# 2015 Archaeological Monitoring Report Philadelphia Housing Authority (PHA) Queen Lane Apartments Project City of Philadelphia ER #2011-0018-101

This report is being submitted as a summary of the Archaeological Monitoring performed by Cultural Heritage Research Services, Inc. (CHRS) which took place during calendar year 2015, in accordance with Section V of the Programmatic Agreement (PA) for the Queen Lane Apartments Project,

#### **January 2015:**

No Archaeological Monitoring was required.

#### February 2015:

In accordance with the PA, PHA provided the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (SHPO) with overlaid mapping indicating the final building design, landscape plans, utility locations and other ground disturbing activities, overlaying areas that retain high archaeological potential, for review and concurrence of the proposed testing areas.

No Archaeological Monitoring was required.

# March 2015: (Construction Start)

On March 23, 2015 Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (SHPO) issued correspondence indicating agreement with the recommendations for Phase II testing in the proposed areas of impact with high archaeological potential. ( see Exhibit B )

Demolition of the paved areas of the block began. Ground disturbance was mainly limited to pavement "skin" and removal of curbing, creation of the construction entrance, and removal of trees. No features were encountered. No human remains or intact burials were encountered.

# **April 2015:**

On April 3, 2015 HUD indicated receipt of correspondence from the SHPO regarding the Phase I Archaeological Survey for the Queen Lane development. The SHPO concurred with HUD and the Phase II testing could commence as identified in the Phase I Archaeological Survey completed by Cultural Heritage Research Services, Inc. ( see Exhibit C )

Demolition activities continued. Test pits were dug to sample soil content and density. Debris from houses formerly situated along Penn Street, Pulaski Avenue, and Priscilla Street was encountered. Removal of soil in 1-foot passes and soil exchange began in the location of Buildings 1, 2, 3, and 4. Archaeological Features 5 and 6 were encountered. (see Exhibit A attached) No human remains or intact burials were encountered.

## May 2015:

Removal of soil in 1-foot passes and soil exchange continued on all buildings. Archaeological Features 7 through 10 were encountered. ( see Exhibit A attached ) Oyster shells and ashy deposits were encountered. Artifacts recovered and documented were largely domestic in nature. No human remains or intact burials were encountered.

#### June 2015:

Removal of soils for the pipe trench along Pulaski Avenue (Building 3) began. Bricks and stones associated with former structures were encountered. No artifacts were recovered. No significant archaeological features were identified. No human remains or intact burials were encountered.

## July 2015:

Removal of soils for the pipe trench along the rear of Building 3 began. Archaeological Features 11 through 18 were encountered. (see Exhibit A attached) Artifacts were collected and documented. No human remains or intact burials were encountered.

## **August 2015:**

No Archaeological Monitoring was required.

## September 2015:

Removal of soils for the pipe trench behind Building 1 began, and removal of soil for the retaining wall behind Building 1 took place. Archaeological Features 19 through 22 were encountered. (see Exhibit A attached) Artifacts were collected and documented. No human remains or intact burials were encountered.

#### **October 2015:**

No Archaeological Monitoring was required.

### November 2015:

No Archaeological Monitoring was required.

### **December 2015:**

Excavation in the area behind Building 2 for Storm Water Basin 1 and removal of soil for the retaining wall behind Building 3 is anticipated for December.

To date, 22 archaeological features have been identified. Of these, 5 features yielded a relatively high number of artifacts. The remaining features were either, left largely unexcavated as they would not be further impacted by the project, or the artifact yield was too small to provide detailed and meaningful data.