

Registration Requirements

The previous chapters have highlighted some of the most significant historic themes associated with the postbellum period in Prince George's County, identified important resources associated with each theme, proposed a range of possible research issues and questions, and suggested particular data that will be required to adequately determine the significance of associated resources. These chapters have reflected the cultural diversity that forms the fabric of the Prince George's County postbellum period—the transition from a slave-based economy to a wage-oriented one, farming based on tobacco but also evolving to supply the growing demand from Washington, D.C., and Baltimore, increased manufacturing capacity in Laurel, and the rise of suburbs, to name but a few of the trends.

This section focuses on the implementation of this context and research guide and its implications for determining site significance. First, the state of archeological investigations regarding postbellum sites in Prince George's County is reviewed in terms of field and archival investigations and determinations of historical significance in an attempt to identify typical practices. Second, the Prince George's County guidelines on archeological site significance are reviewed, and guidelines on attributes that postbellum sites should possess in order to be determined historically significant are discussed. The last section of this chapter identifies opportunities for expanding the scope of research conducted at postbellum sites in Prince George's County.

Known Postbellum Archeological Sites in Prince George's County

In order to understand the current state of knowledge regarding postbellum archeological sites in Prince George's County, a search of the archeological site files and reports of field investigations maintained by MHT was conducted in October 2007 and March 2008. As of October 2007 there were 361 sites located in Prince George's County that at least partly date to the postbellum period. Queries were run to determine the number of postbellum sites by class and type, with class and type predetermined by categories listed in the Archaeological Site Survey Basic Data Form. In both instances, it is possible for researchers to identify more than one class or type for a single site.

Site classes as identified on the Archaeological Site Survey Basic Data Form include domestic, industrial, transportation, military, religious,

sepulcher, commercial, education, agricultural-industrial, unknown, and other. The 361 postbellum sites in Prince George's County had 391 identified classes. Domestic, identified at 276 sites, was by far the largest single category. The domestic class, however, could imply the residential structure located at a farmstead, a tenant's house, a suburban house, or a rural resident's house. The site-type category of farmstead and plantation may provide an indication of the number of farm-related residential and outbuilding archeological sites that have been identified in Prince George's County. When combined, 131 have been found. The remaining sites could be urban or suburban structures, although the sites could be farm-related with the form not properly coded.

Other postbellum site types have been identified in Prince George's County. The MHT database lists 17 industrial sites in the county, and many industrial site types also are identified. Mills are most numerous at nine, followed by "other" industrial at five. The mill sites often have been identified as the remains of a mill, dam, or raceway. Standing (or partially standing) mills were found at Adelphi Mill (18PR105), Gardner's Site 8 (18PR109), Traband Grist Mill (18PR173), Avondale Mill Complex (18PR388), Bevard-5 site (18PR461), and Canter Site 7 (18PR889). Dams or raceways include the Park millrace (18PR150), the Mill Branch Crossing dam and millrace (18PR859), and the Laurel Cotton Mills dam (18PR227). Each of the dams and millraces may be associated with as-yet undiscovered remains of a mill structure.

One example of the "other industrial" category is 18PR729, a possible brick manufacturing location dating to the nineteenth- or early-twentieth century. Single examples of a furnace/forge and quarry are also listed. The furnace is the Muirkirk Furnace (18PR149) that has been discussed in Chapter 4 of this context and research guide. Portions of the complex reportedly have been integrated into existing structures, while other portions have been impacted by an adjacent brick manufacturing operation. The quarry site, 18PR421, includes a cluster of foundations related to the adjacent quarry area.

Military resources, in contrast, are poorly identified, with few examples present in the database. One of the few is Fort Washington (18PR353). Transportation-related sites include those associated with roads and railroads (n=6), wharfs and landings (n=6), and bridges (n=3). The railroad-related sites include examples of alignments (18PR605, a portion of the Chesapeake Beach Railway, and 18PR606, a portion of the Southern Maryland Railroad), bridge approaches (18PR432, a WW&G Railroad bridge approach that was never constructed), and a power plant (18PR261, built for the Washington Railway & Electric Company, but never finished). An example of bridges is 18PR257, a trolley bridge constructed for the Columbia & Maryland Railroad Company during the late nineteenth century. Wharfs and landings are represented by 18PR6, 18PR232, 18PR236, 18PR302, and 18PR309. These sites include the wharf or landing as well as, in some instances, associated structures such as houses and stores. Two sites are identified as towns, one of which is Mount Calvert (18PR6).

Many additional sites (n=32) are only identified as “other” or “unknown” postbellum sites. These sites tend to be concentrations of artifacts without any above-ground structural remains. Often these sites are described as scatters of ceramics and glass, and at times, bricks are noted as present. In at least one instance, for 18PR848, the site form suggests that the site area consists of the remains of a domestic structure. Many of these sites may be trash-disposal areas, although others may be the former location of wood-frame structures that have since been razed.

Phase I Survey Investigations

Although a rigorous review of the archeological site survey reports for projects in Prince George’s County was not conducted, due mainly to the large number, several reports can be highlighted to detail how postbellum sites are typically treated in the county. One report, for which the senior author (Kreisa) was co-author and principal investigator, illustrates two key weaknesses with regard to the treatment of postbellum archeological sites in the county. The survey of the Locust Hill property was conducted in 2005, and in that survey the remains of a house structure and a railroad station were found. Neither location, despite the presence of structural remains and artifacts, was registered with the MHT as an archeological site. Other archeologists beside the senior author of this context and research guide have taken this approach. For instance, in an earlier report, subsurface feature remains at the College Park Airport were discovered by MAAR, Inc., in a survey in advance of the construction of a Metro station (Basalik 1980). The subsurface features, consisting of portions of a number of the original hangers at the airport, were not registered with the MHT as an archeological site. These are just two projects of many where postbellum remains have not been considered “true” archeological sites, and as such, were not registered as archeological sites with the MHT. And if such remains are not viewed as archeological sites, it becomes much easier to dismiss or not determine their potential historic significance.

Returning to the Locust Hill survey report, the house structure illustrates another weakness often associated with the treatment of postbellum sites in Prince George’s County, that of assessing significance. Despite a large number of artifacts recovered from the site, the lack of features and the late period of occupation (late-nineteenth to mid-twentieth century) were cited as reasons why this site was not historically significant. Banguilan and Boyd (2007) made similar arguments when evaluating 10 postbellum sites on the Smith property. “Commonness” and “ubiquity” were cited by Banguilan and Boyd (2007) as the underlying reason that the sites were not historically significant.

A third problem appears to be common to the work of all archeologists, not just those working in Prince George’s County, and that is an over-interpretation of the results of shovel-test data. The Locust Hill house structure mentioned earlier and the postbellum residential sites discussed by Banguilan and Boyd (2007) are both described as lacking features based on the results of shovel-

test excavations. In an otherwise excellent argument regarding the evaluation of three postbellum sites, Sanders et al. (1999) also use this argument. To illustrate this point, site 18PR853 is a late-nineteenth to early-twentieth-century domestic site with foundation remnants discussed by Sanders et al. (1999). It is defined as 5,600 square meters in area, and within that area, 61 shovel tests, each approximately 35 cm in diameter, were excavated. The total area investigated within this site is approximately 6.2 square meters, or one-tenth of 1 percent of the site area. The odds of actually encountering a feature, perhaps other than a large structural element such as a cellar or foundation (which, incidentally, was present at this site), and recognizing it as such, would appear to be rather small given the typical strategy that archeologists must employ. A lack of features identified by shovel-test excavations most likely does not equate to a lack of features within a site. But, just what feature types are present at postbellum sites in Prince George's County, and how effective would shovel-test excavations be in locating them? This question is perhaps better addressed while reviewing data from Phase II and Phase III site excavations.

Sanders et al. (1999) provide a good example of a Phase I-level treatment of many of the issues associated with the identification and evaluation of postbellum sites in Prince George's County. All postbellum sites located in the survey were registered with the MHT as archeological sites. Specific significance evaluations are also presented. In this instance, all of the sites are described as having a "thin and mostly late sheet midden that reflects the late historic occupation," and no substantial features or deposits are present within the site areas. Because of this, the authors conclude that additional investigations would not yield a better understanding of late nineteenth-century site layout, rural lifeways, foodways, or disposal patterns. Sanders et al. (1999) provide a very explicit statement as to why these sites are not significant, and the authors did not rely on "commonness" or "late date" as an explanation. While the specific conclusions based on the evidence presented are arguable, the use of field and archival data to reach an explicitly stated conclusion on site integrity and research potential provides a model for the approach to significance evaluation that should be more widely employed in Prince George's County.

Phase II NRHP Evaluation Investigations

Archeologists have conducted further investigations, typically described as Phase II investigations, at 21 postbellum sites in Prince George's County. These investigations are designed to determine whether the sites retain sufficient integrity to allow researchers to address important research questions or topics and to identify specific research questions and topics that could be pursued with data generated by additional investigations. For archeologists, integrity means the degree to which a site is physically undisturbed. Typically, sites do not retain total integrity or lack integrity altogether, but this quality varies by degree. Archeologists must try to determine in Phase II investigations whether the degree of integrity present within a site area, in conjunction with artifacts and features, would allow researchers to address specific significant research

questions or topics. Examples of research questions and topics related to particular postbellum themes have been detailed in previous chapters of this context.

The site files and reports at the MHT were reviewed in order to better understand the state of Phase II investigations conducted at postbellum archeological sites in Prince George's County (Table 15). In all, 42 sites with postbellum occupations have been subjected to Phase II investigations in Prince George's County. This review identified that 21 of these sites had postbellum components that were not the focus of the Phase II investigations. The focus of investigations at these sites was prehistoric Native American or historic period eighteenth- to mid-nineteenth-century components. Information from these 21 sites is not included in the following discussion. For each of the remaining 21 postbellum archeological sites investigated as of March 2008, data on the type of site, time period, nature of field investigations, types of features found, artifacts recovered, level of archival research, significance recommendations, and the reason for the recommendation, were collected.

The 21 postbellum sites investigated at the Phase II level in Prince George's County are weighted toward domestic and domestic farmstead sites, totaling 19 of the 21 sites investigated. The other two sites are described as refuse or artifact scatters. Fourteen of the sites were occupied during the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, three were occupied after 1900, three span the period from the eighteenth through twentieth centuries, and one was occupied during the nineteenth century. Some level of archival research was conducted at all 21 sites. Typically, this included a review of historic maps, family recollections, and census records. Occasionally, other documents, such as probate, deed, and tax records were also consulted.

Excavation strategies at the sites included shovel testing only (at one site), a combination of shovel testing and excavation of test units (12 sites), test units only (6 sites), and shovel testing and use of mechanical equipment (2 sites). The amount of area excavated varied widely, ranging from a low of 2 square meters (at two sites) to a high of 401.5 square meters (at one site, at which mechanical equipment was used). However, less than 20 square meters of area was investigated at 15 of the 21 sites, and the median area excavated was 12.2 square meters. Features were found at 11 of the 21 sites investigated, although large structural remains, relatively easy to locate on the site surface, were found at 9 of the 11 sites. Structural remains only were found at six sites, a combination of structural remains and other features were found at four sites, and only nonstructural features were found at one site. If large structural remains are subtracted from further consideration (since these can be identified from a surface inspection of the site area in a Phase I investigation), 17 of 21 postbellum sites lacked subsurface features. Two possible reasons for the lack of such features can be advanced; archeologists are typically not excavating enough of the site area to find such remains, or such remains are not associated with domestic postbellum sites.

Table 15. Selected attributes of 21 postbellum archeological site NRHP evaluation investigations.

Site	Time Range	Area Excavated	Site Area (m2)	Features	NRHP Evaluation	Reference
18PR737	1902-1930	8.5	10,500	1 privy	NE	Hoffman & Sperling 2005
18PR736	18th-20th century	13.5	1,350	None	NE	Hoffman & Sperling 2005
18PR383	Early-20th century	21.1	50	None	NE	Koski-Karell 1989
18PR377	Late 19th to mid-20th century	28.4	8,400	3 structures & 7 other	NE	Goodwin et al. 1991
18PR780	Late 19th to 20th century	2.0	375	None	NE	Ward & Wingate 2006
18PR782	Late 19th to 20th century	2.0	3,600	None	NE	Ward & Wingate 2006
18PR424	Mid-19th to 20th century	401.5	2,400	6 structural/wall	NE	Hoffman & Cosans-Zebooker 1993
18PR425	Mid-19th to 20th century	109.5	2,000	2 structures	NE	Hoffman & Cosans-Zebooker 1993
18PR677	Mid-19th to 20th century	21.0	5,248	None	NE	Hill et al. 2005
18PR669	1760-1914	19.0	6,724	None	NE	Hill et al. 2005
18PR580	19th to 20th century	13.5	22,448	None	NE	Hill et al. 2005
18PR867	Mid-19th to 20th century	12.2	2,800	14 structural	NE	Kerns-Nocerito & Furgerson 2007
18PR498	19th century	18.1	8,125	1 sheet midden	NE	Furgerson & Boyd 2003
18PR448	Early- to mid-20th century	9.0	200	2 structures	NE	Bienenfeld & Leininger (1999)
18PR446	19th to 20th century	8.6	Unknown	None	NE	Bienenfeld & Leininger (1999)
18PR445	Late 19th to 20th century	7.4	378	None	NE	Bienenfeld & Leininger (1999)
18PR444	Late 19th to early-20th century	9.2	75	3 posts, 2 brick pilings, 1 unknown	NE	Bienenfeld & Leininger (1999)
18PR443	19th to 20th century	4.7	25	None	NE	Bienenfeld & Leininger (1999)
18PR521	1850s-1906	7.0	8,624	1 structure	E	Fischler et al. 1999
18PR579	Late 18th to 20th century	9.2	20,651	1 cellar, 2 pits, 1 posthole	E	Hornum et al. 1999
18PR416	19th to 20th century	27.8	3,192	5 structural remains, 1 pit	NE	Shellenhammer et al. 2007

Key: NE = not eligible; E = eligible.

When the total area excavated as a percentage of total site area is calculated, the Phase II investigations ranged from a low of less than one-tenth of 1 percent to a high of 42.2 percent of the site area excavated (this figure could not be calculated for one site as no site area figure was given by the investigators). Thirteen of 21 sites had 1 percent or less of the site area investigated. If the two sites investigated using mechanical devices are excluded, the five sites with more than 1 percent of area investigated all can be seen to have small total site areas. These five sites have site areas between 50 square meters and 378 square meters, and the total area excavated is less than 10 square meters for all but one of these sites. The two mechanically investigated sites, both over 2,000 square meters in size, had between 100 and 400 square meters investigated.

This discussion suggests that archeologists in Prince George's County are following a model of Phase II investigations regardless of site size; generally less than 20 square meters are excavated, and when possible, generally less than 10 square meters are excavated. Site size appears not to be taken into account, or at least only minimally so. However, common sense suggests that larger site areas have more possible locations at which features could be constructed. The data discussed here suggest that archeologists have been concentrating on the investigation of above-ground features, with little effort expended on whether, especially given some of the large site sizes, subsurface features or deposits are present at postbellum sites. We do not know whether subsurface features are present at such sites, their numbers, their location, or whether such features would contain any materials that would allow archeologists to address significant historical research issues.

In this light, it is not surprising that the consulting archeologists found that 19 of the 21 sites investigated were not historically significant. Most were not significant due to either a lack of integrity; previous use or development at the site had disturbed archeological deposits, or the site lacked subsurface features or deposits (also possibly due to prior disturbance). Interestingly, even though structural remains were found at many of these same sites, this did not lead to the site being viewed as historically significant. For a small minority of the sites, the consultants suggested that the artifacts and features found did not have the potential to address significant research issues. Data redundancy was cited at one site, suggesting that additional investigations would yield no new or different features or artifacts than those that had been already found. For two of the sites, the archeologists specifically noted that architectural artifacts were overrepresented in the artifact assemblage and that these materials do not reflect farm life or activities.

This line of argument is based on the typically unstated proposition that little significant information can be obtained from studying architectural materials.

This last point is interesting in that the senior author noted a similar pattern at late-nineteenth- to twentieth-century farmsteads at Fort Riley,

Kansas. Twelve of the 21 Prince George's County postbellum sites present artifact counts that could be examined in an attempt to determine whether large numbers of architectural artifacts was a common pattern. The amount of architectural artifacts as a percentage of the total artifact assemblage was calculated, and this ranged from a low of 24 percent to a high of 66 percent. Six of the sites had artifact assemblages that were comprised of less than 50 percent architectural materials, while six had artifact assemblages that were comprised of 50 percent or more of architectural materials. These data suggest that high frequencies of architectural materials should be the expected pattern at postbellum sites, although other artifact classes may be well-represented at a few sites.

Although the overall percentage of architectural materials may be high at postbellum sites, the impact of such a pattern will likely vary by total artifact assemblage size. For instance, small artifact assemblages with high architectural artifact counts will retain very few artifacts that can be used to address research questions. An artifact assemblage with 200 items, 50 percent of which are architectural, will have at most 100 items that potentially can be used to address research questions. In contrast, an artifact assemblage of 2,000 items, 50 percent of which are architectural, will have at most 1,000 items that potentially can be used to address research questions. It is more likely that significant research issues can be addressed with 1,000 items rather than 100 items, regardless of the percentage of architectural items recovered from the site.

Two of the postbellum sites investigated at the Phase II level, 18PR521 and 18PR579, were determined by the investigators to be historically significant. Both are domestic portions of farmsteads, with one perhaps having transitioned from a farmstead to a rural residence during the late nineteenth century. The total amount excavated at the two sites was 7 and 9.2 square meters, respectively, quite normal amounts for Phase II excavations in Prince George's County. The surface remains of a structure was found at 18PR521 while the surface remains of a cellar, as well as two pit features and a posthole, were found at 18PR579 (only the posthole at this site dates to the postbellum period, the other features dating to the eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries). Researchers suggested that the artifacts and features found at the two sites could address significant research issues or questions regarding aspects of the postbellum history of Prince George's County. Specifically, for 18PR579 researchers identified the topics of farmstead development and spatial organization, while for 18PR521 researchers identified adaptation to changing economic conditions (e.g., the shift from a slave-based economy to a wage-labor economy) and the influence of religious affiliation on consumption patterns, as research issues that could be pursued with data generated by additional investigations.

Phase III Mitigation Data Recovery Investigations

If sites retain sufficient integrity, features, and appropriate artifacts that would allow researchers to address significant research questions or topics, the site is often determined to be historically significant, as were 18PR521 and 18PR579. Similar to the Phase II reports reviewed above, Phase III reports were reviewed in order to better understand the state of investigations conducted at the sites. Data on the type of site, time period, nature of field investigations, type of features found, artifacts recovered, and level of archival research, was collected.

As mentioned in the previous section, two postbellum archeological sites in Prince George's County, 18PR521 and 18PR579, have been determined to be historically significant under Section 106 of the NHPA. It would appear that no Phase III mitigation data recovery investigations were conducted at 18PR521. Presumably, the site was avoided by the proposed development. Locus A of 18PR579, a yard area of the Beechwood Plantation with deposits dating from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, was investigated at a Phase III level. The Phase III investigations at Locus A consisted of the excavation of 41 shovel test pits, 10 1-x-1-m test units, and 5 1-x-10-m trenches, for a total of approximately 64.1 square meters investigated. Five features were identified: post molds (possibly from an outbuilding), a brick-lined well, a gas pump, a collapsed loading structure, and the piers of a frame building. The excavations also resulted in the recovery of 433 artifacts, 299 (69 percent of the assemblage total) of which were architectural in nature. The investigators identified three research issues that excavations at the site could address: whether trash disposal patterns changed through time; subsistence strategies; and socioeconomic status. Unfortunately, these three issues were not explicitly addressed in the final report.

Significance Requirements

This section on significance requirements attempts to explicitly identify those attributes that a postbellum archeological site must possess to be determined historically significant in Prince George's County. In Guidelines for Archeological Review, M-NCPPC identifies five attributes that are used to determine whether an archeological site is to be considered historically significant. These are:

A. Rarity: The degree of uniqueness (e.g., few examples in Prince George's County) possessed by the postbellum archeological site and its potential for providing information about a person, structure, event, or historical process.

B. Research Value: The extent to which the archeological information contained on the postbellum archeological site would contribute to the expansion of knowledge.

C. Public Value: The level of importance the postbellum archeological site has to the community as a specific location associated with a significant person, structure, event, or historical process.

D. Site Integrity: The extent to which soil stratigraphy and original placement and condition of archeological resources on the postbellum archeological site have not been disturbed or altered in a manner that appreciably reduces their research or public value.

E. Interpretative Value in Place: The extent to which the postbellum archeological site retains its spatial context and offers the opportunity for visual interpretation to the public about the history of the county.

As is evident, these five attributes are not the same as those criteria used to determine site significance under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, but are closely based on those criteria. County Attribute A is essentially Criteria A, B, and C of the NRHP, while Attribute B corresponds with NRHP Criterion D. Attribute D, integrity, is treated as one of the essential qualities that historic resources must retain, to a degree, in order to be eligible for listing in the NRHP. Qualities defined in County Attributes C and E, though, are not considered in any of the NRHP criteria. It is also evident that archeological sites in Prince George's County may retain one or more of these five attributes. For instance, a site may be rare but lack site integrity and research value, at least as associated with archeological deposits. Yet such a site may be significant in terms of its public value, in that it highlights a specific important event, person, or process, and as such, its interpretive value to the people of Prince George's County may be tremendous. Prince George's County has an opportunity, by not employing the four NRHP criteria of significance, which do not explicitly consider public value and interpretation in determination of significance, to expand preservation and mitigation efforts beyond the typical choices of avoidance and excavation.

Archeological site 18PR260 provides an excellent example of this approach to determining site significance. This site consists of the remains of a number of temporary housing units associated with the World War II ERCO airplane manufacturing facility in Riverdale. At some point in the 1950s, the wood-frame superstructures were removed, and the only remaining evidence of this community is a road network, a number of concrete pads, infrastructure elements, and the occasional artifact. An archeological survey conducted during the 1980s prior to a proposed road project suggested that no intact deposits were likely at this site. Incidentally, this particular parcel was not selected by the road project, and so the remains are present to this day. Based on the archeological survey of this site, it would appear that 18PR260 does not retain subsurface integrity—in fact, there may have been little in the way of artifacts deposited during the occupation of this site. So is 18PR260 historically significant under the five criteria specified by Prince George's County?

In answer to that question, a strong case can be made that it is. It is a rare site type; private World War II temporary housing is a rarity in Prince George's County. It does retain site integrity—perhaps not subsurface integrity—but clearly it retains some measure of the integrity of the organization of the community as it was established during World War II, as evidenced by the surviving road system, infrastructure, and concrete structure pads. It is associated with and is a visible reminder to the people of Prince George's County of World War II and the impact that the conflict had on the county: the influx of people and the response of ERCO and the federal government to the conflict. As such, it provides an opportunity for interpretation of World War II and the county's response to that conflict to the public. Finally, limited archeological investigations but more importantly archival investigations can be employed to illuminate this aspect of history. Site 18PR260 is arguably significant as a historic resource under the county guidelines.

But just as clearly, 18PR260 would offer little in terms of value if investigations and treatment were to employ the typical approach most often used in Section 106-driven archeological projects: mitigation through excavation. The postbellum sites discussed throughout this context and resource guide, like 18PR260, may be historically significant but should not be approached only in terms of mitigation through excavation. Often, postbellum sites, and especially those associated with the twentieth century, contain little more than a scatter of incidentally discarded artifacts, surface middens, and structural debris associated with demolition. In this instance, proper mitigation measures may include limited archeological investigations such as mapping structural remains and surface middens, sampling the artifacts, and documenting the construction materials and techniques associated with the structural remains. The most important aspects of mitigation would include historical research on the property and the creation of appropriate public interpretative materials such as signage, brochures, web content, or displays. The Prince George's County archeology legislation was implemented in an attempt to document and protect the history of the county for the people, and such an approach to archeological resources would go a long way to meeting that challenge.

The concept of integrity with regard to farms and farmstead sites must also be viewed somewhat differently from that of many other archeological sites. Beaudry (2001-2002) and many others recognize that farms and farmsteads are loci of constant change and innovation and that farmers were, perhaps subconsciously, engaged in a strategy of permanence involving reuse, rebuilding, remodeling, and moving buildings. In many ways, what archeologists would define as disturbance, or lack of integrity, may instead be evidence for the ongoing organization and reorganization of the farm when faced with changes in technology, crops, livestock, markets, and labor, among other factors (Beaudry 2001-2002; Catts 2001-2002; Klein et al. 2001-2002). Farms occupied for short periods that retain integrity may in fact be an economically unsuccessful sample of the farm population. Those occupied for longer periods,

but which have experienced impacts to their integrity, are more likely to be the economically successful sample of the farm population. Documentation of farmstead change, then, may be another example of research that is not often considered by archeologists.

It is recommended that postbellum archeological sites should be considered to be historically significant when they retain one of the five attributes under which M-NCPPC evaluates properties. To be considered significant under one of the seven themes detailed in this context and research guide, sites must be identifiable as having historically been one of the property types associated with a particular theme. In addition, each site must demonstrate one or more of the following:

- **Rarity:** For an archeological site to be significant under this criterion, it must be demonstrated that either few examples of the site type exist or that few have been preserved or investigated in Prince George's County. The Muirkirk Furnace and sites such as blacksmith shops are examples of rare site types in Prince George's County.
- **Public Value:** For an archeological site to be significant under this criterion, it must be associated with a significant person and must contain intact archeological deposits that can be linked to the significant person's period of occupation, or must evidence intact archeological deposits or features that are associated with a significant event, pattern, or trend.
- **Research Value:** For an archeological site to be significant under this criterion, it must have yielded, or be likely to yield, information important in history. Investigators must be able to demonstrate that that research questions relevant to a particular theme or specific subthemes can be addressed through additional archeological and/or documentary investigations.
- **Site Integrity:** For an archeological site to be significant under this criterion, Phase II excavations must demonstrate the presence of intact subsurface features (earthen features, structural features, or midden deposits) that will allow researchers the ability to address research questions relevant to particular themes or specific subthemes.
- **Interpretative Value in Place:** For an archeological site to be significant under this criterion, a site must retain surficial and/or subsurface integrity to the extent that the features offer the opportunity for visual interpretation to the public on some aspect of the postbellum history of the county.

Based on these criteria, we suggest that for a site to be mitigated by traditional archeological methods, in other words Phase III excavation, it must retain high levels of subsurface integrity and have demonstrated research potential. For those sites that do not retain subsurface integrity (or perhaps never had such integrity) we suggest that a public interpretive mitigation track

be pursued if the site retains a lower level of surface integrity along with a combination of the rarity, public value, and interpretative value attributes.

The Future of Postbellum Archeological Sites in Prince George's County

This context and research guide began with the proposition that Prince George's County likely has many, perhaps thousands, of archeological sites dating to roughly the 1865 to 1958 time period, but that until recently relatively few were being registered as sites, fewer yet were investigated after their identification, and none had been determined to be historically significant by consulting archeologists. To overcome these trends, Prince George's County M-NCPPC created this resource guide and context, and the county appears to be rather unique in its attempt to provide guidance on the significance of many classes of postbellum archeological sites. The historical overview and themes chapters identified particular resource types that could be identified as archeological sites and listed a number of research issues and questions that could be addressed by investigations at such sites. Finally, we have examined the state of postbellum archeological investigations in Prince George's County as of late 2007 and early 2008, and this confirmed many of the observations made in the opening section of this document.

To better serve the citizens of Prince George's County, we have suggested that the county guidelines on significance be viewed outside of the normal "box" in which most archeologists place themselves. Significance and subsequent mitigation should in effect be separated, and further, mitigation should be approached in terms not only of archeological excavation but also of public interpretation. Not surprisingly, while conducting the research necessary to create a document with the breadth of scope that a context and research guide on postbellum resources must have, we have identified several substantive issues that the archeological and historic preservation community, as well as M-NCPPC, should consider. Among these are the following.

In many instances, archeological sites dating to the postbellum period, and especially the twentieth century, are given scant description in compliance reports and not registered with MHT. Such examples include artifact scatters and structure remains. It is suggested that a definition of postbellum archeological sites be created and that M-NCPPC request that all consultants register sites that meet the definition with MHT. It is recommended that this requirement be included in county guidelines.

In all instances of compliance reports reviewed for this study, investigators evaluated site significance based on NRHP criteria. The county guidelines suggest the use of county criteria, but also state that NRHP criteria can be used as well. As discussed in Significance Requirements, it would appear that a site could be determined significant under county criteria but not under NRHP criteria. It is therefore suggested that, for projects that are solely being

considered under county regulations, the use of county criteria be encouraged. When a project is being considered under both county and federal legislation, both sets of criteria can be considered.

As part of the county archeological guidelines, reviewers should request that consultants clearly state their finding regarding the significance of postbellum sites and that the finding be based on subsurface integrity and the ability of associated features and artifacts to be used in addressing research questions and topics.

The county criteria include the consideration of whether the archeological site represents a rare type or is associated with a historically significant person, event, pattern, or trend. To evaluate a site with regard to these criteria, consulting archeologists should prepare adequate historical background research at a Phase I level. Such research should attempt to determine ownership of the property through the postbellum period and the land-use history of the site.

Rarity as a criterion of significance combines two aspects: rarity as a site type and rarity of investigation. For instance, blacksmith's shops appear to be rather common in Prince George's County during the last half of the nineteenth century, but no such sites have been archeologically investigated. A similar case could be made for a very common site type, the farmstead. However, other site types, such as the temporary World War II ERCO housing discussed earlier, are both rare in that not many similar sites exist in the county, and none have been archeologically investigated. Consulting archeologists and county staff should consider both aspects of rarity when conducting or reviewing investigations at postbellum archeological sites.

Consulting archeologists and county staff should consider expanding the options for mitigation measures to include public interpretation at archeological sites where traditional excavation approaches may be inappropriate. Other mitigation measures could include having the applicants produce much more narrowly focused themes, such as agriculture, Laurel industries, or regional themes (northern or southern portions of the county, rural neighborhoods, etc.).

Initially, because so few postbellum archeological sites have been investigated above the level of inventory survey, an increased number of Phase II investigations should be recommended. This can be used to create a baseline of expectations for particular site types. If after a baseline of data on particular site types is gathered, and the sites typically do not retain intact deposits or subsurface deposits capable of addressing research issues, such sites could then be excluded from future Phase II investigations.

Both consulting archeologists and county staff should consider expanding the amount of excavation required at the Phase II level at postbellum sites, at least until it can be determined whether nonstructural features are typically

associated with these sites in Prince George's County and whether such features retain artifacts that could be used to address significant research issues.

After an appropriate period of increased investigations, M-NCPPC should sponsor a review of the results of Phase II and Phase III investigations at postbellum sites in Prince George's County. Such a review then could be used to refine research issues and themes, identify site types that have not been adequately investigated, and identify site types where either adequate investigation has been conducted or where Phase II investigations typically are not an appropriate treatment.

While formulating this research guide and context, it became clear that the sensitive treatment of postbellum archeological sites presents a challenge to archeologists, the wider historic preservation community, and the people of Prince George's County. Many of the issues cited by archeologists in Chapter 1 of this research guide and context concerning postbellum archeological sites lie at the center of this challenge: postbellum sites are numerous, they are recent in time, standing examples are often present, we do lack the perspective of time regarding their historic importance, they are not the focus of attention for many academics, and they do present avenues of investigation and understanding outside of archeology. But just as clearly, many postbellum resources are valued by the people of Prince George's County. Such diverse postbellum standing properties as the Goddard Spacecraft Magnetic Test Facility, College Park Airport, the Greenbelt Center School, the Bowie Railroad buildings, and the Hyattsville Post Office have been recognized as locally significant historic resources.

At its best, historic preservation represents an ongoing dialogue within society regarding what is truly important and reflective of our past experience as a people. This dialogue incorporates many diverse peoples and voices: archeologists and historians, county officials, the business community, and most importantly, the citizens of Prince George's County. Each has a particular set of life experiences to offer to this dialogue, and it is a dialogue that has no right or wrong answers. This research guide and context on the postbellum sites of Prince George's County is offered as one aspect of that ongoing dialogue. Together, the citizens of Prince George's County will ultimately define the importance of these sites to the history of the county.

