NELSON'S DOCKYARD NATIONAL PARK, ENGLISH HARBOUR, ANTIGUA, PROGRAM IN MARITIME STUDIES FIELD SCHOOL FALL 2022



View of English Harbour 1800 to 1900 (Library of Congress, Public Domain)

Professor Lynn Harris (Principal Investigator), Professor Jennifer McKinnon (Co-Investigator), Jeremy Borrelli (Staff Archaeologist and Research Associate), and Ryan Bradley (Diving and Water Safety Officer), Ian Cole Dunshee, Levi Eric Holton, Raymond Carleton Phipps, Olivia Livingston, Dayan Goulet Weller, Nicholas Baker, Logan Garrett Willis, Katelyn Dannielle Rollins, Daniel Jordan Schaefer, Madison Elsner (MA Students 2022) and Aero O'Hanlon (compilation assistant)

Table of Contents	Page
List of Figures	iv
List of Graphs	vii
Abstract	viii
Acknowledgements	ix
INTRODUCTION	1
SECTION 1: Tank Bay Shipwreck	8
Historical background	8
Project Archaeology	10
Methodology	11
Excavation and Survey	11
Photogrammetry	12
Artifacts	12
Reburial	12
Paperwork	13
Conservation	13
Excavation Units	13
Unit 1	13
Unit 2	16
Unit 3	17
Artifacts	20
Artifact Assemblage	20
Recovery Procedures	20
Documentation	22
Storage	23
Reburial	24
Dredge Spoil	24
Non-Diagnostic Artifacts	24
Diagnostic Artifacts	25
Artifact and Organic Materials Distribution Graphs	38
Unit 1	38
Unit 2	40
Unit 3	40
SECTION 2: Naval Dockyard	40
Historical Background	42
Historic Structures	44
Cannon	46
Moorings	48
Carronades	51
Mounted Guns	52
Other Cannon	55
Stone Quay	58
Methodology	60

SECTION 3: Fortifications	63
Historical Background	63
Fort Berkeley	63
West India Regiment Complex	67
Fort Charlotte & Horseshoe Battery	70
Lookout Point and Blockhouse	72
Methodology	74
Photography	74
Drone Operation at Fort Berkeley	75
Photogrammetry Processing of Drone Footage	76
Lidar Scan with Scaniverse Application	78
SECTION 4: Snorkel Survey	80
Historical Background	80
Season 2022 Methodology	82
SECTION 5: Breezeway Graffiti	89
Historical background	89
Methodology	91
Discussion	92
SECTION 6: UNESCO/UNITWIN Workshops	93
REFERENCES	95
APPENDICES	
A. Photograph Inventory	102
B. Mylar (Pro Formas) Inventory	136
C. GPS Point Inventory	137
D. Field Specimen Inventory	138
E. Artifact Inventory	139
F. UNESCO/UNITWIN Program	142

List of Figures

FIGURE 0.1. Collaborative East Carolina University, National Parks Authority of	
Antigua and Barbuda, the Association Archéologie Petites Antilles/ University	
of Antilles team (Courtesv of NPAA, 2022).	3
FIGURE 0.2. Map of the gazetted boundaries of the Nelson's Dockvard National	U
Park including marine and terrestrial areas and the Antigua Naval Dockyard and	
Related Archaeological Sites (Antigua and Barbuda National Park Service 2022)	5
FIGURE 1.1 Unit 1 (Digitized by Levi Holton, ECU 2022)	14
FIGURE 1.1. Unit 1. (Digitized by Levi Holton, ECU, 2022).	14
FIGURE 1.2. Unit 1. (Digitized by Levi Holton, ECU, 2022).	15
FIGURE 1.5. Ullit 1. (Digitized by Levi Holton, ECU, 2022).	1J 16
FIGURE 1.4. Unit 1. (Digitized by Levi Honori, ECU, 2022).	10
FIGURE 1.5. Working Traced Digitized Model of Unit 2 (Image by Logan Willis,	17
ECU, 2022).	1/
FIGURE 1.6. Photogrammetry Model of Unit 2 (Image by Claude Michaud,	
Association Archéologie Petites Antilles).	17
FIGURE 1.7. Photogrammetry Model of Unit 3 (Image by Claude Michaud,	
Association Archéologie Petites Antilles).	20
FIGURE 1.8. Pipe bowl from Tank Bay Wreck. (Photo by Nicholas Baker, ECU,	
2022.)	26
FIGURE 1.9. Typical 18 th and 19 th century pipe bowl shapes. (Hume 2001)	27
FIGURE 1.10. Drawing of pipe bowl decoration (Drawing by Raymond Phipps,	
ECU, 2022)	27
FIGURE 1.11. Chert or possible gun flint from Tank Bay Wreck (Photo by Ian	
Dunshee, ECU, 2022)	28
FIGURE 1.12. Typical blade-based gunflints. <i>Left.</i> 'Black' British gunflints from	
the Royal Armoury Kathmandu Nepal <i>Right</i> , 'Blonde' French gunflints	
collected by an amateur in Obio USA (Ballin 2014)	28
FIGURE 1.13 Ton interior view of wine bottle base recovered from Tank Bay	20
Wreck (Photo by Nicholas Baker ECU 2022)	29
FIGURE 1.14 Base view of wine bottle base recovered from Tank Bay Wreck	2)
(Depto by Katalyn Dolling, ECU 2022)	20
EICUDE 1.15 Turical 19th and 10th Contury wine bottle bases. (Schulz et al.	29
FIGURE 1.15. Typical 18th and 19th Century whe bottle bases. (Schulz et al.	20
	30
FIGURE 1.16. Tank Bay Wreck Chinese porcelain with blue floral design.	•
(Photos by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.)	30
FIGURE 1.17. An 18th century Dutch East Indiaman, found at Cape Town, 1971.	
The International Journal of Nautical Archaeology and Underwater Exploration	
5.4(1974): 305-316.	31
FIGURE 1.18. Chinese export porcelain in the middle Qing Dynasty: Study on	
the blue-and-white porcelains excavated from the "Xiaobaijiao I" shipwreck.	
Journal of Archaeological Science: Reports 38(2021): 103024.	32
FIGURE 1.19. Wine bottle neck and upper shoulder recovered in Unit 1. (Photo	
by Nicholas Baker and Lynn Harris, ECU, 2022)	32
FIGURE 1.20. British beer bottles found on the wreck of Mardi Gras. (Ford, 2017).	33
FIGURE 1.21. Image of 18th-Century colonial onion bottle (East Carolina	

University, 2022).	33
FIGURE 1.22. Glass wine bottle Glass Wine Bottle recovered from an 18th-	
Century inn from Uxbridge, England (Pearce, 2014).	34
FIGURE 1.23. Rat Bones in Unit 1 (Photo by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022)	34
FIGURE 1.24. Rat Femur from Unit 1 (Photo by Lynn Harris, ECU 2022).	35
FIGURE 1.25. Fishing Weight from Unit 3 (Photo by Lynn Harris, ECU, 2022).	35
FIGURE 1.26. Musket ball from Unit 3 (Photo by Lynn Harris, ECU, 2022).	36
FIGURE 1.27. Creamware with feather edge rim design from Unit 3. Diagram in	
Hume 2001. (Photo by Lynn Harris, ECU)	37
FIGURE 2.1. Aerial View of Nelson's Dockyard looking west (Photo by Jeremy	
Borrelli, ECU, 2022).	43
FIGURE 2.2. View of the Capstan House looking northeast (Photos by Jeremy	
Borrelli, ECU, 2022).	45
FIGURE 2.3. Cannon locations within English Harbour. (Photo by Nicholas Baker,	
ECU, 2022.)	47
FIGURE 2.4. Cannon location within the dockyard itself. (Photo by Nicholas	
Baker, ECU, 2022.)	47
FIGURE 2.5. Image of several cannons driven into the Northern perimeter of the	
dockyard. (Photo by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.)	48
FIGURE 2.6. Photo of CAN17 driven into the ground next to pillars used for	
sail repair. (Photo by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.)	49
FIGURE 2.7. Images of CAN35 (Photo by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.)	49
FIGURE 2.8. The three dockyard carronades. <i>Top</i> , CAN14. <i>Bottom Left</i> ,	
CAN16. Bottom Right, CAN19. (Photos by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.)	52
FIGURE 2.9. CAN13. Top Left, profile photo of French gun Top Right, 1793,	
the year CAN13 was constructed. Bottom Left & Bottom Right, propaganda	50
carved into the cannon. (Photos by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.)	53
FIGURE 2.10. CAN34. (Photo by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.)	54
FIGURE 2.11. CAN34. (Photo by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.)	54
FIGURE 2.12. CAN34. (Photo by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.)	55 56
FIGURE 2.15. CANT. (Photo by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.)	30 56
FIGURE 2.14. CAN7. (Photo by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.)	50 57
FIGURE 2.15. CANS. (Photo by Nicholas Daker, ECU, 2022.)	51
FIGURE 2.10. CAN16. (Photo by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.) FIGURE 2.17. Quey profile. (Created by ECU field school participants. Digitized	38
by Deven Weller, ECU 2022.)	67
EIGURE 2.18 Students manning the Quay (Photos by Lynn Harris, ECU 2022)	62 62
FIGURE 2.16. Students inapping the Quay (Flotos by Lynn Hallis, ECO, 2022.) FIGURE 3.1 Dan of Fort Parkalay (Imaga courtagy of John Carter Brown Library)	64
FIGURE 3.1. Flair of Fort Berkeley (image countesy of John Carter Brown Library).	04
aliffside (Photo by DI Schoofer, ECU, 2022)	67
EIGURE 2.2 LiDAR scan of the West India Regiment Officer's Quarters	07
foundation (Image by Davan Weller, ECU, 2022)	60
FIGURE 3.4. Perspective view looking northeast of the West India Regiment	07
cistern (Photo by Madison Elsner, ECU 2022)	70
FIGURE 3.5 Man by Kane Horneck showing the Eleven-Gun (Horseshoe)	70
Battery in 1752 (Image courtesy of the John Carter Brown Library)	71
Battery in 1752 (image courtesy of the John Carter Brown Elorary).	/1

FIGURE 3.6. Perspective looking west of the powder magazine at the Blockhouse	
ruins (Photo by Olivia Livingston, ECU, 2022).	74
FIGURE 3.7. Orthomosaic of Fort Berkeley from the photogrammetric data	
(Image by Jeremy Borrelli and Raymond Phipps, ECU, 2022).	78
FIGURE 3.8. Aerial perspective for the LiDAR scan of Keane's Battery (Image	
by Madison Elsner, Dayan Weller, Nick Baker, DJ Schaefer, Logan Willis, ECU,	
2022).	80
FIGURE 4.1. Snorkel survey around Fort Berkeley. (Map by Aero O'Hanlon,	
ECU, 2022.)	83
FIGURE 4.2. Snorkel survey path around Fort Berkeley. (Map by Aero O'Hanlon,	
ECU, 2022.)	84
FIGURE 4.3. Artifact locations recorded during the snorkel survey (Map by	
Nicholas Baker)	84
FIGURE 4.4. Ceramic base with part of English stamp visible (Photo by Katelyn	
Rollins, ECU, 2022.)	85
FIGURE 4.5. Ceramic plate fragment (Photo by Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022.)	85
FIGURE 4.6. Exposed Anchor (Photo by Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022.)	86
FIGURE 4.7. Modern Fishing Trap (Photo by Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022.)	86
FIGURE 4.8. Mooring Block with Chain. (Photo by Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022.)	87
FIGURE 4.9. Cut stone from Fort Berkeley's Wall. (Photo by Katelyn Rollins,	
ECU, 2022.)	87
FIGURE 4.10. Unknown Timber Section. (Photo by Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022.)	88
FIGURE 4.11. Hook in cliff wall near stairs of Fort Berkeley. (Photo by Katelyn	
Rollins, ECU, 2022.)	88
FIGURE 4.12. Artifact locations documented during snorkel survey (Plotted by	
Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022)	89
FIGURE 5.1. R.K. Arbuthnot Engraving. (Photo by Daniel Schaefer, ECU, 2022).	91
FIGURE 5.2. Rear-Admiral Sir Robert Keith Arbuthnot (Photo courtesy of	
Arbuthnot 1920:324).	92

List of Graphs	Page
GRAPH 1.1. Ceramics by unit (Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022).	38
GRAPH 1.2. Bones by unit (Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022).	38
GRAPH 1.3. Unit 1 artifact distribution with wood (Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022).	39
GRAPH 1.4. Unit 2 artifact distribution with wood (Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022).	40
GRAPH 1.5. Unit 2 artifact distribution (Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022).	40
GRAPH 1.6. Unit 3 artifact distribution with wood (Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022).	41
GRAPH 1.7. Unit 3 artifact distribution (Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022).	41

42

GRAPH 1.8. Sheathing by unit (Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022).

ABSTRACT

The following report includes the results of ECU's Fall Advanced Field School in Antigua in partnership with National Parks Authority of Antigua and Barbuda and University of Antilles. The field school comprised several projects specific to teaching and learning requirements and partnership needs. The primary focus of the field school included assisting University of Antilles partners with the excavation and recording of Tank Bay Shipwreck. Secondary projects included assisting the Park recording sections of the Naval Dockyard seawall and other topside features and artifacts, associated forts and buildings, and a snorkel survey. In addition to fieldwork, the team held a UNESCO UNITWIN training in underwater archaeology for diving professionals of Antigua. The details of the field school are reported below. Acknowledgements

Many individuals and organizations contributed to the success and efficiency of this fall semester 2022 field school. First and foremost, we would like to thank Dr. Jean-Sébastien Guibert Association Archéologie Petites Antilles (AAPA) in partnership with the University of Antilles permit holder for the Tank Bay wreck project, Dr. Christopher Waters, Director of Heritage Resource and Delsey Gardner, Heritage Resources Officer of National Parks Authority of Antigua and Barbuda, Nelson's Dockyard National Park, English Harbour, Antigua, for inviting the Program of Maritime Studies, of East Carolina University to be part of this exciting project. Your collective leadership and generosity in this collaboration was outstanding. The partnership project was an incredibly valuable field and professional experience for our ten graduate students. Working side by side with the AAPA team members Jean-Sébastien Guibert, Franck Bigot, Alain Tissier, Margaux Tronchet, Jean-Luc Verdier, Claude Michaud substantially enhanced both the archaeological and culinary experience!

Chris and Desley, we would like to thank you profusely for your generous help and hospitality for everything from multiple airport transportations, unexpected medical emergencies, office space, coordinating boats and boat captains, and arranging opportunities to work with the local community and media. We realize also that it would not have been possible without all the other behind the scenes work of Ann Marie Martin, Parks Commissioner, and the entire NPA. It made a huge contribution towards the challenges of offering a first-time field school in a new venue and making it a success. The research vessel *Acropora* was an excellent work platform, and we could not have executed our daily commutes and mooring exercises without the superb boat captains Ruleo Camacho, Marinus Smith, Travis Weste, Sherwin Mescall and Derrik "Que" Johnson.

ix

Waterfront Inn was the perfect accommodation venue with a wonderful kitchen and open patio to watch Antigua harbor sunsets. Many thanks to Jenna and Joey Compton, owners of the Waterfront Inn and all the staff: manager Kimesha (Kim) Mickle who organized billing and patiently responded to millions of questions, Sheneeze Cummings (we highly recommend her hot sauce), and Enid Smith who helped in innumerable small ways. Last and not least, Karen Underwood, our Program in Maritime Studies administrator, helped with all the challenging aspects of budgets, paperwork, and administrative aspects in organizing and wrapping up billing for an international field school.

Introduction

In fall semester 2022 the Program in Maritime Studies of East Carolina University conducted a field school in Antigua, a Leeward Island in the Caribbean region from October 15-31. The ECU faculty and staff leaders consisted of: Professor Lynn Harris (Principal Investigator), Professor Jennifer McKinnon (Co-Investigator), Jeremy Borrelli (staff archaeologist), and Ryan Bradley (Diving and Water Safety Officer). Our team comprised second year MA graduate students: Ian Cole Dunshee, Levi Eric Holton, Raymond Carleton Phipps, Olivia Livingston, Dayan Goulet Weller, Nicholas Baker, Logan Garrett Willis, Katelyn Dannielle Rollins, Daniel Jordan Schaefer, and Madison Elsner. Students learnt to apply archaeological skills and techniques learnt in HIST 6820 (Research Methods for Nautical Archaeology), and HIST 5520 (Field School in Maritime History and Underwater Archaeology). The objectives were to: modify skills and techniques learnt in summer field school (HIST 5520) and adapt to new data sets, sites, and environments; compile archaeological and historical information; evaluate and analyze archaeological and historical information; create a scientific report about the project as a team describing, illustrating, and interpreting archaeological and historical information; and present illustrated talks to the public on the field school research outcomes.

The field school had multiple opportunities for students to learn and practice skills. They participated fully in excavating and documenting the Tank Bay shipwreck, recovering, and curating artifacts from the wreck, and compiling and post processing data – all culminating in further historical research to co-author a report for submission to the Naval Dockyard UNESCO World Heritage Site managers in December. Other fieldwork activities extended to underwater mapping of a historic quay in the dockyard, documenting historic cannon, anchors, and multiple historic fortifications "at risk" on the hilltops surrounding the harbor. In addition to historic

structure research, the team also gathered baseline data (using photography, LIDAR, and 3-D modelling) on erosion on these coastal heritage sites, and on submerged seabed areas below the fortifications where historic artifacts and old anchorage mooring chains abounded. All these cultural sites also fall within the boundaries of the Naval Dockyard UNESCO world Heritage Site. Daily students were split daily into two or three sub teams with 1. Shipwreck excavating team (Dive Safety Officer present) 2. Dockyard, a quay and coastal structures like fortifications (land survey) recording team 3. Artifact excavation processing team.

The expedition represented a collaboration between Program of Maritime Studies at East Carolina University, the University of the French West Indies (AIHP GEODE), the Antigua and Barbuda National Parks, and supported by Antigua & Barbuda Search and Rescue (ABSAR) and the American Association of Port Authorities. It was made possible with contributive financing of the French Ministry of Europe and Foreign Affairs, the Directorate of Memory, Culture and Archives of the French Ministry of the Armed Forces, the National Park of Antigua and Barbuda and East Carolina University. Dr. Jean-Sébastien Guibert led the team of the Association Archéologie Petites Antilles (AAPA) consisting of the AAPA team members Jean-Sébastien Guibert, Franck Bigot, Alain Tissier, Margaux Tronchet, Jean-Luc Verdier, Claude Michaud in partnership with the University of Antilles. He was the permit holder for the Tank Bay wreck project.

Our hosts in Antigua were Dr. Christopher Waters, Director of Heritage Resource and Delsey Gardner, the Heritage Resources Officer of National Parks Authority of Antigua and Barbuda, Nelson's Dockyard National Park, English Harbour. NPA is the recognized managing Authority for this UNESCO World Heritage Site. Boat captains Ruleo Camacho, Marinus Smith, Travis Weste, Sherwin Mescall and Derrik "Que" Johnson assisted with the logistics of the project. Our team also worked with several regional leaders and stakeholders representing commercial and recreational SCUBA groups by offering UNESCO UNITWIN capacity building workshops in the evenings or as part of daily rotations. Our ECU Program is a full member of this organization that promotes international networking, academic, and community collaboration.



FIGURE 0.1. Collaborative East Carolina University, National Parks Authority of Antigua and Barbuda, the Association Archéologie Petites Antilles/ University of Antilles team (Courtesy of NPAA, 2022).

The NPA officers had several strategic objectives that ECU could potentially contribute

towards:

Objective 1:

- Develop a long-term strategic plan and UNESCO World Heritage Management Plan for the sustainable maintenance and use of the historic buildings in the Dockyard Precinct while protecting and enhancing the OUV
- Collect baseline and intensive data which will inform ongoing management plan upgrades and future planning for the sustainable use of English Harbour
- Collect baseline data for Fort Berkeley erosion to assist in developing and executing a stabilization plan.

Objective 2:

- Record and monitor archaeological sites within the WHS and NDNP while protecting and enhancing the OUV
- Mapping the Tank Bay Wreck for its long-term protection and interpretation
- Mapping English Harbour for the heritage assets and developing management plans for their protection
- Collect baseline data for Fort Berkeley erosion

Objective 3:

- Expand research opportunities for secondary, tertiary and professional researchers in heritage, heritage management, culture, archaeology, history, and related subjects with the NPA as an equal partner
- Collaboration with the University of the Antilles and Eastern Carolina University and possible future collaboration in recording, stabilization projects, geographical and geological studies
- Offer training for Antiguan and Barbudan diving operations and other governmental organizations to enhance capacity for the NPA and Antigua and Barbuda
- Generate new interpretation for national and foreign visitors

Objective 4:

- Enhance development guidelines, development monitoring and development recording within the NDNP
- Increase capacity in baseline data acquisition, management processes and procedures, and recording.

Nelson's Dockyard National Park is one of the highlights for tourism ventures in Antigua and Barbuda. Although it served as the former British Naval Dockyard heavily reliant on enslaved labor, the heritage site spans the 20th century including WWI and WWII activity. The Royal Navy relinquished control of property in vicinity of English Harbour in 1899 and granted title to the Crown. In 1906, the Crown gave the title to the colonial government of Antigua (<u>Antigua and Barbuda National Park Service, About the Park</u>). The stewardship of the National Parks Authority over Nelson's Dockyard National Park was recognized by UNESCO in 2016. The Dockyard and

surrounding military archaeological sites were officially inscribed as a World Heritage Site. The remainder of the park forms the official World Heritage Buffer Zone. Today, the Nelson's Dockyard National Park is home to vibrant communities, pristine conservation zones, and an internationally recognized yachting and tourism destination (Antigua and Barbuda National Park Service, Acts and Regulations).



FIGURE 0.2. Map of the gazetted boundaries of the Nelson's Dockyard National Park including marine and terrestrial areas and the Antigua Naval Dockyard and Related Archaeological Sites. (Antigua and Barbuda National Park Service, 2022).

English Harbour became more important with the expansion of the Dockyard in the

1740s, and numerous fortifications were constructed to protect the naval installation. Dr.

Christopher Waters (2018) researched and published valuable contributions on these heritage

sites, many threatened by coastal and erosion (De Albuquerque & McElroy 1995). Site

visitations and baseline documentation of a sample of these forts was an important part of the field school activities.

An exciting centerpiece of the project was the excavation of Tank Bay wreck under the leadership of Dr. Jean-Sébastien Guibert. The shipwreck, located within the Antigua Naval Dockyard UNESCO World Heritage Site, has an illustrious global biography. Its legacy contributes vignettes to French, British, American, and Caribbean history. The wreck is believed to be the 900-ton vessel *Beaumont* built in 1762 for French East Indies Company trade in the Indian Ocean. When the company dissolved in 1769 the ship was deployed into French naval service as a fourth-rate-ship-of-the-line. In 1772 it left naval service and was purchased by a private citizen, Dessaudrais Sebire and Co., who renamed it Lyon, commanded by Captain Jean Michel, who carried out trade that supported the rebel patriots during the American War of Independence. A British ship HMS *Maidstone*, under the command of Captain Alan Gardener, captured Lyon off the Virginia coast on 3 November 1778 and took it to Antigua as a prize. Garner's report in the naval records describe Lyon, as a French ship of 40 guns, (viz.) 28 twelve pounders on her main deck, 6 six pounders on the quarter deck and 6 four pounders on the forecastle, staffed with 216 men, and commanded by Captain Jean Mitchell, from Virginia to L' Orient with upwards of 1300 hogsheads of tobacco. The engagement included mortalities on both vessels. Four were HMS Maidstone and eight killed and eighteen men wounded aboard Lyon. Both vessels incurred significant structural damage. Lyon was taken to Antigua as a prize venue. A 1780 map clearly shows the outline of a ship titled Lyon in English Harbour at the current location of the wreck. Enslaved divers who built and labored in the dockyard were probably involved in salvaging materials from the wreck through time. The dockyard was a significant Caribbean hurricane shelter and careening venue for repairing and maintaining ships.

Salvaged materials from older ships or wrecks, like well-preserved wood and hardware, were valuable recycled commodities (<u>Guibert et. al. 2021:12-26</u>; <u>Cross 2020:613-640</u>; <u>Foy 2016: 6-35</u>).

So far, the findings are compelling, but the collaborative team could only excavate a small portion of the wreck with the time and limited resources available. We opened three 2-meter (6.74 inches) square units in the bow, stern and midships and dredged into mud compacted with shells and concretions to depths around one meter. Currently our ECU team is analyzing the data we collected and writing our report. It is a significant case study of French allegiance and support of the rebel patriot cause in the American Revolution through continued shipping and trade despite the dangers. Identifying the wreck will provide a tangible and exciting centerpiece to highlight this intrigue for both scholars and the public to learn more about the social and economic dynamics with further evidence garnered from both historical documents and the archaeological evidence. We are planning a virtual conference later this semester to present our findings along with our Antigua and French West Indies partners. We hope to continue this productive and exciting research collaboration for future field schools and to seek grants to further our research capabilities.

Section 1: Tank Bay Shipwreck

Historical Background

The history of the ship *Lyon* is steeped in fascinating events and roles that will supplement future excavations and research. Built in 1762 by Francois Caro, *Lyon* started life as *Beamont*, a 900-ton vessel spanning 145ft. and a breadth of 37ft. that was armed with 26 12-pound cannons. The French East Indies Company deployed it as a trading vessel voyaging between France and China until 1774 when it was bought by Alain Le Breton de Blessin and Guy Jean Dessaudrais Sebire, two major shipowners from Saint Malo who converted the vessel for slaving purposes (Guibert et al. 2021:16-17). *Beaumont* made its final trip to China between the years 1775-1777 before leaving to the America's where it was used as a blockade runner for the Continental Congress during the Revolutionary War.

Purchased by Jacques-Donatien Le Ray Chaumont in 1777, a powerful French aristocrat sympathetic to the American colony's war for independence who acted as the link between King Louis XVI and Bejamin Franklin, *Beaumont* was re-christened as *Lyon* with the intended mission of running the British blockades. With large decks that could be used as fighting platforms as well as sizable storage capacity, *Lyon* was the ideal vessel for breaking through British-held waters with supplies in bulk (Guibert et al. 2021:15-17). From here, *Lyon* is noted multiple times in the naval records of the Continental Navy carrying of trade goods intended for exchange between France and the Colonies, followed with a description of the eventual capture.

After its purchase for aiding the colonial cause, primary sources provide a detailed account of the vessel's lifespan up to its final encounter with the Royal Navy. The first of these records dates to 1777 in volume 10 of the Continental Naval records where a vessel by the name

of Lyon is mentioned within a message to Chaumont. It notes that it should be sold to him and was loading merchandise in France bound for the war effort in North America. Other noteworthy pieces within this source reveal discussions between Frenchmen about uses, direction, and accompaniment of men, arms, and other vessels to aid the Lyon during voyages (Crawford 1996: 962-998). The next mention of Lyon within these records appears in volume 11 where it is notes that Lyon was outfitted in December of 1778 with 40 guns, 200 men, and packed with goods from Europe and India. Lyon left from the Port of Lorient on the last day of the year with a smaller 20-gun French vessel in company and two other continental vessels. Its destination is was Boston, with a large quantity of supplies as well as the intention to carry dispatches from the Continental Congress to France. Lyon never made it to this port and instead opted for Virginia. However, Lyon and another vessel of a comparable size were chased from the Port of Virginia for several hours by the Royal Navy which forced the convoy to redirect once again. *Lyon* finally entered the Port of New-London in March of 1778 in foggy weather with a cargo of salt and woolens for the rebelling colonies (Crawford 2005: 629-856). Lyon was expelled from several areas before and after arriving in New London by the Royal Navy but had many escapes before its final demise by HMS Maidstone.

Lyon's final voyage begins within volume 12 where entries note that *Lyon* had nearly completed the sale of its cargo by April of 1718 and about to leave (<u>Crawford</u> 2013: 124). Shortly after leaving, volume 13 notes <u>Lyon</u> as "having fell in with an English Frigate (<u>Crawford</u> 2019: 154)." This encounter was a 14-hour running battle that took place against *HMS Maidstone* before *Lyon* capitulated. As *HMS Maidstone* was charged with suppressing all support for the Revolutionary War effort in North America, the capture of this vessel and its large consignment of tobacco, gunpowder and other warlike materials was a significant prize for

the Royal Navy crew and their Captain, Alan Gardener (<u>Garnder 1776: 1</u>). Over the course of the coming weeks, Gardener tried to sail his prize north where he could collect a much larger reward for his spoils in London, but was eventually forced to sail the damaged *Lyon* into English Harbour, Antigua (<u>Guibert et al. 2021</u>: 16-17). After offloading all valuables now to be used for the British war effort, *Lyon* was stripped of all parts to the waterline and scuttled inside the Harbour.

Project Archaeology

The goals of this project, in relation to the broader research agenda, were to excavate and archaeologically record the site. Specific goals included: 1) The excavation of sediment, and seagrass overlying the shipwreck structure at both ends of the site and the estimated midships; 2) To identify the bow, stern, and the mast-step of the shipwreck site; 3) The collection of significant artifacts which might provide cultural or temporal affiliation; 4) Taking timber samples to identify wood species and potential construction origin; and 5) publication of a ECU class site report.

Dr. Jean-Sébastien Guibert Association Archéologie Petites Antilles (AAPA) in partnership with the University of Antilles permit holder for the Tank Bay wreck project, excavated the site the previous season to determine the outline of the wreck. A 47m baseline was placed along the exposed keelson with a nylon line and tape was attached to rebar at each end of the shipwreck. The French team strategically placed the units at the extent of the exposed keelson with the goals of more fully exposing the bow and stern of the shipwreck. Initially there was no vertical control, until the structure was uncovered. From there, it was the goal of both French and ECU teams to excavate each unit evenly to maintain the context of any cultural

material found on the site. Spoil bags were to be brought up after each dive to be sifted through for material culture.

Methodology

Excavation and Survey

Excavation proceeded in a 2x2 meter unit for horizontal control, placing 3 of these units at the 0-2 meters and 45-47 meters, strategically placing the second unit at 22-24 meters where the midship was exposed. The excavation site included a water induction dredge of 10centimeter hose, galvanized steel head, and a Pacer IntekPro OHE eight-horsepower water pump. The sediment was collected and screened through a 1/4-inch mesh bag attached to the outlet hose of the dredge spoil. The French team consisted of the same dredge set-up; however, they had a rigid hose and two outflows. The outflow bags were placed approximately 6 to 8 meters away from the site, based upon the unit. At the end of each dive excavation session, the bags were removed and lifted to the surface for screening. Once systematically sorted, all artifacts were placed in a secure and labelled container to be stored in the office of the Director of Heritage Resources in Antigua and Barbuda, Dr. Christopher Waters.

With the French team already placing the baseline and units on the site, the ECU team was tasked with photographing, sketching, taking trilateration points of artifacts, and evenly dredging the units. Prior to initial dredging sessions, the ECU team had about 15 minutes dedicated to taking photographs, mud mapping, and measuring the exposed timbers. Once completed, excavation began. Each unit had a team of ECU divers, spending about 60 minutes underwater. The ECU dive teams consisted of one faculty member and two students, tasking one of the two students with dredging the given unit and switching each other out after 30 minutes.

Photogrammetry

The French team conducted multiple dives to take photos for photogrammetry purposes for unit 1, 2, and 3 as they were being excavated during the project.

Artifacts

Artifacts that were deemed diagnostic during the archaeological survey were drawn into their respective units using trilateration. After having the provenience of the artifacts documented, they were lifted to the surface where they were taken back to the office of Dr. Christopher Waters. Artifacts from the dredge spoil bag were sifted through on the floating barge with a quarter inch screen. Material culture recovered from this process was taken to Dr. Waters' office to be post-processed. During post-processing, artifacts were separated into two groups, diagnostic (ceramics, glass, bone, pipe bowls, etc.) and non-diagnostic (wood, lead slag, charcoal, ballast). Non-diagnostic artifacts were separated into categories, photographed with a scale bar, collected into bags filled with salt water, and stored in buckets for later reburial on the site. Diagnostic artifacts were photographed with scales and bagged individually. Typological, technological, and functional analysis of the diagnostic artifacts were completed prior to reburial and conservation. Dr. Waters initiated the conservation process of designated artifacts. A section of wood from the shipwreck was brought to surface with the intentions of being used to collect wood samples by the French team.

Reburial

The metal rebar used to establish the baseline remained in the sediment as reference points for future field work. The intentions were to rebury the site, though the ECU team did not participate in the reburial process. The French team placed non-diagnostic material on site for reburial while diagnostic artifacts are being conserved by Dr. Chris Waters.

Paperwork

There were several forms that were used for recording data throughout the field season. The forms include participant field notebooks, photographic logs, artifact inventory, and proformas. The ECU proforma of the 10x10 excavation units was used in the field, while the French team's artifact proforma was used during inventory. Through these various forms, data was recorded and collected efficiently, and was also digitally uploaded to the drive.

Conservation

Dr. Chris Waters oversaw all conservation-related activities. The process for conserving diagnostic materials is an on-going desalination process. Materials for curation (buckets, plastic bags) were provided by ECU and the Heritage Office.

Excavation Units

<u>Unit 1</u>

Unit one on the Tank Bay Wreck was situated on point A of the established baseline at zero to two meters. The two-meter grid square was separated into four quadrants, a through d, in which corners a and d were on the baseline. At the beginning of excavations structure was visible in quadrants a and d, and ran parallel to the baseline as well as several loose metal objects were located in quadrant b. In a team of three, consisting of two students and one instructor, one excavated with the dredge while the other two assisted with monitoring the dredge spoil and the collection and recording of artifacts encountered. As the team went down, they kept the unit level and completed trilaterations upon the artifacts uncovered. Some frames became exposed in the wall of quadrant b after bringing the level down, but they only slightly protruded into the unit

and continued eastward of the baseline and unit. After further excavations, the structure was more exposed in quadrant c, although most of the structure remained in quadrants a and d and loose metal artifacts that were often found in b and c quadrants.

The largest focus was upon the structural components of the wreck with the aim of distinguishing the way the vessel was oriented. In turn, towards the latter part of excavations, the unit was expanded west of the baseline in order to expose more of the structural components. As the team proceeded to dredge down, the keel was positively identified and possibly the keelson as well. The intention for the project was to locate the bow and the stern of the vessel and excavations confirmed that unit 1 was in fact the location of the bow.



FIGURE 1.1. Unit 1. Not to scale (Digitized by Levi Holton, ECU, 2022).



FIGURE 1.2. Unit 1. Not to scale (Digitized by Levi Holton, ECU, 2022).



FIGURE 1.3. Unit 1. Not to scale (Digitized by Levi Holton, ECU, 2022).



FIGURE 1.4. Unit 1. Not to scale (Digitized by Levi Holton, ECU, 2022).

Unit 2

Along the 50 m baseline, unit 2 is found midship between the bow and stern. A presumed modern anchor resides on the port side of the baseline with no affiliation to the wreck. The offset continues on the starboard side for an additional 15 m with datums (e, f, i, j, g and h). The dredging in unit 2 was extended for an additional 15 m in effort to collect the approximate midship width. The cleaning of seagrass and mud was necessary to reveal datums a, b, c and d that show the keel, keelson, planking and frames of the wreck. When looking at datums e through h, there is a large collection of ballast stones surrounding the timbers.



FIGURE 1.5. Working Traced Digitized Model of Unit 2 (Image by Logan Willis, ECU, 2022).



FIGURE 1.6. Photogrammetry Model of Unit 2 (Image by Claude Michaud, Association Archéologie Petites Antilles).

Unit 3

Unit 3 was placed at what was expected to be the furthest southern extent of the site along the south-southeast by north-northwest orientation of the wreck based on observations made during the previous field season (<u>Guibert et al. 2021:23-30</u>); the intent being to discern which end of the wreck was the bow or the stern and document its structure. Placed between 44m and 46m and protruding approximately west-southwest (later determined to be the port side) on the established baseline, the unit consisted of a 2x2m square outlined by segments of 2-inch diameter polyvinyl chloride (PVC) pipe fit together. This was divided into 1m square quarters by two high-visibility pink lines pulled taut and strung perpendicular to one another from the center of each side of the square to form a grid. The corners of this PVC frame were placed at a fixed height with four 1/4-inch diameter bar driven into the substrate to hold the frame in place and act as a vertical reference point for the subsequent excavation. Like other units, each 1x1m quadrant was labeled a, b, c, or d respectively beginning from the bottom left corner and continuing clockwise with a and d being the quadrants along the baseline. These labels were written in permanent ink on ear tags (for livestock) which were also affixed to the rebar at the corner they labeled.

Before excavation, the unit was covered in seagrass, removed by hand and placed into the dredge to be screened along with the rest of the spoil. During the project, divers dug up the substrate by hand-faning into the dredge in even layers, continuing around structure and features encountered. Each unit level was defined by the date and sequential number of that excavation for that day. The levels were therefore varied in depth depending on the progress of each diver, averaging about 5 cm per dive.

During the second half of the project (Wednesday October 26th, 2022) the structure became defined enough to allow project leadership to make more precise decisions about where best to excavate to answer the established research questions, namely, to determine the type, extent, and depth of the vessel's construction. As a result of this, efforts in unit 3 shifted focus from a general even excavation to the deepening of an approximately 20cm wide trench laid along the structure across the center of the unit parallel to the baseline. By the end of the project, the trench reached a depth of roughly 18 ft. (based on dive computer observations) and reached the bottom edge of what timbers were connected to the keelson above.

As a result of these excavations, the confirmed stern construction of the vessel could be thoroughly documented. Structural pieces of the sternpost were located along the baseline. Large sections of lead sheathing that were bent and contorted were found at the center of the unit and within the northern section of the unit, between datum 'a' and 'd.' A section of the keelson, approximately 40cm wide, was uncovered. A separate timber was found adjacent to the keelson that had lead sheathing towards the end nearest datum 'a.' This timber is believed to be a section of the stern post assembly and measured approximately 40cm by 40cm from a plan view perspective. Attached to the stern post was a large, concreated piece of metal that appeared to be the gudgeon. The gudgeon was an eyelet affixed to the base of the stern post where the rudder would be secured using a pintle. Other gudgeons and pintles were placed further up on the stern post so that the rudder was secured and could swing freely (Dear & Kemp 2005:250-1). Attached to this gudgeon was a large section of wood that is believed to be part of the rudder. This section of the rudder was approximately 120cm by 40cm from a plan view perspective. Large sections of the rudder still have lead sheathing wrapped around it with loose pieces of lead sheathing around that section of the unit.

Smaller artifacts were in this unit that could potentially provide context for dating the wreck. Among these was a glass bottle neck, measuring 67mm from the base of the lip, the lip measuring 9mm, and the width of the neck was 37.5mm. Two sherds of feathered creamware were found in the unit, one a base sherd and the other a rim sherd.



FIGURE 1.7. Photogrammetry Model of Unit 3 (Image by Claude Michaud, Association Archéologie Petites Antilles).

Artifacts

Artifact Assemblage

Excavation of the Tank Bay Wreck yielded a fascinating artifact assemblage that appears to be conducive with the material that was anticipated to be found aboard a vessel such as *Lyon*. Commonly found non-diagnostic objects in the assemblage included large amounts of coal and charcoal, lead sheathing, and wood fragments from the remains of the hull, and concretions that have yet to be examined for any material they may hold. These objects are supplemented by fascinating artifacts of a diagnostic nature that included wine bottles, glass, differing types of ceramics, a pipe stem and bowl, gunflints, a metal anode, animal bone, and fishing weights that can help to provide a possible date range for the Tank Bay Wreck.

Recovery Procedures

The Tank Bay Wreck is a relatively shallow wreck located in 3-4 meters of calm water that is relatively clear so long as silt deposits surrounding the ship remain undisturbed. The strategy concerning the recovery of artifacts on site involved the use of divers working in shifts across 4 units that divided the wreck into sections from bow to stern that were intended to be excavated using dredging and hand fanning methods. While divers were encouraged to photograph any objects they discovered in situ, any other objects of special significance were placed in plastic bags while still underwater and brought to the surface separately.

All other artifacts found on site were brought up using two dredges working in different units of the wreck at any one time. Using large mesh bags clipped to the end of the outtake pipe of the dredge, all spoil was identified using a tag in the bag with the following information:

- Tank Bay Wreck
- Date
- Unit and Level
- Artifact Identification

Upon bringing it to the surface, all spoil from the selected bag was placed into a sifter located on the wooden platform floating above the site and cleaned off with buckets of salt water to see any possible objects more clearly. Once cleaned, individuals at the sifter began to comb through the spoil to locate objects of significance and divide similar artifacts into groups. For temporary storage, all artifacts of the same types were placed in the same plastic bags before being placed together in one large plastic bag. Each small bag was provided with a tag of the same information as previously disclosed while the larger bag was also given its own tag containing the same information.

All artifacts brought up from the days of excavation were either identified as "diagnostic" or "non-diagnostic" artifacts. While diagnostic objects were any materials that could help to provide a date range for the Tank Bay Wreck, all non-diagnostic artifacts were items that were unable to provide dating information or were not significant enough to warrant long term conservation efforts. All diagnostic artifacts were planned to be kept at English Harbour with

minimal conservation efforts to maintain the current condition of materials that were raised from the site while non-diagnostic artifacts were to be reburied in their original positions on cite as delineated by the bag they were contained within.

Documentation

After each bag had been accounted for, each artifact was provided with measurements and photographs the following day. Each object was provided with measurements (length, width, and thickness) and a sketch within each field notebook prior to final storage or reburial. This was rounded off with an infield photo for all artifacts was typically completed with a smart phone and scale. In the case of artifacts that came in multiple pieces, a count was also given.

After completion of initial measurements, more significant objects moved on to an official photography station for professional photos. Each object of special significance or diagnostic nature was placed with a scale and artifact tag within a white foldable studio that was complimented with lighting. After several perspectives of the objects were completed, it was logged within a record sheet that included the folder it was logged in as well as the identification numbers of the photos that were provided to us by the camera that was used. This made the process of finding specific artifact photos easier when they were called upon. While artifacts that were provided in field photographs were placed back in the original bag and storage area they were pulled from, artifacts selected for official photography were placed within buckets that had been made to separate those that had and hadn't been photographed.

In the case of non-diagnostic artifacts, each object was divided into specific buckets to identify that documentation had been completed. This was accomplished with 4 buckets labeled to hold artifacts from each of the 4 units that the wreck had been divided into. After the object

had been photographed, it was placed within one of these buckets based on where it had come from originally to signal that all documentation had been completed and it was prepared for reburial. Other artifacts of a more significant nature were placed within buckets with labels that specified they had been photographed along with the date they were raised from the wreck to be transferred back to their original bucket at a later date to free up storage for other artifacts undergoing the same process.

Storage

As new artifacts in need of the same documentation process were being recovered every day, a quick storage strategy was needed to prevent valuable objects from being lost as new artifacts were added. This was accomplished using buckets filled with saltwater from the Harbour that were organized based on the day the objects were brought in. Upon the return of the dive boat with new artifacts, a bucket(s) had been prepared with tags indicating the date and their association with the Tank Bay Wreck.

All objects were left in the plastic bags they were originally placed in from the dive boat and were also filled with water from the Harbour prior to being stored within their designated buckets. Newly found artifacts that were deemed of special significance were the exception to this rule and were provided with their own smaller bucket that was not identified by day. As these objects were often requested for tours, measurements, and photos, these artifacts were provided with their own tags and placed in a smaller casing filled with salt water identified as "significant artifacts" that could quickly be tabbed through to find the desired piece.

Reburial

Reburial was accomplished using bio-degradable mesh bags that were each reserved for non-diagnostic from a single unit to be placed within. Once divers returned the bag with all objects to the unit they were discovered in, the site was filled back using the dredge that had been used to uncover the wreck. In the case of more significant diagnostic artifacts, the use of RO (Reverse Osmosis) water or a mixture of RO water with 2.5% sodium carbonate was recommended to maintain the condition of these artifacts over the foreseeable future to prevent cracking from saltwater permeation and to begin the desalination process. All objects were then moved to a small storage shed in English Harbour where they can be accessed for future research and projects.

Dredge Spoil

The two dredges implemented during this excavation were the primary tools used to uncover the remains of the Tank Bay Wreck. As the collection of all small artifacts by hand would have proved nearly impossible, most small artifacts resided within the bags of spoil recovered by divers who used one of the two to begin clearing their respective units of silt. These bags of spoil yielded a plethora of both non-diagnostic and diagnostic artifacts that helped the field school in the collection of evidence to help either confirm or deny the identity of this wreck as *Lyon*.

Non-Diagnostic Artifacts

Items collected during sifting activities included many wood fragments as well as iron sheathing. The small wood fragments typically ranged in sizes between 5-15 centimeters in length and are most likely a post depositional result of the Tank Bay Wreck deteriorating over

the course of the last 244 years. These wood fragments appear have yet to be identified and were found across all 4 units of the site. The large amount of wood fragment finds are contrasted by the high number of iron sheathing found within all spoil brought up from all 4 units of site as well. These fragments ranged from 2-30 centimeters in length and could help to tell additional information on the state of the vessel at the time of its sinking. Possible uses of this iron sheathing could have included additional protection over certain parts of the vessel that were critical to its function as well as serving to fix excessive damage or deterioration which a high level of iron sheathing found on a site such as this could suggest.

Diagnostic Artifacts

Items found within dredge spoil of a more significant nature that could aid in the dating and identification of the Tank Bay Wreck includes:

- Pipe stem and bowl that do not appear to be a part of the same pipe
- Gunflints
- Various types of bone from rats, cow, pig, fish and turtle
- Copper alloy anode
- Different types of glass from wine bottles as well as a medical bottle
- Grape shot
- Musket ball
- Trigger guard



FIGURE 1.8. Pipe bowl from Tank Bay Wreck. (Photo by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.)

The surface of the bowl remains relatively white and was found in fairly good condition. Included on the surface of this bowl are several engravings that depict a sun, a rose, and the possible makers mark of the individual responsible for making this object. Identifying this bowl could help to place the age of the wreck within a 1-2 year date range and help to either confirm or deny the assertion of these remains as *Lyon*. The shape of this pipe appears to match typical shapes of clay pipes taken within the late 18th to early 19th centuries that can be found below. Possible comparisons that could be made to this bowl include the clay pipes found on the site of a Dutch 18th-Century East Indiamen as well as a late 18th-Century inn from the Middlesex that can be found alongside the previously made comparison. Both these instances can help to place the wreck roughly within the period that *Lyon* would have existed. The next step in helping to determine a precise age of the vessel is the identification of the markings of the pipe that are still currently being researched.


FIGURE 1.9. Typical 18th and 19th century pipe bowl shapes. (Hume 2001)



FIGURE 1.10. Drawing of pipe bowl decoration (Drawing by Raymond Phipps, ECU, 2022)



FIGURE 1.11. Chert or possible gun flint from Tank Bay Wreck (Photo by Ian Dunshee, ECU, 2022)

The discovery of two possible gunflints suggests the presence of small arms aboard the Tank Bay Wreck which aligns with the role of *Lyon* as a blockade runner that was in need of considerable weaponry to protect the contents of its cargo. These flints appear worn and flat on one side and are 3-5 centimeters in length. They appear to be in a highly worn state as compared to other flints of the period that possess a more squared appearance that may have experienced less usage or deterioration. Possible comparisons to these flints include English flints from this period appear a similar color but are not degraded to the level in which this suspected flint is. French comparisons do not match this style and appear a much brighter color.



FIGURE 1.12. Typical blade-based gunflints. *Left*, 'Black' British gunflints from the Royal Armoury, Kathmandu, Nepal. *Right*, 'Blonde' French gunflints collected by an amateur in Ohio, USA (<u>Ballin, 2014</u>).









As a common item often brought on many French vessels, the discovery of wine bottle remains such as this are one of several ways in which this wreck can be both dated and identified. This base is in poor condition and has been completely separated from the rest of the bottle with its most prominent feature being the inward taper at the bottom that resembles several styles of bottle during the 18th Century. The base of this object was most likely made using a pontil technique which incorporated the use of a long rod in the finishing stages of wine bottle construction and hold it in place after it is released from the blowpipe (<u>Schulz et al., 2016: 103</u>).

While a determination of the nationality of this object has not yet been made, it does align with typical examples of 18th-Century pontil marks as can be seen in the image below and align well with other objects concerning the Tank Bay Wreck's identity as an 18th-Century vessel.



FIGURE 12. "Wine" bottle bases with sand pontil marks: a) and b) 18th century; c) late 18th, early 19th century; d) 19th century.

FIGURE 1.15. Typical 18th and 19th Century wine bottle bases. (Schulz et al., 2016).



FIGURE 1.16. Tank Bay Wreck Chinese porcelain with blue floral design. (Photos by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.)

Many different styles of porcelain, ceramics and pottery were discovered during the excavation of the wreck of Tanks Bank Bay, which can help provide a plethora of dating information and the type of cargo transported. Of these shards, a small porcelain piece touting a blue floral design is perhaps one of the most unique within this part of the assemblage. This

portion remains in good condition with designs that can be clearly seen. Other examples that can be used to compare this piece includes pieces found on the wreck of an 18th-Century VOC vessel as well as the Chinese *Xiaobaijiao I*. In both these instances, these wrecks were found with the remains of blue porcelain that resemble the piece found with the Tank Bay Wreck which speaks to the truly global nature of this material. This similarity also helps to align the vessel more closely within the 18th Century to move towards confirming its identity as *Lyon*. Discovering these objects could suggest either the men or the vessel itself was one which traveled great distances as these pieces have been found far from their place of origin, an idea that fits within the history of *Lyon* perfectly.



FIGURE 1.17. An 18th century Dutch East Indiaman, found at Cape Town, 1971. The International Journal of Nautical Archaeology and Underwater Exploration 5.4(1974): 305-316.



FIGURE 1.18. Chinese export porcelain in the middle Qing Dynasty: Study on the blue-andwhite porcelains excavated from the "Xiaobaijiao I" shipwreck. Journal of Archaeological Science: Reports 38(2021): 103024.



FIGURE 1.19. Wine bottle neck and upper shoulder recovered in Unit 1. (Photo by Nicholas Baker and Lynn Harris, ECU, 2022)

Included in the increasing list of glass and alcoholic related items on the Tank Bay Wreck is a 5-10cm bottle neck that is believed to be French in nature. The discovery of only wine bottles on the site suggests this wreck to be French in nature as vessels of other nationalities did not prefer a drink of this type on board. The key characteristics that provide this information is the olive-green color as well as the lip at the top of the neck. This object has been broken off from its base and appears to be in fair condition. Potential matches for this piece include a bottle found at an 18th-Century Inn in Middlesex that has a similar top to the one depicted. This idea helps to place the wreck within the correct 18th Century time period once again. Other similar objects to this neck also include an American onion bottle constructed in the 18th Century as well as a British beer bottle found on the wreck of *Mardi Gras* Although the Tank Bay Wreck is suspected to be of French origin, the bottle neck appears to match typical examples of English wine bottles within the time period *Lyon* sailed. While this is only a tentative identification, this assertion presents the idea of this object originating from the men who worked to salvaged *Lyon* after its capture. Possible matches to the shape of this bottle neck could date this piece within the early 19th to early 18th Century. Both comparisons can be found below.



FIGURE 1.20. British beer bottles found on the wreck of Mardi Gras. (Ford, 2017).



FIGURE 1.21. Image of 18th-Century colonial onion bottle (East Carolina University, 2022).



FIGURE 1.22. Glass Wine Bottle recovered from an 18th-Century inn from Uxbridge, England (Pearce, 2014).



FIGURE 1.23. Rat Bones in Unit 1 (Photo by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022)



FIGURE 1.24. Rat Femur from Unit 1 (Photo by Lynn Harris, ECU 2022).

Among the many identifiable faunal remains recovered from the Tank Bay wreck are several rat bones recovered from Unit 1. While some are fragmentary, others are complete diagnostic bones, like the pictured femur. Rats have been a common inhabitant of ocean-going vessels throughout history, and when subject to full zooarchaeological analysis can provide critical information relating to the origin of the vessel, or the ports it visited. When analyzed alongside other faunal remains present on a wreck, evidence of rat bite marks can indicate food which may have been consumed by the unwanted rodents aboard a vessel rather than its intended sustenance for crew members (Queen Anne's Revenge Project 2017).



FIGURE 1.25. Fishing Weight from Unit 3 (Photo by Lynn Harris, ECU, 2022).

An interesting group of artifacts recovered from Unit 3 are lead objects identified as likely fishing weights. Averaging around five centimeters in length, these artifacts have a twist or spiral in their construction, with a crevice running down the center, potentially used for the attachment of line. Similar artifacts have been recovered and interpreted as fishing weights from the site presumed to be the final resting place of Blackbeard's flagship the *Queen Anne's Revenge*, also an eighteenth-century vessel (<u>Queen Anne's Revenge Project 2020</u>). At present, no typologies have been created for lead weights from the period, and the artifacts remain an area in need of further study. While the objects recovered from the Tank Bay wreck most closely resemble what have been identified as fishing weights from other sites, somewhat similar lead objects have been interpreted previously as scale balancing weights (<u>Meide</u> 2015:383), and it is possible the objects could have served alternative purposes.



FIGURE 1.26. Musket ball from Unit 3 (Photo by Lynn Harris, ECU, 2022).

One significant artifact recovered from Unit 3 is an intact lead musket ball. With a 0.59inch diameter, it is smaller than typical .68-70 caliber "Brown Bess" British military issue musket balls used during the American Revolutionary War, though it could possibly be British shot belonging to a smaller arm. Being nearly 0.60 inches in diameter (a discrepancy which could be the result of photo distortion, or degradation of the musket ball), it is more likely shot belonging to an eighteenth-century French Charleville musket. Further analysis of the marks visible on the musket ball would be required to determine whether these represent the smooth bands and scars of a fired musket ball, or simply environmental damage incurred post-deposition. The musket ball lacks the severe indentations and distortions to shape found in musket balls surgically removed from wounded combatants. An important diagnostic element of musket balls is the density; as weights were not taken of the musket ball, complete analyses and positive identification is not possible at present (<u>Sivilich 1996:103-107</u>).



FIGURE 1.27. Creamware with feather edge rim design from Unit 3. Diagram in Hume 2001. (Photo by Lynn Harris, ECU).

Of the ceramics recovered from the Tank Bay wreck, one of the most diagnostic pieces is was found in Unit 3. It is a roughly eight-centimeter-long portion of the rim to a piece of feathered edge creamware, alongside an additional base piece from the same plate, though lacking the easily identifiable features of the rim. Creamware was a popular English produced ceramic that saw widespread distribution throughout the areas of British imperial influence. Though most associated with the 1780s and 1790s in the historical record, creamware was produced from 1762-1900. Relief molded creamware, like the feathered edge visible in the recovered ceramic, was produced from 1762-1785. Giving the piece an even tighter date range,

the blue hand-painted variety came about between 1765 and 1780, consistent with the suspected

identify of the Tank Bay vessel as the Lyon (ex-Beaumont) (Lloyd 2018:25-28).

Artifact and Organic Materials Distribution Graphs

A breakdown of artifact types by percentage in units 1 to 3 displays the following trends:

UNIT 1

Unit 1 contained a total of 205 recovered items. It comprised 125 non-diagnostic wood fragments, 35 concreted ballast stones, 11 carbonized wood fragments, 16 metal fragments, 9 bone fragments, 4 ceramic items, 2 glass sherds, and 3 non-identifyable materials. This unit in the bow area contained 43% of the ceramic sherds and 65% of the bone fragments of total assemblage in the three units.



GRAPH 1.1. Ceramics by unit (Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022).



GRAPH 1.2. Bones by unit (Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022).



GRAPH 1.3. Unit 1 artifact distribution with wood (Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022).

Metals present in the unit include iron strips or patches, iron fastenings, and lead sheathing. Diagnostic items were ceramic sherds (3), a pipe bowl (1) and a bottle base and neck (2). A small mammal bone could represent the right femur of a rat. Rats have been a common inhabitant of ocean-going vessels throughout history. A full zoo-archaeological analysis might supply critical information relating to the origin of the vessel, or the ports visited. When analyzed alongside other faunal remains present on a wreck, evidence of rat bite marks can indicate food which may have been consumed by the unwanted rodents aboard a vessel rather than its intended sustenance for crew members (Queen Anne's Revenge Project 2017).

Both the white kaolin pipe bowl and the dark green bottle neck in Unit 1 date to the latter part of the 1700s and early 1800s. The pipe bowl shape and heel location suggest it a date range of 1760 to 1820. The down-tooled string rim of the bottle neck dates to 1780—1800 (<u>Hume</u> 2001:303, 70-71).

UNIT 2 (MIDSHIPS)

Unit 2 contained a total of 51 recovered item. It comprised 27 non-diagnostic wood fragments, 6 ceramic sherds, 3 glass sherds, one piece of leather, 1 metal item, and 10 non-identifyable materials.



GRAPH 1.4. Unit 2 artifact distribution with wood (Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022).



GRAPH 1.5. Unit 2 artifact distribution (Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022).

UNIT 3 (STERN)

Unit 3 contained a total of 194 recovered item. It comprised 133 non-diagnostic wood fragments, 22 ballast stones, 18 metal fragments including a musketball, 5 carbonized wood fragments, 4

bone fragments, 4 ceramic sherds, 3 glass sherds, 3 gunflints, one piece of leather, and 2 nonidentifyable materials.



GRAPH 1.6. Unit 3 artifact distribution with wood (Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022).



GRAPH 1.7. Unit 3 artifact distribution (Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022).

Unit 3 contained 60% of the sheathing in the recovered assemblage, compared to 40 per cent in unit and nothing in unit 2.



GRAPH 1.8. Sheathing by unit (Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022).

Section 2: The Naval Dockyard

Historical Background

The area now known as English Harbour has been a haven in which ships can find protection from storms since 1660 (Nicholson 2002:3). Its first European-built structures appeared in 1725 and the area was decommissioned as a military base in 1895 (NPA 2014). Antigua has many fortifications along its coastlines set up to protect the island from outside invasions. The British had a constant naval presence in the area, but this required a place of upkeep to maintain the fleet. English Harbour was recognized as important for its sheltered, deep bays that were almost enclosed by hills (NPA 2014). The harbor was perfect for providing safe anchorage within an easily defendable geography (NPA 2014). Antigua was purely reliant on imports from neighboring islands, but this was constantly under peril from the wars fought in the Caribbean. To protect its cargo, having naval vessels near the trade routes helped support the local economy (Waters 2018).

Because of the protection it offered as well as its strategic value, English Harbour became a common place for careening and repair (<u>NPA</u> 2014). In 1725, the naval war in the Caribbean

required the British to establish bases where ships would be safe to be refitted or repaired (NPA 2014). English Harbour became quite valuable to the British as they waged war in the western world. Over the next two years, the Dockyard, then called St. Helena, was being built. Over the course of the next century the British Government added to the Dockyard whatever building it needed to run efficiently. In 1745, a capstan house, "Pitts" for careening blocks, storehouse, and watch house was added (NPA 2014). In 1895, the Antigua Dockyard was demilitarized due to the expanding use of steamships that it was not fit to repair (NPA 2014).

Today, the Dockyard is no longer a military base, but a tourist destination frequented by cruise ship passengers and the yachting community. Numerous travelers enter the Dockyard daily to learn about how giant ships once anchored in the surrounding bays waiting their turn to be refitted before returning to the ever-present war outside its protected waters.



FIGURE 2.1. Aerial View of Nelson's Dockyard looking west (Photo by Jeremy Borrelli, ECU, 2022).

Naval Dockyard Historic Structures

English Harbour is home to numerous historic structures within the scope of Nelson's Dockyard National Park. The structures that were focused on in this project were the capstan house and two heave down blocks. These structures were vital to dockyard operations as they were used to pull or "heave" ships onto their port and starboard sides for careening. The team documented the capstan house and the western most heave down block with 4k video from an iPhone 12 Pro Max at 60 frames per second. The remaining heave down block on the Careening Wharf that remains was documented with still images from a Nikon D3400. These videos and photos of these structures were used to create a photogrammetric model in Agisoft Metashape version 1.8.4.

The flight path taken for the heave down blocks started with a perimeter route around the block, with the second pass following the same route but from a lower angle, and the third pass was from a higher angle looking down at the block. For the heave down block next to the stone quay, an extra pass was made to document the cannon that was on top of it. The video length for this heave down block was 4 minutes and 1 second. The flight path for documenting the capstan house had to be altered due to the walls, the three capstans in the interior, and the cannon on the eastern end. The video recording started at the western most entrance to the capstan house and captured the exterior perimeter of the area to lock everything in for the photogrammetry model. The second pass followed the first but focused on a top-down angle of the capstan house wall. Once completed, the inner perimeter of the capstan house wall was recorded, followed with doing individual perimeter passes of the capstans starting with the western most, center, and

eastern most. The final section of the flight path was dedicated to capturing the cannon at the eastern side of the area. The video of the capstan house was 18 minutes and 30 seconds.

The capstan house at the English Dockyards was constructed in 1807 while the heave down blocks construction date is unknown, but they preceded the 1820 construction of the stone quay. These structures were used for careening operations, where tackles were attached to vessel's masthead on one end while the other end was connected to the three capstans. The vessel was then laid onto one side, exposing the hull for it to be cleaned and repaired, if necessary. To control the angle of heel, and to right the vessel once the cleaning or repairs were complete, tackles were run underneath the keel secured to the heave down blocks. The process would be repeated once one side was completed (Dear & Kemp 2005:88).



FIGURE 2.2. View of the Capstan House looking northeast (Photos by Jeremy Borrelli, ECU, 2022.).

The construction of the English Dockyard capstan house was built in the post-and-beam style, something that was typical of the other structures in the dockyard. The interior was open so that the capstans could function without impediment. The loft of the house was reserved for quartering the seaman of the vessels being careened. In 1925, a hurricane destroyed the capstan house leaving the low brick foundation line. (NPA 2014)

The heave down blocks were constructed of locally quarried stone. Contained within were three admiralty longshank anchors. The central anchor was positioned with the ring protruding at the seaward end of the structure. This ring is where tackles would be attached to control the vessels being laid on their side. The other two anchors were positioned in the opposite direction. On the western most heave down block, a portion of an anchor's fluke can be seen through the top of the block. (NPA 2014).

Cannon

As English Harbour became a major hub for Royal Navy activities from the mid to late 18th-century, many cannons were used throughout the area for several reasons. In total, 39 cannons were documented throughout the dockyard with purposes that included the mooring of vessels to the dockyard, defense, and decoration. While the majority of these guns were found within the primary docking area, two still reside at Fort Berkeley and another two can be found on Galleon Beach. These weapons can help to tell the story of how vessels were roped in place upon their arrival, the dockyard's capacity to defend itself, and even the typical armament possessed by vessels that made use of the harbour.

46



FIGURE 2.3. Cannon locations within English Harbour. Each gun is defined by the designation 'CAN' and followed by a number. (Photo by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.)



FIGURE 2.4. Cannon Location within the dockyard itself. Each gun is defined by the designation "CAN" and followed by a number. (Photo by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.)

Cannon Moorings

Of the 39 total cannons found within English Harbour, the majority of them were found driven into the ground just past their trunnions with muzzle facing upwards. Most of these cannons that have been driven into the ground are evenly distributed along the dockyard's 3 sided perimeter that is facing the water while the landlocked side has none. The purpose of these guns appear to be for mooring vessels into place. In total, CAN2-6 are moored into the northern facing perimeter, CAN9-12, CAN27, and CAN30 are located along the southern perimeter, and CAN, 24,25,26, and 28 are along the northeastern perimeter. Of all the cannons within the dockyard, these are likely the only guns that have remained insitu while all other guns have been moved through the years on the carriages they still remain on or have been placed on the ground in areas to be viewed by those who have come to see the harbour. The sizes of these guns appear to range from 4-18 pounders.



FIGURE 2.5. Image of several cannons that have been driven into the Northern perimeter of the dockyard to either side of the heave down block. (Photo by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.)

Another driven cannon that appears to serve a functional capacity is CAN17, a singular gun found alongside the large pillars used for sail repair. Based on its proximity to this facility, CAN17 may have been used to moor vessels undergoing sail repair closer to these pillars to make transporting sails between the vessel and the repair location easier. Using these cannons can help to determine how many vessels could be moored into the dockyard.



FIGURE 2.6. Photo of CAN17 driven into the ground next to pillars used for sail repair. (Photo by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.)

The final driven cannon that appears to serve a specific function within the dockyard is CAN35, a large gun that has been driven into the rocks at the tip of the peninsula that boasts Fort Berkeley. The leading theories toward the purpose of this gun include its use as a mooring point in which to help slingshot vessels into the habour or the point that allowed the Royal Navy to stretch a boom chain across the harbour entrance. Other iron spikes and buttons were found both in Fort Berkeley and just behind CAN35 that could have allowed soldiers within the Fort to operate some sort of chain or roping to complete either of the offered theories.



FIGURE 2.7. Images of CAN35, believed to either have been used to ferry vessels into the the harbour or to stretch a chain boom across the dockyard access for defense. (Photo by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.)

But while these driven cannons appear to have an intended purpose based upon their locations within the dockyard, others appear to serve only as decorations. Examples of this can be seen in the case of the entry to the dockyard where 2 cannons have been placed at both the beginning and end of the short road that allows entrance into the docks. These cannons identified as CAN20, 21, 22, and 23 appear to be small 1-3 pounders that serve no other purpose than for the entrance to be more aesthetically pleasing. Upon entering the dockyard, another cannon can be found driven into the ground just in front of the sail house while 3 more (CAN 31, 32, and 33) line the southern side of the structure that sits just in front of the museum. These appear once again to only serve to make the building entrance more appealing.

Other driven cannons that seem to have been forgotten are cannons 29 and 38 that are nearly completely driven into the ground rather than only partially. While CAN38 sits on the Northern corner of the former copper and lumber storage building, CAN29 sits directly across from it on the other side of the street. A final cannon that is also buried to its muzzle is CAN28 that can be found just behind the heave down block on the northwestern edge of the dockyard. Possible answers as to why these cannons have found themselves driven almost completely into the ground could be due to interference they caused at another point in time and complete burial solved this issue. In total 27 cannons are driven into the ground in the harbour. A common factor in the case of all these guns is the condition of their bores which have all been either capped with iron or filled with dirt. This no doubt pertains to the safety measures taken to ensure these guns could not be fired while in the ground as well as help to preserve the integrity of the gun and prevent standing water from accumulating inside the bore and rotting the gun out from the inside. These guns can help to tell us more about the number of vessels that docked in the area and how they used additional cannons that had fallen out of service for other means.

Of the 39 cannons that sit within the dockyard, 12 either remain in their carriages or now sit idle along the ground. Two of these cannons appear to be larger in nature than the ones driven within the ground and not all have had their bores filled or capped with any materials. The chances of these guns being in situ are low and have most likely been moved throughout the years to make room for other projects as well as make the dockyard more appealing to visitors. Other guns appear to have been severely damaged and were off-loaded by the vessel they came on for them to become a permanent feature of the dockyard.

Carronades

Of these guns, 3 are carronades, a style of gun intended to be used at close range. While all three of these guns now rest in carronades, two match one another and may match the description of British carronades dating to 1780 (<u>Nicholson 1994: 35-37</u>). While one of these guns (CAN16) is found directly in front of the structure now used as a gift shop, the second carronade (CAN19) found at the entrance within a man-made half dome that has been carved out of the cliff alongside the roadway entrance. The final carronade (CAN14) is much larger than the previously two stated guns and rests on the southeast side of the Dockyard Museum. This gun is also of British origin based upon the seal of King George as well as the mark of British

51

Ordnance. This gun appears to match ones constructed in 1800 and could bring 32-pound cannon fire or larger at close range with devastating effects (Nicholson 1994: 35-37).



FIGURE 2.8. Dockyard carronades. *Top*, CAN14, the largest of the three carronades within the dockyard. *Bottom Left*, CAN16. *Bottom Right*, CAN19. CAN16 and CAN19 are the smaller of these gun types and appear to match one another. (Photos by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.)

Mounted Guns

Other guns still remaining within their carriages include two guns that sit in front of the dockyard museum, two on Galleon Beach, and one within Fort Berkeley. Of the two guns in front of the museum, one is French (CAN13) and one is English (CAN15), both appear to be 18-24-pounders. This is determined based on the French markings on one gun that associate it with the French Revolution as well as the Seal of King George and the mark of British Ordnance on

the other. While the French gun was mounted in front of this building after its capture to be used as propaganda against the French, the English appears to also be used for decoration. The French gun and English gun have had their touch holes filled while only the French gun has had its bore capped with iron.



FIGURE 2.9. CAN13. *Top Left*, a profile photo of French gun CAN13 displayed outside of the museum. *Top Right*, 1793, the date CAN13 was constructed. *Bottom Left & Bottom Right* reveal propaganda carved into the cannon. (Photos by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.)

The rest of the guns still remaining in carriages are found outside of the harbour with one remaining gun located on Fort Berkeley that has yet to be discussed and two on Galleon Beach. Of these 3 guns, the one found on Fort Berkeley (CAN34) can be found within the small redoubt that was the original defense that comprised Fort Berkeley and appears to be an 18-24 pounder English gun. This assertion is based on the seal of King George as well as the mark of British

Ordnance on the top of the gun. Other marking also feature on the carriage of the gun that does not appear to match the gun it currently houses. These markings include what appear to be sizes and weights of what the carriage is rated for.



FIGURE 2.10. CAN34. (Photo by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.)



FIGURE 2.11. CAN34. (Photo by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.)



FIGURE 2.12. CAN34. (Photo by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.)

The final two guns that can still be seen on carriages is an English gun (CAN36) and a Swedish gun (CAN37). These guns do not feature in their original carriages and were placed in white mounts that have been anchored in the sand. These guns appear to be 4-8pounders that are intended to only serve as beach decorations with no records of their original position in the dockyard.

Other Cannon

The remaining 4 guns within the Harbour can all be found on their sides and laying in a position clearly intended for the viewing pleasure of passing tourists. All these guns feature in the dockyard and have not been filled or capped with any material inside their respective bores. Within this cannon grouping, both largest guns in the dock feature in this set (CAN1 and CAN7) and are tentatively identified as English 32-pounders. While CAN1 can be found lying atop the dockyard's northeastern heave-down block, CAN7 sits within the remains of the capstan house. Noteworthy features of these guns include a cracked muzzle as well as cascabel on CAN7 which

could suggest why this gun was left in the dockyard as well as an "A" on the trunnion of CAN1 that has been identified as a maker's mark.



FIGURE 2.13. CAN1. (Photo by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.)



FIGURE 2.14. CAN7. (Photo by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.)

Right across the road from CAN7 is another gun laying on wooden blocks that has had severe corrosion and damage to the muzzle (CAN8). This gun is much smaller than the previously mentioned naval guns and is most likely a 3-4pounder. While the surface is rusted, the most prominent feature of CAN8 is its exploded muzzle that may have occurred while firing the gun. After this incident, the gun was most likely dropped off by the ship it came with where it has been left to this day.



FIGURE 2.15. CAN8. (Photo by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.)

The final gun within this category is a small gun that is likely a 1/2-2pounder (CAN18). CAN18 has been deposited on the steps behind the sail repair shop and remains totally covered in concretion. The condition of the gun is poor and no record exists as to where this gun may have originated. As opposed to the other guns within the harbour that were most likely placed there by naval vessels and moved throughout the yard over the years, the high degree of concretion may indicate that CAN18 spent a significant amount of time beneath the water before being pulled to the surface.



FIGURE 2.16. CAN18. (Photo by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022.)

The collection of these guns present in English Harbour as one of high activity and importance during its peak in the 18th Century. The state that each gun was found in can tell us more about their function or state when they reached the dockyard. While the guns found driven in the ground can tell us about how many vessels could dock in the harbour at any one point as well as how they were moored in place, guns in carriages can help to show how these guns may have been used to defend the harbour or simply be used as decoration along with guns driven into the ground that are nowhere near water. This is combination with guns that continue to lay along the ground that could have been decommissioned due to use, age, or damage and abandoned at the dockyard to become permanent features to this day.

Stone Quay

The original wharf in Nelson's Dockyard was made of tar-coated wood pilings wrapped in copper sheeting and iron tipped points. The wooden pilings were driven deep into the seabed and remained the dockyards mooring method until 1821. Boatswain Francis Fox and a crew of 34

enslaved Africans (23 laborers and 11 stonemasons) began the construction of a new stone wharf in 1821. The purpose of the new wharf was to expand dock space along with the working platform. South of the Dockyard, stones were collected from the natural rock surfaces of Antigua and then heated and pressed into large blocks. The stones were then transported to the waterside and placed over the original wharf. In 2003, much of the stone wharf in the Dockyard was renovated due to the increased risk of erosion. The original stones quarried in 1821 were removed and mounted on a new foundation of pre-cast interlocking blocks. A concrete slab was poured over the blocks which replaced the old wharf stones but left it appearing aged. On October 16th, 2022, the East Carolina University team began documenting and collecting measurements of the stone wharf directly facing Nelsons Dockyard and the second heave down block. It became evident that sea level rise and erosion is a pressing matter in the Dockyard. At high tide the water rises well above the stone quay and onto the walkway typically around 1600 each day. When the team's divers entered the water, the first glance led to the abundance of marine life, algae and seagrass clinging to the stone wharf. Mussels aligned consistently 40 to 60 cm below and throughout the baseline at the low tide waterline. Environmentalist visiting the site, confirmed that the mussels inhabiting the stone quay are an invasive species that may be cousin to the zebra mussel (Rollins 2022:7). The dive teams quickly noted that the overgrowth of algae and marine life below the waterline obscured the block stone features, making it difficult to accurately identify where one block ends and another begins (Rollins 2022:7). The stones are mostly heterogeneous in shape (Dunshee 2022:5-10), with the majority measuring 16x40cm (Livingston 2022:10). To obtain these measurements, the dive teams relied heavily on touch with respect to marine life. The wharf is built on three separate levels with the bottom level sloping outward and protruding toward Tank Bay. The protrusion is not unform in every section of the stone quay. For example, on the baseline, the sections noted as 30

m to 40 m have a noticeably large, damaged area. This damage resulted in a large portion of the bottom level to be missing. Aside from portions and corners of stone blocking being nicked from years of docked yachts, many square impressions were found along the stone wharf that potentially housed metal O-rings for vessel dockage (Willis 2022: 2-7).

Stone Quay Methodology

The Stone Quay was once a heavily trafficked area for the dockyard and still is in frequent use to this day. Recording the surface of the sea wall would allow for a more comprehensive understanding of dockyard maritime practices from the 18th century until contemporary times in Antigua. A 70-meter baseline was established on top of the Stone Quay in which teams of two would record the vertical surface area of the sea wall. Each pair was assigned a ten-meter section of the Stone Quay in which they completed scaled profile and crosssection drawings. The teams began with profile drawings of the sea wall and prior to each dive, proformas were made with the inclusion of established baseline and offset measurements to the top edge of the sea wall. Once entering the water, the dive teams would map in their designated sections, in reference to the established points from the baseline, of what was discernible from the harbour wall. The ten-meter section per team was further divided into five-meter units where teams created both the profile and cross section drawings and for each unit, team members would rotate through taking measurements and drawing the profile. Divers had to be quite cognizant through this process due to the sea life covering the harbour wall, while being cautious of the wildlife, the teams often had to carefully feel along the stone in order to distinguish the edges of the blocks. The cross-section drawings would be particularly relevant for highlighting areas of change and damage to the sea wall. However, teams of four were needed in order to obtain accurate measurements from the edge of the wall at every five meters along the baseline. A

60

measuring tape was attached to the length of a hollow PVC pipe, at just past four meters in length, and a level was secured at the top of the PVC pipe with tape. Of the team of four, one individual would remain at the surface and keep the PVC pipe level to the harbour edge while another would remain at the bottom to keep the PVC pipe from shifting. Between the remaining divers, one would use a ruler to measure the distance of the wall to the attached vertical measuring tape while the other diver recorded the measurements on a baseline and offset table. Following the end of the dives, the teams plotted their points to create the cross-sections of the Stone Quay. Once drawings were completed after three days of diving along the area, the team individually created drawings in illustrator for both the profiles and cross-sections for the aim to merge them into complete profile and cross-section views of the harbour wall.



FIGURE 2.17. Quay profile. (Created by ECU field school participants. Digitized by Dayan Weller, ECU, 2022.)



FIGURE 2.18. Students mapping the Quay (Photos by Lynn Harris, ECU, 2022.)
Section 3: Fortifications

Historical background

Fort Berkeley

Fort Berkeley was the bulwark of the defensive fortifications protecting English Harbour, Antigua. The small protruding peninsula acted as a gate for protecting the harbor permitting entrance and exit of vessels from the west side of English Harbour. The defenses at Fort Berkeley go back 21 years before the Royal Navy's presence in English Harbour. Initial fortifications on the peninsula were originally constructed in 1704 (<u>Waters</u> 2018:158). This original construction consisted of a small square redoubt built near the tip of the jutting peninsula. Construction for the redoubt was funded through the Antiguan colonial government and constructed by the local enslaved population (<u>Waters</u> 2018:155). The stone and concrete appear to have been sourced locally from a limestone quarry located off the harbor at the base of the peninsula on which Fort Berkeley is located. The limestone bricks that make up the redoubt are not uniformly designed, which demarcates the early construction prior to the involvement of British engineers (<u>Waters</u> 2018:155).

The guardhouse of Fort Berkeley is the first addition to the fortification since the square redoubt's construction in 1704. The guardhouse acted as a sentry post for Fort Berkeley and was constructed in 1726 (Waters 2018:155). It originally was the storehouse for gunpowder at Fort Berkeley before the construction of the bombproof magazine in 1811 (Waters 2018:156). It was also a source of wind protection for the soldiers stationed there during colder nights as well as an additional fortification with windows constructed with a clear view to the east of English Harbour to Fort Charlotte, one window directed towards the mouth of the harbor, as well as a window directed to the outward Atlantic Ocean.



FIGURE 3.1. Plan of Fort Berkeley (Image courtesy of John Carter Brown Library).

The most comprehensive construction of Fort Berkeley occurred in the 1740s under the command of Commodore Charles Knowles. During this construction period, Commodore Knowles was in command of the Leeward Islands Squadron at Nelson's Dockyard and notably constructed a linear defensive wall with embrasures for cannons at Fort Berkeley (Waters 2018:157-58). This construction was completed via the professional engineering of the Royal Navy, as seen through the uniformity and alignment of its construction. The same quarry was used for its construction that was used for the original square redoubt fortification (Waters 2018:158). The construction of the wall was at the initiative of Commodore Knowles, and the Royal Navy covered the construction cost rather than the Antiguan colonial government (Waters 2018:159). This was one factor in the temporary removal of Commodore Knowles from command by the Royal Navy as they saw the expenses as unjustified (Waters 2018:159).

The bombproof magazine acted as a replacement for the role the guardhouse had in storing gunpowder. It was constructed in 1811 during the peak of hostilities of the Napoleonic Wars. The significant traffic of British Royal Navy ships into the English Harbour likely caused this construction during this time (<u>Waters</u> 2018:155). The bombproof magazine also contained space for a cooperage and sifting room for packing explosives. The structure was built to hold approximately 300 barrels of gunpowder (<u>Etherington</u> 2002:199).

The armament of Fort Berkeley was 29 cannons at the peak of its use (<u>Waters</u> 2018:155). Originally the fortification was occupied by locally trained Antiguan gunners. It was only in 1783 that Fort Berkeley was occupied and staffed by British soldiers. Some historians believe there was a massive chain attached to an upturned cannon bollard on site attached to the other side of English Harbour to Fort Charlotte (<u>Oliver 1894:5</u>). An additional strength of Fort Berkeley was the wind itself; wind severely limited the entrance of sailing vessels into English Harbour. Ships were forced to sail directly at the fortifications of Fort Berkeley, where they would then drop their sails and drop hard, pulling into the harbor and drifting in (<u>Waters</u> 2018:92-93). The vessel would then have to be pulled into English Harbour by ropes from Fort Berkeley.

Fort Berkeley was never actively used in any conflict scenario. The preventative nature of its construction was enough to cause enemy vessels to stay away and never attempt a direct invasion or attack on English Harbour. The primary role of the fort was to protect English Harbour, where vessels would go for shelter from hurricanes, repair work, or scrapping. By 1707, British vessels first used English Harbour as a shelter, and by 1723 the Harbor was in full operation (Waters 2018:12-13). Fort Berkeley was officially handed over to the Royal Crown in 1783 immediately following the American Revolution (Waters 2018:159). This was potentially

due to mistrust between the local Antiguan colonial government and the government of the Royal Crown because of the Navigation Acts, which blocked Antiguan trade with the newly established American nation. Following the end of the Napoleonic Wars in 1815, Fort Berkeley and most Antiguan fortifications were left in disrepair, and then in 1850, all operations at Fort Berkeley ceased.

The last restoration work for Fort Berkeley occurred in 1989 and focused on the guardhouse. The guardhouse roof is made of wood, and therefore has experienced deterioration from wind and rain. Portions of the roof are missing, and in need of repair. The bombproof magazine is largely intact, with some historic and modern graffiti carved on the inside walls. The inside ceiling of the magazine shows signs of water intrusion due to the discoloration of the mortar on the top sections. There is one remaining cannon, forged in 1805 and stamped with a King George III seal (Oliver 1894:5). The most significant erosion at the fort is located at the edge of the crenelated wall built by Royal Navy. On the windward side of the fortification, wave action has caused a 5.5m section of the wall to collapse into the ocean. Almost 3m of the stone walkway has also eroded either when the wall broke apart or after that event (Figure 3.2). The cliff immediately below the broken section is significantly eroded so more damage is likely to occur with increasing storm activity in the Caribbean.



FIGURE 3.2. Aerial view of the eroded wall of Fort Berkeley and underlying cliffside (Photo by DJ Schaefer, ECU, 2022).

West India Regiment Complex

The West India Regiments of the British military were composed mostly of enslaved-Africans, though the legal status of the soldiers in the West India Regiments was ambiguous for most of the regiment's history. Originally assembled to support the failing British efforts against French colonial incursions in the Caribbean, two regiments of recently arrived slaves were raised in 1795, with six more being put together five months later, and ultimately an additional four added by the end of 1798 (Buckley 1978:83). These twelve regiments were born out of necessity, as the crown was unable to recruit enough white soldiers for service in the West Indies, and too few free volunteers existed to form adequate defense forces for the Caribbean colonies (Lampert 2011:633-635). While predominantly composed of recently arrived slaves, the West India Regiments were not exclusively made up of forced laborers; their ranks included freemen from the colonies along with white Englishmen, adding to the complexity of what space the West India Regiments occupied regarding the compulsory nature of the service (Buckley 1978:92). In 1807, the Prime Minister Lord Grenville declared that all enslaved members of the armed forces were officially considered free men, clarifying that this had always been the position of the government regarding the West India Regiments. Despite the seemingly abolitionist position of the Prime Minister when it came to those purchased for military service, in practice the newly clarified legal status and full pay did not see African soldiers able to enjoy their technical freedom- all enlistment in the West India Regiments (coerced or otherwise) was considered a lifetime employment, without the ability to exit the contract (Wells 2021:48; National Parks 2014:88).

Over 13,000 enslaved Africans were purchased for British Military service during the West India Regiments existence, very few of which were former plantation workers in the Carribean. Since those with ties to local communities were seen to have a higher likelihood of rebellion, the ideal West India serviceman was not accultured to Carribean living in the eyes of the British (Chartrand 2011). Even with extreme reservations on the part of the British legislature when it came to employing a majority enslaved military force in the West Indies, the West India Regiments proved successful in combat, participating in campaigns during the Napoleonic Wars from 1805-1815, including the invasion of Guadeloupe (<u>Wells 2021:45</u>). Even with the battlefield successes of the West India Regiments, the British were not able to completely avoid complications from their decisions to use enslaved soldiers. Multiple mutinies broke out in the ranks of the 2nd and 8th West India Regiments during the first years of the Napoleonic Wars, though none were entirely successful and were put down after a few days in each case. In the

immediate aftermath of the Napoleonic Wars, the West India Regiments were not involved in many significant conflicts, though they were occasionally employed in the stopping of slave rebellions in the British colonies (<u>Wells 2021:52</u>). Antigua was not subject to any combat during the years of colonial warfare between France and the British Empire, and the defenses of the island maintained by the West India Regiments went unused until they were disbanded.



FIGURE 3.3. LiDAR scan of the West India Regiment Officer's Quarters foundation (Image by Dayan Weller, ECU, 2022).

On Antigua, the 4th battalion of the West India Regiment was stationed at a complex known as the "Middle Ground Barracks", above Fort Berkeley at English Harbour. Immediately below the complex is a battery alternately called "Keane's Battery" or "One-Gun Battery." While no structures remain fully standing at the West India Regiment complex, the foundations of the complex remain intact, along with a few remnants of wall sections, and a considerable amount of material culture on the surface of complex (Figure 3.3). Most of the associated material culture consists of ceramic scatter (some with diagnostic features), along with lower concentrations of historical bottle glass. Additionally, a musket ball was recorded approximately twenty meters west of the boundaries of the complex, near the edge of the Middle Ground Trail. Using historical maps, the foundations of multiple structures were able to be identified. The largest structure at the West India Regiment complex was the officer's quarters, which also appears to have the highest concentration of surface artifacts (though this may be complicated by the presence of overgrown vegetation on other parts of the site). The most intact structures are the cisterns, located north of the officer's quarters and Keane's Battery (Figure 3.4). Additionally, the foundations of enlisted barracks and officer's kitchen are present on the site, along with heavily degraded remnants of canals running over the hillside towards the cisterns.



FIGURE 3.4. Perspective view looking northeast of the West India Regiment cistern (Photo by Madison Elsner, ECU, 2022).

Fort Charlotte and Horseshoe Battery

The Antiguan government constructed a fortified line for musketeers during the early part of the 1700s. It was built approximately 100 meters to the west of English Harbour Fort, now known as Fort Berkeley. In 1745, a map of the fortification depicted the addition of 11 guns (<u>Nicholson 1994:19</u>). Kane Horneck, an officer in the Royal Engineers, reported in 1752 that shows this fortification was referred to as 'Eleven Gun Battery' and in 1755 it was referred to as 'Horseshoe Battery' (Figure 3.5). The number of guns at the battery changed over the next two decades with 8 guns being reported in 1765 and 12 guns on a 1773 map that included officer's barracks on the cliff above (Nicholson 1994:19).



FIGURE 3.5. Map by Kane Horneck showing the Eleven-Gun (Horseshoe) Battery in 1752 (Image courtesy of the John Carter Brown Library).

In 1780, there was movement in Antigua to reinforce the fortifications of the island. During this period in 1790 another battery was constructed above Horseshoe Battery, located over the 'Pillars of Hercules.' This fort would later be named Fort Charlotte, after Queen Charlotte the King George III's consort. Fort Charlotte was constructed in the shape of a horseshoe, similar to the battery below it, with large sandstone bricks (<u>Nicholson 1994:19</u>). The overall thickness of the battery's rampart was 336cm with an interior and exterior wall built with these sandstone bricks (<u>Waters</u> 2018:162). The interior wall's bricks were approximately 15-20cm in length, 30cm in height, and 20-30cm thick. The exterior wall had larger bricks that measured approximately 55-70cm in length, 40-50cm in height. The gap between the two walls were filled with a mixture of rubble, mortar, and dirt. This technique created a thicker layer or protection for stationed cannon and gun crews stationed here (<u>Waters</u> 2018:162).

Both Fort Charlotte and Horseshoe Battery served as part of the defense for English Harbour and to help prevent any rear attack on Falmouth Harbor. According to map in 1745, there is an anchor in the reef northwest of Horseshoe Battery. Here a chain was attached and drawn across the entrance of the harbor to a fastening point at Fort Berkeley. This chain would have had spars attached to it to deter enemy ships from entering the harbor. Fort Charlotte was further developed in the following years as a signal station. In 1823, a map of Fort Charlotte shows two guardhouses that were built at the lower end of the battery (Nicholson 1994:18-19).

Today, Horseshoe Batter has collapsed along the cliff side, likely due to erosion. Fort Charlotte is still accessible via a trail that begins at Galleon beach. The battery is still intact, though there is significant erosion along the exterior wall, namely at the base of it with recess points measuring from 10 to 45 centimeters deep. Along the southern edge of the exterior wall there is vegetation that has grown up to the wall, possible helping maintain soil integrity.

Lookout Point and Blockhouse

Within a short distance of Nelson's Dockyard is a former military complex, Shirley Heights, that consists of Lookout Point and Blockhouse. In 1781 the new Captain-General of the Leeward Islands, Thomas Shirley, came to Antigua with a plan to fortify the eastern heights above the Naval Dockyard (Weaver 2002:5). Named after Thomas Shirley, the complex was erected to defend the Dockyard, serve as a military depot, and to provide the necessary facilities for troops (Weaver 2002:5). At this time, however, Britain had control over Jamaica, Barbados, and Antigua with fear of a French attack, causing the formation and expansion of Shirley Heights

by building about fifty structures (<u>Weaver 2002:6</u>). From the 1780s to 1854, Shirley Heights and the Blockhouse were continuously occupied by the British regiment until the last of the troops were reassigned to another Caribbean colony, Trinidad (<u>Weaver 2002:7</u>). The dominant structures were Fort Shirley, the Royal Artillery Quarters, the powder magazine, officer's quarters, and the barracks. During the fall 2022 field school, the Program of Maritime Studies particularly looked at the remaining ruins of the Lookout Point and the Blockhouse.

At 490 ft, the Lookout Point offers a panoramic view of the Naval Dockyard. It consists of the Royal Artillery Guard House, which was once responsible for the Signal Station, where a flag was hoisted for warnings and alerts (<u>Waters</u> 2018:76) and the Royal Officer's Barracks. Today, the Guard House serves as a restaurant and bar while the Royal Officer's Barracks is eroding. To the east of Shirley Heights and considered the easternmost part of the complex is the Blockhouse. The Blockhouse has several buildings, being that of the Officer's Quarters, a cistern, men's barracks, offices, powder magazine, and married stables (<u>National Parks Authority of Antigua and Barbuda 2014:63, 65</u>). Today, most of the buildings are dilapidated due to age and environmental stressors, however, some, such as the powder magazine, remain in good condition.



FIGURE 3.6. Perspective looking west of the powder magazine at the Blockhouse ruins (Photo by Olivia Livingston, ECU, 2022).

Methodology

Photography

The Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) and Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) have a development of standards regarding documenting and recording historic architecture (Historic American Buildings Survey, 2020). By implementing the HABS and HAER recommendations throughout the terrestrial fieldwork in Antigua, the team captured structures of interest for future site assessments and the historical record. Throughout the photography process, GPS points were taken through the World Geodetic System (WGS84) for reference points, as well as implementation of scales and measurements within the photos. Using the Nikon DSLR for documentation, the team followed HAER guidelines for the various view types of each structure, gathering a general or environmental views, front façade, perspective view of front and rear, as well as exterior and interior details (<u>Heritage Documentation Programs</u> 2015:3). Through these numerous perspectives, the structure and surrounding environment can be assessed.

Drone Operation at Fort Berkeley

One of the objectives for this project was to complete a full 3-dimensional recording of Fort Berkeley to assist in on-going site management. Due to the large area to be surveyed, the team opted to use a DJI Mavic Pro Platinum UAV to collect video data, which would be input into photogrammetric software to render a 3D image. This drone was connected to a controller attached to one team member's phone, an iPhone 11. The controller locks onto the phone and connects through a downloadable application, so the operator can connect through Bluetooth to the drone. This connects the drone's camera to the iPhone, so that the screen portrays what the camera sees. The operator stands at a position above the landscape, if possible, or at a position to best see the drone while flying it. As a team, we separated at certain points of the landscape so that one person at each time had eyes on the drone. Multiple individuals acted as spotters so that there was someone who could see the flight path and direct the operator, so the drone did not crash or get too close to the ground and ocean.

When the team worked on Fort Berkeley, the drone operator stood on a peak above the fort, which provided an optimal viewpoint to see the entire landscape. Each student was positioned at locations along the fort to keep the drone in view, like at the edge of the fort where the operator would not be able to see the drone in a low pass. The drone did three revolutions around the fort to capture the foundation as well as the roofs and tops of any structures. Lastly, the drone did two final passes over the top of the fort to record any remaining places not

previously captured. The drone was used to capture footage of Fort Berkeley and the erosion around the foundation. This method was attempted at the West India Regiment ruins, but the drone was attacked by a hawk and destroyed.

Photogrammetry Processing of Drone Footage

To process the drone video footage, the video files were first imported into Agisoft Metashape Professional Version 1.8.4. and photos were extracted at 30 frames per second. Once extracted, under 'Workflow,' 'Align photos' was selected and the following preselects were chosen; accuracy set to 'High,' 'Generic Preselection' is checked, key point limit is set to 40k, and tie point limit set to 4k. The remaining boxes were left unchecked and 'Ok' was selected to align the photos. Once the alignment was completed, any camera that showed 'NA' was manually realigned. The point cloud was then adjusted to fit properly on the grid, using keyboard shortcuts '1', '3', and '7' to get straight alignment from profile, plan, and front views of the model.

The next step in the process was to remove any distortion from the point cloud. To do this, less accurate tie points were deleted using 'Gradual Selection' under the 'Model' tab. There are four options to select from, but only three were used for processing this data: 'Reprojection Error,' 'Reconstruction Uncertainty,' and 'Projection Accuracy.' Each option was selected from top to bottom, each being selected twice. Once selected, the bar was manually moved to select approximately 10% of the tie points. From here they were deleted and under 'Tools' 'Optimize Cameras' was selected. All 10 cameras were selected, and the cameras were optimized. This process was repeated for each selection twice, doing the same selection back-to-back.

Once the tie point distortion was removed, 'Create Mesh' was selected under 'Workflow.' Under 'General' the following selections were made: For 'Source Data' 'Depth Map' was chosen, for 'Surface Type' 'Arbitrary (3D)' was chosen, for 'Quality' 'High' was chosen, and for 'Face Count' 'High' was chosen. Under 'Advanced' the following selections were made: under 'Interpolation' 'Enabled' was selected, for 'Depth Filtering' 'Mild' was selected, and 'Calculate Vortex Color' was selected. Once completed, 'OK' was selected and the 'Mesh' was created.

The following step was to create the model's texture. Before this could be done, any unnecessary areas of the mesh were removed. Once the texture process is initiated, the software will attempt to add texture to 100% of everything in the model, including poorly rendered areas particularly around the edges. This would have taken more time to run, and the object being modeled would have been less detailed. Like before, under 'Workflow,' 'Create Texture' was selected. Under 'General' the following selections were made: for 'Texture Type' 'Diffuse Map' was selected, for 'Source Data' 'Image' was selected, for 'Mapping Mode' 'Generic' was selected. Under the 'Advanced' section only the 'Enable Hole Filling' was checked. Once the texture process was completed, the model had been rendered and was complete.



FIGURE 3.7. Orthomosaic of Fort Berkeley from the photogrammetric data (Image by Jeremy Borrelli and Raymond Phipps, ECU, 2022).

Lidar Scan: Three-Dimensional Documentation with the Scaniverse Application

To more thoroughly document the fortifications surrounding English Harbour, phone and tablet-based lidar scanning technologies were also implemented. This method was chosen due to its portability to the remote locations in which many of the fortified structures are found and because there were no high-accuracy three-dimensional laser scanning or Structure from Motion (SfM) devices available for use during the project. Applications using the cameras and lidar features of hand-held cellular devices for three-dimensional documentation have overall become more common in cultural heritage projects for these reasons (Basílio et al. 2022; <u>Labędź et al.</u> 2022; <u>Teppati Losè et al. 2022</u>), because of their ability to be stored long-term in librarial institutions (<u>Mune 2022</u>), and due to their general low-cost, often being free (Basílio et al. 2022; Dickinson et al. 2022; <u>Niantic, Inc. 2022</u>). While specifications concerning the accuracy and precision of the point cloud and three-dimensional mesh files generated by such programs are often not reported by the developers (<u>Niantic, Inc. 2022</u>; <u>Teppati Losè et al. 2022</u>), independent academic studies have shown their results to have an accuracy to approximately 1-3cm if fully functional and being used properly, though this accuracy can sometimes be lower (Costantino et

al. 2022; <u>Rodriguez et al. 2022</u>). This is significantly less exact than other three-dimensional documentation methods (Dickinson et al. 2022; <u>Teppati Losè et al. 2022</u>) and the resulting products are generally reported to be less dense in informational geometry compared to more sophisticated tools, some with as many as 50% of their recorded points unaligned (<u>Łabędź et al.</u> 2022; <u>Teppati Losè et al. 2022</u>). However, the intent of this documentation was not to collect archival-quality three-dimensional models but instead to be the first of its kind for these cultural resources and most importantly, to help assess current on-site deterioration and erosion to be compared with data collected in the future.

The Scaniverse application (<u>Niantic, Inc. 2022</u>) was chosen for its free-cost and ease of use. While Scaniverse can operate using lidar if used in concert with lidar-equipped devices, none were available and so the collected data used its alternate SfM capabilities to directly output three-dimensional mesh files (<u>Niantic, Inc. 2022</u>). Upon arrival at each site, any significant small features (such as cannon, anchors, small buildings or structures, etc.) were scanned individually. If possible, this was followed by a full-site or structure scan in which team members left the device continually recording, passing it from one to the other when necessary and taking care to not include the body of any person in the captured images when doing so. This was done wherever possible, though because of the application's distance limit of 5m (Basílio et al. 2022; <u>Niantic, Inc. 2022</u>), some structures were too tall, too distant, or too precariously located to record fully.



FIGURE 3.8. Aerial perspective for the LiDAR scan of Keane's Battery (Image by Madison Elsner, Dayan Weller, Nick Baker, DJ Schaefer, Logan Willis, ECU, 2022).

Section 4: Snorkel Survey

Historical Background

Although the primary focus of ECU's Antigua Fall 2022 Field School was the excavation of the Tank Bay Wreck, English Harbour's rich surrounding history could not be overlooked. As the archaeological remains and archival history of the dockyard stretches far beyond the reaches of the suspected Continental blockade runner, the exploration of other parts of the dockyard to provide additional context around the remains of *Lyon* was also critical as many of these archaeological remains have not been thoroughly examined.

Of these remains, the waters immediately surrounding Fort Berkeley falls into this category. As the primary fortification of the Harbour used to protect its narrow entry point, the decision to explore the waters around the cliffs of the fort warranted a plethora of new artifacts and Harbour features that tells the tale of the different types of vessels that entered the dockyard and how they interacted with this fortification. The peninsula of land that narrows the mouth of the Harbour significantly was the chosen location of the first permanent fortification to be built in defense of the dockyard in 1704. A small redoubt was constructed for several cannons at the tip of the peninsula by wealthy planters along with a guard house to accommodate the troops in the region for the purpose of attracting the Royal Navy to house their warships within the harbour along with a guard house to accommodate the troops (Nicholson 1994: 16-18). As English Harbour grew in importance, Fort Berkeley was improved upon with the construction of two long fortifications to the west of the original redoubt for the purpose of increasing the amount of cannons that could be held in the fort in 1744. While the first of these line fortifications specified as "battery A" was built by the islanders and could hold 12 additional guns, the second line known as "battery B" was constructed by Royal Navy Engineers and could hold another 10 guns, bringing the number of guns within Fort Berkeley up to 29 that ranged between either 24 or 18 pounders (Nicholson 1994: 16-18). The completion of Berkeley presented a deadly defense for any hostile vessel attempting to enter harbour as it had to present itself side on to the fort for it to make entry. The defenses of Berkeley were never tested and remains in a relatively stable condition today with the exception of some areas being threatened by erosion processes.

As the years continued to go by, Fort Berkeley was finally provided with a proper magazine in 1811 for the storage of the ammunition meant for the guns that lined its walls. This

37x21ft magazine was able to hold up to 300 barrels of powder along with cooperage (Nicholson 1994: 16-18). Other additions also included the installation of a large cannon protruding up at ninety degrees from an outcropping at the tip of the peninsula it was constructed upon. Leading explanations as to the purpose of this cannon include its usage as a bollard to warp vessels into the harbour in a slingshot manner or its use as one of two attaching points for a boom chain that would have stretched across the mouth of the harbour to Horseshoe Battery. Other remains of possible support structures to support this gun also include an iron nail and buttons that feed into Berkeley through a gunport on the redoubt that comes off at an angle that aligns with these support structures shows how this apparatus may have been controlled from the inside of the fortifications.

Methodology

The water surrounding the peninsula that Fort Berkeley sits atop of had not been thoroughly explored prior to the ECU's Fall 2022 Field School and was an area that provided a plethora of information concerning how vessels interacted with Berkeley upon their entry into the harbour. The snorkel search that followed yielded several new features that can help to present a better idea of the workings of the harbour and how Berkeley fits into this framework.

The peninsula of Fort Berkeley has water depths that range from 5-12 meters with perfect visibility that make scuba equipment unnecessary to complete an effective search and allows snorkel kits to be used instead. In total, 7 field school members were involved in order to provide comprehensive coverage of a search pattern that began at the pier which rested alongside the original wall of English harbour meant to provide protection for sailors as well as keep them from deserting. The selected search method made use of all 7 field school members spreading

out adjacent to the shoreline with approximately 3 meters between each individual. The search party then moved parallel to the shoreline until it reached Fort Berkeley and completed its search after it had rounded the peninsula. As the peninsula produced a strong tidal effect that caused water to run quickly along this shoreline during storms could take smaller objects with it, searching this shoreline prior to reaching Berkeley was critical to provide complete coverage of the intended area.

After creating the search line, all field school members maintained the line and distances between one another while they searched. In the event something was found, the member who made the discovery signaled the search line to stop. After this occurred, one field school member that possessed a Garmin GPS unit marked the location of the object or feature while a second member recorded these coordinates a second time in writing as well as what the object was on mylar paper. After a record was completed, the search line continued to move as one unit again.



FIGURE 4.1. Snorkel survey around Fort Berkeley. (Map by Aero O'Hanlon, ECU, 2022.)



FIGURE 4.2. Snorkel survey path around Fort Berkeley. (Map by Aero O'Hanlon, ECU, 2022.)



FIGURE 4.3. Artifact locations recorded during the snorkel survey (Map by Nicholas Baker)



FIGURE 4.4. Ceramic base with part of English stamp visible (Photo by Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022.)



FIGURE 4.5. Ceramic plate fragment (Photo by Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022.)



FIGURE 4.6. Exposed Anchor (Photo by Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022.)



FIGURE 4.7. Modern Fishing Trap (Photo by Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022.)



FIGURE 4.8. Mooring Block with Chain. (Photo by Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022.)



FIGURE 4.9. Cut stone from Fort Berkeley's Wall. (Photo by Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022.)



FIGURE 4.10. Unknown Timber Section. (Photo by Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022.)



FIGURE 4.11. Hook in cliff wall near stairs of Fort Berkeley. (Photo by Katelyn Rollins, ECU, 2022.)



FIGURE 4.12. Artifact locations documented during snorkel survey. See Appendix C (Plotted by Nicholas Baker, ECU, 2022)

Section 5: Breezeway Graffiti

Historical Background

According to the UNESCO World Heritage Site, historical graffiti is pre-20th century inscriptions or figure drawings carved into walls or pottery. The Caribbean has numerous graffiti findings that often date to the colonial era (Lace et al. 2019), however in Antigua there is graffiti related to the period of the Second World War (WWII). The field school recorded graffiti located within the breezeway and adjacent office of the former Naval Officer's Quarters. During World War II, the West India Regiment and Caribbean Regiment occupied Nelson's Dockyard, where servicemen who were stationed there carved their initials and dates into the walls. Since then, the breezeway has been painted over multiple times, making some graffiti illegible.

English Harbour was used as a barracks and training facility for Antiguan contingent soldiers of the West India Regiment in Antigua. The history of the regiment goes back to its founding in 1795. The breezeway of the observed graffiti was constructed in the late 1800s. This is likely through the consolidation of the regiment into two battalions in 1888, where 1st battalion consisted of Antiguan recruits (<u>Healy 2000:70</u>). The regiment had significant combat experience. In the late 1800s, the regiment was heavily engaged in the Ashanti War of West Africa. The British military utilized West Indian soldiers for their disease immunity in West Africa (<u>Healy 2000:68</u>).

The regiment was utilized in a similar role in East Africa during the First World War against the German territories from 1914 to 1918. To fill additional labor needs, the British West India Regiment was formed as a volunteer fighting force of 12 battalions and 16,000 volunteers (<u>Puri & Putnam 2017:41</u>). This force fought in Palestine from 1917-1918 and was part of the force to capture Jerusalem from the Ottoman Turks in 1918 (Wilson 2021:122). The British East India Regiment was disbanded after the war. The East India Regiment and its two battalions also were disbanded shortly after, and its colors were officially cased in 1927 (<u>Healy 2000:72</u>).

Notably, there was much graffiti, primarily names and dates, from the 1940s in the breezeways and multiples from 1944. In April 1944, the Caribbean Regiment was formed of 1200 volunteers (Dyde 2000:223). On the enlistment roster are two Antiguan officers and 72 enlisted soldiers (War Diary of 1/CR, Orders for Embarkation 1945). The Antiguan soldiers were likely recruited and consolidated at English Harbuor, where they could undertake basic training. Further training was conducted at Fort Eustis near Williamsburg, VA, from May to June 1944 (<u>Healy 2000:81</u>). In June 1944, the Caribbean Regiment left for occupational duties in Italy. In October 1944, until the end of the war, the Regiment was sent to Egypt, where it guarded German prisoners of war (<u>Healy 2000:82</u>). The Caribbean Regiment was then returned to the Caribbean and disbanded in early 1946 (<u>Healy 2000:85</u>).

Methodology

The intention was to record the graffiti in detail and its location with the breezeway and the office. A couple methods were attempted, one of which did not succeed. An attempt with recording using LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) via an app called "Scaniverse" was unsuccessful. It is likely that the glossy white paint coating the walls did not allow for enough texture to be recorded to create a mesh.

Thus, the team opted to take individual photographs of the breezeway and office as the primary form of recording. The pictures were taken using the Nikon DSLR camera and implementing a scale to capture each name. The team started by taking pictures at eye level with a scale. The team photographer used a two-step pace count, allowing the pictures to overlap. A ladder was then employed using the same step pace count technique to capture the higher levels of the wall while using a scale for reference. Lastly, the team captured the bottom level of the walls using the same technique in the unlikely case of engravings on the lower levels.



FIGURE 5.1. R.K. Arbuthnot Engraving. (Photo by Daniel Schaefer, ECU, 2022).



FIGURE 5.2. Rear-Admiral Sir Robert Keith Arbuthnot (Photo courtesy of Arbuthnot 1920:324).

Discussion

With termite damage and the age of the wood used, the Dockyard is considering replacing the walls, which ultimately means destroying all graffiti. Primarily, the images uncovered with the Nikon DSLR will be used to preserve and interpret the engraved graffiti. The historical context will be preserved by having the team document the graffiti and cross-reference the names and dates of the graffiti individual through archival research. Although that process has not yet begun, one set of graffiti was identified to a specific individual.

In one of the rooms of the Naval Officer's Quarters, now a real estate office, there was a name carved into the wall that is still defined and readable. The name R.K. Arbuthnot, along with the date May 1889, is now framed in this office. The engraving is believed to be that of

Rear-Admiral Sir Robert Keith Arbuthnot, 4th Baronet. It was potentially framed as a memorial because Arbuthnot notably lost his life in 1916 during the Battle of Jutland (<u>Gordon 1996:445</u>). He would have been a 26-year-old junior naval lieutenant stationed in Antigua. He also officially succeeded to his father's baronetcy on 5 June 1889, and the engraving potentially marks the event (<u>Bonnett 1968:114</u>). Additional research to identify other names and associations with the regiment are underway.

Section 6: UNESCO/UNTWIN Workshops

The Program in Maritime Studies is a full partner in the UNESCO/UNTWIN Underwater Archaeology Network. Established in 2012, the network "bring together University programs, research centers, and museums dedicated to increasing capacity and enhancing the protection of underwater cultural heritage. The Nework supports the work of the UNESCO Secretariat of the 2001 Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage.

There are a number of objectives the Network focuses on, but "act(ing) as a bridge between the academic world, civil society, local communities, research and policy-makers, promoting awareness of underwater cultural heritage and influencing cultural heritage policies," is the objective that was utlized as part of the training During the field school ECU faculty, staff, and students offered a training workshop to local commercial, recreational, and professional divers, in addition to NPA cultural resource manager s(Appendix F). Participants included Desley Gardner of the National Parks Authority of Antigua and Barbuda, Louis Evans of DiveCarib, Kelshon Joseph and Jordan Otto of K. Hood Diving, Wilmer Duran of Indigo Divers and Soul Immersions, Kweesi Gyan and Joshua Tubbs of Soul Immersions, Maurice A. Belgrave, and Omory Williams of Water Services.

The training included powerpoint presentations followed by hands on terrestrial training in archaeological methods, and finally an invitation to visit and participate in archaeological fieldwork. Trainees were given a certificate of completion after the training and a final discussion about "next steps" was fruitful in identifying where the Parks authorities could engage the diving community in heritage management and monitoring. Participants were also offered a follow-up training to attend with the Florida Public Archaeology Network free of charge.

References

Antigua and Barbuda National Parks Authority (NPA)

2014 The Antigua Naval Dockyard and Related Archaeological Sites. World Heritage Site Nomination Document, UNESCO, Antigua. https://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1499.pdf

Antigua and Barbuda National Park Service [2022] About the National Park, https://www.nationalparksantigua.com/about/. Accessed 20 November 2022.

Antigua and Barbuda National Park Service [2022] Acts and Regulations, https://www.nationalparksantigua.com/acts-and-regulations/. Accessed 20 November 2022.

Arbuthnot, Ada Jane Evelyn.

1920. Memories of the Arbuthnots of Kincardineshire and Aberdeenshire. Creative Media Partners, LLC., United States.

Ballin, Torben B.

2014 Identification of Gunflints from Shipwrecks. Lithic Research, Sterlingshire. University of Bradford. Stirlingshire.

Basílio, Ana Catarina, André Texugo, and Tiago do Pereiro

2022 Archaeo'pad: using LiDAR sensors from mobile devices in Archaeology. OSF Preprints https://osf.io/cj7pw>. Accessed 22 November, 2022.

Bonnett, Stanley

1968 'The Price of Admiralty'. 114. Robert Hale Ltd., London, United Kingdom.

Buckley, Roger Norman

1978 Slave or Freedman: The Question of the Legal Status of the British West India Soldier, 1795-1807. *Caribbean Studies* 17(3/4):83-113.

Chartrand, René

2011 The British Army's Unknow, Regular, African-West Indian Engineer and Service Corps, 1783 to the 1840s. *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research* 89(358):117-138.

Costantino, Domenica, Gabriele Vozza, Massimiliano Pepe, and Vincenzo Saverio Alfio 2022 Smartphone LiDAR Technologies for Surveying and Reality Modelling in Urban Scenarios: Evaluation Methods, Performance and Challenges. *Applied Systems Innovations* 5(4):63-84.

Crawford. Michael (editor) 2019 Naval Documents of the American Revolution, Vol 13. Naval History and Heritage Command, Washington, DC.

Crawford. Michael (editor) 2013 Naval Documents of the American Revolution, Vol 12. Naval History and Heritage Command, Washington, DC.

Crawford. Michael (editor) 2005 Naval Documents of the American Revolution, Vol 11. Naval History and Heritage Command, Washington, DC.

Crawford. Michael (editor) 1996 Naval Documents of the American Revolution, Vol 10. Naval History and Heritage Command, Washington, DC.

Crawford, Michael, and Dudley, William 2001. *The Early Republic and the Sea: Essays on the Naval and Maritime History of the Early United States.* Brassey's, United States,

Cross, Elizabeth

2020 The Last French East India Company in the Revolutionary Atlantic. *The William and Mary Quarterly* 77(4): 613-640.

De Albuquerque, Klaus and Jerome McElroy. 1995 Antigua and Barbuda: a legacy of environmental degradation, policy failure, and coastal decline, Report No. 1792-2016-141988.

Dear, I.C.B, & Peter Kemp 2005 *The Oxford Companion to Ships and the Sea*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, United Kingdom. Demerliac, A.

1995 La Marine de Louis Xv: Nomenclature des navires français de 1715 à 1774. Éd. Omega

Dickinson, T., C-YJ Liu, and M. Roughly

2022 The affordances of 3D imaging modalities for forensic facial identification. Poster given at the 19th Biennial Meeting of the International Association for Craniofacial Identification. Virtual.

Dunshee, Ian.

2022 East Carolina University Fall Field School Journal, Antigua. 5-10. East Carolina University.

Dyde, Brian.

2000 A history of Antigua: the unsuspected isle. Interlink Publishing Group Inc. Northampton, MA.

East Carolina University

2022 Sport Diver Archaeology Manual. East Carolina University, Maritime Studies Program, Greenville, NC.

Etherington, Melanie.2002 *The Antigua and Barbuda Companion*. Interlink Books. United States.

Ford, Ben

2017 The Glass and Ceramic Assemblages of the Mardi Gras Shipwreck. *Historical Archaeology* 51(2017): 379-391.

Foy, Charles

2016 The Royal Navy's employment of black mariners and maritime workers, 1754–1783. *International Journal of Maritime History* 28(1): 6-35.

Gardner, Alan

1776 Journal of H.M.S. Maidstone. Ship log, Transcription, volume 4, pp. 1474.

Gordon, Andrew

1996 The Rules of the Game: Jutland and British Naval Command. Naval Institute Press, 1997. Annapolis, MD.

Guibert, Jean-Sébastien, Hélène Botcazou, Gilbert Pachoud, Chuck Meide, Michel Daeffler, Claude Michaud, Christopher K. Waters, Alexandre Arqué.

2021 Archaeology of military ships lost in the Lesser Antilles during the American Revolutionary War 1775-1783. Report to National Parks of Antigua and Barbuda, English Harbour, St. Lucia National Trust, Castries, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines National Trust, Kingstown, from l'Université des Antilles [University of the French West Indies], Schoelcher, Martinique.

Harris, J. R.

1966 Copper and Shipping in the Eighteenth Century. *The Economic History Review* 19(3):550 569.

Healy, Michael S.

2000 Colour, Climate, and Combat: The Caribbean Regiment in the Second World War. *The International History Review*, vol. 22, no. 1, 2000, pp. 65–85.

He, Yan, Weidong Le, Xiaoke Lu, Changsong Xu, Tao Jin, and Guocong Lin
2021 Chinese export porcelain in the middle Qing Dynasty: Study on the blue-and-white
porcelains excavated from the "Xiaobaijiao I" shipwreck. *Journal of Archaeological Science*:
Reports 38(2021): 103024.

Heritage Documentation Programs2015 HABS/HAER/HALS Photography Guidelines. National Parks Service.

Historic American Buildings Survey2020 Guidelines for Historical Reports. National Parks Service.

Hume, Ivor Noel 2001 *A guide to the artifacts of colonial America*. University of Pennsylvania Press. PA.

Łabędź, Piotr, Krzysztof Skabek, Paweł Ozimek, Dominika Rola, Agnieszka Ozimek, and Kseniam Ostrowska

2022 Accuracy Verification of Surface Models of Architectural Objects from the iPad LiDAR in the Context of Photogrammetry Methods. *Sensors* 22(21): 8504-8522.
Lace, Michael J., Nancy A. Albury, Alice V. M. Samson, Jago Cooper & Reniel Rodríguez Ramos

2019 Ship Graffiti on the Islands of the Bahamas, Turks and Caicos, and Puerto Rico: A Comparative Analysis. *Journal of Maritime Archaeology* 14:239-271.

Lampert, David

2018 '[A] Mere Cloak for their Proud Contempt and Antipathy towards the African Race': Imagining Britain's West India Regiments in the Caribbean, 1795–1838. *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 46(4):627-650.

Lightley, Robert

1976 An 18th century Dutch East Indiaman, found at Cape Town, 1971. *International Journal of Nautical Archaeology and Underwater Exploration* 5.4(1974): 305-316.

Livingston, Olivia 2022. East Carolina University Fall Field School Journal, Antigua. 10. East Carolina University.

Lloyd, Janet R.

2018 Laboratory Procedures and Artifact Classification Manual. University of West Florida Archaeology Institute. Pensacola, FL.

Meide, Chuck

2015 "Cast Away off the Bar": The Archaeological Investigation of British Period Shipwrecks in St. Augustine. *The Florida Historical Quarterly* 93(3):354-386.

McCarthy, Michael 2005 *Ships' Fastenings*. Texas A&M University Press, College Station, TX.

Mune, Christina D.

2022 Supporting 3D: Potential Practices for the Creation and Preservation of 3D/VR in Libraries. *Public Services Quarterly* 18(3): 209-217.

Niantic, Inc.

2022 Scanning Tips, Frequently Asked Questions. Scaniverse Support, Niantic, Inc. https://scaniverse.com/support. Accessed 22 November, 2022.

Nicholson, Desmond V.2002 English Harbour: The First 2000 Years. Carib Press, St. John's, Antigua and Barbuda.

Nicholson, Desmond V.

1994 Forts of Antigua and Barbuda. Museum of Antigua and Barbuda, St. John's, Antigua and Barbuda.

Oliver, Vere Langford.

1894 The History of the Island of Antigua. United Kingdom, Mitchell, and Hughes.

Pearce, Jacqueline

2014 A Late 18th-century inn clearance assemblage from Uxbridge, Middlesex. *Post Medieval Archaeology* 34(2000): 144-186.

Peterson, Mendel

1965 *History Under the Sea: A Handbook for Underwater Exploration.* Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Puri, Shalini & Lara Putnam

2017 Caribbean Military Encounters. Palgrave Macmillan, US.

Queen Anne's Revenge Project 2020 Fishing Weights. <<u>https://www.qaronline.org/conservation/artifacts/tools-and-instruments/fishing-weights</u>>. Accessed 20 November 2022.

Queen Anne's Revenge Project 2017 A Moveable Feast. < <u>https://www.qaronline.org/blog/2017-08-01/artifact-month-bone</u>>. Accessed 20 November 2022.

Rodger, N. A. M.1986. *The Wooden World: An Anatomy of the Georgian Navy*. Annapolis, Maryland: Naval Institute Press.

Rodriguez, Colten, Eftekhar Jahan, Michael Reyes, Russell Gill, Gregory Mulhern 2022 A Comparison of Point Cloud Data from an iPad Pro LiDar Sensor to a Terrestrial Scanner 022-01-5083. Automotive Technical Papers, SAE International <u>https://www.sae.org/publications/technical-papers/content/2022-01-5083/</u>. Accessed 22 November, 2022.

Rollins, Katelyn.2022. East Carolina University Fall Field School Journal, Antigua. 5-7. East Carolina University.

Sivilich, Daniel M.1996 Analyzing Musket Balls to Interpret a Revolutionary War Site. *Historical Archaeology* 30(2):101-109.

Schulz, Peter, Rebecca Allen, Bill Lindsey, and Jeanette Schulz (editors)
2016 Baffle Marks and Pontil Scars: A Reader on Historic Bottle Identification. *The Society for Historical Archaeology Special Publication No. 12*, Germantown: MD.

Teppati Losè, Lorenzo, Alessandra Spreafico, Filiberto Chiabrando, and Fabio Giulio Tonolo 2022 Apple LiDAR Sensor for 3D Surveying: Tests and Results in the Cultural Heritage Domain. *Remote Sensing* 14(17): 4157-4186.

War Diary of 1/CR, Orders for Embarkation, 17 Dec. 1945. 1945. Public Record Office, War Office Records 176/41.

Waters, Christopher K.

2018 *Putting Forts in their Place: The Politics of Defense in Antigua, 1670-1785.* Doctoral dissertation, Department of Anthropology, Syracuse University. Syracuse. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Weaver, David

2002 English Harbour, Antigua: The Rise and Fall of a Strategic Military Site. *A Journal of Caribbean Culture*, 48(4):1-11.

Wells, David A. J.

2021 The West Indian Soldier: a brief history of the British Army and the Caribbean. National Army Museum – West India Committee, London, UK.

Willis, Logan.

2022. East Carolina University Fall Field School Journal, Antigua. 2-7. East Carolina University.

Wilson, Lee B.

2021. Bonds of Empire: The English Origins of Slave Law in South Carolina and British Plantation America, 1660-1783. United Kingdom, Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX A: Photograph Inventory

Photo Log

Project:	Fall Field School 2022
Site:	Nelson's Dockyard National Park, Antigua

FILE#	DETAILED DESCRIPTION (Site, Feature, Context, Artifact, etc.)	FULL NAME	DATE	CAMERA MODEL
DSC_0001	Group tour of Nelson's Dockyard at stone quay	Jeremy Borrelli	10/17/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0002	Group tour of Nelson's Dockyard at stone quay	Jeremy Borrelli	10/17/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0004	Group tour walking through Dockyard	Jeremy Borrelli	10/17/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0005	Group tour at Admiral's Inn	Jeremy Borrelli	10/17/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0006	Group tour at Sail Loft Pillars	Jeremy Borrelli	10/17/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0007	Group tour at Sail Loft Pillars	Jeremy Borrelli	10/17/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0008	Group tour walking through Dockyard	Jeremy Borrelli	10/17/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0009	Students examining cannon from Fraternite	Jeremy Borrelli	10/17/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0010	Dockyard wall looking south from Dockyard	Jeremy Borrelli	10/17/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0011	Graffiti on breezeway walls	Jeremy Borrelli	10/17/2022	NIKON D3400
DJI_0012	English Dockyard at Ops Center with Dayan, Madie, Ray, Liv, and Harris	Logan, Ian, DJ, and Katelyn	10/18/2022	DJI Mavic Pro
DJI_0013	English Dockyard overlooking rebuilt dock with dock under survey in the background.	Logan, Ian, DJ, and Katelyn	10/18/2022	DJI Mavic Pro
DJI_0014	English Dockyard aerial	Logan, Ian, DJ, and Katelyn	10/18/2022	DJI Mavic Pro
DJI_0015	English Dockyard aerial	logan, Ian, DJ, and Katelyn	10/18/2022	DJI Mavic Pro
DJI_0016	English Dockyard aerial	Logan, Ian, DJ, and Katelyn	10/18/2022	DJI Mavic Pro
DJI_0017	English Dockyard aerial	Logan, Ian, DJ, and Katelyn	10/18/2022	DJI Mavic Pro
DJI_0020	English Dockyard aerial	Logan, Ian, DJ, and Katelyn	10/18/2022	DJI Mavic Pro
DJI_0021	English Dockyard aerial	Logan, Ian, DJ, and Katelyn	10/18/2022	DJI Mavic Pro
DJI_0022	19 second video of English Dockyard aerial view	Logan, Ian, DJ, and Katelyn	10/18/2022	DJI Mavic Pro
DJI_0023	English Dockyard aerial with dive ops center	Logan, Ian, DJ, and Katelyn	10/18/2022	DJI Mavic Pro
DJI_0024	Nadir Aerial View of Madie and Dayan on Dive Barge, Far	Logan, Ian, DJ, and Katelyn	10/18/2022	DJI Mavic Pro
DJI_0025	Nadir Aerial View of Madie and Dayan on Dive Barge, Close	Logan, Ian, DJ, and Katelyn	10/18/2022	DJI Mavic Pro
DJI_0026	Forward View of Madie and Dayan Donning on Dive Barge, Close	Logan, Ian, DJ, and Katelyn	10/18/2022	DJI Mavic Pro
DJI_0027	Forward View of Madie and Dayan Donning on Dive Barge, Close	Logan, Ian, DJ, and Katelyn	10/18/2022	DJI Mavic Pro

D.	JI_0028	Aerial Forward View of English Harbour/Tank Bay, Facing West	Logan, Ian, DJ, and Katelyn	10/18/2022	DJI Mavic Pro
D.	JI_0029	Aerial Forward View of English Harbour/Tank Bay, Facing West	Logan, Ian, DJ, and Katelyn	10/18/2022	DJI Mavic Pro
D.	JI_0030	Aerial Forward View of English Harbour/Tank Bay, Facing West	Logan, Ian, DJ, and Katelyn	10/18/2022	DJI Mavic Pro
~		Jeremy teaching drone operation to Ray, Liv, Maddie, and Dayan at English Harbour	Logan, Ian, DJ, and Katelyn	10/18/2022	DJI Mavic Pro
D.	JI_0031	Bar	Lagan Jan DL and Katalun	10/18/2022	
D.	JI_0032	Aerial Forward View of Nelson's Dockyard Historic Site, South Forward Aerial View of Nelson's Dockyard Historic Site, Closeup on Staff Tent Area	Logan, Ian, DJ, and Katelyn	10/18/2022	DJI IVIAVIC PIO
D.	JI 0033	Divers in the Water	Logan, Ian, DJ, and Katelyn	10/18/2022	DJI Mavic Pro
D	_ SC_0477	Cannon1_Side Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
D	SC_0478	Cannon1_Side Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
D	SC_0479	Cannon1_Front Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
D	SC_0480	Cannon1_Front Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
D	SC_0481	Cannon2_Side Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
D	SC_0482	Cannon2_Side Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
D	SC_0483	Cannon2_Front Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
D	SC_0484	Cannon2_Front Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
D	SC_0485	Cannon3_Side Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
D	SC_0486	Cannon3_Side Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
D	SC_0487	Cannon3_Top Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
D	SC_0488	Cannon3_Top Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
D	SC_0489	Cannon4_Side Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
D	SC_0490	Cannon4_Side Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
D	SC_0491	Cannon4_Top Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
D	SC_0492	Cannon4_Top Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
D	SC_0493	Cannon5_Side Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
D	SC_0494	Cannon5_Side Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
D	SC_0495	Cannon5_Top Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
D	SC_0496	Cannon5_Top Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
D	SC_0497	Cannon6_Side Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
D	SC_0498	Cannon6_Side Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
D	SC_0499	Cannon6_Top Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400

DSC_0500	Cannon6_Top Perspective
DSC_0501	Cannon7_Side Perspective
DSC_0502	Cannon7_Side Perspective
DSC_0503	Cannon7_Front Perspective
DSC_0504	Cannon7_Front Perspective
DSC_0505	Cannon8_Side Perspective
DSC_0506	Cannon8_Side Perspective
DSC_0507	Cannon8_Front Perspective
DSC_0508	Cannon8_Front Perspective
DSC_0509	Cannon9_Side Perspective
DSC_0510	Cannon9_Side Perspective
DSC_0511	Cannon9_Top Perspective
DSC_0512	Cannon9_Top Perspective
DSC_0513	Cannon10_Side Perspective
DSC_0514	Cannon10_Side Perspective
DSC_0515	Cannon10_Side Perspective
DSC_0516	Cannon10_Top Perspective
DSC_0517	Cannon11_Side Perspective
DSC_0518	Cannon11_Side Perspective
DSC_0519	Cannon11_Top Perspective
DSC_0520	Cannon11_Top Perspective
DSC_0521	Cannon12_Side Perspective
DSC_0522	Cannon12_Side Perspective
DSC_0523	Cannon12_Top Perspective
DSC_0524	Cannon12_Top Perspective
DSC_0525	Cannon13_Side Perspective
DSC_0526	Cannon13_Side Perspective
DSC_0527	Cannon13_Front Perspective
DSC_0528	Cannon13_Front Perspective
DSC_0529	Cannon14_Side Perspective(Carronade)
DSC_0530	Cannon14_Side Perspective(Carronade)

Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400

DSC_0531	Cannon14_Front Perspective(Carronade)	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0532	Cannon14_Front Perspective (Carronade)	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0533	Cannon15_Side Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0534	Cannon15_Side Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0535	Cannon15_Front Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0536	Cannon15_Front Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0537	Cannon16_Side Perspective (Carronade)	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0538	Cannon16_Side Perspective (Carronade)	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0539	Cannon16_Front Perspective (Carronade)	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0540	Cannon16_Front Perspective (Carronade)	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0541	Cannon17_Side Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0542	Cannon17_Side Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0543	Cannon17_Top Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0544	Cannon17_Top Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0545	Cannon18_Side Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0546	Cannon18_Side Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0547	Cannon18_Rear Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0548	Cannon18_Rear Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0549	Cannon19_Side Perspective (Carronade)	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0550	Cannon19_Side Perspective (Carronade)	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0551	Cannon19_Front Perspective (Carronade)	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0552	Cannon19_Front Perspective (Carronade)	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0553	Cannon20_Side Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0554	Cannon20_Side Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0555	Cannon20_Top Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0556	Cannon20_Top Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0557	Cannon21_Side Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0558	Cannon21_Side Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0559	Cannon21_Top Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0560	Cannon21_Top Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0561	Cannon22_Side Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400

DSC_0562	Cannon22_Side Perspective
DSC_0563	Cannon22_Top Perspective
DSC_0564	Cannon22_Top Perspective
DSC_0565	Cannon23_Side Perspective
DSC_0566	Cannon23_Side Perspective
DSC_0567	Cannon23_Top Perspective
DSC_0568	Cannon23_Top Perspective
DSC_0569	Cannon24_Side Perspective
DSC_0570	Cannon24_Side Perspective
DSC_0571	Cannon24_Top Perspective
DSC_0572	Cannon24_Top Perspective
DSC_0573	Cannon27_Side Perspective
DSC_0574	Cannon27_Side Perspective
DSC_0575	Cannon27_Top Perspective
DSC_0576	Cannon27_Top Perspective
DSC_0577	Cannon29_Side Perspective
DSC_0578	Cannon29_Side Perspective
DSC_0579	Cannon29_Top Perspective
DSC_0580	Cannon29_Top Perspective
DSC_0581	Cannon30_Side Perspective (Capped with Iron)
DSC_0582	Cannon30_Side Perspective (Capped with Iron)
DSC_0583	Cannon31_Side Perspective
DSC_0584	Cannon31_Side Perspective
DSC_0585	Cannon31_Top Perspective
DSC_0586	Cannon31_Top Perspective
DSC_0587	Cannon32_Side Perspective
DSC_0588	Cannon32_Side Perspective
DSC_0589	Cannon32_Top Perspective
DSC_0590	Cannon32_Top Perspective
DSC_0591	Cannon33_Side Perspective
DSC_0592	Cannon33_Side Perspective

Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400

DSC_0593	Cannon33_Top Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0594	Cannon33_Top Perspective	Nick,Dayan,Logan	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0595	Cannon13_Makers mark "1793"	Nick	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0596	Cannon13_Makers mark "1793"	Nick	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0597	Cannon13_Makers mark "Creusot"	Nick	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0598	Cannon13_Makers mark "Creusot"	Nick	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0599	Cannon13_Makers mark 3 words	Nick	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0600	Cannon13_Makers mark 3 words	Nick	10/19/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0475	Group measuring Fort Berkeley erosion	Jeremy Borrelli	10/20/2022	
DSC_0476	Group measuring Fort Berkeley erosion	Jeremy Borrelli	10/20/2022	
DSC_0477	Group measuring Fort Berkeley erosion	Jeremy Borrelli	10/20/2022	
DSC_0478	Guardhouse with English Harbour in background	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022	
DSC_0479	Guardhouse with English Harbour in background	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022	
DSC_0480	Guardhouse_Front Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022	
DSC_0481	Guardhouse_Front Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022	
DSC_0482	Guardhouse_Right Side Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022	
DSC_0483	Guardhouse_Right Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022	
DSC_0484	Guardhouse_Left Side Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022	
DSC_0485	Guardhouse_Rear Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022	
DSC_0486	Guardhouse_Rear Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022	
DSC_0487	Guardhouse_Rear Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022	
DSC_0488	Guardhouse_Rear Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022	
DSC_0489	Guardhouse_Rear Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022	
DSC_0490	Guardhouse_Rear Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022	
DSC_0491	Guardhouse_Rear Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022	
DSC_0492	Guardhouse_Rear Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022	
DSC_0493	Guardhouse_Rear Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022	
DSC_0494	Guardhouse_Front Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022	
DSC_0495	Guardhouse_Front Stairs	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022	
DSC_0496	Guardhouse_Inside_Front Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022	
DSC_0497	Guardhouse_Inside_Right Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022	

DSC_0498	Guardhouse_Inside_Roofing	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022
DSC_0499	Guardhouse_Inside_Right Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022
DSC_0500	Guardhouse_Inside_Right Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022
DSC_0501	Guardhouse_Inside_Left Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022
DSC_0502	Guardhouse_Inside_Looking Out Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022
DSC_0503	Guardhouse_Inside_Front Window	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022
DSC_0504	Guardhouse_Inside_Right Window	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022
DSC_0505	Guardhouse_Inside_Rear Window	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022
DSC_0506	Guardhouse_Inside_Rear Window Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022
DSC_0507	Guardhouse_Inside_Right Window Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022
DSC_0508	Guardhouse_Front Doorway Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022
DSC_0509	Guardhouse_Front Doorway Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022
DSC_0510	Guardhouse_Front Doorway Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022
DSC_0511	Guardhouse_94cm Scale	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022
DSC_0512	Guardhouse_94cm Scale	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022
DSC_0513	Guardhouse_Inside_Rear Window Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022
DSC_0514	Guardhouse_Front Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022
DSC_0515	Guardhouse_Front Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022
DSC_0516	Guardhouse_Right Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022
DSC_0517	Guardhouse_Inside Right Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022
DSC_0518	Guardhouse_Inside Looking Out Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022
DSC_0519	Guardhouse_Inside_Left Perspective	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022
DSC_0520	Guardhouse_Inside_Right Window	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022
DSC_0521	Guardhouse_Inside_Front Window	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022
DSC_0522	Guardhouse_Inside_Doorway	D.J. Schaefer	10/20/2022
DSC_0523	Gunpowder Magazine_Outside stairway to English Harbour	Madie Elsner	10/20/2022
DSC_0524	Gunpowder Magazine_Outside stairway to English Harbour	Madie Elsner	10/20/2022
DSC_0525	Gunpowder Magazine_Front Side Perspective	Madie Elsner	10/20/2022
DSC_0526	Gunpowder Magazine_Front Perspective	Madie Elsner	10/20/2022
DSC_0527	Gunpowder Magazine_Left Perspective	Madie Elsner	10/20/2022
DSC_0528	Gunpowder Magazine_Right Perspective	Madie Elsner	10/20/2022

DSC_0529	Gunpowder Magazine_Front Entrance Engraving-1	Madie Elsner	10/20/2022
DSC_0530	Gunpowder Magazine_Front Entrance Engraving-1	Madie Elsner	10/20/2022
DSC_0531	Gunpowder Magazine_Front Entrance Engraving-2	Madie Elsner	10/20/2022
DSC_0532	Gunpowder Magazine_Front Entrance Engraving-3	Madie Elsner	10/20/2022
DSC_0533	Gunpowder Magazine_Inside_Right Perspective	Madie Elsner	10/20/2022
DSC_0534	Gunpowder Magazine_Inside_Wall Texture	Madie Elsner	10/20/2022
DSC_0535	Gunpowder Magazine_Inside_Left Perspective	Madie Elsner	10/20/2022
DSC_0536	Gunpowder Magazine_Entrance	Madie Elsner	10/20/2022
DSC_0537	Group photo at One Gun Battery	Jeremy Borrelli	10/21/2022
DSC_0538	Group photo at One Gun Battery	Jeremy Borrelli	10/21/2022
DSC_0539	Logan at One Gun Battery	Jeremy Borrelli	10/21/2022
DSC_0540	Dayan at One Gun Battery	Jeremy Borrelli	10/21/2022
DSC_0541	Group photo at One Gun Battery	Jeremy Borrelli	10/21/2022
DSC_0542	Group photo at One Gun Battery	Jeremy Borrelli	10/21/2022
DSC_0543	DJ at One Gun Battery	Jeremy Borrelli	10/21/2022
DSC_0544	DJ at One Gun Battery	Jeremy Borrelli	10/21/2022
DSC_0545	Group photo on cliffs of One Gun Battery	Jeremy Borrelli	10/21/2022
DSC_0546	Madie at One Gun Battery	Jeremy Borrelli	10/21/2022
DSC_0547	Fort Berkeley	Jeremy Borrelli	10/21/2022
DSC_0548	West India Regiment Cistern	Madie Elsner	10/21/2022
DSC_0549	West India Regiment Cistern	Madie Elsner	10/21/2022
DSC_0550	West India Regiment Cistern	Madie Elsner	10/21/2022
DSC_0551	West India Regiment Cistern	Madie Elsner	10/21/2022
DSC_0552	West India Regiment Cistern	Madie Elsner	10/21/2022
DSC_0553	West India Regiment Cistern	Madie Elsner	10/21/2022
DSC_0554	West India Regiment Cistern	Madie Elsner	10/21/2022
DSC_0555	West India Regiment Cistern	Madie Elsner	10/21/2022
DSC_0556	West India Regiment Cistern	Madie Elsner	10/21/2022
DSC_0557	West India Regiment Cistern	Madie Elsner	10/21/2022
DSC_0558	West India Regiment Cistern Catch Barrel	Madie Elsner	10/21/2022
DSC 0559	West India Regiment Cistern Catch Barrel	Madie Elsner	10/21/2022

DSC_0560	West India Regiment Cistern Drain	Madie Elsner	10/21/2022
DSC_0561	West India Regiment Structure 4	Madie Elsner	10/21/2022
DSC_0562	West India Regiment Structure 4	Madie Elsner	10/21/2022
DSC_0563	Ceramic (Porcelain), found near West India Regiment Cistern	Madie Elsner	10/21/2022
DSC_0564	Ceramic (Porcelain), found near West India Regiment Cistern	Madie Elsner	10/21/2022
DSC_0565	Ceramic (Porcelain), found near West India Regiment Cistern	Madie Elsner	10/21/2022
DSC_0566	West India Regiment Irrigation	Madie Elsner	10/21/2022
DSC_0567	West India Regiment Irrigation	Madie Elsner	10/21/2022
DSC_0568	West India Regiment Irrigation	Madie Elsner	10/21/2022
DSC_0569	West India Regiment Irrigation	Madie Elsner	10/21/2022
DSC_0570	West India Regiment Irrigation	Madie Elsner	10/21/2022
DSC_0571	West India Regiment Irrigation	Madie Elsner	10/21/2022
DSC_0572	West India Regiment Structure 4	Madie Elsner	10/21/2022
DSC_0573	Glass, found near West India Regiment Barracks	Nicholas Baker	10/21/2022
DSC_0574	Bottle neck, found near West India Regiment Barracks	Nicholas Baker	10/21/2022
DSC_0575	Bottle neck, found near West India Regiment Barracks	Nicholas Baker	10/21/2022
DSC_0576	Porcelain, found near West India Regiment Barracks	Nicholas Baker	10/21/2022
DSC_0577	Porcelain, found near West India Regiment Barracks	Nicholas Baker	10/21/2022
DSC_0578	Porcelain, found near West India Regiment Barracks	Nicholas Baker	10/21/2022
DSC_0579	Porcelain, found near West India Regiment Barracks	Nicholas Baker	10/21/2022
DSC_0580	Porcelain, found near West India Regiment Barracks	Nicholas Baker	10/21/2022
DSC_0581	Porcelain, found near West India Regiment Barracks	Nicholas Baker	10/21/2022
DSC_0582	Porcelain, found near West India Regiment Barracks	Nicholas Baker	10/21/2022
DSC_0583	Porcelain, found near West India Regiment Barracks	Nicholas Baker	10/21/2022
DSC_0584	Porcelain, found near West India Regiment Barracks	Nicholas Baker	10/21/2022
DSC_0585	Porcelain, found near West India Regiment Barracks	Nicholas Baker	10/21/2022
DSC_0586	Porcelain, found near West India Regiment Barracks	Nicholas Baker	10/21/2022
DSC_0587	Wine or onion bottle fragment, found near West India Regiment Barracks	Nicholas Baker	10/21/2022
DSC_0588	Wine or onion bottle fragment, found near West India Regiment Barracks	Nicholas Baker	10/21/2022
DSC_0589	Porcelain, found near West India Regiment Barracks	Nicholas Baker	10/21/2022
DSC_0590	Lead musketball, found on cliffside near barracks storehouse	Dayan Weller	10/21/2022

DSC_0591	Group photo by barracks	Jeremy Borrelli	10/21/2022
DSC_0592	Madie and Dayan by cannon 36	Jeremy Borrelli	10/21/2022
DSC_0593	Madie and Dayan by cannon 36	Jeremy Borrelli	10/21/2022
DSC_0594	Madie and Dayan by cannon 36	Jeremy Borrelli	10/21/2022
DSC_0595	Madie and Dayan by cannon 36	Jeremy Borrelli	10/21/2022
DSC_0596	Madie and Dayan by cannon 36	Jeremy Borrelli	10/21/2022
DSC_0597	Madie by cannon 36	Jeremy Borrelli	10/21/2022
DSC_0598	Galleon beach anchor	Jeremy Borrelli	10/21/2022
DSC_0599	Galleon beach anchor	Jeremy Borrelli	10/21/2022
DSC_0600	DJ and Nicholas by cannon 37	Jeremy Borrelli	10/21/2022
DSC_0601	Nicholas by cannon 37	Jeremy Borrelli	10/21/2022
DSC_0602	DJ and Nicholas by cannon 37	Jeremy Borrelli	10/21/2022
DSC_0603	Madie and Dayan by Galleon Beach Anchor	Jeremy Borrelli	10/21/2022
DSC_0604	Group recording Galleon Beach Anchor	Jeremy Borrelli	10/21/2022
DSC_0605	Cannon37_Side Perspective	Nicholas Baker	10/21/2022
DSC_0606	Cannon37_Side Perspective	Nicholas Baker	10/21/2022
DSC_0607	Cannon37_Rear Perspective	Nicholas Baker	10/21/2022
DSC_0608	Cannon37_Front Perspective	Nicholas Baker	10/21/2022
DSC_0609	Cannon37_Front Perspective	Nicholas Baker	10/21/2022
DSC_0610	Cannon36_Side Perspective	Nicholas Baker	10/21/2022
DSC_0611	Cannon36_Side Perspective	Nicholas Baker	10/21/2022
DSC_0612	Cannon36_Rear Perspective	Nicholas Baker	10/21/2022
DSC_0613	Cannon36_Rear Perspective	Nicholas Baker	10/21/2022
DSC_0614	Cannon36_Front Perspective	Nicholas Baker	10/21/2022
DSCF5002	Unit 1 Keelson with Scale	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5003	Unit 1 Keelson with Scale	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5004	Unit 1 Plank	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5005	Unit 1 Plank	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5006	Unit 1	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5007	Unit 1 with Dredge Hose	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5008	Unit 1 with Keelson and Scale	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022

DSCF5009	Unit 1 Plank	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5010	Unit 1	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5011	Katelyn in Unit 1	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5012	Unti 1 with Dredge Hose	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5013	Ray's Hand and Ballast	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5014	Katelyn Unit 1	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5015	Ray and Dredge Hose	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5016	Ray and Dredge Hose	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5017	Ray and Dredge Hose	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5018	Unit 3 Lead Sheathing	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5019	Unit 3 Lead Sheathing	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5020	Unit 3 Corner	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5021	Unit 3 Lead Sheathing	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5022	Unit 3 Corner with scale	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5023	Unit 3 Corner with Lead Sheathing	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5024	Bottle	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5025	Unit 3 Lead Sheathing	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5026	Unit 3 Lead Sheathing	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5027	Lead Sheathing with Scale	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5028	Unit 3 Lead Sheathing with Scale	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5029	Unit 3 Lead Sheathing with Scale	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5030	Lead Sheathing and Fish	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5031	Modern Rope	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5032	Modern Rope	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5033	Lead Bits	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5034	Ray Recording	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5035	Diver on Unit 3	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5036	Katelyn Dredging	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5037	Katelyn Dredging	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5038	Katelyn Dredging	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022
DSCF5039	Shell-edged Ceramic with Scale	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/21/2022

DSCF5040	Shell-edged Ceramic with Scale	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray
DSCF5041	Shell-edged Ceramic with Scale	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray
DSCF5042	Bottle with Scale	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray
DSCF5043	Bottle with Scale	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray
DSCF5044	Bottle with Scale	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray
DSCF5045	Bottle with Scale	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray
DSCF5046	Bottle with Scale	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray
DSCF5047	Bottle with Scale	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray
DSCF5048	Bottle with Scale	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray
DSCF5049	Proforma Unit 3	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray
DSCF5050	Liv backroll	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray
DSC_0615	Group photo at barge	Jeremy Borrelli
DSC_0616	Dredges	Jeremy Borrelli
DSC_0617	Levi, Logan, Dr. McKinnon with tanks	Jeremy Borrelli
DSC_0618	Dredges	Jeremy Borrelli
DSC_0619	Levi, Logan, Dr. McKinnon in water	Jeremy Borrelli
DSC_0620	Levi, Logan, Dr. McKinnon in water	Jeremy Borrelli
DSC_0629	Small iron con. and poss. Ballast, U1L1	Ian Dunshee
DSC_0630	Small iron con. and poss. Ballast, U1L1	Ian Dunshee
DSC_0631	Small iron con. and poss. Ballast, U1L1	Ian Dunshee
DSC_0632	Small iron con. and poss. Ballast, U1L1	Ian Dunshee
DSC_0633	Small iron con. and poss. Ballast, U1L1	Ian Dunshee
DSC_0634	Small iron con. and poss. Ballast, U1L1	Ian Dunshee
DSC_0635	Small iron con. and poss. Ballast, U1L1	Ian Dunshee
DSC_0636	Clay U1L2	Ian Dunshee
DSC_0637	Clay U1L3	Ian Dunshee
DSC_0638	Clay U1L4	Ian Dunshee
DSC_0639	Clay U1L5	Ian Dunshee
DSC_0640	Clay U1L6	Ian Dunshee
DSC_0641	Clay U1L7	Ian Dunshee
DSC_0642	Clay U1L8	lan Dunshee

y	10/21/2022	
y	10/21/2022	
у	10/21/2022	
	10/22/2022	NIKON D3400
	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400

DSC_0643	Clay U1L9	Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0644	Poss. Con., undecipherable French tag	Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0645	Poss. Con., undecipherable French tag	Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0646	Poss. Con., undecipherable French tag	Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0647	Burnt wood, 'Unit 2 NE de Unit 2 Zome de lost'	Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0648	Poss. Con., 'Survey 3 A 78 B 153 D 170' (unreliable trilat)	Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0649	Poss. Con., 'Survey 3 A 78 B 153 D 170' (unreliable trilat)	Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0650	Metal, 'Survey 3 A 78 B 153 D 170' (unreliable trilat)	Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0651	Metal, 'Survey 3 A 78 B 153 D 170' (unreliable trilat)	Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0652	Sheathing, 'Survey 3 A 78 B 153 D 170' (unreliable trilat)	Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0653	Sheathing, 'Survey 3 A 78 B 153 D 170' (unreliable trilat)	Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0654	Poss. Con., 'Survey 3 A 78 B 153 D 170' (unreliable trilat)	lan Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0655	Poss. Con., 'Survey 3 A 78 B 153 D 170' (unreliable trilat)	lan Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0656	Poss. Con., 'Survey 3 A 78 B 153 D 170' (unreliable trilat)	lan Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0657	Poss. Con., 'Survey 3 A 78 B 153 D 170' (unreliable trilat)	lan Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0658	Poss. Con., 'Survey 3 A 78 B 153 D 170' (unreliable trilat)	Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0659	Poss. Con., 'Survey 3 A 78 B 153 D 170' (unreliable trilat)	Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0660	Poss. Con., 'Survey 3 A 78 B 153 D 170' (unreliable trilat)	Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0661	Poss. Con., 'Survey 3 A 78 B 153 D 170' (unreliable trilat)	Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0662	Poss. Con., 'Survey 3 A 78 B 153 D 170' (unreliable trilat)	Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0663	Poss. Con., 'Survey 3 A 78 B 153 D 170' (unreliable trilat)	Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0664	Poss. Con., 'Survey 3 A 78 B 153 D 170' (unreliable trilat)	Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0665	Porcelain, U2 Baseline 23M	Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0666	Porcelain, U2 Baseline 23M	Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0667	Porcelain, U2 Baseline 23M	Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0668	Porcelain, U2 Baseline 23M	Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0669	Porcelain, U2 Baseline 23M	Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0670	Porcelain, U2 Baseline 23M	Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0671	Square fastener U1 L2 B202 C103 D106	Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0672	Square fastener U1 L2 B202 C103 D106	Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0673	Wood U1 L1	Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400

DSC_0674	Wood U1 L1
DSC_0675	Rodent bone, U1, undecipherable French
DSC_0676	Rodent bone, U1, undecipherable French
DSC_0677	Rodent bone, U1, undecipherable French
DSC_0678	Rodent bone, U1, undecipherable French
DSC_0679	Ceramic, U1, undecipherable French
DSC_0680	Ceramic, U1, undecipherable French
DSC_0681	Rodent bone, U1, undecipherable French
DSC_0682	Rodent bone, U1, undecipherable French
DSC_0683	Glass, U3, undecipherable French
DSC_0684	Glass, U3, undecipherable French
DSC_0685	Glass, U3, undecipherable French
DSC_0686	Metal, U3, undecipherable French
DSC_0687	Metal, U3, undecipherable French
DSC_0688	Metal, U3, undecipherable French
DSC_0689	Poss. Con., U3, undecipherable French
DSC_0690	Poss. Con., U3, undecipherable French
DSC_0691	Poss. Con., U3, undecipherable French
DSC_0692	Photo of French tag U3
DSC_0693	Photo of French tag U3
DSC_0694	Photo of cow hip bone
DSC_0695	Photo of cow hip bone
DSC_0696	Photo of cow hip bone
DSC_0697	Photo of cow hip bone
DSC_0698	Photo of UID Metal
DSC_0699	Photo of UID Metal
DSC_0700	Photo of UID Metal
DSC_0701	Photo of UID Metal
DSC_0702	Photo of gun flint
DSC_0703	Photo of gun flint
DSC_0704	Photo of gun flint

Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee	10/23/2022	NIKON D3400
Nicholas Baker	10/24/2022	NIKON D3400
Nicholas Baker	10/24/2022	NIKON D3400
Nicholas Baker	10/24/2022	NIKON D3400
Nicholas Baker	10/24/2022	NIKON D3400
Nicholas Baker	10/24/2022	NIKON D3400
Nicholas Baker	10/24/2022	NIKON D3400
Nicholas Baker	10/24/2022	NIKON D3400
Nicholas Baker	10/24/2022	NIKON D3400
Nicholas Baker	10/24/2022	NIKON D3400
Nicholas Baker	10/24/2022	NIKON D3400
Nicholas Baker	10/24/2022	NIKON D3400

DSC_0705	Photo of gun flint	Nicholas Baker	10/24/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0706	Photo of pipe stem	Nicholas Baker	10/24/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0709	Photo of pipe stem	Nicholas Baker	10/24/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0709	Photo of pipe stem	Nicholas Baker	10/24/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0710	Photo of lead fishing weight	Nicholas Baker	10/24/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0711	Photo of lead fishing weight	Nicholas Baker	10/24/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0712	Photo of lead fishing weight	Nicholas Baker	10/24/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0713	Photo of lead fishing weight	Nicholas Baker	10/24/2022	NIKON D3400
GH_010321	Video of Unit 3 (0:30)	Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
GH_010322	Video of Unit 3 (0:23)	Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
GH_010323	Video of Unit 3 ft. Ray (0:33)	Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
GH_010324	Video of Unit 3 (1:01)	Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
GH_010325	Video of Unit 3; focused on sheathing (0:23)	Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
GH_010326	Video of Unit 3; focused on sheathing (0:44)	Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
GH_010331	Video of Unit 3; focused on sheathing (0:39)	Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
GH_010332	Video of Unit 3; sheathing and artifacts (0:21)	Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
GH_010333	Video of Unit 3; bagging artifact/sheathing (0:56)	Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
GH_010334	Video of Logan (0:09)	Logan Willis	10/24/2022	GoPro
GH_010335	Video of Unit 3; lead sheathing (0:30)	Logan Willis	10/24/2022	GoPro
GH_010336	Video of Unit 3; lead sheathing (0:17)	Logan Willis	10/24/2022	GoPro
GH_010339	Video of Unit 3; Logan/Jeremy Dredging (2:21)	Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
GH_010340	Video of Unit 3 (2:18)	Logan Willis	10/24/2022	GoPro
GH_010343	Video of Unit 3; sternpost assemblage (0:43)	Logan Willis, Raymond Phipps, Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
GH_010347	Video of Unit 3 w/ photo meter	Logan Willis, Raymond Phipps, Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
GOPR0216	Katelyn dredging	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
GOPR0217	Katelyn dredging	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
GOPR0218	Katelyn dredging	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro

GOPR0219	Unit 1 scale (keel)	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
GOPR0220	Unit 1 scale (keel)	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
GOPR0222	Unit 1 scale (keel)	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
GOPR0223	Unit 1 scale (keel)	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
GOPR0224	Unit 1 scale (keel)	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
GOPR0225	Unit 1 scale (keel)	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
GOPR0226	Unit 1 scale (keel)	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
GOPR0227	Unit 1 scale (keel)	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
GOPR0228	Unit 1 scale (keel)	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
GOPR0229	Unit 1 scale (keel)	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
GOPR0230	Unit 1 scale	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
GOPR0231	Unit 1	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
GOPR0232	Unit 1 corner scale	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
GOPR0233	Unit 1 corner scale	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
GOPR0234	Unit 1 corner scale	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
GOPR0235	Unit 1 corner scale	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
GOPR0236	Unit 1 corner scale	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
GOPR0237	Unit 1 scale	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
GOPR0238	Unit 1 scale	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro

lan mapping	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
lan mapping	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
lan mapping	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
lan mapping	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
Katelyn dredging	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
Katelyn dredging	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
Katelyn dredging	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
Katelyn dredging	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
Katelyn dredging	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
Katelyn dredging	Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon	10/24/2022	GoPro
Sheathing Unit 3	Logan Willis, Raymond Phipps, Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
Jeremy in Unit 3	Logan Willis, Raymond Phipps, Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
Unit 3; inner/outer sternpost	Logan Willis, Raymond Phipps, Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
Unit 3; inner/outer sternpost	Logan Willis, Raymond Phipps, Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
Unit 3; inner/outer sternpost	Logan Willis, Raymond Phipps, Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
Unit 3; inner/outer sternpost	Logan Willis, Raymond Phipps, Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
Unit 3; inner/outer sternpost photoscale	Logan Willis, Raymond Phipps, Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
Unit 3; inner/outer sternpost photoscale	Logan Willis, Raymond Phipps, Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
Unit 3; gudgeon	Logan Willis, Raymond Phipps, Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
	Ian mappingIan mappingIan mappingIan mappingKatelyn dredgingKatelyn dredgingKatelyn dredgingKatelyn dredgingKatelyn dredgingKatelyn dredgingSheathing Unit 3Jeremy in Unit 3Unit 3; inner/outer sternpostUnit 3; inner/outer sternpost photoscaleUnit 3; inner/outer sternpost photoscaleUnit 3; inner/outer sternpost photoscaleUnit 3; inner/outer sternpost photoscale	Ian mappingKatelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon Katelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon Logan Willis, Raymond Dr. McKinnon Logan Willis, Raymond Unit 3; inner/outer sternpostUnit 3; inner/outer sternpostPhipps, Jeremy Borrelli Logan Willis, Raymond Unit 3; inner/outer sternpost photoscaleUnit 3; inner/outer sternpost photoscalePhipps, Jeremy Borrelli Logan Willis, Raymond Logan Willis, Raymond Logan Willis, Raymond Logan Willis, Raymond 	Ian mappingKatelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon10/24/2022Ian mappingDr. McKinnon10/24/2022Ian mappingDr. McKinnon10/24/2022Ian mappingDr. McKinnon10/24/2022Ian mappingKatelyn Rollins, Ian Dunshee, Dr. McKinnon10/24/2022Katelyn dredgingDr. McKinnon10/24/2022Jeremy in Unit 3Dr. McKinnon10/24/2022Jeremy in Unit 3Dr. McKinnon10/24/2022Unit 3; inner/outer sternpostPhipps, Jeremy Borrelli10/24/2022Unit 3; inner/outer sternpostDrag Willis, Raymond10/24/2022Unit 3; inner/outer sternpost photoscalePhipps, Jeremy Borrelli10/24/2022Unit 3; inner/outer sternpost photoscalePhipps, Jeremy Borrelli10/24/2022Unit 3; inner/outer sternpost photoscalePhipps, Jeremy Borrelli10/24/2022Unit 3; inner/outer sternpost photoscalePhipps, Jere

GOPR0349	Unit 3; gudgeon	Logan Willis, Raymond Phipps, Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
GOPR0350	Unit 3; gudgeon	Logan Willis, Raymond Phipps, Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
GOPR0351	Unit 3; gudgeon	Logan Willis, Raymond Phipps, Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
GX010212	Frank organizing		10/24/2022	GoPro
GX010213	Video of Unit 1 (2:52)	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/24/2022	GoPro
GX010214	Video of Unit 1 (0:47)	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/24/2022	GoPro
GX010215	Video of Unit 1 (0:20)	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/24/2022	GoPro
GX010221	Video of Unit 1 (0:04)	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/24/2022	GoPro
GX010249	Video of Unit 1 Keel (0:40)	Dr. Harris, Katelyn, Ray	10/24/2022	GoPro
PA240094	Ray, Katelyn, Ryan topside	Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	
PA240095	Ryan and Frank topside	Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	
PA240096	Lead sheathing	Logan Willis, Raymond Phipps, Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
PA240097	Unit 3 datum d	Logan Willis, Raymond Phipps, Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
PA240099	Unit 3 datum d	Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
PA240101	Lead sheathing	Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
PA240102	Sternpost assembly	Jeremy Borrelli	10/24/2022	GoPro
DSC_0621	Musketball	Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0625	Feather Edged Creanware; 1 Rim and 1 Base	Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0626	Feather Edged Creanware; 1 Rim and 1 Base	Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0627	Feather Edged Creanware; 1 Rim and 1 Base	Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0630	Mammal Bone – Rib	Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0631	Mammal Bone – Rib	Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0632	Mammal Bone – Rib	Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0633	Chert (Possibly Gun Flint) (Brown)	Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0634	Chert (Possibly Gun Flint) (Brown)	Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0635	Chert (Possibly Gun Flint) (Brown)	Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0637	Glass Fragments (1 Modern Green; 1 Olive Green)	Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC 0638	Glass Fragments (1 Modern Green: 1 Olive Green)	lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400

DSC_0639	Glass Fragments (1 Modern Green; 1 Olive Green)
DSC_0640	Bone-Vertebre
DSC_0641	Bone-Vertebre
DSC_0642	Bone-Vertebre
DSC_0643	Bone-Vertebre
DSC_0644	Bone-Vertebre
DSC_0645	Bone-Vertebre
DSC_0646	Bone-Vertebre
DSC_0647	Bone-Vertebre
DSC_0648	Bone-Vertebre
DSC_0649	Bone-Vertebre
DSC_0650	Bone-Vertebre
DSC_0651	Bone-Vertebre
DSC_0652	Bone-Vertebre
DSC_0653	Bone-Vertebre
DSC_0654	Lead Along Keel
DSC_0655	Lead Along Keel
DSC_0656	Lead Along Keel
DSC_0657	Lead Along Keel
DSC_0658	Lead Along Keel
DSC_0659	Lead Along Keel
DSC_0660	Lead Along Keel
DSC_0661	Lead Along Keel
DSC_0662	Lead Along Keel
DSC_0663	Lead Along Keel
DSC_0664	Lead Along Keel
DSC_0665	Lead Along Keel
DSC_0666	Mammal Bone Fragment
DSC_0667	Mammal Bone Fragment
DSC_0668	Mammal Bone Fragment
DSC_0669	Mammal Bone Fragment

Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400

DSC_0670	Mammal Bone Fragments-3
DSC_0671	Mammal Bone Fragments-3
DSC_0672	Lead Sheathing
DSC_0673	Lead Sheathing
DSC_0674	Lead Sheathing
DSC_0675	Lead Sheathing
DSC_0676	Lead Sheathing
DSC_0677	Lead Sheathing
DSC_0678	Lead Fishing Weights
DSC_0680	Lead Fishing Weights
DSC_0681	Lead Fishing Weights
DSC_0682	Ceramic- Porcelain Base
DSC_0683	Ceramic- Porcelain Base
DSC_0684	Ceramic- Porcelain Base
DSC_0685	Ceramic- (Possibly Delft) Curved Rim
DSC_0686	Ceramic- (Possibly Delft) Curved Rim
DSC_0687	Ceramic- (Possibly Delft) Curved Rim
DSC_0688	Bone Fragments (2)
DSC_0689	Bone Fragments (2)
DSC_0690	Bone Fragments (2)
DSC_0691	Treenails
DSC_0692	Treenails
DSC_0693	Treenails
DSC_0694	Treenails
DSC_0695	Treenails
DSC_0696	Treenails
DSC_0697	Curved Glass Shard - Olive Green
DSC_0698	Curved Glass Shard - Olive Green
DSC_0699	Curved Glass Shard - Olive Green
DSC_0700	Lead
DSC_0701	Lead

lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400

DSC_0702	Lead
DSC_0703	Bone Fragment
DSC_0704	Bone Fragment
DSC_0705	Bone Fragment
DSC_0706	Bone Fragment
DSC_0713	Concreted fastener
DSC_0714	Concreted fastener
DSC_0715	Mammal Bone
DSC_0716	Mammal Bone
DSC_0717	Mammal Bone
DSC_0718	Mammal Bone
DSC_0719	Mammal Bone
DSC_0720	Mammal Bone
DSC_0721	Mammal Bone (2 Frags)
DSC_0722	Mammal Bone (2 Frags)
DSC_0723	Mammal Bone (2 Frags)
DSC_0724	Leather Piece
DSC_0725	Leather Piece
DSC_0726	Leather Piece
DSC_0727	Mammal Bone (2 Frags)
DSC_0728	Mammal Bone (2 Frags)
DSC_0729	Brown Salt Glazed Stoneware – Body
DSC_0730	Brown Salt Glazed Stoneware – Body
DSC_0731	Brown Salt Glazed Stoneware – Body
DSC_0732	White Ceramic – Body
DSC_0733	White Ceramic – Body
DSC_0734	Ceramic Sherd, Body, Possibly Biot Jar
DSC_0735	Ceramic Sherd, Body, Possibly Biot Jar
DSC_0736	Mammal Bone
DSC_0737	Mammal Bone
DSC_0738	Tile Sherd/Brick Frag?

Ian Dunshee Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee. Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee. Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee. Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
lan Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400

DSC_0739	Tile Sherd/Brick Frag?
DSC_0740	Tile Sherd/Brick Frag?
DSC_0741	Decorative Pipe Bowl
DSC_0742	Decorative Pipe Bowl
DSC_0743	Decorative Pipe Bowl
DSC_0744	Decorative Pipe Bowl
DSC_0745	Decorative Pipe Bowl
DSC_0746	Decorative Pipe Bowl
DSC_0747	Decorative Pipe Bowl
DSC_0748	Decorative Pipe Bowl
DSC_0749	Decorative Pipe Bowl
DSC_0750	Decorative Pipe Bowl
DSC_0751	Concreted Trunnel
DSC_0752	Concreted Trunnel
DSC_0753	Concreted Trunnel
DSC_0754	Concreted Trunnel
DSC_0755	Iron Fastener Top?
DSC_0756	Iron Fastener Top?
DSC_0757	Iron Fastener Top?
DSC_0758	Wine Bottle Base
DSC_0759	Wine Bottle Base
DSC_0760	Wine Bottle Base
DSC_0761	Wine Bottle Base
DSC_0762	Copper Tube (Modern?)
DSC_0763	Copper Tube (Modern?)
DSC_0764	Copper Tube (Modern?)
DSC_0765	Copper Tube (Modern?)
DSC_0766	Fory Berkeley
DSC_0767	Fort Charlotte
DSC_0768	Fort Charlotte
DSC 0769	Fort Charlotte

Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Ian Dunshee, Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400

DSC_0770	Fort Charlotte	Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0771	Fort Charlotte	Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0772	Fort Charlotte	Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0773	Fort Charlotte	Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0774	Fort Charlotte	Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0775	Fort Charlotte	Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0776	Fort Charlotte	Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0777	Fort Charlotte	Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0778	Fort Charlotte	Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0779	Fort Charlotte	Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0780	Fort Charlotte	Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0781	Fort Charlotte	Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0782	Fort Charlotte	Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0783	Fort Charlotte	Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0784	Fort Charlotte	Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0785	Fort Charlotte	Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0786	Fort Charlotte	Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0787	Fort Charlotte	Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0788	Fort Charlotte	Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0789	Fort Charlotte	Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0790	Fort Charlotte	Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_0791	Fort Charlotte	Katelyn Rollins	10/26/2022	NIKON D3400
IMG0255	Unit 1 Wood	Raymond Phipps	10/26/2022	iPad Pro 12
IMG0257	Unit 1 Concretion	Raymond Phipps	10/26/2022	iPad Pro 12
IMG0258	Unit 1 Wood	Raymond Phipps	10/26/2022	iPad Pro 12
IMG0259	Unit 1 Lead	Raymond Phipps	10/26/2022	iPad Pro 12
IMG0260	Unit 1 Iron	Raymond Phipps	10/26/2022	iPad Pro 12
IMG0261	Unit 1 Concretion	Raymond Phipps	10/26/2022	iPad Pro 12
IMG0262	Unit 1 Charcoal	Raymond Phipps	10/26/2022	iPad Pro 12
IMG0263	Unit 1 Lead Sheathing	Raymond Phipps	10/26/2022	iPad Pro 12
IMG0264	Unit 1 Iron/Concretion Fastner Void	Raymond Phipps	10/26/2022	iPad Pro 12

IMG0265	Unit 1 Wood	Raymond Phipps	10/26/2022	iPad Pro 12
IMG0266	Unit 1 Concretion	Raymond Phipps	10/26/2022	iPad Pro 12
IMG0267	Unit 1 Charcoal	Raymond Phipps	10/26/2022	iPad Pro 12
IMG0268	Unit 1 Wood Concretion	Raymond Phipps	10/26/2022	iPad Pro 12
IMG0269	Unit 2 Wood	Raymond Phipps	10/26/2022	iPad Pro 12
IMG0270	Unit 2 Charcoal	Raymond Phipps	10/26/2022	iPad Pro 12
IMG0271	Unit 2 Concretion	Raymond Phipps	10/26/2022	iPad Pro 12
IMG0272	Unit 2 Wood	Raymond Phipps	10/26/2022	iPad Pro 12
IMG0273	Unit 2 Concretion	Raymond Phipps	10/26/2022	iPad Pro 12
IMG0274	Unit 2 Copper	Raymond Phipps	10/26/2022	iPad Pro 12
IMG0275	Unit 3 Wood	Raymond Phipps	10/26/2022	iPad Pro 12
IMG0276	Unit 3 Charcoal	Raymond Phipps	10/26/2022	iPad Pro 12
GH010352	Video of Olivia and DJ Dredging Unit 1	Jeremy	10/27/2022	GoPro
GH010353	Video of Olivia and DJ Dredging Unit 2	Jeremy	10/27/2022	GoPro
GH010362	Unit 2	Jeremy	10/27/2022	GoPro
GH010386	Video of Dive Boat	Madie Elsner	10/27/2022	GoPro
GH010387	Video of Dive Boat	Madie Elsner	10/27/2022	GoPro
GH010388	Video of Dive Boat	Madie Elsner	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0354	Picture of Olivia and DJ Dredging	Jeremy	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0355	Picture of Olivia and DJ Dredging	Jeremy	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0356	Picture of Olivia and DJ Dredging	Jeremy	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0357	Picture of Olivia and DJ Dredging	Jeremy	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0358	Picture of Olivia and DJ Dredging	Jeremy	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0359	Picture of Olivia and DJ Dredging	Jeremy	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0360	Picture of Olivia and DJ Dredging	Jeremy	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0361	Picture of spam can	Jeremy	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0363	Unit 2	Dr. Harris	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0364	Unit 2	Dr. Harris	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0365	Maddie Dredging Unit 2	Dr. Harris	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0366	Maddie Dredging Unit 3	Dr. Harris	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0367	Maddie Dredging Unit 4	Dr. Harris	10/27/2022	GoPro

GOPR0368	Maddie Dredging Unit 5	Dr. Harris	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0369	Maddie Dredging Unit 6	Dr. Harris	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0370	Maddie Dredging Unit 7	Dr. Harris	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0371	Maddie Dredging Unit 8	Dr. Harris	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0372	Maddie Dredging Unit 9	Dr. Harris	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0373	Maddie Dredging Unit 10	Dr. Harris	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0374	Maddie Dredging Unit 11	Dr. Harris	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0375	Maddie Dredging Unit 12	Dr. Harris	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0376	Maddie Dredging Unit 13	Dr. Harris	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0377	Copper Sheathing	Dr. Harris	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0378	Copper Sheathing	Dr. Harris	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0379	Copper Sheathing	Dr. Harris	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0380	Unit 1	Dr. Harris	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0381	Unit 1	Dr. Harris	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0382	Unit 1	Dr. Harris	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0383	Unit 1	Dr. Harris	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0384	Unit 1	Dr. Harris	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0385	Unit 1	Dr. Harris	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0387	Olivia and DJ Mapping Unit 1	Jeremy Borrelli	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0389	Picture of Dive Boat	Madie Elsner	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0390	Ryan in Unit 3	Jeremy Borrelli	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0391	Ryan in Unit 3	Jeremy Borrelli	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0392	Ryan in Unit 3	Jeremy Borrelli	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0395	Stem Assembly	Olivia Livingston	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0396	Stem Assembly	Olivia Livingston	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0397	"b" corner of Unit 1	Olivia Livingston	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0398	"b" corner of Unit 1	Olivia Livingston	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0402	DJ in Unit 1	Olivia Livingston	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPR0403	DJ in Unit 1	Olivia Livingston	10/27/2022	GoPro
GX010358	Video of Olivia and DJ Mapping Unit 1	Jeremy Borrelli	10/27/2022	GoPro
GX010372	Video of Unit 2 with Olivia and DJ	Jeremy Borrelli	10/27/2022	GoPro

GX010374	Video of Unit 2 with Olivia	Jeremy Borrelli	10/27/2022	GoPro
GX010377	Video of Olivia and DJ Mapping Unit 2	Jeremy Borrelli	10/27/2022	GoPro
GX010393	Video of Dredging Unit 1 to Get Beneath the Keel	Jeremy Borrelli	10/27/2022	GoPro
GX010399	Video of Dredging Unit 1 to Get Beneath the Keel	Jeremy Borrelli	10/27/2022	GoPro
GX010404	Video of Olivia Dredging with DJ	Jeremy Borrelli	10/27/2022	GoPro
GOPRO421	Anchor	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO422	Anchor	katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO423	Anchor	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO424	Anchor	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO425	Anchor	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO426	Bottle Finish with scale	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO427	Bottle Finish with scale	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO428	Modern Anchor	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO429	Modern Anchor	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO430	Modern Anchor	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO431	Modern Anchor	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO432	Timber	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO433	Timber	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO434	Chains	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO435	Chains	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO436	Chains	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO437	Chains	katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO438	Metal Drum	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO439	Metal Sheathing	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO440	Maddie Snorkeling	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO441	Maddie Snorkeling	katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO442	Maddie Snorkeling	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO443	Maddie Snorkeling	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO444	Timber	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO445	Timber	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO446	Timber	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro

GOPRO447	Fish Trap	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO448	Fish Trap	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO449	Ceramic	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO450	Ceramic	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO451	Ceramic	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO452	Dr. Harris Snorkeling	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	GoPro
GOPRO453	Glass	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO454	Ceramic	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO455	Ceramic	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO456	Sea Grass	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO457	Cuttle Fish	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO458	Blue Ceramic	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO459	Blue Ceramic	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO460	Ceramic (2 pieces)	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO461	Ceramic (2 pieces)	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO462	Ceramic	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO463	Ceramic	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO464	Chain	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO465	Chain	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO466	Chain	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO467	Metal Rod	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO468	Metal Rod	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO469	Metal Rod	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO470	Mooring Block	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO471	Mooring Block	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO472	Mooring Block	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO473	Mooring Block	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO474	Mooring Block	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO475	Metal Rod	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO476	Mooring Block	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO477	Mooring Block	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro

GOPRO478	Mooring Block	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO479	Mooring Block	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO480	Mooring Block	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO481	Mooring Block	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO482	Mooring Block	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO483	Block from Fort Berkeley in the water	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO484	Nick Snorkeling	DJ Schafer	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO485	Nick Snorkeling	DJ Schafer	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO486	Mooring Pin	DJ Schafer	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO487	Mooring Pin	DJ Schafer	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO488	Mooring Pin with scale	DJ Schafer	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO489	Mooring Pin with scale	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO490	Mooring Pin with scale	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO491	Mooring Pin with scale	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO492	Mooring Pin with scale	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO493	Mooring Pin with scale	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO494	Mooring Pin with scale	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO495	Mooring Pin with scale	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO496	Maddie and Katelyn Snorkeling Fort Berkeley	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO497	Fort Berkeley	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO498	Fort Berkeley	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO499	Fort Berkeley	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO500	Katelyn Living Her Best Life	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO501	Tip of Fort Berkeley	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO502	Edge of Fort Berkeley	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
GOPRO503	Edge of Fort Berkeley	Katelyn Rollins	10/28/2022	Gopro
DSC_1124	View of Nelson's Dockyard looking north from Fort Charlotte	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1125	Olivia overlooking English Harbour	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1126	Raymond surveying the ocean	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1127	Dayan and Ian climbing over rocks at the Pillars of Hercules	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1128	The coastline to the east of Fort Charlotte	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400

DSC_1129	Hiking trail between Fort Charlotte and the Blockhouse	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1130	The coastline to the east of Fort Charlotte	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1131	Survey team of Dayan, Ian, Olivia, Logan, Raymond on the hiking trail	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1132	Broken rocks showing erosion of the cliff edge	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1133	Mermaid Gardens tidal pool	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1134	Dayan relaxing at Mermaid Gardens	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1135	Dog overlooks survey team rinsing off at Mermaid Gardens	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1136	Dog overlooks survey team rinsing off at Mermaid Gardens	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1137	Logan floating at Mermaid Garden	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1138	Survey team of Dayan, Ian, Olivia, Logan, Raymond on the hiking trail	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1139	Dayan surveys the remaining trail	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1140	Pipe stem found along hiking path to Shirley Heights	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1141	Pipe stem found along hiking path to Shirley Heights	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1142	View of the Blockhouse ruins from the hiking trail	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1143	Olivia with the Blockhouse in the background	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1144	Shirley Heights Officer's Quarters, full view	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1145	Shirley Heights Officer's Quarters, perspective of ruins	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1146	Shirley Heights Officer's Quarters, perspective of ruins	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1147	Shirley Heights Officer's Quarters, perspective of ruins	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1148	Shirley Heights Officer's Quarters, perspective of ruins	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1149	Signage of Shirley Heights Lookout	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1150	View of English Harbour from Shirley Heights	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1151	View of English Harbour from Shirley Heights	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1152	View of English Harbour from Shirley Heights	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1153	Ruins in the woods between Shirley Heights and the Blockhouse	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1154	Ruins in the woods between Shirley Heights and the Blockhouse	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1155	Survey team of Dayan, Ian, Olivia, Logan, Raymond working at ruins between Shirley Heights and Blockhouse	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC 1156	Survey team of Dayan, Ian, Olivia, Logan, Raymond working at ruins between Shirley Heights and Blockhouse	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1157	Survey team of Dayan, Ian, Olivia, Logan, Raymond working at ruins between Shirley Heights and Blockhouse	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1157	Heights and Blockhouse	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D340

DSC 1158	Survey team of Dayan, Ian, Olivia, Logan, Raymond working at ruins between Shirley Heights and Blockhouse	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC 1159	Raymond measuring ruins	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC 1161	Logan measuring ruins	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
_ DSC 1162	Ruins in the woods between Shirley Heights and the Blockhouse	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
_ DSC 1163	Ruins in the woods between Shirley Heights and the Blockhouse	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
_ DSC 1164	Ruins in the woods between Shirley Heights and the Blockhouse	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
_ DSC 1165	Survey team walking towards the Blockhouse	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
_ DSC 1166	Blockhouse ruins	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
	Goats at the Blockhouse	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
_ DSC 1168	Goats at the Blockhouse	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1169	Goats at the Blockhouse	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1170	Goats at the Blockhouse	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1171	Olivia at the overlook of the Blockhouse	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1172	Goats within the Blockhouse	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1173	Goats within the Blockhouse	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1174	Goats with a broken Blomefield cannon at the Blockhouse	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1175	Broken Blomefield cannon at the Blockhouse, full view from muzzle	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1176	Broken Blomefield cannon at the Blockhouse, full view from cascabel	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1177	Broken Blomefield cannon at the Blockhouse, detail of cascabel	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1178	Powder Magazine at the Blockhouse, rear perspective	Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1179	Powder Magazine at the Blockhouse, front perspective	Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1180	Powder Magazine at the Blockhouse, front perspective	Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1181	Powder Magazine at the Blockhouse, front perspective	Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1182	Powder Magazine at the Blockhouse, interior	Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1183	Powder Magazine at the Blockhouse, water drainage system	Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1184	View looking west towards Blockhouse ruins	Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1185	Damage to concrete at the Blockhouse	Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1186	Erosion of the fortified wall of the Blockhouse	Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1187	Erosion of the fortified wall of the Blockhouse	Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1188	UID structure at the Blockhouse, full view perspective	Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400

DSC_1189	UID structure at the Blockhouse, full view perspective
DSC_1190	UID structure at the Blockhouse, side perspective
DSC_1191	UID structure at the Blockhouse, side perspective
DSC_1192	UID structure at the Blockhouse, side perspective
DSC_1193	UID structure at the Blockhouse, full view perspective
DSC_1194	UID structure at the Blockhouse, full view perspective
DSC_1195	UID structure at the Blockhouse, full view perspective
DSC_1196	UID structure at the Blockhouse, full view perspective
DSC_1197	UID structure at the Blockhouse, full view perspective
DSC_1198	UID structure at the Blockhouse, full view perspective
DSC_1199	UID structure at the Blockhouse, full view perspective
DSC_1200	UID structure at the Blockhouse, full view perspective
DSC_1201	UID structure at the Blockhouse, full view perspective
DSC_1202	UID structure at the Blockhouse, full view perspective
DSC_1203	UID structure at the Blockhouse, full view perspective
DSC_1204	UID structure at the Blockhouse, full view perspective
DSC_1205	UID structure at the Blockhouse, side perspective
DSC_1206	UID structure at the Blockhouse, side perspective
DSC_1207	UID structure at the Blockhouse, side perspective
DSC_1208	UID structure at the Blockhouse, side perspective
DSC_1209	UID structure at the Blockhouse, entrance detail
DSC_1210	UID structure at the Blockhouse, entrance detail
DSC_1211	Cistern at the Blockhouse, full view perspective
DSC_1212	Cistern at the Blockhouse, decoration detail
DSC_1213	Cistern at top of Jones Valley Trail, full view perspective
DSC_1214	Cistern at top of Jones Valley Trail, erosion
DSC_1215	Raymond taking a break at the cistern at top of Jones Valley Trail
DSC_1216	"Caroline Wieburg" tombstone on Jones Valley Trail
DSC_1217	"Ann Gladwin" tombstone on Jones Valley Trail
DSC_1218	Raymond hiking past 18th century dam on Jones Valley Trail
DSC 1219	18th century dam on Jones Valley Trail

Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Olivia Livingston	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400

DSC_1220	Rock fallen within an 18th century dam on Jones Valley Trail	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1221	UID structure near dam on Jones Valley Trail	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1222	18th dam on Jones Valley Trail, interior	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1223	Survey team hiking on Jones Valley Trail	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1224	Hermit crab on Jones Valley Trail	Jeremy Borrelli	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1225	Ceramic, body fragment, Unit 2	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1226	Ceramic, body fragment, Unit 2	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1227	Ceramic, body fragment, Unit 2	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1228	Ceramic, body fragment, Unit 2	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1229	Ceramic, rim sherd, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1230	Ceramic, rim sherd, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1231	Lead bilge strainer fragment, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1232	Lead bilge strainer fragment, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1233	Lead shot, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1234	Lead shot, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1235	Decorated ceramic, plate base sherd fragment, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1236	Decorated ceramic, plate base sherd fragment, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1237	Decorated ceramic, plate base sherd fragment, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1238	Decorated ceramic, plate base sherd fragment, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1239	Decorated ceramic, plate base sherd fragment, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1240	Decorated ceramic, body sherd fragment, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1241	Decorated ceramic, body sherd fragment, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1242	Lead fragment, possible fishing weight, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1243	Lead fragment, possible fishing weight, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1244	Lead fragment, possible fishing weight, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1245	Lead fragment, possible fishing weight, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1246	Lead fragment, possible fishing weight, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1247	Lead fragment, possible fishing weight, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1248	Lead fragment, possible fishing weight, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1249	Copper alloy cup handle, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1250	Copper alloy cup handle, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400

DSC_1251	Copper alloy cup handle, Unit 3	lan Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1252	Copper alloy cup handle, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1253	Lead fragment, possible fishing weight, Unit 3	lan Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1254	Lead fragment, possible fishing weight, Unit 3	lan Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1255	Lead fragment, possible fishing weight, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1256	Lead fragment, possible fishing weight, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1257	Ceramic fragment, base sherd, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1258	Ceramic fragment, base sherd, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1259	Ceramic fragment, base sherd, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1260	Clay pipe stem fragment, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1261	Clay pipe stem fragment, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1262	Clay pipe stem fragment, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1263	Clay pipe stem fragment, Unit 3	lan Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1264	Bone shoulder fragment, Unit 3	lan Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1265	Bone shoulder fragment, Unit 3	lan Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1266	Bone shoulder fragment, Unit 3	lan Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1267	Bone shoulder fragment, Unit 3	lan Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1268	Bone shoulder fragment, Unit 3	lan Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1269	Bone shoulder fragment, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1270	Bone shoulder fragment, Unit 3	lan Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1271	Bone fragment, rib, Unit 3	lan Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1272	Bone fragment, rib, Unit 3	lan Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1273	Bone fragment, rib, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1274	Bone fragment, rib, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1275	Bone fragment, rib, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1276	Copper alloy instrument, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1277	Copper alloy instrument, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1278	Copper alloy instrument, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1279	Copper alloy instrument, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1280	Copper alloy instrument, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1281	Copper alloy instrument, Unit 3	Ian Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1282	Leather fragment, Unit 2	lan Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
----------	--------------------------	-------------	------------	-------------
DSC_1283	Leather fragment, Unit 2	lan Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1284	Leather fragment, Unit 2	lan Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1285	Bone fragment, Unit 3	lan Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1286	Bone fragment, Unit 3	lan Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1287	Bone fragment, Unit 3	lan Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1288	Bone fragment, Unit 3	lan Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1289	Bone fragment, Unit 3	lan Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1290	Bone fragment, Unit 3	lan Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1291	Bone fragment, Unit 3	lan Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1292	Bone fragment, Unit 3	lan Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1293	Bone fragment, Unit 3	lan Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1294	Bone fragment, Unit 3	lan Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1295	Bone fragment, Unit 3	lan Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400
DSC_1296	Bone fragment, Unit 3	lan Dunshee	10/29/2022	NIKON D3400

APPENDIX B: Mylar (Pro Formas) Inventory

cession#	Date	Unit	Level	Creators	Title, Comments	Pro Fo	orma	
1	10/24/2022		3	2 JB RP LW	Stern interpretation. Includes keelson measurements.			
2	10/23/2022		3	2 DS ME JB	Outside Grid. Chain.			
3	10/28/2022			ID JB	Tank Bay Wreck. UFP			
4	10/23/2022			ME DS	Tank Bay Wreck. Wood, sheathing, lead shot (spoil), bone.	UFP		
5	24-Oct		3	1 RP LW	Tank Bay Wreck, Trilat points,			
6	24-Oct		3	1 RP I W	Lead sheathing Eastener			
7	21000		3	MT	Tank Bay Wreck Wood sheathing lead shot (spoil) hone	LIED		
,	24-Oct		2	2 1 \\/	Tank Bay Wreck. Wood, sheatning, icad shot (spon), bonc.	LIED		
0	24-000		3		Exploratory dive observations made at each mater along baseling	o Groon hot	ttla 11 matal fragmants al	
10	20-000		000		Table have Dately apple descriptions made at each meter along baseline	e. Green bo	ttie. 41 metal fragments, ci	
10	21-00		1		Tank bay. Bottle neck drawing.		.	
11	22-Oct		1	T JR JM	Tank Bay Wreck. Trilats of Artifacts recovered. Large iron concretion. Large fastener square			
12	22-Oct		200	1 LH LW	Tank Bay Wreck. Square fastener, trunnel.			
13	23-Oct		2	1 OL	Tank Bay Wreck. Iron: Encrusted.			
14	21-Oct	1&3		RP KR	Tank Bay Wreck. Bottle neck			
15	21-Oct		1	1 KR RP	Tank Bay Wreck. Loose timber. Iron Object.			
16	23-Oct		1	2 LH LW	Tank Bay Wreck. Bottle Base. Iron artifact. lead.			
17	24-Oct		1	1 KR ID	TBW. Concretion. Wood block. Thin metal. Nail holes.	UFP		
18	28-Oct		1	RP OL	TBW. Timber measurements.			
19 20	22-Oct 17-Oct		1	3 LW RP OL	TBW. Lead. Trunnel. Hull plank. Nothing found in dredge spoil. Stones forming a wall. Mussel line. Degraded ledge. Stone mea	surements.	UFP	
21	17-Oct			RP OL	Sea wall. Mussel line. Stone measurements.			
22	17-Oct			ID KR	Careening Block Sea Wall Profile.			
23	17-Oct			ME DW	Sea wall. Mussel line. Stone measurements.			
24	17-Oct			KR	Stone Quay. Mussel line. Recessed area.			
25	19-Oct			RP OL	Stone Quay. 40-45m.			
26	19-Oct			RP OL	Stone Quay. 40-45m.			
27	19-Oct			ID KR	Sea Wall. 60-65m.			
28	19-Oct			DS ME	Sea wall 55-60m.			
29	18-Oct			RP OL DW ME	Antigua Dockyard cross-section.			
30	18-Oct			RP OL	Cross-section. 1m 5m 10m			
31	18-Oct			DS KR ID NB	Keystone. 35-40m			
32	18-Oct			ID KR DS NB	Sea wall Cross-Section. 25-30m			
33	19-Oct		_	RP OL	Sea wall cross section 40-45			
34	19-Oct		_	RP OL	Sea wall cross section 40-45			
35	19-Oct			DS KR ID ME	Sea waii Cross section bull to bo			
36	19-Oct			DS KR ID NP	Quay 50-55m			
20	10-0ct		1		Ougu E0 60m			
30	19-0ct		-		Sea wall 25-30m			
	19-000			ID KK DS ND	Sea waii 25-5011			
10	15-Oct			NB	Cannon 13 (see back)	Can	aon	
40	23-Oct		2	2 ME DS IB	Bone	SO		
42	23-0ct		1		Concreted fastener	50		
42	23-00		2 1/2		Eching weight	50		
43	22-001		2 1/2		2 Gun flinte	30		
44	22-OCt		2 1/2		2 our mills	50		
45	22-OCt		5 1/2	D2 IVIE 18	Pipe Steffi	50	Gentley Course	
46	20-Oct				Fort Berkeley Powder Magazine	Fort	incation Survey	
47	20-Oct			ME NB DS J D	Fort Berkeley	Fort	ification Survey	
48	20-Oct			DS	Fort Berkeley Blackhouse			
49	19-Oct			DW	Possible 9, possible /	Canr	non	
.50	22-Oct			I W I H RB	Square Fastener			

APPENDIX C: GPS Point Inventory

1	English Ha	rbour							
2	latitude	longitude	elevation (Meters) time	name	cmt	desc	legend	CreationTime	Recorder
3	17.0087	-61.7646	17.913452 2022-10-17T15:21:20Z	BLOO	BLOO	BLOO	BL=Baseline	2022-10-17T15:21:20Z	NB_LH
4	17.00869	-61.7647	17.438065 2022-10-17T15:25:30Z	BL10	BL10	BL10	CAN=Cannon	2022-10-17T15:25:30Z	NB_LH
5	17.00864	-61.7648	17.431738 2022-10-17T15:26:44Z	BL20	BL20	BL20	B=Bollard	2022-10-17T15:26:44Z	NB_LH
6	17.00863	-61.7648	17.707272 2022-10-17T15:28:16Z	BL30	BL30	BL30	ST=Structure	2022-10-17T15:28:16Z	NB_LH
7	17.00861	-61.7649	17.897005 2022-10-17T15:29:47Z	BL40	BL40	BL40	IR/LB=Iron Spikes/Buttons	2022-10-17T15:29:47Z	NB_LH
8	17.00858	-61.765	18.172394 2022-10-17T15:30:56Z	BL50	BL50	BL50	OGB=One Gun Battery	2022-10-17T15:30:56Z	NB_LH
9	17.00856	-61.7651	18.092522 2022-10-17T15:32:15Z	BL60	BL60	BL60	NPFB=National Park Fort Berkeley	2022-10-17T15:32:15Z	NB_LH
10	17.00852	-61.7652	18.662979 2022-10-17T15:33:28Z	BL70	BL70	BL70		2022-10-17T15:33:28Z	NB_LH
11	17.00855	-61.7649	18.139975 2022-10-17T16:20:54Z	CAN1	CANNON1	CANNON1		2022-10-17T16:20:54Z	NB
12	17.00811	-61.7643	17.156954 2022-10-17T17:01:27Z	CAN10	CANNON10	CANNON10		2022-10-17T17:01:27Z	NB
13	17.00802	-61.7644	17.105232 2022-10-17T17:06:14Z	CAN11	CANNON11	CANNON11		2022-10-17T17:06:14Z	NB
14	17.00779	-61.7646	16.569557 2022-10-17T17:09:30Z	CAN12	CANNON12	CANNON12		2022-10-17T17:09:30Z	NB
15	17.00802	-61.7652	17.889179 2022-10-17T17:12:55Z	CAN13	CANNON13	CANNON13		2022-10-17T17:12:55Z	NB
16	17.00791	-61.7653	17.662022 2022-10-17T17:16:04Z	CAN14	CANNON14	CANNON14		2022-10-17T17:16:04Z	NB
17	17.00805	-61.7653	16.912882 2022-10-17T17:22:34Z	CAN15	CANNON15	CANNON15		2022-10-17T17:22:34Z	NB
18	17.00808	-61.7652	17.160418 2022-10-17T17:25:07Z	CAN16	CANNON16	CANNON16		2022-10-17T17:25:07Z	NB
19	17.00838	-61.7658	17.728407 2022-10-17T17:28:49Z	CAN17	CANNON17	CANNON17		2022-10-17T17:28:49Z	NB
20	17.00799	-61.7656	18.565836 2022-10-17T17:32:44Z	CAN18	CANNON18	CANNON18		2022-10-17T17:32:44Z	NB
21	17.00839	-61.7661	21.233767 2022-10-17T17:38:54Z	CAN19	CANNON19	CANNON19		2022-10-17T17:38:54Z	NB
22	17.00881	-61.7645	16.507879 2022-10-17T16:37:54Z	CAN2	CANNON2	CANNON2		2022-10-17T16:37:54Z	NB
23	17.00852	-61.7663	3 21.623064 2022-10-17T17:42:54Z	CAN20	CANNON20	CANNON20		2022-10-17T17:42:54Z N	B
24	17.00843	-61.7663	3 22.053612 2022-10-17T17:44:55Z	CAN21	CANNON21	CANNON21		2022-10-17T17:44:55Z N	B
25	17.00829	-61.7658	3 20.483919 2022-10-17T17:48:06Z	CAN22	CANNON22	CANNON22		2022-10-17T17:48:06Z N	.В
26	17.00828	-61.7657	20.727108 2022-10-17T17:50:09Z	CAN23	CANNON23	CANNON23		2022-10-17T17:50:09Z N	B
27	17.00858	-61.7646	5 17.235586 2022-10-17T18:40:44Z	CAN24	CANNON24	CANNON24		2022-10-17T18:40:44Z N	В
28	17.00849	-61.765	5 15.1243 2022-10-17T18:45:22Z	CAN25	CANNON25	CANNON25		2022-10-17T18:45:22Z N	В
29	17.00846	-61.7652	2 15.315233 2022-10-17T18:46:44Z	CAN26	CANNON26	CANNON26		2022-10-17T18:46:44Z N	В
30	17.0083	-61.7641	15.071494 2022-10-17T18:51:12Z	CAN27	CANNON27	CANNON27		2022-10-17T18:51:12Z N	В
31	17.00877	-61.7644	16.875797 2022-10-17T16:41:09Z	CAN3	CANNON3	CANNON3		2022-10-17T16:41:09Z N	В
32	17.0087	-61.7643	3 17.334862 2022-10-17T16:45:26Z	CAN4	CANNON4	CANNON4		2022-10-17T16:45:26Z N	В
33	17.00868	-61.7642	2 17.471073 2022-10-17T16:47:22Z	CAN5	CANNON5	CANNON5		2022-10-17T16:47:22Z N	В
34	17.00867	-61./642	16.839413 2022-10-17116:50:322	CAN6	CANNON6	CANNON6		2022-10-1/116:50:322 N	В
35	17.00851	-61.7642	2 17.380421 2022-10-17T16:53:42Z	CAN7	CANNON7	CANNON7		2022-10-17T16:53:42Z N	В
36	17.00839	-61./642	18 2022-10-1/116:57:542	CANS	CANNON8	CANNON8		2022-10-1/116:57:54Z N	В
37	17.00821	-61./643	3 17.708607 2022-10-17116:59:422	CAN9	CANNON9	CANNON9		2022-10-1/116:59:422 N	В
38	17.00849	-61.7649	9.665441 2022-10-18T14:04:21Z	CAN28!	CANNON28!	CANNON28!		2022-10-18T14:04:21Z N	В
39	17.00803	-61.765	5 10.80624 2022-10-18T14:07:02Z	CAN29	CANNON 29	CANNON 29		2022-10-18T14:07:02Z N	В
40	17.0082	-61.7643	3 12.253579 2022-10-18T14:10:45Z	CAN30	CANNON 30	CANNON 30		2022-10-18T14:10:45Z N	В
41	17.00813	-61.7651	15.238887 2022-10-19T15:49:35Z	CAN31	CANNON31	CANNON31		2022-10-19T15:49:35Z N	В
42	17.00813	-61.7651	16.222147 2022-10-19T15:53:20Z	CAN32	CANNON32	CANNON32	1	2022-10-19T15:53:20Z N	B
43	17.00809	-61.7652	2 16.380728 2022-10-19T15:55:57Z	CAN33	CANNON33	CANNON33	1	2022-10-19T15:55:57Z N	B
44	17.00415	-61.7628	3 52.291504 2022-10-20T16:53:30Z	CAN34	CANNON34	CANNON34		2022-10-20T16:53:30Z N	В

APPENDIX D: Field Specimen Inventory

PHOTO ID NO.	ARTIFACT NO. DESCRIPTION	UNIT	LEVEL	DATE RECOVERED	DATUM A	DATUM B	DATUM C	DATUM D	DATUM E	DATUM P	DATUM G	DATUM H	DATUM I	DATUM J	BASELINE	DREDGE SPOIL	EXCAVATION UNI	TINITIALS
0730-0733	1 Glass Bottle Finish and Part of Shoulder (Green)		1	21/10/2022	94 cm	99 cm	210 cm										X	KR.RP.LH
	2 Glass Shard (Possibly Modern, Green)		3	21/10/2022												x		KR.RP.IH
	3 Glass		3	21/10/2022												x		KR RDIH
0600.0603	5 Cidass 4 Eiching Minisht (in long with severe fastenes)		3	21/10/2022												× v		NG W, LIT
0003-0035	4 Fishing Weight (in dag with square lasterier)		2	25/10/2022												A V		
	5 Dead		3	21/10/2022												A		
	6 Carbonized Wood (Many Fragments)		1	21/10/2022												x		
	7 Quartz		1	21/10/2022												x		
0675-0678	8 Small Mammal Bone- Femur (Possibly Rat)		1	21/10/2022												X		
0681-0682	9 Bone Fragment Mammal		1	21/10/2022												X		
0679-0680	10 Ceramic Sherd		1	21/10/2022												Х		
	11 Ceramic Sherd - Base, Refined Earthenware		1	21/10/2022		66 cm?	155 cm ?										x	
0722-0729	12 Pipe Bowl with designs of Sun, Rose, and Potential Makers Mark		1	21/10/2022		66 cm ?	155 cm ?										x	
	13 Featherd Edge Creamware		3	21/10/2022		125 cm	105 cm	160 cm									x	RYKRIH
	and the second																	
0743 0745	14 Square Factors (same bag as fishing weight)		4	32/10/2022	43.000	165.000	145.000											LINE THE DE
0742-0745	14 Square Pascier (same bag as issning weight)		1	23/10/2022	42011	105011	143011											CLV, LH, RE
0702-0703	15 bredge spoil - Two dun Plints and Two Pipe Steams			2 25/10/2022														US, IVIE, JB
	10 Concreted fastener		1	1 23/10/2022	Taacuu		95cm	190cm										JMI, OL, LH
0694-0697	17 Cow bone		3	2 23/10/2022														
0698-0701	18 Copper alloy mystery item		3	1 23/10/2022												X		
	19 5 Lead Sheathing		3	2 23/10/2022														DS, ME, JB
	20 Ballast/Concretion		3	2 22/10/2022														DS, ME, JB
	21 Fibers		3	1 23/10/2022			115	110)									DS, ME, JB
	22 Charcoal		3	2 22/10/2022														DS, ME, JB
	23 2 Fasteners on Plank		1	1 23/10/2022		199	110	80	1									LH OL IM
	24 Iron Concretion		2	1 22/10/2022	160	0 100	120	00	-									LH OL IM
	24 Iron concretion		2	2 23/10/2022	100	0 100	/ 150											LR, OL, JIV
	25 bredge spon		3	2 25/10/2022														JB, DS, IVIE
	26 Lead Sneathing		3	2 22/10/2022														DS, IVIE, JB
	27 Lead Sheathing		3	2 22/10/2022														DS, ME, JB
	28 Charcoal		3	2 22/10/2022														DS, ME, JB
			la series								-							
PHOTO ID NO.	ARTIFACT NO. DESCRIPTION	UNIT	LEVEL	DATE RECOVERED	DATUM A	A DATUM B	DATUM C	DATUM D	DATUM E	DATUM F	DATUM G	DATUM H	DATUM I	DATUM J	BASELINE	DREDGE SPOIL	EXCAVATION UNI	TINITIALS
	29 Wood		3	2 22/10/2022														DS, ME, JB
	30 5 Pieces of Lead Sheathing		1	1 23/10/2022														LH, OL, JM
0714-0717	31 Porcelain blue flower		1	2														ID
0718-0721	32 Rat bone (21 fragments)		1	2 24/10/2022												х		JM, KR, ID
0734-0737	33 Ceramic- black/white wavy		3	21/10/2022		125	5 105	160)									
0738-0741	34 Ceramic- grey, cross-hatching					10.	100	100										
0748-0751 07	35 Lead Sheathing Rectangle 10 nail holes		3	1 24/10/2022			100	105	5									IR RP IW
0753 0755 07	25 Load Sheathing, Rectangle, 10 han notes		3	1 24/10/2022		140	75	105	, 									50, IN, LIV
0756 0750	27 Severe Fastener (conception bules in middle)		3	1 24/10/2022		4 15		100										
0750-0753 07	57 Square Pasterier (concretion bulge in midule)		1	1 24/10/2022	17	4 134	•	190	,									100
0/00-0/03,0/	38 Iron Sneatning (concretion popping on top)		1	1 24/10/2022	1/1	U 43	,											KR
0665-0670	39 Porcelain blue wave pattern (Rice Bowl)		2	23/10/2022														
0629-0632	40 Small Iron Concretion with possible Ballast		1	1 23/10/2022														
0621	41 Musket Ball		3	1 23/10/2022												x		JB, DS, ME
0625-0627	42 Feather Edged Creanware; 1 Rim and 1 Base		3	1 23/10/2022												x		JB, DS, ME
0630-0632	43 Mammal Bone - Rib		3	1 23/10/2022												x		JB, DS, ME
0633-0635	44 Chert (Possibly Gun Flint) (Brown)		3	1 23/10/2022												x		JB, DS, ME
0637-0639	45 Glass Fragments (1 Modern Green: 1 Olive Green)		2 Keelson	22/10/2022													×	lean-luc
0640 0652	46 Page Vortebro		2 Koolson	22/10/2022													~	Jean Luc
0040-0033	40 bone-vertebre		2 Reelson	22/10/2022											1.84			Jean-Luc
0054-0005	47 Lead Along Keel		1	23/10/2022											1 101		x	JIVI, LH,
0666-0669	48 Mammai Bone Fragment		2	1 21/10/2022													x	JM, ID, OL
0670-0671	49 Mammal Bone Fragments-3		3	1 24/10/2022														JB, LW, RP
0672-0677	50 Lead Sheathing		3 4?	22/10/2022	71	8 153	3	170)								x	FB
0678, 0680-06	51 Lead Fishing Weights		3 4?	22/10/2022	71	8 153	3	170)								x	FB
0682-0684	52 Ceramic- Porcelain Base		2	22/10/2022											23 M		x	CM
0685-0687	53 Ceramic- (Possibly Delft) Curved Rim		2	22/10/2022											23 M		x	CM
0688-0690	54 Rone Fragments (2)		1	2 22/10/2022												×		IB DS ME
0691.0696	55 Transile		1	2 22/10/2022	1.0/	0	11/	104	1									IP DS ME
0607.0600	EE Curried Class Shard, Olive Creen		2	21/10/2022	10	0	114	104										CL AA/NIT
0037-0033	50 Curved diass shard - Onve dreen		0	21/10/2022														GL, WI/N T
0700-0702	57 Lead		3	21/10/2022														GL, WI/N I
PHOTO ID NO.	ARTIFACT NO. DESCRIPTION	UNIT	LEVEL	DATE RECOVERED	DATUM	A DATUM B	DATUM C	DATUM D	DATUM E	DATUM P	F DATUM G	DATUM H	DATUM I	DATUM J	BASELINE	DREDGE SPOIL	EXCAVATION UN	TINITIALS
0703-0706	58 Bone Fragment	inter s	2	1 22/10/2022												x		JM, LV, H
0713-0714	59 Concreted fastener		1	1 24/10/2022?	5	4 15-	4 190)									x	ID, KR, JM
0715-0717	60 Mammal Bone		3	25/10/2022													x	JLV, AT
0718-0720	61 Mammal Bone		1	1 25/10/2022												x		KR. ID. I H
0721-0723	62 Mammal Bone (2 Frags)		1	25/10/2022	2	0		20	n								×	FR
0721-0725	62 Leather Direc		2 1 (Teansh)	23/10/2022	-	0		20									<u>.</u>	10
0724-0720	os cestrer Piece		2 1 (Trench)	24/10/2022													X	15, JL
0/2/-0/28	64 Mammai Bone (2 Frags)		2 1 (Trench)	24/10/2022													x	JS, JL
0729-0731	65 Brown Sait Glazed Stoneware - Body		2 1 (Trench)	24/10/2022													x	15, JL
0732-0733	66 White Ceramic - Body		2 1 (Trench)	25/10/2022											East 3.29 (Offset 1.30), West 3	x	
0734-0735	67 Ceramic Sherd, Body, Possibly Biot Jar		2 1 (Trench)	£25/10/2022												x		JB, RP, LW
0736-0737	68 Mammal Bone		2 1 (Trench)	25/10/2022											East 3.14 (Offset 0.5), West 3.4	x	JB, RP, LW
0738-0740	69 Tile Sherd/Brick Frag?		2 1 (Trench)	25/10/2022											East 3.65 (Offset 1.36), West 3	x	JB, RP, LW
0741-0750	70 Decorative Pipe Bowl		1	21/10/2022		0.6	6 1.5	5							(3.1m Dee	p)	x	FB
0751-0754	71 Concreted Trunnel		1	1 25/10/2022												x		KR, ID, LH
0758-0761	72 Wine Bottle Base		1	1 25/10/2022											0.4		x	KR, ID, LH
0755-0757	73 Iron Fastener Top?		1	1 25/10/2022											0.4		x	KR, ID, LH
0762-0765	74 Conner Tube (Modern?)		2	2 25/10/2022										50cm wo	t from L/Ne	Offent	v	IM ID DD
0601 0600	74 copper labe (woderni)		2	2 23/10/2022										Jociniwe	in com s fire	Volisey	^	Crook
0622-0022	75 10 x Wold		3	20/10/2022														Fidlik
0025-0024	76 10 X Ballast/Concretion		3	20/10/2022												X		FIGHK
0625-0626	// 3 x Charcoal		3	26/10/2022												x		Frank
0633-0634	78 122 x Wood		3	26/10/2022												x		JLV/MT
0638-0639	79 2 x Iron Sheathing		3	26/10/2022												x		JLV/MT
0642-0643	80 11 x Ballast Concretion		3	26/10/2022												x		JLV/MT
0644-0645	81 1 x Coal		3	26/10/2022												x		JLV/MT
0646-0647	82 1 x Iron Sheathing		1	26/10/2022												x		Frank
0650-0651	83 23 x Wood		1	26/10/2022												x		Frank
0652-0652	84 3 x Burnt Wood		1	26/10/2022												x		Frank
0658-0659	85.4 v Burnt Wood/Metal		1	26/10/2022												0		Frank
0058-0059	as 4 x Burnt Wood/Metal		1	20/10/2022												A		Frank
0000-0661	db 29 x Ballast Concretion		1	26/10/2022												X		Frank
PHOTO ID NO	ARTIFACT NO. DESCRIPTION	UNIT	LEVEL	DATE RECOVERED	DATUM	A DATUM P	DATUM	DATUM D	DATUM F	DATUM	F DATUM G	DATUM H	DATUM	DATUM I	BASELINE	DREDGE SPOIL	EXCAVATION LIN	IT INITIALS
0664 0665	P7 22 x Mood		1	25/10/2022								1-20.00010						KD ID I''
0004-0005	87 22 X WOOD		1	25/10/2022												A		KK, ID, LH
0000-0667	88 3 X COBI		1	25/10/2022												X		KK, ID, LH
0670-0671	89 1 x Bone		1	25/10/2022												x		KR, ID, LH
0672-0673	90 6 x Ballast Concretion		1	25/10/2022												x		KR, ID, LH
0676-0677	91 16 x Wood		2	26/10/2022												x		LEH, LH, D.
0678-0679	92 4 x Bone		2	26/10/2022												x		LEH, LH, D.
0680-0681	93 2 x Coal		2	26/10/2022												x		LEH, LH, D.
0682-0683	94 1 x Porcelain with Blue Decoration		1	25/10/2022												x		KR, ID, LH
0686-0688	95 11 Wood Chunks with 1 x Glass (modern)		2	26/10/2022												x		ME, DL, IN
IMG 0255	96 80 Wood fragments		1	23/10/2022												x		IIV. MT
	So do troba naginenta		17													175.		-hery 1911

APPENDIX E: Artifact Inventory

Unit 1		
0730-0733	1	Glass Bottle Finish and Part of Shoulder (Green)
	6	Carbonized Wood (Many Fragments)
	7	Quartz
0675-0678	8	Small Mammal Bone- Femur (Possibly Rat)
0681-0682	9	Bone Fragment Mammal
0679-0680	10	Ceramic Sherd
	11	Ceramic Sherd - Base, Refined Earthenware
		Pipe Bowl with designs of Sun, Rose, and Potential Makers
0722-0729	12	Mark
0742-0745	14	Square Fastener (same bag as fishing weight)
	16	Concreted fastener
	23	2 Fasteners on Plank
	30	5 Pieces of Lead Sheathing
0714-0717	31	Porcelain blue flower
0718-0721	32	Rat bone (21 fragments)
0756-0759	37	Square Fastener (concretion bulge in middle)
0760-0763, 0711-		
0712	38	Iron Sheathing (concretion popping on top)
0629-0632	40	Small Iron Concretion with possible Ballast
0654-0665	47	Lead Along Keel
0688-0690	54	Bone Fragments (2)
0691-0696	55	Treenails
0713-0714	59	Concreted fastener
0718-0720	61	Mammal Bone
0721-0723	62	Mammal Bone (2 Frags)
0751-0754	71	Concreted Trunnel
0758-0761	72	Wine Bottle Base
0755-0757	73	Iron Fastener Top?
0646-0647	82	1 x Iron Sheathing
0650-0651	83	23 x Wood
0652-0653	84	3 x Burnt Wood
0658-0659	85	4 x Burnt Wood/Metal
0660-0661	86	29 x Ballast Concretion
0664-0665	87	22 x Wood
0666-0667	88	3 x Coal
0670-0671	89	1 x Bone
0672-0673	90	6 x Ballast Concretion
IMG_0255	96	80 Wood fragments

Unit 2		
	24	Iron Concretion
0665-0670	39	Porcelain blue wave pattern (Rice Bowl)
0637-0639	45	Glass Fragments (1 Modern Green; 1 Olive Green)
0640-0653	46	Bone-Vertebre
0666-0669	48	Mammal Bone Fragment
0682-0684	52	Ceramic- Porcelain Base
0685-0687	53	Ceramic- (Possibly Delft) Curved Rim
0703-0706	58	Bone Fragment
0724-0726	63	Leather Piece
0727-0728	64	Mammal Bone (2 Frags)
0729-0731	65	Brown Salt Glazed Stoneware - Body
0732-0733	66	White Ceramic - Body
0734-0735	67	Ceramic Sherd, Body, Possibly Biot Jar
0736-0737	68	Mammal Bone
0738-0740	69	Tile Sherd/Brick Frag?
0762-0765	74	Copper Tube (Modern?)
0676-0677	91	16 x Wood
0678-0679	92	4 x Bone
0680-0681	93	2 x Coal
0686-0688	95	11 Wood Chunks with 1 x Glass (modern)
Unit 3		
	2	Glass Shard (Possibly Modern, Green)
	3	Glass
0689-0693	4	Fishing Weight (in bag with square fastener)
	5	Lead
	13	Feathered Edge Creamware
0702-0709	15	Dredge Spoil - Two Gun Flints and Two Pipe Steams
0694-0697	17	Cow bone
0698-0701	18	Copper alloy mystery item
	19	5 Lead Sheathing
	20	Ballast/Concretion
	21	Fibers
	22	Charcoal
	25	Dredge Spoil
	26	Lead Sheathing
	27	Lead Sheathing
	28	Charcoal
	29	Wood
0734-0737	33	Ceramic- black/white wavy

0748-0751, 0709-							
0710	35	Lead Sheathing, Rectangle; 10 nail holes					
0752-0755, 0707-							
0708	36	Lead Sheathing, Grey with spine going down middle					
0621	41	Musket Ball					
0625-0627	42	Feather Edged Creanware; 1 Rim and 1 Base					
0630-0632	43	Mammal Bone - Rib					
0633-0635	44	Chert (Possibly Gun Flint) (Brown)					
0670-0671	49	Mammal Bone Fragments-3					
0672-0677	50	Lead Sheathing					
0678, 0680-0681	51	Lead Fishing Weights					
0697-0699	56	Curved Glass Shard - Olive Green					
0700-0702	57	Lead					
0715-0717	60	Mammal Bone					
0621-0622	75	10 x Wood					
0623-0624	76	10 x Ballast/Concretion					
0625-0626	77	3 x Charcoal					
0633-0634	78	122 x Wood					
0638-0639	79	2 x Iron Sheathing					
0642-0643	80	11 x Ballast Concretion					
0644-0645	81	1 x Coal					
Unspecified Unit							
0738-0741	34	Ceramic- grey, cross-hatching					

APPENDIX F: UNESCO UNITWIN Program



SCHEDULE OF CLASSES

Sunday 16 October

6-7pm

- Introductions
- UNESCO UNITWIN Training

Presenters: Lynn Harris and Jen McKinnon

Tuesday 18 October

6-7pm

- Archaeology Search and Survey
- Site Types

Presenter: Ryan Bradley

Thursday 20 October

6-7pm

- 2D Recording and 3D Recording
- Excavation

Presenters: Jeremy Borrelli and Jen McKinnon

Saturday 22 October

2-5pm

• Practical Mapping Session Presenter: Jeremy Borrelli and Lynn Harris

Tuesday 25 October

6-7pm

Dating and Artifact Identification
Presenter: Lynn Harris

Thursday 27 October

6-7pm

Laws and Citizen Science

Presenter: Chris Waters and Jen McKinnon

WEBSITE LINKS

Program in Maritime Studies https://maritimestudies.ecu.edu/

UNESCO UNITWIN underwater archaeology http://www.underwaterarchaeology.net/ABOUT.htm http://www.underwaterarchaeology.net/OBJECTIVES.htm

Presenter Bios and websites

Lynn Harris https://history.ecu.edu/lynn-harris/

Jen McKinnon https://history.ecu.edu/jennifer-mckinnon/ https://people.ecu.edu/mckinnonje/

Jeremy Borrelli https://history.ecu.edu/jeremy-borrelli/

Ryan Bradley https://diving.ecu.edu/