



Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office

PENNSYLVANIA HISTORICAL AND MUSEUM COMMISSION

May 21, 2024

Martha Frech
Streamline Engineering, Inc.
110 Allan Street
Lower Burrell , PA 150680000

RE: ER Project # 2024PR00022.006, Quaker Valley High School, Department of Environmental Protection, Leetsdale Borough, Allegheny County

Dear Martha Frech,

Thank you for submitting information concerning the above referenced project. The Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office (PA SHPO) reviews projects in accordance with state and federal laws. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, and the implementing regulations (36 CFR Part 800) of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, is the primary federal legislation. The Environmental Rights amendment, Article 1, Section 27 of the Pennsylvania Constitution and the Pennsylvania History Code, 37 Pa. Cons. Stat. Section 500 et seq. (1988) is the primary state legislation. These laws include consideration of the project's potential effects on both historic and archaeological resources.

Above Ground Resources

Identification of Historic Properties

Based on the information provided and available in our files, we are of the opinion that Muottas (Resource # 2004RE03024) continues to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Despite its relocation, removal of the front porch, and placement on a new foundation, the mansion house retains sufficient architectural detailing at the interior and exterior to convey significance as an example of Colonial Revival architecture designed by Alden and Harlow under Criterion C and Criterion Consideration B for moved properties in the area of Architecture with a POS of 1904 and a boundary being the current footprint of the house (excluding the foundation). The removal of the guest cottage, servant's cottage, stable, garage/workshop, and shed likely affect the ability of the property to convey significance as an early twentieth century estate and may also negate significance for association with William Walker as only the prominence of the architecture remains; additional information would be needed to assess significance beyond Criterion C. Please note: Our opinion is conditional based on the information available to date. Should new information be brought to our attention in any future reviews of the property, a re-evaluation of the significance, integrity, and/or overall National Register eligibility of this property may be necessary.

Assessment of Effect

Based on the information received and available within our files, the proposed demolition of Muottas has the potential to adversely affect historic properties. Please provide documentation of consideration of a variety of alternatives that avoid or minimize effects to Muottas. Why does the building need to be demolished? Has any consideration been given to retention and rehabilitation of the building? Has it been marketed for relocation to a nearby site?

For questions concerning above ground resources, please contact Barbara Frederick at bafrederic@pa.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Emma Diehl".

Emma Diehl

Environmental Review Division Manager



Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office

PENNSYLVANIA HISTORICAL AND MUSEUM COMMISSION

May 2, 2024

Sent Via PA-SHARE

RE: ER Project # 2024PR00022.004, Quaker Valley High School, Department of Environmental Protection, Leetsdale Borough, Allegheny County

Dear Submitter,

Thank you for submitting information concerning the above referenced project. The Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office (PA SHPO) reviews projects in accordance with state and federal laws. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, and the implementing regulations (36 CFR Part 800) of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, is the primary federal legislation. The Environmental Rights amendment, Article 1, Section 27 of the Pennsylvania Constitution and the Pennsylvania History Code, 37 Pa. Cons. Stat. Section 500 et seq. (1988) is the primary state legislation. These laws include consideration of the project's potential effects on both historic and archaeological resources.

Above Ground Resources

No Above Ground Concerns - Environmental Review - DOE - Not Eligible Above Ground Property

Based on the information received and available in our files, it is our opinion that the 200 and 210 Camp Meeting Road are Not Eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places due to a lack of integrity and/or significance. These resource has not been evaluated for archaeological potential. Our opinion is conditional based on the information available to date. Please Note: Should new information be brought to our attention in any future reviews of the property, a re-evaluation of the significance, integrity, and/or overall National Register eligibility of this property may be necessary.

For questions concerning above ground resources, please contact Barbara Frederick at bafrederic@pa.gov.

Sincerely,

Emma Diehl
Environmental Review Division Manager



Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office

PENNSYLVANIA HISTORICAL AND MUSEUM COMMISSION

May 20, 2024

Sent Via PA-SHARE

RE: ER Project # 2024PR00022.003, Quaker Valley High School, Department of Environmental Protection, Leetsdale Borough, Allegheny County

Dear Submitter,

Thank you for submitting information concerning the above referenced project. The Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office (PA SHPO) reviews projects in accordance with state and federal laws. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, and the implementing regulations (36 CFR Part 800) of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, is the primary federal legislation. The Environmental Rights amendment, Article 1, Section 27 of the Pennsylvania Constitution and the Pennsylvania History Code, 37 Pa. Cons. Stat. Section 500 et seq. (1988) is the primary state legislation. These laws include consideration of the project's potential effects on both historic and archaeological resources.

Archaeological Resources

No Archaeological Concerns - Environmental Review - DOE- Not Eligible - Archaeology Report

The PA SHPO concurs with the findings of the report that the following properties are Not Eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places due to a lack of integrity and/or significance: 36BT0801 Camp Meeting Road site. This report meets our standards and specifications as outlined in Guidelines for Archaeological Investigations in Pennsylvania (SHPO 2021) and the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Archaeological Documentation. We agree with the recommendations of this report, and in our opinion, no further archaeological work is necessary for this project. If project plans should change and/or you should be made aware of historic property concerns, including archaeological resources, please reinitiate consultation with our office via PA-SHARE.

For questions concerning archaeological resources, please contact Kristen Walczesky at kwalczesky@pa.gov.

Sincerely,

Emma Diehl
Environmental Review Division Manager



CHRISTINE DAVIS CONSULTANTS, INC.
560 Penn Street; Verona, Pennsylvania 15147
www.christinedavisconsultants.com
Phone: (412) 826-0443 Fax: (412) 826-0458

PHASE I ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY REPORT

**QUAKER VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL PROJECT
LEETSDALE AND EDGEWORTH BOROUGH
AND LEET TOWNSHIP,
ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA**

PR# 2024PR00022

BY:

Mindy LaBelle
Senior Project Manager

Kira M. Heinrich
Cultural Resource Manager

A cultural resource management report prepared for:

STREAMLINE ENGINEERING, INC.

For final submission to:
Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office
Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building, 2nd Floor
400 North Street; Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

April 2024

ABSTRACT

The proposed undertaking is known as the Quaker Valley High School Project located in Leetsdale and Edgeworth Boroughs and Leet Township, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania. The project proposes to construct a new high school campus. Christine Davis Consultants, Inc. (CDC) was retained by Streamline Engineering, Inc. to perform cultural resource investigations for this project. The lead agency is the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP).

The area of potential effect (APE) conforms to the limits of disturbance (LOD) which encompasses approximately 270,865.0 square (sq) meters (m) (2,915,566.7 sq feet (ft) or 66.9 acres (ac)). The LOD is located within the Pittsburgh Low Plateau Section of the Appalachian Plateaus Physiographic Province on the upland above the confluence of Little Sewickley Creek and the Ohio River.

Phase I field survey was conducted in February and March of 2024. Phase I field methodology included surface surveillance and the hand excavation of Shovel Test Probes (STPs) at 5 m and 15 m intervals, 1x1 m units, and Exploratory Auger Probes (APs). Approximately 249,298.5 sq m (2,683,427.3 sq ft or 61.6 ac) was not tested due to the presence of wet soils, slope greater than 15 percent, and disturbances caused by the construction and demolition of several residential structures and moving the main house to a new location on the property, as well as the construction of access roads and grading activities. The remainder of the project area, encompassing approximately 21,566.5 sq m (232,139.4 sq ft or 5.3 ac), was tested. A total of 118 STPs were excavated, including 97 at 15 m intervals and 21 at 5 m intervals, as well as 2 Units. Of these, 98 STPs were negative and 20 STPs and both Units were positive for historic artifactual materials. Additionally, one exploratory auger probe (AP 3) was positive for artifactual materials. One historic period feature, Feature 1: Cistern, was identified.

*Based on the results of the survey, one new historic archaeological site, **Camp Meeting Road Site (36BT0801)**, was discovered. The Camp Meeting Road site dates from ca. 1870 to 1880/ca. 1900 to ca. 1950 and contained 539 historic artifacts and 1 feature. The feature is a brick cistern (ca. 1870 to 1880) with a surficial concrete surround (ca. 1900 to 1950). The artifact assemblage was limited to only a few generally diagnostic artifacts, including fragments of selenium solarized glass that date to between approximately 1914 and the 1920s. All of the artifacts recovered from this site were collected from the disturbed surface level. The site was evaluated for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under Criterion D and is being recommended as not eligible due to a lack of integrity. No further work is recommended for the portion of the site within the project area.*

Based on the results of the Phase I Archaeological Survey, no additional work is recommended for the Quaker Valley High School project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	PROPOSED UNDERTAKING	1
1.2	AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECT (APE)	1
1.3	AGENCY COORDINATION	5
1.4	DISPOSITION OF MATERIALS.....	5
2.0	ENVIRONMENTAL BACKGROUND	6
2.1	PHYSIOGRAPHY/GEOLOGY	7
2.2	CLIMATE	7
2.3	SOILS	8
3.0	BACKGROUND RESEARCH	10
3.1	PRECONTACT CONTEXT	10
3.2	CULTURAL HISTORIC OVERVIEW.....	19
3.3	HISTORY OF PREVIOUS RESEARCH.....	19
4.0	RESEARCH DESIGN	27
4.1	PRECONTACT RESOURCE POTENTIAL	27
4.2	CONTRIBUTING PREDICTABILITY FACTORS	27
4.2.1	<i>Topographic Setting, Soil Types and Degree of Slope</i>	<i>27</i>
4.2.2	<i>Proximity to Water Sources.....</i>	<i>28</i>
4.2.3	<i>Association with Precontact/Historic Indian Paths</i>	<i>28</i>
4.2.4	<i>Previously Recorded Precontact Archaeological Sites</i>	<i>28</i>
4.2.5	<i>Previously Recorded Historic Archaeological Sites</i>	<i>28</i>
4.2.6	<i>Previous Impacts</i>	<i>28</i>
4.2.7	<i>Summary of Probability Assessment.....</i>	<i>32</i>
5.0	PHASE I FIELD SURVEY	34
5.1	FIELD METHODOLOGY.....	34
5.2	SURVEY RESULTS	34
6.0	STATEWIDE PRECONTACT PROBABILITY MODEL	55
7.0	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	56
8.0	REFERENCES	58

APPENDICES:

- I AGENCY COORDINATION
- II PASS FORM INFORMATION
- III ARTIFACT INVENTORIES

FIGURES

1	GENERAL PROJECT LOCATION, PENNSYLVANIA TRANSPORTATION MAP	2
2	AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECT, EVANS CITY, PA 7.5' USGS MAP	3
3	PROJECT MAPPING INDICATING AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECT	4
4	PROJECT MAPPING INDICATING TESTED, WET, STEEP, AND DISTURBED AREAS	33
5	CAMP MEETING ROAD SITE LOCATION	38
6	TESTING PLAN	43
7	CAMP MEETING ROAD SITE TESTING	48

PHOTOGRAPHS

1	NEW CONCRETE FOUNDATION, LOOKING WEST	29
2	GRADING AND DISTURBANCE WEST OF NEW CONCRETE FOUNDATION, LOOKING WEST TOWARD NEW LOCATION OF MOUTTASS. NOTE PILE OF DEMOLITION DEBRIS	30
3	GRADING AND DISTURBANCE ALONG RIDGETOP, LOOKING EAST FROM MOUTTASS. NOTE PAVED AND GRAVELED ACCESS ROAD.	30
4	200 CAMP MEETING ROAD, LOOKING NORTHEAST	31
5	210 CAMP MEETING ROAD, LOOKING SOUTHEAST	31
6	ORIGINAL, PAVED ACCESS DRIVE, LOOKING WEST	32
7	TRANSECT 2, LOOKING NORTH	40
8	TRANSECT 4, LOOKING EAST	40
9	TRANSECT 7, LOOKING SOUTH TOWARD MOUTTAS HOUSE	41
10	TRANSECT 10, LOOKING NORTH	41
11	TRANSECT 12, LOOKING NORTH	42
12	TRANSECT 15, LOOKING SOUTH	42
13	INSIGNIFICANT BRICK FOUNDATION REMNANT FROM THE ORIGINAL LOCATION OF THE MOUTTASS MANSION, LOOKING NORTHEAST	46
14	INSIGNIFICANT STONE AND CONCRETE FOUNDATION REMNANT FROM THE ORIGINAL LOCATION OF THE MOUTTASS MANSION, LOOKING NORTHEAST	46
15	DEPRESSION 1, LOOKING SOUTH	47
16	DEPRESSION 2, LOOKING NORTHEAST TOWARD DEPRESSION 1	47
17	FEATURE 1 OVERVIEW, LOOKING WEST	53

TABLES

1	PREVIOUSLY RECORDED ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES WITHIN A ONE MILE RADIUS OF THE LOD	25
---	---	----

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Cultural resources are protected under federal law through Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended and implementing regulation 36 CFR 800 as revised in January of 2001; the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974; Section 101(b)(4) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969; and the guidelines developed by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) as well as under state law by Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Acts Numbers 1970-120 and 1978-273; the Pennsylvania History Code (H.B. 1731). This project will be reviewed under the authority of, and in accordance with, the Environmental Rights amendment, Article I, Section 27 of the Pennsylvania Constitution; the Pennsylvania History Code, 37 P.S. 507. Archaeological investigations are conducted in accordance with the Guidelines for Archaeological Investigations prepared by the Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office (PA SHPO) in October of 2021.


1.1 PROPOSED UNDERTAKING

The proposed undertaking involves the Quaker Valley High School project located in Leetsdale and Edgeworth Boroughs and Leet Township, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania (Figures 1 to 2). The project consists of the construction of a new high school campus. Christine Davis Consultants, Inc. (CDC) was retained by Streamline Engineering, Inc. to perform cultural resource investigations for this project. The lead agency is the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP).


1.2 AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECT (APE)

The area of potential effect (APE) for the archaeological survey is equivalent to the limit of disturbance (LOD) and consists of approximately 270,865.0 square (sq) meters (m) 2,915,566.7 sq feet (ft) or 66.9 acres (ac)) (Figure 3). The LOD is located northeast of Ohio River Boulevard and Beaver Street, which parallel the Ohio River.






Christine Davis Consultants
 Archaeology and History
 Cider Mill of Pittsburgh
 560 Penn Street
 Verona, PA 15147
www.ChristineDavisConsultants.com
 412-826-0443




1 INCH = 10 MILES

REFERENCES:
 PA DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION
 Tourism and Transportation Map - 2023

Project Location
 QUAKER VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL PROJECT
 PR # 2024PR00022
 Leetsdale and Edgeworth Boroughs and Leet Township
 Allegheny County, Pennsylvania

PROJECT NO.
 24-007

FIGURE 1



Christine Davis Consultants
 Archaeology and History
 Cider Mill of Pittsburgh
 560 Penn Street
 Verona, PA 15147
www.ChristineDavisConsultants.com
 412-826-0443

REFERENCES:
 STREAMLINE ENGINEERING, INC.
 4-QuakerLOD11_2024.shp

USGS 7.5 MINUTE QUADRANGLE
 Ambridge, PA 1960, Photorevised 1990




SCALE 1:24 000
 1000 0 1000 2000 3000 4000 5000 6000 7000 FEET
 1 KILOMETER
 CONTOUR INTERVAL, 20 FEET

Limit of Disturbance (LOD)
QUAKER VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL PROJECT
PR # 2024PR00022
Leetsdale and Edgeworth Boroughs and Leet Township
Allegheny County, Pennsylvania

PROJECT NO.

24-007

FIGURE 2






Christine Davis Consultants
Archaeology and History
Cider Mill of Pittsburgh
560 Penn Street
Verona, PA 15147
www.ChristineDavisConsultants.com
412-826-0443

LEGEND

 LOD

 **CAMP MEETING ROAD SITE (36BT0801)**



1 CM = 40 METERS

Project Mapping
QUAKER VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL PROJECT
PR # 2024PR00022
Leetsdale and Edgeworth Boroughs and Leet Township
Allegheny County, Pennsylvania

REFERENCES:
STREAMLINE ENGINEERING, INC.
4-Quaker.LOD1_11_2024.shp
MICROSOFT CORPORATION
Aerial Imagery - 2024

PROJECT NO.
24-007

FIGURE 3

The project area is located on the upland above the confluence of Little Sewickley Creek and the Ohio River. Within the project area the hill slopes contain woodland while the flat area along the spine of the upland contains grasses and herb/shrub communities. The LOD includes all areas where potential ground surface impacts will occur as part of the proposed undertaking.

1.3 AGENCY COORDINATION

This project was submitted to the Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office (PA SHPO) through the Pennsylvania Statewide Historic and Archaeological Resource Exchange (PA SHARE) system. In a letter dated January 9, 2024, PA SHPO responded with a request for Phase I Archaeological Survey based on the presence of a previously unidentified archaeological site: 36BT0227.

The PA SHPO letter also requested more information, including photographs, for the Muotta House (Resource No. 2004RE03024), two abandoned residential buildings in the project area (Structure #2 at 200 Camp Meeting Road and Structure #3 at 210 Camp Meeting Road), and the Quaker Valley High School/Leetsdale High School (Resource No. 2019RE18002), which is not located within the project area but may be abandoned as a result of the new construction.

1.4 DISPOSITION OF MATERIALS

All photographs will be retained and all documents relating to the project will be stored as an executive file at the office of CDC at 560 Penn Street in Verona, Pennsylvania. CDC will supply copies of this document and shape files to Streamline Engineering, Inc. and the PA SHPO after the analyses by CDC are complete. Pennsylvania Archaeological Site Survey (PASS) information for the Camp Meeting Road Site (36AL0801) is in Appendix II. A copy of the Phase I Artifact Inventory for the site is in Appendix III. Currently, final curation of the artifact collections is still undecided. The landowners have been contacted requesting gift of the collection to the State Museum of Pennsylvania. Pending the landowner's gift decision, the artifact collection and/or the site documentation will be submitted to the State Museum for curation.



2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL BACKGROUND

Environmental changes have important effects on precontact and historic systems. The literature search originates with information regarding the glacial retreat from the Northeast. By 16,000 B.C. during the Pleistocene Wisconsinian glaciation, boreal forests extended to the Carolinas, and marginal glacial regions consisted of permanently frozen park tundra with large open meadows and zones of spruce and fir trees with some shrub/herbaceous communities. By about 7240 B.C., the ecological system of Appalachia was much as it is today. The cooler, dryer climates of the Late Pleistocene were described by Guilday (1982) who suggested that forests were more open and diverse with more browsing herbivores. Forests consisted of a mixed but essentially coniferous spruce/fir cover interspersed with grasslands. Seventy-five species of large mammals were known including several associated with early man such as caribou, elk, mammoth, and mastodon. By the early Holocene, the major faunal species had been reduced to six and the once diversified ecological systems had evolved into a more homogenous mast forest with “deficient understory, long winter resting periods, and intermittent snow cover” (Guilday 1982). It was not until 7240 B.C. that essentially modern invertebrates and vertebrates were present in mid-Appalachia (Guilday 1982).

Significant environmental changes occurred in the post-glacial period involving a two-stage transition based on pollen data from 13 Middle Atlantic sites. Early mesic forests of pine and then oak evolved into a later xeric period of hickory maximum. This transition from warm/wet conditions to a warmer and dryer period took place by at least 3200 B.C. The dryer conditions lasted until ca. 1000 B.C. and possibly later. As a result, major environmental changes affecting the distribution of plant and animal communities took place. Human populations responded to these climatic fluctuations either by abandoning traditional exploitative strategies in one zone and continuing them in another, or by exploiting new resources (Custer 1985).

Biological communities in the region have been altered by modern agriculture and industrial activities that significantly modified natural habitats and relationships.



Clear-cutting for the purpose of agriculture or lumbering creates a warmer, drier environment, and the resulting invasion of species tolerant to those conditions.

2.1 PHYSIOGRAPHY/GEOLOGY

The APE is topographically situated within the Pittsburgh Low Plateaus Section of the Appalachian Plateaus Province characterized by the narrow steep-sided valleys, broad ridge tops, and rolling uplands of southwestern Pennsylvania. Allegheny County contains ridge tops about 1,200 ft above sea level (asl) and conversely has elevations in the river valleys about 830 ft asl. These narrow steep sided valleys dissect the plateau in the region (USDA 1981).

Surficial rocks relate with the Mississippian, Pennsylvania, and Permian Systems with shale, siltstone, sandstone, and conglomerate. Bedrock units belong to the Glenshaw Formation of the Conemaugh Group and the Allegheny Formation. The Glenshaw formation consists of cyclic sequences of shale, sandstone, marine limestone, and siltstone but only thin coal strata. This sequence is composed of two formations, the lower Glenshaw Foundation and the upper Casselman Formation, each about 300 ft thick. Ames limestone forms the boundary of the two formations. The Allegheny Formation is bracketed by the Upper Freeport coal on the top and Brookville Coal at the base (Geyer and Bolles 1979). The geology of Allegheny County is mainly comprised of sedimentary rocks in origin which have horizontal layering with a gentle regional dip to the south (USDA 1981).

2.2 CLIMATE

Climatic conditions in Allegheny County include a typically humid continental regime with cold and snowy winters and warm to hot summers. Precipitation is adequate and well-distributed. The average temperature for most of the county is 50 degrees with frosts well into May. Summer temperatures range from a daytime average of 80 degrees to 50 degrees at night. Annual precipitation is 36 to 40 inches (in) with July being the wettest month (USDA 1981).



2.3 SOILS

Soil capabilities have an established relationship with prehistoric settlement patterns as well as the preservation of archaeological sites. Erosion and deep cultivation decrease the probability of extant archaeological horizons while well-drained soils capable of supporting rich mast and fruit production or prehistoric horticultural practices increase the probability of archaeological sites.

Soil types mapped within the LOD are Ernest-Vandergrift silt loam (EvD), Gilpin silt loam (GID), Gilpin-Upshur complex, very steep (GQF), Gilpin, Weikert, Culleoka channery silt loams (GSF), Rayne silt loam, Conemaugh geology (RycB and RycC), and Urban land-Rainsboro complex (URB) (USDA 2024).

Ernest-Vandergrift silt loam (EvD) are moderately deep, moderately well drained soils found on hill slopes of 15 to 25 percent. Typical profiles consist of a surface level of silty loam overlying a level of silty clay loam, and two levels of channery silt loam to a depth of 60 to 72 inches below the surface.

Gilpin silt loam (GID) are shallow, well drained soils on hill slopes of 15 to 25 percent. Typical profiles consist of a silt loam surface level overlying a second level of silt loam, a channery silty clay loam, and finally the bedrock at a depth of 30 to 40 inches below the surface.

Gilpin-Upshur Complex, very steep (GQF) are shallow, well-drained soils located on hill slopes of between 25 and 75 percent. The typical soil profile consists of two layers of organic material and two levels of channery silt loam underlain by an extremely channery silt loam and bedrock at a depth of between 30 and 40 inches below the surface.

Gilpin, Weikert, Culleoka channery silt loams (GSF) are shallow, well-drained soils found on hillslopes with slopes of 25 to 80 percent. The typical soil profile consists of a level of slightly decomposed plant material overlying two levels of channery silt loam underlain by an extremely channery silt loam and bedrock at a depth of between 33 and 43 inches below the surface.

Rayne silt loam, Conemaugh geology (RycB and RycC) are well drained soils found on upland landforms with slopes of 3 to 8 and 8 to 15 percent,



respectively. Typical soil profiles consist of two levels of silt loam overlying a channery silt loam, a very channery loam, and finally bedrock at a depth of 45 to 55 inches below the surface.

Urban land-Rainsboro complex (URB) is an area of land with slopes of between 0 and 8 percent containing soils composed of 75 percent urban land and 20 percent Rainsboro or similar soil. Urban land soils are composed of human transported materials. Rainsboro soils are moderately deep, moderately well drained soils found on terraces. Typical profiles consist of three levels of silty loam overlying a level of sandy clay loam, and a level of gravelly sandy loam at a depth of 60 to 72 inches below the surface.



3.0 BACKGROUND RESEARCH

3.1 PRECONTACT CONTEXT

An examination of the cultural prehistory of the general region provides relevant background data for characterizing and predicting the area's precontact settlement system. This data contributes to the ability of archaeologists to identify and establish the probability of archaeological sites in a specific area.

PALEOINDIAN

The **Paleoindian** occupation originating between 9500 B.C. and 9000 B.C. marks the first undisputed evidence of man's entry into Pennsylvania. However, based on radiocarbon dates from Meadowcroft Rock Shelter near Avella in Washington County it can be suggested that a pre-Paleoindian occupation employing polyhedral-core and blade-based lithic technology may have been present as early as 14,000 B.C. (Adovasio 1993:207). Paleoindian fluted projectile lanceolates, distinguished by elongated channel scars, are sometimes found in association with extinct Pleistocene megafauna such as mammoth and mastodon. These artifacts provide compelling evidence that fluted points mark the early Paleoindian occupation in the Northeast. The geographical distribution of these distinctive points and other tool forms from this period includes most of the New World (Brennan 1982).

The majority of Paleoindian sites in Pennsylvania are recognized by fluted points, keeled unifacial tools, gravers, and blades fabricated from a variety of cherts and jaspers. Site types suggested by Lantz (1985) include kill sites with single projectile points; upland and waterside camps with varied tool kits; trail camps associated with Indian paths and natural trails; and specialized quarry and tool manufacturing sites where raw materials were procured and worked into tools. An average of 72 percent of Paleoindian sites in Pennsylvania are located less than 200 m from second or higher-order streams (Carr 1998a). These riverine environments would have provided Paleoindian groups with a diversity of important resources.



Glacial conditions and colluvial and alluvial processes contributed to the profusion of open environments and coniferous vegetation during the Paleoindian and later Early Archaic periods. Based on pollen profiles of the Middle Atlantic region, a dramatic increase in conifer pollen is seen towards the end of the Paleoindian period and the beginning of the Early Archaic period when forests were dominated by pine and hemlock (Carr 1998a).

ARCHAIC

The **Early Archaic** period (8000 B.C. - 6000 B.C.) correlates with a time of notable environmental changes that began during the Pleistocene with episodes of glacial retreat; however, late Paleoindians lived within essentially the same environment as subsequent Archaic groups (Adovasio et al. 1998:18). Continuity between the Paleoindian and Early Archaic periods have been recognized, particularly through their subsistence regimes and mobility patterns (Stewart and Kratzer 1989; Adovasio 1993). By the Early Archaic, Pleistocene megafauna became extinct and were replaced by modern species such as caribou and elk. Oak pollen increased towards the beginning of the Early Archaic period, but conifers continued to dominate in the northern portions of Pennsylvania until 7000 B.C. when a Northern Hardwood forest began to take over the region (Carr 1998a).

Landscape modification resulting from melting and retreating glaciers may have reworked sediments in a way that would have destroyed archaeological evidence for the Early Archaic and Paleoindian periods in many loci, but the paucity of sites may be more closely related to a lack of understanding the Early Archaic tool kit. Evidence for resource availability is poorly known, but it is believed that Early Archaic cultures were generalized hunters and gatherers living in small ephemeral sites located in a diversity of geographical settings. The Paleoindian preference for floodplain settings is replaced with an increase in upland site locations. Where floral preservation in archaeological strata is present, a high percentage of vegetable foods, particularly acorns and hickory nuts, have been recovered. This suggests that either the excavated sites represented specialized camps or that Early Archaic peoples were subsisting on a diet supplemented with vegetable products.



The Early Archaic period is recognized by classic projectile tool types such as Kirk, Palmer, Big Sandy, and Thebes found at a relatively small number of localities. Continuity with Paleoindian populations can be suggested by Early Archaic tool attributes such as basal grinding. Based on the PASS files, less than 350 Early Archaic sites have been recorded in Pennsylvania and ninety-five percent of these are represented by surface finds (Carr 1998a:50). The number of stratified Early Archaic sites excavated in Pennsylvania has been low until recently when excavations at several stratified archaeological sites have revealed Early Archaic components. Most of these tend to cluster in the central portions of the state (Carr 1998a:51) and none are located in close proximity to the APE.

LeCroy and other bifurcate points mark the end of the Early Archaic period and the gradual emergence of the **Middle Archaic** cultures (Broyles 1971). By the Middle Archaic period (6500 B.C. - 3000 B.C.), some archaeologists suggest that a major economic shift toward increased specialization in hunting and gathering resources had occurred perhaps in response to continued Early Holocene environmental changes (Stewart and Kratzer 1989). Significant environmental shifts in the post-glacial period involved a two-stage transition based on pollen data from 13 Middle Atlantic sites. Early mesic forests of pine and then oak evolved into a later xeric period of hickory maximum and, according to Carr (1998b), the Middle Archaic can be best defined as an adaptation to this emerging deciduous forest. This transition from warm and wet conditions to a warmer and dryer period took place by at least 3200 B.C. The dryer conditions lasted until at least 1000 B.C. As a result, major environmental changes affected the distribution of plant and animal communities. Human populations responded to these climatic fluctuations either by abandoning traditional exploitative strategies in one zone and continuing them in another or by exploiting new resources (Custer 1985). The adaptive responses in place during the Middle Archaic period were coupled with a significant increase in population. Population increase also may be correlated with the trend toward territoriality and more sedentary lifeways as observed in the subsequent Late Archaic period.



Based on the PASS files, the Middle Archaic sites recorded in Pennsylvania are based primarily on the presence of diagnostic projectile points found during surface collections (Carr 1998b:80). Seventy-five percent of these sites are defined by early Middle Archaic MacCorkle, St. Albans, and LeCroy bifurcate points, indicating that later Middle Archaic phases are under-represented in Pennsylvania (Carr 1998b:80). Relatively few Middle Archaic sites have been examined in Pennsylvania until recently when excavations have occurred at several such sites. Most of these tend to cluster in the central and eastern portions of the state, and none are located in close proximity to the APE.

Hallmarks for the **Late Archaic** period include an emerging widespread interaction sphere in which objects such as copper, marine shell and chert were traded vis.-a-vis. long distance networks. Woodworking, weaving, and hideworking tools are evident on larger base camps and settlement camps where ceremonial and domestic activities were likely to have occurred. Base camps were located on major rivers and may have at least partially functioned to take advantage of riverine links with cultures outside of the river valleys for the purpose of trade, group hunting activities, ceremonies, and/or the exchange of ritual and marriage partners.

Corresponding with the Late Archaic period is the xerothermic climatic interval accompanied by an increased potential for oak-hickory forest development. Such specialized subsistence practices as the collection of mussel shell and hickory nuts as well as an increased use of fish and avian resources seem to have intensified during the Late Archaic, although data for an increase in subsistence diversity is difficult to assess because of the scarcity of archaeological findings for this period. A diversity of topographic situations in the uplands and major riverine areas were utilized during the Late Archaic.

EARLY WOODLAND

The **Early Woodland** period (1000 B.C.-100 B.C.) in Western Pennsylvania began at a time of change to warmer and moister climatic conditions. Trends that began in the earlier Late Archaic period developed to a greater extent in the Early Woodland period predominantly in areas with clustered and diverse resources.



Characteristics of this period are: 1) increase in social complexity and interactions; 2) increase in population; 3) establishing a cultural identity with territorial boundaries; 4) increasingly elaborate mortuary ritual in burial mounds; 5) expansion of trade and exchange; 5) shift to ceramic vessels and new lithic tool forms; and, 6) introduction of domesticated plants. During the Early Woodland period, preferred habitation sites included floodplains and terraces of major rivers and streams where ceremonial and domestic activities likely occurred. These sites may have at least partially sighted to take advantage of riverine links with cultures outside of the river valleys for the purpose of trade, group hunting activities, ceremonies, and/or the exchange of ritual and marriage partners. The exchange network had its origins during the Late Archaic period when objects such as copper, marine shell, and lithics were traded vis-à-vis long-distance trade. This interaction sphere continued and expanded into the Early Woodland period.

Early Woodland cultural phases recognized in southwestern Pennsylvania are defined as Half-Moon and Cresap. The **Half-Moon Phase** dates from 1100 B.C.-450 B.C. and was named for the Half-Moon Site in West Virginia. Sites from this period are typically located on stream terraces and uplands or rockshelters. Before the introduction of ceramic vessels, Early Woodland populations used flat-bottomed stone containers produced from steatite. The earliest ceramics in the region are Half-Moon grit-tempered vessels named for the type site. Temper materials ranged from sandstone, shale, limestone or other clastic materials. Mayer-Oakes dated Half-Moon cordmarked ceramics to the Adena period (2130 ± 200/180 B.P.) when he ran one of the region's first radiocarbon dates from the deeply stratified Georgetown Site along the Ohio River (Davis 1988). These ceramics have been found in association with Steubenville Stemmed and Adena Ovate Base projectile points as well as notched and stemmed points from Meadowcroft Rockshelter (McConaughy 2003). Forest notched points also are associated with Half-Moon ceramics in northwestern Pennsylvania and other parts of the Upper Ohio Valley. The Forest notched point appears to be a continuum from the Terminal Late Archaic broad spears and Orient fishtail types (Mayer Oakes 1955). Features found on Half-Moon Sites include small



hearths and small oval pits with no fire-cracked rock (FCR) or charcoal that have been interpreted as storage pits (McConaughy 2003). On the Youghiogheny River drainage, features containing both Forest Notched points and Half-Moon ceramics had radiocarbon dates of 420 B.C. $\pm$ 55 to 450 B.C. $\pm$ 55 (Ballweber 1989:84, 86, 90).

The **Cresap Phase** dates from 1700 B.C.-A.D. 460 based on a series of radiocarbon dates from sites on the Monongahela River and Chartiers Creek. Half-Moon ceramics are found in Cresap Phase sites, but new ceramic types were also introduced, including Adena Plain also known as McKees Rocks Plain. Projectile point types include Cresap, Adena Ovate-Based, and Forest Notched along with the Robbins point which occurs late in the phase. Among the classic Adena artifacts are reel-shaped gorgets, grooved adzes, bone awls, and marine shell (Dragoo 1963). New materials such as copper, greenstone, fireclay, and exotic lithics, cultivated tobacco for smoking pipe were components of the Adena Interaction Sphere. Objects exchanged from Western Pennsylvania in the Adena Interaction Sphere include blocked-end tubular pipes of fireclay, gorgets, marine shell and stone tablets. The range of other lithic tool forms includes granite and hematite celts, gravers, stemmed and leaf-shaped blades, drills, scrapers (hafted, thumb-nail, and side), lenticular blades and pestles (Dragoo 1963).

Several Cresap Phase sites with associated features have been found in southwestern Pennsylvania. The Mayview Ballfield Site along Chartiers Creek contained a shallow FCR feature (Robertson et al. 1993:45-58, 88). The Crawford-Grist #2 Site above the Monongahela River had a series of features and postmolds dating from the Early Woodland period (Grantz 1986). Forest notched points were also found on the Thorp Site in association with five oval to rectanguloid houses with central hearths and an earth oven dating from 1900 $\pm$ 60 B.P. (George 1998).

The Georgetown Site (36BV29) in Beaver County was one of the few Early Woodland sites with evidence of a structure. A crescent-shaped structure consisting of 17 postmolds was found in association with an Adena knife, two Adena cache blades, and a high percentage of Flint Ridge chalcedony. This unique Early Woodland structure was excavated by Christine Davis in 1986 and located near



earlier excavations conducted by William Mayer-Oakes in the 1950s. As a result of the Mayer-Oakes excavation, Georgetown became the type site for Upper Ohio Valley ceramics including Half-Moon cordmarked vessels with a date of 173 ± 200 B.C. (Davis 1988).

Three Early Woodland loci have been recorded on the Chartiers Creek: Mayview Depot Site (36AL124), Mayview Bend Site (36AL125), and Mayview Ballfield Site (36AL134). The majority of Early Woodland features found on these sites were shallow, round, or oval pits with FCR, charcoal, and debitage. Shallow roasting pits of 1 m in diameter were slightly oval and lined with sandstone slabs, thermally altered clay, and FCR suggesting high temperatures. Few lithics, seeds, or other plant remains were found in these features; however, the function was suggested as plant processing. Dates for the roasting pits range from 2800 to 1200 B.P. (Robertson et al. 2008:128,136). At the Leetsdale Site (36AL7), two Early Woodland features with high artifact and feature density ranged in age from 2860 B.P. to ca. 1860 B.P. Activity areas included lithic tool forms, roasting pits, and hearths. Several postmolds were found but no structures were identified (Miller 2012:10-69).

MIDDLE WOODLAND

The **Middle Woodland** period (A.D. 50-400/450) in western Pennsylvania is associated with the florescence and ultimate collapse of the Hopewell culture, which was centered in Ohio's Scioto valley where the greatest concentration of sites and artifacts have been found. The early Middle Woodland is identified by biface and bladelet industries, the use of earth ovens, and evidence of Eastern Agricultural Complex swidden gardens (Dancey 1991). Earlier Adena sites were often occupied into the Middle Woodland period as ritual/mortuary activities focusing on mounds and circular earthworks continued (Carskadden and Morton 1997:365, 372). The trade or exchange of objects in the Hopewell Interaction Sphere involved artifacts from as far west as the Rocky Mountains, as far north as the Great Lakes, as far east as the Atlantic seaboard, and as far south as the Gulf of Mexico. Exotic materials such as obsidian from Wyoming, Knife River flint from North Dakota, pipestone, quartz



crystals, petrified wood, copper, mica, marine shell, sharks' teeth, and marine turtle shell were among the materials traded into the Hopewell Interaction Sphere. The Middle Woodland era was vibrant with unusual and diverse raw materials and finished tool forms, ornaments, and ritual artifacts. Chalcedony, cherts, fireclays, petrified wood, and greenstone were among the materials exchanged through the Hopewell Interaction Sphere at various levels of intensity.

The Middle Woodland settlement pattern involved the construction and maintenance of earthworks and mounds. A subsistence system based on the reliance on deer and other mammals continued but with an increase in aquatic resources, including fish, birds, turtles, and amphibians. Evidence for domesticated plants is not impressive during the Middle Woodland; instead, there seems to be more of a dependence on a broad-spectrum subsistence pattern, including the harvesting of wild or quasi-domesticated crops near rich hunting and gathering sites (Crites 1987).

In southwestern Pennsylvania, the Fairchance Phase of Middle Woodland was named for a site near Moundsville, West Virginia. Fairchance Phase sites are influenced by the Hopewell Interaction Sphere and exhibit settlement pattern traits including small, compact, semi-permanent villages with simple post structures but no substantial houses (Hemmings 1984:12). Snyder's Corner notched and Manker Stemmed points, lamellar blades, and banded gorgets are characteristic of this phase. Thin limestone-tempered cordmarked ceramics, both incised and plain, are found in both the Fairchance Phase and Late Woodland Watson Farm Phase. Few Fairchance sites have been excavated in southwestern Pennsylvania. The Billy #3 and #1 in Westmoreland County represent a Fairchance Phase mound and hamlet (George 1998). The Barking Road Site (36AL313) on a glacial terrace above the Allegheny River also has Watson ceramics in features with radiocarbon dates including A.D. 210-370 and A.D. 340-450 (Kingsley et al. 1994:40).

LATE WOODLAND

The term **Late Woodland** as related to southwestern Pennsylvania archaeology has been used interchangeably with Late Precontact and Late Middle



Woodland. This period of southwestern Pennsylvania prehistory extends from A.D. 450-900/950 and marks the end of the Hopewell Interaction Sphere and the emergence of Monongahela Culture (McConaughy 2012). The Late Woodland period is a significant time of transformation from Middle Woodland dispersed settlement patterns to the nucleated agricultural villages of the Monongahela. The powerful combination of an accelerated shift to a maize-based economy and the introduction of the bow and arrow are important traits expressed in Late Woodland. Earth-and rock-covered mounds were used for burials during the Late Woodland (McConaughy 2002; 2012).

The Late Woodland period is marked by point types from this period including Backstrum side-notched, Jacks Reef, Raccoon, Kiski, Garver's Ferry, and Murphy's Stemmed (George 1992). Limestone tempered cordmarked Watson Ware ceramics continue through the Late Woodland (McConaughy 2012:24-26). The type site for the Watson Farm Phase of Late Woodland is the Watson Farm Village (46HK34) which dates to A.D. 628 and is located on the Ohio River in Hancock County, West Virginia. Forty features were found on the site including 28 small oval basins containing ash, charcoal, thermally altered clay, and FCR were identified during excavation. Associated posts suggested roasting racks. Four features contained dense FCR but no charcoal. Seven earth ovens were identified as deep basin-shaped features with FCR. Evidence for houses included one large postmold interpreted as a central roof support for an oval house with circling postmolds and pit features lining the interior. Arcs of postmolds also were found (McConaughy 2002).

LATE PRECONTACT/PROTO-HISTORIC

During the Late Precontact/Proto-Historic periods (A.D. 900/950-1635), the lower Upper Ohio River Valley of southwestern Pennsylvania and parts of Ohio, West Virginia and Maryland were occupied by groups collectively known as the Monongahela. Throughout the Late Precontact period, subsistence strategies involved an increase in maize and other cultigens in a diet involving hunting and wild plants. By 1300-1350, the onset of the Little Ice Age is believed to have caused summer temperatures to decline, and conditions may not have been favorable for



successful maize agriculture for at least two centuries (George 2007:73). Disruption and change in precontact settlement and subsistence patterns ensued as villages were abandoned. Sociopolitical relationships transformed. A complex settlement system dominated by circular villages with or without stockades also included rockshelters, hunting and gathering stations, winter campsites, and small farmsteads. The classic small circular village pattern is documented throughout the Monongahela region, yet evidence of more elaborate settlements has been forthcoming as a result of excavations of the Sony Site (36WM151) and a unique settlement pattern at the Jones Site (36GR4) (Davis 1997; 2014).

3.2 CULTURAL HISTORIC OVERVIEW

Archival documentation of the general area is significant in understanding past land use patterns and cultural events relating with the regional cultural history. The recorded history of the area begins with the French and English fur traders and explorers who penetrated the Allegheny Mountains in the late seventeenth century during a prolonged period of internecine warfare among Native Americans. When the Iroquois recognized the superior trade objects offered by Europeans, attempts were made to acquire new hunting lands to provide the traders with furs. The attack on Huronia in 1649 marked the beginning of the Beaver Wars and a period in which the Iroquois progressively gained regional control. The wars dragged on until the first half of the eighteenth century when the Iroquois held the balance of power between the French and English in America (Wallace 1965). During this period, the indigenous populations dispersed, and refugees established villages, cabins, farmsteads and trading stations associated with the rivers and trading paths of southwestern Pennsylvania.

The Sewickley Bottoms area (now Leetsdale) was one of the earliest of the refugee occupations in this part of the Ohio River Valley. In 1731, the Asswekales, a Shawnee group, moved to Sewickley Bottoms from their earlier town near present-day Tarentum on the Allegheny River. The village, known as Chinque, was abandoned by the Shawnee after the pressure of European settlement and conflict drove them to the



mouth of the Scioto River in Ohio (Donehoo 1928:183). The precise location of this Contact Period occupation could not be documented through historic records. However, the Sewickley Bottoms area was noted on an 1851 map as being in Leetsdale between the Little and Big Sewickley Creek (Sidney and Neff 1851).

The old Indian town of Chinque, now within the communities of Ambridge and Leetsdale, became one of Pennsylvania's most complex cultural areas during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The town expanded and contracted to accommodate hundreds of Indians and later the French and English who came first to trade and later to conquer. The area was claimed first by the French and later by Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania. Dignitaries including George Washington and Celeron de Blainville visited the town. French and English traders, disenfranchised Native Americans, coeur de bois, criminals, and vagabonds were among the residents and visitors. As boundary disputes among Indians and the French and English escalated, treaties of international significance were negotiated along the Ohio River at the mouth of Sewickley Creek.

More than a quarter of a century before Fort Duquesne was built at the Forks of the Ohio, the French built a fort of "Loggs" at Logstown located downstream from Sewickley Bottoms. The complexity and composition of Logstown changed through time as Indians, French, English, Virginians, Canadians, and others occupied the town. Logstown was situated 17.5 miles (57 perches by the path) from Fort Pitt. The lower town extended about "60 perches" over a rich bottom to the foot of a low steep ridge, on the summit of which stood the upper town (Mulkearn and Pugh 1954:110-12). The town expanded to both sides of the river including the wide terrace at present-day Aliquippa. It is likely that the settlement at Logstown expanded into the Leetsdale area to accommodate the hundreds of Europeans and Indians who claimed the region. George Croghan built a trading center at Logstown in 1744 and 1745 and within three years, at least 20 traders resided in the center. The town increased in importance as a center for negotiating treaties. In 1748, between August 27 and September 18, Conrad Weiser, Pennsylvania Indian interpreter and emissary, held a conference there for the Six Nations, Shawnee, Wyandott, and other western tribes. In August of the following



year, French Army officer Celeron de Blainville attended a conference at Logstown and reported that the Iroquois, Shawnee and Delaware occupied at least 50 cabins there.

Virginia confirmed claims to the region around Logstown, and George Washington conferred with the Half King (Tanacharison and Monakatoocha) and a number of the Six Nations at Logstown during the period between 1752 and 1753 about the Virginia claims. However, it was the French who forced the Virginians to withdraw and in June of 1754, the Indians who remained at Logstown burned their village and left as well. The French then constructed 30 cabins at Logstown for their allies, the Shawnee. After the defeat of the French at Fort Duquesne, Logstown continued as an important center for negotiations among Native Americans and the English.

The Delaware retained ownership of the Sewickley Bottoms area at Leetsdale until the tumultuous period following the Revolutionary War. In 1779, the Delaware gave Sewickley Bottoms to Colonel George Morgan, an Indian trader from Princeton, New Jersey as a token of their gratitude for his attempts to “benefit their race.” Morgan refused the land donation (Davis 1999).

After the Revolutionary War, the towns at Logstown and Sewickley Bottoms were abandoned and described as “old fields quite grown up with shrubs, which have destroyed their beautiful appearance and verdure. There is still a great deal of fine blue grass among the plum trees and other bushes.” Then on November 28, 1792, General Anthony Wayne arrived in the Logstown area with the Legion of the United States to establish a camp. This group would later become the United States Army. Wayne's entourage of more than 2,000 men constructed the camp of 500 buildings along the Ohio River as a base for a military force against an alliance of western Indians. President George Washington commissioned Wayne as the Commander-in-Chief, and two years later Wayne defeated the Indian alliance commanded by Shawnee Chief Blue Jacket at the Battle of Fallen Timbers. Three years after the battle, the Treaty of Greenville opened Ohio and parts of Indiana for settlement and in 1796, all of the British garrison along the Great Lake surrendered (Oliver 1993).

The military road established by General Wayne joined Pittsburgh with Legionville along the Beaver Road, a road that became the principal route for western



travel and was instrumental in the emerging agricultural and early industrial regions in Beaver County. Major Daniel Leet of Washington County purchased land in Leetsdale as early as 1791 and a stone house known as the Lark Inn was built on his property. The inn was often referred to as the Halfway House because of its location halfway between Pittsburgh and Beaver. Daniel Leet was commissioned as a deputy surveyor for Augusta County, Virginia in 1776 and later surveyed the portions of Pennsylvania's donation and depreciation lands. Daniel's brother, Jonathan Leet, also surveyed the "depreciated lands" north of the Ohio River and laid out the town of Beaver Falls. Daniel Leet laid out the town of Beaver and also the lands at the "old French settlement, formerly called Logstown." Colonel Isaac Melcher purchased five of the lots extending from one mile below the Big Sewickley Creek to the mouth of Logstown Run (Mulkearn and Pugh 1954:110-11).

By 1850, Leetsdale was a small village of several houses surrounded by large farms along both the bottom lands and the uplands around the Little and Big Sewickley Creeks. It was not until June 26, 1869 that Leet Township was established from a part of Sewickley. Members of the Leet family including John Bean, a brother-in-law, and Daniel Leet's daughter Eliza, wife of Daniel Shields, resided in the Leetsdale area for most of the nineteenth century. Shields owned six of the Depreciation Tracts (Everts 1872:164; Leet Township 1969:9-10). Both the Shields and Leets families continued as area landowners through the 1850s (Sidney and Neff 1851).

The construction of the Pittsburgh, Fort Wayne and Chicago Railroad through Leetsdale in the 1850s was a significant development for the small riverside village. A station on the railroad at Leetsdale provided a river-to railroad connection with the town's ferry across the Ohio River to Shousetown. The railroad later constructed an engine house at Leetsdale (Hopkins 1862) and, in the early twentieth century, upgraded the railroad station and added additional tracks to meet the needs of the rapidly growing industries in Leetsdale and Ambridge.

The town of Leetsdale was originally laid in two plans including the Gazzam Plan on the east side of the railroad and the U.S. Building and Loan Association's plan on the west side of the railroad to the river. After D. Leets Shield sold his property in Leetsdale



to F. M. Love, a land speculator named Gazzam laid out part of the town. The Union Company added to this plan and by 1906, this section of the community was densely occupied by residential buildings including many frame buildings built to house workers for the nearby American Bridge Company and other local industries (Donnelly 1982). The majority of homes in the U.S. Building and Loan Association's Plan were demolished to make way for industrial development along the railroad. All that remains in the Union Company's original plan are several residences and two barns located on First Street.

In the early nineteenth century, the Economites purchased the area north of the existing Leetsdale Industrial Park from the Leet family for use as a brick works. The brick works was located on Leet Street. Soon after Eliza Leet, only child of Daniel and Wilhemina Leet, married David Shields, the couple moved to Sewickley Bottoms. Leet Street was one of two streets to cross the floodplain between the railroad and riverfront at this point. Shousetown Road, later Ferry Road, crossed on the east side to provide a route for the ferry boat between Leetsdale Railroad Station and Shousetown on the opposite side of the river. A tributary stream between the Little and Big Sewickley Creeks flowed through the floodplain to join the Ohio River approximately 305 m (1,000 ft) west of Shousetown Road (Hopkins 1876). Hugh Bevington and Captain C.W. McCormick, a river pilot, resided near the Economy brick works.

As nineteenth century industrial expansion in the City of Pittsburgh brought smoke and congestion to the urban environment, city dwellers looked for relief in suburbs with access along the railroad systems. The villages of Leetsdale, Sewickley and Edgeworth became summer retreats along the Pittsburgh, Fort Wayne and Chicago Railroad. Most of the grand Victorian estates were located on Camp Meeting Road or in Leet Township although several large mansions stood on high terraces overlooking the Ohio River on Beaver Road. The Hay Walker house, now demolished, was one example of housing from this period (Donnelly 1982). Another large mansion occupied the site of what is now Henle Park, named after the former Mayor Edward C. Henle. Located here in the 1860s was the estate of Henry M. Atwood, a brass manufacturer, who planted his estate with many rare trees, some of which survive



today. During the building of the Atwood house, the remains of an old cabin was discovered. Possibly the home of an early trader, the cabin could have dated to the late-eighteenth or early-nineteenth centuries.

The village of Fair Oaks, located on the boundary of Beaver County on Big Sewickley Creek, later became incorporated into Leetsdale Borough. In the 1870s the family of General Alexander Hays, who was killed in the Civil War, built the First Missionary Baptist Church, now the Leetsdale Baptist Church. After the General died, his widow and children moved to the area and named the village after the Civil War battle that resulted in her husband's promotion to General. This stone church and the stone McCrum House both occupied lots on Beaver Road in Fair Oaks.

Leetsdale evolved from a rural village to an industrial town with a series of plans laid out by developers and land speculators after the construction of Riter-Conley Company's plant at the end of Ferry Street in 1903. By 1906, there were at least nine housing plans in the borough including the two original plans (Gazzam and the U.S. Building and Loan Association) as well as the Samuel W. Black Plan, multiple Union Company plans, the Leetsdale Plan, the William Dunn Partition Plan, and the James B. Oliver Estate Plan (Hopkins 1906). The town grew as new workers' housing and private dwellings infilled the large nineteenth century land tracts and estates (Sanborn 1905). Then, in the mid-twentieth century, Leetsdale was re-oriented from the old Beaver Road to Ohio River Boulevard resulting in important changes to the historic character and feeling of the community.

3.3 HISTORY OF PREVIOUS RESEARCH

The literature search included an examination of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the PASS, the Allegheny County Historic Site Survey, and secondary county histories.

Archaeological Resources

Overall, there are 820 previously recorded archaeological sites in Allegheny County, including 3 in Leetsdale Borough, 51 in Edgeworth Borough, and 5 in Leet



Township. Based on a search of the Pennsylvania State Historic and Archaeological Resource Exchange (PA-SHARE) system, there are no previously recorded archaeological sites within the LOD.

There are eight previously recorded archaeological sites within a one-mile radius of the LOD (Table 1). Leetsdale (36AL0007) is a precontact period archaeological site that is identified in the PA SHARE system as demolished. Kusnirak (36AL0210) is a precontact period site that has been determined not eligible for the NRHP. Two sites, Chinque/ Harmony Brickworks (36AL0480) and Dashields Dam (36AL0600), are multicomponent historic and precontact period sites. Both sites are unevaluated for the NRHP. The remaining four sites are open precontact sites that are unevaluated for the NRHP.

TABLE 1
PREVIOUSLY RECORDED ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES WITHIN A
ONE MILE RADIUS OF THE LOD

Site Number: Site Name	Site Type	NR Status
36AL0007 : Leetsdale	Pre-Contact Open Habitation	Demolished
36AL0061 : Upper Leetsdale	Pre-Contact Open Habitation	Unevaluated
36AL0210 : Kusnirak	Pre-Contact Open Site, Unknown Function	Not Eligible
36AL0319 : Bethlehem Steel Plant	Pre-Contact Open Site, Unknown Function	Unevaluated
36AL0386 : Leets #1	Pre-Contact Open Habitation	Unevaluated
36AL0387 : Leets #2	Pre-Contact Open Habitation	Unevaluated
36AL0480 : Chinque/ Harmony Brickworks	Historic and Pre-Contact	Unevaluated
36AL0600 : Dashields Dam	Historic and Pre-Contact	Unevaluated

Above Ground Resources

There is one National Register-eligible located within the LOD: Muottas/William Walter Estate (Resource No. 2004RE03024). Muottas is a Colonial Revival stone mansion built in ca. 1905 as a summer estate. The resource is eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C for Architecture. In 2017, the mansion was moved approximately 1,000 ft west along the ridge top and placed atop a new concrete foundation. All the associated outbuildings, including a guest cottage, servants cottage, stable, garage/workshop, and shed, were demolished at that time to make way for the construction of a new home in the former location of the mansion. After



extensive grading activities and the construction of a concrete foundation that was larger than the footprint of the Muottas House, the project was subsequently abandoned and no further construction activities were undertaken.

There is one NRHP-listed property immediately adjacent to but not within the LOD: Elmridge (Resource No. 2000RE00364). Elmridge is an Italianate style mansion dating ca. 1869 to 1901 located at the intersection of Camp Meeting and Beaver Roads.

Previously Conducted Cultural Resource Investigations

There are no previously conducted cultural resource surveys located within the boundaries of the LOD.



4.0 RESEARCH DESIGN

4.1 PRECONTACT RESOURCE POTENTIAL

Variation in exploitation zones depended on factors such as technology, seasonality and proximity to other important activities. Understanding the subsistence and procurement strategies of precontact populations requires a comprehensive knowledge of the settlement system including the relationship of small low-density sites to topographic settings. The function of small low-density campsites changed in response to modifications in subsistence and procurement strategies during major cultural shifts. For example, the seasonal procurement of nuts, fruits and salt as well as raw materials for the fabrication of textiles, baskets and other perishables not available in the archaeological record may be related to the presence of temporary outlying camps.

4.2 CONTRIBUTING PREDICTABILITY FACTORS

4.2.1 *Topographic Setting, Soil Types and Degree of Slope*

Archaeological sites are more likely to be present on well drained, nearly level soil types than poorly drained or steeply sloping soils. High probability soil types mapped in the LOD are Rayne silt loam, Conemaugh geology (RycB) and Urban land-Rainsboro complex (URB), which are more likely to produce cultural material. High probability soils have slopes that range from 0 to 8 percent. Soils containing slopes greater than 8 percent and less than 15 percent, such as Rayne silt loam, Conemaugh geology (RycC) soils, were considered to have a lower potential to produce cultural material. Low probability soils contain slopes greater than 15 percent and were considered to have a very low potential to produce cultural material. Within the LOD this includes Ernest-Vandergrift silt loam (EvD), Gilpin silt loam (GID), Gilpin-Upshur complex, very steep (GQF), and Gilpin, Weikert, Culleoka channery silt loams (GSF) (USDA 2024).



4.2.2 Proximity to Water Sources

The project area is located in the Ohio River Watershed (Subbasin 20G) and is well watered and drained by the Ohio River and Little Sewickley Creek. The confluence of Little Sewickley Creek with the Ohio River is located approximately 0.75 miles south of the LOD.

4.2.3 Association with Precontact/Historic Indian Paths

Early paths increase the probability of prehistoric archaeological resources from all cultural periods, particularly the Late Prehistoric and Contact periods. The Great Path which runs from Pittsburgh to Detroit passes through the project area. Additionally, the Logstown Path ran from the Indian settlement of Logstown, located approximately 3.75 mile north of the project area to the confluence of the Allegheny River and French Creek. Before the Forks of the Ohio River were occupied by Europeans, the Logstown path was the preferred Indian route from this area to Erie and Venango. Logstown Path closely follows the Ohio River at Leetsdale (Wallace 1965).

4.2.4 Previously Recorded Precontact Archaeological Sites

There are no previously recorded precontact archaeological sites located within the boundaries of the LOD.

4.2.5 Previously Recorded Historic Archaeological Sites

There are no previously recorded historic archaeological sites located within the boundaries of the LOD.

4.2.6 Previous Impacts

Previous impacts include widespread disturbance across the spine of the upland flat caused by the construction and subsequent demolition of the mansion outbuildings, relocation of the mansion building, and grading/ excavation for installation of the new concrete house foundation. Additional disturbances in the LOD are associated with



construction of 200 and 210 Camp Meeting Road and grading for both access drives
(Photos 1 to 6).



Photo 1: New Concrete Foundation, Looking West





Photo 2: Grading and Disturbance West of New Concrete Foundation, Looking West Toward New Location of Mouttas. Note pile of demolition debris



Photo 3: Grading and Disturbance Along Ridgetop, Looking East from Mouttas. Note paved and graveled access road.





Photo 4: 200 Camp Meeting Road, Looking Northeast



Photo 5: 210 Camp Meeting Road, Looking Southeast






Photo 6: Original, Paved Access Drive, Looking West

4.2.7 Summary of Probability Assessment


The entire project area was designated into areas with low, moderate, or high potential for the presence of archaeological sites (Figure 4). Areas that contained standing water or saturated soils, and disturbances caused by access, demolition, grading, and construction within the LOD. The remainder of the project area was determined to have a high probability for containing precontact archaeological sites and was tested at 15 m intervals.





Christine Davis Consultants
Archaeology and History
Cider Mill of Pittsburgh
560 Penn Street
Verona, PA 15147
www.ChristineDavisConsultants.com
412-826-0443

- LEGEND**
- LOD
 - TESTED
 - STEEP
 - DISTURBED



Tested, Steep and Disturbed Areas
QUAKER VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL PROJECT
PR # 2024PR00022
Leetsdale and Edgeworth Boroughs and Leet Township
Allegheny County, Pennsylvania

REFERENCES:
STREAMLINE ENGINEERING, INC.
4-Quaker.OD1_11_2024.shp
MICROSOFT CORPORATION
Aerial Imagery - 2024

PROJECT NO.
24-007
FIGURE 4

5.0 PHASE I FIELD SURVEY

5.1 FIELD METHODOLOGY

The Phase I field methodology conforms to the approach developed by the PA SHPO (PA SHPO 2021). Field work began with a ground surface inspection of the LOD for the purpose of defining any surface evidence of archaeological sites such as foundations or other extant features; of detecting any variability in topographic and soil maps that would affect the predictive model; and finally, to note any impact to the archaeological integrity of the LOD.

In potentially undisturbed areas of less than 15 percent slopes, where ground surface visibility was not adequate for surface collection, the hand-excavation of 0.5 by 0.5 m shovel test probes (STPs) were conducted at 15 m intervals. If artifactual materials were identified within a STPs, reduced interval testing at 5-m intervals was performed in the four cardinal directions. STPs were excavated to undisturbed soil levels. Once sterile subsoil was reached, a minimum of 10 cm of additional subsoil was excavated to confirm the natural stratigraphy of the horizon.

Two 1 x1 m square Units were placed to examine feature areas. Both Units were hand excavated in 10 cm levels within natural strata to a minimum of one 10-cm level into sterile subsoil.

All hand-excavated soils were screened through quarter-in hardware mesh and returned to original ground surface condition. All subsurface units were numbered sequentially, and soil profiles were cleaned and documented by a pedological description. When artifacts were found, each location was assigned a field site number.

5.2 SURVEY RESULTS

The LOD encompasses approximately 270,865.0 sq m (2,915,566.7 sq ft or 66.9 ac). During the ground surface inspection, portions of the LOD were designated as low to high probability for precontact archaeological sites based mainly on landform, degree of slope, wet areas, and disturbances within the LOD. Portions of the LOD were



not tested due to the presence of slope greater than 15 percent, wet areas, and disturbances caused by access, demolition, grading, and construction. Approximately 249,298.5 sq m (2,683,427.3 sq ft or 61.6 ac) was not tested. The remainder of the LOD, 21,566.5 sq m (232,139.4 sq ft or 5.3 ac), was testable (see Figure 4).

Testable areas were examined through pedestrian survey, the excavation of sequentially numbered STPs, judgmental STPs, Exploratory Auger Probes (APs), and Units as described below. A total of 118 STPs were excavated, including 97 at 15 m intervals and 21 at 5 m intervals, as well as 2 Units. Of these, 98 STPs were negative and 20 STPs and both Units were positive for artifactual materials. Additionally, one exploratory auger probe (AP 3) was positive for artifactual materials. One historic period feature, Feature 1: Cistern, was identified. Based on the results of the Phase I Archaeological Survey, one new historic period archaeological site, **Camp Meeting Road Site (36AL0801)** was discovered (Figure 5).



Tested Area

Description: The tested area encompasses the portion of the LOD that was not excluded from testing due to the presence of slope, wet areas and disturbances caused by access, demolition, grading, and construction (Figure 6; Photos 7 to 12). A total of 21,566.5 sq m (232,139.4 sq ft or 5.3 ac) was amenable for subsurface testing. The area is bound by Camp Meeting Road to the north, and the limits of the LOD in all other directions. The LOD is topographically situated in the uplands above the confluence of Little Sewickley Creek and the Ohio River. Within the project area the hill slopes contain woodland, while the flat area along the spine of the upland contains grasses and herb/shrub communities. One NRHP-eligible above ground property, the Muottas/William Walter Estate (Resource No. 2004RE03024), and two unevaluated residences, 200 and 210 Camp Meeting Road, are located within the LOD. Elevations range from approximately 1,106 to 760 ft asl.

Methodology: Field methodology consisted of pedestrian survey and the hand-excavation of STPs at 5 m and 15 m intervals. Short interval STPs were placed within the area of the observed potential surface feature and depressions along with additional intensive pedestrian survey. Exploratory APs and Units were placed judgmentally to investigate depressions.

Results: Initially, a total of 118 STPs were hand excavated, including 97 STPs at 15 m intervals. Additionally, pedestrian reconnaissance identified one intact visible surface feature (Feature 1: Cistern) and two possible depressions (see Figure 6). Of the STPs excavated at 15-m intervals in the area of the feature, 4 were positive for historic period artifacts. To further investigate the potential site area, an additional 21 5-m interval STPs were excavated in the area adjacent to Feature 1 and the identified depressions. Overall, of the 118 STPs, 98 were negative and 20 were positive for historic period artifacts.

Subsequently, 3 APs were judgmentally placed to explore the depressions (potential features) and one AP was positive. Finally, two Units were placed to sample potential depression areas and both Units contained historic period materials.



Soil Profile STP 4-3	Strat and Artifact Description
Description	
Brown Silty Loam	0-26 cm Ap Horizon No Cultural Material
Yellowish-Brown Silty Clay Loam	26-36 cm C Horizon No Cultural Material

Undisturbed STPs across the LOD exhibit one of two upland profiles. Most commonly, tests contained a brown silty loam Ap horizon underlain by a C horizon of yellowish-brown silty clay loam. These tests are located on areas of upland flat or terraces located within larger mapped areas of steep slopes. This includes the tests along Transects 3 through 12, a most of Transects 13, Transects 14 and 15, and

a portion of Transect 16.

Along Transects 11, 12, and 13 soil profiles were very shallow and STPs terminated at bedrock below a thin level of yellowish-brown silty clay loam subsoil. Transect 5 is located just southeast of, but beyond the disturbances associated with construction of the concrete foundation in the former Muottas House location. Transects 7 and 8 are located just north of the deeply excavated, flat area constructed to place the new Muottas House foundation.

Soil Profile STP 2-1	Strat and Artifact Description
Description	
Brown Silty Loam	0-28 cm A Horizon No Cultural Material
Yellowish-Brown Sandy Loam	26-36 cm B Horizon No Cultural Material
Yellowish-Brown Coarse Sand	57+ cm C Horizon No Cultural Material

A small number of tests along Transect 2 contained profiles consisting of a brown sandy loam underlain by a level of yellowish-brown sandy loam, and yellowish-brown coarse sand. This transect was located along the edge of a small intermittent tributary or drainage channel located just northwest of the intersection of Camp Meeting Road and Beaver Street.



Soil Profile STP 1-3	Strat and Artifact Description
Description	
Black Silty Loam, gravelly	0-27 cm Disturbance No Cultural Material
Yellowish-Brown Silty Clay Loam	27-37 cm Subsoil No Cultural Material

The remaining STPs exhibit various levels and types of disturbances. This includes Transect 1, located near the intersection of Camp Meeting Road and Beaver Street. STPs along this transect contained rocky, black silty loam historic period fill overlying the yellowish-brown silty clay loam subsoil. Disturbed soils were also found along sections of Transects 13 and 16, in the area of observed historic

period feature and surface depressions. STPs in this area contained a similar surface level of black, gravelly silty loam fill overlying the yellowish-brown silty clay loam subsoil. Many of the STPS within this area terminated at bedrock either underlying the surface disturbance or a thin layer of subsoil.





Photo 7: Transect 2, Looking North



Photo 8: Transect 4, Looking East





Photo 9: Transect 7, Looking South toward Mouttas House



Photo 10: Transect 10, Looking North






Photo 11: Transect 12, Looking North



Photo 12: Transect 15, Looking South






Christine Davis Consultants
Archaeology and History
Cider Mill of Pittsburgh
560 Penn Street
Verona, PA 15147
www.ChristineDavisConsultants.com
412-826-0443

LEGEND

- LOD
- CAMP MEETING ROAD SITE (36BT0801)
- NEGATIVE STP 15M
- POSITIVE STP 15M

0 70 140
1 CM = 35 METERS

Testing Plan
QUAKER VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL PROJECT
PR # 2024PR00022
Leetsdale and Edgeworth Boroughs and Leet Township
Allegheny County, Pennsylvania

REFERENCES:
STREAMLINE ENGINEERING, INC.
4-Quaker.OD1_11_2024.shp
MICROSOFT CORPORATION
Aerial Imagery - 2024

PROJECT NO.
24-007

FIGURE 6

Pedestrian reconnaissance in the former location of the Muottas House and the current vicinity of the modern concrete foundation identified two partially intact, remnant foundations associated with the historic house. The remnant brick, stone, and concrete foundation segments were observed within the cut walls of the area within which the concrete foundation had been constructed (Photos 13 and 14). This area was extensively disturbed during the moving of the Mouttas House to a new location on the property to the east and the construction of a new foundation for a home that was never built. No intact soils, other features, or artifacts were found in association with these remnants and the Mouttas House itself is still standing in its new location. Email correspondence with the PA SHPO office dated March 1, 2024 determined that these foundation remnants did not need to be recorded as an archaeological site but should be noted in the subject report.

Based on the results of testing, one new historic period archaeological site, the **Camp Meeting Road Site (36AL0801)**, was identified within 4 positive 15-m interval STPs, 16 positive short interval STPs, one Exploratory AP, and two Units. The newly identified historic site includes one feature, a brick cistern with a surficial concrete surround, and associated historic artifacts. All of the positive STPs are located in the immediate vicinity of the visible surface feature.





Photo 13: Insignificant Brick Foundation Remnant from the Original Location of the Mouttas Mansion, Looking Northeast



Photo 14: Insignificant Stone and Concrete Foundation Remnant from the Original Location of the Mouttas Mansion, Looking Northeast



Camp Meeting Road Site (36AL0801)

Camp Meeting Road Site (36AL0801) is a historic period archaeological site encompassing approximately 984.1 sq m (10,593.2 sq ft or 0.24 ac) at an elevation of 1,089 ft asl (Figure 7). The site includes 536 historic artifacts and 1 feature: a brick cistern with a surficial concrete surround (Feature 1: Cistern) that dates between ca. 1870 to 1880/ca. 1900 to 1950.

Historic period artifacts were initially recovered from 4 of the 15-m interval STPs. Once the initial Phase I fieldwork was completed, it was determined that an additional Phase I level examination of the site was needed. Additional surface reconnaissance and testing was conducted, including short interval STPs placed in the LOD within the vicinity of Feature 1 and two large surface depressions (Depression 1 and 2). In total, 16 of the 21 short interval STPs and 1 of 3 Exploratory APs were positive for historic artifacts. Two Units were also placed, one within a large rectangular depression (Depression 1) and one to the east of the depression, toward Feature 1. The Camp Meeting Road site boundary is based on the location of Feature 1 and positive testing.

The results of testing within the site boundary reveal that much of the site area has undergone extensive, previous ground disturbance. This may be associated with the removal of structural remains in this location during the mid-twentieth century. Most testing, including close interval STPs placed to investigate Depressions 1 and 2, exhibited disturbance overlying subsoil or bedrock. Clearing of vegetation and inspection of both depressions failed to reveal evidence of intact foundations, foundation remains, or other features at these locations. Based on the evidence of disturbance and absence of intact features, Depressions 1 and 2 have been identified as evidence of previous disturbance and not representative of a former building due to lack of material evidence (Photos 15 and 16).






Photo 15: Depression 1, Looking South



Photo 16: Depression 2, Looking Northeast toward Depression 1





LEGEND - CAMP MEETING ROAD SITE (36BT0801) - NEGATIVE STP 15M - POSITIVE STP 15M - NEGATIVE STP CLOSE INTERVAL - POSITIVE STP CLOSE INTERVAL - FEATURE - POSITIVE UNIT	Christine Davis Consultants Archaeology and History Cider Mill of Pittsburgh 560 Penn Street Verona, PA 15147 www.ChristineDavisConsultants.com 412-826-0443	0 4 8 1 CM = 2 METERS	REFERENCES: STREAMLINE ENGINEERING, INC. 4-QuakerL0D1_11_2024.shp MICROSOFT CORPORATION Aerial imagery - 2024
CAMP MEETING ROAD SITE (36BT0801) TESTING QUAKER VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL PROJECT PR # 2024PR00022 Leetsdale and Edgeworth Boroughs and Leet Township Allegheny County, Pennsylvania			PROJECT NO. 24-007 FIGURE 7

History of Camp Meeting Road Site

The Camp Meeting Road site, which consists of a brick-lined cistern with a surficial concrete surround and associated historic artifacts, is located in Leet Township near a secondary driveway that was formalized in the ca. 1970s to access the mansion and cluster of outbuildings of the 130+-acre Mouttass Estate. This secondary driveway extends east from Camp Meeting Road. The Mouttass Estate was constructed in 1904 and, at that time, the long and winding primary driveway extended north from Little Sewickley Creek Road. The history of the Mouttass Estate and the original owners, the Walker's, has been previously and extensively documented and the information is accessible on PA SHARE (Creque 1982; Dennis 2004; Davis and LaBelle 2016). The Walker's combined several parcels of land during the initial land purchase for their estate and then made subsequent land purchases to adjust the boundary and acquire adjacent land, often buying and selling small pieces of land between family and friends who were living nearby. More recently, when the property was acquired by the Quaker Valley School District, additional parcels were purchased and the property now includes the following: 705-P-280, 705-N-85, 705-N-90, 704-C-362, 704-D-186, 704-D-126, and 704-D-221. Further, several of these parcels were themselves made up of several smaller parcels; the significant number of land transactions made the deed analysis extremely complicated (ACDB 17097:122; 16204:446; 16393:180; 16326:362; 16326:357; 16230:386; 9343:73; 7943:535; 7816:108; 7435:273; 7322:625; 4471:132; 3130:528; 1983:173; 1878:468; 1878:470; 1263:145; 1233:445).

A map from 1876 is the earliest available historic map that depicts a building in the general vicinity of the Camp Meeting Road Site. During that year, a 75-acre property owned by Jamison and Lewis appears on the mapping; however, this property is not depicted on earlier mapping from 1851 or later mapping from 1883 (Caldwell 1876; Sidney and Neff 1851; Krebs 1883). Census records from 1870 indicate that the Ache and Henrietta Jamison and Henry Catherine Lewis families were living side by side and both men worked as machinists and were in their early 20s. They appear to have been farming the land together for a number of years but



by 1880 both families had moved to different parts of Pittsburgh (U.S. Federal Census 1860, 1870, 1880). This brief period of occupancy from ca. 1870 to ca. 1880 could explain the paucity of material evidence from their occupation. The brick lining of the cistern could be from that time period but the concrete construction material on the surface of the cistern does not coincide with that early date.

Between 1908 and ca. 1950, a residence appears on the historic USGS mapping sequence in the vicinity of the Camp Meeting Road Site (USGS 1908, 1938, 1944, 1955). Due to the complex deed chain, the owner of this property was unclear. In addition, this land does not appear to have been within the Mouttass Estate during that time period but was located immediately adjacent to it to the west of the Mouttass Estate. After 1955 and into the present, no other buildings appear on available mapping at this location.

Artifact Analysis

A total of 539 historic artifacts were recovered from 20 positive STPs, one AP, and 2 Units. All of the artifacts were recovered from the upper stratum, which was in most tests a disturbed surface level overlying intact subsoil or bedrock. In the remaining tests the surface level was less disturbed plow zone overlying intact subsoil or bedrock. A copy of the PASS information for the site is in Appendix II. A copy of the Phase I Artifact Inventory for the Camp Meeting Road (36AL0801) is in Appendix III. Recovered artifacts include:

Camp Meeting Road (36AL0801)		
Artifact Types	#	%
ceramic	23	4.3
porcelain	2	0.4
semi-porcelain	3	0.6
whiteware	10	1.9
ironstone	3	0.6
redware	2	0.4
yellowware	2	0.4
unidentified	1	0.2
glass	290	53.8
bottle	17	31.2
container	76	14.1



tumbler	2	0.4
table	7	1.3
marble	1	0.2
flat/window	182	33.8
metal	20	3.7
Ammunition, fired	1	0.2
unidentified	19	35.2
geological	4	0.7
brick fragments	4	0.7
biological	1	0.2
avian bone	1	0.2
Total	539	100%

Identified functional categories include kitchen (n=124; 23.0%), architectural (n=186; 34.5%), ammunition/firearms (n=1), toys (n=1), and unidentified. No concentrations of domestic or architectural remains within the site were identified. Overall, the majority of the artifacts were recovered from the two excavation units (n=210; 38.9%), with a much lower artifact density within the remainder of the site area. This circumstance is likely based on the type of testing rather than indicative of any artifact distribution patterning. Widespread disturbance within the site, as evidenced by the results of shovel testing, has also made identification of intra-site artifact patterning difficult.

The date of the site from ca. 1870 to 1880/ca. 1900 to 1950 relates to the known occupations of this property based on historic mapping and historic research. This is supported by the recovery of a few generally diagnostic artifacts, including one fragment of selenium solarized glass, which dates to between about 1914 and 1930 (Lockhart 2006). No strongly diagnostic artifacts were recovered.

Feature 1: Cistern

Feature 1 is a brick cistern with a surficial concrete surround measuring approximately 2 m (6.6 ft) by 1.9 m (6.2 ft) with an internal diameter of approximately 0.6 m (1.9 ft) (Photo 17). A stoneware pipe leading to the cistern opening is visible and embedded in the southwest corner of the concrete surround (see Photo 13). The interior of the cistern is parged with concrete. The cistern was filled with leaves



overlying stone, metal fragments, and asphalt shingle fragments in a dark brown loam matrix from just below the opening of the feature to a depth of approximately 180 cm (5.9 ft) below the surface of the concrete surround. One AP (AP 3) was placed within the feature to sample the interior deposits. Heavily corroded unidentifiable metal fragments and fragments of asphalt shingle were recovered to the base of the feature. AP 3 terminated at a stone, bedrock, or concrete impasse. The asphalt shingle fragments were observed in the field but not collected for curation.

Short interval STPs were placed along one transect around Feature 1 (STPs A-1 to A-4). STPs A-1 and A-2, located east of the feature contained a surface level, possibly a plow zone, of brown silty loam overlying the yellowish-brown silty clay loam subsoil. STPs A-3 and A-4, located west of the feature, contained a shallow level of brown silty loam overlying stone or bedrock. A total of 26 historic period artifacts were recovered from all 4 STPs. A small number of domestic ceramic sherds were recovered, but overall, the absence of domestic refuse from within and in the immediate vicinity of the feature suggests that either it was not adjacent to a domestic structure, or that it was filled after the site was abandoned and onsite domestic refuse was no longer accumulating.

Feature 1: Cistern		
Artifact Types	#	%
ceramic	8	30.8
porcelain	2	7.7
semi-porcelain	1	3.8
whiteware	5	19.2
glass	1	3.8
Prince Rupert's drop, clear	1	3.8
metal	16	61.5
ammunition, fired	1	3.8
unidentified	15	57.7
geological	1	3.8
brick fragments	1	3.8
Total	26	100%





Photo 17: Feature 1 Overview, Looking West

Based on the background research and historic mapping, the brick lined cistern most likely was associated with the brief occupation of the Jamison and Lewis families ca. 1870 to 1880, followed the emplacement of the concrete surround between ca. 1900-ca. 1950. Other than spatially, the feature does not appear to be otherwise related to the secondary driveway.

Determination of Eligibility

Camp Meeting Road (36AL0801) is a historic archaeological site dating from ca. 1870 to 1880/ca. 1900 to 1950 located in the uplands above the confluence of Little Sewickley Creek and the Ohio River. The site includes 539 historic artifacts and 1 feature: a brick cistern with a surficial concrete surround (Feature 1: Cistern). The site boundary includes the feature and all areas where historic artifacts were found. Additional testing in high probability areas to locate subsurface features, including other foundations, privies, walkways, and depressions, was unsuccessful. Testing within two depressions that were identified during the pedestrian survey



revealed that both depressions were likely from grading and other related earth moving disturbances as they did not contain any evidence of foundation materials.

The site appears to relate to a brief occupation from ca. 1870 to 1880 followed by another occupation from ca. 1900 to 1950. During ca. 1870 to 1880, the site appears to have been associated with the Jamison and Lewis families who occupied the area only briefly before moving away (Caldwell 1876). It appears as though they built the brick portion of the cistern. The other occupants between ca. 1900 and 1950 are unknown due to the complicated deed chain. It appears as though those occupants installed the surficial concrete surround. After ca. 1950, no buildings appear on any available historic mapping or aerials. This portion of land was not part of the original Muottas Mansion property and was only added later so it does not appear to be associated with the Walker family.

The artifact assemblage contained both domestic refuse and architectural remains, but no internal site artifact patterning could be identified. Almost 40 percent of the recovered artifacts were from Units 1 and 2. A limited number of generally diagnostic artifacts were recovered that correspond to the date of the property as determined by the historic research were recovered.

The Camp Meeting Road Site (36AL0801) was evaluated for the NRHP under Criterion D and is being recommended as not eligible. Feature 1 and its immediate vicinity are the only portion of the site that remains intact. The remainder of the site area has been subject to intensive previous ground disturbance resulting in the presence of several depressions extending through the subsoil to the bedrock. Disturbance has also resulted in a lack of artifact patterning within the site area. Feature 1, while intact, contains one level of fill that, based on the absence of domestic artifacts and presence of asphalt shingle fragments, likely dates to after the abandonment and potentially removal of the other site features. This site does not have the ability to contribute important new information to the field of historic archaeology and is recommended not eligible for the NRHP. No further work is recommended.



6.0 STATEWIDE PRECONTACT PROBABILITY MODEL

The results of the Phase I Archaeological Survey do not support the model prediction as no precontact archaeological sites were identified within the moderate or high probability areas. This is likely due to the historic use of the LOD as well as previous ground disturbances within the portions of the project area that are moderate to high probability for the presence of precontact period sites.

Sensitivity Tier	Area within this Tier	Percent of Total Project Area	Method(s) Used to test this Tier	Number of Sites Located
High	14,059.8 sq m	5.2 %	STPs	0
Moderate	97,820.7 sq m	36.1 %	STPs	0
Low	158,984.5 sq m	58.7 %	STPs	0



7.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed undertaking involves the Quaker Valley High School project located in Leetsdale and Edgeworth Boroughs and Leet Township, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania. The project consists of the construction of a new high school campus. CDC was retained by Streamline Engineering, Inc. to perform cultural resource investigations for this project. The lead agency is DEP.

The APE/LOD is approximately 270,865.0 sq m (2,915,566.7 sq ft or 66.9 ac). The Phase I Archaeological survey was conducted in February and March of 2024. Phase I field methodology included surface surveillance, and the hand excavation of STPs at 15-m and 5-m intervals, auger probes, and excavation units. Approximately 249,298.5 sq m (2,683,427.3 sq ft or 61.6 ac) was not tested due to disturbances caused by access, demolition, grading, and construction. The remainder of the project area, encompassing approximately 21,566.5 sq m (232,139.4 sq ft or 5.3 ac), was tested.

Initially, a total of 118 STPs were excavated, including 97 at 15 m intervals and 21 at 5 m intervals, as well as 2 Units. Of these, 98 STPs were negative and 20 STPs and both Excavation Units were positive for artifactual materials. Additionally, one exploratory auger probe (AP 3) was positive for artifactual materials. One historic period feature, Feature 1: Cistern, was identified.

Based on the results of the survey, one new historic archaeological site, **Camp Meeting Road Site (36BT0801)**, was discovered. The Camp Meeting Road site dates from ca. 1870 to 1880/ca. 1900 to 1950 and contained 539 historic artifacts and 1 feature. The feature is a brick cistern with a surficial concrete surround. The artifact assemblage was limited to only a few generally diagnostic artifacts, including fragments of selenium solarized glass that date to between approximately 1914 and the 1920s. All of the artifacts recovered from this site were collected from the disturbed surface level. The site was evaluated for the NRHP under Criterion D and is being recommended as not eligible due to a lack of integrity. No further work is recommended for the portion of the site within the project area.



Based on the results of the Phase I Archaeological Survey, no additional work is recommended for the Quaker Valley High School project.



8.0 REFERENCES

Adovasio, J. M.

1993 The Ones That Will Not Go Away: A Biased View of Pre-Clovis Populations in the New World. In *From Kostenki to Clovis: Upper Paleolithic-Paleo-Indian Adaptations*, edited by O. Soffer and N.D. Praslov. Plenum Press, New York.

Adovasio, J. M., R. Fryman, A. G. Quinn, D. C. Dirkmaat, and D. R. Pedler

1998 The Archaic West of the Allegheny Mountains: A View from the Cross Creek Drainage, Washington County, Pennsylvania. In *The Archaic Period in Pennsylvania: Hunter-Gatherers of the Early and Middle Holocene*, edited by P. A. Raber, P. E. Miller and S. M. Neusius. Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.

Allegheny County Deed Book (ACDB) 17097:122; 16204:446; 16393:180; 16326:362; 16326:357; 16230:386; 9343:73; 7943:535; 7816:108; 7435:273; 7322:625; 4471:132; 3130:528; 1983: 173; 1878:468; 1878:470; 1263:145; 1233:445

Ballweber, H. L.

1989 A Study of Six Early/Middle Woodland Sites in Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania. In *Pennsylvania Archaeologist* 59 (2):46-99.

Brennan, L.

1982 *A Compilation of Fluted Points of Eastern North America by Count and Distribution: An AENA Project*. AENA 10:27-46.

Broyles, B. J.

1971 The St. Albans Site, Kanawha County, West Virginia. *West Virginia Geological and Economic Survey, Report of Archaeological Investigations* 3.

Caldwell, J.A

1876 *Caldwell's Illustrated Historical Centennial Atlas of Allegheny County, Pennsylvania*. Condit, Ohio.

Carskadden, Jeff and James Morton

1997 *Living on the Edge*. IN: Ohio Hopewell Community Organization. Edited by Dancey, William S. and Paul J. Pacheco. Kent State University Press.

Carr, K. W.

1998a The Early Archaic Period in Pennsylvania. *Pennsylvania Archaeologist* 68(2):42-69.

1998b Archaeological Site Distributions and Patterns of Lithic Utilization During the Middle Archaic in Pennsylvania. In *The Archaic Period in Pennsylvania: Hunter-Gatherers of the Early and Middle Holocene*, edited by P. A. Raber, P.



E. Miller and S. M. Neusius. Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.

Crites, Gary

1987 Human-Plant Mutualism and Niche Expression in the Paleo-Ethnobotanical Record: A Middle Woodland Example. *American Antiquity* 52 (4):725-740.

Custer, Jay

1985 The Paleoecology of the Late Archaic: Exchange and Adaptation. *Pennsylvania Archaeologist* 54(3-4):32-47.

Dancey, William S.

1991 A Middle Woodland settlement in Central Ohio: A Preliminary report on the Murphy site (33LI212). *Pennsylvania Archaeologist* 61(2):37-72

Davis, Christine

1988 *Phase III Data Recovery The Dravo #1 Site, 36BV240*. A report prepared for the Dravo Corporation and Standard Aggregates Inc.

1997 *Phase III Data Recovery of the Sony Site (36WM151), Westmoreland County, Pa.* A report submitted to the Westmoreland County Industrial Development Corporation.

Davis, Christine and Mindy LaBelle

2016 Historic Resource Survey Form: William Walker Estate/Muottas. Form prepared for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office. Electronic Document available through the PA SHARE system <https://share.phmc.pa.gov/pashare/landing> , accessed April 2024.

Dennis, Stephen Neal

2004 Historic Resource Survey Form: Muottas. Form prepared for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office. Electronic Document available through the PA SHARE system <https://share.phmc.pa.gov/pashare/landing> , accessed April 2024.

Donnelly, L.

1982 *Leetsdale Borough (003-62), Allegheny County Survey*. Pittsburgh History and Landmarks.

Dragoo, Don W.

1963 Mounds for the Dead. *Annals of Carnegie Museum* 37:1-315.

Everts, L. H.

1872 *History of Allegheny County, Pennsylvania*. J. B. Lippincott, Philadelphia.



George, Richard L.

1992 Early Late Woodland in Western Pennsylvania: the Backstrum Side Notched Point Evidence. *Pennsylvania Archaeologist* 62 (1):62-72.

1998 The Early Woodland Thorpe Site and the Forest Notched Point. *Archaeology of Eastern North America* 26: 1-32.

2007 Further Discussion of Drew Tradition Radiocarbon Dates, Migration, Mea Culpa, Etc. *Pennsylvania Archaeologist* 77 (2):70-75.

Geyer, A. R. and W. H. Bolles

1979 *Outstanding Scenic Geological Features of Pennsylvania*. Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources, Bureau of Topographic and Geologic Survey.

Grantz, D.L.

1986 Archaeological Investigations of the Crawford-Grist Site #2 (36FA262): An Early Woodland Hamlet. *Pennsylvania Archaeologist* 56 (3-4):2-21.

Guilday, J. E.

1982 Appalachia 11,000-12,000 Years Ago: A Biological Review. *Archaeology of Eastern North America*, vol. 10.

Hemmings, E. Thomas

1984 Fairchance Mound and Village. *West Virginia Archaeologist* 36 (1): 3-52.

Hopkins, Griffith Morgan and Company

1862 *Atlas of Greater Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania*. G. M. Hopkins and Company, Philadelphia.

1876 *Atlas of Allegheny County*.

1906 *Northern Vicinity of Pittsburgh, Plat Book*. Published by G. M. Hopkins and Company.

Kingsley, R.G., P.E. Siegel, and T.L. Benedict

1994 The Barking Road Site: A Multicomponent Prehistoric Occupation. A report prepared for CNG Transmission Corporation.

Krebs, Otto

1883 Map of Allegheny County, Pennsylvania. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Lantz, S.

1985 The Paleo-Indian Period. In *A Comprehensive State Plan for the Conservation of Archaeological Resources*, vol. II. Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, Harrisburg.



Leet Township

1969 *Leet Township Centennial*. Privately published. Copy on file at Leetsdale Borough Building.

Lockhart, William

2006 The Color Purple: Dating Solarized Amethyst Container Glass. *Historical Archaeology* 40(2):45-56.

Mayer-Oakes, William J.

1955 *Prehistory of the Upper Ohio Valley*. Annals of Carnegie Museum Anthropological Series No. 2.

McConaughy, Mark A.

2002 Watson Farm Site (36H34): A Possible Late Middle or Early Late Woodland Village in the Northern Panhandle of West Virginia. *West Virginia Archaeologist* 54 (1&2):1-54).

2003 The Middle Woodland: Western Pennsylvania vs. Eastern Pennsylvania. Paper presented at the annual Eastern States Archaeological Conference, Mt. Laurel, New Jersey.

2012 The Middle Woodland: Western vs. Eastern Pennsylvania. *Pennsylvania Archaeologist* 82 (2):17-33.

Miller, Patricia E.

2012 Synthesis of Research Results and Site Significance (Chapters 10). Data Recovery at Site 36AL480 Leetsdale Industrial Park, Leetsdale, Pennsylvania. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Pittsburgh District.

Mulkearn, L. and E. V. Pugh

1954 *A Traveler's Guide to Historic Western Pennsylvania*. University of Pittsburgh Press.

Oliver, Judith A.

1993 "History of Legionville." *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*. November 28, 1993.

PA State Historic Preservation Office (PA SHPO)

2021 *Guidelines for Archaeological Investigations in Pennsylvania*. Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office, Harrisburg.

Creque, Peta

1982 Historic Resource Survey Form: Muottas. Form prepared for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office. Electronic Document available through the PA SHARE system
<https://share.phmc.pa.gov/pashare/landing> , accessed April 2024.



Robertson, James A., et al.

1993 Archaeological Data Recovery of the Mayview Site (36AL0134). Allegheny County, Pennsylvania. John Milner Associates.

Robertson, James, Douglas C. Kellogg, and Robert G. Kingsley

2008 Three Early Woodland Occupation Loci in the Chartiers Creek Drainage, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania. IN: *Transitions: Archaic and Early Woodland Research in the Ohio Country*. Edited by Martha P. Otto and Brian G. Redmond, Ohio University Press.

Sanborn Insurance Company

1905 *Sanborn Insurance Company Map of the City of Pittsburgh*. Sanborn Insurance Company, New York.

Sidney and Neff

1851 *Map of Allegheny County*. Copy on file at CDC.

Stewart, Michael and Judson Kratzer

1989 Prehistoric Site Locations on the Unglaciaded Appalachian Plateau. *Pennsylvania Archaeologist* 59 (1):14-36.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service (USDA)

1981 *Soil Survey of Allegheny County, Pennsylvania*. Prepared in cooperation with the Agricultural Experiment Station and the Cooperative Extension Service of the College of Agriculture, and the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources, and the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture.

2024 Web Soil Survey. Electronic document, <https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx> accessed February 2024.

United States (U.S.) Federal Census

1860 Federal Census for Edgeworth Borough, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania

1870 Federal Census for Edgeworth Borough, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania

1880 Federal Census for Edgeworth Borough, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania

United States Geological Service (USGS)

1908 *Sewickley, Pennsylvania*. 7.5 Minute Topographic Map.

1938 *Sewickley, Pennsylvania*. 7.5 Minute Topographic Map.

1944 *Sewickley, Pennsylvania*. 7.5 Minute Topographic Map.

1955 *Ambridge, Pennsylvania*. 7.5 Minute Topographic Map.

Wallace, P.

1965 *Indian Paths of Pennsylvania*. Prepared in association with the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, Harrisburg.



APPENDIX I

AGENCY COORDINATION





Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office

PENNSYLVANIA HISTORICAL AND MUSEUM COMMISSION

January 9, 2024

Martha Frech
Streamline Engineering, Inc.
110 Allan Street
Lower Burrell, PA 150680000

RE: ER Project # 2024PR00022.001, Quaker Valley High School, Department of Environmental Protection, Leetsdale Borough, Allegheny County

Dear Martha Frech,

Thank you for submitting information concerning the above referenced project. The Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office (PA SHPO) reviews projects in accordance with state and federal laws. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, and the implementing regulations (36 CFR Part 800) of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, is the primary federal legislation. The Environmental Rights amendment, Article 1, Section 27 of the Pennsylvania Constitution and the Pennsylvania History Code, 37 Pa. Cons. Stat. Section 500 et seq. (1988) is the primary state legislation. These laws include consideration of the project's potential effects on both historic and archaeological resources.

Proposed Project

The proposed project involves the construction of a new high school campus on a 159-acre parcel located near the existing school. The proposed project is located adjacent to the National Register listed Elmridge (Resource # 2000RE00364), located on the east side of Camp Meeting Road and in the boundary of the National Register eligible Muotta House (Resource # 2004RE03024).

Archaeological Resources

More Information—Archaeological—High Probability

Based on an evaluation by our staff, there is a high probability that National Register-eligible archaeological sites are present within this project area. These sites could be adversely affected by project activities. Our review considers the locations of known archaeological resources, the Statewide Pre-Contact Predictive Model, soil type, topographic setting, slope direction and distance to water, among other regionally specific predictive factors for archaeological site locations. It is our opinion that a Phase I archaeological survey should be conducted to locate potentially significant resources. Guidelines and instructions for conducting all phases of archaeological survey in Pennsylvania are available on our website:

<https://www.phmc.pa.gov/Preservation/About/Documents/Guidelines%20for%20Archaeological%20Investigations.pdf>.

More Information Request—New Survey

Please use this request for more information to enter survey and resource details and upload the survey report. Please submit the requested materials to the PA SHPO through PA-SHARE using the link under SHPO Requests More Information on the Response screen.

Above Ground Resources

Thank you for providing photographs of the three abandoned residential structures located on the property and the associated project information. Additional information is needed to evaluate the potential of the project to affect above ground historic properties located within the project area.

More Information Request—Identification of Historic Properties

Muotta House (Resource #2004RE03024):

Based on the information provided and available in our files, the project has the potential to affect the property associated with the Muotta House (Resource #2004RE03024), which was determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion C in the area of architecture. The mansion house is eligible as an example of Colonial Revival architecture designed by the prominent institutional and residential architectural firm of Alden and Harlow. A subsequent review of this property in 2016 indicated that the mansion retained sufficient integrity in the areas of design, material, and workmanship to convey its architectural significance. Since 2016, it appears the guest cottage, servant's cottage, stable, garage/workshop, and shed have been removed. Additional information on the architectural integrity of the Muotta House is needed to determine if it still retains sufficient integrity to convey architectural significance.

Please provide interior photographs of the house. If possible, key the photographs to floor plans labeled with room names/functions. Please provide information on any alterations to the house made since 2016 including replacement of windows, removal of any exterior features such as the porch, and alterations to the interior of the house.

Abandoned Residential Structures #2 and #3:

Please provide more information on existing abandoned residential structures #2 and #3 within the project APE. Please indicate if these buildings are 45 years in age or older, and if so, please provide a map showing the locations of these buildings and photographs of all elevations of the buildings.

Quaker Valley High School (Leetsdale High School, Resource #2019RE18002):

Please provide more information on the existing Quaker Valley High School (previously identified in PA-SHARE as Leetsdale High School, Resource #2019RE18002). Are there plans to abandon or demolish the existing school following construction of the planned project? If the school is to be abandoned or demolished, we request update documentation on the resource in PA-SHARE. Please include the following information as an attachment to the resource: exterior photographs of all elevations of the school and associated outbuildings; interior photos of primary spaces such as the main lobby/office area, auditorium, gymnasium, cafeteria, representative classrooms and hallways showing typical finishes, trims, and features; interior floor plans, ideally original plans to compare with current plans; the floor plans should be labeled with room names/functions; key the interior photos to the current floor plans, showing the photo number and a small arrow pointing the direction the camera is facing; key the exterior photos to current aerials in the same manner. A link to the statewide Historic Educational Resources of Pennsylvania 1682-1969 and list of consultants who routinely prepare this type of documentation is found under Attachments on the Response screen.

More Information Request--Proposed Project and Potential Effects

We require more information on the proposed project to complete our review. Please provide a site plan for the location of the proposed new Quaker Valley High School, including the 2-story school,

tennis courts, stadium, and parking areas. Please key all existing abandoned residential structures to this site plan. Will the relocated Muotta House be demolished, remain in an abandoned state, or are there plans to incorporate this resource into the development of the new school? Provide information on plans for abandoned residential structure #2 and #3. Will these buildings be demolished, continue to remain abandoned, or are there plans to incorporate either of these buildings into the development of the new school?

For questions concerning archaeological review, please contact Kristen Walczesky at kwalczesky@pa.gov. For questions concerning above ground resources, please contact Barbara Frederick at bafrederic@pa.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Emma Diehl".

Emma Diehl

Environmental Review Division Manager

APPENDIX II

PASS FORM INFORMATION



PA SHPO PASS Submission through PA SHARE

Project Name: Quaker Valley School District High School

Project Number: 2024PR00022

Shape Files: Required

Attachments: USGS Map
Artifact Inventory

County: Allegheny

Municipality: Township of Sewickley

Site Name: Camp Meeting Road Site

Site Chronology: Historic period, ca.1900- 2015

Site Type: historic domestic

Site Area (sq m): 970 **Basis:** Computed in GIS

Stratified (y/n): N

Site Discovery Method: STPs

Potential for Organic Preservation: None

Features (y/n): Y

Feature Type: depression, cistern

Artifact Recovery: STP excavation

Lithic Raw Material: none

Precontact Diagnostics: N/A

Other Precontact Artifacts: none

Historic Materials: Total = 100

Camp Meeting Road Site	Sum of Quantity
[-] Hist activities arms & weapons	1
metal	1
[-] Historic domestic good prep/consumption	33
biological	1
ceramic	20
glass	12
[-] Historic structural building materials structural remains	14
metal	14
[-] Historic unidentified	52
ceramic	2
geological	4
glass	43
metal	3
Grand Total	100

Soil: auto-populated

Elevation: 1089 ft

Slope/Aspect: N

Slope Basis: Soil Survey or Map

Bedrock: auto-populated

Physiographic Province: Auto-populated

Topographic Setting: upland

Vegetation: forest, maintained grasses

Primary Disturbance: construction

Watershed: auto-populated

Nearest Water: Distance – 746.3 m
Elevation – 761 ft
Direction – E
Order –
Type – perennial

2nd Nearest Water: Distance – 1,445 m
Elevation – 693 ft
Direction – SE
Order –
Type – perennial

Nearest Perennial Confluence: Distance –21,234 m
Elevation – 711 ft
Direction –SE
Order below confluence–

Relationship of Waters upstream from confluence and between waters

Landowner: Private

Recording Reason: Compliance

Description:

The Camp Meeting Road Site is a historic period archaeological site. The historic period component of the site dates to the nineteenth century. The site is located within the central portion of the LOD and is characterized by the presence of a cistern and large rectangular depression. The site is at an elevation of 1089 ft asl. The site boundary within the LOD is based on visible surface features and positive STPs.


Two features were identified: feature 3; characterized as a cement and brick cistern and feature 4; characterized as a rectangular depression with disarticulated brick, stone, and cement. Four judgmental STPs were conducted around feature 3 and each test yielded artifacts. A total of 24 artifacts were recovered in association with feature 3. Six judgmental STPs were conducted around feature 4 and five of the six tests yielded artifacts. A total of 53 artifacts were recovered in association with feature 4.



7.5 Min USGS Quadrangle Map, Leetsdale PA (Google Earth)



Google Earth overview of Site Area



1876 Caldwell Map showing site area



Feature 3: Cement and Brick Cistern



Feature 4: Rectangular Depression with Disarticulated Stone and Brick Surrounding

APPENDIX III

ARTIFACT INVENTORY



ARTIFACT INVENTORY

Catalog Number	Specimen Number	Phase	Provenience	Depth (cmbs)	Quantity	MNV	Artifact Group	Material Type	Artifact Type	Ceramic paste	Glass Color	Glass Form
2	1	I	STP 13-21	0-29	1	1	historic	ceramic	whiteware sherd, undecorated, glazed exterior	whiteware		
2	2	I	STP 13-21	0-29	1	1	historic	ceramic	refined earthenware spall, brown glaze exterior	refined earthenware		
2	3	I	STP 13-21	0-29	1	1	historic	ceramic	whiteware sherd, undecorated, spalling, glazed exterior	whiteware		
2	4	I	STP 13-21	0-29	1	1	historic	glass	clear glass bottle fragment, embossed design and lettering		clear	bottle
2	5	I	STP 13-21	0-29	1	1	historic	glass	aqua container glass fragment		aqua	container
2	6	I	STP 13-21	0-29	1	1	historic	glass	amber container glass fragment		amber	container
2	7	I	STP 13-21	0-29	1	1	historic	glass	amber crown cap bottle finish fragment		amber	bottle
3	1	I	STP 13-22	0-31	1	1	historic	ceramic	ironstone sherd, undecorated	ironstone		
3	2	I	STP 13-22	0-31	1	1	historic	ceramic	ironstone base sherd, undecorated, glazed interior and exterior	ironstone		
3	3	I	STP 13-22	0-31	1	1	historic	ceramic	redware rim sherd, lead glaze interior and exterior	redware		
3	4	I	STP 13-22	0-31	1	1	historic	glass	clear glass bottle fragment, embossed lettering		clear	bottle
3	5	I	STP 13-22	0-31	1	1	historic	glass	milk glass lid liner fragment		milk	container
3	6	I	STP 13-22	0-31	1	1	historic	glass	amber glass shard		amber	unid
4	1	I	STP 13-23	0-40	1	1	historic	ceramic	whiteware sherd, green and pink/red transferprint design	whiteware		
4	2	I	STP 13-23	0-40	2	2	historic	ceramic	semi-porcelain sherds	porcelain		
4	3	I	STP 13-23	0-40	1	1	historic	glass	amber container glass fragment		amber	container
4	4	I	STP 13-23	0-40	2	2	historic	glass	clear container glass fragment		clear	container
4	5	I	STP 13-23	0-40	1	1	historic	metal	heavily corroded metal object			
4	6	I	STP 13-23	0-40	1	1	historic	metal	heavily corroded metal object			
5	1	I	STP 13-24	0-22	1	1	historic	glass	clear glass fragment with decorative glass ridge		clear	container
5	2	I	STP 13-24	0-22	1	1	historic	glass	clear container glass fragment		clear	container
7	1	I	STP A1	0-37	2	2	historic	ceramic	whiteware sherds, undecorated, spalling	whiteware		
7	2	I	STP A1	0-37	1	1	historic	glass	clear glass Prince Rupert's Drop, broken tail		clear	container
7	3	I	STP A1	0-37	1	1	historic	geological	deep red/maroon brick fragment			
7	4	I	STP A1	0-37	1	1	historic	metal	heavily corroded metal object			
8	1	I	STP A2	0-40	2	1	historic	ceramic	porcelain sherds, discolored	porcelain		
8	2	I	STP A2	0-40	1	1	historic	ceramic	whiteware body sherd, undecorated	whiteware		
8	3	I	STP A2	0-40	1	1	historic	ceramic	whiteware spall, undecorated	whiteware		

ARTIFACT INVENTORY

Catalog Number	Specimen Number	Phase	Provenience	Depth (cmbs)	Quantity	MNV	Artifact Group	Material Type	Artifact Type	Ceramic paste	Glass Color	Glass Form
8	4	I	STP A2	0-40	1	1	historic	ceramic	semi-porcelain teacup handle fragment	porcelain		
8	5	I	STP A2	0-40	1	1	historic	metal	heavily corroded metal object			
8	6	I	STP A2	0-40	5	5	historic	metal	heavily corroded metal object			
9	1	I	STP A3	0-7	1	1	historic	ceramic	whiteware sherd, undecorated	whiteware		
9	2	I	STP A3	0-7	4	4	historic	metal	heavily corroded metal object			
10	1	I	STP A4	0-19	1	1	historic	metal	gun ammunition/cartridge base with headstamp, fired			
10	2	I	STP A4	0-19	2	2	historic	metal	heavily corroded metal object			
11	1	I	STP B1	0-35	1	1	historic	ceramic	yellowware body sherd, brown sliptrail	yellowware		
11	2	I	STP B1	0-35	1	1	historic	glass	aqua flat glass shards		aqua	flat
11	3	I	STP B1	0-35	1	1	historic	biological	avian bone			
12	1	I	STP B2	0-44	1	1	historic	metal	heavily corroded metal object			
12	2	I	STP B2	0-44	2	1	historic	geological	red-orange brick fragments			
13	1	I	STP B3	0-19	3	2	historic	glass	aqua flat glass shards		aqua	flat
13	2	I	STP B3	0-19	1	1	historic	geological	red-orange brick fragments, burned (?)			
14	1	I	STP B5	0-34	1	1	historic	ceramic	ironstone sherd, undecorated	ironstone		
14	2	I	STP B5	0-34	1	1	historic	ceramic	whiteware base sherd, undecorated	whiteware		
14	3	I	STP B5	0-34	1	1	historic	glass	clear container glass fragment		clear	container
14	4	I	STP B5	0-34	35	30	historic	glass	aqua flat glass shards		aqua	flat
14	5	I	STP B5	0-34	1	1	historic	metal	heavily corroded metal object			
15	1	I	STP B6	0-31	1	1	historic	ceramic	whiteware sherd, light blue transferprint design	whiteware		
15	2	I	STP B6	0-31	1	1	historic	ceramic	buff yellowware sherd	yellowware		
15	3	I	STP B6	0-31	2	1	historic	glass	aqua flat glass shards		aqua	flat
				TOTAL	100							

200 CAMP MEETING ROAD

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

200 CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTO DIRECTION KEY



KEY:

Number

#

Direction





200 CAMP MEETING ROAD

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

200 CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 1: 200 Camp Meeting Road, Front (West) Façade, Looking Northeast



Photo 2: North Side of Residence, Looking South

200 CAMP MEETING ROAD

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

200 CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 3: Rear of Residence, East Side, Looking Southwest



Photo 4: South Side of Residence, Looking North

210 CAMP MEETING ROAD

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

210 CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTO DIRECTION KEY



KEY:	
Number	#
Direction	↖



210 CAMP MEETING ROAD

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

210 CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 1: 210 Camp Meeting Road, Front (West) Façade, Looking Northeast



Photo 2: Side of Residence, Looking North

210 CAMP MEETING ROAD

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

210 CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 3: Rear of the Residence, Looking Southwest



Photo 4: North Side of the Residence, Looking South

210 CAMP MEETING ROAD

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

210 CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 5: Garage, Looking North



Photo 6: Retaining Walls, Looking East

210 CAMP MEETING ROAD

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

210 CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 7: Shed, Looking East

2004RE03024: MUOTTA HOUSE

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTO DIRECTION KEY



KEY:

Number

#

Direction

2004RE03024: MUOTTA HOUSE
LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA
CAMP MEETING ROAD
PR# 2024PR00022
PHOTO DIRECTION KEY



KEY:

Number	#
Direction	↘

FLOOR 1

2004RE03024: MUOTTA HOUSE
LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA
CAMP MEETING ROAD
PR# 2024PR00022
PHOTO DIRECTION KEY



KEY:	
Number	#
Direction	↘

FLOOR 2

2004RE03024: MUOTTA HOUSE

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTO DIRECTION KEY



KEY:	
Number	#
Direction	↘

FLOOR 3

2004RE03024: MUOTTA HOUSE

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 1: Muotta House, Front Façade, Looking Northeast



Photo 2: North Side of Residence, Looking South

2004RE03024: MUOTTA HOUSE

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 3: Rear of Residence, Looking South

2004RE03024: MUOTTA HOUSE

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 4: Rear of Residence, Looking South



Photo 5: South Side of Residence, Looking North

2004RE03024: MUOTTA HOUSE

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 6: Interior, Front Hall

2004RE03024: MUOTTA HOUSE

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 7: Reception Room Fireplace

2004RE03024: MUOTTA HOUSE

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 8: Library



Photo 9: Dining Room

2004RE03024: MUOTTA HOUSE

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 10: Back Stairway and Stained Glass

2004RE03024: MUOTTA HOUSE

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 11: Kitchen

2004RE03024: MUOTTA HOUSE

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 12: Kitchen

2004RE03024: MUOTTA HOUSE

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTOGRAPHS




Photo 13: Scullery

2004RE03024: MUOTTA HOUSE

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 14: Servants Hall

2004RE03024: MUOTTA HOUSE

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 15: Back Stairway, Second Floor

2004RE03024: MUOTTA HOUSE

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 16: Former Servants Rooms 2 and 3, Second Floor

2004RE03024: MUOTTA HOUSE

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 17: Former Servants Room 1, Second Floor

2004RE03024: MUOTTA HOUSE

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 18: Second Floor Hallway

2004RE03024: MUOTTA HOUSE

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 19: Second Floor Landing

2004RE03024: MUOTTA HOUSE

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 20: Bedroom 4, Second Floor

2004RE03024: MUOTTA HOUSE

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 21: Bathroom 2, Second Floor

2004RE03024: MUOTTA HOUSE

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 22: Bedroom 2, Second Floor

2004RE03024: MUOTTA HOUSE

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 23: Bedroom 1, Second Floor

2004RE03024: MUOTTA HOUSE

LEET TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CAMP MEETING ROAD

PR# 2024PR00022

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 24: Ballroom/Billiard Room, Third Floor



Photo 25: Bathroom, Third Floor