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PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEFINITION OF SURVEY AREA:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County(ies):</th>
<th>Fulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USGS Quadrangle(s):</td>
<td>Northwest and Northeast Atlanta, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat/Long Coordinates of Project Centerpoint:</td>
<td>33.815842, -84.375081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTM Zone(s):</td>
<td>16 North</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Description:
The proposed mainline Atlanta BeltLine Northeast (NE) Trail is a 4.2-meter (m) (14-foot [ft]) wide concrete shared-use path approximately 4.3 kilometers (km) (2.7 [miles]) in length (Figure 1). The proposed project includes approximately 3.4 km (2.1 mi) of spur trail 3.7 m (12 ft) in width. The proposed project concept also includes 20 walls and 6 bridges. The proposed Atlanta BeltLine NE Trail begins at the existing terminus of the Eastside Trail at the intersection of 10th Street and Monroe Drive. The corridor runs along the old railroad alignment that crosses under Park Drive, across Evelyn Street and Westminster Drive, under Piedmont Avenue and Montgomery Ferry Drive, over the existing Buford Spring Connector on the existing bridge (that will be retained) and crosses under Interstate (I-) 85 in the existing tunnel. At the end of the tunnel the trail will cross under the existing Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) bridge, which spans over Mayson Street. The trail then transitions to the Norfolk Southern Railway and MARTA maintenance road before paralleling MARTA and the Norfolk Southern Railway, and transitioning to a proposed bridge over the active Norfolk Southern Railway tracks and yard. After crossing the Norfolk Southern Railway tracks, the trail will continue on a bridge over Armour Drive adjacent to the existing industrial plants and over Chessie Seaboard Consolidated (CSX) Transportation railroad and Peachtree Creek. The trail transitions on to a proposed bridge over Norfolk Southern and remains on the bridge structure all the way until it connects with Kinsey Court. This point is where the future connection to the Atlanta BeltLine Northwest Trail is proposed. This point ends the mainline trail. There are also four spur alignments off the mainline trail, described below.

The first spur continues from the mainline trail at the proposed connection point to the future Northwest BeltLine Trail at Kinsey Court East on structure over a Peachtree Creek tributary and then at-grade parallel to Peachtree Creek, under the Norfolk Southern Railway and MARTA. From there, the spur trail continues behind Passion City Church along Peachtree Creek before bridging up to Garson Drive. The second spur would serve as a connection to the MARTA Lindbergh Connection. The spur trail will continue at-grade along Garson Drive crossing the existing MARTA overpass. This will require a road diet to make room for the proposed spur trail with the oversized lanes on Garson Drive reduced from existing 3.7 to 5.5 m (12 to 18 ft) lanes to 3.4 m (11 ft) lanes, allowing room for a curb and gutter section and a 1.5 m (5 ft) buffer. The spur trail then continues adjacent to Garson Drive and crosses the Lindbergh Drive intersection at grade before tying into the Lindbergh MARTA station plaza. The third spur alignment would serve as a connection to the existing PATH 400 trail by spurring off the MARTA Lindbergh connection trail to the east of Passion City Church, following Peachtree Creek, passing under the Piedmont Road overpass and running along the 2:1 slopes on structure until tying into PATH 400 near Parkland Drive. The fourth spur alignment would serve as a connection to the Armour-Ottley business district by bridging off the mainline trail to follow along Armour Drive as a side path ending at the Ottley Drive and Clayton Rd intersection.

The existing right-of-way (ROW) is 15.2 m (50 ft) on Armour Drive NE and varies from 15.2 to 26 m (50 to 85 ft) on Garson Drive NE. Additional ROW would be required for the proposed project. The proposed ROW would vary from 15.2 to 27.4 m (50 to 90 ft) on Armour Drive and 15.2 to 26 m (50 to 85 ft) on Garson Drive NE.

Definition of Survey Area:
There were no design plans at the time of the survey, thus the survey area for this proposed project includes all areas within an Environmental Survey Boundary (ESB) that was provided to Edwards-Pitman, Inc. (EP) by the project design engineers (see Figure 1). The ESB encompasses 42 hectares (ha) (103.7 acres [ac]) and was designed to encompass all areas of possible or foreseeable ground disturbance for the currently proposed project. When design is complete, the area of potential effect (APE) for the proposed project will likely be smaller than the ESB that is shown. The ESB following the mainline trail measures approximately 1.2 km (0.7 mi) in length and ranges in width from approximately 21.5 m (70.5 ft) to 228 m (748 ft) wide. Spur 1 of the ESB measures approximately 0.9 km (0.6 mi) in length and ranges in width from approximately 60 m (196.9 ft) to 142 m (465.9 ft) wide. Spur 2 of the ESB measures approximately 0.6 km (0.4 mi) in length and ranges in width from approximately 20 m (65.6 ft) to 118 m (387.1 ft) wide. Spur 3 of the ESB measures approximately 0.5 km (0.3 mi) in length and ranges in width from approximately 69 m (203.4 ft) to 102 m (334.6 ft) wide. Spur 4 of the ESB
measures approximately 1.8 km (1.1 mi) in length and ranges in width from approximately 12 m (39.4 ft) to 95 m (311.7 ft) wide. Hereinafter the ESB is also described as the survey area.

☒ This archaeological survey included all areas within an Environmental Survey Boundary (ESB) provided by the project Designer.

☐ This archaeological survey included all areas of the APE and an additional 100 foot Expanded Survey Corridor (ESC).

☐ This archaeological survey covers the APE only and does not include an additional 100 foot Expanded Survey Corridor. A waiver was obtained on [Click arrow to choose date.](https://example.com) from the GDOT Archaeology Team Leader. (Attach Documentation.)

![Figure 1. Project location map.](image-url)
ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND RESEARCH:

Previously Recorded Sites within 1 km:
Prior to field investigations, EP conducted a search of the Georgia Archaeological Site File (GASF) and Georgia’s Natural, Archaeological, and Historic Resources Geographic Information System (GNAHRGIS) online database for previously recorded sites within 1 km (0.62 mi) of the ESB. According to GASF and GNAHRGIS, a total of six previously recorded sites are located within 1 km (0.62 mi) of the ESB and are summarized in Table 1 and depicted in Figure 2. Of the six previously recorded sites within 1 km (0.62 mi) of the survey area, only one site (9FU55) is considered to be eligible. Site 9FU55 consists of a grouping of Precontact rock shelters overlooking the South Fork of Peachtree Creek, which were found in association with Precontact ceramics as well as lithic tools and debitage. Two sites (9FU38 and 9FU56) are located within 15 m (49.2 ft) of the survey area. There are no previously recorded sites within the survey area.

A portion of the ESB is located within the study area of Peachtree Creek Battlefield Boundary as established by the American Battlefield Protection Program (ABPP) Civil War Sites Advisory Commission (CWSAC) (see Figure 2).

Table 1. Previously Recorded Sites within 1 km (0.62 mi) of the ESB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Year Recorded</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Cultural Period</th>
<th>NRHP Eligibility Recommendation</th>
<th>Distance from the Survey Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9FU38</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Precontact Effigy and Historic Scatter</td>
<td>Precontact and Historic</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>10 m (32.8 ft) south of the ESB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9FU41</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.4 km (0.2 mi) east of the ESB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9FU55</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Precontact Habitation and Lithic Scatter</td>
<td>Precontact</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>0.6 km (0.4 mi) southeast of the ESB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9FU56</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Lithic Scatter</td>
<td>Precontact</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>13 m (42.7 ft) south of the ESB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9FU465</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Precontact and Historic Scatter</td>
<td>Precontact and Historic</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>0.2 km (0.1 mi) south of the ESB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9FU673</td>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>69.0 m (226.4 ft) north of the ESB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous Surveys Intersecting Current Project Survey Area:
Five previously conducted surveys intersect the ESB (see Figure 2). In 1975, an archaeological survey of the proposed route for the relief trunk sewer of Peachtree Creek South Fork was conducted by an archaeological survey team from Georgia State University, under the direction of Dr. Roy S. Dickens, Jr. Two archaeological resources, 9FU55 and 9FU56, were identified as a result of this survey (Dickens 1975). Both are within the 1km (0.62 mi) search radius but outside the current ESB. Anderson (1977) conducted an in-house survey for the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) ahead of the widening of I-75 and I-85; no new archaeological resources were identified. In 1998 GDOT conducted a survey for the proposed removal and replacement of concrete roadway and bridge approach slabs at Peachtree Creek (Fleming and D’Avino 1998). No archaeological resources were identified as a part of this survey. New South Associates conducted a survey in 2001 for the Athens-Atlanta Rail Corridor which resulted in the identification of one newly recorded site, 9FU410, in Fulton County (Joseph 2002), a historic-era Euro-American site recommended ineligible for inclusion to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). EP conducted a survey in 2015 ahead of upgrades to existing traffic signals at ten intersections in Fulton County and the city of Atlanta, in which no archaeological resources were identified (Moss 2015).
Figure 2. Previously recorded sites within 1 km (0.62 mi) of the ESB, and previously conducted surveys that intersect the ESB.
References:

Anderson, Nain E.
1977 Project I-85-2(24), DeKalb County. Georgia Department of Transportation Interdepartment Correspondence, Atlanta, GASF Report No. 6375.

Dickens, Roy S., Jr.

Federal Highway Administration, Georgia Department of Transportation, and the Georgia State Historic Preservation Office
2015 Programmatic Agreement Regarding Historic Streetcar Archaeological Sites in Georgia. Copies available from the Georgia Department of Transportation, Office of Environmental Services, Atlanta.

Federal Railroad Administration (FRA)

Fleming and D’Avino

Georgia Council of Professional Archaeologists (GCPA)

Joseph, J. W.

Moss, Richard

Soil Survey Staff, Natural Resources Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture (USDA)

Sullivan, Patrick, W., Matthew Tankersley, Mary Beth Reed, Sara Gale and Mary Hammock

United States Department of the Interior (USDI), National Park Service (NPS), American Battlefield Protection Program (ABPP)

Additional Contextual Information:
A portion of the ESB lies within the Civil War study area for the Battle of Peachtree Creek, as shown in Figure 2 (United States Department of the Interior [USDI], National Park Service [NPS], ABPP 2010). The “study area” as defined by ABPP represents the battle’s tactical context and visual settings and reflects the battle’s extent as known through documentary research and on-site investigations (ABPP 2010, 2016). Since “study areas” are not considered to be federal land, no Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) permit was required for this project. No artifacts or features associated with this 1864 battle have been officially recorded within 1 km (0.62 mi) of the ESB.

In addition, per the GDOT Programmatic Agreement (PA) regarding historic streetcar sites (Sullivan et al. 2012), the Atlanta streetcar GIS database was consulted to identify any possible non-Georgia Power Streetcar Sites (Non-GPSS) that predate the Georgia Power streetcar lines within the survey area (Federal Highway Administration, GDOT, and the Georgia State Historic Preservation Office 2015). The results revealed that there are no streetcar systems, either GPSS or Non-GPSS, within the survey area.

**ARCHEOLOGICAL SURVEY INFORMATION:**

**Soil Descriptions:**
According to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Staff (NRCS) soil survey, the ESB has little natural soil (Table 2) (Soil Survey Staff, NRCS, USDA 2020). The four soil types mapped in the survey area are either urban land (74.1%) or an admixture of urban land with typical Piedmont soils, including Congaree (8.3%), Udorthents (6.1%), and Wickham (1.3%) complexes. Urban land indicates an area where soils have been completely disturbed by development, and is common in densely populated, developed areas such as the ESB. Although urban land complexes contain some natural soils, their admixture with urban land is intricate and complex, making it difficult for the USDA to map them separately at an appropriate scale. Therefore, these complexes are typically highly variable.

The soils EP encountered during field investigations were highly disturbed and variable across the ESB, and are therefore consistent with the mapped soil types. Low lying wetland areas within the ESB generally appeared to have experienced less disturbance. A typical shovel test within a wetland area contained 0-20 centimeters below surface (cmbs) (7.9 inches below surface [inbs]) of dark gray (5YR 1/4) sandy loam from the surface, underlain by hydric weak red (2.5YR 4/2) sandy clay subsoil. The majority of excavated shovel tests reflected disturbance. A typical shovel test profile within developed urban areas consisted of 0-5 cmbs (2 inbs) of dark grayish brown (10YR 4/2) sandy loam underlain with disturbed red (2.5YR 5/8) sterile sandy clay subsoil that extended to the base of excavation at 15 cmbs (5.9 inbs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Unit Symbol</th>
<th>Map Unit Name</th>
<th>Acres (hectares) in Survey Area</th>
<th>Percent of Survey Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CpA</td>
<td>Congaree sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, occasionally flooded</td>
<td>8.6 (3.5)</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ua</td>
<td>Udorthents, 0 to 10 percent slopes</td>
<td>6.3 (2.5)</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ub</td>
<td>Urban land</td>
<td>76.8 (31)</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>10.6 (4.2)</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wcb</td>
<td>Wickham sandy loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes</td>
<td>1.4 (0.6)</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals for Survey Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>103.7 (42)</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Topography:**
The survey area surrounds Peachtree Creek. The area surrounding the portion of the creek on the eastern side of the ESB is comprised of slopes giving way to a series of undulating hills. The southern and central portions of the ESB surrounding Peachtree Creek include lower lying wetland areas which appear to be subject to periodic flooding. In the southwestern portion of the survey area, eroded slopes along Peachtree Creek revealed exposed bedrock (Figure 3). Much of the natural topography of the survey area has been altered by transportation and urban development (Figure 4).
Land Use/Vegetation/Ground Cover:
Current land use is primarily associated with urban development, motor vehicle and rail transportation (Figure 5). Typical of urban developed areas, the region has experienced significant artificial landscaping. During EP’s survey, decorative grasses, trees, and shrubs were the most common types of vegetation encountered in these areas (Figure 6). The portions of the survey area along Peachtree Creek featured slopes with mixed hardwoods and pines that are less than 30 years old, as well as a thick understory of vines, tall grasses, and shrubs (Figures 7-8). Additionally, EP did not identify any areas with ground surface visibility. Excluding the surface bedrock at the western portion of the ESB, vegetation covered the entirety of the survey area.

Survey Limitations and Disturbance(s):
Disturbances in the ESB consist of artificial terrain modification as a result the construction of I-85, MARTA rail lines, parking lots, residential and commercial buildings, and buried utility lines (Figures 9-10). During the 2020 fieldwork season for this project, a portion of the ESB was within an active construction zone south of I-85 where the BeltLine Eastside Trail in now located (see Figure 9).

Figure 3. View of bedrock outcrop along Peachtree Creek, facing southwest.
Figure 4. View of topography and vegetation along Peachtree Creek, facing west.

Figure 5. View of land use within the survey area, along Peachtree Creek, facing east.
Figure 6. Artificial landscaping and buried utilities within the ESB, facing northwest.

Figure 7. Vegetation in ESB, facing east.
Figure 8. Vine covered slope with mixed hardwoods and modern trash, within the Battle of Peachtree Creek battlefield study area, facing southwest.

Figure 9. Active construction within the ESB south of I-85 for the Beltline Eastside Trail, facing south.
Survey Methods:
The ESB was systematically surveyed with 30-centimeter (cm) (11.8 inch (in)) round shovel tests excavated at 30-meter (m) (98.4-foot (ft)) intervals along transects placed 30 m (98.4 ft) apart (Figures 11a-11g). Shovel tests were excavated into sterile subsoil and were backfilled once the test was completed. Shovel tests were generally excavated to a depth of 15 to 25 cmbs (5.9 to 9.8 inbs). All soils were screened through 0.64 cm (0.25 in) hardware mesh. Shovel tests that could not be excavated due to obstructions, such as pavement and buildings, were marked as “no-digs” and were photo-documented. Occasionally, the 30 m (98.4 ft) shovel test and transect interval was deviated due to the presence of undiggable obstacles, Peachtree Creek, safety buffer for active rail line, and the overall shape of the ESB creating gaps in coverage. For instances of a undiggable obstruction the shovel test was offset a maximum of 3 m (9.8 ft) from the planned location and the distance and direction of this offset shovel test was recorded. Transects paralleling the creek banks of Peachtree Creek fluctuated causing the transects to sometimes be closer than 30 m (98.4 ft) and at other times greater than 30 m (98.4 ft). In order to maintain the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) and United States Department of Transportation’s (USDOT) required 7.6-m (25-ft) safe working buffer around a railroad (FRA 2018), a 7.6-m (25-ft) buffer was established around the railroad that parallels or bisects multiple locations along the ESB; no shovel testing was conducted within this buffer. Due to the shape of the ESB minor gaps in coverage occurred that were between 30 and 60 m (98.4 and 196.8 ft). In those areas, judgmental shovel tests (JST) were placed to fill these gaps in coverage. All excavated tests were either negative shovel tests (n=281) or no digs (n=159). In addition, the entire length of the ESB was subjected to a pedestrian survey; no cultural features or artifacts were on the surface. Two previously recorded sites exist outside of the ESB but in close proximity that warranted close interval shovel testing (see Figures 11d-f). In areas near known sites shovel test intervals were decreased in distance from 30 m (98.4 ft) to 15 m (49.2 ft) per GCPA standards.

A systematic metal detection survey was also implemented, but only in the areas where the survey area overlapped the Civil War Study Area for the Battle of Peachtree Creek (see Figures 11b and 11c). The GCPA guidelines note that coverage in military sites should be “systematic, along 1.5 m (4.9 ft) wide lanes, spaced at no more than 30 m (98.4 ft) intervals” (GCPA 2019). Even though the area where the survey area overlapped with the Battle of Peachtree Creek is not considered to be within direct action of the battle activities nor are there any Civil War era sites recorded nearby, this area was treated as having the potential to yield artifacts and subjected to metal detection. The metal detection survey was done in close intervals, between 10 and 15 m (32.8 and 49.25 ft), following the established survey transects; disturbed areas (e.g. pavement and standing structures) were avoided. When a possible metal target (signal) was detected, further examination consisted of flagging the location and then conducting a test excavation using hand tools or shovels, to a depth typically no deeper than 10 cmbs (4 inbs). The metal detectors were then used to sweep the bottom of the test

Figure 10. Buried sewer line within the ESB, facing west.
excavation to ensure total metallic recovery and metallic absence at deeper levels. If a metal detector signal produced any cultural material 50 years or older, the hit would be considered a positive metal detector find (MDF), and the location would be recorded with a Global Positioning System (GPS).

The initial area of metal detection investigation for this survey was highly disturbed from construction of modern infrastructure. All metal detector hits were investigated regardless of the quality or type of signal received on the metal detector. Systematic metal detecting efforts resulted in numerous finds across the ESB, but all materials were determined to be modern and therefore discarded. Materials found included aluminum cans, foil, metal wire, modern nails, bottle caps, and miscellaneous iron, among other materials. The location of buried utilities along the metal detection lanes often produced a false positive detection. No historic materials were recovered, and no further work was conducted.

No. of STs: 281  No. of No Digs: 159

Additional Survey Information:
As noted above, the ESB lies within the Battle of Peachtree Creek battlefield study area (USDI, NPS, ABPP 2010). Following the most recent guidance from the GCPA (2019), EP archaeologists conducted metal detection survey across the ESB on the same transects used for shovel test survey. No cultural materials were recovered as a result of this metal detection survey, and no features associated with the battlefield were encountered.
Figure 11a. Survey results map, map 1 of 7.
Figure 11b. Survey results map, map 2 of 7.
Figure 11c. Survey results map, map 3 of 7.
Figure 11d. Survey results map, map 4 of 7.
Figure 11e. Survey results map, map 5 of 7.
Figure 11f. Survey results map, map 6 of 7.
Figure 11g. Survey results map, map 7 of 7.
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