

Portions of this document have been REDACTED because they are CONFIDENTIAL pursuant to Part 6 of the Commission's Rules, Section 87(2)(a) of the New York Public Officers Law, and the New York Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation Law.



**Mortimer-Golah 109/110
Transmission Rebuild Project**

**Supplemental Phase IB Archaeological Survey
Part 1 of 2**

Phase III Data Recovery Work Plan

National Grid CLCPA Mortimer-Golah Lines 109 and 110 Transmission Project

Monroe County, New York

NYSHPO Project Review # 24PR03368



Prepared for:



National Grid

Contact: Frank Sciortino

Frank.sciortino@nationalgrid.com

Prepared by:



Environmental Design & Research, D.P.C.

217 Montgomery Street, Suite 1100

Syracuse, New York 13202

www.edrdpc.com

August 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Introuction.....	1
2.0	Background and Site Descriptions	2
2.1	[REDACTED]	2
2.2	[REDACTED]	5
3.0	Methodology	6
3.1	Potential Research Themes	6
3.2	Close Interval Shovel Testing.....	7
3.3	Test Units.....	7
3.4	Mechanical Removal of the Plowzone	8
3.5	Cultural Features	8
3.6	Cultural Material Analysis.....	9
3.7	Phase III Report.....	9
3.8	Unanticipated Cultural Resources Discoveries Protocol and Human Remains Protocol	9
4.0	Conclusions	11
	References.....	12

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Figures

Figure 1: Regional Project Location

Figure 2: Site [REDACTED] Artifact Density

Figure 3: Site [REDACTED] – Close Interval Shovel Testing

Figure 4: Site [REDACTED] Artifact Density

Figure 5: Site [REDACTED] – Mechanical Removal of the Plowzone

Figure 6: Site [REDACTED] – Mechanical Removal of the Plowzone

1.0 INTRODUCTION

On behalf of National Grid (the Applicant) and Burns & McDonnell, Environmental Design & Research, Landscape Architecture, Engineering & Environmental Services, D.P.C. (EDR) conducted a Phase II site examination of Site [REDACTED] in March 2025 for the proposed National Grid CLCPA Mortimer-Golah Lines 109 and 110 Transmission Project in Monroe County, New York (the Project) (Attachment A, Figure 1; EDR, 2025a). Following the Phase II survey, the NYSHPO determined that the site is Eligible for the State/National Register of Historic Places (S/NRHP) and therefore necessitates a Phase III data recovery, as a majority of the site is located within proposed construction.

Further, due to changes in Project design following completion of the Phase II site examination, EDR conducted a supplemental Phase IB survey in June 2025 and identified Site [REDACTED] (EDR, 2025b), an Indigenous site recommended as potentially Eligible for inclusion on the S/NRHP. Due to design constraints, avoiding the site is not feasible. Therefore, a Phase III data recovery was recommended due to the site's proximity to [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. This memo therefore presents the Work Plan for a Phase III data recovery at Site [REDACTED] and a combined Phase II/III at Site [REDACTED]

All archaeological services provided by EDR for the Project will continue to be conducted under the supervision of a Registered Professional Archaeologist (RPA) who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines (per 36 CFR, Part 61) for Professional Qualifications in Archaeology. In addition, the work will be performed in accordance with the New York Archaeological Council's *Standards for Cultural Resources Investigations and the Curation of Archaeological Collections in New York State* (the NYAC Standards), and the NYSHPO's *Phase I Archaeological Report Format Requirements* (the NYSHPO Guidelines), as appropriate

2.0 BACKGROUND AND SITE DESCRIPTIONS

This section is intended to provide background information regarding the archaeological investigations conducted thus far at sites [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

2.1 Site [REDACTED]

Site [REDACTED] an Early Archaic to Late Woodland Indigenous site, was identified by EDR via shovel testing and pedestrian survey during the Phase IB survey conducted in 2024 (EDR, 2024a). The site, located on a terrace in an agricultural field, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Soils within the site are mapped as Arkport very fine sandy loam, 0 to 6% slopes; Ontario fine sandy loam, 3 to 8% slopes; Halsey gravelly loam; and Cosad loamy fine sand (NRCS, 2025).

Site [REDACTED] is located within [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Artifacts identified at these sites included steatite pottery and lithics.

According to data available on the CRIS database, [REDACTED] was identified as a Late Woodland (1,000-3,200 years before present) village, cemetery, and enclosure first excavated in 1935 by Joseph Mattern, a hobbyist. Notably, 33 burials were excavated at the site, as well as a number of debitage, pottery, and lithic tools. Burial goods were present in a number of these burials, with two containing a 6-inch layer of pot sherds that covered the entire grave. Additional artifacts also included pipes with human and animal effigies. Over the course of the twentieth century, the artifacts and human remains were housed at the Rochester Museum and Science Center (RMSC Hne 25-1) but were eventually transferred to the [REDACTED] where the collection remains today.

At the time of the Phase IB survey (EDR, 2024a) standing corn was present, necessitating shovel testing in the majority of the site delineation. The site was originally determined to be approximately 6,999 square meters. In total, 227 artifacts were recovered from the Phase IB survey. No features were identified at the site during the Phase IB survey. Artifacts were primarily recovered from the plowzone or surface (Stratum I). However, three artifacts were recovered from Stratum II (Bt horizon) and included three tertiary flakes. Artifacts recovered from the site during the Phase IB primarily consisted of debitage, which included five angular debris/ shatter, one secondary flake, 189 tertiary flakes, three utilized flakes, and four indeterminate flakes. In addition to debitage, tools and pottery were recovered from the site during the Phase IB. Tools recovered from the site included one graver, one Accokeek Creek contracting stem projectile point, two bifaces of indeterminate temporal periods, and one Brewerton side notched projectile point. The Accokeek Creek and Brewerton projectile points dated the site to the Early Woodland and Late Archaic periods, respectively. Two pottery sherds were also recovered from the site, both grit tempered. One sherd also contained a corded design.

Prior to commencement of the Phase II site examination, a geophysical survey was conducted in order to identify areas of interest for testing during the Phase II site examination (TerraSearch, 2025). The GPR survey identified four potential palisade features, six potential house features, and four potential hearth features. Although no indication of Indigenous burials was observed, the report stated that these features *can be difficult to identify* (TerraSearch, 2025). Additionally, the identification of potential Indigenous features is likely conservative according to the GPR report. Deep furrows, weather conditions, and the presence of large surface cobbles contributed to the suspected conservative nature of the GPR results.

During the Phase II site examination which was conducted based on a NYSHPO approved work plan (EDR, 2024b; NYSHPO, 2024), the agricultural field where the site is located contained greater than 70% visibility. As such, a pedestrian survey was conducted within the APE and areas immediately adjacent to the APE in order to refine the site boundary. Ten test units were also excavated during the Phase II survey. Following the pedestrian survey, the site boundary was expanded from 6,999 square meters (1.7 acres) to 28,328 square meters (7 acres). Additionally, during the pedestrian survey and due to the greater visibility during the Phase II site examination, a U-shaped landscape feature was noted surrounding the southern, eastern, and western portions of the site boundary. The landscape feature could potentially be the enclosure described by Squier in his 1850 publication (1850:43). The landscape feature measures approximately 307 meters in length east to west and includes an approximately 75-meter extension to the southwest. The landscape feature, from the base of its southern flank to its apex, rises approximately 2 meters (6.5 feet), with a much sharper increase in elevation in the southern flank. The landscape feature appears naturally formed and likely glacial in nature, which is supported by the presence of

Ontario soils identified in test unit 3 which are described as nearly level to very steep soils on convex upland till plains and drumlins.

In total, 1,896 artifacts were identified during the Phase II site examination. The pedestrian survey conducted during the site examination identified 981 surface artifacts. Of these, 207 were analyzed in-field but not collected as these artifacts were outside the APE at the time of the Phase II examination. Artifacts recovered from the 10 test units totaled 915 and were recovered from Stratum I and Stratum II. Additionally, 12 glass and two metal fragments were also recovered from excavations in test units 9 and 10.

Lithic artifacts accounted for most of the Phase II assemblage. In total, 1,723 lithics were identified, 919 of which were recovered from the surface and 804 from test unit excavations. Debitage accounted for the largest portion of the assemblage (n=1,637) followed by worked stone (n=54), projectile points (n=17), thermally altered rock (n=10), cores (n=4), and ground stone tool (n=1). Of the lithic artifacts, 10 were temporally diagnostic. In general, lithic artifacts were identified across the entirety of the site.

In addition to lithic artifacts, pottery was also identified at the site. In total, 159 pottery sherds were identified, 62 of which were surface finds and 97 from test unit excavation. Of these, 10 were identified in the Bt-horizon, while the remainder were identified on the surface or in the plowzone. Pottery sherds with no identifiable decorations (n=101) accounted for the largest portion of the pottery assemblage followed by cord impressed (n=53), corded punctate (n=4), and incised (n=1). One pottery sherd was determined to be temporally diagnostic. Unlike the lithics recovered from Site [REDACTED] pottery sherds were generally centralized in the middle of the site at the approximate center of the landscape feature.

Two features (Feature 1 and Feature 2) were identified during the Phase II site examination. Feature 1 was determined to be non-cultural and consisted of a decomposed taproot. However, Feature 2, identified within a geophysical anomaly, was determined to be a cultural feature due to the presence of in-situ Indigenous artifacts (e.g. pottery) and may represent a remnant living surface.

In June 2025, and following completion of the Phase II site examination, EDR conducted a supplemental Phase IB survey due to design changes. During the Phase II site examination, the site boundary was increased to 7 acres. However, following the supplemental Phase IB survey, the site boundary expanded from 7 acres to 7.1 acres (EDR, 2025b). At the time of the survey, the ground surface contained less than 70% visibility due to scrub and weed growth. Therefore, shovel testing was conducted. However, artifacts were noted on the ground surface between shovel test locations and therefore included as part of the site boundary. In total, 29 Indigenous artifacts were recovered during the supplemental Phase IB survey. Artifacts were recovered from the ground

surface and plowzone, and included 19 tertiary flakes, seven angular debris/shatter, one secondary flake, one Lamoka projectile point, and one Levanna projectile point. The projectile points date from the Middle to Late Archaic and the Late Woodland, respectively. No features were identified during the supplemental Phase IB survey.

The combined results of the Phase IB surveys, Phase II site examination, and geophysical survey indicate that Site [REDACTED] represents consistent land use by Indigenous peoples from 9,450 Before Present (BP) to 750 BP (Early Archaic through Late Woodland). While the length of any individual land use episode is unknown, long-term settlement is supported by the identification of potential cultural features via the geophysical survey (which identified potential houses, hearths, and palisades) as well as the variety of the artifact assemblage and identification of an intact cultural feature during the Phase II site examination. Additionally, Site [REDACTED] is likely associated with, or part of, the [REDACTED]

2.2 Site [REDACTED]

Site [REDACTED] was identified during supplemental Phase IB survey (EDR, 2025b), via a combination of shovel testing and surface finds [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] At the time of the survey, the field exhibited less than 75% surface visibility. Therefore, shovel testing served as the primary investigation method. However, artifacts were noted on the ground surface between shovel test locations and therefore included as part of the site boundary. Site [REDACTED] consists of an Indigenous lithic scatter of an unknown temporal period spread across 2,505 square meters (0.6 acres). Additionally, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Soils within the site are mapped as Galen very fine sandy loam silt loam, 0 to 2% slopes and Cosad fine loamy sand (NRCS, 2025). The closest waterbody to the site is Honeoye Creek, located approximately 420 meters northwest.

In total, 70 artifacts were recovered from 55 surface find locations and Stratum I (Ap-horizon) of shovel test Q.274 and Statum II (Bw-horizon) of shovel test Q.304, the spatial extent of which are the basis for the site's boundary. The artifact assemblage consisted almost entirely of chert debitage (n=67) followed by worked stone tools (n=3). No diagnostic artifacts were recovered from the site.

In addition to artifacts, a potential cultural feature was identified within shovel test Q.309. The potential feature was identified 28 centimeters below ground surface at the base of the plowzone (Stratum I) and consisted of a very dark brown (10YR 2/2) sand. The potential feature was approximately 19 centimeters thick. No artifacts were recovered from the matrix of the potential feature or from Stratum I and Stratum II of shovel test Q.309

3.0 METHODOLOGY

Phase III data recoveries are required if an archaeological resource Listed or Eligible for inclusion on the S/NRHP is identified and impacts to the resource by a proposed project are anticipated, per the NYAC Standards (NYAC, 1994). The purpose of a Phase III data recovery is to recover information contained in a significant archaeological site before all or part of it is destroyed. Thus, the goals of Phase III data recovery focus on collecting and preserving cultural, contextual, environmental, and any other data of value from a site before it is lost. In addition to the recovery of cultural, contextual, and environmental data points during the fieldwork, these investigations also involve laboratory analyses and preparation of a report not only to describe the work undertaken during Phase III data recovery, but also to provide examples of the long-term research potential provided by the acquired Phase III database in totality.

Therefore, this section will provide the proposed methodology regarding Phase III data recovery at Site [REDACTED] (which has been determined Eligible for inclusion on the S/NRHP) and Site Q-NALS-05.

3.1 Potential Research Themes

The general objective of the data recovery revolves around research themes that address several aspects of Indigenous life in the Genesee Valley region. These research themes aim to address questions of cultural chronology, site settlement patterns, artifact assemblages, and subsistence and seasonality studies. While not all questions may be able to be addressed based on the data recovered, these questions serve as a starting point for addressing the site's significance to the region. Questions that may be addressed include:

1. How do the sites relate to Indigenous sites [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Additionally, were glacial landforms incorporated into the site layout?
2. What impacts/differences of new technology, if any, are observed between the Early Archaic and Late Woodland?
3. What do the different soil horizons, both artifact bearing and culturally sterile, indicate about environment and environmental changes over time?
4. What features are present at the sites (i.e., hearths, cooking pits, storage pits, lithic reduction activity areas, and postmolds)?
5. If structural features are identified, what is the relationship between specific feature functions? Are hearths or storage pits located inside or outside potential structures? Are middens near or far from potential structures? Is there a relationship between structural features and activity areas?
6. In the absence of postmolds defining structural features, can feature and/or artifact densities be used to identify potential structures within any one component?

7. What specific stone tools, and by extension, types of tools (i.e., formal versus expedient) are present in any given component?
8. Can shifts in the types of tools be seen between components such as greater or lesser reliance on expedient tools?
9. What types of activities do the stone tool assemblages represent?
10. Were lithic materials taken from nearby sources? Are there examples of non-local source materials? How does this compare from the Archaic period to the Woodland period?
11. Are non-local ceramic types present?
12. What vessel types and sizes are present in any one component? What types of activities does the vessel assemblage indicate?
13. What kinds of tools or tool kits can be identified for the processing of various classes of subsistence items (i.e., groundstone tools)?

3.2 Close Interval Shovel Testing

Close interval shovel testing is proposed only for Site [REDACTED]. In total, 75 close interval shovel tests will be excavated on a 7.5-meter grid across the site boundary (Attachment A, Figure 2 and Figure 3). Shovel tests will measure between 30 and 50 centimeters in diameter and will be excavated by natural stratigraphy to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of hand excavation. Shovel test data will be recorded on standardized forms and include a record of cultural material recovered, as well as descriptions of soil stratigraphy. Soils excavated from shovel tests will be processed through 0.25-inch hardware mesh. Cultural material will be placed in plastic bags and labeled with standard provenience information.

3.3 Test Units

Test units will be utilized to collect data pertaining to the vertical deposition of cultural material as well as the establishment of site stratigraphy and geological context in which the cultural material is situated. Each test unit will be excavated by hand according to natural stratigraphy. Excavations will extend two levels (i.e., 20-centimeters) into sterile subsoil. Test unit data will be recorded on standardized forms and include a record of cultural material recovered, description of soil stratigraphy, and associated profile maps. Soils excavated from test units will be processed through 0.25-inch hardware mesh. Cultural material will be placed in plastic bags and labeled with standard provenience information. Based on the combined results of the Phase IB and Phase II surveys conducted at Site [REDACTED], EDR proposes the excavation of 10 1-meter by 1-meter test units within the site boundary, specifically targeting areas of high artifact density and Feature 2 (EDR, 2025a). EDR proposes five 1-meter by 1-meter test units within the site boundary of [REDACTED].

3.4 Mechanical Removal of the Plowzone

EDR proposes mechanical stripping of the plowzone within the portion of the site located within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) to adequately identify, assess, evaluate, and record the presence or absence of potential intact cultural features or buried deposits. Mechanical stripping within the site will include the following:

1. Mechanical stripping will include the careful removal of the plowzone under the direction and supervision of a Registered Professional Archaeologist, in accordance with the NYAC Standards (NYAC, 1994). The machinery necessary to complete the mechanical removal of the plowzone will be operated by a qualified operator. The machine used for this work will have a flat blade, with a maximum width of 3 feet. Please note, for this work, a bar welded across blade teeth will not be a substitute for a flat blade.
2. Machine-aided stripping will only be conducted to the base of the plowzone and will cease at or immediately above the plowzone/subsoil interface. Archaeologists will then "shovel-shave" the interface to provide a clean, open view of the subsoil in order to identify features. The vertical maximum of mechanical stripping will be limited to 60 centimeters below ground surface.
3. Following mechanical stripping of the plowzone, archaeologists will assess the subsoil for culturally sensitive material and/or features, and document as required, discussed below.

In total, approximately 5.7 acres of Site [REDACTED] are located within the APE and will be disturbed by Project construction. Due to the recorded proximity of burials from the nearby Klink Site, EDR recommends mechanical stripping of the entire 5.7 acres within the APE to ensure construction will not affect burials, as well as other potentially significant features (Attachment A: Figure 5).

The entirety of Site [REDACTED] is located within the APE (0.6 acres). Therefore, due to the recorded proximity of burials from the nearby Klink Site and the proximity to Site [REDACTED] EDR proposes the mechanical stripping of the plowzone within entire 0.62-acre site boundary (Attachment A: Figure 6).

3.5 Cultural Features

Cultural features, and/or soil anomalies identified during the Phase III data recovery will be recorded using professional-grade GPS equipment/ total station, photographed, documented on standardized forms, and mapped in plan-view prior to their excavation. Where feasible, features will be bisected and/or quartered and excavated in arbitrary 10-centimeter levels within feature

fill strata. Up to 1 cup of the feature fill will be retained for flotation while the remaining feature fill will be screened through 0.125-inch hardware mesh. If feature fill appears to include charcoal, burnt materials, paleo-botanical remains, faunal remains, or other noteworthy inclusions, then a sample of those materials will be collected in accordance with standard archaeological excavation practices. Recovered cultural material will be placed in plastic bags labeled with standard provenience information.

3.6 Cultural Material Analysis

All recovered materials will be washed, dried, and cataloged per standard archaeological laboratory procedures to prepare an artifact inventory for inclusion in the Phase III report. If archaeological features are identified, samples of the soil matrix of those features may be retained for specialty analysis following consultation with the NYSHPO, Seneca Nations of Indians, Tonawanda Seneca Nation, and Tuscarora Nation. If charcoal material suitable for Carbon 14 dating is encountered, samples may be collected for analysis at a third-party laboratory facility. No more than 10 such samples will be collected, if applicable. The presence of materials such as coal, cinder, brick, and modern materials will be noted but these materials will not be collected for further processing or analysis.

3.7 Phase III Report

Following completion of the Phase III data recovery, EDR will summarize the results of the Phase III data recovery in a report suitable for submission to the NYSHPO, Seneca Nation of Indians, Tonawanda Seneca Nation, Tuscarora Nation, and all other consulting parties. This report will include results of the site investigation including an inventory/summary count of artifacts recovered during the fieldwork, appropriate maps and photographs, a detailed site history, and conclusions. EDR will provide a PDF of the Phase III report to the NYSHPO via their Cultural Resource Information System (CRIS) database.

3.8 Unanticipated Cultural Resources Discoveries Protocol and Human Remains Protocol

The Applicant recognizes that it is possible that unanticipated buried or aboveground archaeological features and/or artifacts may be encountered during the Phase III data recovery and Project construction. Therefore, in order to provide additional safeguards against the possibility that the proposed Project might impact archaeological resources, EDR, on behalf of the Applicant, will prepare an Unanticipated Cultural Resources Discovery Protocol (UDP). The UDP will outline the steps for dealing with unanticipated discoveries of cultural resources which may be encountered during construction of the proposed Project. This protocol will include stopping work, notifying the appropriate personnel (e.g., USACE, NYSHPO, Indigenous Nations), and photographing the finds. A site visit by an archaeologist to further investigate and document the

discovery may be necessary, and appropriate mitigation measures will be determined. This process will occur in consultation with NYSHPO and Indigenous representatives as appropriate. UDPs are written to provide construction contractors guidance and protocols for identifying possible archaeological material and/or human remains uncovered during construction, and similar protocols will be followed by archaeological crews during Phase III work.

In the event of an unanticipated discovery of potential human remains and/or funerary objects during the Phase III investigation, all work in the immediate vicinity will stop until further notice and the NYSHPO, the county coroner/medical examiner, local law enforcement, and all consulting parties identified in the Protocol will be contacted. The potential remains/funerary objects will be treated with respect, left in situ by on-site personnel, and protected from further disturbance. If human remains or funerary objects are determined to be Indigenous, a treatment plan will be developed in consultation with the NYSHPO, Seneca Nation of Indians, Tonawanda Seneca Nation, and Tuscarora Nation consistent with established protocols and guidance. These will include NYSHPO's *Human Remains Discovery Protocol* (2021), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's *Policy Statement on Burial Sites, Human Remains and Funerary Objects* (ACHP, 2023), and the *Haudenosaunee Policy on Human Remains* (Grand Council of the Haudenosaunee, 2014).

The NYSHPO, ACHP, and Haudenosaunee human remains protocols all require temporary suspension of activity in the vicinity of the discovery, protection of discovered remains, notification of NYSHPO and Indigenous representatives, and consultation regarding treatment of remains. The coroner and local law enforcement will make the official ruling on the nature of the remains, being either forensic or archaeological. A decision concerning avoidance or hand excavation of the burial and final disposition of the remains shall be made by consulting parties.

4.0 CONCLUSIONS

As significant ground disturbance cannot be fully avoided by the proposed Project for Sites [REDACTED] a Phase III data recovery is recommended. The proposed methodology for the Phase III data recovery of Sites [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] consists of close interval shovel testing, the excavation of 1-meter by 1-meter test units, the mechanical stripping of the plowzone, and the excavation of cultural features. Following completion of the Phase III data recovery, the report will be prepared and submitted to the NYSHPO, Seneca Nation of Indians, Tonawanda Seneca Nation, and Tuscarora Nation.

REFERENCES

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP). 2023. *Policy Statement Regarding Treatment of Burial Sites, Human Remains, and Funerary Objects*. Available at: <https://www.achp.gov/digital-library-section-106-landing/achp-policy-statement-burial-sites-human-remains-and-funerary>.

Environmental Design & Research, Landscape Architecture, Engineering, & Environmental Services, D.P.C. (EDR). 2024a. *Phase IB Archaeological Survey, National Grid CLCPA Mortimer-Golah 109/110 Transmission Project, Monroe County, New York*. Prepared for Burns & McDonnell by EDR, Syracuse, New York.

EDR. 2024b. *Phase II Site Examination Work Plan, National Grid CLCPA Mortimer-Golah 109/110 Transmission Project, Monroe County, New York*. Prepared for Burns & McDonnell by EDR, Syracuse, New York.

EDR. 2025a. *Phase II Site Examination, National Grid CLCPA DE Mortimer-Golah 109/110 Transmission Project Monroe County, New York*. Prepared for Burns & McDonnell by EDR, Syracuse, New York.

EDR. 2025b. *Supplemental Phase IB Archaeological Survey National Grid CLCPA Mortimer-Golah 109/110 Transmission Project Monroe County, New York*. Prepared for Burns & McDonnell by EDR, Syracuse, New York.

Grand Council of the Haudenosaunee. 2014. *Haudenosaunee Policy on Human Remains*. Grand Council of Haudenosaunee. Available at <https://www.indiantime.net/story/2014/06/26/culture/cultural-corner/14470.html> (Accessed May 2025).

Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS). 2025. Web Soil Survey. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC. Available at: <http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app> (Accessed May 2025).

New York Archaeological Council (NYAC). 1994. *Standards for Cultural Resources Investigations and the Curation of Archaeological Collections in New York State*. New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation, Waterford, NY.

New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation (NYSHPO). 2005. *New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) Phase I Archaeological Report Format Requirements*. On file, New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation, Waterford, NY. Available at <https://cris.parks.ny.gov/>.

NYSHPO. 2021. *New York State Historic Preservation Office Human Remains Discovery Protocol*. New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation, Waterford, NY.

NYSHPO. 2024. Re: USACE National Grid CLCPA Mortimer-Golah 109/110 Project Brighton, Henrietta, and Rush, Monroe County, NY Correspondence from Bradley Russell (NYSHPO) to Janna Napoli (EDR). NYSHPO, Waterford, NY. November 26, 2024.

Ritchie, William. 1944. *Pre-Iroquoian Occupations of New York State*. Rochester Museum of Arts and Sciences. Rochester, New York.

Squier, Ephraim George. 1850. *Aboriginal monuments of the state of New-York. Comprising the results of original surveys and explorations*. The Smithsonian Institution.

TerraSearch Geophysical, LLC (TerraSearch). 2025. *Geophysical Investigations Along the National Grid CLCPA Mortimer-Golah 109/110 Transmission Line, at Site [REDACTED] West Rush, New York*. Prepared for EDR Syracuse by TerraSearch Geophysical, LLC. May 2025.

Attachment A. Figures

