

Archaeological Significance in Cities:
Developing Contexts and Criteria for Decision-Making

by
Pamela J. Cressey
City Archaeologist
City of Alexandria, Virginia

and

Susan L. Henry
Preservation Planner
Fairfax County, Virginia

Alexandria Archaeology
Office of Historic Alexandria
City of Alexandria, Virginia



Copyright 1989

This paper was originally presented in the Symposium,
Assessing Significance in the Urban Environment
Annual Meeting of the Society for historical Archaeology
Baltimore, Maryland
January 7, 1989

Preface By Pam Cressey

I want to acknowledge the individuals that have contributed to our preservation efforts and, in turn, this paper. Beginning with our first preservation activities in 1978, Terry Klein and Sue Henry developed the concepts and framework for all subsequent work. Ellis Coleman added to this effort with important survey data. John Stephens developed the historical methods for the survey and continued with the NEH survey project. His methods and data are the basis of the Alexandria Historic Street Directory. John also completed our management plan, which Terry and Sue initially conceived. Steve Shephard with Don Creveling developed our Preservation Tracking System and assessment procedure. Don created the SITES data base for this information. Steve also wrote much of the Archaeology Preservation Guidelines. Peter Matthews is producing an excellent compendium of knowledge for our Street Directory and Archaeology Atlas. Our current preservation archaeologist, Keith Barr, is now creating Alexandria Archaeology Areas and a revised set of guidelines. He also provided comments for this paper. Lastly, I want to state the important role that the Alexandria Archaeological Commission has played in developing draft legislation and grappling with this issue of significance.

SIGNIFICANCE

What is this concept of significance that causes us so much confusion and frustration? The most common interpretation of the concept of significance is that used for National Register listing:

"The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects of State and local importance that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and

- (a) That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- (b) That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- (c) That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- (d) That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history." (36 CFR 60.6)

As archaeologists, we are concerned most with criterion "d", where the word "important" is the key -- how do we recognize importance (Aten 1988)?

For more than one hundred years before the National Register criteria were made a part of the Code of Federal Regulations, "importance" was understood intuitively by archaeologists and historic building preservationists alike. Patriotic values, the homes of great men, civic pride, and the study of vanishing Indian lifeways were important preservation endeavors (Hosmer 1965:260; King et al 1977:15). With the passing of the Antiquities Act in 1906, the concept of importance was phrased in terms of "historic or scientific interest." The Historic Sites Act of 1935 elaborated a little by

referring to "national significance," properties of "exceptional value as commemorating or illustrating the history of the United States," "properties of national historical or archaeological significance," and "places and events of historical or archaeological significance" (see King et al 1977:202). In neither the 1906 Act or the 1935 Act was the concept of importance defined — practitioners were still doing that intuitively.

Shortly after the National Trust for Historic Preservation was chartered in 1949, it established a study committee to develop criteria for evaluating the importance of sites and buildings (King et al 1977:25). These criteria included characteristics of "historic values combined with a 'preponderance of original material'" (Hosmer 1965:261). Here were the beginnings of the concept of integrity as a necessary component of significance.

With the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act in 1966, a nationwide preservation framework was created, and the National Register was established to "list districts, sites, structures, buildings, and objects of importance in American history, architecture, archeology, and culture" (King et al 1977:31). The focus had shifted from the homes of great men and rich archaeological sites to representative examples of "the nation's social and historical diversity" (King et al 1977:56).

It was not, however, until after the Act's implementing regulations (and the significance criteria) were adopted, the National Environmental Policy Act was passed in 1969, and Executive Order 11593 was signed in 1972, that archaeologists really began trying to apply the National Register criteria in earnest. The concept of significance became an operational, a methodological issue (Aten 1988), as Federal agencies and State governments were required to take National Register properties

into consideration during planning and development. The National Register, and its concept of significance, became a tool in the preservation management process, providing criteria for decision-making (King et al 1977:96; Barnes et al 1980:553; King 1984:75). The National Register criteria of significance had become "measures of utility" — is the property useful for research, for improving the quality of the environment (King et al 1977:96)? The original concept of significance, as an intuitive recognition of importance and value, had been transformed into a management tool, which some continue to feel is bureaucratic, cumbersome, and frustrating (see King 1984:76; Schiffer and Gumerman 1977:239). There have been numerous discussions in the literature about how to apply the National Register criteria of significance (see, for example, Glassow 1977, Raab and Klinger 1977, Barnes et al 1980), and the National Park Service and the Advisory Council have published numerous guidelines to assist us. Some archaeologists have even proposed different kinds of significance, such as scientific, ethnic, and monetary (Schiffer and Gumerman 1977:239-290; Raab and Klinger 1977).

Despite its drawbacks, the Federal interpretation of significance drives most of archaeological resource management. One of its positive contributions is that it has forced us to critically evaluate why we feel something is important, and to do it within a relevant frame of reference. This frame of reference lies in a State or local preservation plan's historic contexts (Federal Register 1983:44724-44725), which are discussions of whose history is important. Archaeologists have tended to interpret significance in terms of research value — it is our history as a scientific data base that is important. The importance of a community's history, as perceived by the community itself, rarely figures in archaeological significance evaluations. This occurs even though community benefit is stated as the purpose of Federal preservation laws, and professional ethical standard

include responsibilities to the public. The importance of archaeological sites for public enjoyment and education seems to be component of significance evaluation only in local archaeology programs. For example, the Fairfax County (Virginia) Heritage Resource Management Plan (Henry 1988:II-5-II-6) incorporates the concept of "public significance" right up there with the standard National Register interpretation. Criteria for Fairfax County's public significance include values of community heritage, community identity and pride, and public education, and recognition of these values is dependent upon information provided by the community itself. For the community, "importance" is an emotional, an intuitive issue, not bound up in procedures and regulations. It is incumbent upon us, especially those of us who work closely with the public, to frame our interpretation of significance within the context of community concerns as well as professional goals.

URBAN AND ALEXANDRIA CONTEXTS

By assigning significance to an archaeological resource, we are declaring that it has meaning, importance and consequence. We are signifying—stating publicly—that we believe this resource (or property) has the characteristics which express something valuable about human existence. This is an act of distinction. We are distinguishing this resource from others without such consequence. We are also stating that we will take action to preserve this significant resource. Conversely, we are choosing to let other resources go. We assume that some archaeological resources are not highly expressive and meaningful, and thus, do not need to be preserved.

We create this distinction based upon current government standards, contemporary research directions and methods, practical concerns (time and money) and our own gut instinct. As Joseph

Tainter has stated: "The importance or significance of a site is not inherent, but is assigned in the context of consensual research" (1987:222). Significance changes over the years as we reach new consensus leading to new distinctions, which separate highly expressive resources from all the rest.

It is important for us to remember that this is a creative process conducted not only within the "historic context" of the resource, but also within our own profession's historic context.

Federal criteria of significance can be listed: integrity of location or materials; association with significant events or people; embodiment of types, periods or methods; yielding (or likely to yield) information important to prehistory or history. Yet, most of these criteria contain within themselves the need to evaluate the importance of the person, event, information, etc.

The current method of evaluating significance develops historic contexts for a study area and then sets forth "a reasoned argument" which documents that a property has characteristics that "qualify it as part of the context" (National Register Bulletin 24:45). It may be possible to present facts in a logical way, but the selection of facts and the ultimate decision-making process still remains subjective. Our best bet is to reach professional consensus, rather than to evaluate in idiosyncratic ways. This can be done while still being mindful of variations between communities which yield special resource types and new approaches.

Our job as urban and community archaeologists is to:

1. Define the **broad contexts** of urban and community history by clarifying the urban phenomena we study. In short, generate research frameworks.
2. Define the **property and resource types** which can and do exist within these contexts.
3. Build **comparative urban frameworks and standards** for evaluation, which can be included in state and local plans.
4. Define the **historic contexts of specific cities** with regional research designs which recognize the wide ranging effects that cities have within their spheres.
5. Identify and locate **resources within cities**, which relate to both broad and specific historic contexts and express the character of each place.
6. Produce events and materials to **promote the significance of urban archaeology**.
7. **Re-evaluate** our methods, frameworks and ideas from time to time, and produce **comparative studies** to renew our notion of significance.

This session on urban significance is one step toward setting standards and establishing some professional consensus. We have come together because daily we all face the choice between action and inaction on many sites. This is essentially the choice between life and death of our

archaeological heritage. It is significant that we understand archaeological significance: We manage public money, and often public land; We are working at a time when urban resources are revealed, studied, and threatened at a staggering pace. We thus have both the means and the opportunity to declare what is significant and to act accordingly.

We have the responsibility, and are actually at cause in this matter. I believe that my responsibility in Alexandria is not merely an obligation, but a privilege. We are continually grappling with both our assumptions and methods in choosing to act or not to act. Our intent is to make wise choices which benefit the citizens, visitors and researches over the years.

In Alexandria, we have established a Preservation Tracking System through which all development projects (about 200 annually) requiring approval by the Planning Commission are processed and evaluated. This process occurs voluntarily, and there is no legislation requiring compliance at this time. City projects are also examined in this manner. To evaluate the importance of archaeological materials in a project area we have established criteria which relate to four central questions. These questions are oriented toward the **results** of our preservation actions in determining significance, rather than purely an evaluation of the resources' characteristics. We ask: Will our steps to preserve the archaeological heritage in this place;

Expand professional knowledge?

Increase public awareness and information?

Produce public support for archaeology in general?

or

Demonstrate good faith to the community?

In other words, will our action be significant in preserving, enhancing and understanding history? Affirmative answers lead to preservation actions.

To answer these questions we evaluate an area's resources when development is planned along six continua: **research value** (ability to answer questions related to major themes and time periods), **rarity**, **public value**, previous disturbance and damage to the resources (**integrity**), **presence of materials**, effect on the resource by **proposed impact** (Archaeology Preservation Guidelines, City of Alexandria: 6-8). We examine a specific set of primary and secondary sources and inspect the site. Information is placed on standardized forms for easy retrieval (Appendix 1 and 2). A computer data base for some of the information provides quick access.

We use a numerical structure to rank significance along the six continua. It works well. The only drawbacks appear to be: 1) lack of all the pertinent information (for instance, ground disturbance is often hard to assign from only a surface examination); and 2) the cancellation effect of some criteria over others. For instance if a site has been blown away, a zero numerical rank in this category overshadows 10's in all the other categories. The best aspect of the numerical approach is that you must be specific and write down your opinions for posterity. It also encourages concrete comparisons of each continuum between several staff members' judgments to assure good quality evaluation. This is truly a way to declare significance! The ratings stay within the project file, but are not included on the recommendation page (Appendix 3 and 4).

I want to address four points related to our community preservation activities. First, our local

criteria for significance are broader than the federal ones. We will judge a resource significant and take preservation actions — in cases which might not fit federal standards for information or integrity — because the result will be public enrichment and enhancement of the historic landscape. Or, because our actions will bolster the community's faith in our ability to act. In turn, archaeology as a whole is seen as valuable and significant. This concept is extremely important in maintaining goodwill and marshaling support in the future.

Secondly, we have found that our sense of what is significant changes over the years. This must be built into the evaluation process and data management systems. Let me give you just one example. When we first developed our preservation plan (Stephens 1982), an archaeological context was perceived as interpretable (and thus significant) if two conditions were met: 1) the stratigraphy had not been disturbed; and 2) the resources could be associated with a specific land use (such as a pottery) or with residential use that could be tied to a definite socioeconomic/ethnic affiliation continuously for minimally 40-60 years.

At that time we assumed: Resources without integrity in the ground or confirmed historical affiliation (as delineated by occupational and real estate assessment rankings) were not worthy of our attention, since they could not be interpreted or related to our research design (Cressey and Stephens 1982).

Today our criteria are broader. After working daily in the same locale for nearly 12 years we have wider research questions dealing with religious groups, public health, education and amusements. We know that excellent archaeological contexts — like a wood-lined root cellar

with 18th century materials or evidence of the fire of 1827 — exists even where the stratigraphy is chaotic. With so many "significant" sites excavated, we can actually expand the Alexandria Archaeology collection in areas we would have passed up before. Now sites are examined and collections accepted if the artifacts are useful for public education, document a particular technology, or provide a goodwill function in the community.

A third issue deals with our concept of recommendations based upon the evaluation of significance. When we began evaluating Planning Commission dockets we made brief, standardized recommendations regarding the actions we should take (Appendix 3). They ranged from no action, to construction monitoring, testing, full excavation, and in situ preservation.

We now write extensive comments on properties which we evaluate as significant, and we recommend that the property owner conduct the preservation actions (Appendix 4). We have had very good cooperation and interest from the private sector. This tact increases our ability to preserve and provide public interpretation within private developments. We now have developers contacting us prior to City application to determine what they can do to find and use their archaeological heritage to full advantage. We write the proposals for the developers and serve in an over sight role to insure a compatible product between consulting archaeologists. We find that we need to produce more specific guidelines for consulting archaeologists to follow so that we form a team.

We envision a loose-leaf binder format for use by the private sector which brings together present knowledge and standards in one place. The notebook will contain a concise city history,

relevant articles and demographics, historic and analytical maps, artifact categories and statistics, descriptions of excavated archaeological sites, collection and storage practices, guidelines for archaeological and historical research, report formats, significance criteria, and bibliography. This is an organic document, updated as our knowledge changes, which goes beyond our preservation plan and guidelines. It is a set of principles and policies to encourage full use and appreciation of all the archaeological work conducted within the City of Alexandria.

Lastly, I want to discuss with you our recent direction for the designation of archaeological areas within the City of Alexandria, proposed legislation, data management and interpretive formats. We are currently reorganizing our data from a variety of Alexandria Archaeology projects and other sources into a street-by-street directory. Rather than organizing information within project files (for instance, the Black neighborhood study, the Quaker Household study, and the Waterfront study), we are moving files and synthesizing data by street and block onto **Alexandria Street Face Resource** forms. The potential for resources to exist on each street face is then assessed from surface reconnaissance. Approximately 50% of the street faces in the Historic Alexandria section appear to have extant archaeological resources. For each of these street faces, an **Alexandria Historic Street Directory** form is created which describes what is known about the street face, identifies its relationship to major themes, and evaluates its significance and development potential (Appendix 5). Specific addresses are noted with major importance and affiliation. We expect to create maps displaying the data for historical analysis.

The new draft legislation will set out Archaeological Areas based upon this information. Within these areas, development projects requiring site plan approval by the Planning Commission will

evaluate the effects of the proposed action upon the archaeological resources. Both the evaluation and preservation actions would be undertaken by the property owner. This means that many more people will be using our files and references to research and evaluate their properties. Hence, the need for two major tools for public use: good data management and education.

Our files are now organized by street and address with separate topical and person files. Volunteer projects index previous studies into these formats for easy retrieval. The Alexandria Archaeology Atlas will be produced to record important information by archaeology area and street to encourage civic and property owner pride. While much of the information will be historical, not archaeological, we expect that new opportunities for private involvement in preservation and education will result. The Atlas will provide a descriptive historic context for Alexandria. Since research questions and other criteria of significance will continue to change, a good compendium of descriptive information amassed in a spatial framework will be our ever-increasing data base with which to ask the question: Is this significant in preserving, enhancing and understanding our past?

REFERENCES CITED

Archaeology Preservation Guidelines.

1988 Alexandria Archaeology, City of Alexandria, Virginia.

Archaeological Resource Management Plan for Alexandria, Virginia.

1982 Alexandria Archaeology, City of Alexandria, Virginia.

Aten, Lawrence F.

1988 Telephone conversation, October 12, 1988.

Barnes, Mark R., Alton K. Briggs, and Jerry J. Neilsen

1980 A Response to Raab and Klinger on Archaeological Site Significance. American Antiquity 45:551-553.

Cressey, Pamela J. and John F. Stephens

1982 The City-Site Approach to Urban Archaeology in Alexandria, Virginia. In Archaeology of Urban America: The Search for Pattern and Process, R.S. Dickens, Jr., ed., pp.41-61. Academic Press, New York.

Federal Register

1983 Archeology and Historic Preservation; Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines. Federal Register 48(190):44716-44740 (September 29, 1983).

Glassow, Michael A.

1977 Issues in Evaluating the Significance of Archaeological Resources. American Antiquity 42:413-420.

Henry, Susan L., editor

1988 Fairfax County Heritage Resource Management Plan. Fairfax County Office of Comprehensive Planning, Fairfax, Virginia.

Hosmer, Charles B. Jr.

1965 Presence of the Past: A History of the Preservation Movement in the United States Before Williamsburg. G.P. Putman's Sons, New York.

King, Thomas F.

1984 Is There a Future for the National Register? In The Historic Preservation Yearbook: A Documentary Record of Significant Policy Developments and Issues. First Edition 1984/85. Adler and Adler in cooperation with the National Trust for Historic Preservation, Bethesda, Maryland.

- King, Thomas F., Patricia Parker Hickman, and Gary Berg
1977 Anthropology in Historic Preservation Caring for Cultures Clutter.
Academic Press, New York.
- Raab, L. Mark and Timothy C. Klinger
1977 A Critical Appraisal of "Significance" in Contract Archaeology.
American Antiquity 42:629-634.
- Schiffer, Michael B. and George J. Gumerman, editors
1977 Conservation Archaeology: A Guide for Cultural Resource Management.
Academic Press, New York.
- Tainter, Joseph A.
1987 The Politics of Regional Research in Conservation Archaeology.
American Archaeology6 (3): 217-227.

RECOMMENDATION

- 1. No comment
- 2. No adverse effect
- 3. Monitor
- 4. Test
- 5. Excavate
- 6. Preserve in situ

Comments: _____

COMMENT DUE: ___/___/___

OWNER/APPLICANT PROJECT NAME: _____

- 1. Owner _____ Phone _____
- 2. Address _____
- 3. Applicant _____ Phone _____

- REFERAL 1. BAR HD 2. BAR PG 3. Planning Comm.
 4. Subdivision 5. Site Plan 6. _____

- LEGAL 1. Entry Agreement 2. Temp. Custody 3. Donation
 4. Loan 5. Gift 6. _____

PROPOSED ACTION

- 1. Demolition Comments: _____
- 2. New Const. _____
- 3. Addition _____
- 4. Rest./Renov. _____
- 5. Landscaping _____
- 6. _____

STREET FACE 1790 | 1810 | 1830 | 1850 | 1870 | 1890 | 1910 |

1. Socio-economic							
2. Occupation							
3. Ethnicity							
4. Owner/Tenant							
5. Tax Deciles							
6. Neighborhood							
7. Notable people/uses							

MAPS

1.1977

2.1931

3.1921

4.1907

5.1896

6.1891

7.1885

8.1877

SITE FILES

Previous archaeological work

Site reports

OTHER SOURCES

Cox

Water Co.

Directories

Tapes, books, articles

Newspapers

Lloyd House, Court House

PREHISTORIC POTENTIAL

Slope

Landform

Water proximity

HISTORY SUMMARY

Earliest occupation _____ Continuity _____

Socio-economic group _____ Ethnic group _____

Land use _____

Tax rank _____ Research significance _____

Uniqueness _____

Public significance _____

ALEXANDRIA ARCHAEOLOGY
PTS ASSESSMENT FORM-4

IN-HOUSE COMMENT

Date ___/___/___

ASSESSMENT

1. No adverse effect
 2. High research value
 3. Low research value
 4. Possible research value

Researcher _____

RECOMMENDATION

1. Field check
 2. Monitor
 3. Excavate
 4. Archival research

Begin ___/___/___ Due ___/___/___

FIELD CHECK(S)

Date ___/___/___ Date ___/___/___ Date ___/___/___ Date ___/___/___

Date ___/___/___ Date ___/___/___ Date ___/___/___ Date ___/___/___

FIELD OBSERVATIONS _____

FUTURE ACCESS TO SITE _____

FIELD COMMENT

IMPACT

1. High
 2. Medium
 3. Low
 4. None

ASSESSMENT

1. Disturbed
 2. Fill
 3. Defined stratigraphy
 4. Artifacts present
 5. Dates _____
 6. Unique features
 7. In situ preservation

RECOMMENDATION

1. No adverse effect
 2. No action
 3. Monitor
 4. Test
 5. Excavate

EVALUATION OF SIGNIFICANCE

Numerical Value

Research Significance _____ (0 - 10)
 History/Question _____ (0 - 5)
 Site Features/Artifacts _____ (0 - 5)

Disturbance _____ (10 - 0)

Impact _____ (0 - 10)

Uniqueness _____ (0 - 10)

Public Significance _____ (0 - 10)

TOTAL VALUE

ALEXANDRIA ARCHAEOLOGY
SITE INSPECTION FORM

ADDRESS _____
DOCKET# _____/_____/_____
PTS# _____
AX# _____

APPENDIX 2

SITE NAME _____

APPLICANT _____ Phone () _____

OWNER _____ Phone () _____

ADDRESS _____

TENANT _____ Phone () _____

CONTACT _____ Phone () _____

ADDRESS _____

LEGAL 1. [] Entry Agreement 2. [] Temp. Custody 3. [] Donation
4. [] Loan 5. [] Gift 6. [] Other

DATES Initial Contact ___/___/___ Site Check ___/___/___

HOURS WORKED _____ Description _____

PROJECT IMPACT 1. [] High 2. [] Medium 3. [] Low 4. [] None

PROJECT ACTION 1. [] Demolition 2. [] New Construction 3. [] Addition
4. [] Rest./Renov. 5. [] Landscaping 6. [] _____

RESEARCH POTENTIAL 1. [] High 2. [] Medium 3. [] Low 4. [] None

FEATURES AND ARTIFACTS RECORDED _____

DISTURBANCE/STRATIGRAPHY _____

FIELD OBSERVATIONS _____

RECOMMENDATION 1. In-House Assess. Yes ___ No ___ 2. [] No Adverse effect
3. [] No Action 4. [] Monitor
5. [] Test 6. [] Excavate

ARCHAEOLOGIST Signature _____ DATE ___/___/___

OWNER/CONTACT Signature _____ DATE ___/___/___

SITE PLAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE

AS BUILT _____ PREL. x PREL. FINAL _____ FINAL _____ REVISED FINAL _____

DATE OF MEETING MARCH 11, 1988 SITE PLAN NUMBER # 88-003

DEPARTMENT **ARCHAEOLOGY** TITLE 1121 King Street Retail/Office Building
DEPARTMENTAL CONDITIONS ONLY. LOCATION 1121 King Street

If going to Committee, please return this form to Transportation & Environmental Services. Room 4130, before 5:00 PM, two (2) days before the meeting.

Preface each condition with the following code: F = Findings & Information
C = Code or Ordinance
R = Recommendations
S = Suggestions

F-TES-0190

Evaluation of this property indicates there is the potential that 19th century artifacts and structural remains may be present.

RECOMMENDATION: Contact Alexandria Archaeology at least one month prior to any ground disturbance to arrange for City archaeologists to conduct archaeological testing prior to construction and to monitor the development work after it begins.

Steven J. Shephard

ARCHAEOLOGIST 838-4399
105 N. Union Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

DATE _____

SIGNATURE _____

APPENDIX 4

DATE: AUGUST 6, 1988

TO: PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT - SUBDIVISION

FROM: ALEXANDRIA ARCHAEOLOGY

SUBJ: COMMENTS ON 1801 & 1901 N. BEAUREGARD ST. WINKLER
PROPERTY 4 LOT SUBDIVISION

This property has important Native American and historic period sites. An archaeological investigation prior to development is necessary to preserve the information contained within these sites. The property is one of the most archaeologically significant areas in the City. An archaeological walk-over in 1979 of the Winkler property (bounded by I-395, Seminary Road, Beauregard Street and Roanoke Avenue) found 21 locations with Native American artifacts, three locations with historic period artifacts, and two possible Civil War earthworks. Within the land included in this four lot subdivision there are at least seven sites with Native American artifacts, two with Historic period artifacts and two earthworks.

- R-1 A Phase I archaeological investigation, consisting of documentary research and archaeological survey and below-ground testing, be conducted by a professional historian and qualified archaeologists. The documentary research will include study of historical records relating to the property including deeds, maps and other archival sources. The archaeological investigation will include a walk-over survey to relocate sites and identify any others. Test excavations will be made on sites requiring below ground study. Results of the documentary and archaeological research will be presented in a professional report which will include recommended preservation treatments for significant resource areas. Such treatments may include excavation of selected sites to be impacted by development and/or archaeological observation of ground alteration during the construction process.
- R-2 The applicant proceed in development of this property in a manner that:
- a. ensures sufficient time for scientific survey, recording and recovery;
 - b. includes all archaeological tasks in the project timetable;
 - c. informs contractors and subcontractors of the archaeological needs of the project prior to bidding. These needs include the inclusion of archaeologists at regular meetings, the planned scheduling of archaeological work, machinery assistance in archaeological work, and possible changes in site preparation/alteration if significant archaeological resources are encountered.
- R-3 All plans for preservation and treatment of the archaeological

resources on the property will be made in consultation between the applicant, the applicants archaeological consultant, and the City Archaeologist.

- R-4 All archaeological personnel and methods shall conform with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines and the draft Archaeology Preservation Guidelines of the City of Alexandria, Virginia.
- R-5 The Winkler Botanical Preserve and other sites on the property that can be preserved be nominated to the National Register of Historic Places.
- S-1 Sites on the property be interpreted through brochures, signage and/or exhibits on the property.

ALEXANDRIA HISTORIC STREET DIRECTORY

STREET-FACE NAME: 400 S. Royal Street, east side

STREET-FACE SURVEY NUMBER: 23.4

PREHISTORY OVERVIEW:

Archaeological excavations of an 8x30 area within
[Signature]

18TH CENTURY OVERVIEW:

Thomas Hartshorne owned northern 1/2 - prior to 1810; one
 use occupied by blacks; Joseph Coleman owned central
 (8.422) section & had his cooper shop at 418. Richard
 Bell owned southern portion as a lot.
 very little 18th c. activity

EARLY 19TH CENTURY OVERVIEW:

Free black residents primarily, but some
 had slave status (21%) until 1840 - many were
 family of free blacks. Most were skilled craftsmen.
 Gradually density & new house construction
 one of highest densities of black households in city
 in 1830, but on the fringe of the heaviest black
 nucleus on 300 S. Fairfax & 300 Duke

CIVIL WAR OVERVIEW:

LATE 19TH CENTURY OVERVIEW:

(mulatto)
 Afro American residential of workers,
 service (semi-skilled) occupations with
 decreasing number of craftsmen. Property ownership
 increased, homes are in the lowest property
 values in city. Some families have long
 continuity on the block. Some property
 values move to 8th percentile. Near the
 train tracks on Wilkes Street & Foundry

20TH CENTURY OVERVIEW:

Street face continues as black
 residential area - many of 19th c. families
 continue

INSTINCTIVE LAND USES:

Residential; Cooper shop, elite BLACK HOME at 404 (George Seaton)

POSSIBLE OR KNOWN RESOURCE TYPES

House + out BUILDING FOUNDATIONS, ~~Sett~~ Decomposed floor joists, Trash pits, backyard MIDDON - 3 to 4' deep

NEIGHBORHOOD AFFILIATION:

HAYTI

HISTORIC THEME (1): Social Composition - Afro Americans

(2): Neighborhood

(3): Daily Life

UNIQUENESS: 1 OF OLDEST BLACK STREET FACES

ARCHITECTURAL INTEGRITY:

ARCHAEOLOGICAL INTEGRITY: May be well preserved on northern 1/2; southern half (except 424) is gone. 424 has had renovations + landscaping - see file

PUBLIC VALUE:

Strong BLACK AFFILIATION

RESEARCH VALUE

LONG continuity of AFRO HOMEOWNERS + RESIDENTS - particularly AS ASSOCIATED WITH Quaker sales/rentals to BLACKS

SIGNIFICANCE RANK:

HIGH, especially 404.

DEVELOPMENT PRESSURES 418, 420, 422 recently redone; 400-41. MAY HAVE ADDITIONS + BACKYARD LANDSCAPING. Desirable LOCATION, so will be more improvements

ASSETS

404 is George Seaton's home - 1st Black Councilman & master carpenter/builder. Close to Wilkes St. tunnel

LIABILITIES

High development pressure, many years ~~unavailable~~

KEY PRESERVATION ISSUES

PUBLIC EDUCATION TO PRESERVE + APPRECIATE, CALL CITY IF

DOING RENNOVATION; MAINTOANCE OF BLACK IDENTITY

TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

NEIGHBORHOOD TALK ON COLEMAN DIG; DIG 404; include AFRO DATA IN BLACK HERITAGE CENTER

AX NUMBERS: AX30 COLEMAN SITE

PTS NUMBERS:

WRITTEN SOURCES: See McLeod ; Cressy 1985

MAP SOURCES: McLeod MAPS

PHOTO SOURCES:

ADDRESS FILES:

PEOPLE FILES: George Seaton, ^{-died 1881} Sara Revis ^{person} INDEX OF ^{McLeod's} ~~Black~~ BOOK

Moroccan & Robert H. Miller, Edward Evans, William Waugh, Catherine HAMILTON, William Dudley, JOHN Credit + NANCY