

7.1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), the New York State Historic Preservation Act (SHPA), and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (Section 106 of NHPA), this analysis assesses the potential of the Proposed Project to affect cultural resources. Cultural resources include both archaeological and architectural resources (historic structures). Archaeological resources are physical remains, usually subsurface, of prehistoric (Native American) or historic-period activities. Architectural resources include historically important buildings, structures, objects, sites, and districts. Consistent with SHPA and Section 106, this chapter considers the Proposed Project's effect on archaeological and architectural resources that are National Historic Landmarks (NHL), properties listed on the State or National Register of Historic Places (S/NR), and properties determined eligible for such listing (S/NR-eligible).

This chapter of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) includes the following sections:

- Section 7.2: Methodology.**
- Section 7.3: Existing Conditions.**
- Section 7.4: The Future Without the Proposed Project.**
- Section 7.5: Probable Impacts of the Proposed Project.**
- Section 7.6: Conclusions.**

The analyses presented in this chapter conclude that overall, with the implementation of further investigation and potential mitigation for archaeological resources for a portion of one of the potable water main routes and portions of four of the five raw water transmission main route options, the Proposed Project would not result in adverse effects on archaeological resources. The Proposed Project also would not adversely affect the setting or context of any architectural resources. The new structures added to the Intake Site and Water Treatment Plant Site would have limited visibility from the surrounding areas because of the buffering effects of topography, vegetation, and existing structures nearby. At the Intake Site, the new structure would be in the context of nearby industrial structures that would minimize its visual prominence.

7.2. METHODOLOGY

7.2.1. ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

For archaeological resources, the Area of Potential Effect (the APE) is the area that would be physically disturbed for construction of the Proposed Project, since this is the area where any buried archaeological resources could be affected. For the Proposed Project, the archaeological resources APE includes the Intake Site, the Water Treatment Plant Site, and the potential site access routes (see Figure 2-3 in Chapter 2, "Project Description"). It also includes potential

Haverstraw Water Supply Project DEIS

routes for potable water mains from the new water treatment plant and five raw water transmission main route options (see Figure 2-6 in Chapter 2).

To evaluate the Proposed Project's potential effects on archaeological resources, a number of archaeological studies were prepared by Hartgen Archeological Associates, Inc. (Hartgen) and reviewed by the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP). Copies of correspondence with OPRHP are included in **Appendix 7.1** to this DEIS. The following archaeological studies were prepared (and copies of these documents are provided in **Appendix 7.2** to this DEIS):

- A Phase 1A archaeological study prepared in July 2008 evaluating the Intake Site and Water Treatment Plant Site and potential site access routes. In a letter dated September 8, 2009, OPRHP concurred with the recommendations of this report.
- A Phase 1B archaeological study prepared in September 2008 for the Intake Site, which had been identified as warranting further study. In a letter dated September 8, 2009, OPRHP concurred with the recommendations of this report.
- A Phase 1A archaeological study prepared in November 2008 for the potential potable water main routes. In a letter dated September 8, 2009, OPRHP concurred with the recommendations of this report.
- A Phase 1A archaeological study prepared in August 2010 to evaluate four raw water transmission main route options not previously evaluated.

These studies were conducted in accordance with the New York Archaeological Council's *Standards for Cultural Resource Investigations and the Curation of Archaeological Collections* (1994), which are endorsed by OPRHP. The results of those investigations are summarized in this chapter of the DEIS.

7.2.2. ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES

In general, potential effects on architectural resources can include both direct physical effects (e.g., demolition, alteration, or damage from construction on nearby sites) and indirect contextual effects, 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. The architectural resources APEs, or study areas, considered in this DEIS include primary and secondary study areas to account for any potential effects that may occur where proposed construction activities could physically alter architectural resources or be close enough to them to potentially cause physical damage or visual or contextual effects. The following study areas for architectural resources were analyzed for this DEIS (see also **Figure 7-1**):

- **Primary Study Area for Intake Site:** The primary architectural resources study area for the Intake Site was defined as the area within visual range of the Site. For the Intake Site, the primary study area is roughly bounded by River Road, 5th Street, Beach Road, the Haverstraw Marina, and areas on the west shoreline of the Hudson River closest to the Intake Site.
- **Primary Study Area for Water Treatment Plant Site:** For the Water Treatment Plant Site, the architectural study area was also defined as the area within visual range of the Site. This is the area roughly bounded by Holt Drive to the north; Benson Street, Adler Court, and Blauvelt



- Project Sites
 - Cultural Resources Primary Study Area Boundary
 - Intake Pipe
 - Potential Utility Route
 - Potential Site Access
- Known Cultural Resource**
- M/V Commander (approximate location)

- Raw Water Transmission Main Route Options**
- Option 1
 - Option 2
 - Option 3
 - Option 4
 - Option 5



Figure 7-1 Cultural Resources

- Avenue to the west; the northern ends of the CSX railroad access road, Carol Avenue, and North Wayne Avenue to the south; and Ecology Road and Beach Road to the east.
- **Primary Study Area for Raw Water Transmission Main Route Options:** The primary study area for the below-ground raw water transmission main route options was defined as the area within 100 feet of each alternative route, to account for potential physical effects related to construction activities. Since the raw water transmission main would not be visible once construction is complete, it would have no potential for adverse contextual or visual effects and no study area for such effects was evaluated.
 - **Primary Study Area for Potential Access Roads:** The primary study area for the access roads to the new water treatment plant via the CSX access road, Carol Avenue, or North Wayne Avenue was defined as the area within 100 feet of the affected streets to account for traffic associated with the Water Treatment Plant Site’s operation and accessibility.
 - **Secondary Study Area:** A larger, secondary study area was defined to include architectural resources in Rockland and Westchester Counties within five miles of the Project Sites, also included as “Aesthetic Resources” in the Visual Resources analysis (see Chapter 4, “Visual Resources”).

Within the study areas, architectural resources analyzed include properties designated as NHLs, properties listed on the S/NR, and properties determined eligible for such listing (S/NR-eligible). To identify these types of resources, the OPRHP database was consulted. One such architectural resource was identified within the primary study area. This resource is the *M/V Commander*, a naval vessel, described below. The Rockland County Historic Preservation Board was also contacted to identify locally designated resources; Rockland County does not have an official list of locally designated properties. No such resources have been identified within the primary study area. The Westchester County Inventory of Historic Places was also consulted. In addition, a survey of the primary study area was undertaken by an architectural historian to identify any previously undesignated properties that could meet S/NR eligibility criteria (“potential architectural resources”). Once architectural resources were identified in the study areas, the potential effects of the Proposed Project on those resources were then evaluated. Architectural resources in the secondary study area were specifically analyzed to account for the potential visibility of the Project Sites from any such resources near the Hudson River.

7.3. EXISTING CONDITIONS

7.3.1. ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Research was conducted at OPRHP and the New York State Museum (NYSM) to collect information on previously identified archaeological resources located within the general area of the Project Sites, using a one-mile radius of the Water Treatment Plant Site as a reference. A total of seven archaeological sites, all dating to the historic period, were identified in the OPRHP files; the NYSM’s files included information on only two archaeological sites, both of which date to the prehistoric period. **Table 7-1** summarizes the information available for these archaeological sites, as included in the two 2008 Phase 1A studies prepared by Hartgen. Table 7-1 includes the general location of each site in relation to the proposed Water Treatment Plant Site and the potential potable water main routes.

Table 7-1

Reported Archaeological Sites within One Mile of the Project Sites

OPRHP Site No.	NYSM No.	Site Identifier	Site Description	Distance from Water Treatment Plant Site ¹	Distance from Potential Potable Water Main Routes ²
08744.000005		Treason House Site	c. 1700s. Erroneously thought to be where Benedict Arnold and John Andre met to arrange the surrender of West Point.	Approx. 3,020 ft west	Approx. 100 ft (30m) west of Kay Fries Drive
08744.000017		William Smith House, "The White House"	c. 1774-1809. Where Benedict Arnold and John Andre met in 1780 to negotiate Arnold's treason.	Approx. 3,200 ft west	Approx. 1,160 ft (353m) west of Cosgrove Ave
08744.000004		Peck Rolling Mill Site	c. 1830-1842	Approx. 4,060 ft southwest	1,170 ft (356m) south of Railroad Ave
08744.000009		ROC-300	Historic foundation	Approx. 5,350 ft southwest	1,860 ft (566m) southwest of Railroad Ave
08744.000010		ROC-102	Historic foundation	Approx. 5,900 ft southwest	3,150 ft (989m) southwest of Railroad Ave
08744.000013		ROC-9930	1 glass fragment	Approx. 3,730 ft south	900 ft (247m) southwest of Tanneyanns Lane
08744.000161		ROC-101	Historic foundation	Approx. 4,600 ft southeast	2,680 feet (816m) east of Tanneyanns Lane
	4653	ACP "Parker Site"	Traces of occupation	Covers a large area between Rt 9W and Hudson River, overlapping the Project area	Covers a large area between Rt 9W and Hudson River, overlapping the Project area
	7926	Grassy Point	Camp	Represented as a large "X" on OPRHP maps that overlaps part of the Project area	Represented as a large "X" on OPRHP maps that overlaps part of the Project area
<p>Sources: 1 <i>Phase 1A Literature Review and Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment, Haverstraw Water Supply Project, Rockland County.</i> Hartgen Archaeological Associates, Inc. September 2008. 2 <i>Phase 1A Literature Review and Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment, Haverstraw Water Supply Project, Treated Water Lines, Rockland County.</i> Hartgen Archaeological Associates, Inc. November 2008.</p>					

None of the archaeological sites discussed above appear to have been evaluated for S/NR listing, and no S/NR-listed or eligible archaeological sites have been recorded within a one-mile radius of the Water Treatment Plant Site and the potential potable water main routes. A small number of archaeological surveys have previously been completed that covered portions of the current Project Sites. One of these prior archaeological surveys included the proposed Water Treatment Plant Site and other previous archaeological surveys included portions of Beach Road that would be part of the Proposed Project's Raw Water Transmission Main Route Option 1. These previously completed surveys concluded that their respective project areas had no archaeological sensitivity due to prior disturbance.

Based on an analysis of historic maps, the environmental setting, site file searches, site walkover, and a characterization of prior site disturbances, the September 2008 Phase 1A assessment evaluated the Project Sites' potential to contain buried prehistoric and historic-period archaeological resources (areas with the potential to contain buried archaeological resources are considered to be potentially archaeologically "sensitive"). The September 2008 Phase 1A assessment concluded that most areas of the Project Sites have no archaeological sensitivity, and

therefore, no additional archaeological study of these areas was warranted. Areas with no archaeological sensitivity include the Water Treatment Plant Site, the currently paved portion of the Raw Water Transmission Main Route Option 1, the potential access roads, and all but one location in the potential routes of potable water mains. Areas with potential archaeological sensitivity are described below.

A supplemental Phase 1A assessment was prepared in November 2008 to evaluate the potential routes under consideration for new potable water mains that would deliver water treated at the Water Treatment Plant Site. Those areas of the new potable water main routes with the potential for archaeological sensitivity are described below.

In August 2010, a Phase 1A assessment was prepared as an addendum to the August 2008 Phase 1A assessment to evaluate four raw water transmission main route options not previously considered—Options 2 through 5. Option 1, which follows Beach Road and Ecology Lane, was analyzed as the “raw water transmission main route” in the August 2008 Phase 1A report.

The five raw water transmission route options are illustrated on Figure 7-1 above. As described in the Chapter 15, “Construction Impacts,” each of the five route options would involve ground disturbance (see section 15.2.2.3 in Chapter 15). Options 2 through 5 would be constructed using an 800-foot-long open-cut trench that would extend along the north side of the former Haverstraw Landfill. Although the depth of the trench has not yet been determined, it is anticipated that the depth would be approximately 8 to 10 feet and be excavated within a construction access corridor with a width of 20 feet centered on the trench. Each of Options 2 through 5 would involve horizontal directional drilling using a pit at the edge of the landfill (referred to as point B) and several different pits along Beach Road, depending on the route. These are referred to as points C, D, and E (for more information, see Chapter 15, “Construction Impacts”). The pits would reach depths of approximately 8 to 10 feet. Point E is located at the Intake Site and therefore was assessed in the August 2008 Phase 1A and Phase 1B reports. Options 1, 2, and 3 would require open trenches along Beach Road in areas already analyzed in the 2008 Phase 1A assessment.

Areas of the Project Sites identified in the 2008 and 2010 Phase 1A assessments as having potential archaeological sensitivity that warrant further analysis are described below:

- **Intake Site:** The September 2008 Phase 1A assessment concluded that the Intake Site is archaeologically sensitive, specifically for resources associated with the early 19th century brick works once present in this location. The location was found to be sensitive for such resources as docks, paving for kiln sheds, anchors for molding machines, and the remains of ancillary structures such as worker housing and sheds.

To determine whether archaeological resources are actually present on the Intake Site, additional investigation in the form of Phase 1B archaeological testing was conducted in August 2008. Approximately 130 feet of subsurface trenching was conducted on the Intake Site to assess subsurface conditions and catalog any historical materials encountered. No historical materials were encountered during this testing. Therefore, the Phase 1B documentation concludes that the Intake Site is not archaeologically sensitive and no further study is warranted at the Intake Site.

- **Potential Potable Water Main Routes:** The November 2008 Phase 1A assessment concludes that these routes are not archaeologically sensitive, except for a portion of one potential route that crosses a lawn area east of Benson Street. A Phase 1B investigation is

recommended for this area. As discussed later in this chapter, this investigation would be conducted prior to any Project-related disturbance of the potentially sensitive area.

- **Potential Raw Water Transmission Main Routes Options 2 through 5:** The August 2010 Phase 1A assessment identified two areas within the routes of Options 2 through 5 as potentially sensitive for the presence of prehistoric resources and/or historic-period resources such as brick yard-related resources and other historic-period structures and features identified on historic maps. These areas are:
 - The 800-foot-long open cut along the north side of the Haverstraw Landfill.
 - The directional drilling pits along Beach Road at points C (to be used for Option 3 and Option 4) and D (to be used for Option 2).

Further analysis in the form of a Phase 1B investigation is recommended for these areas of Options 2 through 5. As discussed later in this chapter, the Phase 1B investigation for Options 2 through 5 would be conducted prior to any Project-related disturbance of the potentially sensitive areas.

All other areas of the Project Sites were found to have been disturbed and therefore were not considered sensitive for prehistoric or historic-period archaeological resources. The September 2008 Phase 1A assessment concluded that the western portion of the proposed Raw Water Transmission Main Route Option 1 was considered sensitive for the presence of prehistoric archaeological resources. The September 2008 report concluded that this portion of the Water Treatment Plant Site was wooded and did not appear to have been significantly disturbed by past construction or land alterations and, given its location in the vicinity of the Hudson River and Minisceongo Creek, may have been an attractive location for various prehistoric activities. However, field visits conducted in fall 2008 as part of the November 2008 Phase 1A assessment found that the western portion of the Raw Water Transmission Main Route Option 1—the undeveloped land north of Carol Avenue and North Wayne Avenue—has been disturbed and no longer warrants further archaeological investigation.

7.3.2. ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES

7.3.2.1. PROJECT SITES

There are no architectural resources on the Project Sites. Two buildings are close to the boundaries of the shoreline Intake Site—a boathouse/fishing structure and a residence. Neither appear to meet criteria for S/NR listing in terms of age or historic and architectural significance. This building is a boathouse/fishing structure located to the south of the Intake Site and immediately north of the existing U.S. Gypsum (USG) Company conveyor structure. This wood-frame one-story boathouse is approximately 30 feet long by 12 feet wide, and has a wooden deck extension on the water side. The residence is a single-family structure located on the waterfront that is not architecturally distinguished. In addition, the USG conveyor structure is also located close to the boundaries of the Intake Site. This structure also does not appear to meet criteria for S/NR listing.

There are no structures situated on the Water Treatment Plant Site or on the route directly affected by Raw Water Transmission Main Route Options 1 through 5, access roads, or potable water mains.

7.3.2.2. STUDY AREAS

7.3.2.2.1. Primary Study Areas

There is one known architectural resource in the primary study areas, the *M/V Commander*, a naval vessel. This resource listed on the S/NR is a 1917 vessel leased to the U.S. Navy in 1918. During World War I, the vessel served to protect the Rockaway Air Station from German zeppelins. Since 1919, the *M/V Commander* has functioned as an excursion boat on the Hudson River. At the present time, the *M/V Commander* is moored in the Haverstraw Marina, immediately south of the Intake Site.

The existing buildings in the primary study areas include one- to three-story older free-standing houses that have been substantially altered, including the addition of vinyl siding and new windows; some newer, two-story attached and free-standing houses; the large, multi-structure USG plant northwest of the Intake Site and the associated metal conveyor structure; and cinder block industrial buildings and a sewage treatment plant building complex, which are of recent construction. None of these buildings in the primary study areas appear to meet criteria for S/NR listing. Therefore, other than the *M/V Commander*, there are no other known or potential architectural resources in the primary study areas.

7.3.2.2.2. Secondary Study Area

There are approximately 83 known architectural resources in the larger secondary study area. These resources are shown in **Table 7-2**. In the secondary study area, the closest known architectural resource is the Railroad Avenue School (S/NR-eligible) at 1 Cosgrove Avenue. The school is approximately 2,000 feet [0.37 miles] southwest of the Water Treatment Plant Site. Other known architectural resources in the secondary study area include the Stony Point Battlefield (NHL, S/NR) and the Stony Point Lighthouse (S/NR) in Stony Point and the Fowler Library (S/NR) in Haverstraw. The Stony Point Battlefield and the Stony Point Lighthouse are sited on the west bank of the Hudson River waterfront more than two miles north of the Intake Site. The Fowler Library is approximately two miles south of the Raw Water Transmission Main Route Option 1, which is the raw water transmission main route option closest to this architectural resource. However, none of the raw water transmission main routes would be visible after construction and, therefore, would not adversely affect this architectural resource in any case. The Croton North Railroad Station (S/NR) in Croton-on-Hudson, located on the east bank of the Hudson River across from the Intake Site, is the only architectural resource in the secondary study area from which the Proposed Project potentially could be visible.

Table 7-2

Architectural Resources within 5-Mile Study Area

No.	Name	Address	Location (County)	Designation
Rockland County				
1.	Palisades Interstate Parkway	Fort Lee, NJ to Bear Mountain, NY	Fort Lee, NJ to Bear Mountain, NY (Orange)	S/NR
2.	Bear Mountain State Park Historic District		Highlands & Stony Point (Orange & Rockland)	S/NR
3.*	Bear Mountain Administration Building	Bear Mountain State Park—Off Route 9W, south of Bear Mountain Bridge facing Bear Mountain Inn	Bear Mountain (Rockland)	S/NR
4.*	Bear Mountain Bath House	Bear Mountain State Park—Route 9W area	Bear Mountain (Rockland)	S/NR
5.*	Bear Mountain Inn	Bear Mountain State Park—West side of Route 9W near Hessian Lake	Bear Mountain (Rockland)	S/NR
6.*	Bear Mountain Bus Terminal	Bear Mountain State Park—North of Inn, West Side of Route 9W, near Hessian Lake at the Grove	Bear Mountain (Rockland)	S/NR
7.*	Bear Mountain Passenger Terminal	Bear Mountain State—Hudson River Dayline Dock on the Hudson River, east of Route 9W Park	Bear Mountain (Rockland)	S/NR
8.*	Stone Residences	Bear Mountain State Park—Route 9W at maintenance area	Bear Mountain (Rockland)	S/NR
9.*	Stone Storage Building and Maintenance Area	Bear Mountain State Park—Mulefield east of Route 9W	Bear Mountain (Rockland)	S/NR
10.*	Bear Mountain Bridge	Route 6 across the Hudson River	Bear Mountain (Rockland)	S/NR
11.*	Bear Mountain Bridge Toll House	Route 6—at the west end of Bear Mountain Bridge	Bear Mountain (Rockland)	S/NR
12.*	Comfort Stations	Bear Mountain State Park—Route 9W near Hessian Lake	Bear Mountain (Rockland)	S/NR
13.	William H. Rose House	110 Tompkins Avenue	Stony Point (Rockland)	S/NR
14.	Stony Point Battlefield	Stony Point State Park—North of Stony Point on U.S. 2 and 202	Stony Point (Rockland)	NHL, S/NR
15.	Stony Point Battlefield Museum	Stony Point State Park, Stony Point Battlefield off Park Road	Stony Point (Rockland)	S/NR
16.	Stony Point Lighthouse	Stony Point State Park, Stony Point Battlefield off Park Road	Stony Point (Rockland)	S/NR
17.	c. 1840 vernacular dwelling	88-90 East Main Street—US 9W, Cedar Brook vicinity	Stony Point (Rockland)	S/NR-eligible
18.	c. 1830 vernacular dwelling	92 East Main Street—US 9W, Cedar Brook vicinity	Stony Point (Rockland)	S/NR-eligible
19.	US Post Office--Haverstraw	86 Main Street	Haverstraw (Rockland)	S/NR
20.	Kings Daughters Public Library	Main and Allison Streets	Haverstraw (Rockland)	S/NR
21.	Homestead	143 Hudson Avenue	Haverstraw (Rockland)	S/NR
22.	M/V Commander	Haverstraw Marina—Stony Point Bay on the Hudson River	West Haverstraw (Rockland)	S/NR
23.	Fraser-Hoyer House	Treason Hill off US 9W	West Haverstraw (Rockland)	S/NR
24.	Henry M. Peck House	US 9W at Helen Hayes Hospital	West Haverstraw (Rockland)	S/NR
25.	Railroad Avenue School	1 Cosgrove Avenue	West Haverstraw (Rockland)	S/NR-eligible
26.	Letchworth Village Developmental Center	Fernald Road	Thiells (Rockland County)	S/NR Historic District-eligible
27.	Pomona Village Hall	100 Ladentown Road	Pomona (Rockland)	S/NR-eligible

Table 7-2 (cont'd)
Architectural Resources

No.	Name	Address	Location (County)	Designation
Rockland County (Cont'd)				
28.	Ladentown United Methodist Church	145 Old Route 202A/Ladentown Road	Pomona (Rockland)	S/NR-eligible
29.	H.R. Stevens House	234 Congers Road	New City (Rockland)	S/NR
30.*	English Church and Schoolhouse	484 New Hempstead Road	New City (Rockland)	S/NR
31.	Building A (Residence)	North Main Street— west side, north of New Hempstead Road	New City (Rockland)	S/NR-eligible
32.	Carriage House (History Center—Blacksmith Shop)	20 Zukor Road	New City (Rockland)	S/NR
33.	Barn (History Center—Storage)	20 Zukor Road	New City (Rockland)	S/NR
34.	History Center of Rockland County	20 Zukor Road	New City (Rockland)	S/NR
35.	Museum of the Historical Society of Rockland County	20 Zukor Road	New City (Rockland)	S/NR
36.	Jacob Abramse Blauvelt House	20 Zukor Road	New City (Rockland)	S/NR
37.	Building	61 Zukor Road	New City (Rockland)	S/NR-eligible
38.	Rockland County Courthouse and Dutch Gardens	Jct. of South Main Street and New Hempstead Road	New City (Rockland)	S/NR
39.	Building	101 Old Route 304	Brownsell Corner/Centenary (Rockland)	S/NR-eligible
40.	Building	16 Phillips Hill Road	Brownsell Corner/Centenary (Rockland)	S/NR-eligible
Westchester County (Across the Hudson River from the Project Sites)				
1.*	Ford Administration Building	1031 Elm Street	Peekskill (Westchester)	S/NR, WCI
2.*	Thomas Nelson House	1231 Seymour Lane	Peekskill (Westchester)	S/NR, WCI
3.*	Beecher-McFadden Estate	East Main Street	Peekskill (Westchester)	S/NR, WCI
4.*	Drum Hill High School	Ringgold Street	Peekskill (Westchester)	S/NR, WCI
5.*	US Post Office—Peekskill	738 South Street	Peekskill (Westchester)	S/NR, WCI
6.*	Peekskill Presbyterian Church	705 South Street	Peekskill (Westchester)	SR, WCI
7.*	Peekskill Downtown Historic District	Main, Division, Park, Brown, Bank Streets	Peekskill (Westchester)	S/NR, WCI
8.*	Nelson Avenue-Fort Hill Historic District	Nelson Avenue, John, Diven, Constant, Orchard, Paulding, Decatur Streets	Peekskill (Westchester)	SR, WCI
9.*	Villa Loretto	Crompond Road	Peekskill (Westchester)	S/NR, WCI
10.	Arco Scrap Iron and Metal Company	411 Central Avenue	Peekskill (Westchester)	S/NR-eligible
11.	PR Trane Residence	310 Depew Street	Peekskill (Westchester)	S/NR-eligible
12.	Standard House (Carbones Restaurant)	50 Hudson Avenue	Peekskill (Westchester)	S/NR, WCI
13.	Building	125 Hudson Avenue/306 Simpson Place	Peekskill (Westchester)	S/NR-eligible
14.	Algozzini Residence	144 Hudson Avenue	Peekskill (Westchester)	S/NR-eligible
15.	Zimmer Residence	147 Hudson Avenue	Peekskill (Westchester)	S/NR-eligible
16.	Grove Street Realty Company	163 Hudson Avenue	Peekskill (Westchester)	S/NR-eligible
17.	School	1024 McKinley Street	Peekskill (Westchester)	S/NR-eligible
18.	Building	North Water Street	Peekskill (Westchester)	S/NR-eligible
19.	Peekskill Railroad Station—Hudson Line	Railroad Avenue	Peekskill (Westchester)	S/NR-eligible

Haverstraw Water Supply Project DEIS

**Table 7-2 (cont'd)
Architectural Resources**

No.	Name	Address	Location (County)	Designation
Westchester County (Cont'd)				
20.	Wohlstein Residence	358 Smith Street	Peekskill (Westchester)	S/NR-eligible
21.	Purdy Residence	400 Smith Street	Peekskill (Westchester)	S/NR-eligible
22.	South Street—Chaplain's House/Bldg #5; Convent/Girls' Dormitories and Classrooms; Fire Station/Bldg #7; Former Townsend Estate Residence—Mt. Saint Francis; Heating Plant/Bldg #9; Infirmary—Trade School/Bldg #6; Laundry—Auditorium/Bldg #10; Novitiate/Bldg #4; Print Shop/Bldg #8; St. Margaret's Chapel	South Street	Peekskill (Westchester)	S/NR Historic District-eligible
23.	Fire Company Building	1 South Water Street	Peekskill (Westchester)	S/NR-eligible
24.	Pump House/Camp Smith	U.S. Route 6	Peekskill (Westchester)	S/NR-eligible
25.	Suarez Residence	315 Washington Street	Peekskill (Westchester)	S/NR-eligible
26.	Funeral Home	344 Washington Street	Peekskill (Westchester)	S/NR-eligible
27.	Tomassio Residence	832 Washington Street	Peekskill (Westchester)	S/NR-eligible
28.	Peekskill Armory	955 Washington Street	Peekskill (Westchester)	S/NR-eligible
29.	Augustowski Residence	960 Washington Street	Peekskill (Westchester)	S/NR-eligible
30.	Aaron Copland House	1538 Washington Street	Cortlandt Manor (Westchester)	S/NR
31.	Church of Saint Patrick	Eleventh Street at Highland Street	Verplanck (Westchester)	S/NR
32.	Building	134 Sixth Street	Verplanck (Westchester)	S/NR-eligible
33.	Veterans Administration Medical Center (FDR Hospital)	Route 9A	Montrose (Westchester)	S/NR Historic District-eligible
34.	Biddle House	142 Mountain Airy Road	Cortlandt (Westchester)	S/NR-eligible
35.	Croton North Railroad Station	Senasqua Road at Farrengton Road	Croton-on-Hudson (Westchester)	S/NR
36.	Asbury United Methodist Church, and Bethel Chapel and Cemetery	Old Post Road South	Croton-on-Hudson (Westchester)	S/NR
37.	Van Cortlandt Manor	US 9, North of Jct. with US 9A	Croton-on-Hudson (Westchester)	S/NR
38.	Old Croton Aqueduct	Runs North from Yonkers to New Croton Dam	Yonkers and Croton (Westchester)	S/NR
39.	Stevenson Houses	Old Post Road and North Prospect Place	Croton-on-Hudson (Westchester)	S/NR Historic District-eligible
40.	Saint Augustine's Episcopal Church	6 Old Post Road North	Croton-on-Hudson (Westchester)	S/NR-eligible
41.	Quaker Bridge	Quaker Bridge Road (crossing the Croton River)	Croton-on-Hudson (Westchester)	S/NR
<p>Notes: S/NR: State/National Register of Historic Places; S/NR-eligible: State/National Register-eligible; S/NRHD: State/National Register Historic District; S/NRHD-eligible: State/National Register Historic District-eligible; WCI: Westchester County Inventory.</p> <p>* Resource located outside the 5-mile study area.</p> <p>Sources: New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation's GIS database, July 2008; Westchester County Inventory of Historic Places, July 2008.</p>				

7.4. THE FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT

In the future without the Proposed Project, this DEIS assumes that the Project Sites would likely remain unchanged. As there would be no in-ground disturbance, there would be no effects to any potential archaeological resources on the Project Sites.

7.5. PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

7.5.1. ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

As described above in section 7.3, “Existing Conditions,” the Intake Site, the Water Treatment Plant Site, most of Raw Water Transmission Main Route Options 1 through 5, the potential access roads (the railroad access road, Carol Avenue, and North Wayne Avenue), and most of the potential potable water main routes have been determined to be not sensitive for archaeological resources. Therefore, construction of the Proposed Project would not result in adverse effects to archaeological resources at these Project Site locations.

The November 2008 Phase 1A archaeological study identified a portion of one potential potable water main route that crosses a lawn area east of Benson Street as potentially sensitive for the presence of prehistoric archaeological resources. If such resources are present, they could be adversely affected by subsurface construction-related activities in that area. If this potable water main route is selected, further study in the form of a Phase 1B archaeological investigation would be undertaken to determine the presence or absence of prehistoric archaeological resources in the lawn area portion of the potential potable water main route.

As described above, the August 2010 Phase 1A archaeological study identified the 800-foot-long open-cut area alongside the Haverstraw Landfill associated with raw water transmission main Options 2 through 5 and the two directional drilling pit locations along Beach Road at Points C (to be used for Option 3 and Option 4) and D (to be used for Option 2) as potentially sensitive for prehistoric and/or historic archaeological resources. If a raw water transmission main route is selected that would affect these areas—and if such resources are present—they could be adversely affected by subsurface construction-related activities. Phase 1B backhoe trenching would be undertaken in the affected areas to determine the presence or absence of historic archaeological resources in these areas of the Project Sites.

All Phase 1B archaeological testing would be undertaken in consultation with OPRHP and would occur prior to construction of the Proposed Project. If any archaeological resources are encountered during testing at the Project Sites, further investigation and research may be required to document the extent of the find and its potential significance. If significant resources are identified, measures would be developed to avoid or mitigate adverse effects to those resources in consultation with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) and OPRHP.

As Project designs are advanced, if information becomes available regarding previous disturbance of the open cut area or directional drilling pit locations, such as the presence of utilities, conclusions about the sensitivity of these locations and the need for further investigation may change.

7.5.2. ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES

7.5.2.1. PROJECT SITES

There are no architectural resources on the Project Sites and therefore the Proposed Project would not result in any adverse effects to architectural resources on the Sites.

7.5.2.2. STUDY AREAS

7.5.2.2.1. Primary Study Areas

As discussed above, one historic resource is located in the primary study areas, the historic marine vessel, the *M/V Commander*, which is currently moored in the Haverstraw Marina. This mooring is located more than 1,000 feet from the Intake Site and almost one-half mile from the Water Treatment Plant Site. The *M/V Commander* mooring is east of the Beach Road portion of the raw water transmission main route Options 1 and 3. This historic ship is too far from the proposed construction to be adversely affected during construction of the Proposed Project. Its distance from the Project Sites would also mean that no adverse effects to its context or setting would occur. As discussed in Chapter 4, “Visual Resources,” the new structures added to the Intake Site and Water Treatment Plant Site would have limited visibility from the surrounding areas, because of the buffering effects of topography, vegetation, and existing structures nearby. At the Intake Site, which is on the Hudson River waterfront, the new structure would be in the context of nearby industrial structures that would minimize its visual prominence. Furthermore, the *M/V Commander* is moored in a marina among other vessels that already limit its visibility and views to the Project Sites. While the vessel itself is a designated historic resource, the mooring location and the marina are not a part of this historic designation. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not adversely affect the context or setting of the historic resource.

7.5.2.2.2. Secondary Study Area

Although there are approximately 81 architectural resources in the secondary study area located on both the west and east sides of the Hudson River, these resources are generally at too great a distance from the proposed Water Treatment Plant Site or Intake Site to be directly or indirectly affected by the Proposed Project. This includes any visual or contextual effects, such as obstructing views to these resources or affecting their historic built context. In addition, views to the Project Sites from historic resources would be limited as the proposed waterfront components of the Proposed Project would be similar in scale to other waterfront structures in this area of the Hudson River. Furthermore, the visibility of the Proposed Project from any architectural resources with views to the waterfront would be limited due to distance, because the Hudson River is two miles wide in this area. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not be expected to result in any adverse effects to architectural resources in the secondary study area.

7.6. CONCLUSIONS

To avoid adverse effects on potential archaeological resources, subsurface testing and any further required analysis or mitigation would be undertaken in consultation with OPRHP on a portion of the potable water main route that crosses the lawn area and on segments of raw water main transmission route Options 2 through 5 (depending on which option is selected) prior to construction activities for the Proposed Project. With the implementation of further investigation and potential mitigation for archaeological resources, the Proposed Project would not result in adverse effects on archaeological resources. The Proposed Project also would not adversely

affect the setting or context of any architectural resources. The new structures added to the Intake Site and Water Treatment Plant Site would have limited visibility from the surrounding areas, because of the buffering effects of topography, vegetation, and existing structures nearby. At the Intake Site, the new structure would be in the context of nearby industrial structures that would minimize its visual prominence. *