

**The U.S. Virgin Islands
Statewide Historic Preservation Plan**

Historic Preservation in the U.S. Virgin Islands: Preserving our Past for our Future

For

2016-2021

**Compiled by the Staff of
The Virgin Islands State Historic Preservation Office**

And

**The Office of Archaeological Research
University of Alabama Museums**

September 2016

To Provide Public Comment:

To provide input regarding the State Historic Preservation Plan, please use the attached Comment Form at the end of this document. Comments may be submitted anonymously; however, you may indicate your identity if you wish. Please note the page and paragraph numbers where comments are indicated.

To submit your completed Comments Form or to discuss the proposed plan, contact the VISHPO, complete a comment form at the Public Hearing(s), or send an email with your comments to: USVIPreservationPlan@gmail.com.

*An online survey is also available at:
https://universityofalabama.edu/qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_6L8liqdzXVZUfFr*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS 2

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE STATEWIDE HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN 4

 A. Mission Statement..... 5

 B. Preservation Philosophy..... 5

II. THE PURPOSE OF A PRESERVATION PLAN..... 6

 A. The Plan and Its Relation to Our Mission Statement and Preservation Philosophy 6

 B. Overview of Five-Year Goals to Accomplish the Mission 6

 C. Public and Professional Involvement in the Historic Preservation Plan Development 7

 D. Development of the 2016-2021 Historic Preservation Plan..... 7

III. IMPORTANT THEMES IN U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS PREHISTORY AND HISTORY ... 9

 A. Prehistory of the U.S. Virgin Islands 9

 1. The Archaic Age 9

 2. The Early Ceramic Age..... 10

 3. The Late Ceramic Age 10

 4. Issues for Prehistoric Sites 11

 B. History of the USVI..... 12

 1. St. Croix, Colonization, Emancipation, and Broad Trends 12

 2. St. Thomas and St. John..... 18

IV. PRESERVATION EFFORTS IN THE U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS 23

 A. Legislation, Institutions, and Community Groups in the Virgin Islands 23

 1. Federal Historic Preservation Legislation 23

 2. Territorial Legislation: The Antiquities and Cultural Properties Act of 1998 24

 B. The VISHPO Today: A Federal Historic Preservation Program 26

 C. The National Park Service 27

 D. Local GVI Organizations, Community Organizations and Preservation Societies 27

V. THE FUTURE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION IN THE US VIRGIN ISLANDS..... 30

 A. Conditions and Trends that Negatively Affect Historic Preservation..... 30

 1. Economic Trends 30

 2. Population Trends 31

 3. Housing Trends 31

 4. Infrastructure: Transportation, and Communication..... 32

 5. Infrastructure: Energy Sources..... 32

 6. Seaport Development..... 33

 7. Shifting Population and Disappearance of the Rural Landscape 33

 8. Cultural Attitudes 33

 9. Maintenance of Historic Districts and HPC Activities 34

 10. Enforcement of Antiquities Legislation and Regulatory Decisions..... 35

 11. Museums, Curation, and Collections Management 35

 12. Data Management 36

 13. Natural and Environmental Forces..... 37

 B. Beneficial Trends in Historic Preservation 37

 1. Legislation..... 38

 2. Interagency Coordination and Government-Private Sector Partnerships..... 38

 3. Education 39

 4. Incentives for Revitalization of Historic Districts..... 39

VI. FIVE-YEAR GOALS FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS. 40

 Goals and Objectives: 40

SOURCE MATERIALS 43

The U.S. Virgin Islands Statewide Preservation Plan

PUBLICATIONS AND DOCUMENTS RELATED TO THE VIRGIN ISLANDS..... 46
HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN ON FILE WITH THE VISHPO 46
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 47
VISHPO CONTACT INFORMATION..... 48
COMMENT FORM FOR THE 2016-2021 HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN..... 49

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE STATEWIDE HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN

The people of the U.S. Virgin Islands (USVI) are the beneficiaries, as well as the custodians, of a rich and diverse archaeological, cultural, and architectural heritage. This heritage is visible in prehistoric and historic archaeological deposits (both terrestrial and marine); manifested in sites of cultural and spiritual meaning; and reflected in the outstanding architecture and beauty of many of the above-ground historic buildings and sites of the Virgin Islands. As reflections of the many diverse peoples who have made these Virgin Islands their home over thousands of years, these treasures give the islands their distinctive character and pride. These cultural sites provide physical reminders of the islands' history, while rich oral histories passed down through generations offer compelling reminders of the struggles and achievements that led to freedom, the pathway towards self-governance, and the many factors that help to shape modern-day cultural identity in the USVI. Historic preservation figures prominently in how a community defines its past, but a continued interest in historic preservation can help define a community's future. Accordingly, thus U.S. Virgin Islands Statewide Historic Preservation Plan (SHPP) asserts the importance of cultural resources in contributing to the quality of life in the Virgin Islands, and attempts to describe present and future mechanisms for their continued identification, protection, preservation, and appreciation.

This preservation plan reviews the cultural resources of the Virgin Islands and identifies the key issues that impact the Territory's efforts to protect these resources. This plan provides a roadmap for identifying the issues that are likely to impact historic preservation in the Territory over the next five years, 2016 to 2021, and highlights the goals that the Virgin Islands State Historic Preservation Office (VISHPO) will work toward in that timeframe. This SHPP seeks to provide guidance for individuals, community organizations, and government institutions working to protect the Territory's significant cultural resources, and offers an opportunity for those same institutions to provide comment on the relative success of historic preservation through the public presentation of the SHPP.

The overarching goals of this preservation plan were developed by the Virgin Island State Historic Preservation Office (VISHPO), a division of the Department of Planning and Natural Resources (DPNR) and of the Government of the Virgin Islands (GVI). The VISHPO is a federally funded historic preservation program that is supported by both the Department of the Interior's (DOI) National Park Service (NPS) and the GVI. The VISHPO's missions are to implement federal and territorial historic preservation legislation and limit the impact of development on cultural properties, as mandated by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and the Antiquities and Cultural Properties Act of 1998 (Title 29, Chapter 17, §950 of the V.I. Code), in addition to other relevant legislation. The VISHPO promotes historic preservation; reviews cultural resource management projects; maintains the Virgin Islands Register of Historic Buildings, Sites, and Places; maintains a list of documented historic and archaeological properties; manages archaeological collections; administers Historic Preservation fund grants; and manages the historic preservation needs of the Territory. The VISHPO works in conjunction with the St. Thomas-St. John Historic Preservation Commission and the St. Croix Historic Preservation Commission to monitor Historic and Architectural Control Districts, provide tax credits for the rehabilitation of historic structures, and provide guidance for historic preservation throughout the Territory.

As Commissioner of the Department of Planning and Natural Resources, Dawn L. Henry serves as the State Historic Preservation Officer. The Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer and Acting Director of the VISHPO is Sean L. Krigger. The VISHPO has a total of six employees, all of whom work closely with other divisions of DPNR to achieve the goals of historic preservation program. The VISHPO has two office locations. The VISHPO's office on St. Thomas is located at the Charles W. Turnbull Regional Library in Estate Tutu, St. Thomas. The VISHPO's office on St. Croix is located at Fort

Frederik Museum in Frederiksted. The activities of the Historic Preservation Committees (HPC) for each district are coordinated through the VISHPO. The HPCs consist of approximately ten individuals who are approved and appointed by the Government of the Virgin Islands. The VISHPO can be reached by calling one of our offices, emailing our staff, or by contacting your local DPNR headquarters. Contact information for the VISHPO is located at the end of this preservation plan.

A. Mission Statement

The Virgin Islands of the United States contain a wealth of historical, cultural, and archeological properties, both on land and in coastal waters. Their preservation, study, and interpretation are vital to the self-understanding of the people of the Virgin Islands and to the efforts of national and international researchers to develop a comprehensive understanding of the history and cultures of the Virgin Islands and, on a broader scale, of the Caribbean.

The cultural patrimony of the Virgin Islands is an integral part of creating a better quality of life. At the VISHPO, our mission is to preserve that cultural heritage by increasing awareness and appreciation of our unique history. This history is manifested in sites of cultural and spiritual meaning, contained in prehistoric and historic archaeological deposits, and reflected in the outstanding architecture and beauty of historic buildings and sites of the Virgin Islands. We will accomplish this mission through guidance, encouragement, and education, and by sponsoring and assisting programs that promote historic preservation in the Virgin Islands.

B. Preservation Philosophy

Our cultural resources are a continuing legacy that reflects the struggles, successes, and failures of the prehistoric and historic people who have inhabited the Virgin Islands over the last 4,000 years. These diverse peoples lived their lives against a background of cultural, political, and economic forces, all of which have contributed to the vibrant culture of the USVI of the present day. Such cultural resources include, but are not limited to: sites of memory, historic landscapes, historic viewsheds, inundated prehistoric sites, historic sites, shipwrecks, and other underwater features; terrestrial prehistoric villages, prehistoric procurement sites, and special activity areas; historic properties and architectural control districts; individual historic buildings of architectural merit; historic structures; historic features; and historic archaeological sites that range from sites of the early Colonial period to contextual sites for standing buildings. These remains contribute in a variety of ways to the quality of life for Virgin Islanders today, as well as those who visit the islands on a short-term basis.

The preservation of prehistoric and historic archaeological sites, historic viewsheds, standing historic structures, and other features of the historic landscape, is essential to the well-being, pride, cultural construction, and sense of continuity for the islands. As custodians of our own cultural heritage, the VISHPO promotes the preservation of archaeological and historic resources because their continued existence enhances the ambience of our lives today. While we endeavor to preserve these resources, our efforts are balanced with community development to ensure that the historic, cultural, and architectural traditions of our community will continue to figure prominently in the lives of Virgin Islanders well into the future.

II. THE PURPOSE OF A PRESERVATION PLAN

The United States Government, through the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, and a series of related legislation, has established a Federal-State partnership for the protection of historical and cultural properties. Among the goals of this partnership is the development of a comprehensive preservation plan that specifies the long-term preservation goals for individual states and territories and formulates proposed methods of implementation. This comprehensive Statewide Historic Preservation Plan (SHPP) for the USVI addresses the historic preservation concerns of the Territory that may arise over the next five years, including 2016 through 2021. After 2021, the current plan will be reviewed and a new SHPP will be prepared.

This SHPP was developed in order to comply with the VISHPO's overall historic preservation mission, and is in keeping with our preservation philosophy. This plan assesses the mechanisms presently available to promote the preservation of the diverse resources that reflect our cultural heritage in the Territory. This plan also enables us to look at the effectiveness of both federal and local historic preservation legislation in protecting the resources threatened by development, as well as to provide an opportunity to review local laws and assess their adequacy. The SHPP outlines potential concerns and issues that are likely to impact cultural resources over the next five years and, finally, describes present and future goals for preservation. This preservation plan recognizes the importance of these resources to the quality of life in the Virgin Islands, and attempts to describe current and future procedures for their continued identification, protection, preservation, and appreciation.

The Virgin Islands SHPP also provides an assessment of resources available to promote preservation of the diverse and numerous resources that reflect our cultural heritage. Presently, there are a number of excellent programs managed by the Division for Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP), now referred to as the Virgin Islands State Historic Preservation Office, to establish and maintain an ongoing inventory of historic cultural properties and archaeological sites. These inventories provide a method for the evaluation of such resources and permit the relative preservation conditions of individual properties to be tracked over time. The existing programs of the VISHPO are presented herein, along with a discussion of additional needs.

A. The Plan and Its Relation to Our Mission Statement and Preservation Philosophy

Development of an SHPP requires that those charged with the responsibility for the preservation of heritage take the time to evaluate their program and look critically at its direction, effectiveness, and weaknesses. Such assessment involves: (1) the inventory, identification, and interpretation of the wide range of resources in question; (2) a critical evaluation and assessment of the existing historic preservation program; (3) an evaluation of the current and future threats to historic preservation; (4) the examination of both prior and existing goals for historic preservation and cultural resource management; and, (5) a realistic definition of those goals to increase effectiveness of the program.

B. Overview of Five-Year Goals to Accomplish the Mission

The VISHPO aims to strengthen and enforce its legislative mandate to protect the cultural resources of the Territory through regulatory review, technical guidance, and outreach. We seek to raise public awareness about the importance of historic preservation so that our islands' significant resources are preserved for many generations to come. The five-year goals for historic preservation in the USVI must build upon and strengthen existing programs and partnerships, including coordination with government agencies, preservation professionals, community groups, and the general public. We aim to meet and exceed the standards for historic preservation set by preservation colleagues, and to make our historic preservation program a 21st century program that is geared to address 21st century needs. This

includes offering training to Historic Preservation Commission members to increase their expertise in both federal and locally established regulations, as well as the creation of partnerships between the VISHPO and territorial, federal, state, university, and non-profit institutions. We strive for increased dissemination of information about historic preservation, including educational information, technical guides, and information that guides the public through the regulatory review process. One remaining goal is to establish an interactive website for disseminating information via the Internet, social media, or digital media. Broadly, we continually strive to implement our mission statement, to heighten the awareness of historic preservation within the Virgin Islands, and to protect our Territory's cultural resources for the enjoyment and education of all Virgin Islanders.

C. Public and Professional Involvement in the Historic Preservation Plan Development

In anticipation of the overall plan development and implementation, the public and are our preservation partners are being invited to review the current draft of the SHPP. Digital copies of the SHPP were sent to preservation partners, while hard copies will be available at the VISHPO offices and distributed at the public meetings. A series of public meetings will then be held so that comments can be collected for possible inclusion in the final document. Meetings for the 2016-2021 SHPP will consist of a public presentation of the SHPP, with a follow up question-and-answer period for clarification. The public will be permitted to comment on the proposed SHPP in writing, via email or postal service, or in person, by attending the public meetings and offering comment. Received comments will be collected and analyzed for the purpose of addressing any overriding public concerns regarding historic preservation in the Territory, including a specific focus on those that were pertinent to the overall Goals and Objectives as stated in the proposed SHPP. In addition to an open discussion with the community in public meetings, preservation professionals and local preservation organizations will be contacted directly and given adequate opportunity to provide written comments for incorporation in the final plan. If any professional comments are in conflict with the proposed goals and objectives, they will be answered in writing. After receiving public comment and integrating any new concerns, the final and approved five year plan for 2016-2021 will be submitted to the NPS for approval. Following their approval, the SHPP may be obtained by contacting the VISHPO.

D. Development of the 2016-2021 Historic Preservation Plan

The 2016-2021 preservation plan was prepared by the VISHPO with the assistance of The University of Alabama Museums' Office of Archaeological Research (OAR). All drafts of this preservation plan have been reviewed and approved by the VISHPO, under the guidance of Director Sean Krigger.

Prior to OAR involvement, VISHPO staff had already reviewed the last State Historic Preservation Plan, entitled *Creating Ambience for a Better Quality of Life* (October 2001). Their review sought to expand areas where preservation concerns could be addressed practically, or to identify concerns that had become increasingly critical in the ten-year period in which a SHPP was not in place. The VISHPO worked in concert with a third party to prepare an initial draft of the 2008-2013 SHPP. Due to organizational changes at the VISHPO, the 2008-2013 SHPP was never submitted. However, in 2013, VISHPO staff were tasked with reviewing the draft of the 2008-2013. Given that the proposed five-year range for the 2008-2013 preservation plan had reached a close, the VISHPO was granted permission to prepare a 2014-2018 preservation plan. The VISHPO moved forward to prepare a 2014-2018 plan, but contract issues resulted in a delay. In 2015, the VISHPO moved forward with an open bidding process to request proposals for preparation of the 2016-2021 SHPP. In January of 2016, OAR was contracted by the VISHPO to update and revise the 2016-2021 SHPP.

In preparation of the 2016-2021 five year plan, three public meetings have been planned, including one public meeting each for the islands of St. Thomas, St. John, and St. Croix. The intent will be to allow the comments of the public to be included in the final document. Preservation professionals and local organizations have been given the opportunity to provide written comments for incorporation in the final plan, but may submit additional comment at any time prior to the finalization of the document.

When all comments have been integrated, the SHPP will be a collaborative document that reflects the ideas and input from the VISHPO staff, the general public, preservation professionals, and the community, as a whole. This SHPP will serve both as a cultural resource management guide, and a structure upon which to plan for both the immediate and long-term preservation of these threatened areas through FY 2016-2021.

III. IMPORTANT THEMES IN U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS PREHISTORY AND HISTORY

Many factors and historical currents have played a role in forming the social, cultural, and economic patterns that exist in the USVI today. Physical manifestations of these broad historical trends, including structures and sites, are building blocks that provide a foundation for the identity of the USVI. These resources must be protected in order to maintain that sense of identity and to ensure continuity for future generations of Virgin Islanders. The current plan, and its five-year goals for historic preservation and cultural resource management, will hopefully provide a framework for the preservation of these sites and structures for years to come.

The earliest period of human occupation begins with occupation of the islands by Archaic peoples, followed by nearly 1,000 years of occupation by Ceramic Age inhabitants with cultural roots in South America. The cultural mosaic that emerged from these thousands of years of occupation, trade, warfare, and migration led to the emergence of indigenous populations that were integrally linked to other communities throughout the Caribbean. The agricultural and maritime lifeways associated with the indigenous populations of the Virgin Islands were irrevocably impacted by a broad range of historic contexts, including the initial explorations of the New World by Christopher Columbus, the first recorded instance of Indo-Hispanic conflict, the enslavement of indigenous peoples, and the importation of large numbers of African slaves into the Caribbean beginning in the early 16th century. Unstable processes of conquest and colonization then took hold between 1493 and 1917, when St. Thomas, St. Croix, and St. John became a part of the United States.

The major cultural themes of the Virgin Islands reflect the shift from indigenous lifeways towards colonial experiments and rivalries; the implementation of Danish land-use patterning and agricultural exploitation; and the attendant regulated transport, enslavement, and formalized subjugation of large numbers of West Africans, culminating in the incorporation of the Virgin Islands into the United States in the early to mid-20th century. Many of the important identifiable themes in the history and prehistory of the Virgin Islands are outlined below.

A. Prehistory of the U.S. Virgin Islands

USVI prehistory spans from 2000 BC to AD 1500 and reflects a broad range of activities and a long history of occupation, as expressed in villages, burial grounds, specific resource extraction sites, petroglyph sites, ball court sites, submerged sites, and ceremonial grounds. The cultural resources of the historic and post-Colonial period span the period from the 15th century to the present day, and include a wide range of fortifications, domestic structures, plantations, factory sites, shipwrecks, post-emancipation settlements, homesteads, productive buildings, railways, roads, bridges, architectural achievements, water management strategies, and cemeteries, with the form of each feature reflecting the economic base and specific architecture of a colonial entity's involvement in the islands. These types of sites are representatives of each of the historic themes of the Virgin Islands. The following section provides highlights of the prehistory and history of the Virgin Islands and discusses some of the existing reminders of these episodes of history.

1. The Archaic Age

The initial human settlement of the Virgin Islands began around 1500 BC and refers to the cultural remains of Archaic Age hunter-gathering-fishing populations. Archaic Age peoples are identified archaeologically through their extensive lithic and shell toolkits, which include a range of both ground stone and flaked lithic artifacts. Archaic Age peoples did not make pottery, but used shell, stone, and wooden tools to manipulate their environment and to build houses and canoes. Archaic subsistence primarily exploited the rich resources of the sea through inshore fishing, hunting, and the gathering of shellfish and mollusks,

although they also relied on birds, iguana, and a terrestrial rodent, the hutia, to supplement their diet. These early inhabitants also utilized the bounteous edible fruits and medicinal plants that are native to the Caribbean, in addition to bringing domesticated crops from other areas. Growing evidence suggests that Archaic Age groups may have been horticultural, raising the possibility that these groups relied on a broader range of domesticates than previously thought. Possible domesticates could have included squash, maize, sapote, soursop, wild fig, purslane, and arrowroot, although additional evidence would be needed to confirm the existence of these neotropical domesticates in the Virgin Islands in the Archaic Age. Little is known regarding the full distribution of Archaic sites and the inter-island relationship that these inhabitants had with other islands, but they successfully inhabited the islands of the Caribbean for over a thousand years.

The most well-known Archaic sites in the USVI are located in the vicinity of Krum Bay, St. Thomas. The Krum Bay site is one of four sites that were originally included in the Krum Bay National Register Archaeological District, although large portions of these sites have been destroyed through 20th century military development, road widening, construction, and industrial activities. What little is left of the site was fenced off by the DAHP in 1983. While it continues to be monitored by the VISHPO, the site is presently threatened by modern industrial development and erosion. Although other Archaic sites have been discovered on St. Croix and St. John, additional sites are expected to be found elsewhere on the three main islands.

2. The Early Ceramic Age

Beginning around 500 B.C., the Virgin Islands came to be inhabited by Ceramic Age peoples, another cultural group whose roots lie in South America. In contrast to earlier Archaic cultures, these new Ceramic Age migrants brought a fully developed ceramic-making tradition to the islands. Ceramic Age peoples throughout the Greater Antilles spoke Arawakan languages and practiced a developed ceremonialism based on shamanism. The earliest Ceramic Age peoples made Saladoid ceramics and relied on root crop horticulture, consuming manioc, sweet potato, wild fig, soursop, papaya, and, possibly, maize. Marine fauna accounted for the majority of the animal protein in the Saladoid diet, although terrestrial resources, such as hutia and iguana, continued to be utilized through the rest of the Ceramic Age.

The earliest Ceramic Age culture in the USVI is represented by the Saladoid series ceramics, which are identified by polychrome, monochrome, and red-on-white (ROW) painted ceramics, in addition to red-slipped and unpainted ceramics with zone-incised crosshatching (ZIC). Assemblages dominated by ROW and other painted wares are referred to as Cedrosan Saladoid ceramics, while the unpainted ZIC-wares are primarily associated with Huecan Saladoid or Huecoid ceramics. Traditional models have suggested that Huecan ceramics may represent *in situ* ethnogenesis, but recently scholars have proposed that they may represent the entry of another group with non-South American roots into the Caribbean. While additional study will be required to answer these broad questions, Saladoid sites representing both the Cedrosan and Huecan archaeological cultures are found throughout the Virgin Islands, including at Salt River, Aklis, Prosperity, Longford, Cinnamon Bay, Tutu, and the Main Street Archaeological site in Charlotte Amalie.

3. The Late Ceramic Age

Widespread social shifts began to occur in the Virgin Islands between AD 500 and AD 600 as the Virgin Islands became influenced by other Late Ceramic Age cultures. These Late Ceramic Age cultures, collectively referred to as the Ostionoid, are associated with marked changes in ceramic styles, an increased reliance on root crop agriculture, demographic growth, and broad changes in community organization. The material culture associated with these shifts, and the sources of these changes, have

been the subjects of recent archaeological and ethnohistorical research throughout the Antilles. Together, these data provide evidence that rather drastic socio-economic and cultural changes occurred, along with the development of a complex ceremonialism associated with the worship of zemís, the introduction of ceremonial ball courts at sites like Salt River, and the probable emergence of chiefdoms throughout the Virgin Islands. While additional ball court sites are likely to have existed throughout the Virgin Islands, the only site that has been documented to date is located near the western point of Salt River Bay on St. Croix.

Late Ceramic Age peoples in the USVI produced different styles of ceramics that differ from the earlier Saladoid series, including Elenan Ostionoid ceramics and Chican Ostionoid ceramics. Elenan Ostionoid ceramics are characterized by anthropozoomorphic modeled appliqué adornos, a limited range of incised designs, and both unpolished and polished surface treatments. Elenan Ostionoid ceramics are found in both unpainted and painted forms, including red-slipped wares and painted designs on ceramics. Chican Ostionoid ceramics are characterized by a baroque decorative style that incorporates curvilinear incising, oval-based incising, and elaborately modeled anthropomorphic and zoomorphic appliqué adornos. Chican Ostionoid ceramics are typically unpainted and burnished, a surface treatment that creates a vitrified look. Elenan Ostionoid ceramics are also found throughout Puerto Rico and the Leeward Islands between AD 600 and AD 1200, while Chican Ostionoid ceramics are found throughout the Greater Antilles and, more infrequently, the northern Leeward Islands between AD 1200 and AD 1500.

The majority of the Ceramic Age sites that are documented in the Virgin Islands are associated with Late Ceramic Age peoples, including a wide range of prehistoric village sites, ball court sites, petroglyph sites, resource extraction points, itinerant campsites, burial sites, and submerged prehistoric sites. Recent scholarly research has focused on the Late Ceramic Age peoples of the Virgin Islands and their relationship to contemporaneous societies throughout the Antilles, including the so-called “Taine” of Puerto Rico and the so-called “Caribs” of the Lesser Antilles.

Traditional narratives hold that the populations of the Virgin Islands began to experience raids in the 15th century by the Island-Caribs or Kalinga who inhabited the Lesser Antilles. Both archaeological and ethnohistorical data suggest that intermittent raiding did occur just prior to European Contact, although the full impacts of these raids on local communities are unclear. While future research should shed light on the cultural diversity of the communities that existed into the 15th century in the Virgin Islands, the ultimate fate of these inhabitants, whether Taíno or Carib, was derailed by the ambitions of an entrepreneurial Genoese admiral who attempted to seek a sea route to Asia by sailing west over open seas.

4. Issues for Prehistoric Sites

The imagery, artistry, and presence of prehistoric sites are well-known throughout the USVI, although their perpetually threatened status is not quite as well publicized. Overall, the 1992 discovery and extensive excavation of a prehistoric village in Estate Tutu, St. Thomas, have considerably increased our knowledge of the lifeways of the prehistoric inhabitants of the islands. Since the Tutu investigations were multi-disciplinary, significant information pertaining to the paleobotany and zooarchaeology of the Virgin Islands was also recovered. Careful analyses of human remains yielded important information about the health, diet, and paleopathology of the inhabitants of the site. The Tutu site has figured prominently in public awareness of archaeology of the Virgin Islands, and in scholarly research in the region. The excitement over Tutu parallels the more recent discovery of the Main Street Archaeological Site, a prehistoric Saladoid site within downtown Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas. These 2014 excavations were widely covered in local news outlets and even resulted in a documentary film, all which stimulated discussion of the role of historic preservation planning in protecting the archaeological sites of the

Territory. That such significant resources remain preserved following historic modification of the landscape, even amid modern development, raises awareness of the importance of historic preservation in the Virgin Islands and suggests that many mysteries of the past may still remain undiscovered.

Another factor impacting prehistoric sites is our ability to fully document their distribution. Results of past archaeological investigations have often led investigators to expect prehistoric sites to be located in coastal areas. Indeed, it has been shown that many of the Territory's beaches and bays do exhibit evidence of prehistoric occupation. Similarly, embayed beaches on the offshore cays also show evidence of either short-term prehistoric occupation or periodic use. Several sites have also been documented towards the interior of the islands in low-lying flatlands, on the peaks of rolling ridges, and, more rarely, on the flanks of the highest upland elevations. However, due to a "coastal occupation" bias in investigative strategies, and the fact that coastal sites are more likely to be discovered through regulatory review and modern development, many interior and upland prehistoric sites have gone unidentified. As a result, interior sites may be generally under-represented in the Virgin Islands Registry and, unfortunately, in the regulatory review process. While coastal sites are more likely to be impacted by commercial development, inland sites are more likely to be impacted by residential development and newly created subdivisions. However, thanks to the implementation of the Antiquities and Cultural Properties Act of 1998, the oversight that has attended federally mandated compliance projects, and increased public awareness of the importance of prehistoric sites, new sites are still being discovered and investigated, whether located in coastal or upland interior areas.

Although such resources are rarely documented, underwater prehistoric sites are certainly present in offshore locations on the three islands. Since sea levels worldwide have fluctuated over the millennia, and large sections of former coastal areas are now inundated and/or submerged, it may readily be assumed that many more prehistoric sites, or at least portions of these sites, now lie submerged and offshore. Many of the most significant early prehistoric sites are threatened by rising sea levels, including the Aklis Site and the Great Pond Archaeological Site, among others. Coastal resources are also under threat from the effects of natural disasters, including hurricanes, tsunamis, storm surges, and overland flooding. While some researchers and agencies have been working to document and salvage these important sites, there is a constant, and pressing, need for site stabilization throughout the Territory.

While future research will no doubt continue to address pressing issues regarding the diversity and overall nature of the prehistoric inhabitants of the Virgin Islands, it is clear that Virgin Islands archaeology will continue to play a role in the historic preservation efforts of the Territory.

B. History of the USVI

This section will offer a broad historical narrative of the USVI. The Virgin Islands have a vibrant colonial history that is influenced by major colonial powers of the Caribbean, but distinguished by unique historical events. Virgin Islands history reflects early Indo-Hispanic interaction, competition between colonial powers, the commercial development of the islands, the introduction of the slave trade, and, ultimately, a powerful narrative of revolt and emancipation. That these events followed different trajectories on each of the three islands is no surprise, given the diverse and unique makeup of each of the three islands today. Common historic resources within the Virgin Islands include historic plantation sites; vernacular cottages; submerged archaeological sites; shipwrecks; vernacular cottages; historic residential structures; architectural features; historic railway fragments; bridges; wells; cisterns; and cemeteries.

1. St. Croix, Colonization, Emancipation, and Broad Trends

The first documented contact between the indigenous population of the Virgin Islands and Europeans took place at Salt River Bay, St. Croix, on November 14, 1493, during Christopher

Columbus's second voyage to the "New World". From this moment on, the lives of the prehistoric inhabitants of the Virgin Islands were unalterably changed. Within 150 years of this initial contact, enslavement, genocide, and disease gave way to cultural disruption and a drastic reduction in the native population of the islands.

During Columbus' second voyage, he skirted the north shore of St. Croix and anchored his fleet at Salt River Bay. When seamen from the flotilla were sent in to replenish their water stores, a small canoe of "Indians" (as they became known) ventured out to see the great ships. Upon their return from water-victualing, Spanish sailors attempted to cut off the small canoe. As they neared the shore, other natives let loose a swarm of arrows to repulse the foreigners. This was answered with a volley of musket-fire as the Spaniards seized the occupants of the small canoes. This exchange occurred along the eastern side of Salt River Bay along a rocky shoal still visible today, which Columbus referred to as the "Cabo de las Flechas," or Cape of the Arrows. Thus began the first open conflict between Europeans and Amerindians in the New World, and the only instance in which Columbus entered territory associated with the modern-day United States.

Spain laid claim to St. Croix following this initial encounter, although their late-15th century and early-16th century efforts at colonization focused primarily on Hispaniola, Puerto Rico, and Cuba. While no formal Spanish colonial settlements were established during that time, colonizers from neighboring islands conducted slave-raids throughout the 16th century that rapidly decimated the native population of the Virgin Islands. While some indigenous peoples likely fled to other parts of the Caribbean to escape such practices, the native population of St. Croix steadily decreased over the course of the 16th century.

The indigenous population of St. Croix was next mentioned in the ethnohistoric accounts by the naturalist John White, who accompanied Sir Walter Raleigh in establishing the first English colony in Virginia. In a 1587 visit to Salt River Bay, White observed a small native village and cluster of houses on the eastern point and provided a description of the pottery fragments that were scattered around the bank. White's observations of pottery and community organization may constitute the first recorded archaeological observation in the Virgin Islands. However, in the years following White's account, the long history of the indigenous populations of St. Croix came to an end, as the island was found to have been entirely depopulated when other European powers attempted to formally settle the island in the early 17th century.

Spanish claims to St. Croix were not formally recognized by other European powers, and a series of attempts at settlement were made in the 17th century by the Dutch, English, French, and, for a brief period, even the Knights of Malta. British and French attempts to settle the island throughout the 1630s were originally thwarted by Spain, but the 1640s saw more lasting colonizing efforts and increasing competition among colonial powers. British, Dutch, and French settlers arrived in 1642, with the British concentrated near modern-day Frederiksted. The Dutch located near Christiansted (then referred to as Bassin harbor), with the French distributed between Christiansted and Salt River. British colonization led to the construction of an earthwork fortification in the vicinity of modern-day Frederiksted and various settlements in the vicinity of Salt River Bay. Increased tension among these few colonists led to the island's resources frequently changing hands. The Dutch occupied portions of the island until 1645, when English settlers regained control of the island.

A 1647 Spanish "spy map" from the Harlan Hutchins Collection of the St. Croix Landmarks Society depicts a number of early settlements and forts on St. Croix, including the early English fort on the site of the present Fort Frederik and an earthen fort on the western point at Salt River Bay. Originally, this earthen fortification was constructed by the Dutch and named Fort Flamand, or "the Flemish Fort." It was later rebuilt by the French and named Fort Salé, the name under which it is recognized today. In 1647, however, the English occupied the area around Salt River. Historic maps depict a friary near the

southwest end of the Salt River estuary and settlements on both banks of the mouth of Salt River Bay. The English remained in control until 1650, when they were driven out by the Spanish, who, in turn, were immediately routed out by the French. Under French rule, governmental headquarters were established on the east side of the Salt River estuary in what is now known as Judith's Fancy.

Since many of these early colonization efforts largely focused on Salt River Bay, the GVI and the NPS have worked together to found the Salt River Bay National Historic Park and Ecological Preserve (SARI). Thanks to this federal and territorial partnership, some 1,015 acres have been preserved, including 600 acres of submerged resources and 415 acres of terrestrial resources. Within SARI, 223 acres are federally owned, 54 acres are owned by the GVI, and 138 acres represent private inholdings within the park. The five acres of the park containing the remains of the Salt River Archaeological Site and Fort Salé have been designated a National Historic Landmark, one of only five within the Territory.

Between 1650 and 1696, when they abandoned the island, French settlers established a system of diversified agriculture and systematic deforestation, growing a variety of crops such as tobacco, coffee, cotton, indigo, ginger and sugar. The port of Bassin (modern-day Christiansted) grew as a commercial port during this time. It was during this period (1651-1665) that, although still a French colony, the land was deeded to the Knights of Malta under a contract with Louis the XIV. At its peak, the French colony contained about 1,300 persons, including indentured servants and enslaved Africans. The French colonization was ill-fated, however, and the island was abandoned by the French in favor of St. Dominigue (Haiti) in 1696. St. Croix reverted to wilderness and remained sparsely populated until the island was acquired by the Danish West Indian and Guinea Trading Company in 1733.

While the initial attempts at Danish colonization of the Islands were unsuccessful, the first permanent Danish settlement was established on St. Thomas in 1672 and on St. John in 1718. When the Danes purchased St. Croix from the French in 1733, it completed their West Indian acquisitions and united the US Virgin Islands for the first time. Numerous remnants of early settlement as a Danish colony exist on all three Islands.

Immediately upon taking control of St. Croix in 1733, the Danish West India and Guinea Trading Company parceled out large oblong plots of land measuring around 150 acres to planters for cultivation of primarily sugar and cotton. The town of Christiansted was established on the site of the former French town, Bassin, and the construction of Fort Christiansvaern was initiated in 1738. An area to the west of the fort was set aside for the Company's buildings, including a Customs House, a Scale House, residential structures, and various warehouses. Over the course of the 18th century, Christiansted became a major administrative center within the Danish West Indies due to the commercial trade, the productive capacity of St. Croix, and the naturally defensible harbor protected by coral reefs.

Christiansted town has remained one of the best examples of 18th century architecture in the Virgin Islands, as historic structure abound throughout the city district. Among these is Government House, which was constructed as a private residence in 1749. It also served as the residence of the Governor and office of the Colonial Government during most of the Danish era. The administrative capacity of Government House continues today, where it houses a number of territorial government agencies. The historic heart of Christiansted is included in the National Register Historic District and, later, in the Christiansted Historic and Architectural Control District that is overseen by the St. Croix Historic Preservation Commission. Fort Christiansvaern, the Customs House, and the Scale House, the Steeple Building, and the West Indian Trading Company warehouses are included in the NPS's Christiansted National Historic Site. Additional Danish military installations are present in the vicinity of Christiansted harbor, including the Protestant Cay battery and Fort Louise Augusta.

As early as 1745, land was reserved from Estate LaGrange for the construction of a fort and the establishment of a town at St. Croix's western end. It was not until 1751, however, that the government ordered Jens M. Bick, a surveyor, to prepare a plan for the town. On October 19, 1751, the directors of the Danish West India & Guinea Company approved the establishment of a town, and in the following year, construction on Fort Frederik (Frederiksfort) began. Frederiksted was slow to develop, and by 1766, it only had 341 residents.

As early as 1735, the initial survey of St. Croix was nearly complete. Some 300 plantations were laid out on a grid of rectangular plots measuring 2,000 by 3,000 feet, oriented in a north-south direction. St. Croix sugar plantations ranged between 250 and 300 acres, while cotton and other non-sugar producing plantations contained between 75 and 150 acres. Many planters relocated there from St. Thomas and St. John, hoping for fertile soils and greater fortune. By 1742, 264 of these plantations were under cultivation; by 1754, the number had increased to 375. During the second half of the 18th century, some 150 windmills were built on St. Croix. Such rapid growth provides a clear index of the impact that the introduction of plantation-based agriculture had on the social, cultural, and economic landscapes that emerged during the 18th and 19th centuries in the Virgin Islands.

Plantation agriculture always demanded a large supply of cheap, unskilled labor. Attempts by some of the early colonists in the West Indies to use European indentured servants were unsuccessful, as such laborers were unaccustomed to performing vigorous manual labor in a tropical climate and were susceptible to the New World diseases. These indentured servants rapidly gave way to the incorporation of enslaved Africans into the plantation economy. The Portuguese, English, Spanish, and Dutch had engaged in the slave trade since the late 1500s and early 1600s. Between the 1600s and 1803, when the importation of slaves was legislated to be ended in the Danish West Indies, hundreds of thousands of enslaved Africans of various tribes and nations had been captured and sold through the Danish and Scandinavian slave trade. Of these, well over 28,000 individuals were brought into the Virgin Islands. Others were sold to other European entities or to colonies throughout the Caribbean and the Americas as part of what have become known as the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade. This "Triangular Trade" carried cheap European goods to Africa to trade for slaves. The slaves from Africa were then sold throughout the Caribbean, and North and South America for a five-fold profit. This profit was then used to buy raw materials in North America, with both the raw materials and profits returning to Europe. Recent efforts by non-profit groups in the Territory have worked to provide a face and historical narrative to the thousands of Africans who entered the Territory during the Danish colonial rule. An incredible benchmark that provides a voice to historically marginalized peoples has been set by the Virgin Island Social History Associates, who have organized the St. Croix African Roots Project (SCARP), a searchable online database for the residents of St. Croix between 1734-1917, including both slaves and free peoples. The SCARP database includes biographic and basic demographic data, and is accessible to all interested parties at www.visharoots.org.

If sugar was the heart of the economy, it was the enslaved Africans who provided the muscle to cultivate the fields; harvest the cane; produce the sugar and rum; build the factories and great houses; and transport the cotton, sugar, and rum to the ports. Their labor formed the base for Danish economic success, and it was often exploited in a very cruel manner. This volatile tension bred fear among the plantation owners and resentment and movements of liberation among enslaved populations. Slave revolts and resistance are an integral part of Virgin Islands history, with the earliest known revolt taking place in St. John in 1733. Slave revolts and conspiracies also occurred on St. Croix in 1746 and 1759. The conspiracy of 1746 was brought under control very quickly, while the subjugation of the 1759 conspirators was brutal and widespread.

Although the slave trade was formally abolished by Royal Ordinance in 1792, the institution of slavery persisted in the Danish West Indies well into the 19th century. Legislation and royal decrees

throughout the 1840s offered formal education to children, whether slaves or nonslaves, and formally abolished slavery by 1859. However, these efforts proceeded too slowly for local populations suffering under the yoke of the institution, and local leaders organized major slave revolts, including a critical revolt in July of 1848 that was led by Moses “Buddhoe” Gottlieb, among others. In response, Peter von Scholten, Governor General of the Danish West Indies, made an emancipation decree on September 22, 1848, that freed all individuals who were unfree, provided provisions for the old and infirm, and made restrictions against unpaid labor and the immediate removal of slaves from estate housing. A recent education and outreach program led by the St. Croix Landmarks Society highlights the significance of the 1848 Emancipation Revolt by sharing the lives and stories of the enslaved individuals who fought against this historic oppression. Specifically, the *Connecting to Emancipation Project* aims to investigate the 156 women and men who were jailed or arrested during the 1848 Emancipation Revolt. This groundbreaking project encourages local students, native Virgin Islanders, and interested parties to learn about the individuals who were arrested following the Emancipation Revolt through archival, genealogical, and historical research. By highlighting the role of individuals who stood up for freedom, this project provides a critical point of engagement for discussing the past and weaves a powerful narrative linking the island’s historic trajectory to places and to families still present on the island.

Frederiksted has served as a benchmark for the emancipation movement in the Virgin Islands, which contributes to the town’s modern nickname, “Freedom City.” Following the Emancipation of 1848, Frederiksted grew due to an influx of both free and unfree people. However, on October 1, 1878, a large portion of the town was burned and ransacked during a five-day revolt against unjust labor laws, now known as Fireburn. The total damage extended throughout the island, impacting over 50 estates and burning nearly 900 acres of land. Fireburn gutted more than four blocks of the older section of Frederiksted town. When the town was restored following the revolt, in-town construction was influenced by Victorian architectural elements, including the “jigsaw,” or “gingerbread” features associated with barge boards and house trim. Such decorative elements became characteristic of the late 19th century Frederiksted, and are now considered to be one of the important decorative motifs of Frederiksted buildings. The town of Frederiksted is an established National Register Historic District and an Architectural and Historic Control District, which is overseen by the St. Croix Historic Preservation Commission.

A typical colonial settlement pattern for plantations in the Virgin Islands consisted of domestic and production areas centrally located within the estate. Domestic areas for the planters typically contained an Estate House and associated outbuildings, including a cookhouse, dovecote, hen house, stable, privy, cistern and a gazebo. Nearby buildings also consisted of quarters for house slaves, an overseer or estate manager’s house, and a sick house. The planter’s family burial ground, which was not far from the domestic area, was usually walled and contained above-ground masonry vaults that were normally rectangular in shape with flat or rounded tops. Inscribed marble tablets were often found on the tops of flat-topped vaults. Facilities for the enslaved workers were typically located nearer the production areas, sometimes at a distance from the Great House. Such facilities usually consisted of a community of slave cabins, cookhouses, animal pens, provision grounds, and wells. Slave cemeteries and burial grounds were separate from the family cemeteries of estate owners, nearer to the domestic area of the slave community. Historic slave cemeteries include both marked and unmarked gravesites, often in the vicinity of large tamarind trees.

The historic archaeological sites that are distributed throughout the Virgin Islands offer a poignant reminder of the past, but they also offer an exceptional opportunity for archaeological research that could reveal important information about slave life. Most chronicles of slave life were written from the perspective of the plantation owners, overseers, and missionaries, who saw the life of a slave from a less-than-subjective aspect. Many of their interpretations of traditional customs, traditions, and belief systems, as they interpreted them, have been disputed, both historically and archaeologically, because of

continued and rigorous research. Slave cemeteries and burial grounds were often unmarked, yet may have been in use for hundreds of years before their locations were lost to memory. Today, the VISHPO is trying to document these “lost cemeteries” and preserve them from destruction due to development and neglect. Additional research is warranted to investigate the everyday living conditions, struggles, and achievements of the enslaved individuals working on historic plantations during colonial rule.

Plantation production facilities included a range of structures related to plantation economy. Sugar plantations usually contained a windmill, a back-up animal mill for grinding cane, and a two-story factory for boiling sugar and producing molasses. Rum was produced in a nearby or attached still. Other buildings might include a bagasse shed, storehouses, cisterns, wells, an overseer’s residence, and animal pens.

In 1754, the Danish West India and Guinea Trading Company sold its holdings in the Caribbean to the King of Denmark, thereby bringing the islands formally under Danish control. The planter economy of the USVI continued to prosper during this time, peaking in the 1760s. The price of sugar doubled after 1795. Planters responded by converting to a mono-crop economy largely based on sugar, forcing the cotton industry into decline. By 1815, sugar plantations comprised 90 percent of the land. The sugar boom peaked in 1820, but the commitment to a single crop made the economy vulnerable to price and demand fluctuations in the world market. Declining soil fertility, mounting production costs, falling sugar prices, and the progress towards Emancipation beginning in 1848 made it increasingly difficult for planters in the Danish West Indies (DWI) to compete with the newly-recognized European sugar beet industry and with lower cost production elsewhere. However, sugar production continued in the USVI, especially on St. Croix, even into the 20th century.

Education of enslaved and free Africans in the DWI began with the Lutherans in the early 1700s, but was generally related only to religious instruction. The government of Denmark institutionalized formal education for enslaved children in the DWI in 1790, with the creation of four public schools, including three on St. Croix and one on St. Thomas. In 1798, the Moravians began to build schools for enslaved children on their plantations, although these were still primarily relegated to religious instruction. In 1839, Governor-General Peter von Scholten introduced a system of free, compulsory education for both enslaved and free children between the ages of six and thirteen years. He selected the Moravians to operate the schools under Danish, Moravian and Lutheran supervision throughout the Territory. Governor von Scholten directed the construction of eight schools on St. Croix and planned similar numbers for St. Thomas and St. John.

The von Scholten schools were uniform in their overall size and design, as planned by Albert Lovmand, a Danish architect and builder. Before coming to the West Indies in 1832, Lovmand had received a classical education in architecture at the Royal Academy of Fine Arts in Copenhagen. This training is reflected in the design and detailing of the St. Croix schools. Between 1839 and 1842, the following schools were built: La Grande Princesse, Diamond, Two Williams, Mount Victory, Peter’s Rest, Kingshill (in Estate Upper Bethlehem), Estate Hill (in Estate Green Cay) and La Vallee. The schools at Mount Victory, LaGrande Princesse, and Diamond are currently listed on the NRHP.

During the first part of the 20th century, patterns of land use on St. Croix changed, but the rural landscape remained virtually the same in character. Surviving sugar plantations enlarged their holdings and introduced new technology that impacted sugar production, including the steam-powered mill. Between 1880 and 1917, nearly all of the sugar factories and sugar mills on occupied plantations fell into disuse. As a result, the planters processed cane in the central factory system located at Bethlehem Estate. The central factory system allowed laborers to acquire or rent small parcels of plantation land, and by 1917, there were 246 privately owned small holdings throughout the island. Tenant farming on existing

estates also became popular. Few new substantial structures were built during this period, however, and rural inhabitants continued to live in the old plantation villages.

The demographic, political, and economic landscape of the Virgin Islands again shifted after the United States purchased St. Thomas, St. John, and St. Croix from Denmark on March 31, 1917, for a total of \$25 million. After this date, which is referred to as Transfer Day, the Virgin Islands were rapidly put under control of the United States Navy. The Navy contributed to the development of infrastructure throughout the Territory, focusing on public health, transportation, police protection, and education initiatives. Economically, the Territory continued to rely on traditional industries, including agricultural production and sugar production, however the economic depression associated with World Wars I and II did negatively impact the Territory. Although the United States did attempt to subsidize the Virgin Islands sugar industry, exploitation, low-wages, and high prices on the world sugar market resulted in labor disputes and a generally depressed economy. In 1963, sugar production in the Virgin Islands ceased altogether when the Bethlehem Sugar Factory shut down. It was not until the 1950s and 1960s, with the advent of post-World War II tourism and an increase in commercial expansionism, that residential, industrial, and commercial development became part of the landscape in the rural areas of St. Croix.

The majority of historic sites that are listed on the NRHP and the Virgin Islands Register of Historic Places in St. Croix relate either to the historic plantation economies of the Virgin Islands or to historic buildings in the towns of Christiansted and Frederiksted. However, surveys conducted as part of Section 106 Reviews between 1982 and 1997 resulted in the identification of many additional prehistoric and historic properties on St. Croix and contributed to a heightened awareness of St. Croix's continuing archaeological potential, as well as its remaining above-ground cultural resources. There is an increasing appreciation for the cultural importance of resources related to the small landholder, such as the vernacular cottage, the post-emancipation society, and the economy of St. Croix. As a result, there is a greater emphasis on preserving and protecting these once-overlooked resources.

2. St. Thomas and St. John

The primary reason for establishing permanent colonial settlements in the West Indies was to cultivate cash crops that could be shipped to the colonial nations for high profits. The earliest principal cash crops were cotton and tobacco. In 1691, only five percent of the plantations on St. Thomas were devoted to sugar cane. By the early-to-mid 1700s, sugar cane and cotton became the most profitable. Plantation agriculture as a highly profitable endeavor, however, was short-lived on St. Thomas and St. John. Peak production was reached in 1725 on St. Thomas, and plantation agriculture diminished in importance on both islands after 1754. Instead, St. Thomas became a major center of marine commerce and trade based on coaling stations, mail distribution, and maritime dockyards to aid in boat repair. St. John's resident population never reached the density of either St. Thomas or St. Croix, although it was still impacted by the broader trends in agriculture, commerce, and emancipation. St. John's reduced production was due, in part, to both absentee ownership and the fact that plantation owners on St. John never fully recovered from the effects of the slave revolt that occurred in 1733, in which insurrection leaders captured the Fortsberg citadel in Coral Bay and took control of much of the island, with a number of Danish soldiers and plantation owners were killed. This slave militia maintained control of the island for nearly a year, until troops could be brought in from neighboring islands. The ruins of the various historic estates give testimony to the oppression that sparked the rebellion, while an ash layer discovered during archaeological investigations one of the house ruins at Cinnamon Bay is believed to date directly to the 1733 uprising.

Both St. Thomas and St. John boast a large number of ruins, structures, and sites associated with the historic development of plantation economies. These structures are in varying degrees of preservation but are widely distributed throughout the islands, adding interest and beauty to the islands' landscape.

Remains of factory complexes, including mills, sugar production areas, rum stills, slave quarters, hospitals, great houses, cemeteries, burial grounds, and other related structures, portray the agricultural economy at its peak. Evidence of civil discord, colonial politics, and strained economies are also evident in the various forts, protective batteries, and military installations present on St. Thomas and St. John.

Prior to 1700, the Virgin Islands were sparsely populated, economically underdeveloped, and bypassed by most major European shipping lanes in the Caribbean. As a result, piracy, privateering, smuggling, and the lucrative slave trade, dominated early commercial activity in St. Thomas harbor. Under the governorship of the Esmitt brothers (1680-1684), St. Thomas became a sanctuary for pirates who found an opportunity to sell or trade cargos that were often “salvaged” on the high seas at the end of either a swivel gun or a sword. Among those to frequent the harbor were the English pirates, Bartholomew Sharp and Captain William Kidd. Although some acts of piracy and accounts of ship seizures continued as late as the 1820s, the obvious attributes of St. Thomas’s harbor were favorable for development of legitimate commerce. St. Thomas’s Charlotte Amalie harbor provided a good shelter from storms and was easily defended from enemy attack. Most importantly, its key location at the northeast corner of the Antilles made it a logical refueling, watering, and transfer point for trade between Europe and the Caribbean.

In St. Thomas, commerce soon replaced plantation agriculture as the most important source of revenue. During the 18th and 19th centuries, St. Thomas’s excellent harbor, free port status, and enterprising mercantile community stood at the hub of the Virgin Islands archipelago’s vigorous maritime life. In its heyday between 1815 and 1870, the prosperous port of Charlotte Amalie played host to more than 2,300 vessels annually. During this period, it was arguably the premier port in the Caribbean Basin, attracting ships and merchants of all nations by its myriad and lucrative commercial opportunities. By providing a venue for foreign nations that still could trade slaves legally, St. Thomas and the rest of the Danish West Indies continued to engage in the slave trade for many years after it had been legally outlawed.

Charlotte Amalie’s banking, insurance, communication, and marine casualty services were among the best in the hemisphere, as were its extensive ship repair and bunkering facilities. Moreover, the substantial merchant class of St. Thomas owned and operated a large fleet of ships that regularly engaged in trade with North and South America, and with other Caribbean islands. In 1840, approximately 80 percent of St. Thomas’s population of 14,000 was involved in trade and commerce. That St. Thomas had the largest free black population in the Danish West Indies at that time is significant, as it suggests that the freed population constituted a major socioeconomic force in harbor development and trade. St. Thomas maintained its principal status until the last decades of the 19th century, when shipping began a progressive decline that lasted into the 20th century.

St. John did not attract much shipping on account of its relatively limited agricultural output. However, since it stood athwart the sea lanes linking St. Thomas and St. Croix with Europe and North America, most of the ships trading with the archipelago islands of the Greater Antilles and the Southeastern U.S. passed through their waters. St. John and the British Virgin Islands also engaged in a considerable inter-island commerce with St. Thomas.

With the advent of steamships, St. Thomas became an important coaling station. The great coaling docks of St. Thomas and Hassel Island provided fuel for ships of all nations. They employed huge numbers of coal-carrying women, who were identified by their cotton dresses, bare feet, and large woven baskets, each carrying up to 80 pounds of coal on their turbaned heads. Related economic developments include the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company, which established its mail packet station at Hassel Island, where the world-famous Creque Marine Railway and shipyard were also constructed. Navigational aids, a lighthouse, and signal station were installed atop the high point of the seaward side of the island.

Structural remains of this intense commercial period still exist on the island today. These unique resources on Hassel Island are owned, for the most part, by the NPS, although some areas are owned by private interests or by the GVI. The Virgin Islands National Park (VIIS) has worked in conjunction with the St. Thomas Historical Trust and the Friends of the Virgin Islands National Park to improve access to Hassel Island and to document the numerous historic resources that are distributed throughout the island. Their coordination has resulted in a series of established walking trails, signage, and stabilization efforts for some of the historic structures. Long-term goals include establishing a museum and interpretation center at the Creque Marine Railway, which provide an important and highly visible point of engagement with the historic narrative of St. Thomas. As such a plan would offer a new experiential way for visitors and residents to learn about the history of Hassel Island and the Virgin Islands in general, these types of outreach and restoration projects are a model for sustainable tourism at historic sites.

The high level of historic maritime activity, treacherous offshore reefs, hurricanes, war, and piracy have, together, led to a large number of shipwrecks in the Virgin Islands. In 1985, a Registry of USVI Shipwrecks was compiled by historian George Tyson. The registry records various ships that sank between 1523 and 1917 in the British and U.S. Virgin Islands. This shipwreck registry was created from information culled from a wide variety of source materials such as local newspapers, Lloyd's of London List, and the notary records (Notarial Protocol) maintained by Danish officials. Newspapers published on St. Thomas and St. Croix during the 19th century yielded the largest number of shipwreck references. Today, the database contains over 424 recorded shipwrecks, or an estimated 80 percent of the major shipwrecks known to have occurred in, and around, the USVI. The VISHPO has worked with East Carolina University's Institute of Maritime History to refine the database and provide a predictive model for future submerged survey studies.

The Shipwreck Registry reflects the ascendancy of St. Thomas as the maritime center of the Virgin Islands during the 19th century, while simultaneously documenting the general decline in shipping and other maritime economic activity after 1870. Between 1800 and 1917, 60 percent of wrecks in the territorial waters occurred in St. Thomas, three-quarters of them in the harbor. During the 19th century, nearly all Charlotte Amalie's wrecks were due to hurricanes, which claimed 74 vessels in 1819, 14 in 1825, 21 in 1828, and 30 in 1837. While not a primary focus, an interesting by-product of the Registry is a reasonably accurate record of 18th and 19th century hurricanes.

Unfortunately, looting, anchoring, storms, dredging, harbor development, and shoreline improvements, have impacted the preservation and likelihood of discovery of intact shipwrecks in harbors. Repeated dredging and harbor clearing, disturbance from daily cruise ship visits, the removal of artifacts by scuba divers, and modern and historic salvage activities have removed the vast majority of shipwreck remains from the main harbor of St. Thomas. While significant submerged resources are likely to be present in some areas within Charlotte Amalie Harbor, records compiled in past decades by the National Hurricane Center, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency (NOAA), and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, indicate that the harbor floor, in many areas, has been stripped of overburden.

One of the best-known wrecks of the USVI is the HMS Santa Monica, which sank off St. John in 1772 and has been listed on the NRHP since 1977. Similarly significant resources may yet be preserved in other environments, such as in near shore waters. Where either erosional siltation or dredge-and-fill operations have occurred, there are areas containing deep sediments in which submerged resources may yet be preserved. As an example, a scuttled ship's hull was found buried under the sidewalk along the waterfront in Charlotte Amalie. This hull apparently had been discarded and included in fill placed at the mouth of a gut when the waterfront pavement and highway were expanded. And as recently as 2011, bathymetric investigations by the NOAA provided evidence of additional submerged shipwrecks in the deeper waters between St. Thomas and St. John. Such submerged resources, including the shipwrecks,

cargo dumps, cannons, and anchors, are an important legacy of both prehistoric and historic maritime activity in the Virgin Islands and should play an important part in interpreting the Territory's past.

St. Thomas and St. John possess numerous examples of military fortifications and harbor defenses that were constructed to protect trade. Fort Christian in Charlotte Amalie, constructed between 1672 and 1680, has been a National Historic Landmark since 1977. Although Fort Christian had been shuttered for a number of years, DPNR has successfully reopened the Fort Christian facility, made progress on renovation efforts, and begun to offer student tours. Military barracks, officer's quarters, garrison houses, and batteries are present on Hassel Island, dating both to the 18th-20th century Danish occupation and to the brief bouts of British occupation at the beginning of the 19th century.

In order to protect their anchorage at Coral Bay on St. John, early Danish colonists built Fortsberg, a small citadel and shore battery, in 1717. Cruz Bay harbor was fortified by the British through the 1807 construction of Lind Point battery. While some plantations were fortified in response to the slave revolt of 1733, at a broader scale, St. John never boasted the prominence or military presence that was associated with Christiansted, Frederiksted, or Charlotte Amalie.

The British occupied the Virgin Islands twice during the Napoleonic Wars, once in 1801 for ten months and, again, from 1807 until 1815. The British fortified the harbor mouth at Charlotte Amalie and fortified and posted Hassel Island during both periods. This was done while they were also building harbor defense and support facilities. They built Fort Shipley, Fort Willoughby, and Cowell Battery on Hassel Island, which were added to VIIS holdings in 1978. These fortifications were constructed by the British to protect merchant convoys when assembled at Charlotte Amalie. These well preserved military fortifications are of unique historic significance because they are the only documented remaining physical monuments on present-day United States soil that were built by the British during the Napoleonic conflicts. The St. Thomas Historical Trust and the VIIS continue efforts to document these significant resources through both terrestrial and underwater survey.

Numerous buildings and sites on all three islands are associated with the political development of the Virgin Islands. Government House was constructed in Charlotte Amalie between 1865 and 1867 to replace an earlier building that was built in 1819, and used for the same purpose. Emancipation Garden, named in commemoration of the 1848 abolishment of slavery in the former Danish West Indies, is the site of many of St. Thomas's official ceremonies. The Senate Building, originally constructed as a barracks for the Danish Militia, is now the home of the Virgin Islands Legislature. The long, two-story arcaded Italian Renaissance structure also served as a U.S. Marine Corps barracks between 1917 and 1930 and as a public high school until 1957.

Other historic neighborhoods include the Savan section of Charlotte Amalie, which was composed of lots that were sold off to accommodate the free blacks of the Virgin Islands between 1764 and 1765. The original lots were further subdivided after the 1848 Emancipation, when many newly freed slaves moved into town from the outlying plantations and estates. Savan has played an important role in the architectural history, as well as the social and economic development, of St. Thomas.

Religion has always had a pervasive influence in the lives of Virgin Islanders. During the colonial period, Lutheranism was the official religion of the Virgin Islands. However, the Danes were tolerant of other religious denominations and, as a result, a religious diversity occurred that included Jews, Catholics, Reformed Dutch, Anglicans, and Moravian missionaries, who specifically ministered to the incoming Africans. In addition to offering spiritual guidance, the churches impacted much of the social life in the community. The Lutheran and Moravian churches played important roles in the social advancement and education of both enslaved and free blacks. The Lutherans initiated the formal education of black Virgin Islanders in 1773, when a school was established primarily for religious education. On St. Thomas, the

first baptism of a slave was held at the Nisky Moravian Mission. On St. John, a school was established at the mission-church-plantation of Emmaus, a site that is now listed on the NRHP. The churches and missions that these groups built are among the islands' oldest and finest remaining architectural landmarks. These records of the historic churches also provide an important documentary source of marriages, divorces, births, and deaths throughout the historic ear.

To the early settlers, living and working in the Virgin Islands presented many technical problems that demanded local solutions. For example, lime for plaster and construction was produced in crude limekilns using local resources. The West Indian windmill for grinding sugar cane was another local adaptation that combined features of an animal-powered sugar grinding mill and the conventional European windmill for grinding grain. Water was scarce and the necessity of carefully collecting and conserving water is represented in the many fine examples of water catchment basins and cisterns that dot the landscape. Other examples of local technical ingenuity are wharves, guardhouses, signal stations, retaining walls, and mountain roads. There are further remnants such as the handful of sugar, indigo, cotton, and cassava processing works hidden in the bush on St. Thomas and St. John.

Residential architectural styles in the Virgin Islands include plantation great houses and elegant townhouses. Some fine examples of townhouses in Charlotte Amalie include the La Valette House (now Hotel 1829) at #30A Kongens Gade, the Jacob Lind House (Bethania) at #6 Norre Gade, and a building at #2 Dronningens Gade that was the birthplace of Camille Pissarro. Additional information regarding historic structures within the city districts can be obtained from the Christiansted Historic District Guide, the Frederiksted Historic District Guide, and the Charlotte Amalie Historic District Guide published by the DAHP (VISHPO).

Following the acquisition of the Virgin Islands by the United States in 1917 and the advent of World Wars I and II, a series of coastal defense installations were constructed throughout the Territory. While the larger developments were located on St. Thomas and on Water Island, located off the coast of St. Thomas, small reminders of the U.S. involvement in these wars are located throughout all three islands. Following World War I, the U.S. Navy established a base in Crown Bay and developed Lindbergh Bay as an airfield. In 1940, the U.S. Marine Corps established a training field and airfield at Bourne Field, including a series of housing units, administration buildings, warehouses, and infrastructural improvements. By 1941, a larger submarine base was commissioned in Krum Bay and the west Gregerie Channel. The submarine base included military barracks, administrative buildings, catchment areas, reservoirs, finger piers, and docking areas. Shortly thereafter, the U.S. Army also established Fort Segarra, a bombproof fortification with multiple gun emplacements, watchtowers, underground bunkers, and a variety of associated structures. Other WW II military installations were located on St. Croix, including batteries, barracks, and air fields. From the late 1940s through 1950, Fort Segarra also served as the home of the U.S. Army Chemical Corps, who were responsible for testing and preparing for chemical warfare.

The military resources associated with World War I and World War II represent an important historical development that drew the Virgin Islands into the global war efforts, as these bases remained active throughout both wars. While some of these areas have been impacted by modern development, the remaining structures, batteries, and gun emplacements, are significant cultural resources, both at a local and national scale. These resources are not currently listed on the NRHP or, individually, on the V.I. Registry, although their continued preservation through a NRHP nomination is of key interest to the VISHPO.

IV. PRESERVATION EFFORTS IN THE U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS

Virgin Islanders are fortunate to have numerous sites, structures, and objects that act as reminders of the themes of their history and culture. The challenge to historic preservationists will be to ensure that these physical reminders are cared for, integrated into planning for contemporary needs, and preserved for future generations.

The condition of historic and archaeological sites in the Virgin Islands and the development of preservation mechanisms have a complex history. While modern day Virgin Islanders have a significant interest in preserving prehistoric archaeological and historic sites; historic structures; and traditional cultural landscapes associated with the islands' history, it has always been challenging to balance the sometimes competing demands of preservation and modern development. As economic development has taken hold over the last fifty years, the Territory's significant and abundant cultural resources are increasingly at risk. However, the preservation of those same resources contributes to a sense of pride in the Territory's heritage, identity construction of modern Virgin Islanders, and to a burgeoning tourism-based economy.

The VISHPO works alongside federal and local government agencies, developers, community groups, nonprofit organizations, and historic preservation groups to preserve the resources of the Territory and to encourage their academic study. This is achieved through local and federal legislation that empowers the VISHPO to consult with Federal regulatory agencies, review projects prior to development, provide guidance for developers, and promote education through outreach programs. This section will introduce the various mechanisms through which the VISHPO seeks to identify, protect, and preserve the prehistoric archaeological and historic sites of the Virgin Islands.

A. Legislation, Institutions, and Community Groups in the Virgin Islands

1. Federal Historic Preservation Legislation

The United States government has provided for the preservation of significant cultural resources through passing legislation and broadly offering guidance for assessing the significance of key cultural properties. The most significant legislation is the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended. The NHPA has a broad scope with regard to historic preservation, as it provides guiding legislation for assessing the impact that a particular undertaking may have and defines the responsibilities of regulatory agencies that assist in the review of such undertakings. The NHPA asserts the importance of maintaining the historical and cultural foundations of the nation "...as a living part of our community life and development in order to give a sense of orientation to the American people."

The NHPA also established State and Tribal Offices of Historic Preservation (SHPO and THPO), a program that oversees the identification, evaluation, and preservation of properties, sites, buildings and objects that are deemed to be important in our nation's history and development. It also mandates the creation of a State (or Tribal) Historic Preservation Officer, who is responsible for managing the federally funded historic preservation program and for overseeing historic preservation concerns within the state. The VISHPO's goals, as discussed here and elsewhere, are to implement federal historic preservation legislation, advocate for historic preservation concerns, promote the identification of significant cultural resources, and constructively limit the impact that development may have on identified resources through regulatory review.

Section 101 of the NHPA established the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), a list of sites that have been deemed significant at local, state, and national levels. Importantly, because of their recognized significance, NRHP-listed sites are afforded a higher level of protection. The NHPA also

created State Historic Review Boards to consider and evaluate nominated resources before being forwarded to the National Register program for review.

The NRHP serves several purposes. First and foremost, it provides a means for important historic places, structures, and archaeological sites to be recognized as nationally significant and worthy of preservation. NRHP-listed properties are afforded a higher degree of protection than non-NRHP sites. However, being listed on the NRHP does not guarantee preservation of that property in perpetuity. For example, NRHP properties are sometimes modified by private landowners outside of the Section 106 review process or impacted by compromises that allow developments despite their impact to the character or integrity of a National Register property. For sites that are continually impacted by modern land usage, development, or even natural processes like erosion, the integrity of the resources may be so damaged that a property may lose its National Register status. However, on the whole, NRHP listings serve to strengthen the VISHPO's review process within the Territory and to positively highlight the significant cultural resources of the Territory.

Section 106 of the NHPA is responsible for ensuring that federally funded, licensed, permitted or sponsored projects do not unwittingly have an adverse effect on the nation's important cultural resources. The significance of a resource is evaluated based upon the Criteria of Eligibility for the NRHP and is determined through review by the federally funded historic preservation programs (SHPOs and/or THPOs). While Section 106 addresses resources affected by federal undertakings, it does not provide similar review for projects undertaken by local and territorial governmental agencies or by private entities. Section 110 of the NHPA requires federal agencies themselves to have historic preservation programs, to survey lands and record archaeological sites and historic standing structures under their jurisdiction, and to consider the overall impact of their activities on historic properties.

Section 201 of the NHPA established the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), a federal agency that is tasked with advocating for the preservation of cultural resources, providing guidance to federal and state agencies, and promoting effective preservation policies. In 1979, the ACHP published its *Guidelines for the Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties*. These guidelines, which have been periodically revised and expanded, are known as 36 CFR part 800.

2. Territorial Legislation: The Antiquities and Cultural Properties Act of 1998

Over the last 40 years, the Government of the Virgin Islands (GVI) has worked to pass historic preservation legislation that complements the above-mentioned federal historic preservation legislation and makes VISHPO review a part of local permitting and development. Although the NHPA was enacted in 1966, it was not until 1976 that the Virgin Islands responded with the establishment of a federally funded Historic Preservation program. Prior to that time, several local statutes were enacted which were designed to recognize and protect historic and archaeological sites. The duties and responsibilities of the various agencies, departments, and offices that were created by earlier legislation are now assumed by the VISHPO, a division of the Virgin Islands Department of Planning and Natural Resources (DPNR).

In 1968, legislation was introduced to "provide for the conservation and preservation of historic and cultural assets of the Virgin Islands..." (Act No. 2258, Virgin Islands Code, Title 29, Chapter 3, Subchapter V). Initially, responsibility for historic preservation was vested in the Division for Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP), a division of the Virgin Islands Planning Office, which was, in turn, a division of the former Department of Conservation and Cultural Affairs.

In 1973, in recognition of the number of important prehistoric archaeological sites that had been discovered and investigated by visiting archaeologists, the GVI established its own Office of Archaeological Services (OAS) within the Department of Conservation and Cultural Affairs (DCCA).

The OAS was charged with the responsibility of investigating, recording, and protecting archaeological sites, focusing explicitly on prehistoric archaeological sites. Historic archaeological sites were not considered by the OAS at that time. A register of sites was initiated, along with a territorial site numbering system that implemented the Smithsonian's trinomial naming system. The OAS was dissolved when the government was reorganized in 1987, with responsibility for both prehistoric and historic sites being vested in the newly-formed DAHP under the present-day DPNR.

In 1978, Chapter 21 was added to Title 12 of the Virgin Islands Code, which became known as the Virgin Islands Coastal Zone Management Act. When the local Coastal Zone Management Act was originally established, provision for the protection of cultural resources within the Coastal Zone was not specifically included in its text. As a result, cultural resources surveys requested by the DAHP under the auspices of the act were legally challenged. A determination by the Virgin Islands Attorney General in 1987 supported the DAHP's position that, under the federal consistency requirement, projects that require Coastal Zone Management (CZM) permits should also be required to consider potential impacts to cultural resources as part of environmental protection oversight. In the same finding, the Attorney General supported local legislation that provided for DAHP review of subdivision permit applications to determine potential impacts to cultural resources prior to the subdividing of land under DPNR's division of Comprehensive and Coastal Zone Planning (CCZP). Following this decision, guidelines adopted by the DAHP applied not only to the NHPA's Section 106 compliance, but also to subdivision requests and to CZM review.

In 1983, under the auspices of the DAHP, an Antiquities Act was submitted to the Legislature of the Virgin Islands. After a nearly 14 year review process, legislation known as the Antiquities and Cultural Properties Act of 1998 was introduced to the 22nd Legislature of the Virgin Islands. The Antiquities and Cultural Properties Act (Title 19, Chapter 17 of the V.I. Code), as approved on May 29, 1998, charges the GVI to protect and manage the Territory's cultural and archaeological resources and asserts that their preservation serves a public benefit.

The Antiquities and Cultural Properties Act of 1998 establishes the duties of the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and asserts the GVI's control over cultural properties and archaeological sites located on public lands, in territorial waters, and on leased public lands. The Antiquities Act also establishes the right of the SHPO to comment on any government, government-approved, or government-assisted undertaking that may impact sites eligible for listing on either the NRHP or on the Virgin Islands Registry of Historic Buildings, Sites, and Places (VI Registry). While this mandate is not always adhered to by other government agencies, this legislation is essentially the local equivalent of the federal Section 106, which requires federally funded undertakings to consider the potential impact of the project to historic resources. The Antiquities Act empowers the VISHPO to temporarily list threatened archaeological sites on the VI Registry for a period of one year to provide for their investigation, and to provide consultation to landowners, agencies, and institutions regarding the preservation of cultural resources. Individuals applying for an Earth Change permit (Title 12, Chapter 13 of the V.I. Code) for commercial purposes are also required to conduct cultural resources surveys to determine their potential impact. This Act protects prehistoric, historic, and modern human burial sites from being disturbed without prior approval by VISHPO, including both marked and unmarked burial sites, and burials on both private and public lands.

It also asserted the Virgin Islands' control of underwater cultural resources, created a permitting system for all archaeological research conducted within the Territory, and reserved the right for a site location to be kept confidential. This Act made it illegal to damage, destroy, or loot archaeological sites on private lands without an owner's permission; conduct excavations without a VISHPO permit; and remove artifacts or collections from the territory without permission of the VISHPO. It also established both civil and criminal penalties for failure to comply with provisions of the Act. Importantly, the

Antiquities Act also made it illegal for individuals to excavate an archaeological site by mechanical or manual means for the purpose of collecting artifacts without a VISHPO permit. The Antiquities Act also created an Archaeological Preservation Fund for support of the historic preservation program. The Antiquities Act conferred the title of the SHPO on the Commissioner of DPNR, and the title of the Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer on the Director of the VISHPO.

Importantly, the Antiquities Act also established the Historic and Architectural Control Districts of Charlotte Amalie, Frederiksted, and Christiansted. Later, rules and regulations for management of the districts were also written and enforced. Presently, management of those rules and regulations for properties within the historic districts are overseen by the Virgin Islands Historic Preservation Commission (VIHPC), whose members are nominated by the Governor and approved by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands. The committees meet monthly to provide guidance to landowners and to review requests for change within the historic districts of Charlotte Amalie, Christiansted, and Frederiksted. They ensure that property owners abide by the guidelines for maintaining historic and architectural integrity within the three districts. While the HPC would benefit from an updated penalty structure and a more stringent enforcement policy that would bring penalties in line with modern-day costs, the HPC effectively maintains the architectural and historic integrity of the historic towns of the Virgin Islands.

B. The VISHPO Today: A Federal Historic Preservation Program

In 1976, a federally funded historic preservation program for the USVI was established. The first SHPP for the Virgin Islands was developed soon thereafter. The VISHPO fulfills the requirements of a federally funded historic preservation program by completing the Section 106 review and enforcing federally-required regulatory review. The VISHPO also reviews locally permitted activities as per the Antiquities and Cultural Properties Act of 1998 and other binding legislation. The VISHPO maintains several diverse facilities as part of the overall effort to preserve and protect cultural resources on all the islands. The VISHPO has also assumed the responsibilities associated with earlier iterations of the agency, including the DAHP and the OAS. Therefore, the VISHPO reviews commercial Earth Change permits, CZM permits, and subdivision permits; issues excavation permits; conducts salvage excavations of threatened sites; implements federal and local antiquities legislation; and coordinates with the HPC.

The VISHPO serves as a resource for historic preservation professionals, academic researchers, and archaeological consultants by providing technical guidance and information regarding the Territory's resources to the public. Among the VISHPO's data resources are files on sites listed on the NRHP, a list of surveyed areas, photographic and written inventories of buildings in the three historic districts, a complete library of cultural resource management reports, and evaluation reports and project files for all cultural resource management projects. The VISHPO also maintains a library of select historic photographs, historic property maps, aerial photographs, and a general photographic file of archaeological sites and historic properties outside of the historic districts. In addition, the VISHPO maintains a site file database of archaeological sites that have been documented in the Territory. The VISHPO has coordinated with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to produce a Geographic Information System (GIS) database of the site file maps, and plans to continue working towards developing its GIS capabilities within the next five-year cycle.

The VISHPO site file and project databases record: 1) the locations of known historic and prehistoric sites, 2) areas surveyed for cultural resources, and 3) the level of survey or investigation for those areas mapped. Other resources include the Virgin Islands Inventory of Historic Buildings, Sites, and Places, which lists sites of local significance; a reference library; and architectural and archaeological collections that are available upon request. The Virgin Islands Inventory of Historic Places includes both prehistoric and historic archaeological sites and is updated as cultural resources are discovered through regulatory review, cultural resource surveys, and scholarly research. As a result of VISHPO review and of

the required archaeological surveys, important cultural resources are being continually discovered and protected.

Staff members of the VISHPO encourage education, outreach, and community involvement in historic preservation efforts. Accordingly, VISHPO staff are available to visit local schools and offer lectures, slide shows, and other presentations. The VISHPO's public outreach and education programs have been recognized as exceptional; the office has a long list of educational publications available to the public. VISHPO also coordinates with local citizens and historic societies to address questions and concerns regarding cultural resources within the Territory.

C. The National Park Service

The National Park Service (NPS) plays an important role in protecting the cultural resources of the Territory through their role as resource managers for federal landholdings in the Virgin Islands. Virgin Islands National Park (VIIS) administers nearly 2/3 of the island of St. John and large landholdings on Hassel Island, St. Thomas. On St. Croix, the NPS manages Christiansted National Historic Site, Buck Island Reef National Monument, and federal landholdings within Salt River Bay National Historic Park and Ecological Preserve (SARI). The NPS on St. Croix has opened a Visitor Center at Salt River Bay and aspires to develop the Marine Research and Education Center (MREC), an education and research facility that will be built on federal lands in Judith's Fancy. Within each of the above parks, monuments, and historic sites, the NPS has worked to increase public access to federal lands and to encourage scholarly research on the Territory's natural and cultural resources. The NPS also reviews and permits archaeological investigations conducted on federal land, as per the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (ARPA). Other federal agencies reviewing ARPA permits include the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, whose territorial land holdings include Sandy Point National Wildlife Refuge, located in Frederiksted, St. Croix, and the Buck Island National Wildlife Refuge, located along St. Thomas's southern shore.

The VISHPO has a long history of working closely with the NPS on a number of cooperative preservation initiatives, including protecting the cultural and natural resources that are located within Salt River Bay and the restoration of the Steeple Building clockworks on St. Croix. The VISHPO also successfully coordinated with the NPS's Southeast Archaeological Center (SEAC) to conduct geophysical investigations of burial sites disturbed during tropical storm flooding in 2010. VISHPO also works with the NPS to review federally funded undertakings on NPS property, in compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA and other binding legislation. The NPS is a natural partner for the VISHPO concerning historic preservation issues, as both institutions uphold a strong preservation philosophy that includes both natural and cultural resource management.

D. Local GVI Organizations, Community Organizations and Preservation Societies

Non-profit organizations, community groups, and foundations are assuming an increasing share of the responsibility for heightening community appreciation of historic and archaeological resources. Their efforts are critical to the long-term success of historic preservation in the Territory, and they are the VISHPO's most active partners. These non-profit organizations often interact with various governmental agencies, co-sponsor restoration projects within the historic towns, collaborate to preserve threatened sites, and sponsor the restoration and rehabilitation of historic properties. Several examples of cooperative non-profit organizations and neighborhood groups are outlined below, although this is by no means complete.

The **St. Thomas Historical Trust** takes an active interest in preservation efforts within the island and undertakes projects that are designed to foster historic preservation and public education. Both the

Trust and its sister society, the **St. John Historical Society**, work to educate the public about the preservation of historic and archaeological sites through sponsored field trips and tours that teach others about the significance of the historic sites in each district. The St. Thomas Trust and St. John Historical Society also undertake select restoration projects, such as the clearing and restoration of historic structures and cemeteries, and promote new research on the cultural resources within each district. These preservation groups effectively target resources in need, raise necessary funding, and provide important resources for both historic and archival research.

Similarly, the **St. Croix Landmarks Society's** mission is to further the understanding, appreciation for, and active participation in preserving the history and culture of the island of St. Croix. The Society's preservation program has a broad mission to offer educational programs, host community events, and maintain a historic and genealogical research library at Whim Plantation, a NRHP listed historic property on the west end of St. Croix. The Society conducts historic house tours and sponsors a number of other workshops, lectures, and educational programs. Prime among these are the well-known "Ruins Rambles," or tours of historic sites presented by venerable local historians. Over the last several years, St. Croix Landmarks has hosted a series of engaging exhibits and begun new projects highlighting the diverse historic narratives since colonization, including the *Connecting to Emancipation Project* that was discussed earlier. These projects put inhabitants in touch with a means to investigate their own family histories and heritage, which will have a lasting impact on the way that Virgin Islanders engage with historic preservation.

The **Virgin Islands Humanities Council**, funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities, supports research, education and public projects in the humanities through the distribution of grants. The Council has served the people of the Virgin Islands since 1984, fostering cultural awareness of native Virgin Islands and Eastern Caribbean lifestyle and art. In the past, the Virgin Islands Humanities Council, along with the VISHPO, has funded a series of seminars for school teachers that are designed to give them the tools to teach Virgin Islands history and prehistory to their students. An accompanying educational booklet for school children also has also been prepared. Through the support of the Council, many people are provided the opportunity to express and explore what it means to be human through history, literature, folk life studies, cultural anthropology, archaeology, philosophy, ethics, comparative religion, law, and the history and criticism of art.

The **Virgin Islands Economic Development Authority (EDA)**, a GVI agency, has designated four Enterprise Zones, in which the EDA works with property owners and the community to promote business, improve living standards, and provide economic benefits for revitalizing historic areas with high population densities. **Enterprise Zones** on St. Croix include the historic towns of Christiansted and Frederiksted. On St. Thomas, the Enterprise Zones include Savanne/Downstreet and Garden Street/Upstreet. For property owners located within this historic district, the EDA provides a Rehabilitation Tax Credit that provides a 10-year exemption on property tax and an income tax credit based on renovation expenditures. For businesses, tax credits also include a tax exemption for GDP based on the renovation expenditures. The availability of the EDA Rehabilitation Tax Credit alleviates the burden of renovation within the historic districts, incentivizes property ownership, and effectively revitalizes business activity within the urban areas that contribute to the unique cultural heritage of the USVI. In such cases, EDA serves as a liaison between the VISHPO, the HPC's, and the community, providing critical guidance and education. EDA's workshops and charrettes also provide guidance for estate planning, which is important in ensuring the clear delineation of property ownership within the historic districts. EDA also pioneers Board-Up programs and Scrape and Paint programs within the Enterprise Zones, both of which serve to secure derelict buildings while rejuvenating the exterior with a fresh coat of paint. Such programs limit the derelict eyesores that are common within the historic districts, thereby increasing the standard of living of the entire community. The effectiveness of the EDA and the Enterprise Zone is powered by an engaged outreach program, energetic staff who canvass neighborhoods,

and well-appointed revitalization programs. The continued success of these programs will result in great change within the historic districts.

The **Friends of the Virgin Islands National Park** also serve as advocates for heritage and preservation by offering tours of historic sites, sponsoring internships, fostering community engagement, supporting academic research, and promoting the natural and cultural resources within Virgin Islands National Park. The Friends of the East End Marine Park, Friends of Fort Frederik Museum, and Friends of Christiansted National Historic Site strive to promote a similar mission by focusing on preservation of cultural resources on St. Croix.

Our Town Frederiksted seeks to better the quality of life in Frederiksted through the restoration of Frederiksted's "West End" culture, the preservation of its buildings, monuments, and cultural landscapes; and the revitalization of its economy, while, simultaneously, promoting the safety and harmony of all of its citizens. This group has worked to restore important structures within the historic town, and has drafted a Town Plan that highlights the importance of focusing on historic preservation while also providing for future development. Our Town Frederiksted has worked successfully alongside community members and government agencies to advocate for the maintenance and restoration of the Frederiksted Architectural and Control District for generations to come.

St. Croix United for Community, Culture, Environment and Economic Development, Inc. (SUCCEED) and **St. Croix Action for Heritage, Economic and Development** (AHEAD) had previously been working to promote Crucian heritage by seeking to have the entire island of St. Croix designated as a National Heritage Area. This designation would highlight the unique natural environment and cultural traditions of St. Croix, hopefully providing a direction for future development and management within the island. A Heritage Area designation would make funding available for community groups, organizations, and local business to highlight Crucian heritage in a range of economic and community settings. Associated developments include the development of a Maroon Ridge Sanctuary Park and the development of heritage tourism within the island.

The **Society of Virgin Islands Historians** also continues to conduct new, engaging research regarding the historic occupation of the Virgin Islands, and to make that information accessible through outreach and public presentations. The **St. Croix Foundation** promotes economic development through community engagement and grant programs that support the rehabilitation of buildings and vacant lots within urban areas. Neighborhood groups, such as **We From Upstreet** and **We Savaneros**, have encouraged and conducted preservation projects within their communities with the assistance and consultation of the VISHPO and the EDA. Through DPNR, the VISHPO has worked collaboratively with **The Nature Conservancy** and the **Virgin Islands Army National Guard** on projects involving cultural resources that can be both preserved and interpreted for the public. The **St. Croix Archaeology Society** sponsors lectures about the islands' archaeological heritage and runs a small archaeological museum that is open to the public. Finally, the faculty and staff of the Social Sciences Department and the Cooperative Extension Service of the **University of the Virgin Islands** also contribute to the pool of organizations that share the VISHPO's mission to preserve the history and cultural resources of the Virgin Islands.

V. THE FUTURE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION IN THE US VIRGIN ISLANDS

Despite the broad community interest and support for historic preservation, the VISHPO faces substantial challenges in preserving the cultural resources of the Territory. Although the importance and eventual benefit of preserving cultural resources is slowly gaining momentum, there is a great need to make the general population aware that the historic buildings, ruins, artifacts, and cultural landscapes that they take for granted must be protected. Without quick and vigilant action, the traditional cultural landscapes of the Virgin Islands may be lost due to economic development, natural forces, or the many indiscriminate forces that constantly threaten historic and archaeological sites.

A. Conditions and Trends that Negatively Affect Historic Preservation

1. Economic Trends

Historic preservation is always affected by shifting economic trends, although it is important to realize that no one factor stands alone and that the interplay of social and economic factors is complicated. From the slave-raiding that followed European contact to the colonial plantation economies, even the earliest cultural landscapes of the Virgin Islands were impacted by economic and developmental pressures. Early historic settlers took advantage of the best habitation sites, many of which had been previously settled by the prehistoric occupants of the islands. The many historic features and structures that are intrusive into prehistoric sites bear testimony to the fact that even historic development within the islands destroyed important archaeological resources.

Economic development and increased speculation over the last fifty years have resulted in the accelerated destruction of historic buildings and archaeological resources. In fact, many of the Territory's most significant sites have been bull-dozed, cleared, or built over in the name of progress. Today, the desire to capitalize on economic development creates a climate wherein there is a strong inclination to sacrifice historic and archaeological resources for immediate economic gain. This pressure is only offset by the vigilance of non-profit groups, the community, and regulatory conservation agencies such as the VISHPO and DPNR, whose mission it is to protect the environmental and cultural resources of the Territory. However, as new commercial enterprises continue to spring up in previously undeveloped areas, both documented and as yet undiscovered sites will be negatively impacted with greater frequencies.

Archaeological and historic sites are constantly threatened by various forms of economic development, including tourism-related development, development in the coastal zone, and modern reuse of historic features. Specifically, large resort and residential complexes are constant threats to the Territory's undeveloped bays and coastal areas. While the potential impact to onsite resources would certainly be mitigated by cultural resources surveys, data recovery, and the preservation of significant resources, the competing demands of development and historic preservation will become even more important in the Virgin Islands over the next five years.

Modern use of the landscape can also take its toll on the traditional landscapes of the Virgin Islands, as many of the roadways, bridges, and culverts in use today have historic foundations. As such foundations were not intended to bear the weight or the strain caused by the volume of modern day traffic, their continued use raises issues for historic preservation. This issue was highlighted by concerns regarding many of the historic bridges and culverts located along St. Croix's west end, which are negatively impacted by high volumes of heavy truck traffic. Similarly, one of the longest historic boundary walls in the USVI parallels Contentment Road, a major thoroughfare leading into Christiansted. As a result, the boundary wall flanking this roadway is constantly impacted through car accidents and unintentional scuffing, even despite protective guardrails installed by the Virgin Island Department of

Public Works (DPW). While continued economic development is, indeed, an encouraging trend for the USVI, historic preservation must be considered in future planning efforts.

2. Population Trends

The 2010 census indicates that there are approximately 106,405 residents living in the USVI. A steady stream of out- and in-migration keeps this figure fairly constant, even as the ethnic composition of the Virgin Islands population undergoes rapid change. In the 1950s and 1960s, a variety of forces encouraged individuals from other islands to immigrate to the USVI, thereby creating the cultural mosaic that exists today. As a result, today there has been a significant influx of peoples from other Caribbean nations, including Dominica, Haiti, the Dominican Republic, St. Kitts, and even neighboring Puerto Rico. While the resulting cultural milieu creates a diverse population, it could also result in less concern for historic resources and cultural patrimony by non-native Virgin Islanders.

At a minimum, however, the influx of peoples of such different backgrounds suggests that there is an urgent need to provide education materials and historic preservation literature to a wider audience. Moreover, given that many immigrants may speak Spanish, French, or and French-Creole dialects, it will be important to provide educational materials in a variety of languages, especially for young children in the school system.

3. Housing Trends

Federally funded housing programs have provided the economic means to establish large new housing developments in the countryside of the three islands. Normally, Section 106 compliance ensures the discovery and protection of significant cultural resources. However, during the recovery periods following Hurricane Hugo (1989), and Hurricane Marilyn (1995), there was some pressure, at the expense of cultural resources, to expedite construction that provided immediate shelter for affected families. While this "emergency" period has long since passed, expanded affordable housing needs continue. When considered alongside residential subdivisions and the development of "eco-resorts" that look to move into remote and pristine landscapes, the threats to both prehistoric and historic sites continue unabated.

Housing trends also impact cultural resources through the subdivision of large parcels of land and the formation of subdivisions, which are defined by the USVI Code as the division of a parcel into four or more plots for the purposes of transferring ownership or development, or any division of land if a new road is involved. While VISHPO does review most of the subdivision plans prior to their approval, the creation of subdivisions does negatively impact cultural resources. On one hand, newly established subdivisions suggest economic and residential development in previously undeveloped areas, which always has a high potential for impacting cultural resources. Moreover, if cultural resources are present, or are discovered in a survey prior to the subdivision, there is a high risk that the cultural resources pertaining to a single site may become fragmented and divided among multiple property owners. While most developers do comply with conditions placed on development and are working to limit the impact to significant resources, the integrity of a site is more likely to be threatened when portions are distributed among multiple landowners. The fragmentation of historic sites also makes it more difficult for cultural resource managers, such as the VISHPO, to monitor development.

For many landowners, there is a particularly romantic appeal to building or purchasing a home that sits among historic buildings, sites, or features. It is also common for portions of historic structures, or for historic foundations, to be rehabilitated and incorporated into modern residential or commercial structures. To that end, both the VISHPO and HPC can provide guidance regarding best practices for protecting and rehabilitating historic structures, and for conducting archaeological surveys in advance of such development. However, these types of projects run the risk of irrevocably damaging historic and

prehistoric resources if landowners either do not consult with the VISHPO, or if landowners ignore the conditions established through regulatory review. The integrity of some of our islands' most impressive archaeological sites is being diminished as landowners undertake seemingly innocuous terrace projects, road improvements, or house modifications that are, quite literally, clearing the Territory's heritage away. If landowners seek guidance from qualified preservation professionals and the VISHPO, it is easier to balance the desire for preservation with the understanding that progress can, and should, be positive, including development in the vicinity of significant cultural resources.

4. Infrastructure: Transportation, and Communication

Infrastructural improvements and road construction always have a potential to impact cultural resources. In order to minimize the impact that potential impact, FHWA is tasked for implementing Section 106 adherence on all federal highways projects and for consulting with the VISHPO. However, local construction, road repair, and utilities projects conducted by the DPW have not, historically, been consistently reviewed for impacts to cultural resources. Such projects have inadvertently destroyed buried archaeological resources or detracted from the historic ambiance of adjacent historic buildings, sites, and landscapes. More frequently, the integrity of sites, structures, and features is threatened through the application of incompatible materials, such as concrete and Portland cement, to historic structures and features. While the VISHPO does successfully coordinate with other government agencies, there is dire need to tighten the regulatory review process with regard to road, bridge, and culvert construction. One purpose of the Antiquities and Cultural Properties Act is to guarantee compliance by local governmental agencies, and to make such territorial compliance equivalent with the compliance required of federal agencies under Section 106 of the NHPA. Moreover, as noted previously, increased governmental coordination will be necessary to ensure that future roadway, culvert, and bridge projects do not unnecessarily, and permanently, damage the numerous historic features that provide a foundation for modern transportation.

Infrastructural improvements often run the risk of encountering deeply buried cultural deposits, as evidenced in the discovery of a prehistoric site in a waterline replacement project on Main Street in Charlotte Amalie. The Main Street Archaeological project provided new and exciting data regarding early Ceramic Age sites in the Territory, which further reiterates the wisdom of more stringent regulatory review for water, sewer, and other infrastructural projects. The success of the Main Street project also emphasizes the high potential for discovering significant cultural resources in earth change projects, even in highly developed areas that are thought to have already been disturbed.

In the same vein, improvements to the utility lines and communications infrastructure of the Virgin Islands will likely continue to impact cultural resources through the excavation and replacement of utility lines, access points, and new cable installation. For example, recent projects have expanded internet and broadband access throughout the Virgin Islands. While the VISHPO has successfully coordinated with the Virgin Islands Next Generation Network and with Broadband V.I. to perform cultural resource surveys in advance of earth change projects, the increasing demand for expanded service must continue to occur with regulatory review so that the cultural resources are minimally impacted.

5. Infrastructure: Energy Sources

Since the economic losses and the closing of Hovensa, a petroleum refinery on St. Croix, the USVI have been under intense pressure to develop immediate, sustainable energy alternatives. Since the closing announcement, residents, public agencies, and private development groups have explored natural gas, biodiesel, solar energy, and wind turbine projects as viable alternatives. While the VISHPO supports the development of sustainable energy sources in the Virgin Islands, the earth change associated with the

installation, maintenance, and distribution of energy products will certainly impact cultural resources on multiple scales.

6. Seaport Development

Increasing demands for maritime transportation and shipping will continue to create pressures for seaport expansion, with concomitant negative effects on both terrestrial and submerged cultural resources. Growth in tourism and commercial development also has the potential to impact submerged cultural resources, especially as bays and harbors are dredged or terraformed to accommodate cruise ships or marine-related industry. Dredging practices are especially of concern when conducted within the historic harbors of Christiansted, Charlotte Amalie, Cruz Bay, and Frederiksted. Such activities are likely to continue to disturb submerged shipwrecks. Increased regulatory review of dredging activities would be productive.

7. Shifting Population and Disappearance of the Rural Landscape

In the past, the highest population densities have been located in historically-developed population centers with "country" in between. Today, there residential development is extending to the farthest reaches of St. Thomas, and populations are increasingly becoming more dispersed throughout St. Croix and St. John. The changing landscape could be attributed to increased affluence and a greater demand for residential housing in remote areas, although another prime factor is the increased availability of affordable housing. This demographic shift out of the urban centers has resulted in the loss of archaeological resources and historic ruins that, in the past, were often located in undeveloped nooks and crannies of large properties. Today, large parcels are being subdivided and re-subdivided, and there is a lower likelihood that cultural resources will remain untouched. The concurrent demand for additional facilities, such as roads, schools, fire stations, police stations, shopping centers, and other necessities, also poses a threat to cultural resources and to a formerly rural landscape.

On St. John, the demands for commercial property in Cruz Bay and large landholdings by Virgin Islands National Park have made privately held land scarce and less affordable. Since St. John is still undergoing extreme development pressure, new urban centers are developing. In East End and Coral Bay, for instance, a second major population center is now developing. While Coral Bay was once an untouched constellation of extremely important prehistoric and historic sites, development pressures and proposed development periodically threaten in situ resources. Local activist groups, such as the Coral Bay Community Council, are actively working to balance preservation of natural and cultural resources with economic development in such areas.

8. Cultural Attitudes

Despite the fact that the Territory's historical narrative figures prominently in the cultural construction of many native Virgin Islanders, the sites and structures associated with historic and prehistoric sites are frequently taken for granted or dismissed. To many, the Territory's historic structures are merely seen as run-down masonry buildings or neglected spaces. Others may not fully appreciate the aesthetic and communal value of historic structures in the Virgin Islands, perhaps in favor of more modern architectural styles. Others may view the remnants of historic sites as painful reminders of the oppression of enslaved individuals during the colonial era. However, a better understanding of the Territory's resources would demonstrate the value of preserving a site or of rehabilitating a historic building. In fact, only after these cultural resources are gone will people realize what they have lost. It is imperative that a heightened awareness be brought to the general population before it is too late. A critical point of engagement for historic preservation involves bridging the gap between historic sites as monuments of oppression and creating a dialogue that reflects the diverse narratives of peoples who

inhabited these islands during the colonial era, including all sectors of the population. The development of educational materials and outreach programs, both for the general public and for school-age children, would help bridge that gap, as would the continued academic study of the prehistoric and historic USVI.

Finally, there is a broad bias for the protection of historic sites over prehistoric sites, which affects the likelihood of whether the latter would be preserved or impacted. This trend is, in part, due to a broad lack of community groups with the ability to demonstrate and claim descent from the indigenous peoples of the Virgin Islands. Without a federally recognized tribal organization to argue for its preservation, and without the impressive standing architecture associated with historic sites, prehistoric sites are especially threatened. However, the largest challenge to changing cultural perceptions about the prehistory of the Virgin Islands is the overall lack of awareness about the importance of those resources, a fact that could be changed with the development of educational materials for a wide range of audiences.

9. Maintenance of Historic Districts and HPC Activities

Much of the aforementioned development is restricted to the same densely settled urban areas that have been focal points on the landscape for centuries, if not millennia. As the Virgin Islands benefit from economic growth, development will increasingly impact the aesthetic and historic nature of the Historic and Architectural Control Districts of Charlotte Amalie, Frederiksted, and Christiansted. While the HPCs work in concert with the VISHPO to offer guidance on how development can proceed without altering the aesthetic and architectural feel of these areas, there are real challenges facing landowners, developers, and stakeholders who attempt rehabilitation, reconstruction, or modification within these districts. The cost of an architecturally and historically appropriate rehabilitation can exceed the capabilities of individual landowners or institutions. The Historic Preservation Fund grants offered by the VISHPO, federal restoration tax credits, and EDA-sponsored programs within the Enterprise Zones offer important services for rehabilitation within the historic districts, the continued maintenance and rehabilitation of the historic districts will always exceed the funding that is currently available. It can also be difficult for property owners within the historic districts to find appropriate information regarding recommended contractors or guidelines, as this information is not currently available online.

Historic districts also pose challenges from the perspective of the HPCs. The lack of enforcement is a critical issue, as it makes it difficult for the HPC to maintain the architectural cohesion of the districts. The overall mechanism for assessing fines for infractions is also inadequate. First, current policy requires that any fine be assessed by the SHPO (DPNR Commissioner). If the authority to assess fines were granted to the HPC, rather than the SHPO, it would streamline this process and make it easier to bring violations to bear. Second, the current fee rates are negligible and do not serve as a deterrent. The fee schedule has not been updated since 1998, and these fees must be increased in order to encourage compliance. With a more stringent fee schedule and with proper enforcement, this could provide a revolving source of funding for use by the HPC, a portion of which could be made available and redistributed through microloans to the community. The overall awareness of the historic districts also poses a challenge to the HPCs, as there are no visible markers indicating the boundaries of the districts. Proper signage, including welcoming signs, distinctive street signs, interpretive signs, and district boundary markers, would provide a critical point of engagement for individuals living, working, and visiting our historic towns.

A number of important buildings in Frederiksted and Christiansted have been lost to fire and decay. Preservation efforts in these towns today are focused on the conservation and restorative treatment of these remains, but our community should continue to remain vigilant in our stewardship and awareness of these important buildings and sites. The EDA's Board-Up programs and Scrape and Paint programs enact much positive change in the district, but even these programs are just a start. Addressing the needs

of the historic district will involve widespread community action, increased levels of funding, and a greater awareness of the significant of maintaining the districts.

Currently recognized historic districts are limited to Christiansted, Frederiksted, and Charlotte Amalie. However, the VISHPO has been working with local historians to prepare a nomination to establish a historic and architectural control district in Cruz Bay, St. John. Such a designation would be a monumental achievement, as it would recognize the unique and historic nature of Cruz Bay, honor the historic development of St. John, and work to preserve architectural features within the boundaries of the downtown district. If approved, this new designation for Cruz Bay will require that a new set of guidelines be established, along with new administrative procedures on behalf of the HPC, especially if the historic district would be governed by the jointly-administrated St. Thomas-St. John HPC.

10. Enforcement of Antiquities Legislation and Regulatory Decisions

Like many other government agencies, the VISHPO struggles to fully enforce its enabling legislation and regulatory decisions due to a lack of funding, limited governmental support, and insufficient staff. The VISHPO and its staff are primarily supported by the federal funding offered by the Department of the Interior's NPS, although the GVI provides for staff and offers institutional support. However, the VISHPO's current regulatory and management duties, as per local and federal legislation, merit both additional staff and financial support. With a larger staff, the VISHPO could truly excel in meeting its planning goals. One of the primary objectives named in this plan is to initiate additional legislated support for the VISHPO within the next five-year cycle.

In addition, there are certain statues within the Antiquities Act that are not fully enforced. Most importantly, § 957 of Title 29, Chapter 17 of the VI Code establishes the responsibility of government agencies with regard to historic preservation. This section mandates that any government, government-approved, or government-assisted undertaking that may impact sites eligible for listing on either the NRHP or the VI Registry must provide the VISHPO fifteen working days to comment and make recommendations and determine whether the project could have an adverse effect on significant cultural properties. It further requires that GVI agencies contact the VISHPO early within the planning process, provide reports of archaeological investigations, and assume financial responsibility for the preservation of historical, cultural, and archaeological properties under their control. If fully implemented, this legislation would authorize the VISHPO would comment on nearly every GVI-funded undertaking in the territory, which would provide a significant, and meaningful, increase in the scope of their regulatory review. Although the interpretation of this mandate is clear as presented in the VI Code, this section of the Antiquities Act is woefully ignored by other government agencies. If this legislation were adhered to and unequivocally applied, it would raise the profile of the VISHPO and historic preservation to unprecedented levels. Since this section of the Antiquities legislation is clearly written and previously ratified, future enforcement could be coordinated through a series of position papers authored by the VISHPO and disseminated throughout other GVI agencies.

The permits for archaeological excavation are also not fully enforced, as visiting researchers often fail to request excavation permits from the VISHPO. This sometimes leads to unqualified persons working in the Territory, an unethical practice that leads to poor scholarship and inadequate analysis of recovered materials.

11. Museums, Curation, and Collections Management

The management and long-term curation of the Territory's museum and research collections are two of the most critical issues facing the USVI today. There is a great need for a centralized repository that meets federally established standards for curation as per 36 CFR Part 79 of the NHPA. Currently, the

artifacts, scientific samples, and associated project data from the numerous research and cultural resource management projects that have taken place in the USVI are stored in variable and less than ideal conditions. On both St. Croix and St. Thomas, the VISHPO shares storage space with other government agencies. However, while such spaces may meet an immediate need, the Territory is in dire need of a permanent curation and collections management facility that would provide for secure, climate controlled, long-term storage of archaeological collections within the Territory. As it currently stands, many of the artifacts recovered in archaeological excavations are maintained in personal collections, stored in commercial storage units, or temporarily removed from the Territory, all due to the lack of appropriate storage by the VISHPO.

While there are costs associated with curation and collections management, there are long term benefits to the local management of archaeological collections. Specifically, a collections facility would keep the materials in the territory and under the control of the GVI, as opposed to nonlocal institutions, and would make such collections available to both local and visiting researchers. Most importantly, the data held in the VISHPO collections is, quite literally, invaluable and irreplaceable. These collections reflect nearly 200 years of excavations at some of the most important sites in the Virgin Islands, if not in the Caribbean. Without an appropriate storage facility that is provided for, staffed, and maintained in perpetuity, the integrity of these unique and important collections will continue to degrade, effectively erasing thousands of years of history and prehistory merely due to a lack of storage.

The need for a curation facility mirrors the need for local museums. In many other Caribbean islands, locals and visitors alike are often surrounded by museums, murals, and art installations depicting the prehistoric and historic lifeways of the island. Such installations are common on other Caribbean islands, but rare, or nonexistent, in the USVI. The reason for this discrepancy is that the governments and residents of other Caribbean nations have placed value on long-term heritage management, heritage education, and the interpretation of that heritage to a wide audience. However, teaching both visitors and native Virgin Islanders about the Territory's long history through exhibits, museums and interpretive promotion make good economic sense. A partnership between the Division of Libraries, Archives and Museums (DLAM), the VISHPO, the Virgin Islands Tourism Department, and the tourism industry in the Virgin Islands, would contribute to the development of sustainable heritage tourism and provide a source of funding local museums and interpretive cultural exhibits. Overall, awareness of the multifaceted heritage of the Virgin Islands, and its many peoples, may well be considered an economic product that might be "cast upon the waters" to return seven-fold. As is the case with other historic preservation programs, the will to establish an outstanding museum system can only come only from dedicated leaders who recognize its importance.

12. Data Management

Much of the information regarding the historic and prehistoric sites in the Virgin Islands is based on research and assessments that are decades old. It is reasonable to assert that outdated sources of information need to be reanalyzed in light of current data and interpretive frameworks. Many of these early works provide important data sources, as many of the sites that were recorded in the past may have been impacted, or may no longer be available for study due to many factors. However, continuing to rely on outdated information will limit the development of USVI programs for archaeology and historic preservation. For example, many of the NRHP nominations were prepared in the 1970s and 1980s and, as a result, contain outdated or even incorrect data. The current state of NRHP-listed properties should be assessed, threatened sites should be addressed, and the background information for each site should be updated to meet modern standards. Moreover, the integrity and eligibility of NRHP listings should be reassessed, as some sites have been irrevocably impacted or destroyed. The VISHPO site file database also needs to be reviewed and updated, as a number of new sites await registration. The Smithsonian trinomial system for archaeological site identification and a comparable system for historic architectural

resources should be applied. This information should be maintained in duplicate to ensure retention of information should a catastrophic event damage the site file repository. The VISHPO is currently working on its internal files, although this endeavor merits additional consideration.

Another critical issue with regard to data management lies in the institutional knowledge of departmental archives of various government and non-government agencies. Currently, private, public, religious, and community organizations independently maintain important archives that are critical to long-term preservation efforts. Whether dealing with plot maps, marriage records, engineering drawings, cemetery records, or report libraries, the specific details of these key resources are frequently passed down through oral history and the institutional knowledge of, frequently, single individuals. Since such information is easily lost, it would be of great benefit for the VISHPO to contact local churches, community groups, GVI agencies, non-profits, etc., to request information regarding any archived materials and to assemble a database of which entities are responsible for which data.

13. Natural and Environmental Forces

The natural environment of the Caribbean contributes to the wonderful quality of life in the Virgin Islands; however, natural forces can also pose a severe threat to the Territory's cultural resources. The disaster caused by storm events, hurricanes, tropical storms, tropical depressions, and tsunamis, is nothing new to Virgin Islanders. However, the indirect effects of the overland flash flooding, storm surges, and erosion that occur alongside such storms, are less well-known. As many of the significant cultural resources of the Territory are located in low-lying areas near or on the coastline, coastal resources are constantly threatened by erosion, overland flooding, beach erosion, and storm surges. These events can cause significant damage to archaeological sites, as evidenced in 2010 when overland sheet flooding from a tropical storm resulted in the disturbance of human remains in the vicinity of Fort Frederik. While the site was disturbed, the VISHPO successfully coordinated with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the Virgin Islands Police Department, and the Department of Housing, Parks, and Recreation, to recover the disturbed remains and prepare a resource management plan for the onsite resources. In this case, the resources benefitted from being in a public area, where the damage was noticed. However, the potential range of disturbance in other, less public areas, could result in a large amount of unrecorded damage with every approaching storm or flood event.

Climate change is another environmental factor that will impact cultural resources. In fact, rising sea levels and future shifts in weather patterns will significantly, and permanently, alter the Territory's morphology. Some portions of coastal sites, even today, are washing away with every wave due to slow changes in sea levels and ocean currents. As these resources are increasingly impacted, there will be an even greater need for the VISHPO and researchers working in the Territory to conduct salvage excavations and perform site stabilization in order to protect coastal resources from being impacted.

B. Beneficial Trends in Historic Preservation

Despite these many challenges, the VISHPO continues to reach milestones and to advance the overall program of historic preservation for the Territory. The VISHPO has diligently worked to improve interagency coordination with both federal and territorial government agencies, including the NPS, FEMA, FHWA, the Virgin Islands Territorial Emergency Management Agency (VITEMA), the EDA, and the GVI's DPW. The VISHPO has increased its community profile through outreach and education, and through the development of historic preservation guides that help property owners and developers understand the regulatory review process. Between Fiscal Years 2007 and 2011, the VISHPO has also awarded nearly \$200,000 in grant funding to support research, rehabilitation, and historic preservation planning throughout the Territory through the Historic Preservation Fund Grant, an annual fund that is provided for by the VISHPO's establishing funding. We anticipate that similar levels of funding will be

made available over the next five years. The VISHPO has successfully engaged with FEMA on post-disaster mitigation projects and promoted research on the key historic and prehistoric resources of the Territory. The VISHPO has worked to increase access to the Territory's cultural resources and offered professional guidance to countless homeowners, clients, and developers, regarding historic preservation. The VISHPO strives to continuing their commitment to high standards of regulatory review and enlightened preservation planning suitable for the modern world. While many of the achievements of the historic preservation movement in the territory have been discussed above, a few broad trends are highlighted below.

1. Legislation

The 1998 passage and implementation of the Antiquities and Cultural Properties Act was a hopeful sign that community leaders and politicians are becoming aware of the need to protect the cultural resources of the Virgin Islands. This public awareness is evident in the numerous community groups promoting historic preservation, the large numbers numerous media articles and interviews that have covered historic preservation, the general public interest in prehistoric and historic resources in the Territory, and the success of government-sponsored tax credit and rehabilitation programs. If such trends continue, the future of historic preservation will be well served. The economic hope of the commercial districts of Charlotte Amalie, Christiansted, Frederiksted, and, potentially, Cruz Bay, lies their historic ambience. Evidence also suggests that historic preservation is increasingly recognized as an important avenue for developing heritage tourism and related economies, and we hope that historic preservation will continue to figure prominently in future development for the Territory. Similarly, the HPC has taken an aggressive stance in the Historic and Architectural Control Districts and successfully minimized the impact of development in the historic districts. The nature and aesthetic feel of the historic districts is as cohesive as it has ever been, largely thanks to the activities of conscientious property owners working in concert with the HPC, the VISHPO, and other community groups. In the same vein, the VISHPO has provided comment relevant legislation that effectively strengthened or attempted to weaken the antiquities legislation. The VISHPO has also worked to formalize the interdepartmental review process to ensure that the Territory's cultural heritage is preserved, and that the Antiquities legislation is enforced.

2. Interagency Coordination and Government-Private Sector Partnerships

The potential is great for creation of public-private sector partnerships in the Virgin Islands. The Tutu Archaeological Village Project, which took place from 1992 through 1993, was an outstanding example of such cooperation. Businesses are often willing to contribute resources to that which they have access, or to make contributions that will either produce tax benefits and/or publicity for their products and services. More recent projects have highlighted the progress that can be made when agencies and institutions work together. For example, a small historic village near Contentment was slated to be impacted by the construction of the Christiansted Bypass. However, FHWA partnered with the VISHPO to protect and restore the Contentment Village, an 19th and 20th century village that is slated for rehabilitation using a combination of federal, territorial, and private funds. Initial efforts will focus on the rehabilitation and reconstruction of one structure, although there are plans to extend the rehabilitation to the rest of the site. In other parts of the Territory, the VISHPO and DPNR are working alongside the NPS to address threatened cultural resources in the vicinity of Salt River, and with the DPW to ensure that the Charlotte Amalie Veterans Drive Highway and Waterfront Improvement Project complemented the historic and aesthetic feel of downtown Charlotte Amalie. The VISHPO has also worked within numerous private developers to preserve archaeological sites as greenspaces that can be enjoyed by residents, and to encourage the development of small heritage exhibits in a variety of contexts.

The VISHPO's record of achievement hinges on partnering with private institutions and other government agencies to protect the Territory's cultural resources and to promote preservation through

coordination, mitigation, and research. We expect this trend not only to continue, but to flourish, over the next five years.

3. Education

Historic structures and properties enrich the communities in which they exist and engender cultural pride in those who live among them. Archaeological resources hold the keys to understanding the particular heritage of a people — that which makes them unique. The most direct way of enlightening the general population of the USVI and promoting historic preservation is to make legislators, government officials, educators, businessmen, and community activists of the Virgin Islands aware of the importance of historic preservation to and its fundamental role in the cultural health of a community. Our leaders must set the example, but the VISHPO also seeks to reach out to the future leaders of the islands through education and outreach. A program of improved teacher-training coupled with seminars and training of government officials and staff, would promote the awareness of, and appreciation for, the preservation of our irreplaceable cultural resources.

The VISHPO also supports hands-on education by providing walking tours of the historic districts and sites of memory for school groups; providing training for local students interested in archaeology and historic preservation; and by volunteering their assistance to archaeological projects, historic research, and other conservation groups.

4. Incentives for Revitalization of Historic Districts

The revitalization of the historic districts is critical to long-term historic preservation efforts in the territory. Rather than letting buildings rot or fall into disrepair, the VISHPO promotes economic and residential development within the historic districts. The availability of federal tax incentive programs and the success of the EDA-sponsored Enterprise Zones provide excellent examples of how adaptive reuse and targeted funding can lead to positive change within a community. The best argument for the continued preservation of key sites is their continued use, and we anticipate that future efforts will continue these revitalization efforts.

VI. FIVE-YEAR GOALS FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The following are the Five-Year Goals for Historic Preservation in the Virgin Islands. These goals are to be accomplished in addition to the ongoing yearly programs of the Federal Historic Preservation Program. Many of the goals of the five-year projection will be promoted by the VISHPO in conjunction with various preservation organizations and other governmental agencies.

Goals and Objectives:

1. Amend, enhance, and revise existing policy and legislation that will assist in the protection and preservation of cultural resources and historic properties.
 - A. Develop a territorial rehabilitation and restoration tax incentive program.
 - B. Develop updated policy, rules, and regulations for implementation and enforcement of the “Antiquities and Cultural Properties Act through a series of position papers, including a statement on the significance of the section pertaining to the Responsibility of Government Agencies With Regard to Historic Preservation (§957, Title 29, Chapter 17 of the VI Code).
 - C. Enforce the federal and territorial antiquities legislation through regulatory review, monitoring, and public awareness campaigns.
 - D. Improve interdepartmental review to ensure that VISHPO determinations are recognized and enforced.
 - E. Update fee schedule and fee assessment mechanism for violations within the historic districts.
 - F. Explore the creation of special revolving funds for private archaeological and historic preservation restoration projects.
 - G. Work with local legislators to provide additional territorial funding to support the institutional, staffing, and professional needs of the VISHPO.
 - H. Develop a collections management plan for the archaeological and scientific collections that are maintained by the VISHPO.
 - I. Seek funding and legislative support for the development of a curation and museum facility to permanently store and highlight the archaeological and scientific collections maintained by the VISHPO.
 - J. Increase the size of the historic and architectural control districts for Christiansted, Frederiksted, Charlotte Amalie, and, if approved, Cruz Bay.
2. Seek and encourage financial assistance from organizations and individuals engaged in historic preservation within the Territory.
 - A. Encourage non-profit organizations to develop funding programs for preservation projects.
 - B. Increase VISHPO funding grants to increase survey, inventory, and identification of cultural resources within the Territory.
 - C. Supplement the funding available for disbursement through the Historic Preservation Fund.
 - D. Lobby financial institutions and businesses to provide grants to non-profit historic preservation organizations.
 - E. Lobby financial institutions to provide low-interest loans to owners of historic buildings used for commercial and residential purposes.
 - F. Encourage community development corporations to consider historic preservation projects.

3. Increase territorial awareness and appreciation of historic preservation and encourage appropriate treatment of cultural resources.
 - A. Encourage heritage tourism and establish a Heritage Trail for St. Thomas /St. John.
 - B. Expand "Preservation Week" activities to a month-long observance.
 - C. Assist non-profit organizations in developing and sponsoring public lecture series, conferences, and workshops.
 - D. Publish historic preservation technical guides, educational materials, and newsletters.
 - E. Increase online accessibility of the technical guides, educational materials, and VIHSPPO newsletters.
 - F. Encourage and foster relationships with private property owners, real estate agents, contractors, architects, other design professionals, and local government departments.
 - G. Encourage preservation organizations to recognize excellence in preservation.
 - H. Conduct educational and technical seminars/workshops for legislators, government agencies, private preservation organizations, and neighborhood organizations.
 - I. Develop and disseminate a historic and cultural preservation curriculum guide for primary, secondary, and University level institutions, teachers, parents, and students.
 - J. Promote academic research on the historic and prehistoric resources of the Territory to highlight their local, national, and regional significance.
 - K. Take advantage of the 100 year anniversary of Transfer Day to highlight the historic resources of the Territory.

4. Identify significant archaeological and historic properties within the Territory through an ongoing systematic survey and identification program.
 - A. Survey vacant lots slated for development within historic districts to identify prehistoric and historic archaeological resources.
 - B. Increase nominations of sites and buildings to the NRHP and create a tracking database system for their production and updates.
 - C. Revise existing NRHP nominations and reassess the eligibility.
 - D. Document historic and prehistoric cemeteries and burial grounds.
 - E. Reevaluate the historic and prehistoric sites that are recorded in the VI Registry and update the associated site file database.

5. Develop information technology to facilitate research, preservation initiatives, and information exchange.
 - A. Enhance the VISHPO's social media presence and internet home page located on the DPNR website.
 - B. Make preservation guides, regulatory review guides, and VISHPO forms available through the departmental webpage.
 - C. Organize cultural resource management (CRM) projects, maps, and photographic and archaeological collections for the establishment of a computer-based curation system.
 - D. Seek funding sources for the development and maintenance of a Geographic Information System (GIS) and for a searchable online site file database for standing historic structures and, with a more limited distribution, archaeological sites.
 - E. Develop digital records of the site files, historic maps, project reports, and cultural resource management reports that are on file with the VISHPO.

- F. Contact GIS Division of the Office of the Lt. Governor to request that the boundaries of the Historic and Architectural Control Districts be included in the MapGeo property viewer available online.
 - G. Contact the Tax Collector's Office to request that information regarding property ownership within Historic and Architectural Control Districts be included in printed text on property tax bills.
 - H. Target property owners within historic districts through specific mailings, poster generation, or outreach campaigns.
6. Improve standard levels of competency for archeological and historic preservation professionals and others working in historic preservation in the Virgin Islands.
- A. Provide training opportunities in traditional and contemporary conservation techniques to local Virgin Islanders, students, the general public, and non-profit institutions.
 - B. Increase collaborative training opportunities with federal agencies involved in cultural resource management.
 - C. Update and maintain a list of archaeological consultants approved to work in the Territory.
 - D. Develop relationships with institutions that offer graduate programs in archaeology and historic preservation to encourage practical experience for students.
7. Implement planning solutions for threatened historic and archaeological sites in the Virgin Islands.
- A. Monitor and assess government-sponsored development to limit the potential impact to historic preservation.
 - B. Increase coordination with the NPS and DPNR's Salt River Task Force to address threatened archaeological sites within Salt River Bay National Historic Park and Ecological Preserve.
 - C. Monitor and provide current assessments for cultural resources within DPNR and the CZM's Areas of Particular Concerns.
 - D. Partner with GVI organizations to ensure that cultural resources are considered in development plans.
8. Annual Recurring Goals for the VISHPO
- A. Increase awareness of historic preservation.
 - B. Provide training for HPC members.
 - C. Provide training for select staff members of the DPNR
 - D. Provide training for neighborhood organizations.
 - E. Provide training for newly elected officers of preservation organizations and government officials.
 - F. Increase the educational opportunities for the general public to learn about historic preservation and the cultural resources of the Virgin Islands.
 - G. Offer professional guidance and consultation to historic preservation professionals, landowners, and government agencies.
 - H. Continue to improve VISHPO through efficient and timely review.

SOURCE MATERIALS

Allaire, Louis

- 1997 The Lesser Antilles before Columbus. In *The Indigenous People of the Caribbean*, edited by Samuel M. Wilson, pp. 20-20. University of Pres of Florida, Gainesville.

Ausherman, Betty

- 1982 *St. John Sites Report 1981-82*. Virgin Islands Planning Office, U.S. Virgin Islands.

Boyer, William W.

- 2010 *America's Virgin Islands. A History of Human Rights and Wrongs*. Corilins Academic Press, North Carolina.

Bullen, Ripley P.

- 1962 Ceramic Periods of St. Thomas and St. John Islands, Virgin Islands. The William L. Bryant Foundation, American Studies Report 4. Central Florida Museum, Orlando.

Bullen, Ripley P., and Slight, Frederick W.

- 1963 The Krum Bay Site: A Preceramic Site on St. Thomas, US Virgin Islands. The William L. Bryant Foundation, American Studies Report 5. Central Florida Museum, Orlando.

Chanlatte Baik, Luis A.

- 2013 Huecoid Culture and the Antillean Agroalfarero (Farmer-Pottery Period). In *The Oxford Handbook of Caribbean Archaeology*, edited by William F. Keegan, Corinne L. Hofman, and Reniel Rodríguez Ramos, pp. 171-183. Oxford University Press, New York.

Curet, L. Antonio

- 2003 Issues on the Diversity and Emergence of Middle-Range Societies of the Ancient Caribbean: A Critique. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 11(1):1-42.

Dahl, Thorkel and Kjeld de Fine Licht

- 2004 *Surveys in 1961 on St. Thomas & St. Croix*. Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, Danish Architectural Press, Copenhagen.

Dookhan, Isaac

- 1994 *A History of the Virgin Islands of the United States*. Canoe Press, Jamaica.

Figueredo, Alfredo E.

- 1974 History of Virgin Islands Archaeology. Virgin Islands Archaeological Society's Journal 1:1-6.

Gjessing, Fred

- 1997 The Historic Architecture of the Virgin Islands. Draft submitted to the VISHPO. Ms on file at the VISHPO.

Hardy, Meredith

- 2007 Archaeological Investigations at Salt River Bay National Historical Park and Ecological Preserve, St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands. SEAC Accession Number 1953. Southeast Archaeological Center, Tallahassee.

- 2008 Saladoid Economy and Complexity on the Arawakan Frontier. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Anthropology, Florida State University, Tallahassee.

2011 *Christiansted National Historic Site, St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands: Archaeological Overview and Assessment*. National Park Service Report, SEAC Accession 1839. Tallahassee.

Hatt, Gudmund

1924 Archaeology of the Virgin Islands. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Congress of Americanists* (Part 1), 29-42. The Hague.

Morse, Birgit Faber

1989 Saladoid Remains and Adaptive Strategies in St. Croix, Virgin Islands. In *Early Ceramic Population Lifeways and Adaptive Strategies in the Caribbean*, edited by Peter E. Siegel, pp. 29-42. British Archaeological Reports, BAR International Series 506. Oxford.

2004 At the Onset of Complexity. Late Ceramic Developments in St. Croix. In *Late Ceramic Age Societies in the Eastern Caribbean*, edited by André Delpuech and Corinne L. Hofman, pp. 183-193. British Archaeological Reports, BAR International Series 1273, Oxford.

National Park Service

1993 A Planning Companion for NPS-49, Chapters #6, 30, and 31: Suggestions for Designation and Implementing of a State Preservation Planning Process. Inter-agency Resources Division.

Newsom, Lee A. and Elizabeth Wing

2004 *On Land and Sea. Native American Uses of Biological Resources in the West Indies*. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.

Owlig, Karen F.

1985 *Cultural Adaptation and Resistance on St. John: Three Centuries of Afrocaribbean Life*. University Presses of Florida, Gainesville.

Pagán Jiménez, Jaime R.

2013 Human-Plant Dynamics in the Precolonial Antilles: A Synthetic Update. In *The Oxford Handbook of Caribbean Archaeology*, edited by William F. Keegan, Corinne L. Hofman, and Reniel Rodríguez Ramos, pp. 391-406. Oxford University Press, New York.

Righter, Elizabeth

1984 Guidelines for the Conduct of Cultural Resources Surveys in the Virgin Islands. Ms. on file at the VISHPO.

1986 A Comprehensive Statewide Historic Preservation Plan. Ms. on file with the VISHPO.

1995 A Critical Look At Prehistoric Settlement Patterns in the U.S. Virgin Islands. Proceedings of the 16th International Congress for Caribbean Archaeology, Guadeloupe.

Righter, Elizabeth (Editor)

2002 *The Tutu Archaeological Village Site: A Multidisciplinary Case Study in Human Adaptation*. Routledge, New York.

Righter, Elizabeth and Emily Lundberg

1991 Preliminary Report of Findings at the Tutu Archaeological Village, St. Thomas, USVI. Proceedings of the 14th International Congress for the Study of Caribbean Archaeology, Barbados.

Righter, Elizabeth C., Ken S. Wild, and Emily R. Lundberg

- 2004 Late Ceramic Age Developments in the Virgins Archipelago: The Puerto Rican Connection. In *Late Ceramic Age Societies in the Eastern Caribbean*, edited by Delpuech, André and C. L. Hofman, pp. 101-118. BAR International Series 1273; Paris Monographs in American Archaeology 14. Archaeopress, Oxford

Rodríguez Ramos, Reniel, Jaime R. Pagán-Jiménez, and Corinne L. Hoffman

- 2013 The Humanization of the Insular Caribbean. In *The Oxford Handbook of Caribbean Archaeology*, edited by William F. Keegan, Corinne L. Hofman, and Reniel Rodríguez Ramos, pp. 347-362. Oxford University Press, New York.

Rouse, Irving

- 1986 *Migrations in Prehistory: Inferring Population Movement from Cultural Remains*. Yale University Press, New Haven.

- 1992 *The Tainos: Rise and Fall of the People Who Greeted Columbus*. Yale University Press, New Haven.

Sandford, Mary K. and Laura Sappelsa

- 1997 A View to the Past: Investigations of the Bioarchaeology and Paleopathology at the Tutu Site, St. Thomas, United States Virgin Islands. Ms. on file at the VISHPO.

Tyson, George F. and Arnold R. Highfield

- 1994 *The Kalima Folk: Slavery and Slave Life in the Danish West Indies*, edited by George F. Tyson and Arnold R. Highfield. Virgin Islands Humanities Council, Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas, U.S. Virgin Islands.

Vescelius, Gary

- 1952 *Cultural Chronology of St. Croix*. Senior Thesis, Yale University, New Haven.

Wilson, Samuel

- 2007 *The Archaeology of the Caribbean*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Wild, Ken

- 2013 A Timeline of Taíno Development in the Virgin Islands. Paper presented at the 25th Congress of the International Association for Caribbean Archaeology.

**PUBLICATIONS AND DOCUMENTS RELATED TO THE VIRGIN ISLANDS
HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN ON FILE WITH THE VISHPO**

1. Statewide Comprehensive Historic Preservation Plan: Prehistoric Context by Elizabeth Righter.
2. Historic Churches, Synagogues, and Other Religious Institutions of the Virgin Islands by William Chapman.
3. Catherineberg by staff of the State Historic Preservation Office.
4. Christiansted Historic District by staff of the State Historic Preservation Office.
5. Frederiksted Historic District by staff of the State Historic Preservation Office.
6. Charlotte Amalie Historic District by staff of the State Historic Preservation Office.
7. The Homestead Buildings by George F. Tyson.
8. Vernacular Architecture by Myron D. Jackson.
9. The Plantation System of the Virgin Islands: An Overview by George F. Tyson.
10. Historic Architecture of the Virgin Islands by Fred Gjessing.
11. Military Sites and Resources of the Virgin Islands by William Cissel.
12. Urban Residences in the Danish West Indies by William Chapman.
13. Windmills in the Virgin Islands by Fern Penn.
14. The Moravians in the Southeast: Preservation Issues by National Register Programs Division, National Park Service.
15. Virgin Islands Furniture and Craftsmen by Myron D. Jackson.
16. The Danish West Indies in Photographs by The Danish West Indian Society
17. The Slave Ship Friedensborg by Leif Svalesen
18. Historic Preservation Guidelines by Virgin Islands Historic Preservation Commission.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Virgin Islands State Historic Preservation Plan has been written and produced by the University of Alabama's Office of Archaeological Research on behalf of the Virgin Islands State Historic Preservation Office and with their full cooperation, review, comments and approval. This plan was produced through the consultation with the many individuals, agencies, and community groups that promote historic preservation in the Virgin Islands. We thank our preservation partners for their assistance in the production of this report, and for endeavoring to protect the Territory's cultural resources.

This plan has been financed with federal funds from the National Park Service and the Department of the Interior through the Virgin Islands State Historic Preservation Office. However, the content and opinions contained herein do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of the Interior.

The Virgin Islands State Historic Preservation Office receives federal funds from the National Park Service. Regulations of the U.S. Department of the Interior strictly prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, or handicap in any federally assisted program. Any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against in any program, activity, or facility operated by a recipient of federal assistance, should write to:

Director, Equal Opportunity Program
U.S. Dept. of the Interior
National Park Service
P. O. Box 37127
Washington, D.C. 20013-7127

VISHPO CONTACT INFORMATION

The Virgin Islands State Historic Preservation Office and its staff can be reached at the following:

St. Thomas Office:

Charles W. Turnbull Regional Public Library
4607 Tutu Park Mall
St. Thomas, Virgin Islands 00802
Telephone Number: (340) 776-8605
Fax Number: (340) 776-7236

St. Croix Office:

Fort Frederik Museum
198 Strand Street
St. Croix, Virgin Islands 00840
Telephone Number: (340) 719-7089
Fax Number: (340) 719-7343

Staff Contact Information:

Sean L. Kigger, Director and Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
sean.kigger@dpr.vi.gov

David M. Brewer, Senior Archaeologist
David.brewer@dpr.vi.gov

Phil Codrington, St. Croix Historic Preservation Committee Coordinator
phil.codrington@dpr.vi.gov

Eboni Powell, St. Thomas/St. John Historic Preservation Committee Coordinator
eboni.powell@dpr.vi.gov

Patton Mulford, Preservation Assistant
patton.mulford@dpr.vi.gov

OAR Contact Information:

Office of Archaeological Research
University of Alabama
13075 Moundville Archaeological Park
Moundville, AL 35474
Telephone: (205)371-2266
Fax: (205)371-2494
Principal Investigators:
Dr. A. Brooke Persons, RPA, Cultural Resources Investigator, abpersons@ua.edu
Matt D. Gage, RPA, Director, mdgage@ua.edu

