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I. INTRODUCTION

The following report presents the results of a Stage IA Cultural Resources Survey of the East Side Project portion of the proposed Staten Island Industrial Park, performed by Historic Conservation and Interpretation, Inc. (hereafter HCI) of Newton, New Jersey for Energy & Environmental Analysts, Inc. of Garden City, New York. Work was performed primarily by HCI's Primary Investigator Edward S. Rutsch and Researcher Dorothy Hartman in June and July of 1982.

The study area consists of 415 acres in the northwestern quadrant of Staten Island, New York City (see Figure 1). It lies just south of Interstate 278 and just east of the West Shore Expressway. With some minor variations, the project area is bounded on the east by Victory Boulevard, Graham Avenue, and Felton Street, and on the south by Travis Avenue (see Figures 1 and 2).

The survey included a thorough investigation of the cultural resources either noted in the literature, recorded in a wide variety of data repositories (e.g., site files), or known to vocational or avocational researchers having knowledge of the region's culture history. Author Edward S. Rutsch drew on his personal knowledge of and experience in Staten Island prehistory (Rutsch 1968A, 1968B, 1970).
Figure 1. The 1982 Stage 1A Cultural Resources Survey was limited to the 415-acre East Side project area. (Map courtesy of Energy & Environmental Analysts, Inc.)
A list of the professional archeologists consulted in the course of this survey includes the following: Sharene Baugher-Perlin, New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission; Ann Covell, New York State Division of Historic Preservation, New York City office; Bruce Fullem, New York State Division of Historic Preservation; Philip Lord, New York State Museum, Albany; Dr. Bert Salwen, Professor of Anthropology, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, New York University, New York; Charles Thomas, cultural resources researcher with experience in Staten Island sites; and Dr. Lorraine Williams, Chief, Archeology Bureau, New Jersey State Museum, Trenton. Institutions and repositories canvassed include the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission; the New York City Public Library; the New York City Municipal Library; the New York State Museum, Albany; the New York State Library, Albany; the New York State Archives, Albany; the New York State Department of Parks and Recreation, Albany; the New-York Historical Society, New York City; the New Jersey State Museum, Trenton; the Staten Island Institute of Arts and Sciences; the Sussex County, New Jersey Library; the Newburgh, New York Free Public Library; and the Orange County, New York Community College Library. The results of the aforementioned research and interviews are given in the following pages.

In addition to documentary research, the authors visited the study area and physically surveyed it in two ways. First, they conducted a pedestrian survey of the entire project area. Second, they returned to those specific zones where documentation had indicated the possible presence of prehistoric and/or historic cultural resources. General and specific site photographs were taken, some of which illustrate the report.
In the final portion of the following report, the authors evaluate the potential of the study area to yield significant cultural resources. "Significance" is defined as possessing a quality or qualities which meet one or more of the criteria for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. Inasmuch as they assess the study area to possess such a potential, specifically in the area of prehistoric cultural resources, Section IV, Conclusions and Recommendations, suggests that a Stage IB Cultural Resources Survey be undertaken to determine the presence or absence of such suspected resources by means of archeological testing.
II. DOCUMENTARY RESEARCH

A. PHYSIOGRAPHY

The study area is located in the North American Continent's Coastal Plain, which stretches, in the United States, from Cape Cod southward to the Mexican border (Hunt 1974: 209). The portion of the plain from North Carolina northward is called the embayed section, where all but the highest—usually westernmost—portions of the plain have been inundated by the sea (Hunt 1974: 217).

Staten Island topography is also the result of the remains of the terminal moraines of several glaciers, which left deposits of stone and gravel on the landscape, as high as 300 feet above sea level at Saint George (Schuberth 1968: 186; see Figure 3). The study area is located just west of these deposits, which traverse the island in a northeast-to-southwest direction down its length. It is an area the landscape of which consists of the outwash plain of water from the higher ground of the moraine to the east.

The outwash plain in the study area shows little difference in elevation from north to south, but varies from 40 feet above sea level in the east to under 10 feet above sea level in its western portions. Several areas along the South Avenue show signs of having been regularly inundated by floodwaters, and the northwestern portion of the study area
FIGURE 3. Portion of map showing physiography of the metropolitan New York region (Schubert 1968). The approximate location of the study area is shown by a circle. Note the terminal moraine extending through the island in a northeast to southwest direction.
is covered with a permanent marsh. Tidal marshes occur just west of
the study area, where small streams become estuaries of the Arthur Kill
(see Figure 4).

In general, human activity in the project area has been most
intense in the upland regions along its eastern and southern sections,
which have higher elevations. Both aboriginal site areas and historic
period farming and communities located here. Some of the wetlands in
the study area's northern and western zones have hosted significant
amounts of filling, and, no doubt, various amounts of eroded material,
especially since the period of historic tree cutting and subsequent
cultivation.

B. PREHISTORIC PERIOD

The record of prehistoric investigations of Staten Island which
have been reported and shared among archeologists spans the period from
1884 to the present (Hollick 1884). In addition, much unreported
excavation and collection have gone on, as is made clear in references
to such activities in various publications, and as has been experienced
or witnessed by author Rutsch within the last 15 years. Several syntheses
of Staten Island's prehistoric cultural remains have been made, of which
Carlyle Smith's work, Archaeology of Coastal New York, published in 1950,
and Jerome Jacobsen's monograph Burial Ridge, presented in 1980, are
the most important.

Known aboriginal culture history in Staten Island extends from
the Paleo-Indian period through the time of contact with Europeans
(Kraft 1977: 1-9; Bolton 1920). Several sites have located in the region of the study area, and two are within its boundaries. Probably the most important site was called the Bowman's Brook site, located north of the study area in the Mariner's Harbor section. It was reported by Parker in 1920, whose description of its ceramic assemblage has made it the type site for an important aspect of Woodland Period aboriginal history in the New York Coastal Region.

The aboriginal sites reported in the literature or in surveys in and around the study area include the following four, listed by their New York State Museum site numbers (see Figure 4 for their locations):

**Sites within Study Area:**
1. 4597--"Bull's Head"
2. 4596--"Bloomfield" or "Watchogue"

**Sites in Vicinity of Study Area:**
3. 4627--"Chelsea"
4. 4598--"Neck Creek"

Site 4597 (Parker survey site 7) is located in the present study area on a knoll just north of Victory Boulevard (labeled #1 in Figure 4). Parker writes that "... graves are reported to have been found. The site is well known locally as the 'burying ground.' Several grooved axes have come from this site." However, he also remarks that "Attempts to locate any remaining graves have been unsuccessful" (Parker 1920: 681-82). It would appear from the 1982 on-site reconnaissance that this site is presently covered with weeds, brush, and second-growth trees. Its original landscape, to judge by a cut made for a gas line, is still somewhat intact, although woodcutting and agricultural activities,
FIGURE 4. Portion of U.S.G.S. map, Arthur Kill Quadrangle (7.5 minute series, 1966), on which the study area is outlined and approximate locations of previously known sites of aboriginal culture are circled: (1) 4597, Bull's Head site; (2) 4596, Bloomfield or Watchogue site; (3) 4627, Chelsea site; and (4) 4598, Neck Creek.
including cultivation, probably occurred here. Parker’s note that he could not locate any burials on this site may mean that its aboriginal material had been removed. However, because the natural contours of the terrain appear to remain relatively undisturbed, at least in part, careful testing should be carried out at this location as part of the Stage IB Cultural Resources Survey.

Site 4596 (Parker’s Site 6) is known both as the Bloomfield site and earlier, the Watchogue site (see site 2, Figure 4). Parker reports that "... there is no special large village site in this region, but relics occur more or less abundantly on all the dunes and sandhills" (Parker 1920: 681). He noted various aboriginal artifacts, including ceramics and stone, in the collections of an Isiah Merrill. Merrill’s family farm was located in this area, and his family name survives in local place names, e.g., Merrill Road, which bisects the study area (see Figure 2). In general Parker notes that "The site is peculiar on account of the scarcity of shell pits and similar remains. "Relics," he reports, "occur almost entirely as surface finds" (Parker 1920: 681).

In 1914, noted archeologist Alanson Skinner reported on a collection of "Indian relics" made at Watchogue by Peter B. Decker, a resident. The artifacts apparently covered a wide variety of culture periods, including the historic or contact period, as indicated by a "brass arrowhead" which Skinner probably rightly suggested was made of material traded to the Indians by Europeans. Other than a notation that ceramics were found on a "sand hammock," no specific site location or description was made (Skinner 1914: 102-104).
The site today contains the remaining houses of the hamlet of Bloomfield and an extensive grouping of riding and boarding stables for horses. The infield survey revealed that the landscape of the area had been extensively modified by grading and bulldozing. Some remnants of the original surface do seem to exist, despite clearing and cultivation; therefore, a careful testing survey of this part of the study area is warranted and recommended in a Stage IB infield survey.

Sites have been recorded on properties adjoining the project area. They are discussed herein to show the distribution of aboriginal material in the area, which reflects a pattern of use of the uplands along the tidal marshes and creeks on the edge of the Arthur Kill. New York State Museum site 4627 (unnumbered, Parker's survey, site 6 in Skinner's 1903 survey, site 7 in Skinner's 1909 survey, and No. A 085-01-0135 in Salwen's survey of 1967) is located on the south bank of Sawmill Creek at the angle of the Bloomfield Road near its junction with Union Avenue (site 3 in Figure 4).

It is west of the study area but was reported by Skinner to be a continuation of the Bloomfield site (4596) just discussed (Skinner 1903). Skinner's 1903 and 1909 reports mention burials and stone tools but no ceramics. Rutsch examined collections of aboriginal artifacts from this site in the Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation (MAIHF), where he was formerly curator of the research collections (MAIHF Catalog Nos. 5/2147, one grooved axe; 8/7302, eleven projectile points; 13/1974, one grooved axe; and 13/2139, one grooved axe). New York State Museum survey site 4598 (Parker's site 8) is located south of Neck Creek near the New Jersey Central Railroad track, south of the present study area (see site 4, Figure 4). Parker reports that "Scattered lodges and some shells are to be found on the north side of Long Neck" (Parker 1920: 682).
A large number of surface collections and excavations of aboriginal sites have been reported in the Mariner's Harbor section of Staten Island, north of the study area. Many such references are to sites found during industrial, commercial, and residential development around the turn of the century. Although these sites, including the earlier mentioned Bowmans Brook type site, are well out of the study area, they represent a record of use of the northwestern quadrant of the island by a long continuum of prehistoric culture (see Figure 5).

Although neither of the two sites recorded within the study area is on the New York City, New York State, or National Register of Historic Places, they are potentially significant sites. Often times, the search for sites recorded by such early twentieth-century researchers as Skinner and Parker has revealed that many were merely notations made about locations where others had made surface collections in cultivated fields. Other reported sites have been long since removed as a result of subsequent land modification. Such may be the case in the present study area, but only a rigorous field check or Stage IB Cultural Resources Survey can assess the facts on the presence or absence of significant cultural material.
FIGURE 5. Map of Staten Island and adjacent areas, showing the location of the following archeological sites: (1) Ward's Point; (2) Page Avenue; (3) Port Mobil; (4) Smoking Point Pottery Farm; (5) Wort Farm; (6) Richmond Hill; (7) Old Place; (8) Goodrich; (9) Morgan; (10) Laurence Harbor; (11) Cliffwood Beach; (12) Union Beach; (13) Perth Amboy; and (14) Island Farm (Jacobsen 1980: Map I, p. 3).
C. HISTORIC PERIOD

1. In Staten Island

   a. European Exploration

   The written record says that the first Europeans to explore New York Harbor and the islands within it were with Giovanni de Verrazano in 1524. An Italian navigator, Verrazano was employed by the French monarch, Francis I. It is believed, however, that a severe storm prevented any exploration on land during that, his only, visit (Morris 1898: 21).

   Eighty-five years later in 1609, Henry Hudson, an English navigator hired by the Dutch, sailed into New York Harbor on his third voyage to the New World. His explorations, which extended as far north as present-day Albany, included an expedition around parts of Staten Island, which the Indians called Eghquaons or Aguehonga-Monaknong. Hudson named the island Staten Eyland after the States General in the Netherlands (Bolton 1922: 187, 285; Clute 1887: 8).

   b. The Dutch Colony

   The Dutch were initially interested in finding the Northwest Passage to the East Indies, but settled with trading with the Indians, especially furs. A small settlement was established in 1611 at the foot of Manhattan Island (Trager 1979: 2,117), and by 1617 some of the fur merchants had become quite wealthy (Morris 1898: 26). Profitable trading, good farmland, and a favorable climate led to the organization of the Dutch colony into a province and permanent settlement in 1624. During
that year, a group of Walloons, members of a reformed religious sect from the Belgian-French border, settled on Staten Island (Morris 1898: 26). Peter Minuit was the Director of New Netherlands at the time, and established other settlers on Manhattan Island.

David Pietersen DeVries was granted lands on Staten Island around 1630 (Clute 1887: 17), and sent colonists to establish a settlement in 1639 (Barlow 1969: 93). These early settlements were plagued with problems resulting from difficulties with the Raritan Indians, who also inhabited the island. Two skirmishes were known as the "Pig War" and the "Peach War." They developed over the alleged thievery of hogs and fruit from Staten Island bowseries, or farms, by Indians; the Dutch subsequently retaliated (Morris 1898: 32; Smith 1970: 11). At the time of the Peach War in 1655, the population of the island was 90; all were either killed or captured in the conflict, and their settlement was burned (Morris 1898: 38). It was therefore not until c. 1660 that a permanent and lasting settlement was established under Dutch rule on Staten Island.

c. English Colonial Rule

In 1664, an English vessel captained by Colonel Richard Nicolls sailed into New York Harbor and captured a small blockhouse on Staten Island (Smith 1970: 20). The Dutch subsequently surrendered their lands and Colonel Nicolls was appointed Governor of the province. Staten Island became part of "Yorkshire," named after the Duke of York (Smith 1970: 20). In 1670, the new Governor, Francis Lovelace, signed a treaty with the Indians which ended any dispute over the land (Barlow 1969: 94). Nine years later, a Dutch preacher toured the island and noted that the
population consisted of "... a hundred families of which the English constitute the least portion, and the Dutch and French divide between them equally the greater portion." He furthermore added that "About one-third part of the distance from the south side to the west end [including the study area] is still all in woods, and is very little visited" (Barlow 1969: 94). By 1688, Staten Island had become Richmond County and was divided into four towns: Castletown, Northfield, Southfield, and Westfield (Bayles 1887: 95).

During the next one hundred years, homesteading and agriculture became well established on the island. The diary of naturalist Peter Kalm notes, in 1748, the abundance of cleared fields and the cultivation of apple and cherry orchards (Barlow 1969: 94, 95). This agricultural base was to continue throughout the nineteenth century, providing farm products to the growing urban center on Manhattan.

d. The Revolutionary War Era

The New York City area was the center of British Loyalist sentiment and activity during the Revolution. Southern Westchester, Queens, and Richmond were overwhelmingly Tory (Fish 1976: 97). In 1776, British troops--32,000 strong--first landed and camped on Staten Island in their great invasion of New York City. The population on the island at the time was about 3,000 (Smith 1970: 63). It remained in British occupation for the duration of the war.

British-held New York was surrounded by American forces, who effectively denied the invaders the local resources of Staten Island--
game, forage, and timber. Although the British were largely supplied by sea, the above-mentioned bulky commodities were the most difficult to obtain (Barlow 1969: 96). The island, as well as the small enclaves the British held on the Jersey shore, were often caught between the opposing forces, becoming "...the scene of incessant minor attacks and counterattacks throughout the whole of the ensuing period" (Abbott 1962: 209).

Following the American victory, many of the Loyalists living on the island relocated in Nova Scotia (Barlow 1969: 96). New York State confiscated the property of these individuals, realizing $3,600,000 statewide in the resale of their lands (Fish 1976: 101). In addition, a law was enacted in 1784 disenfranchising all voters who had borne arms against the patriotic cause. This law affected two-thirds of the voters in Richmond and Kings counties (Fish 1976: 103). Although the island had endured the ravages of war, by the early 1800s farms were returning to their previous prosperity and the woodlands were regenerating (Barlow 1969: 96).

\textit{e. The Nineteenth Century}

Farming, fishing, and cottage industries were the mainstay of Staten Island economy until the second decade of the nineteenth century. Changes in transportation and technology promoted by influential people, coupled with Staten Island's proximity to Manhattan, started the slow but continual change in the cultural landscape from scattered rural farms to an urban industrial environment.
Daniel D. Tompkins, Governor of New York c. 1812 and Vice-President under James Monroe, established the village of Tompkinsville on the site of DeVries' first settlement (Smith 1970: 99). He was also influential in establishing streets and roads, including the Richmond Turnpike, now Victory Boulevard, which adjoins the study area. This road, which connected Tompkin's ferries at one end with scows at the other, provided one of the shortest and fastest means of getting from New York City to Philadelphia (Smith 1970: 100). Tompkins' Richmond Turnpike Company ran the first steam ferry to Staten Island in 1817 (Smith 1970: 108). By around 1820, five steam ferries crossed regularly from Staten Island to Manhattan (Smith 1970: 101).

Transportation facilities grew when the Staten Island Railroad Company was formed in 1851. By 1860, the railroad was in operation (Clute 1887: 331). Other railroads were chartered and built, including trolley lines. Eventually, all joined to form a system that radiated out from one central ferry terminal (Bayles 1887: 689, 690).

Seafood was always in abundance around New York Harbor, and many residents of Staten Island made their living harvesting and selling oysters. Clute (1887: 329) lists the oyster business as one of the most important industries on the island. After the natural beds were depleted, additional beds were seeded with small oysters from other areas as far south as Virginia. In this way, the supply was kept relatively constant.

Among the enterprises that augmented the shellfish industry were cloth dyeing and cleaning, paper manufacturing, brewing, and the making of linoleum, clay refractory materials, white lead, and linseed oil.
The cloth dyeing establishment was the first, in 1819 (Clute 1887: 322). Eventually, an entire industrial village, known as Factoryville, grew up around the plant (Smith 1970: 122-23).

During the 1840s, a white lead works was established by the Jewett family (Clute 1887: 328), and a fire brick company was built by B. Kreischer, whose success was guaranteed by a fine deposit of white clay found in the immediate area (Clute 1887: 326). The 1850s brought brewing and paper manufacturing to the island. German immigrants established the first brewery, Bechtel's, in 1853 (Clute 1887: 332). Of the five largest breweries operating in 1875, four produced a total of 129,000 barrels, with no listing for the fifth (Clute 1887: 332-33). Linoleum was first produced in the United States on Staten Island in 1875. A mixture of cork and linseed oil, it was far more durable than the previously used oil cloth (Clute 1887: 327).

Although these industrial plants were located on Staten Island, most, if not all, maintained offices in Manhattan. Since its discovery, Staten Island has been closely affiliated with Manhattan Island, beginning with the Dutch. The connection spanned all eras, from settlement, to agricultural community, to the industrial period, and was aided by continuing improvements in transportation. All doubtlessly contributed to Staten Island's incorporation into New York City in 1898 (Ellis et al. 1957: 379).

f. The Twentieth Century

Today's landscape reflects the suburban growth and industrial changes that began in the early twentieth century. The availability of reliable transportation to Manhattan led to the growth of a commuter-
centered housing economy. In addition, the availability of New York Harbor shoreline and its proximity to the New Jersey industrial coast aided in the development of oil industry storage facilities on the island.

Throughout the late nineteenth century and into the twentieth century, the island has also provided excellent recreational advantages. It was first a somewhat rural retreat from Manhattan. Later, a beach resort area developed long the southeastern coast (Sullivan 1927: 402).

2. In the Study Area

The study area lies within that section of Staten Island referred to by the visiting preacher in 1748 as "... still all in woods and very little visited" (Barlow 1969: 94). There is little record of early settlement in the area. The Map of Staten Island...Showing Colonial Land Patents shows grants in the area dated 1680, during the early period of English rule (Skene 1907; see Figure 6). No record was found of early Dutch occupation in the area.

By the Revolutionary period, the settlements of Bullshead, along the southeast border of the project area, and Chelsea, on the shores of the Arthur Kill, just south of the project area, had been established. Bullshead, named for a sign over a local tavern, was a Tory headquarters (Leng and Davis 1930: 338), and Chelsea was known as Pralltown (Leng and Davis 1930: 339; Leng 1896; see Figure 7). The Prall family held land patents in the area during the second half of the seventeenth century (see Figures 6 and 7).
FIGURE 6. Portion of Map of Staten Island...Showing Colonial Land Patents, c. 1680, on which the approximate boundaries of the study area have been delineated (Skene 1907).
FIGURE 7. Portion of Leng's 1896 Map of Staten Island with Ye Olde Names and Nicknames on which the boundaries of the study area have been approximated (Leng 1896).
The settlement most closely related to the project area was known as Merrilltown—later Watchogue and still later Bloomfield (Smith 1970: 180, 182). Richard Merrill, progenitor of the family after which the settlement was originally named, settled on Staten Island in 1675, but it was not known whether he lived in the study area, although he was assessor of the north division in 1699 (Leng and Davis 1930: 927). From that time onward, into the early twentieth century, members of the Merrill family have inhabited and farmed the area.

Agriculture was the main occupation of the study area's residents from the earliest settlement. John Merrell (sic.) owned a plantation that extended from Bullshead to the Arthur Kill (Leng and Davis 1930: 928), and Isaac Merrill was raising "... melons, cabbage, beets and other produce ... for the city markets" in the middle of the eighteenth century (Smith 1970: 180). Well into the nineteenth century, Clute lists strawberries, melons, and sweet potatoes as products from the Bloomfield area (Clute 1887: 228). He also notes that the area is more than ordinarily infested with mosquitoes, and describes it as "... a level, sandy territory, sparsely populated, and, where not cultivated ... covered with a stunted growth of pines and cedars ..." (Clute 1887: 228). Another source describes Bloomfield as a "Small settlement in the sandy region south of Old Place" and Chelsea as "... still a backward section of the island, despite the advantages of its water frontage" (Leng and Davis 1930: 338, 339). Agricultural production for the expanding urban center on Manhattan Island was thus well-documented as the main economic pursuit of study area residents, throughout the historic period. Industry developed at more advantageous locations.
Historic transportation routes traverse the area. As stated previously, the project area is partially bounded by the Richmond Turnpike, now Victory Boulevard. This road is one of the earliest routes that connected the ferries to New York with the New Jersey routes to Philadelphia. Along with its proximity to Bullshead, the Tory headquarters, the road may well be one of the reasons that the Watchogue area was described as being "so near 'the lines' during the war of the Revolution..." (Clute 1887: 228). Railroad and trolley lines, however, favored coastal locations or areas where industry had already been established.

In summary, the project area is sandy land bordered by wetlands in the northwestern area of Staten Island in the town of Northfield. Permanent settlement here began in the late seventeenth century. Agriculture quickly became the economic base and continued as such well into the twentieth century, as reference to the series of historic maps included herein will testify (see Figures 8-10). Parts of small rural communities still exist in the study area, but no structures of architectural significance remain.
FIGURE 8. Portion of Beer's 1887 Atlas of Staten Island, Richmond County, New York, on which the approximate study area is outlined.
FIGURE 9. Portion of Robinson's 1893 Atlas of the Borough of Richmond, City of New York, on which the study area has been delineated. Note that most of the land is in lease farming trails.
FIGURE 9. Portion of Robinson’s 1898 Atlas of the Borough of Richmond, City of New York, on which the study area has been delineated. Note that most of the land is in large farming tracts.
III. FIELD RECONNAISSANCE

Infield reconnaissance of the project area revealed a partially wooded area of second-growth trees interspersed with weed-choked marshy open areas and some wetlands. The southern portion of the area is covered with abandoned and overgrown truck farm fields. The land here is traversed by a few black-topped streets and dirt remnants of old roads and abandoned modern subdivision streetways. A good deal of random dumping has occurred throughout the area, as well as some filling of the marsh with clean fill materials.

Structures within the project area reflect the remains of two small nineteenth-century communities and subsequent twentieth-century development. Farmhouses and single-family dwellings are found in the Bloomfield area and along Victory Boulevard. They date from the second half of the nineteenth century through the early twentieth century. Modern structures within the project area include mostly cement block and brick stables, several modern but abandoned warehouses, and a fire station.

The area is bordered by modern, duplex residential development to the east, single-family, mid-twentieth-century residential areas to the south, and four-lane expressways to the west and north.
Figure 11 is a view westward from the corner of Paulding and Graham avenues. It illustrates the general ground cover found throughout most of the project area. Slightly to the north, near the location of prehistoric site 4597, the area consists of a knoll covered with weeds and second-growth trees. Portions of this area have not been disturbed.

On Sommer Street, west of Graham Avenue (Figure 12), are located two abandoned brick buildings, one of which was part of the Fire Department of New York system. At the end of the street, which turns to dirt and is apparently abandoned, the higher ground grades to the west and is again covered with second-growth trees and dense brush.

Southwest of Graham Avenue, along Victory Boulevard, stands an early twentieth-century farmhouse with associated outbuildings (Figure 13). Surrounding these structures are the remnants of the truck farm's fields, and evidence of field lines and farm lanes still exists. The exposed soil behind the buildings is red to orange in color and is a mixture of sand and silt. The level of disturbance is difficult to assess without testing. The most recent use for this area has been for the dumping of trash and the abandonment of vehicles.

Other open land in the project area is illustrated in Figure 14. Shown is a view toward the northeast from the corner of Travis and South avenues. A recreation field appears in the foreground, and the area rises slightly to woods in the background.

Parts of the Bloomfield settlement remain along Merrill Avenue (see Figure 15). The prehistoric site labeled 2 in Figure 4 is located in this vicinity, on the corner of South and Merrill avenues. However,
FIGURE 11. View westward from the corner of Graham and Paulding avenues along a cleared lane over a gas pipeline. This photograph shows the typical second-growth timber in the higher elevations in the eastern portion of the study area. (Ed Rutsch, photographer, 1982.)

FIGURE 12. View westward at the blocked end of Sommers Street in the higher area. (Ed Rutsch, photographer, 1982.)
FIGURE 13. Early twentieth-century frame farmhouse with outbuildings, standing in the center of an abandoned truck farm along Victory Boulevard, southwest of Graham Avenue. (Ed Rutsch, photographer, 1982.)

FIGURE 14. View northeastward from the corner of Travis and South avenues. Open ball fields are visible in the foreground, and second-growth trees appear at the rear. (Ed Rutsch, photographer, 1982.)
FIGURE 15. Single-family frame homes along Merrill Avenue in the Bloomfield community. (Ed Rutsch, photographer, 1982.)
from the mass of earth piled in a ridge parallel to South Avenue, it would appear that the site was bulldozed for a training ring associated with the riding stables. Such earth moving may well have affected a fair proportion of the site; however, undisturbed areas seem to exist between the earthen ridge and South Avenue. These should be tested in the recommended Stage IB survey.

Structures in the Bloomfield area vary in age from the mid-nineteenth to the early twentieth century. It was the opinion of Anne Covell, employed by the New York State Department of Parks and Recreation, Division of Historic Preservation, New York City, that no standing structures within the project area qualify as significant architectural cultural resources, as defined by the National Register of Historic Places. Visual inspection by Rutsch and Hartman, as well as an assessment by HCI's Historical Architect Herbert J. Githens, confirmed Ms. Covell's opinion. It is therefore unnecessary to describe further the standing structures that are presently located in the Bloomfield area. It suffices to say that they are predominantly one-family frame residences and farmhouses, spanning the period from the late nineteenth century to the early/mid-twentieth century. (The stables and storage buildings have already been mentioned.)

One exception is a house that may date to the early nineteenth century. Located between Glen and Hughes avenues, the structure is a 1½-story frame farmhouse with an interior brick chimney and salt box addition to the rear (see Figure 16). It may well be the oldest residence in the Bloomfield area and is similar to residences found in the settlement of Chelsea. It has, however, been greatly altered. Modern brick columns support the front porch, stucco covers the foundation, and aluminum siding obscures the exterior. It is architecturally insignificant.
FIGURE 16. Much-altered 1½-story frame farmhouse of a modified saltbox style located between Glen Avenue and Hughes Avenue in Bloomfield. (Ed Rutsch, photographer, 1982.)
Figure 17 illustrates Glen Avenue at the northwestern corner of the project area, looking east. The foreground is covered with marshy wetlands, which rise slightly in the background owing to construction fill from the development along Felton Street.
FIGURE 17. View eastward from the northwestern corner of the study area. Marsh grass covers the wet areas in the foreground, and filled marsh appears in the background. (Ed Rutsch, photographer, 1982.)
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. PREHISTORIC PERIOD CULTURAL RESOURCES

Notations found in the literature and various site files show that the upland areas along the tidal marshes of the Kill Van Kull and Arthur Kill were extensively inhabited by aboriginal peoples during several culture periods. Notations of the sites located within and adjacent to the study area are cursory and made in a preliminary fashion during the inventory days of the early twentieth century. They may, therefore, refer to collections and hearsay reports, as well as to actual sites. The two sites reportedly located in the study area (sites 1 and 2 in Figure 4) have been modified by human activity, lessening the likelihood of discovery of aboriginal cultural remains. However, it is only through a systematic field investigation that the presence or absence of such cultural remains can be determined. If they are present, such a survey is also necessary to assess their potential significance. Therefore, such an infield survey is recommended—i.e., a Stage IB Cultural Resources Survey. It should begin with a systematic surface collection, which includes shovel clearing at regular intervals. Test excavations should also be made at regular intervals throughout the dry land areas of the study area. A more concentrated program of excavation should be carried out in the vicinities of reported sites, as well as any place where surface collecting proved fruitful.
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B. HISTORIC PERIOD CULTURAL RESOURCES

The study area has remained woodland and cultivated farmland throughout almost all its recorded history. No sites of significant colonial farmstead existed within the study area. Although some of the residences in the project area are 100 years old, especially in the Bloomfield Community, none is architecturally significant and most have been much altered and poorly maintained. They were built in a variety of vernacular architectural styles, and they have been evaluated here as not meeting the criteria for inclusion on the National Register. Therefore, no further research into historic period cultural remains is recommended.
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