

**ATLANTIC COAST PIPELINE, LLC
ATLANTIC COAST PIPELINE**

and

**DOMINION TRANSMISSION, INC.
SUPPLY HEADER PROJECT**

**Supplemental Filing
May 12, 2017**

APPENDIX C

Revised Architectural Survey Reports

Dominion Resources Services, Inc.
5000 Dominion Boulevard,
Glen Allen, VA 23060



April 7, 2017

Mr. Roger Kirchen, Director
Review and Compliance Division
Virginia Department of Historic Resources
2801 Kensington Ave.
Richmond, VA 23221

**Subject: Section 106 Review –Architectural Survey Report REVISED Addendum 2
Atlantic Coast Pipeline, LLC, Atlantic Coast Pipeline Project
DHR File No. 2014-0710**

Dear Mr. Kirchen:

Atlantic Coast Pipeline, LLC (Atlantic) is requesting review and comment on the enclosed REVISED addendum architectural survey report on investigations conducted for the proposed Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The revisions are based on your comments in a letter dated March 22, 2017. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) is the lead Federal agency for this Project. Atlantic's consultant, Dovetail, conducted the survey and authored the original report, which was edited by ERM, who prepared the enclosed revised report. The document is being submitted pursuant to the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended.

Atlantic would appreciate your comments on the attached REVISED addendum architectural survey report, and we look forward to continuing to work with you on this Project. If you have any questions regarding the enclosed report, please contact Richard B. Gangle at (804) 273-2814 or Richard.B.Gangle@dom.com, or by letter at:

Richard B. Gangle
Dominion Resources Services, Inc.
5000 Dominion Boulevard
Glen Allen, Virginia 23060

Respectfully submitted,

FOR  *RICHARD GANGLE*

Robert M. Bisha
Technical Advisor, Atlantic Coast Pipeline

cc: Richard Gangle (Dominion)
Enclosure: **Architectural Survey Report REVISED Addendum 2**

**PHASE I HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL SURVEY OF THE
ATLANTIC COAST PIPELINE PROJECT**

Virginia Addendum 2

DHR No. 2014-0710

by

Emily K. Anderson and Heather Dollins Staton

Prepared for

Atlantic Coast Pipeline, LLC
701 E. Cary Street,
Richmond, VA 23219

Prepared by

DOVETAIL
CULTURAL RESOURCE GROUP
FOR

Edited and Revised by

Environmental Resources Management

March 2017

**PHASE I HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL SURVEY OF THE
ATLANTIC COAST PIPELINE PROJECT**

Virginia Addendum 2

DHR No. 2014-0710

by

Emily K. Anderson and Heather Dollins Staton

Prepared for

Atlantic Coast Pipeline, LLC

701 E. Cary Street,
Richmond, VA 23219

Prepared by

Dovetail Cultural Resource Group

300 Central Road, Suite 200
Fredericksburg, Virginia 22401

Dovetail Job #14-024

September 2016

Edited and Revised by

Environmental Resources Management

March 2017

ABSTRACT

On behalf of Environmental Resources Management (ERM), Dovetail Cultural Resource Group (Dovetail) conducted an architectural reconnaissance survey for the proposed Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) Project in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Dominion Transmission, Inc. (DTI) will build and operate approximately 600 miles of natural gas transmission pipeline and associated laterals on behalf of Atlantic Coast Pipeline, LLC (Atlantic), which is a company formed by Dominion Resources, Duke Energy, Piedmont Natural Gas, and Southern Company Gas. The pipeline system extends from West Virginia to southern North Carolina, and the Project will also include access roads, meter stations, compressor stations, and other above-ground facilities. This document presents findings for the segment of the pipeline corridor in Virginia, which is 308.1 miles long, and passes through Highland, Bath, Augusta, Nelson, Buckingham, Cumberland, Prince Edward, Nottoway, Dinwiddie, Brunswick, and Southampton counties, and the cities of Suffolk and Chesapeake. It includes the 235.8 mile-long trunk line (AP-1), and three laterals (AP-3, AP-4, and AP-5) that total 72.3 miles. The Area of Potential Effect (APE) includes the 300-foot-wide survey corridor that will encompass the construction zone and the permanent pipeline right-of-way for the proposed pipeline, the footprints for access roads and other facilities associated with the Project, and areas of potential indirect (visual) effects that lie within line of sight of proposed aboveground facilities and landscape changes due to clearing of vegetation or other impacts associated with construction. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) is the lead federal agency, and work was conducted pursuant to the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended.

A report on the original architectural survey on the project corridor was submitted to the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (DHR) in September 2015 and revised in April 2016 (Lesiuk et al. 2016). Since that time, the project corridor has been modified, thus requiring additional identification studies. An initial round of alignment modifications were documented in an addendum report submitted to DHR in February 2016 (Staton 2016). Shortly thereafter, the width of the project impact corridor was clarified to encompass an area wider than originally surveyed. For architectural resources, the project APE is defined as the 150 feet on either side of the ACP centerline plus areas within the viewshed of the corridor where impacts to a resource's setting could occur. Architectural survey for this second addendum report was completed in February 2016. The purpose of the survey was to identify architectural resources over 50 years in age within portions of the project's APE that were not included in the original study.

Since the February 2016 survey, additional alignment modifications have been made, including major reroutes of the portions of the line in Augusta and Highland counties and the City of Suffolk. This report presents the results of the investigation that includes areas of the widened project alignment along the previous right-of-way in places where the APE was not investigated during the original survey. Additional resources within the APE of the modified route will be addressed in Addendum 3. Surveyed resources that were no longer in the APE as a result of the subsequent route modifications are not included in this report; however, the survey forms were

submitted as part of the deliverables for this phase of the investigation. The report follows guidelines established by the DHR.

A total of 80 architectural resources, 10 previously recorded and 70 newly recorded, was identified within the modified project APE. Of the 80 properties, two resources, Folly Farm (007-0015) and Col. Joseph W. Harper House (026-0007), were previously listed in, or determined eligible for, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and Dovetail recommends that they have sufficient integrity to maintain their eligibility status. One resource, the House at 203 Upton Lane (133-0025), was previously determined not eligible for the NRHP in 1975. However, Dovetail recommends that since the previous eligibility determination, the architectural significance of this late-eighteenth century house may have strengthened. As a result, Dovetail recommends that the property is potentially eligible for the NRHP. In addition, one previously identified resource, Red Apple Orchards (062-5121), is recommended as potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP. Six resources recorded within the APE (one previously recorded and five newly recorded) were not given an eligibility determination due to insufficient information because of lack of access to the properties. As such they will be assessed in subsequent addenda when access becomes available, or will be treated as eligible for the purposes of the Project. The remaining 70 resources are recommended as not eligible for listing in the NRHP.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
INTRODUCTION	2
PROJECT METHODOLOGY.....	5
HIGHLAND COUNTY	6
AUGUSTA COUNTY.....	6
Previously Surveyed Resources	6
Newly Surveyed Resources	14
NELSON COUNTY	15
Previously Surveyed Resources	15
BUCKINGHAM COUNTY	18
Previously Surveyed Resources	18
Newly Surveyed Resources	18
CUMBERLAND COUNTY.....	21
Previously Surveyed Resources	21
Newly Surveyed Resources	21
PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY	23
Previously Surveyed Resources	23
Newly Surveyed Resources	23
NOTTOWAY COUNTY.....	25
Previously Surveyed Resources	25
Newly Surveyed Resources	25
DINWIDDIE COUNTY	29
Previously Surveyed Resources	29
Newly Surveyed Resources	32
BRUNSWICK COUNTY.....	32
Previously Surveyed Resources	32
Newly Surveyed Resources	35
GREENSVILLE COUNTY.....	35
Previously Surveyed Resources	35
Newly Surveyed Resources	35
SOUTHAMPTON COUNTY.....	37
Previously Surveyed Resources	37
Newly Surveyed Resources	42
CITY OF CHESAPEAKE	42
Previously Surveyed Resources	42
Newly Surveyed Resources	43
CITY OF SUFFOLK	47
Previously Surveyed Resources	47
Newly Surveyed Resources	48
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	56
REFERENCES	60
APPENDIX A: GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	
APPENDIX B: RESUMES OF KEY PERSONNEL	
APPENDIX C: ACP CORRIDOR	

List of Figures

Figure 1: General Overview of the Project Corridor..	4
Figure 2: Previously Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Augusta County.	7
Figure 3: Previously Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Augusta County.	8
Figure 4: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Augusta County.....	9
Figure 5: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Augusta County.....	10
Figure 6: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Augusta County.....	11
Figure 7: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Augusta County.....	12
Figure 8: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Augusta County.....	13
Figure 9: Previously Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Nelson County.	16
Figure 10: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Buckingham County... ..	19
Figure 11: Newly Surveyed Resource in the Modified Project APE in Buckingham County. ...	20
Figure 12: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Cumberland County. ..	22
Figure 13: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Prince Edward County.....	24
Figure 14: Previously Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Nottoway County. 26	26
Figure 15: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Nottoway County.	27
Figure 16: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Nottoway County.	28
Figure 17: Previously Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Dinwiddie County.30	30
Figure 18: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Dinwiddie County.	31
Figure 19: Previously Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Brunswick County.....	33
Figure 20: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Brunswick County.....	34
Figure 21: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Greenville County.....	36
Figure 22: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Southampton County..	38
Figure 23: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Southampton County..	39
Figure 24: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Southampton County..	40
Figure 25: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Southampton County..	41
Figure 26: Previously Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in the City of Chesapeake.	44
Figure 27: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in City of Chesapeake.....	45
Figure 28: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in City of Chesapeake.....	46
Figure 29: Previously Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in the City of Suffolk.....	50
Figure 30: Previously Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in the City of Suffolk.....	51
Figure 31: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in the City of Suffolk.....	52
Figure 32: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in the City of Suffolk.....	53
Figure 33: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in the City of Suffolk.....	54
Figure 34: Previously Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in the City of Suffolk.....	55

List of Photos

Photo 1: Primary Dwelling of Folly Farm (007-0015), East Oblique.	14
Photo 2: Primary Dwelling (Left) and Stable (Right) Associated with Red Apple Orchards (062-5121).....	17
Photo 3: House at 203 Upton Lane (133-0025), North Elevation.	48

List of Tables

Table 1: Previously Surveyed Architectural Resources in Augusta County Identified Within Modified Project APE.	14
Table 2: Newly Surveyed Architectural Resources in Augusta County Identified Within the Modified Project APE.	15
Table 3: Previously Surveyed Architectural Resources in Nelson County Identified Within Modified Project APE.	15
Table 4: Newly Surveyed Architectural Resources in Buckingham County Identified Within the Modified Project APE.	18
Table 5: Newly Surveyed Architectural Resources in Cumberland County Identified Within the Modified Project APE.	21
Table 6: Newly Surveyed Architectural Resources in Prince Edward County Identified Within the Modified Project APE.	23
Table 7: Previously Surveyed Architectural Resources in Nottoway County Identified Within the Modified Project APE.	25
Table 8: Newly Surveyed Architectural Resources in Nottoway County Identified Within the Modified Project APE.	29
Table 9: Previously Surveyed Architectural Resources in Dinwiddie County Identified Within the Modified Project APE.	29
Table 10: Newly Surveyed Architectural Resources in Dinwiddie County Identified Within the Modified Project APE.	32
Table 11: Previously Surveyed Architectural Resources in Brunswick County Identified Within the Modified Project APE.	32
Table 12: Newly Surveyed Architectural Resources in Brunswick County Identified Within the Modified Project APE.	35
Table 13: Newly Surveyed Architectural Resources in Greensville County Identified Within the Modified Project APE.	35
Table 14: Newly Surveyed Architectural Resource Southampton County Identified Within the Project APE.	37
Table 15: Previously Surveyed Architectural Resource in the City of Chesapeake Identified Within the Project APE.	43
Table 16: Newly Surveyed Architectural Resources in the City of Chesapeake Identified Within the Modified Project APE.	43
Table 17: Previously Surveyed Architectural Resources in the City of Suffolk Identified Within the Project APE.	47

Table 18: Newly Surveyed Architectural Resources in the City of Suffolk Identified Within the Modified Project APE. 49

Table 19: Architectural Resources Surveyed as Part of the Modified Project APE, Organized by County (North to South). *Note:* Resources that Dovetail recommends potentially eligible for, or should remain eligible for or listed in, the NRHP are highlighted in blue. 57

INTRODUCTION

On behalf of Environmental Resources Management (ERM), Dovetail Cultural Resource Group (Dovetail) conducted an architectural reconnaissance survey for the proposed Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) Project in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Dominion Transmission, Inc. (DTI) will build and operate approximately 600 miles of natural gas transmission pipeline and associated laterals on behalf of Atlantic Coast Pipeline, LLC (Atlantic), which is a company formed by Dominion Resources, Duke Energy, Piedmont Natural Gas, and Southern Company Gas. The pipeline system extends from West Virginia to southern North Carolina, and the Project will also include access roads, meter stations, compressor stations, and other above-ground facilities (Figure 1). This document presents findings for the segment of the pipeline corridor in Virginia, which is 308.1 miles long, and passes through Highland, Bath, Augusta, Nelson, Buckingham, Cumberland, Prince Edward, Nottoway, Dinwiddie, Brunswick, and Southampton counties, and the cities of Suffolk, and Chesapeake. It includes the 235.8 mile-long trunk line (AP-1), and three laterals (AP-3, AP-4, and AP-5) that total 72.3 miles. The Area of Potential Effects (APE) includes the 300-foot-wide survey corridor that will encompass the construction zone and the permanent pipeline right-of-way for the proposed pipeline, the footprints for access roads and other facilities associated with the Project, and areas of potential indirect (visual) effects that lie within line of sight of proposed aboveground facilities and landscape changes due to clearing of vegetation or other impacts associated with construction. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) is the lead federal agency, and work was conducted pursuant to the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 USC 470). Section 106 requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings (including the issuance of Certificates) on properties listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). DTI, as a non-federal party, is assisting FERC in meeting its obligations under Section 106 by preparing the necessary information, analyses, and recommendations as authorized by 36 CFR 800.2(a)(3).

The project corridor has been modified since the report on the original architectural survey was submitted to the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (DHR) in September 2015 and revised in April 2016 (Lesiuk et al. 2016). Therefore, additional studies were required. An initial round of alignment modifications were documented in an addendum report submitted to DHR in February 2016 (Staton 2016). Shortly thereafter, the width of the project impact corridor was clarified to encompass an area wider than originally surveyed. For architectural resources, the project APE is defined as the 150 feet on either side of the ACP centerline plus areas within the viewshed of the corridor where impacts to a resource's setting and feeling could occur. Architectural survey for this second addendum report was completed in February 2016.

Since the February 2016 survey, additional alignment modifications have been made, including major reroutes of the portions of the line in Augusta and Highland counties and the City of Suffolk (**Error! Reference source not found., p. Error! Bookmark not defined.**). This report presents the results of the investigation that includes areas of the widened project alignment along the previous right-of-way in places where the APE was not investigated during the original survey. Additional resources within the APE of the modified route will be addressed in

Addendum 3. Surveyed resources that were no longer in the APE as a result of the subsequent route modifications are not included in this report; however, the survey forms were submitted as part of the deliverables for this phase of the investigation.

Data in this report are organized by county, northwest to southeast along the corridor, with the resources for each county arranged by DHR number. This report follows guidance issued by the DHR including *Guidelines for Conducting Historic Resources Surveys in Virginia* (2011) and *Assessing Visual Effects on Historic Properties* (2010). The purpose of this survey was to identify architectural resources over 50 years in age within the project's APE and not included in the original report on identification-level studies. In addition, large historic districts within one mile of the corridor were included in the identification study for future viewshed effect evaluations as requested by the DHR in its October 30, 2014, reply letter on project APE.

Fieldwork on this project was conducted in accordance with guidance set forth by relevant federal and state agencies. Dovetail staff members Emily K. Anderson, Emily Taggart Schrickler, and Dr. Kerri S. Barile conducted the work for this undertaking, with Dr. Barile serving as Principal Investigator. Dr. Barile meets or exceeds the standards established for both Architectural Historian and Historian by the Secretary of the Interior (SOI).

This report has been edited and revised by ERM to update the project description and remove resources that are no longer in the current project corridor. The resource descriptions, results, and recommendations that are included in this document are authored by Dovetail.




Figure 1: General Overview of the Project Corridor.

PROJECT METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this reconnaissance-level architectural survey of the ACP Project corridor was to evaluate any historic buildings, structures, objects, or districts over 50 years in age for NRHP eligibility within portions of the February 2016 APE that had not yet been surveyed for above-ground resources. Each resource was evaluated in regard to: (1) Criterion A, for its association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; (2) Criterion B, for its association with people significant in our nation's history; (3) Criterion C, for its embodiment of distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values; and (4) Criterion D, for its potential to yield information important in history. Criteria considerations were taken into account where necessary. When resources were inaccessible due to property access restrictions and not enough information could be gathered to make an NRHP assessment, efforts will be made to gain access and an assessment will be provided in subsequent reports. Any resources that remain inaccessible will be assumed eligible for the sake of the Project.

The area within the project APE first received an architectural and historical background literature and records search at the DHR in July 2014. Results of this background review can be found in the previously submitted report for this project (Lesiuk et al. 2016). An addendum report was submitted to DHR in February 2016 that addressed areas of the project APE that had not been surveyed due to corridor updates dated October 10, 2015 (Staton 2016).

The current architectural investigation, conducted in February 2016, consisted of a reconnaissance survey of unsurveyed segments of the project's modified architectural APE to identify undocumented architectural resources 50 years of age or older and conduct an abbreviated survey of resources in the modified area that are on file at the DHR. During this survey, Dovetail staff visually inspected the project corridor from the public rights-of-way (ROW), as requested by the client, and recorded extant historic resources. They were documented through photographs, written field notes, and GIS mapping. Information collected about each resource was used to complete Virginia Cultural Resource Information System (V-CRIS) forms, which include recommendations for the resource's NRHP potential.

HIGHLAND COUNTY

The alignment modifications that were made subsequent to the architectural survey for this report resulted in no resources in the surveyed areas remaining in the APE. Resources in the APE of the new alignment in Highland County will be discussed in subsequent addenda.

AUGUSTA COUNTY

The architectural reconnaissance survey identified 13 total resources within the project APE in Augusta County. Two were previously recorded and 11 were newly recorded as part of the current survey. One of the 11 newly identified resources recorded during this effort was inaccessible, and therefore a sufficient amount of information was not acquired to make an eligibility determination. All 13 resources are shown in Figures 2–8 and are detailed in **Error! Reference source not found.** and **Error! Reference source not found.**

Previously Surveyed Resources

Two previously recorded resources were identified within the modified project APE in Augusta County. Folly Farm (007-0015) at 1319 Lee Jackson Highway is a large farmstead built in 1818 and comprises a dwelling, a secondary dwelling, a barn, a silo, a cemetery, a spring house, an ice house, a smoke house, and an outbuilding, portions of which are enclosed with a brick serpentine wall or wooden picket fencing (Photo 1). The property was placed on the Virginia Landmarks Register (VLR) on September 18, 1973 and the NRHP on October 25, 1973 under Criterion C for architecture. The dwelling serves as a well-preserved example of the Jeffersonian style which retains many of its original dependencies and maintains its plantation setting. The primary resource and the farm in its entirety retain its original location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. As such, **Dovetail recommends that the resource remains listed in the VLR and the NRHP under Criterion C.** As an architectural resource, this property is recommended not eligible under Criterion D, but it was not evaluated under that criterion as an archaeological resource.

The second previously recorded resource is Augusta Structure No. 6628 (007-5147). This vehicular bridge was constructed in 1940 to extend Mt. Torrey Road over the Orebank Creek. In 2006, DHR determined this 14-foot wide concrete-slab bridge to be not eligible for listing in the NRHP. Since this determination was made more than five years ago, Dovetail revisited the property. The bridge does not appear to have increased historic or architectural significance since it was deemed not eligible in 2006. As such, **Dovetail recommends that it should remain not eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A–C.** As an architectural resource, this property is recommended not eligible under Criterion D, but it was not evaluated under that criterion as an archaeological resource.




Figure 2: Previously Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Augusta County (Esri 2015).




Figure 3: Previously Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Augusta County (Esri 2015).




Figure 4: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Augusta County (Esri 2015).




Figure 5: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Augusta County (Esri 2015).




Figure 6: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Augusta County (Esri 2015).




Figure 7: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Augusta County (Esri 2015).




Figure 8: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Augusta County (Esri 2015).

Table 1: Previously Surveyed Architectural Resources in Augusta County Identified Within Modified Project APE.

DHR No.	Mile Post	Name/Address	Date of Construction	Eligibility Recommendation
007-0015	139.1–140.3	Folly Farm, 1319 Lee Jackson Highway	1818	Remains Listed
007-5147	153.3–153.4	Augusta Structure No. 6628	1940	Not Eligible



Photo 1: Primary Dwelling of Folly Farm (007-0015), East Oblique.

Newly Surveyed Resources

Eleven new resources were identified within the modified project APE in Augusta County. One resource (007-5587), a dwelling, was inaccessible during the current survey; therefore, enough information was not obtained in order to make an eligibility recommendation. The ten remaining resources are single family dwellings that range in date from around 1900 to the mid 1960s.

One house on Cisco Lane (007-5594) is a two-story, three-bay dwelling constructed around the turn of the twentieth century with a central-hall plan. The frame building is clad in weatherboard and covered by a side-gabled roof. Wooden fish-scale shingles decorate the gable ends. Years of vacancy has resulted in a diminished of historic integrity of materials, workmanship, and details. The primary resource associated with the Farm Complex on Cisco Lane (007-5595) is a one-and-a-half story, single-family dwelling that has been heavily modified in recent decades with the addition of dormers and replacement siding. Additional buildings on this complex include a log dwelling and several agricultural outbuildings ranging in date from the early- to late-twentieth century. Six of the eleven newly recorded resources that date to the early-twentieth century are one-story, single-family residences that were built in a form and style that was common throughout the rural Shenandoah Valley at the time of their construction. They are not representative of high-style architectural trends. Two resources date to the third quarter of the twentieth century (007-5591 and 007-5593), both of which are one-story, Ranch-style houses clad in a brick, stretcher-bond veneer.

Table 2: Newly Surveyed Architectural Resources in Augusta County Identified Within the Modified Project APE.

DHR No	Mile Post	Name/Address	Date of Construction	Eligibility Recommendation
007-5586	124.1–124.4	House, 1095 Jennings Gap Road	ca. 1910	Not Eligible
007-5587	127.0-127.2	House, 100 Bobwhite Lane	pre-1966	Indeterminate
007-5588	129.2–129.3	House, 3387 Churchville Road (US 250)	ca. 1940	Not Eligible
007-5589	131.6–131.7	House, 3862 Morris Mill Road	ca. 1940	Not Eligible
007-5590	131.6–131.7	House, 3892 Morris Mill Road	ca. 1945	Not Eligible
007-5591	131.5–131.7	House, 3895 Morris Mill Road	1964	Not Eligible
007-5592	135.7–135.9	House, 692 Cedar Green Road	ca. 1940	Not Eligible
007-5593	135.7–135.9	House, 680 Cedar Green Road	ca. 1960	Not Eligible
007-5594	147.7–147.9	Abandoned House and Barn, Cisco Lane	ca. 1900	Not Eligible
007-5595	148.2–148.6	Farm Complex, Cisco Lane	ca. 1900	Not Eligible
007-5597	151.1–151.3	House, 680 China Clay Road	ca. 1910	Not Eligible

On a whole, these ten resources have no outstanding architectural elements and are not the known work of a master. Therefore, Dovetail recommends these resources not eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C. They have no known association with a significant event or person and are not associated with any broad patterns in history; consequently, Dovetail recommends them not eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and B. In sum, these resources are recommended not eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A, B, and C. As architectural resources, they are recommended as not eligible under Criterion D, but they were not evaluated under that criterion as architectural resources. In sum, these resources are recommended not eligible for the NRHP.

NELSON COUNTY

One previously-recorded resource was recorded in the APE in Nelson County as part of the current study. There are no newly-identified resources within the modified APE in Nelson County. The previously-recorded resource in Nelson County included in the current study is detailed in **Error! Reference source not found.** and shown below in **Error! Reference source not found.**

Table 3: Previously Surveyed Architectural Resources in Nelson County Identified Within Modified Project APE.

DHR No.	Mile Post	Name/Address	Date of Construction	Eligibility Recommendation
062-5121	179.7–180.5	Red Apple Orchards	ca. 1890	Potentially Eligible, Criterion C

Previously Surveyed Resources

There is one previously recorded resource within the modified project APE in Nelson County. Red Apple Orchards (062-5121) is a farm located on the northeast side of James River Road




Figure 2: Previously Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Nelson County (Esri 2015).

(Route 56) in rural Nelson County, Virginia. According to a circa-1945 brochure on file at the DHR, the farm consists of 1,100 acres, a primary residence dating to circa 1890, a guest house, seven tenant houses, and various agricultural outbuildings (**Error! Reference source not found.**). Because the survey was conducted from the public right-of-way only, most of the secondary resources were not visible during the current survey; however, a few extant contributing resources were identified including a stable and a brooder house.

The primary dwelling at Red Apple Orchards has undergone very few changes since its initial survey in the 1940s. The property appears to retain a high to moderate level of integrity of materials, workmanship, feeling, location, and design and serves as a good example of Colonial Revival architecture in Nelson County, Virginia. Additional research and field visitation are recommended to compare this farm to other surviving similar late-nineteenth century resources in the area. Therefore, Dovetail recommends it potentially eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C. It has no known association with persons significant in the past, nor does it represent a broad pattern of history. Therefore, Dovetail recommends it not eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and B. As an architectural resource, this property is recommended not eligible under Criterion D, but it was not evaluated under that criterion as an archeological resource. In sum, Red Apple Orchards is **recommended potentially eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C.**



Photo 2: Primary Dwelling (Left) and Stable (Right) Associated with Red Apple Orchards (062-5121).

BUCKINGHAM COUNTY

A total of three resources were identified in the modified project APE in Buckingham County, none of which were previously recorded with DHR. One of the three newly identified resources recorded during this effort was inaccessible, and therefore a sufficient amount of information was not acquired to make an eligibility determination. All three resources are detailed in Table 4 and shown on Figure and Figure .

Previously Surveyed Resources

There were no previously recorded resources identified within the modified project APE in Buckingham County.

Newly Surveyed Resources

Three newly recorded resources were identified within the modified APE in Buckingham County during the current survey. One resource, a single family dwelling, was inaccessible during the current survey; therefore, enough information was not obtained in order to make an eligibility recommendation. The remaining two resources are single-family dwellings that date to the mid-twentieth century. The primary resource at the Andersonville Ostrich Ranch (014-5072) is a one-story, three-bay dwelling covered by a low-pitched, side-gabled roof constructed around 1950. The other resource is a circa-1960, one-story mobile home located at 2622 Andersonville Road (014-5073). On a whole, these resources have no outstanding architectural elements and are not the known work of a master. Therefore, Dovetail recommends these resources as not eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C. They have no known association with a significant event or person and are not associated with any broad patterns in history. Consequently, Dovetail recommends them not eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and B. As architectural resources, Dovetail recommends them as not eligible under Criterion D, but they were not evaluated under that criterion as an archaeological resource. In sum, these resources are **recommended not eligible for the NRHP**.

Table 4: Newly Surveyed Architectural Resources in Buckingham County
Identified Within the Modified Project APE.

DHR No.	Mile Post	Name/Address	Date of Construction	Eligibility Recommendation
014-5072	200.4–200.8	Andersonville Ostrich Ranch, 1203 Dixie Hill Road	ca. 1950	Not Eligible
014-5073	202.2–202.4	House, 2622 Andersonville Road	ca. 1960	Not Eligible
014-5074	208.8–209.2	House, 708 Old Curdsville Road	Pre-1964	Indeterminate



Figure 10: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Buckingham County (Esri 2015).



Figure 11: Newly Surveyed Resource in the Modified Project APE in Buckingham County (Esri 2015).

CUMBERLAND COUNTY

One resource was identified in the modified project APE in Cumberland County. This one resource was newly identified during this effort. There were no previously recorded resources identified within the modified APE during the current survey. This resource is detailed in **Error! Reference source not found.** and shown on Figure 12.

Table 5: Newly Surveyed Architectural Resources in Cumberland County Identified Within the Modified Project APE.

DHR No.	Mile Post	Name/Address	Date of Construction	Eligibility Recommendation
024-5109	220.3–220.5	Farm, 710 River Road	ca. 1940	Not Eligible

Previously Surveyed Resources

There were no previously recorded resources identified within the modified project APE in Cumberland County.

Newly Surveyed Resources

One newly recorded resource was identified within the modified APE in Cumberland County. The Farm at 710 River Road (024-5109) is composed of a primary dwelling and approximately seven secondary resources including a barn, agricultural outbuilding, machine shed, sheds, and a bar-be-que pit. The primary dwelling was constructed around 1940 in a form and style that does not reflect high architectural style influences and was vernacular in this region of Cumberland County during the first half of the twentieth century. In addition, it has undergone common modifications, such as the construction of a large addition on the east elevation. This resource does not exhibit high artistic value as the work of a master nor is it an outstanding example of its style or property type. Therefore, Dovetail recommends that this resource be considered not eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C. It is not associated with any significant event or person from history, and Dovetail recommends it not eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and B. As an architectural resource, Dovetail recommends the resource as not eligible under Criterion D, but it was not evaluated under that criterion as an archaeological resource. In sum, these resources are **recommended not eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A-D**



Figure 3: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Cumberland County (Esri 2015).

PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY

One resource was identified in the modified project APE in Prince Edward County. This one resource was newly identified during this effort; there were no previously recorded resources identified within the modified APE during the current survey. This resource is detailed in **Error! Reference source not found.** and shown on Figure 13.

Table 6: Newly Surveyed Architectural Resources in Prince Edward County Identified Within the Modified Project APE.

DHR No.	Mile Post	Name/Address	Date of Construction	Eligibility Recommendation
073-5092	224.5–224.7	Abandoned House, Gully Tavern Road	ca. 1910	Not Eligible

Previously Surveyed Resources

There were no previously recorded resources identified within the modified project APE in Prince Edward County.

Newly Surveyed Resources

One newly recorded resource was identified within the modified APE in Prince Edward County. The abandoned house on the north side of Gully Tavern Road (073-5092) is a one-story dwelling constructed around 1910 with indiscernible architectural style. This resource does not exhibit high artistic value as the work of a master nor is it an outstanding example of its style or property type. Furthermore, it appears to have diminished historic integrity of materials and workmanship. Therefore, it is recommended that this resource be considered not eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C. It has no known association with any significant event or person, and is, therefore, recommended not eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A or B. As an architectural resource, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion D, but it was not evaluated under that criterion as an archaeological resource. In sum, this resource is **recommended not eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A- D.**



Figure 4: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Prince Edward County (Esri 2015).

NOTTOWAY COUNTY

A total of three resources were identified in the modified project APE in Nottoway County, one of which was previously recorded with DHR and the remaining two were newly recorded as part of the current survey. All three resources are detailed in Table 7 and **Error! Reference source not found.** and shown on Figures 14–16.

Previously Surveyed Resources

One previously recorded resource was documented within the modified APE in Nottoway County during the current survey. The primary resource at Bright Shadows (067-0186) is a circa-1850, two-story, single-family dwelling. Associated with this resource are a secondary dwelling, gate post, two mobile homes, and a shed. This resource does not exhibit high artistic value as the work of a master nor is it an outstanding example of its style or property type. Therefore, Dovetail recommends that Bright Shadows be considered not eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C. It has no known association with any significant event or person, and Dovetail recommends it not eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A or B. As an architectural resource, Dovetail recommends it not eligible under Criterion D, but it was not evaluated under that criterion as an archaeological resource. In sum, this resource is **recommended not eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A- D.**

Table 7: Previously Surveyed Architectural Resources in Nottoway County Identified Within the Modified Project APE.

DHR No.	Mile Post	Name/Address	Date of Construction	Eligibility Recommendation
067-0186	230.2–230.4	Bright Shadows, 2624 Jennings Ordinary Road	ca. 1850	Not Eligible

Newly Surveyed Resources

Two newly recorded resources were identified within the modified APE in Nottoway County during the current survey. The building at 3025 Winningham Road (067-5050) is a one-story dwelling constructed around 1920 with an indeterminate architectural style. This resource appears to have diminished historic integrity of materials and workmanship and has undergone common modifications such as the construction of an addition to the southwest corner. The second resource (067-5051) is a one-story dwelling with some Minimal Traditional-style characteristics constructed around 1960. On a whole, these resources have no outstanding architectural elements and are not the known work of a master. Therefore, Dovetail recommends them as not eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C. They have no known association with a significant event or person and are not associated with any broad patterns in history. Consequently, Dovetail recommends them not eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and B. As architectural resources, Dovetail recommends them as not eligible under Criterion D, but they were not evaluated under that criterion as archaeological resources. In sum, these resources are **recommended not eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A-D.**




Figure 14: Previously Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Nottoway County (Esri 2015).




Figure 5: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Nottoway County (Esri 2015).




Figure 6: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Nottoway County (Esri 2015).

Table 8: Newly Surveyed Architectural Resources in Nottoway County
Identified Within the Modified Project APE

DHR No.	Mile Post	Name/Address	Date of Construction	Eligibility Recommendation
067-5050	237.1–237.3	House, 3025 Wunningham Road	ca. 1920	Not Eligible
067-5051	246.6–246.9	House, 725 Green Gable Road	ca. 1960	Not Eligible

DINWIDDIE COUNTY

The architectural reconnaissance survey identified a total of two resources within the modified project APE in Dinwiddie County. One resource was previously recorded with the DHR and the other was newly identified during the current survey. All resources are detailed in Table 9 and **Error! Reference source not found.** and are shown on Figure 7 and Figure .

Previously Surveyed Resources

The Col. Joseph W. Harper House at 4105 Harper’s Road (026-0007) was the only previously identified resource located within the modified project APE during the current effort. It was determined eligible by DHR Staff in February 2011 under Criterion C as it is a rare surviving eighteenth century house in Dinwiddie with a high level of integrity of materials and workmanship. Additionally, the house is one of the only known buildings to utilize “galleting” (the insertion of small stones into mortar), which was used on the foundation. Furthermore, comparisons of current and historic aerial imagery suggest that the dwelling retains many of its secondary resources, including a cemetery and tobacco barn (Google Earth 2016). This resource was not accessible during the current survey. However, modern aerial photography suggests no changes have been made to the property. Therefore, Dovetail **recommends that the Col. Joseph W. Harper House retains sufficient integrity and significance to remain eligible for the NRHP.**

Table 9: Previously Surveyed Architectural Resources in Dinwiddie County
Identified Within the Modified Project APE.

DHR No.	Mile Post	Name/Address	Date of Construction	Eligibility Recommendation
026-0007	259.6–260.2	Col. Joseph W. Harper House, 4105 Harper's Road	ca. 1775	Remains Eligible



Figure 7: Previously Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Dinwiddie County (Esri 2015).



Figure 18: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Dinwiddie County (Esri 2015).

Newly Surveyed Resources

One newly recorded resource was identified within the modified project APE in Dinwiddie County. The resource is a series of houses at 4723–4725 Darvills Road (026-5222). According to historic aerial imagery, this resource was constructed prior to 1968 (Nationwide Environmental Title Research, LLC [NETR] 2016). It was inaccessible during the current survey; therefore, enough information was not obtained in order to make an eligibility determination.

Table 10: Newly Surveyed Architectural Resources in Dinwiddie County Identified Within the Modified Project APE.

DHR No.	Mile Post	Name/Address	Date of Construction	Eligibility Recommendation
026-5222	256.0–256.4	Houses, 4723–4725 Darvills Road	pre-1968	Indeterminate

BRUNSWICK COUNTY

A total of two resources were identified within the modified project APE in Brunswick County. One was previously recorded with the DHR and one was newly recorded as part of the current survey. The newly identified resource recorded during this effort was inaccessible, and therefore a sufficient amount of information was not acquired to make an eligibility determination. All resources are detailed in Table 11 and **Error! Reference source not found.** and shown on Figure 8 and Figure 9.

Previously Surveyed Resources

The farmstead located at 981 Ebenezer Road (012-5136) was the only previously surveyed resource recorded during the current effort. It is a circa-1920 farmstead constructed in a vernacular form to this region of rural Virginia. The farm retains many of its original outbuildings, including several tobacco barns and various agricultural outbuildings. The building is in a deteriorated state and has undergone a series of alterations including exterior wall and roof sheathing. Additionally, this resource does not exhibit high artistic value as the work of a master nor is it an outstanding example of its style or property type. Therefore, Dovetail recommends that this resource be considered not eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C. It is not associated with any significant event or person, so Dovetail recommends not eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and B. As an architectural resource, Dovetail recommends the farmstead at 981 Ebenezer Road not eligible under Criterion D, but it was not evaluated under that criterion as an archaeological resource. In sum, this resource is **recommended not eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A–D.**

Table 11: Previously Surveyed Architectural Resources in Brunswick County Identified Within the Modified Project APE.

DHR No.	Mile Post	Name/Address	Date of Construction	Eligibility Recommendation
012-5136	269.5–270.0	Farmstead, 981 Ebenezer Road	ca. 1920	Not Eligible




Figure 8: Previously Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Brunswick County (Esri 2015).




Figure 9: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Brunswick County (Esri 2015).

Newly Surveyed Resources

One newly recorded resource was identified within the modified project APE in Brunswick County. The resource is a house on Rawlings Road (012-5191). According to historic topographic maps (NETR 2016), this resource was constructed between 1921 and 1942. It was inaccessible during the current survey; therefore, enough information was not obtained in order to make an eligibility determination.

Table 12: Newly Surveyed Architectural Resources in Brunswick County Identified Within the Modified Project APE.

DHR No.	Mile Post	Name/Address	Date of Construction	Eligibility Recommendation
012-5191	262.8–231.2	House, Rawlings Road (Route 629)	ca. 1930	Indeterminate

GREENSVILLE COUNTY

Four resources were identified within the modified project APE in Greenville County, all of which were newly identified during the current survey. There are no previously surveyed resources within the modified APE in Greenville County. All resources are detailed in **Error! Reference source not found.** and shown on Figure .

Table 13: Newly Surveyed Architectural Resources in Greenville County Identified Within the Modified Project APE.

DHR No.	Mile Post	Name/Address	Date of Construction	Eligibility Recommendation
040-5068	291.2–291.6	House, 422 Collins Road	ca. 1965	Not Eligible
040-5069	291.4–291.7	House, 425 Collins Road	ca. 1935	Not Eligible
040-5070	292.1–292.2	Abandoned House, Rock Bridge Road	ca. 1910	Not Eligible
040-5071	292.2–292.3	House, 1490 Rock Bridge Road	ca. 1960	Not Eligible

Previously Surveyed Resources

No previously surveyed resources were identified within the APE in Greenville County.

Newly Surveyed Resources

The four architectural resources identified within the modified project APE in Greenville during the current survey are all dwellings. Two of these resources—the house at 422 Collins Road (040-5068) and the house at 1490 Rock Bridge Road (040-5071)—are one-story, single-family dwellings covered in a brick veneer, capped by a low-pitched, side-gabled roof. They were




Figure 21: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Greenville County (Esri 2015).

constructed in the mid-twentieth century in the Ranch style, which is common to this region and time period. The other two dwellings date to the early-twentieth century. One is an abandoned house located off of Rock Bridge Road (040-5070) constructed around 1910. The other is a one-story, single-family dwelling located at 425 Collins Road (040-5069) constructed around 1935 in an indiscernible style common to the area and era in which it was constructed.

All of the newly surveyed resources within the modified project APE were dwellings built in a common style to this region of southeastern Virginia. They do not exhibit high artistic value as the work of a master nor are they outstanding examples of their style or property type. As such, Dovetail recommends these resources are not eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C. They have no known association with a significant event or person and are not associated with any broad patterns in history. Consequently, Dovetail recommends them not eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and B. As architectural resources, Dovetail recommends them as not eligible under Criterion D, but they were not evaluated under that criterion as archaeological resources. In sum, these two previously recorded resources are **recommended not eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A- D.**

SOUTHAMPTON COUNTY

A total of five resources were identified within the project APE in Southampton County, none of which were previously recorded with DHR. One of the five newly identified resources recorded during this effort was inaccessible, and therefore a sufficient amount of information was not acquired to make an eligibility determination. All resources are detailed in Table 15 and are shown on Figure 10–Figure 13.

Table 14: Newly Surveyed Architectural Resource Southampton County
Identified Within the Project APE.

DHR No.	Mile Post	Resource Name	Date of Construction	Eligibility Recommendation
087-5615	18.5–19	Birdsong Peanuts, 31282 Powells Hill Road	ca. 1960	Not Eligible
087-5616	23.5–23.7	House, 28229 Grays Shop Road (Route 673)	ca. 1950	Not Eligible
087-5617	23.5–23.7	House, 28247 Grays Shop Road (Route 673)	ca. 1900	Not Eligible
087-5618	30.7–31.7	House, 28459 Nottoway Farms Drive	pre-1920	Indeterminate
087-5619	33.1–33.3	Ruins, 28035 Delaware Road	pre-1920	Not Eligible

Previously Surveyed Resources

There were no previously recorded resources identified within the modified project APE in Southampton County.



Figure 10: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Southampton County (Esri 2015).



Figure 11: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Southampton County (Esri 2015).




Figure 12: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Southampton County (Esri 2015).



Figure 13: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in Southampton County (Esri 2015).

Newly Surveyed Resources

Five newly recorded resources were identified within the modified APE in Southampton County during the current survey. One resource, a house at 28459 Nottoway Farms Drive (087-5618), was inaccessible during the current survey; therefore, enough information was not obtained in order to make an eligibility determination. Two resources, the dwelling on the Birdsong Peanut Farm at 31282 Powells Hill Road (087-5615) and the House at 28229 Grays Shop Road (087-5616), are mid-twentieth century, single-family dwellings. While the house at 28229 Grays Shop Road exhibits Craftsman-style elements, both of these dwellings were constructed in a form that was common to this region of Virginia in the time they were constructed. Another resource, the House at 28247 Grays Shop Road (087-5617), is a duplex constructed around 1900. The form of this dwelling suggests that it may have been a tenant house for a larger farm complex. It has undergone common modifications and alterations. Lastly, the ruins of a pre-1920 building are located at 28035 Delaware Road (087-5619). These two resources have lost a substantial amount of historic integrity of design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. As a whole, these four resources have no outstanding architectural elements and are not the work of a master, and therefore are not eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C. They are not associated with any significant event or person, and Dovetail recommends them not eligible under Criteria A and B. As architectural resources, Dovetail recommends them not eligible under Criterion D, but they were not evaluated under that criterion as archaeological resources. In sum, these resources are **recommended not eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A–D.**

CITY OF CHESAPEAKE

A total of 25 resources were identified in the modified project APE in the City of Chesapeake, one of which was previously recorded with DHR. All resources are detailed in Table 15 and Table 16 and shown on Figure 14–Figure 16.

Previously Surveyed Resources

One previously recorded resource was identified within the modified project APE during the course of the survey. The dwelling at 3320 Galberry Road (131-0542) was a circa-1900, single-family dwelling and it was not evaluated for NRHP eligibility during its previous survey in 1987. In 2000, the building was demolished and replaced with a new house, which does not meet the NRHP age criteria. Neither this resource nor the site of the previous dwelling embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction. Additionally, they do not represent the work of a master or possess high artistic value. Therefore, Dovetail recommends these resources not eligible under Criterion C. Furthermore, they are not known to be associated with a significant historic event or person, so Dovetail recommends them as not eligible under Criteria A and B. As architectural resources, Dovetail recommends them not eligible under Criterion D, but they were not evaluated under that criterion as archaeological resources. Dovetail **recommends that these resources are not individually eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criteria A–D.**

Table 15: Previously Surveyed Architectural Resource in the City of Chesapeake Identified Within the Project APE.

DHR No.	Mile Post	Resource Name	Date of Construction	Eligibility Recommendation
131-0542	77.5–77.7	House, 3328 Galberry Road	ca. 1900	Not Eligible

Newly Surveyed Resources

The 24 newly documented resources within the modified project APE include 22 mid-twentieth century single-family dwellings. A majority of these dwellings are located within densely populated residential neighborhoods and are primarily constructed in the Ranch or Minimal Traditional styles. These 22 houses are representative of architectural styles and forms common throughout the mid-twentieth century in the City of Chesapeake and the southeastern region of Virginia. Another resource, a Veterinary Hospital at 618 Happy Acres Road (131-5846), is a one-story, commercial building constructed in 1960 in an indiscernible style for the area and era in which it was constructed. The remaining resource, the Faith Tab Apostolic Holiness Church at 1216 New Street (131-5864), is a one-story, front-gabled house that was converted into a church. The building was constructed around 1950 in a vernacular form common to this area of the City of Chesapeake.

Table 16: Newly Surveyed Architectural Resources in the City of Chesapeake Identified Within the Modified Project APE.

DHR No	Mile Post	Name/Address	Date of Construction	Eligibility Recommendation
131-5842	77.5–77.6	House, 3345 Galberry Road	1945	Not Eligible
131-5843	77.5–77.6	House, 3343 Galberry Road	1947	Not Eligible
131-5844	78.3–78.4	House, 2860 Flag Road	1965	Not Eligible
131-5845	78.6–78.7	House, 2808 Flag Road	1955	Not Eligible
131-5846	78.6–78.7	Veterinary Hospital, 618 Happy Acres Road	1960	Not Eligible
131-5847	79.3–79.4	House, 701 Hopewell Drive	1964	Not Eligible
131-5848	79.3–79.5	House, 2400 Meiggs Road	1964	Not Eligible
131-5849	79.3–79.4	House, 2404 Meiggs Road	1964	Not Eligible
131-5850	79.3–79.4	House, 2408 Meiggs Road	1964	Not Eligible
131-5851	79.3–79.4	House, 2412 Meiggs Road	1964	Not Eligible
131-5852	79.2–79.3	House 2504 Meiggs Road	1963	Not Eligible
131-5853	79.2–79.3	House, 2508 Meiggs Road	1965	Not Eligible
131-5854	79.2–79.3	House, 2512 Meiggs Road	1964	Not Eligible
131-5855	79.2–79.3	House, 2516 Meiggs Road	1964	Not Eligible
131-5856	79.1–79.3	House, 2520 Meiggs Road	1964	Not Eligible
131-5857	79.1–79.2	House, 2524 Meiggs Road	1964	Not Eligible
131-5858	79.1–79.2	House, 2528 Meiggs Road	1964	Not Eligible
131-5859	79.8–79.9	House, 109 Lake Street	1953	Not Eligible
131-5860	79.8–79.9	House, 106 Lake Street	1950	Not Eligible
131-5861	79.7–79.9	House, 110 Lake Street	1960	Not Eligible
131-5862	79.7–79.8	House, 112 Lake Street	1954	Not Eligible
131-5863	79.7–79.8	House, 114 Lake Street	1954	Not Eligible
131-5864	80.9–81.1	Faith Tab Apostolic Holiness Church, 1216 New Street	ca. 1950	Not Eligible
131-5865	80.9–81.0	House, 1709 Currie Ave	1945	Not Eligible



Figure 14: Previously Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in the City of Chesapeake (Esri 2015).



Figure 15: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in City of Chesapeake (Esri 2015).




Figure 16: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in City of Chesapeake (Esri 2015).

On a whole, these 24 resources have no outstanding architectural elements and are not the known work of a master. Therefore, Dovetail recommends these resources not eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C. They have no known association with a significant event or person and are not associated with any broad patterns in history. Consequently, Dovetail recommends them not eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and B. As architectural resources, Dovetail recommends them not eligible under Criterion D, but they were not evaluated under that criterion as archaeological resources. In sum, these 24 resources are **recommended not eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A-D.**

CITY OF SUFFOLK

The architectural reconnaissance survey identified a total of 20 resources within the project APE in the City of Suffolk. Three resources were previously recorded with the DHR and the remaining 17 are newly recorded properties. All resources are detailed in Table 17 and **Error! Reference source not found.** and are shown on Figures 29**Error! Reference source not found.**–34.

Previously Surveyed Resources

Three previously surveyed resources were located within the modified project APE in the City of Suffolk. One of the resources is located on Pruden Boulevard, the E.P. Bradshaw Log Corn Crib (133-0105), and it was not accessible from the ROW during the current survey. One resource, the Ely Farm (133-0233), was found to be no longer extant, and therefore does not meet NRHP criteria to be eligible for listing as an architectural property.

One of the three previously recorded resources is a circa-1780 dwelling at 203 Upton Lane (133-0025) (**Error! Reference source not found.**). It is one of 23 resources constructed between 1780 and 1840 within the vicinity of Suffolk recorded with DHR described as being an example of Federal architecture, five of which have been determined potentially eligible or eligible for, or are listed on, the NRHP. The House at 203 Upton Lane is one of only 18 recorded resources in Suffolk that dates to the eighteenth century. In 1975, DHR determined that the resource at 203 Upton Lane was not eligible for the NRHP. Because current survey work was restricted to the public right-of-way, Dovetail could gather only limited data that could speak to this resource’s architectural significance and surviving historic integrity. However, it appears to retain much of its original building fabric and associated outbuildings including one-story dairy and one-story garage. As such, Dovetail **recommends that this resource is potentially eligible under Criterion C.**

Table 17: Previously Surveyed Architectural Resources in the City of Suffolk Identified Within the Project APE.

DHR No.	Mile Post	Resource Name	Date of Construction	Eligibility Recommendation
133-0025	65.3–65.6	House, 203 Upton Lane	ca. 1780	Potentially Eligible, Criterion C
133-0105	59.0–59.2	E.P. Bradshaw Log Corn Crib, Pruden	ca. 1840	Indeterminate

DHR No.	Mile Post	Resource Name	Date of Construction	Eligibility Recommendation
		Boulevard		
133-0233	60.1–60.3	Eley Farm, Lake Prince Road	ca. 1890	Not Eligible



Photo 3: House at 203 Upton Lane (133-0025), North Elevation.

Newly Surveyed Resources

There were 17 newly surveyed resources within the project APE during the current survey. Fifteen of these resources are mid-twentieth century, single-family dwellings constructed in the Ranch or Minimal Traditional style, which was common to this area and era. Two resources are early-twentieth century resources, both of which are located on Chappell Drive. The first is the House at 533 Chappell Drive (133-5555), which was built around 1900 in a vernacular form. The second—the House at 564 Chappell Drive (133-5556)—is a circa-1925, vernacular I-house. As a whole, these 17 domestic resources were constructed in a form and style that is common to the City of Suffolk and to the era in which they were built, so they are not eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C. None of them are known to be associated with a significant person or event from history, so Dovetail recommends them as not eligible under Criteria A and B. As architectural resources, Dovetail recommends them not eligible under Criterion D, but they were not evaluated under that criterion as archaeological resources. In sum, these resources are **recommended not eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A-D.**

Table 18: Newly Surveyed Architectural Resources in the City of Suffolk
Identified Within the Modified Project APE.

DHR No	Mile Post	Name/Address	Date of Construction	Eligibility Recommendation
133-5547	47.4–47.6	House, 414 Dutch Road	1954	Not Eligible
133-5548	50.6–50.7	House, 5229 Holland Road (Route 58)	ca. 1960	Not Eligible
133-5549	50.6–50.7	House, 5233 Holland Road (Route 58)	ca. 1950	Not Eligible
133-5550	50.6–50.7	House, 5237 Holland Road (Route 58)	ca. 1950	Not Eligible
133-5551	50.6–50.7	House, 5241 Holland Road (Route 58)	ca. 1960	Not Eligible
133-5552	50.6–50.7	House, 5245 Holland Road (Route 58)	ca. 1960	Not Eligible
133-5553	50.6–50.7	House, 5301 Holland Road (Route 58)	ca. 1940	Not Eligible
133-5554	50.6–50.7	House, 5325 Holland Road (Route 58)	ca. 1965	Not Eligible
133-5555	51.5–51.7	House, 533 Chappell Drive	ca. 1900	Not Eligible
133-5556	51.7–51.9	House, 564 Chappell Drive	1925	Not Eligible
133-5557	55.7–55.8	House, 3557 Kings Fork Road	1951	Not Eligible
133-5558	56.9–57.1	House, 3112 Archers Mill Road	1945	Not Eligible
133-5561	60.1–60.3	House, 3477 Lake Prince Drive	1950	Not Eligible
133-5562	60.1–60.3	House, 3481 Lake Prince Drive	1950	Not Eligible
133-5564	59.8–60.0	House, 3944 Lake Point Road	1961	Not Eligible
133-5565	60.4–60.6	House, 3600 Labrador Lane	1949	Not Eligible
133-5567	61.3–61.4	House, 3901 Matoaka Road	1960	Not Eligible



Figure 29: Previously Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in the City of Suffolk (Esri 2015).



Figure 17: Previously Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in the City of Suffolk (Esri 2015).




Figure 31: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in the City of Suffolk (Esri 2015).



Figure 32: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in the City of Suffolk (Esri 2015).



Figure 33: Newly Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in the City of Suffolk (Esri 2015).



Figure 34: Previously Surveyed Resources in the Modified Project APE in the City of Suffolk (Esri 2015).

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Dovetail conducted an architectural reconnaissance survey for the proposed ACP Project in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Atlantic proposes to construct and operate approximately 600 miles of natural gas transmission pipelines and associated aboveground facilities in West Virginia, Virginia, and North Carolina. A report on the original architectural survey on the project corridor was submitted to the DHR in September 2015 and revised in April 2016 (Lesiuk et al. 2016). Since that time, the project corridor has been modified, thus requiring additional identification studies. An initial round of alignment modifications were documented in an addendum report submitted to DHR in February 2016 (Staton 2016). Shortly thereafter, the width of the project impact corridor was clarified to encompass an area wider than originally surveyed. For architectural resources, the project APE is defined as the 150 feet on either side of the ACP centerline plus areas within the viewshed of the corridor where impacts to a resource's setting could occur. Architectural survey for this second addendum report was completed in February 2016. The purpose of the survey was to identify architectural resources over 50 years in age within portions of the project's APE that were not included in the original study.

Since the February 2016 survey, additional alignment modifications have been made, including major reroutes of the portions of the line in Augusta and Highland counties and the City of Suffolk. This report presents the results of the investigation that includes areas of the widened project alignment along the previous right-of-way in places where the APE was not investigated during the original survey.

A total of 80 architectural resources, 10 previously recorded and 70 newly recorded, was identified within the modified project APE (Table 19). Of the 10 previously recorded properties, two resources, Folly Farm (007-0015), and the Col. Joseph W. Harper House (026-0007) were previously listed in, or determined eligible for, the NRHP. Dovetail recommends that these two resources have sufficient integrity to maintain their eligibility status. One resource, the House at 203 Upton Lane (133-0025), was previously determined not eligible for the NRHP in 1975. However, in the 40 years since that eligibility determination was made, the architectural significance of this late-eighteenth century house increased. As a result, additional contextual data and architectural survey are required to make a formal eligibility recommendation. Dovetail recommends that the property should be considered potentially eligible for the NRHP. In addition, one previously identified resource, Red Apple Orchards (062-5121), is recommended potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP. Five previously identified resources are recommended not eligible for listing in the NRHP.

Six resources identified within the APE (one previously recorded and five newly recorded) were not given an eligibility determination due to insufficient information because of lack of access to the properties. As such they will be assessed in subsequent addenda when access becomes available, or will be treated as eligible for the purposes of the Project. The remaining 65 newly recorded resources are recommended not eligible for listing in the NRHP.

Table 19: Architectural Resources Surveyed as Part of the Modified Project APE, Organized by County (Alphabetical). *Note:* Resources that Dovetail recommends potentially eligible for, or should remain eligible for or listed in, the NRHP are highlighted in blue.

DHR No.	Mile Post	Name/Address	Date of Construction	Eligibility Recommendation
<i>Augusta County</i>				
007-0015	139.1–140.3	Folly Farm, 1319 Lee Jackson Highway	1818	Remains Listed
007-5147	153.3–153.4	Augusta Structure No. 6628	1940	Not Eligible
007-5586	124.1–124.4	House, 1095 Jennings Gap Road	ca. 1910	Not Eligible
007-5587	127.0–127.2	House, 100 Bobwhite Lane	pre-1966	Indeterminate
007-5588	129.2–129.3	House, 3387 Churchville Road (US 250)	ca. 1940	Not Eligible
007-5589	131.6–131.7	House, 3862 Morris Mill Road	ca. 1940	Not Eligible
007-5590	131.6–131.7	House, 3892 Morris Mill Road	ca. 1945	Not Eligible
007-5591	131.5–131.7	House, 3895 Morris Mill Road	1964	Not Eligible
007-5592	135.7–135.9	House, 692 Cedar Green Road	ca. 1940	Not Eligible
007-5593	135.7–135.9	House, 680 Cedar Green Road	ca. 1960	Not Eligible
007-5594	147.7–147.9	Abandoned House and Barn, Cisco Lane	ca. 1900	Not Eligible
007-5595	148.2–148.6	Farm Complex, Cisco Lane	ca. 1900	Not Eligible
007-5597	151.1–151.3	House, 680 China Clay Road	ca. 1910	Not Eligible
<i>Brunswick County</i>				
012-5136	269.5–270.0	Farmstead, 981 Ebenezer Road	ca. 1920	Not Eligible
012-5191	262.8–231.2	House, Rawlings Road (Route 629)	ca. 1930	Indeterminate
<i>Buckingham County</i>				
014-5072	200.4–200.8	Andersonville Ostrich Ranch, 1203 Dixie Hill Road	ca. 1950	Not Eligible
<i>Cumberland County</i>				
014-5073	202.2–202.4	House, 2622 Andersonville Road	ca. 1960	Not Eligible
014-5074	208.8–209.2	House, 708 Old Curdsville Road	pre-1964	Indeterminate
024-5109	220.3–220.5	Farm, 710 River Road	ca. 1940	Not Eligible
<i>Dinwiddie County</i>				
026-0007	259.6–260.2	Col. Joseph W. Harper House, 4105 Harper's Road	ca. 1775	Remains Eligible
026-5222	256.0–256.4	Houses, 4723–4725 Darvills Road	pre-1968	Indeterminate
<i>Greensville County</i>				
040-5068	291.2–291.6	House, 422 Collins Road	ca. 1965	Not Eligible
040-5069	291.4–291.7	House, 425 Collins Road	ca. 1935	Not Eligible
040-5070	292.1–292.2	Abandoned House, Rock Bridge Rd	ca. 1910	Not Eligible
040-5071	292.2–292.3	House, 1490 Rock Bridge Road	ca. 1960	Not Eligible
<i>Nelson County</i>				
062-5121	179.7–180.5	Red Apple Orchards	ca. 1890	Potentially Eligible, Criterion C
<i>Nottoway County</i>				
067-0186	230.2–230.4	Bright Shadows, 2624 Jennings Ordinary Road	ca. 1850	Not Eligible

DHR No.	Mile Post	Name/Address	Date of Construction	Eligibility Recommendation
067-5050	237.1–237.3	House, 3025 Wunningham Road	ca. 1920	Not Eligible
067-5051	246.6–246.9	House, 725 Green Gable Road	ca. 1960	Not Eligible
<i>Prince Edward County</i>				
073-5092	224.5–224.7	Abandoned House, Gully Tavern Road	ca. 1910	Not Eligible
<i>Southampton County</i>				
087-5615	18.5–19	Birdsong Peanuts, 31282 Powells Hill Road	ca. 1960	Not Eligible
087-5616	23.5–23.7	House, 28229 Grays Shop Road (Route 673)	ca. 1950	Not Eligible
087-5617	23.5–23.7	House, 28247 Grays Shop Road (Route 673)	ca. 1900	Not Eligible
087-5618	30.7–31.7	House, 28459 Nottoway Farms Drive	pre-1920	Indeterminate
087-5619	33.1–33.3	Ruins, 28035 Delaware Road	pre-1920	Not Eligible
<i>City of Chesapeake</i>				
131-0542	77.5–77.7	House, 3328 Galberry Road	ca. 1900	Not Eligible
131-5842	77.5–77.6	House, 3345 Galberry Road	1945	Not Eligible
131-5843	77.5–77.6	House, 3343 Galberry Road	1947	Not Eligible
131-5844	78.3–78.4	House, 2860 Flag Road	1965	Not Eligible
131-5845	78.6–78.7	House, 2808 Flag Road	1955	Not Eligible
131-5846	78.6–78.7	Veterinary Hospital, 618 Happy Acres Road	1960	Not Eligible
131-5847	79.3–79.4	House, 701 Hopewell Drive	1964	Not Eligible
131-5848	79.3–79.5	House, 2400 Meiggs Road	1964	Not Eligible
131-5849	79.3–79.4	House, 2404 Meiggs Road	1964	Not Eligible
131-5850	79.3–79.4	House, 2408 Meiggs Road	1964	Not Eligible
131-5851	79.3–79.4	House, 2412 Meiggs Road	1964	Not Eligible
131-5852	79.2–79.3	House 2504 Meiggs Road	1963	Not Eligible
131-5853	79.2–79.3	House, 2508 Meiggs Road	1965	Not Eligible
131-5854	79.2–79.3	House, 2512 Meiggs Road	1964	Not Eligible
131-5855	79.2–79.3	House, 2516 Meiggs Road	1964	Not Eligible
131-5856	79.1–79.3	House, 2520 Meiggs Road	1964	Not Eligible
131-5857	79.1–79.2	House, 2524 Meiggs Road	1964	Not Eligible
131-5858	79.1–79.2	House, 2528 Meiggs Road	1964	Not Eligible
131-5859	79.8–79.9	House, 109 Lake Street	1953	Not Eligible
131-5860	79.8–79.9	House, 106 Lake Street	1950	Not Eligible
131-5861	79.7–79.9	House, 110 Lake Street	1960	Not Eligible
131-5862	79.7–79.8	House, 112 Lake Street	1954	Not Eligible
131-5863	79.7–79.8	House, 114 Lake Street	1954	Not Eligible
131-5864	80.9–81.1	Faith Tab Apostolic Holiness Church, 1216 New Street	ca. 1950	Not Eligible
131-5865	80.9–81.0	House, 1709 Currie Ave	1945	Not Eligible
<i>City of Suffolk</i>				
133-0025	65.3–65.6	House, 203 Upton Lane	ca. 1780	Potentially Eligible, Criterion C
133-0105	59.0–59.2	E.P. Bradshaw Log Corn Crib, Pruden Boulevard	ca. 1840	Indeterminate

DHR No.	Mile Post	Name/Address	Date of Construction	Eligibility Recommendation
133-0233	60.1–60.3	Eley Farm, Lake Prince Road	ca. 1890	Not Eligible
133-5547	47.4–47.6	House, 414 Dutch Road	1954	Not Eligible
133-5548	50.6–50.7	House, 5229 Holland Road (Route 58)	ca. 1960	Not Eligible
133-5549	50.6–50.7	House, 5233 Holland Road (Route 58)	ca. 1950	Not Eligible
133-5550	50.6–50.7	House, 5237 Holland Road (Route 58)	ca. 1950	Not Eligible
133-5551	50.6–50.7	House, 5241 Holland Road (Route 58)	ca. 1960	Not Eligible
133-5552	50.6–50.7	House, 5245 Holland Road (Route 58)	ca. 1960	Not Eligible
133-5553	50.6–50.7	House, 5301 Holland Road (Route 58)	ca. 1940	Not Eligible
133-5554	50.6–50.7	House, 5325 Holland Road (Route 58)	ca. 1965	Not Eligible
133-5555	51.5–51.7	House, 533 Chappell Drive	ca. 1900	Not Eligible
133-5556	51.7–51.9	House, 564 Chappell Drive	1925	Not Eligible
133-5557	55.7–55.8	House, 3557 Kings Fork Road	1951	Not Eligible
133-5558	56.9–57.1	House, 3112 Archers Mill Road	1945	Not Eligible
133-5561	60.1–60.3	House, 3477 Lake Prince Drive	1950	Not Eligible
133-5562	60.1–60.3	House, 3481 Lake Prince Drive	1950	Not Eligible
133-5564	59.8–60.0	House, 3944 Lake Point Road	1961	Not Eligible
133-5565	60.4–60.6	House, 3600 Labrador Lane	1949	Not Eligible
133-5567	61.3–61.4	House, 3901 Matoaka Road	1960	Not Eligible

REFERENCES

Esri

- 2015 World Imagery. Electronic document, <http://services.arcgisonline.com/arcgis/services>, accessed March 2015.

Google Earth

- 2016 Aerial Imagery. Electronic document, <https://www.google.com/earth/>, accessed February 2016.

Lesiuk, Adriana T., Stephanie A.T. Jacobe, Michelle Salvato, M. Chris Manning, Caitlin Oshida, and Emily K. Anderson

- 2016 *Architectural Reconnaissance Survey of the Atlantic Coast Pipeline Corridor Highland, Augusta, Nelson, Buckingham, Cumberland, Prince Edward, Nottoway, Dinwiddie, Brunswick, Greensville, and Southampton Counties and the Cities of Suffolk and Chesapeake, Virginia*. Dovetail Cultural Resource Group. Fredericksburg, Virginia.

Nationwide Environmental Title Research, LLC (NETR)

- 2016 Various Historic Topographic Maps and Aerial Images. Electronic document, <http://www.historicaerials.com/>, accessed February 2016.

Open Street Map

- 2015 Open Street Map. Electronic document, <http://www.openstreetmap.org/#map=5/51.500/-0.100>, accessed March 2015.

Staton, Heather Dollins

- 2016 *Addendum: Architectural Reconnaissance Survey of the Atlantic Coast Pipeline Corridor Highland, Augusta, Rockbridge, Nelson, Buckingham, Cumberland, Prince Edward, Nottoway, Dinwiddie, Brunswick, Greensville, and Southampton Counties and the Cities of Franklin, Suffolk, and Chesapeake, Virginia*. Dovetail Cultural Resource Group. Fredericksburg, Virginia.

Virginia Department of Historic Resources (DHR)

- 2010 *Assessing Visual Effects on Historic Properties*. Electronic document, http://www.dhr.virginia.gov/pdf_files/Assessing_Visual_Effects_JUN10.pdf, accessed November 2015.
- 2011 *Guidelines for Conducting Historic Resources Survey in Virginia*. Electronic document, http://www.dhr.virginia.gov/pdf_files/survey%20manual-revoct.2011final.pdf, accessed November 2015.

APPENDIX A: GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Acronym/Abbreviation	Stands for...
ACP	Atlantic Coast Pipeline
APE	Area of Potential Effects
Atlantic	Atlantic Coast Pipeline, LLC
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
DHR	Virginia Department of Historic Resources
DTI	Dominion Transmission, Inc.
FERC/Commission	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
MP	Milepost
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NRG	Natural Resource Group, LLC
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
POTNR	Potential National Register of Historic Places
SOI	Secretary of the Interior
USDOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
VCRIS	Virginia Cultural Resource Information Systems

APPENDIX B: RESUMES OF KEY PERSONNEL



Kerri S. Barile, Ph.D., RPA
Dovetail Cultural Resource Group
President

Dr. Barile has over 20 years of professional experience in the fields of archaeology, architectural history, historic research, and cultural resource management (CRM). She has directed the excavation of a wide array of archaeological sites in Virginia, Delaware, Maryland, Texas, South Carolina, and North Carolina, among others, and has recorded and researched an abundance of historic buildings, structures, districts, and objects. She has written and contributed to over 250 CRM reports. In addition to CRM experience, Dr. Barile has taught university courses in historic preservation and preservation law, architectural history, and archaeology. She has also published numerous professional articles and papers on her studies, including articles in *Historical Archaeology* and several National Register of Historic Places nominations.

Education

University of Texas, Ph.D. in Anthropology & Architectural History, 2004
University of South Carolina, M.A. in Anthropology, 1999
University of South Carolina, Master's Cert. in Museum Management, 1999
Mary Washington College, B.A. in Historic Preservation, 1994

**Professional
Experience**

22 Years

Registration

Secretary of Interior Standards Qualified as Archaeologist, Architectural Historian,
Historian
Register of Professional Archaeologists

**Sample
Project
Experience**

Dominion Pipeline Architectural Study (North Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia). Architectural reconnaissance survey for a proposed 555-mile pipeline.
Broad Street Bus Rapid Transit System (Richmond, Virginia). Reconnaissance-level architectural survey of a 7-mile long project corridor
Eastern Shore Natural Gas Company Southern Expansion Project, Seamills Segment, (Sussex County, Delaware). Phase I cultural resource survey.
Interstate 64 Peninsula Study (Richmond to Hampton, Virginia). Archaeological assessment of a 75-mile section of the I-64 corridor as part of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
Interstate 66 Widening Project (Fairfax and Arlington Counties, Virginia). Cultural resource studies for the Tier 1 and 2 Environmental Assessment for the expansion.
NC 68 Widening Project (Guilford County, North Carolina). Archaeological survey and testing, including intensive testing of identified sites.
Southeast High Speed Rail Corridor Study (Raleigh, North Carolina, to Washington D.C.). Cultural resource studies and project effect coordination.
Purple Line Light Rail (Montgomery and Prince Georges County, Maryland). Phase 1A reconnaissance studies, archival research, architectural analysis, Determinations of Eligibility, Phase 1B archaeological surveys, GIS field data collection, cultural resource GIS layers, coordination geomorphological studies, and reporting.



Emily K. Anderson
Dovetail Cultural Resource Group
Preservation Technician

Through her coursework at University of Mary Washington and her experience at Dovetail Cultural Resource Group, Ms. Anderson is proficient in a variety of computer programs, including AutoCAD, Photoshop, Microsoft Word, PowerPoint, and Excel, and has gained understanding of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and other preservation law. She has experience documenting structures to meet various standards, including Historic American Building Survey (HABS) guidelines, utilizing photography, drafting, and archival research of both primary and secondary sources. During her time at Dovetail, Ms. Anderson has contributed to various cultural resource management reports for Phase I and Phase II projects in numerous states including West Virginia, North Carolina, Virginia, Delaware, and Pennsylvania. Ms. Anderson is currently expanding her knowledge of geographic information systems (GIS).

Education University of Mary Washington, B.A. in Historic Preservation, 2014

Professional Experience 1 Year

Registration N/A

Sample Project Experience

- Prison Camp Road* (Martin County, North Carolina). Archival research and intensive architectural investigations.
- Dominion Pipeline Architectural Study* (North Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia). Architectural reconnaissance survey for a proposed 555-mile pipeline.
- Stafford Slavery Report* (Stafford County, Virginia). Reconnaissance and intensive level architectural survey, archival research, historic map overlays, and report production.
- Falmouth Trail* (Falmouth, Virginia). Reconnaissance architectural investigation, historic map overlays, and report production.
- Cultural Resource Survey of the Ardent Mills-Norfolk Southern Rail Expansion Project* (Culpeper, Virginia). Architectural reconnaissance survey of the Ardent Mills-Norfolk Southern Rail Expansion Project area.
- Richmond Area to Potomac Segment (RAPS)* (Virginia). Reconnaissance level architectural fieldwork and documentation of buildings, structures, objects, and districts (including battlefields) over 50 years of age.
- Leicester B. Holland Prize* (Keswick, Virginia). Produced a single-sheet measured drawing of floor plan, elevation, and detail for a Historic American Building Survey (HABS) competition
- Preservation Plan for the University of Mary Washington Grading Committee* (Fredericksburg, Virginia). Student representative, architectural investigation and determination of architectural significance.



Caitlin Sylvester, M.H.P.
Dovetail Cultural Resource Group
Preservation Technician

Ms. Sylvester is a recent graduate from the University of Maryland with a Masters of Historic Preservation degree. Through her coursework at the University of Maryland, and her experience at Dovetail Cultural Resource Group, Ms. Sylvester has gained an understanding of preservation laws such as the National Environmental Policy Act, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act, as well as state and local regulations. She is proficient in a range of computer programs such as ArcGIS, Adobe Illustrator and InDesign, and Microsoft Office Suite. Ms. Sylvester has training and experience in reconnaissance and intensive architectural surveys through the use of photography and documentation, as well as with archival and historical research. While at Dovetail Cultural Research Group, Ms. Sylvester has contributed to Phase 1 level cultural resource management reports in West Virginia and Virginia.

Education

University of Maryland, M.H.P, 2014
Furman University, B.A. in History, 2012

Professional Experience

<1 Year

Registration

Secretary of Interior Standards Qualified as Architectural Historian

Sample Project Experience

Germantown, Virginia: A Cultural Landscape Study (Fauquier County, Virginia). Archival research, land and buildings survey, GIS map production, and report production.

Old Goucher Neighborhood: Strengthening a Community Identity Through an Exploration of the Past (Baltimore, Maryland). Archival research, buildings survey, community development, GIS map production, report production.

Southeast High Speed Rail Tier II Environmental Impact Statement- Richmond Area to Potomac Segment (Virginia). Reconnaissance level architectural survey and investigations, and report production.

Atlantic Coast Pipeline Architectural History Survey (Virginia). Reconnaissance architectural survey and investigations, report production.

Architectural Reconnaissance Survey and Report for the Northern Neck (Lancaster, Northumberland and Westmoreland Counties, Virginia). Archival research and reconnaissance level architectural survey.





Heather D. Staton, M.H.P.
Dovetail Cultural Resource Group
Architectural Historian

Ms. Staton has over 10 years of professional experience in the field of historic research, architectural history, and cultural resource management (CRM). Ms. Staton is an architectural historian for Dovetail and is involved with reconnaissance and intensive architectural history surveys. She is key author on cultural resource reports and has worked on and led several Phase I and II architectural surveys while with Dovetail. Her tasks at Dovetail include primary archival research; windshield, reconnaissance- and intensive-level architectural field surveys; National Register Historic Places Nominations; report production; and data entry into the Virginia Department of Historic Resources Data Sharing System.

Education	University of Kentucky, M.H.P, 2011 University of Kentucky, Master's Cert. in Transportation Systems Management, 2011 Mary Washington College, B.A. in Historic Preservation, 2007
Professional Experience	10 Years
Registration	Secretary of Interior Standards Qualified as Architectural Historian and Historian
Sample Project Experience	<p><i>Elmhurst</i> (Fredericksburg, Virginia). National Register of Historic Places nomination of the single family dwelling constructed in 1871.</p> <p><i>Three Historic Districts</i> (Essex County, Virginia). Architectural survey and evaluation of three potential historic districts under the state's cultural resource survey cost-share program.</p> <p><i>Southeast High Speed Rail Corridor Study</i> (Raleigh, North Carolina, to Washington D.C.). Cultural resource studies and project effect coordination.</p> <p><i>Shiloh Baptist Church (Old Site)</i>, (Fredericksburg, Virginia). National Register of Historic Places nomination of the church, constructed in 1890.</p> <p><i>Violet Bank Historic District</i> (City of Colonial Heights, Virginia). Reconnaissance-level architectural survey of resources within the historic district.</p> <p><i>Frank A. Butner House</i> (Surry County, North Carolina). Historic architectural eligibility evaluation in preparation for nearby bridge replacement.</p> <p><i>1700 G Street</i> (Washington, D.C.). Determination of Eligibility (DOE) and completion of a Memorandum of Agreement and National Register of Historic Places nomination.</p> <p><i>Rappahannock River Crossing Project</i> (Stafford and Spotsylvania Counties and Fredericksburg, Virginia). Architectural survey meeting the standards of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the National Environmental Policy Act.</p> <p><i>Prison Camp Road Architectural Eligibility Evaluation</i> (Martin County, North Carolina). Historic architectural eligibility evaluation on behalf of the North Carolina Department of Transportation.</p>




APPENDIX C: ACP CORRIDOR

Appendix C includes maps that show the ACP Corridor in Virginia and resources documented during the current survey.








Sheet 1 of 26

- | | | | | | |
|-------|------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| — | Corridor Centerline | ■ | Previously Recorded Resources | □ | Indeterminate |
| — — — | 0.5-Mile Radius | ▨ | ABPP Core Areas | □ | Listed |
| ○ | Mileposts | ▨ | ABPP Potential NR Areas | □ | Not Eligible |
| — — — | Former Route | ▨ | ABPP Study Areas | □ | Potentially Eligible |
| — — — | Former Route 0.5-Mile Radius | | | | |
| — — — | Visual APE | | | | |






Corridor Centerline	Previously Recorded Resources	Historic Resources Recorded by Dovetail:
0.5-Mile Radius	ABPP Core Areas	
Mileposts	ABPP Potential NR Areas	Indeterminate
Former Route	ABPP Study Areas	Listed
Former Route 0.5-Mile Radius		Not Eligible
Visual APE		Potentially Eligible








Sheet 4 of 26

- | | | | | | |
|-----------|------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| — | Corridor Centerline | ■ | Previously Recorded Resources | ■ | Indeterminate |
| - - - | 0.5-Mile Radius | ▨ | ABPP Core Areas | ▨ | Listed |
| ○ | Mileposts | ▨ | ABPP Potential NR Areas | ▨ | Not Eligible |
| - · - · - | Former Route | ▨ | ABPP Study Areas | ▨ | Potentially Eligible |
| - · - · - | Former Route 0.5-Mile Radius | | | | |
| - · - · - | Visual APE | | | | |





Sheet 5 of 26

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Corridor Centerline 0.5-Mile Radius Mileposts Former Route Former Route 0.5-Mile Radius Visual APE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Previously Recorded Resources ABPP Core Areas ABPP Potential NR Areas ABPP Study Areas | <p>Historic Resources Recorded by Dovetail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indeterminate Listed Not Eligible Potentially Eligible |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|







Sheet 6 of 26

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Corridor Centerline 0.5-Mile Radius Mileposts Former Route Former Route 0.5-Mile Radius Visual APE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Previously Recorded Resources ABPP Core Areas ABPP Potential NR Areas ABPP Study Areas | <p>Historic Resources Recorded by Dovetail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indeterminate Listed Not Eligible Potentially Eligible |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|







Sheet 7 of 26





<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Corridor Centerline - - - 0.5-Mile Radius ○ Mileposts - - - Former Route - - - Former Route 0.5-Mile Radius - - - Visual APE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▭ Previously Recorded Resources ▨ ABPP Core Areas ▧ ABPP Potential NR Areas ▩ ABPP Study Areas 	<p>Historic Resources Recorded by Dovetail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▭ Indeterminate ▭ Listed ▭ Not Eligible ▭ Potentially Eligible
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------










- Corridor Centerline
- - - 0.5-Mile Radius
- Mileposts
- - - Former Route
- - - Former Route 0.5-Mile Radius
- - - Visual APE




- Previously Recorded Resources
- ABPP Core Areas
- ABPP Potential NR Areas
- ABPP Study Areas

- Historic Resources Recorded by Dovetail:
- Indeterminate
 - Listed
 - Not Eligible
 - Potentially Eligible












Sheet 13 of 26

- | | | | | | |
|-----------|------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| — | Corridor Centerline | ■ | Previously Recorded Resources | □ | Indeterminate |
| - - - | 0.5-Mile Radius | ▨ | ABPP Core Areas | □ | Listed |
| ○ | Mileposts | ▨ | ABPP Potential NR Areas | □ | Not Eligible |
| - · - · - | Former Route | ▨ | ABPP Study Areas | □ | Potentially Eligible |
| - · - · - | Former Route 0.5-Mile Radius | | | | |
| - · - · - | Visual APE | | | | |






Sheet 14 of 26

- | | | | | | |
|-----------|------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| — | Corridor Centerline | ■ | Previously Recorded Resources | ■ | Indeterminate |
| - - - | 0.5-Mile Radius | ▨ | ABPP Core Areas | ▨ | Listed |
| ○ | Mileposts | ▨ | ABPP Potential NR Areas | ▨ | Not Eligible |
| - · - · - | Former Route | ▨ | ABPP Study Areas | ▨ | Potentially Eligible |
| - · - · - | Former Route 0.5-Mile Radius | | | | |
| - · - · - | Visual APE | | | | |



Historic Resources Recorded by Dovetail:




- Indeterminate
- Listed
- Not Eligible
- Potentially Eligible



Sheet 15 of 26



- | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Corridor Centerline - - - 0.5-Mile Radius ○ Mileposts - - - Former Route - - - Former Route 0.5-Mile Radius - - - Visual APE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Previously Recorded Resources ▨ ABPP Core Areas ▧ ABPP Potential NR Areas ▩ ABPP Study Areas | <p>Historic Resources Recorded by Dovetail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Indeterminate ■ Listed ■ Not Eligible ■ Potentially Eligible |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|











Sheet 17 of 26

- | | | | | | |
|-------|------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| — | Corridor Centerline | ■ | Previously Recorded Resources | ■ | Indeterminate |
| - - - | 0.5-Mile Radius | ▨ | ABPP Core Areas | ■ | Listed |
| ○ | Mileposts | ▨ | ABPP Potential NR Areas | ■ | Not Eligible |
| - - - | Former Route | ▨ | ABPP Study Areas | ■ | Potentially Eligible |
| - - - | Former Route 0.5-Mile Radius | | | | |
| ▨ | Visual APE | | | | |








<p>0 0.25 0.5 0.75 1 Miles</p>	<p>— Corridor Centerline</p>	<p>▭ Previously Recorded Resources</p>	<p>Historic Resources Recorded by Dovetail:</p>
<p>0 0.25 0.5 0.75 1 Kilometers</p>	<p>- - - 0.5-Mile Radius</p>	<p>▨ ABPP Core Areas</p>	<p>▭ Indeterminate</p>
	<p>○ Mileposts</p>	<p>▨ ABPP Potential NR Areas</p>	<p>▭ Listed</p>
	<p>- - - Former Route</p>	<p>▨ ABPP Study Areas</p>	<p>▭ Not Eligible</p>
	<p>- - - Former Route 0.5-Mile Radius</p>		<p>▭ Potentially Eligible</p>
	<p>- - - Visual APE</p>		






Sheet 20 of 26

- | | | | | | |
|-------|------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|------------------------------------------|
| — | Corridor Centerline | ■ | Previously Recorded Resources | □ | Historic Resources Recorded by Dovetail: |
| - - - | 0.5-Mile Radius | ▨ | ABPP Core Areas | □ | Indeterminate |
| ○ | Mileposts | ▨ | ABPP Potential NR Areas | □ | Listed |
| - - - | Former Route | ▨ | ABPP Study Areas | □ | Not Eligible |
| - - - | Former Route 0.5-Mile Radius | | | □ | Potentially Eligible |
| - - - | Visual APE | | | | |






Sheet 21 of 26




- | | | | | | |
|-------|------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|------------------------------------------|
| — | Corridor Centerline | ■ | Previously Recorded Resources | □ | Historic Resources Recorded by Dovetail: |
| - - - | 0.5-Mile Radius | ▨ | ABPP Core Areas | □ | Indeterminate |
| ○ | Mileposts | ▨ | ABPP Potential NR Areas | □ | Listed |
| - - - | Former Route | ▨ | ABPP Study Areas | □ | Not Eligible |
| - - - | Former Route 0.5-Mile Radius | ▨ | | □ | Potentially Eligible |
| - - - | Visual APE | | | | |



Sheet 22 of 26




- | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Corridor Centerline 0.5-Mile Radius Mileposts Former Route Former Route 0.5-Mile Radius Visual APE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Previously Recorded Resources ABPP Core Areas ABPP Potential NR Areas ABPP Study Areas | <p>Historic Resources Recorded by Dovetail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indeterminate Listed Not Eligible Potentially Eligible |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|





Sheet 24 of 26

- Corridor Centerline
- 0.5-Mile Radius
- Mileposts
- Former Route
- Former Route 0.5-Mile Radius
- Visual APE
- Previously Recorded Resources
- ABPP Core Areas
- ABPP Potential NR Areas
- ABPP Study Areas
- Indeterminate
- Listed
- Not Eligible
- Potentially Eligible



- Corridor Centerline
- 0.5-Mile Radius
- Mileposts
- Former Route
- Former Route 0.5-Mile Radius
- Visual APE
- Previously Recorded Resources
- ABPP Core Areas
- ABPP Potential NR Areas
- ABPP Study Areas
- Indeterminate
- Listed
- Not Eligible
- Potentially Eligible

SHEET 25 OF 26

Note: All resources use '131' prefix - small lots abbreviated for space

