

Legacy Resource Management Program
Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey

VOLUME I

Guide for
Archaeological Resource Management

United States Naval Academy,
Annapolis, MD.

September, 1994

Prepared by:
John L. Seidel & C. Jane Cox

Principal Investigators:
Dr. John L. Seidel and
Dr. Mark P. Leone

Prepared for
Engineering Field Activity, Chesapeake;
United States Naval Academy

By
The University of Maryland, College Park
Department of Anthropology
Archaeology In Annapolis Project

VOLUME I

Table of Contents

Introduction1

Cultural Resource Management2

 The Legal Framework

 The Section 106 Process3

 Archaeology and Section 1064

 Section 106 at the U.S. Naval Academy

Known & Suspected Archaeological Resources
at the Naval Academy

Archaeological Sensitivity Maps

 Series I - The Historic Core

 Series II - Hell Point

 Series III - Lockwoodville

 Series IV - Northeast of College Creek

Using Sensitivity Maps for Resource Management

 Hypothetical Project

 Decision Trees

 Initial Decisions

 Phase I Archaeological Survey

 Phase II Evaluations

Government Agencies & Contacts

Appendices (in Volume IV)

 I. Section 106 Regulations

 II. Nomination Forms for National Register Site?

List of Figures

- Fig. 1: Series Division of the U. S. Naval Academy⁴
Fig. 2: Archaeological Investigations at the U. S. Naval Academy
Fig. 3: Archaeological Sensitivity Map - U.S. Naval Academy
Fig. 3:

Introduction

This is the first of four volumes summarizing archaeological and historical research on the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland, during 1994. The investigations have been undertaken by the Department of Anthropology at the University of Maryland College Park in partnership with the Naval Academy, Engineering Field Activity - Chesapeake, and Historic Annapolis Foundation, Inc.

The separation of the research results into four volumes is part of an effort to make the research easy to use, especially for planners and resource managers within the U.S. Navy. The first volumes summarize the work, presenting it in a condensed and "user-friendly" fashion. Subsequent volumes provide increasing levels of detail. The material has been covered in the following manner:

Volume I: Guide for Archaeological Resource Management

This guide presents an overview of legislation and regulations concerning archaeological resources and explains their relationship to planning at the Naval Academy. In order to keep this volume brief, we have focussed on Section 106 of the Historic Preservation Act. Volume I condenses the results of archaeological and cartographic research into "sensitivity maps", which depict known and suspected resources across the Academy. This volume also outlines the ways in which this information can be used for planning purposes.

Volume II:

This annotated bibliography of historic maps of the Academy provides an essential research and planning tool. In addition to descriptions and copies of historic maps, digital AutoCAD files and printed CAD copies of each map are presented. This approach to the maps allows researchers and planners to overlay historic maps on current maps of the Academy, more readily locating historic sites. The loose leaf design of this volume allows it to be expanded as future maps are located and added to the data base.

Volume III:

Volume III presents the detailed results of the 1994 research. Cartographic research is described and overlays of historic maps are presented. These are accompanied by detailed discussions of possible historic features, their current location, and the rationale behind preparation of sensitivity maps. Maps showing the distribution of artifacts recovered from previous archaeological excavation are also presented. Other recent work which is summarized includes a continuation of the oral history project, focussing primarily upon Hell Point.

Volume IV:

The appendices presented in this final volume provide more detailed information on some aspects of research summarized in Volume III. The map digitizing process is explained, sample transcripts of oral histories are provided, and deed information on individual tracts is presented. Section 106 is included, along with copies of National Register nomination forms for the Academy.

We hope that this somewhat different approach to reporting makes the results easier to use. The sheer volume of data produced in recent investigations makes report organization difficult. It is easy for significant findings to become irretrievably buried within the text, and the size of such reports makes it difficult for planners to quickly lay their hands on relevant information.

This portion of the report, Volume I, provides the most streamlined presentation of research; results are summarized in graphic form, without the sometimes mind-numbing detail which supports them. Supporting data are presented in the other volumes.

This guide to the Academy's archaeological resources begins with an overview of cultural resource management, including the legal framework and regulations which apply to the Academy. It then presents areas of known or suspected archaeological resources through sensitivity maps. The Academy is broken into four areas and detailed maps are presented for each area. These are accompanied by overlays of historic maps, although readers will have to turn to Volumes II and III for detailed discussions of the maps and overlays. The sensitivity maps are followed by a discussion of how they may be used by planners. We close with a listing of government agencies and personnel who may have a role in resource management at the Academy.

Cultural Resource Management

Legal Framework

The legal responsibilities of Federal agencies towards archaeological sites on their property stem from a long chain of legislation. Among the most significant pieces of legislation is the Historic Sites Preservation Act of 1966, which affects all Federal properties. The Act directed the Secretary of Interior to expand and maintain a National Register of Historic Places. Criteria of significance and eligibility for the Register were subsequently established, and the Register includes archaeological sites along with standing structures. Section 106 of the Act also set up the President's Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and gave the Council commentary and review functions whenever properties on or eligible for the National Register were to be affected by Federal actions. Due to the scope and complexity of this mandate, the historic preservation offices of individual states have functioned as the Council's proxy. In Maryland this is the Maryland Historical Trust, and under Section 106 all projects which might disturb Federally owned sites in the state must be reviewed by the Trust.

Executive Order 11593, issued in 1971, was intended to push agencies into active compliance with this and other acts (Historic Sites Act, National Environment Policy Act of 1969, etc.) and to stimulate long term planning for historic preservation. It requires Federal agencies to maintain, restore and preserve cultural resources on their land. It also requires all agencies to prepare an inventory of their cultural resources and determine which are eligible for nomination to the National Register. This inventory process was to be completed by July 1, 1973. Although the process is still incomplete in some Federal agencies, the intent of the order stands and was one of the motivations underlying the development of the Department of Defense's Legacy Program.

As of this writing, the Naval Academy has not prepared an inventory which includes archaeological resources. As a consequence, the process of discovery (Phase I survey) and determination of eligibility to the Register (Phase II evaluation) is required each time any land modification is contemplated. A standard review process for identifying and evaluating resources exists, and this should become the basis for such activities at the Naval Academy.

The Section 106 Process

The Section 106 review process is spelled out in regulations entitled "Protection of Historic Properties", at 35 CFR Part 800 of the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations. Issued by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the regulations outline a five step process of evaluation which should be set in motion whenever a Federal agency begins an "undertaking" likely to disturb ground or otherwise affect cultural resources.

- Step 1: Identify and evaluate historic properties (or resources) which are listed on or might be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.
- Step 2: Assess the effects of the proposed undertaking on listed or eligible properties.
- Step 3: Consult with the State Historic Preservation Office on ways to avoid or mitigate any adverse effects on each affected property. A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) is prepared as a result.
- Step 4: The MOA is submitted the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation for comment.
- Step 5: Work proceeds under the terms of the MOA.

Step 1 (identify and evaluate any resources which might be affected) typically begins with the agency reviewing any background information it has on

the area (including data such as that contained in this report). The agency will also consult with the State Historic Preservation Office (in Maryland, the Maryland Historical Trust) and any others who may have information on the area. Once this information is compiled, the agency will determine whether additional surveys or field investigations are needed for adequate coverage of the property and arrange for such studies to be carried out.

If the initial review or subsequent investigations reveal any resources which are listed on the National Register of Historic Places, the next step is to assess the effects of the proposed undertaking on each listed property. But if the initial review reveals properties which are not listed on the National Register, but which might be eligible for inclusion, then the agency evaluates each potentially eligible resource using criteria published by the National Park Service (which maintains the Register). This evaluation is made in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office, and is geared solely towards determining whether or not a property is eligible. Formal nomination of a property to the Register is a separate process. Section 106 treats both eligible and listed properties in the same way; effects on both types of properties are assessed and adverse effects avoided if possible. If questions or disagreements exist over a property's eligibility to the Register, a formal determination of eligibility may be sought from the Secretary of Interior.

If properties eligible for or listed on the National Register are identified, the agency moves to **Step 2**, an assessment of the effect its undertaking may have on these properties. This part of the process is carried out in close consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office, and should take into account the views of other interested parties. Specific criteria for assessing effects may be found in the regulations (35 CFR 800.9 (a-c)). The assessment will result in one of three outcomes or determinations:

No effect: The undertaking will not have any impact upon the property.

No adverse effect: The undertaking may affect the property, but will not harm it. Generally, this means that the project will not alter any of the characteristics that make the site eligible for inclusion on the Register.

Adverse effect: The undertaking will have an impact upon the property or site, and will alter it in such a way that its eligibility or integrity is diminished.

If an adverse effect will occur, the agency moves to **Step 3** in the process and consults with the State Historic Preservation Office to find ways of lessening or eliminating the harmful effect. The intent of this consultation is to come up with a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) which specifies measures that an agency will take to avoid or reduce the adverse impact. This can be accomplished in a number of ways. The undertaking can be redesigned to completely avoid the property or to eliminate the actions which will have an impact on it. If the primary significance of a property is its potential contribution to archaeological, historical or architectural information, it may be that the information can be substantially preserved by carrying out appropriate research (excavation, for example). If this research is carried out according to standards set by the Secretary of Interior, then the effect of the undertaking on such a property may be considered as "not adverse". In some cases, all parties may agree that no way exists to eliminate or reduce the adverse effects. In that case, the impacts may have to be accepted in the public interest.

If no agreement can be reached, the agency or the State Historic Preservation Office may terminate consultation. If this occurs, the agency is required to provide the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation with documentation and request the Council's comments. These comments must be taken into account by the agency.

Step 4 provides for comment by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. The Council can make comments during Step 3, participating in the consultation and signing the Memorandum of Agreement. If this has not taken place, the agency must afford the Council an opportunity to comment by submitting the Memorandum for review and acceptance. The Council may accept the agreement,

or it can request changes, or simply issue written comments. If the consultation process was terminated, the Council's comments will be sent directly to the head of the agency.

Once a Memorandum has been executed and approved by the Council, the agency proceeds with its undertaking in **Step 5**. The terms of the Memorandum are adhered to during the remainder of the process, and the State Historic Preservation Office is informed of the final outcome and reviews any final documentation. If no Memorandum of Agreement was prepared (due to termination of consultation), the agency head must take into account the Advisory Council's written comments in deciding whether or how to proceed with the undertaking.

Archaeology and Section 106

Archaeological sites which are buried are clearly different than standing structures and other resources covered in various historic preservation laws. Archaeological sites are often difficult to find. Even if their location can be predicted and they can be detected, their significance and integrity is not always immediately apparent. Because of their different nature, different criteria for significance often apply and a distinctive approach to the identification and evaluation of archaeological resources has developed.

Because archaeological sites may not be readily visible on a property, both background research and field investigation may be necessary to identify and inventory sites. This process of site discovery is often referred to as Phase I research, because it precedes any more detailed work. Phase I site discovery is usually accomplished by documentary and map research or through the application of predictive models to identify likely site locations. This is generally followed by subsurface investigation to verify the presence or absence of sites. Because of biases and incompleteness in documentary sources, it usually not enough to simply investigate "likely" spots or historically indicated locales. Some sort of systematic or random testing program is generally required to ensure that unexpected sites are not overlooked. A typical approach to Phase I testing would be to follow background research with a series of small excavations such as "shovel tests", systematically covering the area effected by an undertaking.

While Phase I work is geared towards finding sites, the effort to assess their significance or eligibility is categorized as Phase II research. Site evaluation is set apart as a distinct phase because the mere presence of archaeological remains does not make a site significant. It must meet the criteria outlined in National Register standards. Evaluating significance usually requires an assessment of a site's integrity (is it intact, with stratified remains, or is it highly disturbed) and the degree to which it can add important information to our knowledge of the past. This "information potential" is usually the determining factor for an archaeological site's eligibility to the National Register, as opposed to criteria used for architecture (quality of design and workmanship, uniqueness, association with important events or people, etc.). Assessing significance usually requires the more careful excavation of a larger area than that uncovered by Phase I tests. Phase I tests are useful for detecting sites, but are not well suited to assessing integrity and information potential.

Phase I and II research efforts are geared toward Step 1 in the Section 106 process, that of finding and identifying sites. Agencies sometimes carry out these activities as separate operations, or Phase I and II investigations can be combined. One advantage to separate operations lies with budgeting. It easy to estimate the costs for a systematic Phase I survey, but until its results are known, it is difficult to know how many sites will have to be evaluated in Phase II. On the other hand, combining the two operations speeds compliance and is generally cheaper, as field crews need not be mobilized a second time.

Once sites have been identified and evaluated, effects on the resources can be assessed and a plan of action developed through consultation and preparation of a Memorandum of Agreement. If resources cannot be avoided or adverse impacts eliminated through other means, Phase III archaeological data recovery is often the next step. Because the information an archaeological site holds is often the reason for its eligibility to the National Register, excavations or research which collect and preserve that information can eliminate adverse effect, even if the site is ultimately obliterated by the undertaking. The research design and methodology must meet the Secretary of Interior's standards for this solution to work, and the State Historic Preservation Office must be involved in developing

and reviewing the process. Once an acceptable plan is developed and carried out, an undertaking can be cleared to proceed.

Section 106 at the United States Naval Academy

The Naval Academy has not yet prepared an inventory which includes archaeological resources. As a consequence, the process of discovery (Phase I survey) and determination of eligibility to the Register (Phase II evaluation) is required each time any land modification is contemplated. Activities which might require Section 106 compliance at the Academy can be conveniently lumped into three major categories: 1) new construction; 2) renovation to existing structures and facilities; and 3) utility work.

1. New construction:

Foundation/basement excavation and grading for new construction constitute some of the most serious impacts upon buried archaeological remains. A common strategy in cultural resource management is to identify significant areas prior to any design. This affords maximum flexibility and allows designs to be drawn which either avoid or have a minimal impact on sites.

Flexibility in design at the Academy is already severely constrained by the limited land base of the facility. Relatively few buildable locations are left, so avoidance may not be possible. This may ultimately require Phase III excavation.

Despite these constraints, early identification of resources is advantageous, as complete avoidance is not the only mitigation strategy. Minor adjustments in design can sometimes avoid the most complex archaeological remains, thereby decreasing costs and delay. Also, sites have sometimes been left in place, but shielded from impact by fill. This can be both less expensive than excavation and save the resource. Even if this kind of approach is not possible, a knowledge of resources prior to design allows for more precise budgeting and scheduling, and minimizes surprises which might slow or stop work in progress.

2. Renovation/repair of existing facilities:

Renovation and repair of Naval Academy facilities has been a constant occurrence. It will increase in frequency as infrastructure ages. Foundation repairs, drainage improvements, landscaping changes, and road replacement or repair are but a few examples of activities likely to require archaeological compliance work.

3. Utility installation and repair:

All new utility lines which are buried are likely to require Phase I/II investigations. Even replacement or repair of existing utilities is likely to carry such a requirement, unless disturbance is demonstrably limited to the old utility trench or excavation. This is rarely possible. Utility lines cover a significant portion of the Academy. They also extend beyond the boundary of the Academy proper, crossing the Severn River, for example.

Although major new construction upon the Academy may be limited and to a large extent constrained by land scarcity, it is clear that a wide range of other activities will require compliance work at the Phase I and II levels. Absent an overall survey of the Academy, repair and renovation alone will require a steady stream of small-scale archaeological contracts in the future. Some of these will be on an emergency basis, and repairs may be delayed by Section 106 compliance. Compliance as needed, via a large number of small contracts, will place an added burden on planners, Public Works, and Purchasing. Preparation of scopes of work, requests for bids, and contracts for each project will be accompanied by project monitoring, report review and liaison with oversight agencies.

Anticipation of compliance demands through a facility-wide archaeological survey and planning process is almost always the most efficient and cost-

effective way to ensure appropriate treatment of resources. In the long run, this kind of approach lessens the need for crisis management and is less expensive. It reduces the burden on Academy staff and prevents added complication or damage to facilities in emergency situations. Economies of scale make it far cheaper to cover a large property in one survey than in a multitude of smaller, haphazard surveys.

A good start on a comprehensive approach has been made through the 1993 Legacy projects which started archaeological reconnaissance of a limited portion of the Academy. That process has been continued with the preparation of this report, which provides basic historic and cartographic research. Based on these two projects, we have prepared maps which delineate areas of known archaeological significance or sensitivity. These areas are limited, because the amount of archaeological work at the Phase I and II levels has been so limited. We have also outlined areas of **suspected** significance, based on historical and cartographic research. These sensitivity maps follow in the next section of this guide.

Known & Suspected Archaeological Resources at the Naval Academy

A primary goal of this project has been to identify potential cultural resources on the Academy's grounds. In the pages that follow, we have provided sensitivity maps for each part of the Naval Academy, outlining each area of potential significance. Because the Academy covers a large area, we have divided the property into four areas. A series of maps, historical and archaeological, provide the evidence for sensitive zones within each area, and we have referred to them as Series I through IV.

Although the divisions may initially seem arbitrary, they follow a logical and historically based sequence (see Figure 1). The maps for **Series I** focus upon the historic core of the Academy. The area is bounded by the Severn River and Spa Creek on the north and east and old Hanover Street in the south, while the western boundary runs along a line projected through the Officers' Club and Alumni Hall. This boundary takes in the original Academy grounds and its early acquisitions. It also includes all of the land fill expansions south of College Creek.

Series II lies just south of the historic core, encompassing Porter Row and Halsey Field House. This was actually one of the last areas acquired by the Academy, comprising the old Annapolis neighborhood of Hell Point.

Series III maps cover the area from the historic core west to College Creek. This division also conveniently sets off a distinct old neighborhood. Lockwoodville grew up in this vicinity as the Academy grew, and was eventually subsumed by the institution.

Series IV covers the largest area, including all of the Academy's holdings west of College Creek. Although this is a large area, it was far enough removed from the center of Annapolis that it saw little development and has been poorly mapped during the historic period.

Within each of these areas we have delineated sensitive areas using two primary forms of evidence: 1) close to thirty historic maps, as well as photos, historical documents, and oral histories; and 2) archaeological data recovered in the limited 1993 archaeological survey. Areas covered by archaeological survey are depicted in Figure 2.

The two lines of evidence are different in some significant ways. Archaeological excavations often revealed positive evidence of buried remains, and sometimes provided information useful evaluating the resource's significance.

Historic maps, on the other hand, can only indicate the potential for archaeological resources. Maps can show us where buildings or features once stood, but they cannot tell us whether those features have withstood landscaping, building or other changes through the intervening years. These factors obviously have an impact upon the integrity of the remains and their potential for providing significant information.

For planning and resource management purposes, we have therefore provided maps which show two types of sensitivity areas: 1) areas demonstrated archaeologically to contain cultural resources; and 2) areas which historic sources such as maps suggest may be sensitive. These latter areas clearly have the potential to be important, and should be a priority for Phase I and II testing if any undertaking is contemplated by the Academy in their vicinity.

A map showing sensitivity areas across the Academy as a whole is shown as Figure 3. Because it is difficult to isolate details at that scale, we have also provided maps for each individual area or series. One extremely important tool in delineating these areas was a series of AutoCAD overlays. These overlays consist of digitized historic maps showing the Academy at various points in its history. These were laid over a map of the current Academy to pinpoint the location of earlier structures and their possible archaeological remains. We have included these overlays with the sensitivity map for each Series. Because this volume is intended as a relatively brief guide to resources, we have not discussed individual maps, features, or the considerations behind our drawing of sensitivity boundaries. That evidence and our rationale are fully discussed in Volume III.

The sensitivity maps below are followed by a discussion outlining the ways in which they may be used for cultural resource management.

Archaeological Sensitivity Maps

The maps in this section indicate areas of the United States Naval Academy which, after historic, cartographic and archaeological research, have been assessed as likely to contain sensitive cultural resources. It is important to note that the hatching and lines which outline these areas are not a firm division between the presence and absence of cultural resources, but a synthesis of numerous sources to give a general idea of the location of cultural resources.

The reader is again cautioned that these maps are unlikely to include all of the resources within a given area; they can only highlight those that have been previously discovered archaeologically or were depicted on historic maps.

Included at the end of each series is a list of the digital files for each map in the series. These digital files are included on disks at the back of this volume. Unlike the working files provided with Volume II of this series, these files cannot be written onto or manipulated. They are instead in the form of AutoCAD "slides" which may only be viewed. These provide a quick means of accessing a particular view of an AutoCAD file while using minimal computer memory.

SERIES I - THE HISTORIC CORE

This area or series encompasses the oldest Academy land holdings, which were bought by the Federal Government in 1808 and transferred to the Navy in 1845. This section contains the site of the original Fort Severn and the earliest manifestation of the United States Naval Academy. Although the focus of a great deal of construction and landfill over the years, Series I has a very high potential to yield significant cultural resources. The old shoreline (which now lies beneath fill), portions of the pre-Flagg Naval School, and Santee Wharf are a few of the more interesting possibilities to consider. Two confirmed archaeological sites (18AP67 and 18AP68) are also found in this area. 18AP67 is a site related to the homes of Buchanan and Nicholson, prominent residences in the 18th and early 19th centuries. 18AP68 is the site of the old Governor's Mansion, and the Porter Road site. The confirmed presence and durability of these two old and significant sites strengthens the case that archaeological resources have survived the changes to the historic core of the Academy. A further description of the history of this area can be found in Volume III, Series I Map Overlays.

DRAWING FILES

:\SENS_I

SERIES II - Hell Point

Series II is directly to the southwest of Series I and encompasses parcels acquired by the Academy in 1902 and 1941. These areas were relatively well-documented cartographically by Sanborn Maps as well as by maps prepared by the Navy to document property acquisitions. This area was tested in the 1993 field season and a small area in front of Halsey Field House is a confirmed archaeological site, related to the Hell Point neighborhood (18AP69). Oral History work on this relatively recent neighborhood has revealed a rich source of data. (see Volume III, Oral History.) In addition, areas adjacent to Porter Road have yielded intact archaeological deposits. This series also overlaps with the location of the Governor's Mansion (18AP68). With this rich mix of cultural resources, this area should be treated with extreme care and sensitivity.

For a full discussion of the history of the Hell Point Neighborhood, see Volume III - Series II Map Overlays. For the tract or property histories related to this area see the section on Tract Histories in Volume III.

Drawing Files

:\SENS_II.dwg
:\H1902HPT.dwg
:\HS859.dwg
:\HS919.dwg
:\HS0312.dwg
:\H1941HOL.dwg

SERIES III - LOCKWOODVILLE

Series III is a parcel located directly to the southeast of Dorsey or College Creek. Relatively little modern construction has effected this area, in comparison to the eastern portions of the Academy. It contains some of the most promising of the areas for yielding intact cultural resources. Due to the relative narrowness of College Creek, little if any expansion in the form of landfill has occurred on the banks of the creek.

Perhaps the most significant collection of sites in this area (under the pavement of a parking lot and beneath the grass of Worden Field) is late 19th century Lockwoodville. This parcel was acquired by the Academy in 1889. As with other acquisitions, numerous detailed maps of the area were done in preparation for the acquisition. Historic research indicates that this was an early African American neighborhood, and several photos show rowhouses, wharfs, and outbuildings. Some property was owned by Naval Academy faculty. Due to the fact that so little construction has occurred in this area, it is an extremely sensitive spot and any ground disturbance should be accompanied by extensive planning and a Phase I survey.

Further historical documentation of this area can be found in Volume III - Series III Map Overlays, and the tract histories related to this area may also be found in Volume III.

Drawing Files

:\SENS_III.dwg
:\H1873LKW.dwg
:\H1874LKW.dwg
:\H1889LKW.dwg
:\HS1897.dwg

SERIES IV - Northeast of College Creek

Series IV is northwest of College or Dorsey Creek and includes many of the residential properties on the current Naval Academy. The most obvious cultural resource in this area is the Naval Cemetery. Interestingly, map research has shown that the location of County Road, now Rt.450, has remained almost unchanged from 1781 to the present. Other interesting points include the earliest Naval Hospital, which is in the vicinity of the Water Tower. As with the historic core or Series I, the original shoreline is under fill brought in for expansion into the Severn River. Several other smaller structures were also located on the land and these areas have been flagged by a hatching pattern.

Sensitive areas within Series IV are fairly sparse when compared to the other series maps. This does not necessarily reflect an absence of sites, although site density is certainly lower than elsewhere. It is more a reflection of a general lack of sources for this area. Although there are numerous references to a large estate on this tract known as Strawberry Hill, the home of the last colonial governor of Maryland, no maps have revealed any trace of the resource.

Drawing Files

:\SENS_IV.dwg
:\H1893PTH.dwg
:\H1937TOP.dwg
:\H1938TOP.dwg

Using the Sensitivity Maps for Resource Management

If used properly, the sensitivity maps in this volume may be combined with map overlays and other data as an effective tool for managing cultural resources. They provide a significant step forward in planning and will reduce the amount of background research needed before any ground disturbance is undertaken. As these maps are updated and information from future archaeological surveys is added, the maps will provide an effective overview or data base of the Academy's historic sites.

Hypothetical Project

How can the maps in this volume be used as a planning tool for a specific project? We can provide an example of a typical project and outline the steps which might be undertaken. We have also prepared a series of planning tables which summarize these steps and outline different potential outcomes. As an example, we can take the hypothetical installation of a new utility line in some portion of the Academy. We could just as readily use alternative scenarios such as the construction of a new building, the installation of drainage pipes, or repair of buried facilities, but the basic procedure would remain the same. The map comparison discussed below can be carried out with paper copies of maps, such as those printed in this volume, or (more conveniently) with digital AutoCAD files from Volume II.

For any project such as this, the preferred alignment for the line should first be drawn on a copy of the "existing conditions" map of the Academy. This plan would then be compared with Figure 1 in this Guide to determine the Series or area(s) into which the alignment falls. Using the more detailed maps for that individual area, planners or engineers could compare the proposed alignment with the distribution of sensitive areas. If the proposed construction crosses a sensitive area, several options are available.

The first option might be to shift the alignment into an area which does not show any sensitive remains. As we have cautioned elsewhere, this does not guarantee that no significant resources will be encountered, but it does measurably decrease the likelihood. A Phase I survey might still be required, but it would be less likely to encounter remains and the data from this report would significantly decrease the time and costs associated with background research.

If realignment is possible, the next step would be to determine where along the alignment previous archaeology had been undertaken. Any such areas in which archaeological field work had failed to find significant remains could be excluded from further consideration. Remaining areas could be examined in a Phase I survey, in accordance with the Section 106 process outlined earlier.

If it is not possible to realign the project and avoid sensitive areas, then a different strategy is required. Within sensitive zones, the map overlays can be used to accurately locate many historic features and, if the State Historic Preservation Office agrees, Phase I investigations might be omitted in favor of immediate Phase II evaluations. Using this direct approach and the data provided in this report, costs and time requirements may be substantially reduced. In portions of the alignment for which no previous archaeological surveys have been conducted, and for which no historical documentation is available, Phase I survey will probably be required.

Once Phase I and II discovery and evaluation are complete, the map overlays from this report have not outlived their usefulness. If Phase III investigations are called for after consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office and the Advisory Council, overlays can be effectively used to target excavations and interpret results. If for example, Phase II evaluations have determined that the foundation of an historic structure lies intact beneath the projected utility line, maps can be used to estimate the structure's extent, to pinpoint adjacent or related features, and to identify the features and place them in historic context. Archaeologists armed with such advance knowledge can move more rapidly and productively in Phase III.

Decision Trees

On the following pages we have outlined the process in the form of decision trees, where the appropriate steps for possible situations are outlined. This is

followed by a list of contacts at the State Historic Preservation Office (the Maryland Historical Trust) and the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation.

1. INITIAL DECISIONS ARCHAEOLOGY DECISION SHEET 1

Construction planned for specific area:

1. Consult Resource Guide (this volume) for known archaeological resources by checking the Figure 2 "Archaeological Investigations" map and the "Sensitivity Maps" for the appropriate area.

* If project falls in an area previously surveyed, go to step 2.A.

* If project has not been surveyed, go to step 2.B.

2.A Consult Resource Guide for significant archaeological resources in project area

2.B Consult Resource Guide for historical evidence of resources in area by

Y
c
h
e
c
k
i
n
g
t
h
e
"
S
e
n
s
i
t
i
v
i
t
Y
M
a
p
"
m
a
p

for the area.

volume.

* If no significant resources were found within

* If no resources are indicated,

the project area construction may proceed.

go to DECISION SHEET 2: Phase I

No further steps are needed.

Surveys.

* If significant resources are present in project

* If resources are indicated, go to step

area, go to DECISION SHEET 3: Phase II Evaluation.

3.A.

Decision Sheet III

3.A Consulting the
"Sensitivity Maps" in the
Resource
Guide, see if construction can
be shifted to an area with no
resources indicated. If
possible, do so. In any case,
proceed to DECISION SHEET II:
Phase I Surveys.

Decision Sheet II

2. PHASE I ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY DECISION SHEET 2

Phase I archaeological survey determined necessary:

1. Develop summary of undertaking which will effect archaeological remains, including nature and area of disturbance, as well as overall construction plans.
2. Summarize and/or extract known information on the area of disturbance, including sensitivity maps, historic maps from Volume II of this report and map overlays from Volume III.
3. Transmit materials collected from steps 1 and 2 above to Administrator of Archaeological Services, Office of Preservation Services, Maryland Historical Trust, 100 Community Place, Crownsville, MD 21032-2023 [Tel. 410-514-7600] for comment and consultation.
4. Prepare scope of work for Phase I survey and, if applicable, a request for proposals. Background material from steps 1 and 2 should form part of the package.
5. Assign contract for Phase I work, carry out research. Report and recommendations should be reviewed by USNA and the Maryland Historical Trust.
 - * If no resources are found within project area, undertaking may proceed. No further steps necessary.
 - * If resources are found, go to Decision Sheet 3: Phase II Evaluation.

NOTES:

- * Phase I and II investigations may be combined in a single field survey. Survey methodology should be determined in consultation with the Maryland Historical Trust.
- * In limited areas where map overlays and other data provide clear evidence of historic features, Phase I investigations may be omitted in favor of immediate Phase II evaluation.

3. PHASE II EVALUATIONS DECISION SHEET 3

Phase II evaluations determined necessary:

1. Based on previous investigations, prepare summary and/or extract of relevant information, including known and expected features. Include sensitivity maps, historic maps from Volume II of this report and map overlays from Volume III.
2. Summarize proposed undertaking and its probable impact upon resources suspected from step 1.
3. Transmit materials from steps 1 and 2 to Administrator of Archaeological Services, Office of Preservation Services, Maryland Historical Trust, 100 Community Place, Crownsville, MD 21032-2023 [Tel. 410-514-7600] for comment and consultation.
4. Based on comment from Maryland Historical Trust, prepare scope of work, request for services for the project and assign the project.
5. Carry out Phase II investigation and evaluate resources in final report.
Report reviewed by USNA and the Maryland Historical Trust.
 - * If no resources are deemed eligible for the National Register, proceed with undertaking. No further steps are necessary.
 - * If eligible resources are identified, proceed to step 6.
6. In consultation with Maryland Historical Trust, assess effects on eligible resources.
 - * No effect: proceed with undertaking. No further steps are necessary.
 - * No adverse effect: proceed with undertaking. No further steps are necessary.
 - * Adverse effect: proceed to step 7.
7. Consult with Maryland Historical Trust and determine measures to alleviate adverse impact. Several courses are possible:
 - * Mitigate impact by avoidance or other remedial measures. If agreed upon, prepare Memorandum of Agreement specifying treatment. Go to step 8.

* Mitigate impact through Phase III data recovery. Prepare Memorandum of Agreement specifying treatment. Go to step 8.

(continued)

3. PHASE II EVALUATIONS DECISION SHEET 3

(CONTINUED)

8. Submit Memorandum of Agreement to Advisory Council on Historic Preservation for review and comment. If necessary, revise MOA in light of Council comment. Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, #808, Washington, DC 20004 [Tel. 202-786-0503].
9. Proceed with Phase III data recovery and terms of the Memorandum of Agreement.

Government Historic Preservation Agencies & Contacts

MARYLAND HISTORICAL TRUST (State Historic Preservation Office for Maryland)

All offices use the following address: Maryland Historical Trust
100 Community Place
Crownsville, MD 21032-2023

Office of Preservation Services
Archaeological Services: Ms. Beth Cole (410) 514-
7631

Office of Research, Survey & Registration
Evaluation & Registration: Mr. Ronald Andrews (410) 514-
7649

Office of Archaeology
Chief: Mr. Richard Hughes (410) 514-
7660
State Terrestrial Archaeologist: Mr. Tyler Bastian (410)
514-7600
State Underwater Archaeologist: Dr. Susan Langley (410)
514-7661

State Historic Preservation Officer
Mr. J. Rodney Little (410) 514-
7600

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

1100 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
#808
Washington, DC 20004

Executive Director: Robert D. Bush (202) 786-
0503
General Counsel: John Fowler (202) 786-0503
Eastern Projects Division: Don Klima, Chief (202)
786-0505

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Department of Interior National Register Programs & Archaeological
Assistance
P.O. Box 37127
Washington, DC 20013-7127

Office location: 1100 L Street, NW

National Register Program: Carol Shull, Chief of Registrations (202)
343-9536
Interagency Resources Division: Lawrence Aten, Chief (202) 343-
9500
Cultural Resources: Jerry Rogers, Associate Director (202)
208-7625
Archaeological Assistance Division (202) 343-
4101