

Phase II and Phase III Project Cover Sheet

All information contained within the individual site database and inventory sheets is solely the work of the researchers and authors noted below. The data provided has been culled from the original site reports noted below and in many cases has been lifted directly from them with little or no editing. The database and inventory sheets are meant to serve as a synopsis of the report findings and a finding aid and are not intended to replace or republish the research of the authors noted below.

REPORT INFORMATION:

1994 McAloon, H.B.
 Fort George G. Meade Cultural Resource Management Plan.
 Submitted to the US Army Corps of Engineers
 Library ID No: 00000748 Catalog/Shelving ID: AN 260

Research Firm/Institution:

R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc.
 337 East Third Street
 Frederick, MD 21701

Sites examined:

18AN398	18AN929	18AN982	18AN983	18AN988	18AN989	Others
NRHP Eligible: <input type="checkbox"/> N	NRHP Eligible: <input type="checkbox"/> N	NRHP Eligible: <input type="checkbox"/> N	NRHP Eligible: <input type="checkbox"/> N	NRHP Eligible: <input type="checkbox"/> N	NRHP Eligible: <input type="checkbox"/> N	
Justification	Justification	Justification	Justification	Justification	Justification	

Project Details:

Phase I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Justification:	Project Objectives:
Phase II		The Cultural Resource Management Plan for Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, was prepared in compliance with Army Regulation 420-40 and the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), as amended. The work was prepared on behalf of the Baltimore District of the US Army Corps of Engineers.	-Present a comprehensive inventory of the Ft. Meade installation's architectural resources.
Phase III			-Present a system for assessing archeological resources as they are identified.

MAC Accession: 1998.019

Research Potential:

- See below for remaining research questions at 18AN398.
- See below for remaining research questions at 18AN929.
- See below for remaining research questions at 18AN982.
- See below for remaining research questions at 18AN983.
- See below for remaining research questions at 18AN988.
- See below for remaining research questions at 18AN989.

REPORT INFORMATION:

2003 Mock, K., H. Crowl, and K. Furgerson
 Fort Meade, Phase II Archaeological Evaluation of Sites 18AN398, 18AN929, 18AN982, 18AN983, 18AN988, 18AN989, Anne Arundel County, Maryland.
 Submitted to Ft. Meade Environmental Management Office (EMO)
 Library ID No: 97001835 Catalog/Shelving ID: AN 459

Research Firm/Institution:

URS Group, Inc.
 7101 Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 700
 Bethesda, MD 20814

Sites examined:

18AN398	18AN929	18AN982	18AN983	18AN988	18AN989
NRHP Eligible: <input type="checkbox"/> N	NRHP Eligible: <input type="checkbox"/> N	NRHP Eligible: <input type="checkbox"/> N	NRHP Eligible: <input type="checkbox"/> N	NRHP Eligible: <input type="checkbox"/> N	NRHP Eligible: <input type="checkbox"/> N
Justification	Justification	Justification	Justification	Justification	Justification

Project Details:

Phase I		Project Justification:	Project Objectives:
Phase II	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	At the request of the US Army's Environmental Management Office (EMO) at Fort Meade, Phase II archeological evaluations were carried out at six sites on the Fort Meade property in Anne Arundel County. These evaluations were intended to provide Fort Meade with the information it needs to protect these potentially significant cultural resources and to aid in the evaluation of potential impacts that planned (either currently or in the future) building or activities at the Garrison may have on these resources. As required under Section 106 of the NHPA of 1966, it is possible that these future actions may constitute an undertaking that is subject to the provisions set forth in 36 CFR Part 800.	-Gather further data to determine if any of the six sites are eligible for the National Register.
Phase III			-Make recommendations for the future treatment of the site.

Research Potential:

18AN398 is confined to the plowzone, and no vertical or horizontal artifact patterning was evident. No historic or prehistoric features were identified. In addition, portions of the property have been disturbed as a result of the construction of recreational facilities in the area. Site 18AN398 is not likely to yield significant information about prehistory or history, and should not be considered a significant archeological resource.

Site 18AN929 appears to have been a camp site occupied during the Late Archaic and Late Woodland periods. The site's location along Midway Branch would have been attractive to prehistoric inhabitants of the region. The low artifact count and paucity of tools and diagnostic artifacts suggests the site was used as a temporary camp. The Late Archaic and Late Woodland components appear to be ephemeral, and not of significant research value. No horizontal or vertical patterning was evident. No features were identified during the Phase II study, further limiting the importance of this site. Site 18AN929 has no potential to yield significant information regarding prehistoric lifeways in the Maryland Coastal Plain.

Based on the relatively low number of domestic artifacts and lack of horizontal or vertical artifact patterning, Site 18AN982 is not likely to yield additional significant information about the 19th century inhabitants of the area. Soils in the area are eroded, and no evidence of a yard scatter or midden was found. Therefore the foundation itself provides the only information regarding activities at the site. The foundation was adequately tested during the Phase II evaluation. The site has little to no additional information to reveal.

The integrity of the prehistoric component at 18AN983 was compromised by later historic occupations of the site. There is no vertical, stratigraphic integrity within the prehistoric component and no horizontal artifact patterning was evident. The lack of integrity and artifact patterning, and the ephemeral nature of the occupation severely limit the research value of the prehistoric component. Many early to mid 19th century tenant houses have been excavated in this region. Site 18AN983 is not a good example because its integrity has been compromised by later military activities. In addition, no more information can be gained from the WWI trench feature and associated military activities at the site. Such features are common on the Fort Meade property. The site has little to no additional information to reveal.

Site 18AN988 has been extensively disturbed as a result of subsequent activities, including construction and demolition of barracks and supporting facilities (e.g. roads, water, and sewer pipes). No vertical or horizontal artifact patterning is present. The site is not likely to yield additional information and should not be considered a significant archeological resource.

Most of the artifacts from 18AN989 were recovered from disturbed plowzone contexts and therefore have limited research value. In addition, a compressed stratigraphy at the site limits the value of the Woodland components. The Late Archaic component appears to be ephemeral, and not of significant research value. No features were identified during the Phase II study, further limiting the importance of this site. It was therefore concluded that 18AN989 had no potential to yield significant information regarding prehistoric lifeways in the Maryland Coastal Plain.
