

### **3.8 Historic and Archaeological Resources**

**Comment 3.8-1 (Deputy Mayor Yagel, Public Hearing Transcript, June 4, 2009):** There are two historic sites on the property. The Conklin Family Cemetery, and they're proposing a ten-foot public access across a single family lot. And the Jay Mather Farmstead. While the cemetery is being kept, nothing is being said about what's happening to the Mather Farmstead.

*Response 3.8-1: The site plan has been modified as shown in FEIS Appendix D, to keep the entire J. Mather Farmstead intact and to make it available as a cultural resource to the public.*

**Comment 3.8-2 (Deputy Mayor Yagel, Public Hearing Transcript, June 4, 2009):** There are three single family residences as part of the farmstead, and the Hasting Hills Stable on the property. They do not state what is happening to these, if they are being kept. The lot should be reduced by the appropriate coverage.

*Response 3.8-2: The Conklin Cemetery and the entire J. Mather Farmstead are proposed to be avoided in accordance with the requirements of OPRHP in their letter dated, October 14, 2008 (included within Appendix B of the DEIS. A Figure which shows the non-disturbance area is included as Appendix D. The Hasty Hills Stable is not an archaeological resource and will be demolished as part of the proposed project. The stable is currently used by the Rockland County Sheriff's department for police horse training. The Rockland County Sheriff's department has been made aware of the proposed project so that alternate arrangements can be made.*

**Comment 3.8-3 (Ms. Louie, Public Hearing Transcript, June 8, 2009):** ..you know, tonight or as this process goes on to this Board, you're making a monumental decision. This is not your run of the mill, somebody's coming in for a zoning change, somebody's coming in for a variance, you know, asking for something. This is huge. This is a piece of property that's in a historically, ecologically and culturally sensitive area. This is at the foothills of the Harriman State Park Lands. This is an area that was once known as Ladentown, which was a Revolutionary War Encampment Town. This is a place that for centuries has -- decades has been, you know, preserved and lived in by generations and generations of farmers and villagers. And the history of this area is crucial to the history of Rockland County and to Ramapo itself.

*Response 3.8-3: The Cultural Resource Investigation (i.e. Phase 1 and Phase 2 investigations) identified all potential archaeological and historic resources on the subject property. The final report was reviewed by NYS Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation (OPRHP or SHPO) and determined that aside from the Conklin Cemetery and the J. Mather Farmstead, that the remainder of the site had no significant historic resources.*

**Comment 3.8-4 (Letter #4, Doris F. Uiman, Attorney at Law, July 6, 2009):** The proposed preservation of the historic cemetery and farmstead are inadequate (page 1-30). The cemetery is proposed to be sited on a single family lot with a 10 foot easement giving public access. How many people are going to use the easement which appears to belong to a private person? Is the owner of the lot going to permit that access? The cemetery should be on its own lot with sufficient land to accommodate visitors and public access to a public street. A similar area should be set aside for the farmstead. This can easily be accommodated if the property is developed in accordance with its current zoning.

*Response 3.8-4: Areas proposed as "Avoidance or Non-Disturbed" have been reviewed by OPRHP as to their appropriateness, refer to comments 3.8-5 through 3.8-7. In a letter dated November 16, 2009, the OPRHP has indicated their acceptance of the modified site plan to preserve cultural resources.*

**Comment 3.8-5 (Letter #7, Douglas P. Mackey, Historic Preservation Program Analyst Archaeology, New York Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation, May 6, 2009):** At the Conklin Cemetery, as at all historic locations, SHPO recommends that a protected buffer area be included in the site limits to insure that, the resource is protected. Such buffers help to protect sites against accidental impacts during construction and serve to insure that all resources associated with a site a safely avoided. For the Conklin Cemetery we recommend extending the protected area 25 feet beyond the stone wall. This extension will not affect the proposed building envelopes as identified on the current project plans (dated 8/21/08). In addition we would recommend that a conservation easement be created to insure long term protection of the cemetery, that the area be clearly marked on all construction plans as "Environmentally Sensitive Area, Do Not Disturb" and that the buffer area be protected by easily visible fencing during any construction activities. Since all of this can be accomplished without modifying the proposed extent of the construction envelopes on Lots 7 and 8 these recommendations should be easy to implement.

*Response 3.8-5: The Applicant agrees with all concerns identified in the comment and has amended the site plan as shown in Appendix D to incorporate the additional protection measures as noted.*

**Comment 3.8-6 (Letter #7, Douglas P. Mackey, Historic Preservation Program Analyst Archaeology, New York Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation, May 6, 2009):** The J. Mather Farmstead Site is incorrectly labeled Figures 3.8-2 and 3.8-3 of the DEIS as the J. Mather Farmhouse site, and the proposed avoidance reflects-this mistake.

*Response 3.8-6: The Applicant notes that "farmhouse" should read "farmstead" in the DEIS. Preservation of the entire J. Mather Farmstead area is shown in Appendix D.*

**Comment 3.8-7 (Letter #7, Douglas P. Mackey, Historic Preservation Program Analyst Archaeology, New York Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation, May 6, 2009):** SHPO has determined that the J. Mather Farmstead — including *the* house, the well and additional surrounding areas which produced archaeological material during the investigation are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, not just the stone foundation. Therefore, the proposed avoidance measures included in the DEIS will not protect the site sufficiently, and as 'proposed the project will have an adverse impact on the site that should be mitigated though measures to be developed. The actual site — as identified by the extent of archaeological testing which produced material associated with this occupation, and including a minimal buffer area, extends through much larger segment of Lot 51. When viewed on the current project plan the site covers areas that are identified as a single family home on Lot 51 and Building 158 as well as the entrance road from Route 306. In order to completely avoid impacting the J. Mather Farmstead site, the proposed plan would have to be reconfigured, removing Building 158, if possible shifting the proposed construction on Lot 51 north and west, and removing the access road from Route 306. If the project can not be reconfigured to avoid impacting portions of the site, SHPO would recommend developing additional mitigation measures. We will be happy to consult on the development of appropriate avoidance and/or mitigation measures. Whichever options are selected we would also recommend developing preservation easements or

covenants to protect any portions of the site left intact, and implementing protective fencing during construction.

***Response 3.8-7:** The Applicant has revised the site plan to identify 100% avoidance of the entire J. Mather Farmstead. Refer to Appendix B for correspondence with OPRHP which includes OPRHP acceptance of the revised avoidance plan.*

**Comment 3.8-8 (Letter #10, Adam Peterson, Environmental Analyst, New York State Department of Environmental Permits, Region 3, June 16, 2009):** SHPA - A review of the statewide inventory of archeological resources maintained by the New York Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP), indicates that the proposed project is located within an area considered to be sensitive with regard to archeological resources. Pursuant to the State Historic Preservation Act, a determination of the project's effect on cultural resources would need to be made by the OPRHP, if permits or approvals are required from a state agency for this work.

***Response 3.8-8:** As documented in the DEIS the Applicant has undertaken cultural resource investigations which have been submitted to OPRHP for review and determination. Refer to comments 3.8-5 and 3.8-7.*

**Comment 3.8-9 (Letter #16, Salvatore Corallo, Commissioner, County of Rockland Department of Planning, July 24, 2009):** Each of the proposed actions has the potential to impact the adjacent state parklands. Therefore, we recommend that Palisades Interstate Park Commission review the proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Map, and the DEIS for the mixed-density residential development proposed for the Patrick Farm site. Their concerns, if any, must be satisfactorily addressed.

***Response 3.8-9:** Comment noted. A copy of the project plans, the DEIS and the FEIS will be sent to the Palisades Interstate Park Commission for review and comment prior to the issuance of Findings for the project.*