Peggy Weisnan Telephone convi ZI July 1983 An area which has been ignored 8×8×16 82 63¢



Maryland Department of Transportation

crocient 14 july 73 Lowell K. Bridwell Secretary

M. S. Cattrider Administrator

State Highway Administration

RE: I-97 (BATC 5)

F.A.P. No. I 97-1 (11)

Contract No. AA 572-201-572 Section E3 from North of

Maryland Route 450 to Hawkins Road

Mr. Tyler Bastian Maryland Geological Survey 711 West 40th Street Suite 440 Baltimore, Maryland 21211

Dear Mr. Bastian:

We require clarification and simplification of some aspects of the Phase II Archeological Report of 18 AN 500 in order to determine what additional work is required.

For one, the area of proposed mitigation (Figure 19), which, according to our current highway design maps, is accurate, excludes the "garden" or plow zone, main dumping area, and all concentrations of artifacts, as well as the cabin site. It is, therefore, unclear what the highway will be impacting, and why further mitigation is required. We are not convinced that the level of effort shown in the mitigation proposal is appropriate, given the area of impact and its apparent lack of resource potential.

In view of the low artifact density (Report, page 7) and the lack of associated structures (Report, page 16), it appears that the potential for research recovery is low, especially in the highway impact area. Therefore, it is unclear what the area's research potential is, and how it and the property as a whole relate to the goals of Maryland's State Preservation Plan as it is developed. Additional discussion is needed of: 1) the research questions to be addressed, 2) how these questions relate to Maryland's Perservation Plan, 3) the anticipated resources to be recovered in the impact area, and 4) the research value of the information in the impact area as it applies to the research questions and Maryland's Preservation Plan.

Our final questions revolve around the Phase III Work Proposal. Concurrently implementing documentary research, an oral history program, and excavation does not seem appropriate. A great deal already seems to be known about the layout of the

.. Tyler Bastian une 11, 1983 Page 2

property and the people who occupied it. Without further refining the research questions, it is not clear what useful information can be expected from resources in the impact area. The application to this area of the broad questions presented in the report and in J. Rodney Little's letter of May 2, 1983, seems tenuous, based on the results of the testing, research, and interviews performed to date. Again, additional discussion is needed of what we expect to learn via the proposed, additional work as it relates to the area of highway impact.

The level of positions desribed in the work plan is higher than anticipated. Further discussion is necessary of both the type of personnel and the amount of time proposed in the work plan.

We would appreciate a response, and a revised work plan, if appropriate, at the soonest opportunity, say August 2, 1983.

Very truly yours

Louis H. Ege,

Wm. F. Schneider, Jr., Chief Bureau of Project Planning

Jr.,

Environmental Management

higher crew sin

WFS:RMS:mcr

Mr. Frank Dutrow

Mr. Foster Hoffman

Ms. Rita M. Suffness

Lilas



Maryland Historical Trust

May 2, 1983

Mr. William F. Schneider, Jr. Environmental Management Maryland Dept. of Transportation State Highway Administration P.O. Box 717 707 N. Calvert Street Baltimore, Maryland 21203

Re: I-97 (BATC 5)
Contract No. AA937-201-572
F.A.P. No. I 97-1(11)
Archeological Investigations (Phase II)

Dear Mr. Schneider:

This office has reviewed the above-referenced report. The investigations conducted and the resulting report meet the standards for professional archeological work as outlined in the Guidelines for Archeological Investigations in Maryland. The research and testing was sufficient to assess the National Register eligibility of the archeological site, 18AN500, which will be directly affected by the project.

We concur with the conclusions presented in the report that 18AN500 is significant and potentially eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. We recommend that mitigation of the site be undertaken following the measures outlined in the report. Further historical documentary research, oral research, and field work is recommended if the site is to be impacted.

The Fischer site, 18AN500, represents a significant archeological resource which can yield information on the very poorly understood lifeways of the late 19th and early 20th century rural black populations in Maryland. 18AN500 was the residence of a low income rural black family in Anne Arundel County. Traditional historical sources provide little information on this group, thus making the archeological record almost the only source of information we have for these people. Clearly, a lack of written history does not negate the contributions of this population to Maryland's history and that of the nation at large.

Mr. William F. Schneider, Jr. May 2, 1983
Page 2

George McDaniel studied extant rural black dwellings in Maryland and contributed greatly to our knowledge of them. Although he identified over 300 extant rural black standing structures in Maryland, only 16 lie within Anne Arundel County. Studies like McDaniel's are necessary and informative; however, certain information can only be gained from the archeological record. Archeology can provide information on the material culture, spatial use of the surrounding yard area, activity patterns, and associated comparisons of socio-economic classes. The archeological information will complement and enhance the knowledge gained from studies of standing structures by providing invaluable information on the people who inhabited the buildings we still see around us. At this time, no systematic archeological investigations of 19th-20th century rural black dwellings in Maryland have been conducted.

The archeological record of cultural materials becomes skewed on existing sites by the later materials deposited there and the ground disturbances which inevitably take place. Generally, sites which were occupied and then abandoned have better integrity of archeological deposits than extant sites. The preliminary archeological investigations conducted at 18AN500 have demonstrated that the site's integrity is excellent. There has been no post-occupational plowing or other disturbances of the site since it was abandoned.

The memories of available oral informants will augment the information to be gained from further archeological investigations and historical research. While similar sites may be found in the future, sites with such good integrity and with available oral data will probably be unusual. Although the proposed impact as presently planned will avoid the immediate house and garden area, associated artifacts and possibly features will be destroyed. The testing identified patterns of domestic materials within the impact area. These associated artifacts and features are important to the understanding of the site and, more importantly, this poorly understood population group. Further study of 18AN500 will significantly contribute to our knowledge of late 19th-20th century rural blacks in Anne Arundel County and Maryland.

For the reasons detailed above, this office concludes that the Fischer site, 18AN500, meets the criteria for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. Mitigation in the area of impact is recommended to systematically recover data important to research on rural black populations in Maryland. Mitigation

Mr. William F. Schneider, Jr. May 2, 1983
Page 3

efforts should include additional documentary and oral research. Field testing should be limited to the area of impact with an appropriate sampling technique being employed.

If there are any questions regarding our recommendations, please feel free to contact Wayne Clark or Richard Hughes of my staff at 269-2438. Thank you for allowing us this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

J. Rodney Little, Director

State Historic Preservation Officer

JRL/RBH/mls

cc: Ms. Rita Suffness

Mr. Tyler Bastian

Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.

Ms. Kathy Laffey

Ms. Amy Schlagel

Mr. Anthony F. Christhilf

Mrs. Keren D. Dement

Mr. William F. Schneider etc. etc.

Mr. Schneider:

As per your request of 11 June 1983 we are providing clarification of some aspects of the Phase II ${\tt Ax}$ archeological report on 18 AN 500.

While the current plans call for avoidance of the actual cabin and the adjacent garden, it must be understood that an archeological site encompasses more than architectural features. The architectural features of this site are significant. However, this in no way lessens the significance of the non-architectural aspects of the occupation. Trash, in its varying forms, represents a significant document of past lifeways with a special dist? emphasis on socio-economic matters. Status, wealth, and use of disposable income can all be studied through that which is lost or discarded. Artifact density in the portion of the site that is proposed to be impacted by the constuction of the B.A.T.C. has been computed as roughly 40 artifacts per square meter. The proposed xx 60 one-meter squares should supply an artifact sample of nearly 2,400 items. Given the initial point-type sampling strategy, (pits of 15 cm diameter of 3 meter intervals) few artifacts were recovered. A greater sample of material is necessary to truly typify the area of the site for which impact is planned.

The impact area must be * stripped to search for subsurface features.

Again, as a function of the initial sampling staggy, g very little of the area has been exposed. With pits at 15cm in diameter representing 9 square meters of site area, only .19% of the impact zone has been sampled. The pat-potential for missing features smaller than 3 meters in diameter is enormous.

AS the current Maryland State XXXX Preservation Plan is still undergoing development it is difficult to place the proposed research within the Plan's present framework. One must look, therefore to the suggestions of the Federal Government. In <u>The Archeological Survey: Methods and Uses</u>, published by the U.S. Department of the Interior, the message is succinct:

"It must also be recognized that not all social groups have equal re representation in the written record. Published histories, in the past at least, have tended to emphasize the activities of societies dominant segments, and the generally higher literacy rate among the members of the upper class means they tend to be better represented in the documentary record as well. Often the only sources of data on less dominant social groups are oral, ie., the first-hand accounts of the decendants of such groups. A systematic program as to interview such people may be necessary to gain a full understanding of the areads social history and to identify possible sites of importance to the various segments of the community."

(King 1978:45-46)

Further definition of the significance of this site within the framework of a developing State Blan for Preservation is difficult given the plan's current status. One can, however, look back to the Maryland Historic Recentary Preservation Plan (1970) as it applies to standing structures. Among the "Determinants of Maryland"s Past, Today and Tommorow" is included the major theme "Black Heritage: the struggle for equality". Emphasis is placed on the preservation of standing structures linked to the struggle for equality: "Homes and outbuildings... ghettoes, stores, places of worship and meeting houses" (Raymond, May, Parish, and Plavnick 1970:29). While this plan focuses on the preservation of standing structures, the same thematic questions relate to archeological sites. 18 AN 500 represents what was the typical lot of many rural Blacks following Emancipation. As such it is a significant resource which needs to be preserved.

The use of a combined stratgy of oral history, documentary research, and excavation is the only appropriate manner to approach a site such as 18 AN 500. While we know a great deal about the house area at one point in time (ca.1915) we have little idea how this final appearance relates to the preceding activities at the site. The tenure of Black families in a given residence for the time under consideration appears to have been very short. Joseph L. Sutton in his eighty years as a resident of Talbot County lived in twenty-nine seperate houses (Krech 1981: xviii-xix). Hence, while we know something of the site in the second decade of the twentith century, the preceding thrity to forty years can only be delingated by further research with oral, documentary, and archeological data. This additional research may indicate significant features within the impact zone which were not extant at the time of Mr. Fischer's memories begin.

The level of the positions described in the work plan is necessary for a number of reasons. In the past, a ratio of two supervisors to three or four crew members has been maintained as the most efficient allocation of responsibilities. X With the increased crew size necessary in a Phase III study, a propotionate incease in supervisors is necessary. Rather than add an additional Archeologist, an Assistant Archeologist position has been created at a lesser pay rate. This will allow us to use someone with appropriated supervisory experience at a lesser cost while expanding crew size and maintaining quality control. The Assistant Archeologist will also be someone with sufficient experience in oral and documentary research to assistation these aspects of the study. This will effectively lessen the cost versus having all the oral and documentary research undertaken by one of the Archeologists.

It is hoped that this information clarifies the questions raised by your enquiry. Should you need additional information, feel free to contact

Department of Natural Resources MARYLAND GEOLOGICAL SURVEY Division of Archeology

March 1983

PROPOSAL FOR MITIGATION OF IMPACT AT ARCHEOLOGICAL SITE 15AN500

The Fischer Site (18AN500) is a post-bellum Black domestic site that was occupied until around 1920, abandoned, and apparently remained undisturbed since abandonment. In-depth studies (Hurry 1982) have documented a wide range of oral, documentary, and archeological data associated with the site. The site is considered a significant, rare, and exceptionally well-preserved example of rural Black housing and lifeways in Maryland during the late 19th/early 20th century.

Impact to the Fischer Site resulting from the planned construction of the BATC is herein proposed to be mitigated through retrieval of oral, documentary, and archeological data. The proposed (Phase III) mitigation studies are intended to reinforce and substantively augment the findings of the Phase II work (Hurry 1982). Time and cost proposals are presented in two phases: primary and contingency. The primary phase of work is designed to achieve all of the research objectives outlined below. The contingency phase has been added to cover unanticipated, but possible, occurrences (e.g., extensive archeological features in the impact zone, or productive leads resulting from the oral and/or documentary research that may necessitate additional historical research). The contigency phase will be implemented only after consultation with SHA.

Proposed documentary research will consist of in-depth study of records such as the federal census, birth and death records, land records and possibly church records. Primary goals of this research are to identify the occupants of 18AN500, determine its construction date, and identify possible oral history informants.

The proposed oral history program initiated during Phase II will continue with Mr. Fischer in an attempt to identify other possible informants and to garner details that may have been omitted during the original interviews. The bulk of this phase of the oral history program, however, will center on the interview of new informants identified through the document study or new information from Mr. Fischer. The oral research will be directed at the occupants of the site (who they were, how they lived, etc.) and at learning details of the house (especially the interior) and surrounding land use.

All archeological work will be confined to the impact zone. A 9% sample (consisting of about 60 one-meter squares randomly aligned) of the impact area will be excavated to recover an artifact inventory sufficient for objective analysis, the locating of features, and delineating functional areas. Subsequently, stripping of topsoil in areas deemed appropriate by the results of the one-meter square excavations will be undertaken to more fully examine identified features and to locate possible undetected features.

Artifact processing will follow standard archeological procedures employed by the Division of Archeology and analysis will integrate archeological, oral, and documentary data. The final report will synthesize all data collected and will incorporate the findings of the Phase I and II studies. It is estimated that the proposed study will take 72 calendar-working days at an expense of \$27,000. The contingency phase, if necessary, will take a maximum of 21 additional calendar-working days at an additional maximum expense of \$5,000.

Providing that the remainder of 18AN500 can be avoided during construction, the research proposed above should mitigate the potential impact resulting from highway construction and satisfy the SHA's obligations with respect to this historical resource.

TIME & COST PROPOSAL

DESCRIPTION OF PERSONNEL (per FY84-85 SHA-MGS proposal)*

Archeologist #1

- PI/administrator

\$14.05/hr.

Archeologist #2

- assistant to PI/field director

\$13.30/hr.

Assistant Archeologist

- chief field assistant/archival

researcher/collections manager - \$9.20/hr.

Field/Lab Crew

- \$8.50/hr.

*hourly rates quoted are maximums

LABOR COSTS

Oral History

Primary Research

Archeologist	#1	for	35.5	hr.	@ \$14.05	=	\$498.77
Archeologist	#2	for	35.5	hr.	@ \$13.30	=	472.15
			subto	tal			\$970.92

Contingency

Archeologist #2 for 35.5 hr. @ \$13.30	Ξ	\$472.15
Assistant Archeologist for 35.5 hr. @ \$9.20	=	326.60
subtotal		\$795.75

Documentary Research

Primary Research

Archeologist #2 for 35.5 hr. @ \$13.30	=	\$472.15
Assistant Archeologist for 35.5 hr. @ \$9.20	=	326.60
subtotal		\$798.75

Contigency

Archeologist #2 for 28.4 hr. @ \$13.30	=	\$377.72
Assistant Archeologist for 28.4 hr. @ \$9.20	=	261.25
subtotal		\$639.00

Field Research

Primary Research

	\$2,992.65
Archeologist #2 for 163.3 hr. @ \$13.30 =	2,171.89
Assistant Archeologist for 149.1 hr @ \$9.20 =	1,371.72
Field Assistants for 745.5 hr. @ \$8.50 =	6,336.75

149, (\ 7 45.5 7055 ann >5

\$12,873.01 subtotal

Contingency

Archeologist #1 for 63.9 hr. @ \$14.05	=	\$897.79
Archeologist #2 for 49.7 hr. @ \$13.30	=	661.01
Assistant Archeologist for 49.7 hr. @ \$9.20	=	457.24
Field Assistant for 248.5 hr @ \$8.50	=	2,112.25
subtotal		\$4,125.29

Laboratory Processing

Primary Research

Archeologist #1 for 85.2 hr. @ \$14.05	=	\$1,197.06
Archeologist #2 for 85.2 hr. @ \$13.30	=	1,133.16
	=	
Laboratory Assistants for 170.4 hr. @ \$8.50	=	1,445.40
subtotal		\$4,562.46

Contingency

Archeologist #1 for 21.3 hr. @ \$14.05	=	\$299.26
Archeologist #2 for 21.3 hr. @ \$13.30	=	253.29
Assistant Archeologist for 21.3 hr. @ \$9.20	=	195.96
Laboratory Assistants for 42.6 hr. @ \$8.50	=	362.10
subtotal		\$1.140.61

Artifact Analysis

Primary Research

Archeologist #1 for 71.0 hr. @ \$14.05	=	\$997.55
Archeologist #2 for 35.5 hr. @ \$13.30	=	472.15
Assistant Archeologist for 35.5 hr. @ \$9.20	=	326.60
Laboratory Assistants for 71.0 hr. @ \$8.50	=	603.50
subtotal	\$	2.399.80

No Contigency -

Report Preparation

Primary Research

Archeologist #1 for 106.5 hr. @ \$14.05 = \$1,496.32 Archeologist #2 for 106.5 hr. @ \$13.30 = 1,416.45 Assistant Archeologist for 35.5 hr. @ \$9.20 = 326.60 Typist for 106.5 hr. @ \$9.05 = 963.62 subtotal \$4,203.19

No Contingency

TOTAL LABOR COSTS

Primary Research

\$25,813.13

Contingency

\$6,706.65

· DIRECT COSTS

Oral History

Primary Research

300 miles at 19c/mile = \$57 6, l hour cassette tapes = 18subtotal \$75

Contingency

300 miles at 19¢/mile = \$57 6, 1 hour cassette tapes = 18subtotal \$75

Documentary Research

Primary Research

300 miles at 19c/mile = \$57 copying of documents = $\frac{23}{$80}$

Contingency.

300 miles at 19¢/mile = \$57 copying of documents = $\frac{23}{$60}$

Field Research

Primary Research

4,392 miles at 19¢/mile = \$834.48 Field supplies = 200.00

subtotal \$1,034.48

Contingency

1,344 miles at 19¢/mile = \$255.36 Field supplies = 50.00 subtotal \$305.36

Laboratory Processing

Primary Research

lab supplies = \$150.00

Contingency

lab supplies = 50.00

Report Preparation

Primary Research

graphic supplies = \$50.00xeroxing = $\frac{150.00}{$200.00}$

No Contingency

Total Primary budget (expenses & labor) \$27,352.61

Total Contingency budget (expenses & labor) \$7,217.01

TOTAL DIRECT COSTS

Primary Research \$1,539.48

Contingency \$510.36

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Primary Research \$27,352.61

Contingency \$7,217.01

Department of Natural Resources MARYLAND GEOLOGICAL SURVEY Division of Archeology

March 1983

PROPOSAL FOR MITIGATION OF IMPACT AT ARCHEOLOGICAL SITE 18AN500

The Fischer Site (18AN500) is a post-bellum Black domestic site that was occupied until around 1920, abandoned, and apparently remained undisturbed since abandonment. In-depth studies (Hurry 1982) have documented a wide range of oral, documentary, and archeological data associated with the site. The site is considered a significant, rare, and exceptionally well-preserved example of rural Black housing and lifeways in Maryland during the late 19th/early 20th century.

Impact to the Fischer Site resulting from the planned construction of the BATC is herein proposed to be mitigated through retrieval of oral, documentary, and archeological data. The proposed (Phase III) mitigation studies are intended to reinforce and substantively augment the findings of the Phase II work (Hurry 1982). Time and cost proposals are presented in two phases: primary and contingency. The primary phase of work is designed to achieve all of the research objectives outlined below. The contingency phase has been added to cover unanticipated, but possible, occurrences (e.g., extensive archeological features in the impact zone, or productive leads resulting from the oral and/or documentary research that may necessitate additional historical research). The contigency phase will be implemented only after consultation with SHA.

Proposed documentary research will consist of in-depth study of records such as the federal census, birth and death records, land records and possibly church records. Primary goals of this research are to identify the occupants of 18AN500, determine its construction date, and identify possible oral history informants.

The proposed oral history program initiated during Phase II will continue with Mr. Fischer in an attempt to identify other possible informants and to garner details that may have been omitted during the original interviews. The bulk of this phase of the oral history program, however, will center on the interview of new informants identified through the document study or new information from Mr. Fischer. The oral research will be directed at the occupants of the site (who they were, how they lived, etc.) and at learning details of the house (especially the interior) and surrounding land use.

All archeological work will be confined to the impact zone. A 9% sample (consisting of about 60 one-meter squares randomly aligned) of the impact area will be excavated to recover an artifact inventory sufficient for objective analysis, the locating of features, and delineating functional areas. Subsequently, stripping of topsoil in areas deemed appropriate by the results of the one-meter square excavations will be undertaken to more fully examine identified features and to locate possible undetected features.

Artifact processing will follow standard archeological procedures employed by the Division of Archeology and analysis will integrate archeological, oral, and documentary data. The final report will synthesize all data collected and will incorporate the findings of the Phase I and II studies. It is estimated that the proposed study will take 72 calendar-working days at an expense of \$27,000. The contingency phase, if necessary, will take a maximum of 21 additional calendar-working days at an additional maximum expense of \$8,000.

Providing that the remainder of 18AN500 can be avoided during construction, the research proposed above should mitigate the potential impact resulting from highway construction and satisfy the SHA's obligations with respect to this historical resource.

TIME & COST PROPOSAL

DESCRIPTION OF PERSONNEL (per FY84-85 SHA-MGS proposal)*

Archeologist #1

- PI/administrator

\$14.05/hr.

Archeologist #2

- assistant to PI/field director

\$13.30/hr.

Assistant Archeologist

- chief field assistant/archival

researcher/collections manager - \$9.20/hr.

Field/Lab Crew

- \$8.50/hr.

*hourly rates quoted are maximums

LABOR COSTS

Oral History

Primary Research

Archeologist #1 for 35.5 hr. @ \$14.05 \$498.77 Archeologist #2 for 35.5 hr. @ \$13.30 472.15 subtotal \$970.92

Contingency

 Archeologist #2 for 35.5 hr. @ \$13.30
 \$472.15

 Assistant Archeologist for 35.5 hr. @ \$9.20
 326.60

 subtotal
 \$798.75

Documentary Research

Primary Research

Archeologist #2 for 35.5 hr. @ \$13.30 \$472.15 Assistant Archeologist for 35.5 hr. @ \$9.20 326.60 subtotal \$798.75

Contigency

Archeologist #2 for 28.4 hr. @ \$13.30 \$377.72
Assistant Archeologist for 28.4 hr. @ \$9.20 261.28
subtotal \$639.00

Field Research

Primary Research

Archeologist #1 for 213 hr. @ \$14.05	\$2,992.65
Archeologist #2 for 163.3 hr. @ \$13.30	2,171.89
Assistant Archeologist for 149.1 hr @ \$9.20	1,371.72
Field Assistants for 745.5 hr. @ \$8.50	6,336.75
subtotal	\$12.873.01

Contingency

Archeologist #1 for 63.9 hr. @ \$14.05	 \$897.79
Archeologist #2 for 49.7 hr. @ \$13.30	 661.01
Assistant Archeologist for 49.7 hr. @ \$9.20	 457.24
Field Assistant for 248.5 hr @ \$8.50	2,112.25
subtotal	\$4,128.29

Laboratory Processing

Primary Research

Archeologist #1 for 85.2 hr. @ \$14.05		\$1,197.06
Archeologist #2 for 85.2 hr. @ \$13.30		1,133.16
Assistant Archeologist for 85.2 hr. @ \$9.20		783.84
Laboratory Assistants for 170.4 hr. @ \$8.50	-	1,448.40
subtotal		\$4.562.46

Contingency

Archeologist #1 for 21.3 hr. @ \$14.05	\$299.26
Archeologist #2 for 21.3 hr. @ \$13.30	283.29
Assistant Archeologist for 21.3 hr. @ \$9.20	195.96
Laboratory Assistants for 42.6 hr. @ \$8.50	362.10
subtotal	\$1.140.61

Artifact Analysis

Primary Research

Archeologist #1 for 71.0 hr. @ \$14.05	\$997.55
Archeologist #2 for 35.5 hr. @ \$13.30	472.15
Assistant Archeologist for 35.5 hr. @ \$9.20	326.60
Laboratory Assistants for 71.0 hr. @ \$8.50	603.50
subtotal	\$2,399.80

No Contigency

Report Preparation

Primary Research

Archeologist #1 for 106.5 hr. @ \$14.05	\$1,496.32
Archeologist #2 for 106.5 hr. @ \$13.30	1,416.45
Assistant Archeologist for 35.5 hr. @ \$9.20	326.60
Typist for 106.5 hr. @ \$9.05	963.82
subtotal	\$4,203.19

No Contingency

TOTAL LABOR COSTS

Primary Research

\$25,813.13

Contingency

\$6,706.65

DIRECT COSTS

Oral History

Primary Research

300 miles	at 19¢/r	nile	\$57
6, 1 hour	cassette	tapes	18
	•	subtotal	\$75

Contingency

300 miles at 19¢/mile		\$57
6, 1 hour cassette tapes	• •	<u>18</u>
subtotal		\$75

Documentary Research

Primary Research

300 miles at 19¢/mile	•	\$57
copying of documents		_23
subtotal		\$80

Contingency

300 miles at 19¢/mile	\$57
copying of documents	_23
subtotal	\$80

Field	Research

Primary Research

4,392 miles at 19¢/mile \$834.48 Field supplies 200.00

subtotal \$1,034.48

Contingency

 1,344 miles at 19¢/mile
 \$255.36

 Field supplies
 50.00

 subtotal
 \$305.36

Laboratory Processing

Primary Research

lab supplies \$150.00

Contingency

lab supplies 50.00

Report Preparation

Primary Research

 graphic supplies
 \$ 50.00

 xeroxing
 150.00

 total
 \$200.00

No Contingency

Total Primary budget (expenses & labor) \$27,352.61

Total Contingency budget (expenses & labor) \$7,217.01

TOTAL DIRECT COSTS

Primary Research \$1,539.48

Contingency \$510.36

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Primary Research \$27,352.61

Contingency \$7,217.01

Department of Natural Resources MARYLAND GEOLOGICAL SURVEY Division of Archeology

March 1983

PROPOSAL FOR MITIGATION OF IMPACT AT ARCHEOLOGICAL SITE 18AN500

The Fischer Site (18AN500) is a post-bellum Black domestic site that was occupied until around 1920, abandoned, and apparently remained undisturbed since abandonment. In-depth studies (Hurry 1982) have documented a wide range of oral, documentary, and archeological data associated with the site. The site is considered a significant, rare, and exceptionally well-preserved example of rural Black housing and lifeways in Maryland during the late 19th/early 20th century.

Impact to the Fischer Site resulting from the planned construction of the BATC is herein proposed to be mitigated through retrieval of oral, documentary, and archeological data. The proposed (Phase III) mitigation studies are intended to reinforce and substantively augment the findings of the Phase II work (Hurry 1982). Time and cost proposals are presented in two phases: primary and contingency. The primary phase of work is designed to achieve all of the research objectives outlined below. The contingency phase has been added to cover unanticipated, but possible, occurrences (e.g., extensive archeological features in the impact zone, or productive leads resulting from the oral and/or documentary research that may necessitate additional historical research). The contigency phase will be implemented only after consultation with SHA.

Proposed documentary research will consist of in-depth study of records such as the federal census, birth and death records, land records and possibly church records. Primary goals of this research are to identify the occupants of 18AN500, determine its construction date, and identify possible oral history informants.

The proposed oral history program initiated during Phase II will continue with Mr. Fischer in an attempt to identify other possible informants and to garner details that may have been omitted during the original interviews. The bulk of this phase of the oral history program, however, will center on the interview of new informants identified through the document study or new information from Mr. Fischer. The oral research will be directed at the occupants of the site (who they were, how they lived, etc.) and at learning details of the house (especially the interior) and surrounding land use.

All archeological work will be confined to the impact zone. A 9% sample (consisting of about 60 one-meter squares randomly aligned) of the impact area will be excavated to recover an artifact inventory sufficient for objective analysis, the locating of features, and delineating functional areas. Subsequently, stripping of topsoil in areas deemed appropriate by the results of the one-meter square excavations will be undertaken to more fully examine identified features and to locate possible undetected features.

Artifact processing will follow standard archeological procedures employed by the Division of Archeology and analysis will integrate archeological, oral, and documentary data. The final report will synthesize all data collected and will incorporate the findings of the Phase I and II studies. It is estimated that the proposed study will take 72 calendar-working days at an expense of \$27,000. The contingency phase, if necessary, will take a maximum of 21 additional calendar-working days at an additional maximum expense of \$8,000.

Providing that the remainder of 18AN500 can be avoided during construction, the research proposed above should mitigate the potential impact resulting from highway construction and satisfy the SHA's obligations with respect to this historical resource.

TIME & COST PROPOSAL

DESCRIPTION OF PERSONNEL (per FY84-85 SHA-MGS proposal)*

Archeologist #1

- PI/administrator \$14.05/hr.

Archeologist #2

- assistant to PI/field director

\$13.30/hr.

Assistant Archeologist

- chief field assistant/archival

researcher/collections manager - \$9.20/hr.

Field/Lab Crew

- \$8.50/hr.

*hourly rates quoted are maximums

LABOR COSTS

Oral History

Primary Research

Contingency

Archeologist #2 for 35.5 hr. @ \$13.30 \$472.15
Assistant Archeologist for 35.5 hr. @ \$9.20 326.60

subtotal \$798.75

Documentary Research

Primary Research

Archeologist #2 for 35.5 hr. @ \$13.30 \$472.15 Assistant Archeologist for 35.5 hr. @ \$9.20 326.60 subtotal \$798.75

Contigency

Archeologist #2 for 28.4 hr. @ \$13.30 \$377.72
Assistant Archeologist for 28.4 hr. @ \$9.20 261.28
subtotal \$639.00

Field Research

Primary Research

Archeologist #1 for 213 hr. @ \$14.05	\$2,992.65
Archeologist #2 for 163.3 hr. @ \$13.30	2,171.89
Assistant Archeologist for 149.1 hr @ \$9.20	1,371.72
Field Assistants for 745.5 hr. @ \$8.50	6,336.75
subtotal	\$12,873,01

Contingency

Archeologist #1 for 63.9 hr. @ \$14.05	sa in the second	\$897.79
Archeologist #2 for 49.7 hr. @ \$13.30	·	661.01
Assistant Archeologist for 49.7 hr. @ \$9.20	\$.74 ± 6	457.24
Field Assistant for 248.5 hr @ \$8.50		2,112.25
subtotal	SCOLL SE	\$4.128.29

Laboratory Processing

Primary Research

Archeologist #1 for 85.2 hr. @ \$14.05	\$1,197.06
Archeologist #2 for 85.2 hr. @ \$13.30	1,133.16
Assistant Archeologist for 85.2 hr. @ \$9.20	783.84
Laboratory Assistants for 170.4 hr. @ \$8.50	1,448.40
subtotal	\$4,562.46

Contingency

Archeologist #1 for 21.3 hr. @ \$14.05	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	\$299.26
Archeologist #2 for 21.3 hr. @ \$13.30	1	283.29
Assistant Archeologist for 21.3 hr. @ \$9.20		195.96
Laboratory Assistants for 42.6 hr. @ \$8.50	一、京学艺	362.10
subtotal	\$ ⁷⁷ \$\frac{15}{2}\$	\$1.140.61

Artifact Analysis

Primary Research

Archeologist #1 for 71.0 hr. @ \$14.05	120	\$997.55
Archeologist #2 for 35.5 hr. @ \$13.30		472.15
Assistant Archeologist for 35.5 hr. @ \$9.20		326.60
Laboratory Assistants for 71.0 hr. @ \$8.50		603.50
subtotal	\$	2,399.80

No Contigency

Report Preparation

Primary Research

Archeologist #1 for 106.5 hr. @ \$14.05 Archeologist #2 for 106.5 hr. @ \$13.30 Assistant Archeologist for 35.5 hr. @ \$9.20 Typist for 106.5 hr. @ \$9.05		\$1,496.32 1,416.45 326.60 963.82
subtotal	•	\$4,203.19

No Contingency

TOTAL LABOR COSTS

Primary Research

\$25,813.13

Contingency

\$6,706.65

DIRECT COSTS

Oral History

Primary Research

300 miles at 19¢/mile	·. ·	\$57
6, 1 hour cassette tapes	-	18
subtotal		\$75

Contingency

at 19c/mile cassette tapes	\$57 <u>18</u>
subtotal	\$75

Documentary Research

Primary Research

300 miles at 19¢/mile copying of documents	\$57 23
subtotal	\$80

Contingency

300 miles at 19¢/mile		\$5 7
copying of documents	1.023	23
subtotal	•	\$80

Primary Research

4.392 miles at 19c/mile

Field supplies

subtotal

\$834.48

200.00

\$1,034.48

Contingency

1,344 miles at 19¢/mile

Field supplies

subtotal .

\$255.36

50.00

\$305.36

Laboratory Processing

Primary Research

lab supplies

\$150.00

Contingency

lab supplies

50.00

Report Preparation

Primary Research

graphic supplies

xeroxing

\$ 50.00 150.00

total

\$200.00

No Contingency

Total Primary budget (expenses & labor)

\$27,352.61

Total Contingency budget (expenses & labor)

\$7,217.01

TOTAL DIRECT COSTS

Primary Research

\$1,539.48

Contingency

\$510.36

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Primary Research

\$27,352.61

Contingency

\$7,217.01

DNR MGS DA Marin 1983

PEOPOSAL FOR MITI GATION OF IMPACT AT ARCHEOL SITE 18AN511

Du Fischer Site (18AN 500) is a post-bellen Block domestic site, occupied until around 1920, abandonal, and apparently, undisherbed since abandonment.

In depth studies (there 1982) have documented I wide rung oral, decumentary, and archeological deta associated with the site. The site is considered dignificant, core, and expertending mell-marined example of rural black housing and lifeways in Maryland during the late 1884 (259, 2012 century.

Impact to the Fisher site resulting from the planned son struction of the ATT is herein proposed to be mitissed through retrieve of oral, documentary, and ardirological data. The proposed, untigetion studies are intended to reinforce and substantively augment the friedings of the Phose II work (throng 1982). Time and cost proposels are presented in two phoses: primary and contingency. The primary phase of work is designed to Dehirve all of the research objectives autlined below. The continguing plass has been added to cover un anticipated, but possible, occurrences (eg., extensive 2-dieological festives in the impact some or productive lads resulting from the oral for documentary 1858d in Hut may necessiste Idditional postorical research). The contigues phase will be implemented only after consultation with

()

Proposed Joannesty research will consist

of in-depth study of records such as people of

the federal Ecusus, birth & deeth records, and edited

Prithan goods of this research are to identify

the occupents of 18AN 500, determine its construction

date, and identify possible oral history informents.

In proposed oral history program, nitabled during Phose II will continue with Mr fischer in an attempt to identity ofer possible informante and to garner detests that may have been mitted during the rizonal interviews. The back offis phose of the oral history program, however, will center on the interview of new informacts identified for new information from Mr fischer. The oral research will be directed at the occupants of the site (who they were, how they lived, etc) and at learning letists of the house (especially the interior) and surrounding landuse.

All orders of col work will be infined to
The impact zone. A 90% sample (consisting of about
60 one-meter squares randomly digned) of the
impact area will be excovabled to recover an
orthost intentry sufficient for objective analysis, the
locating features, and delineating functioned
areas. Subsequently, stripping of topsoil in
areas deemed appropriate by the results of the

one-meter square execuctions, will be undertaken to more fully examine identified featheres and to looste possible undetailed featheres. undetected

Arphost processing will follow standard dreduralogical procedures Employed by the DNI sim of Archeology and analysis will integrate archeological, oral, and documentary data. The final report will synthesize all data collected and will incorporate the findings of the Plase I and II studies. It is estimated that the proposed study will take 12 extender-working days at an expense of \$27,000. The contriguing phase, if necessary, will take a maximum of 21 additional culendari days at an additional maximum grand of to 6,000.

Can be avoided during construction, The research proposed above should mitigate the potential impact of resulting from highway construction and satisfy the 3HA's obligations with respect to this bestorical resource.



TIME & COS	57 PROPOSAL NO
	of Personnel SHA-MGS proposel) * 29
	PI / 2dministrator \$14.05/hr
rchrolog3+ #2 -	255t to PI/ field director \$13.30/hr

Assistant Archeologist - chief field asst/archival
researcher/coll ruge - \$9.20/hr
colbections

Field/Lob Crew -\$8.50/hr

* hourly rates quoted are maximums

Of History Alphring

Oral History

Crimary Research

Archeologist #1 for 35.5hs 614.55-4488.77

Arch 0 + #2 5 - 25 51 Contragency Archeologist #2 for 35.5hr 13.30-472.15

subtotal

Contingency

Archeologist #2 for 35.5hr 13.30-*472.15 # 326-60 Assistant Archoologist for 35.54 - 9.20 = ¥718.75 subtotal Documentary Research >>
Primary Research
Ardeologist#2 for 35.54, 13.30 - \$472.15 Assistant Archeologist for 35h 1089,20 = \$326.60 sub total \$798.75 Archaeologit #2 for 28.4hr 13.30= \$ 377.72 526138 Assistant Archologist for 28.44 9.80 # 639.00 sub total Field Research

Princip Research

Archaeologist #1 for 2134-0+14.05=+2992.65 cotory Archeo logist #2 for 163.34-07/3.30-42/7/.89 Assitut Archeologist for 149, 14, 00 9, 20= 1371.72 Field Assistant for 745,5 hr \$ 98.50 - 6336. 75 subtotal \$12,875.01 Ardeologist # 1 For 63.94-614.05 = \$897.79 \$661.01 Archeologist # 2for 49,74 r 13,30 =

Assistant Archologist for 49.7hr x49,20 = \$ 457.29 *2112.25 *4128.29 Field Assistant for 248.5hrx \$8.50 = sub total Laboratory Processing

Primary Rosearch

Archeologist #1 for 85.24-0\$/\$.85=*/197.06 Co-tingency Archeologist#2 for 85.2 hr 13.30=\$/133.16 Assistant Archaelogist for 85.24- \$7.20-\$783.84 Laboratory Assistants for 170.4 hr \$ \$ 8.50-91448,40 subtotal \$ 4562.46 Contingancy A rcheologist # 1 for 21.3 hr \$ 14.05 = ¥299.26 7883 29 Archeolgist #2 for 21.3hr @ 13.30= F 197.80 Assistant Archeologist for 21.34. 1.20 = 362.10 Baiboratory Assistants for 42.64, \$50 = \$ 1142,45 subtotal Prenary meserch.

Archeologist #1 for 71.0 h; \$ 14.05 \$ 997.55 Archeologist #2 for 35.52 - \$ \$13.80=\$ 472.15 Assistant Archeologist for 35,5 h r @ \$ 9,20 = \$326.60 Laboratory Assituats for 71.01-058,50 = \$ 603.50 subtotal # 2404.80

ho catigory

Pirect Costs Oral History Breimany Beskarch # 57 # 18 # 73 300 miles at \$19/mi -6, I have corrette tapes sub total Contingency? \$ 5.5 300 miles at # . 19/mi = +18 6, I hour cossettes tapes -\$ 75 Documenting Research From Research - 300 miles et 19/m; # 57 Contraction # 23 # 80 copying of documents Collangency \$ 23 300 miles et. F. 19/m; capying of documents \$80 Field Passauch Privary Research. 8 3 4. 48 4,3 92 mlesse @ 19\$_ freld Equippedates 200,66 sub total 1034.58

diport port breakdown 1 Controlly 79.80 Contangency ! 1. Contangener 173.56 1,3 4 4 miles @ 119\$ 255, 36 field supplies B 3 0 5 , 3 6 Princey Rosensk Pring #1500 # Cont rages lab supplies lab supplies - \$50.00 Primary Rosearch-graphie suppulses # 50.00 # 50.00 # 3 00.00 Leroking no contingency Total Pomary Boodget (expenses + lubr) \$27,352,61 To tot Continging budget (exenses i labor)

Ardeologist # 1 for 106,5 hr 14.05 = \$1496.32 Ardeologist # 2 for 106.5 hr 13,30 = \$1416.45 Assistant Ardeologist for 35.5 hr \$7,20 = \$326.60 Typist for 166.5 hr \$7,05 = 963.82 sub total \$4263.19 To costingency

Princip Rosearch #1539.48 Contingary \$510.36 Total Project Conta Primary Rasearch \$27352.60 Contingancy 72/8,85

mitigate import Suggest - proposi-Coungr = Asst Archeol Proposal for Mitigation 18 AN500 Introduction This ste paper things anthines a proposal Er mitigation archeology at 184N500. 18AN500 is a past-bellum Black resid domesti site with marich oral and documentary configurate (Hurry, 1983). To preserve the record of occupation at this site a investigation of the areas offin pact has been suggested. This proposal will and approximate costs. As the quality and nature of the resource present were not clear, the proposal is written with both pre luminary and follow-up provisions. Follow-up provisions will not be pursued without consultation with the State Highway Administration. Oral Research (for?)

(when propose five days with an archeologist#2

Isomorphisms to nature, and accessibility of the oral record. Oral research is very time - consuming, and if fruitful leads are discovered, additional time will be needed. For the additional research we propose five days with as archeologist #2 and five days with a collection manager far chivest the assistant ar cheologist

Research with late 19th and early 20th century documents presents a wide range of problems. Later documents such as these are often not get indexed or ore accesible only with special por mission. The very proliferation of documents through tene creates problems, as one has more to look at in such latter research. We propose a week each for as or cheologist # 2 and a Collections Monager Michina to do preliminary research and determine the potential of additional research. Should such research be needed, we suggest four draps for on or cheal agest #2 on d a Callections Manager Hickurs Field Research

the thrust of the proposed field

research at 18 AN 500 sto mitigate

by cultural sesoned. I for different

accomplish the we on a good of problems

simple of site against the proposed

of relighty 50% of the impaired

site ma. These the steps will powrible

site ma. These the steps will powrible

some of the steps will be steps will powrible

some of the steps will be steps wil somple of the artifactual materials we suggest and 1055; bly aid in locating subsulface feature

The thrust of the proposed field research at 18 AN 500 is to nitigate the impact of the proposed east ruction upon the cultural resources within the proposed in pact. Zone. In order to accomplish this we suggest a preliminary sample of approximately I 70 of the proposed impacted site area. We suggest a stratified, non laligned ramod sample to best typify the area. This will provide us with a stratigraphically controlled, sample af artifacts and possibly aid in locating subsurface features. Following the sampling, roughly 50% of the proposed impacted site area should be stripped to expose cultural features

a stratified nonfalling of randon sandle to best typisty the valed. Based on the test be stripped will be based on the test Equare findings. In addition to this or cavation, clearing of the indertorush and surveying will bove to be under taken. We suggest that the proposed field work will require the anchoologist I for thirty dungs, and an archaelogist 2 for threnty-sever days acim for 21 sure ying numbers of field assistants for a total of one hundred and Hive days. Should the excavations expose features, a follow-up phase requiring a archeologist I for nine days and and, on or cheologist 2 for seven days, and field assistants for a total of thing five large is proposed. Based on preliminary testing, the frequency of features should be quite low, suggesting that this follow-up phase will not bove to be implemented.

Projections based on shovel test pit fordings suggest relatively low artifact densities. To process the material, we propose an ardeologist 1 for twelve days, or orcheologist 2 for twelve days, an Collection Manager field assistants for twelve days each. Should features be discovered with additional naterial, a follow up phase with three additional days for each of the above mentioned pospitrois is peroposed.

Artifact Analysis

To analysis the material and correlate
it with the artifacts reconsered in the
Phase II investigations, we suggest two
weeks ext for archeologist I, and week
end for archoologist 2 and two field assistants.
No follow up phase is suggested
for this portion of the research

Report Production

We suggest 15 days each for an archeologist

I and an archeologist 2 to write the

report. An additional week ofor the

Collection's Margager is proposed to prepare

graphics for the report. Finally, fifteen

days for a secretary will be recessory

to type drafts, bills, and the final report.

547.15 8 53.90 13 268.69 64.32.02

#25,754.\$3 7,823.14

#33,577.67