

5370K

AKA 5369

Bergoffen
2004

ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT REPORT - PHASE IA

GREENPOINT-WILLIAMSBURG REZONING

PART I

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND - LOT HISTORIES

DEPT OF CITY PLANNING
RECEIVED
2004 MAY 20 AM 8:44
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW



Lead Agency: New York City Department of City Planning

Prepared by: Celia J. Bergoffen, Ph.D., R.P.A.,
for Philip Habib & Associates

April 2004

04DCP003K

RECEIVED
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

MAY 21 2004

LANDMARKS PRESERVATION
COMMISSION

656

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT AREA AND PLANNED DEVELOPMENT.....1

B. TABLE I - ASSESSMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL SENSITIVITY..... 4

2. GEOGRAPHY OF THE PROJECT AREA..... 9

3. GREENPOINT AND WILLIAMSBURG IN THE 17th - 19th CENTURIES

A. GREENPOINT.....12

B. WILLIAMSBURG.....16

4. SOME MANUFACTURES ON THE PROJECT SITES IN THE 19th CENTURY..... 21

H.C.H. Havemeyer Sugar Refinery, Ship building and the Continental Iron Works,
The Cartledge Porcelain factory, Morocco leather, Lumber and Dye Wood - The New
York and Boston Dyewood Company, E. Berhard Faber

5. LOT HISTORIES: EVALUATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL SENSITIVITY..... 26

6. BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 105

PART II

LOT HISTORIES - SUMMARY DATA

1. NOTES ON ARCHIVAL AND MAP RESOURCES CONSULTED..... 1

2. LOT HISTORIES: SUMMARY OF DATA

A. GREENPOINT - PROJECT SITES 1 AND FOLLOWING..... 4

B. NORTH WILLIAMSBURG: PROJECT SITES 199 AND FOLLOWING..... 71

PART III

PLATES - GREENPOINT

1. LIST OF PLATES 1-127
2. GREENPOINT PROJECT SITES

PART IV

PLATES - NORTH WILLIAMSBURG

1. LIST OF PLATES 128-219
2. NORTH WILLIAMSBURG PROJECT SITES

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT AREA AND PLANNED DEVELOPMENT

The New York City Department of City Planning (DCP) is planning a rezoning of the waterfront and part of the inland portions of Greenpoint and Northside-Williamsburg in Brooklyn, Community District 1 (the "project area"). A number of non-residentially zoned areas in these districts, as well as the Special Franklin Street Mixed Use District and the Special Northside Mixed Use District, would be rezoned to mixed-use and residential districts.

In the area of concern, covering approximately 184 blocks and bounded generally by the East River, the Williamsburg Bridge, the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway, and McGinness Boulevard, the DCP has identified 340 sites: 76 are projected development sites -- judged likely to be developed by 2013, the analysis year for the proposed action -- and 264 are potential development sites, considered less likely to be developed in the foreseeable future.

In its review of the potential archaeological sensitivity of the projected and potential development sites, which was based on archaeological sensitivity models and historic maps, the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) determined that of the above 340 sites, all or part of 114 sites, located on 76 blocks and comprising a total of 185 lots had potential for the recovery of archaeological remains (the "project sites"). The LPC therefore recommended that an archaeological documentary study be performed for these sites. Accordingly, this report provides a detailed review of the primary and secondary historic sources that were consulted in order to determine whether archaeological remains might indeed have survived on the 114 LPC-flagged sites, or whether there was evidence of successive construction episodes in the past that would have negatively impacted any potential remains. In general, if a phase IA archaeological assessment determines that a project site may contain archaeological remains whose integrity has not been compromised by subsurface disturbances associated with later building activities, and which have the potential to yield significant historical information, then a recommendation is made for field testing in order to verify the presence or absence of such remains and their state of preservation.

Portions of the project area that might have had the potential to yield traces of prehistoric activities or occupation, that is, the East River and the Bushwick Creek shorelines, have been thoroughly disturbed and indeed obliterated by landfilling. Because of these operations as well as extensive leveling elsewhere in the project area, and the fact that it was intensively developed for residential, commercial or industrial purposes during the third quarter of the 19th century, no part of the project area is considered archaeologically sensitive for prehistoric remains.

As for historic remains, there are a number of lots within the project area that have remained substantially unchanged since the mid-19th century and the documentary research indicates that they have the potential to contain subsurface installations, that is, cisterns and privies, which could yield significant information for reconstructing the history of occupation in these neighborhoods.

B. LIST OF SITES FLAGGED FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL SENSITIVITY

This report finds that the sites listed in Table I, either in their entirety or only on those constituent lots enumerated, are potentially sensitive for 19th century remains. Project site lots that incorporated several old house lots were separately evaluated in Section 5, below, and Part II of this study but on Table I the modern lot is broken down into its old lots only where some of the old lots were found to be sensitive for archaeological remains while others were not. In that case, small "x"s indicate the sensitivity of each of the old lots. Where all or none of the old lots proved to be sensitive, a single "X" in the appropriate column indicates the result of the analysis.

In many cases, the documentary evidence available from tax assessments and sewer connection records was inconclusive, as neither provides a record of the earliest building phase in the area. Early maps of Greenpoint and Williamsburg from the 1850s and histories of the area revealed that virtually all of the blocks and lots in the project area were developed for housing by that time, approximately a decade before most residents began to avail themselves of the sewer service, which was operable by ca. 1860. Indeed, the majority of sewer connections date to the late 1860s. This means that the project sites evaluated in this study were deemed to be archaeologically sensitive for historic remains unless it could be demonstrated that they a) were

composed of made land and not created or developed until the late 19th century (if at all); b) served an industrial purpose or were used for storage (i.e. as lumber yards); c) remained vacant, that is, were not developed for housing, or d) were impacted over their entire lot area by subsequent building episodes on the lot that would have disturbed or destroyed potential archaeological remains.

TABLE I					
Assessment of Archaeological Sensitivity					
LPC Flagged Sites					
SITE	BLOCK	LOT	OLD LOTS	SENSITIVE	NOT SENSITIVE
1	2472	410			X
2		425			X
3		100			X
		32			X
		2			X
	2494	1			X
	2502	1			X
	2510	1			X
	2520	57			X
4	2482	1			X
8		39		X	
9	2483	61		X	
		62		X	
10		11		X	
		12		X	
11		14		X	
12		20		X	
13		59		X	
15		25		X	
20	2511	14			X
22	2512	60			Conversion site
23		54		X	
24	2520	1			X
25	2521	1		X	
26		5		X	
		6		X	
		7		X	
27		11		X	
29		19			Reactivation site
30	2522	10			X
34	2530	1			X
		55			X
		56			X
35	2531	1		X	
		2		X	
		3			X
36		9			X
		10			X
38		35		X	
		36		X	
39	2531	20	13		x
			14	x	
			40	x	
40	2532	1			X

SITE	BLOCK	LOT	OLD LOTS	SENSITIVE	NOT SENSITIVE	
41	2538	1			X	
42	2539	8		X		
43		29		X		
44	2543	1			X	
46	2549	10		X		
52	2556	55			X	
		57		X		
56	2556B	1			X	
62	2570	1			X	
63	2571	1	36		x	
			1 to 6		x	
			7	x		
			8	x		
		9			x	
68	2590	210			X	
93	2724	31		X		
		30		X		
103	2292	11		X		
106	2722	36		X		
131	2731	44		X		
132		41		X		
		38		X		
133		36		X		
		35		X		
134	2732	33			X	
137	2733	6		X		
138	2734	3		X		
139		13			Reactivation site	
141	2304	36			No new development	
		37			No new development	
144	2305	15		X		
		16		X		
		17			X	
145	2305	18			Conversion site	
149	2307	31	47		X	
			46	X		
152		25		X		
159	2738	24			X	
162	2310	9		X		
		10		X		
		11		X		
166	2313	22		X		
169		28			X	
174	2741	8			X	
176		13	34		x	
			50	x		
			51		x	

SITE	BLOCK	LOT	OLD LOTS	SENSITIVE	NOT SENSITIVE
183	2746	40		X	
		41		X	
184		39			X
185	2317	5		X	
		6		X	
		7		X	
		8		X	
186		12		X	
		13		X	
187		16		X	
		17		X	
192	2321	13		X	
198	2323	9		X	
199	2332	1			X
	2324	1			X
202	2325	26		X	
203	2325	27		X	
		28		X	
		29		X	
204	2325	31		X	
		32		X	
205	2326	32		X	
		33		X	
		34		X	
		35		X	
206		17		X	
208	2327	4		X	
209		16		X	
		18		X	
210		31		X	
		34		X	
211	2590	100			X
	2331	7		X	
217	2335	12		X	
218	2335	13		X	
		15		X	
222	2340	1			X
226	2342	26		X	
		23			X
228	2343	19		X	
235	2349	1		X	
		15			X
244	2353	6		X	
		8		X	
248	2357	24			X
		21		X	
		20		X	

on map?

SITE	BLOCK	LOT	OLD LOTS	SENSITIVE	NOT SENSITIVE	
		18			X	
250	2358	36		X		
252		15		X		
253		22		X		
254		28		X		
		25	25	x		
			26		x	
		24		X		
259	2364	15			X	
		16			X	
		17		X		
267	2368	18		X		
268		28		X		
		27		X		
		26			X	
269		34		X		
		33		X		
		32		X		
		31		X		0
270	2369	4	4	x		
			5		x	
		7		X		
		6		X		
274		37		X		
		38		X		
277	2371	33	33		x	
			32	x		
			31	x		
			23	x		
281	2372	5		X		
297	2378	35		X		
		36		X		
298	2379	42		X		
		43		X		
		44		X		
303	2381	14			X	
		15			X	
		16			X	
304	2382	28			Reactivation site	
306	2384	25		X		
		24		X		
		23		X		
309	2387	7		X		
311	2411	1			X	
		12		X		
312	2390	15		X		
313		16		X		

SITE	BLOCK	LOT	OLD LOTS	SENSITIVE	NOT SENSITIVE	
314	2393	14			X	
315		23		X		
		24			X	
317	2416	8		X		
		7		X		
321	2441	47			X	
324	2442	11			X	
325		21			Reactivation site	
327	2443	37		X		
328		13			Conversion site	
331	2444	2		X		
		3		X		
		4		X		
		5		X		
332		11			Conversion site	

2. GEOGRAPHY OF THE PROJECT AREA

Greenpoint is defined as the district bounded by North 7th Street on the south, the East River on the West, Newton Creek on the north and the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway on the east (pl. 1), corresponding approximately to the area of ward 17 in the 19th century. Project sites 1 to 198 are located in this district. The Greenpoint Historic District, designated by the Landmarks Preservation Commission in 1982, lies mostly east of the project area: its western border running along the east side of Franklin Street, beginning south of Java Street. Only portions of blocks 2558 and 2563 in the project area overlap the historic district, but neither of these contain sites flagged for archaeological assessment by the LPC.

Once also known as Cherry Point, Greenpoint, got its name from the eponymous spit of grassy land that extended into the east river near the foot of later Freeman Street, on part of project site 3, present-day block 2510 (between Freeman and Green Streets, F and G Streets on the 1855 Perris map, pl. 4; Stiles 1870: 414-415; Smith 1940: 1). The name came to designate all of the 17th ward when Greenpoint, Bushwick, and Williamsburg were joined to Brooklyn in 1854 (Felter 1918). At that time, the 17th ward was home to approximately 15,000 inhabitants (Felter 1918). A sandy bluff, in parts over one hundred feet high overlooked the shoreline between Java and Milton Streets, but it was leveled before the middle of the 19th century for use as building material and landfill both in New York and locally (Felter 1918). The original Greenpoint spit disappeared between 1855 and 1868 when the western half of the blocks along the once white sandy shoreline west of West Street were created by landfilling (Felter 1918). During this period, the blocks west of Commerce Street between Ash and Eagle Streets were also created or in the process of being filled. Most of the project site area in Greenpoint bordering the East River and Newton Creek is low-lying land founded on a deep layer of mud. Stiles noted that because of this, many of houses on J [Java] , Washington [West] and Franklin Streets had to be built on stilts (1870: 413).

Until about the middle of the 19th century much of the northeastern half of the Greenpoint peninsula east of the project site area, from around McGuinness Boulevard, was a salt marsh known as the "Back Meadows". So also was the land within the limits of the project site

that bordered Bushwick Creek and the brooks running into it from the southeast (see the 1844-45 USGS map and *The Final Commissioners' Plan of 1821*, reproduced in Cohen and Augustyn, 1997, 108-109, copy at the New York Public Library). Two important creeks drained the salt marshes of the Greenpoint peninsula: Newton Creek, formerly called Maspeth Kill, and Bushwick Creek, called Norman's Kill after Dirck Volckertson (below). The latter has been mostly filled but once extended as far east, approximately, as the intersection of Manhattan and Nassau Avenues (pls. 3 and 5).

Several streams ran from the southeast across Leonard and Lorimer Streets and west of Union Avenue into the creek, over blocks in the project site area (pl. 80, above). At high tide, Bushwick creek formed a considerable bay that would have covered the project sites on blocks 2590, 2570, 1571.

South of Greenpoint, in the area now known as Northside (i.e. North Williamsburg), the project area comprehends portions of the 19th century wards 14, 15, and 13. The borders of these were approximately as follows: the 14th ward: between North 15th and Grand Streets and the East River and Union Avenue; the 15th ward: between Driggs Avenue and Grand Street and Union Avenue and Newton Creek, and the 13th ward: between Grand and Division Streets and the East River and Union Avenue.

In this area, the land rose gradually from a sandy shore that extended inland to about the line of Kent Avenue, where it formed a bluff up to approximately forty-five feet above sea level (Stiles 1869: 383; Prime 1845: 348). According to Armbruster, the "extended slope" of the sandy bluff at the top of the village rose between twenty and fifty feet along the line of Bedford Avenue (Armbruster 1942: 4-5). This bluff, known as the Kijkuit or Keikout, meaning "Lookout" was leveled in 1853 and according to Armbruster, the earth was dug down some 60 feet (p. 5). Stiles however puts the highest point, 129 feet east of Third Street, at 31 feet above high water (1869: 389). Between the two bluffs, the land was almost level. Indeed, the gentle slopes both here and in Greenpoint resulted in the formation of shallow tide pools and generally poor drainage (Adams 1857: 1)¹

The boggy parts of the project area would not have attracted prehistoric settlement. But the Indians of the Archaic Period (ca. 8,000-1,000 B.C.) did favor coastal locations for instance

on islands, at the head of estuaries, or by the seashore for their settlements and food-processing stations, and in particular on elevated, well-drained tracts of land such as the sand bluffs described above may have offered. Nearby marshlands, rivers and bays offered plentiful supplies of shellfish, fish and wild fowl. With the development of agriculture during the Woodland Period (ca. 1,000-1,600 A.D.), the Indians created large, permanent or semi-permanent palisaded settlements inland, although they still traveled seasonally to their hunting or fishing camps on the shores, the latter identified by middens, huge piles of discarded shells. In Brooklyn, the Indians' landing place -- as later for the Europeans -- was near the site of the later Fulton Ferry, at the foot of Fulton Street, where the East River is at its narrowest. Their main path to the interior of Brooklyn commenced at the boat landing, running along the line of later Fulton Street, then just east of Flatbush Avenue, across the Eastern Parkway, to the Prospect Park reservoir (Armbruster 1919, 5ff.; Bolton 1922, 131; Cropsey 1925). At the time of the European conquest, the area of present-day downtown Brooklyn was settled by the Marechkawiek Indians, one of the Long Island Canarsee groups possibly related to Delaware subtribes (Bolton 1920, 271; Bolton 1922, 132). South of Wallabout Bay, a neck of land jutting into the East River was called the "Cape of the Marechkawiek" (Stiles 1867, 307), and the 1639 Manatus map shows a Marechkawiek longhouse in this area (Grumet 1981, 27). While the top of the former bluffs in North Williamsburg and Greenpoint, the Newton Creek or the East River shorelines, or the mouth of the Bushwick Creek might have been attractive to the Indians for settlement or food processing stations, as noted above, all of these areas were extensively impacted by filling or leveling operations in the mid-19th century. The project sites are therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for prehistoric remains.

3. GREENPOINT AND WILLIAMSBURG IN THE 17th - 19th CENTURIES

A. GREENPOINT

The project site area in Greenpoint encompasses what became primarily industrial and commercial areas west of Franklin Street. All of the project site blocks west of Franklin Street were developed during the 1850s (1858 Dripps map). In the earliest period of this section's development, there were residences in the blocks between West and Franklin Streets, but in the third quarter of the 19th century, these were largely supplanted by commercial establishments. There were also residences in some instances (though short-lived) on blocks between the East River and West Street, but by the later 1860s, they were replaced by industrial buildings. The project site area, which includes most of the formerly bustling waterfront as well as the district's first public road along Franklin Street, played an important part in communications, transportation, and the development of Greenpoint's economy during the second half of the 19th century.

The history of this district begins in 1638 with the Dutch purchase of the land that would later encompass the town of Bushwick and the area of Greenpoint proper. A few years later, a group of Scandinavian families, headed by Dirck Volckertsen, also called "Dirck the Norman" settled in Greenpoint (Felter 1918). A patent of ownership for the land was granted him in 1645. According to Felter (1918), Dirck built his house on Calyer Street approximately one to two hundred feet west of Franklin Street, "only a few feet from the exact location where more than two hundred years later the Green Point Savings Bank began its successful career". Later, this building was occupied by Jacobus Calyer, a descendant of Peter Praa (below). Although Norman Kill was renamed, Dirck's presence in Greenpoint is still commemorated in Norman Avenue, which lies just beyond the project site area.

Captain Pieter Praa (1655-1740) gained possession of the northeastern part of Greenpoint through his marriage in 1684 to Marie Hey (Felter 1918; LPC 1982, 1). Praa was a prominent figure in the history of Bushwick -- the municipal center for Greenpoint -- where he served at different times as the Town Assessor, Magistrate and Commander of the Town Militia. The son of Huguenot refugees from Dieppe, Praa was born in Leyden and emigrated with his family to

the United States in 1659 (Felter 1918). The affluent family farmed 68 acres around their homestead, a stone house, about two blocks east of the project area on the north side of Freeman Street east of Oakland Avenue (now McGuinness Boulevard; Stiles 1869: 353; the house was destroyed in 1832, Felter 1918; Provost 1949, 63-64). At his death, Praa's land was divided up among his five daughters (LPC 1982, 1).

Greenpoint continued to be the property of five families descended from Praa until the 1840s. His grandchildren included Abraham and Jacob Meserole, Jonathan Provost, Jacob Bennett and, by marriage to one of Praa's granddaughter's, Jacob Colyer, who last gave his name to one of the streets in the project area and, as mentioned, lived in the house of Dirck Volckertsen near the mouth of Bushwick Creek (Felter 1918; Armbruster 1942: 39; Provost 1949: 67). On the 1852 Field map, a property belonging to John Calyer is shown on Calyer Street just east of Union Avenue. Jacob Bennett's house was also probably in the project site area or just beyond its border but we do not know its exact location. Felter (1918) states that it stood near Clay Street "midway between Franklin Street and Manhattan Avenue", that is, on either of blocks 2482 or 2487. His property, called "Griffin farm", was bought in 1833 by Nezhiah Bliss (see below; the name still survives on the 1852 Field map).

The 1844-45 USGS map (pl. 3) still shows only farm lines in the project area, north of the line approximately of North 13th Street. Before 1838, there was only one public road, running from the Wood Point Landing on Bushwick Creek, near where Guernsey Street and Driggs Avenue would intersect if they met, thence eastward along the line of later Driggs Avenue as far as Humboldt Street, which intersection roughly marked the southern tip of the Back Meadows and lies just beyond the eastern edge of the project site area. Here the road split, one branch continuing north to Newtown Creek the other winding south to Bushwick village, near the intersection of Metropolitan and Bushwick Avenues (Felter 1918; the road appears on the 1844-45 USGS map, pl. 3). It was possible to travel overland by a farm lane across private land, from about Freeman Street west of Manhattan Avenue, southeastwards to the approximate intersection of Greenpoint Avenue and McGuinness Boulevard, thence reaching the Wood Point Road where it met Humboldt Street (Felter 1918).

Greenpoint's first period of urban development opened in the 1830s with the arrival of

the “Patriarch of Greenpoint”, Nezhiah Bliss, from Hebron Connecticut (Stiles 1870: 42, n. 1). In 1827, Bliss opened his Novelty Iron Works factory at the foot of East 12th Street in Manhattan and was shortly manufacturing most of the engines for the steam boats that were being produced in Greenpoint (Felter 1918). In 1832, in partnership with Eliphalet Nott, the President of Union College, Bliss made the first of several land acquisitions in Greenpoint, purchasing 30 acres of John A. and Peter Meserole’s farmland along the shoreline and Newton Creek (Stiles 1870: 411). His marriage to one of Praa’s descendants, Mary Meserole, gained him further property on the East River. The couple lived with her father in grandfather Abraham Meserole’s house. It stood between India and Java Streets (I and J streets, respectively), between West (formerly Washington) and Franklin Streets (Stiles 1870: 407). The house was built ca. 1720 but its western wing was added later, around 1775 (Ibid.) This building, shown as belonging to A.K. Meserole in 1852, appears on the Field map of that date. It stood until 1875, and is probably the mansard-roofed, frame building shown on the Higginson’s 1868 map, pl. 69, immediately east of project site 42 on present-day block 2539 (Felter 1918).

By mid-century, improved transportation both within Greenpoint and with Manhattan, along with the rise of ship building, which had begun ca. 1840 and had attracted scores of workers, craftsmen and business people from across the river, had transformed Greenpoint from an isolated rural area into a budding town. The first private dock was built in 1845 at the foot of Freeman Street by David Provost, who sold building materials (Felter 1918; 1852 Field map). The city had earlier built a dock at the foot of Milton Street with a powder house on it, but the Field map does not show these installations (Armbruster 1942: 241). Felter (1918) claims, however, that they were still standing, though defunct, after 1850.

Before 1850, there was no regular ferry service from Manhattan to Greenpoint or any fixed landing place on the east side of the river. The crossing was made in privately owned skiffs whose owners negotiated their price with passengers. Bliss obtained a lease from the city in 1850 and in 1852 began operating a ferry between Manhattan and Greenpoint first from East 10th Street, then from East 23rd Street, to the foot of Greenpoint Avenue. In addition it was possible, from 1850, to get a stagecoach on Green Street that ran along Franklin Street to the ferry at the foot of Grand Street in Williamsburg (Felter 1918). But it went out of business ca. 1855 when the

New York Railroad extended its service across Bushwick Creek and up Franklin Street. That improvement was again at Bliss' instigation: Greenpoint was connected with Williamsburg by rail by the New York Railroad, whose tracks now ran over the Bushwick Creek Bridge and up Franklin Street.

In 1834, Bliss had Greenpoint surveyed and laid out in streets and lots. He was responsible for the creation of the 60-foot wide Franklin Street, one of Greenpoint's main north-south arteries and the eastern boundary for most of the project site area (Stiles 1870: 412). It was opened in 1839 and connected to bridges over Newton and Bushwick Creeks. First called the Ravenswood, Green Point and Hallett's Cove Turnpike, this street was later renamed in honor of Benjamin F. Franklin (Stiles 1870: 412; Armbruster 1942: LPC 1982, 2, 22). Greenpoint Avenue (also called, at different times, Lincoln or National Street) was laid in 1852 (LPC 1982, 26). Kent Street, probably named for James Kent (1763-1847), the first professor at Columbia college and Chancellor of the New York Court of Chancery was opened in 1852, but most of the houses on it were not built until between ca. 1856 and 1860 (LPC 1982, 32).

We can not trace precisely the development of every block and lot in the project area as there are no detailed maps before the 1868 Higginson. The 1852 Field map shows only public buildings and is therefore misleading. The 1858 Dripps map, however, which indicates by shading the presence of buildings, shows that by that date, all of the project site blocks between West Street and Manhattan Avenue, and Clay and Calyer Streets had been at least partly developed. Only the eastern ends of the blocks west of West Street, which were still in the process of being filled, had buildings on them. Project site blocks 2482 (sites 4 and 8) and 2483 (sites 9-13 and 15) must have been developed shortly after, in the 1860s. The introduction of water and sewer service is discussed in Section 4, below.

A thorough-going street-renaming took place in the 1870s as can be seen by comparing the 1852 Field and updated 1868 Higginson maps, and as recorded on the Higginson maps themselves, which show in many instances both sets of names. The east-west streets in the northern part of Greenpoint were originally lettered A through Q. Echoing the 1939 WPA guide, Smith observed that the exotic toponyms of India and Java Streets were inspired by "trade with remote lands" (1940: 4). It may be noted, however, that the first letter of the east-west street

names follows the same alphabetic order as the letter street names, from A through Q -- i.e. Ash, Box, Clay, Dupont, Eagle, etc. The exceptions are Greenpoint Avenue for L Street -- although it was once known as Lincoln Street -- and Calyer Street for P Street. The early names of the north-south streets were Washington Street for West Street and Kent Avenue; Union Avenue for Manhattan Avenue, Oakland Avenue for McGuinness Boulevard, and Manhattan Avenue for Union Avenue (!). The north-south streets were later numbered sequentially, beginning with 1st Street, now Kent Avenue, on the west (Higginson maps).

B. WILLIAMSBURG

Williamsburg is defined as the district bounded by Greenpoint to the north, north of North 7th Street; east by the Queens county line, and south by Flushing Avenue. Project sites 199-332 are located in the northern part of this district, also known as Northside.

Like Greenpoint, Williamsburg was originally part of the town of Bushwick. The territory was purchased from the Indians by Willem Kieft in 1638 and Bushwick was chartered in 1660. The heart of what would later become Williamsburg village, along the East River shore north of Division Street, was first granted in 1646 to Reyer Lambertsens, son of Lambert Hauybertsens Moll, who farmed a large tract immediately to the south. Reyer's farm was later known as the Meserole or Keikout farm, the former name after Jean Mesurolle (Meserole) of Picardy who, in 1663, acquired a tract of land, formerly part of Reyer's patent, that lay roughly between South 7th and North 1st Streets (Stiles 1869: 307-308). The land north of the Meserole farm to Bushwick Creek and east approximately to Driggs Avenue eventually, in 1719, came into the possession of Francis Titus. His holding, known as the Colonel Francis Titus farm, in Williamsburgh, comprised an initial 58 upland acres and 4 of meadow, but he enlarged it with the purchase of 40 acres to the east and a further 12 acres near Grand Street, this last once part of the Keikout farm. The area was still made up of eight or ten farms at the end of the 18th century, when at the first regular row boat ferry service was established between Grand Street in Manhattan and Grand Street in Williamsburg (Stiles 1870: 566).

At the turn of the 19th century, the enterprising Richard M. Woodhull started running a

horse ferry from Corlaer's Hook at the foot of Grand Street in Manhattan to a landing place at what is now Metropolitan Avenue, formerly the Long Island Road. Thinking that the area would soon be developed for housing, Woodhull bought land near the road to the ferry, then called Bushwick Street. He renamed the street "Williamsburg" in honor of his friend and the town's first surveyor, U.S. engineer Colonel Williams, who was a grand-nephew of Benjamin Franklin (Armbruster 1942: 1). As it turned out, Woodhull was ahead of his time -- New Yorkers were not yet ready to move across the river -- and he went bankrupt. His property was sold and divided up into lots (Armbruster 1942: 42-44).

Thomas Morrell, who later purchased part of the Woodhull property, established Grand Street as the edge of his property. From the foot of this street, Morrell began in 1812 to run a second ferry to Grand Street in Manhattan, which competed with Woodhull's. At that time, the heart of the new village, called "Yorkton", extended four blocks north-south, from North 2nd Avenue (Metropolitan Avenue) to South 1st Street (one block south of Grand Street), while the larger territory between Bushwick Creek and the Wallabout was known as Williamsburg (Armbruster 1942: 45). The town was laid out after the tracts of Woodhull and Morrel were combined to form a parcel extending twenty-six blocks north-south by twelve blocks east-west (Armbruster 1942: 181) But in 1814, Williamsburg was still a village of 759 inhabitants with Grand Street roughly marking the limit of the settled area (Armbruster 1942: 46).

In 1827, Williamsburg was incorporated (as a village), its boundaries laid out on a map created by D. Ewen (after whom Manhattan Avenue was formerly named, Stiles 1870, 389). In the 1820s, aside from the farm houses connected with twenty-three farms, there were only a few buildings on the road leading to the North Second Street ferry (Prime 1845: 348). According to an account by Garret Furman, Esq. cited by Stiles, in 1825, the twenty-five acres of land "beginning on South First street, about one hundred and fifty feet from what is now Grand street, near the corner of Second street, then to South Third street, the width continuing to Sixth street... had no building on it but was enclosed by a good stone wall, divided into small fields for cultivation and pasturage... (Stiles, vol. 2, 387-88). Shortly after, the land was divided into lots and sold and the process of development accelerated. A shore road was opened in 1828 from the Brooklyn line at Division Avenue to Grand Street (Armbruster 1942: 4). This was followed in

1829 with the building of North 3rd Street and South 2nd Streets (Stiles 1870, 392). In 1830, the village had 1007 inhabitants and 148 buildings, including commercial establishments (Stiles 1870, 392). A village hall where the Board of Trustees might meet was built on Kent Avenue just north of Grand Street (Armbruster 1942: 2).

The project site blocks located in what was once the heart of Williamsburg village probably had houses on them already by the later 1830s or 1840s. A "Plan of the Village of Williamsburgh Kings County" dated 1833 and published in Armbruster (1942, 4-5) shows rows of houses along North 2nd (Metropolitan Avenue) and North 3rd Streets, along Kent Avenue south of Grand Street, and on the riverside between Grand and South 2nd Streets (project sites 235, 248, 250-254, 259, and 267-269 are in this section). Grand Street was opened in 1830 from the river to between Rodney and Keap Streets (Armsbruster 1946, 181). The center and most densely populated section of Williamsburg in this period was between Grand and North Fourth Street (Ibid.) By the mid-1830s, the growth of the area resulted in the division into lots of the 13th and 14th wards, that is, of the area lying roughly between Division and North 15th Streets and the East River and Union Avenue. In the later 1830s, about five hundred houses were erected in Williamsburgh in spite of the brief real estate "crash" in 1837 brought on by inflated property values (Armbruster 1942: 5, 9-10). The village, extended in 1835 and with a new ferry service to Peck Slip, now boasted seventy-two streets -- only thirteen open and graded, however, while the remainder were almost all dirt roads (Armbruster 1942, 5, 8; Stiles 1870, 394). Between 1843 and 1845 a further four hundred houses were built in the project area and "the town and village of Williamsburgh" declared its independence from Bushwick -- only to be absorbed some ten year later by Brooklyn, in 1855 (Armbruster 1942, 9). The town's charter was drawn up by S.M. Meeker, a Williamsburg lawyer and village counsellor after whom the street now subsumed by the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway was named (Armbruster 1942, 104). Other streets were also named after town notables of this period: Dr. Abraham J. Berry, the first mayor of Williamsburgh (1852-53) gave his name to Berry Street, while Driggs Avenue is named after Edmund D. Driggs, the last village president (1850-52) (Armsbruster 1942, 87, 148).

According to Prime (1845: 350) few of the houses built in the 1840s were not occupied. This is an important detail because research on the lots in the project area revealed that many of

the lots were purchased as speculations by individuals who did not live in the houses or even necessarily in Brooklyn. The question therefore arises whether the buildings may have stood empty for some time, perhaps until they could be connected to the sewer system and so fetch better rental prices. Prime (1845) and Armbruster (1942), however, make it clear that the area was developed for housing and populated well before 1859 when sewer service became available.

A further spurt of house building occurred in 1854 when a group of investors from New York City began building some one hundred houses on a tract of land that they had purchased near the Green Point Ferry in Williamsburg (Union History Co., 1899, 155). The critically important 1850 and 1858 Dripps maps show that the 1850s was a boom decade in the city's development. Concomitantly, the number of names listed in the Williamsburgh directory, which was first published in 1847, increased dramatically at that time, from 5300 in 1850 to 10,925 in 1854 (Armbruster 1942, 6). The directory listings are a good gauge of housing development, since for single-family homes -- which seem to account for almost all of the buildings in the project area -- generally one head-of-household would be listed for each dwelling. The population figures tell the same story: in 1840, when Williamsburg became a town, its population had reached 5,094; in 1851, when it was chartered as a city, the number had grown to 30,780 (Stiles 1870, 387; Armbruster 1942, 103, 109).

In view of the intensified urban development, the publishers of the city directory deemed it necessary, in 1855-56, to offer directory subscribers a "guide to the streets, avenues, lanes, courts, places &c. (Eastern district)". The guide is prefaced by a warning that highlights the rapidity with which the streetscapes were changing:

NOTE. -- The numbering of the streets &c., of the city is very incomplete and irregular, the same number, in several instances, occurring in two or more places in the same street or avenue. As a rule, the numbers run eastward and northward from the opening of the street or avenue. (Brooklyn City Directory, 1855-56)

The early 1850s produced several studies and much discussion of the district's inadequate water-supply (Jarvis and Burnett, 1852). In 1854-55, thirty-seven public cisterns located largely between North 6 and South 6 Streets may have provided water for those who resided in the

center but people living further north and east relied on their own facilities in their backyards (Brooklyn City Directory 1854-55). Five more public cisterns were built by 1857 (Brooklyn City Directory 1857-58), but in the meantime, the Nassau Water Company had been incorporated, in 1855, and in the following year, began the excavation of a reservoir in present-day Prospect Park (Stiles II: 422). In December 1858, water from the reservoir was introduced into the city mains (Manufacturers 1886, 60-61; Stiles II: 429), and correspondingly, the Brooklyn City Directory of 1859-1860 no longer list any public cisterns. Apparently, residences and business “began at once” to benefit from the new water system (Stiles II: 430)

A Board of Sewer Commissioners had been constituted in April 1857 “to devise and carry into effect a plan of drainage and sewerage for the whole city [of Brooklyn” (Stiles II: 428).¹ By the time the water system was completed, a sewer plan had been adopted and its construction, in the 1st, 3rd, 13th and 14th wards was underway (Adams 1859, 1). Indeed, the Croton Aqueduct Department noted that a “System of sewerage was adopted immediately after introduction of full supply of water,” (*Report Made to the Common Council of the City of New York, 1864*, cited in Goldman 1988, 140). The earliest preserved data in the Brooklyn Sewer Department, however, are the permits recorded in Book 4, which date from 1867. It is not known at what date Book 1 began: presumably around 1860. For those project sites whose sewer connections were recorded in books 1, 2 or 3, therefore, we can only say that they were made after 1859 and before 1867.

The 1858 Dripps map shows that by the end of that decade, the town had been built up as far as Via Vespucci (Graham Avenue) south of Ainslie Street. North of that line, in the 15th ward, there was still little or no development. The 13th and 14th wards, west of Union Avenue between Division and Grand Streets east to Union Avenue and north to approximately North 9th Street, were by and large completely built up. There were more vacant lots north of North 9th Street.

¹ The city council had actually authorized construction of sewers on main thoroughfares already in the early 1850s, but these were meant exclusively to carry storm water and were not part of an overall sewer system (Goldman 1988, 141). Some five-and-a-half miles of these storm sewers had been laid by 1857 (Union History Co. 1899, 227).

4. SOME MANUFACTURES ON THE PROJECT SITES IN THE 19th CENTURY

Manufacturing began in the project area in the 1840s but reached its full development, in a variety of industries, in the 1850s and 1860s. In 1863, by far the largest industry in Brooklyn was sugar refining. This was followed by rope and hemp making; petroleum refining, the manufacture of hats and caps, distilling spirits and brewing beer and making morocco leather (Brooklyn Standard 1928). A number of different manufactures, including several famous names, were once located on some of the project sites.

H.C.H. Havemeyer Sugar Refinery

The scion of the illustrious Havemeyer family, William, immigrated from Germany in 1799 and in the early 19th century opened a refinery in New York. He was followed in the business by his son, William F., who served three times as mayor of New York. The factory in Greenpoint was established in 1856 by William's son, John Craig. Mrs. Henry O. Havemeyer donated the collection named after her to the Metropolitan museum. Her husband was sugar baron Henry O. who, in 1887, formed an illegal trust to control the price of sugar and stave off competition (Bradley 1995, 1140). The American Sugar Refining company, the principal firm in the trust from 1891, is the firm behind Domino Sugar. Until this year it occupied the well-known factory building in Williamsburg near the Williamsburg bridge (not in the project area) but the factory was effectively closed in January when most of its labor force was laid off (Sugar 2004). Both project site 3 (lots 410, 425) and site 222 had buildings on them that belonged to the Havemeyer refinery business including a cooperage on block 2472 lot 410 that presumably made packing materials for the refinery.

Ship Building and the Continental Iron Works

Ship building began in Greenpoint ca. 1840 and was its most important industry for about the next three decades, employing some 35% of the population (Felter 1918). Indeed, Armbruster

(1942: 200) states that “Greenpoint started when John Englis of New York City established a ship yard here on the river front between Java & Kent Streets.” Englis’ shipyard, established in 1850, endured until 1911 (Felter 1918; Armbruster 1942: 40). He manufactured some of the ships that were used in the blockade of the Confederate states during the Civil War; vessels for the China trade, and passenger steamers (LPC 1982: 5).

Another important enterprise was Webb’s ship yard, established in 1850 and the only one shown on the 1852 Field map on the northern shoreline, on the point after which Greenpoint gets its name (see Section 2, above). Webb’s shipyard no longer appears on block 2510; rather, his joint venture with Bell it is now recorded sharing block 2556B, at the foot of Greenpoint Avenue and Milton Street, with John English and Sons. Project site 56 is located on this block. Webb and Bell’s claim to fame -- and the historic interest of the yard on block 2556 -- are the caissons that they built here for the Brooklyn Bridge. Englis’s yard, moreover, was the only one to remain engaged in shipbuilding until just before the First World War (Ibid.; Hyde 1912, pl. 13). Unfortunately, the site of these historic yards on block 2556B was obliterated by the construction of the Greenpoint Terminal corporation’s building, which almost completely covers the site (Part III: pl. 66)

Part of project site 62, on the southern half of block 2470, lot 1, was the site of the Continental Iron Works factory (Part III: pl. 69). In its heyday, the buildings and yards of the Continental Ironworks were spread over seven acres along the East River -- including structures on site 63, block 2571, lot 1 -- and the company employed 1400 individuals (Ibid.). Under its first owner, T.P. Rowland, this firm manufactured the hull of the iron-clad floating battery called *Monitor*, while Nezhiah Bliss, Greenpoint’s first commercial developer, built its revolving gun turret in his Novelty Iron Works (LPC 1982, 3). Engineer John Ericsson was the designer contracted by the U.S. Navy for the vessel. The *Monitor* was launched on January 30, 1862, and its engagement with the iron-clad Merrimac, in which the latter was destroyed, made history.

Following the *Monitor*’s historic victory, Rowland -- who had manufactured gun carriages and mortar beds for the navy as well as outfitting the navy’s steamers in 1861 -- received contracts for four more iron-clads (Ibid.; two more were launched in 1872). But after the Civil War the shipbuilding industry suffered a recession. Felter (1918) attributed the decline to

rising costs for copper and lumber, labor troubles and the introduction of iron vessels. A more immediate cause may have been that the ships built for use during the Civil War were no longer needed after the cessation of hostilities, and were sold at auction by the government, thereby lowering the value and the demand for the shipbuilding industry's products (LPC 1982, 5). In the later 19th century, shipbuilding all but disappeared from the Greenpoint waterfront.

In any case, Rowland's foundry had a diversified output. He not only designed and manufactured boilers, steam engines and gas holders for the oil industry, he also made "housework, pipes, bench castings, condensers, mains, purifiers, and all iron apparatus used in gas-works." (Manufacturer 1870, 106). Business must have been good, because in 1870 he was able to erect a new foundry (on the corner of Calyer and West Streets, Part III: pl. 69).

The Continental Iron Works site was recently in the news: Motiva Enterprises, a division of Shell Oil and owner of the land where the Monitor was launched, announced on December 23, 2003 that it would donate the site, consisting of one acre of land bordering the Bushwick Inlet on Calyer Street, for the Greenpoint Monitor Museum.

Lumber and Dye Wood

Beginning in the middle of the 19th century, there were a number of lumber yards in Greenpoint. Several lots on project sites especially along the river (site 3) were associated with lumber yards. One of the well-known firms of the period was Orr & Fowler & Co. on block 2538 (site 41), between India and Java Streets, on the river.

Site 3, block 2510, also on the river, was formerly occupied by the industrial plant of the New York Extract and Dye Wood Works later known as the New York and Boston Dyewood Company. This firm was reputedly the largest United States manufacturer of natural dyes made from imported Haitian logwood. Its yard was said to contain between ten and fifteen thousand tons of wood (Brooklyn Eagle 1895: 19). The raw chemical derived from logwood, haematoxylin, was a fixative that could be combined with any metallic salt (*mordant*) to produce insoluble dyes (*lakes*) of any color. In the process, the wood was first chipped and shredded into particles in machines equipped with rotary blades, then boiled in water in metal vats. With

further boiling, it could be reduced to a solid. The successful manufacture required an “immense plant”, and production of as pure an extract as possible. A second process used at this factory allowed the moistened, shredded wood to oxydize, thus producing a red color called haema-taein. The factory also produced dyes from yellow fusticwood, imported from Tampico. The author of the article in the *Brooklyn Eagle* cited here notes that this substance was widely used in France in the “manufacture and adulteration of spurious red wines”.

Porcelain

The Cartledge Porcelain factory, one of the first manufactures in Greenpoint, opened in 1848 on what is now part of site 3, on block 2494, at the corner of Eagle and West Streets. This formerly elevated area was called “pottery hill”, while the shore at its foot, now part of block 2472 lots 32 and 2, and possibly also block 2502, lot 1, was known as “pottery beach”. No doubt the land comprising the latter blocks is full of kiln wasters and other ceramic detritus, as the area’s nickname suggests. The company was founded by Charles Cartledge and Herbert Ferguson. In the beginning they produced china door furnishings and calico buttons, the latter printed, liked the popular fabric after which they were named, with dense patterns of small geometric or floral designs. Cartledge later also produced bone china and then porcelain tableware. The factory closed in 1856, after an unsuccessful reorganization under the name “American Porcelain Manufacturing Company”. “Failure was due to operating along the lines of Mediaeval times” (Felter 1918)

Morocco Dressers

In 1868, part of O’Connell’s morocco factory was located on project site 152, block 2307. In the United States, the pre-industrial methods of manufacturing leather goods, including morocco, remained unaffected by industrialization until the 1880s.² It was labor intensive and

² The industry is described in Welsh 1964, where Bishop’s text is also quoted, pp. 15-21.

required a relatively large investment of capital, as the finished hides took on average several months to produce. The manufacture needed a fairly large amount of space to accommodate the pits or vats in which the skins were soaked; the work area, where they were scraped and dressed, and the drying sheds. The process used in 1860 was described by J. Leander Bishop as follows: first the hides were soaked in a milk lime solution (later a barley solution) in a series wood or masonry vats which could be located indoors or out. This process, called raising the hides, opened the pores and loosened the hair. If lime was used, the hide needed to be soaked afterwards in a bate of pigeon, chicken, dog dung or potash or fermented bran water to remove the lime and restore the pliability of the skin. The liming process for cow, calf, horse or pig hides took approximately four months. The skins were then scraped on a wooden beam - "beaming"; after washing, they were scraped with a different knife, then washed again; the hair side was rubbed and smoothed, the skin dipped a third time, and then both sides scraped and smoothed. Finally, the leather was dyed

Morocco leather, as distinct from other leathers, was made of goat skin, which arrived dry from Switzerland, Germany, Africa, the East Indies or Asia Minor, and required more rinsing in running water. It was considered a "fancy leather", highly finished and dyed with sumach, as opposed to the oak bark used for common leather. In the dying process, the skins were sewn up into bags and partly filled with the dyestuff, then set to float in a shallow depth of dye and agitated for several hours. The bags were then stacked, to press the dye through the pores. Finally they were unstitched, rinsed, scraped, and suspended in the drying loft.

Eberhard Faber

Eberhard was the grandson of Kasper Faber, who made the first pencil in 1765. Young Eberhard immigrated to New York from Stein Germany (near Nuremberg) to represent the firm here. He opened a factory in Brooklyn in 1872 and there produced the first eraser-capped pencil. The factory occupied the entire lot (2556) between Greenpoint Avenue and Kent Street west of West Street, but there was also a plant on block 2549. The building still exists and partly overlaps project site 46.

6. LOT HISTORIES: EVALUATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL SENSITIVITY

This section presents the analysis of the data contained in Part II. The detailed information and references included in that last section constitute a record of all the resources consulted for each of the sites. In addition to forming the basis for this evaluation of the project sites' potential archaeological sensitivity, the documentation was also intended to serve as a reference for future research in these districts. The LPC's archaeologists will consult the contents of Part III in order to evaluate this assessment; it will be necessary to consult Part II in the event that archaeological testing is undertaken, and it may be relevant for future assessments in the project area or nearby. This section, however, extracts all the pertinent data and it is not strictly necessary to refer to Part II in order to understand this report's conclusions.

Site numbers in bold type indicate projected development sites; those not bolded are potential development sites.

GREENPOINT

SITE 1
Block 2472, lot 410
Pls. 3, 4, 6 (above), 7

Site 1 is located on block 2476, which is almost wholly composed of landfill (pls. 3 and 4). It has been occupied by a variety of industries, beginning with the Havemeyer sugar refinery (see section 4, above), but any industrial remains will have been obliterated by the later construction, i.e. that of the industrial building that presently occupies the site. *Site 1 is therefore not archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.*

SITE 2
Block 2472, lot 425
Pls. 3, 4, 6 (below) and 8

The 1855 Perris map (pl. 4) indicates that only a narrow triangular area at the eastern end of the

block immediately west of Commerce Street was *not* composed of landfill. Although there has been no construction on this part of the lot, there is also no evidence that there were buildings or yards here possessing subsurface features whose potential remains would be of historical significance. The lot has always been wholly occupied by industrial buildings. In the tax assessments (1866) the site's owner was listed as the Green Point Sugar Company. On the 1868 Higginson map the company name appears as the H.C.H. Havemeyer Sugar Refinery. *Site 2 is not archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.*

SITE 3

Block 2472, lots 100, 32, 2; Block 2494, lot 1; Block 2502, lot 1,
Block 2510, lot 1; Block 2520, lot 57
Pls. 9-21

Block 2472, lots 100, 32 and 2 are almost entirely composed of landfill (pls. 3, 4). They remained vacant until the late 19th century, when lot 100 began to be used as a lumber yard. The 1951 Sanborn map shows that it was also used for a time to store coal. *This part of site 3 is therefore not archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.*

Although there are no buildings recorded in the earliest tax assessments for block 2494, the first being in 1871, the 1868 Higginson map shows a frame building already standing at 235 Franklin Street, at the edge of the project site (pl. 21). The sewer connection record was not located, but water and sewer service were available in the area by this time. The rest of the block was not developed until after 1880. *This part of site 3 is therefore not archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.*

Block 2502 is largely composed of landfill (pls. 3 and 4). A triangular area approximately a third of the block on the eastern side constituted the original shoreline. In its earliest recorded period of development, shown on the 1868 Higginson's map (Pl. 20), there were only spar and lime storage sheds on the block. L. Wood owned the entire block from 1868 to 1875. No buildings are described in the tax assessments for those years. One building is shown on the 1880 Bromley map: the 150 foot wide by approximately 60 foot deep brick building of the Composite Iron Works. This stood on old lots 4 through 9, fronting on Freeman Street and beginning 175

feet from the corner of West and Freeman Streets. The building was demolished before the end of the 19th century. ***This part of site 3 is not archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

From its earliest period of development in the 1860s, Block 2510 was almost wholly occupied by the buildings of the New York Extract and Dye Wood Works (pl. 20, and see section 4, above). These structures would have destroyed any traces of backyard features that might have been associated with what seem to have been residences -- small buildings on single lots -- recorded in the earliest tax records but no longer shown on the 1868 Higginson's map. ***This part of site 3 is not archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Block 2520, lot 57 is presently largely covered by a two-story industrial building, except at the riverside. The 1868 Higginson map shows most of the block occupied by a lumber yard. There were buildings only at the block's eastern end, mostly along West Street, but any potential archaeological remains associated with these would have been destroyed by 1951 when the Lumber Exchange Terminal was built (this is the building still standing on the lot). ***This part of site 3 is not archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

SITE 4

Block 2482, lot 1

Pls. 22 (above), 23, 24

Lot 1 has remained largely vacant throughout its history until the present, except for a one-story frame building, shown as a shed on the 1912 Hyde map, that overlapped its western side. On the Higginson's map this building is colored green for hazard, suggesting that it was a storage facility or served industrial rather than residential purposes. ***Site 4 is therefore not archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

SITE 8

Block 2482, lot 39

Pls. 22 (below), 23 and 24

Lot 39 was occupied by a three-story brick building from at least 1868, probably the same building that stands on the lot today. It was connected to the sewer system in the early 1870s,

probably between 1870 and 1873. The owner, Patrick Giverin, did not reside here, and the name of the occupant at the time of the sewer connection was not traceable, because the record is missing. Because the house existed at least two years, and quite possibly longer, before the sewer connection, it was probably initially equipped with a privy, and probably also a cistern, neither of which would have been impacted by subsequent construction. ***Site 8 is therefore potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

SITE 9

Block 2483, lots 61, 62
Pls. 25 (above), 28, 30

Lot 62 was occupied by a residential building from at least 1866. It was connected to the sewer system in 1874, at which time the occupant was [first name illegible] McBride. This was probably Andrew McBride -- profession given as "railing" -- who is first listed in the Brooklyn City directories residing on Clay Street near Union Ave. (Manhattan Avenue) in 1866-67. There is no listing at this address for the property's owner, Kelly. The house must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. A one-story extension added at the rear at the turn of the 20th century may have impacted a possible cistern but otherwise, significant portions of the building's backyard were not disturbed by subsequent construction. ***This part of site 9 is therefore potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Lot 61 was occupied by a residential building from at least 1866. It was connected to the sewer system in 1874. Consequently, it must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. Extensions to the main building added over the course of the 20th century and reaching the rear lot line would have disturbed a potential privy, but left enough of the back yard undisturbed, along the west lot line, so that the privy may have survived. ***This part of site 9 is therefore also potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy.***

SITE 10

Block 2483, lots 11, 12

Pls. 25 (below), 28, 30

Lot 11 was occupied by a residential building from at least 1866. It was connected to the sewer system in 1875. The resident, grocer Daniel Sullivan, is first listed at this address in that year. No earlier resident could be traced at this address. There is no "Coyle", the owner in 1866, listed at this address between 1866 and 1875. The property must have been initially equipped with a privy and probably also a cistern. Rear wings added at the turn of the turn of the 20th century may have impacted the latter, and there were sheds at the rear of the lot, but otherwise, a significant part of the building's yard was not disturbed by subsequent construction. ***This part of site 10 is potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy.***

Lot 12 was occupied by a residential building from at least 1868, although no building is listed in the tax assessments until 1871. The building was connected to the sewer system in 1875. The resident, plasterer Hugh Burns, had lived here since 1872-73. The property must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The structure does not seem to have undergone any significant changes so that the area immediately behind it, where the cistern would have been located, would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the backyard of this lot was not disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of site 10 is therefore potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

SITE 11

Block 2483, lot 14

Pls. 26, 28, 30

Lot 14 was occupied by a two-story residential building from at least 1868, probably the one still standing on the site. It was connected to the sewer system in 1875. The resident, James McDowell, a carpenter, had moved in in 1872-73. The property must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The structure does not seem to have undergone any significant changes in its footprint so that the area immediately behind it, where the cistern would have been located, would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the backyard of this lot disturbed by

subsequent construction. *Site 11 is therefore potentially archaeologically sensitive for 19th century remains, both for a privy and a cistern.*

SITE 12

Block 2483, lot 20

Pls. 26 (below), 28 and 30

Lot 20 was occupied by a two-story residential building from at least 1866. It was connected to the sewer system in 1875. The first resident that could be traced in the directories was Margaret O'Callahan, the widow of the owner (presumably), who lived here in 1871-72. The mason Patrick Cuningham moved in in 1873-74 and is the person listed in the sewer connection records in 1875 (his name is spelled Cunningham in the 1874-75 directory). The dwelling must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The structure does not seem to have undergone any significant changes so that the area immediately behind it, where the cistern would have been located, would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the backyard of this lot disturbed by any subsequent construction. *Site 12 is therefore potentially archaeologically sensitive for 19th century remains, both for a privy and a cistern.*

SITE 13

Block 2483, lot 59

Pls. 13 (above), 28, 30

Lot 59 was occupied by a three-story residential building at the front of the lot, and a one-story building at the rear of the lot, from at least 1866. The front building is probably the one still standing on the site. The property was connected to the sewer system in 1878. The earliest known resident of 83 Clay Street, Thomas McMahon, a laborer and later a driver, lived here from 1875-76. The owner's name listed in the 1869 tax assessments was illegible and could not be traced. The property must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The structure does not seem to have undergone any significant changes so that the area immediately behind it, where the cistern would have been located, would not have been negatively impacted. The backyard of this lot was not disturbed by any subsequent construction. *Site 13 is therefore potentially*

archaeologically sensitive for 19th century remains, both for a privy and a cistern.

SITE 15

Block 2483, lot 25

Pls. 27 (below), 29, 30

Lot 25 comprehends old lots 24, 25, 26 and 27:

Old lot 24 was occupied by a residential building from ca. 1868. It was connected to the sewer system in 1875. John Kavanagh, a cooper and first owner of the property, lived here only in 1872-73. The name of the resident at the time of the sewer connection, Emmerson, could not be found in the Brooklyn Directories. The residence must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. Although the building was torn down before the end of the 19th century, it is likely that neither the subsequent construction of a narrow, one-story building along the west lot line, nor the erection of a building at the rear of the lot would have impacted either the privy, located in the yard between the front and back buildings that originally stood on the west side of the lot, or the cistern that would most likely have been located between them. *This part of lot 25 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for 19th century remains, both for a privy and a cistern.*

The first building recorded in the tax assessments on old lot 25 was in 1885. Since the lot is vacant on the Higginson's map, it probably did remain vacant at least through the 1870s. A building first appears on the 1898 Hyde map. In view of the late date of the house's construction, well after the time when water and sewer service, one might be inclined to dismiss its archaeological potential. But at least one of its neighbors (below) was not connected to the sewer system until 1923. We cannot therefore rule out the possibility that the building on old lot 25 was initially equipped with a cistern and privy, which will not have been impacted by any subsequent construction on the lot. There is no record of a sewer connection for this lot at all. *This part of lot 25 is therefore considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.*

Old lot 26 was occupied by a residential building from 1875 but was not connected to the sewer system until the early 1880s, probably between 1882 and 1885. Since the owner was the Trustees of Union College and the sewer connection record was lost, it was not possible to trace

the history of occupation, i.e. to locate the residents. The property was probably initially equipped with a cistern and privy, and the building does not seem to have undergone any significant changes so that the area immediately behind it, where the cistern would have been located, would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the potential privy in its yard impacted by subsequent construction. ***This part of lot 25 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, both for a privy and a cistern.***

Old lot 27 was occupied by a residential building from 1875 but was apparently not connected to the sewer system until 1923. Since the owner in 1875 was the Trustees of Union College and the sewer connection record is so late, it was not possible to trace the names of the earliest residents. It is likely that the property was equipped with a cistern and privy. The structure does not seem to have undergone any significant changes so that the area immediately behind it, where the cistern would have been located, would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the potential privy in its yard impacted by subsequent construction. ***This part of lot 25 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, both for a privy and a cistern.***

SITE 20
Block 2511, lot 14
Pls. 31, 32, 33

The updated 1868 Higginson map shows that lot 14 was occupied by a two-story frame building at the rear of the lot that replaced a brick building. Although the frame building does not quite run up to the rear lot line, its predecessor, which is just visible at the edge of addition, apparently did. A later building on the lot, erected before the end of the 19th century covered the entire front portion of the lot. Between the building shown on the Higginson map and the later dwelling, the lot area was completely covered, thus disturbing or destroying any potential backyard features associated with the lot's earliest period of occupation. At present the lot is completely covered by a one-story garage that was built in 1987 and is shown on the 2000 Sanborn map. ***Site 20 is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

SITE 22

Block 2512, lot 60

Pls. 34 (above), 35, 36

This is a conversion site only: potential archaeological remains will not be impacted.

SITE 23

Block 2512, lot 54

Pls. 34 (below), 35, 36

Lot 54 was occupied by a residential building from at least 1866. It was connected to the sewer system in 1888. The first owner, machinist J.W. Alexander, lived here from 1866-67 to 1868-69. Consequently, the building must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The present, three-story building on the front of the lot may date to the 'teens or twenties and have replaced the earlier two story dwelling, thus possibly disturbing a potential cistern, which would have been located at the rear of the earlier structure. The backyard area, however, has remained substantially undisturbed by subsequent construction. *The site is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy.*

SITE 25

Block 2521, lot 1

Pls. 37 (above), 39 and 40

Lot 1, comprising addresses 160-164 West Street, is completely covered by a one-story building which eliminates this site from consideration for archaeological sensitivity since its construction would have destroyed or disturbed any potential archaeological remains on the site. *Site 25 is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.*

SITE 26

Block 2521, lots 5, 6, 7

Pls. 37 (below), 39, 40

Lot 5, now vacant, was occupied by two buildings, one on the front, the other on the rear

of the lot, from at least 1866. The owner, Weeks, named in the first tax assessment, was not listed at this address in the city directories of the late 1860s. The property was connected to the sewer system in 1868. Consequently, the lot may have been equipped with a cistern and privy. No substantial changes were made in the rear of the front building, nor has the former yard, between the two buildings, been impacted by subsequent construction. ***This part of site 26 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Lot 6, now vacant, was occupied by a dwelling from at least 1866. The owner's name listed in the tax assessments is unclear: it may be the same as the one in the tap records. Neither was traceable in the city directories. The property was connected to the sewer system in 1868. Consequently, the lot may have been equipped with a cistern and privy. No substantial changes were made in the rear of the former building, nor has its yard been impacted by subsequent construction. ***This part of site 26 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Lot 7, now vacant, was occupied by a dwelling from at least 1866. The property was connected to the sewer system in 1868. Neither the name of the first owner nor that listed in the tap records could be traced in the city directories and so the history of the building's occupation could not be traced. It may, however, have been equipped with a cistern and privy. No substantial changes were made in the rear of the former building, nor has its yard been impacted by subsequent construction. ***This part of site 26 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

SITE 27
Block 2521, lot 11
Pls. 38 (above), 39, 40

Lot 11 was occupied by a residential building from at least 1866. It was connected to the sewer system ca. 1872. The owner, Edward C. Smith, was a boxmaker who had his shop on Freeman Street near Franklin Street and lived on Freeman Street near Union Avenue. He did not reside here, and the name of the resident at the time of the sewer connection is unknown.

Consequently, it was not possible to trace the history of the building's occupation. It is probable, however, that the property was initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The structure does not seem to have undergone any significant changes so that the area immediately behind it, where the cistern would have been located, would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the backyard of this lot disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***Site 27 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, both for a privy and a cistern.***

SITE 29

Block 2521, lots 19
Pls. 38 (below), 39, 40

This is a reactivation site only: potential archaeological remains will not be impacted.

SITE 30

Block 2522, lot 10
Pls. 41 (above), 42, 43

Lot 10, which comprehends old lots 9 and 10, is covered by a recently erected garage not shown on the 2000 Sanborn map. Any still vacant portions of the lot behind this structure have nevertheless been disturbed by construction in the past.

Old lot 9 may have been occupied by a residential building in the 1860s: the Higginson's map was updated for this address (100 Green Street) to show a vacant lot. The tax assessments name an owner for the property in 1866, but do not include a description of any structure prior to 1871. The building was connected to the sewer system in 1868. Taken together the evidence indicates that a dwelling was erected on the lot ca. 1866-68. Since it was connected to the sewer system more or less at the time of its construction, it was probably not initially equipped with a privy or cistern. In any case, any potential remains would have been impacted with the construction, by the end of the 19th century, of a frame building that completely covered the lot, and the lot is today occupied by an industrial building.. ***This part of site 30 is therefore not considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for 19th century remains.***

Old lot 10 may have been occupied by a residential building in the 1860s: the

Higginson's map was updated for this address (102 Green Street) to show a vacant lot. The tax assessments name an owner for the property in 1866 but do not include a description of any structure in the late 1860s. Yet a building on this lot was connected to the sewer system in 1868. This evidence indicates that there must have been a dwelling here in 1860s and the early residents must have equipped themselves initially with a cistern and privy. Subsequent construction episodes in the 20th century however, in which the lot was completely covered by industrial buildings, will have disturbed or destroyed any potential backyard features. ***This part of site 30 is therefore not considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for 19th century remains.***

SITE 34

Block 2530, lots 1, 55, 56

Pls. 41 (below), 42, 43

Lots 1, 55 and 56 are presently occupied by an industrial building that covers all but a small triangular area at the riverside. This building will have disturbed or destroyed any potential backyard features associated with the residences shown on the 1868 Higginson's map only at the eastern end of the block. The western two-thirds of this block, approximately, is composed of landfill, and the southwestern quarter was still not filled by 1868, since it is shown as a basin on the Higginson's map. Roughly the northwest two-thirds of the block was used at that time as a featureless lumber yard. ***Site 34 is not considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for 19th century remains.***

SITE 35

Block 2531, lots 1, 2, 3

Pls. 35 (above), 48, 49

Lot 1 was occupied by two dwellings, one on the front, the other on the rear of the lot, from at least 1868. The property was connected to the sewer system in the late 1860s, possibly ca. 1869. The first owner either did not live at this address or the name was incorrectly copied, and the resident at the time of the sewer connection is unknown. Consequently, it was not

possible to trace the history of the building's occupation. It is possible, however, that the property was initially equipped with a cistern or privy. The two-story building on the front of the lot seems to have been replaced by a three-story building at the turn of the 20th century, thus disturbing any potential cistern associated with the older building and leaving a considerably narrower part of the yard undisturbed by subsequent construction. ***This part of site 35 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy.***

Lot 2 was occupied by a residential building from at least 1866. It was connected to the sewer system in 1872. The owner listed in 1866, Gallagher, was also the resident in 1872 (presumably: the first name or initial was illegible in both cases), but this name is not listed at this address in the directories of the late 1860s to mid 1870s. It was therefore not possible to verify that the building was actually occupied before it was connected to the sewer system. But the property probably was initially equipped with a cistern and privy. In the later 20th century, however, a one-story office building was constructed on approximately the front two-thirds of the site along the south lot line, leaving only a passage on the north side of the building. Unless the cistern was located at the north end of the old dwelling, the office may well have disturbed or destroyed it. The rear third of the lot, however, has not been impacted by subsequent construction episodes. ***This part of site 35 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and possibly a cistern.***

The first building listed in the tax assessments for Lot 3, possibly the one still occupying this lot, was a 25 X 35 ft, residence enumerated in 1871. This may have been the first dwelling on the lot, since the Higginson's map shows it as an update, i.e. post-1868. It was connected to the sewer system in 1872. It was therefore probably not initially equipped with a cistern or privy. The owner of the first building on the lot in 1871-72, Copeland, is not listed at this address in the directories. Nor is the resident at the time of the sewer connection, Maloney. It was therefore not possible to verify that the building was actually occupied before it was connected to the sewer system. ***This part of site 34 is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

SITE 36

Block 2531, lots 9, 10

Pls. 46 (above)

The first tax assessment for a building on lot 9, a three-story residence, dates 1869-70. This probably was the first building on the lot, because the Higginson map shows it as an update, i.e. post-1868. The property was connected to the sewer system at approximately the same date, apparently shortly after its construction. Consequently, it probably was not initially equipped with a cistern or privy. ***This part of site 36 is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Lot 10 was occupied by a three-story residential building from 1869, according to the tax assessments, and probably not earlier, since the Higginson's map was updated for this lot. It was connected to the sewer system in the same year. Consequently, this building was probably not initially equipped with a cistern or privy. ***This part of site 36 is therefore not considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for 19th century remains.***

SITE 38

Block 2531, lots 36, 35

Pls. 47 (above), 48 and 49

Lot 36 was occupied by a residential building from at least 1866. It was connected to the sewer system in 1874. The resident at the time of the sewer connection, Conrad Smith -- listed first as a cabinet maker, later as a "mechanic"-- had moved in in 1870-71. Consequently, the dwelling must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The structure does not seem to have undergone any significant changes, so that the area immediately behind it, where the cistern would have been located, would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the backyard of this lot disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of site 38 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Lot 35 was occupied by a residential building from at least 1866. It was connected to the sewer system in 1868. The owner, Brinkerhoff, was also listed in the tap records. The first resident traced in the Brooklyn Directories, however, was Hanna Brinckerhoff, on India near

West Street, in 1870-71. The evidence does not allow us to rule out the possibility that the property may have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The structure does not seem to have undergone any significant changes, so that the area immediately behind it, where the cistern would have been located, would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the backyard of this lot disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of site 38 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

SITE 39

Block 2531, lot 20

Pls. 47 (below), 48, 49

Lot 20 comprehends old lots 13 and 14:

Old lot 13 was occupied by a residential building from at least 1866. It was connected to the sewer system in 1872. Consequently, the dwelling must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. But the only areas on the lot where these installations could have been located was covered by buildings erected at the turn of the 20th century. These would have disturbed or destroyed any potential backyard features. ***This part of lot 20 is therefore not considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Old lot 14 was occupied by a residential building from at least 1866, but there is no record of a sewer connection before 1902. Consequently, the dwelling must have been equipped with a cistern and privy. The rear portion of the building seems to have undergone some modifications that could have negatively impacted a possible cistern, but the backyard of this old lot was not disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of lot 20, beginning 25 feet south of Huron Street and approximately 50 ft. west of Franklin Street, is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Old lot 40 was occupied by a three-story building from at least 1868 and was probably initially equipped with a cistern and privy. Neither the building nor its rear yard were impacted by subsequent construction. ***This part of lot 20 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

SITE 40
Block 2532, lot 1
Pls. 50 and 51

Lot 1 is presently covered by a one-story garage that was erected in 1949. *Site 40 is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.*

SITE 41
Block 2538, lot 1
Pls. 52 and 53

Lot 1 is presently covered by industrial buildings erected in 1953. In the 19th century it was occupied by lumber yards, and planing and box factories. *Site 40 is not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.*

SITE 42
Block 2539, lot 8
Pls. 54 (above), 55 and 56

Lot 8 was occupied by a residential building from at least 1866. It was connected to the sewer system in 1870. Charles Etheridge, a book keeper, later the owner of a stationery store on Franklin Street, resided at this address from 1866-67 to 1870. Consequently, the dwelling must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The building, apparently the one still standing on the lot, does not seem to have undergone any significant changes, so that the area immediately behind it, where the cistern would have been located, would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the backyard of this lot disturbed by any subsequent construction. *Site 42 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.*

SITE 43

Block 2539, lot 29

Pls. 54 (below), 55 and 56

Lot 29 was occupied by a residential building from at least 1866. The owner, the widow Margaret Navarro, lived nearby at 40 Java Street. It was not possible to trace the early occupants of the building on this lot, but the property was not connected to the sewer system until after ca. 1878. Consequently, it must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. It is uncertain whether the structure shown on the Higginson's map is the same as the one recorded on the 1898 Hyde since the latter -- apparently the building still standing on the lot -- is set back from the lot line and extends further towards the rear of the lot. The rear extension or new construction could have negatively impacted the cistern, which would have been located close to the rear of the building. The backyard, however, has not been disturbed by any subsequent construction. *Site 43 is therefore potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and possibly also a cistern.*

SITE 44

Block 2543, lot 1

Pls. 57 and 58

Lot 1 is presently covered by industrial buildings of the Vanguard Business Furniture Corp. In the 19th century it was occupied by a lumber yard, and a few frame buildings, including sheds, a stable and an office; in the southwestern corner of the lot was William Smith & Cos. Eagle Steam Saw Mill. *Site 44 is not archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.*

SITE 46

Block 2549, lot 10

Pls. 59, 60, 61

Lot 10 comprehends old lots 9 through 12:

It appears that all four lots were developed by individuals who lived in the next block and moved into their new residences after they were connected to the sewer system. We can not

prove that they rented out their properties before they were connected to the sewer system, but it is likely.

Old lot 9, at 60 Java Street, was occupied by a residential building from at least 1866. It was connected to the sewer system (same owner) in 1869. The owner, however, engineer Michael Smith, did not take up residence here until 1871-72. In the 1870-71 directory, he is listed at 33 Java Street. The earlier residents could not be traced. The dwelling must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. Most of the lot, save for an approximately 16 foot deep rear yard, is covered by a three-story loft that was built in 1929, when it was part of the Eberhard Faber Co.'s factory. This would have destroyed a potential cistern, but a privy might still be found in the undisturbed rear portion. ***This part of site 46 is therefore considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy.***

Old lot 10, formerly 62 Java Street, was occupied by a residential building from at least 1866. It was connected to the sewer system in 1869 by the same owner, John Bassett. A brass finisher, Bassett resided at 35 Java Street from 1866-67 until 1871-72, when he moved into his new home. The dwelling was probably initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The eastern side of the lot is partly covered by the F.P. Construction building (above), which would have impacted a potential cistern. ***This part of site 46 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy.***

Old lot 11, formerly 64 Java Street, was occupied by a residential building from at least 1866. It was connected to the sewer system (same owner) in 1870. Like his neighbors, the owner of this lot, William M. Lowry, resided a block away at 37 Java Street until 1870-71, moving into his new home on this lot in 1871-72. The dwelling was probably initially equipped with a cistern and privy. Neither the back of the building nor its yard was impacted by subsequent construction. ***This part of site 46 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Old lot 12, formerly 66 Java Street, was occupied by a residential building from at least 1866. It was connected to the sewer system, by the same owner, in 1869. The history of occupation of this lot follows that of its neighbors. Owner Isaac W. Angell, a patternmaker, lived at 39 Java Street until 1870-71, moving into his new home the following year, in 1871-72. The

dwelling was probably initially equipped with a cistern and privy. Neither the back of the building nor its yard was impacted by subsequent construction. *This part of site 46 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.*

SITE 52

Block 2556, lots 55, 57

Pls. 62, 63, 64

Lot 55 comprehends old lots 25 and 26:

Old lot 25, 35 Greenpoint Avenue, is completely covered by a three- and two-story wings of a building, possibly the same as that shown on the 1868 Higginson's map. *This part of site 52 is therefore not archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.*

Old lot 26, 33 Greenpoint Avenue, was occupied by a residential building from at least 1866, when there was a three-story brick building on the front of the lot and a one-story frame shed at the rear of the lot. This building was connected to the sewer system in 1872. But by 1898, the rear portion of the lot was completely covered by a frame extension that would have destroyed any potential backyard features *This part of site 52 is therefore not archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.*

Lot 57, according to the tax assessments, was occupied in 1866 by sheds, and by at least 1871 by a shop belonging to William Smith. He also owned a sawmill at the corner of Kent and West Streets (1866-72), but he lived in New York City, on St. Mark's Place. The Higginson's map, which was updated probably during the 1870s, shows the lot as vacant. In 1880, it was occupied by a frame building, but by 1912, it was again vacant. There is no record of a sewer connection for this lot, which may be explained by the earliest building's commercial rather than residential use. The back of the lot has not been impacted by subsequent building episodes during the 20th century, however, and the possibility that the earliest period of the site's use included a privy and cistern can not be ruled out. *This part of site 52 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.*

SITE 56

Block 2556B, lot 1

Pls. 65 and 66

Lot 1 is currently covered by the Greenpoint Terminal Corporation building, built between 1912 and 1929. On the 1868 Higginson's map, the historic Webb & Bells Ship Yard is shown on the western half of the lot, while the updated eastern half of the lot was shown to be occupied by English (*sic*) and Sons Ship Yard (see section 4, above). *Site 56 is not archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.*

SITE 62

Block 2570, lot 1

Pls. 67, 68, 69

Lot 1 was occupied by industrial buildings from the 1870s on, most importantly the historic Continental Iron Works buildings on Calyer and on Quay Streets (see section 4, above). There is no record of any sewer connections prior to the 20th century, and then only on West Street. The buildings of the Continental Iron Works were located along Calyer Street, which formerly bisected this block, and included the site of the foundry at the corner of Calyer and West Streets. These were largely covered by the Consolidated Freightways building. Although mostly undisturbed by subsequent construction episodes, the site of the Continental Iron Work's frame and brick buildings along Quay Street, marked "Bonding and Shaping", "Smithy", "Erecting shop" and "Fitting Shop", would not yield significant archaeological remains because the processes connected with these phases of manufacture did not involve the use of subsurface installations that might have survived the demolition of the above-ground structures. Nor is there any evidence that any of these buildings possessed basements. Although the site is certainly of historic interest, it is unlikely to yield archaeological remains that could help to shed further light on the history of the Continental Iron Works. *Site 62 is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.*

SITE 63

Block 2571, lots 1, 9

Pls. 70, 71, 72

Lot 1 comprehends old lots 36 and 1 through 8:

Old lot 36, corresponding to 69 Calyer Street is covered by an industrial building that was erected in 1972. ***This part of lot 1 is therefore not archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Old lots 1-5, corresponding to 26-34 West Street, are covered by an industrial building that was erected in 1972. ***This part of lot 1 is therefore not archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Old lot 6, corresponding to 36 West Street, was occupied by industrial buildings from its earliest period of occupation. At that time, part of the three-story pattern storage building (probably belonging to William's Ship jobbing Yard across the street) stood on the front of the lot. Behind it was a two-story wing and at the rear, a one-story stable. These three wings covered almost the entire lot area, leaving only a narrow strip on the south side of the stable, and an even narrower alley at the rear of the lot. By the turn of the 20th century, these buildings had become part of the Continental Iron Works' facilities (see above, section 4). There is little or no yard area where a privy or a cistern might be located, and the location for either of these immediately in front of the stables, is not a likely one. There is also no evidence from the maps that the frame buildings that stood here had basements that might contain industrial installations of historic significance. ***This part of lot 1 is therefore not considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Old lot 7, corresponding to 38 West Street, was occupied by a residential building from 1868, but there is no record of a sewer connection prior to the end of the 19th or early 20th century. There were no listings at this address for the lot's first owner, Robert Smith, and therefore it was not possible to verify when the building was first inhabited. But it must have been equipped with a cistern and privy. The building was demolished at the turn of the 20th century, and the lot has not been disturbed by subsequent construction episodes. ***This part of lot 1 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for prehistoric remains.***

Old lot 8, corresponding to 40 West Street, was occupied by a residential building from at least 1866, but it was not connected to the sewer system until 1894. The first owner, book keeper Jeremiah Terry, did not reside at this address and since the tap record is illegible, it is not possible to trace the history of the building's occupation. However, it must have been equipped with a cistern and privy. The building was demolished at the turn of the 20th century, and the lot has not been disturbed by subsequent construction episodes. ***This part of lot 1 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Lot 9, 64 Oak Street, is covered by a one-story factory that was built between ca. 1929 and 1951. ***This part of lot 1 is therefore not archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

SITE 68
Block 2590, lot 210
Pls. 73, 74 and 75

Lot 210 comprehends old lots 11 and 12:

Old lot 11, corresponding to 102 Quay Street, during the late 1860s was the property of Thomas Rowland, owner of the Continental Iron Works. But it is unclear what kind of building stood on the lot, if any, before the two-story frame building shown on the updated Higginson's map (i.e. 1870s). The building was connected to the sewer system in 1869. It is unclear whether the building would have initially been equipped with a privy and cistern. By the end of the 20th century, however, it was replaced by two buildings fronting on Franklin Street, that completely covered the lot area and would have disturbed or destroyed any backyard installations connected with the earlier building. ***This part of lot 210 is therefore not archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Old lot 12, corresponding to 27-31 Franklin Street, seems to have remained vacant, or largely vacant, until the present day. Currently, it is partly occupied, at the rear of the lot, by one-story buildings connected with a filling station. There is no record of 19th century buildings or sewer connections on the lot. ***This part of lot 210 is therefore not archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

SITE 211

BLOCK 2590, lot 100

Pls. 73, 74 and 75

With the exception of one or two small industrial buildings near Franklin Street shown on the 1929 Hyde map, this vacant, marshy area bordering Bushwick Creek has never been built upon. **It is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.**

SITE 93

Block 2724, lots 31, 30

Pls. 76 (above), 77, 78

Lot 31 comprehends old lots 19 and 20. The earliest tax assessments, of 1866, list a three-story building on each of the lots, while the Higginson map shows a two-story dwelling. The reason for this discrepancy was not discovered.

Old lot 19 was occupied by a residential building from at least 1866/68, but was not connected to the sewer system until 1889. The first owner, W. Peterson, a tailor, is listed at 17 Meeker Avenue in the 1870-71 directories (the only time he is listed). The name of the individual who resided here at the time the sewer was connected, is illegible. Consequently, it was not possible to trace the history of the buildings' occupation. The building was no doubt equipped with a cistern and privy. At the turn of the 20th century, it was enlarged at the rear, which would have negatively impacted the potential cistern that was presumably located immediately behind the earlier building. A portion of the yard, however, was not disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of lot 31 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy.***

Old lot 20 was occupied by a building from at least 1866/68 but it was not connected to the sewer system until 1881. Consequently, it must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The footprint of this building seems to have remained substantially unchanged, although the construction of the "club house", shown on the 2000 Sanborn map, may have disturbed or destroyed the cistern, if it was located immediately behind the old building. Portions of the rear yard of the 19th century, however, were not disturbed by the building of sheds or other

subsequent construction episodes. ***This part of lot 31 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy.***

Lot 30 was occupied by a residential building from at least 1866, but it was not connected to the sewer system until after ca. 1882. The same discrepancy between the tax assessments and the Higginson's map was found here. But the building that certainly existed on this lot in the 1860s and 70s -- probably the one still standing on the lot -- must have been equipped with a cistern and privy. It does not seem to have undergone any significant changes, so that the area immediately behind it, where the cistern would have been located would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the backyard of this lot disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of site 93 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy.***

SITE 103
Block 2292, lot 11
Pls. 76 (below), 79, 80

Lot 11 was occupied by a small, one-story frame building in ca. 1875 (first listed in the tax assessments of that year and also shown on the updated Higginson's map, providing a *terminus post quem* for the map's updates). The property was connected to the sewer system in 1892. Although a larger building was erected on the front of the site in the second or third decade of the 20th century, along with a one-story frame building at the rear of the lot, most of the large yard connected with the earlier dwelling was not disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***Site 103 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy.***

SITE 106
Block 2722, lot 36
Pls. 81 and 82

Lot 36 was not developed for housing until after 1880. The lot is still depicted as vacant on the 1880 Bromley map. And although the sewer connection dates to 1891, the 1898 Hyde map

also does not show a building on this lot. It may have been torn down again by this time. Neither the names listed in the tax assessments or in the tap record were traceable in the directories. We can not exclude the possibility that the building was initially equipped with a cistern and privy. *Site 106 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and cistern.*

SITE 131
Block 2731, lot 44
Pls. 83 (above), 85, 86

Lot 44 was occupied by a residential building from at least 1868, although this earliest building may have been just a shed. The first building in the tax assessments dates to 1876. The property was connected to the sewer system after ca. 1882. The first owner, Reynolds, did not reside at this address and the tap record is lost, so the building's occupational history was not traceable. But it was no doubt initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The structure does not seem to have undergone any significant changes, so that the area immediately behind it, where the potential cistern would have been located, would not have been negatively impacted, nor was the backyard of this lot disturbed by any subsequent construction. *Site 131 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.*

SITE 132
Block 2731, lots 41, 38
Pls. 83 (below), 85, 86

Lot 41 comprehends old lots 18, 17 and 16:

Old lot 18 was occupied by a residential building from at least 1872, but not connected to the sewer system until after ca. 1882. The first owner, Reynolds, did not reside at this address and the tap record is lost, so it was not possible to trace the building's occupational history. But it must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The structure does not seem to have undergone any significant changes, so that the area immediately behind it, where the cistern would have been located, would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the backyard of this

lot disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of Site 132 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Old lot 17 was occupied by a residential building from at least 1872, but not connected to the sewer system until after ca. 1882. The first owner, Reynolds, did not reside at this address and the tap record is lost, so it was not possible to trace the building's occupational history. But it must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The original building was demolished or destroyed probably in the 1880s. The lot remained vacant for some years at the end of the 19th to early 20th century until a one-story frame building was erected on its north side. By mid-century, a small brick building was added at the front of the lot. These construction episodes may have negatively impacted the cistern that would have been located immediately behind the original dwelling, but portions of the yard area have remained undisturbed. ***This part of Site 132 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy.***

Old lot 16 was a vacant area at the rear of lot 41. It was occupied by a building from at least 1872, but not connected to the sewer system until after ca. 1882. The first owner, Reynolds, did not reside at this address and the tap record is lost, so it was not possible to trace the building's occupational history. But it must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. It is uncertain which building the tax and sewer records relate to as the maps, prior to the 1929 Hyde, show the lot as vacant. It is possible that they relate to the property on old lot 17, which had the same owner. In any case the rear portion of this area has not been disturbed by any subsequent building episodes. ***This part of Site 132 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy.***

Lot 38 was occupied by a shop from at least 1866, but it was not connected to the sewer system until 1902. The name of the owner in 1866 was not found in the directories and it was therefore not possible to determine the type of business. The property may well have been equipped with a privy and cistern. The structure did not undergo any significant changes, so that the area immediately behind it, where the cistern would have been located, would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the backyard of this lot disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***Lot 38 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

SITE 133

Block 2731, lots 36, 35

Pls. 84, 85, 86

Lot 36 was occupied by a residential building from at least 1866, but not connected to the sewer system until 1891. The first owner, Thomas Sullivan, a tailor, lived next door at 29 Frost Street with J. Sullivan, another tailor (his brother?) from 1870-71. Because they did not reside in the building on lot 36, the early history of its occupation could not be traced. It is likely, however, in view of the temporal gap between the listing of the first building and the sewer connection, that the property was equipped with a cistern and privy. The structure does not seem to have undergone any significant changes, so that the area immediately behind it, where the cistern would have been located, would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the backyard of this lot disturbed by any subsequent construction, except for a narrow frame building along the east lot line. ***Lot 36 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Lot 35 was occupied by a residential building from at least 1866, but not connected to the sewer system until 1889. Consequently, it must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. (Neither the name of the first owner, nor that listed in the tap records, could be traced in the city directories). The building was replaced by a three-story structure at the turn of the 20th century, so that the area immediately behind it, where the cistern would have been located, may have been negatively impacted. A significant portion of the backyard in the center of this lot, however, was not disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***Lot 35 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy.***

SITE 134

Block 2732, lot 33

Pls. 87, 88, 89

Lot 33 comprehends old lots 18 and 17:

Old lot 18 must have been occupied by a building from the mid- to late 1880s, since it was connected to the sewer system in 1888, but we have no maps for the years between 1880 and

1898, and by the latter date, the Hyde map only records a small frame shed near the front of the lot. According to the tax assessments, the first building was a "new shed" in 1888. The 1951 Sanborn records an industrial building covering the rear half of the lot; the 2000 Sanborn shows a one-story building set back from the lot line and today the front part of the lot is occupied by a garage, all of which would have negatively impacted any potential archaeological remains. ***This part of Site 134 is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive.***

Old lot 17, like its neighbor on old lot 18, must have been occupied by a building from the mid- to late 1880s, since it was connected to the sewer system in 1888, but we have no maps for the years between 1880 and 1898, and by the latter date, the Hyde map only records a small frame building at the front of the lot. By the turn of the 20th century, a one-story frame building was erected that covered eastern half of the lot, leaving a small yard between the now brick-clad frame building on the front of the lot but this would have been disturbed by the construction of the industrial building shown on the rear half of the lot on the 1951 Sanborn map, or by the one-story garage currently standing on the lot. ***This part of Site 134 is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

SITE 137
Block 2733, lot 6
Pls. 90, 91, 92

Lot 6 was occupied by a residential building from at least 1869, but not connected to the sewer system until 1889. Consequently, it must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. (Neither the name of the first owner, nor that listed in the tap records, could be traced in the city directories). The building does not seem to have undergone any significant changes, in spite of small differences in the maps -- so that the area immediately behind it, where the cistern would have been located, would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the backyard of this lot disturbed by any subsequent construction ***Site 137 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a cistern and a privy.***

SITE 138
Block 2734, lot 3
Pls. 93 (above), 94, 95

Lot 3 was occupied by a residential building from at least 1872. It was connected to the sewer system in 1876. Consequently, it must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. (The name of the first owner, also that listed in the tap records, could be traced in the city directories). By 1898, additional structures were added, leaving a yard about 12 ft. wide by 20 ft. deep in the center-south side of the lot. While the cistern behind the original building may have been negatively impacted by the construction of the additional wings at the rear, the above-described backyard area was not disturbed by subsequent construction *Site 138 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy.*

SITE 139
Block 2734, lot 13
Pls. 93 (below), 94, 95

This is a reactivation only: potential archaeological remains will not be impacted.

SITE 141
Block 2304, lots 36, 37
Pls. 96, 97

No new development is planned for these lots: potential archaeological remains will not be impacted.

SITE 144
Block 2305, lots 15, 16, 17
Pls. 98 (above), 99, 100

Lot 15 was occupied by a residential building from at least 1868, but not connected to the sewer system until 1879. Consequently, it must have been initially equipped with a cistern and

privy. By 1929, however, the frame building was extended over the entire lot area and this would have disturbed or destroyed any potential archaeological resources. ***Lot 15 is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Lot 16 was occupied by a residential building from at least 1868, but not connected to the sewer system until 1889. Consequently, it must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The original building was replaced by a larger one before the end of the 19th century, and a shed was built in the rear of the yard by 1912. These activities would have disturbed or destroyed a potential privy or cistern located in the yard. ***Lot 16 is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Lot 17 was occupied by a residential building from at least 1878, but not connected to the sewer system until 1886. The first owners listed in the tax assessments, as well as named in the tap records, were the Briggs brothers, who had a cooperage on this block. The address of the cooperage was not given, and John Briggs later took up residence at 176 North 10th (1880-81). Consequently, it was not possible to trace the history of the building's occupation. It is probable, however, that it was initially equipped with a cistern and privy. Except for a series of one-story frame buildings at the rear of the lot, the property has remained largely vacant. ***Lot 17 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

SITE 145

Block 2305, lot 18
Pls. 98 (below), 99, 100

This is a conversion site only: potential archaeological remains will not be impacted.

SITE 149

Block 2307, lot 31
Pls. 101 (above), 102, 103

Lot 31 comprehends old lots 47 and 46:

Old lot 47 was occupied by a factory building from at least 1868. The first owner, a

manufacturer of varnishes called Booden & Son (see section 4, above) was listed on North 9th Street near 7th in the 1870-71 city directory. But before 1882-83, the factory occupied only 243 and 245 North 9th Street. The new address, 243 to 251 North 9th Street, first appears in the 1882-83 city directory. The property on lot 31 (249 North 9th Street) was connected to the sewer system in 1887. It may have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy, but whatever the case, by the end of the 19th century, frame buildings were built over the entire lot, and although these back wings were demolished before 1912, the 1951 Sanborn map shows that a new, brick building had been erected that once again completely covered the lot area. ***This part of lot 31 is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Old lot 46 was occupied, from at least 1870, by a one-story building, apparently a shed, that also belonged to Booden, and is first listed in 1882-83 as part of the varnish manufacturer's plant. It was connected to the sewer system in 1887. The front half of the lot has never been built upon and may have contained a privy or a cistern. ***This part of lot 31 is therefore considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy or a cistern.***

SITE 152

Block 2307, lot 25

Pls. 101 (below), 102, 103

Lot 152 was occupied by a two-story building from ca. 1868 that was probably the home of Christopher O'Connell, the owner, although no street address is given for him in that year in the city directory. The Higginson's map shows only a one-story building at the rear of the lot that was part of O'Connell's morocco factory (see section 4, above). The first listing for the manufacture on 9th Street is 1866-67. In 1880, lot 25 was vacant. Since the property was not connected to the sewer system until 1900, the building listed in the tax assessments was probably equipped with a privy and a cistern. The processing of the hides especially required a great deal of water, so that at least one cistern should have been installed on the property. At the turn of the century, a large, three-story brick building was erected on the front of the lot, along with a second back building. But part of the rear yard belonging to the earliest period of occupation was not disturbed by subsequent construction. ***Site 152 is therefore considered potentially***

archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.

SITE 159

Block 2738, lot 24

Pls. 104 (above), 105, 106

Lot 24 was occupied by three buildings from at least 1868, but not connected to the sewer system until ca. 1885. Consequently, it must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. But by the end of the 19th century, additional wings had been added so that the lot was almost completely covered, except for a narrow space on the south side of the main building. These structures would have disturbed or destroyed any potential backyard installations. *Site 159 is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.*

SITE 162

Block 2310, lots 9, 10 and 11

Pls. 104 (below), 107, 108

Lot 9 was occupied by a two-story building from at least 1868, but not connected to the sewer system until ca. 1873. Frederick Niemann, a mason and one of the owners named in the 1868 tax assessments is listed on North 9th Street at the corner of 3rd (Berry Street), but this does not correspond to lot 9. None of the names associated with the tax assessments or the tap records could be traced in the directories and so we are unable to trace the building's occupational history. But it was probably initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The structure did not undergo any significant changes so that the area immediately behind it, where the cistern would have been located, would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the backyard of this lot disturbed by any subsequent construction. *This part of site 162 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.*

Lot 10 was occupied by a brick building from at least 1868, but not connected to the sewer system until ca. 1873. (It is not known why the height recorded in the tax assessment is not the same as that shown on the Higginson map). The first owner did not reside at this address and the tap record has been lost, so we are unable to trace the building's history of occupation. But it

was probably initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The 1951 Sanborn map shows that the structure acquired a rear wing, and this could have negatively impacted a potential cistern located immediately behind the building. Most of the original yard area, however was not disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of site 162 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Lot 11 was occupied by a brick dwelling from at least 1868. It was connected to the sewer system in 1870. The first resident listed is Nicholas Baker, a watchman, who moved in in 1869-70 and is also named in the tap records. The property may well have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy, although no occupant prior to Baker could be traced. ***This part of site 162 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for 19th century remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

SITE 166
Block 2313, lot 22
Pls. 109 (above), 110, 111

Lot 22 was occupied by a dwelling from at least 1868, which was connected by the owner to the sewer system in 1869. Unfortunately, it was not possible to trace his name in the city directories and so verify whether the building was standing and occupied prior to 1868. The 13th ward was nearly all built up by ca. 1861, so we can not rule out the possibility that it was, and that in that case, it would have been equipped with a cistern and privy. ***Site 166 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

SITE 169
Block 2313, lot 28
Pls. 109 (bottom), 110, 111

Lot 28 was occupied by a one-story building in 1868, but the updated Higginson map shows that it had been demolished by the 1870s. The rear of the lot was now occupied by a two-story wing of a brick building on North 9th Street. The lot was connected to the sewer system ca. 1870, or in the early 1870s. Consequently, the earlier building, if it was a dwelling, could have

been equipped with a cistern and privy, but these would most probably have been located behind the building, which would have stood on or near the curb, like its neighbors, rather than in front of the house, on the street. Since the back of the half of the lot was disturbed by the construction of the above-mentioned brick building, any remains in a back yard area would have been destroyed. *Site 169 is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for 19th century remains.*

SITE 174

Block 2741, lot 8
Pls. 112, 114, 115

Lot 8 was occupied by a dwelling from at least 1869 and probably connected to the sewer system in the same year. The 1858 Dripps map shows that the lot had not yet been developed. The three-story frame building shown on the updated Higginson map is probably this building, and given that all the other lots on Union Avenue save this one and its neighbor are still vacant, it is reasonable to assume that the building shown on the map was the first on the lot and that it was connected to the sewer system more or less immediately after it was completed. Consequently, it was probably not initially equipped with a cistern and privy. *Site 174 is therefore not considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for 19th century remains, for a privy and a cistern.*

SITE 176

Block 2741, lot 13
Pls. 113, 114, 115

Lot 13 comprehends old lots 34, 50 and 51:

Lot 34 was occupied by a two-story dwelling from at least 1866 and connected to the sewer system by the owner in 1868. The owner's name was not traced in the city directories and it was therefore not possible to verify whether the building was occupied prior to being connected to the sewer system. Bet whether or not it was, the lot was completely built over early in the 20th century, so that any potential archaeological remains in the yard would have been disturbed or destroyed. *This part of site 176 is therefore not considered archaeologically*

sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.

Lot 50 was occupied by a shed or “contractor’s stables” from at least 1868 to ca. 1876. The property was connected to the sewer system in 1893. Consequently, it was probably initially equipped with a cistern and privy. By the turn of the century, buildings had been erected on most of the lot, leaving only an area beginning approximately 60 ft. north of Jackson Avenue and measuring about 10 X 20 feet on the east lot line that was not covered by buildings or sited where the earlier stables had stood. This area could conceivably contain a backyard installation. ***This part of site 176 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Lot 51 was occupied by a “contractor’s stables” from at least 1869 to ca. 1876. There is no record of a sewer connection for this lot. It is possible that this building was initially equipped with a cistern and privy, but by the turn of the century, a four-story building with a one-story wing at the rear had been erected that completely covered the lot area. ***This part of site 176 is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

SITE 183

Block 2746, lots 41 and 40

Pls. 116 (above), 117, 118

Lot 41 was occupied by a two-story building from at least 1872, but apparently, the property was not connected to the sewer system until 1928. Consequently, it must have been equipped with a cistern and privy. (But the first owner did not reside here, and so it is not possible to trace the early occupational history of the building). The structure does not seem to have undergone any significant changes, so that the area immediately behind it, where the cistern would have been located, would not have been negatively impacted. And while sheds were built in the backyard against the rear and east lot lines, a significant portion of the yard was not disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of site 193 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Lot 40 was occupied by a two-story building from at least 1866, but the property was connected to the sewer system only in 1928. Consequently, the dwelling must have been

equipped with a cistern and privy. (But the first owner did not reside here, and so it is not possible to trace the early occupational history of the building). It does not seem to have undergone any significant changes, so that the area immediately behind it, where the cistern would have been located, would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the backyard of this lot disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of site 183 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

SITE 184

Block 2746, lot 39

Pls. 116 (bottom), 117, 118

Lot 39 was occupied by a two-story building from at least 1866. It was connected to the sewer system in 1874. Consequently, the dwelling was probably initially equipped with a cistern and privy. By 1929, however, a three-story and a one-story building were erected that completely covered the lot area, thus disturbing or destroying any potential archaeological remains in the former back yard. ***Site 184 is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

SITE 185

Block 2317, lots 5, 6, 7 and 8

Pls. 119 (above), 121, 122

Lot 5 was occupied by a three-story building from 1868, which was connected to the sewer system in 1870. Neither the first owner listed in the tax assessments, nor the name recorded in the tap records could be traced in the city directories and so it was not possible to verify whether the building was actually occupied before being connected to the sewer system. We can not however rule out the possibility that the property was initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The building was replaced, between 1929 and 1951, by a one-story structure, whose footprint was smaller than that of the earlier building and therefore would not have disturbed the potential cistern that could have been located immediately behind the house. Nor was the backyard of this lot disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of site 185 is therefore***

considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.

Lot 6 was occupied by a three-story building from at least 1868, which was connected to the sewer system around 1870. The name of the first owner listed in the tax assessments, the same as for lot 5, could not be traced in the city directories and so it was not possible to verify whether the building was actually occupied before being connected to the sewer system. We can not however rule out the possibility that the property was initially equipped with a cistern and privy. It does not seem to have undergone any significant changes, so that the area immediately behind it, where the cistern would have been located, would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the backyard of this lot disturbed by any subsequent construction. *This part of site 185 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.*

Lot 7 was occupied by a three-story building from at least 1868, which was connected to the sewer system in 1870. Neither the first owner listed in the tax assessments, nor the name recorded in the tap records, both the same as for lot 5 above, could be traced in the city directories and so it was not possible to verify whether the building was actually occupied before being connected to the sewer system. We can not however rule out the possibility that the property was initially equipped with a cistern and privy. It does not seem to have undergone any significant changes, so that the area immediately behind it, where the cistern would have been located, would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the backyard of this lot disturbed by any subsequent construction. *This part of site 185 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.*

Lot 8 was occupied by a three-story building from at least 1868, which was connected to the sewer system in 1870. The name of the first owner listed in the tax assessments, the same as for lot 5, could not be traced in the city directories and so it was not possible to verify whether the building was actually occupied before being connected to the sewer system. We can not however rule out the possibility that the property was initially equipped with a cistern and privy. It does not seem to have undergone any significant changes, so that the area immediately behind it, where the cistern would have been located, would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the backyard of this lot disturbed by any subsequent construction. *This part of site 185 is*

therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.

SITE 186

Block 2317, lots 12 and 13

Pls. 119 (below), 121, 122

Lot 12 was occupied by a one-story building at the rear of the lot from at least 1868. It was connected to the sewer system in 1878. Neither the first owner listed in the tax assessments, nor the name recorded in the tap records could be traced in the city directories, and it was therefore not possible to verify the building's history of occupation. The property was no doubt initially equipped with a cistern and privy. With the exception of small sheds, built at different times along the west and east lot lines, most of the front of the lot was not disturbed by any subsequent construction, and this area could contain archaeological remains. ***This part of site 186 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Lot 13 was occupied by a three-story building from at least 1868. It was connected to the sewer system in 1886. Neither the first owner listed in the tax assessments, nor the name recorded in the tap records could be traced in the city directories and it was therefore not possible to verify the building's history of occupation. It was not doubt initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The building does not seem to have undergone any significant changes, so that the area immediately behind it where the cistern could have been located would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the backyard of this lot disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of site 186 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

SITE 187

Block 2317, lots 16, 17

Pls. 120(above), 121, 122

Lot 16 was occupied by a three-story building from at least 1868. It was connected to the

sewer system by the same owner, John O'Grady, in 1872. O'Grady, a cooper, was first listed at this address in the 1871-72 directory, evidently after the building was connected to the sewer system. We can not however rule out the possibility that the building existed and was occupied prior to O'Grady's tenure. As noted above, the block was developed by 1858. This property may very well have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. Although a three-story building was erected at the rear of the lot early in the 20th century, a significant portion of the rear yard was not impacted by subsequent construction, nor was the back of the old building on the front of the lot. ***This part of site 187 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Lot 17 was occupied by a two-story building from ca. 1868. It was connected to the sewer system ca. 1870, or in the early 1870s. The owner was not listed in the city directories, and it was therefore not possible to verify the building's history of occupation. We can not rule out the possibility that the property was initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The building on the front of the lot was demolished before the end of the 19th century, but the building at the rear of the lot did not undergo any significant changes, nor was the yard between the two buildings disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of site 187 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

SITE 192
Block 2321, lot 13
Pls. 120, 123, 124

Lot 16 was occupied by a two-story building from at least 1868. It was connected to the sewer system ca. 1870, or in the early 1870s. Owner Garritt Cassiday was not listed at this address, but his widow, Catherine moved here in 1871-72. She was already a widow, listed as such in the 1870-71 directory at 176 North 8th Street, where she had formerly lived with her husband, a varnish maker (1868-69 City Directory). Evidently, Catherine, the first known resident of 218 North 8th Street, moved in after the building was connected to the sewer system. We can not however rule out the possibility that the building was standing and occupied earlier, since we know that the block was developed by 1858 (Dripps map). It is therefore quite possible

that the property was not initially equipped with a cistern or privy. The building shown on the 1868 Higginson map seems to have survived until very recently without impacts in its rear portion or in its yard. *Site 192 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.*

SITE 198
Block 2323, lot 9
Pls. 125, 126, 127

Lot 9 was occupied by two-story buildings at the rear of the lot from at least 1868, but the sewer connection for this lot dates only to 1908. The houses must therefore have been equipped with a cistern and privy. Aside from a building that was erected on the front of the lot early in the 20th century, the yard area in front of these buildings was not disturbed by any subsequent construction (the 1929 Hyde map, pl. 127, shows the maximum lot coverage). *Site 198 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.*

NORTH WILLIAMSBURG

SITE 199

Block 2324, lot 1

Block 2332, lot 1

Pls. 128, 129

The 1868 Higginson map shows houses along the Kent Avenue side of Block 2324 with a Weuleman's Cooperage factory occupying most of the rest of the lot. By the end of the 19th century, a huge brick building was erected, the Brooklyn Cooperage Company, that completely covered the area of block 2324. This building survived until the second or third decade of the 20th century. The 1929 Hyde map shows the block completely covered by railroad tracks. The subsequent building episodes on this block would have disturbed or destroyed any potential backyard features that might have been associated with the block's initial period of occupation. *This part of site 199 is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.*

Block 2332 is partly covered by a two-story freight shed in its northwest corner and the rest of the lot was (or is, it is not visible from the street) scarred by railroad tracks. The Higginson map records a largely vacant lot, occupied by a ship yard on the north side of the block and a stave yard on the southeast corner. Later maps show a block largely covered by railroad tracks. *This part of site 199 is also not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains*

SITE 202

Block 2325, lot 26

Pls. 130 (above), 132, 132

Lot 26 was occupied by buildings on the front and rear of the lot from at least 1868. It was connected to the sewer system in 1870. The owner, Rudolph Gross, listed as a hairdresser, moved onto this block in 1870-71 but apparently not into this building, so its history of occupation could not be traced. It is possible that the property was initially equipped with a cistern and privy. Neither building underwent significant changes in its footprint, so that a

cistern, located near one or the other (or both) would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was yard between the two buildings disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***Site 202 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

SITE 203

Block 2325, lots 27, 28 and 29

Pls. 130 (above), 131, 132

Lot 27 was occupied by buildings on the front and rear of the lot from at least 1868. It was connected to the sewer system in 1870. Neither the first owner listed in the tax assessments, nor the name recorded in the tap records could be traced in the city directories, and it was therefore not possible to verify the building's history of occupation. We can not rule out the possibility that the building may have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. Neither the front building nor probably the back building underwent significant changes in its footprint, so that a cistern, located near one or the other (or both) would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was year between the two buildings disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of site 203 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Lot 28 was occupied by two-and-a-half story building on the front of the lot from ca. 1868, when it belonged to the heirs of J. Young. It was connected to the sewer system in ca. 1870 or in the early 1870s. Mary Young, listed as a widow living at 43 North 6th Street since at least 1862-63, moved in to the building on this lot in 1871-72. She was apparently the first resident at this address, and evidently had waited for the sewer connection to be made before making her home here. We can not however rule out that the building was older (since the 1858 Dripps map shows it as also developed), and therefore probably initially equipped with a cistern and privy. ***This part of site 203 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and possibly a cistern.***

Lot 29 was occupied by two-and-a-half story building on the front of the lot from at least 1868. It was connected to the sewer system in 1871. Neither the first owner listed in the tax assessments, nor the person named in the tap records could be traced in the city directories, and it

was therefore not possible to verify the building's history of occupation. The property could have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. It is uncertain whether this building, recorded in the earliest tax assessments, is the same as the three-story building that appears on the updated 1868 Higginson map. Thus, we can not be certain that the area immediately behind the original building, where the cistern would have been located, was not negatively impacted by the possible new construction of the dwelling shown on the map. The backyard area, however, was not impacted by any subsequent construction. ***This part of site 203 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and possibly a cistern.***

SITE 204

Block 2325, lots 31 and 32

Pls. 130 (below), 131, 132

Lot 31 was occupied by a two story building on the front of the lot from at least 1868. There is no record for a sewer connection for this lot, which does not mean that the building was never connected, only that there is no record. But it is likely that for a some years the property was equipped with a cistern and privy. The tax assessments list a two-story building but the 1868 Higginson map shows a three-story dwelling. /This could have been an enlargement or a new building, in which case it might have impacted the rear portion of the earlier structure and possibly also its cistern. The backyard area, however, was not impacted by any subsequent construction. ***This part of site 204 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and possibly a cistern.***

Lot 32 was occupied by two buildings, the one at the front of the lot a three-story dwelling built after 1868. The property was connected to the sewer system in 1870. The widow Julia McDevitt (or McDivitt), who ran a boarding house at 35 North 6th Street and lived at that address until 1870-71, moved into her new house on this lot in 1871-72, having evidently waited for the sewer connection to be made. She is the first known owner and resident at this address. It is not unlikely however that there was a building on this lot prior to the arrival of Ms. McDivitt, which would have been equipped with a privy and cistern. Although some shed were built on the rear of the lot before the end of the 19th century, a substantial portion of the rear yard was not

impacted by subsequent construction. ***This part of site 204 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy.***

SITE 205

Block 2326, lots 32, 33, 34 and 35

Pls. 133 (above), 134, 135

Lot 32 was occupied by a three story building on the front of the lot from at least 1868 but the owner lived a block away, not in this building. The sewer connection record for this lot has been lost. The property may have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy, as this block was developed by 1858 (Dripps map). It did not undergo any significant changes in its footprint, so that a cistern, located near the rear of the building would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the yard disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of site 205 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Lot 33 was occupied by a four story building on the front of the lot from ca. 1870. It was connected to the sewer ca. 1870, or in the early 1870s, and may have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The building did not undergo any changes in its footprint, so that a cistern, located at the rear would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the yard disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of site 205 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Lots 34 and 35 were developed by ca. 1868 with five houses, two in the front, of three stories, and three small buildings, at the rear, also of three stories. The buildings on lot 34 were connected to the sewer system in 1870, while those on lot 35 were connected in 1871. The probable developer, Edward Collery, had a liquor store at 75 North 6th Street, but did not live in any of the houses on lots 34 or 35, and it was therefore not possible to trace the history of their occupation. These dwellings were probably initially equipped with a cistern and privy. None underwent any changes in its footprint, so that any potential cisterns, located near them, would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the yard between the front and back buildings disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of site 205 is therefore considered***

potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.

SITE 206

Block 2326, lot 17

Pls. 133 (bottom), 134, 35

Lot 17 was occupied by two buildings, one on the front, and one on the rear of the lot, from at least 1868. The property was connected to the sewer system by the same owner, H. Myers, in 1870. Unfortunately, there is no H. Myers at this address in the directories, so we are unable to verify whether the building was occupied prior to being connected to the sewer system. Myers owned other lots in the project area and was therefore buying up properties as an investment (see also block 2411, lot 35, site 311, and Block 2393, lot 23, site 315), but there are several Myers (or Meyers) in the directories, so it was not possible to verify which was the owner of this property. The property may have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy, although this part of block 2326 was not yet developed in 1858 (Dripps map). The rear building was demolished before the end of the 19th century, but neither underwent any changes to its footprint, so that any potential cisterns, located near them, would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the yard between them disturbed by any subsequent construction. *Site 206 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy.*

SITE 208

Block 2327, lot 4

Pls. 136 (above), 138, 139

Lot 4 was occupied by a four story building on the front of the lot from ca. 1871. It was connected to the sewer system in 1873. Neither the first owner listed in the tax assessments, nor the person named in the tap records could be traced in the city directories and it was therefore not possible to verify the building's history of occupation. This block was developed by 1858 and the house was probably initially equipped with a cistern and privy. It did not undergo any changes in its footprint, so that a cistern, located near the rear of the building would not have been negatively impacted. Similarly, the area between the back and front building was not

disturbed by any subsequent construction. *Site 208 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.*

SITE 209

Block 2327, lots 16 and 18

Pls. 136 (below), 138, 139

Lot 16 was occupied by a two-story building on the front of the lot, from at least 1868. It was connected to the sewer system in 1872. Neither the first owner listed in the tax assessments, nor the person named in the tap records could be traced in the city directories and so it was not possible to verify the building's history of occupation. The property was probably initially equipped with a cistern and privy. Although a front building was added before the end of the 19th century, the original yard between the two was not disturbed by any subsequent construction.

This part of site 209 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.

Lot 18 was occupied by a two-story dwelling, apparently the one still standing on the lot, from at least 1868. It was connected to the sewer system, by the same owner, M. Harrington, in 1869. Harrington owned a junk yard on the Lower East Side in Manhattan. He lived nearby, at 108 North 7th Street, but not in the building on this lot. The block was developed by 1858, and it is therefore likely that the first occupants of the building at number 152 North 7th Street had a privy and probably also a cistern in the yard. Neither the front building nor the yard appear to have been impacted by subsequent construction. *This part of site 209 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.*

SITE 210

Block 2327, lots 31 and 34

Pls. 137, 138, 139

Lot 31 was occupied by a three-story building on the front of the lot from at least 1868. It was connected to the sewer system in 1869. Neither the name in the tax assessments nor that in the tap records is listed at this address in the city directories, and it was therefore not possible to

verify whether the building was occupied prior to being connected to the sewer system. We cannot rule out the possibility that the building existed prior to 1868, especially as the 1858 Dripps map indicates that the block was already developed by that time. Neither the back of the building nor its yard appear to have been impacted by subsequent construction. ***This part of site 210 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Lot 34 was occupied by a three-story building, which still stands on the front of the lot, from at least 1868. It was connected to the sewer system in 1870 by the same owner, John Reardon, a clerk. He moved in 1871-72 with his widowed mother. In the previous year, John Rearden, the only person of this name and presumably Ellen's husband, was listed at another address. The owners therefore moved in only once the building was connected to the sewer system. We cannot rule out the possibility, however, that the building existed prior to 1868, in which case it would certainly have been equipped with a cistern and privy. There were not impacts to the rear of the building or to its yard. ***This part of site 210 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

SITE 212
Block 2331, lot 7
Pls. 140, 141, 142

Lot 7 was occupied by a two-story building on the front of the lot from ca. 1868, but it was not connected to the sewer system until 1887. Consequently, the building must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. It did not undergo any changes in its footprint, so that a cistern, located near the rear of the building would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the rear yard disturbed by any subsequent construction. Site 212 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.

SITE 217

Block 2335, lot 12

Pls. 143 (above), 144, 145

Lot 12 was occupied by a three-story building on the front of the lot from at least 1868, but the property was not connected to the sewer system until 1903. Consequently, it must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. It did not undergo any changes in its footprint, so that a cistern, which would have been located near the rear of the building, would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the rear yard disturbed by any subsequent construction. *Site 217 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.*

SITE 218

Block 2335, lots 13, 15

Pls. 143 (below), 144, 145

Lot 13 was occupied by a three-story building on the front of the lot from at least 1868. It was connected to the sewer system in 1870. Neither the name listed in the tax assessments nor that in the tap records appears in the city directories, and it was therefore not possible to verify whether the building was occupied prior to being connected to the sewer system. The block was only partly developed by 1858, according to the Dripps map of that year. It is however likely that the property was initially equipped with a cistern and privy. A one-story rear wing, added between 1929 and 1951, may have negatively impacted the potential cistern, which would have been located near the rear of the building, but the rear yard was not disturbed by any subsequent construction. *Site 218 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy*

Lot 15 comprehends lots on both North 5th and North 6th Streets, but the former are covered by a one-story building and may be eliminated from consideration for archaeological sensitivity. The old lots on North 6th Street are numbers 15, 16, and 17:

Old lot 15 was occupied by a three-story building on the front of the lot from at least 1868. It was connected to the sewer system by the same owner, machinist John Hineson, in 1872,

and he moved in in that year. It was not possible to trace the building's history of occupation earlier, but the building probably did have a cistern and privy in its yard, given the four-year gap between the earliest tax assessment and the tap record. ***This part of lot 15 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Old lot 16 was occupied by a three-story building on the front of the lot from at least 1868. It was connected to the sewer system in 1873. Neither the name recorded in the tax assessments, nor that in the tap records could be traced in the city directories, but the building must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. A three-story wing, added to the back of the building between 1929 and 1951, may have negatively impacted a potential cistern, which would have been located near the rear of the building. Most of the rear yard, however, was not disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of lot 15 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy.***

Old lot 17 was occupied by a three-story building on the front of the lot from at least 1868. It was connected to the sewer system by the same owner in 1870. The name is not listed at this address in the city directories and it was therefore not possible to verify if the building was occupied prior to being connected to the sewer system, but it probably was initially equipped with a cistern and privy. Since the tax assessment lists a three-story building and the updated Higginson's map shows a three-story building with a three-story back wing, it is possible that the rear wing was a later addition that could have negatively impacted a potential cistern located immediately behind the original building. The rear yard, however, was not disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of lot 15 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and possibly a cistern.***

SITE 222
Block 2340, lot 1
Pls. 146, 147, 148

Lot 1, which comprises the whole of block 2340, was occupied by industrial buildings throughout its history. It is largely composed of landfill: only its eastern end, on Kent Avenue, is not made land. The tax assessments, researched through 1890, provide no description of any of

the buildings on the lot, but the updated 1868 Higginson's map shows a frame storage building, for coopers' materials" and the "maceration of paper stock" at 369-363 Kent Avenue (present address 164 Kent Avenue), and a frame office and stable at 355 Kent Avenue. The earliest sewer connection was made for 369 Kent Avenue, ca. 1873. In 1880, connections were made for 363 Kent Avenue, which at that time belonged to Havemeyer & Elder, the sugar refining company (see section 4, above). This company also owned the property at 355 Kent Avenue, which was connected ca. 1882-85. By the end of the century, the Havemeyers' buildings were demolished and the only structure on the lot was the Pennsylvania Freight Depot building on its southeast corner. The rest was covered by railroad tracks. The one-story industrial building that presently covers most of the site would have disturbed any potential archaeological remains. But it is questionable whether this storage and administrative site was ever equipped with cisterns or privies, and, even if it were, what significant historical information could be derived from their contents, given that they would not have been connected either with a particular family, or shop, or manufacturing site. *Site 222 is therefore not considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.*

SITE 226

Block 2342, lots 26, 23

Pls. 149 (above), 150, 151

Lot 26 was occupied by a three-story building on the front of the lot from at least 1868. It was connected to the sewer system, by the same owner, Albert Freeman, in 1870, and he moved in in the same year. It was not possible to trace earlier possible owners or residents at this address, but the block was developed by 1850 (Dripps map), and it is likely that the property was initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The footprint of the original building is unknown, since the lot was updated on the Higginson's map, and the two-story rear wing shown there may have been a later addition, made after the building was connected to the sewer system. But while the cistern may have been negatively impacted by these buildings, a substantial part of the backyard was not disturbed by subsequent construction. *This part of site 226 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.*

Lot 23 is covered by a one-story industrial building, erected between 1912 and 1929. ***This part of site 226 is therefore not considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

SITE 228
Block 2343, lot 19
Pls. 149 (below), 152, 153

Lot 19 was occupied by a two-story building on the front of the lot and a large shed on the rear of the lot from at least 1868. The property was connected to the sewer system in 1878, and Joseph Anthony, a peddler, moved in in that year. The first owner's name was not listed at this address in the tax assessments. Consequently, it was not possible to trace the building's earlier history of occupation prior Anthony, but the block was developed by 1858, according to the Dripps map. The original building was replaced or enlarged at the turn of the century and the new, three-story dwelling may have negatively impacted the potential cistern, which would have been located near the rear of the old building. The rear yard, however, was not disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***Site 228 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy.***

SITE 235
Block 2349, lots 1, 15
Pls. 154, 155, 156

The northern 50 X 280 feet of lot 1 and most of lot 15 was occupied in from at least 1868 by the industrial buildings of a distillery. The distillery buildings were ranged around a yard that continued into the eastern quarter of the lot. After the distillery ceased to exist, in the early 20th century, this area was covered by railroad tracks. The southern part of lot 1, covering an area 100 feet north/south by 200 feet east/west was divided up into house lots. By the early 20th century already several of these had been torn down. After this row of dwellings was demolished, this part of lot 1 remained vacant -- not even railroad tracks traversed it. The former yards of five of the old lots that were developed for housing are therefore considered archaeologically sensitive

for historic remains. The three that can be eliminated are old 3, on Kent Avenue, since it was completely covered by a building, and old lots 35 and 31, since neither was developed for housing. ***Site 235 is considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains on portions of lot 1; it is not sensitive for historic remains on lot 15***

SITE 244

Block 2353, lots 6 and 8

Pls. 157, 158, 159

Lot 6 comprehends old lots 4/6 and 5/7.

Old lot 4/6 was occupied by two one-story buildings on the front of the lot from ca. 1868. There is no description of a building in the tax records, but a sewer connection was made in 1869 by the owner, who moved in in 1870-71. Although the date of the first assessment and sewer connection are close, the Dripps map indicates that the block was already developed for housing by that date, and it is likely that the house on this lot was older than the first tax assessment. The maps however indicate that the earliest recorded buildings were replaced by a three-story building before the end of the 19th century, and this could have negatively impacted a potential cistern located immediately behind one of the old houses. A large part of yard area, however, some thirty feet deep, was not impacted by subsequent construction. ***This part of lot 6 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Old lot 5/7 was occupied by a four-story building on the front of the lot from 1868, but the updated Higginson map shows two brick buildings with a narrow vacant area between. The sewer connection data is confusing for this property as the configuration of the lot was different in the tap records. It seems, however, to have been made later in the 19th century. We have no way of knowing where the earlier building was or whether any part of its yard fell in the space not impacted by the buildings shown on the Higginson and later maps. But probably, the earlier building on this lot had a privy and a cistern, and there is therefore a possibility of finding at least the privy, undisturbed, in that part of the yard not impacted by subsequent construction. ***This part of lot 6 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Lot 8 was occupied by a two-and-a-half story building on the front of the lot from 1868.

The tap record is lost, but should date ca. 1870 or early 1870s. The owner did not live at this address. Consequently, it was not possible to verify if the building was occupied prior to being connected to the sewer system. It may have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The building was enlarged or replaced by a new building at the turn of the 20th century, which could have negatively impacted a potential cistern located near the rear of the building. The rear yard, however, was not disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of lot 15 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

SITE 248

Block 2357, lots 24, 21, 20 and 18
Pls. 160, 161, 162

Lot 24 is occupied by a two-story wing of a warehouse that extends over 85-83 Metropolitan Avenue. ***This part of site 248 is therefore not considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Lot 21 was occupied by a two-story building on the front of the lot from 1868. It was connected to the sewer system, by the same owner, in 1873. He did not live at this address, and it is therefore not possible to trace the building's history of occupation. It was probably equipped with a cistern and privy. As the building did not undergo any changes in its footprint, the potential cistern located near the rear of the building would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the rear yard disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of site 248 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a cistern and a privy.***

Lot 20 was occupied by a three-story building on the front of the lot from 1868. Although the tap record is lost, it was in book 1 and therefore must date to the early 1860s, certainly before 1868. The name of the owner listed in the first tax assessments (1868) was not found in the city directories (1862-1869). We can not be certain that the lot was not initially equipped with a cistern or privy. This is the oldest part of Williamsburg, and the 1850 Dripps map shows that the block was already developed for housing by that date. The building on the front of the lot was replaced by a larger structure between 1912 and 1929, which would have negatively impacted a potential cistern located immediately behind the building. But otherwise, the back yard was not

disturbed by subsequent construction. ***This part of site 248 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Lot 18 comprehends old lots 24 and 25:

Old lot 24 was occupied by a three-story building on the front of the lot from 1868. It was connected to the sewer system in 1870. The first owner listed in the tax assessments, Bernard Short, had a liquor store here from 1866-68. But the 1868 Higginson's map shows that the lot area was completely covered by the building, including its back wings. It did not therefore did not have a yard or any vacant area in which to install a cistern or privy. At the turn of the century, the old building was replaced by a four-story industrial structure that covered all but a few feet at the rear of the lot. ***This part of site 248 is therefore not considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Old lot 25 was occupied by a three-story building on the front of the lot from 1868. Although the tap record is lost, it was written in book 3 and therefore should date to the mid-1860s, before 1868. The owners listed in 1868, Lewis and Ralph Cohen, cigarmakers, are first listed at this address only in 1871-72. It is not possible to trace the history of occupation of the building on this lot prior to 1868. Given that this is the oldest part of town, as noted above, the building probably was initially equipped with a cistern or privy, but in any case, by 1929, the old building had been replaced by a four-story building on the front of the lot with an industrial building overlapping most of the former yard in the rear and this would have destroyed any potential backyard installations. ***This part of site 248 is therefore not considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

SITE 250

Block 2358, lot 36

Pls. 163 (above), 165, 166

Lot 36 was occupied by a two-story building on the front of the lot from before the first tax record, 1868, since the building was connected to the sewer system in 1867. Neither the name recorded in the tax assessments, nor that in the tap records could be traced in the city directories (1863-73). Consequently, it was not possible to trace the building's history of occupation. The

block on which this lot is located is in the oldest part of Williamsburg, and the 1858 Dripps map indicates that the block was already developed by this date. It is likely that this property was initially equipped with a cistern and privy. Neither the footprint of the original building nor the backyard was impacted by subsequent construction. *This part of site 248 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.*

SITE 252

Block 252, lot 15

Pls. 163 (below), 165, 166

Lot 15 was occupied by a two-story building on the front of the lot from ca.1868. It was connected to the sewer system in 1873. Neither the name recorded in the tax assessments, nor that in the tap records could be traced in the city directories (1863-73). Consequently, it was not possible to trace the building's history of occupation. It was probably initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The building did not undergo any changes in its footprint, so that a potential cistern, which would have located near the rear of the building, would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the rear yard disturbed by any subsequent construction. *Site 252 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.*

SITE 253

Lot 22

Pls. 163 (below), 165, 166

Lot 22 comprehends old lots 16 and 17:

Old lot 16 was occupied by a two-story building on the front of the lot from ca.1868. The sewer connection unfortunately is lost, but it was probably in the later 19th century (book 8). The name of the owner listed in the tax assessments was not found in the city directories, so that the history of the building's occupation could not be traced. The 1858 Dripps map indicates that the block was already developed by that date and the property was therefore probably initially equipped with a cistern and privy. It did not undergo any changes in its footprint, so that a potential cistern, which would have located near the rear of the building, would not have been

negatively impacted. Except for a shed built at the turn of the 20th century the rear yard was not disturbed by subsequent construction. ***This part of lot 22 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Old lot 17 Lot 15 was occupied by a two-story building on the front of the lot from ca.1868. There is no record of a sewer connection. The name of the owner listed in the tax assessments was not found in the city directories, so that the history of the building's occupation could not be traced. It was torn down presumably during the 1870s, since the updated Higginson's map shows the lot as vacant. The rear part of the lot was impacted by the construction of a shed and parts of buildings on neighboring lots that overlapped its northwest and southwest corners. The original building may have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy which may be preserved, as significant portions of the lot have not been disturbed by subsequent construction. ***This part of lot 22 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

SITE 254

Block 2358, lots 28, 25, 24
Pls. 164, 165, 166

Lot 28 was occupied by a two-story building on the front of the lot from ca.1869. It was connected to the sewer system in 1871, by the same owner, Robert Bailey, a laborer, who then moved in in the same year. The 1858 Dripps map indicates that the block was already developed by that date and the property was therefore probably initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The building shown on the 19th century maps was apparently replaced by the one-story building shown on the 1951 Sanborn map. The potential cistern associated with the lot's first period of occupation may have been negatively impacted by this event. The back yard, however, was not disturbed by subsequent construction. ***This part of site 254 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Lot 25 comprehends old lots 25 and 26:

Old lot 25 was occupied by a three-story building on the front of the lot from ca.1868. It was connected to the sewer system probably ca. 1870 or in the early 1870s. The owner, Owen

Donnelly, a stevedore, also owned the building at 111 Metropolitan Avenue, and moved in there in 1871-72. Consequently, it was not possible to trace the history of occupation of the building on lot 25, but it may have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. It did not undergo any changes in its footprint, so that a potential cistern, which would have located near the rear of the building, would not have been negatively impacted. Except for a small shed shown on the 1951 Sanborn map, the rear yard was not impacted by subsequent construction. ***This part of lot 25 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Old lot 26 was occupied by a two-story building on the front of the lot from perhaps the early 1860s, as that is the probably date of the lost tap record in book 1. The name of the owner listed in the earliest tax assessments (1868) was not found in the city directories (1862-1872) and it was therefore not possible to trace the history of occupation of the building on this lot, or to ascertain more precisely when it was built. It was probably equipped with a cistern and privy but by 1951, the lot was completely covered by a commercial building. ***This part of lot 25 is therefore not considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Lot 24 was occupied by a three-story building with basement on the front of the lot from ca.1868 but was not connected to the sewer system until 1891. Consequently, the building must have been equipped with a cistern and privy. The maps indicate that some rebuilding or remodeling of the property took place, which could have negatively impacted a potential cistern located near the rear of the original building. The rear yard, however, was not disturbed by subsequent construction. ***This part of site 254 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

SITE 259

Block 2364, lots 15, 16, 17
Pls. 167, 168, 169

Lot 15 comprehends old lots 15 and 31:

Old lot 15 was occupied by a one-story building on the front of the lot from ca.1868. It was connected to the sewer system in 1892. Consequently, the building may have been initially

equipped with a cistern and privy. By the end of the 20th century, however, a new building was erected that completely covered the lot, thus disturbing or destroying the old backyard installations. ***This part of lot 15 is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Old lot 31 was occupied by a three-story building on the front of the lot from ca.1868. It was not connected to the sewer system until 1880 (probably by a descendant of the original owner). Consequently, the building was probably equipped with a cistern and privy. By 1880, however, a brick building was erected on the lot that completely covered it, thus disturbing or destroying the potential backyard features associated with the earliest phase of the lot's occupation. ***This part of lot 15 is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Lot 16 comprehends old lot 16 and 30:

Old lot 16 was occupied by a three-story factory from ca. 1868. It was connected to the sewer system in 1879. Consequently, the building may have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. By the time of the updated Higginson's map, however (probably in the 1870s), the lot area was completely covered by the "Empire Wine Works". ***This part of lot 16 is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Old lot 30 was occupied by a two-story building on the front of the lot from ca.1868. It was connected to the sewer system in 1896. Consequently, the building must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. In the early 20th century, however, new construction completely covered the lot area, thus disturbing or destroying the potential backyard installations associated with the earliest phase of the lot's occupation. ***This part of lot 16 is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Lot 17 is completely covered by a one-story industrial building that would have disturbed or destroyed any potential backyard installations. The earliest maps show industrial buildings on the lot, a wheelbarrow factory at 103 North 1st Street, and a chair factory at 105 North 1st Street. ***This part of site 259 is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

SITE 267

Block 2368, lot 18

Pls. 170 (above), 172, 173

Lot 18 was occupied by a two-and-a-half story building from ca. 1868, and was connected to the sewer system also ca. 1868. The owner did not reside at this address and therefore, the history of the building's occupation could not be traced. The 1858 Dripps map indicates, however, that the block was already developed by that time and it is therefore likely that the building was initially equipped with a cistern and privy.. The building shown on the 1868 Higginson map did not undergo any significant change in its footprint, nor was the rear yard significantly impacted by subsequent building episodes. *Lot 18 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.*

SITE 268

Block 2368, lots 28, 27 and 26

Pls. 170 (below), 172, 173

Lot 28 was occupied by a two-story building from ca. 1868. It was connected to the sewer system ca 1868 or earlier. The name of the owner was not located in the city directories and it was therefore not possible to trace the building's history of occupation. But the 1858 Dripps map shows that this block was already developed by that date and it is therefore likely that the building was initially equipped with a cistern or privy. Neither the footprint of the building shown on the 1868 Higginson map, nor its yard was significantly impacted by subsequent construction. *This part of site 268 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.*

Lot 27 was occupied by a one-and-a-half story building from ca. 1868 that was enlarged or replaced by a two-and-a-half story building in 1871. The building was connected to the sewer system ca. 1868. The name of the owner was not located in the city directories and it was therefore not possible to trace the building's history of occupation. But the 1858 Dripps map shows that this block was already developed by that date and it is therefore likely that the building was initially equipped with a cistern or privy. The cistern may have been impacted but

the construction of the building shown on the 1868 Higginson map, but the yard was not significantly impacted by any subsequent construction. ***This part of site 168 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy.***

Lot 26 was occupied by a one-and-a-half story building from ca. 1868, which was enlarged or replaced by a two-and-a-half story building in 1871. The building was connected to the sewer system after ca. 1894. Consequently, it must have been equipped with a cistern and privy. (The name of the owner was not located in the city directories and it was therefore not possible to trace the building's history of occupation). The updated Higginson's map evidently shows a third building phase since the structure is three stories. This building covered all but a narrow rear yard area. That yard area was disturbed by the construction, between 1929 and 1951, of a factory building on Metropolitan Avenue whose rear portion overlapped the back of lot 26. At present, a one-story auto repair shop stand on the rear of the lot. ***Lot 26 is therefore not considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

SITE 269

Block 2368, lots 34, 33, 32 and 31
Pls. 171, 172, 173

Lot 34 was occupied by a two-story building on the front of the lot from ca.1868, when A. Caldwell was the owner. It was connected to the sewer system in the same year, by James Caldwell, a cigarmaker, who is first listed in the city directories at this address in 1867-68. James was also listed in the 1865-66 directory on North 1st Street near 6th Street, i.e. Roebling Avenue, on the west side of the block, but lot 34 is much closer to Havemeyer Street, the east side of the block. A number of instances may be noted (above), of individuals moving from down the block or down the street into a new house, once it was connected to the sewer system, and it is likely that this was also the case here. The 1858 Dripps map however indicates that the block was developed by then, and we can not rule out the possibility that it was therefore have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. Neither the footprint of the building nor its rear yard were impacted by subsequent construction. ***Lot 34 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Lot 33 was occupied by a two-story building on the front of the lot from ca.1868. It was connected to the sewer system in 1874. The owner, carpenter James A. Johnson, lived here from ca. 1869. Consequently, the building must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. It did not undergo any changes in its footprint, so that a potential cistern, which would have located near the rear of the building, would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the rear yard disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***Lot 33 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Lot 32 was occupied by a two-story building on the front of the lot from ca.1864. It was connected to the sewer system in 1873. William Conquest, a carpenter, is listed at both 128 and 126 ½ North 1st Street -- either this lot or next door on lot 31 -- from ca. 1864. Probably both buildings were equipped with a cistern and privy. This is one of the rare instances where the existence of a building for several years -- four, here -- prior to the first tax assessment can be demonstrated by tracing the history of its occupation through the city directories. It also supports the idea that the block was developed some years before the earliest tax assessments. With the exception of a long, narrow rear wing half the lot width, which may have negatively impacted a potential cistern located near the rear of the original building, the rear yard was not disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***Lot 32 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Lot 31 was occupied by a two-story building on the front of the lot from ca.1868. It was connected to the sewer system in 1873. As noted in the previous entry, it is uncertain whether the owner, William Conquest, lived on this lot or next door, on lot 32, but he is listed at both 128 and 126 ½ North 1st Street from 1864 on. It is therefore highly likely that both buildings were equipped with a cistern and privy. With the exception of a long, narrow rear wing half the lot width, which may have negatively impacted a potential cistern located near the rear of the original building, the rear yard was not disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***Lot 31 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

SITE 270

Block 2369, lots 4, 7, 6

Pls. 174 (above), 175, 176

Lot 4 comprehends old lots 4 and 5:

Old lot 4 (93 Havemeyer Street) was occupied by a two-story building on the front of the lot from ca.1868. It was connected to the sewer system by the same owner, the widow Jane Short, in 1870, who had lived here since 1869. The building therefore must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. Although it was enlarged by an additional story, it does not seem to have undergone any changes in its footprint, so that a potential cistern, which would have located near the rear of the building, would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the rear yard disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***Old lot 4 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Old lot 5 was occupied by a three-story building on the rear of the lot from ca.1868. It was connected to the sewer system by the same owner, in 1871. The variously spelled William Sherred, listed as both a foreman and a cooper, lived here from 1865-66. Consequently, the building must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. But in the late 19th century it was demolished and a new frame building was erected on the front of the lot. A rear wing was added in the early 20th century. These buildings would have disturbed or destroyed any potential subsurface installations that could have been located in the vacant area at the front of the lot and connected with its earliest period of occupation. ***This part of lot 4 is therefore not considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Lot 7 was occupied by a two-and-a-half story building on the front of the lot from ca.1868. It was connected to the sewer system in 1871. The first owner's name recorded in the tax assessments was not found in the city directories, while the individual listed in the tap records lived next door at 87 Havemeyer Street. The building on lot 7 must have been was equipped with a cistern and privy. The old building was demolished and a new one erected by the mid-20th century. This may have disturbed or destroyed a potential cistern, which would have located near the rear of the old building. Most of the original rear yard area, however, was not disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***Lot 7 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive***

for historic remains, for a privy.

Lot 6 was occupied by a two-story building on the front of the lot from ca.1868. It was connected to the sewer system in 1871. The cigarmaker David Betts (various middle initials) lived here from 1868. Consequently, the building must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The building was slightly enlarged at the rear in the late 19th century, possibly disturbing a potential cistern, which would have located near the rear of the building. The rear yard, however, was not disturbed by any subsequent construction. *Lot 6 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy.*

SITE 274

Block 2369, lots 37, 38

Pls. 174 (below), 175, 176

Lot 37 was occupied by a two-story building on the front of the lot from at least 1867, when it was connected to the sewer system. The name listed in the tap records is unclear and could not be found in the city directories. The owner, in 1868, lived next door on lot 38 (below). The 1858 Dripps map shows that the lot was already developed by that date. In addition, the city directories demonstrate that at least two buildings on this block -- one next door -- existed and were occupied from as early as 1865-66. Probably the building on this lot was erected considerably earlier than 1867 and was initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The building did not undergo any significant changes in its footprint, so that a cistern, located immediately behind it would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the yard disturbed by subsequent construction. *Lot 37 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.*

Lot 38 was connected to the sewer system in 1868, but the building existed from at least 1866, since owner George Quinn, a mason, is listed here in that year. For 1870, the records list a three-story building with basement on the lot. This building, probably the one shown on the 1868 Higginson map did not undergo any significant alterations in its footprint, nor were the rear or most of the front portions of the yard impacted by subsequent construction. *Lot 38 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.*

SITE 277

Block 2371, lot 33

Pls. 177, 178, 179

Lot 33 comprehends old lots 3/33, 2/32, 1/31 and 32a/23:

Old lot 3/33 was occupied by shed that belonged to Francis Swift. These may be the large one-story building shown on the 1868 Higginson's map, or they were torn down and replaced by this structure. In any case, Swift lived on 10th Street near Union Avenue from 1864-65, on one of the adjoining lots either old lot 2/32 or 1/31 (see below). The one-story building on this lot was torn down before the end of the 19th century, and a new frame building was erected at the rear of the lot. By the early 20th century the lot was vacant and has remained so. There is an area at the front of the lot that has not been impacted by subsequent building episodes, but the building connected with the lot's earliest period of occupation was evidently used for storage, while its owner lived on one of the adjoining lots whose yard will have contained his privy and cistern. *This part of lot 33 is therefore not considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.*

Old lot 2/32 was occupied by a two-story building from at least 1866 -- possibly a shed -- or possibly 1864-65, since the owner, Francis Swift is listed in the directory of that year living on 10th Street near Union Avenue, presumably the three-story brick building next door on lot 1/31 (below). Described merely as a contractor in most of the directory listings, in the 1866-67 volume, his business is listed as: Swift Francis & Co. offal contractor for Brooklyn, Montague Hall, Court and basement of Williamsburgh City Bank, 1st c. S. 7th, h 10th c. Union ave.. By 1868, a large one-story building had been erected on old lot 2/32, set well back from the street. By 1880, this was demolished and a brick building erected at the rear of the lot. Late in the 19th century a frame wing was added at the front. Between 1912 and 1929, this building was demolished and except for a small storage building at the rear of the lot, shown on the 1951 Sanborn, the lot has remained vacant. Although a potential cistern located in the area immediately behind the original building would have been negatively impacted by the subsequent construction episodes, a large part of the front yard was not disturbed by later building. *This part of lot 33 is considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic*

remains, for a privy.

Old lot 1/31 was occupied by a three-story brick building from at least 1866 or possibly 1864-65, since the owner, Francis Swift is listed in the directory of that year living on 10th Street near Union Avenue -- presumably either this building or the one on lot 2/32 (above). The 1858 Dripps map shows that the block was already developed by that date. It was probably initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The building did not undergo any significant changes in its footprint, so that a cistern, located near the rear of the building would not have been negatively impacted. And, with the exception of a small, frame building erected at the rear of the lot early in the 20th century, most of the yard was also not disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of lot 33 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Old lot 32a/23 runs at right angles behind the above three lots. With the exception of a small frame shed behind lot 1 shown on the 1868 Higginson's map and a small shed at the southern end of the lot shown on the 1929 Hyde, the lot has remained largely vacant. The potential privies or cisterns associated with the above old lots could be located in this area. ***This part of lot 33 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

SITE 281

block 2372, lot 5

Pls. 180 (above), 181, 182

Lot 5 comprehends old lots 2, 3, 4, 15

Old lot 2 was occupied from ca. 1857-58 by a primary "Colored School". The 1868 Higginson map shows this building fronting on the Union Avenue side of the lot., and by a one-and-a-half story building on the Keap Street side at number 126. The house is listed in the tax assessments in 1866, while the sewer connection, although the data is unclear, may date to 1872. It is likely that the school was equipped with privies in the yard, a large part of which was not impacted by subsequent construction. ***This part of lot 5 is therefore considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a cistern and a privy.***

Old lot 3 was occupied by a two-story building from ca. 1866. It was connected to the sewer system probably in the 1880s (the record is lost). The owner's name was not found in the city directories, but no doubt the property was equipped with a cistern and privy. By the end of the century, a brick building was added at the rear of the lot. The front building did not undergo any significant changes in its footprint, so that a cistern, located immediately behind it would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the yard disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of lot 5 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Old lot 4 was occupied by a two-story building from ca. 1866. It was connected to the sewer system probably in the 1880s (the record is lost). The owner's name was not found in the city directories, but no doubt the property was equipped with a cistern and privy. The building did not undergo any significant changes in its footprint, so that a cistern, located immediately behind it would not have been negatively impacted. Except for the addition of a brick building on the rear of the lot in the late 19th century, most of the yard area was not disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of lot 5 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Old lot 15 was occupied by a one-story building from ca. 1866. The property was connected to the sewer system in 1872. The owner, a polisher called John Biffan, lived here from 1865-66. Consequently, the building must have been equipped with a cistern and privy. It did not undergo any significant changes in its footprint, so that a cistern, located immediately behind it, would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the yard disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of lot 5 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern***

SITE 297
Block 2378, lots 35, 36
Pls. 180, 183, 184

Lot 35 was occupied by a three-story building from ca. 1868. There is no tap record for this lot, unless it was the one on the east side of the adjoining lot 36, which was made in the early

1860s. The block is in the oldest part of Williamsburg and was developed by 1850 (Dripps map). The name of the owner was not found in the directories, but the property was not doubt initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The building was evidently a shop as it is marked "drugs" on the 1868 Higginson's map. It did not undergo any changes in its footprint, so that a cistern, located immediately behind it would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the yard disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***Lot 35 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Lot 36 was occupied by a three-story building from ca. 1868. It was connected to the sewer system in the mid-1860s, certainly before 1868. It is likely that the lot was developed long before the first tax record, as indicated by the 1850 Dripps map and that it was consequently initially equipped with a cistern and privy. Neither the footprint of the building nor its rear yard were negatively impacted by subsequent construction. ***Lot 36 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

SITE 298

Block 2379, lots 42, 43, 44
Pls. 185 (above), 186, 187

Lot 42 was occupied by a four-story building from ca. 1868. It was connected to the sewer system in 1876. Neither the name recorded in the tax assessments, nor that in the tap records could be traced in the city directories, so that the history of its occupation could not be traced, but no doubt it was initially equipped with a cistern and privy. The building did not undergo any significant changes in its footprint, so that a cistern, located immediately behind it would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the yard area disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of site 298 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Lot 43 was occupied by a four-story building from ca. 1868. It was connected to the sewer system before ca. 1868. but the owner named in the first tax assessments (1868), driver (or laborer) Clayborn Smith, is first listed in the city directory at this address in 1867-68. The block was developed by at least 1850, as indicated by the Dripps map of that year, so that the property

was no doubt initially equipped with a cistern and privy. Neither its footprint of the building nor its yard were impacted by subsequent construction. *This part of site 298 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.*

Lot 44 was connected to the sewer system in the early- to mid-1860s, while the first tax assessment dates to 1868 (the name of the owner could not be traced in the city directories). The block, however, was already developed by 1850, as indicated by the Dripps map of the date, so the property probably was initially equipped with a cistern and privy. *This part of site 298 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.*

SITE 303

Block 2381, lots 14, 15, 16

Pls. 185 (below), 188, 189

Each of the now vacant lots evaluated here, 14, 15 and 16 -- this last comprising old lots 19, 20 and 21-- had a two-story building on it at least as early as 1868 (five buildings in all) according to the tax assessments, and the sewer connections on these lots were also made around 1868, since the connections were all recorded in the lost book 3, which covers roughly 1867/1868. None of the owners, apparently, lived on their properties, which suggests that they purchased the lots and constructed buildings on them as an investment and in order to rent them out. (The owners' names were not found in the Brooklyn city directories -- they may have lived in Manhattan). The 1858 map and the general development history of the area however indicates that the buildings predated the earliest assessments and their sewer connections. It is probable that they were all initially equipped with cisterns and privies at the rear of the lots, on North 1st Street. Subsequent construction on the lots, however, will have disturbed or destroyed potential archaeological remains on most of these lots. Note that the eastern end of the block (lot 16) was truncated in the late 19th century when Driggs Avenue was widened.

Lot 14: the rear portion of the old yard area on North 1st Street was covered by the end of the 19th century, while the auto repair shop shown on the 2000 Sanborn map will have disturbed or covered the small part of the surviving yard shown on the 1898 Hyde map. *This part of site*

303 is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.

Lot 15 has the same development history as lot 14. The small section of its yard not already covered by buildings before the of the 19th century will have been disturbed by the auto repair shop buildings shown on the 2000 Sanborn map. ***This part of site 303 is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Lot 16, old lot 19/16: the entire lot area was covered by the end of the 19th century, as shown on the 1898 Hyde map. ***This part of lot 16 is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Lot 16, old lot 21/17 (23.3 X 87.10 ft. on the eastern side of lot 16) was completely covered by buildings in successive construction episodes (the yard behind no 185 Grand Street would have been covered by the building shown on the 1898 and 1912 Hyde maps). ***This part of lot 16 is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Lot 16, old lot 20/17 (14.9 X 89.9 ft., immediately west of old lot 21/17): a comparison of the 1868 Higginson map with the 1898 and 1912 Hyde maps shows that at different times the entire lot area was covered by buildings that would have destroyed any potential archaeological remains. ***This part of lot 16 is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

SITE 304
Block 2382, lot 28
Pls. 190 (above), 191

This is a reactivation only: potential archaeological remains will not be impacted.

SITE 306
Block 2384, lots 25, 24, 23
Pls. 190 (below), 192, 193

Lot 25 was occupied by a three-story building probably from the early 1860s, since the sewer connection was recorded in the lost book I, which should cover those years. In 1868, at the time of the first tax assessments, Joseph Gackler's grocery store was here. It was not possible to

trace his name back in the directories. This area was developed by 1858, as shown on the Dripps map, and the house was therefore probably initially equipped with a cistern and privy. An addition made in the early 20th century, immediately behind the old house, will probably have impacted the potential cistern, but the rear of the lot has not been disturbed by subsequent construction. *This part of site 306 is therefore considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy.*

Lot 24 was also occupied by a three-story building probably from the early 1860s since the sewer connection was recorded in the lost book 1, which should cover those years. The first listing of the building itself is the 1868 tax assessments. D.H. Brown, who owned the building at that time but did not live in it. Nor did he have his paint shop here. That was at 222 or 238 or 236 Grand Street (these three probably the same building with different numbers), and finally at 285 Grand Street, on the other side of the street, a few houses down from the building on lot 24. It is likely that he purchased lot 24 as an investment, and had the building connected to the sewer system soon after in order to make it more attractive to potential tenants. This area was developed by 1858, as shown on the Dripps map, and the house was therefore probably initially equipped with a cistern and privy. An addition made in the early 20th century, immediately behind the old house, will probably have impacted the potential cistern, but the rear of the lot has not been disturbed by subsequent construction. *This part of site 306 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.*

Lot 23 was occupied by a three-story building from ca. 1868. It was connected to the sewer system in the early- or mid-1860s (the connection was recorded in the lost Book 1). The name of the owner could not be found in the directories, so the building's history of occupation could not be traced. As noted, the Dripps map shows that the block was already developed by this date and the house was therefore probably initially equipped with a cistern and privy. An addition made in the early 20th century, immediately behind the old house, will probably have impacted the potential cistern, but the rear of the lot has not been disturbed by subsequent construction. *This part of site 306 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.*

SITE 309

Block 2387, lot 7

Pls. 194, 195, 196

Lot 7 comprehends old lots 31/7, 32/8, 33/9:

Old lot 31/7 was occupied by a four-story building from ca. 1872. It was connected to the sewer system in 1880. The history of the building's occupation could not be traced (neither the name recorded in the tax assessments nor that in the tap records was found in the city directories), but clearly, it must have been initially equipped with a cistern and privy. It did not undergo any significant changes in its footprint, so that a cistern, located immediately behind it would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the yard area disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of lot 7 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Old lot 32/8 was occupied by a four-story building from ca. 1868. It was connected to the sewer system in that year or shortly before 1868. Samuel Willett, named in the tax assessments was not listed in the Brooklyn city directories. It is likely that lot 32/8, located in this newly developing area, was purchased as an investment -- Willett bought this lot and the one next door (below) -- and the building would have been connected to the sewer system shortly after to make it more attractive to potential tenants. Block 2387 was at the eastern end of the area that had been developed by 1858 (Dripps map). The building on lot 32/8 probably predates the earliest tax assessment and consequently was initially equipped with a cistern and privy. Neither the footprint of the building shown on the 1868 Higginson map, nor its yard were impacted by subsequent construction. ***This part of lot 7 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Old lot 33/9 was occupied by a four-story building from ca. 1868. It was connected to the sewer system before 1868. The arguments for this lot are the same as for the previous. There is no evidence of impacts. ***This part of lot 7 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

SITE 311

Block 2411, lots 1, 12

Pls. 197, 198, 199

Lot 1, which comprehends old lots 22, 23, 24, 25, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 37, 36, 35, 34, is covered by industrial buildings and may be eliminated from consideration for archaeological sensitivity.

Lot 12 was occupied by a two-story building from ca. 1866. It was connected to the sewer system before 1868. The owner, William Kohlmeier, also owned old lots 22, 23, and 24 of lot 1 and evidently bought the properties in this newly developing area as an investment. This block was developed before the end of the 1860s and so the building on lot 12 was probably initially equipped with a cistern and privy. Neither the rear of the building shown on the 1868 Higginson map nor its yard were impacted by subsequent construction episodes. *This part of site 311 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.*

SITE 312

Block 2390, lot 15

Pls. 200 (above), 201, 202

Lot 15 was occupied by a four-story building on the front of the lot from ca. 1866. It was connected to the sewer system by the same owner, Bernard Vath, in 1870. Vath also owned the property next door on lot 16 where he lived from 1867-68 (see next entry). It is likely that he purchased this building as an investment and rented it out. Although we can not trace the history of this building's occupation, it is likely that it was equipped with a cistern and privy like its identical neighbor on lot 16. Neither the back of the building nor its yard were impacted by subsequent construction. *Site 312 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.*

SITE 313

Block 2390, lot 16

Pls. 200 (below), 201, 202

Lot 16 was occupied by a four-story building on the front of the lot from ca. 1866. The building was connected to the sewer system in 1870. The resident, Bernard Vath, moved in in 1867-1868, a couple of years before the sewer connection was made. Consequently, Mr. Vath would have needed a cistern and privy and the property was probably so equipped. Neither the yard, nor the back of the house, where the cistern would have been located, have been impacted by subsequent construction episodes. ***Site 313 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

SITE 314

Block 2393, lot 14

Pls. 203 (above), 204, 205

Lot 14 comprehends old lots 13 and 14:

Old lot 13 was occupied by a three-story building from ca. 1868. It was connected to the sewer system in the early 1860s. The property was probably developed earlier and was equipped with a cistern and privy, but in any case, a one-story rear wing added in the early 20th century that completely covered the former yard would have negatively impacted any such installations. ***This part of lot 14 is therefore not considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Old lot 14 was occupied by a four-story building from ca. 1868. It was connected to the sewer system in the early 1860s. The property was probably developed earlier and was equipped with a cistern and privy, but in any case, a one-story rear wing added in the early 20th century that completely covered all but a small section of the yard at the rear of the lot would have negatively impacted any such installations. ***This part of lot 14 is therefore not considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

SITE 315

Block 2393, lots 23, 24

Pls. 203 (below), 204, 205

Lot 23 was occupied by a three-story building in 1868. The sewer connection probably dates from the early- to mid-1860s, since it was recorded in the lost book 1, which should cover those years. This property was also owned by H. Meyers, who no doubt purchased it as an investment (see site 206, block 2326, lot 17). The block was developed before the end of the 1850s so this lot probably was initially equipped with a cistern and privy. A rear wing was added in the early 20th century that could have impacted a potential cistern, but the rear yard was not impacted by subsequent construction. ***This part of site 315 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Lot 24 was occupied by a three-story building from ca. 1868. It was probably connected to the sewer system before that date. The possibility that the building was older and had a cistern and privy can not be ruled out (the history of its occupation could not be traced, as the owner was not listed in the city directories). But whether or not a privy and cistern once existed on the lot, a brick building erected before the end of the 19th century would have disturbed or destroyed any potential archaeological remains. ***This part of site 315 is therefore not considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

SITE 317

Block 2416, lots 8 and 7

Pls. 206 (above), 207, 208

Lot 8 comprehends old lot 3 and 4:

Old lot 3 was occupied by a two-and-a-half story building from the early- to mid-1860s, since its sewer connection was recorded in the lost book 1, which should cover those years. (The history of its occupation could not be traced, as the owner was not listed in the city directories). This block is in the oldest part of Williamsburg and the 1850 Dripps map shows that it was already developed by that date. It was possible to trace occupation on this block, in the city directories, back to 1857-58 (see lot 7, below). This lot was probably initially equipped with a

cistern or privy. Neither the back of the building, where a potential privy could have been located, nor the rear yard were negatively impacted by subsequent construction. ***This part of lot 8 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

Old lot 4 was occupied by a one-story building from ca. 1868. It was connected to the sewer system in 1875. No doubt the property was equipped with a cistern and privy. (The owner, Ezra H. Ferry lived next door -- see next entry -- and it was therefore not possible to trace the history of occupation on this lot). The building was enlarged at least twice in his history, which would probably have negatively impacted a potential privy that could have been located immediately behind it. The back yard, however, was not disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This lot 8 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy.***

Lot 7 was occupied by a three-story building from ca. 1868. It was connected to the sewer system by the same owner, Ezra H. Ferry, in 1877. Ferry, who sold produce at the Fulton market in New York, lived at this address from 1857-58 and no doubt had access to privy and probably also a cistern on his lot. The building did not undergo any significant changes in its footprint, so that a cistern, located immediately behind it would not have been negatively impacted. Nor was the yard area disturbed by any subsequent construction. ***This part of site 317 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.***

SITE 321

Block 2441, lot 47

Pls. 206 (below), 209, 210

Lot 47 was occupied by a two-story building from ca. 1868. The property was connected to the sewer system in the early- to mid-1860s. A building was probably already standing on this lot in the 1850s (see above), which would have been equipped with a cistern and privy. But whether it was or not, a brick rear wing added to the original building between 1912 and 1929 completely covered the formerly vacant area of the lot and would have disturbed or destroyed any potential archaeological remains. ***Site 321 is therefore not considered potentially***

archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.

SITE 324

Block 2442, lot 11

Pls. 211 (above), 212, 213

Lot 11 comprehends old lots 9, 10, 11, 12. The front part of these old lots, where the buildings stood in the 19th century, is vacant, but the rear portion, in the area of the yards, is currently covered by an industrial building. *This lot is therefore not considered archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.*

SITE 325

Block 2442, lot 21

Pls. 211 (below), 212, 213

This is a reactivation only: potential archaeological remains will not be impacted.

SITE 327

Block 2443, lot 37

Pls. 214, 215, 216

Lot 37 comprehends old lots 39, 38, 37, and 36:

Old lot 39 was occupied by a two-story building from ca. 1868, and connected to the sewer system in the same year. The owner did not live at this address and it is therefore not possible to trace the building's history of occupation. The 1858 Dripps map indicates that this block was already developed by that date and the building on this lot was therefore equipped with a cistern and privy. Except for the addition of a one-story building immediately behind the house, on part of the lot's width, the rear yard was not impacted by subsequent construction. *This part of lot 37 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.*

Old lot 38 was occupied by a two-and-a-half story building from ca. 1868. It was connected (or a predecessor) to the sewer system probably in that year or shortly before. The

owner, David Downing, did not reside here, but an engineer named Daniel Downing lived here from at least 1871-72. Before that year, he was listed at 62 South 5th Street back to 1857-58. This may be the same building, as in the 1860s, since the house numbers on this block, between Berry Street and Bedford Avenue ranged from 55 to 92, and the even numbers may have been on the north side of South 5th Street, if one understands “left” in the street directory to mean on the left, moving east from the river. If it was the same address, then Downing lived in the house on old lot 38 from at least 1857 and would certainly have had a privy and a cistern. Neither the area immediately behind the original building nor the rest of the rear yard was impacted by subsequent construction. *This part of lot 37 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains, for a privy and a cistern.*

Old lot 37 was occupied by a two-story building from ca. 1868. It was connected (or a predecessor) to the sewer system in the early- or mid-1860s. The owner apparently did not live here, as he / she is not listed in the directories and it is therefore not possible to trace the building’s history of occupation. Since the block was developed in the 1850s, the building on this lot was no doubt initially equipped with a cistern and privy like its neighbors. Neither the area immediately behind the original building nor the rest of the rear yard was impacted by subsequent construction. *This part of lot 37 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.*

Old lot 36 was occupied by a two-story building from at least 1868. It was connected to the sewer system by the same owner in 1869. Herman Dale, who sold “fancygoods” only took up residence here in 1872-73; the building’s history of occupation before that date could not be traced. Whether or not it was equipped with a cistern and privy, the original building was torn down before the end of the 19th century and replaced by a large, three-story building that covered almost the entire lot area, leaving only an approximately two- or three-foot alleyway around it. *This part of lot 37 is therefore not considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.*

SITE 328

Block 2443, lot 13

Pls. 214 (below), 215, 216

This is a conversion site only: potential archaeological remains will not be impacted.

SITE 331

Block 2444, lots 2, 3, 4, 5

Pls. 217 (above), 218, 219

Lot 2 was occupied by a three-story residential building from ca. 1868. It was connected (or a predecessor) to the sewer system in the early- to mid-1860s. The owner, Nathaniel Briggs, a merchant, did not reside here, but apparently purchased this lot and lot 5 (below) as an investment. The building's history of occupation therefore could not be reconstructed. But this area was developed before the end of the 1850s and so there was no doubt once a cistern and privy on this lot. Neither the back of the building nor its rear yard were impacted by subsequent construction. ***This part of site 331 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Lot 3 was occupied by a three-story residential building from ca. 1868. It was connected (or a predecessor) to the sewer system in the early- to mid-1860s. The owner's name was not found in the directories and so the building's history of occupation could not be traced. But this area was developed before the end of the 1850s and so there was no doubt once a cistern and privy on this lot. Neither the back of the building nor its rear yard were impacted by subsequent construction. ***This part of site 331 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Lot 4 was occupied by a three-story residential building from ca. 1868. It was connected (or a predecessor) to the sewer system in the early- to mid-1860s. No "William Hall", the owner listed at this address in the tax assessments, resided at this address during the 1860s. It was therefore not possible to trace the building's history of occupation. As in the previous cases, however, there was no doubt once a cistern and privy on this lot. ***This part of site 331 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

Lot 5 was occupied by a three-story building from ca. 1868. There is no sewer connection recorded for this lot. Since it was also owned by Nathaniel Briggs (see lot 3), who did not reside here, its history of occupation could not be traced. As in the previous cases, however, we may assume that there was once a cistern and privy on this lot. The rear fifteen-feet of the site has not been impacted by subsequent construction. ***This part of site 331 is therefore considered potentially archaeologically sensitive for historic remains.***

SITE 332
Block 2444, lot 11
Pls. 217 (below), 218, 219

This is a conversion site only: potential archaeological remains will not be impacted.

6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources:

City Records

Brooklyn Directories 1843-1880

Sewer Department tap records

Tax Assessments

Maps

Bromley, G.W. & E. Robinson

1880 *Atlas of the Entire City of New York*. New York.

Dripps, M.

1850 *Village of Williamsburgh*.

Dripps, M.

1858 *Ward map of Brooklyn*. New York.

Field, Thomas W.

1852 *Map of the City of Williamsburgh and the town of Bushwick, including Green Point with part of the City of Brooklyn*.

Hyde, E. Belcher

1929 *Desk Atlas Borough of Brooklyn City of New York*. Vol. 2. New York:

Higginson, J.H.

1868 *Higginson's Insurance Maps of the City of Brooklyn, Long Island*. Vol. 4.

Perris, Wm.

1855 *Brooklyn*. Pl. 16

Sanborn

1951 *Insurance Maps of the Borough of Brooklyn*, vols. 3 and 4.

1979 *Insurance Maps of the Borough of Brooklyn*, vols. 3 and 4.

2000 *Insurance Maps of the Borough of Brooklyn*, vols. 3 and 4.

United States Coastal Survey

1844-45 *Map of New York Bay and Harbor and the Environs*

United States Geological Survey

1999 *Brooklyn Quadrangle, New York. 7.5-Minute series (Topographic).*

Secondary Sources

Adams, Julius W.

1857 *Report of the Engineer to the Board of Sewer Commissioners of the City of Brooklyn upon a Plan for the Drainage of that portion of the City Lying Between North-Fourteenth Street, Union Avenue, Broadway, River Street, Kent Avenue and the East River, Comprising the Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Part of the Fifteenth, Sixteenth and Nineteenth Wards.* December 9. Brooklyn: L. Darbee & Son, Book and Job Printers, 146 Fourth Street, corner of South First.

1859 *Report of the Engineer to the Commissioners of Sewerage of the City of Brooklyn on the General Drainage of the City.* Brooklyn: L. Dargee & Son

Armbruster, Eugene L.

1919 *The Ferry Road on Long Island.* New York: Published by the author.

1942 *Brooklyn's Eastern District.* Brooklyn: the author.

Bolton, Reginald Pelham

1920 "New York City In Indian Possession". *Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation. Indian Notes and Monographs*, vol. II, no. 7.

1922 Indian Paths In the Great Metropolis. *Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation. Indian Notes and Monographs*, misc. No. 23.

Bradley, James

1995 "Sugar". P. 1140 in: *The Encyclopedia of New York City*, ed. by Kenneth T. Jackson. Yale U. Press.

Brooklyn Eagle

1895 "Making Dye from Wood: An Industry in Which Brooklyn Leads", (Anon.), *Brooklyn Eagle*. No Byline. Dec. 22, p. 19.

Brooklyn Standard

1928 "Industry". *Brooklyn Standard Union 1863-1928 Anniversary Issue*. No Byline. (Consulted at <http://www.bklyn-genealogy-info.com/Newspaper/BSU/Anniversary/Industry.html>).

Cohen, P.E. and Augustyn, R.T.

1997 *Manhattan in Maps 1527-1995*. New York: Rizzoli.

Cropsey, Frances Bergen

1925 Indian Trails of Kings County compiled by Frances Bergen Cropsey. Read at meeting of Women of '76, D.A.R., Nov. 1925. MS, New York Historical Society.

Felter, William L.

1918 *Historic Greenpoint a brief account of the beginning and development of the northerly section of the borough of Brooklyn, City of New York locally known as Greenpoint*. Issued in connection with the semicentennial of the Greenpoint Savings Bank and by that institution. New York.

Goldman, Joanne Mara

1988 *The Development of a Sewer System in New York City, 1800-1866: Evolution of a Technological and Managerial Infrastructure*. Ph.D. Diss. State University of New York at Sony Brook.

Grumet

1881 *Native American Place Names in New York City*. Museum of the City of New York.

Howard, Henry W.B.

1893 *The Eagle and Brooklyn: The Record of the City of Brooklyn. Progress of the Brooklyn Daily Eagle...History*. Brooklyn Daily Eagle.

HPI

1984 *Phase IA Archaeological Impact Report for the Watchtower Bible and Tract Society Brooklyn Project*. Historical Perspectives.

LPC

1982 *Greenpoint Historic District Designation Report*. New York: Landmarks Preservation Commission.

Manufacturer

1870 The Continental Works, Greenpoint, Long Island, A Model Foundry. (No byline)
The Manufacturer and Builder, Vol. 2: 105-106

Manufacturers

1886 *Half-Century's Progress of the City of Brooklyn. The City's Leading Manufacturers and Merchants*. New York: International Publishing Co.

Map

1776-7 *Map showing the original high and low grounds, salt marsh and shorelines In the City of Brooklyn, from Original Government Surveys made In 1776-7.* New York Public Library, Map Division.

Ostrander, Stephen M.

1894 *A History of the City of Brooklyn and Kings County.*

Prime, Nathaniel S.

1845 *A History of Long Island from its First Settlement by Europeans, to the year 1845...* New York: Robert Carter.

Provost, Andrew J. Jr.

1949 *Early Settlers of Bushwick, Long Island, New York and their Descendants.* Vol. One. Darien, CT: the author.

Stiles, Henry R.

1867 *A History of the City of Brooklyn, Including the Old Town and Village of Brooklyn, the Town of Bushwick and the Village and City of Williamsburgh,* vol. I.

1869 *A History of the City of Brooklyn, Including the Old Town and Village of Brooklyn, the Town of Bushwick and the Village and City of Williamsburgh,* vol. II.

1870 *A History of the City of Brooklyn, Including the Old Town and Village of Brooklyn, the Town of Bushwick and the Village and City of Williamsburgh,* vol. III.

Sugar

2004 "Greed's behind Domino site's fall". No Byline. *New York Daily News*, January 12.

Union History Co.

1899 *History of Architecture and the Building Trades of Greater New York.* Vol. I. New York.

Welsh, Peter C.

1964 *Tanning in the United States to 1850: A Brief History.* Smithsonian Institute.