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Management Summary

S&ME, Inc. (S&ME) has completed an Archaeological and Historic Resources Survey of the Former Harriet Tubman Homes Site, located north of Southern Street and west of Roanoke Avenue. The Project Area is an approximately 42.68-acre (0.067 square miles) parcel, in Chattanooga, Hamilton County, Tennessee. The property is depicted on the 7.5-minute United States Geological Survey (USGS) Chattanooga quadrangle map. The work was conducted in general accordance with S&ME Proposal No. 41-1800380, dated June 29, 2018.

The Project Area is currently grassed, vacant land with remnants of previous site improvements (basestone, paved roads, and gravel access drives from the former structures of the housing complex). Mature trees are located in the northern portion of the Project Area and along the western perimeter. The Project Area is accessible from the east via Roanoke Avenue and from the southwest via Sholar Avenue. The Project Area is bound to the north by undeveloped, wooded land and the former Garber Elementary School; to the east by Roanoke Avenue; to the south by Southern Street; and to the west by Norfolk Southern’s Debutts Rail Yard. Land use on the immediately surrounding properties consists of light industry to the north and west and is mixed use (though primarily residential) to the south and east.

This survey was completed under the direction of the Barge Design Solutions, in anticipation of an application to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to permit planned impacts to wetlands and streams that will be part of future development at the property. The goal of the current survey was to identify archaeological sites within the Project Area and/or historic resources within or adjacent to the Project Area. The USACE will serve as the lead agency. For the purpose of this survey, S&ME presumed that the entire 42.68-acre Project Area of the Former Harriet Tubman Homes Site may be subject to direct effects resulting from construction related activities and, therefore, constitutes the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for direct effects. The APE for indirect effects will be limited to properties adjacent to or visible from the Project Area.

Background research indicated that no historic structures were within or adjacent to the Project Area and 31 archaeological sites and eight archaeological surveys (Alexander 2013, Carruth & West 2017, Council 1989, Dorwin 1984, Honerkamp 1984, 1987, Keith & Keith 1999, and Nance 2001) were recorded within the vicinity of the Project Area (Figures 1 and 2).

The current study was conducted on November 12, 2018 and consisted of a pedestrian reconnaissance and the hand excavation of 15 shovel tests. No archaeological sites or historic resources were identified within the Project Area. The field investigation did not identify remains indicative of the presence of previously undocumented archaeological resources. This study did not collect archaeological materials and no laboratory analysis or curation of artifacts was necessary. Based on the results of this study, it is S&ME’s opinion that future development in the Project Area will have no effect on significant archaeological sites and no additional archaeological investigations are necessary.

One previously unrecorded historic area, the Avondale neighborhood, was identified during the survey. Avondale is a large neighborhood located south and east of the Project Area that encompasses a number of subdivisions that were constructed from the early to the mid- to late-twentieth century; it includes the Mary Ann Garber Elementary School, a circa-1955 neighborhood school building. The Avondale neighborhood has the potential to represent the scope of growth in this portion of Chattanooga during the twentieth century, as well as demonstrate the shift in architectural styles and planning during this period. S&ME recommends additional survey and research efforts on the neighborhood to identify areas that retain sufficient integrity to convey the historic and architectural contexts and make a definitive National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) evaluation.
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1.0 Introduction

S&ME has completed an Archaeological and Historic Resources Survey of the Former Harriet Tubman Homes Site, north of Southern Street and west of Roanoke Avenue. The Project Area is an approximately 42.68-acre (0.067 square miles) parcel, in Chattanooga, Hamilton County, Tennessee. The work was conducted in general accordance with S&ME Proposal No. 41-1800380, dated June 29, 2018.

This survey was completed under the direction of the Barge Design Solutions, in advance of an application to the USACE to permit planned impacts to wetlands and streams that will be part of future development. As such, the planned development is subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), which is implemented by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation’s regulations Protection of Historic Properties (36 CFR 800).

Potential impacts to archaeological remains will be associated with ground disturbance related to preparation and construction of the planned development. The construction of industrial facility has the potential to impact the setting and character of historic properties, if present, that are visible from the development.

The USACE will serve as the lead agency. For the purpose of this survey, S&ME presumed that the entire 42.68-acre Former Harriet Tubman Homes Site (Project Area) may be subject to direct effects resulting from construction related activities. Potential indirect effects will be limited to properties adjacent to or visible from the Project Area. This proposed Area of Potential Effect (APE) is based on S&ME’s understanding of the proposed undertaking and not based on correspondence from the USACE, SHPO, or other government agencies.

The goal of this survey was to identify archaeological sites and historic resources in the Project Area and aboveground resources in the viewshed of the Project Area, and make recommendations for further investigations to evaluate their eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

This study was conducted in November 2018. Aaron Brummitt, RPA served as the Principal Investigator and conducted the fieldwork. Heather Carpini served as the Senior Architectural Historian. Quinn-Monique Ogden, RPA served as the Project Archaeologist and assisted writing this report. Aaron Brummitt, RPA conducted the background research at the state archaeological site files housed at the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation, Division of Archaeology. As this study did not collect archaeological materials, no curation of artifacts was necessary.
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2.0 Environmental Setting

The Project Area encompasses approximately 42 acres of moderately flat, vacant land. The Project Area is currently grassed, vacant land with remnants of previous site improvements (basestone, paved roads, and gravel access drives from the former structures of the housing complex). Mature trees are located in the northern portion of the Project Area and along the western perimeter. The Project Area is accessible from the east via Roanoke Avenue and from the southwest via Sholar Avenue. The Project Area is bound to the north by undeveloped, wooded land and the former Garber Elementary School; to the east by Roanoke Avenue; to the south by Southern Street; and to the west by Norfolk Southern's Debutts Rail Yard. Land use on the immediately surrounding properties consists of consists of light industry to the north and west and is mixed use (though primarily residential) to the south and east.

The Project Area is located in the Ridge and Valley Physiographic Province of East Tennessee, a region characterized by parallel ridges separated by valleys with broad floodplains and terraces. These deeply dissected plateau lands rest on beds of limestone and shale. Soils in the region are chiefly formed from parent bedrock with silty and sandy loams on uplands and silty sand and loams with some clay on slopes and valley floors. Soils tend to be relatively thin and both ridges and slopes tend to be rocky with low fertility. The Tennessee River and its tributaries drain almost the entire Ridge and Valley Province.

In Pleistocene and Holocene ages, Anderson (2001) discusses the climate going through several transition phases in temperatures, rainfall, and seasonal pattern during the periods of human occupation in the region. Delcourt and Delcourt (1985) suggest that by the end of the Pleistocene in the region, the forest shifted from a spruce and pine boreal forest to oak/hickory hardwood forest (Delcourt and Delcourt 1985). Historically the Project Area is within the Mixed Mesophytic Forest region, consisting of oaks, tuliptree, gum and hickory in the forests and hemlock, tuliptree, basswood, buckeye, red oak, sugar maple, yellow wood and birch in the valleys (Braun 1950). The present-day climate in the region is temperate with cool winters and warm summers. The environment of the riverbanks attracted prehistoric inhabitants, and was later used as farmsteads and military sites.

Topography in the Project Area is relatively flat, with a change in grade in the northern portion of the Project Area that slopes to the north/northwest toward Tannery Branch which flows along the northern property boundary and empties into Citico Creek about 1,250 feet west of the Project Area. Citico Creek empties into the Tennessee River about 1.5 miles downstream. Similarly, topography in the southern portion of the Project Area slopes to the south, toward a topographic low, which appears to correspond with an unnamed tributary to Tannery Branch. The elevation ranges between approximately 660-670 feet above mean sea level (AMSL), with the average surface elevation at the Project Area approximately 665 feet above the National Geodetic Vertical Datum.

The USDA records one soil type is located within the Project Area (Figure 9); the description can be found in Table 1 (USDA Web Soil Survey, Accessed November 1, 2018). Sequatchie soils are typically deep, well-drained soils with moderately high to high permeability. The Urban Land mapping unit is applied to extensively built-up areas where 85 percent or more of the ground surface is covered by buildings, streets, and/or parking lots. Urban land soils have been altered or covered during development such that it is not feasible to classify soil types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Drainage</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Slopes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sequatchie-Urban Land</td>
<td>Loam</td>
<td>Well drained</td>
<td>Stream Terrace: Alluvial fan</td>
<td>2 to 7 percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3. Field Conditions in the Project Area, facing southeast.

Figure 4. Remants of former neighborhood in the Project Area, facing west.
3.0 Cultural Context

S&ME conducted background research in order to assess the potential for significant resources and to formulate our expectations regarding the nature and types of cultural resources we were likely to encounter. While this text provides a general prehistory and history of the region, we refer the reader to the original sources for additional information. In summary, the site types in this region are habitation sites, farmsteads and military sites found along the terraces of the waterways.

3.1 Prehistoric Context

Over the last two decades there has been continued debate over when humans first arrived in the New World. The traditional interpretation is that humans first arrived in North America via the Bering land bridge that connected Alaska to Siberia at the end of the Pleistocene, approximately 13,500 years ago. From Alaska and northern Canada, these migrants may have moved southward through an ice-free corridor separating the Cordilleran and Laurentide ice sheets to eventually settle in North and South America.

3.1.1 Pre-Paleo Period

Humans have occupied various parts of North America for at least 12,500 years; however, an exact date for initial settlement of the New World is the subject of an ongoing debate (e.g., Adovasio and Pedler 1996; Dillehay and Collins 1988). Possible evidence for occupations that predate the Paleo-Indian Period (often termed Pre-Clovis) has been found at Monte Verde in southern Chile (Dillehay 1997; Meltzer et al. 1997), at the Cactus Hill site in Sussex County, Virginia (McAvoy and McAvoy 1997), and in Allendale County, South Carolina, where a possible Pre-Paleo component is being evaluated (Goodyear 2005). Despite the growing number of sites attributed to Pre-Paleo occupations, there are problems surrounding the interpretation of these early sites, precluding their widespread acceptance.

3.1.2 Paleo-Indian Period

The initial human settlement is generally accepted as having occurred during the last glacial period, sometime between 15,000 and 11,000 BP. The end of the Pleistocene epoch is characterized by the retreat of the Laurentide Ice Sheet, the resulting change to the vegetation makeup, and the simultaneous extinction of the Pleistocene megafauna (Anderson et al. 1990).

Little is known about the Paleo-Indian period in the east, since intact Paleo-Indian sites are rare in this portion of North America (Barber and Barfield 1994). During the Paleo-Indian period, small, semi-nomadic bands are believed to have followed migratory game and searching for suitable sources of high quality stone for tools (Kelly and Todd 1988).

During the transitional period between the Pleistocene and Holocene (ca. 12,000–10,000 BP), massive ice sheets that covered most of what is now the United States receded, leaving behind a boreal forest populated by large mammals (i.e., megafauna) such as mastodon, wooly mammoth, and ground sloth. An presence of megafauna was recovered at the Coats-Hinds site in Tennesse, with the discovery of butchered mastodon remains (Brietburg et al. 1996). Continuing changes in the environment, including rising temperatures and sea levels, led to a replacement of the boreal forests with a deciduous forest of pine, oak, maple, and birch trees (Delcourt and Delcourt 1983; Watts 1975). The megafauna of the Pleistocene did not survive into the Holocene, although
whether their extinction was due to rapid environmental changes or whether they were hunted to extinction by humans (or a combination of both) is still the subject of debate.

The Clovis point is the best-known item in the Paleo-Indian toolkit and typically is recognized as the earliest diagnostic tool form on the continent. While the distinctive tool kit of the period (fluted projectile points and a well-developed blade technology) has been found in association with the remains of megafauna, most commonly in western North America and occasionally in the East (Webb et al. 1984), current interpretations suggest that a more generalized subsistence strategy was in effect in the Southeast (Ward 1983).

3.1.3  Archaic Period

Major environmental changes at the terminal end of the Pleistocene led to changes in human settlement patterns, subsistence strategies, and technology. As the climate warmed and the megafauna became extinct, population size increased and there was a simultaneous decrease in territory size and settlement range. Much of the Southeast during the early part of this period consisted of a mixed oak-hickory forest. Later, during the Hypsithermal interval between 8000 and 4000 B.P., southern pine communities became more prevalent in the interriverine uplands and extensive riverine swamps were formed (Anderson et al. 1996; Delcourt and Delcourt 1985).

The Archaic period typically has been divided into three subperiods: Early Archaic (10,000–8000 B.P.), Middle Archaic (8000–5000 B.P.), and Late Archaic (5000–3000 B.P.). Each of these subperiods appears to have been lengthy, and the inhabitants of each were successful in adapting contemporary technology to prevailing climatic and environmental conditions of the time. Settlement patterns are presumed to reflect a fairly high degree of mobility, making use of seasonally available resources in the changing environment across different areas of the Southeast. The people relied on large animals and wild plant resources for food. Group size gradually increased during this period, culminating in a fairly complex and populous society in the Late Archaic.

During the Amnicola Farm Survey (Dorwin 1984), several open habitation Archaic and Woodland sites (40HA175, 40HA177-185, 40HA187, 40HA188, 40HA190, 40HA192, 40HA194, 40HA195, and 40HA198) were identified along the terraces of the Tennessee River. These prehistoric habitation sites are likely the type of Archaic and Woodland sites to be found in the Project Area because of the similar landforms and vicinity of less than a mile from the Project Area.

3.1.3.1  Early Archaic (10,000–8000 B.P.)

During the Early Archaic, there was a continuation of the semi-nomadic hunting and gathering lifestyle seen during the Paleoindian Period; however, there was a focus on modern game species rather than on the megafauna, which had become extinct by that time. During this time there also appears to have been a gradual but steady increase in population and a shift in settlement patterns. In general, these models hypothesize that Early Archaic societies were organized into small, band-sized communities of 25 to 50 people whose main territory surrounded a portion of a major river (Anderson and Hanson 1988).

Diagnostic markers of the Early Archaic include a variety of side and corner notched projectile point types such as Hardaway, Kirk, Palmer, Taylor, and Big Sandy, and bifurcated point types such as Lecroy, McCorkle, and St. Albans. Other than projectile points, tools of the Early Archaic Period include end scrapers, side scrapers, gravers, microliths, and adzes (Sassaman et al. 2002), and likely perishable items such as traps, snares, nets, and basketry.
evidence of Early Archaic basketry and woven fiber bags was found at the Icehouse Bottom site in Tennessee (Chapman and Adovasio 1977).

3.1.3.2 **Middle Archaic (8000–5000 B.P.)**

The beginning of the Middle Archaic period coincides with the onset of the Younger Dryas, a warmer, dryer period. Although it is less apparent in the Western Highland Rim, the Middle Archaic period was marked by an increase in population density across the region (Amick and Carr 1996). Archaeologists can distinguish this period by a decrease in the diversity of the lithic tool kit and an increase in the number and type of ground stone tools, including atlatl weights, netsinkers, and ground axes (Chapman 1985). Stone tools diagnostic of the Middle Archaic period include Morrow Mountain, White Springs, Benton, and Stanley projectile points.

3.1.3.3 **Late Archaic (5000–3000 B.P.)**

The Late Archaic period is marked by increased complexity in subsistence strategies, social organization, and trade networks. Sunflower seeds found at the Hayes site (40ML139) were found to exhibit signs of domestication, indicating early domestication in the Late Archaic period, and perhaps as early as the Middle Archaic (Crites 1993). Squash and gourds were also apparently cultivated around this time, as is evidenced by the presence of charred squash rinds in a fire pit at the Bacon Bend site (Chapman 1985). The presence of steatite bowls and other artifacts made from exotic materials such as marine shell, copper, and nonlocal chert suggest that expanded trade networks had been established. Linked to the expansion of trade networks is the development of social stratification. Social stratification during the Late Archaic is evidenced in the differential burial treatment and exotic materials identified as grave goods in burials of individuals of presumed higher rank (Chapman 1985). Diagnostic projectile points from the Late Archaic period include Savannah River, Appalachian Stemmed, and Iddins.

3.1.4 **Woodland Period (ca. 3000–3500 B.P.)**

Like the preceding Archaic Period, the Woodland is conventionally divided into three subperiods—Early, Middle, and Late—based on technological and social complexity and population increase. Among the changes that occurred during this period are the widespread adoption of ceramic technology, an increased reliance on native plant horticulture, and a more sedentary lifestyle. Ceramics became more refined and regionally differentiated, particularly with regard to temper. There was also an increase in sociopolitical and religious interactions, as evidenced by an increased use of burial mounds, increased ceremonialism, and expanded trade networks (Anderson and Mainfort 2002).

3.1.4.1 **Early Woodland (3000–2300 B.P.)**

The Early Woodland is identified by two phases, Watts Bar and Long Branch. The earliest Woodland phase, Watts Bar, is recognized by the appearance of quartz-tempered, fabric-impressed pottery, Adena-like stemmed, and Wade corner notched points (Franklin 2002). Except for the presence of pottery, the material culture appears to have been very similar to that of the preceding Late Archaic peoples. The Long Branch phase replaced the Watts Bar phase around 400 B.C. During the Long Branch phase, limestone tempering replaced the quartz tempering in pottery and stemless projectile points replaced the Wade and Adena-like points. Although some stemmed varieties have been recovered, the majority of the projectile points from the Early Woodland are triangular in shape. Evidence for the domestication of chenopodium, sumpweed, and sunflower during the Early Woodland has been found at the Big Bone Cave in central Tennessee (Faulkner 1991).
3.1.4.2 **Middle Woodland (2300–1500 B.P.)**

The Middle Woodland is a continuation and elaboration of traits exhibited during the Early Woodland, mixed with intensive burial ceremonialism and a changing community structure. Sand and limestone tempered pottery with stamped designs is found during this time period; in less frequency, simple-stamped, check stamped, and complicated stamped pottery is found as well (Schroedl et al. 1990, Chapman 1985).

The McFarland phase is representative of the Middle Woodland period in central Tennessee, exhibiting a more structured and organized village. Exotic goods such as copper objects, mica, galena, and pottery decorations, not normally found in this area of Tennessee, suggest participation in the Hopewell Interaction Sphere. Many of these goods were found at the Yearwood site, where numerous cremated burials were also found, indicating that this site may have served as both a redistributive center and a mortuary center (Butler 1979; Faulkner 2002). The most obvious change in ceremonialism during this time period is represented by the construction of Old Stone Fort (40CF1) on the edge of the Eastern Highland Rim.

While hunting and gathering continued as a major mode of subsistence, the use of domesticates, most notably maize, increased substantially during the Late Woodland (A.D. 600–900) period. The shift to smaller projectile point types, such as Madison and Hamilton, has been interpreted as indicating the adoption of the bow and arrow (Des Jean and Benthall 1994). Very little is known about the Late Woodland in the Cumberland drainage (Kerr 2010).

The Late Woodland site of Roxbury Mound Site (40HA66) is located in the floodplain of the Tennessee River in the city limits of Chattanooga (Council and Honerkamp 2001). This site consists of a conical burial mound dating to the Late Woodland. The mound has been looted throughout the last century, C.B. Moore even declined to investigate it in 1914 due to the damage from looting and bioturbation (Moore 1915; Council and Honerkamp 2001). The Project Area has a potential for Late Woodland habitation site types due to the proximity of two miles of this mound.

3.1.5 **Mississippian (900–1600 A.D.)**

In Tennessee, as in the Southeast in general, the Mississippian Period is characterized by major changes in social structure, subsistence strategies, and a shared cosmological ideology. Large permanent settlements arose, led by chiefs and primarily supported by the cultivation of maize. Political and military power emerged in these large centers and appears to have been highly centralized, with each center supported by numerous outlying hamlets and farmsteads. Practices such as the construction of wall-trench houses, large platform mounds, and changes in pottery technology and style serve as the material correlates for the shared ideology associated with the Mississippian world.

The Mississippian period marked a fundamental change in the settlement patterns that had persisted for thousands of years prior. The people of this period were no longer dispersed across the landscape pursuing a hunter gatherer subsistence system. Instead, they concentrated into villages, mainly in floodplain settings, with a subsistence base centered on the cultivation of corn, beans, squash, and other cultigens. Much of Tennessee was controlled by Mississippian chiefdoms of varying sizes.

The major diagnostic artifact type of the Mississippian period is shell tempered pottery, though shell was not used exclusively in pottery manufacture. Diagnostic projectile points include Madison, Sand Mountain, Fort Ancient, Nodena, Cahokia Side Notched, and Hamilton (Ezell 2002).
The Mississippian sites of Citico town and mound (40HA65) and Dallas Island mound site (40HA1) are mound sites along banks of Citico creek and North Chickamauga Creek in Chattanooga. These towns contained burial mounds, platform mounds, and household remains. Remains of the mound sites with platforms and burials or village associated with these mound sites are potential Mississippian site types which could be found in the project area since these site types are found along banks of waterways (TN Site Survey Records).

### 3.2 Historic Context

Hamilton County was formed in 1819 and named after Alexander Hamilton, who served as Secretary of The Treasury under President George Washington. The land for the County was initially ceded by the Cherokee during the Hiwassee Purchase in 1817. Treaties with the native groups were a top priority for the newly formed United States government after the American Revolution, but this period for Euro-American and Native-American relations might be described as a land grab because of broken treaties. Most notably, North Carolina ignored the Cherokee Treaties and, in 1782, the North Carolina Legislature gave land west of the Appalachian Mountains to Revolutionary War veterans (Royce 1888). In 1789, North Carolina ceded its land west of the Appalachian Mountains to the United States Government. On June 1, 1796, Tennessee was admitted to the United States as the sixteenth state.

In the late eighteenth century, a Cherokee town along the Tennessee River was established by Cherokees loyal to the British. The Shelby Expedition of 1779 destroyed the town and there is no evidence it was reoccupied. This location, recorded as Site 40HA66, is approximately two miles north of the Project Area (TN Site Survey Records).

In order to accommodate further westward expansion, another treaty was negotiated with the Cherokee in 1805 by Indian agent R. J. Meigs, on behalf of the United States Government. The careful maneuvering of lands based upon the Treaty of 1805, and a subsequent treaty in 1819, resulted in the eventual removal of the Cherokee in 1830. The Indian Removal Act of 1830 the removal of the Cherokee from their remaining ancestral lands on the infamous Trail of Tears (Mooney 1995).

Most early settlers to Hamilton County were from English, Irish, and Scottish descent who migrated from North Carolina. Dallas was the first county seat; in 1840 the county seat was shifted to Harrison and, finally, in 1870 the county seat settled in Chattanooga (Van West 2009). In 1849, Chattanooga was selected as the northern terminus for the Western and Atlantic Railroad, followed by lines from the Nashville and Chattanooga Railroad in 1854. Additional lines from the East Tennessee, Virginia and Georgia Railroad as well as the Cincinnati Southern found their way to Chattanooga in the next few years. Hamilton County became known as the Gateway of the South (Wilson 1998).

The Amnicola Farm House complex is within a mile of Project Area. The farm was operated by several owners throughout the nineteenth century. Owners of this 1000-acre farm in the 1800s were Samuel Williams, James A. Whiteside, and Thomas Crutchfield Jr. The home of Thomas Crutchfield Jr., circa 1863, is listed on the NRHP, however, it was destroyed in the 1981. The current Project Area could have been part of the farm land and have possible remains of tenant farm occupations (Dorwin 1984).

The general vicinity of Project Area was the site of Civil War activity by both Union and Confederate soldiers. Confederate troops created a picket line along the Tennessee River shoreline during the battles of Wauhatchie and Brown’s Ferry on October 27 and 28, 1863. The picket line served as an outpost for the Confederate soldiers until the battle of Orchard Knob on November 23, 1863. Union soldiers establish a line of communication slightly south of the picket line, which was used during the battles of Lookout Mountain and Missionary Branch on
November 12, 1863 (see Map of the Battlefields of Chattanooga (Figure 10) (Alexander 2013). Missionary Ridge (40HA445) is approximately two miles from the Project Area, known as Sherman’s Reservation in the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park. Missionary Ridge is the site of two Civil War battles, the Battles of Billy Goat Hill and Tunnel Hill. The earthworks associated with this fighting no longer exist but the Ridge had several entrenchments, according to a statement made by Union General Gordon Granger (TN Site Survey Records 1998).

After the Civil War ended, Hamilton County in general, and specifically Chattanooga, experienced several catastrophes, including: a cholera epidemic in 1873, yellow fever in 1878, and severe flooding in 1867 and 1886. However, by the late 1880s the manufacturing industry flourished, with such companies as Coca-Cola establishing its first bottling plant there, as well as offices for several major insurance companies. Combustion Engineering, DuPont, and McKee Baking served as major employers in the county by the end of the nineteenth century (Van West 2009).

Despite the damage of the Civil War and the subsequent post-war hardships, Hamilton County’s population increased over time. In 1820 the population was only 821; according to the 2010 U.S. Census the population was at 336,463. The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) had a significant impact on the area by inundating productive farm land with the creation of the Chickamauga Dam and Reservoir. TVA’s Watts Bar and Sequoyah power plants contributed to the population increase during the 1970s.

The Project Area operated as a low income housing complex from about 1952 until about 2012. This housing complex consisted of 74 multi-tenant residential buildings, along with a community building and a service garage. The Chattanooga Housing Authority sold the property to the City of Chattanooga in 2014 and the City of Chattanooga demolished the structures. Since that time, property site has been vacant. Prior to development as the housing complex (between 1935 and 1951), the property appears to have been used for residential (three to five homes depicted) and agricultural purposes. Historical land use on surrounding properties to the north and west was farmland, until they were developed for commercial/industrial purposes in the early 1950s. The rail line that runs along the western boundary of the Project Area, as well as the line that runs to the south/southeast of the Project Area, have been in place since the mid- to late-1800s. The Debutts Yard/Norfolk Southern Rail Yard, adjacent to the western edge of the Project Area, has been in operation since the mid twentieth century.
4.0 Methods

This section of the report discusses the methods used during this study.

4.1 Background Research

On November 8, 2018, a background literature review and records search were conducted at the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation, Division of Archaeology as well as curated site forms and readily available reports of previous cultural resources studies. The area examined was a mile radius surrounding the Project Area. If cultural resources were noted within the mile radius, then additional reports and site forms contained at the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation, Division of Archaeology were consulted.

4.2 Archaeological Survey

The archaeological investigation consisted of a pedestrian reconnaissance and hand excavation of shovel test pits.

The pedestrian reconnaissance served to characterize the level of prior ground disturbance in the Project Area and examine the ground surface for aboveground indications of archaeological features such as cemeteries, building foundations, and artifact scatters. We attempted to conduct the pedestrian reconnaissance by walking along existing roadways.

Excavation of shovel test pits served to confirm observations made during the pedestrian reconnaissance and to examine areas that could not be characterized as disturbed to the extent that the depositional context of archaeological remains would have been destroyed. In these areas shovel test pits, measuring approximately 30 cm in diameter, were excavated into culturally sterile subsoil. Soils were passed through 0.25-inch hardware cloth to ensure uniform recovery of cultural materials. The shovel tests were backfilled after the soils are classified with the Munsell System of Color Notation and their contents were recorded on standardized forms. The Field Director maintained notes on survey methods and relevant environmental factors such as soil types associated with the Project Area. Representative field conditions were recorded with digital photography.

The field investigation did not identify remains indicative of the presence of previously undocumented archaeological resources. This study did not collect archaeological materials and no laboratory analysis or curation of artifacts was necessary.

4.3 Historic Architecture Reconnaissance

In addition to the archaeological survey, a limited architectural resource reconnaissance was conducted to locate historic architectural resources on or immediately adjacent to the Project Area. Historic maps and county tax records were consulted to identify locations that were likely to contain aboveground resources greater than 50 years of age. The location of each identified resource was plotted on a project base map and digital photographs were be taken. Information regarding historical value, appearance, and integrity was noted to aid in the determination of NRHP eligibility.
4.4 National Register Eligibility Assessment

For a property to be considered eligible for the NRHP it must retain integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association (National Register Bulletin 15:2). In addition, properties must meet one or more of the criteria below:

A. are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
B. are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
C. embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
D. have yielded or may be likely to yield information important in history or prehistory.

The most frequently used criterion for assessing the significance of an archaeological site is Criterion D, although other criteria were considered where appropriate. For an archaeological site to be considered significant, it must have potential to add to the understanding of the area’s history or prehistory. A commonly used standard to determine a site’s research potential is based on a number of physical characteristics including variety, quantity, integrity, clarity, and environmental context (Glassow 1977). These factors were considered in assessing a site’s potential for inclusion in the NRHP.
5.0 Background Research

This section of the report discusses the results of the background literature and records research. The purpose of this research was to identify previously recorded cultural resources in the Project Area and its vicinity. This information contributed to understanding the likely nature and distribution of cultural resources that might be present in the Project Area and provided a comparative basis for the evaluation of resources identified.

On November 8, 2018 Aaron Brummitt conducted background research at Tennessee Division of Archaeology in Nashville. Background research indicated that there are no previously recorded archaeological sites or architectural resources in the Project Area.

Background research indicated that no historic structures were within or adjacent to the Project Area (Figure 6). The Tennessee Historical Commission’s online database indicates that the nearest previously documented historic structures are located approximately one mile north of the current Project Area and consist of multiple resources associated with early twentieth century growth of Chattanooga.

![Tennessee Historical Commission Viewer](image)

Figure 6. Tennessee Historical Commission map. The approximate location of the Project Area is highlighted in red.
Background research identified eight archaeological surveys (Alexander 2013, Carruth & West 2017, Council 1989, Dorwin 1984, Honerkamp 1984, 1987, Keith & Keith 1999, and Nance 2001) that have been conducted in the vicinity of the Project Area. These past investigations identified 31 archaeological sites (Figures 1 and 2).

Two of the previously recorded archaeological sites (40HA475 and 40HA476) are the Drane’s and Taylor’s Route of the Trail of Tears. These routes are located approximately 0.27 miles northwest and east of the Project Area. The Indian Removal Act of 1830 forced the removal of the Cherokee from their remaining ancestral lands on the infamous Trail of Tears (Mooney 1995). Nance (2001) states that: “Excavations of road segments might reveal something about the overall use and history of that road, but it would not likely provide any greater insight into the Cherokee Removal”. As such, our opinion is that development in the Project Area will not have an effect on associations between 40HA475 (Glass Street) and 40HA476 (Riverside Drive) and the Trail of Tears.

### Table 2. Previously recorded cultural resources within the vicinity of the Project Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NRHP Eligibility</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40HA175</td>
<td>Late Archaic lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
<td>Dorwin 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA176</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Dorwin 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA177</td>
<td>Late Archaic-Early Woodland lithic scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Dorwin 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA178</td>
<td>Early and Late Archaic-Early Woodland, Mississippian artifact scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Dorwin 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA179</td>
<td>Late Archaic-Early Woodland, Mississippian artifact scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Dorwin 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA180</td>
<td>Late Archaic-Middle Woodland artifact scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Dorwin 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA181</td>
<td>Late Archaic-Middle Woodland, Mississippian artifact scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Dorwin 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA182</td>
<td>Late Archaic, Early Woodland and historic artifact scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Dorwin 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA183</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Dorwin 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA184</td>
<td>Early Archaic lithic scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Dorwin 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA185</td>
<td>Early Archaic lithic scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Dorwin 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA186</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Dorwin 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA187</td>
<td>Early Archaic lithic scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Dorwin 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA188</td>
<td>Archaic and Early Woodland artifact scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Dorwin 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA189</td>
<td>Late Woodland lithic scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Dorwin 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA190</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Dorwin 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA191</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Dorwin 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA192</td>
<td>Early Archaic and Early Woodland artifact scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Dorwin 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA193</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Dorwin 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA194</td>
<td>Early Archaic lithic scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Dorwin 1984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NRHP Eligibility</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40HA195</td>
<td>Prehistoric and historic artifact scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Dorwin 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA196</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Dorwin 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA197</td>
<td>Prehistoric and historic artifact scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Dorwin 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA198</td>
<td>Archaic and historic artifact scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Dorwin 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA199</td>
<td>Prehistoric and historic artifact scatter</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Dorwin 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA414</td>
<td>Woodland artifact scatter</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
<td>TN Site Survey Record 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA441</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
<td>TN Site Survey Record 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA445</td>
<td>Missionary Ridge/ Sherman’s Reservation</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
<td>TN Site Survey Record 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA475</td>
<td>Trail of Tears, Taylor’s Route</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
<td>Nance 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA476</td>
<td>Trail of Tears, Drane’s Route</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
<td>Nance 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40HA568</td>
<td>Rosenwald HA-06 Rowland Hayes School</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
<td>TN Site Survey Record 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As part of the background research, S&ME also reviewed available historic maps. A map of the Battlefields of Chattanooga shows the picket line that served as an outpost for the Confederate soldiers until the battle of Orchard Knob and the Union established a line of communication, slightly south of the picket line, used during the battles of Lookout Mountain and Missionary Branch (Figure 7). The 1893 30-minute USGS Chattanooga quadrangle depicts the Project Area in between two railroads and east of the Tennessee River (Figure 8). The 1936 and 1941 7.5-minute USGS Chattanooga quadrangles depict the Project Area, with Tanner’s Creek flowing through the northern portion of the Project Area, the Nashville, Chattanooga, and Louisville railroad to the west, and Southern Railroad to the southeast; with one structure is shown in the northwest corner and three structures in the southeast corner (Figure 9 and 10). The 1968 7.5-minute USGS Chattanooga quadrangle depicts the area as a developed urban location with roadways following a similar alignment of present-day Project Area (Figure 11). No structures are shown, as it is located within the urban limits of Chattanooga, but the structures depicted on the 1936 and 1941 7.5-minute USGS Chattanooga quadrangles were no longer extant on the property, as the low-income housing development had been constructed in 1952. An aerial photo from 2013 displays the former low-income residential development with multi-family residential structures (Figure 12); the aerial photo from 2016 shows the former residential development covered with grass and lined with asphalt roadways (Figure 13).
Figure 7. Portion of Atlas of the battlefields of Chickamauga, Chattanooga, and vicinity (1896), the approximate location of the APE is highlighted in red.
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Figure 12. Google Earth 2013 Aerial View

Figure 13. Google Earth 2016 Aerial View
6.0 Results

In November 2018, Aaron Brummitt, RPA conducted the field investigation of the Project Area and an architectural resource reconnaissance (Figure 13). In the text below, the field efforts and results are discussed individually for each resource type.

The Project Area encompasses approximately 42 acres of moderately flat, vacant land. The Project Area is currently grassed, vacant land with remnants of previous site improvements (basestone, paved roads, and gravel access drives from the former structures of the housing complex). Mature trees are located in the northern portion of the Project Area and along the western perimeter. The Project Area is accessible from the east via Roanoke Avenue and from the southwest via Sholar Avenue. The Project Area is bound to the north by undeveloped, wooded land and the former Garber Elementary School; to the east by Roanoke Avenue; to the south by Southern Street; and to the west by Norfolk Southern’s Debuts Rail Yard. Land use on the immediately surrounding properties consists of light industry to the north and west and is mixed use (though primarily residential) to the south and east.

At the time of S&ME’s site visit, the Project Area was a vacant lot with remnants of former roads that were part of the non-extant low-income multi-family housing development (Hardy Street, N. Hawthorne Street, Glass Street, and Sholar Avenue). Several fire hydrants are still visible, with storm water drains still in place.

6.1 Archaeological Survey

Aaron Brummitt, RPA, conducted this survey on November 12, 2018.

The Project Area is urban land, previously developed as residential low-income housing, including streets and 14 multi-tenant structures. Mechanized earthmoving has been used to make asphalt roads and prepare the area for development lots depicted on the recent USGS maps. Our pedestrian reconnaissance revealed that the Project Area has been impacted by its initial clearing, modern road construction, natural erosion, and mechanized earthmoving (Figures 1-4, 14).

The field investigation included excavation of 15 shovel test pits (Figure 14). A typical soil profile in the northwestern portion consisted of approximately 25 cm strong brown (7.5YR 5/6) silty clay loam mottled with strong brown (7.5YR 5/8) clay loam subsoil (Figures 16 and 17). In many cases, the clay loam subsoil was visible at either the ground surface or immediately below the root mat/humic zone. In these cases, excavation of that shovel test pit concluded. All shovel test pits were negative and no archaeological sites were recorded.

Based on the conditions at the site and the lack of archaeological deposits in the excavated shovel tests, S&ME concludes that the Project Area has a low potential for containing intact archaeological sites and recommends that no additional archaeological investigations are necessary for the Project Area.

6.2 Architectural Survey

The area immediately surrounding the Project Area consists of industrial development to the north and west and a primarily residential neighborhood to the south and east. Consultation of historic maps and county tax records indicates that the residential neighborhood surrounding the Project Area has the potential to contain numerous structures greater than 50 years of age. Therefore, the surrounding neighborhood was treated as a single historic area.
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Figure 15. Example of a former site of a home within the former neighborhood, facing east.

Figure 16. Example of Shovel Test in the Project Area.
6.2.1 Avondale

The residential neighborhoods surrounding the Project Area to the south and east have historically been referred to as Avondale; the distinction has appeared on USGS topographic maps since 1940. Avondale is roughly bounded by Infantry Road to the north, Francis Street to the east, Wilson Street to the south, and North Holtzclaw Avenue/Sholar Avenue to the west; it consists of a number of distinct subdivisions that were constructed between the 1920s and the 1970s. Between the Project Area and the railroad corridor to the southeast, there are three separate subdivisions, which were constructed during multiple building periods. The Hardy Heights subdivision is located directly east of the Project Area and encompasses Bragg, Curtis, Hardy, and Sherman streets and Roanoke Avenue; the houses within this subdivision were built during the 1950s (Figures 18 through 21). South of Hardy Heights is the Ross Addition, which includes the parcels on both sides of Ruby Street, between Dodson and Roanoke avenues; the houses within this portion of Avondale were built between the 1940s and the 1970s, with some of the later infill replacing early twentieth century structures. South of the Project Area is the Peyers subdivision, which includes Ocoee, Olive, and Southern streets, as well as North Hawthorn, North Hickory, North Orchard Knob, and Sholar avenues; the houses within this subdivision included structures from the 1920s through the 2000s, with the majority of the residences constructed between the late 1950s and the early 1970s. South and east of the railroad tracks, additional subdivisions include residences constructed from the 1920s through the 1970s, with some more modern infill. Northeast of the Project Area is the former Mary Ann Garber Elementary School, which was constructed around 1955 as a neighborhood school for the Avondale section of Chattanooga (Figure 22).

Avondale, as a whole, represents the development of this portion of Chattanooga from the early twentieth century into the mid- to late portion of the century. The residential growth and infill contains examples of multiple architectural styles and demonstrates the growing use of common architectural plans, with minor alterations, in planned subdivisions. Although there is some loss of housing stock and some modern infill, overall the Avondale neighborhood appears to retain the feeling of a neighborhood constructed in the early to mid-twentieth century. It retains its historic grid street arrangement and the houses have uniform setbacks and mature vegetation as part of the landscape. The presence of an extant neighborhood school serves to further convey the character of the neighborhood. S&ME recommends that additional survey and research be conducted on the Avondale neighborhood, as a whole, to determine which portions retain sufficient integrity to express its historic and architectural contexts and represent the development of this area of Chattanooga.
Figure 18. View of a portion of Hardy Height, from the Project Area, facing southeast.

Figure 19. Streetscape along Hardy Street, toward the Project Area, facing west.
Figure 22. Mary Ann Garber Elementary School building, facing northwest.
7.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

S&ME has completed an Archaeological and Historic Resources Survey Resources Survey of the approximately 42.68-acre (0.067 square miles) Former Harriet Tubman Homes Site Project Area, located north of Southern Street and west of Roanoke Avenue, in Chattanooga, Hamilton County, Tennessee. The work was conducted in general accordance with S&ME Proposal No. 41-1800380, dated June 29, 2018.

The Project Area consists of approximately 42.68 acres or 0.067 square miles. The property consists of urban land previously prepared for a residential neighborhood with streets and formerly developed lots. Properties adjacent to the Project Area are railroad, industrial development, wooded lots, and residential uses.

Background research indicated that no historic structures were within or adjacent to the Permit Area and 31 archaeological sites and eight archaeological surveys (Alexander 2013, Carruth & West 2017, Council 1989, Dorwin 1984, Honerkamp 1984, 1987, Keith & Keith 1999, and Nance 2001) were recorded within the vicinity of Permit Area. Background research indicated that no historic structures were within or adjacent to the Project Area. The Tennessee Historical Commission's online database indicates that the nearest previously documented historic structures are located approximately one mile north of the current Project Area and consist of multiple resources associated with early twentieth century growth of Chattanooga.

The current archaeological survey was conducted on November 12, 2018 and consisted of the hand excavation of 15 shovel tests; no archaeological sites or historic resources were identified within the Project Area. The field investigation did not identify remains indicative of the presence of previously undocumented archaeological resources. This study did not collect archaeological materials and no laboratory analysis or curation of artifacts was necessary. Based on the results of this study, it is S&ME’s opinion that future development in the Project Area will have no effect on significant archaeological sites and no additional archaeological investigations are necessary.

One previously unrecorded historic area, the Avondale neighborhood, was identified during the survey. Avondale is a large neighborhood located south and east of the Project Area that encompasses a number of subdivisions that were constructed from the early to the mid- to late-twentieth century; it includes the Mary Ann Garber Elementary School, a circa-1955 neighborhood school building. The Avondale neighborhood has the potential to represent the scope of growth in this portion of Chattanooga during the twentieth century, as well as demonstrate the shift in architectural styles and planning during this period. S&ME recommends additional survey and research efforts on the neighborhood to identify areas that retain sufficient integrity to convey the historic and architectural contexts and make a definitive National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) evaluation.

As this literature review was conducted as a data gathering effort, and there is no established undertaking (as defined by 36 CFR 800.16(y)), this study did not include correspondence with the SHPO, Native American groups, or other potential stakeholders. If at some point the proposed development requires federal oversight or permitting, then the lead federal agency will be required to initiate the Section 106 process (per 36 CFR 800.3) to determine, in consultation with the SHPO, whether this project will require additional cultural resources investigation or if consultation with other stakeholders is appropriate.
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