

PR- CEQR-Q

B 96 82

# REPORT ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL TESTING IN ADVANCE OF IMPROVEMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE FENCE PROJECT AT **RUFUS KING PARK** JAMAICA AVENUE AT 150 - 153 STREETS JAMAICA, QUEENS, NEW YORK Contract # Q023-295



151-01 Jameica Blod

Rufus King Manor House & Park

Prepared for:

627

Gazebo Contracting Inc. 3-02 26 Avenue

Submitted by:

Astoria, New York 11102

Linda Stone, MA, SOPA 249 East 48th Street, #2B New York, New York 10017

August 15, 1997

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The New York City Department of Parks and Recreation commissioned an archaeological testing program at Rufus King Park associated with improvements done in relation to a fence project. This report presents the results of that work. Research questions focussed on several themes; outbuildings, features, landscape, seventeenth-century use, and prehistory. Testing took the form of probing, shallow and shovel testing, and monitoring.

The only feature identified during testing was a series of mortared bricks directly behind, and likely related to, the summer kitchen section of the house. The top of the feature was exposed and there will be no further disturbance of the feature during the fence project. Testing also revealed the property contains about two feet of twentieth century fill. Both the modern fill and the historic deposits beneath it show a concentration of activity to the east of the house. Although no structural remains associated with a building mapped in 1842 were found during the fence project, the impacts and testing associated with the fence project were limited. Therefore the vicinity of that former structure is still considered archaeologically sensitive. Although one possible prehistoric artifact was recovered during testing, its identification was dubious and it was found in a modern fill deposit. Therefore testing has shown a lack of evidence of prehistoric site use.

No adverse impacts to archaeological resources will result from the fence project. However two key areas were identified during this project as still containing archaeological potential related to known information, the bluestone walk behind the house and the area between it and the summer kitchen and the area east of the house where a building was mapped in 1842.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

د فيكسر

Executive Summary
List of Plates and Figures ii
INTRODUCTION 1
SITE HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL
METHODOLOGY
RESULTS       10         Probes       10         Shovel Tests       10         Shallow Tests       10         Monitoring       12         Artifact Interpretation       12
DISCUSSION
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
PLATES AND FIGURES
BIBLIOGRAPHY 19

# LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Testing Proposed and Completed as Part of the Rufus King Park Fence Project 6
Table 2	Location of Shovel Tests at Rufus King Park in Relation to the Manor House and Comfort
	Station
Table 3	Locations of Artifacts Recovered During Archaeological Monitoring at Rufus King Park by
	Recovery Date

# APPENDICES

Appendix A	Scope of Work
Appendix B	Shovel Test Stratigraphy
	4 10 T

Appendix C Artifact Inventory

3

~

# LIST OF PLATES

- Cover Fence post excavation in progress, facing southwest, showing the King manor house in the background.
- Plate 1 Shallow Test 103, trowel pointing north.
- Plate 2 Remains of mortared brick found during grading for the bluestone walk, trowel pointing north.
- Plate 3 Wide shot photograph of the mortared brick remains in the area graded for the bluestone walk showing its relationship to the exterior wall of the summer kitchen section of the King manor house.
- Plate 4 Artifacts retained from Shovel Test 7 Stratum 5; possible prehistoric flake and a porcelain tile fragment.
- Plate 5 Flower pot fragments retained from monitoring fence post excavations in front of the King manor house.

# LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 1 Rufus King Park site plan for the security fence project.
- Figure 2 Section of the 1842 Johnson Map with the current Manor House and Park Comfort Station overlaid.
- Figure 3 Archaeological testing performed for the fence project at Rufus King Park, eastern side of project area.
- Figure 4 Archaeological testing performed for the fence project at Rufus King Park, western side of project area.
- Figure 5 Results of three probe transects east of King Manor, Rufus King Park.
- Figure 6 Brick feature found behind the summer kitchen during grading for the bluestone handicapped access ramp at Rufus King Park.

#### INTRODUCTION

The New York City Department of Parks and Recreations is in the process of conducting several improvements at Rufus King Park in Jamaica, Queens which involve excavations of various types in the vicinity of the Manor House, a New York City landmark and a National Register of Historic Places site. Some of the impacts from these improvements were deemed to have the potential to affect archaeological resources. Therefore the a program of archaeological testing was prepared and conducted. The results of that fieldwork are presented in this report. The archaeological scope of work is attached as Appendix A.

Impacts from this initial phase of improvements are fairly minimal and include below ground disturbances related mainly to fence post excavations. In fact, the project is generally referred to as the security fence project. The locations of the project impacts are depicted on Figure 1, the site plan. The specific impacts are:

- 1) Installation of a new fence posts in concrete piers 3' deep and 1' wide, 3 gates will create below ground disturbances 4.5' deep and 3.5' wide.
- 2) Relocation of a portion of the existing temporary construction fence fence posts will be driven down about 3' or set in concrete, as soil conditions dictate.
- 3) Installation of 5 signs posts will be set in concrete 1' wide to a depth of 3.5'.
- 4) Installation of a bluestone on concrete walk behind house excavated to 8".
- 5) Installation of a stabilized screenings walk to and from Comfort Station edging will reach a depth of 3", walk will be excavated down 1 2" and 1 2" of fill added.
- 6) Planting of three trees west of the house root ball will be up to 5'.
- 7) Installation of a placque base of excavation at 1.5' below pavement, location not yet known.

Although no archaeological documentary study has been conducted of the park, several previous archaeological and historic reports have been prepared and were reviewed to determine if or where archaeological deposits may survive. The site history and background on archaeological potential are presented in the following section of this report.

This report was prepared for Gazebo Contracting Inc. by Linda Stone. Archaeological services were

initially subcontracted to Charles Hoelzer & Sons Fence Corporation and later to Gazebo Contracting Inc. The archaeological fieldwork described in this report was conducted by Linda Stone with the assistance of Patience Freeman and Shelly Spritzer. Shovel testing was conducted on several days between September 10 and October 17, 1996. Monitoring of contractor excavations was done sporadically from March 19, 1997 to June 17, 1997.

#### SITE HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

Rufus King was a prominent politician during the early years of our country. Among his accomplishments, he was a delegate to the Continental Congress and the Constitutional Convention. To that end, he was a framer and signatory of the Constitution. He was also one the first senators from the state of New York and served three terms in the senate. He also served as minister to Great Britain and later as ambassador.

For a man with such a public life, relatively little is known about the history of his home in Jamaica, Queens, purchased in 1805 and his residence from 1806 until his death in 1827. The house remained in the King family until the end of the 19th century when the property was sold to Jamaica Village which later incorporated into New York City at which time the King property came under the Parks Department jurisdiction. The house is still standing. It was restored in the early 1990s and is now home to the King Manor Museum, dedicated to interpreting the life and times of Rufus King.

When King purchased the Jamaica farm in 1805, there was already a modest house standing on it as well as at least one other small residence. The original house was built by sometime around 1730, although the exact date of construction and location of the building are not known (Venables 1989:9). It is believed the central portion of the existing structure is the earliest element of the house, although it was probably located elsewhere on the property. The western half of the main portion of the house was constructed in about 1755. Other structures which may have been on the property at the time King purchased it, and in the vicinity of the fence project impacts, are not known. After King purchased the property, the primary addition was added, the eastern part of the main portion of the house. King continued adding to the house and by 1810 enlarged the dining room in the main house, perhaps relocating the original building directly behind it, and he also may have added the summer kitchen to the rear (Gibson Bauer Associates, Johannson and Walcavage 1985:3.3.4, Hibbard 1992:L,M). Exact dates of construction and locations of some of these alterations are elusive. Part of the challenge for archaeology has been to address some of the inconsistencies or unknowns within the documentary record.

One consistency among the earlier historical and archaeological reports is that the location and use of all historic outbuildings is not known (Cotz 1984:8). There is no information about possible seventeenth century occupation or use of the site. Evidence of leather tanning from this period may exist buried "in the rear and side yards" (Cotz 1984:6). An early-nineteenth-century building, documented to the east

of the house, may have served as the original Parks Department comfort station (Cotz 1984:13, Grossman 1991:9-10). Historic map data was reevaluated and some depth probes placed in the possible location of this building to document the western extent (Grossman 1991:13-14,21,fig.9). Figure 2 is a reproduction of the 1842 Johnson Map depicting the outbuilding to the east of the Manor house. The current plans may impact the eastern extent of this building as well as the area to its north and south. The area to the south may have had previous below ground disturbances from the installation of an "open sewerage vault" (Cotz 1984:14).

In addition to the Manor house and outbuildings, the use of the landscape changed under King's tenure to a more intensive working farm which was maintained, after his death, through the mid-century after which a steady decline was documented (Cotz 1984:10). Rufus King was an avid gardener and horticulturist. The Historic Structures and Landscape Report for Rufus King Manor found "no plans for the development of King's land or for the layout of individual gardens...nor...any evidence that King consulted a 'landscape gardener' in laying out the grounds" (Gibson Bauer Associates, Johannson and Walcavage 1985:3.1.2.7). That report goes on to say "the area in front of the house became a lawn, and King's account book mentions 'the lawn west of my house'" (ibid.). The property had an apple orchard prior to King's purchase. King added other fruit trees and well as a variety of local and other trees and plants to transform "the property from a working farm to a country manor" (Grossman 1991:iv, Venables 1989:15-16). However specific locations are not identified.

The planned impacts from the fence project were determined to have the potential to provide answers to questions associated with the King Manor house, historic outbuildings and features such as wells and cisterns, landscape features and use, 17th century property use, and prehistoric period use.

As described above, the construction dates of various building elements are not known. Additionally, it is believed that King moved the original ca. 1730 structure around to the back of the main house creating an "L" shaped structure (Post 1973:#7). The available documentation also indicates the property may contain archaeological remains of buildings for which there is no historic documentation. Analysis of the previous archaeological testing in the area of a known early-19th-century building indicates archaeological evidence of this structure may lie below the surface in the area of planned impact to the east of the house (Grossman 1991:21-22). The use of this building as well as its date of construction is not known.

It is known that King had at least one cistern, although the location is unknown (Gibson Bauer Associates, Johannson and Walcavage 1985:3.1.2.5). The archaeological testing could reveal its location, excavation of the cistern could provide information on the residents not available from other sources. The combination of results from the proposed testing could provide data on usage of the tested areas of the property and compare them with the existing body of data on the Rufus King Park property. It has been well documented that King was an avid gardener and horticulturist. However no plans of his gardens exist. Therefore, this data could only be obtained archaeologically. Archaeological data predating the King period may also exist within the project impact areas. Speculation that archaeological evidence of leather tanning may be found to the west and north of the house was presented in the Archaeological sites are rare and there are no well known documented prehistoric archaeological sites in Queens, there are indications such evidence may be found in Rufus King Park (Grossman 1991:Ap.B:8, Platt 1991). Therefore any data on prehistoric site use or occupation would be important not only for the site, but for the wider area as well.

# METHODOLOGY

Understanding the gaps in the history of the house and property in the areas of planned disturbances provided an opportunity to create some broad research questions as well as some specific questions to guide the archaeological work (see Appendix A). Certainly the disturbance in the location of the outbuilding between the house and Comfort Stations shown on the 1842 Johnson Map was a concern. Also possible identification of leather tanning features on the western and northern sides of the house mentioned in the Archaeological Sensitivity Model report needed consideration. Another major item of concern within the impact areas was the identification of a cistern.

The testing program at Rufus King Park associated with the fence project involved three field techniques applied to address the particular research potential of specific impact areas; depth probes, shovel testing, and monitoring. The intensity of testing was highest in area of highest archaeological potential and lowest in areas of low archaeological potential. Table 1 provides a summary of the testing recommended and conducted within the impact areas from the Rufus King Park fence project.

AREA OF TESTING	PROPOSED TEST TYPE	COMPLETED TEST TYPE
Temporary construction fence	shovel tests	shovel tests
New security fence, entire perimeter	shovel tests	shovel tests
New security fence, eastern side	probing	probing, shovel tests
Bluestone walk, handicapped access ramp	shallow tests, monitoring	shallow tests, monitoring
Stabilized screenings walk	monitoring	monitoring
Tree plantings	none	monitoring
Gate signs at park entrances	monitoring	monitoring
Gate signs at new security fence	none	monitoring
Service entrance sign	shovel test	shovel test
Plaque	monitoring	none

 
 Table 1
 Testing Proposed and Completed as Part of the Rufus King Park Fence Project

Depth probes were recommended for part of the proposed new fence to locate the remains of the early-

19th-century building to the east of the house. Like the Grossman testing strategy, lines of probes were to be placed to cross possible building remains.

The proposed shallow testing strategy could identify the location of the cistern. The shovel testing could find features associated with leather tanning, if they exist. Identification of currently unknown buildings was also a possibility with shovel testing. The use of areas of the historic landscape in relation to living space could be addressed in a minimal way, should areas of high or low artifact density or differing temporal assemblages be identified in various sides of the house. No systematic study of prehistoric archaeological potential has been made for the park. However documentation of stray finds within construction areas to the south and west of the house was reported (Platt 1991). Although it is not known if these were from indigenous soils or from fill brought from another location. Previous testing resulted in the recovery of three fragments of "possible prehistoric ceramic" from a test off the northwest corner of the house (Grossman 1991:Ap.B:8). Therefore it seems possible that prehistoric artifacts may be found within the park. Questions regarding the historic landscape of Rufus King Park such as plantings and their locations could not likely be answered by the type of testing within impact areas from the below ground disturbances created by most of this project.

Monitoring of excavations for the stabilized screenings walk to and from the Comfort Station and the bluestone walk to the rear of the house was determined to be the most efficient way to evaluate those areas. The extremely shallow disturbances of the stabilized screenings walk would likely contain only modern debris. The slightly deeper disturbance from the bluestone walk had potential to contain earlier material. The clearing or skimming of the surface might also be expected to reveal evidence of historic landscape features such as trees or gardens, or remains from Native American occupation. Archaeological documentation of any such features was recommended.

# Field Testing

The probing technique involved inserting a four foot long metal rod into the soil and measuring the depth attained. Probes were inserted at six inch intervals along three transects designed to cover more than the footprint of the historic structure depicted to the east of the manor house on the 1842 map.

Differential shovel test intervals were used based on expected findings as described in the previous archaeological report. The previous archaeological testing identified a low density of cultural material in the shovel tests conducted to the rear of the house (Grossman 1991:23). However, rear yards are

historically known for their likelihood of containing archaeological remains. While a low density of cultural material was identified, those tests were in a line with the western side of the house rather than in an east-west line behind it as planned for the fence project. Additionally, a low density of material remains from historic occupation was expected to the west and south, since these areas reportedly were lawns during the King tenure. Therefore shovel testing was recommended to be more intensive along the new fence line to the rear of the house, west of the asphalt path, and less intensive to the front and sides. A fifteen foot testing interval was recommended to the rear of the house and a twenty-five foot interval to the front and sides. The excavation for the bluestone walk to the rear of the house had potential to reveal evidence of the former building extension shown on mid-19th century maps (see Figure 2) as well as a cistern. A series of close interval shallow shovel tests was recommended for that area. A line of tests with six foot centers excavated to 8", the planned impact depth, was expected to find these features if they exist. The earlier archaeological work identified stratified historic deposits in tests near the Comfort Station (Grossman 1991:22). Therefore a higher intensity of shovel testing was recommended for the new fence locations from the Comfort Station north to the asphalt walk and the security fence south from comfort station. However as the location of the fences approach the southern asphalt path the intensity of testing was decreased because of the proximity to the front yard where archaeological potential was low. Ten foot shovel test intervals were recommended in the higher intensity areas with fifteen foot intervals closer to the asphalt path.

Immediately prior to testing, the contractor marked the impact areas from the fence posts with spray paint, thus providing potential shovel test locations. The shovel tests were about one to one and a half feet in diameter and excavated to the depth of non-artifact bearing subsoil, or the limit of the methodology, to evaluate the nature of the soils and the presence or absence of archaeological remains. All soils excavated from the shovel tests were screened through 1/4 inch mesh for the recovery of artifacts. Soils, stratigraphy and artifact inclusions were recorded on forms. The shovel test stratigraphy is attached as Appendix B. Changes in soil color or texture were recorded as separate levels. Soil color descriptions were made using comparisons to the Munsell Soil Color Charts. Shovel test locations were mapped on the site plan. Photodocumentation and drawings were done as appropriate.

# Artifact Processing

Artifacts known in the field to be non-diagnostic modern materials or to be associated with modern fill deposits were noted in the field records but generally either sampled or not retained. Retained artifacts were also marked on these forms. All artifacts listed on the field records are included in the stratigraphy

summary (see Appendix B).

All recovered artifacts were washed and rinsed in tap water and left to air dry before labelling and rebagging in clean 4-mil zip-lock bag. Most artifact categories, with the main exception being metal, were individually labelled with the provenience. Provenience labels contained the project location abbreviation (RKP), the test number and stratum from which it came, separated by a decimal point. The provenience for artifacts collected during monitoring is their collection date. All zip bags were labeled with the project location, Rufus King Park, and the provenience.

All ceramic and glass artifacts are considered sherds, unless otherwise noted in the inventory. Ceramic identifications and date ranges of manufacture for white-bodied refined earthenwares were based on style of decorations, when available, and are referred to in the inventory as "refined earthenwares". If identifications were also based on ware type, such as creamware/pearlware/whiteware, then these types are used as identifiers in the inventory. The inventory of retained artifacts is attached as Appendix C.

#### RESULTS

A total of 42 shovel tests, 8 shallow tests and 33 probes were performed as part of the fence project. The actual test locations are depicted on Figures 3 and 4. A summary of the depths, soil colors, textures and artifact inclusions is attached as Appendix B.

#### Probes

Three transects of probe lines measuring five feet each were placed crosswise to the fence impacts between the house and comfort station. The northern two probe transects were designed to crosscut the former building depicted on the 1842 map. The southern transect was placed slightly to the south to provide a base line. Locations of the transects are depicted on Figure 3. At the time the probe transects were conducted, a temporary construction fence which has since been removed was located from the six inch to about the one foot probes along each transect. This fence line is marked on Figure 5, the results of the probing.

The average depth of each probe was only 0.52 feet below the ground surface. The deepest any probe penetrated was 1.14 feet and the shallowest probe only went 0.25 feet. The deeper probes were all located in proximity to the since removed fence. It seems probable the soil in that area had been softer due to saturation from rain water dripping off that fence. Whereas, further away from the fence extreme soil compaction was a limiting factor. Therefore the probe method was deemed unsuccessful and shovel tests at ten foot intervals were recommended as a testing alternative.

# Shovel Tests

Of the 42 shovel tests excavated, the breakdown of their location in relation to the manor house and comfort station is given in Table 2 and depicted on Figures 3 and 4.

The average depth of all shovel tests was 2.7 feet below ground surface. The typical test contained four strata; sod, dark loam, mottled clay, and sand (see Appendix B). The sod and dark loam layers represent the topsoil and grass found throughout most of the project area. It was generally dark brown or very dark gray brown in color and 0.7 feet thick. The dark brown or dark yellowish brown mottled clay represents an earlier episode of fill. It was generally 1.2 feet thick. This stratum was often extremely dry and compacted, particularly to the east of the house where excavation by shovel alone was not possible in many tests. The contractor used a mechanically powered punch to break through these soils and enable the shovel tests in these locations to continue through to completion. The dark yellowish

brown or yellowish brown sand deposit is interpreted as the culturally sterile subsoil. It was generally excavated for down an additional 0.9 feet.

LOC	CATION OF SHOVEL TESTS	NUMBER OF TESTS
North of M	lanor House	6
West of M	anor House	6
South of M	fanor House	5
East of Ma	nor House	4
	North and West of Comfort Station	9
	South and West of Comfort Station	12
	TOTAL	42

 Table 2
 Location of Shovel Tests at Rufus King Park

 in Relation to the Manor House and Comfort Station

The area to the east of the house, in addition to containing extremely dry and compacted soils, also contained numerous tests with buried asphalt paving tiles, over 40% of shovel tests in that area. The asphalt was generally buried from 0.4 to 0.7 inches below the current ground surface. This finding helped explain the lack of success of the probing done in that vicinity.

Two tests encountered unmarked utility lines; Shovel Tests 37 and 41. Fortunately, the pipes did not obscure the tests and both were excavated to the depth of culturally sterile soil. Buried topsoil was noted in a number of shovel tests located in the eastern half of the project area, east of a line with the house. It was encountered at an average of 1.1 feet below ground surface in over one-third of the tests. The implication is that amount of fill covers a large portion of the project impact area. Park activities and impacts have historically focused on areas east of the manor house, therefore it is not surprising to find more fill in that part of the project area.

# Shallow Tests

A series of shallow tests were placed in the areas of planned impacts from the bluestone walk behind the house. The depth of each was only eight inches or 0.7 feet. It was expected the depth represented topsoil and its removal could reveal archaeological features. The close intervals of these tests were

designed to find a relatively small feature such as a cistern. Part of a possible feature was identified in the base of Shallow Test 103. It was an *in situ* mortared brick (see Plate 1). Although the test was 6.5 feet behind the summer kitchen wing, the relationship of the brick to the rear wall of the summer kitchen was noticed. The brick seemed to line up with the eastern side of a bricked-up arch in the wall. It is not known if this relationship is coincidental.

# Monitoring

Monitoring had been recommended as a follow up precaution during the contractor's excavations in areas of low archeological potential as well as to get a wider view of the grading for the two walkways. Fence, gate and sign post hole excavation was done by mechanical auger (see report cover). A six inch auger was used for the temporary construction fence and a twelve inch auger for the security fence, gates and signs. No structural features were identified in any of the auger hole excavations.

The area of the new plaque, west of the new fence was originally planned for monitoring, but the depth of impact was reduced to eight inches and was in an area of low archaeological potential, therefore monitoring was eliminated. Conversely, some areas originally not proposed for monitoring were monitored. These include the three tree plantings and the signs at the new fence. No archaeological features were identified during monitoring of construction excavations in these locations either. The same was the case for the stabilized screenings walk to the north and south of the comfort station.

The only monitored location where a feature was identified was in the bluestone walk behind the summer kitchen, where a brick was found during excavation of the shallow tests. The same brick, along with others, was found during monitoring at the base of the excavation (see Plate 2 and Figure 6). Plate 3 shows the hypothesized relationship with the east side of the bricked-up arch in the rear wall of the summer kitchen.

# Artifact Interpretation

Shovel test artifacts were viewed in light of the soil strata from which they came in order to provide dates of deposition for the major strata identified. This was done by using the artifact inventory (Appendix C) in conjunction with the shovel test stratigraphy (Appendix B). The data was sorted to yield a *terminus post quem (tpq)*, the earliest date at which the most modern artifact could have been manufactured. The *tpq* is the earliest date which a soil stratum could have been deposited.

The tpq for the dark loam stratum comes from a Zima bottle cap, found in Shovel Test 17 - Stratum 2 which was noted but not retained. Since Zima is a beverage which has only been produced in the last decade, that is when this soil deposit was placed. This soil layer was most likely associated with the improvements done in the park around the time of restoration of the manor house. In several tests, the mottled clay deposit contained plastic pieces of a type manufactured beginning in the 1930s. Therefore this soil type is probably associated with fill placed in the park during improvements done during that time period or somewhat later. The sand stratum contained at the base of most tests did not contain any cultural material and was therefore initially interpreted as subsoil. However several tests did include artifacts in that stratum. All of these tests were located to the east of the house, where greater disturbance has been documented, therefore it is possible this stratum had been exposed to a large degree east of the house while in the western part of the project area this stratum may be the actual subsoil. That being said, the tpq associated with the sand stratum is the early-nineteenth century based on whiteware and ironstone ceramic sherds recovered from Shovel Tests 1, 17, and 42. Based on the finding associated with the level above the sand and the tpqs associated with artifacts found in the sand strata itself, it seems most likely this sand represents part of an earlier ground surface, at least in some locations.

Although evidence of site prehistoric use or occupation was considered a possibility, only one potential prehistoric artifact was identified during the entire fence project (see Plate 4). The artifact is tentatively identified as a flake, a byproduct of stone tool manufacture. However this particular piece exhibits only some characteristics of a flake and its identification as such is therefore dubious. The piece was retained from Shovel Test 7 - Stratum 5 which was described as a sandy fill deposit and also contained an asphalt tile, modern glass, and a porcelain bath tile fragment, further confusing its identification as a prehistoric artifact.

Although a number of artifacts were recovered and retained from the shallow tests done in the footprint of the bluestone path behind the house, only those from Shallow Test 103 can be interpreted in relation to the brick feature identified in both that test and from monitoring the mechanical excavation for grading the walkway. The tpq of that test is the early-nineteenth century based on an ironstone ceramic sherd. Therefore the fill covering that feature could not predate that time period.

In addition to the provenienced artifacts recovered during systematic archaeological excavations, a number of artifacts were retained from soils excavated during archaeological monitoring. These are recorded in

Appendix C by date of recovery. The "X"s on Figures 3 and 4 depict the general locations of recovery and Table 3 describes recovery dates in relation to the locations.

RECOVERY DATE	MATERIAL RECOVERED	RECOVERY LOCATION	
10/16/96	flower pot sherds	6th post hole west on front yard fence	
3/19/97	bottle base	near 1842 building	
	ceramic sherds	on electrical path near 1842 building	
3/20/97	ceramic sherds	east of house during leveling for fence post forms	
3/24/97 flower pot sherds 7th pos ceramic sherds 11th po		7th post hole west on front yard fence	
		11th post hole west on front yard fence	
3/25/97 porcelain sherd in t for		in front of east window bay during leveling for fence post forms in front yard	
marble on a line leveling for whiteware sherd west of fr front yard		on a line between front door and east side of house during leveling for fence post forms in front yard	
		west of front door during leveling for fence post forms in front yard	
	ironstone sherd	east of house during leveling for fence post forms in east yard	

# Table 3Locations of Artifacts Recovered DuringArchaeological Monitoring at Rufus King Park by Recovery Date

The only potentially interesting finds recovered during monitoring are eleven fragments of at least six flower pots from two post holes in the front yard (see Plate 5). Although flower pots have been made domestically since the early-eighteenth century, they continue to be manufactured today (Ramsay 1939:128). Therefore it is a stretch to conclude any relationship between this cluster of sherds and Rufus King, an avocational horticulturist, but the possibility is intriguing.

#### DISCUSSION

The previous archaeological report included results of testing in the general vicinity of the fence project, located in that report's Areas C and D (Grossman 1991). Area C was located to the east of the house and Area D to the west. No structural remains were found to the east of the house during either the earlier work or the fence project. Both testing episodes documented fill up to about two feet below ground surface. However work on the fence project found the earlier ground surface to date from the early-nineteenth century, not quite as old as was found in the previous testing, but nevertheless applicable to the Rufus King period of occupation.

The previous archaeological testing identified a privy and a dry-well in Area D, west of the house (Grossman 1991:iii). The work done for the fence project was not designed to impact these locations. Both episodes of testing revealed a low density of cultural material to the west of the house.

It was thought an archaeological feature such as a cistern may have been found behind the house in the area of the bluestone walk, but it was not. It is known that King had at least one cistern for which he bought a pump in 1807, as discussed above (Gibson Bauer Associates, Johannson and Walcavage 1985:3.1.2.5). An advantageous research opportunity at the Library of Congress led to the discovery of a letter handwritten by Rufus King himself in the spring of 1822 from the Senate Chambers to an unknown person, perhaps the caretaker of his property in Jamaica. He discussed having the property readied for his return. Among other things, he wrote about having the cistern finished and a pump put in, implying the cistern was new. This would mean the King property had at least two cisterns. It is possible one of these cisterns was destroyed during the installation of the central air conditioner unit located near the northwest corner of the building (see Figure 1). This location would be considered to have high archaeological potential for containing a cistern or a trash deposit related to the occupants of the house. The unit was installed during the time of restoration and excavation for it was done without an archaeological study or the presence of an archaeologist. The workers installing the unit saved a box of artifacts they recovered during the work and gave them to the King Manor Museum. Unlike the archaeological collections from this project and from the earlier work which contained fragmentary artifacts indicative of fill deposits, the artifacts from the air conditioner location were found intact or in relatively large pieces. The quality and condition of these artifacts is indicative of a contained deposit. such as the protection found within the fill of a cistern. A cursory examination of this artifact collection revealed it contained materials which were generally associated with a narrowly defined date range. The

tpq of the collection is 1894, based on the date on the back of the doll's head. However marked bottles and dishes all date from the late-19th century through the early-20th century. If the collection were in fact from a cistern which was filled during the mid 1890s, it may have been able to provide information on the family of Cornelia King, the last member of the King family to live in the home, as well as on the cistern structure itself.

.

#### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Archaeological testing done in conjunction with the fence project at Rufus King Park revealed information which can be used to plan future work in the park, as well as leaving some of the archaeological research questions unanswered. Shovel testing documented about one to two feet of fill around the property, with the concentration of fill to the east of the house. An earlier ground surface, possibly dating to the Rufus King period, was identified below the fill in several locations east of the house. A brick feature was identified behind the summer kitchen section of the house in the path of the bluestone walk. It is presumed the feature extends to the south toward the house and is related to the summer kitchen. It was found at the base of the excavations and will not be disturbed any further by the fence project. No structural remains associated with a building mapped in 1842 were found during the fence project.

Research questions focussed on several themes; outbuildings, features, landscape, seventeenth-century use, and prehistory. No previously unknown structures or outbuildings were identified during testing. The only feature identified was the mortared brick feature mentioned above. No other archaeological features were identified during testing associated with the fence project. This includes a cistern or landscape features. Although no archaeological features were identified within the project impacts, this does not mean features could not be found elsewhere on the property. While no features were identified, numerous artifacts were recovered. The concentration of artifactual material to the east of the house, contained in stratigraphic dated deposits, indicates a history of more intensive use in that part of the property dating back to the tenure of Rufus King.

The Archaeological Sensitivity Model report presented the possibility of finding archaeological remains associated with the seventeenth-century leather tanning industry (Cotz 1984:6). However no such evidence was found in the areas tested as part of the fence project. Only minimal evidence of site prehistory was identified in the form of a possible flake. Any interpretation of site prehistoric use based on this one artifact would be suspect. All that can be said is there is a lack of clear evidence of prehistoric site use in the areas tested as part of this project at Rufus King Park.

No adverse impacts to archaeological resources will result from the fence project. However, should certain key areas identified during this project be disturbed during future work, archaeological testing, perhaps leading to data recovery, is recommended (see Figures 3 and 4). The key locations, or sensitivity zones, include the area of the brick feature behind the summer kitchen, as well as the space

between the two. Although no evidence of the outbuilding mapped in 1842 was found, this is still considered an archaeologically sensitive area. Should any widespread excavations be planned within the footprint of that building, physical evidence of its existence and use could be archaeologically documented. Based on the archaeological testing done as part of the fence project, Rufus King Park, particularly in the vicinity of the manor house, has the potential to address many of the gaps in the history of the property and of those who resided there.



Shallow Test 103, trowel pointing north.



Plate 2 Remains of mortared brick found during grading for the bluestone walk, trowel pointing north.



Plate 3 Wide shot photograph of the mortared brick remains in the area graded for the bluestone walk showing its relationship to the exterior wall of the summer kitchen section of the King manor house.



Plate 4

Artifacts retained from Shovel Test 7 - Stratum 5; possible prehistoric flake and a porcelain tile fragment.



ï

Flower pot fragments retained from monitoring fence post excavations in front of the King manor house.



LEGEND

· .	THE WITH SIZE AND BASE ELEVATEM
ñ	
	personal sector of the sector
	ruci
5.71	SPOT ELEVATER
0	WATER MANRELL
à	JUNNERS MARKEN
Ū.	0.5CTMC #0X
	DIRACING FOLMTAN
0	NOLDER
X	71.000 LIONT
\$	PARE LIGHT
-	CATCH BARH
a/	CHAN LIFE FORE
-	WARDAR WON FURCE
-104	HEN THEF
	TRANSPLANTED TRADE
Ŕ	related balloce
	NEW T-O ATTOL MUST MERCE
	to opp with preameres
Long Action	SDADIUZED OCHEEN NIGO WALK
7	BLUESTONE INVENENT ON CONCRETE
777	reconstruct LAWN
مسم	514H5
	- DEDUL HUNDRE STANDARD DEDULD
Ð	- DEPAL HUMBER & ASTRICAL DEFALLS

GIGN (A)	CITY OF PARKS & OLMSTED FLUSHING MEADO FLUSHING, NE	NEW YORK RECREATION CENTER WS-CORONA PARK W YORK 11368			
	PROJECT TITLE THE CONDITION OF A SECURITY MENCE ARCUND THE PERSANDERS. OF THE PLAN HELL MADE HOUSE IN ARTIS INHE THERE, ISO'TH STRATT, JANUAL NEL HELL HELL PROJECT POROUGH OF CUSTOME				
	DRAWING TITLE LAYOUT, PLANTING AND	devening river			
	DRAWN BY	CHERRY STORE			
	APPROVED BY THE.	FOREL JOINER, CONT OF DIG.			
	SCALL APPROXIMATION ON PROVINCE	CONTINUET NO. OR ED-DALLES			
	DATE CHANNEL &, HOD	SHEET M. 4			



Figure 2 Section of the 1842 Johnson Map with the current Manor House and Park Comfort Station overlaid.



Figure 3 Archaeological testing performed for the fence project at Rufus King Park, eastern side of project area.



# WEST

EAST

# Probe Transect 3



1 inch = 1 foot





#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

#### Boger, Louise Ade

1971 The Dictionary of World Pottery and Porcelain. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

## Busch, Jane

1991 Second Time Around: A Look at Bottle Reuse. As reprinted in *Approaches to Material Culture Research for Historical Archaeologists*. Compiled by G.L. Miller, et al. Pp.113-126.

#### Cotz, Jo Ann E.

1984 Draft Archaeological Sensitivity Model for the Rufus King Manor and Park, Jamaica, borough of Queens, NYC. For Gibson Bauer Associates. December 1984

#### DuBois, J. Harry

# Fike, Richard E.

1987 The Bottle Book: A Comprehensive Guide to Historic, Embossed Medicine Bottles. Salt Lake City: Gibbs M. Smith, Inc. Peregrine Smith Books.

#### Gibson Bauer Associates, Johannson and Walcavage

1985 Historic Structures and Landscape Report for Rufus King Manor and Park, Preliminary Draft. February 1985

## Godden, Geoffrey A.

1992 An Illustrated Encyclopedia of British Pottery and Porcelain. Second Edition. Leicester, England: Magna Books.

# Grossman, Joel W.

1991 Archaeological Test and Artifact Analysis Results from Rufus King Park, Jamaica, Queens, New York (Draft). Prepared by Grossman and Associates for Land-Site Contracting Corp. March 5, 1991.

#### Hibbard, Shirley

1992 The Architectural Evolution of King Manor, Jamaica, Queens. An Annotated Reference and Resource Guide. Compiled and Annotated for King Manor Museum.

#### Johnson, Martin G.

1842 Map of the Village of Jamaica, Queens County, Long Island.

#### Jones, Olive and Catherine Sullivan

1989 The Parks Canada Glass Glossary for Description of Containers, Tableware, Flat Glass, and Closures. Studies in Archaeology, Architecture, and History. Ottawa: National Historic Parks and Sites Branch, Parks Canada, Environment Canada.

#### Ketchum, William C., Jr.

# King, Rufus

1822 Letter to unknown person. April 9, 1822. In the collection of the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress.

<sup>1972</sup> Plastics History U.S.A. Boston: Cahners Books.

<sup>1991</sup> American Redware. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Majewski, Teresita and Michael J. O'Brien

1987 The Use and Misuse of Nineteenth-Century English and American Ceramics in Archeological Analysis. Advances in Archaeological Method an Theory II:97-209, M. Schiffer (ed.).

Maxwell, D.B.S.

1993 Beer Cans: A Guide for the Archaeologists. *Historical Archaeology* 27(1):95-113.

# Mercer, Henry C.

1975 Ancient Carpenters' Tools. Fifth Edition. Bucks County Historical Society. Horizon Press.

#### Miller, George L.

1991 A Revised Set of CC Index Values for Classification and Economic Scaling of English Ceramics from 1787 to 1880. Historical Archaeology 25(1):1-25.

Miller, George L. and Robert H. Hunter, Jr.

1990 English Shell Edged Earthenware: Alias Leeds, Alias Feather Edge. Thirty-Fifth Wedgwood International Seminar 201-232.

## Myers, Susan H.

1978 The John Paul Remensnyder Collection of American Stoneware. November 1978 -November 1979. Washington, D.C.: The National Museum of History and Technology. Smithsonian Institution.

#### Noël Hume, Ivor

1991 A Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America. Originally published 1969. New York: Vintage Books.

# Platt, Edward J.

1991 Rufus King Park Site. New York Institute of Anthropology Journal. Vol 12, No 3, September 1991.

#### Post, Robert C.

1973 National Register of Historic Places Inventory - Nomination Form. Prepared 6/28/73.

#### Ramsay, John

1939 American Plates and Pottery. Boston: Hale, Cushman and Flint.

#### South, Stanley

1978 Evolution and Horizon as Revealed in Ceramic Analysis in Historical Archaeology. In Historical Archaeology: A Guide to Substantive and Theoretical Contributions. Robert L. Schuyler (ed.). Pp. 68-82. Reprinted. Farmingdale, NY: Baywood Publishing Company, Inc. Originally published 1971. In The Conference on Historic Site Archaeology Papers 6(2):71-106.

#### Venables, Robert W.

1989

Sourcebook. King Manor, Jamaica, Queens, New York City. Cornell University.

Appendix A

Scope of Work

.

# REVISED SCOPE OF WORK FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL TESTING IN ADVANCE IF IMPROVEMENTS AT RUFUS KING PARK JAMAICA, QUEENS, NEW YORK

#### August 27, 1996

The New York City Department of Parks and Recreations is planning several improvements at Rufus King Park which will involve excavations of various types in the vicinity of the Manor House. These impacts may have the potential to affect archaeological resources. Therefore this scope of work addresses the potential in specific areas and what and where testing should be performed, prior to construction excavation, to evaluate for the presence or absence of archaeological resources. All activities indicated below shall be conducted in a manner consistent with the LPC *Guidelines for Archaeology* (1987) and the *City Environmental Quality Review Technical Manual* (1993). The impacts are as follows (see highlighted areas on the attached plan):

1) Installation of a new fence - posts in concrete piers 3' deep and 1' wide, 3 gates will create below ground disturbances 4.5' deep and 3.5' wide.

2) Relocation of a portion of the existing security fence - fence posts will be driven down about 3' or set in concrete, as soil conditions dictate.

3) Installation of 5 signs - posts will be set in concrete 1' wide to a depth of 3.5' (locations of two signs at the Jamaica Avenue entrances have yet not been determined).

4) Installation of a bluestone on concrete walk behind house - excavated to 8".

5) Installation of a stabilized screenings walk to and from Comfort Station - edging will reach a depth of  $3^{"}$ , walk will be excavated down  $1 - 2^{"}$  and  $1 - 2^{"}$  of fill added.

6) Planting of three trees west of the house - root ball will be up to 5'.

7) Installation of a placque - base of excavation at 1.5' below pavement, location not yet known.

Several previous archaeological and historic reports were reviewed to determine if or where archaeological deposits may survive. One consistency among the six reports is that the location and use of all historic outbuildings is not known (Cotz 1984:8). There is no information about possible seventeenth century occupation or use of the site. Cotz suggests evidence of leather tanning from this period may exist buried "in the rear and side yards" (p.6). An early nineteenth century building, documented to the east of the house, may have served as the original Parks Department comfort station (Cotz 1984:13, Grossman 1991:9-10). Grossman reevaluated historic map data and placed some depth probes in the possible location of this building to document the western extent. The current plans may impact the eastern extent of this building as well as the area to its north and south. However, the area to the south may have had previous below ground disturbances from the installation of an "open sewerage vault" (Cotz 1984:14).

The use of the landscape changed under King's tenure to a more intensive working farm which was maintained, after his death, through the mid-century after which a steady decline was documented (Cotz 1984:10). Rufus King was an avid gardener and horticulturist. Gibson Bauer Associates, Johannson and Walcavage (GBA/JW) found "no plans for the development of King's land or for the layout of individual gardens...nor...any evidence that King consulted a 'landscape gardener' in laying out the grounds" (3.1.2.7). They go on to say "the area in front of the house became a lawn, and King's account book mentions 'the lawn west of my house'" (ibid.). The property had an apple orchard prior to King's purchase. King added other fruit trees and well as a variety of local and other trees and plants to transform "the property from a working farm to a country manor" (Grossman 1991:iv, Venables 1989:15-16). However specific locations are not identified.

÷,

: •. The Parks Department has records of utility lines of all types throughout the planned impact areas, with the concentration to the east of the house. Additionally, unmapped utilities are known to exist in the front of the house (Mary Anne Mrozinski personal communication). Archaeological testing for the installation of some utilities in the vicinity of the house was done in 1991. None of Grossman's shovel tests or depth probes were placed in the footprints of the currently planned impacts, although those to the west of the Comfort Station and those behind the house were close (Grossman 1991:Fig.5). Grossman placed shovel tests in the rear of the house and found "this section of the site contains only a low density of historic cultural material" (p.iv). However Grossman also reports the locations of tests conducted by Greenhouse Consultants, several of which are within the current impact areas. While the locations of these tests are known, the stratigraphy and artifact data is not available.

The areas of planned impacts have the potential to contain archaeological resources which could yield information important to the site's history and prehistory, as well as the wider region. Such archaeological resources could potentially provide answers to the following research questions:

1) Are any previously undocumented buildings, outbuildings, or structures within the areas of impacts?

2) If so, what are these, where are they located and what was their purpose?

3) Is there any evidence of 17th century uses of the property, most particularly are there any features or artifacts associated with the tanning industry?

4) Will the planned impacts disturb remains of the eastern side of a known early 19th century building?

5) Are any historic landscape features present?

6) Is the cistern within the areas of planned impacts?

7) How was the landscape used in relation to known buildings, particularly the Manor House?

8) Do the impact areas contain evidence of prehistoric use?

9) If so, what type of usage was there and for which time periods?

Many of these questions cannot be answered through the literature, or can only be partially answered. The following is a brief review of the available documentation compiled into the reports in the attached bibliography as it applies to the above questions. As discussed above, all of the reports reviewed indicate the property may contain archaeological remains of buildings for which there is no documentation (1 & 2). Cotz (1984) further speculated that archaeological evidence of leather tanning may be found (3). Analysis of the previous archaeological testing in the area of a known early 19th century building indicates archaeological evidence of this structure may lie below the surface in the area of planned impact to the east of the house. The use of this building as well as its date of construction is not known (4). It has been well documented that King was an avid gardener and horticulturist. However no plans of his gardens exist. Therefore, this data could only be obtained archaeologically (5). It is known that the King House had a cistern, although the location is unknown. The proposed archaeological testing could reveal its location and provide information on the residents not available from other sources (6). The combination of results from the proposed testing could provide data on usage of the tested areas of the property and compare them with the existing body of data on the Rufus King Park property (7). Stratified prehistoric archaeological sites are rare. There are no well known documented prehistoric archaeological sites in Queens. Therefore any data on prehistoric site use or occupation would be important not only for the site, but for the wider area as well (8 & 9). Although some of the research questions are fairly general, it is important to consider them given the fact that Rufus King Manor is both a New York City Landmark and a National Register site.

The recommended testing strategy for the areas of planned impacts includes a combination of depth probes, shovel testing, and monitoring. The intensity of testing will be higher in areas of highest

probability and lower in areas of less archaeological potential. No tests will be placed in areas of known prior disturbance from utility lines. Tests will be located to identify specific resources and answer appropriate research questions. Questions regarding the historic landscape of Rufus King Park such as plantings and their locations will not likely be answered by the type of testing within impact areas from the below ground disturbances created by most of this project. The proposed shovel testing strategy could identify features associated with leather tanning, if they exist. It could also find the location of the cistern which GBA/JW reported the existence of (3.1.2.5). Identification of currently unknown buildings is a possibility with shovel testing. The use of areas of the historic landscape in relation to living space could be addressed in a minimal way, should areas of high or low artifact density or differing temporal assemblages be identified in various sides of the house. No systematic study of prehistoric archaeological potential has been made for the park. However documentation of stray finds within construction areas to the south and west of the house was reported (Platt 1991). Although it is not known if these were from indigenous soils or from fill brought from another location. Grossman found three fragments of "possible prehistoric ceramic" in the test off the northwest corner of the house (Ap.B, p.8). Therefore it seem possible that prehistoric artifacts may be found within the park.

Depth probes are recommended for part of the proposed new fence to locate the remains of the early 19th century building to the east of the house. Like the Grossman testing strategy, lines of probes will be placed to cross possible building remains. These probe lines will be conducted as shown on the attached plan. Although Grossman did not draw any conclusions from the results of these probes, it is an economical approach to possible identification of the former building in this area. Findings from the probes could also determine if an electrical line, under the footprint of the new fence west of the Comfort Station, extends south thus obliterating any evidence of the historic building foundation within the planned impacts in that area. Should a previous disturbance be identified, it would extend along the new fence line from past where it turns toward the Comfort Station heading south to a point east of the cellar door, effectively eliminating the need for archaeological testing along that portion of the new fence. Should this not be the case, an increased frequency of shovel tests would be warranted in that area.

Grossman identified a low density of cultural material in the shovel tests conducted to the rear of the house. Additionally, a low density of material remains from historic occupation would be expected to the west and south, since these areas reportedly were lawns during the King tenure. This would encompass the impact area from the new fence to the south of the previously discussed electrical line disturbance. However, rear yards are historically known for their likelihood of containing archaeological remains. While Grossman identified a low density of cultural material, his tests were in a line with the western side of the house rather than in an east-west line behind it. Therefore shovel testing should be more intensive along the new fence line to the rear of the house, west of the asphalt path, and less intensive to the front and sides. A fifteen foot testing interval is recommended to the rear of the house and a twenty-five foot interval to the front and sides. Should the results of these tests be as expected at the front and sides of the house, with a low density of cultural material and no historic features, no additional tests will be recommended in the areas of the three tree plantings, the sign or the security fence in these locations. The excavation for the bluestone walk to the rear of the house may reveal evidence of the former building extension shown on mid-19th century maps as well as a cistern. A series of close interval shallow shovel tests is recommended for this area. A line of tests with six foot centers excavated to 8", the planned impact depth, should be able to find these features if they exist.

Grossman found stratified historic deposits in tests near the Comfort Station. Therefore a higher intensity of shovel testing is recommended for the new fence and security fence locations from the Comfort Station north to the asphalt walk and the security fence south from comfort station. However as the location of the new security fence approaches the southern asphalt path the intensity of testing could decrease because of the proximity to the front yard where archaeological potential is low. Ten foot shovel test intervals are recommended in the higher intensity areas with fifteen foot intervals closer to

the asphalt path. Although the security fence posts may be driven rather than placed in concrete posts, because the decision of which method to use will be deferred until work is under way, it is thought best to test in areas of the security fence where archaeological resources may be disturbed.

Monitoring of excavations for the stabilized screenings walk to and from the Comfort Station and the bluestone walk to the rear of the house will be the most efficient way to evaluate those areas. The extremely shallow disturbances of the stabilized screenings walk will likely contain only modern debris. The slightly deeper disturbance from the bluestone walk may contain earlier material as well. However, the clearing or skimming of the surface may reveal evidence of historic landscape features such as trees or gardens, or remains from Native American occupation. The archaeologist will document any such features should they be identified.

The shovel tests will be about one to one and a half feet in diameter and excavated to the depth of non-artifact bearing subsoil, or the limit of the methodology, to evaluate the nature of the soils and the presence or absence of archaeological remains. All soils excavated from the shovel tests will be screened through 1/4 inch mesh for the recovery of artifacts. Soils, stratigraphy and artifact inclusions will be recorded on forms. Shovel test locations will be mapped on the site plan. Photodocumentation and drawings will be done as appropriate. Standard methods of artifact processing, labeling, identification, evaluation and documentation will be done on the recovered materials.

Within one month of completion of archaeological testing of this Rufus King Park project, the consultant will provide a written report to the New York City Parks Department and the Landmarks Preservation Commission setting forth the results of the field testing. The report shall indicate how the research questions and fieldwork activities described above have been addressed. It shall also include; a record of stratigraphy within shovel tests, a complete catalogue of artifacts recovered, and an assessment of the locations of intact archaeological resources for which data recovery, if needed, is recommended. Map(s) at a scale of 1"=20' will be provided indicating results from such investigations with location investigated using depth probes, shovel testing and monitoring techniques, and showing locations of archaeological sensitivity with an indication of resource type.

Should any archaeological resources or any soils with the potential to contain archaeological resources be identified, archaeological mitigation excavations, depth probes or monitoring may be recommended at that time. Such recommendations would be commensurate with the significance of the find and potential for impact to the resource. This additional evaluation of archaeological resources would define their significance and extent within the planned impacts. The consultant would develop a research design and scope of work for archaeological data recovery, analysis, and curation, based upon the findings from the documentary record and archaeological field testing. The scope of work would specify at a minimum:

A) the information important in the prehistory or history of New York City that the archaeological resources could potentially provide and the research questions the information could answer;

B) why these research questions cannot be addressed using the existing literature and/or other resources (and listing the resources consulted);

C) the proposed methods for archaeological mitigation, with an explanation of their relevance to the research questions;

D) the professional standards that the archaeological team shall use in implementing the field work, laboratory analysis, and data management; and

E) a written protocol for conservation; curation and disposition of archaeological collections.

The consultant would then provide a copy of the research design and scope of work for archaeological data recovery, analysis, and curation to the Parks Department and LPC for review and approval. After such review and approval, the consultant would implement the research design and scope of work.

Following completion of the analysis specified in the mitigation research design, and within three months of completion of field work, the consultant would provide a copy of the final report to the Parks Department and the LPC for review and approval. The report would indicate how Items A. through E. above have been addressed. The Parks Department, in consultation with the LPC, would then identify an appropriate institution in New York City that meets the Department of Interior's requirements of *Curation of Federally Owned and Administered Archaeological Collections* (36 CFR Part 79) for disposition of any significant archaeological materials along with the field and laboratory records.

Should results of this testing program reveal no finding of effect or impact to significant archaeological remains, then no further archaeological work would be recommended, except for monitoring of the signs whose locations are yet to be determined. However, because of the possibility of unknown features or buildings within the Rufus King Park, the contractor should be sensitive to potential archaeological finds and the archaeologist should be available to document these if they are encountered. Therefore, the contractor should be obliged to temporarily stop work should any archaeologist to the site. An appropriate course of action shall be decided by the Parks Department in consultation with the LPC. This may include further archaeological mitigation, photographing and recording the feature in plan and section, as well as recovering any samples or artifacts associated with it. Findings from such an on-call response would be prepared by the archaeologist and included in the final report or an appendix, within three months of completion of the fieldwork.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cotz, Jo Ann E.

1984 Draft Archaeological Sensitivity Model for the Rufus King Manor and Park, Jamaica, borough of Queens, NYC. For Gibson Bauer Associates. December 1984

#### Gibson Bauer Associates, Johannson and Walcavage

1985 Historic Structures and Landscape Report for Rufus King Manor and Park, Preliminary Draft. February 1985

Grossman, Joel W.

1991 Archaeological Test and Artifact Analysis Results from Rufus King Park, Jamaica, Queens, New York (Draft). Prepared by Grossman and Associates for Land-Site Contracting Corp. March 5, 1991.

## Hibbard, Shirley

1992 The Architectural Evolution of King Manor, Jamaica, Queens. An Annotated Reference and Resource Guide. Compiled and Annotated for King Manor Museum.

## Platt, Edward J.

1991 Rufus King Park Site. New York Institute of Anthropology Journal. Vol 12. No 3. September 1991.

#### Venables, Robert W.

1989 Sourcebook. King Manor, Jamaica, Queens, New York City. Cornell University.



Appendix B

Shovel Test Stratigraphy

h.

•

-

.

F

TEST	LEVEL	DEPTH	MUNSELL	COLOR	TEXTURE	ARTIFACTS
1	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.3 0.8 1.4 1.7	10YR3/2 10YR3/3 10YR4/4 10YR4/4	very dark gray brown dark brown dark yellowish brown dark yellowish brown	sandy loam with turf dry compact clay silt gravelly clayey silt silty sand	modern glass, cigarette butt, plastic, colt 45 cap modern glass, plastic, 1974 penny, ceramics ceramic, nail, brick frags, modern glass
2	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.4 1.2 2.1	10YR3/3 10YR4/4 10YR4/6	dark brown dark yellowish brown dark yellowish brown	silty topsoil with sod stoney silt stonier sand silt	plastic, glass marble, rubik's cube piece brick frags, shell, ceramic, metal metal, glass to 1.7 and nothing below
3	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.4 0.9 1.3 1.8	10YR3/3 10YR4/3 10YR4/4 7.5YR4/4	dark brown brown/dark brown dark yellowish brown brown	pebbly silty soil silty soil compact gravelly silt gravelly sandy silt	plastic. modern glass. pull tab. brick frags modern glass. brick frags
4	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.1 1.4 1.8 2.5	10YR3/3 10YR5/8 7.5YR4/6	dark brown yellowish brown strong brown	wood chips compact dry rocky silt mottled compact silt compact clayey silt	plastic modern glass.brick frags. coal frags. asphalt
5	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.4 0.8 1.0 1.9 2.9	10YR3/3 10YR3/2 10YR3/2 10YR3/2	dark brown very dark gray brown very dark gray brown dark yellowish brown	very compact silt loam clayey silt asphalt rocky sandy loam coarse sand	modern glass asphalt. modern class, shell frags, brick frag pipe stem, amber glass
б	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.6 2.8 3.1	10YR3/4 10YR4/3 10YR5/8	dark brown brown yellowish brown	gravelly silt with sod ashpalt over silt loam coarse sand	modern glass, modern nail plastic, asphalt. glass modern glass
7	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.3 0.9 1.1 1.4 2.3 3.0	10YR3/4 10YR3/2 10YR5/1 10YR4/3 10YR4/6 10YR3/2	dark yellowish brown very dark gray brown gray brown/dark brown dark yellowish brown very dark gray brown	silty topsoil silty loam dry silty sand silty sand sandy fill loamy clay	modern glass. plastic, wood veneer nails. plastic, modern glass, brick frags, asphalt plastic, modern glass, nail, concrete pop top, birck frags, reinforced glass, fiberglass asphalt tile, modern glass
8	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.2 0.8 1.5 2.1	10YR3/3 10YR4/3 10YR4/1 10YR4/3	dark brown brown/dark brown dark gray brown/dark brown	silty loam dry compact clay silt stoney silty loam stoney sandy silt	modern glass, balloon, ceramic asphalt, concrete, modern glass asphalt/concrete, modern glass, plastic, wood chip ceramic, modern glass, brick frags, mortar. coal

TEST	LEVEL	DEPTH	MUNSELL	COLOR	TEXTURE	ARTIFACTS
9	1 2 3. 4 5 6	0.6 0.7 1.5	10YR3/4 10YR5/6 10YR3/2	dark yellowish brown yellowish brown very dark gray brown	silty top soil mottled silt organic soil	plastic. metal, shell edge pearlware ceramic glass
10	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.1 0.7 1.6 3.2	10YR4/4 10YR3/2 10YR4/4	dark yellowish brown very dark gray brown dark yellowish brown	wood chips pebbly compact soil compact silt gravelly silt	modern glass, brick frags modern glass, brick frags, ceramic shell, brick frags, window glass, metal, ceramic
11	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.4 0.7 0.9 1.9 2.2	10YR3/3 10YR3/3 10YR4/3 10YR4/3	dark brown dark brown brown/dark brown brown/dark brown	sandy loam organic with wood chip silty loam silty loam sandy silt	modern glass modern glass glass marble shell frag, coal frag, glass. nail
12	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.3 0.4 1.6 1.9	10YR5/2 10YR4/4 10YR3/2 10YR3/4	grayish brown dark yellowish brown very dark gray brown dark yellowish brown	sandy with wood chips mottled silty soil silty soil with roots	modern glass, plastic plastic, modern glass shell frag, modern glass, ceramic, flower pot
13	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.5 0.9 2.4 3.0	10YR3/2 10YR3/3 10YR4/6 10YR4/6	very dark gray brown dark brown dark yellowish brown dark yellowish brown	silty loam very compact soil dry sandy silt sandier silt	balloon frag, modern glass, nickel modern glass, candy wrapper brick frag, modern glass, flower pot, ceramic flow blue ceramic
14	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.5 0.7 1.0 2.0 2.3	10YR3/4 10YR5/1 10YR4/4 10YR3/3 10YR4/6	dark yellowish brown gray dark yellowish brown dark brown dark yellowish brown	silty sod compact silt silt sandy silt sandy silt	modern glass. asphalt mirror, ceramic asphalt. brick frag, modern glass, nail. ceramic
15	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.1 1.1 2.1	10YR3/3 10YR3/4	dark brown dark yellowish brown	sod compact silty soil silt	modern glass modern glass, mortar, brick frag
16	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.3 0.9 2.9 3.2	10YR4/2 10YR4/3 10YR4/3	dark gray brown brown/dark brown brown/dark brown	turf compact clayey silt pebbly silt pebbly silty soil	modern glass plastic, modern glass, flower pot, nail shell frag, ceramic, glass, brick frag

I

TEST	LEVEL	DEPTH	MUNSELL	COLOR	TEXTURE	ARTIFACTS
17	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.2 0.4 1.0 3.0	10YR3/3 10YR4/4	dark brown dark yellowish brown	sod organic silty loam asphalt coarse sand	Zima cap. modern glass. plastic brick frag. modern glass. ceramic
18	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.2 0.9 1.2 2.2 2.7	10YR4/3 10YR3/3 10YR4/4	brown/dark brown dark brown dark yellowish brown	sod dry silty loam asphalt clayey loam sandy clay	nail ceramíc, brick frag?
19	1 2 3 4 5 6	1.0 1.4 2.5	10YR4/3 10YR4/4 10YR4/3	brown/dark brown dark yellowish brown brown/dark brown	silt covered with sod gravelly coarse sand pebbly silty sand	glass, asphalt ceramic, metal
20	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.6 2.2 2.9 3.4	10YR4/3 10YR3/6 10YR3/3 10YR5/6	brown/dark brown dark yellowish brown dark brown yellowish brown	loam under sod compact silty sand loamy silty loam	flower pot, ceramic, glass glass
21	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.5 1.1 3.1	10YR4/3 10YR3/3 10YR4/6	brown/dark brown dark brown dark yellowish brown	silty loam under sod compact sandy silt silty sand	crack vile asphalt, shell frags, flower pot, modern glass
22	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.3 1.1 2.4 3.2	10YR3/1 10YR3/2 10YR4/6 10YR4/4	very dark gray very dark gray brown dark yellowish brown dark yellowish brown	organic loam with sod stony silty loam moist silty sand moist stony silty sand	coal, modern glass, plastic wrap, beer caps ceramic, naii, glass, coal
23	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.8 2.1 2.9 2.9	10YR3/3 10YR3/4 10YR3/4 10YR5/6	dark brown dark yellowish brown dark brown yellowish brown	sod with top soil mottled silty soil gravelly sandy silt sand	modern glass. plastic brick. ceramic, glass
24	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.2 3.0 1.2 1.9 2.8	7.5YR2/3 10YR3/4 7.5YR2/3 10YR4/4 10YR3/4	very dark brown dark yellowish brown very dark brown dark yellowish brown dark yellowish brown	silty loam silty silty mottled silty soil sandy silt	modern glass soda caps plastic wrap. ceramic, soda caps modern glass

÷

I

TEST	LEVEL	DEPTH	MUNSELL	COLOR	TEXTURE	ARTIFACTS
25	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.2 0.9 1.3 1.7 2.1	10YR2/2 10YR3/3 10YR4/4 10YR3/3 7.5YR4/4	very dark brown dark brown dark yellowish brown dark brown brown	silty loam compact silt compact mottled silt sandy clay coarse silty sand	ceramic shell. bathroom tile, modern glass, coal, asphalt ceramic
26	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.6 1.1 2.8 3.0	10YR3/3 10YR4/3 10YR4/4 10YR5/8	dark brown brown/dark brown dark yellowish brown yellowish brown	sod with top soil mottled silt stony clay gravelly sand	coal, modern glass ceramic. nail. glass
27	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.3 0.9 1.3 2.1 3.0	10YR3/2 10YR3/3 10YR3/4 10YR4/4 10YR4/6	very dark gray brown dark brown dark yellowish brown dark yellowish brown dark yellowish brown	sod with topsoil mottled silty loam mottled clayey silt moist clayey silt gravelly sand	modern glass, plastic, nail, brick frag. coal window glass, ceramic ceramic
28	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.4 0.9 2.6 2.9	10YR2/2 10YR3/3 10YR3/6 10YR4/6	very dark brown dark brown dark yellowish brown dark yellowish brown	silty loam silt mottled clayey silt coarse sand	modern glass. brick. plastic. shell shell
29	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.3 1.4 2.2 2.4	10YR2/2 10YR3/4 10YR5/6 10YR5/6	very dark brown dark yellowish brown yellowish brown yellowish brown	silty loam clayey silt coarse clayey sand dry clayey sand	plastic
30	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.5 1.5 2.5	10YR4/3 10YR3/2 10YR3/6	brown/dark brown very dark gray brown dark yellowish brown	sod with topsoil mottled gravelly silt gravelly sand	foil. modern glass
31	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.3 1.4 2.4 2.9	10YR2/2 10YR3/4 10YR3/4 7.5YR4/6	very dark brown dark yellowish brown dark yellowish brown strong brown	sod with topsoil pebbley clayey silt pebbley silt sand	nail
32	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.3 1.9 3.1 3.4	10YR2/2 10YR3/6 7.5YR5/8 7.5YR5/8	very dark brown yellowish brown strong brown strong brown	silty loam mottled pebbley silt pebbley silt coarse sand	plastic wrap

TEST	LEVEL	DEPTH	MUNSELL	COLOR	TEXTURE	ARTIFACTS
33	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.7 2.0 2.6	10YR4/2 10YR4/6 10YR4/6	dark grayish brown dark yellowish brown dark yellowish brown	sod with topsoil mottled compact silt pebbley sand	modern glass. ceramic
34	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.3 0.8 2.2 2.8	10YR3/2 10YR3/3 10YR4/6 10YR4/6	very dark gray brown dark brown dark yellowish brown dark yellowish brown	sod with topsoil sandy loam mottled sandy clay sand	brick. modern glass modern glass. nail, ceramic
35	1 2 3 4 5 6	1.3 3.0 0.0	10YR4/2 10YR4/4	dark grayish brown dark yellowish brown	sod with topsoil mottled sandy silt	shell, plastic. modern glass, ceramic
36	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.3 1.5 2.8 3.0	10YR2/2 10YR3/6 7.5YR4/6 7.5YR5/8	very dark brown dark yellowish brown strong brown strong brown	silty loam mottled silt sandy silt coarse sand	pull tab. nail modern glass. pipe stem
37	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.3 0.7 1.4 2.4	10YR3/3 10YR3/2 10YR3/3 10YR4/4	dark brown very dark gray brown dark brown dark yellowish brown	sod with topsoil sandy loam mottled clayey sand stony silty sand	modern glass, brick, celophane wrapper modern glass, coal coal, plastic
38	1 2 3 4 5 6	1.2 1.9 3.2	10YR3/3 10YR4/4 10YR4/4	dark brown dark yellowish brown dark yellowish brown	sod with topsoil mottled silty clay gravelly clayey sand	modern glass. paper
39	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.2 0.4 0.8 1.2 2.6 3.0	10YR3/3 10YR3/1 10YR4/4 10YR4/4 10YR4/4	dark brown black dark yellowish brown dark yellowish brown dark yellowish brown	sod with wood chips silty loam organic loam mottled silty clay mottled silty clay silty sand	modern glass, cigarette butts brick asphalt. coal, shell, bottle glass, nail, brick shell, ceramic
40	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.1 0.4 0.8 1.2 2.3 3.2	10YR3/2 10YR3/2 10YR3/2 10YR4/4 7.5YR4/4	very dark gray brown very dark gray brown very dark gray brown dark yellowish brown brown	sod silty loam asphalt in silty loam silty loam mottled silty sand stoney clayey sand	asphalt. styrofoam plastic modern glass. shell, plastic. metal faunal bone

.

TEST	LEVEL	DEPTH	MUNSELL	COLOR	TEXTURE	ARTIFACTS
41	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.2 0.7 1.2 1.4 2.4 3.2	10YR3/2 10YR3/3 10YR3/2 10YR3/3 10YR3/3 10YR4/6	very dark gray brown dark brown very dark gray brown dark brown dark brown dark yellowish brown	sod with topsoil dry clayey silt silty loam silty laom silty loam moist clayey sand	modern glass styrofoam, modern glass, brick frag brick frag. coal, plastic. slag, nails, ceramic charcoal, slag, brick, mortar, metal, nail shell, slag, brick
42	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.2 0.5 1.0 1.7 2.2 3.0	10YR3/2 10YR3/3 10YR5/4 10YR3/3 10YR4/4 10YR4/4	very dark gray brown dark brown yellowish brown dark brown dark yellowish brown dark yellowish brown	sod with topsoil silty loam mottled silty clay clayey silt clayey sand coarse stoney sand	modern glass cermaic, faunal bone ceramic, glass shell, metal, glass, plastic, ceramic, brick, bone ceramic
100	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.4 0.7 0.0	10YR3/3 10YR4/4	dark brown dark yellowish brown	sod with topsoil sandy silt	wire. modern glass
101	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.2 0.8 0.0	10YR4/4	dark yellowish brown	sod silty sand	coal coal, modern glass, ceramic
102	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.3 0.7 0.0	10YR2/2 10YR4/6	very dark brown dark yellowish brown	silty loam mottled silt	plastic shell
103	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.3 0.8 0.0	10YR2/2 10YR4/6	dark brown dark yellowish brown	silty loam silt	brick, mortar, ceramic, nail
104	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.3 0.7 0.8	10YR3/3 10YR3/3	dark brown dark brown	sod sandy loam silty sand	modern glass brick, mortar brick, mortar
105	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.5 0.8 0.0	10YR3/3 10YR3/1	ɗark brown very dark gray	sod with topsoil ashy silty sand	

TEST	LEVEL	DEPTH	MUNSELL	COLOR	TEXTURE	ARTIFACTS
106	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.1 0.4 0.6 0.7	10YR2/2 10YR3/4 10YR2/2 10YR3/2	very dark brown dark yellowish brown very dark brown very dark gray brown	silty loam silt silty coarse sand	brick, mail brick asphalt
107	1 2 3 4 5 6	0.4 0.6 0.7	10YR3/2 10YR3/3 10YR4/4	very dark gray brown dark brown dark yellowish brown	sod with topsoil sandy loam silty sand	brick, modern glass. paint chip. ceramic modern glass, asphalt, cement modern glass, milk glass

•

.

Appendix C

ľ

.

Artifact Inventory

# ARTIFACT INVENTORY FOR RUFUS KING PARK ARCHAEOLOGICAL TESTING

SHOPE     TIST     1     Caractor     fromstance     5     white     white     early 19thC -present       1.3     Grantic     portplain     rim     3     outff     Rekinghan type     133/2, 1900       1.3     Grantic     corport     portplain     yite     133/2, 1900       1.4     Grantic     corport     portplain     yite     133/2, 1900       1.4     Corport     corport     portplain     yite     133/2, 1900       1.4     Corport     corport     portplain     yite     133/2, 1900       1.5     Corport     corport     portplain     yite     133/2, 1900       1.4     Corport     corport     portplain     yite     133/2, 1900       1.4     Corport     corport     portplain     yite     136/2, 1920       1.4     Corport     portplain     yite     yite     137/2, 1920       1.4     Corport     portplain     yite     portplain     137/2, 1920       1.4     Corport     portplain     yite     portplain     137/2, 1920       1.4     Corport     portplain     portplain     portplain     137/2, 1920       1.4     Mortplain     portplain     portplain     portplain	CONTEX	T MATERIAL	IDENTITY	FORM	# W⊺-g	COLOR	DESCRIPTION	DATE RANGE
1.3         Cerearic parcel all 1.3         Cerearic certheware certheware 1.3         5         white white 1374         Cerearic Rockingham type 1374         cerearic 13974         cerearic 13974         cerearic 13974         cerearic 13974         13974         13974         13974         13974           1.3         Cerearic C	SHOVEL	TEST 1						
1.3       Corranic       porcelain       ria       1       white       1000000000000000000000000000000000000	1.3	Ceramic	ironstone		5	white		early 19thC -present
1 3 Generic       certhemane       3       buff       Rockinghan type       1530-c.1900         1 3 Metai       compare       perky       1       pink       game piece       1594         1 4 Generic       creamware       reamware       1       white       1762-1820         1 4 Generic       creamware       rin       1       white       1762-1820         1 4 Generic       perkware       rin       1       white       1792-1820         1 4 Hetai       rion       1       white       square shark, badly corruded       1792-1820         2 1 Glass       curved       1       green       modern       1295-1530s         2 1 Glass       mathe       nathe       1       olace/start       1900-present         2 1 Glass       mathe       nathe       1       olace/start       1300-present         2 1 Glass       mathe       nath       155       nath       nath	1.3	Ceramic	porcelain	rim	1	white		and a second processo
1       Neal       copper       peny       1       1074 <td< td=""><td>1 3</td><td>Ceramic</td><td>earthenware</td><td></td><td>3</td><td>buff</td><td>Rockingham type</td><td>1830-c 1900</td></td<>	1 3	Ceramic	earthenware		3	buff	Rockingham type	1830-c 1900
1 3       Plastic       Corport       gog toy       2       pink       game piece       1945-present         1 4       Orranic       creative       creative       creative       1       white       1762-1820         1 4       Orranic       tronstance       rim       1       white       1762-1820         1 4       Orranic       parhware       rim       1       white       1792-1820         1 4       Orranic       parhware       rim       1       white       square shak, badly corrodd         2 1       Caranic       refined canthemware       1       white       anular type bie interior.       1795-1530;         2 1       Grass       curved       1       clear       blue Hetring TE CT DE/CA R"       1980-present         2 1       Grass       curved       1       clear       blue Hetring TE CT DE/CA R"       1980-present         2 1       Grass       curved       1       clear       blue Hetring TE CT DE/CA R"       1980-present         2 1       Grass       curved       1       clear       blue Hetring TE CT DE/CA R"       1980-present         2 1       Grass       rim       nati       clear       blue Hetring TE CT DE/CA R"       <	1 3	Metal	conner	Depriv	ĩ	bur.	1974	1974
1     Ceraric     creasware     rim     1     white     1762-120       1     Ceraric     creasware     rim     1     white     1762-120       1     Ceraric     pearhane     rim     1     white     1762-120       1     Ceraric     pearhane     rim     1     white     1762-120       1     Karaic     pearhane     rim     1     white     1792-1300       1     Karaic     pearhane     rim     1     white     square shark, badly corroded       SIOVEL TEST 2     refined centhemare     1     white     anular type blue interior.     1795-15305       2     1     Glass     curved     1     clear     blue lettering "E CT BZ/CA P"     1295-15305       2     1     Glass     curved     1     clear     modern     1395-15305       2     1     Glass     curved     1     clear     modern     1395-15305       2     1     Glass     narble     1     clear     clear     1395-15305       2     1     Glass     narble     1     clear     nodern     1395-15305       2     1     Glass     narble     1     clear     nodern     1390-	1 3	Plastic	copper	dog tov	2	nink	dame piece	1940s-present
1       Corranic       creamware       rin       1       white       1762-1820         1       Corranic       creamic       tronstone       4       white       1762-1820         1.4       Corranic       perhvare       4       white       perhvare       1772-1820         1.4       Corranic       perhvare       rin       1       white       perhvare       1792-1820         1.4       Corranic       perhvare       rin       1       white       anular type blue interior, white exterior glaze       1792-1820         2.1       Grass       curved       1       clear       nodern       1795-1930S         2.1       Grass       curved       1       clear       nodern       1900-present         2.1       Grass       curved       1       clear       nodern       1900-present         2.1       Grass       rin       nati       1       clear       nodern       1900-present         2.1       Grass       rin       nati       1       clear       nodern       1900-present         2.1       Grass       rink       nati       1       square shank, baily cornoded       1800-present         2.2					-	Pink	June Proce	19405 present
-         Ceramic i - Ceramic i - Ceramic i - Ceramic pearly isol. present i - Ceramic pearly isol. present i - Ceramic i - Cerami	. 4	Ceramic	creamware		1	white		1762-1820
1 4       Ceramic       per/Ware       4       white       early 19bC.present         1.4       Ceramic       per/Ware       rim       1       white       1779-1820+         1.4       Ceramic       refined earthenware       rim       1       white       1799-1820+         SIOVEL       TEST 2       2.1       Caramic       refined earthenware       1       white       arnulan type blue interion.       1795-1930s         2.1       Grass       butle       1       clear       blue littering?       1795-1930s         2.1       Grass       curved       1       clear       blue littering?       1905-present         2.1       Grass       curved       1       clear       modern       1905-present         2.1       Grass       marble       1       clear/orange       noudern       1905-present         2.1       Grass       marble       1       white       round shank, corroded       cal800-present         2.1       Grass       marble       1       better       square shank, badly corroded       1970-present         2.2       Grass       mitk       nail       1       clear       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca, 1890 </td <td></td> <td>Ceramic</td> <td>creamware</td> <td>rim</td> <td>1</td> <td>white</td> <td></td> <td>1762-1820</td>		Ceramic	creamware	rim	1	white		1762-1820
1.4       Geranic       pearlware       in       1       white       1779-1820-         1.4       Geranic       pearlware       rin       1       white       square shank, badly corroded         SHOWEL       TEST 2       refined earthenware       1       white       arrular type blue interior, white exterior glaze       1795-1930s         2.1       Glass       curved       1       clear       modern       1800-present         2.1       Glass       curved       1       green       modern       1905-present         2.1       Glass       curved       1       green       modern       1905-present         2.1       Glass       curved       1       green       modern       1905-present         2.1       Glass       mrlk       natit       1       white       reaud shank, corroded       1905-present         2.1       Glass       mrlk       natit       1       white       square shank, badly corroded       1905-present         2.1       Glass       mrlk       natit       1       black       reariy 195hC, present         2.1       Glass       mrlk       natit       1       black       reariy 195hC, present	: 4	Ceramic	ironstone		4	white		early 19thC -present
1 4 Coranic       paarlware       rim       1       white       1779-1220-         1.4 Yetal       iron       1       white       square shak, badly corroded       1779-1220-         SHOUL TEST 2       2.1 Cananic       refined centhenwere       1       white       annular type blue interior, white exterior glaze       1795-1530s         2.1 Glass       curved       1       clear       blue littering "E CD B/CA R"       120s-present         2.1 Glass       curved       1       clear       blue demon       120s-present         2.1 Glass       curved       1       clear       modern       120s-present         2.1 Glass       marble       1       clear       modern       cala90-present         2.1 Plastic       ronstone       nat1       nat1       early 196b-160s+       cala90-present         2.2 Coranic       tronstone       prock       13       black       round shak, corroded       cala90-present         2.2 Coranic       tronstone       prock       13       round shak, badly corroded       198-spresent         2.2 Coranic       tronstone       prock       1       blue       square shak, badly corroded       198-ca. 1890         2.3 Glass       fron       prock	1.4	Ceramic	pearlware		4	white		1779-1820+
1.4       Metal       iron       1       more square shank, badly corroded       1795-1930s         SHOWEL TEST 2       2       Caramic       refined carthenware       1       white exterior glaze       1795-1930s         2.1       Glass       bottle       1       clear       blue lettering T CT DE/CA RT       1920s-present         2.1       Glass       curved       1       green       modern       1000-present       1900-present         2.1       Glass       curved       1       green       modern       1900-present       1900-present         2.1       Glass       marble       1       clear textured goose bump exterior, modern       1900-present       1900s-present         2.1       Glass       milk       natl       natl       natl       natl       1900-present         2.1       Glass       milk       natl       natl       natl       natl       1900s-present         2.1       Glass       milk       natl       natl       natl       natl       1900-present         2.1       Plastic       brick       1       35       red       carvid shank, badly corroded       1979-a.1890         2.2       Grenatic       iron       natl	1 4	Ceramic	pear]ware	rim	٦	white		1779-1820+
SHOUL TEST 2 2.1 Ceramic refined earthenware 1 white annular type blue interior, white extension glaze 2.1 Glass curved 1 clear blue lettering "ECT DE/CA R" 1920-present 2.1 Glass curved 1 clear blue lettering "ECT DE/CA R" 1920-present 2.1 Glass curved 1 clear blue lettering "ECT DE/CA R" 1920-present 2.1 Glass curved 1 clear blue lettering "ECT DE/CA R" 1920-present 2.1 Glass milk 1 clear modern 2.1 Glass milk 1 clear and textured goose burg exterior, modern 2.1 Glass milk 1 clear blue blue interior and textured goose burg exterior, modern 2.1 Flastic brick 1 35 red 1 black 1000-present 1900-present 2.2 Ceramic ironstone 2 white 2 white early 19chC. present 2.2 Ceramic whiteware footning 1 white square shank, badly corroded 1798-ca. 1890 2.2 Metal iron 2 5 2.3 Glass 1 flat 1 clear 2 square shank, badly corroded 1798-ca. 1890 SHOVEL TEST 4 4.2 Plastic bottle base 1 clear ridged resting point, concentric late 19th cpresent 1.1 Glass 1 clear 1 white aspirin type with safety closure 1941-present 2.3 Glass 2 bottle base 1 clear ridged resting point, concentric late 19th cpresent 2.4 Greanic kaolin pipe stem 1 white beer bottle type 104-present 2.5 SHOUL TEST 5 3.4 Glass 2 curved 1 green modern 1 and 2 clear 1 and 1 and 2 clear 1941-present 1941-present 1941-present 2.5 SHOUL TEST 6 3.6 Glass 3 Curved 1 green 1 and thite beer bottle type 1941-present 1940-present 1 3.7 Ceramic 151 6 3.8 Glass 1 aluminum 1 al 1	1.4	Metal	iron	1 (0)	1	ini i co	square shank, badly corroded	1772-10201
SINVEL TEST 2 2.1 Gramic refined eartherware $1$ white arnular type blue interior. 1795-1930s 2.1 Glass refined eartherware $1$ clear blue lettering "E CT D2/CA R" 1920s-present 2.1 Glass curved 1 clear modern 2.1 Glass curved 1 green modern 2.1 Glass milk and 1 clear textured goose burp exterior. modern 2.1 Glass milk and 1 clear textured goose burp exterior. modern 2.1 Glass milk and 1 clear textured goose burp exterior. modern 2.1 Glass milk and 1 clear textured goose burp exterior. modern 2.1 Glass milk and 1 clear textured goose burp exterior. modern 2.1 Glass milk and 1 clear textured goose burp exterior. modern 2.1 Glass milk and 1 clear textured goose burp exterior. modern 2.1 Glass milk and 1 clear textured goose burp exterior. 1901-present 2.1 Plastic tronstome footring 1 black reference textured goose burp exterior. 1905-present 2.2 Granic tronstome footring 1 black reference textured goose burp exterior. 1996-ca.1890-present 2.2 Granic tronstome footring 1 black reference textured goose burp exterior. 1996-ca.1890 2.2 Metal from nail 2 white square shark, badly corroded 1996-ca.1890 2.2 Shell clam footring 1 white square shark, badly corroded 1996-ca.1890 SHOVEL TEST 4 4.2 Plastic texture textur					177		- 1	
2.1       Caramic       refined canthenware       1       white       arnular type blue interior.       1795-1930s         2.1       Glass       butle       1       clear       blue lettering "E CT DE/CA R"       1920s-present         2.1       Glass       curved       1       clear       modern       1920s-present         2.1       Glass       curved       1       green       modern       1901-present         2.1       Glass       marble       1       clear       textured goes bump exterior.       1901-present         2.1       Glass       marble       1       clear       textured goes bump exterior.       1901-present         2.1       Glass       marble       1       clear/orange       1901-present       1905-present         2.1       Metal       fron       natil       1       black       1905-present       1905-present         2.1       Plastic       fron       natil       1       black       1901-present       1905-present         2.1       Plastic       ironstone       pron       135       red	SHOVEL	TEST 2						
2.1       Glass       bottle       1       clear       inderning Te CT DE/CA R       1920s-present         2.1       Glass       curved       1       clear       modern       inderning Te CT DE/CA R       1920s-present         2.1       Glass       curved       1       green       modern       inderning Te CT DE/CA R       1920s-present         2.1       Glass       curved       1       green       modern       inderning Te CT DE/CA R       1920s-present         2.1       Glass       curved       1       green       modern       inderning Te CT DE/CA R       1920s-present         2.1       Glass       marble       1       clear / drange       1901-present       inderning         2.1       Metal       iron       nail       1       white       roud shank. corroded       inderning       inderni	2.1	Ceramic	refined earthenware		1	white	annular type blue interior.	1795-1930s
2.1     Glass     butle     1     clear     blue lettring "E CT DE/CA R"     1920s-present       2.1     Glass     curved     1     green     modern     modern       2.1     Glass     curved     1     clear     modern     modern       2.1     Glass     curved     1     clear     modern     modern       2.1     Glass     milk     1     clear     modern     1800s-1960s+       2.1     Glass     milk     1     white     1800s-1960s+       2.1     Metal     iron     nail     1     round shank. conroded     ca.1890-present       2.1     Glass     milk     135     red     acily 19thCpresent     1970s-present       2.2     Ceramic     ironstone     2     white     square shank, badly corroded     1798-ca.1890       2.2     Ceramic     iron     nail     1     clear     square shank, badly corroded     1798-ca.1890       2.3     Glass     flat     1     clear     square shank, badly corroded     1798-ca.1890       2.3     Metal     iron     nail     1     white     aspirin type with safety closure     1941-present       2.4     Plastic     bottle     1     white<							white exterior glaze	
2. 1 Glass curved 1 clear modern 2. 1 Glass m'lk anal 1 clear modern 2. 1 Glass m'lk anal 1 clear curved 1 black corroded ca 1390-present 2. 1 Plastic for modern 2. 2 Ceramic from anil 1 black round shak, corroded 1970s-present 2. 2 Ceramic from anil 2 white carly 19th cpresent 2. 2 Ceramic from anil 2 square shak, badly corroded 1798-ca. 1890 2. 2 Metal from anil 2 square shak, badly corroded 1798-ca. 1890 2. 2 Metal from anil 2 square shak, badly corroded 1798-ca. 1890 2. 2 Metal from anil 2 square shak, badly corroded 1798-ca. 1890 2. 2 Metal from anil 2 square shak, badly corroded 1798-ca. 1890 2. 2 Metal from anil 2 square shak, badly corroded 1798-ca. 1890 2. 2 Metal from anil 2 square shak, badly corroded 1798-ca. 1890 SHOUEL TEST 4 4. 2 Plastic bottle base 1 clear from anil ? 3 square shak, badly corroded 1798-ca. 1890 SHOUEL TEST 5 5. 4 Ceramic kaolin pipe stem 1 white aspirin type with safety closure 1941-present embosed circles 5. 4 Glass curved 1 amber beer bottle type SHOUEL TEST 6 6. 3 Glass curved 1 modern from beer bottle type SHOUEL TEST 6 6. 3 Glass curved 1 modern from beer bottle type SHOUEL TEST 7 7. 2 Ceramic kaolin bick 1 5 red from beer bottle type SHOUEL TEST 7 7. 2 Ceramic from tab 1 curved 1 modern from beer bottle type SHOUEL TEST 7 7. 2 Ceramic from tab 1 curved 1 modern from beer bottle type SHOUEL TEST 7 7. 2 Ceramic from tab 1 curved 1 modern from beer bottle type SHOUEL TEST 7 7. 2 Ceramic from tab 1 curved 1 modern from beer bottle type SHOUEL TEST 7 7. 2 Ceramic from tab 1 from from beer bottle type SHOUEL TEST 7 7. 2 Ceramic from tab 1 from from beer bottle type from beer bottle type SHOUEL TEST 7 7. 2 Ceramic from tab 1 from from beer bottle type from beer bottle type SHOUEL TEST 7 7. 2 Ceramic from from from from from from from from	2.1	Glass		bottle	1	clear	blue lettering "E CT DE/CA R"	1920s-present
2. 1 Glass curved 1 green modern 2. 1 Glass curved 1 clear textured goose burn exterior. modern 2. 1 Glass milk nable 1 clear textured goose burn exterior. modern 2. 1 Glass milk nable 1 clear textured goose burn exterior. modern 2. 1 Glass milk nable 1 clear textured goose burn exterior. modern 2. 1 Glass milk ron nable 1 clear textured goose burn exterior. Multi's cube 1 black curved 2 clear textured goose burn exterior. 2. 2 Geranic tronstone 2 white early 19thC. present 2. 3 Metal iron 2 5 2. 3 Metal iron 2 5 2. 3 Metal iron 1 clear square shank, badly corroded 1798-ca. 1890 SMOVEL TEST 4 4. 2 Plastic bottle textured gooint, concentric late 19th cpresent 5. 4 Grass kaolin pipe stem 1 white aspirin type with safety closure 1941-present 5. 4 Glass curved 1 maber beer bottle type 5. 4 Glass curved 1 maber beer bottle type 5. 4 Glass curved 1 maber beer bottle type 5. 4 Glass curved 1 maber 1 side 19th cpresent 6. 3 Glass curved 1 maber 1 side 19th cpresent 5. 4 Glass curved 1 maber beer bottle type 5. 5. 6 modern. 6. 3 Glass curved 1 maber beer bottle type 5. 6 modern beer bottle type for present 1 maber beer bottle type 5. 7 C Geranic curved 1 maber 1 side 1940-present 1 maber beer bottle type 5. 7 C Geranic curved 1 maber beer bottle type for present 1 maber beer bottle type 5. 6 maber beer bottle type for present 1 maber bea	2.1	Glass		curved	1	clear	modern	
2. 1       Glass       curved       1       clear       tetwind goose bump exterior, modern         2. 1       Glass       milk       narble       1       clear/orange       1901-present.         2. 1       Glass       milk       narble       1       clear/orange       1901-present.         2. 1       Glass       milk       nail       milk       1000-present.       1890-present.         2. 1       Plastic       iron       nail       1       blick       roud shak, corroded       cal90-present.         2. 2       Ceranic       ironstone       poick       135       red       early 19th Cpresent         2. 2       Ceranic       ironstone       potick       135       red       early 19th Cpresent         2. 2       Ceranic       iron       nail       2       white       square shank, baily corroded       1798-ca. 1890         2. 2       Shell       clam       nail?       3       clear       square shank, baily corroded       1798-ca. 1890         2. 4       tetal       iron       nail?       3       clear       ridged resting point, concentric       late 19th cpresent         2. 3       Metal       iron       pipe stem       1	2.1	Glass		curved	1	green	modern	
Indem is a clarify or angemarbleindem is a clarify or angemarbleindem is a clarify or ange1901-present2.1Glassmilkinonnailiclarify or angenud shank, corroded1903-present1903-present2.1Metalironnailiblackround shank, corroded1970s-present1970s-present2.2Geranicironstonebrick1.35redwhiteearly 19thCpresentearly 19thCpresent2.2Geranicwhitewarefootring1whitesquare shank, badly corroded1798-ca.18902.2Glassironflat1clearsquare shank, badly corroded1798-ca.18902.2Shellclamironnail?3square shank, badly corroded1798-ca.1890SHOVELTEST 4ironnail?1clearsquare shank, badly corroded1941-presentSHOVELTEST 5bottle1whiteaspirin type with safety closure1941-presentSHOVELTEST 6curved1amberbeer bottle type1SHOVELTEST 6curved1amberbeer bottle type1970s-presentSHOVELTEST 7rurved1squeenmodern1970s-presentCarroediiiirurvedisqueenSHOVELTEST 7rurved1squeenmodern1970s-present	2.1	Glass		curved	1	clear	textured goose bump exterior.	
2.1Glassmarble1clear/orange1901-present2.1Glassmik1white1905-1960s+2.1Metalironnail1round shank, corrodedca.1890-present2.1Plasticronstonebrick1.35redearly 19thCpresent2.2Ceranicwhitewarefootring1whitesquare shank, badly corroded1795-ca.18902.2Metalironnail2whitesquare shank, badly corroded1795-ca.18902.2Metalironnail2square shank, badly corroded1798-ca.18902.2Metalironnail?3square shank, badly corroded1798-ca.18902.3Glassironnail?3square shank, badly corroded1798-ca.18902.4Metalironnail?3square shank, badly corroded1798-ca.18902.5SHOVEL TEST 4bottle1whiteaspirin type with safety closure1941-present2.4Startbottle1whiteaspirin type with safety closure1ate 19th cpresent2.5SHOVEL TEST 5bottle base1clearridged resting point, concentric1ate 19th cpresent2.5SHOVEL TEST 6curved1amberbeer bottle type1ate 19th cpresent5.4Ceranickaolinpipe stem1whitefrom beer bottle type6.3Glassaluminumtab1from							modern	
2. 1       Glass       mik       1       white       1990s-1960s+         2. 1       Plastic       iron       nail       1       black       round shak, corroded       ca.1890-present         2. 1       Plastic       iron       nail       1       black       round shak, corroded       ca.1890-present         2. 2       Ceramic       ironstone       prick       1 35       red       early 19th Cpresent         2. 2       Ceramic       whiteware       footring       1       white       square shak, badly corroded       178-ca.1890         2. 2       Shell       clam       25       square shak, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         2. 3       Metal       iron       nail       1       clear       square shak, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         SHOVEL TEST 4       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -         SHOVEL TEST 5       -       bottle       1       white       aspirin type with safety closure       1941-present         SHOVEL TEST 6       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -	2.1	Glass		marble	1	clear/ora	nge	1901-present
2. 1Metal Plasticironnaïl Rubik's cube1blackround shank, cornodedca.1890-present2. 2Ceramic Presentinon1 35 Pd 2 white Partic1 35 Pd 2 white Particround shank, cornodedca.1890-present2. 2Ceramic Particinon1 35 Pd Particround shank, cornodedca.1890-present2. 2Ceramic Particinon1 35 Pd Particround shank, badly cornodedround shank, cornoded2. 4Metal Particinonnaïl2 Particsquare shank, badly cornoded1798-ca.18902. 3Glass Particflat Partic1 Particclear Particsquare shank, badly cornoded1798-ca.18902. 3Metal Particinonnaïl1 Particclear Particsquare shank, badly cornoded1798-ca.18902. 4Metal Particinonnaïl1 Particclear Particsquare shank, badly cornoded1798-ca.1890SHOVEL TEST 4 4. 2Plasticinonnaïl1 Particclear Particridged resting point, concentric embossed circleslate 19th cpresent embossed circlesSHOVEL TEST 5 5. 1Glasscurved1 Particamber Particbeer bottle typeSHOVEL TEST 6 6. 3curved1 Particamber Particbeer bottle typeSHOVEL TEST 7 7. 2Ceramic Particbrick Partic15 Particround shank naïl with white Platif1941-present<	2.1	Glass	milk		1	white		1890s-1960s+
2. 1       Plastic       Rubik's cube       1       black       1970s-present         2. 2       Ceramic       ironstone       brick       1 35       red       early 19thCpresent         2. 2       Ceramic       ironstone       footning       1       white       early 19thCpresent         2. 2       Ceramic       iron       nail       2       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         2. 2       Shell       clam       1       clear       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         2. 3       Glass       iron       nail ?       3       clear       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         SHOVEL       TEST 4       1       clear       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca. 1890         SHOVEL       TEST 5       bottle       1       white       aspirin type with safety closure       1941-present         SHOVEL       TEST 5       bottle base       1       clear       ridged resting point, concentric       late 19th cpresent         SHOVEL       TEST 5       bottle base       1       clear       ridged resting point, concentric       late 19th cpresent         SHOVEL       TEST 6       i       Glass       curved	2.1	Metal	iron	nail	1		round shank, corroded	ca.1890-present
2. 2       Ceramic       ironstone       brick       1 35       red       early 19thCpresent       early 19thCpresent         2. 2       Ceramic       whiteware       footning       1       white       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         2. 2       Metal       iron       nail       2       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         2. 3       Glass       iron       flat       1       clear       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         2. 3       Metal       iron       flat       1       clear       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         2. 4       Metal       iron       flat       1       clear       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         2. 4       Plastic       bottle       1       white       aspirin type with safety closure       1941-present         SHOVEL       TEST 6       bottle base       1       clear       ridged resting point, concentric       late 19th cpresent         SHOVEL       TEST 6       curved       1       amber       beer bottle type       sets point       late 19th cpresent         6. 3       Glass       curved       1       amber       beer bottle type	2.1	Plastic		Rubik's cube	1	black		1970s-present
2.2       Ceramic       iron       prick       1 35       red         2.2       Ceramic       iron stone       2       white       early 19thCpresent         2.2       Metal       iron       nail       2       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         2.2       Metal       iron       nail       2       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         2.3       Glass       flat       1       clear       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         2.3       Metal       iron       nail       2       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         SHOVEL TEST 4       iron       nail       1       clear       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         SHOVEL TEST 4       iron       nail       1       white       aspirin type with safety closure       1941-present         SHOVEL TEST 5       .1       Glass       bottle base       1       clear       ridged resting point, concentric       late 19th cpresent         5.4       Ceramic       kaolin       pipe stem       1       white       set       set         5.4       Glass       curved       1       amber       beer bottle type       set	~ ^			1				
2. 2       Ceramic       ironstone       2       white       early 15thCpresent         2. 2       Ceramic       whiteware       footning       1       white       early 15thCpresent         2. 2       Metal       iron       nail       2       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         2. 2       Metal       iron       nail       2       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         2. 2       Shell       clam       2       5       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         2. 3       Metal       iron       nail       2       5       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         SHOEL       TEST 4       1       clear       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         SHOEL       TEST 5       bottle       1       white       aspirin type with safety closure       1941-present         SHOEL       TEST 5       bottle base       1       clear       ridged resting point, concentric       late 19th cpresent         SHOEL       TEST 6       curved       1       amber       beer bottle type       set of the same       set of the same         SHOEL       TEST 6       curved       1       amber <td< td=""><td>2.2</td><td>Ceramic</td><td>· · · · ·</td><td>Drick</td><td>1 35</td><td>red</td><td></td><td>_</td></td<>	2.2	Ceramic	· · · · ·	Drick	1 35	red		_
2. 2       Ceramic       whiteware       footring       1       white       early 19th C1900+         2. 2       Metal       iron       nail       2       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         2. 2       Metal       iron       nail       2       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         2. 3       Glass       flat       1       clear       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         2. 3       Metal       iron       nail       2       5       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         2. 3       Metal       iron       nail       1       clear       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         SHOVEL TEST 4       -       bottle       1       white       aspirin type with safety closure       1941-present         SHOVEL TEST 5       -       bottle base       1       clear       ridged resting point, concentric       late 19th cpresent         5. 4       Ceramic       kaolin       pipe stem       1       white       seer bottle type         5. 4       Glass       curved       1       amber       beer bottle type       seer bottle type         6. 3       Glass       curved       1	2.2	Ceramic	ironstone	-	2	white		early 19thCpresent
2. 2       Metal       iron       nail       2       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         2. 2       Metal       iron       1       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         2. 2       Shell       clam       2 5       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         2. 3       Glass       flat       1       clear       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         2. 3       Metal       iron       nail ?       3       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         2. 3       Metal       iron       nail ?       3       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca.1890         SHOVEL TEST 4        bottle       1       white       aspirin type with safety closure       1941-present         SHOVEL TEST 5        bottle base       1       clear       ridged resting point, concentric       late 19th cpresent         5. 4       Grass       curved       1       amber       beer bottle type         5. 4       Glass       curved       1       amber       beer bottle type         6. 3       Glass       curved       1       green       modern       from beverage can       1970s-present <t< td=""><td>2.2</td><td>Ceramic</td><td>whiteware</td><td>footring</td><td>1</td><td>white</td><td></td><td>early 19th C1900+</td></t<>	2.2	Ceramic	whiteware	footring	1	white		early 19th C1900+
2. 2       Metal       iron       1       square shank, badly corroded         2. 2       Shell       clam       2 5         2. 3       Glass       flat       1       clear         2. 3       Metal       iron       nail ?       3       square shank, badly corroded         2. 3       Metal       iron       nail ?       3       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca, 1890         SHOVEL TEST 4       bottle       1       white       aspirin type with safety closure       1941-present         SHOVEL TEST 5       5       1       Glass       bottle base       1       clear       ridged resting point, concentric       late 19th cpresent         SHOVEL TEST 5       5       4       Glass       curved       1       amber       beer bottle type         5. 4       Glass       curved       1       amber       beer bottle type       1         5. 4       Glass       curved       1       amber       beer bottle type       1         6. 3       Glass       curved       1       amber       from beer bottle type       1         6. 3       Slag       1       -5       from beer age can       1970s-present       1      <	2.2	Metal	iron	nail	2		square shank, badly corroded	1798-ca.1890
2. 2       Shell       clam       2 5         2. 3       Glass       flat       1       clear         2. 3       Metal       iron       nail ?       3       square shank, badly corroded       1798-ca, 1890         SHOVEL TEST 4       bottle       1       white       aspirin type with safety closure       1941-present         CHOWEL TEST 5       bottle       1       white       aspirin type with safety closure       1941-present         CHOWEL TEST 5       bottle base       1       clear       ridged resting point, concentric       late 19th cpresent         CHOWEL TEST 6       bottle base       1       clear       ridged resting point, concentric       late 19th cpresent         SHOVEL TEST 6       curved       1       amber       beer bottle type       state 19th cpresent         SHOVEL TEST 6       curved       1       amber       beer bottle type       state 19th cpresent         6. 3       Glass       curved       1       amber       beer bottle type       state 19th cpresent         6. 3       Glass       curved       1       amber       beer bottle type       state 19th cpresent         6. 3       Slag       1       state 1       1       from beverage c	2.2	Metal	iron		1		square shank, badly corroded	
2.3Glass Metalflat nail ?1clearsquare shank, badly corroded1798-ca. 1890SHOVEL TEST 4 4.2Plasticbottle1whiteaspirin type with safety closure1941-presentSHOVEL TEST 5 5.1Glassbottle base1clearridged resting point, concentriclate 19th cpresentSHOVEL TEST 6 5.4Glasspipe stem curved1white amberbeer bottle typeSHOVEL TEST 6 6.3Glass Glasscurved1green ambermodern beer bottle typeSHOVEL TEST 6 6.3Glass aluminumcurved1green ambermodern beer bottle typeSHOVEL TEST 7 7.2Ceramic rbrick nail15redround shank nail with white plastic nut?1941-present	2.2	Shell	clam		25			
Z. 3BiassTrat1Clear2. 3Metalironnail?3square shank, badly corroded1798-ca, 1890SHOVEL TEST 4bottle1whiteaspirin type with safety closure1941-presentCHOVEL TEST 5bottle1whiteaspirin type with safety closure1941-presentCHOVEL TEST 5bottle base1clearridged resting point, concentriclate 19th cpresentSHOVEL TEST 6curved1amberbeer bottle typeSHOVEL TEST 6curved1amberbeer bottle typeSHOVEL TEST 6curved1amberbeer bottle type6. 3Glasscurved1amberbeer bottle type6. 3Glasscurved1amberbeer bottle type6. 3Slags1clearfrom beverage can1970s-present6. 3Slag11square shank nail with white1941-present7. 2Ceramicprick15red7. 2Metal & Plasticnail1redround shank nail with white1941-present		0]		57 - 1				
2. 3       Metai       iron       nail?       3       square shank, badly corroded       1/98-ca. 1890         SHOVEL TEST 4       4. 2       Plastic       bottle       1       white       aspirin type with safety closure       1941-present         SHOVEL TEST 5       5. 1       Glass       bottle       1       clear       ridged resting point, concentric       late 19th cpresent         5. 4       Ceramic       kaolin       pipe stem       1       white       seer bottle type         5. 4       Glass       curved       1       amber       beer bottle type         SHOVEL TEST 6       curved       1       green       modern         6. 3       Glass       curved       1       amber       beer bottle type         6. 3       Glass       curved       1       amber       beer bottle type         6. 3       Glass       curved       1       amber       beer bottle type         6. 3       Glass       curved       1       amber       beer bottle type         6. 3       Slag       1        from beverage can       1970s-present         6. 3       Slag       1        round shank nail with white       1941-present <td>Z. 3</td> <td>Glass</td> <td>•</td> <td>TIAL</td> <td>1</td> <td>clear</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Z. 3	Glass	•	TIAL	1	clear		
SHOVEL 4.2FEST 4 Plasticbottle1whiteaspirin type with safety closure1941-presentSHOVEL 5.1Glassbottle base1clearridged resting point, concentriclate 19th cpresent5.4Geramic 6.3kaolinpipe stem curved1white amberbeer bottle typeSHOVEL 6.3Glass 6.3Glass aluminumcurved1green ambermodern beer bottle type6.3Glass 6.3Glass aluminumcurved1 ambergreen ambermodern beer bottle type6.3Slagsaluminum1green ambermodern beer bottle type6.3Slagsaluminum11green ambermodern beer bottle type from beverage can1970s-present6.3Slagbrick nil15red round shank nail with white1941-present	Z. 3	Metal	iron	nail ?	3		square shank, badly corroded	1798-ca, 1890
A. 2Plasticbottle1whiteaspirin type with safety closure1941-presentCHOVEL TEST 55. 1Glassbottle base1clearridged resting point, concentriclate 19th cpresentS. 4Ceramickaolinpipe stem1white5. 4Glasscurved1amberbeer bottle typeSHOVEL TEST 6curved1greenmodern6. 3Glasscurved1amberbeer bottle type6. 3Glasscurved1amberbeer bottle type6. 3Slag11from beverage can1970s-present6. 3Slag11round shank nail with white1941-present7. 2Ceramicbrick15round shank nail with white1941-present	SHOVE	TEST 4						
SHOVEL TEST 5       bottle base       1       minte       clear       ridged resting point, concentric late 19th cpresent embossed circles         5. 4       Ceramic       kaolin       pipe stem       1       white         5. 4       Glass       curved       1       amber       beer bottle type         SHOVEL TEST 6       curved       1       green       modern         6. 3       Glass       curved       1       amber         6. 3       Slass       curved       1       amber         6. 3       Slass       curved       1       amber         6. 3       Slass       curved       1       amber         6. 3       Slag       1       -5       5         SHOVEL TEST 7       7       2       Ceramic       brick       1 5         7. 2       Metal & Plastic       nail       1       round shank nail with white       1941-present	4 2	Plastic		bottle	1	white	aspirin type with safety closure	1941-present
SHOVEL TEST 5bottle base1clearridged resting point, concentriclate 19th cpresent5. 4Glassbottle base1white amberbeer bottle type5. 4Glasscurved1amberbeer bottle typeSHOVEL TEST 6 6. 3Glass curvedcurved1green ambermodern beer bottle type6. 3Glass curvedcurved1amber amberbeer bottle type6. 3Glass curved1amber amberbeer bottle type6. 3Slag11red6. 3Slag1117. 2Ceramic ramicbrick15SHOVEL TEST 7 7. 2Metal & Plasticbrick15Additional & Plasticnail11red round shank nail with white1941-present plastic nut?	л. <b>н</b>	, labore		500010	-	MITTEE	dopin in type with objecty crosure	1941 presene
5. 1       Glass       bottle base       1       clear       ridged resting point, concentric late 19th cpresent embossed circles         5. 4       Geramic       kaolin       pipe stem curved       1       white amber       beer bottle type         SHOVEL TEST 6       curved       1       green curved       modern       beer bottle type         6. 3       Glass       curved       1       amber       beer bottle type         6. 3       Glass       curved       1       amber       beer bottle type         6. 3       Glass       curved       1       amber       beer bottle type         6. 3       Slag       1       1       from beverage can       1970s-present         6. 3       Slag       1       1       from beverage can       1970s-present         6. 3       Slag       1       1       from beverage can       1970s-present         6. 3       Slag       1       1       from beverage can       1970s-present         7. 2       Ceramic       prick       1       fround shank nail with white       1941-present         7. 2       Metal & Plastic       nail       1       fround shank nail with white       1941-present	SHOVEL	TEST 5						
startstartstartpipe stem: curved1 mberwhite memberbeer bottle typeSHOVEL TEST 6 6.3 Glass 6.3 Slagcurved t 1 tab1 green modern beer bottle type from beverage can from beverage can1970s-presentSHOVEL TEST 7 7.2 Ceramicbrick nail15 1red plastic nut?1941-present plastic nut?	5.1	Glass		bottle base	1	clear	ridged resting point, concentric	late 19th cpresent
<ul> <li>5. 4 Ceramic kaolin pipe stem curved 1 white amber beer bottle type</li> <li>SHOVEL TEST 6</li> <li>6. 3 Glass curved 1 green modern</li> <li>6. 3 Glass curved 1 amber beer bottle type</li> <li>6. 3 Glass aluminum tab 1 </li> <li>5. 4 Slag</li> </ul>							embossed circles	,
5. 4 Ceramic kaolin pipe stem 1 white 5. 4 Glass curved 1 amber beer bottle type          SHOVEL TEST 6         6. 3 Glass       curved 1 green modern         6. 3 Glass       curved 1 amber beer bottle type         6. 3 Glass       curved 1 amber beer bottle type         6. 3 Glass       curved 1 state         6. 3 Slag       1          7. 2 Ceramic       brick       1 5         7. 2 Metal & Plastic       brick       1 5         7. 2 Metal & Plastic       nail       1								
5.4       Glass       curved       1       amber       beer bottle type         SHOVEL TEST 6	5.4	Ceramic	kaolin	pipe stem	1	white		
SHOVEL TEST 6       6.3 Glass       curved       1       green       modern         6.3 Glass       curved       1       amber       beer bottle type         6.3 Metal       aluminum       tab       1       from beverage can       1970s-present         6.3 Slag       1       1       from beverage can       1970s-present         7.2 Ceramic       brick       1 5       red       round shank nail with white       1941-present         7.2 Metal & Plastic       nail       1       round shank nail with white       1941-present	5.4	Glass		curved	1	amber	beer bottle type	
SHOVEL TEST 6         6. 3 Glass       curved       1       green       modern         6. 3 Glass       curved       1       amber       beer bottle type         6. 3 Metal       aluminum       tab       1       from beverage can       1970s-present         6. 3 Slag       1       1       store and tab       1       from beverage can       1970s-present         6. 3 Slag       1       1       5       store and tab       1       store and tab         7. 2 Ceramic       brick       1.5       red       round shark nail with white       1941-present         7. 2 Metal & Plastic       nail       1       round shark nail with white       1941-present	2000 E1	TFOT C						
6.3     Glass     curved     1     green     modern       6.3     Glass     curved     1     amber     beer bottle type       6.3     Metal     aluminum     tab     1     from beverage can     1970s-present       6.3     Slag     1 <5	SHUVEL	IESI 6		,	-			
6.3     Glass     curved     1     amber     beer bottle type       6.3     Metal     aluminum     tab     1     from beverage can     1970s-present       6.3     Slag     1 <5	6.3	Glass		curved	Ţ	green	modern	
6.3       Metal       aluminum       tab       1       from beverage can       1970s-present         6.3       Slag       1 <5	6.J	Glass		curved	1	amber	beer bottle type	
6. 3 Slag       1 < 5	6.3	Metal	aluminum	tab	1		from beverage can	1970s-present
SHOVEL TEST       7         7. 2       Ceramic         7. 2       Metal & Plastic         7. 2       Metal & Plastic         9       1         1       round shank nail with white         1       1941-present         1       plastic nut?	6.3	Slag			1 <5			
Anover rear     7.       7.     2       7.     2       7.     2       7.     2       8     Plastic       1     round shank nail with white       1     1       1     plastic nut?	CUNVEL	TECT 7						
7. 2 Metal & Plastic nail 1 round shank nail with white 1941-present nlastic nut?	7 2	Ceramic		brick	15	red		
nlastic nut?	7 2	Metal & Plas	tic	nail	1		round shank nail with white	1941-present
	··· -				-		plastic nut?	

.

J

1

1

# ARTIFACT INVENTORY FOR RUFUS KING PARK ARCHAEOLOGICAL TESTING

CONTEX	T MATERIAL	IDENTITY	FORM	# ₩T-g	COLOR	DESCRIPTION	DATE RANGE
7.2	Plastic		cap	1	clear	embossed "LIFT BAIL/57/PULL OUT/5"	1941-present
73 73 3 73	Plastic Metal Metal Metal	iron ìron alloy	rim nail nail tack	1 1 1	c]ear	slight patina round shank, corroded square shank, badly corroded corroded	1930s-present ca.1890-present 1798-ca.1890
7 4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4	Glass Glass & Metal Metal Metal	aluminum alloy	light bulb window bottle cap hardware plate	1 1 1	clear clear	reinforced plate glass corroded 10 1/2" x 5" with two squares folded out of the middle for holes, 1" and 7/8"	
75 75	Ceramic Stone	porcelain	tile flake ?	1 1	white		
SHOVEL 8. 1	TEST 8 Ceramic	earthenware	tile	1	white	tin glaze one side, embossed on other "MA" "DE"?	
8.3 8.3	Glass Glass	milk	bottle finish tile	1 1	green white	wine type, machine made back side textured	late 19th cpresent 1890s-1960s+
84	Ceramic	creamware		1	white		1762-1820
540VEL 9.1 9.1 9.1	TEST 9 Ceramic Glass Metal	pear]ware iron	curved	1 1 1	white green	green shell edge modern round shank fragment	mid 1770s-1840s
9,2 9,2 9,2	Ceramic Plastic Plastic	ironstone	tile bead? flat	2 1 1	white blue aqua	bathroom type: mends	early 19thCpresent 1930s-present 1930s-present
9.3 9.3 3 3 3 3 3	Ceramic Coal Glass Glass Glass	whiteware .	rim curved curved bottle base	1 1 1 1	white amber amber amber	textured exterior beer type, machine made, ridged resting point, embossed heel "SE	early 19th C1900+ late 19th cpresent
9.3 9.3 9.3	Glass Glass Glass	mi]k	curved curved tile	1 1 1	green clear white	UON ILK". base "10/31/89 <motif>" textured one side</motif>	1890s-1960s+
SHOVEL 10.3 10.3	TEST 10 Ceramic Glass	ironstone	curved	1 1	white clear	modern	early 19thC -present
10.4 194 10.4 10.4	Ceramic Ceramic Metal Metal	creamware copper iron	brick rim tack hardware	2 <5 1 1 2	red white	furniture type hook?. badly corroded	1762-1820

# ARTIFACT INVENTORY FOR RUFUS KING PARK ARCHAEOLOGICAL TESTING

CONTEXT MAT	TERIAL	IDENTITY	FORM	# ₩T-g	COLOR	DESCRIPTION	DATE RANGE
SHOVEL TEST	T 11					÷	
11. 3 Gla	22		marble	1	blue	swirled	1901-present
11.4 Gla	55		curved	1	aqua	vial?	
11. 4 Met	al	iron	nail	1		square shank. badly corroded	1798-ca.1890
11.4 Met	al	iron		1		square shank fragment	
1-07EL TEST	T 12						
12.3 Cer	amic	porcelain	base	1	white	blue interior. white exterior glaze	
12. 3 Cer	amic	redware	flower pot	1			
12. 3 Cer	amic	refined earthenware		1	white	blue annular exterior glaze	1795-1930s
SHOVEL TEST	T 13						
13.1 Met.	al	copper alloy	nickel	1		1961	1961
13. 3 Cera	amic	redware	flower pot rim	1	red		
13. 3 Cera	amic	creamware		2	white		1762-1820
13. 3 Cera	amic	pearlware	rim	1	white	blue underglaze decoration interior	1779-1820+
13. 3 Cera	amic	redware		1	red	manganese glaze interior.	late 17th-late 19thC
13. 3 Gla	ss		curved	1	amber	slight patina	
13, 4 Cer	amic	creamware	spall	1	white		1762-1820
11 4 Cer	amic	pearlware		2	white	blue underglaze decoration. mends	1779-1820+
SHOVEL TEST	T 14						
14. 1 Gla:	22		bottle base	1	green	soda type, embossed heel "BW-". ridged resting point	late 19th cpresent
14.1 Gla	\$5		bottle finish	1	amber	machine made. screw top	1889-present
14. 2 Cer	amic	creamware		1			1762-1820
14. 3 Cera	amic	creamware	rim	1	white		1762-1820
14. 3 Cer	amic	refined earthenware	rim	1	white	burned	ca.1800-present
14.3 Met	al	iron	nail	3		square shank fragments, badly corroded	1798-ca.1890
SHOVEL TEST	⊺ 16						
16 2 Cer	amic	redware	flower pot rim	1	red		
16 2 Gla:	\$5		bottle base	1	clear	machine made, embossed "TLE"	late 19th cpresent
16.2 Met	al	iron		1		badly corroded	
16. 3 Cer	amic		brick	5 10	red		- 740 - 660
16. 3 Cer	amic	creamware		1	white	have and hit as the state of the state of	1/62-1820
16. 3 ter	amic	pearlware		1	white	underglaze interior	1810-1835
16.3 Cer	amic	pearlware		1	white		1/79-1820+
16.3 Cer	amic	whiteware	<b>G</b>	2	white	mends	early 19th C1900+
16.3 Gla:	ss al	iron	ilat nail	2	pare aqua	square shank badly corroded	1798-ca.1890
				-		-1	
16.4 Cer	amic	pearlware		1	white	glaze spalled	1779-1820+
16.4 Cer	amic	whiteware		1	white	g‡aze spalled	early 19th C1900+

.

# ARTIFACT INVENTORY FOR RUFUS KING PARK ARCHAEOLOGICAL TESTING

.

CONTEXT MATERIAL	IDENTITY	FORM	# WT-	g COLOR	DESCRIPTION	DATE RANGE
SHOVEL TEST 17 17. 4 Ceramic	whiteware	·	1	white		early 19th C1900+
						-
SHOVEL TEST 18 18. 2 Metal	iron	nail	1		square shank, badly corroded	1798-ca.1890
		haid	1 ~6	and		
4 Ceramic	pearlware	DITICK	1 \5 3	white		1779-1820+
JOVEL TEST 19						
19.1 Glass		bottle base	3	clear	machine made, ovoid, textured bottom, mends	late 19th cpresent
19. 3 Ceramic	creamware		1	white		1762-1820
19.3 Ceramic	pearlware	rim	1	white	hand painted blue underglaze decoration interior	1779-1820+
19 3 Metal	iron	nail	1		square shank, badly corroded	1798-ca.1890
SHOVEL TEST 20						
20.1 Ceramic	creamware		1	white		1762-1820
20.1 Ceramic	redware	flower pot	1	red		
20. 1 Glass		curved	1	clear		
20. 2 Glass		drinking base/	sidel	clear	tumbler?, faceted exterior side	
SHOVEL TEST 22						
.12 2 Ceramic	ironstone		2.	white	partially burned: mends	early 19thCpresent
2 2 Ceramic	whiteware	rim ?	1	white		early 19th C1900+
22. 2 Glass		curved	1	green	modern, soda bottle type	
22. 2 Glass		curved	1	amber	modern, beer bottle type	
22. 2 Glass		Tlat	1	blue	white paint stripe one side	
ZZ. Z GIASS	allau	naroware :	3	DIACK	allon at amotion	
22. 2 Metal	alloy Joco	washer : nail	1		source shark hadly conneded	1709 ~ 1900
22. 2 Metal	iron/copper	hardware	1		parallelogramic shape, 7/8"	1/30-Cd.1030
<b>—</b> 22 2 Disatés		augura d	,		long, corroded	a 1020 ann ant
ZZ. Z Plastic		curved	1	orange		c.1930-present
SHOVEL TEST 23		N - 200 N	700 - 400 1900			
23. 2 Ceramic	27.22	brick	1 90	red		1760 1000
23. 2 Ceramic	creamware	battle losse	1	White	and first weeks and have been a first	1762-1820
23. 2 Glass		DOTTIE Dase	1	clear	point, embossed "21"	late 19th cpresent
SHC/EL TEST 24						
■ 24 3 Ceramic	pearlware ?	rim	1	white	blue transfer print both sides. slightly burned	1783-ca.1900
SHOVEL TEST 26						
26. 2 Ceramic	creamware		5	white		1762-1820
26.2 Ceramic	ironstone		1	white		early 19thCpresent
.26.2 Ceramic	pearlware		2	white	blue shell edge; scalloped; impressed lines; mends	mid.1770s-1860
26. 2 Ceramic	pearlware		2	white	- Province a construction of a second second	1779-1820+
26. 2 Ceramic	redware		2	red	glaze spalled	late 17th-late 19thC
26. 2 Ceramic	redware		1	red	manganese specks in clear glaze	late 17th-late 19thC
📕 26. 2 Ceramic	redware	flower pot	1	red		

# ARTIFACT INVENTORY FOR RUFUS KING PARK ARCHAEOLOGICAL TESTING

CONT	EXT M	<b>IATERIAL</b>	IDENTITY	FORM	# ₩T-g	COLOR	DESCRIPTION	DATE RANGE
26.	2 Ce	eramic	whiteware		3	white		early 19th C -1900+
26.	2 Ce	eramic	stoneware		1	red	gray exterior, slip interior	early 18thCpresent
26.	2 G1	ass		curved	3	green	slight patina	•
<b>2</b> 6.	2 G1	ass		curved	1	clear	modern	
26	2 Me	al	iron	nail	1	creat	square shank hadly corroded	1708 63 1900
	2 11			((a ) )	r		square shank, badiy corroded	1790-08.1090
	EL TE	ST 27						
27.	1 Me	etal	iron	nail	1		square cut, badly corroded	1798-ca.1890
27.	1 P1	astic		ะา์ก	1	pink		1930s-present
27	2 Ce	eramic	refined earthenware	snall	2	white		ca 1800-present
27	2 61	acc	, er med eur brendere	flat	1	clear		ca. 1000-present
27.	2 01	055		1100	<u>, Т</u>			
_ 27	3 Ce	eramic	whiteware	rim	1	white		early 19th C1900+
LeO.	IFL TE	ST 31						
	1 Me	atal	iron	nail	1		square shank hadly connoded	1709 ca 1900
51.	I ne		ii on	hatt	*		square shank, baary corrobed	1/90-La.1090
SHOV	EL TE	ST 33						
33.	l Ce	eramic	porcelain	rím	1	white	blue hand painted interior rim	
-								
SHOV	EL TE	ST 34						
34.	2 Ce	eramic	ironstone		1	white		early 19thCpresent
<b>-</b> 34	2 Me	tal	iron	nail	1		square shank, badly corroded	1798-ca.1890
📕 E.J	EL TE	ST 35						
3é.	1 Ce	ramic	creamware		1	white		1762-1820
					-			1,02 1020
SHOV	EL TE	ST 36						
<b>3</b> 6.	1 Me	tal	iron	nail	1		badly corroded	
					-			
36.	2 Ce	ramic	kaolin	pipe stem	1	white		
_								
SHOV	'EL TE	ST 37						
37.	3 P1	astic		hardware?	2	white	mends	1930s-present
					-			19005 present
SHOV	'EL TE	ST 39						
39.	3 G1	ass		curved	1	clear		
<b>3</b> 9.	3 Me	tal	iron	nail	1		round shank, corroded	ca.1890-present
								16 (F. 1250) (F. <b>1</b> 7 DECOMPOSIDE
39.	5 Ce	ramic	stoneware		1	buff	brown exterior, unglazed	early 18thCpresent
							interior	<ul> <li>Me terre fire consists a</li> </ul>
-								
SHOV	'EL TE	ST 40	30790-50					
40	4 G1	ass	milk		1	white	embossed floral exterior	1890s-1960s+
40.	4 Me	tal	iron	hardware ?	2		badly corroded	
40.	5 Bo	ne	COW	rib	8		fragments likely from the same	
							rib	
-	(C) TC	CT 41						
SHUV		SI 41	<b>z</b> z ) .1		-	1.74 ·		
41,	ა Ce	ramic	refined earthenware		Z	white		ca.1800-present
41.	3 Co	ncrete			1 190			
41.	3 Me	tal	iron	nail	1		square shank, badly corroded	1798-ca.1890
41,	3 Me	tal	iron	nail	1		round shank, badly corroded	ca.1890-present
41.	3 Me	tal			1		badly corroded; unidentifiable	
							and UD	

# ARTIFACT INVENTORY FOR RUFUS KING PARK ARCHAEOLOGICAL TESTING

	MATERIAL	IDENTITY	FORM	# ₩T-g (	Collor	DESCRIPTION	DATE RANGE
41.4	Ceramic		brick	1 50	red		
41.4	Metal	iron	hardware ?	1		round disk shape, badly corrode	d
41.4	Metal	iron		1		square shank fragment, corroded	
41.4	Mortar			1 10	white		
41.5	Ceramic		brick	1 915	red	half: hand made: trace of white on edge: 2 1/8" x 3 1/2" x ?	
41 5	Concretion			15	white		
	TEST 42						
42. 2	Bone	rodent ?	femur.	1			
42.2	Ceramic	pearlware		2	white		1779-1820+
_ 42 3	Ceramic	refined earthenware		1	white	spall	ca. 1800-present
42 3	Ceramic	white granite		1	white	- <b>F</b> - · · ·	1840s-c 1900
42.3	Glass	initiae grantae	curved	1	green	slight patina	10/05/0.1900
<b>—</b> A2 A	Bana	CD14	molan	2		monds	
42.4	Conamia	204	hoiai	1 340	nod	inerius	
42.4	Cenamic	0003mu300	DITER	2 240	vehito.		1762 1020
46. 4 • A	Clean	Crealiware	and the second	3	WITTLE	-link - time	1/02-1020
- 4	blass Dlastin		curvea	2 <b>⊥</b> 0 2 <b>1</b>	green blue Pu	Stigni patina	1000
4	Plastic		straw	1	DILLEAW	mite	1930-present
42.5	Ceramic	whiteware		1	white		early 19th C1900
SHOVEL	TEST 101						
101. 2	Ceramic	pearlware		1	white		1779-1820+
SHOVEL	TEST 103						
103. 2	Ceramic		brick	55	red		
103. 2	Ceramic	ironstone	base	1	white		early 19thCprese
103 2	Ceramic	porcelain		1	white		F
103 2	Metal	iron	nail	î		square shank badly corroded	1798-ca 1890
103 2	Mortar		hari	1 30		sample	1770 00.1070
- 100. L				1 00		Sumpre	
SHOVEL	TEST 104						
104.3	Ceramic		brick	1 125	red		
<b>—</b> 104. 3	Mortar			15	white		
SHOVEL	TEST 107						
107.1	Metal			1		conglomerate	
107.2	Asphalt			1 20			
107 2	Concrete			1 45			
101 2	Glass		bottle	1	areen	modern embossed "ML ("	1867-present
vr. 2			200010		3	maderin, energiado ne (	Loor productio

TOTAL ARTIFACTS RECOVERED FROM SHOVEL TESTS 265 - 1900 grams

# ARTIFACT INVENTORY FOR RUFUS KING PARK ARCHAEOLOGICAL TESTING

CONTEXT	MATERIAL	IDENTITY	FORM	# COLOR	DESCRIPTION	DATE RANGE
	N DATE					
10/16/96	Ceramic	redware	flower not	1 red		1725 procent
10/16/96	Ceramic	redware	flower pot base	2 red	two different vessels	1725-present
10/16/96	Ceramic	redware	flower pot rim	6 red	six different vessels	1725-present
. N. LECTIO	N DATE					
3 19/97	Ceramic	pearlware		1 white	blue transfer print exterior	c.1795-1840
03, 19/97	Ceramic	redware		l red	white slip interior	1750-1875
03/19/97	Glass		bottle base	l green	empontilled push-up; 3 3/4"	c.1740-1820s
				-	diameter	
COLLECTIO	n date					
03/20/97	Ceramic	pearlware		1 white	blue transfer print exterior	c.1795-1840
03/20/97	Ceramic	refined earthenware		1 white	blue transfer print	1783-c.1900
COLLECTIO	N DATE					
03/24/97	Ceramic	redware	flower pot	l red		1725-present
03/24/97	Ceramic	redware	flower pot base	l red		1725-present
03/24/97	Ceramic	whiteware	rím	1 white	blue transfer print rim	early 19th C1900+
	N DATE					
03/25/97	Ceramic	ironstone		1 white	molded exterior decoration	early 19th Connesen
77 25/97	Ceramic	porcelain	rim	1 white	orange banded interior: burned	iy tour o presen
25/97	Ceramic	whiteware	lid	1 white	brown glaze decoration on	early 19th C1900+
					exterior	
03/25/97	Glass		marble	l clear	white inclusions with green hue	1901-present

TOTAL ARTIFACTS RECOVERED FROM COLLECTION 21

TOTAL ARTIFACTS RECOVERED FROM FENCE CONTRACT 286 - 1900 grams