial Stories: 1 story
Alteration Historic Core rectangular

Roof Features
Shape: hip
Materials: composition shingle

Porch Features
Shape: shed
Porch Width: over 1 bay but less than full

Construction frame
Exterior Walls: brick veneer
Foundation: slab construction

Significant Architectural
This hipped roof, ranch house is clad in a brick veneer in an American bond pattern. There is a large, exterior chimney on the front elevation. The windows are horizontal, two-over-two, double hung and surrounded by decorative shutters. There is a front shed roof that covers the front door and a triple set of windows; it is supported by faux-vine decorated, wrought posts. There is a large, rear, gabled addition.

Alterations: rear addition

Architect(s)/Builder(s):
Historical Information

Photographs

Program Management
Recorded by: Rachel Bragg
Date Recorded: 03/04/2015
Identifyion
Historic
Common
Address/Location: 208 W. 6th N St

City: Summerville County: Dorchester

Ownership: Private Category: building

Historical Domestic

Current Domestic

National Register of Historic Places
SHPO National Register
Notes on National Register

Other Designation:

Property Description
Construction c. 1965 Commercial Stories: 1 story

Alteration Historic Core rectangular

Roof Features
Shape: gable, lateral
Materials: composition shingle

Porch Features
Shape: 

Construction frame
Exterior Walls: brick veneer
Foundation: slab construction

Significant Architectural
This lateral gabled roof has a projecting gable on the front façade. Beneath it is a picture window, flanked by three-over-one, double hung sash windows, and decorative shutters. The rest of the windows are three-over-one, double hung sash, with decorative shutters. The engaged carport is in the eastern portion of the house. There is a small, recessed porch in the center of the front elevation.

Alterations:

Architect(s)/Builder(s):
South Carolina Statewide Survey of Historic Properties

Intensive Documentation Form

Historical Information

Historical Information:

Photographs

Program Management

Recorded by: Rachel Bragg
Date Recorded: 03/04/2015
Statewide Survey of Historic Properties
State Historic Preservation Office
South Carolina Department of Archives and History
Quad Name: Summerville
8301 Parklane Rd.
Columbia, SC 29223-4905 (803) 896-6100

Intensive Documentation Form

Identification
Historic
Common
Address/Location: 1010 W. 5th N. St.

City: Summerville  County: Dorchester
Vicinity of:
Ownership: Private  Category: building
Historical Commerce/Trade
Current Commerce/Trade

National Register of Historic Places
SHPO National Register
Notes on National Register

Other Designation:

Property Description

Construction  c. 1950  Commercial  1-part commercial block  Stories: 1 story
Alteration  Historic Core  rectangular

Roof Features
Shape: gable, end to front
Materials: composition shingle

Porch Features
Shape: gable
Porch Width: over 1 bay but less than full
Shape: gable

Construction  masonry
Exterior Walls: other
Foundation: slab construction

Significant Architectural
This building has a front gabled roof, clad in composite shingles. It was constructed c.1950 of CMUs on a concrete slab and has a front gabled projecting porch on the front elevation. The scale and design of this resource suggests it was initially constructed for commercial purposes. It is wider and longer than other resources with a similar form and lacks windows except for two small, fixed-panes in the front elevation.

Alterations:

Architect(s)/Builder(s):
Historical Information:

Source of Photographs

Use Grid for Sketching

Program Management

Recorded by: Rachel Bragg
Date Recorded: 03/04/2015
Intensive Documentation Form

Identification
Historic
Common

Address/Location: 930 W. 5th N. St.

City: Summerville  County: Dorchester

Vicinity of:

Ownership: Private  Category: building

Historical Unknown

Current Vacant/Not In Use

National Register of Historic Places

SHPO National Register

Notes on National Register

Other Designation:

Property Description

Construction c. 1935  Commercial  Stories: 1 story

Alteration Historic Core  rectangular

Roof Features
Shape: gable, lateral
Materials: composition shingle

Porch Features
Shape: composition shingle

Construction frame

Exterior Walls: other

Foundation: concrete block

Significant Architectural It is side gabled, with fixed pane windows on the front façade. The cladding ranges from original wood siding on the side elevations to concrete on the front elevation. There is an extant chimney on the east elevation. This building may have originally been constructed as a residence. Extensive alterations of the windows, doors, and cladding have compromised the resource’s integrity of design, materials and workmanship

Alterations:

Architect(s)/Builder(s):
Historical Information

Historical Information:

Source of Photographs

Use Grid for Sketching

Program Management

Recorded by: Rachel Bragg
Date Recorded: 03/04/2015