
**Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune
Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan
FY 2012 – 2017**



December 2011

Final Report

**Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune
Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan**

2012 to 2017

Rick Richardson

**Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune
PSC Box 20004
Camp Lejeune, North Carolina 28542-0004**

Bruce J. Larson

**Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Atlantic
6506 Hampton Boulevard
Norfolk, Virginia 23508-1278**

**Prepared for Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune
Cultural Resources Management Program
Environmental Management Division**


**Prepared by Southeastern Archaeological Research, Inc.
Contract No. N62470-06-D-7102 TO 16**

APPROVAL

I approve the implementation of all activities in this Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (ICRMP) for Marine Corps Base (MCB), Camp Lejeune as sustaining and enhancing the military mission and conserving cultural resources for future generations. This Plan has been prepared pursuant to Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI) 4715.16, Department of Defense (DoD) Measures of Merit, Secretary of the Navy Instruction (SECNAVINST) 4000.35A, Chief of Naval Operations Instruction (OPNAVINST) 5909.1C Chapter 27, and Marine Corps Order P5090.2A (Change 2, Chapter 8). The Plan has set appropriate and adequate guidelines for managing cultural resources and conserving and protecting significant cultural resources of this Marine Corps installation.

16 Feb 12

Date



D. J. Lecce

Colonel, U.S. Marine Corps

Commanding Officer

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune

Page intentionally left blank

ANNUAL REVIEW

The MCB Camp Lejeune ICRMP must be updated each year to include changes, amendments, and updates pertaining to the cultural resources on the installation. The review should note changes in stakeholder points of contact (POC), initiatives completed over the past year, and an outline of proposed projects. Updated information may be found in **Appendices III-IV, VII, IX, XII, XVII, and XX**. The ICRMP has been reviewed and updated as needed by:

NAME: _____
TITLE: _____
DATE: _____
UPDATED INFORMATION? YES NO
NOTES: _____

NAME: _____
TITLE: _____
DATE: _____
UPDATED INFORMATION? YES NO
NOTES: _____

NAME: _____
TITLE: _____
DATE: _____
UPDATED INFORMATION? YES NO
NOTES: _____

NAME: _____
TITLE: _____
DATE: _____
UPDATED INFORMATION? YES NO
NOTES: _____

Page intentionally left blank

PREFACE

This ICRMP was prepared for the Cultural Resources Management Section of the Environmental Conservation Branch at Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, North Carolina as part of Task Order #0016 of a United States Navy, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Atlantic IDIQ contract (A&E Contract Number N62470-06-D-7102). Funding was provided by NAVFAC MIDLANT. The Camp Lejeune Technical Representative was Rick Richardson, Base Cultural Resources Manager, and the Navy Project Manager was Bruce Larson. Mr. Larson guided the development of this document and provided regulatory insight. Mr. Richardson provided guidance throughout the project and was instrumental in securing access to facilities and providing maps, reports, and other necessary documents for this project. Ms. Kristine Keenan assisted Mr. Richardson with compilation and dispensation of data, which was greatly appreciated.

The work was performed by Southeastern Archaeological Research, Inc. under Program Manager, Anne V. Stokes, Ph.D. The Principal Investigators for the ICRMP were Rebecca Klein, Ph.D. and Brenda Swann, M.A., with assistance from Bryan Harrell, M.S., Geoffrey Mohlman, M.A., Kristine Keenan, and Travis Fulk, M.A. Graphics were prepared by Debra Wells, M.A.

Page intentionally left blank

ACRONYMS

ACHP	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
AHPA	Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act
AIRFA	American Indian Religious Freedom Act
APE	Area of Potential Effect
ARPA	Archaeological Resources Protection Act
Base S-3	Training, Education, and Operations
CO	Commanding Officer
CatEx	Categorical Exclusion
DM	Decision Memorandum
DoD	Department of Defense
DON	Department of the Navy
EA	Environmental Assessment
ECON	Environmental Conservation Branch
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EIWG	Environmental Impact Working Group
EMD	Environmental Management Division
EQB	Environmental Quality Branch
FMF	Fleet Marine Force
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
GSRA	Greater Sandy Run Area
HABS/HAER	Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record
HPP	Historic Preservation Plan
HUTA	Highest Use Training Area
I & E	Installation and Environment
ICRMP	Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan
iNFADS	internet Navy Facilities Assets Data Store
ISS	Installation Safety and Security
MARSOC	Marine Special Operations Command
MCAS	Marine Corps Air Station
MCB	Marine Corps Base
MCCS	Marine Corps Community Services
MCOLF	Marine Corps Outlying Landing Field
MCO	Marine Corps Order
MILCON	Military Construction
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement
MPDF	Multiple Property Documentation Form
NAGPRA	Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act

NCDCR	North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources
NCOSA	North Carolina Office of State Archaeology
NCSHPO	North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office
NAVFAC MIDLANT	Naval Facilities Mid-Atlantic Region
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHL	National Historic Landmark
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NPS	National Park Service
NRHP or NR	National Register of Historic Places
OLF	Outlying Landing Field
OPNAVINST	Chief of Naval Operations Instruction
PA	Programmatic Agreement
POC	Point of Contact
PPV	Public/Private Venture
PWD	Public Works Department
REIR	Request for Environmental Impact Review
ROD	Record of Decision
ROICC	Resident Officer in Charge of Construction
SECNAVINST	Secretary of the Navy Instruction
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose

The Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (ICRMP) is intended to provide procedural guidance for identifying, evaluating, nominating, and managing historic properties located at MCB Camp Lejeune. It is an internal compliance and management plan that integrates cultural resources program requirements with ongoing mission activities and other planning documents and metrics. Implementation of the ICRMP will ensure that MCB Camp Lejeune meets its stewardship responsibilities toward cultural resources in a manner that supports the military mission and minimizes conflicts with resource protection.

This ICRMP is a management guide for achieving compliance with Sections 106 and 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act and other preservation laws.

Application

This ICRMP was developed with the intention of providing a framework for complete compliance with Sections 106 and 110 of the NHPA by MCB Camp Lejeune. This is a revision of the Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan developed in 2002 (Lewis 2002).

Surveys have identified 1,244 archaeological sites and 188 NRHP-eligible buildings and structures, with all but one within eight historic districts.

The current status of cultural resources at MCB Camp Lejeune as of December 2008 includes the identification of 1,244 archaeological sites and 2,617 buildings and structures 50 years old or older, 1,280 of which are still present on base (iNFADS 2008). All of the World War II-era buildings and structures recorded at MCB Camp Lejeune have been evaluated (n=1,280). Of these, 188 buildings and structures are considered eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and only one, the USO Building, is not within a historic district. Of the remaining 187 NRHP-eligible buildings or structures, eight meet NRHP criteria individually and are contributing elements to a historic district, and 179 are contributing elements to historic districts. Additionally, 38 other resources (such as roads, objects, and landscapes) are considered contributing resources to eight historic districts (**Table 1**).

Nineteen archaeological sites are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places and 140 are awaiting determinations.

Of the 1,244 archaeological sites that have been identified on properties administered by MCB Camp Lejeune, 140 archaeological sites are awaiting NRHP eligibility determinations: 19 sites have been evaluated in the past year and the determinations are awaiting the state historic preservation office's (NCSHPO) concurrence, and 121 sites are unassessed and still need Phase II evaluation. Nineteen archaeological sites have received Phase II evaluation and are eligible for listing on the NRHP (**Table 1**).

Integration of cultural resources management with MCB Camp Lejeune's ongoing mission and operations is a primary goal of the ICRMP.

Integration

One goal of the ICRMP is to integrate cultural resources management with the installation's programs, mission, and administrative structure. Under Marine Corps Order P5090.2A (Change 2), the Commanding Officer at MCB Camp Lejeune is ultimately responsible for the protection and management of cultural resources. At Camp Lejeune, integration of cultural resources is achieved through the NEPA process and the Environmental Impact Working Group (EIWG). Reviews requiring consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (NCSHPO) and the Office of State Archaeology (NCOSA) are conducted by the Camp Lejeune Cultural Resources Manager and representatives from other programs and agencies as necessary.

Consultation requires the concurrence of state and federal preservation agencies.

Consultation Procedures

Consultation is an integral part of the process of identifying, assessing, evaluating, and mitigating effects to significant historic properties. Sections 106 and 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as well as other federal laws and DoD instructions, require that federal agencies identify stakeholders early in the process and initiate consultation. External stakeholders may include: the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, State Historic Preservation Offices, federally recognized Indian Tribes, Tribal Historic Preservation Officers, and other interested organizations and individuals concerning potential effects that undertakings may have to historic properties. Internal stakeholders include, but are not limited to, master planning offices, public works divisions, range control activities, facility managers, and the environmental management division. In the case of MCB Camp Lejeune, consultation generally will be conducted with the NCSHPO and internal stakeholders; other consulting parties may be invited dependent upon the project.

Based on the results of cultural resource studies, the evaluation recommendations for significant historic resources should be detailed in

reports prepared under Sections 106 and 110 of the NHPA. If concurrence is not reached with the NCSHPO during consultation, MCB Camp Lejeune may choose to provide documentation of findings or determinations of eligibility on properties to the Keeper of the National Register, or to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP). In addition, MCB Camp Lejeune may request that NCSHPO and the ACHP review the protocols for implementing the protection, preservation, and management of those resources presented in the ICRMP.

Implementation

Implementation of this ICRMP can be realized through resource identification and assessment, development of agreement documents, and approval through the chain of command. The process of identifying archaeological sites within the boundaries of MCB Camp Lejeune has been completed; currently approximately 51,224 acres (20,730 ha) have received Phase I archaeological survey. This constitutes the entirety of the area designated as having high potential for archaeological resources. An additional 29,179 acres (11,808 ha) have been cleared through NCSHPO consultation. Combined, 80,403 acres (32,538 ha) have been surveyed or cleared through NCSHPO consultation. The remaining acreage has low probability for archaeological resources and requires no further assessment.

Implementation of the ICRMP includes assessment of historic and archaeological resources.

The recordation of all World War II-era structures has been completed. MCB Camp Lejeune has one historic context, that of World War II (from 1941 to 1946). No other contexts have been identified and none is expected to be identified, since MCB Camp Lejeune's mission has not changed since 1946, and though the Marines who trained at MCB Camp Lejeune played a significant role in Cold War Era (1946 to 1991) defense, none of the built environment at MCB Camp Lejeune was constructed specifically for Cold War functionality. Thus, the recordation of World War II-era historic resources constitutes the entirety of buildings, structures, objects, and historic districts eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

Compliance with Section 110 of the NHPA entails determination of the eligibility status of identified cultural resources through Phase II archaeological evaluation or building evaluations. Compliance with Section 106 (NHPA) requires that when there is an undertaking, the effect on National Register-listed or eligible properties must be assessed. Such effects can result from planned actions or ongoing operations at the base. A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) or Programmatic Agreement should be developed which defines the mitigation of project effects on significant resources.

Implementation also includes determination of resource eligibility and compliance with federal laws.

Summary

This ICRMP should be used by Camp Lejeune facilities planners, environmental staff, range control, and operations managers to remain in compliance with state and federal cultural resource laws and to ensure that significant historic properties are not affected by planned undertakings. This document begins by explaining the purpose of the ICRMP, laws pertaining to cultural resources management on lands managed and owned by the Marine Corps, and the mission of MCB Camp Lejeune. Next, the ICRMP discusses the environment, prehistory, and history of the area, discusses the potential for significant historic resources, and summarizes the current status of known cultural resources on the base. The Cultural Resources Management Program at MCB Camp Lejeune is then described, followed by a series of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) detailing the steps that must be taken in order to remain compliant with federal, state, and military regulations regarding historic properties. The SOPs also provide procedures for dealing with common issues that may arise when planned undertakings may affect cultural resources. A five-year action plan is then outlined in the final section of the ICRMP. Appendices are also included that contain all existing agreements that have been developed between MCB Camp Lejeune and the NCSHPO/NCOSA in regards to the management of historic properties, complete inventories of historic structures and archaeological sites, and other reports and lists pertinent to the management of cultural resources at MCB Camp Lejeune. Additional guidance and coordination is available from the MCB Camp Lejeune Cultural Resources Manager, Rick Richardson.

Table 1. Data Summary for MCB Camp Lejeune

	Mainside	Greater Sandy Run Area (GSRA)	Total	MCOLF Oak Grove
Facility Acreage (terrestrial)	101,450	41,400	142,850	976
Acres Surveyed	28,956	22,268	51,244	125
Acres cleared through NCSHPO consultation	9,020	20,160	29,180	0
Acres to be Surveyed	0	0	0	0
Archaeological Sites	1,213	31	1,244	16
Ineligible Sites	1,054	31	1,085	13
Sites Awaiting NRHP Determinations	140	0	140	2
Eligible Sites	19	0	19	1
Structures 50 Years Old (Built pre-1958)	1,898	0	1,898	1
World War II Structures	1,280	0	1,280	1
Structures Surveyed	1,280	0	1,280	0
Historic Districts	8	0	8	0
Eligible Structures	188	0	188	0
Individually Eligible Structures¹	10	0	10	0
Contributing Structures	187	0	187	0
Other Contributing Historic Resources²	38	0	38	0

¹Eight of the Individually Eligible Structures are also Contributing Structures.

²Examples of other contributing historic resources include the parade field in the Command Services/Regimental Area No 3 Historic District, ranges at the Stone Bay Rifle Range, traffic circles at Camp Geiger and Services/Regimental Area No. 3 Historic Districts, and the tunnel at the Stone Bay Rifle Range. See LBA 2008 for a complete list of contributing elements.

Page intentionally left blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPROVAL	I
ANNUAL REVIEW	III
PREFACE	V
ACRONYMS	VII
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	IX
Purpose	ix
Application	ix
Integration.....	x
Consultation Procedures.....	x
Implementation	xi
Summary	xii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	XV
LIST OF FIGURES	XVIII
LIST OF TABLES	XVIII
INTRODUCTION	1
ICRMP Purpose	2
ICRMP Integration	3
ICRMP Audience	4
Points of Contact	5
Statutes and Regulations.....	5
MCB Camp Lejeune Mission Statement	7
MCB Camp Lejeune Description	7
Cultural Resources at MCB Camp Lejeune	10
Summary Status of Knowledge.....	11
Archaeological.....	12
Architectural.....	12
Enforcement of Cultural Resource Laws	12
Program Alternatives (36 CFR 800.14)	13
Alternate Procedures	13
Exempted Categories	13
Programmatic Agreements	14
Standard Treatments	14
Program Comments	14
PHYSICAL AND CULTURAL CONTEXTS	15
Environmental Setting.....	15
Paleoenvironment and Sea-Level Change	15
Physiology and Geology	16
Hydrology	17
Soils	17
Vegetation.....	21

Conclusions	22
Historical Setting	22
Prehistoric Overview	22
Historic Overview.....	30
STATUS OF KNOWLEDGE	41
Previous Archaeological Surveys.....	41
Early Surveys in the Area	41
Surveys and Sites at MCBCL.....	42
Results of Archaeological Evaluations	48
Previous Architectural Surveys.....	52
Early Surveys.....	52
Surveys of World War II Properties	52
Results of Evaluations.....	55
CULTURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.....	61
Program Management	61
Archaeology.....	62
Architectural History	62
Curation/Conservation.....	63
GIS Database Manager	63
Integration.....	63
STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES.....	65
SOP #1 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Compliance	66
SOP #2: NHPA Section 106 Compliance	68
SOP #3: Emergency Undertakings.....	74
SOP #4: NHPA Section 110 Compliance	75
SOP #5: Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA).....	76
SOP #6: Unexpected Discoveries	77
SOP #7: Data Management	79
SOP #8: Coordination with Natural Resources Management.....	80
SOP #9: Native American Consultation.....	82
SOP #10: Management of Historic Properties	84
SOP #11: Demolition of Historic Properties	88
SOP #12: Use of Historic Resources	90
SOP #13: Disposition of Human Remains	91
SOP #14: Curation	93
SOP #15: Public Involvement	94
FIVE-YEAR ACTION PLAN FOR MCB CAMP LEJEUNE	97
Historic Property Inventory.....	97
Archaeology	97
Historic Structures	98
Historic Property Mitigation	98
Archaeology	98
Historic Structures	99
Curation.....	99

Information Management	100
Historic Property Monitoring	100
Public Outreach	101
Integration	101
Annual Review of ICRMP	101
REFERENCES CITED.....	103
APPENDICES	117
Appendix I	Glossary of Terms
Appendix II	MCOLF Oak Grove
Appendix III	Current Archaeology Site Inventory
Appendix IV	Historic Structure Inventory
Appendix V	Programmatic Agreement, MARSOC Development, Stone Bay Rifle Range
Appendix VI	Programmatic Agreement, Privatization of Family Housing
Appendix VII	List of Archaeological Reports, MCB Camp Lejeune
Appendix VIII	NCSHPO Letter for Greater Sandy Run Area (GSRA)
Appendix IX	Unassessed Site Locations
Appendix X	Memorandum of Agreement, Camp Geiger
Appendix XI	Guidelines for Historic Buildings Management
Appendix XII	Historic District Layouts
Appendix XIII	Memorandum of Agreement, Building H1 Window Repair at Naval Hospital
Appendix XIV	Programmatic Decision Memorandum MCB Camp Lejeune
Appendix XV	NCSHPO Letter and Decision Memorandum, Native American Consultation at MCB Camp Lejeune
Appendix XVI	SHPO Letter, Historical Architecture Evaluations Addendum, Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, Onslow County, North Carolina
Appendix XVII	Upcoming Projects at MCB Camp Lejeune
Appendix XVIII	Cultural Resources Metrics at Camp Lejeune
Appendix XIX	ICRMP Distribution List and POCs MCB Camp Lejeune
Appendix XX	Annual Review

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.	Location of MCB Camp Lejeune and Greater Sandy Run Area (GSRA)	9
Figure 2.	Geologic Formations beneath MCB Camp Lejeune.....	18
Figure 3.	Dominant Soil Types within MCB Camp Lejeune	19
Figure 4.	Tar Kiln in Onslow County	31
Figure 5.	Lonnie Spicer owned 32.2 acres in the area	37
Figure 6.	Obstacle Course Training at Montford Point	38
Figure 7.	Probability Model for Archaeological Resources at MCB Camp Lejeune	49
Figure 8.	Surveyed Areas of MCB Camp Lejeune	50
Figure 9.	National Register Eligible Sites at MCB Camp Lejeune	51
Figure 10.	Historic Districts at MCB Camp Lejeune.....	56
Figure 11.	Illustration of the Section 106 Process For MCB Camp Lejeune -- Archaeology.....	69
Figure 12.	Illustration of the Section 106 Process For MCB Camp Lejeune – Architectural History.....	70

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Data Summary for MCB Camp Lejeune	xiii
Table 2.	Impact Potential of Common Undertakings to Cultural Resources, MCB Camp Lejeune	10
Table 3.	Soil Types within MCB Camp Lejeune	20
Table 4.	Summary Data of Historic Districts at MCB Camp Lejeune	55

INTRODUCTION

Cultural resources are defined as buildings, structures, districts, archaeological sites, historic landscapes, cemeteries, Traditional Cultural Places, Indian sacred sites, and objects of significance in history, architecture, archaeology, engineering or culture (OPNAVINST 5090.1C). These are nonrenewable resources that illustrate the historical development of our nation and are distributed across the landscape as a reflection of prehistoric and historic processes and events.

*Cultural Resources
defined in OPNAVINST
5090.1C*

Federal agencies have a special role as stewards of historic resources; this responsibility is recognized in the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended; in the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA); in Executive Order No. 11593 (Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment) and Executive Order No. 13287 (Preserve America); and in numerous other Federal laws and regulations.

*The federal
responsibility for
preservation of
cultural resources*

The NHPA, enacted in 1966 and amended in 1992, established a nationwide historic preservation program. Each Federal agency is tasked with the responsibility for establishing a preservation program to identify, evaluate, and nominate historic properties to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The National Register was established by the NHPA as an inventory of archaeological sites and historic resources that are of local, state, or national importance.

*The NHPA was
enacted to ensure
stewardship by
federal agencies.*

Properties under a Federal agency's jurisdiction or control that are listed or eligible for listing in the National Register should be managed and maintained in a way that considers the preservation of their historic, archaeological, architectural, and cultural values. In addition, the NHPA declares that the costs of preservation activities are eligible project costs in all undertakings of the Federal agency (NHPA Sections 110 and 106).

*NHPA provides that
costs of preservation
activities shall be
eligible project costs in
all federal agency
undertakings.*

The Marine Corps and Navy have recognized their historic preservation responsibilities in "Protection" Marine Corps Order (MCO) P5090.2A Chapters 8, 11, and 12 (Change 2), MCO 5090.4A (13 February 2007), SECNAVINST 4000.35A (9 April 2001), and OPNAVINST 5090.1C Chapter 27 (30 October 2007). As stated in these instructions, the Marine Corps and Department of the Navy's (DON) policy towards historic and archaeological resources is to:

*The policy of the
Department of the Navy
on protection of cultural
resources is outlined in
SECNAVINST 4000.35A.*

- (a) Incorporate preservation considerations into routine management of historic buildings, districts, sites, ships, aircraft, and other cultural resources.
- (b) Initiate timely consultation with SHPOs, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Native Americans, other interested agencies, and the public whenever the DON conducts or supports undertakings that may affect any National Register eligible or listed property.

ICRMP Purpose

Department of Defense (DoD) Instruction 4715.16 (18 September 2008) and the HQ Marine Corps ICRMP guidance document (U.S. Marine Corps Guidance for Completion of an Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan Update, February 2009) have established the requirements for an Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (ICRMP).

An ICRMP is a five-year plan for compliance with cultural resource statutes, executive orders, presidential memoranda, regulations, and other requirements. ICRMPs are internal Marine Corps compliance and management plans that 1) integrate the facility's cultural resources program with mission activities, 2) allow for identification and reduction or resolution of potential conflicts between the facility's mission and cultural resources management, and 3) outline compliance actions necessary to support the primary mission of the facility while taking cultural resources issues into consideration. This ICRMP is tailored for the specific cultural resources issues at MCB Camp Lejeune, and is meant to serve as a component of the Base Master Plans.

The ICRMP covers a period of five years, following a pattern similar to, and integrated with, the rolling five-year fiscal program and budget cycle used by the Department of Defense. After each five-year period, the ICRMP receives a major review from the MCB Camp Lejeune command staff, and is updated to reflect changes in the base cultural resources inventory, as well as changes in any Federal or Base cultural resources regulations. Internal reviews of the ICRMP should be made on a yearly basis. The ICRMP thus provides a forum to examine long-term management goals, to explore the intended focus of efforts on critical issues, and to achieve consensus about these issues.

The ICRMP is a five-year plan for compliance with cultural resource regulations.

The goals of the ICRMP are to:

- Provide a current inventory of all cultural resources listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and identify data gaps;
- Provide the framework for management of National Register-listed or eligible properties in compliance with NHPA, NEPA, and all Federal laws and Marine Corps instructions;
- Provide an opportunity to address concerns and requirements of internal and external stakeholders;
- Preserve and protect cultural resources within the mission of MCB Camp Lejeune;
- Inform the necessary parties where relevant information regarding cultural heritage issues, including statutes, laws, and regulations can be obtained.
- Serve as a means of public outreach concerning cultural resources present on MCB Camp Lejeune and enlist support for installation initiatives;
- Serve as the institutional memory about the cultural resources program.

At MCB Camp Lejeune, the Director, Environmental Management Division (EMD), under the Installation and Environment Department Director (Director/I & E), and assisted by the Head, MCB Camp Lejeune Environmental Conservation Branch (ECON), is tasked with implementing the ICRMP. The Cultural Resources Manager at MCB Camp Lejeune is the delegated expert on the development and maintenance of the ICRMP.

The Environmental Management Division and Installation and Environment Department at MCB Camp Lejeune are tasked with ICRMP implementation.

ICRMP Integration

In accordance with DoD Instruction 4715.16, which requires the integration of cultural resource considerations into installation master planning and operational planning, the ICRMP is designed to proactively guide the management of cultural resources by establishing procedures that limit and reduce potential conflicts between installation mission and compliance. Cultural resources management becomes integrated with the base mission through coordination with other installation offices whose undertakings may affect cultural resources and by consulting with outside entities who have a stake in cultural resources on the installation.

The integration of cultural resources management should happen:

- With the daily activities of the facility;
- With other planning documents;

- With other environmental programs;
- With outside entities, including the North Carolina State Historic Preservation Officer (NCSHPO), the North Carolina Office of State Archaeology (NCOSA), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), and Native American groups, as applicable.

ICRMP Audience

The ICRMP is intended for use by persons and agencies both within and outside of MCB Camp Lejeune. The primary users of the ICRMP are:

- Director, Installation and Environment (I&E)
- Director, Training, Education and Operations (Base S-3)
- Director, Marine Corps Community Services (MCCS)

The following subsets of the above users should integrate the ICRMP into their plans and daily operations as well:

- Installation Development Division
- Environmental Management Division
- Public Works Division
- Range Control Division
- Master Planning
- NEPA
- Housing
- Facilities and Maintenance
- Training Operations
- Public Affairs

Agencies outside MCB Camp Lejeune that are directly involved with cultural resources management include:

- North Carolina SHPO Office/Office of State Archaeology
- North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources (NCDRC)
- Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), if necessary

In addition, copies of the ICRMP will be distributed to the Commanding Office and Marine Corps Headquarters (HQMC). The ICRMP will also be posted on the MCB Camp Lejeune website, though information on the location of NRHP-eligible resources will be restricted from public view in accordance with Article 9 of the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, amended in 1988 (ARPA), and Section 304 of the NHPA which require that managers of archaeological resources on public lands keep resource information and locations confidential.

Points of Contact

Cultural Resources Manager at MCB Camp Lejeune:

Mr. Rick Richardson
Environmental Conservation Branch (ECON)
Marine Corps Base
Camp Lejeune, NC 28542
Phone (910) 451-7230
Mobile (910) 376-7515
Fax (910) 451-1787
rick.richardson@usmc.mil

Archaeological resources:

Mr. Stephen R. Claggett
North Carolina Office of State Archaeology
421 N. Blount St.
Raleigh, NC 27601
Phone (919) 733-7342
<http://www.arch.dcr.state.nc.us/>

Historic Architectural Resources:

Jeffrey Crow, Ph.D.
State Historic Preservation Officer
4610 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-4610
Phone (919) 807-7280
<http://www.hpo.dcr.state.nc.us/>

Statutes and Regulations

Statutes and regulations that pertain to the management of cultural resources on Marine Corps installations are listed below. Explanation of terms relating to cultural resource management is included in the glossary in **Appendix I**.

*Statutes and
Regulations relating
to cultural resources*

STATUTES

- Antiquities Act of 1906 (16 U.S.C. 431-433)
- Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act of 1935 (Public Law 74-292, 16 U.S.C. 461)
- National Historic Preservation Act ([NHPA](#)) of 1966, as amended (16 USC 470-470w)
- National Environmental Policy Act ([NEPA](#)) of 1969 (42 USC 4321-4370c)

- Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act ([AHPA](#)) of 1974 (16 U.S.C 469)
- American Indian Religious Freedom Act ([AIRFA](#)) of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 1996)
- Archaeological Resources Protection Act ([ARPA](#)) of 1979 (16 USC 470aa - 470ll)
- Public Buildings Cooperative Use Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-541)
- Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act ([NAGPRA](#)) of 1990 (25 USC 3001-3013)

EXECUTIVE ORDERS

- [EO 11593](#)—Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment
- [EO13007](#)—Indian Sacred Sites
- [EO13175](#)—Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments
- [EO13287](#)—Preserve America

PRESIDENTIAL MEMORANDA

- Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies dated April 29, 1994: [Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments.](#)

FEDERAL REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE

To search for Federal Regulations online visit

<http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/cfr/index.html>

- Department of the Interior, [Curation of Federally Owned and Administered Archaeological Collections, 36 CFR 79](#)
- Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, [Protection of Historic Properties, 36 CFR 800](#)
- Department of the Interior, [Native American Graves Protection and Reparation Act Regulations, 43 CFR 10](#)
- Department of the Interior, [Historic Preservation Professional Qualification Standards](#)

MILITARY REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE

- Department of Defense, [DoD Instruction 4715.16: Cultural Resources Management](#)
- Department of Defense [DoD Instruction 4715.9: Environmental Planning and Analysis](#)
- U.S. Marine Corps, MCO 5090.4A: Conservation Law Enforcement Program
- U.S. Marine Corps, MCO 5090.2A (Change 2): Environmental Compliance and Protection Manual

- U.S. Marine Corps, MC Base Order 5090.8: Archaeological and Historic Properties Management
- Department of the Navy, [SECNAV Instruction 4000.35A: Department of the Navy Cultural Resources Program](#)
- Department of the Navy, [OPNAV Instruction 5090.1C: Environmental Readiness Program Manual](#)
- Department of Defense, [DoD Directive 4165.6: Real Property](#)
- Department of Defense, [DoD Instruction 4165.70: Real Property Management](#)

MCB Camp Lejeune Mission Statement

MCB Camp Lejeune's mission always has been, and continues to be, to maintain combat-ready units for expeditionary deployment. To help prepare warfighters for combat and humanitarian missions abroad, MCB Camp Lejeune takes advantage of approximately 156,000 acres, 11 miles of beach capable of supporting amphibious operations, 34 gun positions, 50 tactical landing zones, three state-of-the-art training facilities for Military Operations in Urban Terrain and 80 live fire ranges including the Greater Sandy Run Area (<http://www.lejeune.usmcs.mil>).

*The mission of MCB
Camp Lejeune*

MCB Camp Lejeune Description

MCB Camp Lejeune is located in Onslow County approximately 130 miles southeast of Raleigh along the North Carolina coastal plain. The New River runs through the center of the property (**Figure 1**).

The Base is split into two areas, Mainside and Greater Sandy Run, divided by U.S. Highway 17. The Mainside area, which was constructed mainly in the mid-1940s, comprises approximately 101,450 acres east of U.S. Highway 17, approximately 18,000 of which make up the New River. It is characterized by pine and hardwood forest, and includes eleven miles of oceanfront. Elevations range from near sea level to approximately 23 meters (75 feet) above mean sea level (amsl). The eastern boundary of the Mainside base is defined by State Roads 24 and 172; the western boundary is defined by U.S. Highway 17. The conjunction of these roads forms the northern boundary. The southern boundary of the Mainside base is defined by the Atlantic Ocean.

For the purposes of this report, Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) New River is considered part of Camp Lejeune. It is located within the northwest portion of the Mainside Base and shares resources with the base. The mission of MCAS New River is to maintain and operate aviation facilities, provide services and material to support ground

*MCAS New River is
considered part of MCB
Camp Lejeune. MCOLF
Oak Grove is addressed in
Appendix II.*

combat forces located at MCB Camp Lejeune, and perform such other air operations as requested. MCAS New River units extensively utilize two auxiliary landing fields, Bogue (12 miles east of Camp Lejeune) and Oak Grove (30 miles north). Bogue airfield is under the purview of MCAS Cherry Point, and is addressed in the Cherry Point ICRMP. Oak Grove has recently come under the purview of MCB Camp Lejeune. Though its cultural resource totals are listed in the data summary table (**Table 1**) for MCB Camp Lejeune, cultural resources management issues at Oak Grove are addressed in **Appendix II**.

*Greater Sandy
Run Area (GSRA)*

The Greater Sandy Run Area (GSRA) was acquired in the 1990s and comprises approximately 41,400 acres west of U.S. Highway 17. Characterized by swamp and pocosin environments, the GSRA is much flatter and wetter than the Mainside area. Elevations in this part of the base range from four to twenty-one meters above mean sea level (amsl), although the overwhelming majority of the GSRA lies between four and six meters amsl. The eastern boundary is defined by U.S. Highway 17, and the western boundary by State Road 50. The intersection of these forms the southern boundary. The northern boundary roughly follows Padgett Road.



Figure 1. Location of Camp Lejeune and Greater Sandy Run Area (GSRA)

The ultimate goal of MCB Camp Lejeune's ICRMP is to manage all National Register properties.

Cultural Resources at MCB Camp Lejeune

The ultimate goal of MCB Camp Lejeune's preservation program is to identify and evaluate all cultural resources pursuant to the National Register of Historic Places criteria for evaluation, and to provide a program for managing those resources that are eligible for listing in the National Register. The identification and evaluation of cultural resources will result in an inventory of the base's historic properties. The inventory will be available on maps and in database format and will include all identified cultural resources and their evaluation. This will become an element of the base's GIS. The evaluation also will determine management options suitable for inventoried resources.

The inventory of cultural resources will expand in two ways: (1) from general studies sponsored through the installation's cultural resources program, or (2) from specific identification and evaluation studies activated by program-driven undertakings that must be reviewed as part of Section 106 compliance. Both types of studies must be performed by personnel who meet the Professional Qualifications Standards contained in the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Archaeology and Historic Preservation* (48 Federal Register 44738-9).

Types of undertakings associated with MCB Camp Lejeune most likely to result in impacts to cultural resources within the property are detailed in **Table 2**.

Table 2. Impact Potential of Common Undertakings to Cultural Resources, MCB Camp Lejeune

Undertaking	Impact Potential
Activities within Cantonment Areas where historic districts are present	High
Foxhole Construction	Low ¹
Impact Zones	High
Short Duration Bivouac with Soakage Pits	Low
Tracked Vehicle Operation	High ²
Trench Construction	High

Table 2 continued

Undertaking	Impact Potential
Land Management Activities	
Ditch/Chanel Construction	High
Firelane Construction	High
Timber Harvesting	Low
Forestry Site Preparation	
- Bedding	High
- Trail Construction	High
- Logging Decks	High
- Drum Chopping	Low
- KG Blade	Low
Support Activities	
Borrow Pit Excavation	High
Footings for Structure (e.g. Antenna)	High
Landscaping – New	High
Parking Lot Construction	High
Road Construction	High
Utility Building Construction (Foundation)	High
Utility Line Construction	High
Grading	High
¹ When dug by platoon or smaller sized units ² When done off established roads, trails, or previously disturbed areas Source: Lewis 2002	

Summary Status of Knowledge

Intensive surveys have been conducted, resulting in a complete inventory of the archaeological resources at MCB Camp Lejeune and a complete inventory of the architectural resources that were built before 1947 at MCB Camp Lejeune. Archaeological assessments are still needed for those sites that do not have a National Register eligibility determination. A comprehensive inventory of National Register eligible properties will be available only after the evaluation of each unassessed resource, applying the National Register criteria for evaluation (36 CFR 60.4[a-d]).

The current inventory of resources that have been listed in or identified as eligible for the National Register at Mainside and GSRA has been prepared (**Appendices III and IV**). This list is based on Section 106 and Section 110 surveys and evaluations.

Identification of archaeological sites and World War II-era structures is complete.

Archaeological

Archaeological survey of high-potential areas is complete.

The various archaeological surveys at MCB Camp Lejeune have consisted of intensive shovel testing and pedestrian survey in areas of variable potential for cultural resources. Information gathered from these investigations was supplemented by data recorded from archaeological surveys conducted in the vicinity of MCB Camp Lejeune to facilitate the development of a preliminary model of prehistoric settlement along the New River. All areas with a high potential for containing archaeological sites have been subject to identification surveys. Additionally, the NCSHPO has determined that large areas of MCB Camp Lejeune and its auxiliary facilities do not need additional survey due to safety concerns or low probability of containing significant archaeological resources.

Phase II evaluation is recommended for 140 archaeological sites.

A total of 1,244 archaeological sites have been identified at MCB Camp Lejeune, including prehistoric, historic, and multicomponent sites. Nineteen of these sites are considered eligible for listing on the National Register, and an additional 140 sites are awaiting NRHP eligibility determinations and are recommended for Phase II evaluation, 19 of which have been evaluated as of November 2008, and are awaiting NCSHPO concurrence.

Architectural

There are 188 NRHP-eligible historic buildings and structures within eight historic districts.

The World War II era – from 1941 to 1946 – is considered the only significant historic context at MCB Camp Lejeune. Camp Lejeune had no Cold War-era construction programs. Various architectural surveys have recorded and evaluated 2,617 structures that date to this period; as of August 2008, 1,280 of these structures are still standing (iNFADS 2008); 188 of these buildings are considered eligible for listing on the NRHP. Of these 188, only one, the USO Building, is not within a historic district. Of the remaining 187 NRHP-eligible buildings or structures, nine meet NRHP criteria individually and are contributing elements to a historic district and 179 are contributing elements to historic districts. An additional 38 NR-eligible resources (such as roads, objects, and landscapes) are all classified as contributing resources to a historic district.

Enforcement of Cultural Resource Laws

Primary responsibility for enforcement of cultural resources protection at MCB Camp Lejeune is assigned to the Director, Installations and Environment, in coordination with the Military Police and the Base Conservation Law Enforcement Section/EMD, as necessary. Additional

protections are enforced through the development of training manuals, ICRMP SOPs, and close oversight by the Cultural Resources Manager. Under SECNAVINST 4000.35A(c), the Commandant of the Marine Corps (CMC) is responsible for the overall compliance with cultural resources legal and policy requirements for Marine Corps facilities.

Program Alternatives (36 CFR 800.14)

Section 800.14 of 36 CFR 800 lays out a variety of methods available to federal agencies to meet their Section 106 obligations. These Program Alternatives are designed to streamline the Section 106 process by creating categories of historic property types, undertakings, or effects, and developing blanket procedures for dealing with them. Program Alternatives include Alternate Procedures, Exempted Categories, Programmatic Agreements (PAs), Standard Treatments, and Program Comments.

Alternate Procedures

A federal agency may develop Alternate Procedures to fulfill Section 106 requirements rather than attempt to adapt its undertakings to the process as defined by ACHP regulations, if those Alternate Procedures will result in decreased time and cost with the same results. The proposed alternate procedures must be developed in consultation with the NCSHPO, and submitted for a 60-day review period to the ACHP, who must approve them before the agency can adopt them as final procedures. As of August 2008, the Department of the Navy (DON) does not have any Alternate Procedures in place.

The DON has no Alternate Procedures.

Exempted Categories

This Program Alternative allows the ACHP or agency to define a category or group of actions or undertakings that is exempt from further review under Section 106. The category must be developed in consultation with the NCSHPO and ACHP, and must meet the following criteria:

The DON has no Exempted Categories.

- The actions within the category would otherwise qualify as “undertakings” as defined in 36 CFR 800.16
- The potential effects of the actions within the category upon historic properties are foreseeable and likely to be minimal or non-adverse
- Exempted categories must be consistent with the purposes of the National Historic Preservation Act

As of August 2008, the Department of the Navy (DON) does not have any Exempted Categories.

Programmatic Agreements

MCB Camp Lejeune has two Programmatic Agreements.

When routine or repetitive actions are likely to affect unassessed resources, a Programmatic Agreement (PA) should be developed in consultation with the NCSHPO and ACHP. The development of a PA will allow for consideration of the effects of repetitive actions to unassessed resources through a planned approach to the completion of these tasks. The implementation of such a plan agreement has the added benefit of reducing the volume of consultation necessary with the NCSHPO and the ACHP. Currently, MCB Camp Lejeune has signed Programmatic Agreements in place for MARSOC Operations at the Stone Bay Rifle Range Historic District (**Appendix V**) and for Phase I of the Privatization of Family Housing (**Appendix VI**).

Standard Treatments

DoD is developing Standard Treatments for historic structures.

The establishment of standard methods for the treatment of a category of historic properties, a category of undertakings, or a category of effects on historic properties as outlined in 36 CFR 800.14 may be another alternative to case-by-case Section 106 compliance. Standard treatments are developed by the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation (ACHP) and may be at the request of, and in consultation with, a federal agency.

In 2008, the DoD requested a series of Standard Treatments for undertakings involving the repair and maintenance of building materials and systems common to historic military structures, specifically the repair and maintenance of historic exterior masonry.

Program Comments

There are no Program Comments that apply to MCB Camp Lejeune.

In lieu of conducting individual reviews, an agency may request the ACHP to provide comments on a category of undertakings. The agency will define the category of undertakings, identify the potential effects on historic resources, outline the steps to be taken to ensure the effects are taken into account, delineate the time period for which the comment is requested, and summarize any views submitted by stakeholders or the public. The agency must then consider, but is not obligated to follow, the ACHP's comments. If the ACHP declines to comment, or the agency does not follow the comments, the agency will continue to comply with the Section 106 process. There are no Program Comments that apply to MCB Camp Lejeune.

PHYSICAL AND CULTURAL CONTEXTS

Environmental Setting

Paleoenvironment and Sea-Level Change

Archaeologists generally agree that human migration into North America occurred during the late Pleistocene epoch as the landscape was slowly transitioning out of the full Wisconsin glacial period 16,000 to 10,000 BC. The environmental landscape that these people encountered was much different than the environmental landscape of today. During the full Wisconsin glacial period, North Carolina, like most of the Southeast, was much cooler and drier with an average sea level approximately 120 meters lower than current sea-level stands (Bense 1994:18, Rohling et al. 1998:162). Vegetation included cold-weather species such as spruce and jack pine (Delcourt and Delcourt 1981), confirmed by palynological studies of the Dismal Swamp in northeastern North Carolina (Whitehead 1972). As humans slowly trickled into North America, temperatures were increasing as interglacial conditions began to prevail.

The first people to come to the eastern shore found the environment cooler and drier than today.

By 8,000 BC, glacial conditions ceased, marking the beginning of the Holocene. The Early Holocene (8000–6500 BC) was a period of warmer, drier summers and rapid sea level rise. The large dominant forest belts that had existed for millennia began breaking into smaller biotic communities (Bense 1994:22). Also, the megafauna that had characterized the Pleistocene epoch were becoming extinct. The Middle Holocene (6500– 2000 BC), known as the Altithermal or Hypsithermal, was much drier and hotter than previous periods as the tropical air mass moving out of the Caribbean and Gulf of Mexico influenced summer weather patterns (Bense 1994:22). During this period, swamp and peat habitats developed as various species of pine expanded across the central and southern Coastal Plain (Watts 1980).

As a generalization, the climate, water levels, and plant communities of North Carolina attained essentially modern conditions by 1000 BC and have been fairly stable through all phases of habitation by ceramic-using cultures.

Physiology and Geology

MCB Camp Lejeune lies within an inter-riverine zone of the Outer Coastal Plain.

MCB Camp Lejeune is located in Onslow County, North Carolina, and lies mainly within an inter-riverine zone of the Outer Coastal Plain, designated the “Sea Island” section (Reid and Simpson 1998a:6-7, McNab 1996). This section of the Outer Coastal Plain is characterized by a smooth, arcuate coastline, small estuaries, and offshore islands (Soller and Mills 1991). The inland areas are typically characterized by large areas of wetlands, classified as pocosins.

The topographic appearance of MCB Camp Lejeune is primarily a result of Pleistocene climate changes. Rising and falling sea levels have led to the erosion, deposition, and general reworking of the land surfaces of the area (Burnette 1977). The result has been the formation of the weakly dissected alluvial plain that the base occupies today. The deposits are primarily clean sand and clay sand, layered with deposits of clay and shell. Along the Atlantic coast, stream sediment deposition and natural shore processes create and maintain beaches, swamps, and mud flats (MCBCL 2006:2.4).

The base is characterized by a combination of poorly drained flatlands and better drained rolling hills.

MCB Camp Lejeune is characterized by a combination of poorly drained, broad, level flatlands and gently rolling, better-drained areas (MCBCL 2006:2.3). The area east of the New River is dominated by broad, flat interstream areas and is typically poorly drained, with elevations ranging from eight to fifteen meters above mean sea level (amsl). The area west of the river has a more varied relief, with elevations reaching up to 24 meters amsl (MCBCL 2006:2.3). The Atlantic coast is formed by a barrier island strand. An estuarine system occurs between the barrier islands and the mainland (Soller and Mills 1991).

There are three primary geographic surfaces at MCB Camp Lejeune. The Pamlico surface is characterized by elevations of zero to seven meters above mean sea level (amsl) along the Intracoastal Waterway and in narrow strips along the New River and its tributaries. The Talbot surface underlies the majority of the base. It contains elevations ranging from seven to fifteen meters amsl. The Wicomico surface is located in a few spots south of Jacksonville, primarily on the west side of the New River, and is characterized by elevations ranging from fourteen to 22 meters amsl (MCBCL 2006:2.4; Reid and Simpson 1998a:7).

Distributed beneath these sediments lie three Tertiary Age formations composed primarily of hardened and fossiliferous limestones and sands (**Figure 2**). The Belgrade Formation, with its heavy shell and sand content, underlies most of the eastern portion of MCB Camp Lejeune

east of Verona in the north and New River Inlet to the south. A small area of Castle Hayne fossiliferous bryozoan-echinoid limestone is found near French Creek and along the western edge of the Greater Sandy Run Training Area. Finally, the River Bend Formation, composed of fossiliferous molluscan-mold limestone, occurs throughout much of the western portion of MCB Camp Lejeune (Wagner 1995:2).

Gravel deposits occur in the vicinity of the base, mainly in areas of stream-cut banks and in eroded areas along estuary shorelines (Loftfield 1976:5). These deposits, primarily quartz and quartzite, would provide a local source for lithic raw materials.

Hydrology

The main portion of the base falls within the White Oak River Basin (NCDWQ 2007). Most of this area drains into the New River sub-basin, which is the dominant hydrologic feature at MCB Camp Lejeune. Drainage also flows into the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Bear Creek, and Queens Creek. The majority of the Greater Sandy Run Area (GSRA) drains into the Northeast Cape Fear River (part of the Cape Fear watershed), although a small portion flows into the New River (MCBCL 2006:2.2; NCDWQ 2007).

Drainage flows mainly into the New River.

Soils

As would be expected in an area as large as MCB Camp Lejeune, a variety of Coastal Plain soils are present (**Figure 3**). The predominant soils are well-drained Baymeade fine sand (0 to 6 percent slopes), which covers approximately 19,200 acres of the property, and poorly drained Leon fine sand, which covers approximately 14,850 acres (USDA 2004). Other common soils include Croatan muck, Marvyn loamy fine sand (6 to 15 percent slopes), Muckalee loam, Murville fine sand, Torhunta fine sandy loam, and Woodington loamy fine sand. Each of these makes up between 7,000 and 10,000 acres of the property, and they range from very poorly drained to well-drained in nature. **Table 3** lists all the soil types present and their associated characteristics.

Soils within the facility range from poorly drained to excessively drained.




Figure 2. Geologic Formations beneath Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, Onslow County, North Carolina
Source: North Carolina Geological Survey 1985




Figure 3. Dominant soil types within MCB Camp Lejeune
Source: USDA 2004

Table 3. Soil types found within MCB Camp Lejeune. Source: USDA 2004

Soil Name	Acreage	% of Project Area	Drainage
Alpin fine sand, 1-6% slopes	900	0.63%	Excessively drained
Baymeade fine sand, 0-6% slopes	18,162	12.71%	Well drained
Baymeade-Urban land complex, 0-6% slopes	3,870	2.71%	Well drained
Bohicket silty clay loam	2,900	2.03%	Very poorly drained
Carteret fine sand	11	0.01%	Very poorly drained
Corolla fine sand	177	0.12%	Moderately well drained
Craven fine sandy loam, 1-4% slopes	266	0.19%	Moderately well drained
Craven fine sandy loam, 4-8% slopes	251	0.18%	Moderately well drained
Croatan muck	8,507	5.95%	Very poorly drained
Dorovan muck	1,021	0.71%	Very poorly drained
Duckston fine sand	237	0.17%	Poorly drained
Foreston loamy fine sand, 0-2% slopes	5,073	3.55%	Moderately well drained
Goldsboro fine sandy loam, 0-2% slopes	461	0.32%	Moderately well drained
Goldsboro-Urban land complex, 0-5% slopes	1,507	1.06%	Moderately well drained
Kureb fine sand, 1-6% slopes	5,137	3.60%	Excessively drained
Lenoir loam	111	0.08%	Somewhat poorly drained
Leon fine sand	14,233	9.96%	Poorly drained
Lynchburg fine sandy loam	152	0.11%	Somewhat poorly drained
Marvyn loamy fine sand, 6-15% slopes	9,389	6.57%	Well drained
Muckalee loam	8,704	6.09%	Poorly drained
Murville fine sand	7,826	5.48%	Very poorly drained
Newhan fine sand, dredged, 2-10% slopes	187	0.13%	Excessively drained
Newhan-Beaches complex, 0-30% slopes	637	0.45%	Excessively drained
Newhan-Corolla-Urban land complex, 0-30% slopes	503	0.35%	Moderately well drained
Norfolk loamy fine sand, 0-2% slopes	81	0.06%	Well drained
Norfolk loamy fine sand, 2-6% slopes	1,152	0.81%	Well drained
Onslow loamy fine sand	6,379	4.47%	Moderately well drained
Pactolus fine sand	1,644	1.15%	Moderately well drained
Pantego mucky loam	292	0.20%	Very poorly drained
Pits	167	0.12%	
Rains fine sandy loam	815	0.57%	Poorly drained
Stallings loamy fine sand	3,780	2.65%	Somewhat poorly drained
Torhunta fine sandy loam	7,189	5.03%	Very poorly drained
Udorthents, loamy	49	0.03%	Well drained
Urban land	892	0.62%	
Wando fine sand, 1-6% slopes	4,509	3.16%	Well drained
Woodington loamy fine sand	7,446	5.21%	Poorly drained
Yaupon fine sandy loam, 0-3% slopes	124	0.09%	Somewhat poorly drained
Water	<u>18,108</u>	<u>12.68%</u>	
Total Acreage (approx.)	142,853	100.00%	

Vegetation

MCB Camp Lejeune contains a variety of local ecosystems, all dominated by trees, shrubs, or marshes (Reid and Simpson 1998a:11). Detailed discussions of the vegetation communities are found in Loftfield (1976, 1981a, b, c) and the *Camp Lejeune Multiple Use Natural Resources Management Plan* (MCBCL 1987). These ecosystems include:

*Vegetation zones
and ecosystems*

Hardwood Forest: This vegetation zone contains the most biodiversity within the property, and covers approximately 22,000 acres of the base (MCBCL 2006:2.5). It is typically found in association with poorly drained Muckalee soil, along the major drainages and associated floodplains, and in depressions near pocosins. Dominant tree types include sweet gum and swamp black gum, as well as bald cypress, water and laurel oak, red maple, various species of bay, American holly, and white cedar. Shrubs include wax myrtle, large-leaf bayberry, dahoon holly, myrtle dahoon, swamp azalea, dog hobble, and cinnamon fern. This zone can support a variety of fauna, including fish (in permanently flooded areas), amphibians, reptiles, migratory and sedentary birds, several species of rodents, and medium-sized mammals such as raccoons and otters. Larger mammals are less common, though not unprecedented (Reid and Simpson 1998a:12).

Pine-Hardwood Forest: This mixed-vegetation zone is found in approximately 22,600 acres of MCB Camp Lejeune (MCBCL 2006: 2.5). It is located between upland pine communities and hardwood bottomlands, and is typically associated with poorly drained Woodington and Torhunta soils. Seasonal flooding is common in this area. Dominant vegetation includes pond pine and loblolly alongside hardwoods such as water, laurel, and live oaks, red maple, sweet gum, and red, sweet, and loblolly bays. The understory is typically comprised of sweet and low gallberry, greenbriar, wax myrtle, switchcane, and various ferns and mosses. Associated fauna include white-tailed deer, turkey, and grey squirrels (Reid and Simpson 1998a:12).

Pine Forest: MCB Camp Lejeune incorporates approximately 47,700 acres of loblolly and longleaf pine forest (MCBCL 2006:2.5). This zone is associated with the dry sand ridges of Foreston and Stallings soils, as well as with the wetter Torhunta, Murville, and Leon soils. Loblolly-longleaf pine forest attracts a variety of fauna such as deer, quail, turkey, and grey squirrels. It is typically characterized by an understory of gallberry, blueberry, fetterbush, broomsedge, wiregrass and bracken (Reid and Simpson 1998a:12).

Estuarine Marshes: Located along the shorelines of sounds and estuaries, these marshes serve as a transition area between open water and upland vegetation habitats (MCBCL 1987:33-34). Estuarine marshes are associated with poorly drained peats and mucks, and natural vegetation includes rushes, sedges, and grasses. These open waters are home to a large variety of fish, shellfish, and amphibians (Reid and Simpson 1998a:12-13).

Pocosins: Pocosins are palustrine scrub vegetation communities that tend to develop in areas of poor drainage (Cowardin et al. 1979). These low depressional areas typically contain highly organic muck and peat soils, underlain by marine sediments, and they lack permanent standing water. Dominant vegetation includes pines and broadleaf scrub, often so dense that sunlight cannot reach the ground surface. Today the dominant tree species in this zone is pond pine; early historic communities were dominated by Atlantic white cedar, cypress, and black gum (MCBCL 1987:23-24; Reid and Simpson 1998a:12; Sharitz and Gibbons 1982).

Conclusions

The natural environment of MCB Camp Lejeune would have been attractive to both prehistoric and historic-period settlers, particularly the better-drained upland areas adjacent to water. Access to the area was facilitated by the many creeks and sounds of the area, and the extensive forests would have offered numerous resources for housing, fuel, and food.

Historical Setting

Prehistoric Overview

Paleoindian Period (12,000–8000 BC)

The most widely accepted model for the peopling of North America argues that Asian populations migrated to the western hemisphere over the Bering land bridge that linked Siberia and Alaska, some 12,000 years ago. However, data are mounting in support of migrations that date to before then. Regardless of the precise timing of the first occupation of North America, it does not appear that North Carolina was inhabited by humans prior to about 12,000 years ago.

Phelps (1983:19) divided the Paleoindian period into Early (12,000–10,000 BC) and Late (10,000–8000 BC) sub-periods. Recent work

throughout the Southeast (Anderson 1995), however, has identified Early (10,550–8950 BC), Middle (8950–8550 BC), and Late (8550–8050 BC) sub-periods. For the Coastal Plain region, these dates are tentative at best as few, if any, radiocarbon dates have been associated with Paleoindian sites (Reid and Simpson 1998a:31). The lack of identified Paleoindian sites in this region is probably the result of rising sea levels, submerging many sites in riverine basins and offshore locales (Phelps 1983:21).

Evidence of Paleoindian occupation is based primarily on the recovery of various types of lanceolate-fluted and non-fluted projectile points. Within the Southeast, these types include Clovis, Cumberland, Dalton, Quad, and Suwannee. Perkinson (1971, 1973), in a state-wide survey of fluted Paleoindian projectile points, reported 16 fluted points for the entire Coastal Plain region. Through the course of various archaeological surveys, the number of Paleoindian sites has increased substantially, but remained less than fifty by 1983 (Phelps 1983:18).

Early and Middle Paleoindian projectile point variants in the North Carolina Coastal Plain include the Hardaway blade and Hardaway-Dalton. Late Paleoindian variants include Hardaway side-notched. Some archaeologists view the Hardaway complex as a manifestation of the Early Archaic period, suggesting that the Hardaway types are the result of synchronic tool modification as opposed to diachronic change. Most agree, however, that the other tools, such as side- and end-scrapers, found in association with Hardaway Complex points, are very similar to a Paleoindian tool assemblage (Ward and Davis 1999:42). As such, the Hardaway Complex could be a transitional Late Paleoindian/Early Archaic assemblage.

Settlement models derived from data recovered in the Piedmont suggest a Paleoindian settlement system focused on high-quality lithic material (Gardner 1977). This model, however, may not be applicable to the lithic-deprived Coastal Plain. Reid and Simpson (1998a:33) suggest that a settlement model proposed by Dent (1995) for the Chesapeake region, which includes the Coastal Plain of Virginia, Maryland, and Delaware, is more applicable to the Coastal Plain of North Carolina. The model proposes two sites types: regional residential bases and locations, reminiscent of Binford's (1980) foraging system. The residential bases serve as the "hub of subsistence activities," while the locations function as extractive sites (Binford 1980:9).

The earliest human activity on the Outer Coastal Plain was hunting and foraging by Paleoindians.

The Paleoindian site types are regional residential bases and extractive locations.

Little is known about Paleoindian subsistence in the Southeast. Most of the information regarding subsistence is based on evidence from sites in the western United States. This model essentially holds that Paleoindian groups were highly mobile, big-game hunters. The problem, much like settlement systems, is whether this model is applicable to sites in North Carolina, specifically the Coastal Plain. Flora and fauna remains recovered from a Paleoindian hearth at Shawnee Minisink in Pennsylvania include hawthorne plum, hackberry, wild grapes, and unidentified fish, demonstrating a broader subsistence pattern (Department of Anthropology, American University n.d.).

Archaic Period (8000–1000 BC)

Early Archaic (8000–6000 BC) sites, like Paleoindian sites, are typically identified through a series of diagnostic projectile points. As noted, some archaeologists view the Hardaway complex as a transitional Late Paleoindian/Early Archaic lithic assemblage, a viewpoint that is open to debate (Ward and Davis 1999). There are, however, a series of points, based on definitive stratigraphic context in the Piedmont, categorized as Early Archaic, including Palmer Corner Notched and Kirk Corner Notched types. Other tools include end-scrapers, side-scrapers, blades, and drills along with various bone and antler tools (Reid and Simpson 1998a:34). This general tool assemblage is also found at archaeological sites within the Coastal Plain (Phelps 1983:22).

Early Archaic projectile points include Palmer Corner Notched and Kirk Corner Notched.

Early Archaic sites are typically small with a settlement pattern indicating frequent relocation within both floodplain and upland ecosystems (Steponaitis 1986:371). Daniel (1998:194) suggests that movement was most likely predicated on the availability of knappable stone, as opposed to a drainage basin adaptation proposed by Anderson and Hanson (1988). Phelps (1983:24), however, suggests that Early Archaic site location in the lithic-poor Coastal Plain was based on stream accessibility.

Archaic settlement patterns indicate movement between floodplain and uplands.

Little is known about Early Archaic subsistence. Based on the recovery of bone and antler tools, however, white-tailed deer appear to have been an important species, both for tools and diet, for Early Archaic peoples. Additional terrestrial and aquatic fauna such as small mammals and fish, as well as available floral resources such as nuts and seeds, are suggested dietary staples based on the location of sites within different environmental niches.

The Middle Archaic (6000–3000 BC) is marked by the appearance of the Stanly Stemmed projectile point, along with Morrow Mountain Stemmed and Guilford Lanceolate points (Ward and Davis 1999:73).

The tool assemblage expands to include atlatl weights, grooved axes, and notched pebbles. Middle Archaic settlement and subsistence patterns were similar to the previous Early Archaic, as groups continued to utilize local resources as they occupied upland terraces and floodplains.

While earlier periods were marked primarily by morphological change of projectile points, the Late Archaic (3000–1000 BC) is marked by the advent of pottery. Some of the earliest vessels are carved from steatite. Fiber-tempered, clay ceramics were produced at roughly the same time, predating steatite vessels in some areas (Sassaman 1993:180). The earliest expression of fiber-tempered ceramics in the Coastal Plain is the Stallings series (Ward and Davis 1999:76). Exterior surface treatments included punctations, incising, and finger pinching. Stallings pottery is found throughout the southern Coastal Plain, but is rare north of the Neuse River, leading Phelps (1983:26) to subdivide the Coastal Plain into north and south sub-regions. The Thom's Creek series, which is similar to the Stallings series in terms of exterior surface treatments, is a sand-tempered ceramic also associated with the Late Archaic.

The Late Archaic is marked by the advent of pottery.

Late Archaic groups, however, did not abandon lithic technology. In the North Carolina Coastal Plain, the broad-bladed, broad-stemmed Savannah River type is the diagnostic projectile point of the period. Late Archaic groups also continued to use atlatl weights and grooved axes seen during the Middle Archaic.

During this period, settlements seem to shift from the upland terraces and riverine valleys to estuaries and the mouths of major rivers (Ward and Davis 1999:75). In South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, large coastal shell rings and shell sheet middens have been associated with the Late Archaic. These types of sites are rare along the North Carolina coast (Reid and Simpson 1998a:39). Late Archaic sites in this area are reminiscent of earlier site types including large, residential base camps and smaller resource extraction locations.

Late Archaic settlements shift from upland terraces and river valleys to estuaries and mouths of major rivers.

Woodland Period (1000 BC–AD 1650)

The Woodland Period is marked by cultural regionalization typically reflected in ceramic assemblages, leading to a division of the Coastal Plain into northern and southern sub-regions. The northern Coastal Plain extends from the Neuse River north to the Virginia state line, while the southern Coastal Plain extends from the Neuse River south to the South Carolina state line.

The Woodland Period is marked by cultural regionalization.

The Early Woodland (1000–300 BC) is typically marked by the common usage, and subsequent common archaeological occurrence, of pottery. Early minority pottery types in the Coastal Plain represent a southeastern tradition and include the fiber-tempered Stallings wares and sand-tempered Thom's Creek series. More common wares recovered throughout the Coastal Plain reflect more of a Middle Atlantic influence as evidenced by the frequent recovery of sand-tempered, cord-marked and fabric-impressed ceramic sherds.

Early Woodland in the northern Coast and Coastal Plain is marked by Deep Creek ceramics.

In the northern Coast and Coastal Plain, the Early Woodland period is known as the Deep Creek phase and is identified by the recovery of Deep Creek ceramics. The series was named for a small tributary of the Tar River where the complex was first recognized at the Parker site (31ED29) (Phelps 1983:29). The Deep Creek series contains medium to coarse sand tempering with, in order of frequency, cordmarked, net-impressed, fabric-impressed, simple-stamped and plain surfaces. In the southern Coastal Plain, the Early Woodland (1000–300 BC) period is known as the New River phase and is identified by the recovery of New River ceramics. Identified by Loftfield (1976), the New River series is medium to coarse sand tempered with, again in order of frequency, cord-marked, net-impressed, fabric-impressed, simple-stamped, and plain surfaces. Because of the similarities of the two ceramic types, Phelps (1983:31) subsumes the New River series within the Deep Creek series and suggests that the southern Coast and Coastal Plain may actually represent a component of a Southeastern and Middle Atlantic interaction area extending from the Neuse to the Savannah River as opposed to a separate cultural continuum.

In the southern Coastal Plain, the Early Woodland is identified by the recovery of New River ceramics.

The Hamp's Landing series, a limestone- or marl-tempered ceramic, has also been associated with Early Woodland contexts (Hargrove and Eastman 1997:92). Surfaces are typically plain, simple-stamped, fabric-impressed, or cordmarked. Associated lithic tools are somewhat limited and include the Gypsy point, thought to be a derivation of the Savannah River type, and the Roanoke triangular point (Phelps 1983:29).

Little is known about Early Woodland settlement patterns on the Coastal Plain; however, Phelps (1983:32) speculates that it was similar to that of the Late Archaic period. Reid and Simpson (1998a:41) suggest that the Woodland settlement pattern proposed by Gardner (1982) in the Virginia Coastal Plain may be applicable to the southern Coastal Plain of North Carolina. The settlement model included two site types: large base camps and smaller resource extraction camps.

Subsistence data for the Early Woodland is also lacking. Archaeologists infer, based on the limited recovery of fauna remains and the locations of sites, that Early Woodland groups continued a generalized hunting and gathering lifestyle with an increased utilization of shellfish and other marine and riverine resources (Reid and Simpson 1998a:42).

The Middle Woodland (300 BC–AD 800) period is known as the Cape Fear phase in the south and the Mount Pleasant phase in the north. Cape Fear and Mount Pleasant ceramics are tempered with medium sand and include “an occasional large particle of quartz sand” (South 1976:18) or “larger clastic inclusions” (Phelps 1983:32). Surfaces are cordmarked, fabric impressed, or net impressed. Hanover ceramics, also associated with Middle Woodland contexts throughout the Coastal Plain, are tempered with crushed sherds and/or lumps of fired clay (grog). Exterior surfaces were also cordmarked and fabric impressed. The Hanover series is identical to the Carteret series developed by Loftfield (1976:154). Information concerning the remainder of the Cape Fear phase artifact assemblage is limited. However, Roanoke points, biface blades, abraders, celts, and shell pendants and gorgets have been associated with the Mount Pleasant phase in the northern Coastal Plain (Phelps 1983:33).

The Middle Woodland period is characterized by Cape Fear and Hanover ceramics.

Settlement patterns during the Middle Woodland have been described as “dispersed,” marked by “a relatively high rate of residential mobility.” (Herbert 2002:302). Loftfield (1976) notes a shift from upland areas to bottomland sites, perhaps in response to increased plant cultivation and estuaries. The number of shell midden sites also increases during this period. The most visible sites, however, are low, sand burial mounds associated with Cape Fear groups. These circular, low burial mounds contain secondary burials and cremations (Ward and Davis 1999:206). The mounds are typically found on low, sand ridges some distance from habitation sites. Artifacts recovered from the McLean Mound in Cumberland County included stone smoking pipes, pottery sherds, antler points, shell and bone beads, celts, and paint pigments (Ward and Davis 1999:207).

There is a high rate of residential mobility during the Middle Woodland.

Subsistence data for the Middle Woodland southern Coastal Plain is limited. In the north, subsistence reflects a greater dependence on estuarine resources than in previous periods. Phelps (1983:33) suggests that small camps located in the estuaries were used as shellfish collecting stations with hunting and fishing relegated to minor activities. Subsistence patterns in the south may be similar.

Middle Woodland has a greater reliance on estuarine resources than earlier periods.

*Late Woodland/
Contact period is
referred to as the
White Oak/Oak
Island phase.*

The Late Woodland/Contact (800–1650 AD) period is divided into the Colington phase along the northern Tidewater, the White Oak/Oak Island phase along the southern Coast, and the Cashie phase within the interior northern Coastal Plain associated with historically documented Algonquian-speaking, Siouan-speaking, and Iroquois-speaking tribes, respectively. While Phelps (1983) has identified the southern Coastal groups as Siouan speakers, Loftfield (1990) suggests that, at least as far south as Onslow County, these were Algonquian speakers. Regardless of the language, these would be the people that met European explorers from the east. Information on the Late Woodland associations in the southern, interior Coastal Plain/Sandhills area continues to be problematic; however, the Cultural Resources division at Fort Bragg has made continued efforts to unravel the intricacies of prehistoric and protohistoric lifeways in this area.

Native American Colington phase sites along the northern coast are identified primarily by the recovery of shell-tempered ceramics. Surface treatments are fabric impressed, simple stamped, plain, and incised, in order of popularity. Additional artifacts include small triangular points, abraders, celts, bone pines and awls, fishhooks, shell hoes and picks, freshwater pearls, and shell beads (Ward and Davis 1999:211).

*Late Woodland
peoples lived in
longhouses.*

Although settlements have been identified both archaeologically and historically, settlement patterns remain problematic. Post molds associated with two Colington phase longhouses and a palisade were uncovered at the Amity Site (31HY43) east of Lake Mattamuskeet in Hyde County in 1985. The use of longhouses is supported in an historic context from accounts of European explorers and with the help of drawings by John White in 1585. White's drawings provide a very different view of village organization. The village of Pomeiock, located on the north side of the Pamlico Sound, is a palisaded, circular settlement with numerous longhouses in the interior, while Secoton, located on the south side of the Pamlico River, appears to be more of an elongated village with nucleated and dispersed sets of longhouses (Ward and Davis 1999:214-215).

*Evidence of
agricultural
subsistence patterns
is found in the
historic record.*

The use of charnel houses is also shown in White's drawings. Mass graves or ossuaries appear to have been a major part of the Algonquian burial complex; however, semi-flexed and bundle pit burials have been associated with Colington ceramics in Dare County, suggesting alternate burial practices (Ward and Davis 1999:216).

Again, evidence for subsistence is provided in the historic record. White's drawings of the village of Secoton show fields of corn in various

stages of maturity (Ward and Davis 1999:215). In addition, Colington phase site locations suggest the continued use of riverine, upland, and estuarine environments.

The Oak Island or White Oak phase is named for the associated ceramic types identified by South (1976) and Loftfield (1976), respectively. White Oak and Oak Island series have been used interchangeably. Both types are shell tempered with plain, cordmarked, fabric-impressed, net-impressed, and simple-stamped exterior surfaces. Information regarding lithic tools is sparse. However, Loftfield (1988) has identified what he believes to be an oyster knife. The "knife," which is used to open oysters, is a small, pebble tool with a series of flakes removed. Additional artifacts include nutting stones and stone and clay pipes.

Subsistence data from the Late Woodland is more plentiful than from other periods.

Late Woodland sites increase in number throughout the estuaries in the southern Coast. Like their neighbors to the north, White Oak groups lived in long houses. Two types of long house have been identified: a small, rectangular type measuring 24 x 12 feet and a larger type measuring over 50 x 18 feet. Some houses were even partitioned with interior walls (Loftfield and Jones 1995:130). Mass secondary ossuaries were also common during the White Oak phase. More than 150 individuals in bundled and mixed burial contexts were recovered from the Flynt site (31ON305) in Onslow County (Ward and Davis 1999:218).

Subsistence data from Late Woodland contexts are more plentiful than from previous periods. Recent work by Loftfield (1988) and Loftfield and Jones (1995) have shown a subsistence regime built around estuarine environments. White Oak groups were primarily subsisting on oysters and small fish throughout the year and clams on a seasonal basis. Although deer and other small mammals were recovered from these sites, quantities suggest that they played a small role in the overall subsistence strategy. Recovered flora included the remains of hickory nuts and acorns with minor quantities of corn, sunflower, and squash (Reid and Simpson 1998a:46).

The Cashie phase is associated with the Iroquois-speaking Tuscarora in the northern, inner Coastal Plain. Most of the information on the Cashie phase comes from excavations at the Jordan's Landing site (31BR7) in Bertie County. Cashie ceramics are tempered with small pebbles that typically extrude through the interior and exterior surfaces. Surface treatments are fabric-impressed, simple-stamped, incised, and plain. Additional artifacts include numerous bone tools such as awls and perforators, shell beads, and small Roanoke and Clarksville triangular points, just to name a few.

The Cashie phase is characterized by smaller ossuaries.

Cashie burial practices were different than those seen along the coast. Cashie ossuaries typically contain two to five individuals, as opposed to the large number of individuals found in Colington and White Oak ossuaries. Phelps (1983:43) suggests that the small number may reflect sociopolitical organization focused at the village level.

Based on the archaeological and historical record, Phelps (1983:43) defines the settlement pattern as small villages, farmsteads and specialized camp sites. However, as of 1983, no complete Cashie structures had been identified (Phelps 1983:47). Subsistence data include hickory nuts, various species of mammals, turtles, turkey, mussels, and domesticates such as maize and beans (Phelps 1983:46).

Historic Overview

Onslow County

Historians have speculated that the earliest European contact with the Native Americans living in what is now Onslow County – mainly Siouan groups such as the Pee Dee, Cape Fear, and Waccamaw groups – may have occurred during the 1524 exploratory voyage of Giovanni da Verrazzano (Loftfield and Littleton 1981:19). The plan to reconnoiter the Atlantic coast included a brief foray into the southern coast of North Carolina between Bogue and New River Inlets. After Verrazzano's French superiors failed to capitalize on the explorer's discoveries, the entire North Carolina coast lay open to colonization efforts by other countries. It has been speculated that the Walter Raleigh and John White expeditions of the 1580s may have included exploration of present-day Onslow County. Following the failure of the Raleigh settlements and the subsequent establishment of the first permanent English colony in Jamestown, in Virginia in 1607, European settlement began to trickle into North Carolina. By the end of the 17th century, settlements had appeared on the coast but Europeans did not begin to expand into the hinterlands until after the Tuscarora War (1711-1712) (Watson 1995:2-3).

Permanent European settlement of the area around MCB Camp Lejeune began in the late 17th century.

The land now encompassing Onslow County had been a part of several different counties prior to its formation in 1731. The county was formed out of Carteret and New Hanover Precincts, both of which were once part of the larger Bath County which was established in 1696 (Watson 1995:3-4). Onslow County was named in honor of a distinguished English politician, Sir Arthur Onslow, who had never actually visited the area or owned land there (Onslow County Historical Society 1983:1).

Early settlements were situated along waterways.

Initial settlement of Onslow County and the New River region began in the second decade of the 18th century and focused on sounds, rivers,

and other waterways that provided the most efficient means of transportation. Numerous land grants were issued, but nearly half were to individuals who did not live in the area. Because of this, and because of the navigational difficulties presented by the New River, growth was slow and the area remained largely unsettled throughout the century. In the 1730s, approximately 100 people lived in the New River region (Watson 1995:18). One of the earliest roads was constructed in 1723 and stretched from the Beaufort area to the White Oak River. Several years later, a ferry was in operation across the New River (Loftfield 1981c:37, 59-61). The first courthouse in the county was located on Jarrott's Point at Courthouse Bay (present-day MCB Camp Lejeune), although it later moved to several private residences (Watson 1995:9). In 1737, a new courthouse, along with a prison, stocks, and a whipping post, was constructed at what is now Paradise Point (also in present-day MCB Camp Lejeune). Seven years later, after the courthouse burned, a new one was built in Johnston that later was destroyed in a hurricane. The seat of government ultimately rested at Wantland's Ferry (now known as Jacksonville) (Watson 1995:10).

Onslow County's early economy was based on agriculture, forest products (mainly naval stores), fishing, and limited manufacturing (Loftfield 1981c:62-64). Agricultural pursuits were focused on corn, peas, and livestock. Abundant pine forests nourished the growth of the naval stores industry based on tar and pitch (**Figure 4**). Due to the county's geographic location near the Atlantic and the New River, fishing was an important occupation. Milling was the principal manufacturing industry in the region. Between 1764 and 1775, an average of two new mills appeared in the county every year (Watson 1995:13-14). These various economic activities attracted settlers to Onslow County in the decades before the American Revolution. By 1776, there were an estimated 1,400 people living in the county. A significant number were indentured servants and some were free blacks. Between one-third and one-half of the inhabitants during this period were slaves (LBA 2006:8; Watson 1995:18-19).



Figure 4. Tar kiln in Onslow County

Onslow County was a staunch supporter of the American Revolution. Residents were spurred into action by external events such as the Boston Tea Party, the Intolerable Acts, and military actions in neighboring provinces. Local issues—including gubernatorial authority, currency shortages, and the proper jurisdiction of colonial courts—also contributed to the growing anti-British sentiment in Onslow. During the war, numerous men from the county served in the state militia and the Continental Army. However, there remained a sizable number of loyalists who cooperated with the British during several raids in Onslow County (Loftfield 1981c:105; Watson 1995:28).

Population growth in Onslow County between the Revolutionary War and the Civil War was slow relative to North Carolina as a whole. During the early 19th century, a significant portion of the population was lost on account of out-migration to Georgia, Tennessee, and the Gulf Coast states where land was more plentiful (Watson 1995:30-31). Those who remained lived in emerging towns and villages including French's Mill, Foy's Store, Rich Lands, Stones Bay, and Swansborough (later Swansboro) (Watson 1995:32-34). After the Revolution, slavery became a much more integral part of Onslow County society with the number of slaves doubling between the late 18th century and the mid-19th century (Loftfield 1981c:113; Watson 1995:36-37).

The city of Jacksonville was established in 1842.

The community that became Jacksonville was firmly established in the pre-Civil War era. Wantland's Ferry changed its name in 1819 to Onslow Court House and in 1842 it was again changed to Jacksonville (Watson 1995:29). The town was named for Andrew Jackson who had recently served as President of the United States (Watson 1995:33). One of the first institutions of public education in Onslow, a female seminary, was constructed in Jacksonville in 1851. It admitted males several years later and became the Jacksonville Male and Female Seminary (Watson 1995:42).

Agriculture and naval stores were the primary industries of the 18th and 19th centuries.

The backbone of Onslow County's economy in the antebellum era remained, as in years before, agriculture and naval stores (Watson 1995:47). Farms varied in size from small family plots to large plantations. Some wealthy planters engaged in both farming and naval stores (Watson 1995:48-49). Landings along the New River facilitated the export of goods to the markets of the eastern United States coast and the West Indies (Watson 1995:47, 55). Tobacco, which would later become a primary crop in Onslow, was at this point grown only in small amounts. Cotton had become a valuable crop (Watson 1995:88). By 1840, the county ranked fourth in naval stores production among all counties in North Carolina. Aside from agriculture and naval stores, the

county's economy was somewhat diversified. Shipbuilding, fishing, and milling each had a visible presence in the decades before the Civil War (Watson 1995:49-51).

Citing decades of northern infractions against the Constitution, personal liberty laws, and the rights of the Southern people, North Carolina seceded from the United States in 1861 and joined the Confederate cause. Like many other counties in the region whose economy was closely linked to slavery, Onslow stood firmly behind the movement to secede (Loftfield 1981c:132-133). Over 70% of the county's voting population enlisted as soldiers during the conflict (LBA 2006:10). The county itself witnessed its share of Federal incursions. In November of 1862 the Union gunboat *USS Ellis* (formerly a Confederate gunboat before its capture) steamed up the New River to Jacksonville where it captured two small schooners and intercepted the mail from nearby Wilmington. Upon its escape, the boat ran aground where it was shelled until the Federal force retreated. The main focus of the Federals in the closing years of the war was the saltworks in the area. Onslow citizens suffered tremendously from hunger, poverty, and inflation during and after the war (Watson 1995:70-71).

In 1861, North Carolina seceded from the United States.

The aftermath of the Civil War left Onslow County in an economically and socially depressed condition that generally persisted into the twentieth century. The area's landed aristocracy had virtually ceased to exist, leaving people without the means for survival (LBA 2006:12). The number of people relying on government support increased in the years following the war. In the 1860s and 1870s, the county poorhouse was a major expense in the county budget. Although agriculture was still the mainstay of the county's economy, the value of Onslow County's farms had dropped by 75 percent. Soil depletion, and extensive cultivation in other states, had diminished cotton production. Experiments with different crops, including peanuts and rice, were attempted in the 1870s but both failed to become the new cash crop.

The Civil War left Onslow County in an economically and socially depressed condition.

Tobacco, however, was successful, and by the beginning of the 20th century it had improved, but not necessarily invigorated, the county's economy (Loftfield 1981c:158). After the arrival of the railroad in the late 1880s, northern capital (and some from the South) was attracted to Onslow County's timber resources. Interest in the industry became much stronger in the 20th century (Watson 1995:85-89). As prominent as the lumber industry became in the New River region, it was extractive and therefore did not bring economic prosperity to Onslow County (Loftfield 1981c:163).

Tobacco and timber became major cash crops of the 20th century.

During the closing decades of the 19th century, Jacksonville's population was growing as a result of the lumber industry and the town's location along the railroad. In 1883, legislation enlarged its corporate limits and in the following decade a commission-style government was installed. At the turn of the century, Jacksonville, the largest town in Onslow County, could count three corn mills, a cotton gin, nine boardinghouses, and a carriage maker's shop. In 1891, the Wilmington, Onslow, and East Carolina Railroad, which ran from Wilmington to Jacksonville, was completed and began hauling lumber (Watson 1995:94). The population had more than doubled from 170 residents in 1890 to 309 in 1900 (Watson 1995:98). As these population figures illustrate, Jacksonville was yet a small town.

Onslow County remained rural and isolated through the first half of the 20th century.

Aside from agriculture, several other industries that were present in Onslow County in the first half of the 20th century were dependent on its natural environment. Naval stores had a long history in the area, but by World War I the industry in the county, as well as the rest of North Carolina, was drawing to a close due to the depletion of turpentine resources. In its wake, the lumber industry grew to new proportions and became one of the most significant manufacturing industries in the county (Watson 1995:115). Swansboro grew as a result of the expansion of the lumber industry. New homes and commercial buildings appeared there in the 1920s. In the early 20th century, there were at least three large sawmills on the New River at Jacksonville (Onslow County Historical Society 1983:43). Fishing, long a traditional source of income for Onslow County residents, was an important component of the local economy throughout the 20th century (Watson 1995:115). Along the shores of the New River, resorts and hunting camps were established as the tourist industry began to lay roots in the county (Loftfield 1981c:166). Despite these developments, there was no question that agriculture was of paramount importance; the majority of residents were engaged in subsistence farming and manufacturing. On the eve of World War II, Onslow County was, as it had been through its history, rural and relatively isolated.

As it was becoming clear that the United States would be drawn into World War II, Onslow County attracted interest from the defense industry. The county's proximity to the coast and the availability of land were strong incentives. Holly Ridge, which was an insignificant crossroads settlement, became the location of the 3,200-acre Camp Davis in 1940. One thousand buildings were constructed in several months' time in order to facilitate the arrival of trainees. An anti-aircraft training facility, the camp was operated by the War Department during World War II. Soldiers at Camp Davis, noting Holly Ridge's amazing

growth, often referred to it as “Boom Town” (Watson 1995:106-107; Onslow County Historical Society 1983:23). Military training facilities were created at Topsail Island and Fort Fisher. Following the war, Camp Davis was turned over to the Marine Corps (Watson 1995:132-133).

MCB Camp Lejeune

The construction of MCB Camp Lejeune during World War II was perhaps the most significant event in the history of Onslow County since the Civil War. Despite the fact that hundreds of individuals were displaced in order for construction to proceed, the New River region quickly became the most populous area in the county following the base’s construction. Jacksonville emerged as the urban center of Onslow as the base created numerous new jobs and became a major employer in the central part of the county. The establishment of MCB Camp Lejeune brought economic prosperity and modernization to Onslow County. The largest Marine base in the United States, MCB Camp Lejeune also garnered prestige for the state of North Carolina as a whole (Watson 1995:133-134).

The establishment of MCB Camp Lejeune in 1941 brought economic prosperity and modernization to Onslow County.

MCB Camp Lejeune, originally known as Marine Barracks at New River, was established in 1941. With war raging in Europe and the United States growing more involved every day, the need for a new Marine training facility became apparent. The War Department had determined that existing bases at Quantico, Virginia and Parris Island, South Carolina were not large enough to accommodate the training of troops. In February of 1941, the War Department’s request for a new facility was approved by the House Naval Affairs Committee which then ordered the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with finding a location suitable for a base. Marine officers searched the coast from Norfolk, Virginia to Corpus Christi, Texas before deciding that the New River area was the most desirable (Watson 1995:133-134). The new base spanned 110,000 acres, or 170 square miles, and included 14 miles of oceanfront (Onslow County Historical Society 1983:51-52). It was intended to provide training facilities for all amphibious and ground activities of the 1st Marine Division, which with the 1st Marine Air Wing and four base defense battalions, comprised the Atlantic arm of the Fleet Marine Force (FMF).

The original base spanned 110,000 acres and 14 miles of oceanfront.

The construction of the base was a massive undertaking such as Onslow County had never seen. Three firms out of Charlotte were employed to fill contracts for over \$14 million, the largest defense contract ever awarded in the South at that time (Carraway 1946:17-18). Eight thousand individuals from around the region were employed in the effort that began in April of 1941 and continued throughout the war

Construction of the base began in 1941 and continued throughout World War II – at a cost of over \$14 million.

(Carraway 1946:18-23). Initial construction began on the north side of New River between Hadnot Point and French's Creek (Watson 1995:134). The Civilian Conservation Corps assisted with building roads and draining swamplands (Carraway 1946:18-23). As construction progressed and troops began to arrive, the base was renamed Camp Lejeune in honor of Lt. Gen. John A. Lejeune, a World War I veteran and former commandant of the Marine Corps (Onslow County Historical Society 1983:51-52).

Many residents of the area were forced to give up their land.

For MCB Camp Lejeune to become a reality, hundreds of individuals who were living within the area encompassed by the new base were forced to relinquish rights to their land and property. Many residents of the area, which was predominantly rural and agricultural, had lived there for generations and established productive farms. Some had established small businesses, such as the tourist cabins that appeared around Paradise Point in the 1930s. Churches and cemeteries dotted the landscape. The needs of the national military, however, required that all of these places be emptied. Approximately 720 families living within the New River region had to vacate (Watson 1995:135). Those residing in the northern part of the planned base were given an evacuation deadline of June 1, 1941 (Onslow County News and Views 1941b) while those in other areas that were not slated for immediate construction had until early fall of that year (Onslow County News and Views 1941c).

Several cemeteries were re-located to make room for the new base.

Throughout 1941, the U.S. Navy conducted appraisals of land and structures across the area planned for the base in order to compensate the owners (Onslow County News and Views 1941d). There was also the task of documenting and removing hundreds of graves, some of which were solitary burials and others full-fledged cemeteries, in order to make way for military training. Whites were subsequently re-interred in nearby Montfort Point and blacks in Verona (Onslow County Old Cemetery Society 1997).

"The order to evacuate came as a paralyzing shock," wrote historian and longtime resident of Onslow County Joseph Parsons Brown, leaving residents "stunned and hopeless and without money." For this land that had recently become some of the most desirable real estate in the country, the military offered an average of twelve dollars per acre (Brown 1960:188). While not all residents living within the region were opposed to the establishment of a base, many voiced objections to the price offered for their property and the time frame within which they had to leave. The September 1 evacuation deadline conflicted with the way of life of many inhabitants of the New River region. E.B. Smith, a

prominent citizen of Marines (a town in the boundaries of the planned base) expressed his opinions in the local newspaper. “You see, our farming isn’t over September 1,” Smith said. “Pigs aren’t fat and tobacco ain’t mature” (Onslow County News and Views 1941e). As a result of complaints, those who were farming in the area were permitted to harvest their crops before they vacated. Still, dissatisfaction concerning the amount of compensation persisted. To combat this resistance, the government chose to condemn the property of those who refused to leave it (Loftfield 1981c:168-169).

The thousands of acres that became MCB Camp Lejeune were turned over to the military mainly through condemnation procedures. The North Carolina Defense Relocation Corporation, which was created by the Farm Security Administration and the State Department of Agriculture, helped displaced individuals find new farms in Onslow and nearby counties. The organization also provided temporary housing for

both white and black residents of what was to become MCB Camp Lejeune (Onslow County News and Views 1941f).

Compensation was slow in arriving, especially for those whose principal investment was their land. While some, such as Lonnie Spicer (Figure 5), received compensation in the same year that they evacuated,

most waited two years before they received their checks (Brown 1960:187). Although it was a difficult transition for many residents of Onslow County, the transformation created much-needed jobs and economic development in the area.

The effect in Jacksonville of the base’s creation was felt immediately. Several days after construction began, the local newspaper described the scene: “Already Jacksonville is crowded. Hundreds more people are expected tomorrow and the day after” (Onslow County News and Views



Figure 5. Lonnie Spicer (center) owned 32.2. acres in the area for which he received \$1,487.06 from U.S. Navy officials in 1941.

Source: Murrell and Murrell 2001

MCB Camp Lejeune was the first facility to train African American Marines.

1941a). Census figures illustrate the incredible surge in population that the county experienced. In 1940, the census counted 17,939 in Onslow County. By the end of the decade, that number had more than doubled to 42,157 (Watson 1995:105).

Following the attack on Pearl Harbor and the United States' entry into World War II, the already remarkable pace of construction at MCB Camp Lejeune was increased (Watson 1995:134). By the end of the war, the base was the most modern of its kind in the nation. After President Franklin D. Roosevelt issued Executive Order 8802 barring discrimination in defense programs in 1941, the first African-American troops arrived to train at the segregated Montford Point area of MCB Camp Lejeune (Carraway 1946:51). Between 1942 and 1949, over 20,000 African Americans were trained at the base (**Figure 6**). Women were trained at the base in nearly all facets of the military (except combat) beginning in 1943 (Watson 1995:135). The camp hospital was completed in the same year. There was also a dog training school where hundreds of canines were prepared for war duty (Carraway 1946:35-36). Recreational facilities were expanded midway through the war and included nine movie theaters, a stadium, and a 36-hole golf course (Carraway 1946:23-27). At the end of the war, the base had stocked fish ponds, a bird sanctuary, and recreational beachfront (Carraway 1946:31-37).



Figure 6. Obstacle course training at Montford Point, the training center for African American Marines
Source: Smith 1943

MCB Camp Lejeune brought enormous residential growth to the Jacksonville area. Before the construction of the base, Jacksonville had a population of 873. In 1950, its population had risen to 3,960 and by 1960, it reached 13,491, nearly 70% of which were Marines (LBA 2006:67; Watson 1995:106).

Following the war, MCB Camp Lejeune continued as a training and support center for the Fleet Marine Force (FMF) and other units, and continued to grow. Many of the temporary structures were replaced by permanent buildings, and the years immediately after the war were characterized by the construction of new quarters, streets, and utilities (Darden 1985:70). This growth pattern continued through the late twentieth century, and culminated in 1992 with the acquisition of an additional 41,000 acres west of U.S. Route 17, an area known as the Greater Sandy Run Area (GSRA) (LBA 2006:81). By the early 1990s the base boasted a population of approximately 110,000 (including non-military personnel), an area of over 142,000 acres, and over 7,650 structures (LBA 2006:80).

In 1992 MCB Camp Lejeune annexed the Greater Sandy Run Area (GSRA) which serves as a training and support center for the FMF.

Page intentionally left blank

STATUS OF KNOWLEDGE

Previous Archaeological Surveys

There have been a series of regional studies that have benefited the work conducted in and around Onslow County and MCB Camp Lejeune. These studies have provided a baseline of information and remain the cornerstone of early North Carolina archaeology.

Numerous archaeological surveys have been conducted in the area.

Early Surveys in the Area

In 1953 and 1954, William Haag (1958) conducted an archaeological survey of the North Carolina coast from the Neuse River to the Virginia border. The survey, sponsored by the Office of Naval Research, resulted in the recording of numerous archaeological sites throughout the Pamlico, Albemarle, and Currituck sounds, and the creation of a seriated ceramic typology for the northern coast (Ward and Davis 1999:195). Although the chronology was applicable only to that area, it provided key comparative data for subsequent work in other regions, and helped to develop an overall cultural chronology for the Coastal Plain.

William Haag created a ceramic typology which helped develop an overall cultural chronology.

In 1960, Stanley South (1976) evaluated sites in New Hanover and Brunswick counties, southeast of MCB Camp Lejeune, in an effort to understand the relationship between historic aboriginal ceramics recovered from Brunswick Town and local prehistoric pottery from the southern Coastal Plain. South (1976:14) recognized five separate ceramic types, three based on temper. The three temper-based types include the Hanover series (clay or grog tempered), Cape Fear series (sand tempered), and Oak Island series (shell tempered). While the validity of the Oak Island series has been called into question (Mathis 1999), the Hanover and Cape Fear series are frequently recovered from Woodland period sites at MCB Camp Lejeune.

Stanley South defined characteristics to distinguish between prehistoric and historic aboriginal pottery.

In 1964, Joffre Coe published *The Formative Cultures of the Carolina Piedmont*. Although Coe's work focused on archaeological cultures west of the Fall Line, the Paleoindian and Archaic data proved valuable for the Coastal Plain, demonstrating similar chronologies and diagnostic tool assemblages in both regions. The Woodland cultures, however, which tend to be region-specific, are applicable only to the Piedmont (Phelps 1983:10).

Loftfield created a relative chronology based on the seriation of five ceramic types.

Thomas Loftfield, as part of his dissertation research in the 1970s, conducted an archaeological survey of southern coastal areas of North Carolina between the Pamlico Sound to the north and the Cape Fear River to the south. The survey extended as far inland as the upper reaches of the White Oak, Newport, North, and New Rivers (Loftfield 1976:103). Loftfield identified five ceramic series that included New River (coarse sand tempered), Carteret (clay or grog tempered), White Oak (shell tempered), Adam's Creek (fine sand tempered), and Onslow (gravel-sized, crushed quartz tempered). In an effort to create a relative chronology, Loftfield (1976:173-174) seriated the five ceramic series, noting a temporal trend in tempering and surface treatment.

Phelps synthesized earlier surveys to develop a model of culture history of Coastal Plain archaeology.

In 1983, David Phelps published an impressive work in an attempt to produce "an initial model of culture history for the region" (1983:2), which offered a comprehensive examination of North Carolina Coast and Coastal Plain archaeology. Synthesizing the works from archaeologists such as Coe (1964), South (1976), Loftfield (1976) and others, Phelps' model has maintained integrity with minimal modification over the past 20 years, and has become a primary source for understanding prehistoric cultural development throughout the Coastal Plain region.

Studies by Ward and Davis have been the most recent attempts to synthesize the large body of archaeological data.

The most recent attempt to synthesize the vast amount of archaeological information across the state has come from Ward and Davis (1999). Their book, *A Time Before History*, provides an overview of cultures from the Paleoindian period to European contact, and covers North Carolina from the mountains to the coast. For the Coastal Plain region, they incorporate much of the data from the aforementioned authors with an updated view provided by various academic and cultural resource management surveys conducted since Phelps' synthesis in 1983.

Surveys and Sites at MCBCL

Over the past 25 years, several large cultural resource management surveys conducted at MCB Camp Lejeune have added to the prehistoric and historic contexts of the base, as well as to the Coastal Plain region and to North Carolina in general. A list of survey reports conducted on base up to December 2008 is presented in **Appendix VII**.

Loftfield and Littleton identified 51 sites.

Loftfield and Littleton. In 1980, Thomas Loftfield, with the help of Tucker Littleton, conducted an archaeological and historical reconnaissance of MCB Camp Lejeune (Loftfield 1981a, b, c; Loftfield and Littleton 1981). An unsystematic survey, it consisted of surface and

subsurface examination of approximately 20-25% of the Base, including MCAS New River. It also included MCOLF Oak Grove. The purpose of the survey was to identify areas that would have the highest probability for containing archaeological sites (Loftfield 1981a:1). The archaeological component was composed primarily of surface examination of exposed and disturbed ground surfaces within specific environmental zones. A total of 51 sites were identified within the Mainside Base during this survey. The study also included an extensive review of the civilian history of the MCB Camp Lejeune area, greatly adding to the general history of Onslow County (Loftfield and Littleton 1981). An additional 23 sites were archive-identified through the historical component of the study.

Water and Air Research. In 1986, Water and Air Research (WAR) conducted a limited archaeological and architectural survey of approximately 59 acres of the Mainside Base in order to compile a Historic Preservation Plan (HPP) for MCB Camp Lejeune (Wayne and Dickinson 1986). The survey involved revisiting those sites identified previously by Thomas Loftfield (1981a, b, c) in order to expand and clarify the information available on the known sites, and to make assessments about site significance. Surface inspection was made to locate cultural materials or features, and to evaluate the condition of the site. During the course of this survey, twelve new sites were identified (**Appendix III**). The WAR HPP was updated in 1990 (Kimmel and Arnold 1990), and was the precursor to the MCB Camp Lejeune Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (ICRMP).

*WAR developed the first
Historic Preservation
Plan for MCB Camp
Lejeune.*

Brockington and Associates. Between 1988 and 1992, Brockington and Associates, Inc. conducted a series of Phase I and Phase II surveys within MCB Camp Lejeune (Espenshade 1988; Espenshade and Gunn 1990; Poplin et al. 1992). An intensive sample survey and data recovery (Poplin et al. 1992) of 1,835 acres of Mainside Base, west of the New River resulted in the identification of 76 previously unrecorded archaeological resources, both sites and isolated finds (**Appendix III**). Poplin et al. focused the survey on specific soil types with a high potential for archaeological resources, and used data from this and other surveys to develop and refine the soils-based probability model for cultural resources at MCB Camp Lejeune. This model identified the highest probability areas for archaeological resources and has directed the course of archaeological surveys at the Base.

*Brockington identified 76
sites in areas of high site
potential.*

R. Christopher Goodwin and Associates. Between 1993 and 1996, Goodwin and Associates conducted several surveys and Phase II studies of the Mainside area, primarily along the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad,

U.S. Highway 172, and Mockup Road. These surveys covered a total of approximately 1,210 acres and identified several archaeological sites.

LBA has surveyed approximately 26,000 acres of MCB Camp Lejeune and the Greater Sandy Run Area.

Louis Berger and Associates (LBA). LBA conducted a series of cultural resources studies of the base between 1985 and 2000 (Cultural Resource Group 1991a, b, 1992; Rosin 1992; Reid 1993; Reid et al. 1995; Reid and Simpson 1997, 1998a, b; Voigt and Simpson 2000), resulting in a total surveyed area of approximately 26,000 acres. These surveys documented both archaeological sites and historic structures. Two were conducted along the U.S. Highway 17 corridor, and led to the identification of 14 sites (Cultural Resource Group 1991b, 1992). Sites not tested by LBA were determined ineligible or not relocated during the LBA or subsequent TRC surveys.

In 1995, LBA surveyed the Greater Sandy Run Area (GSRA) (Reid et al. 1995), the only major survey to have been conducted in that part of the base to date. The survey strategy emphasized those soil types that were determined to have medium to high potential for archaeological resources; in total, approximately 21,650 acres were examined. Twenty-two archaeological sites were identified, 16 of which contained prehistoric elements, primarily dating to the Early and Middle Woodland periods. The historic sites dated to the late nineteenth or early twentieth centuries and included farmsteads and cemeteries. Distribution analysis indicated that all the prehistoric sites were located on well-drained microlandforms, often in areas immediately adjacent to the swamp margins (Reid and Simpson 1998a). Phase II testing on 15 of these sites resulted in a determination of ineligible for listing on the National Register for all of them (Reid and Simpson 1997). The testing revealed that these sites were small, multicomponent resource procurement locations. They were occupied as early as the Late Paleoindian and Middle Archaic periods, but utilized primarily during the Early and Middle Woodland periods (Lewis 2002:26).

The most recent surveys conducted by LBA were in 1998. Voigt and Simpson (2000) conducted a survey for the mechanized assault course, Range F-245, and the Riverine Center of Excellence (RCE). During the survey of RCE, LBA systematically surveyed site 31ON667 (originally identified by former MCBCL Archaeologist Robert Abbott in 1995), refining the site boundaries, and identifying previously recorded sites 31ON690 and 31ON715 in close proximity to 31ON667. Voigt and Simpson determined that sites 31ON667 and 31ON715 were not eligible for listing on the National Register. Site 31ON690 contained culturally significant deposits. The North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office (NCSHPO) concurred with LBA's recommendations.

Also in 1998, LBA (Reid and Simpson 1998a, b) produced an overview survey, based on current and historical maps, historic records, and soils data, of the approximately 83,285 acres of the Mainside portion of the base, not including water acreage. The purpose of the survey was to provide additional information for archaeological resource management at MCB Camp Lejeune by examining variables such as Danger Areas, Red Cockaded Woodpecker Habitat, Artifact Depth Potential, Disturbed Zones, and Complete Archaeological Surveys. A key component of this survey was the graphic representation of these variables on a base-wide scale.

LBA produced an overview survey and predictive model.

TRC Garrow Associates, Inc. The next major survey efforts were conducted by TRC Garrow Associates, Inc. between 1999 and 2008. The sum total area covered by these surveys was over 14,700 acres, concentrated mainly in the Mainside portion of the Base, adjacent to the New River and along the Atlantic coastline in areas of high probability for archaeological sites based on soil type. Most of these were conducted as part of the base-wide forestry program, the Silvicultural Prescription Plan. Reports from these surveys are forthcoming. The various surveys have resulted in the identification of 953 archaeological sites.

TRC Garrow identified 953 sites.

In addition, TRC Garrow has conducted Phase II testing and evaluations on previously identified sites. From 1999 through 2001, as part of a contract dedicated to revisiting sites identified by former MCB Camp Lejeune Archaeologist Robert Abbott, TRC Garrow surveyed the area around site 31ON667 and combined the three sites (31ON667, 31ON690 and 31ON715) under the original 31ON667 number, expanding the site from less than one acre to approximately 17 acres. No report has been produced for the survey and no official NRHP determination of eligibility was made for the site.

Southeastern Archaeological Research, Inc. Since 2005, Southeastern Archaeological Research, Inc. (SEARCH) has conducted several archaeological and architectural studies within the MCB Camp Lejeune property. In April and May of 2006, SEARCH conducted an archaeological identification survey of 172 acres at the Marine Special Operations Command (MARSOC) high probability area, located north of Everett Creek and west of New River. This study, which included pedestrian survey and subsurface testing, resulted in the expansion of one previously recorded site (31ON646), a small Early/Middle Woodland period site. In addition, four isolated finds (31ON1601, 31ON1602, 31ON1603, and 31ON1604) and six archaeological sites

SEARCH, Inc. has conducted several Phase I surveys and Phase II evaluations at MCB Camp Lejeune.

(31ON1596, 31ON1597, 31ON1598, 31ON1599/1599**, 31ON1600, and 31ON1611) were identified during the course of the survey. The isolated finds and three of the sites (31ON1596, 31ON1600, and 31ON1611) were considered ineligible for listing on the National Register due to limited assemblages and the lack of research potential. Sites 31ON1597, 31ON1598, and 31ON1599/1599** appeared intact with moderate artifact density. They were considered to have the potential to yield new and important information regarding prehistoric and historic activity in the area, and additional work has been recommended in order to assess their eligibility for listing in the National Register (Harrell 2007a).

Also in 2006, SEARCH conducted archaeological evaluations of four recorded sites (31ON1014, 31ON1261/1261**, 31ON1319/1319**, and 31ON1337/1337**) located in the southwestern part of Mainside Camp Lejeune, west of Stone Bay (Harrell 2007b). Site 31ON1014 is a relatively large multi-component Woodland period site located on an upland terrace in Training Area LC, and was determined ineligible for listing on the National Register. Site 31ON1261/1261** is a relatively large multi-component prehistoric and historic site located in the southeastern portion of Training Area LB. Locus A of this site exhibited continued research potential that may add new information to our knowledge of prehistoric culture in the Coastal Plain of North Carolina. Therefore, site 31ON1261/1261** was determined eligible for listing in the National Register. Site 31ON1319/1319** is located on the western side of Range Road in the northeastern portion of Training Area LD. An examination of four loci revealed a multicomponent site that has been severely disturbed by the construction of a retention pond and asphalt parking lot. It was therefore determined ineligible for listing in the National Register. Site 31ON1337/1337** is a multi-component prehistoric and historic site located in the southwestern portion of Training Area LD on the east side of SR 210. Based on site disturbance and limited diagnostic artifact assemblage, this site was determined ineligible for listing in the National Register.

The same year, a survey of 40 acres at proposed PPV housing locations resulted in the relocation of previously identified (Poplin et al. 1992) site 31ON482. In addition, this survey identified sites 31ON1593 and 31ON1594 as well as several Isolated Finds (Harrell 2006).

Finally, in December of 2006, a survey of 63 acres was conducted in the southeastern portion of Training Area KD, north of Rhodes Point Road on the western side of New River. Systematic subsurface testing and pedestrian survey of the project area resulted in the recovery of several

prehistoric ceramic sherds associated with previously recorded archaeological site 31ON317 (Loftfield 1981c), one subsurface isolated find (31ON1612), and four archaeological sites (31ON1613, 31ON1614, 31ON1615, and 31ON1616**) (Harrell 2007c). Site 31ON317 is a multicomponent site containing Middle Woodland and eighteenth/nineteenth century elements; earlier surveys noted severe disturbance and determined it ineligible for listing on the National Register (Loftfield 1981c; Wayne and Dickinson 1986). SEARCH concurred with these findings and recommended no further research. Of the new archaeological resources identified during the current survey, three of the four sites (31ON1613, 31ON1614, and 31ON1615), along with isolated find 31ON1612, contained Early/Middle Woodland components, while the fourth site (31ON1616**) was associated with the only historic artifacts recovered within the project area. Due to the limited artifact assemblages and the lack of research potential, the isolated find and four archaeological sites were determined ineligible for listing in the National Register.

In May of 2007, SEARCH conducted a Phase I survey of approximately 11 acres within the Midway Park PPV Area. The survey was conducted in anticipation of new construction associated with the Midway Park Housing Public/Private Venture (PPV), which involved the demolition of the existing 532 housing units and the construction of 537 new housing units, potentially affecting the remaining unsurveyed high probability soils in the Midway Park Housing Area. No artifacts were recovered from this survey (Harrell 2007d).

In October 2007, SEARCH conducted a Phase I survey and Phase II archaeological evaluation of site 31ON667 (Harrell 2007e). Originally identified by former MCBCL Archaeologist Robert Abbott, the site had been systematically surveyed in 1998 by Louis Berger & Associates (LBA) and again in 2001 by TRC Garrow and Associates. No official determination of eligibility was conducted at that point. Based on the 2007 examination, SEARCH concluded that the disturbance at the site rendered it ineligible for listing in the National Register.

In 2008, SEARCH conducted Phase II evaluations on six unassessed prehistoric sites (31ON631, 31ON1057, 31ON1059, 31ON1061, 31ON1077, 31ON1132) at MCB Camp Lejeune and one site (31ON1367) at MCAS New River. All of these sites have been determined ineligible for listing on the National Register due to poor contextual integrity, low artifact frequency, and lack of artifact class diversity (Harrell 2008a).

SEARCH recently completed archaeological evaluation of five sites (31ON434, 31ON632, 31ON971, 31ON979, and 31ON1408) for Phases IV and V of the family housing PPV at MCB Camp Lejeune (Harrell 2008b). Sites 31ON434 and 31ON971 were determined not eligible for listing on the NRHP. The results of the remaining three sites are contained in an addendum report which is in progress. Sites 31ON632 and 31ON1408 were found to be ineligible for listing on the NRHP while 31ON979 was recommended eligible for the NRHP.

The results of recent Phase II evaluations are pending.

Currently, SEARCH is conducting Phase II archaeological surveys of 38 previously identified sites throughout the base (**Appendix III**). Determinations of eligibility on 19 sites are pending SHPO concurrence.

Results of Archaeological Evaluations

Based on several of the earlier surveys as well as soils data, a model delineating areas of high probability for archaeological resources has been developed over the past decade (**Figure 7**). This model has in turn directed the course of archaeological research at MCB Camp Lejeune.

GSRA is considered a "free zone."

As of August 2005, archaeological inventory of the GSRA has been completed and the NC Department of Cultural Resources (NCDCCR) has concurred with the findings in a letter dated August 9, 2005 (ER 99-8077) (**Appendix VIII**). Surveys of the GSRA have determined that this area does not have the potential to contain undisturbed significant archaeological deposits. A total of 31 sites were located (20 prehistoric, 8 historic, and 3 with both components) and of these, 15 were recommended for Phase II assessment. Subsequent Phase II assessment determined they were all ineligible for listing on the National Register.

At Mainside, as of August 2008, all high probability areas have been subject to archaeological site identification survey with many moderate and low potential areas inventoried as well (**Figure 8**). The studies conducted to date at Mainside constitute sufficient and complete identification survey of Mainside.

Surveys have resulted in the identification of 1,244 sites: 1,213 on Mainside, and 31 on GSRA.

At Mainside, 1,213 archaeological sites were recorded. Of these, 19 have been determined eligible for listing on the National Register (**Figure 9** and **Appendix III**). An additional 140 sites are awaiting NRHP eligibility determinations; 19 of which have already undergone Phase II evaluations and the eligibility determinations are pending NCSHPO concurrence. Further investigation is recommended for the remaining 121 unassessed sites (**Appendix IX**).




Figure 7. Probability Model for Archaeological Resources at MCB Camp Lejeune
Source: MCB Camp Lejeune




Figure 8. Surveyed Areas of MCB Camp Lejeune.

**This page removed to protect
sensitive information**

Many of these unassessed sites were identified during early, non-systematic surveys; MCB Camp Lejeune is currently in the process of relocating and evaluating these.

The majority of the archaeological identification surveys have been undertaken for the purpose of Section 106 compliance, in anticipation of new activities, or as part of the base-wide Silvicultural Prescription Plan, which fulfils both Sections 106 and 110 requirements. Sites tend to be concentrated along the New River and its tributaries, along the Atlantic coastline, and in the northwestern corner of the Mainside area, although the latter may result from intensive survey in that area rather than an actual localization of archaeological activity. In general, however, given the general patterns of site distributions in the area, this concentration of sites along permanent water sources is expected.

The remaining 1,085 known sites at MCB Camp Lejeune (31 at GSRA and 1,054 at Mainside) have been determined ineligible for listing on the National Register, and no further work is required.

Previous Architectural Surveys

Early Surveys

As part of Loftfield's 1980-81 survey of cultural resources on the base, local historian Tucker Littleton compiled a civilian history of the MCB Camp Lejeune area and identified potential historic sites within the base (Loftfield and Littleton 1981). Wayne and Dickinson (1986) used this baseline survey to evaluate potential historic structures for the MCB Camp Lejeune Historic Preservation Plan (HPP). At that point, the only structure on the base identified as over 50 years old was a barn that did not meet the criteria of significance. Wayne and Dickinson did not find any structures that had "exceptional historic merit" (NPS 1984:C-9). Individual structures on the base were determined to be "neither unique nor particularly distinctive examples of their styles" (Wayne and Dickinson 1986:5-19); however, the base as a whole was considered to constitute an area of potential significance to modern military and national history. The HPP included a call for a determination of significance after 1991, at which point the base would be over 50 years old.

Surveys of World War II Properties

MCB Camp Lejeune has one historic context, that of World War II (from 1941 to 1946) resources. No other contexts have been identified and none is expected to be identified, because MCB Camp Lejeune's mission

World War II is considered the period of significance at MCB Camp Lejeune.

of Marine training and mobilization has not changed since World War II, and it did not have a significant role during the Cold War era (1946 to 1991). Thus the surveys of the built environment at MCB Camp Lejeune to date have focused exclusively on World War II-era structures.

Panamerican Consultants, Inc. The most comprehensive architectural survey of the base to date was conducted in 1996 by Panamerican Consultants, Inc. (Reed-Hoffman and Archibald 1996). This study comprised a survey of 2,617 properties on Mainside Camp Lejeune and MCAS New River dating to World War II (1941-1946). A total of 1,641 structures were found to exemplify what could be considered “the best of a community’s effort” during the mobilization of the U.S. military forces during WWII (Reed-Hoffman and Archibald 1996: iii). One pre-war structure was identified; it and 32 military buildings were recommended for additional assessment for eligibility for listing on the National Register. These recommendations were based on integrity of design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, as well as architectural significance. The other buildings were found ineligible for National Register listing based on lack of integrity, design, materials, feeling, architectural distinction or important historical associations.

Panamerican surveyed all World War II-era structures on base.

Louis Berger and Associates (LBA) In 1997, LBA were the first surveyors to delineate a historic district at MCB Camp Lejeune. In *Historical Documentation: Camp Geiger Historic District* (1997), 196 structures at the former Tent City built between 1941 and 1943 were evaluated. Fifty-nine of these were considered contributing resources to the district, and one (TC601, the Chapel), was determined individually eligible. A 1997 MOA allows undertakings at Camp Geiger, including alteration and demolition of all buildings except TC601, without further consultation (**Appendix X**).

LBA evaluated Camp Geiger Historic District in 1997.

In 1998, LBA produced a Multiple Property Documentation form (MPDF) of World War II Construction of MCB Camp Lejeune (Cunning and Bowers 1998). Intended to elaborate upon the Panamerican survey (Reed-Hoffman and Archibald 1996), this report presented the historic context of design, construction, and use of MCB Camp Lejeune as a Marine Corps training base during World War II, with detailed historical descriptions and assessments of significance of many of the structures on the base. This study has formed the basis for nominations of several of these buildings to the National Register.

LBA developed the MPDF of World War II construction on MCB Camp Lejeune.

One of the most important contributions of the MPDF report for future management decisions on the base is its creation of a typology for historical resources at MCB Camp Lejeune. The report outlines six

The MPDF includes a typology of historical resources on the base.

property types: training units, training facilities, service/support facilities, military family housing, unaccompanied personnel housing, or medical facilities. Included are general comments about the current conditions of each resource type, and the requirements that resources corresponding to these property types would have to meet to be considered eligible for the National Register.

The MPDF report was supplemented by a list of structures at MCB Camp Lejeune that, based on preliminary investigations, were most likely to meet the National Register's Criteria for Evaluation (36 CFR 60.4) (Lewis 2002). These resources were recommended for more detailed examination in order to determine their significance. This list has been reviewed and approved by MCB Camp Lejeune and the North Carolina State Historic Preservation Officer (NCSHPO).

LBA evaluated seven historic districts in 2000.

In 2000, LBA produced *Historical Architectural Evaluations (HAE), Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, Onslow County, North Carolina* (Bowers and Dixon 2000). This report identified seven potential districts: the Assault Amphibian Base, Montford Point Camp No.1, Montford Point Camps Nos. 2 and 2A, Parachute Training, Regimental Area No. 3, Stone Bay Rifle Range, and Command Services. Within the seven districts, 151 structures were considered contributing resources. In addition, the report assessed several individual buildings as eligible for listing on the National Register. In 2004, the NCSHPO concurred with the determinations of three of the districts (the Assault Amphibian Range, the Stone Bay Rifle Range, and the Parachute Training). In addition, NCSHPO concurred with the eligibility determinations of eight individual structures: Building 1 (Post Headquarters), Building 2 (Administration), Building H1 (Naval Hospital), Building 15 (Infirmary), Building 16 (Protestant Chapel), Building 17 (Catholic Chapel), Building 19 (Base Theater), and Building 235 (Bus Station).

In 2004, SHPO concurred with determinations of eligibility for the Assault Amphibian Range, the Stone Bay Rifle Range, and the Parachute Training Historic Districts.

In 2007, LBA conducted an evaluation of the Naval Hospital Historic District in order to determine eligibility for listing on the National Register (Dixon 2007). In 2008, LBA produced a revised *Historical Architectural Evaluations (HAE), Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, Onslow County, North Carolina*. LBA also developed guidelines for the management of the historic built environments of MCB Camp Lejeune, and these are included in this ICRMP as **Appendix XI**.

In 2008, SHPO concurred with determinations of eligibility for the several historic districts.

In 2008, the NCSHPO office concurred with this determination of eligibility of the Naval Hospital Historic District, along with the determinations of eligibility for the four remaining districts evaluated by LBA in 2000 (see above). Two of those districts, the Command Services

Historic District and the Regimental Area No. 3 Historic District were combined into one contiguous district. In addition, NCSHPO concurred with the determination of eligibility of the Camp Geiger Historic District.

Southeastern Archaeological Research, Inc. (SEARCH) In 2008, SEARCH prepared a Consultation Package to determine the effects of proposed demolition of nine of the structures within Stone Bay Rifle Range Historic District (RR29-RR37). SEARCH prepared the environmental assessment for this project and conducted the mitigative HABS recordation of the structures (Mohlman 2008a, b, c).

SEARCH conducted HABS recordation for the Stone Bay Rifle Range in 2008.

Results of Evaluations

As of August 2008, all structures at MCB Camp Lejeune dating to the World War II period (1941-1946) have been surveyed. Of the approximately 2,600 structures associated with this context, 188 of them are considered eligible for listing on the National Register, either individually or as contributing resources to an historic district. Eight historic districts have been identified (**Figure 10**). These are discussed individually below, and summarized in **Table 4** and **Appendix XII**.

MCB Camp Lejeune contains 188 NR-eligible historic buildings and structures within eight historic districts.

Table 4. Summary Data of Historic Districts at MCB Camp Lejeune

Historic Districts	Contributing Structures	Individually Eligible Structures	Other Contributing Resources
Assault Amphibian Base	2	0	0
Camp Geiger	1	1	3
Command Services/Regimental Area No 3	45	7	24
Montford Point Camp 1	53	0	1
Montford Point Camp 2 and 2A	39	0	0
Naval Hospital	7	1	2
Parachute Training	3	0	3
Stone Bay Rifle Range	37	0	5
Totals:	187	9*	38
Individually Eligible Structures		Associated Historic District	
H1: Naval Hospital		Naval Hospital	
1: Base Headquarters		Command Services/Regimental Area No 3	
2: FSSG HDQTRS		Command Services/Regimental Area No 3	
15: Infirmary		Command Services/Regimental Area No 3	
16: Protestant Chapel		Command Services/Regimental Area No 3	
17: Catholic Chapel		Command Services/Regimental Area No 3	
19: Base Theater		Command Services/Regimental Area No 3	
235: Bus Station		Command Services/Regimental Area No 3	
TC601		Camp Geiger	
USO Building		None	

*Nine individually eligible structures contribute to historic districts. The USO Building is individually eligible but does not contribute to a district.




Figure 10. Historic Districts at MCB Camp Lejeune.*
* See Appendix XII for more detailed historic layouts.

Assault Amphibian Base Historic District

The Assault Amphibian Base at MCB Camp Lejeune was built in 1942, and provided enlisted personnel with training in amphibious landings. Between the First and Second World War, amphibious landing capabilities emerged as a primary mission for the Marine Corps, as they provided the tactical basis for the primary wartime missions of seizing, occupying, and defending advance bases for naval operations. The district was thus determined eligible for listing on the National Register under Criterion A – its direct association with the primary mission of MCB Camp Lejeune during World War II. The district contains two contributing resources: Buildings A-1 (Carpenter Shop) and A-2 (Machine Shop).

*Assault Amphibian Base
Historic District*

Camp Geiger Historic District

This district represents one of the earliest areas to be developed at MCB Camp Lejeune; the first priority in the construction of the base was to build an emergency landing field and a tent camp to house 10,000 soldiers. It was originally known as the Tent Camp Area, or Tent City. Construction began in April, 1941, and the camp consisted of tents on wooden platforms with associated wood frame washroom buildings, mess halls, storehouses and other support facilities. An extension of the Tent Camp, called Tent Camp No. 2, was built in 1942. Due to the rationing of wood and canvas, this area was characterized by portable Homosote huts. By 1944, both the tents and the Homosote huts were replaced by metal Quonset huts, which in turn were replaced by concrete structures in 1951. In 1952 Tent City was renamed Camp Geiger.

*Camp Geiger Historic
District*

Since 1970, many of the excess buildings at Camp Geiger have been demolished. In 1997 the USMC developed an MOA (see **Appendix X**) that allowed unlimited alteration or demolition of all the structures at Camp Geiger, with the exception of the Chapel (Building TC 601). Today the Historic District includes the Chapel, the landscaped area around the chapel, the portions of 6th Street, 7th Street, A Street, and Church Street that surround the chapel and landscape areas, and Monument Circle. It remains eligible for listing on the National Register under Criterion A.

Command Services/Regimental Area Number 3 Historic District

Command Services describes the activities and functions necessary for the administration, operation, maintenance, and supply of MCB Camp Lejeune. Hadnot Point became the administrative locus of the base in 1942, when the Post Command moved into the Base Headquarters

*Command Services/
Regimental Area 3
Historic District*

(Building 1). The area was built to an architectural scale that reinforced its position within the military hierarchy.

Immediately adjacent to Command Services, Regimental Area Number 3 was built between 1942 and 1945 to house and train personnel during World War II. It is composed of three battalions, each containing four barracks, a mess hall, administration building, warehouses, and classrooms.

These two districts have been combined to form a single contiguous historic district, due to their geographic proximity. This district contains 109 resources, 69 of which are contributing buildings (n=45), structures (n=6), sites (n=12), and objects (n=6). It is considered significant both under Criterion A, for its association with MCB Camp Lejeune's primary mission – the training of personnel – and Criterion C, as a distinctive built environment reflecting and reinforcing military organization and hierarchy. In addition, seven structures within the district are considered individually eligible for listing on the National Register (Bldgs 1, 2, 15, 16, 17, 19, and 235).

Montford Point Camps Number 1, 2 and 2A Historic Districts

Montford Point Camps Historic Districts

These two districts, which historically served as the training camp for African American Marines, contain 53 and 39 contributing resources, respectively. Montford Point Camp Number 1 was built in 1942, and originally consisted of 150 Homosote huts, with wooden washroom buildings, mess hall, administration building, and infirmary. Montford Point Camps Number 2 and 2A were constructed in 1943 to accommodate a growing number of African American Marines.

The structures within this area were built in what came to be known as the "Montford Point Style," which was dictated largely by the materials and skills which were available for the project. These two districts were determined eligible for listing under Criterion A, for their association with MCB Camp Lejeune's primary mission – the training of personnel – and Criterion C, as distinct built environments (Lewis 2002). Montford Point Camp No. 1 contains 67 resources, 53 of which are contributing structures to the district. Montford Point Camps No. 2 and 2A contain 43 resources, 39 of which are contributing resources; these are all structures.

Naval Hospital Historic District

Naval Hospital Historic District

This district contains seven structures, all contributing: the hospital and associated "Surgeon's Row," which is comprised of three residential structures, two garages and a utility building. All the buildings were

constructed between 1942 and 1945. The district also includes the landscape areas around the structures, and the U-shaped drive that leads from Seth Williams (River) Road to the hospital's formal entrance. Evaluation of the district was based on criteria under the (Cunning and Bowers 1998) property type "medical facilities." It was determined eligible under Criterion A because it directly participated in the programs of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, and also under Criterion C because it reflects "noteworthy standard design characteristics developed by the Bureau of Yards and Docks for naval hospitals, and incorporates Neocolonial architectural themes utilizing materials and ornament to define and reinforce MCB Camp Lejeune's principal buildings as distinguished structures" (Dixon 2007:8.2). In addition, the hospital has retained integrity of location, design, materials, and workmanship, minor replacements and repairs aside. As such, the hospital (H1) is also individually eligible for listing on the National Register. The replacement of 900 windows in Building H1 resulted in the development of an MOA for that activity (**Appendix XIII**).

Parachute Training Historic District

Parachute training facilities were established at MCB Camp Lejeune in 1942, as part of the Marines' planned use of paratroop landings in support of amphibious assaults (Lewis 2002). The facilities included three steel training towers with associated equipment buildings (PT-4, PT-5, and PT-6), a parachute storage and packing building (PT-1), a training building (PT-2), jumping platforms, and a small heating plant (PT-3). The three training towers are contributing resources to the historic district, which is eligible for listing under Criterion A, based on its critical training role in the survival of paratroop Marines. The landscape areas around the training towers are also contributing resources to the district.

*Parachute Training
Historic District*

Stone Bay Rifle Range Historic District

This area consists of 75 resources, 37 of which were considered contributing buildings. Five sites are also considered contributing resources to the district. It was evaluated under the MPDF (Cunning and Bowers 1998) types "training unit" and "training facility." The Rifle Range Historic District was determined eligible for listing under Criterion A – it was directly and importantly associated with MCB Camp Lejeune's wartime mission – and under Criterion C based on its highly specialized physical characteristics (Bowers 1999). A Programmatic Agreement is in place (see **Appendix V**) directing all future MARSOC operations at the rifle range. In 2008, SEARCH prepared a Consultation Package to determine the effects of proposed demolition of nine of the structures within Stone Bay Rifle Range Historic District (RR29-RR37).

*Stone Bay Rifle Range
Historic District*

SEARCH prepared the environmental assessment for this project and conducted the mitigative HABS recordation of the structures (Mohlman 2008a, b, c).

USO Building

USO Building

The USO building, built in 1941 and located at the corner of Tallman Street and Riverview Street in downtown Jacksonville, is the only NR-eligible structure under the jurisdiction of MCB Camp Lejeune that is not part of a historic district. It was determined eligible under Criteria A, for its association with an event that made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. While its main period of significance is the WWII era, the facility has continued to function as a USO since the early 1940s, and continues to operate today (Anderson 2004).

All historic buildings or structures dating pre-1947 that are not listed in **Appendix IV** have been evaluated and determined not eligible for listing in the National Register. No further consultation is required for those non-eligible properties. No building or structure survey work for those buildings constructed post-1946 has been completed, because the World War II era (1941-1946) is the only significant historic context at MCB Camp Lejeune.

CULTURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Under Marine Corps Order 5090.2A (Change 2), SECNAVINST 4000.35A (2001), and DoDI 4715.16, all Marine Corps installations are required to prepare, maintain, and implement Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plans for all installation lands and water that contain cultural resources. Cultural Resources personnel must meet the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Archaeology and Historic Preservation* (48 Federal Register 44738-9) in appropriate disciplines. At MCB Camp Lejeune, Mr. Rick Richardson acts as Cultural Resources Manager and GIS Manager, and is responsible for overall Program Management, Archaeology, Architectural History, and Curation/Conservation.

Program Management

Program Management refers to the oversight of all cultural resources operations and activities, and for upholding the mission of the Cultural Resources Management Program (CRMP). Under this purview, the Cultural Resources Manager supervises staff, provides guidance on the execution of projects, and oversees the final dissemination of results. The Cultural Resources Manager develops contractual requirements for cultural resources management work, and coordinates with various contracting offices in order to execute work. The Cultural Resources Manager acts as the primary liaison to other parties for formal and informal consultation, including the North Carolina SHPO and ACHP. The Cultural Resources Manager drafts compliance and consultation correspondence, including letters and agreements, and facilitates appropriate review activities. The Cultural Resources Manager is involved in public outreach, including the promotion of preservation and awareness through education and activities.

*Program Management
refers to the oversight of
all cultural resources
operations.*

The Archaeology Program is responsible for management of all prehistoric and historic archaeological sites at MCB Camp Lejeune.

Archaeology

Under this purview, the Cultural Resources Manager is responsible for ensuring the base is compliant with all Federal Laws pertaining to archaeological sites, particularly the NHPA of 1966, as amended. Thus the Cultural Resources Manager is responsible for the management of all prehistoric and historic archaeological sites on the base. The Cultural Resources Manager oversees all survey and testing activities, and makes determinations about eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. This includes defining site boundaries and assessing effects. In addition, the Cultural Resources Manager is responsible for ensuring that all sites considered eligible or that are unassessed for listing on the National Register are adequately monitored, and effects are mitigated, under Section 106. This may require coordination with other divisions and land users, and may necessitate development of an MOA. In addition, in order to meet Section 110 requirements, this position is responsible for keeping an inventory of archaeological resources on the base. The Cultural Resources Manager may also be responsible for various duties, including research, report production, archaeological survey, monitoring, coordination and consultation with other interested parties, and public outreach.

Architectural History

The Architectural History Program is responsible for the management of all historic structures and landscapes at MCB Camp Lejeune.

The Cultural Resources Manager is responsible for ensuring the base is compliant with all Federal Laws pertaining to historic structures and landscapes, particularly the NHPA of 1966, as amended. This entails review and oversight of all construction activities that occur on the base, and coordination with internal divisions such as the Planning department, and outside agencies such as the NCSHPO. The Cultural Resources Manager ensures that future construction is sensitive to existing historic structures and/or in keeping with the cultural integrity of historic districts or landscapes. This position is also responsible for ensuring that the base's historic buildings are properly maintained. This may include the development and implementation of Programmatic Agreements and Memoranda of Agreement when considering impacts to historic structures or landscapes. The Cultural Resources Manager is responsible for ensuring the base is compliant with Section 106 and 110 regulations, which includes developing and maintaining an inventory of historic buildings, districts, and landscapes; identifying and evaluating buildings, districts, and landscapes for eligibility for listing on the National Register; preparing evaluation reports; and consulting with the NCSHPO regarding those determinations.

Curation/Conservation

The Cultural Resources Manager is responsible for the management and maintenance of all historic properties, artifacts, and records pertaining to MCB Camp Lejeune. This position ensures the base is compliant with all Federal Laws pertaining to the curation of archaeological materials, particularly 36 CFR 79, *Curation of Federally-Owned and Administered Archaeological Collections*. This entails development and implementation of a long-term management and preservation plan, securing access to a Federally-approved storage and curation facility, and development of an inventory detailing the locations and status of the collection. The Cultural Resources Manager is also responsible for ensuring the collections are available for scientific, educational, and religious uses, subject to such terms and conditions as are necessary to protect and preserve the condition, research potential, religious or sacred importance, and uniqueness of the collection. The Cultural Resources Manager may thus be responsible for all outgoing or incoming loan agreements, and for providing access to collections for researchers.

Curation/Conservation refers to the management of all historic properties, artifacts, and records at MCB Camp Lejeune.

GIS Database Manager

The GIS Manager maintains and updates the base's cultural resources GIS database. This entails maintaining the inventories of archaeological sites and historic structures, districts and landscapes within the base; and developing and maintaining graphic models of survey and activity areas, and existing historic properties. The GIS Manager is responsible for ensuring the data is spatially accurate and includes the necessary information, such as site number, eligibility status, and need for further work. This position may also involve supplementary tasks, such as assisting the Program Manager and Archaeologist in the development of a predictive site model.

The GIS Manager is responsible for the management the base's cultural resources GIS database.

Integration

Under DoD Instructions 4715.16 (September 2008) and 4715.9 and MCO 5090.2A (Change 2), Marine Corps installations must integrate the historic and archaeological resource protection requirements of applicable laws with their planning and management efforts. At MCB Camp Lejeune, the Head, Environmental Conservation Branch, is responsible for ensuring that current and planned installation programs, plans, and projects (e.g. training and test-range management plans, master plans, integrated pest management plans, endangered species recovery plans, golf course management plans, grounds maintenance

Installation plans, projects and programs must be integrated and compatible with cultural resources programs.

plans, facilities construction site approvals, and other land use activities) are integrated and compatible with natural and cultural resources programs, plans, and projects. The Cultural Resources Manager assesses the impact of installation programs on the cultural environment of the facility.

DoD Instruction 4715.3 outlines the Environmental Conservation Program for military installations. This instruction addresses the management of both cultural and natural resources under one review process (NEPA), and calls for the integration of the conservation program with mission activities, including environmental programs. This policy further requires the incorporation of conservation values into DoD education, training, construction programs, and performance evaluation policies. At MCB Camp Lejeune, all projects are submitted to the NEPA office, and then distributed among the various sections of the Environmental Conservation Branch (ECON) to determine cultural and environmental impacts. Potential impacts to archaeological and historic resources at MCB Camp Lejeune are assessed as part of this NEPA review by the Base Environmental Impact Working Group (EIWG), composed of representatives from internal stakeholders, including:

*Environmental
Impact Working
Group (EIWG)*

- Installation Development Division
- Public Works Division
- Environmental Conservation Branch, including NEPA, Forestry, Cultural Resources, Threatened and Endangered Species, Land and Water Resources, and Conservation Law Enforcement sections, as needed
- Environmental Management Division (all Branches)
- Operations and Training (Base S-3)
- Commanding Officer (CO), MCAS, New River
- Resident Officer in Charge of Construction (ROICC)
- Base Logistics Support Department (Base S-4/S-6/BPO)
- Staff Judge Advocate/Eastern Area Council Office (EACO)
- II Marine Expeditionary Force
- 2nd Marine Division
- 2nd Force Service Support
- 2nd Marine Air Wing, MCAS New River
- Marine Corps Community Services
- Occupational and Preventive Medicine
- Installation Security and Safety (ISS)
- Defense Reutilization and Marketing

Not all of these representatives attend every EIWG meeting; attendance is determined as necessary based on the proposed project.

STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES

Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) are designed to provide guidance for non-cultural resource personnel in addressing the most common situations that involve cultural resources. DoD Directive 4715.16 E6.2.k requires the ICRMP to include standard operating procedures that are tailored for the particular conditions of the installation for routine occurrences and where blanket statements can coordinate a process where cultural resources are involved. These SOPs have been prepared to assist MCB Camp Lejeune in complying with applicable state and federal laws, regulations, and guidelines pertaining to cultural resources. They address specific situations that are triggered by specific events, and they identify personnel or categories of personnel, who implement the protocols for each event. They will be refined over time as this document is upgraded.

At MCB Camp Lejeune, the Cultural Resources Manager is:

Rick Richardson
Environmental Conservation Branch (ECON)
Marine Corps Base
Camp Lejeune, NC 28542
Phone (910) 451-7230
Mobile (910) 376-7515
Fax (910) 451-1787
rick.richardson@usmc.mil

SOP #1 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Compliance

At MCB Camp Lejeune, the management of both cultural and natural resources is conducted under the NEPA review process. This SOP outlines the NEPA program procedures and how cultural resources fit within the program.

There are three paths that review and documentation of proposed undertakings can take, depending on their complexity and potential environmental impacts.

Programmatic Review and Documentation. For Public Works Department (PWD) projects, the PWD first determines if the proposed action requires environmental analysis and documentation. If the proposal falls under a Programmatic Categorical Exclusion (CatEx) as developed by NEPA, then no further environmental analysis and documentation are required. A Decision Memorandum (DM-05-44) was developed for the vast majority of proposals generated by PWD Operations Branch (**Appendix XIV**). No analysis and documentation beyond the Decision Memorandum (DM) is required if a proposed action fits the parameters of that document. PWD should ensure that the stipulations in the DM are implemented. However, Section 106 of the NHPA may still require that impacts to cultural resources be considered if the project is defined as an undertaking (see SOP #2).

If the proposed action does not fit the terms of the DM, the project representative should contact the NEPA office within the Environmental Conservation Branch (ECON) (of the Environmental Management Division of the Installations and Environment Department) for guidance in compliance with environmental impact review procedures.

The project sponsor and NEPA representatives will collaborate to complete and submit a Request for Environmental Impact Review (REIR) to the NEPA office. These requests are then distributed throughout EMD and to all EWIG members in other departments as necessary (this includes the Cultural Resources Management office).

“JET” Review and Documentation. If the project is minor or urgent, a “JET” review may be requested by the NEPA office. A “JET” review is generally completed within three weeks of initiation, and does not

involve the Environmental Impact Working Group (EIWG). At the end of the review, the NEPA office will publish a DM for the proposal.

EIWG Review and Documentation. If the proposed action does not clearly meet the requirements for a CatEx or the stipulations of the DM, and does not undergo JET review, the REIR will be referred to the Environmental Impact Working Group (EIWG). During monthly EIWG meetings, the project sponsors will present the project(s) for review. Federal regulation 36 CFR Part 800.8 (Protection of Historic Properties) encourages integration of Section 106 of the NHPA with NEPA (see SOP #2). The EIWG members will determine one of the following NEPA outcomes:

- 1) No Documentation Required. The proposed action is not of the types subject to environmental impact review and no NEPA documentation is required. No cultural resource documentation is required.
- 2) Categorical Exclusion (CatEx). The proposed action falls within a CatEx. CatExes are for those actions that do not have the potential for significant impacts and do not require a detailed level of environmental analysis (such as an Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement). One or more CatExes may apply to the project. However, if the project qualifies as an undertaking requiring review under Section 106, then impacts to cultural resources must still be considered. The NEPA office will prepare a DM.
- 3) Environmental Assessment. An EA is performed when an action does not fit an existing CatEx or its potential for significant impacts is unknown. This assessment should include a determination of impact on significant historic properties. If no significant impacts are anticipated, then a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) will be prepared. If impacts are anticipated to be significant, then an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) should be performed. The project sponsor is responsible for obtaining funding for the EA.
- 4) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The project sponsor and Environmental Management Division (EMD) will work together to secure a contractor to prepare the EIS which will discuss the project, alternatives, alternatives analysis, and mitigation. Impact to significant cultural resources by the proposed undertaking must be analyzed and any potential impacts discussed in the EIS. EIWG members may provide some of the information required to complete the analysis. The project sponsor is responsible for funding environmental documentation and review.

SOP #2: NHPA Section 106 Compliance

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) is a review process designed to ensure that historic properties are taken into account during the planning and execution of federal undertakings. The Advisory Council for Historic Preservation (ACHP), under its rulemaking authority (NHPA Section 211), provides the regulations for the process of Section 106 compliance. The regulations, "Protection of Cultural Resources" (36 CFR 800), outline a five step process that is designed to identify possible conflicts between the objectives of historic preservation and a proposed activity, and resolve those conflicts through consultation. Those steps are outlined in **Figure 11**. 36 CFR 800 also encourages integration with NEPA (see SOP #1).

Any activity that may affect historic properties, both above or below ground, is considered an undertaking under Section 106 and requires review. In order to avoid a review for every project, a Programmatic Agreement (PA) may be developed with the NCSHPO and ACHP in which categorical exclusions are detailed for the types of projects that have no ground disturbance and for areas previously determined to be disturbed or to be without National Register eligible, listed, or unassessed properties. PAs also may be developed to address rehabilitation of historic properties to include such actions as painting, replacement of windows, compliance with the ADA, and landscaping. In this way, only cases that fall outside the scope of the PA will require individual project review.

Requirements under Section 106 include: (1) identification of listed or unassessed resources within an undertaking's "Area of Potential Effect" (APE); (2) identification of one-time or routine activities that may have an impact on unassessed or eligible resources; and (3) consultation with the NCSHPO and, if necessary, the ACHP before approval of any actions that may affect National Register eligible or listed resources. These steps are discussed below.

Identification of Cultural Resources

The identification of cultural resources may be done by consulting existing inventories of recorded resources for those areas for which a cultural resources study has been completed, or may require a survey of the undertaking's APE to identify previously unrecorded resources. If new resources are identified during a survey, a determination must be made of National Register eligibility. If the resources within the APE are determined ineligible for listing on the National Register, then Section




Figure 11. Illustration of the Section 106 Process for MCB Camp Lejeune - Archaeology




Figure 12. Illustration of the Section 106 Process for MCB Camp Lejeune – Architectural History

106 requirements have been met and the undertaking may proceed. If resources are present that are determined to be eligible or are unassessed for listing, then further work is required in order to determine and manage impacts to those resources.

At MCB Camp Lejeune, all proposed undertakings are submitted to the base NEPA office, and distributed throughout EMD and to all EWIG members in other departments as necessary for Environmental Impact review. The NEPA review process is outlined in SOP #1 and may occur in conjunction with Section 106 review.

Identification of Activities

Single Occurrence activities may be generated from MILCON, Special Projects, or other projects, and may include construction, demolition, or renovation/repair. Operations such as training or maneuvers that may require landscape modification also qualify as single occurrence activities.

Routine Activities may have a one-time or cumulative effect on cultural resources. The most common type of routine activity at MCB Camp Lejeune includes training or maneuvers that may require landscape modification such as excavation of foxholes, bivouacs, and pits. The use of heavy equipment, such as tanks or armored personnel carriers, also may cause sub-surface disturbance. A formal review process is in place in order to make certain that the NEPA Coordinator is informed of the locations and extent of ground disturbing training or maneuvers. All proposed ground disturbing activities are sent to the MCB Camp Lejeune NEPA office for review and further action, if there is a potential for adverse impact to significant cultural resources (this process is outlined in SOP #1). These actions are considered undertakings under Section 106 of the NHPA and should not be conducted without Section 106 clearance.

Other common routine activities include road and railroad maintenance, and landscape maintenance. Landscape maintenance may involve sub-surface disturbance, including the installation or removal of plantings, trees, signage, fencing, or water runoff control. Grass cutting normally would not include sub-surface disturbance. Recreational activities also qualify as routine actions that may have a cumulative effect on listed or eligible resources through proximity or by providing access to resources through recreation areas.

Depending upon the results of a completed Phase I survey and Phase II evaluations, repetitive or routine activities that may impact National Register eligible cultural resources can be dealt with through the development of a Programmatic Agreement (PA). This document would set guidelines and procedures for the routine maintenance or treatment of National Register resources. The PA would be approved by the Base, the NCSHPO and the ACHP, and would allow for the routine completion of operations, maintenance, or recreational actions without repetitive consultation with the NCSHPO or ACHP.

Consultation

Once an undertaking is determined to result in an *adverse effect* to a National Register-eligible or an unassessed resource, the Cultural Resources Manager will initiate consultation procedures with the NCSHPO and other interested parties. The purpose of the consultation is to allow all parties the opportunity to comment on the undertaking. The NCSHPO must respond to the consultation request within 30 days of receipt, stating either:

- The undertaking may proceed without further consultation, or
- Further consultation is necessary in order to mitigate adverse effects associated with the undertaking. This often results in the development of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), which stipulates the measures to be taken.

If mitigation measures outlined in a MOA cannot be resolved, the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation (ACHP) will be notified and its comment sought.

Memoranda of Agreement

The Base should consult with the NCSHPO/NCOSA to develop a mitigation or treatment plan whenever National Register eligible resources will be affected by one-time activities. Mitigation or treatment plans should include a description of the resource, the undertaking, and the steps that will be taken to mitigate the adverse effect of the undertaking on the resource. A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) must be developed and approved by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) if a planned action will have an adverse effect on a National Register-eligible property. Upon receipt of written concurrence on the mitigation plan from the NCSHPO and the ACHP, and approval of the MOA if necessary, the mitigation may proceed.

Foreclosure

When the Section 106 review process has been ignored, when an undertaking already has caused irreparable harm to a historic property, or when an undertaking has proceeded so far that earlier stage alternatives are no longer possible, the ACHP may conclude that an agency has foreclosed the opportunity for ACHP comment. In such cases, the ACHP will notify the agency official of its decision and this official will be given opportunity to respond before the ACHP issues a determination of foreclosure. Once foreclosure is determined, the agency is vulnerable to litigation.

SOP #3: Emergency Undertakings

Emergency Undertakings are provided for in 36 CFR 800.12. This regulation permits an agency to waive Section 106 requirements and comply with 36 CFR Part 78 in cases where there is an “imminent threat to national security” or a “major natural disaster.” This waiver of Section 106 procedures only applies in cases where an agency head has determined that national security would be degraded or human life or property destroyed if the agency were to meet its historic preservation responsibilities. In these cases, agencies are encouraged to develop plans for taking historic properties into account during emergency undertakings. Section 106 procedures also may be waived in response to cases where the President or Governor has declared a natural disaster or emergency, and in response to cases where there is imminent threat to public health or safety resulting from natural disaster or emergency declared by a local government. In all other cases, agencies should develop a plan of action to deal with emergencies and gain concurrence on this plan from the NCSHPO and ACHP.

Normally, repairs that may impact cultural resources require Base Maintenance to submit a REIR (see SOP #1). However, for emergency repairs (repairs that have no ground disturbance, those that occur in areas that have been surveyed and shown to contain no significant historic resources, those that are confined to previously disturbed ground, or in the event that the Director, I&E, declares an emergency that poses an imminent threat to safety, health, life or property), the repairs may proceed without any cultural resources review. In the event that an emergency is declared which requires actions that could impact historic properties, MCB Camp Lejeune will proceed with required corrective actions and notify SHPO as soon as possible of required actions and any effects that may be occurred as a result of the actions.

SOP #4: NHPA Section 110 Compliance

The intent of Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) is to ensure that historic preservation is fully integrated into the ongoing programs at Federal agencies. Agencies must assume responsibility for the preservation of historic properties under their jurisdiction and, to the maximum extent feasible, use historic properties available to the agency. Responsibilities of MCB Camp Lejeune under this section include:

- The establishment of a program to locate, inventory, and nominate to the National Register those properties that meet the criteria for listing that are under the jurisdiction of MCB Camp Lejeune;
- The management and maintenance of properties eligible for listing or listed on the National Register in a way that considers the preservation of their historic, archaeological, architectural, and cultural values in compliance with Section 106, and that special consideration be given to the preservation of designated National Historic Landmarks (NHL);
- The development and implementation of a program to ensure that significant cultural resources are not inadvertently transferred, sold, demolished, substantially altered, or allowed to deteriorate significantly;
- Full consideration in project planning to the preservation of properties subject to effects as a result of base activities, even if those properties are not under MCB Camp Lejeune's jurisdiction;
- The development and implementation of Base preservation-related activities in consultation with other federal, state, and local agencies, Native American tribes, and the private sector;
- The documentation of any significant cultural resources that must be damaged or destroyed; and
- The use of available historic properties for acceptable military purposes whenever feasible.

An identification and evaluation of architectural resources constructed before 1946 has been completed for MCB Camp Lejeune. Archaeological identification survey (Phase 1 survey) has been completed for all of MCB Camp Lejeune. Data including location and description of identified resources is entered into the base GIS database. Much of the survey work conducted at MCB Camp Lejeune, particularly the Silvicultural Prescription Surveys, the GSRA survey, and the HUTA work, fulfils both Section 106 and Section 110 requirements.

SOP #5: Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) Compliance

This SOP implements the provisions of Public Law 9696 (93 Stat. 721; 16 USC 470aa470MM), Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (ARPA), and the final uniform regulations issued under the Act by the Department of Defense (32 CFR 229), Protection of Archaeological Resources. Per this Act, it is a federal offense to excavate, remove, damage, alter, or otherwise deface archaeological resources on federal lands without authorization. The sale, purchase, exchange, transport, and/or receipt of archaeological resources obtained in violation of this law also are federal offenses. The Cultural Resources Manager at MCB Camp Lejeune is responsible for ARPA enforcement on the installation.

Exceptions to ARPA require a federal permit. This applies to any archaeological investigations that may result in the excavation and/or removal of archaeological resources. An ARPA permit is obtained by submitting an ARPA permit application to the CRM at MCB Camp Lejeune, pursuant to Section 4(a) of ARPA. To qualify for an ARPA permit, the Principal Investigator for the project must meet the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Archaeology and Historic Preservation* (48 Federal Register 44738-9).

In the case of ARPA violations at MCB Camp Lejeune, Military Police and Conservation Law Enforcement Officers should identify and detain the suspects, and immediately notify the Director/EMD, Cultural Resources Manager, the NEPA Coordinator, and Naval Criminal Investigative Services (NCIS). NCIS will conduct the criminal investigation, while the MCB Camp Lejeune Base Archaeologist or his assignees will be responsible for conducting a damage assessment at the archaeological site or sites affected by the illegal activities.

Currently, the CRM conducts routine inspections of NRHP eligible and unassessed archaeological sites for damage or destruction not previously noted. Unauthorized damage to NRHP eligible and unassessed archaeological sites is reported up the chain of command, and investigations are conducted to determine how the damage occurred.

SOP #6: Unexpected Discoveries

Archaeological or historical sites occasionally are discovered during construction projects, regardless of whether the project area has been subjected to a complete cultural resources identification survey. Federal agencies are encouraged to plan for discoveries. If a federal project has discharged all of the appropriate compliance rules and regulations and, subsequently, cultural resources are discovered, all ground disturbing activities should be stopped, and the Director of Environmental Management (910-451-5003), the Cultural Resources Manager and, if human remains are identified, the Provost Marshall should be notified. At that point, one of three options can be undertaken.

1. The Cultural Resources Manager (Rick Richardson, 910-451-7230) should be contacted and advised of the discovery. As much information as possible concerning the cultural resource, such as resource type (archaeological or architectural), date/temporal period, location, and size, as well as any information on its eligibility, should be provided. The CRM can then notify and consult with the NCSHPO and the ACHP if necessary, either of whom may require an on-site examination of the affected property. Pursuant to their finding, they may require that mitigation measures be undertaken. The Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974, as amended, provides that up to 1 percent of the total construction cost can be applied to mitigate the adverse effects of the proposed construction. The 1 percent rule does not apply to projects with a total budget of less than \$50,000.00 or where the cost of mitigation exceeds more than 1 percent of the project budget.
2. A second option is to prepare a mitigation plan after the cultural resource is discovered. This plan should be sent to the NCSHPO and the ACHP within 48 hours of the discovery. The ACHP must respond within 48 hours of the notification. This is the most time-efficient approach, because technically the construction project does not have to be halted. However, MCB Camp Lejeune and/or its agents would be expected to make a reasonable attempt to avoid further destruction of the resource until a formal data recovery mitigation plan can be executed.
3. The third option is the Section 106 compliance process. Because this can be a time consuming procedure, it is not

recommended in the case of unexpected discoveries. If this option is chosen, thorough and complete documentation of the proposed impact and subsequent mitigation plan must be completed to ensure the technical adequacy required by the NCSHPO or ACHP.

Native American Human Remains: Indigenous human remains have been identified within MCB Camp Lejeune to date, including two ossuaries. The Courthouse Road ossuary (31ON898) dates to the Late Woodland period (800 AD to 1450 AD) and yielded a minimum of 158 individuals. The Jarrott's Point ossuary (31ON309) (Loftfield and McCall 1986) showed characteristics representative of both Algonquian and Siouan cultures (Reid and Simpson 1998a). These and other indigenous human remains found on MCB Camp Lejeune (e.g. 31ON308 and 31ON1236) demonstrate that there is the potential to find additional indigenous human remains on the base. However, these remains were determined to be unaffiliated with any extant federally recognized tribe.

There are no federally recognized Native American Tribes in Onslow County where MCB Camp Lejeune is located. If an unexpected discovery consists of Native American human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony, all ground disturbing activities should stop, and the CRM, Military Police, Naval Criminal Investigative Services (NCIS), and State Archaeologist should be contacted. In accordance with North Carolina General Statute 70-29 *Discovery of remains and notification of authorities* the remains may be excavated and other activities may resume after the appropriate authorities have been notified (see http://www.ncleg.net/enactedlegislation/statutes/pdf/bysection/chapter_70/gs_70-29.pdf). If in the future, NAGPRA is determined to apply at MCB Camp Lejeune, and Native American remains are identified, follow the appropriate consultation procedures outlined in SOP #9.

Non-Indigenous Human Remains: If an unexpected discovery consists of non-Native American human remains, all ground disturbing activities should stop, and the Cultural Resources Manager, Military Police, Naval Criminal Investigative Services (NCIS), and State Archaeologist contacted. In accordance with North Carolina GS 70-29, the remains may be excavated and other activities may resume after the appropriate authorities have been notified.

SOP #7: Data Management

In order to facilitate compliance with Sections 106 and 110 of the NHPA, as well as NEPA and curation requirements, an effective data management system is necessary. All cultural resources data are entered into the MCB Camp Lejeune GIS database, which includes both spatial information and narrative regarding any survey work conducted at the property. In addition, general information on historic structures is available to base personnel through iNFADS.

The Data Management system on base is updated as changes occur to reflect recent cultural resource surveys and assessments. The GIS Manager is responsible for ensuring that all known resources are included in the database.

Currently at MCB Camp Lejeune, the Cultural Resources Manager and GIS Manager have sole access to the GIS cultural resources database. General historic structure information is available to all base personnel through iNFADS, but in accordance with ARPA regulations (Article 9) to protect archaeological sites and Section 304 of the NHPA, specific resource location information is not accessible or available to the public. When necessary, the Cultural Resources Manager and GIS Manager will release information as it relates to upcoming projects. In November 2008 the Cultural Resources office made the GIS database on the built environment internally accessible to Base GIS users to aid in planning.

SOP #8: Coordination with Natural Resources Management

Department of Defense Directive 4715.16 requires the cultural resources management programs be integrative with natural resources programs. The Cultural Resources Manager is responsible for coordinating with all branches of the Environmental Management Division (EMD), which includes:

- Environmental Conservation Branch (ECON)
- Administrative & Finance (A & F)
- Environmental Compliance Branch (ECB)
- Environmental Quality Branch (EQB)

This coordination is meant to ensure that a) cultural resources will not be adversely affected by activities associated with natural resources management, and b) cultural resources activities do not adversely affect significant natural resources.

NEPA regulations provide the mechanism for coordination between cultural and natural resource management programs. All proposed projects that have not been cleared by a CatEx are subject to review by the Environmental Impact Working Group (EIWG). Each project is reviewed by this group to determine impacts to both cultural and natural resources, and each section of ECON is tasked with developing appropriate programs for assessment and mitigation that are compliant with every other section's concerns.

The EIWG is made up of permanent and on-call members. Permanent members are required to attend all EIWG meetings; on-call members attend meetings as needed

Permanent members include:

- Chairman: Head, NEPA Section, ECON/EMD
- Head, ECON
- Representative, Director I&E
- Representative, Base S-3
- Representative, CO, MCAS, New River
- Legal Advisor: Representative, SJA & EACO

On call members include but are not limited to:

- Representative, Public Works Division
- Representative, Operations Branch
- Representative, ROICC
- Representative Base S-4/S-6/BPO
- Representative, II Marine Expeditionary Force
- Representative, 2d Marine Division
- Representative, 2d Marine Logistics Group (MLG)
- Representative, 2d Marine Air Wing, MCAS New River
- Representatives, Each EMD Branch
- Representative, Camp Lejeune Installation Geospatial and Information Services (IGI&S) & East Coast Regional GEO Fidelis (Geospatial) Center Base S-4/S-6/BPO
- Representative, Marine Corps Community Services Office
- Chief, Veterinary Medicine Service, Naval Hospital
- Chief, Occupational and Preventative Medicine Service, Naval Hospital
- Base Safety Officer, Department of Public Safety
- Representative, Base Fire Protection Division
- Representative, Defense Reutilization & Marketing Office
- Director, Base S-3

SOP #9: Native American Consultation

NAGPRA Consultation is required prior to excavation of Native American graves but does not replace the Section 110 or Section 106 consultation requirements.

Consultation is the formal, mutual process by which an installation commander or Cultural Resources Manager communicates and coordinates with Tribal governments. It is intended to foster positive relationships with sovereign Native American nations and to ensure active participation by Tribes in the planning and implementation of activities that may affect resources of interest to those groups. Consultation provides an essential means of obtaining the advice, ideas and opinions of Native American parties regarding the management of federal resources, as well as ensuring the concerns of all involved parties are addressed. Consultation is mandated by federal laws, including the National Historic Preservation Act, American Indian Religious Freedom Act, Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act.

Currently, there is one federally recognized Native American Tribe in North Carolina, the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians of North Carolina. However, the Tribe has no land area claims in Onslow County where MCB Camp Lejeune is located.

MCB Camp Lejeune, in consultation with the NC Office of State Archaeology, has determined that cultural resources on the base have no links to modern, federally recognized tribes. This determination, current as of 2008, resulted in a Decision Memorandum signed by the MCB Camp Lejeune Commanding Officer (**Appendix XV**).

For MCB Camp Lejeune, the path for consultation for Native American issues other than NAGPRA is through the Office of State Archaeology. NAGPRA issues are coordinated through the Department of the Interior.

NAGPRA. Although cultural resources on the base have no links to modern federally recognized tribes, MCB Camp Lejeune provides the NPS National NAGPRA coordinator reports and updates of culturally unidentified remains. If at any time cultural affiliation with a modern federally recognized tribe is determined for remains at MCB Camp Lejeune, this section provides the guidance needed to be in compliance.

NAGPRA consultation is required in the event of the planned excavation or unexpected discovery of Native American graves and associated objects. NAGPRA consultation will be in addition to and does not replace Section 110 or Section 106 consultation requirements.

NAGPRA issues are coordinated through the Department of the Interior. Consultation requirements of NAGPRA include: (1) providing written notification to Indian tribes that are likely to be culturally affiliated, aboriginally occupied the area, or are likely to have a cultural relationship with the human remains or cultural objects that may be excavated; (2) consulting about priority of custody of the remains and/or cultural objects, and their treatment and disposition, pursuant to 43 CFR 10.5; (3) documenting the consultation in a written plan of action in accordance with 43 CFR 10.5(e) signed by the Commanding General or his designee, which the consulting tribes have the option to sign; (4) if applicable, before proceeding, ensure that removal of Native American human remains, associated funerary objects, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony does not occur until after (a) a permit is issued pursuant to ARPA [16 U.S.C. 470aa-470ll], or (b) compliance with Section 106 [36 CFR 800] is carried out; (5) following protocol for the treatment and disposition of Native American human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony as outlined in 43 CFR 10.

Additional information about NAGPRA procedures can be found at <http://www.nps.gov/history/nagpra/mandates/index.htm>.

SOP #10: Management of Historic Properties

The Secretary of the Interior has developed four treatment standards to manage historic properties: preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction. Preservation is the most appropriate treatment strategy to manage archaeological sites. Preservation, in the strict technical application of the term, is the process of maintaining the existing form, integrity, and materials of a building, structure, or archaeological site. National Register eligible archaeological sites should be preserved undisturbed whenever feasible or practical. National Register eligible historic structures should be maintained using materials and finishes that match existing materials and finishes. In cases in which Marine Corps undertakings will have effects or adverse effects on these cultural resources, then MCB Camp Lejeune will activate the Section 106 consultation process with the NCSHPO and the ACHP (**Figure 11**).

Management of Archaeological Sites

MCB Camp Lejeune has determined that undertakings on the base may have an adverse effect on archaeological properties (sites and districts), that are eligible for listing or listed on the National Register of Historic Places, and has consulted with the ACHP and the NCSHPO pursuant to Section 800.14 of the regulations (36 CFR 800) implementing Section 106 and Section 110 of the NHPA. These three agencies have agreed that the program of operation, maintenance and development of archaeological properties will be administered in accordance with the following stipulations to satisfy the Marine Corps' Section 106 responsibility for all individual undertakings of the program on MCB Camp Lejeune:

Staffing. The Cultural Resource Management Staff consists of one professional archaeologist, who meets the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (48 Federal Register 44738-9). The Commanding Officer (CO) is responsible for selecting this individual as his/her designee for the management of the Installation's cultural resources, and is responsible for providing notification to the NCSHPO, as necessary, confirming changes to personnel.

Planning. The Cultural Resources Manager is responsible for:

- Analyzing installation documents to identify specific undertakings that may affect significant or potentially significant archaeological sites. The documents to be analyzed include, but are not limited to, NCSHPO records, cultural

resource reports, environmental assessments, Base Master Plan, MCB Camp Lejeune forestry plan, military construction plan, and troop training and range operations plans that are scheduled within 5 years of the execution of this ICRMP

- Establishing schedules and priorities for the location, identification, evaluation, and treatment of significant or potentially significant archaeological properties.
- The management of archaeological properties on MCB Camp Lejeune in accordance with the treatments described here and related guidance. These treatments shall include preservation, avoidance, and mitigation, as required and feasible, in support of the Combat Training mission at MCB Camp Lejeune.
- The development of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the North Carolina Office of State Archaeology (NCOSA) before the expiration date of this agreement to curate its archaeological collections and Native American human remains at the NCOSA Archaeological Research Center. The curation of archaeological collections from MCB Camp Lejeune shall conform to the NCOSA *Archaeological Curation Standards and Guidelines* and related guidance.

In accordance with MCO 5090.2A, Change 3, Environmental Compliance and Protection Manual, Chapter 8, Part 8301, the CO is responsible for:

- Ensuring that all relevant offices at MCB Camp Lejeune are informed of the schedules and priorities for the location, identification, evaluation, and treatment of significant archaeological properties, the potential of undertakings to have an adverse effect on archaeological properties, the requirement to ensure that an analysis of alternatives is fully considered as early as possible in project planning, and the requirement for review of the undertaking pursuant to Section 106.
- Ensuring that all undertakings and related activities are planned, reviewed, and implemented in accordance with the terms of this ICRMP. The CO should also ensure that these undertakings are included in the annual report (discussed below).
- Ensuring that MCB Camp Lejeune makes reasonable and good faith efforts in its planning to minimize the adverse effects to archaeological properties on MCB Camp Lejeune. Where prudent, feasible, and consistent with the military mission, the preferred treatment for archaeological properties shall be preservation in place. The preservation and protection of archaeological properties shall be in accordance with the

Council's *Treatment of Archaeological Properties* and related guidance. If it is determined that a project shall have an adverse effect on archaeological properties, the Base Commander shall coordinate with the Cultural Resources Manager and the NCSHPO.

Project Review. As long as MCB Camp Lejeune continues to retain an adequate and qualified cultural resources management staff, all projects and plans, with the exception of those identified below, should be reviewed by the Cultural Resources Manager instead of individually coordinated with the NCSHPO. This review process should follow Section 106 guidelines (see SOP #2).

Exceptions: The following activities must be individually coordinated with the NCSHPO:

- Plans for major construction at or prior to the 35% design level in any area of MCB Camp Lejeune that the cultural resources management staff determine may have an adverse effect on NRHP-eligible or unassessed archaeological properties.
- Projects that have received significant public comment.
- Projects that involve the proposed destruction of known archaeological properties.
- Projects that involve the inadvertent discovery of Native American human remains.

If, during the planning stages of one of these projects, archaeological properties are determined to be present within the APE, MCB Camp Lejeune shall forward documentation supporting the purpose of its action to the NCSHPO for review and concurrence. The NCSHPO shall be afforded 30 calendar days from the date of its receipt to review the action MCB Camp Lejeune is proposing to take. If NCSHPO does not provide its comment and concurrence on the action within 30 calendar days of its receipt date, the NCSHPO shall be viewed as having no comment on the proposed action. If MCB Camp Lejeune and NCSHPO agree that the archaeological properties are not eligible for listing on the NRHP, no further avoidance or documentation shall be necessary. MCB Camp Lejeune and NCSHPO shall consult the Keeper of the National Register pursuant to 36 CFR 800.4(c) should a disagreement arise regarding the eligibility determination for an archaeological site.

Emergency Undertakings. If archaeological properties are affected by natural disaster or emergency, MCB Camp Lejeune must adhere to the procedures in 36 CFR 800.12 (see SOP #3), and consult with the NCSHPO and ACHP on emergency undertakings within seven days if MCB Camp Lejeune considers that circumstances permit.

If the NCSHPO or ACHP object to the emergency operations at MCB Camp Lejeune, MCB Camp Lejeune must then comply with 36 CFR 800.3-6.

Involvement of Consulting Parties. MCB Camp Lejeune, in consultation with the NCSHPO, shall identify parties that may be interested in the effects of undertakings on archaeological properties and develop a plan for involving such parties in consultations pursuant to 36 CFR 800.3(e-f) to resolve adverse effects.

Management of Historic Built Environment

Louis Berger and Associates (LBA) has developed a set of guidelines for the historic built environment at MCB Camp Lejeune (**Appendix XI**). These guidelines contain an inclusive list of maintenance and repair activities involving historic properties that will not require consultation between MCB Camp Lejeune and the NCSHPO. They also outline in detail the processes and procedures required to manage and maintain the historic districts and structures eligible for listing on the National Register. It is recommended that this document serve as the primary guideline for the management of the historic built environment of MCB Camp Lejeune.

Program Alternatives

There are currently six program alternatives in place to guide the management of historic properties at MCB Camp Lejeune. Programmatic Agreements are in place for MARSOC operations at Stone Bay Rifle Range and for PPV housing (**Appendix V and VI**, respectively). The DoD is currently working on Standard Treatments for the rehabilitation of materials and finishes on historic DoD properties. Program Comments exist for the management of 1) Wherry/Capehart housing, 2) ammunition storage structures, and 3) Cold War Era Unaccompanied Personnel housing.

SOP #11: Demolition of Historic Properties

Demolition should always be the last course of action when dealing with historic properties, but it can occur if deemed necessary for the military mission, following due consultation. If a determination is made that the demolition of a property is the preferred alternative, consultation should be conducted promptly with the NCSHPO, ACHP, and other consulting parties. It also should allow for public involvement. If the historic property is a National Historic Landmark (NHL), consultations should also include the Secretary of the Interior.

If a PA or an MOA outlining the demolition process has not already been established through prior consultation, the following steps should be taken by the Cultural Resources Manager as outlined in DoDI 4715.16:

- Establish coordination procedures with all commands at the base, and develop a means by which he/she receives notification of any proposed demolition plans
- Determine National Register status of resource proposed for demolition
 - If the resource is determined **ineligible for listing** and is not within an historic district, demolition may proceed without further consultation. However, the Cultural Resources Manager should be aware of unexpected archaeological discoveries that may occur during the demolition process.
 - If the resource is determined **eligible for listing or listed on the National Register**, Section 106 consultation is required (see SOP #2). This applies to properties that are either individually listed/eligible for listing or properties that are contributing resources to an historic district.
 - If the resource is classified as a **non-contributing resource in an historic district**, Section 106 consultation and compliance are recommended. The Cultural Resources Manager should be aware that the demolition of a non-contributing resource could potentially affect other historic properties within the district.
- Undertake an economic analysis for any historic property that is being considered for demolition or replacement. This analysis should include an evaluation of life-cycle maintenance costs, utility costs, and replacement costs over a 20-year time period.
- If, after evaluating the full range of alternatives, demolition is deemed the best option, prepare an MOA outlining the demolition process, and including the stipulation(s) to mitigate

or offset the adverse effects of the undertaking. This MOA should be developed in consultation with the NCSHPO and other interested parties, as appropriate.

- Prepare mitigative documentation (e.g. HABS/HAER recordation or a form of alternative/creative mitigation). Mitigative action must be reviewed and accepted by the NCSHPO before the undertaking can proceed.
- Conduct archaeological monitoring of the demolition process, if the undertaking could have an adverse effect on archaeological resources.

Different stipulations will apply during emergency conditions, as stipulated under 36 CFR 800.12. Refer to SOP #3: Emergency Undertakings for more information.

Footprint Reduction

Executive Order 13227, *Federal Real Property Asset Management* (January 2005), calls for the disposal of unutilized or underutilized properties for the purposes of footprint reduction. In accordance with this, the Chief of Naval Operations has set a target of a 30 million square feet reduction by 2013.

At MCB Camp Lejeune, the demolition of excess property is the responsibility of the Director, Installations & Environment Department. The proposed demolition of any structure is reviewed according to NEPA and Section 106 regulations (see SOPs #1 and 2). Changes to the landscape should convey the historic pattern of land use, topography, transportation patterns, and spatial relationships. The character-defining materials and features, and design and workmanship of buildings, structures, districts, and landscapes should be maintained as much as possible, while still meeting footprint reduction directives.

SOP #12: Use of Historic Resources

Under Marine Corps Order 5090.2A (Change 2) and in accordance with Section 110 of the NHPA, prior to new construction, lease, or the acquisition of buildings for the purpose of carrying out Marine Corps responsibilities, the Marine Corps must, to the maximum extent feasible, use available historic buildings, while preserving the historic character and function.

As of January 2008, there were 188 structures on MCB Camp Lejeune that were eligible for listing on the National Register (**Appendix IV**). All of these are currently in use. Some are serving their original function; there are others whose functions have changed due to changing demands of the facility.

The Cultural Resources Manager should be notified of any proposals for alternative use of historic resources.

SOP #13: Disposition of Human Remains

The discovery and/or disturbance of human remains is a sensitive issue that MCB Camp Lejeune must address if the situation arises. It is possible that human remains could be encountered if an unmarked grave or cemetery is impacted by construction. If previously unrecorded burials are exposed, work should stop, and the appropriate authorities notified (see SOP #6: Unexpected Discoveries).

There are no marked cemeteries at MCB Camp Lejeune; all known graves were relocated in the 1940s with the construction of the base. Should human remains be found in the location of these former cemeteries, SOP #6: Unexpected Discoveries should be followed.

If the Marine Corps cannot determine adequately or identify a specific cultural or ethnic group, MCB Camp Lejeune will make a reasonable effort to locate and notify group(s) who may have a legitimate interest in the disposition of the remains based on a determination of generalized cultural affinity by a recognized professional. Qualified groups will be provided an opportunity to consult with MCB Camp Lejeune in determining the appropriate treatment of the interment.

MCB Camp Lejeune, in consultation with the NC Office of State Archaeology, has determined that cultural resources on the base have no links to modern federally recognized tribes, thus NAGPRA does not apply (see **Appendix XV**). However, if it can be determined adequately that the discovered burials have an affinity to any federally recognized Native American or other ethnic group, a reasonable effort will be made to identify, locate, and notify leaders or representatives of these groups. It is the claimants' responsibility to document and validate their claim. If within the lifetime of this ICRMP NAGPRA is determined to apply, this SOP and SOP# 9 provide the guidance needed to be in compliance.

In accordance with GS 70-35(a) *Disposition of human skeletal remains*, if the next of kin has been identified, that person has authority in determining the ultimate disposition of the remains. If no next of kin is identified, the skeletal remains shall be transferred to the State Archaeologist and permanently curated according to standard museum procedures after adequate skeletal analysis.

While final disposition of newly discovered human remains is being determined, or if the remains are to remain in the location in which they were discovered, the area in question should be fenced, its

location should be plotted on maps, and it should be maintained. If it is not possible to protect the newly discovered cemetery, the MCB Camp Lejeune should make provisions for the removal and curation of the burials. To achieve better coordination, this should be undertaken after consultation with the NC State Archaeologist and the NCSHPO's office. If warranted, detailed archaeological and bio-archaeological investigations of these remains should be conducted.

State and federal guidelines must be followed. Applicable North Carolina codes (General Statutes Chapter 70, Article 3) state: (1) that authorization must be obtained from the county medical examiner if under his jurisdiction, or from the State Archaeologist before the removal of burials; and (2) that the destruction of cemeteries and their features is punishable by law, unless the cemetery has been abandoned and the prior consent of the State has been received.

MCB Camp Lejeune will treat all discovered human remains with dignity and respect. Any costs that accrue as a result of consultation, treatment, curation, etc., will be the responsibility of the base.

SOP #14: Curation

MCB Camp Lejeune's cultural resource responsibilities include providing for the curation of archaeological collections and historical documents recovered from Marine Corps property. These protocols are based on regulations for the curation and care of federal archaeological collections under 36 CFR 79 *Curation of Federally Owned and Administered Archaeological Collections*.

An archaeological collection is defined in 36 CFR 79 as "material remains that are excavated or removed during an archaeological survey, excavation, or other study of prehistoric or historic cultural resources and associated records that are prepared or assembled in connection with the survey, excavation, or other study." Archaeological collections always remain the property of the Department of the Navy, and must be maintained in perpetuity. An historical document may be any paper product that contains information such as architectural and landscape drawings, maps, photographs, books, ledgers, receipts, and deeds. Conservation and curation procedures should be conducted for all documents that pertain to the development, occupation, activities, and history of MCB Camp Lejeune.

At MCB Camp Lejeune, the Cultural Resources Contractor, as a stipulation of their contract, is responsible for the preparation of artifacts, field maps, site notes, historic documents, and other project related material according to the *Archaeological Curation Standards and Guidelines*, as released by the North Carolina Office of State Archaeology, for ultimate disposition at the North Carolina Archaeological Research Center in Raleigh. Inventories of archaeological and historical collections are maintained at MCB Camp Lejeune by the GIS Manager (see SOP #7). The North Carolina Archaeological Research Center, with whom MCB Camp Lejeune has a permanent custodial agreement – is ultimately responsible for the maintenance and conservation of the collections, as well as various issues such as access to and loans of collections, duplication of historic records, and dissemination of information. The Camp Lejeune collection includes lithic artifacts, clay, shell, bone – both animal and human – and documents and records. The Cultural Resources Manager at MCB Camp Lejeune makes annual inspections of the curation facility to ensure compliance with the curation standards outlined in 36 CFR 79.

SOP #15: Public Involvement

Current federal law, DoD Instructions, and DON Instructions require installations to involve the public in the Section 106 process. The Preserve America Executive Order 13287 (2003) states that “it is the policy of the Federal Government to provide leadership in preserving America’s heritage by actively advancing the protection, enhancement, and contemporary use of the historic properties owned by the Federal Government...” This order encourages installations to coordinate and collaborate with state, tribal, and local governments and the private sector in the planning of the management of the nation’s cultural resources. DoD Instruction 4715.16 states “all installations with cultural resources will have a public outreach program.”

MCB Camp Lejeune has several programs for public outreach and education of base personnel and visitors. These include:

- *The Montford Point Marines Museum.* This museum, located in historic structure M101 at Montford Point Camp No. 1, is sponsored and run by the Montford Point Association. Displays and exhibits present the Black Marine Experience at MCB Camp Lejeune.
- *Popular History.* “Semper Fidelis: A Brief History of Onslow County, North Carolina, and Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune”, a popular history of MCB Camp Lejeune, was developed by the Louis Berger Group in 2006. It presents a historical narrative about MCB Camp Lejeune from its World War II origins to the present that will appeal to the general reader. Sources of information included Marine Corps Historical Center, Washington, D.C., the historic files maintained by the Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff, Training Education and Operation, the results of the oral/archival history, and information from the Public Affairs Office. Photographs were acquired from the files of Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, Marine Corps, Headquarters, and the North Carolina State and the National Archives.
- *Historical Society Lecture Series.* The MCB Camp Lejeune Cultural Resources Manager presents lectures on cultural resource issues to local historical societies and interested groups.

- *NEPA Review Process.* The NEPA process involves public scoping and meetings in order to disseminate information on cultural resources to the general public.

In addition, the Cultural Resources office maintains an informational booth at the base celebration of Earth Day, and there are occasional lectures on archaeology given at local schools.

Page intentionally left blank

FIVE-YEAR ACTION PLAN FOR MCB CAMP LEJEUNE

MCB Camp Lejeune recognizes its role in the stewardship of significant historic properties. This five-year plan directs the future of compliance and stewardship responsibilities in the areas of historic property inventory, historic property mitigation, curation of archaeological collections and historic documents, monitoring of significant historic properties, public outreach, integration, and review. Proposals to conduct this ongoing work should be submitted through HQMC on an annual basis. The list of upcoming projects at MCB Camp Lejeune is contained in **Appendix XVII**. This list should be continually updated by inserting the biweekly summary report into **Appendix XVII**.

Historic Property Inventory

Archaeology

Current Status: The areas of the Mainside base considered to have the highest potential for archaeological sites, according to the base predictive model (see **Figure 7**), have been surveyed. The remainder of the base is considered to have low to medium potential for archaeological resources due to poor drainage and lack of permanent water sources. Many of these areas have been surveyed despite their lower site potential as well under Section 110 planning surveys and Section 106 compliance surveys. As a result of these surveys, 163 sites, all on the main base, are awaiting National Register eligibility determinations. Thirty-eight of these have been evaluated as of November 2008, and the determinations are awaiting NCSHPO concurrence.

Phase II evaluations should be undertaken at 125 sites within MCB Camp Lejeune.

Work Required: No further Phase I archaeological survey is required for either Greater Sandy Run or Mainside Camp Lejeune. Phase II evaluation of 125 unassessed sites should be completed (**Appendix IX**).

Historic Structures

Current Status: All historic buildings and structures built prior to 1947 on the base have been inventoried and evaluated as to their potential for listing on the National Register. Of these 2,617 architectural resources, 188 of them were determined eligible for listing on the National Register, either individually, or as a contributing resource to an historic district. Eight historic districts have been identified as eligible for listing on the National Register.

Work Required: MCB Camp Lejeune has met its Section 106 and 110 obligations for the identification of buildings, structures, objects, and historic districts eligible for listing in the National Register. MCB Camp Lejeune has one historic context, that of World War II (from 1941 to 1946). No other contexts have been identified and none is expected to be identified. MCB Camp Lejeune's mission has not changed since 1946, and none of the built environment at Camp Lejeune was constructed specifically for Cold War era (1946 to 1991) functionality. The recordation of all World War II-era structures has been completed, and these resources constitute the entirety of buildings, structures, objects, and historic districts eligible for listing on the National Register. No further historic building survey work is required.

Historic Property Mitigation

Archaeology

Current Status: As a result of the surveys conducted across MCB Camp Lejeune, 19 archaeological sites have been determined eligible and 163 are awaiting determinations for listing on the National Register.

Work Required: A mitigation plan should be developed for the eligible and unassessed archaeological resources on MCB Camp Lejeune that may be affected by proposed undertakings. Variability in site type should be studied to develop a plan for multiple mitigation and to avoid excavating similar site types and producing redundant data. The mitigation plan should allow for data recovery on a representative sample of a certain site type, preservation of a representative sample of each type, and delisting of the remainder as redundant. Treating the sites in this manner will be more cost effective for the Navy than individual evaluation of each unassessed site and long term management of these sites.

A mitigation plan should be developed for eligible and unassessed archaeological sites.

Historic Structures

Current Status: There are eight historic districts and 188 buildings and structures at MCB Camp Lejeune that are eligible for listing on the National Register. An additional 38 sites, roads, landscapes, and objects are eligible as contributing resources to historic districts. The intensive training regime and the level of daily activity in these districts and structures create significant potential for adverse effects to historic properties. Several historic structures have required mitigation of adverse effects in the form of Programmatic Agreements (PAs) or Memoranda of Agreement (MOAs) (see **Appendices V – VI, X and XIII**), and additional plans for preservation, avoidance, and mitigation are likely.

Work Required: Louis Berger and Associates (LBA) has developed a set of guidelines for the historic built environment at MCB Camp Lejeune (LBA 2008, **Appendix XI**). These guidelines contain an inclusive list of maintenance and repair activities involving historic properties that will not require consultation between MCB Camp Lejeune and the NCSHPO. They also outline in detail the processes and procedures required to manage and maintain the historic districts and structures eligible for listing on the National Register. It is recommended that this document serve as the primary guide for the management of the historic built environment of MCB Camp Lejeune.

*Management
guidelines for the
built environment*

Development of MOAs and mitigation measures should be initiated in the early planning stages of projects. Mitigation of adverse effects to historic structures can be accomplished and facilitated through coordination between the Cultural Resources Manager and project managers, and through adherence to the management guidelines laid out in **Appendix XI** of this document.

Curation

Current Status: Currently MCB Camp Lejeune curates archaeological collections, documents generated from cultural resource surveys, and other historic documents including maps, photographs, drawings, and records. These materials are housed at the North Carolina Archaeological Research Center in Raleigh, which meets the requirements of 36 CFR 79, and with whom MCB Camp Lejeune has a permanent custodial agreement.

Work Required: The Navy is in the process of reviewing their curation requirements and potentially establishing a regional curation facility.

*Curation procedures
are currently under
review.*

MCB Camp Lejeune should evaluate whether it would be beneficial to curate all material generated from cultural resource projects in a regional Navy-owned facility.

Information Management

Current Status: All data on historic properties at MCB Camp Lejeune are in a GIS database, which includes both spatial information and narrative regarding any survey work conducted at the property. In addition, general information on historic structures is available to base personnel through iNFADS. These databases are updated as changes occur to reflect recent cultural resource surveys and assessments. The GIS Manager is responsible for ensuring that all known resources are included in the database. Currently at MCB Camp Lejeune, the Cultural Resources Manager and GIS Manager have sole access to the GIS database. General historic structure information is available to all base personnel through iNFADS, but in accordance with Section 304 of the NHPA and Article 9 of ARPA on the confidentiality of resource locations, archaeological site information is not accessible.

Work Required: The GIS database should be maintained at its current level and updated as changes occur to remain accurate. The Cultural Resources office has made the database on the built environment internally accessible to base personnel to aid in planning.

The GIS database should continue to be maintained at its current level.

Historic Property Monitoring

Current Status: Surveys at MCB Camp Lejeune have resulted in the identification of numerous historic properties that are eligible for listing on the National Register. Because the base is an active military facility, there is potential for these resources to be adversely affected by development, operations, or routine daily activities.

Work Required: Regular monitoring of historic properties is recommended to ensure their adequate maintenance and protection. Condition assessments of National Register eligible archaeological sites, historic structures, landscapes, roads, objects, and districts should occur on an annual basis or as necessary. **Appendix XII** shows the historic district layouts to aid in monitoring. These assessments, accompanied by treatment or remediation plans, should be included in the annual report submitted to NCSHPO detailing the activities and undertakings of the previous year (see SOP #10 for information on the annual report).

Regular monitoring of historic properties is recommended.

Public Outreach

Current Status: Federal law, DoD Instructions, and DON Instructions require installations to involve the public in the Section 106 process. Currently MCB Camp Lejeune has several outreach programs in place for base personnel and visitors.

Work Required: Current outreach activities including displays, tours, presentations, and publications should be maintained. In addition, partnerships with local groups, including, but not limited to, historical societies, universities, and museums, should be maintained in order to be in compliance with Executive Order 13287: Preserve America, which encourages installations to coordinate and collaborate with state, tribal, and local governments and the private sector in the planning of the management of the nation's cultural resources.

Public outreach activities should be maintained to remain in compliance with EO 13287.

Integration

Current Status: DoD Instruction 4715.16 calls for the integration of the cultural resource program with mission activities, including environmental programs. At MCB Camp Lejeune, integration occurs through the NEPA review process and the collaboration of the Environmental Impact Working Group (EIWG).

Work Required: MCB Camp Lejeune should integrate this ICRMP into the various base Master Plans currently under development in order to make certain that cultural resources are taken into account when planning an undertaking that may have adverse effects on historic properties.

This ICRMP should be integrated into base Master Plans.

Annual Review of ICRMP

Work Required: This ICRMP has a five-year lifespan, at which time a new document should be developed. Minor annual revisions of this document should also occur within the five-year period. These annual reviews should address:

Annual review of and updates to ICRMP

- Changes in point of contact information (POC)
- Results from new surveys and evaluations
- Management changes due to new agreement documents
- Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) violations
- Changes in Native American consultation policies
- Status of goals laid out in the ICRMP Action Plan
- Changes in status of resources (for example, demolition of buildings)

- Implementation of any new policies or Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)

Changes, amendments, and updated information should be placed within **Appendices III, VII, IX, XII, XVII, and XX** of this ICRMP, and pursuant to the cultural resource metrics in **Appendix XVIII**. The annual reviewer should also sign the Annual Review at the front of this ICRMP indicating when the review was conducted and if changes or updates were made.

All of the pertinent points of contacts and MCB Camp Lejeune representatives copied on this ICRMP are listed in **Appendix XIX**.

REFERENCES CITED

Abbott, Robert

- 1995 Archaeological Survey of the FY 98 Silvicultural Prescription, Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, Onslow County, North Carolina. Ms. on file at Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune Jacksonville, NC.

American Lumberman

- 1907 A Trip through the Varied and Extensive Operations of the John L. Roper Lumber Company in Eastern North Carolina and Virginia (Main Offices Norfolk, VA). *American Lumberman* 27 April 1907. Chicago, IL.

Anderson, David G.

- 1995 Paleoindian Interaction Networks in the Eastern Woodlands. In *Native American Interaction: Multiscalar Analyses and Interpretations in the Eastern Woodlands*, edited by Michael S. Nassaney and Kenneth E. Sassaman, pp. 3-26. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville, TN.

Anderson, David G., and Glen T. Hanson

- 1988 Early Archaic Settlement in the Southeastern United States: A Case Study from the Savannah River Valley. *American Antiquity* 53(2):262-286.

Anderson, Pamela P.

- 2004 *An Analysis of Eligibility for Listing in the National Register of Historic Places United Services Organization (USO, 9 Tallman Street, Jacksonville NC*. Prepared for MCB Camp Lejeune, Jacksonville, NC.

Bense, Judith A.

- 1994 *Archaeology of the Eastern United States*. Academic Press: San Diego, CA.

Binford, Lewis R.

- 1980 Willow Smoke and Dogs' Tails: Hunter-Gatherer Settlement Systems and Archaeological Site Formation. *American Antiquity* 45(1):4-20.

Bowers, Martha H.

1999 *Stone Bay Rifle Range Historic District, U.S. Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, Onslow County, North Carolina*. National Register of Historic Places Registration Form No. 10-900. Louis Berger and Associates, Inc., Needham, MA.

Bowers, Martha H., and Stuart P. Dixon

2000 *Historical Architectural Evaluations, Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, Onslow County, North Carolina*. Louis Berger and Associates, Inc. Prepared for Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune under the terms of the contract with the U.S. Department of the Army, Wilmington District Corps of Engineers, NC.

Brown, Joseph Parsons

1960 *The Commonwealth of Onslow: A History*. Owen G. Dunn, New Bern, NC. Bureau of Land Management's Historical Glass Bottle Identification and Information Website, (2006), Electronic document, <http://www.sha.org/bottle/index.htm>.

Burnette, J.P.

1977 *Framework, Processes, and Evolution of the New River Complex*. Unpublished M.S. Thesis. North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC.

Carraway, Gertrude S.

1946 *Camp Lejeune Leathernecks*. Owen G. Dunn Company, New Bern, NC.

Coe, Joffre L.

1964 *The Formative Cultures of the Carolina Piedmont*. *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 54(5):1-130.

Cowardin, L.M., V. Carter, F.C. Golet, and E.T. LaRoe

1979 *Classification of Wetlands and Deep Water Habitats of the United States*. Fish and Wildlife Service, FWS/OBS 79-31, United States Department of the Interior, Washington D.C.

Cultural Resource Group

1991a *Historic Structures Survey Report for the Route U.S. 17 Jacksonville Bypass Onslow County, North Carolina*. State Project No. 6.269001T TIP No U-2107. Louis Berger and Associates, Inc., East Orange, NJ.

1991b *Phase I Archaeological Survey U.S. Highway 17 Improvements Holly Ridge to Jacksonville, Onslow County, North Carolina*. T.I.P. NO.R-2406, State Project No. 6.269002T. Louis Berger and Associates, Inc., Raleigh, NC.

1992 *Phase I Archaeological Survey U.S. Highway 17, Jacksonville Bypass Onslow County, North Carolina*. T.I.P. No. U-2107, State Project No. 6.269001T, CH 91-E-4220-0106. Prepared for North Carolina Department of Transportation, Raleigh, North Carolina. Louis Berger and Associates, Inc., Raleigh, NC.

Cunning, Tracy A., and Martha H. Bowers

1998 *National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form: World War II Construction, Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, Onslow County, North Carolina*. Louis Berger and Associates, Inc., Richmond, Virginia. Prepared for Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune (MCBCL) Jacksonville, NC.

Daniel, I. Randolph

1998 *Early Archaic Settlement in the Southeast: Hardaway Revisited*. The University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa, AL.

Darden, William M.

1985 Camp Lejeune. In *United States Navy and Marine Corps Bases, Domestic*, P.E. Coletta and K. J. Bauer, eds. Greenwood Press, Westport. Pp. 67-71.

Davis, Thomas W., Kathleen M. Child, W. Patrick Giglio and Martha R. Williams

1997 *Phase 1 Archaeological Investigations at Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, North Carolina*. Prepared for Naval Facilities Engineering Command Atlantic, Norfolk, VA.

Davis, Thomas W., Kathleen M. Child, Peter L. Godwin, and Joshua Roth
2003 *Archaeological Investigations at MCAS Cherry Point and MCHOLF Oak Grove in Craven and Jones Counties, North Carolina*. MS. on file at the North Carolina Office of State Archaeology, Raleigh, NC.

Davis, Thomas W., Patrick W. Giglio, Brooke V. Best, Lex Campbell, and Hugh McAloon

1998 *Architectural Investigations at Marine Corps AirStation Cherry Point, North Carolina*. Prepared for the Atlantic Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Norfolk, VA.

- Delcourt, Paul A., and Hazel R. Delcourt
1981 *Vegetation Maps for Eastern North America*. In *Geobotany II*, R. Romans, ed., pp. 123-165, Plenum Press, NY.
- Dent, Richard, J., Jr.
1995 *Chesapeake Prehistory: Old Traditions, New Directions*. Plenum Press, New York, NY.
- Department of Anthropology, American University
n.d. *Shawnee Minisink: New Dates on the Paleoindian Component*.
Electronic document, http://www.american.edu/cas/anthro/shawnee_minisink_2.html, accessed June 13, 2006. The expanded text is from a poster presentation by Richard J. Dent in the North American Paleoindian and Archaic Session at the 1999 Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Chicago, IL.
- Dixon, Stuart P.
2007 *Naval Hospital Historic District, Onslow County, North Carolina. World War II Construction at Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, 1941-1945*. National Register of Historic Places Registration Form No. 10-900. Louis Berger and Associates, Inc., Richmond, VA.
- Espenshade, Christopher T.
1988 *Site Specific Survey of 31ON308, 31ON309, 31ON386, and 31ON391, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina*. Brockington and Associates, Atlanta, GA.
- Espenshade, Christopher T., and Joel D. Gunn
1990 *Specific Survey of Twelve Sites, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina*. Brockington and Associates, Atlanta, GA.
- Finley, Anthony
1824 *North Carolina [Map]*. A. Finley, Philadelphia, PA.
- Freeman, Paul
2007 *Abandoned and Little Known Airfields: Oak Grove MCOLF*.
Electronic document, <http://www.airfields-freeman.com>, accessed November 20, 2008.

Gardner, William M.

- 1977 Flint Run Paleoindian Complex and Its Implications for Eastern North American Prehistory. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 288:255-263.
- 1982 Early and Middle Woodland in the Middle Atlantic: An Overview. In *Practicing Environmental Archaeology: Methods and Interpretations*, edited by Roger W. Moeller. Occasional Paper Number 3. American Indian Archaeological Institute, Washington D.C.

Haag, William G.

- 1958 *The Archaeology of Coastal North Carolina*. Coastal Study Series 2. Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA.

Hargrove, Thomas, and Jane M. Eastman

- 1997 Limestone- or Marl-Tempered Ceramics from the Lower Cape Fear Region, New Hanover County, North Carolina. *North Carolina Archaeology* 46:91-108.

Harrell, Bryan C.

- 2006 *Archaeological Investigation of Proposed PPV Housing Locations at Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, Onslow County, North Carolina*. Southeastern Archaeological Research, Inc. Prepared for Naval Facilities Engineering Command Atlantic (NAVFACANT), Norfolk, Virginia, and Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune (MCBCL) Jacksonville, North Carolina.
- 2007a *Archaeological Identification Survey of 172 Acres at Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, Onslow County, North Carolina*. Southeastern Archaeological Research, Inc. Prepared for Naval Facilities Engineering Command Atlantic (NAVFACANT), Norfolk, Virginia, and Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune (MCBCL) Jacksonville, North Carolina.
- 2007b *Archaeological Evaluations of Four Recorded Sites(31ON1014, 31ON1261/1261**, 31ON1319/1319**, and 31ON1337/1337**) at Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, North Carolina*. Southeastern Archaeological Research, Inc. Prepared for Naval Facilities Engineering Command Atlantic (NAVFACANT), Norfolk, Virginia, and Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune (MCBCL) Jacksonville, North Carolina.
- 2007c *Archaeological Identification Survey of 63 Acres at Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, Onslow County, North Carolina*. Southeastern Archaeological Research, Inc. Prepared for Naval Facilities Engineering Command Atlantic (NAVFACANT),

- Norfolk, Virginia, and Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune (MCBCL) Jacksonville, North Carolina.
- 2007d *Archaeological Identification Survey of the Midway Park PPV Area, Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, Onslow County, North Carolina.* Southeastern Archaeological Research, Inc. Prepared for Naval Facilities Engineering Command Atlantic (NAVFACANT), Norfolk, Virginia, and Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune (MCBCL) Jacksonville, North Carolina.
- 2007e *Archaeological Evaluation of Site 31ON667 at Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, Onslow County, North Carolina.* Southeastern Archaeological Research, Inc. Prepared for Naval Facilities Engineering Command Atlantic (NAVFACANT), Norfolk, Virginia, and Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune (MCBCL) Jacksonville, North Carolina.
- 2008a *Archaeological Evaluation of Six Sites at Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune and One Site at Marine Corps Air Station New River, Onslow County, North Carolina.* Prepared for Naval Facilities Engineering Command Atlantic (NAVFACANT), Norfolk, Virginia, and Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune (MCBCL) Jacksonville, North Carolina.
- 2008b *Archaeological Evaluation of Five Sites for Phases IV and V of the Family Housing Public/Private Venture at Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, Onslow County, North Carolina.* Prepared for Naval Facilities Engineering Command Atlantic (NAVFACANT), Norfolk, Virginia, and Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune (MCBCL) Jacksonville, North Carolina.
- 2008c *Archaeological Site Identification Survey of 115 Acres at Marine Corps Outlying Landing Field (MCO) Oak Grove, Jones County, North Carolina.* Prepared for Naval Facilities Engineering Command Atlantic (NAVFACANT), Norfolk, Virginia, and Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune (MCBCL) Jacksonville, North Carolina.
- Pending *Addendum to Archaeological Evaluation of Five Sites for Phases IV and V of the Family Housing Public/Private Venture at Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, Onslow County, North Carolina.* Prepared for Naval Facilities Engineering Command Atlantic (NAVFACANT), Norfolk, Virginia, and Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune (MCBCL) Jacksonville, North Carolina.

Herbert, Joseph M.

- 2002 A Woodland Period Prehistory of Coastal North Carolina. In *The Woodland Southeast*, edited by David G. Anderson and Robert C. Mainfort, Jr., pp. 292-317. The University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa, AL.

internet Navy Facilities Assets Data Store (iNFADS)

2008 Electronic database of Navy facility assets. Database search and update of coding for historic buildings conducted by DoD upon request. Data provided on September 10, 2008.

Kimmel, Richard H., and Alison L. Arnold

1990 *Historic Preservation Plan, Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, Supplement I*. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wilmington District, Wilmington, NC.

Lewis, Richard H.

2002 *Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan, Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune*. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wilmington District, Wilmington, NC.

Loftfield, Thomas C.

1976 "A Briefe and True Report..." *An Archaeological Interpretation of the Southern North Carolina Coast*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC.

1981a *An Archaeological and Historical Reconnaissance of U.S. Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune*. Submitted to the Department of the Navy, Washington D.C. Ms. on file at the Office of State Archaeology, Raleigh, NC.

1981b *Executive Summary: Archaeological and Historical Survey U.S.M.C. Base Camp Lejeune, M.C. Air Station (Helicopter) New River, Oak Grove Outlying Landing Field*. University of North Carolina, Wilmington, NC.

1981c *Report on Archaeological Survey of Portions of New River: Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune*. University of North Carolina, Wilmington, NC.

1988 Prehistoric Oysterman of the Central North Carolina Coast. *In Sea and Land: Cultural Biological Adaptations in the Southern Coastal Plain*, edited by James L. Peacock and James C. Sabella, pp. 107-121. Southern Anthropological Society Proceedings No. 21. The University of Georgia Press, Athens, GA.

1990 Ossuary Internments and Algonkian Expansion on the North Carolina Coast. *Southeastern Archaeology* 9(2):116-123.

Loftfield, Thomas C., and David C. Jones

1995 Late Woodland Architecture on the Coast of North Carolina: Structural Meaning and Environmental Adaptation. *Southeastern Archaeology* 14(2):120-135.

Loftfield, Thomas C., and Tucker R. Littleton (compilers)

1981 *An Archaeological and Historical Reconnaissance of U.S. Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune Part 2: The Historic Record*. Submitted to the Department of the Navy, Washington D.C. Ms. on file at the Office of State Archaeology, Raleigh, NC.

Loftfield, Thomas C., and R. Dale McCall

1986 *Osteological Data Recovery and Analysis at U.S. Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina*. Department of Anthropology, University of North Carolina, Wilmington, NC.

Louis Berger and Associates (LBA)

1997 *Historical Documentation: Camp Geiger Historic District*. Richmond, Virginia. Prepared for Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune (MCBCL) Jacksonville, NC.

2006 *Semper Fidelis: A Brief History of Onslow County, North Carolina, and Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune*. United States Marine Corps.

2008 *Guidelines for Historic Buildings Management, Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, Onslow County, North Carolina*. Richmond, Virginia. Prepared for Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune (MCBCL) Jacksonville, NC.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune (MCBCL)

1987 *Multiple Use Natural Resources Plan*. Prepared by Camp Lejeune with the assistance of the Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

2006 *Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (2007-2011)*, Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, Onslow County, NC.

Mathis, Mark A.

1999 Oak Island: A Retiring Series. *North Carolina Archaeology* 48:18-36.

McNab, W. H.

1996 *Ecological Subregions of the United States*. USDA, U.S. Forest Service, Washington D.C.

McManamon, Francis P.

2000 The Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (ARPA). *In Archaeological Method and Theory: An Encyclopedia*, edited by Linda Ellis. Garland Publishing Co., New York and London.

- Millis, Tracy L., C. Damon Jones, Heather Millis, and Lance Greene
2005 *Archaeological Survey of the FY01 Silvicultural Prescription and Company Battle Course, and Phase II Testing of Site 31ON1019/1019** on Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, Onslow County, North Carolina*. Ms. on file Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, NC.
- Mobley, Joe A.
2003 *The Way We Lived in North Carolina*. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, NC.
- Mohlman, Geoffrey
2008a Consultation Package for the Proposed Demolition of Buildings RR29-RR37 at the Stone Bay Rifle Range, Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, Onslow County, NC.
2008b Photographic Recordation for Buildings RR29-RR37 at the Stone Bay Rifle Range, Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, Onslow County, NC.
2008c Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Demolition of Buildings RR29-RR37 at the Stone Bay Rifle Range, Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, Onslow County, NC.
- Murrell, Stratton C., and Billie Jean Murrell
2001 *Jacksonville and Camp Lejeune*. Arcadia Publishing, Charleston, SC.
- National Park Service (NPS)
1984 36 CFR Part 61 Procedures for Approved State and Local Government Historic Preservation Programs. *Federal Register* 49(94): 20309-20311.
- North Carolina Division of Water Quality (NCDWQ)
2007 River Basin Maps. Electronic document, <http://www.eenorthcarolina.org>.
- North Carolina Geological Survey
1985 *Geologic Map of North Carolina*. Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Raleigh, NC.
- Onslow County Historical Society
1983 *Heritage of Onslow County*. Hunter Publishing Company, Winston-Salem, NC.

Onslow County News and Views

- 1941a Thousands Flock Here As Marine Base Begins [1941]. Jacksonville, NC. Ms. on file at the Onslow County Museum, Richlands, NC.
- 1941b Marine Base Occupants Must Move; No Extension. Jacksonville, NC. Ms. on file at the Onslow County Museum, Richlands, NC.
- 1941c Oct. 1st New Deadline to Evacuate Marine Base. 22 August 1941. Jacksonville, NC. Ms. on file at the Onslow County Museum, Richlands, NC.
- 1941d More Checks Received for Marine Base Property. 17 June 1941. Jacksonville, NC. Ms. on file at the Onslow County Museum, Richlands, NC.
- 1941e Barden to be Present at Mass Meet Monday [1941]. Jacksonville, NC. Ms. on file at the Onslow County Museum, Richlands, NC.
- 1941f Funds Allocated Aid Marine Base Evacuees [1941]. Jacksonville, NC. Ms. on file at the Onslow County Museum, Richlands, NC.

Onslow County Old Cemetery Society

- 1997 *Makers of Time: Cemeteries of Onslow County, Volume I*. Onslow County Old Cemetery Society, Jacksonville, NC.

Perkinson, Phil H.

- 1971 North Carolina Fluted Projectile Points—Survey Report Number One. *Southern Indian Studies* 23:3-40.
- 1973 North Carolina Fluted Projectile Points—Survey Report Number Two. *Southern Indian Studies* 25:3-60.

Phelps, David S.

- 1983 Archaeology of the North Carolina Coast and Coastal Plain: Problems and Hypotheses. In *The Prehistory of North Carolina: An Archaeological Symposium*, edited by Mark A. Mathis and Jeffrey J. Crow, pp. 1-52. North Carolina Division of Archives and History, Raleigh, NC.

Poplin, Eric C., David C. Jones, Joel D. Gunn, and Christopher T. Espenshade

- 1992 *Intensive Sample Survey and Data Recovery at Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, Onslow County, North Carolina*. Ms. on file U.S. Engineer District, Wilmington, NC.

Reed-Hoffman, Inez, and Lauren Archibald

- 1996 *A Phase I Architectural Survey: Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, Onslow County, North Carolina*. Panamerican Consultants, Inc., Tuscaloosa, Alabama. Prepared for Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, Onslow County, NC.

Reid, William

- 1993 *Phase IB Cultural Resource Investigations, Greater Sandy Run Acquisition Area, Camp Lejeune Marine Corps Base, Onslow County, North Carolina*. Louis Berger & Associates, Inc., Richmond, VA.

Reid, William H., and Kay Simpson

- 1997 *Phase II Investigations of Nine Prehistoric Sites and Phase I Survey of the P-028 Range Area, Greater Sandy Run Acquisitions Area, Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune*, 2 vols. Louis Berger & Associates, Inc., Richmond, VA.
- 1998a *Cultural Resources Study, Mainside, Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, Onslow County, North Carolina, Volume I: Archaeological Resources Study*. Submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wilmington District. Ms. on file at the Office of State Archaeology, Raleigh, NC.
- 1998b *Cultural Resources Study, Mainside, Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, Onslow County, North Carolina, Volume II: Archaeological Survey of the Stones Bay Shoreline*. Submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wilmington District. Ms. on file at the Office of State Archaeology, Raleigh, NC.

Reid, William H., and Loretta Lautzenheiser

- 1998 *Archaeological Survey of Proposed Borrow Pit, Camp Lejeune, Onslow County, North Carolina*. Submitted to Avolis Engineering, New Bern, NC. Ms. on file at the Office of State Archaeology, Raleigh, NC.

Reid, William H., Philip E. Penderton, and Kay Simpson

- 1995 *Cultural Resources Survey, Greater Sandy Run Acquisition Area, Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune*, 2 vols. Louis Berger & Associates, Inc., Richmond, VA.

Rohling, E.J., M. Fenton, F.J. Jorissen, P. Bertrand, G. Ganssen, and J.P. Caulet

- 1998 Magnitudes of Sea-Level Lowstands of the Past 500,000 Years. *Nature* 394: 162-165.

Rosin, Elizabeth

- 1992 *Historic Structures Survey Report for the U.S. Highway 17 Improvement Project NC50 at Holly Ridge to Four Lanes South of Jacksonville, Onslow County, North Carolina*. Louis Berger and Associates, Inc., East Orange, NJ.

Sassaman, Kenneth E.

- 1993 *Early Pottery in the Southeast: Tradition and Innovation in Cooking Technology*. The University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa, AL.

Sharitz, Rebecca R., and J. Whitfield Gibbons

- 1982 *The Ecology of Southern Shrub Bogs (Pocosins) and Carolina Bays: A Community Profile*. Region IV, Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington D.C.

Smith, Roger

- 1943 Bayonet Action. Photograph, Montford Point. On file at the Montford Point Marine Museum in Jacksonville, NC.

Soller, David R., and Hugh H. Mills

- 1991 Surficial Geology and Geomorphology. In *The Geology of the Carolinas*, J.W. Horton, Jr. and V.I. Zullo, eds. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville, TN.

South, Stanley

- 1976 An Archaeological Survey of Southeastern Coastal North Carolina. *The Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology Notebook (The University of South Carolina)* 8:1-56.

Steponaitis, Vincas P.

- 1986 Prehistoric Archaeology in the Southeastern United States, 1970-1985. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15:363-404.

Stout, G.P.

- 1978 Onslow County, N.C. 1978 Roads [map]. On file at the Onslow County Library, Jacksonville, NC.

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA)

- 1921 North Carolina Soils Map—Onslow County Sheet [map]. On file at Onslow County Library, Jacksonville, NC.
- 2004 Soil Survey, Onslow County, North Carolina. Natural Resources Conservation Services, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Navy

- 1941a Property Map, Area C. Bureau of Yards and Docks, Wilmington. On file at Camp Lejeune Public Works, Jacksonville, NC.
- 1941b Tract C-401, 142.8 Acres, E.L. Cox Heirs. On file at Camp Lejeune Public Works Department, Jacksonville, NC.
- 1941c Tract C-402, 1123 Acres, John L. Roper Lumber Company. On file at Camp Lejeune Public Works Department, Jacksonville, NC.
- 1941d Graveyards within Camp Land Acquisition Areas at Start of Construction. Bureau of Yards and Docks, Wilmington. On file at Camp Lejeune Public Works, Jacksonville, NC.

Voigt, Eric, and Kay Simpson

- 2000 *Archaeological Survey of the Mechanized Assault Course, Range F-245, and Riverine Center of Excellence Project Areas*. Report submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wilmington District, NC.

Wagner, Daniel P.

- 1995 *Pedology and Geomorphology of U.S. Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, Jacksonville, North Carolina*. Prepared by Geo-Sci Consultants, Inc., College Park, Maryland, for Louis Berger & Associates, Inc., Richmond, VA.

Ward, H. Trawick, and R.P. Stephen Davis, Jr.

- 1999 *Time Before History: The Archaeology of North Carolina*. The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, NC.

Watson, Alan D.

- 1995 *Onslow County: A Brief History*. North Carolina Division of Archives and History, Raleigh, NC.

Watts, W.A.

- 1980 *Late-Quaternary vegetation history at White Pond on the inner coastal plain of South Carolina*. *Quaternary Research*. v. 13, no. 2, pp. 187-199.

Wayne, Lucy B., and Martin F. Dickinson

- 1986 *Historic Preservation Plan, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina*. Water and Air Research, Inc. Gainesville, FL.

Whitehead, D.R.

- 1972 *Development and Environmental History of the Dismal Swamp*. *Ecological Monographs* 42:301-315.

Page intentionally left blank

**Appendix content removed to protect
sensitive information**