

ings and structures. The Maryland Historical Trust and Delaware Historic Preservation Office served as a source of information on previously-documented architectural and archaeological resources in each state. County and state maps and atlases were consulted at the Historical Society of Cecil County and the Historical Society of Delaware. Six of these that showed detailed buildings and structures proved to be useful. Simon J. Martenet's *Martenet's Map of Cecil County* and Lake, Griffing and Stevenson's *An Illustrated Atlas of Cecil County, Maryland* (1877) located at the Historical Society of Cecil County and Rea and Price's *Map of New Castle County, Delaware* (1849), J. G. Beers' *Atlas of the State of Delaware* (1868), G. M. Hopkins' *Map of New Castle County, Delaware* (1881) and G. W. Baist's *Atlas of New Castle County, Delaware* (1893) located at the Historical Society of Delaware served as the basis for this study. These maps were supplemented by G. T. Poussin's *Canal de la Chesapeake a la Delaware* (1834) and with U.S. Coast Survey maps from 1841 – 1905. However, the U.S. Coast Survey maps provided coverage of either end of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal but not the interior of the canal alignment. The *Map of the Profile of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal* (Chesapeake and Delaware Canal Company 1829) was examined at both the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal Museum located at the Pump House in South Chesapeake City and at the Grass Dale facility of the Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control. This map is currently hanging in both places under glass and was examined, informally photographed, and detailed in notes by the principal investigator.

In addition to historic maps, Ralph D. Gray's *The National Waterway: A History of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal 1769-1985* (1989) provided background context for the history and development of the canal. K.T. Morgan and J. K. Titter's *Chesapeake City: The Canal Town Through the Years* (2000) and J.T. Scharf's *History of Delaware* provided 19th-century

historical material for towns along the project corridor. Several historic preservation planning documents, including *A Management Plan for the Archaeological Resources of the Upper Delmarva Region of Maryland* (1983), *The Maryland Comprehensive Historic Preservation Plan: Planning the Future of Maryland's Past* (1986), *Delaware Comprehensive Historic Preservation Plan* (1989), *Management Plan for Delaware Historical Archaeological Resources* (1990) and *Delaware Historic Context: Archaeology of Agriculture and Farm Life, New Castle and Kent Counties, Delaware, 1830-1940* (1992) as well as Lu Ann De Cunzo's *Historical Archaeology of Delaware: People, Contexts, and the Cultures of Agriculture* (2004) provided context for the development of the cultural landscape to the north and south of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal.

## **2. PREHISTORIC AND HISTORIC LAND-USE HISTORY**

### **A. Prehistoric Background**

#### ***1. Introduction***

This chapter commences with a brief overview of the paleoenvironment. This is followed by an outline of Delmarva Peninsula prehistory organized according to the framework proposed by Jay Custer (1983, 1984, 1989, 1994) and Charles Weslager (1968), and taking into account Richard Dent's prehistory of the Chesapeake Bay region (1995).

#### ***2. Paleoenvironment***

The paleoenvironmental processes affecting the Delmarva peninsula over the past 15,000 years or so have been dominated by the post-Pleistocene warming trend and the resultant rise in sea level which has submerged what we now know as the continental shelf. The general trends for the Mid-Atlantic coast can be

outlined briefly, but caution must be exercised when seeking patterns for any specific locality. The maximum eustatic low level occurred at the height of the Wisconsin glaciation, approximately 18,000 to 14,000 B.P. Scholars have traditionally maintained that, at that time, the sea level was roughly 120 meters (394 feet) lower than at present and the coastline was some 130 kilometers (80 miles) east of its present position. From circa 14,000 to 7,000 B.P. transgression proceeded fairly rapidly as the continental glaciers melted and returned water to the oceanic basins and before significant isostatic uplift processes had begun. During this period the rapid submergence rate of approximately 160 cm (5.24 feet) per century generally inhibited the stable formation of coastal lagoons, large bays or estuaries. After 7,000 B.P. the sea level continued to rise, although at a much slower rate (Milliman and Emery 1968; Edwards and Merrill 1977).

The calculation of rates of prehistoric sea level rise remains a controversial topic however and recent data have revised previously accepted analyses. Research by Daniel F. Belknap and John Kraft (1977, 1981) on the Delaware coast merits particular attention as their results have shown a slower rate of sea level rise and have tended to support the continental shelf-tilt hypothesis. The latter hypothesis holds that the outer continental shelf over the Baltimore Canyon trough geosyncline has subsided some 40 meters over the last 10,000 years owing to geosynclinal tectonics, dropping of a fault block, or water loading (Belknap and Kraft 1977:624). If the continental shelf-tilt hypothesis is accepted, a smoother and flatter curve of sea level change can be postulated. For example, around 12,000 B.P., sea level would then have been approximately 30 meters (as opposed to 60 meters) below the present level.

With the retreat of the Wisconsin ice and the gradual warming of the climate, the interior of the Delmarva peninsula will have become drier and progressively more forested. By the time humans first inhabited

Eastern North America, probably about 12,000 to 14,000 B.P., the area was characterized by open, spruce-dominated forest which increased in density towards the south. A combination of zonal and mosaic distributions included more cold-adapted coniferous and deciduous species which were recovering and expanding from relict positions as temperatures continued to increase. As time went on, the proportion of deciduous tree species will have increased and areas of grassland will have developed. However, rising sea levels caused the water table to rise in lowland locations, and freshwater wetland environments became more brackish.

Although there has been no definite recorded association of Early Man with Pleistocene megafauna in the Eastern United States, the numerous fossil and subfossil finds attest to the presence of mammoth (which became extinct about 12,000 B.P.), mastodon (which became extinct about 10,000 B.P.), walrus and ground sloth in the Mid-Atlantic region shortly before the beginning of the Paleo-Indian period. Finds of these species are especially associated with former estuaries and the 10,000-9,000 B.P. coastline, and may have been redeposited or reflect extensive erosion of the earlier shoreline (Edwards and Merrill 1977:8-11; Dragoo 1979). Although mammoth and mastodon may have been extinct or had migrated north of the Delmarva peninsula by the time the first humans appeared in the Delmarva peninsula, caribou and deer were probably still abundant during the Paleo-Indian period. Other fauna present in the region include fox, bear, elk and moose.

Around 8,500 B.P. the vegetation changed from grasslands and coniferous woods to large dense mesic forests of hemlock, oak and pine. Low lying poorly drained areas became swamps and marshes supporting species such as deer and turkey. It is at this time that the continental climate stabilizes with distinct seasonal differences (Custer and Silber 1995:12). By 5,000 B.P. the climate conditions had changed to

warm and dry for an extended period of time known as the xerothermic. This period was followed by a cold and moist period causing a decrease in oak and an increase in hickory forests with large open grasslands. The climatic conditions and sea level stabilized in the region around 2,500 B.P. producing conditions very similar to those of the present.

### ***3. An Outline of Delmarva Peninsula Prehistory***

A human presence is detectable in the Mid-Atlantic region beginning approximately 12,000 to 14,000 years ago. The chronological sequence for the region, and specifically for the Lower Delaware Valley and Delmarva Peninsula, can be conveniently divided into four major cultural periods: Paleo-Indian (circa 14,000-8,500 B.P.); Archaic (circa 8,500-5,000 B.P.); Woodland I (5,000 B.P.-A.D. 1000); and Woodland II (A.D. 1,000-A.D. 1600). This cultural-temporal framework is derived from paleoenvironmental studies (especially palynology) and from stratigraphically excavated archaeological sites that have yielded artifacts whose ages have been determined by radiocarbon dating or by comparison with other dated assemblages. Each period or sub-period is characterized by its own distinctive technologies and subsistence and settlement strategies that enabled these prehistoric peoples to adapt to continuous changes in their natural and social environments.

#### **Paleo-Indian Period (circa 14,000-8,500 B.P.)**

The earliest recognized groups of hunter-gatherers on the North American continent are referred to as Paleo-Indians. The archaeological hallmark of these peoples is a distinctive style of projectile point which was used to tip javelins or spears and could also have served as a knife used in butchering. These points, generally referred to as being of Clovis type, are easily distinguishable from those made in later periods

by the presence of single or multiple flake scars which extend vertically from the base of the artifact towards its tip. This distinctive manufacturing technique (presumed to aid in hafting the point to a foreshaft) resulted in these tools being collectively referred to as “fluted points.” A second family of projectile points, the notched points of Kirk and Palmer type, is also recognized as being characteristic of the late Paleo-Indian/early Archaic period.

While there have been numerous surface finds of Paleo-Indian fluted and notched points, there are no known Paleo-Indian sites per se in the Delmarva peninsula where artifacts have been recovered from stratified archaeological deposits (Custer 1984:48-60; 1989:81-121). Reconstruction of Paleo-Indian activity in Delaware is therefore mostly undertaken with reference to better known, more substantive, excavated sites elsewhere in the region, such as the Flint Run complex in the Shenandoah Valley (Gardner 1983), Meadowcroft Rockshelter in western Pennsylvania (Adovasio et al. 1977), the Shawnee-Minisink site in the Upper Delaware Valley (McNett et al. 1977), and the Turkey Swamp site in the New Jersey Outer Coastal Plain (Cavallo 1981).

Based on typological comparison of fluted points and consideration of the regional context, Custer (1989:86) suggests that the earliest Paleo-Indian activity probably took place in the Delmarva peninsula around 10,000 years B.P. or later. For the most part, even though Delaware-specific evidence has yet to be identified, Paleo-Indian occupation is likely to have consisted of a low density network of quarry sites, quarry reduction stations, base camps, base camp maintenance stations and outlying hunting stations. Lithic procurement and tool manufacture and maintenance will have occurred chiefly in the “neck” of the Delmarva peninsula, where outcrops referred to the Delaware Chalcedony Complex are known. Base camps and base camp maintenance stations were probably mostly associated with this exploitation of

lithic resources. Elsewhere in the peninsula, Paleo-Indian activity most likely involved short term hunting and gathering forays to food-rich locations such as wetland environments with diverse fauna and flora (Custer 1989:56-57, 93-100, 119-121).

### **Archaic Period (circa 8,500-5,000 B.P.)**

Generally speaking the Archaic period was marked by warmer temperatures resulting in continued glacial melt and rising sea levels. Pollen analysis has shown that mixed deciduous-coniferous forests (with oak and hemlock prevalent) and patches of grassland vegetation increasingly replaced the spruce-dominated Paleo-Indian environment. The megafauna had by this time become extinct and caribou had migrated north, leaving the more solitary browsing animals such as deer, elk and moose as the largest species available to hunters. The Native American population of the Archaic period is generally differentiated from that of the preceding Paleo-Indian period by its apparent greater social complexity expressed in the appearance of mobile small-band organizations with simple social structuring (Custer 1984:61-64; 1989:122-127).

Although the material culture was still aceramic during the Archaic period, there was an expansion and diversification in the types of lithic tools being made. Stone artifacts characteristic of the Archaic period include bifurcate-base and stemmed projectile points, while ground stone items such as axes, gouges, grinding stones and plant processing tools appear in the archaeological record for the first time. Also characteristic of the Archaic period is a marked decline in the use of cryptocrystalline materials for lithic tools, and a corresponding increase in the exploitation of new stone materials such as rhyolite (found in south-central Pennsylvania) (Custer 1984:64-74; 1989:127-140).

As is the case with the Paleo-Indian period, there are no known stratified Archaic period archaeological sites in the Delmarva peninsula, and evidence therefore takes the form of surface finds. Archaic period activity in the area therefore again involves extrapolation from other sites in the region -- for example, the Neville site in New Hampshire (Dincauze 1976) and the Doerschuk site in North Carolina (Coe 1964). Custer (1989:129-139) suggests a range of site types, including macro-band and micro-band base camps and procurement sites. Base camps, in his scheme, served as habitation areas for multiple families and were located in areas of "maximum habitat overlap", especially around interior freshwater swamps and bay/basin features. Among the better-known Archaic period sites in Delaware are a series of resources, including the Clyde Farm site, located on terraces around the freshwater swamp known as Churchman's Marsh (Custer et al. 1986b) and a cluster of bifurcate point sites in a similar setting in the Burnt/Cedar Swamp-Upper Pocomoke region of south-central Delaware.

### **The Woodland I Period (5,000 B.P.-A.D. 1000)**

The Woodland I period has received particular attention and has yielded archaeological data of exceptional interest reflecting influences from far beyond the Delmarva peninsula. Continuing sea level rise led to brackish estuarine conditions along the Delaware Bay, and oak and hickory increasingly dominated the forest cover (Custer 1984:75-93; 1989:176-184).

Artifact assemblages became more diversified in the Woodland I period with a wide range of new projectile point styles becoming evident, including large-stemmed and narrow-bladed points, and broad-bladed points (or broadspears), in addition to a continuation of the notched point tradition. Cache pits of late-stage bifaces, usually made of non-local argillite, are also found for the first time.. Still more diagnostic of the Woodland I period is the appearance in the archaeo-

logical record of soapstone (steatite; another non-local raw material) and ceramic containers. Woodland I period ceramics have been studied in considerable detail and a well-established typological sequence has been worked out, beginning with the Marcey Creek plain ware and progressing through the Dames Quarter and Seldon Island wares, Wolfe Neck ware (cord and net-impressed), a range of clay-tempered wares (e.g., Nassawango, Coulbourn, Wilgus), the shell-tempered Mockley ware, and the quartz-tempered, fabric or cord-impressed Hell Island ware (Custer 1984:93-113; 1989:144-176).

A much greater variety of site types is evident in the Woodland I period as compared with the preceding Archaic period, and a number of stratified sites have been investigated in both Delaware and Maryland, enabling more confident reconstruction of Native American lifeways. Beginning around 5,000 B.P. there is asserted to be a marked increase in the number of base camps throughout the Delmarva peninsula and an emphasis on locations in areas with a reliable supply of surface water. Seasonal occupation of base camps is recognizable and there is also intensive use of coastal sites. In essence, the aboriginal population can be described as semi-sedentary for the first time. Two archaeological traditions or complexes are used to define the early portion of the Woodland I period -- the Clyde Farm complex in the Churchman's Marsh area of northern New Castle County and the Barker's Landing complex in Kent and Sussex Counties. Both complexes persisted until around 2,500 B.P. (500 B.C.) and are reflective of the changes in tool kits, settlement and resource procurement patterns, and social organization that distinguish the Woodland I period from the Archaic (Custer 1984:113-130; 1989:185-248).

From around 500 .B.C. to 1 B.C. the Woodland I period cultures reached a peak of complexity and show clear signs of Adena influence from the Ohio Valley. The Wolfe Neck and Delmarva Adena complexes are

both distinguished by new pottery styles, evidence of increased trade and exchange networks, intensified food gathering and expanded exploitation of estuarine resources. A Wolfe Neck component has been identified at many earlier Woodland I sites (e.g., the Clyde Farm, Delaware Park and Mitchell Farm sites). Adena influences have been recognized at more than a hundred sites in the Delmarva peninsula, but only a handful of these have been archaeologically examined.

The telltale signs of Adena influence are the presence of raw materials originating only from the Ohio Valley and diagnostic materials such as corner-notched and side-notched projectile points, large finely-fashioned bifaces, clay-tempered ceramics, copper beads and tubular beads. Few Adena-influenced habitation sites have been excavated, the two most important being the Wilgus and Killens Pond sites, both micro-band base camps. Most material culture items have in fact emanated from cemetery sites, or what Custer refers to as mortuary-exchange centers, the most notable of these -- the Killens Pond, St. Jones and Frederica sites -- occurring in the Mid-Drainage Zone of the central Delmarva peninsula. These mortuary sites yield few traces of domestic activity, and the burials (including both cremations and inhumations) are frequently accompanied by exotic grave goods (Custer 1984:113-130; 1989:249-275).

By around 1 B.C. Adena influences were on the wane, long distance exchange networks were breaking down, and the complex ritual treatment of the dead seen in the earlier mortuary sites had apparently ceased. The level of material culture declined somewhat, the diagnostic materials during this period being the shell-tempered Mockley wares and stemmed projectile points including the Rossville and Fox Creek types. Sites belonging to the Carey Complex (e.g., the Carey Farm site and components within other sites such as the Clyde Farm site) indicate that the basic settlement-subsistence pattern in the High and Low Coastal Plain of the Delmarva peninsula remained much as before,

except for the disappearance of the mortuary centers. This was also the case for the Piedmont/Fall Line area in northern Delaware represented by the Black Rock Complex. Diagnostic material relating to period are stemmed points and refined Vinette I/Wolfe Neck ceramics.

In the period between 500 and 1000 A.D., at least three different traditions or complexes are recognizable. The Delaware Park Complex in the northern Delmarva peninsula exhibits continuing utilization of what have been interpreted as macro-band base camps, and the type site, the Delaware Park site, included large storage features indicative of intensive harvesting of plants and sedentary occupation (Thomas 1981). Two other contemporary complexes, however, the Late Carey Complex and the Webb Complex, tend to suggest a breakdown or fissioning of the macro-band base camp pattern into smaller micro-band base camps. Sites recently excavated by the University of Delaware Center for Archaeological Research (the Carey Farm Site, Island Farm Site, Snapp Prehistoric Site [located within the Project Corridor], Pollack Prehistoric Site and Leipsic Site) suggest that larger sites interpreted as macro band base camps may in fact be several different micro band base camps which have been continuously reoccupied (Custer 1994:153-156).

The Webb Complex, evident chiefly in central Kent County, is far more notable for showing clear evidence of a resurgence of mortuary ceremonialism and a resumption in long-distance trade and exchange. The site most closely associated with these latter traits is the Island Field site on the Murderkill River (Thomas and Warren 1970; Thomas 1974), where more than 120 burials with grave goods have been excavated. The non-local materials recovered from the Island Field site have in the past frequently been linked to the Hopewell culture in the Ohio Valley, but scholars today see stronger connections with the Clemson Island tradition in the Susquehanna Valley, the Kipp

Island and Hunter's Home complexes of upstate New York and Intrusive Mound complexes of the Mid-West. Thus, despite the apparent "fissioning" of the settlement pattern, the Webb Complex, at least, seems to suggest the brief re-emergence of at least some complex societies in the terminal Woodland I period (Custer 1984:130-145; 1989:276-297).

### **The Woodland II Period (A.D. 1000-A.D. 1600)**

By around 1000 A.D., the final breakdown of the trade and exchange networks that flowered in the Woodland I period appears to have been complete. There also appears to have been a weakening of patterns of lithic procurement and ongoing disruption of the macro-band base camps. On the other hand, it is in the period between 1000 and 1600 A.D. that agriculture supplements the subsistence base of prehistoric groups and this brought about a re-orientation of the settlement pattern around more permanent occupation sites. Increased harvesting of plants and shellfish, expanded use of storage facilities (chiefly in the form of pits) and the appearance of more permanent house structures all characterize the Woodland II period. Increased sedentism brought increased population growth and the establishment of semi-sedentary villages with multiple social units that soon surpassed the macro-band base camps in size and complexity. The emphasis on expanding agricultural systems caused an occupational shift to the fertile floodplains of the major drainages within an environment that was by this time essentially modern in character.

The material culture of the Woodland II period was broadly similar to the preceding Woodland I period, but certain diagnostic types of lithics and ceramics can be recognized. Small triangular projectile points, probably related to the appearance of the bow and arrow, are characteristic of the period, while at least three main groups of diagnostic ceramics -- the

Townsend, Minguannan and Killens wares -- have been recognized through their tempering materials and more elaborate decorative motifs.

Two main complexes of sites have been identified for the Woodland II period in Delaware -- the Minguannan Complex and the Slaughter Creek Complex. The former complex includes macroband base camps in a variety of settings throughout the Delmarva peninsula and there is a strong material culture and locational thread linking these sites to their predecessors in the preceding Woodland I period. The Minguannan Complex sites do not appear to indicate any major expansion into areas of arable land, and agriculture may not have been so critical a part of the settlement-subsistence pattern. The Slaughter Creek Complex, however, defined by the presence of Townsend ceramics, very large macro-band base camps, possible villages and numerous storage features, would seem to represent a far more sedentary society with a greater dependence on agricultural production. Key sites in this complex, all of which can be classified as large macroband base camps or possible villages, include the Slaughter Creek site, the Townsend site, the Mispillion site, the Leipsic site and the Gabor site. The first two of these sites also produced burials, while the final three have produced evidence of subterranean house features or "pit houses" (Custer 1984:146-171; Custer and Griffith 1986; Stewart et al. 1986; Custer 1989:298331).

Native American contact with Europeans in Delaware began around 1600 A.D. At this time, the dominant Native American group along the Delaware Bay were the Lenape, while a series of other ethnographic groups lived to the west (e.g., the Nanticoke) and south (e.g., the Assateague). Native American-European contact initially centered on the fur trade, and especially on the European interest in beaver pelts. The fur trade had far-reaching effects upon Native American society, causing inter-tribal conflict and bringing a variety of European manufactured, goods to aborigi-

nal groups. Still more disruptive was the spread of European-introduced disease and the European acquisition and settlement of Native American lands. During the 17th and 18th centuries, Native Americans were gradually overwhelmed by the incoming settlers and traders until, by the early 19th century, they were almost totally subsumed within Euro-American culture (Custer 1989:332-341).

## **B. Historical Background**

### ***1. Introduction***

Given the breadth of the study corridor the historical background has been broken into several parts. The first is the early history of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, followed by the 18th- and 19th-century histories of the Maryland and then Delaware sections of the project corridor discussed by town or village. A 20th-century-to-modern-day history of the canal and Maryland and Delaware sections by village is then presented.

### ***2. The Chesapeake and Delaware Canal and Communities during the 19th Century***

The Chesapeake and Delaware Canal as it exists today is a sea-level waterway that connects the Chesapeake and Delaware Bays. Constructed through Cecil County, Maryland and Pencader, Red Lion and St. George's Hundreds in New Castle County Delaware, the canal provides a direct shipping route to the major ports of Philadelphia and Baltimore. Though the majority of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal lay in Delaware, few Delawareans initially offered support for the canal. Instead the canal was originally conceived and financed by Pennsylvanians who saw a canal through Maryland and Delaware as a way to divert Susquehanna Valley trade from Baltimore to Philadelphia. Since its construction, the canal has

figured prominently into national debates over federal aid to internal improvements, provided an important transportation route during the Civil War and more recently figured into the 20th-century debate over the Atlantic intra-coastal waterway system. However, while the canal was always more of a “national” than a “local” project, the construction of what was originally a thirty-six feet wide, ten feet deep and fourteen mile long channel unquestionably affected the cultural and historical landscape of the region through which it was constructed (Gray 1989:xv-xix).

The first permanent settlements in Maryland and Delaware were founded in the 1630s by the English and the Swedes, respectively. These early settlers immediately recognized the utility of a waterway connecting the Chesapeake and Delaware Bays and by 1654 Governor Johan Rising of New Sweden had written letters to his superiors in Sweden calling for such a watercourse. Augustine Herman, an early settler and proprietor of Bohemia Manor in Maryland, also called for a cross-peninsular waterway as early as 1661. However, these early thoughts remained only dreams for nearly a century. The first real efforts at surveying a canal were not made until the 1760s when Philadelphia merchant Thomas Gilpin surveyed five canal routes. Though this first step indicated progress, little in the way of actual construction occurred until the early 1800s (Gray 1989).

In 1802 the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal Company was incorporated and Benjamin Latrobe was hired to survey additional canal lines. By 1804 an “upper route” from the Elk River in Maryland to the Christina River in Delaware was selected. Construction began that year but ceased shortly thereafter due to insufficient funding. The Canal Company petitioned Congress for financial support on the platform that the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal was of national importance, but this funding did not materialize for twenty years and construction was on hold until 1825 (Gray 1989).

However, in the meantime, the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal Company planned to resume construction. In 1822, the company hired William Strickland and John Randel, Jr. to make new surveys and by 1824 the company had adopted a modified canal line based on the plan Randel put forth. The canal was to begin on the Delaware River near Newbold’s Landing (now Delaware City) and end in Maryland at the confluence of the Broad and Back Creeks. Engineers planned to utilize the channels of Broad and St. George’s Creeks as a base for the main channel of the canal through Cecil County, Maryland and New Castle County, Delaware. With federal funding granted in 1825, construction proceeded. The alignment of the canal is depicted on G. T. Poussin’s *Canal de la Chesapeake a la Delaware*, mapped in 1834 (Figure 3; Gray 1989).

The difficult process of constructing the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal took place over the next four years, before the era of mechanization. Mud, excavated by hand, was deposited along the canal’s banks which became difficult to stabilize, especially through the Deep Cut, a part of the canal between Bethel and St. George’s that was dug through a ridge. At the Deep Cut, upwards of 75 vertical feet of mud had to be removed. Approximately 1,500 mostly Irish or African American men were hired to complete the work. Many of these workers established makeshift residences along the banks of the canal while others settled in Bohemia Village (present-day Chesapeake City). Despite the challenges facing engineers and canal workers, dredging of the canal channel was completed by 1829. When the canal opened, the channel was thirty-six feet wide and ten feet deep and locks were located at Chesapeake City, St. George’s and Delaware City (Gray 1989; Morgan and Titter 2000:13-14).

The Chesapeake and Delaware Canal Company operated the toll canal for the next ninety years. Though the company was plagued by financial difficulties through the 1830s and 1840s, its situation improved

by the 1850s. The canal was particularly profitable during the Civil War when it served as an important conduit for the general transport of troops, weapons and supplies and of Confederate prisoners to Fort Delaware. The company continued to enjoy prosperity until the end of the century (Gray 1989).

While the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal Company enjoyed economic success, so too did the towns along the canal corridor. Some of these towns pre-existed the canal, some developed in direct response to the construction and opening of the canal. However all experienced some measure of prosperity during the 19th century and all would also experience a measure of demise in the 20th century after multiple canal widening projects took their toll on each community. In order to understand the effect of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal on the cultural landscape of Cecil County, Maryland and New Castle County Delaware, one must understand the history of each community it passed through – Chesapeake City and Bethel in Cecil County, Maryland and Summit Bridge, St. George’s and Delaware City in New Castle County, Delaware.

### **Cecil County, Maryland**

Cecil County is bounded by Pennsylvania, Delaware, the Sassafras River, the Chesapeake Bay and the Susquehanna River. It is intersected by the Bohemia, Elk and North East Rivers and contains the western terminus of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal. Lord Baltimore formed Cecil County from Baltimore County in 1674 at the urging of Augustine Herman, an early settler and cartographer who had named and indicated the bounds of Cecil County on a map he produced in 1670. From its earliest settlement until the 1740s, Cecil County’s economy was driven by the tobacco slaves harvested on the county’s scattered plantations, including that of Augustine Herman (Copley).

Augustine Herman was one of the earliest settlers in Cecil County in the vicinity of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal corridor. Lord Baltimore granted Herman, who had emigrated in 1661 from Kingdom of Bohemia, a large tract of land in return for his services as a cartographer. Herman called this first grant, which included much of the land east of the Elk River and north of the Bohemia River, “Bohemia Manor” and he established his manor house on the north bank of the Bohemia River. In 1671, Herman received additional grants to “Little Bohemia,” located south of the Bohemia River and “St. Augustine Manor,” located between Bohemia Manor and the Delaware River and bounded on the north and south by the St. George’s and Appoquinimink Creeks (Earle and Skirven 1916:91-92; Scharf 1888:949).

Surveyor John Randel Jr.’s plan for the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal utilized the channel of Back Creek through Bohemia Manor. Anticipating the approval of his plan for the canal, Randel ultimately purchased several thousand acres of Bohemia Manor near the mouth of Back Creek. He named the tract Randalia, built a manor house and operated a steam saw mill on the property (MD 35 and MD 31). He originally purchased the tract with the intention of developing the area into a canal port town. However, his plans fell through and he eventually sold the land (Morgan and Titter 2000:4).

Instead a port town developed at present-day Chesapeake City and outside of this town and Bethel (Pivot Bridge) to the east, the rest of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal corridor in Cecil County remained rural. After 1740, when tobacco production had ceased to be the primary cash crop in the region, much of the land was put towards the cultivation of grains. *Martenet’s Map of Cecil County* shows that much of the land on Randalia and Welch Point along Back Creek remained in large tracts in the hands of the Randel family, likely used for agricultural purposes

(Figure 4). And while the Randel family had sold all of the property in the area by 1877, there was virtually no additional development by that time (Figure 6).

### Chesapeake City

By the 1830s, a town had developed at present-day Chesapeake City. This settlement developed in direct response to the commercial and industrial activities generated by the opening of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal. Prior to 1825, only a small village consisting of a tan yard, saw mill and wharf was located at Chesapeake City which was then known as “Bohemia Village.”

However, canal construction spurred development as a number of canal workers established residences and formed a community in Bohemia Village. Evidence of this community remains in present-day Chesapeake City. The Nowland-Hofra-Shelby Group Houses (MD 17) - a group of four row houses, and Nellie Allen’s House (MD 15) - a small double frame house, in North Chesapeake City are standing examples of typical early workers’ residences. St. Rose of Lima Catholic Church (MD 12), constructed in 1875, began as a mission in 1844 to serve German and Irish canal workers and today stands as testimony to the community formed by these early immigrants (Maryland Historic Trust 1973, 1973a; Shagena 1996:38-39).

Construction of the canal through the north bank of Back Creek divided the community into three distinct sections: the north side of Back Creek, south side of Back Creek and the causeway, known as Whig Island, which was formed between the north and south sides of Chesapeake City. Warehouses and docks lined the waterfront along the creek and the causeway and the waterfront quickly became the center of activity in town. Several Canal Company buildings, a

Masonic Hall, doctor’s office, fire house and several homes were built on Whig Island in the 19th century (Morgan and Titter 2000:6).

Two bridges connected Whig Island to the north and south sides of Chesapeake City – the Long Bridge and the High Bridge. Though its construction date is unclear, the Long Bridge was the first bridge constructed at Chesapeake City after the opening of the canal. Located at the foot of Bohemia Avenue, it connected the south side of Chesapeake City with the causeway. The bridge itself was a wooden structure that rotated 180 degrees to allow barges to pass into and out of the Back Creek basin. The High Bridge, an A-frame wooden bridge that was lifted by a man-powered crank, connected the north side of Chesapeake City with the causeway (Morgan and Titter 2000:48-49).

By 1839 the town had grown enough to warrant the opening of a post office and the town was renamed Chesapeake as a testimony to its prominent location at the western terminus of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal. Ten years later, Chesapeake City held a population of 400 and it was incorporated as a town. *Martenet’s Map of Cecil County* shows that by 1858, the majority of development had occurred in South Chesapeake City, where a number of residential and commercial structures lined the streets near the canal (Figure 5). By 1877, the population had reached 1,400 and Lake, Griffing and Stevenson’s *An Illustrated Atlas of Cecil County* reveals a truly bustling town (Figures 7 and 8). It contained two blacksmiths, two druggists, nine stores, two physicians and attorney and a number of other commercial establishments as well as several churches and a school (Lake, Griffing and Stevenson 1877; Shagena 1996:4; Morgan and Titter 2000:4).

Chesapeake City’s architecture stands as testimony to the prosperity of the 1800s. The South Chesapeake City Historic District (MD 39) contains commercial

and residential buildings from all periods of the 19th century. Many of the structures are two or three stories high, made of wood with clapboard siding. The Greek Revival style of architecture is dominant, though examples of Italianate and a Romanesque Masonic Building also exist. The finest example of 19th-century commercial architecture in Chesapeake City is the J. M. Reed Store (Reese Store Building) (MD 42). This building was intimately tied to the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal as advertisements reveal that its shelves were always well-stocked with goods shipped from Baltimore and Philadelphia on Ericsson Line Steamboats via the canal (Bourne 1974; Bourne and Wein 1976).

### **Bethel**

Bethel (also known as Pivot Bridge) was a small canal crossing community located two miles east of Chesapeake City. The road from Back Creek to Elkton crossed the Chesapeake and Delaware canal at a small canal community called Pivot Bridge, or Bethel. The influx of people to Chesapeake City in the 1800s also extended to outlying towns like Bethel. The community grew quickly and *Martenet's Map of Cecil County*, published in 1858 (Figure 4) and Lake, Griffing and Stevenson's *An Illustrated Atlas of Cecil County*, published in 1877 (Figure 6) show that by the mid-19th century Bethel contained a cluster of residences and shops as well as a Methodist Church. Bethel continued to thrive into the early 20th century (Martenet 1858; Lake, Griffing and Stevenson 1877; Morgan and Titter 2000:13).

### **Pencader Hundred, New Castle County, Delaware**

Formed in 1710, Pencader Hundred is bounded by White Clay Creek, New Castle, Red Lion and St. George's Hundreds and by Maryland. A majority of Pencader Hundred was originally part of the Welsh

Tract and St. Augustine Manor, two of the earliest land grants in New Castle County. The southern portion of Pencader Hundred, through which the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal passes, was originally part of St. Augustine Manor. This tract, granted by Lord Baltimore to Augustine Herman, in 1671 included land stretching from the Delaware River westward to Bohemia Manor and bounded on the north and south by St. George's and Appoquinimink Creeks (Scharf 1888:948-949).

Most early development occurred in the northern part of Pencader Hundred. The earliest roads connected New Castle and Christiana with the Elk River and several early mills were constructed along the waterways in the old Welsh Tract. The discovery of iron ore on Iron Hill also attracted early settlers to the northern part of Pencader Hundred. For the most part, southern Pencader Hundred remained rural. By the mid-19th century, the 1,300 acre Cazier farm on the north side of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal in particular was known as "one of the most productive and valuable estates in the country" (Scharf 1888:949).

Outside of the villages of Kirkwood and Summit Bridge, land was held in large tracts and was used primarily for the cultivation of cereals and grains throughout the 19th century. Rea and Price's *Map of New Castle County* of 1849 (Figure 9) reveals very sparse development in the vicinity of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal. While Beers' 1868 *Atlas of the State of Delaware* (Figure 10), Hopkin's *Map of New Castle County, Delaware* of 1881 (Figure 15) and Baist's 1893 *Atlas of New Castle County, Delaware* (Figures 18 and 19) show a number of buildings along the roads from Summit Bridge, the land immediately adjacent to the canal still remained agricultural throughout the 19th century.

### **Summit Bridge**

Summit Bridge, formerly known as Jesterville (DE 116), was the only village along the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal corridor in Pencader Hundred. Located south of canal near the boundary lines of Red Lion, St. George's and Pencader Hundreds, Summit Bridge was named on account of the high bridge constructed over the canal on the road leading to Kirkwood (Scharf 1888:958). The Summit Bridge (DE 117), a 247 foot long wooden covered bridge that sat 90 feet above the canal was completed in October 1826 and it was immediately an attraction. This bridge spanned the Deep Cut where a piece of earth 230 feet wide at the top, 36 feet wide at the bottom and 80 feet deep had been cut away to create the canal channel. Guide books and personal accounts written by travelers declared the magnificence of the Summit Bridge. One account lauded, "Independently of the interest excited by the bridge, the view of the canal from its commanding height is grand beyond description" (Gray 1989:102). Naturally, such a structure was a fitting setting for the canal's grand opening ceremonies which were held at Summit Bridge in 1829. However forty years later, the grand bridge was in such a state of disrepair that its replacement was inevitable. By 1866, the original covered wooden structure was replaced with a new drawbridge (Gray 1989:62, 65, 102, 148, 152).

Development in Summit Bridge pre-dates the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal but the town benefited from its proximity to the waterway. Although the canal limited travel between northern New Castle County and the rest of Delaware, one of the two early roads that crossed the canal was located at Summit Bridge. In the late 18th and early 19th centuries the town was simply known as Buck Tavern. At that time it contained only the tavern of the same name (DE 30) and a post office, which had been established in 1825. However, by 1888 Summit Bridge had expanded to include a church, the Delaware Wagon-Works, two

blacksmith shops, a hotel, three stores and fifteen residences and was well-suited to serve the needs of the surrounding farmers (Scharf 1888:957-958).

### **Red Lion Hundred, New Castle County, Delaware**

Red Lion Hundred was created in 1710 from New Castle Hundred. It is bounded by the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, the Delaware River, Pencader Hundred and Red Lion Creek, for which it was named. Because a portion of the town of St. George's once lay in St. George's Hundred, the boundary of Red Lion Hundred was extended in 1875 to incorporate all of St. George's. A portion of Red Lion Hundred adjacent to the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal was originally part of the "St. George's Neck" tract purchase by Jacob Young in 1675. This tract was situated on the north side of St. George's Creek between that Creek and Dragon's Run (Scharf 1888:958-959).

Agriculture was important to Red Lion Hundred's early economy. The Hundred contains rich and productive soil and some of the finest agricultural land in Delaware was found here. Like Pencader Hundred, there was little but agricultural development in the nineteenth century, outside of the villages (Figures 9, 11, 15 and 18). Prior to the "peach boom" of the 1830s, Delaware's main agricultural products were grains. However, between 1831 and 1870, Delaware became the center for peach production in the eastern United States. Early peach production occurred in northern Delaware because of its strategic location near the shipping facilities afforded by the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal and railroads. The first peach orchards in Delaware were planted in Red Lion Hundred in 1831 and were successful there until the "peach blight" of the 1850s. Delaware City and St. George's became major shipping points for peaches and other agricultural products grown in southern New Castle County. The peach industry also led to a variety of associated industries including

canneries and peach tree nurseries and some of these industries developed in the area along the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal as well. The construction of “peach houses” in the Italianate architectural style accompanied the prosperity of the peach industry and this architectural style was common along the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal corridor (Scharf 1888:958; Custer and Jehle).

### St. Georges

St. George’s was settled near the end of the 17th century when a bridge was constructed over the St. George’s Creek at the southern end of present-day Broad Street on the well-traveled road between New Castle and Lewes. This crossing became the focal point for a small grouping of houses that were built on both the north and south sides of the St. Georges Creek. By 1708, the growing settlement north of the creek was substantial enough to be described as “a pretty village, ten miles below New Castle” and by 1714, a grist mill, mill pond and race had also been constructed to the west of the bridge. A more formalized vision of a town plan, however, does not seem to have emerged until around 1730 when local landowners began to reserve parcels of land for town lots along present-day Main Street. In 1762, the Kings Highway was formally laid out through St. George’s, though the route had existed since the late 17th century, and the town became a popular place for stage coach stops. Several inns and taverns were built in town during this period to service King’s Highway traffic. After 1762, the village gradually increased in size and was incorporated as a town in 1825 (Scharf 1888:967-968; Brizzolara 1995; Hunter Research, Inc. 2007).

Though development of St. George’s predated the construction of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, the construction of the canal was a pivotal event in the history of the village. St. George’s was perfectly located to reap the benefits of the canal. A 100-foot long,

23 feet wide lock and swing bridge were installed at St. George’s just to the west of the original bridge. At the location of the old bridge, a basin was constructed for the loading of canal boats. This transformed the town into a major shipping point for Delaware’s agricultural products, including peaches as previously mentioned (Hunter Research, Inc. 2007).

Rea and Price’s *Map of New Castle County* shows development in St. George’s from the opening of the canal until 1849 was largely restricted to the north side of the canal. Only five buildings including a steam saw mill existed on the south side of the canal (Figure 9). By 1868, when Beers’ published his *Atlas of the State of Delaware* (Figure 12), approximately fifty buildings existed north of the canal and twenty buildings had been constructed on the south bank of the canal, linearly along the southern approach to North St. Georges. North St. Georges was clearly the civic focus of town. All of the village’s banks, churches and lodge halls were located on North St. George’s more heavily developed and formalized street plan. The commercial and industrial infrastructure in South St. George’s was entirely focused on the canal. The largest of these enterprises was Bellville and Wells (DE 175 and DE 181), a company that dealt in “general merchandise.” A store (DE 178) was located next to the canal and the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal Company also maintained a building along the banks of the canal (DE 177).

G. W. Hopkins’ *Map of New Castle County, Delaware* of 1881 (Figure 16) shows that throughout the second half of the 19th century there was very little change in St. George’s. In the years between 1868 and 1893, the most notable change was the construction of the buildings of the St. George’s Fruit Packing Company (DE 176).

### **Delaware City**

Unlike St. George's, Delaware City was deliberately planned in response to the construction of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal. It did not grow from an existing crossroads.

In 1675 Edmund Andros, Governor of the Duke of York's territories in America, granted a large tract of land, including most of present day Delaware City, to Henry Ward. Ward's family held this land for nearly 125 years, but it is unknown what, if any, settlement occurred during their ownership. In 1801, Henry Ward Pearce sold the tract in separate pieces to John, Clayton and Barzillia Newbold (Scharf 1888:971).

John Newbold, a land speculator, acquired the piece of land that would later become Delaware City and immediately built a wharf there. The area, then known as "Newbold's Landing," became a center for grain shipping and trading. However by 1824, plans for the construction of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal indicated that the eastern terminus of the canal would be located on Newbold's land. Recognizing the potential economic prosperity this would bring, Newbold's sons, Daniel and William, immediately plotted a town at Newbold's Landing. They planned numerous small-sized lots in anticipation of the great land rush the canal would bring. The Newbolds named the town Delaware City and envisioned that the town would come to rival Philadelphia as a center of trade and commerce (Scharf 1888:971-972).

Delaware City did grow into an important shipping town due to its location on the Delaware River, Chesapeake and Delaware Canal and the railroad. However, the town grew slowly through the 19th century; it did not experience the boom in development that the Newbolds had envisioned. The earliest development occurred at the northeast end of town along Clinton, Washington, Hamilton and Third Streets extending toward the canal (Figure 13). After

1880, expansion was directed away from the river and canal toward the southwest and northwest and land was parceled in larger quantities (Figure 17; Scharf 1888:973; Cesna 1983).

While most activity centered on the canal, improvements in agriculture and fishing industry in the surrounding area also contributed to economic prosperity. Delaware City has never been an important center of manufacturing and what manufacturing did exist was small in scale. Industries in town included the manufacture of mince-meat, wagon work and blacksmithing, production of stamped tin and sheet iron ware and a grist mill. The abovementioned peach industry also lent to the prosperity of Delaware City (Scharf 1888:973, 980; Cesna 1983).

### **St. George's Hundred, New Castle County, Delaware**

Created in 1682, St. George's Hundred was one of the original Delaware Hundreds. It is bounded by the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, the Delaware River, Appoquinimink Creek and Maryland. It was named for the creek that once formed its northern border. Though Middletown, Odessa and Port Penn are all important towns or villages within the boundaries of St. George's Hundred, none are located along the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal corridor.

Peter Alrichs was the first to take up land in St. Georges Hundred. He took up land bounded on the north and south by St. Augustine and St. George's Creek and on the east and west by the Delaware River and Kings Road. The Alrichs family held portions of this tract until 1880 (Scharf 1888:982)

Like the rest of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal corridor, St. George's was important agriculturally through the 19th century. Scharf reports in 1888 that with the exception of marshland along the Delaware

River, the entire Hundred was under cultivation. Like Red Lion Hundred on the north side of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, a large portion of St. George's Hundred was devoted to peach production in the 1800s. After the peach blight of the 1850s, farmers in the region turned to wheat, corn and oats (Scharf 1888:981-982).

In 1849 there were scattered farms located in St. George's Hundred along the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal. Only a few buildings appear along the canal corridor on Rea and Price's *Map of New Castle County* (Figure 9). J. T. Bird, L. G. Clark, T. McWhorter and K. John (DE 214) all owned land and buildings in the vicinity of the canal. By 1868, these scattered farms were joined by additional dwellings and the commercial building of "F. McWhorter & Bro," (DE 210) located on the neck of land between the canal and Scott Run (Figure 14). By 1881, an additional commercial structure, the Commercial Ice Company (DE 215), had been constructed along the canal (Figure 15). G. W. Baist's *Atlas of New Castle County, Delaware* indicates that St. George's Hundred's landscape had not significantly changed by 1893 (Figures 18 and 19).

### **3. *The Chesapeake and Delaware Canal and Communities during the 20th Century***

The towns along the corridor of the Chesapeake and Delaware canal were affected by two major projects undertaken on the canal in the 20th century – the federal government's conversion of the lock canal to a sea-level waterway and a major widening project begun in the 1960s.

Owing to the financial difficulties experienced by the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal Company at the end of the 19th century, calls were made to convert the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal from a lock canal to a sea-level ship channel. Though supporters of

the ship canal had surveyed several routes, by the 1890s the current alignment of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal was the route that received the strongest support. However, the Canal Company was not in a financial position to convert their lock canal into a ship canal. In response, the federal government purchased the canal from the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal Company in 1919 and the operation of the canal was transferred to the Corps of Engineers. By 1927 the government-sponsored conversion of the canal was complete. The new sea-level canal followed the same course as the original canal, excepting the relocation of the eastern entrance south of Delaware City. The new channel was ninety feet wide and twelve feet deep and new bridges were built at Delaware City, St. George's, Summit Bridge and Chesapeake City (Gray 1989).

Shortly after the Philadelphia District Corps of Engineers took over operation of the canal in 1933, Congress authorized several expansions of the waterway. Between 1935 and 1938 the canal was enlarged to a width of 250 feet. In 1954 Congress authorized further expansion of the canal to a width of 450 feet. These improvements began in the 1960s and were completed by 1981. This project included the replacement of all but one of the old vertical lift bridges across the canal with modern high-rise highway bridges. Both the conversion project of the 1920s and the widening of the canal in the 1960s affected every community along the canal, forcing each town to redefine its character and economy. (Gray 1989).

#### **Chesapeake City**

Chesapeake City witnessed a final period of growth in the 1910s when a sizable Ukrainian population moved from central Pennsylvania into the town. Bishop Ortinsky purchased 700 acres of land south of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal for the Ukrainian set-

tlers. Like immigrant groups of the early 1800s, this more recent immigrant found work on the canal – they worked to convert the canal to a sea-level waterway in the 1920s (Morgan and Titter 2000:75).

However, the federal government's conversion of the Chesapeake and Delaware canal to a sea-level waterway marked the beginning of decline of Chesapeake City. While this conversion was greatly beneficial to long distance freight shippers, it had dire consequences for local commerce. Most of the causeway's land was removed in order to construct the sea-level waterway and when conversion was complete, Chesapeake City's locks were removed; freight and ship traffic passed right by the town. The only buildings remaining on the causeway today are the Corps of Engineers Office and the Old Lock Pump House (MD 44) (Shagena 1996:11; Morgan and Titter 2000:8).

Chesapeake City suffered another blow in 1942 when a tanker collided with the lift bridge that connected George Street on the south side of the canal with Lock Street on the north side of the canal. Though the bridge was replaced with a ferry, the level of vehicular traffic that had been sustaining the town's economy greatly declined. Still, the final blow came in 1948 when a single span tied arch bridge, designed by Parsons Brinkerhoff & Douglas, was constructed to the west of the town bypassing the core of Chesapeake City (MD 10) (Coneybeer 1994; Shagena 1996:12).

The final widening project begun in the 1960s destroyed a good portion of Chesapeake City. A number of homes in North Chesapeake City were razed to make room for the widened channel. Schafer's wharf, store and restaurant were relocated for the third time and a boatyard and service station on the south bank of the canal were abandoned. Because of this, the intact historic core of Chesapeake City today lies on the south bank of the canal (Gray 1989:261).

### **Bethel**

Bethel, Maryland suffered a fate similar to Chesapeake City's. The town's A-frame bridge was dismantled as part of canal's conversion to a sea-level waterway. Though it was replaced with a ferry until 1929, the bridge was never reconstructed. The once thriving town began a steady decline through the first half of the 20th century. The widening of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal in the 1960s was again the final blow for this small canal town. Virtually the entire town was demolished to make way for the new canal line. The extension of the canal over the Bethel Methodist Episcopal Church cemetery and part of an older Bethel cemetery on the south bank of the canal involved the excavation and reburial of the remains of 1,137 persons and the demolition of the Bethel Methodist Episcopal Church. All that remains of Bethel today is the Methodist Church Cemetery, the Thompson-Parkinson House (MD 57) and the nearby Dickinson-Johnson House (MD 70) (Gray 1989:261-262; Morgan and Titter 2000:50, 139-140).

### **Summit Bridge**

The bridge at Summit Bridge was replaced with a modern high-rise highway bridge in 1960. This new bridge was located slightly west of the original alignment of Summit Bridge, thus bypassing the core of historic Summit Bridge (Gray 1989:261). The widening of the canal also forced the relocation of the Buck Tavern. Threatened with destruction, the State of Delaware acquired the tavern from the Army Corps of Engineers and relocated it from its original site in Summit Bridge to Lums Pond State Park. Though this action ensured its preservation, the tavern is now permanently dislocated from its historic setting.

### **St. George's**

South St. Georges, as it survives today, is greatly changed from the 19th century village. Each phase of canal widening has resulted in greater losses of land in South St. George's and today approximately half of the buildings that once stood in South St. Georges have been demolished as a result of undertakings along the canal. Because most of South St. Georges' industrial and commercial infrastructure was focused on the canal, few non-residential buildings remain there today. Approximately eight residences, several stores, a bakery, the St. George's Fruit Company and the buildings of "Bellville and Wells" were among the buildings lost. The canal lock at St. George's was removed along with those at Chesapeake City and Delaware City in the 1920s. At the same time, a new steel vertical lift bridge was constructed at the foot of Main Street (Hunter Research, Inc. 2007).

Like the bridge in Chesapeake City, St. George's lift bridge was destroyed when a freighter collided with it in 1939. Again, like Chesapeake City, when its bridge was replaced in 1941 it was located to the west of the town. The construction of the new tied arch steel highway bridge resulted in the demolition of additional buildings, the permanent physical disassociation of North and South St. Georges and the abandonment of the town streets for through traffic. A widened canal served as a literal division between North and South St. George's (Hunter Research, Inc. 2007).

### **Delaware City**

Both the rise and fall of Delaware City can be attributed to construction activities along the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal corridor. After the government purchased the canal and converted it into a sea-level canal, they redirected the eastern terminus to Reedy Point. This diverted freight traffic away from Delaware City. By the 1960s, the canal as it flowed

through Delaware City was merely a small feeder canal and therefore was not affected by the widening of the main channel as were other towns along the canal. Since the 1920s, the city that once sat witness to an immense amount of freight and passenger traffic flowing through the canal has been primarily used by small pleasure craft (Cesna 1983).

### **4. Summary**

Today, millions of tons of cargo are shipped annually through the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal. However since the locks and basins that allowed canal towns to prosper in the 19th century are no longer, the towns along the canal have found new ways to take advantage of the waterway that runs through them. Today, the canal and the towns along it have been reinvented with an eye to tourism.

The idea that the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal could provide space for play and recreation was expressed as early as the 20th century. By the early 20th century, Lorewood Grove, a popular recreation spot, had developed along the banks of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal. Located two miles west of St. George's and one mile east of the railroad bridge, Lorewood Grove was "'a beautiful picnic ground, where dancing, bathing, boating, and fishing are much enjoyed'" (Gray 1989:219). The Ericsson Line stopped at Lorewood Grove daily as it traveled from Baltimore to Philadelphia through the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal and this is one indication of the character of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal corridor would develop in the 20th century.

Improvements to recreational facilities occurred concurrently with the widening project in the 1960s. Fishing piers were built along the banks of the canal and many landowners along Back Creek in Maryland constructed summer cottages, docks and beaches along the canal (Gray 1989:263).

Chesapeake City in particular has profited greatly from its association with the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal. The Chesapeake City District Civic Association formed after a severe economic downturn in the 1960s, in which residents abandoned their homes and businesses closed. This group had the foresight to recognize the economic power that could be harnessed from Chesapeake City's identity as a 19th-century canal town and was instrumental in saving and restoring several historic buildings in town. By the 1980s, the Bayard House Restaurant and Back Creek General Store opened in restored 19th-century buildings. While Chesapeake City no longer thrives on canal trade and commerce, it is the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal that still provides the backbone of the town's identity and economy (Shagena 1996 14-15).

### **3. INVENTORY OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL RESOURCES**

#### **A. Introduction**

This survey has identified 284 resources within the project corridor. These resources fall into six different categories:

1. Buildings, Structures or Sites Listed in the National Register,
2. Buildings, Structures or Sites Considered Eligible for Listing in the National Register,
3. Buildings, Structures or Sites Considered Not Eligible for Listing in the National Register,
4. Historical Buildings, Structures or Sites Identified from SHPO Files,
5. Historic Map Documented Buildings, Structures or Sites, and
6. Previously Identified Prehistoric Archaeological Sites.

Each category of resource is discussed by the state they are located in because of minor differences in the way Maryland and Delaware each register and document historic resources.

National Register-listed buildings, structures or sites (category 1) are those that have been nominated and reviewed through a joint state/federal process, culminating in acceptance by the National Register of Historic Places, a list maintained by the National Park Service. This designation is important because these historic properties are protected by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Buildings, structures or sites considered eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (category 2) are also protected by this Federal legislation. Finally, buildings, structures or sites that have been formally evaluated as Not Eligible (category 3) do not receive protections from the Federal government. All of these sites have received significant investigation and consideration that evaluates their history and integrity.

Many of the historic sites, with or without standing structures, that have been surveyed in Maryland and Delaware by both the respective states and as part of cultural resource investigations have been identified but not evaluated for their National Register eligibility. These sites (category 4) may be eligible, however the formal process of determining this status has not been conducted. These sites are briefly documented with simple survey forms.

The majority of historic resources identified by this investigation are Historic Map Documented Buildings, Structures or Sites (category 5). Historic map documented resources are defined as those structures that appear on historic map coverages of the project corridor but have not been previously architecturally or archaeologically surveyed. For the most part, these resources are now historic archaeological sites with no above-ground elements, although some may still