

### **3.6 Historic & Archaeological Resources**

#### **3.6.1 Historic and Prehistoric Resources**

A Stage 1A Literature Review and Sensitivity Analysis was conducted on the area within and adjacent to the project site by City/Scape Cultural Resource Consultants in November 2002. This study was recommended by the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) in correspondence dated April 30, 2001. OPRHP indicated the potential for an archaeological site to be present in or adjacent to the project area. The Stage 1A survey included a site inspection, a review of OPRHP files, various text references including histories of Orange County, other previously published surveys, and a review of historical maps of the project area and its environs. The Stage 1A Literature Review and Sensitivity Analysis is found in Appendix D.

Results of the documentary review indicated that:

- No historic sites or structures listed on the State Register were identified by OPRHP in the immediate vicinity or vicinity of the proposed project area
- No sites or structures listed on the National Register were identified by OPRHP in the immediate vicinity or vicinity of the proposed project area.
- As a result of the OPRHP's review of the Stage 1A and 1B Report prepared by City/Scape, the Turner Farm House and Barn, located off the project site, but in the vicinity of the project, has been identified as being potentially eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. Measures have been taken to provide screening for the Turner Farm House and Barn.
- No additional structures currently under consideration for the State/National Register are known to be located adjacent to or in the vicinity of the project area

Information provided by OPRHP did indicate that there are two professionally excavated prehistoric sites both are more than a mile away from the project area. The Mombasha Brook Turnpike site was interpreted as a prehistoric camp, and the Monroe-Woodbury Prehistoric Site provided middle & late archaic affiliations. None of these sites would be impacted by the proposed project. Correspondence with OPRHP identified the project area as having the potential to contain a prehistoric archeological site.

#### *Sensitivity Assessment/Site Prediction*

Environmental criteria applied by the New York State Museum Archaeological site files suggest that the project area has the potential to contain prehistoric sites. Among these criteria are:

- The presence of the Ramapo River abutting the area.
- The similarity of the topography within the project area with the topography in which prehistoric sites have been identified, and;
- The relationship of the project area to areas where prehistoric sites have been identified.

The literature review and map investigation conducted by City/Scape indicated settlement in the area of the Village of Monroe in the early years of the eighteenth century. In 1851 this area contained a number of dwellings, two taverns, a store, a blacksmith shop and a Methodist Church. The blacksmith shop was located on the Ramapo River, perhaps to take advantage of its flow, perhaps to operate a bellows or hammer. At the north end of the lake, where the stream entered the lake was a mill. In 1851 several buildings were located along the road including one owned by P. Turner. The Turner family owned and operated a gristmill in Seamanville for many years. On an 1859 map it appears that no structures were located within the boundaries of the project area. The dwellings owned by the Turners were located west of the road, but were not within the boundaries of the project area.

*Results of the Stage 1A Literature Review and Sensitivity Analysis*

Based upon the presence of numerous prehistoric sites located in similar topography, it was not possible to rule out the presence of prehistoric cultural material within the project area. The presence of fresh water and areas of level land on the site heightened the potential. No prehistoric village sites were identified near the Village of Monroe, but the potential for still hunting camps or specialized activity camps could not be eliminated. Taking these facts and the environmental factors outlined above into consideration, it was recommended that subsurface testing be undertaken on the well drained areas of the site to determine the presence or absence of prehistoric cultural materials.

The Stage 1A Literature Review and Sensitivity Analysis found that the project site has potential to contain a prehistoric site or sites. City/Scape therefore recommended that a Stage 1B Archeological Field Survey be undertaken, focusing on those areas deemed suitable for prehistoric occupation. Areas that have been significantly disturbed by construction of the municipal sewer system or areas that are prohibitively wet would be excluded from testing.

An examination of the project area and the examination of historic maps indicate that no historic structures were located within the boundaries of the proposed project area. It is therefore considered unlikely that the project area will contain subsurface historic features.

The Turner Farmhouse, which has the potential to be historically significant, is located north of the project site along Freeland Street, and the barn associated with the Turner Farmhouse is located in close proximity to the proposed Hidden Creek Road. The farmhouse would be more than 250 feet from the nearest building on the Hidden Creek project. There is existing vegetative screening in this area which will remain undisturbed. Supplemental vegetative screening has been provided on the Landscape Plan to further screen these structures.

Site plans, including the screening to be provided, was sent to the OPRHP. In a letter dated September 23, 2003 the OPRHP stated, "Based upon our review of this material, the OPRHP has no further concerns regarding this project." A copy of this letter is contained at the rear of Appendix D, Archaeological Assessment.

### 3.6.2 Potential Impacts to Cultural Resources and Mitigation Measures

As recommended by the archaeological consultant, based on the findings of the Stage 1A Literature Review and Sensitivity Analysis, a Stage 1B Archeological Field Survey was conducted on November 30, December 1 and December 8, 2002 to investigate those areas on the site noted above deemed suitable for prehistoric occupation.

#### *Results of the Stage 1B Archaeological Field Reconnaissance Survey*

The approximately 29 acre site was blanketed with over 100 shovel test pits in all areas identified as suitable for subsurface testing. During the field survey several pieces of chert debitage were recovered. Cardinal points at 10 foot intervals were dug for each of these positive tests. The area all around the positive shovel tests was tested to rule out the presence of significant sites within the project area. None of the cardinal points yielded prehistoric material. No significant sites were identified. All recovered material was collected, and is identified and described in the Stage 1B Archaeological Field Reconnaissance Survey included in Appendix D, Archaeological Assessment.

Based upon the results of the Stage 1B Archaeological Field Survey, no further archaeological investigation is required for the project site. In a letter dated February 28, 2003 the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation stated " Our office has no further concerns regarding archeology and this project: additional survey for this project is **not** warranted. A copy of this letter can be found in Appendix D, Archeological Assessment. As a result of this letter, no further modifications were made to the Hidden Creek Archaeological Assessment.

Additionally, the Archaeological report was reviewed by a consultant to the Village and a number of questions were asked. The applicant's archaeologist responded to those questions and this information is attached to the report in Appendix D. As there are no known or documented historic or prehistoric resources within the project site, no mitigation is required . In the event that prehistoric cultural resources are found on the project site that would be impacted by the project, appropriate mitigation measures would be taken in accordance with applicable local, state and federal regulations.

However, to offset the impact of removal of vegetation on the site generally, significant new plantings are planned as illustrated on the landscape plan. The impact from the removal of second growth wooded areas will be mitigated by the replacement of the removed trees with a mixture of deciduous and evergreen trees, and large shrubs. The new plantings will act to screen the new development from view and, as they mature and blend with the existing wooded areas that are retained, they will return the area to a more rural feel.