

**TECHNICAL REPORT**

**UPDATED  
MBTA GREEN LINE EXTENSION PROJECT  
HISTORIC AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES  
RECONNAISSANCE SURVEY  
AND HISTORIC RESOURCES INTENSIVE SURVEY  
VOLUME I  
Cambridge, Medford, and Somerville Massachusetts**

Virginia H. Adams  
Suzanne Cherau  
Jennifer Banister  
John J. Daly  
Carey Jones  
Jenny Fields Scofield  
Quinn Stuart

Submitted to:  
**Massachusetts Department of Transportation**  
10 Park Plaza  
Boston, Massachusetts 02116

Submitted by:  
**The Public Archaeology Laboratory, Inc.**  
210 Lonsdale Avenue  
Pawtucket, Rhode Island 02860

**PAL Publications**

**CARTOGRAPHERS**

Dana M. Richardi/Jane Miller

**GIS SPECIALIST**

Jane Miller

**GRAPHIC DESIGN/PAGE LAYOUT SPECIALISTS**

Alytheia M. Laughlin/Gail M. Van Dyke

**EDITOR**

Ken Alber





## MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

The Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT), formerly the Executive Office of Transportation and Public Works, in coordination with the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA), is planning the Green Line Extension Project. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is the lead federal agency for the project. The project will extend existing MBTA Green Line service from Lechmere Station in Somerville through the northwest Boston corridor communities of Cambridge, Somerville, and Medford, with a spur line to Union Square in Somerville. PAL completed a series of historic and archaeological surveys as part of the Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. team for the project. PAL undertook a historic and archaeological resources reconnaissance survey for the No-Build or “Baseline” alternative and six “build” project alternatives under consideration in 2008, in support of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)/ Environmental Assessment (EA) for the project. PAL completed an intensive historic resources survey within the Proposed Action project area in June 2010.

Subsequently, PAL completed several additional assessment and identification efforts for historic and archaeological resources that could be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register), which are presented as report addenda or supplemental material documents in appendices in this combined and updated report. This report thus integrates all analyses conducted to date and is intended to serve as a comprehensive record of the process undertaken by MassDOT to identify historic properties for the Green Line Extension project.

The 2008 reconnaissance historic resources survey identified a total of 15 areas/districts, including 2 railroad corridor landscapes and 425 individual resources within the project Area of Potential Effect (APE). A total of 13 areas/districts and 53 individual resources were previously recorded in the MHC inventory. The areas/districts included three National Register of Historic Places-listed (National Register) districts, two National Register-listed multiple property submissions, one local historic district listed in the State Register only, and four areas recommended as potentially eligible historic districts. The individual properties included four individually listed in the National Register; six properties previously determined eligible by the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC); 15 recommended individually eligible for National Register listing, and two single-property local historic districts that are listed in the State Register. One of these local historic districts was also recommended eligible for National Register listing. The two railroad corridor landscapes – the Lowell Line and the Fitchburg Line – were recommended as not eligible for listing in the National Register as historic districts, nor were any potentially eligible individual rail-related resources identified within the corridors. Intensive survey with completion of MHC Inventory forms and National Register eligibility evaluation was recommended for six individual properties identified in the reconnaissance survey within the Proposed Action APE that were evaluated as potentially eligible and did not have existing inventory forms on file. Intensive survey and National Register eligibility evaluation was conducted for these six individual properties in June 2010. Five properties were recommended as being individually eligible, and one property was recommended as not eligible.

It was recommended that the FTA and MassDOT continue to consult with the MHC, the Cambridge Historical Commission, the Somerville Historic Preservation Commission, and the Medford Historical Commission regarding the historic resources identification, as well as project impacts and measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate any adverse effects of the project on significant historic properties.

The historic resources 2008 reconnaissance and 2010 intensive surveys, the supplemental studies, and the outcome of the consultation process identified a total of 8 areas/districts, including 2 railroad corridor landscapes, and 276 individual historic resources in the APE of the project's Proposed Action. The identification and evaluation of Section 106 historic properties within the Proposed Action APE resulted in 6 historic districts and 23 individual properties that are listed in, previously determined eligible for, or recommended eligible for the National Register. The districts comprise 1 listed historic district, 1 listed Multiple Property Submission, and 4 areas recommended as eligible historic districts. The individual historic properties consist of 4 listed properties, 4 previously determined eligible properties, and 15 recommended eligible properties. One additional individual historic resource is listed in the State Register only.

The results of the 2008 archaeological resources reconnaissance survey within the APE of the baseline alternative and six alternatives, with landtakings, identified a total of five sensitive areas where potentially significant archaeological resources could be located. These sensitive areas were associated with Alternatives 1 thru 5. They included: 1) historic Middlesex Canal (SMV-HA-1) stone bridge crossing, canal prism, and tow path within and adjacent to the Lowell Line ROW in Medford; 2) mid- to late-nineteenth-century worker housing on Joy Street in Somerville; 3) late-nineteenth- to early-twentieth-century North meat-packing plant factory complex off Somerville Avenue in Somerville; 4) early/mid-nineteenth-century Clark Bennett residence, outbuildings, and yard area on Prospect Street in Somerville; and 5) late-nineteenth-century dwelling (possible worker housing) on the subdivided Clark Bennett estate property on Prospect Street in Somerville. No other areas of archaeological sensitivity were identified for the Green Line Extension Project APE because of the presence of extensive fill and/or previously disturbed belowground soil contexts. Alternative 6 did not contain any archaeologically sensitive areas. The Proposed Action includes two areas identified as having moderate sensitivity: mid- to late-nineteenth-century worker housing on Joy Street in Somerville near the proposed Washington Street Station; and potential for buried intact ground surfaces that could contain Native American sites in the Maintenance Facility Option L area.

No further work was recommended for no/low sensitivity areas of the project alternatives. Avoidance of the archaeologically sensitive areas was recommended. If avoidance through project redesign would not be possible, then subsurface testing as part of an intensive (locational) archaeological survey would be warranted in consultation with FTA, MassDOT, and MHC. Subsequent analyses completed in February 2010 and April 2011 for the Maintenance Facility Option L, and in November and December 2010 for the Washington Street Station and a sidewalk proposed at the College Avenue Station provided updated assessments for these areas as having no/low archaeological sensitivity within the Proposed Action APE. Therefore, no further archaeological survey work was recommended.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## VOLUME I

<b>MANAGEMENT SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Project History .....	1
Project Area Description .....	3
All Alternatives .....	3
Maintenance Facility Option L .....	7
Proposed Action .....	7
Project Scope and Authority .....	7
Project Personnel .....	7
Disposition of Project Materials .....	13
<b>2 METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>14</b>
Historic and Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey .....	14
Project Goals .....	14
Area of Potential Effect .....	14
Archival Research .....	15
Field Survey .....	17
National Register Criteria for Evaluation .....	18
Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment .....	18
Historic and Archaeological Resources Assessment, Maintenance Facility Option L .....	22
Historic Resources Intensive Survey .....	22
Project Goals .....	22
Archival Research .....	23
Field Survey .....	23
Consultation Evaluations .....	23
<b>3 ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT .....</b>	<b>24</b>
Physiographic Setting .....	24
Geology and Glacial Activity .....	25
Hydrology .....	26
Soils .....	27
<b>4 PRE-CONTACT AND CONTACT PERIOD CULTURAL CONTEXT .....</b>	<b>28</b>
Pre-Contact Period .....	28
Previous Archaeological Research in the Charles River Drainage .....	28
PaleoIndian Period (12,500–10,000 B.P.) .....	31
Early Archaic Period (10,000–7500 B.P.) .....	32

Middle Archaic Period (7500–5000 B.P.) .....	33
Late Archaic Period (5000–3000 B.P.) .....	34
Transitional Archaic Period (3600–2500 B.P.) .....	35
Early Woodland Period (3000–1600 B.P.) .....	36
Middle Woodland Period (1650–1000 B.P.) .....	37
Late Woodland Period (1000–450 B.P.) .....	38
Contact Period (450–300 B.P. /A.D. 1500–1620).....	38
Maintenance Facility Option L Area, Somerville .....	39
<b>5 POST-CONTACT PERIOD CULTURAL CONTEXT .....</b>	<b>41</b>
Cambridge .....	41
Plantation Period (1620–1675).....	41
Colonial Period (1675–1775).....	44
Federal Period (1775–1830).....	46
Early Industrial Period (1830–1870).....	48
Late Industrial Period (1870–1915).....	50
Modern Period (1915–present) .....	51
Medford .....	54
Plantation/Colonial Period (A.D. 1620–1775) .....	54
Federal Period (1775–1830).....	55
Early Industrial Period (1830–1870).....	57
Late Industrial Period (1870–1915).....	60
Modern Period (1915–present) .....	61
Somerville .....	62
Plantation Period (A.D. 1620–1675).....	62
Colonial Period (1675–1775).....	62
Federal Period (1775–1830).....	63
Early Industrial Period (1830–1870).....	63
Late Industrial Period (1870–1915).....	65
Modern Period (1915–present) .....	68
Middlesex Canal .....	71
Canal Construction and Operation in Somerville.....	72
Canal Construction and Operation in Medford .....	73
Post-Closure Impacts to the Middlesex Canal .....	74
Railroad Context .....	74
The Boston & Lowell Railroad .....	77
The Fitchburg Railroad .....	77
The Lexington & Arlington .....	79
The Grand Junction Railroad and Depot Company .....	79
The B&M Railroad .....	79
Commuter Rail Service .....	80
ROW History .....	81
Maintenance Facility Option L Area, Somerville .....	88



<b>6</b>	<b>RESULTS – HISTORIC RESOURCES .....</b>	<b>90</b>
	Summary of Historic Resources Identified .....	90
	Reconnaissance Survey .....	90
	Maintenance Facility Option L Assessment .....	91
	Intensive Survey .....	91
	Consultation .....	93
	Project Area Characteristics .....	93
	Railroad Corridor Landscapes .....	94
	MBTA Lowell Commuter Rail Line Corridor (former Boston & Lowell Railroad) .....	94
	MBTA Fitchburg Commuter Rail Line Corridor (former Fitchburg Railroad) .....	98
	All Project Alternatives .....	98
	No Action and Baseline Alternative .....	98
	Alternative 1: Extension to Medford Hillside and Union Square (via commuter rail ROW) .....	101
	Alternative 2: Extension to Mystic Valley Parkway/Route 16 and Union Square (via commuter rail ROW) .....	129
	Alternative 3: Extension to Medford Hillside (via commuter rail ROW) and Union Square (via McGrath Highway and Somerville Avenue) .....	133
	Alternative 4: Extension to Mystic Valley Parkway/Route 16 (via commuter rail ROW) and Union Square (via McGrath Highway and Somerville Avenue) .....	135
	Alternative 5: Extension to Mystic Valley Parkway/Route 16 (via commuter rail ROW) .....	138
	Alternative 6: Extension to Union Square (via commuter rail ROW) .....	140
	Proposed Action (Extension from Lechmere Station to College Avenue with spur to Union Square and Maintenance Facility Option L) .....	141
<b>7</b>	<b>RESULTS – ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES SENSITIVITY .....</b>	<b>147</b>
	Previously Recorded/Inventoried Archaeological Sites .....	147
	Lowell Line ROW .....	150
	Utilities .....	151
	Soil Borings .....	156
	Sensitivity Assessment .....	157
	Fitchburg Line ROW .....	158
	Utilities .....	158
	Soil Borings .....	159
	Sensitivity Assessment .....	159
	Relocation of Lechmere Station .....	160
	Yard 8 Support Facility .....	160
	Underground Utilities and Soil Borings .....	160
	Sensitivity Assessment .....	161
	Maintenance Facility Option L .....	161
	New Stations .....	161
	Bridge Replacements .....	162
	Somerville Avenue Loop Option .....	162
	Landtakings .....	163
	Areas 1, 2, and 3 .....	164

Areas 4, 5A, 5B, 6, and 7 .....	164
Area 5C .....	164
Areas 8 and 8A .....	164
Areas 9 and 9A .....	165
Area 10 .....	165
Area 11 .....	165
Area 12 .....	166
Areas 13 and 13A .....	166
Area 14 .....	166
Area 15 .....	167
Area 16, 16A, and 16B .....	167
Areas 17, 17A, 17B, 18 and 18A .....	170
Area 30 .....	171
Area 31 .....	171
Area 31A .....	171
Areas 32, 33, 34, and 35 .....	170
Area 31B .....	171
Areas 50 and 51 .....	171
Area 52 .....	171
Area 53 .....	172
Area 54 .....	172
Area 55 .....	172
Area 56 .....	172
Area 57 .....	173
Area 58 .....	173
Area 58A .....	173
Area 59 .....	173
Area 60 .....	174
Area 61 .....	174
Area 62 .....	175
Area 63 .....	175
Areas 64 and 65 .....	175
<b>8 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>177</b>
All Alternatives - Reconnaissance Survey .....	177
Historic Resources .....	177
Archaeological Resources .....	180
Maintenance Facility Option L .....	185
Historic Resources Summary and Recommendations .....	185
Archaeological Resources Summary and Recommendations .....	185
Proposed Action .....	185
Historic Resources Summary and Recommendations .....	185
Archaeological Resources Summary and Recommendations .....	186
Report Addenda: Additional Documentation and Assessment .....	187
Historic Resources .....	187
Archaeological Resources .....	189

**REFERENCES..... 189**

**APPENDICES**

**A A-1 TO A-10, LOCATION OF HISTORIC RESOURCES IDENTIFIED  
WITHIN THE GREEN LINE EXTENSION PROJECT APE ..... 201**

**B TABLES 6-1 TO 6-8, HISTORIC RESOURCES IDENTIFIED WITHIN THE  
GREEN LINE EXTENSION PROJECT APE ..... 223**

**C PHOTOGRAPHS OF HISTORIC RESOURCES IDENTIFIED WITHIN  
THE GREEN LINE EXTENSION PROJECT APE ..... 269**

**VOLUME II**

**D NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES FORMS ..... 335**

**E MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL COMMISSION INVENTORY FORMS..... 633**

**F 2010 MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL COMMISSION INVENTORY FORMS FOR  
INDIVIDUAL PROPERTIES INCLUDED IN THE HISTORIC  
INTENSIVE SURVEY ..... 901**

**G G-1 TO G-9, LOCATION OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES IDENTIFIED WITHIN  
THE GREEN LINE EXTENSION PROJECT PROPOSED ACTION APE ..... 973**

**H ARCHAEOLOGICAL SENSITIVITY MAPS FOR THE GREEN LINE  
EXTENSION PROJECT AREA (CONFIDENTIAL - NOT FOR PUBLIC  
DISTRIBUTION) ..... 999**

**I REPORT ADDENDA, HISTORIC RESOURCES ..... 1015**

**J REPORT ADDENDA, ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES (CONFIDENTIAL -  
NOT FOR PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION) ..... 1047**

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1.	Location of the Green Line Extension historic and archaeological resources reconnaissance survey project area on the Boston North, Boston South, and Lexington USGS quadrangles, 7.5 minute series .....	2
Figure 1-2.	Proposed Green Line Extension historic and archaeological resources reconnaissance survey project area, all alternatives, alignments and station locations .....	5
Figure 1-3.	Location of the Green Line Extension historic resources intensive survey, proposed action with maintenance facility Option L, project area on the Boston North, Boston South, and Lexington USGA quadrangles, 7.5 minute series .....	8
Figure 1-4.	Location of the Green Line Extension project manintenance facility Option L .....	9
Figure 1-5.	Location of the Green Line Extension proposed action and historic resources intensive survey .....	11
Figure 3-1.	Physiographic zones of New England with the approximate location of the Green Line Extension project area .....	24
Figure 3-2.	Drainage basins of Massachusetts, with the approximate location of the Green Line Extension project area .....	26
Figure 5-1.	1700 map of the City of Cambridge showing the location of the Green Line Extension project area .....	45
Figure 5-2.	1830 map of the City of Cambridge showing the location of the Green Line Extension project area .....	47
Figure 5-3.	1849 map of the City of Cambridge showing the location of the Green Line Extension project area .....	49
Figure 5-4.	1896 map of the City of Cambridge showing the location of the Green Line Extension project area .....	52
Figure 5-5.	1930 map of the City of Cambridge showing the location of the Green Line Extension project area .....	53

Figure 5-6.	1794 map of the Town of Medford showing the location of the Green Line Extension project area .....	55
Figure 5-7.	1830 map of the Town of Medford showing the location of the Green Line Extension project area .....	56
Figure 5-8.	1855 map of the Town of Medford showing the location of the Green Line Extension project area .....	58
Figure 5-9.	1875 map of the Town of Medford showing the location of the Green Line Extension project area .....	59
Figure 5-10.	1852 map of the City of Somerville showing the location of the Green Line Extension project area .....	64
Figure 5-11.	1889 map of the City of Somerville showing the location of the Green Line Extension project area .....	66
Figure 5-12.	1895 map showing neighborhood near Winter Hill station in Somerville .....	67
Figure 5-13.	1895 showing select industries along the Fitchburg Railroad in Somerville .....	69
Figure 5-14.	1895 map showing development around the Boston and Lowell Railroad in the west side of Somerville .....	70
Figure 5-15.	Historic railroad lines and railroad place names. Contemporary names indicated in parentheses .....	75
Figure 5-16.	Detail, Plan and profile of the Boston & Lowell Railroad, 1836 showing the location of the Green Line Extension project area .....	78
Figure 5-17.	Union Square Station, Somerville, on the Fitchburg Railroad at Webster Avenue, ca. 1889, looking northwest .....	81
Figure 5-18.	Winter Hill Station, Somerville, on the B & M Southern Division .....	82
Figure 5-19.	1923 aerial view of Boston & Maine yards and Miller's River at Prison Point, Cambridge looking northwest .....	84
Figure 5-20.	1930 aerial view of Boston & Maine yards and Miller's River, Somerville looking southeast .....	85
Figure 5-21.	Ca. 1889 view of Fitchburg and Grand Junction (curving left) railroads at Somerville Avenue, Somerville, looking northwest .....	87

List of Figures

---

Figure 5-22. Ca. 1889 view of Fitchburg Railroad at Webster Avenue (foreground) and Prospect Street (background), looking southeast ..... 87

Figure 6-1. Location of Historic Resources Identified within the Green Line Extension project maintenance facility Option L Area of Potential Effect ..... 92

Figure 6-2. Historic Railroad-Related Structures in the Boston & Lowell Railroad Corridor, Green Line Extension APE ..... 95

Figure 6-3. Historic Railroad-Related Structures in the Fitchburg Railroad Corridor, Green Line Extension APE ..... 99

Figure 7-1. Graphic depiction of fill episodes around Boston with the approximate location of the Green Line Extension project area for Cambridge and Somerville ..... 150

Figure 7-2. 2005/2007 Assessor’s Plan Map showing the mapped Middlesex Canal Route in relation to the Lowell ROW of the Green Line Project APE ..... 153

Figure 7-3. 19th century image of the Middlesex Canal crossing at the Mystic River and Boston and Lowell Railroad (Lowell Line ROW) ..... 155

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1.	Archaeological Sensitivity Rankings Used for the Green Line Extension Project Area .....	22
Table 4-1.	Pre-Contact Native American Cultural Chronology for Southern New England. ....	29
Table 5-1.	Post-Contact Cultural Chronology for Southern New England .....	42
Table 6-1.	Areas and Districts Surveyed within the Green Line Extension Project Area of Potential Effect .....	Appendix B
Table 6-2.	Individual Historic Resources Surveyed within the Green Line Extension Project Area of Potential Effect .....	Appendix B
Table 6-3.	Historic Railroad-Related Structures in the MBTA Lowell Commuter Rail Line Corridor (former Boston & Lowell Railroad), Green Line Extension Project APE .....	Appendix B
Table 6-4.	Historic Railroad-Related Structures in the MBTA Fitchburg Commuter Rail Line Corridor (former Fitchburg Railroad), Green Line Extension Project APE .....	Appendix B
Table 6-5.	Previously Demolished Historic Resources in MHC Inventory .....	Appendix B
Table 6-6.	National Register Listed, Determined Eligible, or Recommended Eligible Historic Properties within the Green Line Extension Project Area of Potential Effect for All Alternatives .....	Appendix B
Table 6-7.	Historic Resources in the Intensive Survey for the Green Line Extension Project .....	Appendix B
Table 6-8.	Areas/Districts and Individual Historic Resources within the Green Line Extension Project Area of Potential Effect for the Proposed Action .....	Appendix B
Table 6-9.	National Register Listed, Determined Eligible, or Recommended Eligible Historic Properties within the Green Line Extension Project Area of Potential Effect for the Proposed Action .....	143

List of Tables

---

Table 7-1. Recorded Pre-contact Period Archaeological Sites within One-Half Mile of the Green Line Extension Project APE..... 148

Table 7-2. Known Post-contact Period Archaeological Sites within One-Half Mile of the Green Line Extension Project APE..... 150

Table 8-1. Summary of Historic District Resources within All Alternatives for the Green Line Extension Project Area of Potential Effect..... 178

Table 8-2. Summary of Individual Historic Resources Within All Alternatives for the Green Line Extension Project Area of Potential Effect..... 179

Table 8-3. Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment by Build Alternative, Green Line Extension Project Area of Potential Effect..... 181

Table 8-4. Summary of District and Individual National Register Historic Properties within the Green Line Extension Project Proposed Action Area of Potential Effect ..... 186

Table 8-5. Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment for Proposed Action, Green Line Extension Project Area of Potential Effect..... 187