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ABSTRACT

This Phase Ia Archaeological Survey report evaluates the potential impact of the proposed Ardmore Transit Center Project, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania on potential archaeological resources. The Area of Potential Effect (APE) is situated within the Piedmont Upland Section of the Piedmont Physiographic Province of southeastern Pennsylvania. The Ardmore Transit Center Project is part of a plan to revitalize Ardmore. The revitalization of Ardmore, in Lower Merion Township, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, and the transformation of the community into a destination place through redevelopment efforts have undergone years of planning. The Ardmore Redevelopment Plan, approved by the Montgomery County Planning Commission on March 9, 2005, is influenced by the Ardmore Transit Center Master Plan, prepared in 2003 with three main goals: economic revitalization of the Ardmore Business District, modernization of the existing train station, and an increase in the availability of parking. As proposed, the Ardmore Transit Center Project features mixed-use development on several public parking lots, a new train station with nearby commuter and public parking, new public plazas, several major traffic improvements, and property acquisition along Lancaster Avenue. In addition, the Plan includes the designation of the Schauffele Parking lot on the south side of Lancaster Avenue as a village green available for public use. The Phase Ia Archaeological Survey identifies areas of archaeological sensitivity within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) of the Ardmore Transit Center Project. The cultural resources work was performed for the Federal Transit Agency (FTA) in conjunction with the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transit Authority (SEPTA) and Lower Merion Township.

The area within the APE would not have been attractive for settlement or use of Native American groups. Because of the upland setting of the APE, precontact remains, if present, are likely to have been restricted to the upper soil horizons. Historic uses of the APE is very likely to have destroyed the upper levels of soil within the APE. Precontact archaeological potential is low. All of the extant buildings in the APE appear to post-date the implementation of water and sewer service. Significant historic archaeological deposits associated with these buildings and their occupants are unlikely to be present. It is probable that the construction of buildings within the APE during the twentieth century has disturbed and destroyed archaeological deposits associated with the pre-twentieth-century occupants of the site in much of the APE. However, CHRS, Inc.’s review of cartographic data, considered in light of existing conditions within the APE, led to the identification of two loci of historic archaeological potential.

Should the two loci of historic archaeological potential lie within an area to be disturbed by the proposed project, additional archaeological research is recommended. A combined Phase Ib/II archaeological survey would be necessary to assess if intact archaeological deposits are present beneath the pavement currently covering the two areas of historic archaeological potential within the APE.
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INTRODUCTION

This Phase Ia Archaeological Survey report evaluates the potential impact on potential archaeological resources of the proposed Ardmore Transit Center Project in the town of Ardmore, Lower Merion Township, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania (Figure 1; USGS 1992, 1994). The Area of Potential Effect is situated within the Piedmont Upland Section of the Piedmont Physiographic Province of southeastern Pennsylvania. The Ardmore Transit Center Project is part of a plan to revitalize Ardmore. The revitalization of Ardmore, and the transformation of the community into a destination place through redevelopment efforts, has entailed years of planning. The Ardmore Redevelopment Plan, approved by the Montgomery County Planning Commission on March 9, 2005, is influenced by the Ardmore Transit Center Master Plan, prepared in 2003 with three principal goals: economic revitalization of the Ardmore Business District; modernization of the existing train station; and an increase in the availability of parking. As proposed, the Ardmore Transit Center Project features mixed-use development on several public parking lots, a new train station with nearby commuter and public parking, new public plazas, several major traffic improvements, and property acquisition along Lancaster Avenue. In addition, the Plan includes the designation of the Schauffele Parking lot on the south side of Lancaster Avenue as a village green available for public use. The Phase Ia Archaeological Survey identifies areas of archaeological sensitivity within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) of the Ardmore Transit Center Project. The cultural resources work was performed for the Federal Transit Agency (FTA) in conjunction with the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transit Authority (SEPTA) and Lower Merion Township.

This report was prepared in keeping with federal and state laws that protect significant cultural resources, including historical and archaeological sites. Federal and state mandates for cultural resources include: the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969; the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966; Executive Order 11593; the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974; and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania State Act No. 1978-273, amended as Act No. 1988-72. All work was performed in accordance with regulations set forth in 36 CFR §800, and the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission’s (PHMC) “Cultural Resource Management in Pennsylvania: Guidelines for Archaeological Survey and Mitigation” (Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission 1991).

The research for this report was undertaken by Cultural Heritage Research Services, Inc. (CHRS, Inc.) during September and October 2005. Kenneth J. Basalik, Ph.D. was the Principal Investigator. Philip Ruth was Senior Historian. Graphics for the report were prepared by Bradley Harrison. Jessica Kohn of the CHRS, Inc. staff provided editorial services (Appendix A). This report was prepared under contract to the firm of Gannett Fleming, Inc. of Audubon, Pennsylvania.

METHODS

The Phase Ia Archaeological work entailed background research and archaeological evaluation of the background data. The purpose of the background research was to understand the historical development of the Area of Potential Effect (APE). The information gathered was then evaluated in terms of the potential for intact archaeological deposits to be present within the APE. Sources
consulted included the archaeological site files of the State Historic Preservation Office and historic maps.

The potential for precontact archaeological remains was assessed on the basis of simple descriptive models of precontact land use in conjunction with data collected from the Pennsylvania Archaeological Site Survey. Historic archaeological potential was assessed on the basis of historic map data and information concerning the date for installation of water and sewers within the APE.

CHRS, Inc. investigators collected and uniformly scaled seventeen historic maps of central Ardmore, then examined these maps for evidence of cultural activity within and immediately adjacent to the 0.53-hectare (1.31-acre) Transit Center Lot, which constitutes the APE for archaeological resources. The maps employed in this effort were published in 1871, 1877, 1881, 1887, 1893, 1896, 1900, 1908, 1913, 1920, 1926 (two maps), 1937, 1948, 1950, 1961, and 1971 (Hopkins 1871; Scott 1877; Hopkins 1881; Baist 1887; Naeff 1893; Kiser and Potts 1896; Smith 1900; Kiser 1908; Kiser and Lathrop 1913; Kiser and Lathrop 1920; Bromley and Bromley 1926; Sanborn Map Company 1926; Franklin Survey Company 1937; Franklin Survey Company 1948; Sanborn Map Company 1950; Franklin Survey Company 1961; Sanborn Map Company 1971). Twelve of the maps—with the APE superimposed on them—are reproduced in Figures 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 (Hopkins 1871; Scott 1877; Hopkins 1881; Baist 1887; Smith 1900; Kiser 1908; Kiser and Lathrop 1913; Kiser and Lathrop 1920; Bromley and Bromley 1926; Franklin Survey Company 1937; Franklin Survey Company 1948 and Franklin Survey Company 1961). Additional research into the history of Ardmore in general and the APE in particular was limited to a review of town histories published in 1884 and 1983 (Buck 1884; Maier 1983).

**BACKGROUND DATA**

**Environment**

The Area of Potential Effect (APE) is situated within the Piedmont Upland Section of the Piedmont Physiographic Province of southeastern Pennsylvania. The underlying geology consists of Oligoclase-Mica Schist of the Wissahickon Formation (Xw), probably formed during the Lower Paleozoic Era. This formation includes some hornblende gneiss, some augen gneiss, and some quartz-rich and feldspar-rich members due to various degrees of granitization (Socolow 1980). Materials from these formations are not likely to have been utilized as lithic resources by the precontact inhabitants of the area.

The APE comprises soils within the Made land-Glenelg-Chester association, which are “deep and moderately deep, well-drained soils underlain by schist and gneiss” (Smith 1967). These soils are located on undulating uplands.

The APE occupies a land type characterized as Made land of schist and gneiss materials, sloping (MdB). According to the *Soil Survey of Montgomery County, Pennsylvania*, this land type is the result of altering and mixing of soils formed in material weathered from schist and gneiss (Smith 1967:118). Original soils in these areas include soils in the Chester, Manor, Edgemont,
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Glenelg, and Glenville series. Areas of Made land are usually nearly level to gently sloping, but some steep areas and fill escarpments may be present (Smith 1967:118).

The APE is located within Watershed G of the Lower Delaware River Subbasin. Cobbs Creek flows in a southeasterly direction, approximately 1.93 kilometers (1.2 miles) southwest of the APE. The Creek flows southward, joining Darby Creek just south of the town of Colwyn, in Delaware County, Pennsylvania. Darby Creek then flows south/southwestward through the John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge, joining the Delaware River just south of the city of Philadelphia near the town of Essington.

Pennsylvania has undergone radical changes in environment during the last 15,000 years. The Pleistocene climate was colder and dryer than present conditions. During this period, a forest tundra mosaic was likely to have existed, consisting of spruce stands intermingled with dwarf birch (Watts 1979). As the climate became warmer following the retreat of the Wisconsin glaciation, fir, pine, and alder entered the forest mosaic. Birches were present by 13,000 BP, and hemlock and chestnut appeared by ca. 8000 BP (Watts 1979). Although the forest species continued to shift until ca. 1500 BP, conditions similar to the modern forest were probably present by 5,000 BP (Carbone 1976; Stewart 1981).

The study area is located in the Temperate Deciduous Forest Biome of North America (Shelford 1964:18). This biome, under pristine climax conditions, is a multilayered forest with different species dominating the various layers. Large trees (oak, chestnut, hickory, elm, beech and maple) form the canopy with young members and smaller species (dogwood, sassafras and hornbeam) just below. Immediately beneath this understory tree layer is a bi-level shrub layer, under which is a bi-level herb layer (Shelford 1964:26). This diverse multilayer forest provides many resources for animal and human exploitation, including food (nuts, seeds, berries and fruit), fuel, wood, fiber and various plant products used for dyes and medicinal purposes.

At the time of European settlement, the forests in this region were not completely untouched; Amerind exploitation for thousands of years had modified considerable portions of them. The effects of the activities of these original inhabitants were minimal, however, when compared to the impact of the Europeans. The extensive clearing of the existing forests—for fuel, lumber, and agricultural purposes—rapidly destroyed the integrity of the existing biotic community. Similarly, the faunal resources (elk, deer, bear, wolf, fox, rabbit, hare, beaver, turkey, partridge, pigeon and other fowl) had been exploited by the Amerind populations. Their habitats were largely destroyed by European settlement, causing severe depletion. However, this region contained an abundance of resources for the precontact and early historic populations.

Prehistory

Evidence from precontact sites in the eastern United States indicates a number of successive regional cultural traditions. Although the exact number and nature of these traditions, which varied locally, remains the subject of debate, three major cultural periods can be defined: Paleo-Indian, Archaic, and Woodland. These traditions are best viewed as responses to changing social and environmental conditions.
The Paleo-Indian Tradition, 12,000 – 8,000 BC: The earliest, widely recognized tradition in the northeastern United States is the Paleo-Indian. This tradition is believed to have been characterized by small hunter-gatherer groups subsisting mainly on large mammals, many of which are now extinct or no longer present in the area (woolly mammoth, mastodon, and caribou). The artifact distinctive to this tradition is the fluted projectile point, lanceolate-shaped with a central flake removed from both faces along its longitudinal axis. This and related tools have been found in association with various floral and faunal resources in sites across the eastern United States (Funk 1969; Gardner 1974; Adovasio 1977; Dent and Kauffman 1978). This evidence suggests that the Paleo-Indian population exploited a wide variety of terrestrial, subsistence resources. The Paleo-Indian Period is marked by specific cultural ecological adaptations to the Pleistocene and Early Holocene environments. Custer (1984, 1985) has outlined the expected site types for the Paleo-Indian Period and they include the following: quarry, quarry reduction, base camps, base camp maintenance stations, and hunting sites. Based upon the present data, Paleo-Indian and Early Archaic occupations in the Piedmont tend to be small procurement related encampments associated with small upland bogs, sinkholes, and poorly drained areas in floodplains (Custer and Wallace 1982). The larger sites or base camps are quarry-related (i.e., lithic resource focus) and located near major waterways (Gardner 1978; Custer 1984). The Coastal Plain section of southeastern Pennsylvania may have the potential to contain some of these sites in part because of a suspected high paleo-environmental and lithic resource potential. However, the virtual absence of high quality cryptocrystalline materials in the Piedmont province suggests that few of this site type would be present within this region.

A number of tools diagnostic of the Paleo-Indian Tradition have been found in the Delaware and Schuylkill River Valleys (Mason 1959; Zatz et al. 1985); however, no recorded specimens have been found in the immediate vicinity of the study area. A fluted point was discovered along the Wissahickon Creek, two to three kilometers (1.24 to 1.86 miles) west of the study corridor (Edward Burke, pers. com., 1993).

The Archaic Tradition, 8,000 – 1,000 BC: The Archaic Tradition emerged from the Paleo-Indian with a more generalized subsistence strategy in response to changing environmental and, perhaps, social conditions. Approximately 10,000 years ago, as glacial conditions slowly gave way to the warmer Holocene climate, hardwood forests gradually replaced the tundra-like vegetation (Sirkin 1977:214). The socio-cultural response to the climatic amelioration and resultant environmental diversification was one of resource exploitative expansion in terms of biotic and lithic consumption. The Early Archaic settlement pattern for the Piedmont province is similar in southeastern Pennsylvania to the Paleo-Indian Period which is characterized by the presence of small hunting sites in association with upland bogs, sinkholes, and poorly drained areas in floodplains (Custer and Wallace 1982; Custer 1985). The Coastal Plain, on the other hand, is expected to harbor a wider variety of sites including base camps. These notions are predicated upon models of resource optimalization.

The period of time that signals the cultural adaptation to the fully emergent Holocene milieu is the Middle Archaic division. Settlement patterns in the Piedmont province are thought to be focused on upland slopes adjacent to ephemeral streams and spring heads, and toes of slopes extending into swampy floodplains of the larger drainages (Custer and Wallace 1982:154). The dominant site type is inferred to be procurement or hunting. The Coastal Plain, on the other hand, is anticipated to
contain a more diverse array of site types based upon the high productivity rating for this environment. The focus for base camps in this province is projected to be the extensive swamp lands (Custer and Wallace 1982:34). Changes in habitat are reflected in cultural artifacts by the presence of new tool types (Bryan 1977:363).

Evidence suggests that Archaic peoples lived in small nomadic groups (Cushman 1981:9). The resources exploited varied on the basis of local availability. This factor, coupled with the types and quantities of the lithic materials employed in toolmaking, result in different artifact assemblages at different sites. It is therefore difficult to characterize a typical regional Archaic tool assemblage. Archaic assemblages are, however, clearly distinguished from those of the preceding Paleo-Indian Tradition by the replacement of fluted points with smaller points of cruder materials and the emergence of grinding and ground stone tool (axes, chisels, and gouges) technologies. In general, tool assemblages from this tradition are marked by increasing diversification and specialization through time.

The increased number of sites dating to the Archaic is evidence that population density was greater during the Archaic than it was during the Paleo-Indian Tradition. This increase in population density was possible because, as climatic fluctuations stabilized and hardwood forests became established, the carrying capacity of the environment increased. In addition, the warming trend caused a rise in the sea level which allowed for the formation of extensive marshes and estuaries along the Delaware River. As resources became more abundant in and around major waterways and marshes, settlement was increasingly focused along them (Kraft 1977; Gardner 1980). Despite this trend, there is evidence of continued seasonal nomadism based on a resource-scheduling strategy (Cushman 1981:12).

During the Late Transitional Archaic, trade—particularly in non-local lithic material—new and expanded artifact forms, such as steatite (soapstone) vessels, were used. These attributes are born out by the large number of sites and by the more diverse cultural assemblages found in the region from this cultural period. A larger population with more diverse procurement activities is likely to increase the importance of upland areas in the region during this period. Custer, feeling a continuity in resource exploitation, combines the traditional Late Archaic, Early Woodland, and Middle Woodland Periods together under the term Woodland I. This division is marked by the following items: “focus on the highest productivity settings, an intensified use of certain resources, appearance of large semi-sedentary macro-band base camps, development of storage and processing facilities, extensive use of a wide range of environments, development and maintenance of trade and exchange networks, and the appearance of incipient ranked societies” (Custer 1985:36-37).

Settlement locations for the Woodland I Period in the Piedmont uplands are thought to closely resemble the Middle Archaic pattern (Custer and Wallace 1982:158). These small procurement site-types are postulated to be found in the following settings: upland slopes adjacent to ephemeral streams and spring heads, and toes of slopes extending into swampland floodplains of the larger drainages (Custer and Wallace 1982:154). Additionally the presence of base camps is strongly suggested for the first time in this province (Custer 1985:39). The base camp locations are thought to be associated with well drained ground adjacent to sink holes, swampland floodplains, or interior swamps (Custer and Wallace 1982:158). The settlement pattern for the Coastal Plain is depicted as a diverse array of site types occupying a multitude of suitable micro-environ. These attractive
settings or micro-environs would include the well drained soils and land juxtaposed to the flood plains, swamps, and/or marshes (Custer and Wallace 1982; Custer 1985).

The Woodland Tradition, 1,000 BC – AD 1500: Traditionally the beginning of the Woodland Tradition in this region is marked by the introduction of ceramics (Gardner 1980:3) and by two major trends: increasing sedentism and the development of extensive agriculture (Curry and Custer 1982:4; Cushman 1981:14). During the Woodland Tradition permanent or semi-permanent settlements replaced the seasonal base camp. Settlement patterns derived from sites dating to this period are focused on major waterways (Curry and Custer 1982:1), where the exploitable biomass was the greatest. The harvesting of various plants, waterfowl, fish and shellfish would have provided a more than adequate supply of food. These waterways supplied relatively easy transportation, facilitating trade and increasing the range and quantity of resources that could be exploited. The Late Woodland (Custer’s “Woodland II”) Period is generally characterized by the introduction of maize and squash cultigens and the appearance of sedentary villages. These developments were neither unilateral or temporally concomitant throughout the Mid-Atlantic region.

The Late Woodland Period reflects a continuation of similar land use patterns and settlement location to the earlier Late Archaic-Early through Middle Woodland Periods. The major difference appears as an “increasing use of floodplain settings for relatively large semi-sedentary communities and the habitation-utilization of certain levees along major drainages” (Custer and Wallace 1982:159). The results from Stewart’s (1981) work on precontact settlement and subsistence patterns in the Great Valley of Maryland are congruous with Custer’s study. He found a wide variety of ecotonal settings have supported both the small hunting-procurement type site and the large base camp site within the Late Archaic to Late Woodland Periods. Stating the obvious, it appears that the primary determinant of precontact settlement pattern distributions, excluding mortuary or ceremonial sites, is the location of water resources (Stewart 1981; Custer and Wallace 1982; Hatch, et al. 1985; Snethkamp and Ebright 1982; Gardner 1987). Stewart and Kratzer (1989:28) in their study of the Allegheny Plateau found that the significant site predictive factors translate into a combination of landform type and proximity to surface water. Custer’s research into the lithic scatter sites of the Piedmont uplands is consonant with Stewart’s contention. He found that the most common topographical setting was the upland slope, and sixty-seven percent of the sites are located within forty meters (131.23 feet) of surface water.

The Contact Period, AD 1500-1750: The Late Woodland Period ended with European contact which appears in the archaeological record as an intrusion of European artifacts into Late Woodland assemblages. At the time of Native American/European contact, relations between the two groups took various forms, usually beginning as trade interactions and religious proselytization. Relations then often proceeded to armed conflict, ultimately leading to the displacement of Native populations.

At the time of European forays into southeastern Pennsylvania, the Lenapes (Delawares) occupied the region. Interaction with the Europeans in the early Period consisted primarily of the Swedish and Dutch fur trade on the Delaware River. Becker (1985) suggests that the Lenape may have altered their settlement pattern to a more sedentary and concentrated form as a response to a commensual relationship with Europeans. He suggests that in the 1660s the Lenape were
concentrated in the flatlands of Passyunk in what is now southern Philadelphia (Becker 1985:48). At the end of Dutch rule in the area, and with the dispersion of the Minquas by the Seneca, the Lenape may have returned to a dispersed settlement pattern. By the 1680s the Lenape may have operated with the settlement system of one extended family band per feeder river (Becker 1985:50); however, the evidence for such a conclusion is scanty. The Lenape groups were gradually displaced by the Europeans in southeastern Pennsylvania. Lenape groups began arriving in the Susquehanna River area in the 1680s. Some groups were forced further west by the Iroquois as early as the 1720s (Kraft 1986). In 1742 the coastal Delaware Indians groups which remained in eastern Pennsylvania were asked by Governor Thomas to move to the Susquehanna River. In the Treaty of Lancaster of 1744, all of the Indians still remaining in the Lower Delaware River Valley were ordered to leave (Kraft 1986:233).

**Historical Development of Ardmore and the APE**

An overview of Ardmore’s development from the 1870s through the mid-1980s was written by Phyllis C. Maier and published in the “Lower Merion” chapter of *Montgomery County: The Second Hundred Years* (Maier 1983:309-312). That overview is published below, with some material excised:

Ardmore is both a residential and a commercial center located about three miles [4.82 kilometers] west of Philadelphia’s city line. In 1870 it was known as Athensville, having been named about 1811 by Dr. James Anderson, a classicist and early physician. In 1873 the Pennsylvania Railroad gave notice that it was going to change the name, and Joseph Lesley, the secretary of the railroad, selected “Ardmore,” the suggestion of the Reverend George Anderson, pastor of the Lower Merion Baptist Church.

The Red Lion Inn, built 1796, located at Lancaster and Greenfield avenues, was a hotel, general store, and center of activity. Closed in 1919, a victim of Prohibition, it was razed in 1941.

Lancaster Avenue, formerly known as the Philadelphia and Lancaster Turnpike, was the most important highway of the village. During the 1870s the Lancaster Avenue Improvement Company acquired control of the highway as far as Paoli and thoroughly rebuilt and improved it. Tolls were collected along Lancaster Pike until 1917, when the state took over the roadway.

The Merion Title and Trust Company opened for business in 1889 on the corner of Lancaster and Cricket avenues, in a room formerly occupied by Hartley’s Shoe Store. The first fire company in the township, Merion Fire Company No. 1 of Ardmore, began in 1889, occupying a lot on the north side of Lancaster Pike, west of Ardmore Avenue. The firehouse also served as the first township police station. The police department consisted of a chief and deputies mounted on horseback or bicycles.

When Lower Merion was named a first class township in 1900, Ardmore became the center of government. The first Board of Commissioners met and began construction of sanitary and drainage sewers.
Opening in 1900, the Autocar Works was the first large manufacturing industry in Ardmore. The Autocar developed the shaft-driven principle in an American car, and the circulating oil system. The company was the first to build wheels with wooden instead of wire spokes.

Workers from Philadelphia reached Ardmore by the Pennsylvania Railroad or by the Philadelphia and Western [P&W] Railway, which served Ardmore from the 69th Street Terminal from 1907 to 1966. The handsome P&W station in Ardmore, barely a block from the railroad station on the south side of Lancaster Avenue, has been razed for a parking lot.

In 1901 building continued at a high rate and many businesses began; several operated by succeeding generations were still running in 1981. . . .

Ardmore opened its first movie theater in 1921 to show Rudolph Valentino, Richard Barthelmess, and Lillian Gish.

Sun Oil Company built its first gasoline station in Ardmore also in 1921 at Lancaster Avenue and Woodside Road.

In 1927 a new idea was put into effect: the development of a variety of shops clustered around a large department store, movie theater, supermarket, and business offices. This was Suburban Square.

The stock market crash of 1929 brought great loss to Ardmore residents. At the time Ardmore had three banks—the Merion Title and Trust Company, the Ardmore National Bank, and the Counties Trust Company—all of which closed. The Autocar Company laid off many workers, and unemployment was widespread. Soup kitchens were set up by church groups, and residents who could provide employment for the needy were urged to do so. . . .

The Autocar Co. plant closed down and moved to Exton, Pennsylvania, in 1954. A wrecking crew began to demolish the building but on July 31, 1956, a welder’s torch touched off the worst conflagration ever seen in Ardmore. The fire threatened to destroy the north side of the Lancaster Avenue business district. All of the township’s fire companies fought the fire, assisted by units from Philadelphia. More than a dozen firemen were injured, and it took six million gallons of water to end Ardmore’s worst disaster.

On the site of the former Autocar Co. plant, construction commenced for a shopping center, Ardmore West. Completed in 1973, it contained a variety of shops, a bank, and a fast-food restaurant. Many of Ardmore’s business establishments modernized their properties and increased their parking facilities. Ardmore celebrated its centennial that year with many special activities.
Suburban Square, fifty years old in 1979, received a face-lift. Introducing a European concept, it acquired an open mall surrounded by small shops. The movie theater was converted into market stalls, offering a variety of foods. The Square’s record as the first shopping center in the world accorded by the Guinness Book of World Records proved erroneous after many years. In the 1979 and later issues Guinness has credited a shopping mall near Baltimore with predating it.

The largest black community in Lower Merion lives in South Ardmore (extending south into Delaware County). It is a stable community made up of families who found work on the Main Line several generations ago. Of the residents there 65 percent were born in Ardmore. The Ardmore Progressive Civic Association gives voice to their concerns.

Charitable agencies and government offices concentrate services conveniently in the area. Five organizations serve elderly citizens while the Soul Shack offers constructive activities for children and youth. Beginning with an actual “shack” in the tense times of the late sixties, the Soul Shack keeps its name in the Ardmore Avenue Community center, which was built in 1977 and provides programs for nearly two thousand people of all ages, races, and interests each month.

The Ardmore Free Library also adapted to the aspirations of the black community and opened the Gate Library as a book station in a storefront in 1967. It sponsored a tutorial program and maintained a special collection of black literature, history, and biography, which was filed with the regular collection in 1972 when the Gate Library closed (Maier 1983:309-312).

As will be discussed in greater detail below (in the sections describing Historic Archaeology Loci 1 and 2), data presented on historic maps of Ardmore indicate that the APE was occupied by only a handful of structures from 1871 through 1913 (Hopkins 1871; Scott 1877; Hopkins 1881; Baist 1887; Naeff 1893; Kiser and Potts 1896; Smith 1900; Kiser 1908; Kiser and Lathrop 1913). One of these structures was a residence (fronting on the road now known as Anderson Avenue), another was a railroad storage house, and the remainder were outbuildings associated with a residence standing along Lancaster Avenue, just outside the APE. During this period, most of the APE served as sideyard or backyard for nearby dwellings and their outbuildings.

Approximately one-half of the APE was dramatically altered after 1913. Between that year and 1920, the south-central portion of the APE was divided into at least a dozen narrow lots, upon which were constructed mixed-use buildings fronting on Lancaster Avenue (Figure 8; Kiser and Lathrop 1913; Figure 9; Kiser and Lathrop 1920). In the portion of the APE east of these lots, one large industrial or commercial structure was erected between 1913 and 1920, and two more large industrial or commercial structures were constructed between 1920 and 1926. These construction activities placed approximately one-half of the APE—the south-central and eastern sections—under roof. The north-central and western sections of the APE were left open to serve as parking space.
ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION

Precontact Archaeological Potential

An examination of Pennsylvania Archaeological Site Survey data indicated no recorded precontact archaeological sites within the APE. Precontact archaeological sites are generally located between 100 and 150 meters (328.1 and 492.1 feet) of a source of water, on well drained soils with slopes of less than 15% grade. Other factors which might influence the precontact use of the landscape include resource rich locales, such as swamps, rich in food resources, or lithic outcrops which may serve as a source of raw material for tool production. The APE is more than 150 meters from a source of water. There is no indication that the APE is near a former source of stone which could have been used for tool manufacture. The APE would not have been attractive for settlement or use by Native American groups. Because of the upland setting of the APE, precontact remains, if present, are likely to have been restricted to the upper soil horizons. Historic uses of the APE are very likely to have destroyed the upper levels of soil within the APE. Precontact archaeological potential is low.

Historic Archaeological Potential

Ardmore is an urban area. Landscape modification in urban settings can adversely effect buried deposits. However, historic features such as wells, privies, and cisterns often survive in urbanized settings. Constructed to provide water and the means of waste disposal, these features are usually abandoned when piped-in water and sewerage become available. In addition to the statement concerning construction of sanitary and drainage sewers noted above in the overview of Ardmore (Maier 1983:309), the Department of Public Works for Lower Merion Township reports that the Township began recording sewers in 1904, with the first sewers having probably been built in 1900-1901. Plans showing the sewers were first recorded on mylars in 1924. These plans commence with Sewer #117, suggesting that 116 sewers had been built previously. The introduction of water and sewer within the APE during the early twentieth century has significant archaeological implications. All of the extant buildings in the APE appear to post-date the implementation of water and sewer service. None of these buildings is likely to have had open shaft features such as wells, privies, or cisterns built to service their occupants. Significant historic archaeological deposits associated with these buildings and their occupants are unlikely. All of the extant buildings in the APE appear to post-date the implementation of water and sewer service. Significant historic archaeological deposits associated with these buildings and their occupants are thus unlikely within the APE. It is probable that the construction of buildings within the APE during the twentieth century has disturbed and destroyed archaeological deposits associated with the pre-twentieth-century occupants of the area. However, CHRS, Inc.’s review of cartographic data, considered in light of existing conditions within the APE, led to the identification of two loci of historic archaeological potential.

Historic Archaeology Locus 1: On the earliest map reviewed in the course of this investigation—published in 1871—two structures were denoted entirely or partly within the APE (Figure 2; Hopkins 1871). The westernmost of these structures was depicted standing on the east side of the road now known as Anderson Avenue. This unidentified structure was depicted again on a map of Ardmore published in 1877 (Figure 3; Scott 1877), but no structure was denoted in this location on maps published in 1881 and thereafter. On the 1881 map, the northwest section of the
APE was depicted as an access-and-parking area adjoining a freight house standing within the APE, on the south side of the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks (Figure 4; Hopkins 1881). No freight house was depicted in this location on maps of Ardmore published in 1887 and thereafter (Figure 5; Baist 1887). From 1887 through 1961, the northwest section of the APE was characterized on maps of Ardmore as a structureless access-and-parking area bordered on the north by loading platforms flanking the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks. Because the cartographic data indicates that a substantial structure (possibly residential) stood along the east side of Anderson Avenue from at least 1871 through 1877 (but not after 1880); and because a freight house was depicted on the 1881 map (but no others) standing approximately 30.48 meters (100 feet) to the rear (eastward) of the Anderson Avenue structure; and because maps of Ardmore published after 1881 provide no evidence of soil-disturbing activities more extensive than paving in the area between the footprint of the unidentified Anderson Avenue structure and the footprint of the ca. 1881 freight house, this area appears to have historic archaeological potential. The area is plotted on Figure 14 as “Historic Archaeology Locus 1.”

Historic Archaeology Locus 2: The second structure denoted within the APE on the earliest examined map (1871) was depicted in the southeast portion of the APE, fronting on what is today Lancaster Avenue. This structure was attributed to “Mrs. Sibley” (Figure 2; Hopkins 1871). An unidentified structure was denoted in this vicinity on the 1877 map, but the cartographer located it just outside the APE, with the APE abutting the structure’s southeast and northeast sides (Figure 3; Scott 1877). The location of this structure just outside the APE was confirmed by more-exacting property atlas maps of Ardmore published in 1881, 1887, 1900, 1908, and 1913 (Figure 4; Hopkins 1881; Figure 5; Baist 1887; Figure 6; Smith 1900; Figure 7; Kiser 1908; Figure 8; Kiser and Lathrop 1913). Color-coded to signify its “frame” construction, this residence was attributed to either “J.S. Pearce” or “Josiah S. Pearce” on the 1881, 1887, and 1900 maps, then to the Pennsylvania Railroad Company on the 1908 and 1913 maps. These five maps also indicated that outbuildings associated with this residence were located in its backyard and sideyard from at least 1881 through 1913. Outbuildings to the rear of the residence (standing between the residence and the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks) were located within the APE, as were outbuildings depicted immediately east of the residence. Outbuildings standing on the west side of the residence fell, like the residence, just outside the APE. Some of the outbuildings were characterized as primarily “frame,” and others as primarily “brick.”

On a map of Ardmore published in 1920, town lots were denoted where the Pearce residence had been depicted on the earlier maps, indicating the Pearce residence had been, or would soon be, replaced by abutting residential or mixed-use structures (Figure 9; Kiser and Lathrop 1920). These lots were part of a row of approximately twelve newly-created lots fronting on Lancaster Avenue and extending southeastward into the southeast portion of the APE. This row of lots—all or most of which contain structures today—was depicted on maps of Ardmore published in 1926, 1937, 1948, and 1961 (Figure 10; Bromley and Bromley 1926; Figure 11; Franklin Survey Company 1937;
Figure 12; Franklin Survey Company 1948; Figure 13; Franklin Survey Company 1961). Most of the lots contained a primary structure fronting on Lancaster Avenue, and a smaller, secondary structure (presumably a stable or garage) at the rear of the lot. While only about half of the primary structures were located within the APE, at least a portion of each secondary structure was located within the APE. It is doubtful that the secondary structures included privies. As noted above, sanitary and drainage sewers had been laid along Lancaster Avenue earlier in the twentieth century, so houses and multi-use structures erected along Lancaster Avenue after the publication of the 1913 map were likely equipped with indoor plumbing (Kiser and Lathrop 1913).

The area between these lots and the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks was depicted as largely vacant on the 1920 map (Figure 9; Kiser and Lathrop 1920), and each map published thereafter. The lone exception to this vacant characterization was a non-residential stone structure depicted between the easternmost lots and the railroad tracks. This structure, attributed to the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, was depicted in this location only on the maps published in 1908, 1913, and 1920 (Figure 7; Kiser 1908; Figure 8; Kiser and Lathrop 1913; Figure 9; Kiser and Lathrop 1920). On maps published after 1920, the location it had once occupied was depicted as vacant.

Immediately east of the easternmost of the town lots, a large, rectangular, brick building was depicted on the 1920 map, and each succeeding map (Figure 9; Kiser and Lathrop 1920). This building spanned the width of the APE, and its construction likely entailed extensive soil disturbance within and immediately adjacent to its footprint. The portion of the APE immediately east of this structure (i.e. the easternmost section of the APE), was depicted as vacant on the 1920 map, as it had been on each of the preceding maps (Figure 9; Kiser and Lathrop 1920). This area was depicted on the 1926 map—and each map thereafter—as occupied by two large brick structures (Figure 10; Bromley and Bromley 1926).

On the basis of this cartographic evidence, only a portion of the APE east of Historic Archaeology Locus 1 appears to have escaped extensive soil-disturbing construction activities. This area also served as the backyard for the Sibley-Pearce residence from at least 1871 through 1913. It has therefore been identified as Historic Archaeology Locus 2, and it is plotted with Historic Archaeology Locus 1 on Figure 14.

**SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This Phase Ia Archaeological Survey report evaluates the potential impact on potential archaeological resources of the proposed Ardmore Transit Center Project in the town of Ardmore, Lower Merion Township, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania. The Area of Potential Effect is situated within the Piedmont Upland Section of the Piedmont Physiographic Province of southeastern Pennsylvania. The Ardmore Transit Center Project is part of a plan to revitalize Ardmore. The revitalization of Ardmore, and the transformation of the community into a destination place through redevelopment efforts, has entailed years of planning. The Ardmore Redevelopment Plan, approved by the Montgomery County Planning Commission on March 9, 2005, is influenced by the Ardmore Transit Center Master Plan, prepared in 2003 with three principal goals: economic revitalization of the Ardmore Business District; modernization of the existing train station; and an increase in the availability of parking. As proposed, the Ardmore Transit Center Project features
mixed-use development on several public parking lots, a new train station with nearby commuter and public parking, new public plazas, several major traffic improvements, and property acquisition along Lancaster Avenue. In addition, the Plan includes the designation of the Schauffele Parking lot on the south side of Lancaster Avenue as a village green available for public use. The Phase Ia Archaeological Survey identifies areas of archaeological sensitivity within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) of the Ardmore Transit Center Project. The cultural resources work was performed for the Federal Transit Agency (FTA) in conjunction with the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transit Authority (SEPTA) and Lower Merion Township.

The area within the APE would not have been attractive for settlement or use of Native American groups. Because of the upland setting of the APE, precontact remains, if present, are likely to have been restricted to the upper soil horizons. Historic uses of the APE are very likely to have destroyed the upper levels of soil within the APE. Precontact archaeological potential is low.

All of the extant buildings in the APE appear to post-date the implementation of water and sewer service. Significant historic archaeological deposits associated with these buildings and their occupants are unlikely to be present. It is probable that the construction of buildings within the APE during the twentieth century has disturbed and destroyed archaeological deposits associated with the pre-twentieth century occupants of the site in much of the APE. However, CHRS, Inc.’s review of cartographic data, considered in light of existing conditions within the APE, led to the identification of two loci of historic archaeological potential.

Should the two loci of historic archaeological potential lie within an area to be disturbed by the proposed project, additional archaeological research is recommended. A combined Phase Ib/II archaeological survey would be necessary to assess if intact archaeological deposits are present beneath the pavement currently covering the two areas of historic archaeological potential within the APE.
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