Settlement

This section on settlement focuses on large-scale settlement trends in Prince George’s County during the postbellum period in both rural and urban settings. It focuses on the history and locations of urban and suburban settlement and the continuity and change in rural settlement. An overview of the general trends is first presented, followed by more detailed discussions of suburbanization and the rise of the rural crossroads communities. Settlement based on agriculture has been discussed in Chapter 3 and is not the focus of this chapter. Finally, particular topics often associated with suburbanization and settlement are also treated here: architectural trends, public health, churches, and access to modern utilities.

Settlement Patterns

In many ways, settlement in Prince George’s County through much of the postbellum period appears to correspond to the “Southern County” model. The Southern County model is based upon a dispersed settlement pattern and posits that the organization of the county as community is coincident with the political boundaries of the county. The community, in this sense, is based on a day’s ride to and from the county seat (Arensberg 1965:106–108). Another settlement model that is applicable is that associated with the Upland South tradition. Otto and Anderson (1982) define several characteristics of settlement concerning the Upland South tradition: a dispersed, kin-based settlement; a dispersed, low order central place such as a grist mill, general store, church, or school; and houses located on high ground near a road.

Rural Prince George’s County has many of these characteristics, with the rural crossroads communities performing the role of a low-order central place. It should be noted that the two models are not mutually exclusive. The Upland South model explains settlement at a smaller scale, one more akin to a neighborhood, while the Southern County model, as its name implies, explains settlement at a larger scale.

Throughout the historic period, settlement in Prince George’s County has been tied to transportation. Initial land grants were often along navigable rivers and their tributaries, and it was only after land along these waterways was granted that settlement moved into inland areas during the seventeenth- and early-eighteenth centuries. By the early-eighteenth century, the colonial assembly had established a number of towns along the Potomac and Patuxent Rivers and their tributaries. Many
of these towns also became the location of tobacco inspection stations and would slowly grow with the addition of residents and services. Beginning in the eighteenth and continuing into the nineteenth century, Prince George’s County constructed numerous roads that connected these towns to one another and to the rural hinterland, improving the ability of planters to transport tobacco to the inspection stations, warehouses, and ports. A few small crossroads communities began to be established during this period as well. The early-nineteenth century also saw the construction of two major transportation routes through western Prince George’s County: the Washington-Baltimore Turnpike and later the B&O Railroad, both linking Baltimore with the national capital.

In 1861, when the Martenet map was published, settlement was essentially the same as that of 30 years before. The few larger towns in the county were along navigable (or previously navigable) waterways and were associated with tobacco, including Upper Marlboro (the county seat), Bladensburg, Nottingham, Piscataway, Queen Anne, and Long Old Fields (to become Forrestville) (Figure 23). Railroad and road development in the county encouraged the creation of a few small crossroads communities, often no more than a few residences and a store and post office. Laurel was the only sizable community that was based on manufacturing, being the location of cotton mills and quite close to the Muirkirk iron works. Otherwise, the remainder of the population resided scattered across the rural hinterland.

The 1878 Hopkins map provides a view of settlement after the Civil War in Prince George’s County. By the time the map had been published, two additional railroad lines, those of the B&P Railroad, had been constructed across the eastern portion of the county. Although much of the settlement structure appears to be the same as that depicted on the earlier 1861 map, a few changes can be noted. Many of the crossroads communities appear to have grown; a few more residences and services, such as blacksmith shops, schools,
and churches are present. As well, the number of such communities increased, and these include a number of stops (or stations) on the newly constructed railroad lines. Beginning in the 1880s, many of these stations became the nucleus of both planned and unplanned suburbs of Washington, D.C., (Benson et al. 2003:91). One of the more important of such suburbs, Huntington City (now Bowie), was a planned community at the junction of the Popes Creek and Washington lines of the B&P Railroad.

Although much of the suburbanization occurred along the Washington line, another important area was the so-called Route 1 corridor between Bladensburg and Laurel. An 1894 map by Hopkins suggests that this trend has accelerated, with numerous planned communities (or planned additions), including Hyattsville, Muirkirk, Branchville, Hynesboro, and Ardwick, having been established in the 16 years between the publication of the two maps.

By the 1920s, automobiles had become much more common, and all-weather roads had been constructed. This encouraged an increase in suburbanization along the boundary between Prince George’s County and Washington, D.C. As a consequence of improved transportation, 25 percent of the county population lived in the US 1 corridor, and 75 percent of that population worked in Washington, D.C., (Benson et al. 2003:123). New road construction during the 1940s connecting Washington, D.C., with the Suitland Federal Center and Andrews Field/Air Force Base opened the area to the southeast and south of the city to increased suburbanization as well.

This brief overview of settlement has to this point focused on towns and suburban areas, emphasizing their connection with and dependence on transportation routes for their existence (Benson et al. 2003). Aside from small crossroads communities, many of which are still in existence today (and which were dependent on transportation routes for their existence), larger-scale patterning can also be detected in the rural hinterland of Prince George’s County. No such comprehensive studies have been conducted to date. Although this topic could itself be the focus of a single context, the examination of early-twentieth-century USGS topographic maps can provide for some preliminary discussion. Two areas were randomly selected for review: one to the west of T.B. and another to the west of Bowie, representing rural southern and northern portions of the county (Figure 24).

Similarities and differences in rural settlement can be noted when the portions of the two quadrangles are reviewed (Figure 24). Settlement in both areas is largely, but not exclusively, limited to the uplands. Rural domestic structures are most often placed on hilltops, flat ridge areas, and near the edge of upland formations. Unlike prehistoric Native American sites, and perhaps earlier historic period sites, the location of these structures does not appear to be tied to the proximity of water sources. A few structures can be noted, especially in the area near T.B., as being in sloped areas along ravines and flatter areas along streams. This difference may be due to upland formations
Figure 24: Detail of 1907 topographic maps showing rural settlement patterns: upper portion, area near T.B.; lower portion, area west of Bowie.
being more constricted in the T.B. area than near Bowie. Structure locations appear to be aligned along roads on both maps, although it appears to be more so for the area near Bowie. Structures near Bowie are more often aligned along roads or just off roads, either improved or secondary roads. This appears to be somewhat less the case near T.B., where a number of structures are at some distance from improved and secondary roads.

As can be seen from this short review, both suburban and rural settlement in Prince George’s County is tied to transportation, be that along rivers, railroads, or roads. This pattern appears to have been highly stable through time, with shifting emphasis on particular areas of growth within the county based on the opening of new routes and modes of transportation. These trends are examined in greater detail in the next two portions of this section, focusing on suburbanization (spurred both by rail and automobile), and rural communities.

**Suburbanization**

There has been a considerable boom in real estate for some time. That part of the county around Washington by persons desiring suburban residences....By actual count, nearly three hundred houses were erected from Washington to and including Laurel on the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, in two years....That’s a record which goes far to establish the prediction made that in time there will be a continuous city connecting the two cities of Baltimore and Washington (Scharf 1892).

The phenomenon of suburbanization in Prince George’s County has been addressed by a number of contexts and histories, including that by Benson et al. (2003), Berger (1991a, 1991b), Pearl (1991c, 1991f, 1996), and Virta (1991). The MSHA has produced a context on suburbanization in Prince George’s County with structural resources emphasized (MSHA 2003). Virta (1991) has divided the history of suburbanization into two periods: that during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries associated with the expansion of railroads and streetcars, and that associated with the expansion of a road network and automobile ownership, generally a 1930s and later phenomenon. Berger (1991a) describes this process as representing the movement away from a rural, agriculturally based county toward one that is focused and dependent on urban centers and transportation systems. This division is used to organize the discussion below.

Prior to the Civil War, Prince George’s County was overwhelmingly rural, with a few towns and several small crossroads communities present (Benson et al. 2003:93; Virta 1991). However, it was after the Civil War, with railroad and streetcar expansion and increasing numbers of federal employees, that the initial period of suburbanization took place (Benson et al. 2003:93). Washington, D.C., for instance, grew from a city of 61,000 in 1860 to over 100,000 in 1870, principally due to the influx of new federal workers. As land
in the city became ever more valuable, developers responded by proposing and constructing communities to the east across the Anacostia River and to the north of Florida Avenue. Virta (1991) characterizes the development as first filling in areas around Washington, D.C., then along the B&O Railroad in the northern portion of the county, and later along newly established railroad and streetcar lines, principally within two areas of the county: along the current US 1 corridor and the northeast corner of the District of Columbia. This development had a profound impact on the northwest corner of Prince George’s County. One of the earliest attempts at subdivision was located near Bladensburg. The area around Spa Spring, a park that had mineral waters then used as a curative, was subdivided in the 1868, but this attempt failed (Virta 1991). Subsequently, subdivision along transportation routes provided a proven model for residential development. By 1927, the most populous portion of the county was along the B&O/Baltimore-Washington Turnpike (US 1) corridor.

**Railroad and Streetcar Suburbs**

During the period between the 1870s and 1890s suburban expansion was largely concentrated along railroad lines. Expansion first occurred around previously established communities, including Bladensburg, Hyattsville, and Beltsville. For example, C. C. Hyatt and B. F. Guy purchased and subdivided property around the Hyattsville railroad station leading to the creation of the first suburb in the county (Figure 23). With the establishment of a business and commercial district, this suburb grew to a population of 1,200 by 1900. Benson et al. (2003:91) characterize Hyattsville as developing into a combination of a residential and light commercial/industrial community. However, during this period, many of the suburbs had deed restrictions that precluded commercial development.

Following the success of Hyattsville, other communities were planned and developed. Riverdale Park was platted in 1887 when 475 acres of land from the Riversdale plantation was subdivided, and College Park, Berwyn, and Berwyn Heights were planned and constructed in the 1890s (Berger 1991a) (Figure 23). College Park was subdivided in 1889 by J. O. Johnson as a 125-acre development near the Maryland Agricultural College (now University of Maryland) and a stop on the railroad (Berger 1991a). It has continued to expand as a result of the growth of the university. Takoma Park was developed on the Metropolitan Branch of the railroad during the 1880s, after it was platted as a 90-acre subdivision by B. F. Gilbert in 1883 (Berger 1991a).

To the east, suburbanization initially coincided with the construction of the B&P Railroad. After the Civil War, the Pennsylvania Railroad obtained the charter to construct the railroad. The proposed right-of-way was moved west to enable the railroad to construct a spur into Washington, D.C., and thus to compete with the established B&O Railroad to the west. The line, built to Popes Creek, became known as the Popes Creek Line. At that point, the spur to Washington, D.C., was established, and it is at this junction that one of
the earliest successful suburbs was established. A new community, originally called Huntington City, was platted on 300 acres of land around the juncture of the Popes Creek and Washington Branches of the B&P Railroad (Pearl 1991c). Huntington City was eventually renamed Bowie in honor of the first president of the B&P Railroad and eventual governor of Maryland, Oden Bowie. By the late 1800s, the community consisted of a racially mixed population of professionals, craftsmen, and laborers (Berger 1991a:19). The first trains ran from Bowie to Washington, D.C., in 1872, while the first trains along the Popes Creek Branch line to the south began in 1873. Several small communities grew up along the Washington Branch, including Ardwick, Glenn Dale, Landover, Seabrook, and Lanham (Berger 1991a; Virta 1991). Virta (1991) indicates that these communities generally grew at a slower rate than those located along the B&O line to the west. Other than small crossroads communities, no substantial towns grew along the Popes Creek Branch line, with the possible exception of Brandywine.

The first streetcar line in Prince George’s County, the Maryland & Washington Railway, began operation in 1897 (Berger 1991b). This streetcar extended from Washington, D.C., to Hyattsville, Riverdale, and eventually northward to Laurel by 1902. The streetcar not only provided an additional impetus for growth in the older railroad suburbs but spurred the development of several new suburbs including Mount Rainier, Brentwood, North Brentwood, and Cottage City. By 1900 a new streetcar line, the Chesapeake Beach Railway, was founded in an attempt to transport summer vacationers to the western shore of the Chesapeake Bay. Expansion of service into winter promoted the development of Seat Pleasant, Capitol Heights, and Fairmount Heights, an African-American suburb, to the east of Washington, D.C. The Washington, Baltimore, and Annapolis Railway began operation in Prince George’s County in 1908. The line, which paralleled the B&P Railroad, facilitated the development of such suburbs as Glen Arden, Ardmore, Dodge Park, and Columbia. In contrast, due mainly to the lack of railroad or streetcar access, areas to the south of the Washington, D.C., line remained fairly rural until after World War II.

The expansion of streetcars also provided the impetus for the development of the first African-American suburbs. The older railroad-established suburbs tended to have segregated African-American neighborhoods. The development and growth of Fairmount Heights, North Brentwood, Lincoln, and Lakewood was largely due to the establishment of streetcar lines in the US 1 corridor and to the northeast of the District of Columbia. Fairmount Heights was also one of the earliest planned communities for African-Americans in Prince George’s County, beginning in 1900 (Pearl 1996:64). Lincoln was promoted as a garden suburb and retreat for blacks near a stop on the Washington, Baltimore, & Annapolis Electric Railway. Ardwick, an African-American community of District of Columbia professionals, and many prominent black public school officials, was built during the early-twentieth century (Pearl 1996:40). Figure 25, a Sanborn Fire Insurance Company map, depicts an early period in the suburbanization of Fairmount Heights. Such maps can provide important and detailed evidence.
Figure 25: 1939 Sanborn map showing suburbanization in Fairmount Heights.
regarding structure location, materials, and function when investigating a suburban property. Comparison of a time sequence of such maps for a property can provide important information on changes and their impact on potential archeological deposits.

**Automobile Suburbs**

Population growth continued unabated during the middle of the twentieth century, growing from 60,000 in 1930 to 200,000 in 1950. As with the earlier suburbanization associated with railroad and streetcar transportation, the later suburbanization associated with the automobile was largely the result of an expansion in the number of federal jobs in Washington, D.C., associated with the New Deal and World War II. Prior to the Roosevelt administration, there were 63,000 federal jobs in Washington, D.C., whereas by 1940 that total had increased to 166,000. During that same ten-year span, the population of Prince George’s County increased from 60,000 to 90,000. Virta (1991) characterizes the post-1920s era as a time when Prince George’s County became a bedroom community for Washington, D.C. Although the home construction and service sectors of the economy expanded, there was little additional economic development in the county. It was also during this period that many of the planned suburbs began to include local services for the residents, such as grocery stores, drugstores, theaters, and garages, and early shopping centers (MSHA 2003).

Affordable automobiles and the expansion of improved roads allowed potential residents to abandon the constraints imposed by the railroad and streetcar lines of the late 1800s and early 1900s. The expansion, however, followed similar patterns to those first seen with the railroad and streetcar suburbanization; increased suburbanization began with existing suburbs and only later were new suburbs developed. One of the earliest areas of new suburbanization was in the south of the county and was associated with the establishment of Andrews Air Force Base and the Suitland Federal Center during the 1940s (Benson et al. 2003). Greenbelt countered this trend, although its development presents a unique case (Figure 23).

Greenbelt originated as a New Deal US Resettlement Administration employment project as well as an experiment in city and social planning. Townhouses and apartments, as well as a business district, were constructed. The buildings were owned by the federal government through the 1950s when they were sold to a residents’ co-operative (Benson et al. 2003; Virta 1991:214).

The post-1920s suburbanization has been characterized as largely associated with two demographics: middle and working class residents and African-American residents. The African-American groups located adjacent to the original African-American streetcar suburbs, in large part due to the practice of residential segregation. After World War II, the county changed substantially from a largely rural area based on agriculture to an increasingly metropolitan area (Benson et al. 2003:129). It was during
this period that suburbanization became the norm, and automobiles were increasingly necessary as a part of everyday life. Late in this period, two major new corridors, the Baltimore-Washington Parkway, which opened in 1954, and Kenilworth Avenue, which opened in 1957, became corridors for suburbanization (Benson et al. 2003:133).

**Rural Communities and Residences**

Berger (1991c) discusses rural villages in Prince George’s County, while Pearl (1996) has detailed African-American rural villages and communities. Berger (1991c:7) characterizes rural villages as unplanned settlements that developed to serve nearby agricultural areas. Beginning in the eighteenth century, a network of roads was constructed to link farms with the trading and tobacco inspection centers within the county. The rural villages developed on these roads, often at the intersection of two or more such roads, as way stations for travelers and as depots where the local rural residents could obtain goods and services without having to travel to the more distant trade centers. At the time of the Civil War, most towns and villages in Prince George’s County were small crossroads communities (Virta 1991:144). By the late 1800s, many such crossroads communities coalesced around railroad stops, especially where those stops were located adjacent to roadways. One somewhat unusual community in south Prince George’s County, Silesia, was established by Robert and Richard Stein, immigrants from Prussia, during the 1890s. The extended Stein family thereafter operated a store, post office, and wash house, and a school, which opened in 1903 (M-NCPPC 2002).

A visual examination of the 1861 Martenet map indicates the presence of ten such communities in addition to the larger towns such as Laurel, Beltsville, Hyattsville, Bladensburg, Upper Marlboro, Nottingham, Piscataway, and Queen Anne. Named communities include Buena Vista, Croome, Surrattsville, Old Farmington, Tee Bee, Collington, Woodville, and Horse Head. All were located at a crossing of at least two roads. Six of the eight named communities include a post office (the exceptions being Tee Bee and Old Farmington). In all instances but one, the post office was located within a store, and in the lone exception, at Surrattsville, the post office was located within a tavern. Other facilities included taverns or public houses (four examples, including one hotel), churches (three examples), and schools (four examples). Other services include blacksmith shops (three examples) and a carpenter. Six of the eight named communities had five or fewer houses depicted. Only Croome and Woodville had more than five houses depicted.

By 1878, the number of named rural villages had increased significantly, and many of these were associated with either the B&O or the B&P Railroads. Over 50 named rural communities, up from the eight named in 1861, are depicted on the 1878 Hopkins map of Prince George’s County. Minimally, five types of rural communities can be defined at this period for Prince George’s County. The smallest and least complex are the railroad stations or stops. Examples of these include Seabrook, Shipley, and Sunnyside. Generally, these
named places consisted of only a railroad station at this time, although a number of these were soon to become railroad suburbs.

The second community type demonstrates the growth of the railroad station or stop. These communities generally consisted of the station, a store and post office, and may have also included a blacksmith shop, a mill, a church, and a school, along with a few residences, generally numbering 10 or fewer (Figure 26). Examples of this community type include Branchville, Lanham Station, Collington, and Hall’s Station. Muirkirk is something of an oddity in that it consisted of the station and a cluster of 30 residences at this time but entirely lacked services. Nearby also was Rossville, a small black settlement of laborers at the nearby iron furnace (Benson et al. 2003:89; Berger 1991c:7). However, its existence was based on the presence of the Muirkirk ironworks at this location, and the lack of services may be explained by its proximity to Laurel to the north. Once again, a number of these were soon to become suburbs, such as Lanham Station, Glenn Dale, and College Lawn. There also appears to be, in several instances, the organization of paired communities. These paired communities consist of older aggregates of residences and enterprises and the subsequent establishment of a nearby railroad station. For instance, Wilson’s Station is paired with Blythewood, Bright Seat with Suitsville, and Linden Station with Rosaryville, and Cheltenham has both a community centered on a post office and a nearby one centered on the railroad station.

The third community type consists of those communities that were centered on the intersection of two or more roads in the absence of the railroad. Examples include Florenceville, Buena Vista, Woodmore, Good Luck, Tee Bee, Allentown/Camp Springs, Woodville/Aquasco, and Grimesville/Oxen Hill (Figure 27). These communities range from small, such as Good Luck with three residences and no services, to large aggregations of residences and services. Most of the larger communities included services such as blacksmith shops, churches, and schools, and a number also included stores and post offices. The number of residences in these communities could be quite substantial, in part due to the extended and dispersed nature of occupation at locations such as Woodville/Aquasco and Forestville, each with 30 or more residential structures. The spatial extent of such villages is demonstrated by Berger (1991c:9), who indicates that the village of Croom was scattered along 1.6 miles of Croom Road. Covering large areas, many of these communities appear to represent extended neighborhoods.

Platted suburbs, perhaps the most important manifestation of settlement in Prince George’s County during the twentieth century, are represented by two examples on the 1878 Hopkins map, Brandywine City and Huntington City, soon to be renamed Bowie (Figure 22). Both are at the junctures of important transportation routes (Berger 1991c:8). At this point in time, both are represented by only a few residences along with a store and post office, and in the case of Bowie, by a hotel as well.
Figure 26: Detail of community businesses near Glendale from 1878 Hopkins map.
Finally, one rural community type harkens back more to the antebellum period than it reflects the postbellum period, that of the river landings. This class of settlement has been discussed in greater detail in Chapter 8. With the advent of land-based transportation, such as railroads and later automobiles and trucks, these communities were bypassed as important transportation nodes and diminished in number and size throughout the postbellum period, especially during the 1900s.

Public Health

Under the rubric of public health, this section examines the ability of the people living in Prince George's County to access health care. At the start of the postbellum period, health care was largely a private concern, with medical services provided by private physicians and nurses at home offices and in house calls. No hospitals are depicted on the 1861 Martenet, 1878 Hopkins, or 1894 Hopkins maps, although in each case numerous residences are identified as that of a doctor. The 1861 Martenet map depicts 50 residences as those of doctors, with most districts having between one and four so-indicated. By 1878, only 44 are named on the Hopkins map of that date, with most districts having between one and three named physicians. One of the earliest hospitals in the county was the Laurel Sanitarium, which operated between 1905 and 1963. The sanitarium was advertised as treating nervous and mental diseases.
Eventually, three hospital buildings, including an administration building, comprised the facility. The location of the Laurel Sanitarium is now the Laurel Mall at the intersection of Cherry Lane and US 1 (LaurelMuseum.org 2007).

A specialized hospital constructed during this time was the Glenn Dale Hospital, a tuberculosis sanitarium built by Washington, D.C., between 1933 and 1939 (MIHP PG:70-50). The hospital was closed in 1981 and was not in use as of 1997, although the structures associated with this facility were standing at that time. At that time, 23 structures were present, 22 of which were constructed between 1933 and 1953. These include children’s and adult hospital buildings and residences, doctor’s and nurse’s residences, and several associated treatment and ancillary buildings.

**Public Utilities**

Aside from changes in settlement and transportation patterns in the county, suburbanization also provided the critical mass of population needed for the provision of utilities, gas, electricity, and water. Virta (1991:200) indicates that shortly after 1900, gas was being supplied to many of the suburbs for both residential use and town lighting. Perhaps the single most important event with regard to public health in Prince George’s County, as well as surrounding areas, was the establishment of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) in 1918 (Virta 1991). Prior to this period, individual towns provided disposal, if any (Greene 1946). Hyattsville had installed a water system by 1898 and a sewage system by 1904 while Laurel had installed a water system in 1900 followed by a sewage system in 1914 (Denny 1997).

Prior to the installation of waste treatment systems, waste had been deposited directly into the area’s rivers and streams, at times contributing to the outbreak of infectious diseases. At least beginning in 1912, officials from the neighboring District of Columbia had complained about the problem of wastes, and in 1918 the Maryland legislature commissioned the WSSC to create a unified approach to the problem. The WSSC set about creating an integrated waste system and a water supply system. Existing systems were acquired (Hyattsville system in 1920), while in other communities the WSSC constructed the systems. By 1930, WSSC serviced 78,000 homes and businesses with 283 miles of water main and 205 miles of sewer main. The company also provided solid waste collection and disposal at this time to selected areas with an incinerator maintained for burning the garbage (Greene 1946:6). Through time, both systems have had to expand greatly to service the ever-increasing population of the county. Not only have new lines been constructed, but also filtration plants and reservoirs. Water treatment plants were opened in Hyattsville in 1920 and near Laurel in 1944. A major sewage treatment plant was constructed near Bladensburg during the 1940s. Stormwater management was also initiated in 1945. Increased population growth has led to the construction of numerous additional facilities for water and waste treatment during the late 1950s.
Access to electricity in Prince George’s County can be thought of as proceeding on two different tracks: in the newly suburbanized areas, mainly near Washington, D.C., and along the US 1 corridor, and that in rural areas. The Potomac Electric and Power Company (PEPCO) became the primary supplier of electricity in many of the newly suburbanized areas of Prince George’s County that bordered the District of Columbia. PEPCO began operations in 1896, first bringing electricity to Washington, D.C. PEPCO soon monopolized the electricity market in the District of Columbia and began expanding to include the electric streetcar lines in the late 1890s, including the Washington Railway and Electric Company. This company provided services to suburbs as part owner of the Maryland and Washington Railway Company. Quite early in this process were Laurel (1890s), North Brentwood (1907) and Hyattsville (1907; although the electricity was provided by the Hyattsville Gas and Electric Company) (Denny 1997). Later, PEPCO brought electricity to such suburbs as Berwyn Heights (1921), Fairmount Heights (1937), and Forest Heights (late 1940s), as populations expanded (Denny 1997).

Prior to 1935, electricity was generally not available in the southern portion of Prince George’s County since the area was not serviced by power companies due to its sparse settlement. At that time, only 15 percent of the farms in Maryland were supplied with electricity (Weeks 1940:2). With the creation of the Rural Electrification Agency in 1935, the lack of electricity providers in the southern part of the county was alleviated. In 1937 the Southern Maryland Tri-County Cooperative was established to supply electricity to Prince George’s, Charles, and St. Mary’s Counties. The nonprofit organization changed its name to Southern Maryland Electrical Cooperative, Inc., in 1942, and at that time it served 1,400 households and had 438 miles of line. The largest settlement served was Aquasco, with 30 subscribers (Weeks 1940:7). Throughout this time electrical generation was undertaken at the Popes Creek generating plant in Charles County. This plant closed in 1953, when the Cooperative purchased power from PEPCO. The Cooperative continues to provide electricity to southern portions of Prince George’s County.

Research Questions and Topics

- The study of large-scale settlement patterning in Prince George’s County can be achieved with the use of historic maps and topographic quadrangles, Phase I survey data, and information from the MHT database. Additional investigations can be used to augment these sources of information to determine what types of structures, and their locations, are not depicted on historic maps. An in-depth analysis of settlement patterns in Prince George’s County during the postbellum period should be conducted to establish an understanding of the relationship between site location, the effects of historical precedents, and transportation access on settlement.

- Chapter 6 lists research questions that can be applied to African-American suburbs, especially with regard to residences, community centers, and places of work.
• Chapter 4 lists research questions that can be applied to all suburbs, especially at laborers’ houses, communal centers, and places of work.

• Do the artifact assemblages associated with residences or services differ between the early suburbs and rural communities? Do any differences relate to access to markets or consumer choice?

• Do the artifacts associated with suburban sites and rural communities change through time as transportation access improved?

• What construction techniques and materials were used on the postbellum structures? How does this compare with plans? If they differ, why?

• What was the state of health and health services and products during the postbellum period? Do these differ between rural and suburban communities? How do they change through time?

• How does the increased spread of public utilities during the postbellum period change intrasite settlement patterns? How did it affect the disposal of trash?

**Data Requirements**

**Archeological**: Features with depositional integrity and a wide variety of identifiable associations, inclusive of structural remains; deposits with sufficient quantity and variety of materials to support statistically valid analyses; features such as foundations indicating spatial organization or sheet refuse indicative of activity areas; specialized activity areas such as may be found at service locations, public health facilities, public utility facilities, etc.

**Primary Documentary Sources**: Government facility records; public utility records; census, tax assessment; probate; newspapers; vital statistics and legal records; personal papers; oral histories; photographs; financial records (lease, rent, chattel mortgage); maps; church, school, or fraternal organization membership lists and records; various business records

**Contextual Sources**: Social history; contract reports on similar property type; relevant historical and anthropological literature; oral history

**Artifacts**: A range of artifacts attributable to modified South (1977) categories from identifiable contexts (feature or midden); an adequate quantity of distinctive artifacts to support interpretations

**Ecofacts**: Faunal analysis: wild versus domestic species; preference in species or meat cuts; floral analysis: botanical remains (seeds, pits, pollen, kernels) indicative of diet