

## **VI. STANDARD RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY**

The cultural resource survey of the Camp Wright Project was performed within a general research framework designed to achieve several goals. The research designs for the historic architectural and Phase IA archaeological assessment surveys were developed based on the regional historic contexts and the results of background research. Presented below are general discussions of the overall research designs developed and implemented by these surveys.

### **A. Overall Project Goals**

The cultural resources survey of the Camp Wright Project was conducted with the intent to achieve several goals. While there are slight differences in the specific goals for the historic architectural and archaeological studies, the overall goals of the Cultural Resources Survey were:

- to locate and identify previously recorded and unrecorded cultural resources, both historic architectural and archaeological, within the APE;
- to determine the eligibility of such resources for listing on the Delaware/National Register of Historic Places;
- to evaluate the potential effects of the proposed construction on the resources;
- to develop a land use history (with emphasis on use of the APE as Camp Wright);
- to discern the archaeological sensitivity of the project APE and identify any archaeological target areas that may be contained within the APE; and
- to photodocument and record buildings, structures and landscapes associated with Camp Wright.

### **B. Documentary Research**

Materials examined included relevant project documentation, historic and environmental maps, cultural resource management surveys, technical journals, as well as deed and tax information. Other resources that were reviewed included pertinent publications regarding the Native American history, history, ethnohistory, and geography of the area. Research efforts also included interviews with knowledgeable individuals as well as a review of electronic media (e.g., internet resources).

A land use and occupational history of the APE was developed. This work involved deed searches and the preparation of a summary chain-of-title. The deed searches also assisted project researchers in ascertaining the potential for any postcontact (historic) archaeological sites that predate use of the property as Camp Wright.

### **C. Historic Architectural Research Design and Methods**

This Determination of Eligibility study of historic architectural resources involved a non-comprehensive review of primary and secondary resources, including files held at the state repository, background literature, historic atlases, contemporary subdivision maps, and deed research. State, county, and local histories provided an overview of the historic context of the Area of Potential Effect (APE). Historical maps and atlases provided additional information on development patterns. The field survey for this project involved both windshield and pedestrian techniques.

All above-ground properties within the APE were examined. Each resource was evaluated, making note of its approximate age, condition, function, construction materials, and architectural details. Thirty-five (35) mm and digital photographs were taken of facades showing elevations, lateral views, and details for each building on the property.

The National Register Criteria for Evaluation were applied to each resource. In addition to assessing the integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association, each of the four criteria were considered: (A) association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; (B) association with the lives of persons significant in our past; (C) embodiment of distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; and (D) an ability to yield, or likelihood to yield, information important to prehistory or history (National Register Bulletin, No. 15).

Federal and State Historic Registers were also consulted.

For the purposes of this survey, the research and materials outlined above result in a body of information sufficient to reconstruct the general history of the region and to identify the historic properties within the APE. Each property identified as fifty years or older was evaluated for its ability to meet the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. A Delaware Cultural Resource Survey Property Identification Form (CRS-1) was completed for each historic property identified as over fifty years in age within the APE. Additional forms such as the Main Building (CRS-2), Secondary Building (CRS-3), Structure (Building-Like) (CRS-5), Map (CRS-9), and Potential District (Crs-14) Forms were also completed.

### **D. Phase IA Archaeological Assessment Research Design and Methods**

As noted previously, the purpose of the Phase IA archaeological assessment was to identify potentially Delaware/National Register-eligible archaeological resources that could be affected by the proposed Camp Wright Project. In order to achieve the overall survey goals, the Phase IA archaeological assessment was conducted with the intent to achieve several specific archaeological objectives. Specifically, these objectives were:

- to conduct systematic subsurface archaeological testing within the APE to confirm the presence or absence of subsurface archaeological deposits;
- to provide preliminary assessments of any encountered archaeological resources. When applicable, this objective included:
  - preliminary delineation of site boundaries.
  - characterizations and interpretation of represented data categories with respect to the cultural/temporal periods of the State Plan.
  - preliminary assessments (or evaluation if sufficient data was available) of Delaware Register/National Register eligibility of identified archaeological resources;
- to identify supplemental studies (e.g., formal, extensive evaluation studies or mitigation studies) that may be warranted at any identified archaeological sites;
- to evaluate the potential effects of the proposed construction on any identified sites within the project APE;
- to develop appropriate measures for cultural resource management for the proposed project and for any identified sites; and
- to provide supplemental data that can be used to assess, enhance, and update existing archaeological models of prehistoric and historic settlement patterning.

To achieve the aforementioned goals, several factors were taken into consideration to establish a framework for conducting the research.

Information derived from background research as well as reviews of Delaware cultural resource management plans (Custer 1986a, 1986b, 1989, 1994; De Cunzo and Catts 1990) as well as current Middle Atlantic archaeological predictive models (e.g., Chesler 1982a, 1982b; Cavallo and Mounier 1980; Sinton 1982) was used to assess the overall archaeological sensitivity of the APE and to identify areas to be targeted by the field investigations. The prehistoric and historic archaeological sensitivity of the APE was assessed.

A detailed, systematic field inspection of the APE was conducted as part of the Phase IA archaeological assessment. These efforts consisted of a combination of subsurface testing procedures and pedestrian survey. All areas within the APE were subjected to at a minimum a pedestrian survey examination. The primary objective of this fieldwork was to collect data that would assist in assessing the integrity of any archaeological resources contained in the APE.

As noted earlier, for the archaeological survey, APE was determined to consist of all previously untested areas within the project limits where the proposed construction would result in disturbance of the existing land surfaces. Following review of property site plans, controlled subsurface archaeological testing was conducted within the APE.

Areas outside of the anticipated limits of work, or where previous archaeological testing has been conducted, were not considered part of the APE; however, a minimum of pedestrian survey was conducted on the entire parcel where ground surfaces are not expected to be

disturbed. Both the pedestrian survey and any applicable shovel test pit excavations were performed with the intent to ascertain any potential probability zones that may be located directly adjacent to the established APE. A similar testing regime was also implemented in instances where accurate sampling of the APE was hindered by natural obstacles such as stream channels or standing water.

To maintain consistency with the mapping provided, it was deemed prudent to perform shovel test pit excavations within an English-based system. In general, shovel test pits (STPs), approximately 1.5 feet in diameter, were excavated at fifty and one hundred foot intervals in areas of high and low probability, respectively throughout the identified target areas. Whenever possible, shovel test pit grids were checked accordingly against surveyor stations.

This sampling procedure was subjected to change depending on any pertinent data discovered during the course of fieldwork. The distance between shovel test pits may have been tightened or widened to avoid untestable surfaces, such as paved drives or parking lots. In some areas, due to the presence of utility lines, test pit transects were occasionally offset to control sampling errors. In these types of situations, rather than reducing the number of test locations, shovel test pits were positioned to acquire the best, unbiased sample. In some cases, such as observations of unusual artifact densities or soil stratigraphy, subsequent shovel test pits were excavated in all cardinal directions, if possible, to better discern the limits of these deposits. Test pits were hand-excavated and the soils recovered from these excavations were screened through 1/4-inch mesh.

If appropriate, field-culling was performed for certain artifact classes, specifically coal, brick, slag, and asphalt. Field-culling efforts entailed recordation of recovery and collection of a representative sample.

All collected artifacts were washed, marked, and packed for eventual curation in accordance with procedures developed by the Delaware State Museum (DESM). Artifacts and records will be curated at MT until directed otherwise.

Lithic artifacts were cataloged by raw material and function type. Appropriate physical attributes (e.g., flake scars, platform shape, retouching, surface treatments) of artifacts were also recorded. Historical artifacts were sorted and cataloged based on their material composition, such as ceramic, glass, architectural, and metal. Within these categories, subcategories were also identified based on numerous criteria including color, decoration, and function.

Numerous attributes were recorded for ceramic artifacts excavated. In order to facilitate sorting of tabulated frequencies, criteria for ceramic artifact classification systems were modeled based on the six-digit ware decoration classification and nomenclature system established by Miller (1993, 2000). In Miller's systems (1993, 2000), ware and decoration types are coded by unique three-digit even and odd numbers, respectively. The three-digit number before the decimal point refers to the ware type of the sherd, whereas the three-digit number placed after the decimal point indicates the noted decoration type. Code numbers are

clustered in generalized ware (e.g., porcelains, stonewares, earthenwares, yellow/buff firing wares, refined white firing wares, etc.) and decoration (e.g., underglazed, overglazed, decoration by manipulation of the clay, undecorated, etc.) groups. Written descriptions of the ceramic wares and decoration types, as well as their respective numeric codes, are provided in the data tables presented throughout this report. Whenever possible, the following attributes were recorded for each ceramic sherd: ware type, presence/absence of plastic decoration, presence/absence of applied decoration, pattern, color, form/function, attributed date range(s), and anatomical position of the sherd on the vessel. Glass artifacts were sorted in a similar manner. Whenever possible, the following attributes were recorded for each glass sherd: type (container, table, household, window, other), manufacturing process(es), color, form/function, attributed date range(s), and anatomical position of the sherd on the vessel. Other identifying attributes, such as maker's mark or evidence of alteration, were also recorded for ceramic and glass artifacts. When possible, cross-mending and vessel reconstruction of glass and ceramic artifacts were conducted. In addition, to the above-noted attributes, the following attributes were also recorded for ceramic and glass vessels identified in the assemblage: vessel number, sherd count, rim diameter/height, relevant dimensions, and percentage of extant vessel. This data was recorded with the intent to derive minimum vessel counts and ascertain vessel forms represented in the assemblages. Plotted distribution of artifacts was generated to better assess concentrations within the APE.