

Chapter 8

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the analysis presented in the previous chapter, the whole of the National Register Eligible 7S-C-100 property is adversely affected through the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts resulting from the undertaking. The following recommendations for treatment are therefore offered as options for meeting the requirements of Section 106 and 36CFR 800.6:

1. Given the physical constraints of the construction corridor, avoidance of the property only appears possible if this ramp alignment is abandoned completely and the project totally redesigned. It is assumed that avoidance through placing the ramps on an elevated structure supported on piers in the currently planned location is not a viable option.
2. Consideration should be given to protecting those portions of Archaeological Site 7S-C-100, not directly and immediately affected by the undertaking, through their direct purchase by the Department of Transportation or other designated agency, and the development and implementation of a protective covenant that specifies future land use and management to ensure the long term preservation of the archaeological resources. It is estimated that the purchase of about six acres of land could accomplish this objective for the key portions of the site.
3. The preferred alternative to item 2 above is the Treatment of the Adverse Effects through a program of archaeological and historical research that meets the standards and objectives of the State historic preservation plan and the guidelines of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. The central component of this research would be selective archaeological data recovery to retrieve critical information, based on a formal research design.

Primary emphasis should be on the late 17th-/early 18th- and early/mid-18th-century house sites and the relationship between these two loci within the larger site, including the spatial layout of house sites and related outbuildings, and the identification of refuse disposal patterns through space and time.

Secondary emphases would be on the mid-18th-century occupational locus, the brick clamp, and the prehistoric locus.

A detailed scope of work is not presented for the implementation of this research, but it is recommended that it would include the removal of plowzone over key areas, the exposure and sampling of features, the complete excavation of cellar holes and root cellars, and the half-sectioning of pits, postholes, and shaft features. The research would also include full artifact and sample analysis, reporting and public outreach.

4. Alternative Treatment Options. Consideration should also be given to alternative mitigation strategies that would meet the spirit and intention of 36CFR 800.6. These should not however be implemented to the exclusion of the full archaeological study of the late-17th-/early 18th-century house site, which is considered to be of great significance because of its date, preservation, and the rarity of this type of site in Delaware. If this component is not preserved through a covenant agreement then it should be fully excavated and documented.

There could perhaps be rather more flexibility in the approach taken to other elements of the site, which would be more selectively sampled and documented in exchange for other mitigation actions. Most useful among these would be a comprehensive revision

of the 2002 Historic Context document on Farm and Rural Dwelling Sites 1730-1830 (Bedell 2002). The revision could be state-wide, rather than just applying to New Castle and Kent Counties, and would incorporate the considerable increase in the data-base and the changing perspectives on this subject over the last ten years. Other options could include popular publications and programs linked to the site, or pro-active projects to secure the protection of other archaeological resources.