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DESCRIPTION OF THE AREA

Boundaries

The survey area was approximately 7000 feet in length by 600 feet to 900 feet in width. It was bounded, looking upstream, on the right bank by the Amoco property, the left boundary being the center line of the river. Downstream the survey area began at a line opposite from marker "77", and stretched to a line 7000 feet upstream but perpendicular to the river axis.

Depth

An examination of Coast and Geodetic Survey Chart No. 680, "The Cooper River Above Goose Creek", indicates depths of up to 58 feet but this was not borne out by the on-site survey. At no time were depths of over 50 feet encountered. Scouring and sand deposition that have taken place since the chart was printed could have been the cause for the discrepancies encountered.

Current and Visibility

Current and particulate matter in suspension were two factors adversely affecting visual operations. This part of the river is influenced by tidal forces which results in current reversal during dive operations. Eddies were occasionally encountered possibly caused by uneven bottom contours. Although the current was often difficult to work in it should not have much of an effect on dredge or boat operations. Particulate matter in suspension resulted in a visibility range of 6 inches to about 4 feet. Visibility was also affected by the mixing of salt and freshwater.
THE SURVEY

Research

A search was made in the Institute's files for reports of artifacts or shipwrecks in the survey area but none were found. A similar survey in the University libraries also yielded no results. There was no documentary evidence of habitations on the land adjoining the survey area which is not surprising since the land, during colonial time up to the early twentieth century, was used for rice cultivation and before that time was probably a cypress swamp.

Archival and library research did indicate, however, that the land across the river from the Amoco property was inhabited in both prehistoric and historic times.

Electronic

Three types of electronic remote sensing equipment were used in the survey. First, several runs were made with a recording depth indicator. This was done in order to acquire information about bottom contours before using the second piece of equipment, the Side Scan Sonar. The Sonar electronically scanned the bottom for a distance of up to 300 yards on either side of the vessel. Examination of the Sonar's strip chart indicated that no large man-made objects such as sunken vessels were on the river bottom within the survey area. The third instrument used was a Sub-bottom Profiler. This instrument electronically searched under the surface of the river bottom for objects that would not be seen by sonar or visual search. No buried objects were discovered with this instrument either.
The final search method employed utilized divers conducting a visual search. Since we had determined that there were no sunken vessels or other large objects present the divers were looking for artifact concentrations that had either been washed out of the bank or had been brought down river by the current. Only four artifacts of archeological interest were discovered as a result of the visual search within the survey area however a relatively large bed of fossil material was found. The four artifacts have little significance archeologically but the fossil bed could yield useful paleontological information.

From several locations near the mid-river boundary search patterns were extended to the far bank toward the area that previously had been inhabited. Large concentrations of historic and some prehistoric material was observed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Archeologically there is no reason to object to the proposed dredging so long as the spoil areas are not in the river itself. Caution must be maintained not to disturb the river bottom near the far shore.

2. The South Carolina Museum Commission of 1023 Woodrow Street, Columbia, South Carolina 29205, has a very deep interest in fossil material from state property, such as the river bottom, and should be consulted before dredging operations are begun.