■ 7439m ■ Stone 2006

966

REPORT ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING OF TEST PITS AS PART OF THE MOLD ABATEMENT PROJECT AT BUILDING 214 WITHIN FORT JAY ON GOVERNORS ISLAND NEW YORK, NEW YORK



Building 214 facing north.

Rec e LPC

Prepared for: National Park Service Northeast Region

Submitted by: Linda Stone, MA, RPA 249 East 48th Street, #12B New York, New York 10017

December 14, 2006

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is a report on the archaeological monitoring of two test pits that were excavated as part of a mold abatement program at Building 214 in Fort Jay on Governors Island, New York City, within the Governors Island National Monument. This report is being prepared to comply with Section 106 requirements and meets the standards of both the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (SHPO) and the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC). The work was conducted for the National Park Service by Linda Stone, RPA.

Previous research indicted the potential to identify archaeological resources within the test pit locations.

٩.

÷ 3

Test Pit 1 was located abutting the foundation in the areaway behind Building 214. It contained an artifact rich deposit of mottled soil of undetermined origin. Initial analysis indicates the cultural material dates from the mideighteenth or early-nineteenth century. Additional artifact analysis and interpretation is recommended. Should additional below ground actions be planned behind Building 214, preconstruction archaeological testing is recommended.

Test Pit 2 was excavated inside the basement of Building 214. It contained a rubble layer beneath the concrete flooring. The rubble was underlain by culturally sterile subsoil. No further archaeological work was recommended for that area. However, should additional excavations beneath the flooring be conducted, it could be useful to have an archaeological monitor to ensure no intact ground surfaces exist below the building.

SHPO MANAGEMENT SUMMARY FORM

ţ

SHPO Project Review Number (if available):	
Involved State and Federal Agencies (DEC, CORPS, FHWA, etc): National Park Service	
Phase of Survey: 1B	
Location Information Location: Governors Island, New York City – Fort Jay, Building 214 Minor Civil Division: n/a County: New York	ž
Survey Area (Metric & English) - Monitoring of 2 test pits Length: 3 feet (91 cm) and 3.5 feet (107 cm) Width: 3 feet (91 cm) and 3.5 feet (107 cm) Depth: (when appropriate): 4.1 feet (125 cm) and 2.2 feet (67 cm) Number of Acres Surveyed: n/a Number of Square Meters & Feet Excavated (Phase II, Phase III only): n/a Percentage of the Site Excavated (Phase II, Phase III only): n/a	
USGS 7.5 Minute Quadrangle Map: Jersey City, NJ - NY	•• *
Archaeological Survey Overview n/a Number & Interval of Shovel Tests: n/a Number & Size of Units: 2 test pits were monitored (see above for size) Width of Plowed Strips: n/a Surface Survey Transect Interval: n/a	
Results of Archaeological Survey Number & name of prehistoric sites identified: n/a Number & name of historic sites identified: n/a Number & name of sites recommended for Phase II/Avoidance: 1 artifact concentration	
Results of Architectural Survey Number of buildings/structures/cemeteries within project area: n/a Number of buildings/structures/cemeteries adjacent to project area: n/a Number of previously determined NR listed or eligible buildings/structures/cemeteries/districts: n/a Number of identified eligible buildings/structures/cemeteries/districts: n/a	n/a
Report Author(s): Linda Stone, RPA	

Date of Report: December 14, 2006

....

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary SHPO Management Summary Form
List of Figures and Photographsii
INTRODUCTION
SITE HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL
Pre-Contact Period
Historic Period
METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS
Test Pit 1
Test Pit 2
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FIGURES AND PHOTOGRAPHS after 6
BIBLIOGRAPHY

×*

APPENDICES

-

Appendix A – Scope of Work Appendix B – Preliminary Artifact Inventory

÷

LIST OF FIGURES

Location of Governors Island in I	New	York City.	
	Location of Governors Island in 1	Location of Governors Island in New	Location of Governors Island in New York City.

Figure 2 Location of Buildings 214 within Fort Jay and Governors Island.

- Figure 3 Location of Test Pits at Building 214 in Fort Jay on Governors Island.
- Figure 4 Einhorn Yaffee Prescott drawing of the western basement floor plan of Building 214 showing the location of Test Pit 1.

Figure 5 East profile of Test Pit 1.

Figure 6 Einhorn Yaffee Prescott drawing of the eastern basement floor plan of Building 214 showing the location of Test Pit 2.

LIST OF PHOTOGRAPHS

- Cover Building 214 facing north.
- Photo 1 Test Pit 1 being jackhammered.

Photo 2 Test Pit 1 at the completion of excavation facing east.

Photo 3 Sample of ceramics from TP1 Stratum 2 Level 2, including stoneware, tin-glazed earthen ware and slipware.

Photo 4 Test Pit 2 at completion of excavation facing north (black and white sticks are 3 feet long).

INTRODUCTION

The National Park Service (NPS) is in the process of rehabilitating the buildings within Fort Jay on Governors Island within the Governors Island National Monument. One of the initial steps in this process is mold abatement at Building 214 (see Figures 1 and 2). This building was originally constructed as one of four barracks between 1834 – 1837. The building replaced an earlier structure located somewhat to the south (Yokum 2005: 194, 203). Building 214 was later used as housing by the Coast Guard during their tenure at Governors Island.

The National Park Service, the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) had previously indicated archaeological monitoring of the test pits for the mold abatement work would be appropriate for this project. Two test pits were planned by the engineers, one inside of Building 214 and the other outside of the building in the areaway (Figure 3).

This report will present the findings of archaeological monitoring conducted for the Building 214 test pits. The work has been done in accordance with the guidelines of both the New York State Office of Parks Recreation and Historic Preservation and the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission. This report was prepared by Linda Stone, RPA for the National Park Service. The archaeological fieldwork described in this report was conducted by Ms: Stone on November 13 and 14, 2006. The author would like to acknowledge the assistance of Linda Neal, William Griswold and Edward Lorenzini of the National Park Service and Ron Batcher of Einhorn Yaffee Prescott (EYP) for facilitating the archaeological component of this project.

¥.

SITE HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

Pre-Contact Period

There is no documentation indicating the potential for the Building 214 work to impact any archaeological resources from the Pre-Contact period. However, there are three documented Native American sites on Governors Island and Native American cultural material has been found on the Island in redeposited contexts (PAL 1996: 11; Stone 2006: 10; UMass 2003: 110-111).

Historic Period

Fort Jay, as it exists today, was constructed in 1806, although earlier fortifications on the Island have been documented. "Parts of the 1794 fortification may have been incorporated into what is now Fort Jay" (PAL 1996: 17). Building 214 was constructed in the 1830s, but earlier barracks existed to the south within the fort. There were also barracks for the period after the British withdrawal in 1783 and the end of the eighteenth century when. Governors Island was ceded to the federal government. Limited previous knowledge exists for the location of these.

35

1. a 1

Previous archaeological testing behind the existing barracks was conducted for only the other three barracks, but not, for Building 214 (PAL 1997: 43). Results of that testing indicate "no intact deposits or features relating to the pre-1806 fortification were identified within the present fort walls" (PAL 1997: 51-54). However, material remains from over two centuries of use were recovered from disturbed strata.

Potential archaeological resources within the Building 214 test pit locations include possible builder's trench, trash deposits and other unknown features. The work was also expected to provide an opportunity to document stratigraphy in those locations.

5

METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS

This section describes the work at each test pit and the findings. The scope of work for archaeological monitoring is attached as Appendix A. It included the ability of the archaeologist to temporarily halt excavations should any potentially significant archaeological resources be encountered during contractor excavations. Test pits were hand excavated by the contractor using a shovel after jackhammering through the overlying concrete. Stratigraphy was recorded on forms and is summarized in the tables below. The elevations were recorded as depth below the top of the concrete. The concrete was not given a stratum/level designation. Test Pit 1 was temporarily stopped for archaeological purposes at about three feet below the top of the paving. After that point in time, excavation was continued and all the soil was screened through ¼ inch mesh until the base of excavation. Artifacts were sampled. Photographs were taken in the field of all artifacts found during screening. All ceramics were retained. Other categories of artifacts were sampled with a variety of what was observed was saved. Corroded nails and brick fragments were noted and not retained.

The recovered artifacts were washed and rebagged in plastic zip bags labeled "Governors Island Fort Jay Building 214" and the test pit number, stratum and level. The artifacts were not individually labeled at the request of the National Park Service. The attached artifact inventory is considered preliminary because a complete catalog will be developed by the National Park Service under another contract. That will involve labeling and coding according to the NPS requirements. Minimal time was spent preparing the attached inventory and the date ranges included are based on the author's existing database which used the references listed in the bibliography at the end of this report. No research was done on the specific pieces recovered during the Building 214 test pit work. Table 1 is a summary of artifacts counted in the field and those inventoried by material type.

× +

	CONTEXT TP.Str.Lev	BONE	BRICK	CERAMIC	CHERT	GLASS	METAL	SHELL- CLAM	SHELL- OYSTER	SHELL- SCALLOP	SMOKING PIPE	
	,1.2.1	2 - 2	0 - 2	.2 - 2		1 - 1	0 - 1		0-3	1977-18	ĩ	
1	1.2.2,	18 - 49	2-7	34 - 34		6-20.	4-4	2-6	2-42,		5-5	
	1.2.3	12 - 40	0 - 2	17 - 17	1 - 1	4-7		1-6	3 - 39	1-1	1-1	

Table 1- Artifact Counts
- Numbers represent artifacts retained – total artifacts observed

Test Pit 1

12

Test Pit 1 (TP1) was located on the exterior of Building 214 within the areaway, 11.4 feet east of the end of the areaway (see Figure 4 and Photo 1). It measured three by three feet. The stratigraphy is summarized in Table 2.

After the initial layer of concrete was removed, the soil was dark yellowish brown silty sand. No artifacts were detected, but a fragment of oyster shell was observed and not retained. This soil deposit was underlain by more concrete. Subsequent research by EYP showed that the areaway was built in 1929 and the lower concrete slab was poured in 1939.

The second layer of concrete was underlain by mottled silty sand that was finer than Stratum 1. Artifacts were recovered from Stratum 2 Level 1. At first, it seemed the artifacts were within soils located from about 1.3 feet (40 cm) north of the foundation of Building 214 to the northern end of TP1. However, the concentration became constant throughout the test pit all the way to the base of the level, although no specific artifact-related feature was identified. As excavation continued, additional concrete was encountered within the upper part of Stratum 2 at the

southern portion, along the east side, of TP1 (see Figure 5 and Photo 2). This could explain why the initial impression of the artifact deposit was concentrated in the northern part of TP1. Level 1 was 1.3 feet (40 cm) thick and arbitrarily ended at 3.0 feet (91 cm) below ground surface. At that point in time the archaeological consultant stopped excavations and contacted the NPS to discuss an appropriate course of action.

. . .

.

6. s. s.

The artifacts recovered during the excavation of Stratum 2 Level 1 included mainly animal bones representing food remains. The deposit also contained two ceramic sherds and piece of glass which were all retained, as well as a corroded unidentifiable nail and oyster shell fragments (see Table 1 and Appendix B). The NPS and the archaeological consultant decided to continue with the test pit while screening all soils within the artifact-rich deposit.

			······································	
STRATUM	LEVEL	ELEVATION BELOW CONCRETE IN FEET (CM)	SOIL COLOR	SOIL TEXTURE
Concrete		0.7 (21)		
1	1	1.5 (46)	10YR4/4 – dark yellowish brown	Coarse silty sand
Concrete		1.8 (55)		#*
2	1 .1.9	3.0 (91)	7.5YR4/4 & 10YR3/4 Mottled brown & dark yellowish brown	Fine silty sand
2	2	3.3 (101)	7/5YR4/3 & 10YR3/3 Mottled brown & dark brown	Silty sand
2	3	4.1 (125)	7.5YR4/4 & 10YR3/3 Mottled brown & dark brown	Silty sand

Table 2 – Test Pit 1 Stratigraphy

đ.,

The remainder of the Stratum 2 excavations exhibited fairly uniform soils. A third arbitrary level was established at 3.3 feet (101 cm) below ground surface and continued to the base of excavation at 4.1 feet (125 cm) below ground surface. The engineers excavated deeper against the foundation to a depth of 4.3 feet (131 cm). Soil was not removed from the test pit during this examination and was therefore not screened for artifact recovery.

The artifacts collected are primarily a domestic kitchen-type assortment of material. The collection includes faunal bone and shell representing food remains as well as a wide variety of glass and ceramic sherds representing food storage and table wares. However there are also some brick fragments, window glass, nails and other metal hardware. Some of the ceramic pieces are less fragmentary than others. Level 2 contained a very large base from a stoneware vessel. There was also an associated sherd that mends with the base as well as a variety of other ceramic sherds (see Photo 3).

It was not clear what the artifact-rich deposit represented. It was thicker than a sheet midden. There was no containment within the test pit such as a cistern. Stratum 2 may merely represent a fill deposit. The attached inventory was assessed for possible tpq dates (terminus post quem – the earliest possible deposition date) for the Stratum 2 deposit because this is an easy and obvious observation. Level 1 has a late-nineteenth century tpq. The tpq of Level 2 is 1860 and the Level 3 tpq is 1790. However, the bulk of the collection dates from the mid-eighteenth century. It is possible Level 1 was contaminated with more modern artifacts because it was exposed in the early-twentieth century. However Test Pit 1 Stratum 2 was otherwise homogeneous based on the soil. Analysis of the collection during cataloguing will enable a more precise interpretation of the date of deposition of Stratum 2.

Test Pit 2

Test Pit 2 (TP2) was located inside the eastern wing of Building 214 (see Figure 6). It measured about 3.5 feet square and was in the northeast corner of the room. Table 3 is a summary of the stratigraphy. Beneath the overlying concrete was an ashy silt. Within this deposit was a pipe that extended along the perimeter of the test pit at both walls. The pipe can be seen in Photo 4 with a three-foot long photo stick resting on it near the top of the picture.

12

. . . .

The deposit beneath the ashy fill was sand with a large amount of stone rubble. The rubble stones were generally flat, although they did not appear to have been laid in a surface. They measured about five to six inches thick (12-

4

. 3

STRATUM	LEVEL	ELEVATION BELOW CONCRETE IN FEET (CM)	SOIL COLOR	SOIL TEXTURE
Concrete	· · ·	0.3 (9)		
1	1	0.7 (21)	10YR3/2 - Very dark gray brown	Ashy silt
2.	1	1:8 (55)	10YR4/4 Dark yellowish brown	Rubble and sand
3	1	2.2 (67)	7.5YR5/6 – Strong brown	Sand

· · . 1. S. . . × * . . . 15 cm) and about a foot (30 cm) in length. The stones were mainly sandstone, like those used in the foundation of Building 214, as well as some granite. The basal stratum was a culturally-sterile strong brown sand. This is similar to subsoil seen elsewhere on the Island (Stone 2006: 4-5). The base of excavation was stepped down toward the north as seen on Photo 4. The southern part of the test pit remained unexcavated at Stratum 2. A small pit was excavated for engineering purposes in the northeast corner of TP2 in Stratum 3. This can be seen in Photo 4 at the base of the vertical photo stick. The soil within the small pit was homogeneous with the rest of Stratum 3. No artifacts were observed or recovered from Test Pit 2.

Ng the second

•.2

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Two test pits were excavated at Building 214 within Fort Jay on Governors Island to identify possible sources of and damage from water leakage. These test pits were archaeologically monitored. Test Pit 1 was located in the areaway behind Building 214. It contained an artifact rich deposit of mottled soil. The deposit may represent part of an unidentified feature which extended beyond the limits of the test pit excavations or it may represent part of a fill deposit, it is possible it could relate to the original construction and/or use of Building 214, built in the 1830s. Alternatively, the fill may pre-date Building 214. The preliminary artifact inventory indicates the material recovered could date from the mid-eighteenth or early-nineteenth century. Additional artifact analysis and interpretation is recommended. Should additional below ground actions be planned behind Building 214, preconstruction archaeological testing is recommended.

Test Pit 2 was excavated inside Building 214. It contained a rubble layer beneath the concrete flooring. The rubble was underlain by culturally sterile subsoil. No further archaeological work is recommended for this area. However, should additional excavations beneath the flooring be conducted it could be useful to have an archaeological monitor to ensure no intact ground surfaces exist below the building.

÷.,

.

.

1

.

2.

1

 $x^{(1)} = y^{(1)},$

See.

w.,...

1.

£.

6





Figure 1



Figure 2 Location of Building 214 within Fort Jay and Governors Island.





.

Location of Test Pits at Building 214 in Fort Jay on Governors Island.



Figure 4

Einhorn Yaffee Prescott drawing of the western basement floor plan of Building 214 showing the location of Test Pit 1.

Ground Surface



Figure 5

5

East profile of Test Pit 1.



Figure 6

Einhorn Yaffee Prescott drawing of the eastern basement floor plan of Building 214 showing the location of Test Pit 2.



Photo 1 Test Pit 1 being jackhammered.



Photo 2 Test Pit 1 at the completion of excavation facing east.



Photo 3

Sample of ceramics from TP1 Stratum 2 Level 2, including stoneware, tin-glazed earthen ware and slipware.



Test Pit 2 at completion of excavation facing north (black and white sticks are 3 feet long).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

·

.

.

Boger, Louise A 1971	de The Dictionary of World Pottery and Porcelain, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
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.
Jones, Olive and 1989	Catherine Sullivan 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.
Ketcham, Willia 1991	m C., Jr. American Stoneware. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
Maryland Archa 2002	eological Conservation Laboratory Web Site http://www.jefpat.org/diagnostic/Historic_Ceramic_Web_Page/Historic_Main.htm Updated 5/1/02.
Mercer, Henry C 1975	Ancient Carpenters' Tools. Fifth Edition. Bucks County Historical Society. Horizon Press.
Myers, Susàn 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.
Noel Hume, Ivor 1991	A Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America. Originally published 1969. New York: Vintage Books.
Public Archaeolo 1996	by Laboratory, Inc. Phase 1A Archaeological Assessment of the Governors Island National Historic Landmark District, Governors Island, New York. Submitted to ABB Environmental Services, Inc. Revised August 1996. PAL Report No. 751.
1997	Technical Report. Phase 1B Archaeological Survey of the Governors Island National Historic Landmark District, Governors Island, New York. Submitted to HRP Assoc., Inc. and USCT/CEU Providence. Revised October 16, 1997. PAL, Inc. Report No. 851.
Ramsay, John 1939	American Plates and Pottery. Boston: Hale, Cushman and Flint.
SMU Archaeolog n.d.	gical Lab Ceramic Database Web Site http://www.stmarys.ca/academic/arts/anthropology/sdavis/ceramics/contents
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. Framingdale, NY: Baywood Publishing Company, Inc. Originally published 1971. In The Conference on Historic Site Archaeology Papers 6(2):71-106.
Stillwell, John E. 1926	Crolius Ware and Its Makers. New-York Historical Society Quarterly Bulletin 10:52-66.

Stone, Linda

2006 Report on pre-Construction Archaeological Testing and Construction Monitoring for New Sewers in and Around Buildings 107, 108, 125 and 135 on Governors Island, New York, New York. Prepared for Bedford Construction Corp. August 7, 2006.

University Of Massachusetts, Archaeological Services

2003 Archaeological Overview an Assessment of Governors Island national Monument New York, New York. Presented to: William Griswold, National Park Service. UM-410.

Yokum, Barbara

2005

Historic Structures Report Fort Jay, Governors Island National Monument, National Parks of New York Harbor, New York, New York. Prepared by the Historic Architecture Program, Northeast Region, National Park Service, Lowell, Massachusetts.

APPENDIX A

SCOPE OF WORK

Scope of Work

Instructions for Monitor Mold Abatement and Rehabilitation at Fort Jay Buildings Geotechnical Investigations Governors Island National New York, NY

1. Introduction and Background

Governors Island is located just a few hundred meters off the southern tip of Manhattan, at the confluence of the Hudson and East Rivers in New York Harbor. Fort Jay and Castle Williams, the islands two fortifications, served as an early outpost to protect New York City from enemy naval attack and were an integral part of a larger coastal defense network (NPS website). Fort Jay and Castle Williams were erected between 1796 and 1811 as part of the First and Second American Systems of Fortification and are among the finest examples of defensive structures in use from the Renaissance to the American Civil War. They are located within a larger National Historic Landmark District (NPS Website).

The southern portion of the island was created in the early 20⁻⁻-century using fill. The mold abatement and rehabilitation of buildings at Fort Jay primarily involves interior work associated with the reconditioning of the buildings. However, for this portion of the project, two geotechnical test pits will be excavated- one inside the window well behind Building 214 and one on the interior of the building. These test pits are intended to identify the location of the water infiltration at the back of the building (Figure 1). The area is believed to have been previously disturbed by the construction of the window wells (approx 3-4 feet in depth), but earlier ground surfaces have been preserved at considerable depths on other areas of the island. While PAL did extensive testing to the front of the buildings in the late 1990s, no testing has been done behind the structures. Monitoring is recommended to document depth of previous disturbance and to be certain that archeological resources will not been impacted by rehabilitation efforts. Additional archeological work may be necessary for the remainder of the project to be compliant with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

2. Contractor Services

An archeological monitor is needed for several days during ground disturbing operations. This archeological monitor shall meet Secretary of the Interior's standards for an archeologist. The archeological monitor will observe the ground disturbing activities to make sure that the construction activities do not impact any archeological resources which may have National Register eligibility. *The archeological monitor will have the authority to suspend geotechnical excavations to evaluate archeological resources.* If the archeological monitor suspends work, William Griswold and Linda Neal should be contacted immediately (see contact information at the end of the document).

3. Field and Laboratory Procedures

- 1) Monitor will be on site for ground disturbing activities during the geotechnical testing.
- NPS is required to provide notification to the monitor as to when the activities will take place.
- 3) Any important information identified by the monitor will be recorded on field forms. These forms will include information on soil type and composition, soil color (Munsell), type of deposit, and artifacts found for every natural/cultural strata excavated. These forms should also contain small grids for illustrating plan and profile drawings. Field forms should be filled out in their entirety. Artifact bag inventories and a feature inventory will be kept. Photographs using black and white and color film are to be used for all photographs; digital photographs may also be used to duplicate images taken on archival-stable media.
- 4) If excavation is required, all layers will be excavated stratigraphically. All soil must be sifted through ¼" mesh hardware cloth. Artifacts recovered should be bagged and tagged according to their respective provenience with all necessary provenience information recorded by tags either on or in the bags. Relevant soil samples for particularly informative deposits should be taken
- 5) All applicable OSHA safety standards will be observed.
- All project personnel will conform to the Secretary of the Interior's standards for their respective positions.
- 7) The COTR will be notified immediately of any significant discoveries.
- 8) The archeological contractor will be responsible for all damages to persons and property that occur in connection with the work and services under this contract, without recourse against the Government.
- 9) The archeological contractor is responsible for having adequate insurance coverage for all activities required under this contract. Lack of adequate coverage is not an acceptable excuse for project delays.
- 10) If artifacts are collected, they are to be washed and cleaned, as appropriate to the material. All of the artifacts collected will be cataloged using ANCS + (Rediscovery) and all data entered should conform to the standards and terminology used by the Northeast Region Archeology Program (NRAP). A flow chart and specific instructions

for cataloging and storage of the artifacts will be provided. All material must be stored according to NRAP guidelines. Gail Frace, NRAP (978 970-5151) will serve as inspector for the cataloging, data entry, and storage requirements for the project. All artifacts will be directly labeled and will also have an archival quality tag inserted into the plastic bag containing the artifact.

5. <u>Deliverables</u>

Unless important unanticipated discoveries are made during monitoring, only an end of fieldwork memo will be required to document the project. If important discoveries are made during the monitoring a draft and final report will be required. Artifacts recovered from the monitoring, and associated project documentation, will be cataloged according to NRAP guidelines. They are to be returned with the memo or final report, whichever one is necessary to conclude the project.

6. Report content and format.

If a draft and final report are necessary to document the monitoring discoveries, they will conform to the New York State Guidelines for archeological reports. This document should contain the following sections: Title Page, Abstract, Table of Contents, Management Summary, Acknowledgements, Introduction, Methods and Procedures, Results, Interpretations, Recommendations, References, Appendices including one listing selected fields from the ANCS+ catalog of the artifacts (where applicable). Several graphics should be integrated within the report and should include, but should not be limited to, a locator map, a map illustrating the location of the excavations, plan and profile drawings of selected units and important features, and photographs of unique artifacts or features. Electronic versions of all documents will also be required and will be available in .pdf format.

7. Project Schedule.

Following the award of the contract, the following time milestones will be used for administration of the project:

- 1) The archeological monitoring will begin with NPS notification. Project is expected to begin sometime in October/November 2006.
- 2) The end-of-fieldwork memo shall be submitted within 7 days following the conclusion of the fieldwork.
- 3) If necessary, eight copies of the draft report will be submitted to the COTR within 60 calendar days following the completion of the fieldwork.
- 4) If necessary, comments concerning the draft report will be delivered to the contractor 40 calendar days following the submission of the draft report.

- 5) If necessary, the final report will be submitted within 21 calendar days following the delivery of comments on the draft report. Eight copies of the final report will be submitted.
- 6) All artifacts will be cataloged in ANCS+ (Rediscovery) and will be returned with the submission of the memo or final report. A copy of the ANCS+ program will be provided to the contractor for the duration of the project. A licensing agreement with Rediscovery will need to be signed by both the contractor and a representative from the park. Gail Frace (Inspector 978 970-5151) will review the entries so that they are in conformity with the NRAP standards. All artifacts and associated project documentation will be directly labeled. Artifacts will be bagged according to NRAP standards and will contain an archival quality tag in addition to the direct label.





References

NPS website http://www/nps.gov/gois

Contacts

If significant archeological resources are identified, the archeological monitor will contact:

William A. Griswold, Ph.D. Archeologist, Northeast Region Archeology Program and archeology COTR 978 970-5145 william_griswold@nps.gov

Linda Neal Superintendent, GOIS 212 825-3040 linda_neal@nps.gov

NPS officials will in turn contact Doug Mackey (NYOPRHP) and Amanda Sutphin (NYCLPC) for consultation.

APPENDIX B

, •*

2

.

,

.

.

PRELIMINARY ARTIFACT INVENTORY

с.

Governors Island - Fort Jay - Building 214 - Test Pits Preliminary Artifact Inventory

• • • • •

Page 1 of 3

10

s species a

Pit	Str	Lev	Material	Identity	Form	Color	Count	Description	DateRange
t	2	1	Bone	faunal			2		
			Ceramic	creamware		white	· 1		1762-1820
			Ceramic	stoneware	rim	buff	1	blue decoration exterior	c.1790-c.1870
			Glass		flat	clear	1	textured one side	late 19th Cpresent
				Summary	for Level 1 (4 detail records)		5		
1	2	2	Bone	faunal			. 18	· _	
			Ceramic	ball clay	smoking pipe stem	white	5	· · ·	
			Ceramic	delftware		white	2		c.1600-1800+
			Ceramic	delftware		white	3	blue decoration	1660-1800
			Ceramic	delftware		white	1	green decoration	1660-1800
			Ceramic	earthenware		buff	I	mottled brown glaze	1830-1900+
			Ceramic	earthenware		buff	9	slipware	mid-17th-early-19th C.
			Ceramic	earthenware		red	1	mottled brown glaze	c.1800-1900
			Ceramic	porcelain		white	1	blue decoration exterior	
			Ceramic	redware		red	3	mineral glaze	c.1750-1900
			Ceramic	refined		white	1		
			Ceramic	stoneware		buff	1	·	1720s-present
			Ceramic	stoneware		buff	2	blue decoration	c,1790-c.1870

Page 2 of 3

1

Pit St	r Lev	Material	Identity	Form	Color	Count	Description	DateRange
1 2	2	Ceramic	stoneware		gray	. 1		1720s-present
		Ceramic	stoneware		white	4	salt glazed	c.1720-1805
		Ceramic	stoneware		white	2	salt glazed; incised blue decoration	c.1744-1775
		Ceramic	stoneware	base	buff	2	mends; 4 1/2" diameter base, 7 1/4" high with mend	1720s-present
		Clay	brick		red	1	whole; 8 $1/2" \ge 4 I/4" \ge 2 1/2"$; some adhered mortar	colonial
		Clay	brick		yellow	1	3 3/8" x 1 1/2" x ?	
		Glass		bottle base	green	1	devitrified	c.1740-1820s
		Glass		bottle base	green	1	devitrified; empontilled push-up	c.1740-1820s
		Glass		bottle finish	green	. 1	devitrified	
		Glass		bottle rim	aqua	1	devitrified	
		Glass		curved	amber	1		1860- present
		Glass		flat	aqua	1		
		Metal	iron	disk		1	corroded; possible washer	
		Metal	iron	nail		1	badly corroded	
		Metal	iron	nail		2	corroded; square shank	1798-c.1890
		Shell	clam			2		
		Shell	oyster			2		
			Summary fo	r Level 2 (30 detail records)	-	73		
12	3	Bone	faunal			12		
		Ceramic	ball clay	smoking pipe stem	white	I		
		Ceramic	delftware		white	1		c.1600-1800+

r.

Page 3 of 3

 $\cdots \sim_{n-1} \cdots \sim 1$

Pit Str Lev	Material	Identity	Form	Color	Count	Description	DateRange
1 2 3	Ceramic	delftware		white	3	blue decoration	1660-1800
	Ceramic	delftware		white	1	blue stippled exterior	1660-1800
	Ceramic	delftware	base	white	1	blue decoration	1660-1800
	Ceramic	earthenware		buff	1	manganese glaze	
	Ceramic	earthenware		red	1	slipware	mid-17th-early-19th C.
	Ceramic	earthenware	rim	gray	1	brown glaze	
	Ceramic	stoneware		buff	2		1720s-present
	Ceramic	stoneware		buff	≤ 1	blue decoration	c.1790-c.1870
	Ceramic	stoneware	base	white	t	salt glazed	c.1720-1805
	Ceramic	stoneware	rim	gray	4	mends; cobalt blue decoration	c.1790-c.1870
	Glass		bottle finish	clear	1	medicine type; devitrified	
	Glass		curved	green	2	devitrified	
	Glass		flat	aqua	1		
	Shell	clam			I		
	Shell	oyster			3		
	Shell	scallop			1		
	Stone	chert			I		
		Summary fo	r Level 3 (20 detail records)	-	40		

.

Total Artifacts Recovered (54 detail records) =

3.6

118