

# OPINION

PAGE 6 • STAR-NEWSPAPERS • THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2008

## EDITORIAL

### SugarHouse: We are not rushing history

Brian Rademaeker's article (*Fort, Artifacts Prompting Casino Site Questions*, 1/31/08) fails to address pertinent facts regarding the archeological investigation currently underway at the SugarHouse site.

First, neither SugarHouse nor A.D. Marble has any doubt that a fort once existed on the site or that the site has historical significance dating back to the 18<sup>th</sup> century.

To that end, A.D. Marble has undertaken a comprehensive archaeological investigation that considered all pertinent historical information.

While the site does have historical significance, SugarHouse and A.D. Marble have been charged with finding physical evidence of that history.

After undertaking a thorough investigation, we are confident that after 200 years of factories operating on the site, any physical evidence has been lost.

Remember, after the fort was demolished, a sugar refinery was constructed, operated, and subsequently imploded in the same location where the fort once existed.

Our position is supported by the most recent phase of the archaeological investigation and the findings that are included in A.D. Marble's Phase II report.

Second, we take issue with Mr. Jenk's baseless statement that we are being "cheap and lazy."

SugarHouse and A.D. Marble have been conducting this investigation for close to one year under the guidance of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC) and the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Army Corp).

In addition to the time spent, SugarHouse has spent more than \$500,000 during the course of this study. It is irresponsible to characterize A.D.

Marble's investigation as anything less than comprehensive and professional.

SugarHouse is invested in completing the most thorough investigation possible and, to the extent possible, preserving any historical evidence that may exist on our site.

The suggestion that we are doing otherwise, and the further implication that PHMC and the Army Corps would accept an inferior or substandard product, is simply a ridiculous and meritless statement on the part of someone who obviously does not have a clear understanding of SugarHouse Casino's obligations under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

### The history is everywhere

I have read your article "More Obstacles for SugarHouse," which informs me that there was a fort at that location.

But did you know that where Palmer Cemetery is, the homes surrounding it for at least two blocks were also a part of the cemetery?

Not just any cemetery, but an American Indian cemetery.

So, if the people of Philadelphia want to hold up SugarHouse because there may be some history involved, look around the whole part of the city we call Fishtown. Every home is built on history.

MARY SAPP  
PRETENDER9763@AOL.COM

Furthermore, the suggestion that SugarHouse or A.D. Marble is intentionally seeking to "rush" the archaeological survey or do an incomplete study is absolutely false.

TERRENCE J. MCKENNA,  
P.E.  
PROJECT EXECUTIVE,  
KEATING CONSULTING, LLC  
CONSULTANT TO  
SUGARHOUSE CASINO

Star  
NEWSWEEKLY

Publisher: George Troyano  
Editor: John Scanlon  
Vice President of Finance: Perry Corsetti  
Advertising Director: Ellen Pursley

Managing Editor: Ryan Smith  
Photography & Layout Editor:  
Matthew Godfrey  
Production Director: Bob Posa