Chapter 7: Historic Resources

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter considers the potential of the proposed project to affect architectural and archaeological resources on the project site and in the surrounding area. Within this study area, historic resources considered include properties listed on the State or National Register of Historic Places (S/NR) or properties determined eligible for such listing (S/NR-eligible), New York City Landmarks (NYCLs) or Historic Districts (NYCHDs), properties determined eligible for landmark status, and National Historic Landmarks (NHLs). Additionally, a survey was conducted to identify any previously undesignated properties in the study area that were then evaluated for their potential S/NR or NYCL eligibility, and a Phase 1A Archaeological Assessment (see Appendix B) was completed to evaluate the archaeological sensitivity of the project site.

B. METHODOLOGY

STUDY AREA DEFINITION

In general, potential impacts to architectural resources can include both direct physical impacts (e.g., demolition, alteration, or damage from construction on nearby sites) and indirect contextual impacts, such as the isolation of a property from its surrounding environment, or the introduction of visual, audible, or atmospheric elements that are out of character with a property or that alter its setting. Therefore, the study area for architectural resources (shown in Figure 7-1) has been defined to account for any potential impacts that may occur where proposed construction activities could physically alter architectural resources or be close enough to them to potentially cause physical damage and also to account for potential visual or contextual impacts. For architectural resources, the Fresh Kills Draft Master Plan and Final Scope of Work (August 2006) was used to account for visual or contextual impacts; the study area for architectural resources is defined by a distance of 400 feet from the project site boundaries.

A study area for archaeological resources is usually defined as the area where project-related construction could result in ground disturbance. The study area for archaeological resources is defined as the Fresh Kills project area.

IDENTIFICATION OF HISTORIC RESOURCES IN THE STUDY AREA

Once the study area is defined, a list of officially recognized historic resources within the study area is compiled. This includes NHLs; properties or districts listed on the S/NR or properties determined eligible for such listing; and NYCLs, NYCHDs, and properties pending such designation. Information was collected from the files of the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) and the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) on previously identified architectural and archaeological resources in the study area.
A list of potential historic resources within the study area is also compiled. These are identified based on field surveys of the study area and, where available, information from historical societies or preservation organizations with knowledge of the area. Potential historic resources comprise properties that may be eligible for listing on the S/NR and/or designation as NYCLs.

The National Register Criteria for Evaluation are found in 36 CFR Part 60. Following these criteria, districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects are eligible for the S/NR if they possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

A. are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
B. are associated with the lives of significant persons in our past; or
C. embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
D. have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.

Properties that have been constructed within the last 50 years are ordinarily not eligible. Determinations of eligibility are made by OPRHP. Generally, all properties that are listed on the NR are listed on the State Register, which has the same criteria for evaluation as the NR.

Buildings, properties, or objects are eligible for designation as an NYCL or NYCHD when a part is at least 30 years old. Landmarks have a special character or special historical or aesthetic interest or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the City, State, or nation. There are four types of landmarks: individual, interior, historic district, and scenic.

Historic resources previously identified (listed, designated or determined eligible) and those identified by the means described above are listed in Section D, “Existing Conditions.”

Additional documentary research was conducted, and historic maps and newspapers, census records, local histories, and other materials were consulted in order to provide a context for understanding and evaluating the history, archaeological sensitivity, and built environment of the study area.

**EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS ON HISTORIC RESOURCES**

Once the historic resources in the study area were identified, the potential impacts of the proposed project on those resources were assessed. Project impacts on architectural resources could include both direct (i.e., physical) and indirect (i.e., contextual) impacts. Direct effects could include physical destruction, demolition, damage, or alteration of a historic resource. Indirect effects, such as changes in the appearance of a historic resource or in its setting—including introduction of incompatible visual, audible, or atmospheric elements to a resource’s setting, or elimination of publicly accessible views to the resource—are also considered.

**C. EXISTING CONDITIONS**

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

A Phase 1A Archaeological Assessment (“the Phase 1A”) was prepared for the project site (see Appendix B). As part of the Phase 1A report, previous archaeological surveys conducted in the vicinity were reviewed and previously identified archaeological sites within one mile of the project site were taken into account to evaluate the precontact (Native American) and historic-period (after
initial European contact) archaeological sensitivity of the project site. Historic maps and atlases, local histories, historic deeds, and other primary and secondary sources were used to analyze previous activities on the site. Records of utility installation, landfill operations, and construction of buildings and roadways on the site were evaluated in order to determine locations in which recent ground disturbance may have destroyed or compromised the integrity of archaeological resources.

PRECONTACT PERIOD ARCHAEOLOGICAL SENSITIVITY

Before European contact, the Fresh Kills area of Staten Island was an important hunting, fishing, and habitation location for the local Raritan Indians who resided there. Five Native American sites have been identified within the boundaries of the project site. These sites included two villages, a small camp, and two locations where precontact artifacts were identified. At least 26 additional Native American sites have been identified within one mile of the project site, including several campsites and shell middens. The Phase 1A reported that the entire project site is situated within a region where undisturbed areas are determined to be highly sensitive for the recovery of precontact archaeological resources.

The precontact sensitivity of project sites in New York City is generally evaluated by the presence of level slopes, vicinity to water courses, presence of well-drained soils, and proximity to previously identified precontact archaeological sites. Because portions of the Fresh Kills Park project site are located in the immediate vicinity of all of these, those portions of the project site could have been utilized by Native Americans not only for village sites, but for temporary hunting, processing, or camping locations as well. It is possible that archaeological resources related to those activities, including stone tools and debitage, faunal remains, shell middens, fire-cracked rocks, and other artifacts associated with temporary camp sites may be located in the project site.

However, Native American archaeological sites are generally found at shallow depths and are therefore highly susceptible to disturbance. Native American archaeological resources situated within the areas now occupied by landfill mounds were likely disturbed by landfill activities. In other areas of the site, precontact archaeological resources were most likely disturbed by the installation of utilities and leachate basins and the construction of roads and buildings and as a result of landscape alteration associated with the construction and maintenance of the landfill. Therefore, only undisturbed portions of the project site which are located outside of the leachate walls are determined to have sensitivity for the recovery of archaeological resources dating to the precontact period. In the areas outside of the leachate walls, precontact archaeological resources would be expected at depths extending to approximately 5 feet below the original ground surface. The amount of fill that has been deposited on the pre-landfill (ca. 1912) ground surface, which is assumed to have been relatively similar to the original ground surface, was analyzed and precontact archaeological resources may be affected if the proposed project will impact depths at or below the ca. 1912 ground surface. Figure 7-3 provides the approximate extent of areas sensitive for the presence of precontact resources.

HISTORIC PERIOD ARCHAEOLOGICAL SENSITIVITY

Three previously identified historic-period archaeological resources are located in the project site, consisting of two cemeteries (Blazing Star Burial Ground [NYCL, described below], an 18th century cemetery with standing headstones located on the north side of Arthur Kill Road in the southwestern portion of the study area, and the Morgan Family Burial Ground, a late 18th century burial ground now located under more than 150 feet of landfill refuse) (see Figure 7-2)
and a cluster of wrecked vessels located in the Arthur Kill at the southwestern edge of the project site (see VI on Figure 7-2). This cluster was previously surveyed in a study by Panamerican Consultants (Cultural Resources Survey, New York Harbor Collection and Removal of Drift Project, Arthur Kill, New York Reach; Arthur Kill, New Jersey Reach; and Kill Van Kull, New York Reach, prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1999) which concluded that only two of these vessels, identified as “Vessel 12” and “Vessel 13”; both wooden-hulled, inclined engine, double-ended ferries abandoned circa 1932, possessed historic significance. Due to its state of relative deterioration, Vessel 13 was not recommended for further investigation or protection. However, Vessel 12 was recommended for recordation and the recovery of its inclined engine and frame. No further work has been done on Vessel 12 since the time of this report (Lynn Rakos, ACOE, personal communication, December 14, 2007).

In addition to the vessels previously evaluated by Panamerican Consultants, multiple wrecked and partially submerged vessels that have not been previously studied were observed in waterways within the project site on historic and current maps and aerial photographs. The locations of these vessels are shown on Figure 7-2, labeled V2, V3, and V4.

Through a comparison of historic maps dating to the 17th, 18th, 19th, and 20th centuries, 30 areas that were formerly the locations of historic residential or industrial structures (historic properties, such as brickworks, mills, and blacksmith shops) dating mainly to the 19th century were identified in the APE, largely concentrated along Arthur Kill and Richmond Roads. Archaeological resources that may result from these types of occupation include domestic shaft features (including privy pits, wells, and cisterns) and structural remains. These 30 areas, as well as 2 cemeteries and 4 clusters of submerged vessels are listed and described in Table 5 (see Appendix B); a detailed inventory of each historic structure with map references is provided in Appendix B. The location of each historic property, including the georeferenced location of the map-identified buildings formerly located in each area and a 200-foot buffer to account for possible associated features and map inaccuracies, is depicted on Figure 7-2, with larger scale views of the project site provided in Figures 7-2A through 7-2C.

As a result of 20th century disturbance including the installation of utilities and landscape alteration in connection with the construction of landfill mounds and roads, the potential for these areas to contain intact historic period archaeological resources varies throughout the project site. Construction of the Fresh Kills Landfill Environmental Control Infrastructure system, as well as the leachate wall and leachate collection basins that encircle the landfill mounds, would have destroyed archaeological resources located in those areas. Alterations of the project site’s elevations were determined through comparison of 1912 and 2007 topographical information. Although much of the project site is covered by over 20 feet of landfill, certain areas are covered by significantly less and some areas currently have a lower elevation than they did in 1912.

Therefore, it has been determined that only some or portions of some of the identified historic properties have the potential to contain intact archaeological resources that may be impacted by the proposed action. These areas are indicated on Figure 7-2 and Figures 7-2A through 7-2C with a solid fill. The remaining areas have either been significantly disturbed or are buried under significant quantities of landfill. Table 5 in Appendix B provides a list of each property, a description of possible resources, the change in elevation of the area since 1912, a description of documented disturbances, and a statement of whether or not the project has the potential to impact the resource.
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SEPTEMBER 11, 2001 MATERIALS

As previously discussed, Fresh Kills Landfill closed in March 2001 but was allowed to be reopened for the purposes of receiving materials from the World Trade Center site after the attacks of September 11, 2001. Materials associated with September 11, 2001 were placed within an approximately 50-acre portion of the top of Landfill Section 1/9 and were covered with clean soil. In a letter dated April 18, 2008, OPRHP determined that the September 11, 2001 materials at Fresh Kills are not eligible for the S/NR.

ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES

A list of known and potential architectural resources in the project site and study area is provided in Table 7-1.

Table 7-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site # from Figure 7-2</th>
<th>Potential Resources Identified in Phase 1A Documentary Study</th>
<th>Elevation Change since 1912</th>
<th>Documented Disturbance</th>
<th>Potential for Archaeological Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Structural remnants and domestic shaft features associated with 19th and early 20th century occupation</td>
<td>Between 0 and 20+ feet higher</td>
<td>Locations of former structures now covered by landfill mound. If archaeological resources survived landfill activities, they would be at depths of 20 feet or more below the present ground surface. Resources closer to the shore, which are at elevations that are closer to the pre-landfill conditions may have been affected by the dredging and widening of the Main Creek.</td>
<td>No: The majority of the area is under more than 20 feet of landfill, will not be impacted by the project, and would have been disturbed during landfill site preparation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Structural remnants and domestic shaft features associated with 19th and early 20th century occupation</td>
<td>Between 0 and 10 feet higher</td>
<td>Large structure visible on the location observed in aerial photographs (1955 through 2007) but appears to have been demolished; not known if structure contained a basement. Smaller buildings seen on current surveys. Area is now paved.</td>
<td>Yes: Historic archaeological resources may still be present in this location beginning at a depth of 0 to 10 feet below the paved ground surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Structural remnants and domestic shaft features associated with 19th and early 20th century occupation</td>
<td>Between 0 and 20 feet higher</td>
<td>Utility maps show gas vent trench and leachate containment basin in this location.</td>
<td>Yes: Archaeological resources may still be present beginning at depths of 0 to 20 feet below the ground surface, except in immediate vicinity of gas vent trench and leachate basin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site # from Figure 7-2</td>
<td>Potential Resources Identified in Phase 1A Documentary Study</td>
<td>Elevation Change since 1912</td>
<td>Documented Disturbance</td>
<td>Potential for Archaeological Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Structural remnants and domestic shaft features associated with 19th and early 20th century occupation</td>
<td>Between 0 and 20 feet higher</td>
<td>Partially covered by landfill mound, possibly disturbed by construction of leachate containment wall and collection basins.</td>
<td>Yes: archaeological resources may still be present beginning at depths of 0 to 20 feet below the ground surface, except in immediate vicinity of leachate wall and leachate collection basins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Structural remnants and domestic shaft features associated with 19th and early 20th century occupation</td>
<td>Between 0 and 20+ feet higher</td>
<td>Richmond Road has been widened and slopes alongside Richmond Avenue have been considerably altered; area is partially covered by landfill mound; portions of area were possibly disturbed by construction of leachate containment wall and collection basins.</td>
<td>Yes: archaeological resources may still be present at depths of 0 to 5 feet except in immediate vicinity of leachate wall and leachate basins, and along Richmond Avenue. Some historic period resources would have been disturbed by the widening of Richmond Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Structural remnants and domestic shaft features associated with 19th and early 20th century occupation</td>
<td>Between 0 and 20 feet higher</td>
<td>Partially covered by raised leachate control basins.</td>
<td>Yes: Archaeological resources may still be present beginning at depths of 0 to 5 feet below ground surface. No sensitivity in immediate vicinity of leachate control basin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Structural remnants of coal yard</td>
<td>Between 0 and 20 feet higher</td>
<td>Slopes altered considerably, now occupied by 3 elevated roads constructed on embankments.</td>
<td>No: Any resources present likely disturbed by road construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Structural remnants and domestic shaft features associated with 19th and early 20th century occupation</td>
<td>Between 0 and 20 feet higher</td>
<td>Slopes altered considerably, now occupied by 3 elevated roads constructed on embankments.</td>
<td>No: Any resources present likely disturbed by road construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Structural remnants and domestic shaft features associated with 19th and early 20th century domestic and commercial occupation</td>
<td>Between 0 and 10 feet higher</td>
<td>Possible channel dredging and widening.</td>
<td>Yes: Archaeological resources may still be present beginning at depths of 0 to 10 feet below ground surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Structural remnants of 19th century blacksmith shop</td>
<td>Between 0 and 10 feet higher</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Archaeological resources may still be present beginning at depths of 0 to 10 feet below ground surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Structural remnants of 19th century grist mill and other buildings and potential shaft features</td>
<td>Between 0 and 10 feet higher</td>
<td>Possibly partially disturbed by construction of now-demolished building.</td>
<td>Yes: Archaeological resources may still be present beginning at depths of 0 to 10 feet below ground surface.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7-1 (cont’d)

**Summary of Historic Sensitivity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site # from Figure 7-2</th>
<th>Potential Resources Identified in Phase 1A Documentary Study</th>
<th>Elevation Change since 1912</th>
<th>Documented Disturbance</th>
<th>Potential for Archaeological Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Structural remnants and domestic shaft features associated with 19th and early 20th century occupation</td>
<td>Between 0 and 10 feet higher</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Yes: Archaeological resources may still be present beginning at depths of 0 to 10 feet below ground surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Structural remnants and domestic shaft features associated with late 19th and early 20th century occupation</td>
<td>Between 0 and 5 feet higher</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Yes: Archaeological resources may still be present beginning at depths of 0 to 10 feet below ground surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Structural remnants of late 19th and early 20th century brick manufactory</td>
<td>Between 0 and 20+ feet higher</td>
<td>Mostly covered by landfill mound, also disturbed by channel dredging and widening and construction of leachate containment wall.</td>
<td>Yes: Archaeological resources are likely present and intact along the waterfront and possibly in the western portion of this property where elevations have changed by less than 20 feet since ca. 1912.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Structural remnants and domestic shaft features associated with late 19th century occupation</td>
<td>Between 0 and 20+ feet higher</td>
<td>Possibly disturbed by construction of landfill mound and leachate containment wall.</td>
<td>No: Any resources present likely disturbed by construction of landfill mound, leachate wall, and construction of bank on adjacent property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Structural remnants and domestic shaft features associated with late 19th century occupation</td>
<td>Between 5 feet lower and 20 feet higher</td>
<td>Slopes are considerably different, may have been disturbed by construction of leachate containment wall and construction of banked earth around adjacent property.</td>
<td>No: Any resources present likely disturbed by construction of landfill mound, leachate wall, and construction of bank on adjacent property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Structural remnants and domestic shaft features associated with 19th and early 20th century domestic and institutional occupation</td>
<td>Between 5 feet lower and 20 feet higher</td>
<td>Area appears to have been graded 0 to 5 feet, now occupied by leachate collection basin, may also have been impacted by the construction of the leachate containment wall.</td>
<td>No: Any resources present likely disturbed by construction of landfill mound, leachate wall, and leachate basin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Structural remnants and domestic shaft features associated with 19th and early 20th century occupation</td>
<td>20+ feet higher</td>
<td>Now occupied by large landfill mound.</td>
<td>No: Any resources present likely disturbed by construction of landfill mound, and construction of West Shore Expressway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7-1 (cont’d)

**Summary of Historic Sensitivity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site # from Figure 7-2</th>
<th>Potential Resources Identified in Phase 1A Documentary Study</th>
<th>Elevation Change since 1912</th>
<th>Documented Disturbance</th>
<th>Potential for Archaeological Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Structural remnants and domestic shaft features associated with 19th and early 20th century occupation</td>
<td>Between 0 and 5 feet higher (portion within project site only)</td>
<td>None (portion within project site only)</td>
<td><strong>Yes:</strong> Archaeological resources may still be present in the southern area of the property beginning at depths of 0 to 5 feet below ground surface along Arthur Kill Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Structural remnants and domestic shaft features associated with 19th and early 20th century occupation</td>
<td>Between 0 to 5 feet higher</td>
<td>Former location of Lake’s Island garbage disposal plant, this area is now the site of landfill Plant No. 1, has been disturbed by the installation of utilities and underground storage tanks.</td>
<td><strong>No:</strong> Any resources present likely disturbed by construction of garbage disposal plant and landfill Plant No. 1 and utility construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Structural remnants and domestic shaft features associated with 19th domestic occupation and late 19th and early 20th century brick manufactory</td>
<td>Northern portion of property between 0 and 20+ feet higher, southern portion (near Arthur Kill Road) mostly 0 to 5 feet higher although portions are 0 to 5 feet lower.</td>
<td>Northern areas are likely largely disturbed by construction of landfill mound and leachate containment wall. Slopes are considerably altered in portion along Arthur Kill Road, area contains landfill gas and groundwater monitoring wells. This area was determined to have no archaeological sensitivity as part of the Owl Hollow Park Environmental Assessment Statement (AKRF, Inc. 2007).</td>
<td><strong>Yes:</strong> Archaeological resources may be present in shoreline areas where current elevation has changed by less than 20 feet since ca. 1912.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Structural remnants and domestic shaft features associated with 19th domestic occupation and late 19th and early 20th century brick manufactory</td>
<td>20+ feet higher</td>
<td>Now occupied by large landfill mound.</td>
<td><strong>No:</strong> Any archaeological resources which might have survived the preparation of the site for use as a landfill would be buried beneath more than 150 feet of refuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Structural remnants and domestic shaft features associated with 19th domestic occupation and late 19th and early 20th century brick manufactory</td>
<td>20+ feet higher</td>
<td>Now occupied by large landfill mound.</td>
<td><strong>No:</strong> Any archaeological resources which might have survived the preparation of the site for use as a landfill would be buried beneath more than 150 feet of refuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Structural remnants and domestic shaft features associated with 19th and early 20th century occupation</td>
<td>Northwest portion: between 0 to 5 feet lower; Southeast portion: between 0 to 5 feet higher</td>
<td>Slopes are considerably different and some grading is evident within this area.</td>
<td><strong>Yes:</strong> Archaeological resources may be present beginning at 0 to 5 feet below ground surface near Arthur Kill Road and may be present in other portions of the property, although 0-5 feet of grading appears to have occurred in this area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Historic Sensitivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site # from Figure 7-2</th>
<th>Potential Resources Identified in Phase 1A Documentary Study</th>
<th>Elevation Change since 1912</th>
<th>Documented Disturbance</th>
<th>Potential for Archaeological Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Structural remnants and domestic shaft features associated with 19th and early 20th century residential and commercial occupation</td>
<td>Northern area: 20+ feet higher; Southern area: between 0 and 5 feet higher</td>
<td>Northern area: Now occupied by large landfill mound; Southern area: None.</td>
<td>Yes: Archaeological resources may be present beginning at 0 to 5 feet below ground surface near Arthur Kill Road and may be present in other portions of the property, although 0-5 feet of grading appears to have occurred in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Structural remnants and domestic shaft features associated with early 19th occupation</td>
<td>Between 0 and 5 feet higher</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Yes: Archaeological resources may be present beginning at 0 to 5 feet below ground surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Structural remnants and domestic shaft features associated with mid-19th occupation</td>
<td>Between 0 and 5 feet higher</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Yes: Archaeological resources associated with the home located just outside the project site may be present beginning at 0 to 5 feet below ground surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Structural remnants and domestic shaft features associated with 19th occupation</td>
<td>Between 0 and 5 feet higher</td>
<td>May have been disturbed in connection with the construction of the West Shore Expressway and associated service roads. Slopes have been altered and large structure constructed in vicinity.</td>
<td>No: Any archaeological resources were likely disturbed by construction of West Shore Expressway and adjacent building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Structural remnants and domestic shaft features associated with 19th and early 20th century occupation</td>
<td>Between 0 and 20 feet higher</td>
<td>Slopes have been altered, partially occupied by large landfill mound, may also have been disturbed by construction of Leachate Recovery Facility and associated utilities.</td>
<td>Yes: Archaeological resources may be present beginning at depths of 0 to 5 feet below ground surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Structural remnants and domestic shaft features associated with early 20th century occupation</td>
<td>Between 0 and 5 feet higher</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Yes: Archaeological resources may be present beginning at depths of 0 to 5 feet below ground surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Family Cemetery</td>
<td>Human remains</td>
<td>20+ feet higher</td>
<td>Cemetery appears to have been disturbed during construction of landfill and is now buried beneath more than 150 feet of refuse.</td>
<td>No: Any human remains which might have survived the preparation of the site for use as a landfill would be buried beneath more than 150 feet of refuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blazing Star Cemetery</td>
<td>Human remains</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Yes: Human remains still present below ground surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessel Remains (V1)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Significance of double-ended ferry remains (identified as “Vessel 12” in Panamerican Consultants, 1999) to be reevaluated. Other vessels in V1 cluster require no further evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7-1 (cont’d)
Summary of Historic Sensitivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site # from Figure 7-2</th>
<th>Potential Resources Identified in Phase 1A Documentary Study</th>
<th>Elevation Change since 1912</th>
<th>Documented Disturbance</th>
<th>Potential for Archaeological Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel Remains (V2)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Vessel significance to be evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessel Remains (V3)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Vessel significance to be evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessel Remains (V4)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Vessel significance to be evaluated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Locations of historic properties have been approximated. For specific locations of historic structures, see Appendix A and Figures 13 through 19 in the Phase 1A Archaeological Documentary Study (Appendix B).
- Sensitivity determinations may change if additional information regarding construction methods of the landfill mounds and/or utilities (including leachate containment walls and basins) is located.
Sources: Current topographic data provided by Field Operations (2007) and historic topographic data obtained from the Borough of Richmond Topographical Survey (1907-1913).

PROJECT SITE

Previously Identified Architectural Resources

The project area is not located in a New York City Landmark or S/NR Historic District, nor does it contain structures that have been listed on or determined eligible for listing on the S/NR. There is one New York City Landmark, the Sleight Family Cemetery, located within the project site (see Table 7-2).

Table 7-2
Architectural Resources Located Within the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Ref. #</th>
<th>Name/Type</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>NY CL</th>
<th>NYCL-eligible</th>
<th>S/NR</th>
<th>S/NR-eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previously Identified Architectural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Sleight Family Cemetery/Blazing Star Burial Ground</td>
<td>Arthur Kill Road at Rossville Avenue</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project-Identified Architectural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name/Type</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>NY CL</th>
<th>NYCL-eligible</th>
<th>S/NR</th>
<th>S/NR-eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mohlenhoff Farm/Greenbelt Native Plant Center</td>
<td>3808 Victory Boulevard</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trolley Barn</td>
<td>721 Arthur Kill Road</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2285 Arthur Kill Road</td>
<td>2285 Arthur Kill Road</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Former Rossville Hook &amp; Ladder</td>
<td>2355 Arthur Kill Road</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- See Figure 7-1
- NYCL: New York City Landmark
- NYCL-eligible: Determined to appear eligible for designation as a New York City Landmark
- S/NR: Listed on the State and National Registers of Historic Places
- S/NR-eligible: Officially determined eligible for listing on the State and National Registers of Historic Places
- Potential S/NR-eligible: Meets the eligibility criteria for listing on the S/NR as determined by AKRF field survey

Sleight Family Cemetery (Blazing Star Cemetery) (New York City Landmark)
The Sleight Family Cemetery, also known as the Blazing Star Burial Ground, is located on a low hill on the north side of Arthur Kill Road on the western shore of Staten Island (Figure 7-1, No. 1; and Figure 7-4, Photo 1), in the southernmost portion of the project area. Approximately 40 gravestones remain on site today. North and west of the cemetery is the marshy shore of the Arthur Kill. The earliest European settlers carved out farms on the west shore of Staten Island in
the late 17th century, but it was not until the 1700s that settlement occurred on a more significant scale. Early landowners, of predominantly Huguenot, Dutch, and English extraction, made their living by farming salt hay, grain, and flax. In the 18th and 19th centuries, Blazing Star was the name of the neighborhood now known as Rossville. A thriving settlement, Blazing Star’s economy was sustained by farming, fishing, and trade with New Jersey. The Blazing Star ferry, which started carrying passengers across the Arthur Kill to New Jersey in the early 18th century, originally moored at Smoking Point, north of the cemetery. A new ferry dock was created around 1836, located immediately west of the burial ground site.

The Sleight Family Cemetery is known as one of the oldest community burial grounds in New York City and is currently owned by New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). Interred within its bounds are representatives of the founding families of Staten Island, including the Winants, Sleights, Seguines, Oakleys, Parlees, Coles, LaForges, Perrines, and Poillons. A few hundred feet southwest of the cemetery is the site of the Peter Winant House, no longer extant. Winant’s father, Pieterse Wynant, was one of the small group that made the first permanent settlement on Staten Island in 1661. The gravestones of Blazing Star Burial Ground are significant not only because they mark the graves of early settlers of Staten Island, but also because they represent some of the earliest remaining gravestones in New York. The wide range of carvings that decorate the markers include the death’s head, the winged cherub, and the willow and urn motif.

The Sleight Family Cemetery is a New York City Landmark. It was also determined S/NR-eligible as part of this project.

Architectural Resources in the Project Site Identified by this Project
No architectural resources that were not previously identified were identified within the project site.

STUDY AREA

Previously Identified Architectural Resources
No previously identified historic resources have been identified within the study area.

Architectural Resources in the Study Area Identified by this Project
Potential architectural resources surveyed by AKRF were included in a March 2008 submission to OPRHP that provided photographs and brief descriptions of each potential resource. In a comment letter dated October 9, 2007, OPRHP determined 5 of these resources eligible for listing in the S/NR, including the Sleight Family Cemetery, discussed above, which is located in the project site and was previously designated as a NYCL. The following architectural resources in the study area were determined S/NR-eligible as part of this project:

Mohlenhoff Farm/Greenbelt Native Plant Center (3808 Victory Boulevard)
The property at 3808 Victory Boulevard was historically a farmstead and greenhouse complex; it now serves a similar function as the DPR native plant center (Figure 7-1, No. 2; Figure 7-4, Photo 2; Figure 7-5; and Figure 7-6, Photo 5). It is located in the Travis section of Staten Island, on the southeast side of Victory Boulevard between Ridgeway Avenue and Baron Boulevard. The property is located roughly 350 feet from the northwestern portion of the project area. Structures on the property include a former dwelling (now offices), a barn, two boiler buildings with brick smokestacks, and six greenhouses.
The dwelling on the property is located near Victory Boulevard. It is a two-story cross-gable wood-frame farmhouse, believed to date to the 1890s. The building has an L-plan, and has single-story enclosed porches on both the front and rear façades. (Historical map evidence suggests that the front porch was built between 1907-1917, and the rear porch was added between 1917-1937). Windows throughout the building appear original: they have simple wood frames and contain two-over-two-light double-hung sashes. The dwelling is clad in wood clapboard, and the roof is covered in asphalt shingling. A brick chimney rises from the center of the main roof ridge.

A barn (used for produce packing in the early 20th century) is located immediately to the rear of the dwelling. This single-story wood-frame structure has a long, narrow, rectangular plan. The peak-roofed building is clad in wood clapboard of the ‘novelty siding’ variety popular at the turn of the century. The roof is clad in asphalt shingle. The building has peak-roof gable dormers at its northwestern end containing paired windows, and board-and-batten barn doors. Windows on the structure have simple wood frames and contain either two-over-two- or one-over-one-light double-hung sashes.

To the rear of the barn is a small single-story peak-roofed brick building labeled ‘Heater’ on the 1937 Sanborn map. The northwest façade of the building contains a door and one window. A large, round, brick smokestack with a corbelled top adjoins the building on the northeast side. Southwest of the barn are two greenhouses with arched roofs, apparently constructed of clear plastic or vinyl, probably dating to the second half of the 20th century. These buildings are aligned northeast-southwest. Immediately southeast of these greenhouses is a pair of earlier greenhouses, built prior to 1937. These are constructed of glass lights and metal casements. They have peaked roofs, the ridges of which are aligned parallel to their neighbors. At the northeast end of this pair of greenhouses, a small single-story building adjoins them. This building is described as an office, heater, and potting shed on the 1937 Sanborn map of the property. It has a flat roof and is parged in stucco; a large square brick chimney or smokestack is appended at the west end of the building. An additional pre-1937 glass-and-metal-casement greenhouse with a long, rectangular plan and a peaked roof is located immediately to the southeast of the structure. A sixth long, rectangular-plan building, possibly also a greenhouse, is located northeast of the other structures. This is a more modern, prefabricated structure.

From the mid-19th century, the property belonged to J. Ridgeway. Historic maps show Ridgeway dwellings in several locations over the decades of the late 19th century. The present dwelling first appears between 1887 and 1898. On the 1907 Robinson map, the property is still in the hands of J. Ridgeway: the dwelling is shown with a barn behind it, and two additional structures (no longer extant) at the rear of the property. The house and barn appear on a 1917 Sanborn map of the property, along with a wagon shed and a storage shed (no longer extant). A 1937 map depicts the same structures on the property, with the exception of the storage shed. The barn is labeled ‘Produce Packing,’ and the wagon shed is labeled ‘Equipment Storage.’ Also standing on the property are five greenhouses: two parallel greenhouses are joined with a heating structure and smokestack. A freestanding ‘Heater’ building, also with a smokestack, is located southeast of the house and barn.

The property was associated with the Mohlenhoff family through much of the 20th century, and is still known by many locals as the Mohlenhoff Farm. The family acquired the property prior to 1917. Census records from 1920 and 1930 show that Henry and Wilhelmine Mohlenhoff emigrated from Germany in the 1890s and lived on Victory Boulevard with their 12 children.
Of the five greenhouses depicted on the 1937 Sanborn map, three are still standing. Three additional greenhouses have been constructed since that time (two located southwest of the barn, and one located northeast of the ‘Heater’ building. The house, the barn, three historic greenhouses, three modern greenhouses, and the ‘Heater’ building are still standing and are in good condition.

_Trolley Barn, 721 Arthur Kill Road_

The Trolley Barn is a front-gable structure facing south towards Arthur Kill Road (Figure 7-1, No. 3; Figure 7-6, Photo 6). It is situated close to the road on a large undeveloped parcel, which is located roughly 100 feet from the southeastern portion of the project area. The house is sided in wood shingles; its foundation is not visible and it has no chimney. The roof is shallowly pitched and the eaves are treated with simple bargeboard. The first story of the front façade has a shallow, full-width enclosed entry porch with a shed roof supported by four, evenly spaced, paired supports. Large sliding doors occupy the entire façade of the porch; these appear to be composed of multi-light metal casements. The second story of the structure contains five windows or large rectangular apertures. These are placed in a slightly asymmetrical pattern and each contains three vertical muntins or louvers, creating four divisions that do not appear to contain glass. A single window frame is located in the gable at third-story level. This appears to contain a two-over-two-light double-hung sash.

This structure originally served as a trolley barn for the Tottenville and Richmond Trolley, which ran along Arthur Kill Road in Greenridge and Rossville. The trolley line appears as a proposed route on the 1907 Robinson map of the area, but was apparently not established until ca. 1921. The Trolley Barn is believed to have been built in 1922.⁠¹ A photograph from the 1930s showing the “Staten Island Trackless Trolley” in Tottenville illustrates that the trolley did not run on tracks, but drew its power from parallel overhead wires supported by poles. The trackless trolleys or trolley buses became popular in the early 1930s as a flexible and economical transition between traditional trolleys and diesel-powered buses. In more recent years, the property has been rented from the City by the Staten Island Historical Society, which used the building for storage.

_2285 Arthur Kill Road_

This Second Empire-style building is located on the south side of Arthur Kill Road, just east of the intersection of Rossville Avenue and roughly 90 feet from the project area. Constructed as a dwelling ca. 1860, it is now a nightclub (Figure 7-1, No. 7; Figure 7-7, Photo 7). The two-and-a-half-story wood-frame structure has a symmetrically arranged five-bay façade. The central entry of the building has sidelights, a transom, and a decorative wood door-surround typical of the Second Empire style. The windows that flank the central entry have wide molded wood frames and contain six-over-six-light double-hung sashes. The windows on the second story retain their original frames, but are occupied by modern one-over-one-light double-hung sashes. The building has a mansard roof, now clad in asphalt shingles, and three segmental-arched dormers that contain paired windows with one-over-one-light double-hung sashes. Paired end-chimneys emerge from the mansard slope on the side elevations. A projecting wood cornice is supported by brackets. A simple, single-story front porch appears to be a relatively recent addition. A single-story addition with a long rectangular plan has been appended at the rear of the building. The residence sits at an elevation higher than Arthur Kill Road; the low hillside on

---

¹ Per a personal communication with Joe Ferlazzo, Historian, DPR, December 2006.
which it stands is retained by a fieldstone wall. The building does not appear on an 1853 Butler map of the area, however, it is shown on an 1887 Beers map of the area. On a 1907 Robinson map, the house is labeled “F. W. Decker.”

**Former Rossville Hook and Ladder, 2355 Arthur Kill Road**

The former fire house, Rossville Hook and Ladder, is located on the north side of Arthur Kill Road just west of Rossville Avenue, roughly 300 feet southwest of the project area. The building is a small wood-frame rectangular-plan structure with a hipped roof, a hip-roofed dormer, and a hip-roofed bell tower (Figure 7-1, No. 9; Figure 7-8). The building has an entryway on the east end of the façade surmounted by a six-light transom window. West of the entry are two pairs of large swinging doors. These doors, which presumably allowed fire vehicles to enter and exit, are wood-paneled, with eight fixed lights on their upper portions. At second-story level, there is a central projecting bay window flanked by an additional window on each side. All windows throughout the structure contain one-over-one-light double-hung sashes. The first story of the front façade is sided in brick, while the rest of the structure (with the exception of the dormer and bell tower) has been parged with stucco.

The Rossville Hook and Ladder Company was founded as a local volunteer fire company. The building was probably constructed during the last years of the 19th century. On November 1, 1937, the *New York Times* reported “the last of the volunteer fire companies on Staten Island passed out of existence last night after more than 40 years of service to the South Shore districts and was replaced by regular units from the City Fire Department.” Rossville Hook and Ladder (then under captain William Winant), as well as four other South Shore volunteer fire companies were replaced by two centralized City fire companies at this time, and 2355 Arthur Kill Road ended its tenure as a fire station. Today the building serves as a feed store.

**D. THE FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT: 2016 AND 2036**

It is possible that one or more of the potential resources within the study area may be determined eligible for listing on the State or National Registers or designated as New York City Landmarks absent the proposed project.

Architectural resources that are listed on the National Register or that have been found eligible for listing are given a measure of protection from the effects of federally sponsored or assisted projects under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Although preservation is not mandated, federal agencies must attempt to avoid adverse impacts on such resources through a notice, review, and construction process. Properties listed on the State Register are similarly protected against impacts resulting from state-sponsored or state-assisted projects under the State Historic Preservation Act. Private property owners using private funds can, however, alter or demolish their properties without such a review process. Privately owned sites that are NYCLs, within New York City Historic Districts, or pending designation, are protected under the New York City Landmarks Law, which requires LPC review and approval before any alteration or demolition can occur.
2016

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Absent the proposed project, it is anticipated that the project site would remain a closed landfill. No other development is expected on the project site absent the proposed project through the 2016 analysis year, and therefore no impacts to archaeological resources are anticipated absent the proposed action.

The landfill construction closure process, which would occur in the future without the proposed project.

ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES

Project Site

Absent the proposed project, it is anticipated that the project site would remain a closed landfill. No other development is expected on the project site absent the proposed project through the 2016 analysis year. No impacts to architectural resources are expected absent the proposed action.

Study Area

As discussed in Chapter 2 (“Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy”), there are a number of projects slated for completion by the proposed project’s 2016 analysis year within 400 feet of the project site. These projects, as described below, are not anticipated to have direct impacts on architectural resources in the study area.

NYSDOT has been examining safety and access improvements along the West Shore Expressway (Route 440), a four-lane, limited-access highway running north-south through the study area, as part of the West Shore Expressway Access and Safety Improvements Final Expanded Project Proposal (NYSDOT, May 2004). That study examines potential improvements to several segments of the roadway, some of which are within the study area. The segments are in various phases of design. At this time, NYSDOT has only defined a Build year and project for the segment of the northbound service road between Arthur Kill Road and Arden Avenue; this segment is expected to be completed by 2016, and is described in greater detail in Chapter 16, “Traffic and Parking.” Because this project is still in preliminary planning stages, potential impacts of the project on architectural resources in the study area can not yet be determined.

In the Travis neighborhood, there are plans for the development of a 90-room Holiday Inn Express, and possibly another hotel, on two acres of manufacturing land near the Fresh Kills project site and the West Shore Expressway (Blocks 2644 and 2645, bounded by Wild, Beresford, Dean, and Walton Avenues). No impacts to architectural resources in the study area are anticipated to result from the proposed project.

Furthermore, a number of park projects are also planned in the study area, including the Schmul Park Improvements Project and the Owl Hollow Park Soccer Fields Project, both to be undertaken by NYC DPR and planned for completion prior to 2016. No impacts to architectural resources in the study area are anticipated to result from these projects.
2036

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Absent the proposed project, it is anticipated that the project site would remain a closed landfill. No other development is expected on the project site absent the proposed project through the 2036 analysis year.

ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES

Project Site

Absent the proposed project, it is anticipated that the project site would remain a closed landfill. No other development is expected on the project site absent the proposed project through the 2036 analysis year.

Study Area

There is only one known project in the study area that may be completed after 2016 and by the 2036 analysis year. If constructed, the West Shore Light Rail would begin at the north shore of Staten Island, and would extend north along the West Shore Expressway corridor and also utilizing the existing rail right-of-way in Staten Island’s northwestern corner. The light rail would then cross the Bayonne Bridge to the north, linking with the Hudson-Bergen light rail line in Bayonne, New Jersey. Because this project is still in preliminary planning stages, potential impacts of the project on architectural resources in the study area cannot yet be determined.

E. THE FUTURE WITH THE PROPOSED PROJECT: 2016 AND 2036

2016

In the future with the proposed project, a number of the first phases of the 2,163-acre Fresh Kills Park would be created. The phases to be completed by 2016 would provide a mix of passive and active recreational facilities in the north and south parks as well as four segments of the park roads and landscape enhancement. As described in greater detail in Chapter 1, “Project Description,” the specific components of the park expected to be complete by 2016 include the North and South neighborhood parks, multi-use paths, wetland and North and South mound landscape enhancement, loop trails and overlooks, the segments of the park roads and several parking areas.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

As project design progresses, it is recommended that individual construction projects be reviewed by an archaeologist to determine if the project could impact locations and depths that were identified in the Phase 1A archaeological documentary study (see Appendix B) as potentially sensitive for precontact or historic-period archaeological resources (see Table 7-1 and Figures 7-2 and 7-3). If it is determined that impacts to sensitive levels are possible, it is recommended that further investigation, possibly consisting of Phase 1B archaeological testing to identify the presence or absence of archaeological resources, be carried out in coordination with LPC, and OPRHP as appropriate. If it is determined that the proposed project could impact sunken vessels which have not been previously evaluated for historic significance or require reevaluation (see Table 7-1 and Figures 7-2), further evaluation and documentation of these
vessels would be required prior to construction. To date, two capital projects have been reviewed in order to determine if archaeological impacts would occur. Based on that analysis (which was performed for permitting), it was determined that neither the North Park Phase A or the South Park Arthur Kill Road Parking Lot projects would have archaeological impacts.

ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES

In general, potential impacts on architectural resources can include both direct physical impacts and indirect impacts. Direct impacts include demolition of a resource and alterations to a resource that cause it to become a different visual entity. A resource could also be damaged from vibration (i.e., from construction blasting or pile driving) and additional damage from adjacent construction that could occur from falling objects, subsidence, collapse, or damage from construction machinery. Adjacent construction is defined as any construction activity that would occur within 90 feet of an architectural resource, as defined in the New York City Department of Buildings (DOB) Technical Policy and Procedure Notice (TPPN) #10/88.

Project Site

One architectural resource, the Sleight Family Cemetery (a.k.a. Blazing Star Burial Ground) (NYCL) is located in the project site (see Figure 7-1). No direct or indirect impacts to this resource are expected to result from the first phase of the proposed project, and no construction activities are currently planned within 90 feet of this resource. As project planning progresses, if construction is planned within 90 feet of the resource, a Construction Protection Plan (CPP) would be prepared and implemented which would set forth the specific measures to be used, and specifications that would be applied, to protect the resource during the construction period.

Study Area

No architectural resources in the study area are located close enough (within 90 feet of projected construction activities) to the project site that they would be subject to inadvertent construction-related damages. Therefore, no direct physical impacts on architectural resources are anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

Nine potential architectural resources were identified within the project’s 400-foot study area (see Figure 7-1). Together, the various components of the first phase of the park are not expected to be out of keeping with existing scale or uses in the area and would not alter any character-defining features of the potential architectural resources in the study area. Furthermore, the proposed action would not be anticipated to block views of architectural resources. Therefore, no adverse effects on architectural resources are anticipated as a result of the first phase of the proposed project.

2036

In the future with the proposed project, the entire 2,163-acre waterfront park would be created. A mix of passive and active recreational facilities would be constructed on the Fresh Kills site. As described in greater detail in Chapter 1, “Project Description,” proposed in the long term are

---

1 TPPN #10/88 was issued by DOB on June 6, 1988, to supplement Building Code regulations with regard to historic structures. TPPN #10/88 outlines procedures for the avoidance of damage to historic structures resulting from adjacent construction, defined as construction within a lateral distance of 90 feet from the historic resource.
recreational fields; landscaped areas and enhanced ecological habitats; water access for motorized and non-motorized craft; cultural, entertainment and commercial facilities (e.g., amphitheater, restaurants, event and banquet space); and the supporting park operations and maintenance facilities. In addition, this proposal includes completing the park roads that would connect the park with Richmond Avenue and the West Shore Expressway as well as the necessary service roads and parking facilities. Lastly, the project site includes the Isle of Meadows and a portion of William T. Davis Wildlife Refuge, which would continue to be protected as natural areas.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

As project design progresses, it is recommended that individual construction projects be reviewed by an archaeologist to determine if the project could impact locations and depths that were identified in the Phase 1A archaeological documentary study (see Appendix B) as potentially sensitive for precontact or historic-period archaeological resources (see Table 7-1 and Figures 7-2 and 7-3). This review would occur in consultation with LPC and OPRHP. If it is determined that impacts to sensitive levels are possible, it is recommended that further investigation, possibly consisting of Phase 1B archaeological testing to identify the presence or absence of archaeological resources, be carried out in coordination with LPC, and OPRHP as appropriate. If it is determined that the proposed project could impact sunken vessels which have not been previously evaluated for historic significance or require reevaluation (see Table 7-1 and Figures 7-2), further evaluation and documentation of these vessels would be required prior to construction.

ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES

In general, potential impacts on architectural resources can include both direct physical impacts and indirect impacts. Direct impacts include demolition of a resource and alterations to a resource that cause it to become a different visual entity. A resource could also be damaged from vibration (i.e., from construction blasting or pile driving) and additional damage from adjacent construction that could occur from falling objects, subsidence, collapse, or damage from construction machinery. Adjacent construction is defined as any construction activity that would occur within 90 feet of an architectural resource, as defined in the New York City Department of Buildings (DOB) Technical Policy and Procedure Notice (TPPN) #10/88.1

Project Site

One architectural resource, the Sleight Family Cemetery (a.k.a. Blazing Star Burial Ground) (NYCL) is located in the project site (see Figure 7-1). No direct or indirect impacts to this resource are expected to result from the proposed project, and no construction activities are currently planned within 90 feet of this resource. As project planning progresses, if construction is planned within 90 feet of the resource, a Construction Protection Plan (CPP) would be prepared and implemented which would set forth the specific measures to be used, and specifications that would be applied, to protect the resource during the construction period.

1 TPPN #10/88 was issued by DOB on June 6, 1988, to supplement Building Code regulations with regard to historic structures. TPPN #10/88 outlines procedures for the avoidance of damage to historic structures resulting from adjacent construction, defined as construction within a lateral distance of 90 feet from the historic resource.
Study Area

No architectural resources in the study area are located close enough (within 90 feet of projected construction activities) to the project site that they would be subject to inadvertent construction-related damages. Therefore, no direct physical impacts on architectural resources are anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

Nine potential architectural resources were identified within the project’s 400-foot study area (see Figure 7-1). Together, the various components of the project are not expected to be out of keeping with existing scale or uses in the area and would not alter any character-defining features of the potential architectural resources in the study area. Furthermore, the proposed action would not be anticipated to block views of architectural resources. Therefore, no adverse effects on architectural resources are anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

CONCLUSIONS

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

A Phase 1A study prepared for this project concluded that portions of the project site are sensitive for precontact and historic period archaeological resources. As park capital projects move forward, it is recommended that individual projects be reviewed by an archaeologist to determine if the proposed project could impact any archaeologically sensitive areas identified in the Phase 1A archaeological documentary study. This review would occur in consultation with LPC and OPRHP. If it is determined that impacts are possible, further investigation such as Phase 1B archaeological testing would be necessary to identify the presence or absence of archaeological resources. Additional information on this process is provided in Chapter 23, “Impact Avoidance Measures and Mitigation.”

ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES

One architectural resource (the NYCL Sleight Family Cemetery, a.k.a. Blazing Star Burial Ground) was identified on the project site. No previously identified architectural resources are located in the study area; however, four S/NR eligible architectural resources and nine potential architectural resources which appear to meet the S/NR eligibility criteria were identified in the study area. The proposed project is not expected to result in direct or indirect adverse impacts to architectural resources in the project site or study area. No construction is currently planned within close proximity of the Sleight Family Cemetery, however, as project plans progress, if any construction activity is planned within 90 feet of this resource, a Construction Protection Plan would be prepared and implemented to ensure that the resource would not be inadvertently affected by construction-period impacts. Additional information on the contents of a Construction Protection Plan is provided in Chapter 23, “Impact Avoidance Measures and Mitigation.”
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Figure 7-3b
New York City Landmark and S/NR - eligible Sleight Family Cemetery (a.k.a. Blazing Star Burial Ground), an early cemetery located in Rossville, Staten Island, on the north side of Arthur Kill Road, east of Rossville Avenue

The former Mohlenhoff Farm, now the City of New York Department of Parks and Recreation native plant center. The late nineteenth-century farmhouse (now used as offices) is pictured on the left; the barn is pictured on the right. The property was determined S/NR - eligible as part of this project.
The barn located on the former Mohlenhoff Farm, now the NYCDPR native plant center.

A building that served as a heating plant, and a round brick smokestack located on the former Mohlenhoff Farm, now the NYCDPR native plant center. A greenhouse, built prior to 1937, is pictured on the right; a modern structure is pictured on the left.

Architectural Resources

Figure 7-5
Another building, once used as a potting shed and heat generating facility, located on the former Mohlenhoff Farm, is now the NYCDPR native plant center. Greenhouses built prior to 1937 are visible on the left and right.

Located at 721 Arthur Kill Road, this former trolley barn originally served the Tottenville and Richmond Trolley. This building was determined S/NR - eligible as part of this project.

Architectural Resources

Figure 7-6
The Second Empire-style structure at 2285 Arthur Kill Road, built ca. 1860 on the south side of Arthur Kill Road in Rossville. The former residence is now a nightclub. It was determined S/NR - eligible as part of this project.
The former Rossville Hook and Ladder firehouse at 2355 Arthur Kill Road retains its large central doors and bell tower, but has been parged with stucco and received retrofitted windows. The structure is now a feed store. It was determined S/NR - eligible as part of this project.