CHAPTER 6: HISTORIC AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Introduction

The Proposed Project is being reviewed in conformance with the New York State Historic Preservation Act of 1980 (“SHPA”), especially the implementing regulations of section 14.09 of the Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation Law (“PRHPL”), as well as with the requirements of the Memorandum of Understanding (“MOU”), dated March 18, 1998, between the Dormitory Authority and the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (“OPRHP”) (OPRHP #11PRO4841). As part of this process, a Phase IA Archaeological Documentary Study has been prepared in order to determine the Proposed Project’s potential to encounter (and potentially affect) known and previously-unrecorded cultural resources — both aboveground historic architectural resources and below-ground archaeological resources.1 The Phase IA Archaeological Documentary Study complies with the SHPA and SEQR processes for historic properties.

Methodology

The area that would be affected by construction of the Proposed Project, referred to in this chapter as the Area of Potential Effect (“APE”), is delineated in Figure 6-1. The APE is situated on the southern half of the Project Site. As depicted in Figure 6-1, the Project Site includes the SBUH complex; the Hospital parking garage; the HSC complex; the HSC parking garage; the Ambulatory Surgery Center; the Cancer Center building; multiple surface parking lots; the Central Utility Plant, and the Long Island High Technology Incubator complex.

The APE is irregularly shaped, lying generally between Nicolls Road (CR 97) to the west and Health Sciences Drive to the east. To the south, the APE is bordered by the southern margins of the access road (Edmund D. Pellegrino Road) to the parking lot and the Cancer Center building. North of the APE is the SBUH complex, HSC complex, HSC parking garage, surface parking lots, and the Central Utility Plant and cooling towers. The existing Hospital parking garage and surface parking lot occupy the central part of the APE.

1 Historical Perspectives, Inc.  Phase IA Archaeological Documentary Study, Proposed Renovation, Expansion, and Modernization of Stony Brook University Medical Center, Town of Brookhaven, Suffolk County, New York, May 2011. Prepared for DASNY.
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Area of Potential Effect ("APE")
The Phase 1A Archaeological Documentary Study was designed to determine the potential for the APE to have hosted any potential archaeological resources, and the likelihood that these resources have survived postdepositional disturbances, including construction, regrading, and other land use which may have accompanied subsequent development.

In order to address these concerns, various sources of data were researched. Primary source material on the Project Site was collected to determine the APE’s original topography, early utility construction, and to compile a building history and disturbance record. Maps were researched at the Map Division and online collection of the New York Public Library, the Long Island Division of the Queens Library, the David Rumsey Historical Map Collection, SUNY Stony Brook Early Maps, the University of Alabama Library’s Coastal Topographical Sheets, My Topo Historical Maps, and Historic Map Works. Plans, aerial photographs, and a recent topographic survey of the APE were provided by the project team, particularly in the environmental site assessments by Anson Environmental, Ltd. (2011) and Freudenthal & Elkowitz (2004).

To place the APE in its historical context, both local and regional histories were researched at the New York Public Library, Local History and Genealogy division, the Long Island Division of the Queens Library, and Google Books. The digital archive of The New York Times was searched for relevant information regarding the development of the Stony Brook University and the Medical Center.

Existing archaeological and cultural resource studies for other sites in the vicinity of the APE were obtained from OPRHP, including Bernstein et al.’s (1999) study of a section of the East Campus immediately south of the present APE. Archaeological sites within one mile of the APE, inventoried by New York State Museum (“NYSM”) and OPRHP, were researched.

Existing Conditions

This section describes the results of the documentary, cartographic, and field research conducted for the Proposed Project. The background history of the APE and vicinity is described first, followed by a description of the potential archaeological and known and previously-unrecorded historic architectural resources within the APE.

Background

Prehistoric Era. In the Western Hemisphere, the term prehistoric refers to the time prior to European exploration and settlement. Archaeologists and historians gain their knowledge and understanding of prehistoric Americans in the Suffolk County area from three sources: ethnographic reports, Native American artifact collections, and archaeological investigations.

Based on data from these sources, a prehistoric cultural chronology has been devised for the Suffolk County area. Scholars generally divide the Prehistoric Era into three main periods, the Paleo-Indian (approximately [“ca.”] 14,000 to 9,500 years ago), the Archaic (ca. 9,500 to 3,000 years ago), and the Woodland (ca. 3,000 to 500 years ago). The Archaic and Woodland
periods are further divided into Early, Middle, and Late substages. The Woodland was followed by the Contact Period (ca. 500 to 300 years ago). Artifacts, settlement, subsistence, and cultural systems changed through time with each of these stages. Characteristics of these temporal periods have been well documented elsewhere, and in keeping with the request to professional archaeologists conducting work in New York State by the OPRHP, will not be fully iterated here.

At the time of European contact, the Native Americans who occupied Long Island were Munsee-speaking Lenape (also called Delaware) Indians. According to local histories, the first recorded land purchase by Europeans in the Town of Brookhaven took place in 1655, and the transaction was with Warawakmy, the representative of the Setalcott Indians (also Setauket and Seatalcot), considered one of the most powerful “tribes” in the area of modern Suffolk County, controlling all the lands from Stony Brook to Wading River, about 12 miles (19.4 kilometers [“km”]) east of the APE. According to historian Benjamin Thompson, “they inhabited the sides of the different creeks, coves, and harbors,” and a settlement at Strongs Neck (ca. 3.3 miles/5.3 km north of the APE) was supposedly the “royal” residence (Thompson 1839:67; Bayles 1874).

The vicinity of APE was also known as Nassakeag (or Nassakaag) during the historical period, either the name of a leader of the Nissequogue Indians, or a word meaning “in the middle of the swamp” (USCS 1837; Bernstein et al. 1999:9). It is possible the name was applied by European American settlers, rather than by the Indians.

Archaeologists William Beauchamp and Arthur C. Parker, both working in the first half of the twentieth century, note a shell midden at Stony Brook, and Parker records a village/burials at Port Jefferson, both along the north shore (Beauchamp 1900:149; Parker 1920:698). Parker also notes one of the few inland settlements, on the eastern shore of Lake Ronkonkoma, about 5 miles (8.06 km) to the south (Parker 1920:698).

Historical topographic maps record the nearest fresh water source, a small pond as approximately 0.7 mile northeast of the APE. Ponds/lakes on the north side of the East Campus, and north and east of the campus are manmade bodies of water, which aerial photos show were created between 1966 and 1976 (Anson Environmental 2011). Although it is possible that water may have collected in the low-lying, glacial kettle formations, of which there are at least three surviving in the wooded areas of the APE, this seems unlikely, given the fact that no standing water was visible in these locations during the site inspection (which took place on a spring day following a rainstorm).

**Historical Period.** The Town of Brookhaven had its beginnings in 1655, when the settlement of Setauket was established, about 2.6 miles north (4.19 km) of the Project Site. Six men from Boston and Southold, Long Island, purchased an approximately 30-square-mile area extending east from the Nissequogue River from Warawakmy, the representative of the local Indian group (Bayles 1874). This purchase included the APE, although the APE was an outlying location, distant from Setauket and the later Stony Brook settlement. Development and growth proceeded slowly into the eighteenth century, generally along creeks, where mills were constructed, around the protected harbor, and fertile farmlands, none of which were part of the
APE. The hilly, forested tracts on the glacial moraine like the APE were important sources of firewood, which became an important local export.

The interior of the town was only slowly opened, as roads were built to link the farmsteads of the interior with the harbors along the northern shore. The nearest mapped road to the APE during the eighteenth century was the precursor of the modern Pond Path Drive, approximately 3,800 feet (1.16 km) east of the APE, and the 1797 Hulse map labels the APE vicinity as “West Division of Long Lots Northside of the Countery Road.”

Brookhaven Town was occupied by the British during the Revolutionary War, and the usual depredations to property occurred. Notably, the need for firewood for cooking and heating resulted in the stripping of structures and deforestation. Historical (nontopographical) maps from 1797 through 1873 and beyond, record a featureless void between the roads and unpaved paths surrounding the vicinity of the APE. The 1837 USCS map refers to the area as Nassakaag, which, as discussed in the previous section, refers either to a leader of the Nissequogue Indians, or a word meaning “in the middle of the swamp” (Bernstein et al. 1999:9). Later maps and local histories refer to the area as South Setauket, generally centered on Pond Path Drive, about 3,800 feet (1.16 km) to the east. During the nineteenth century, the continuing harvesting of cordwood greatly reduced the forested areas of the township, and the cleared areas were used for row crops and dairying, although the dominant crop in the agricultural hamlet was apples (Chace 1858; Hyde 1914; Three Villages 2005:81).

By the turn of the twentieth century, real estate atlases record the APE as part of the larger property of George E. Darling, who owned a parcel of more than 204 acres, encompassing the entire present East Campus (Hyde 1904). Darling, a lawyer who resided in Port Jefferson, and also secretary of the Port Jefferson Automobile Club (The New York Times 1910), apparently purchased the land as an investment, since no subsequent changes to the property are apparent. He is recorded as owning other parcels in Suffolk County, a number of which he sold to the Bernie Holding Corporation in 1925 (New York Times 1925), which may point to the general date on which he sold the APE property, which was acquired before 1941 by Ward Melville, a local philanthropist (Hagstrom 1941). An aerial photograph from 1954 shows the APE as an undeveloped forested area, its isolation making it the perfect location for illegal moonshine operations during Prohibition years (Three Villages 2005:1981).

Ward Melville, whose fortune was derived from CVS Drugs and shoe manufacturing — Thom McAn shoe stores — had the dream of creating a Williamsburg-like colonial village restoration centered on the Stony Brook hamlet, and used his vast fortune to pursue that goal. Recognizing the symbiosis between Williamsburg and the College of William and Mary, Melville sought to create a college adjacent to the village, initially donating 340 acres for what has become the Main Campus of the State University of New York at Stony Brook (west of Nicolls Road). Groundbreaking for the Main Campus took place in 1960 (The New York Times 1956, 1960, 1961; Long Island Business News 2003), which would explain the earliest recorded construction on the APE, the water tower, which appeared in the forested area south of the APE and Edmund D. Pellegrino Road on aerial photos between 1957 and 1961 (Anson Environmental
During the same date range, Nicolls Road was widened and improved to its current form (Anson Environmental 2011).

Construction of the Health Sciences Center and University Hospital on the ca. 250 acre East Campus — also donated by Ward Melville — began in the fall of 1970. The architecture of the central part of the facility was described as “a giant futuristic dice cube thrown onto a field of hanging gardens,” and “a domino player’s dream: dark circular windows set against the white surfaces of its eight cubes that together form a giant cube.” The center was to cover “43 acres on the hilly site” (Horsley 1971), and the expected completion date was 1976 (Andelman 1971), but the hospital itself was not opened until 1980 (Cerra 1980).

For the most part, the APE remained a forested area to the south and west of the Hospital and HSC. The area to the south of the APE was developed as the Cancer Center building, the Ambulatory Surgery Center building and accessory parking lots following an archaeological study and testing in 1999, at which time the East Access Road (Edmund D. Pellegrino Road) was also constructed (Bernstein et al. 1999).

Disturbance Record. The APE has been subjected to various forms of subsurface disturbance. Aerial photographs capture the growing encroachment on the forested part of the APE. The Hospital and the Health Sciences Center were erected along the northern boundary of the APE during the late 1960s. The Hospital parking lot, within the central section of the APE, was first built between 1976 and 1980 as surface parking, with a new multi-story garage structure built on the original surface lot location between 1985 and 1994. A new surface parking lot was built on the APE to the south of the garage structure between 1994 and 2006, by which time the access roads and paths had reached their present configuration (Anson Environmental 2011).

Locations of standing structures and their immediate vicinity should be eliminated from further archaeological consideration based on deep subsurface disturbance caused by foundation excavation. Also, given the shallow nature (under normal circumstances) of buried prehistoric cultural remains, usually within three feet of the modern surface, the stump removal, grading and paving of access roads and parking lots, as well as that of their landscaped margins in such a hilly and irregular land surface would be considered subsurface disturbance sufficient to eliminate prehistoric sensitivity in these areas of APE. Evidence of the extent of the land recontouring which has taken place is visible in the retaining walls and stairways along the roadsides and linking sections of the campus. In addition, a drainage system in the southern part of the parking lot, as well as buried utility lines along the access roads, testify to additional subsurface disturbance.

Historic Architectural Resources

Historic architectural properties include properties or districts listed on the State or National Registers of Historic Places (“S/NR”) or determined eligible for such listing; and National Historic Landmarks (“NHLs”).
Criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places ("NRHP") are given in the Code of Federal Regulations ("CFR"), Title 36, Part 63, and these criteria are used for identifying architectural resources for SEQR review. Following these criteria, districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects are eligible for listing on the NRHP if they possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and: (1) are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history ("Criterion A"); (2) are associated with significant people ("Criterion B"); (3) embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, represent the work of a master, possess high artistic value, or represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction ("Criterion C"); or (4) may yield [archaeological] information important in prehistory or history. Properties that are younger than 50 years of age are ordinarily not eligible, unless they have achieved exceptional significance. Determinations of eligibility are made by OPRHP.

No historic structures have been inventoried or identified within one mile of the APE. No historic structures were documented for the campus in the Cassidy and Martin (1987) study, although there is no indication that Cassidy and Martin surveyed the modern structures to identify architecturally-significant buildings on campus. The buildings on the Stony Brook East Campus immediately adjacent to the APE date to the period after 1960. Based on historical aerial photographs, the earliest structure on the East Campus, the water tower about 200 feet (61 meters ["m"] south of the APE (see Figure 6-1), was built during the 1950s (Freudenthal & Elkowitz 2004). In a letter dated July 28, 2011, OPRHP indicated they have no concerns related to standing structures on the Project Site (see Appendix A, Agency Correspondence).

Archaeological Resources

Archaeological Sites within One Mile of the APE. Research conducted at the OPRHP revealed a number of archaeological sites within a one-mile radius of the APE. Table 6-1, below, summarizes these resources.

Table 6-1: Archaeological Sites within a One-Mile Radius of the APE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A10302.001573</td>
<td>Veterans Home</td>
<td>Ca. 0.4 mi. (0.65</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Concentration of 7 quartz flakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locus 1</td>
<td>km) E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10302.001574</td>
<td>Veterans Home</td>
<td>Ca. 0.45 mi. (0.73</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Concentration of 1 flake, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locus 2</td>
<td>km) E</td>
<td></td>
<td>possibly modified cobble, 1 piece of fire-cracked rock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site Number | Site Name | Location | Time Period | Remarks |
---|---|---|---|---|
NYSM 5560 A10302.000487 | State University at Stony Brook | Ca. 0.5 mi. (0.81 km) NW “On Jeep Trails near [S] parking lot” (Kelly Quad) | Prehistoric, historical | Surface collection “White quartz points, clam shell, some historic material” |
Bernstein et al. 1999 | SUNY at Stony Brook | Ca. 0.5 mi. (0.81 km) NW Grad Chemistry bldg. | Prehistoric | Stray surface find of a quartz bifacial tool |
SCAA/Bernstein et al. 1999 | SUNY at Stony Brook | Ca. 0.55 mi. (0.89 km) W, Tabler Quad | Prehistoric | Surface find, Wading River point |
A10302.001575 | Veterans Home Locus 3 | Ca. 0.6 mi. (0.97 km) E | Historical? | Cobble feature, stone wall? |
NYSM 7178 | Messiah Lutheran Church | Ca. 0.7 mi. (1.13 km) ENE Plowzone | Prehistoric and historical | 4 quartz flakes; 5 sherds 19th cent. ceramic and nails |
NYSM 5580 A10302.000499 | Lewis Pond | Ca. 0.9 mi. (1.45 km) E, “Rear [near?] pond on Lewis property” in South Setauket | Prehistoric | “Projectile points” |

Source: Historical Perspectives, Inc.

**Archaeological Studies Within and Adjacent to the APE.** A Phase IA (archaeological) documentary survey of the SUNY/Stony Brook property was undertaken in 1987 (Cassidy and Martin 1987). The survey noted the presence of one prehistoric site (A10302.000487, noted above) on the campus (although additional evidence has been found since that time), discovered in a 1977 surface collection on an exposed and eroding trail and the site (#0487) on the extreme southern edge of South Campus. The Cassidy-Martin Survey (1987:355) concluded that “the potential for the discovery of additional prehistoric sites at Stony Brook remains high. Survey should be done in advance of all construction.”

The section of the Stony Brook East Campus directly south of and slightly overlapping the APE has already been the subject of archaeological study. In 1999 David Bernstein, Michael Lenardi, and Daria Merwin conducted a *Stage I Archival Search and Archaeological Survey* (for the present Ambulatory Surgery facility) to determine whether there was a reasonable likelihood that undisturbed archaeological resources were buried beneath portions of that project site that would be disturbed during the planned construction (Bernstein et al. 1999). The study concluded that although there is a definite prehistoric presence in the vicinity, the lack of freshwater resources would have limited probable prehistoric land use to special-purpose activities such as foraging and hunting.

A subsequent surface survey encountered no artifacts or features, and the second phase of field survey consisted of a program of shovel test pits (“STPs”). Avoiding locations of identified
disturbance and those with greater than 15 percent slopes, a total of 164 STPs were excavated — a single transect of STPs spaced 20 m (66 ft.) apart along the then-proposed East Access Road, part of which now forms the southeastern corner of the APE; and additional STPs in a 10- by 20-m grid south of the current APE and bounded on the west by Nicolls Road. Of the 164 STPs, only two yielded cultural material, one a sherd identified as pearlware (N204/E215), and the other (N177/E184) a “possible quartz secondary flake.” Two additional STPs were dug adjacent to the latter, but both were culturally sterile (Bernstein et al. 1999). Since the single “possible” flake indicated only minimal prehistoric human activity, and had “virtually no research potential,” no further archaeological investigations were undertaken.

A cultural resource assessment of the Long Island State Veterans Home property, approximately 0.4 mile (0.65 km) east of the APE, was completed in 1987 (Grzybowski et al. 1987). The various locations at the Veterans Home Property have already been described in this section in the table of inventoried sites (A10302.001573, 001574, and 001575). Site survey included 337 “shovel probes,” which identified “a light scatter of lithic remains ... dispersed across the site.” The remains included “fire-cracked rock fragments, quartzite core reduction flakes and some core remnants,” but no formal tool or ceramics. Relevant to the current study, the lithics were scattered along the gentler slopes of kettle-hole depressions, topography similar to that of the present East Campus APE.

Three 1- by 1-m test units were also excavated following the survey in an attempt to identify the nature and purpose of three stone cobble concentrations (A10302.001575, Veterans Home Locus 3), but the results were inconclusive, even to identifying them as prehistoric or historical.

The study characterized the “low-density scatter” of prehistoric lithic material as a “non-site manifestation,” the sort of limited cultural remains produced by “sporadic hunting and plant foraging activities.” Additional testing was not recommended.

A third study, conducted for the construction of a sewer force main along Nicolls Road, immediately west of the APE, was completed in 1985 (Louis Berger & Associates 1985). Field testing consisted of a single transect of 114 “posthole tests” at 100-foot intervals along the force main easement (20 ft. by 20,000 ft.). Only five “postholes” produced cultural materials (Nos. 41, 81, 95, 98, and 113), generally historical materials found within the first six inches of the surface, and likely modern roadside discards. Two quartz flakes, from No. 41 and No. 98, were found in what was interpreted as fill deposited during the widening of Nicolls Road in the 1960s. No further prehistoric cultural material was recovered from the additional “postholes” dug at each of the four cardinal points surrounding No. 41 and No. 98. The study concluded that much of the force main site was originally “too steep and rough for intensive prehistoric use,” and was also disturbed by twentieth-century development.

**Future No-Build Condition**

Under the Future No-Build Condition, it is expected that the existing uses in the APE will remain the same as in 2011. No planned development projects have been identified on or within
the immediate vicinity of the APE; thus, cultural resources would not be affected in the Future No-Build Condition.

Future Build Condition

Historic Architectural Resources

Documentary research has provided no evidence of historical occupation of the APE prior to the construction of the water tower on the developing Stony Brook East Campus during the late 1950s/early 1960s, nor evidence of any use that would have left an archaeological footprint. Therefore, no further study or testing regarding historical resources was recommended.

Existing structures within and adjacent to the APE are less than 50 years of age (with the exception of the water tower just south of the APE). Properties less than 50 years old ordinarily are not eligible for listing on the State and or National Registers of Historic Places unless they have achieved exceptional significance. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not affect historic architectural resources.

Archaeological Resources

Knowledge of prehistoric and contact period settlement patterns indicates that early Americans showed marked preference for sheltered, elevated sites close to wetland features and sources of fresh water. Such locations are likely to have been exploited by prehistoric Americans for their processing sites, camps and more permanent settlements. As discussed in the Prehistoric Overview section of this report, the APE in its predevelopment state did not host these resources. The APE, situated near the crest of the Harbor Hill Moraine, presented an irregular, hilly, rocky landscape, with areas of steep slopes (greater than 12 percent) that would not have been hospitable to Native American occupation, whether large-scale settlements or campsites and raw material processing stations. Usage would have been confined to hunting and/or gathering expeditions.

Previous study and testing for prehistoric remains on the East Campus, abutting the APE to the south, characterized the “low-density scatter” of prehistoric lithic material recovered (on terraces similar to those in the APE), as a “non-site manifestation,” the sort of limited cultural remains produced by “sporadic hunting and plant foraging activities.” Based on this information, a similar scatter of prehistoric lithic material would be expected on the APE, although the actual presence or absence of prehistoric resources on undisturbed portions of the present APE can only be ascertained through archaeological testing.

Despite the intensive building programs that have taken place on the APE, extensive undisturbed locations in areas of moderate slopes (less than 12 percent) still exist. These locations are considered sensitive for prehistoric archaeological resources. The areas of prehistoric archaeological sensitivity are depicted on Figure 6-2. These locations were recommended for Phase 1B field testing as per OPRHP standards. In a letter dated July 28,
Precontact Archaeological Sensitivity Areas within the APE

Source: Historical Perspectives, Inc., 2011.
2011, OPRHP concurred with the Phase IA Archaeological Documentary Study recommendations for Phase IB field testing (see Appendix A, Agency Correspondence).

The recommended Phase IB field investigations occurred on November 17 and 18, 2011. As illustrated in Figure 6-2, five specific loci were identified as having precontact sensitivity. For Phase 1B testing purposes, each of these discrete areas were assigned a unique designation, labeled A through E (see Figure 6-3). Grid systems were established parallel to the existing Hospital parking garage (Areas A, B and C) and the existing utility plant (Areas D and E). The ground surface of Areas A, B and C was subjected to an initial pedestrian survey. No historic or precontact features or deposits were encountered. The five Areas then had shovel tests (“STs”) excavated at 15-m (50-foot) intervals. In total, 89 STs were excavated within the five Areas.

The hand-excavated STs measured approximately 40 centimeters (“cm”) square. Each soil stratum encountered during field testing was explored and documented and any cultural materials were noted in order to determine their context and integrity as well as to further ascertain whether or not any potential in situ cultural resources or features were extant. During testing, all soil was sifted through one-quarter-inch screen and stratigraphic profiles of all STs were recorded. Recovered modern material was noted on the field forms but generally discarded in the field.

**Area A.** Area A, the smallest test area with a total of four STs, was located northwest of the existing Hospital parking garage and just west of an existing Hospital valet parking lot. This area had topography with steep hillsides and narrow bluffs. A total of four STs were excavated in Area A (ST1 to ST4). The southern end of Area A was not shovel tested because there were huge piles of fill, as deep as 3 m (10 ft) blanketing the location. STs ranged in depth from 43 cm to 67 cm and had profiles similar to ST1, which is shown in Table 6-2 below. No artifacts were found in this Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Soil type</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
<th>Interpretations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-19cm</td>
<td>Silty sand</td>
<td>Dark yellowish brown</td>
<td>NCM</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-59cm</td>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>Dark yellowish brown</td>
<td>NCM</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59-67cm</td>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>Yellowish brown</td>
<td>NCM</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NCM = No Cultural Material
Source: Historical Perspectives, Inc.

---

2 Historical Perspectives, Inc. Phase IB Archaeological Field Investigations, Proposed Renovation, Expansion, and Modernization of Stony Brook University Medical Center, Town of Brookhaven, Suffolk County, New York, February 2012. Prepared for DASNY.
Stony Brook University Medical Center
Medical Facilities and Parking Project

Location of Areas A – E within the APE

Source: Historical Perspectives, Inc., 2011.
**Area B.** Area B, located west of Area A, was characterized by topography similar to Area A. A total of 14 STs were excavated in this area, ranging in depth from 40 cm to 64 cm. Most of the profiles were similar to ST1, although in ST15 the C horizon was it was grey and in several others it was dark yellowish brown. The C horizon was gravelly sand in several tests. ST9 was similar to the majority except that the A horizon was dark grayish brown, and ST16 had a B horizon with an unusual color. None of the 14 STs in Area B produced artifacts.

**Area C.** A dirt road ran east-west in the middle of Area C, which was located south of Areas A and B. Much of this Area had relatively steep hillsides and narrow bluffs, and the east side was apparently subjected to cut and fill (probably when the adjacent parking lots were built). A total of 24 STs were excavated in Area C, with total depths ranging from 10 cm to 86 cm. Three types of soil profiles were present in the STs. Seven STs were similar to ST1; some of these had a C horizon that was yellowish brown. Ten STs had profiles with an A horizon of very dark grayish brown silty loam or silty sand (e.g., ST 32 and ST40). Seven STs in the middle of Area C tests had disturbed profiles; many, like ST26 contained fill. Two of these STs with disturbed profiles contained artifacts. Brick fragments were found in ST23 and two fragments of terra cotta were encountered in ST24.

**Area D.** Area D used the southwest corner of the existing utility plant as area datum. The west end of Area D was relatively flat and wooded, while the remainder had some steep hillsides and narrow bluffs. The northeast portion of this Area was covered in grass and low brush. A total of 39 STs were excavated in Area D, with total depths that ranged between 39 cm and 93 cm. More than one-half of the STs in Area D had profiles similar to ST1. Half of the remaining STs, including ST46, had profiles similar to ST40. Five tests had profiles that were disturbed and/or had fill. One test had an A horizon with dark brown silty sand, while another was missing a B horizon. No artifacts were found in Area D.

**Area E.** The Area D grid was expanded to cover the irregularly-shaped Area E, which was located just to the southeast. Area E had some steep topography; the northern end was lower and flatter. A total of eight STs excavated were excavated in this Area, with total depths that ranged from 32 cm to 75 cm. Six of these tests had profiles similar to ST1, and two STs on the east side had unusual profiles, ST67 and ST69. In ST67, the B horizon was brown silty loam; in ST69 the C horizon in ST69 was gray sand. No STs in Area E produced artifacts.

**Summary and Recommendations.** The Phase IB field survey consisted of 89 STs at 15-m (50-foot) intervals. Shovel testing did not discover any precontact artifacts. Brick and terra cotta fragments were recovered from disturbed contexts in two consecutive STs. These finds likely date to the late nineteenth or twentieth century, were found in strata of fill, and are not considered potentially significant. Based on these conclusions, the Phase IB report recommended no additional archaeological investigations for the Development Parcel.

**Conclusion**

According to the Phase IA report, documentary research has provided no evidence of historical occupation of the APE prior to the construction of the water tower during the late
1950s/early 1960s, and no evidence of any use that would have left an archaeological footprint. With the exception of the water tower located south of the APE, existing structures within and adjacent to the APE are less than 50 years of age. In general, properties less than 50 years old are not eligible for listing on the State and or National Registers of Historic Places. Given the lack of potential historic architectural resources within or adjacent to the APE, significant adverse impacts to historic architectural resources would not occur as a result of the Proposed Project.

The archaeological field testing did not identify precontact artifacts, and the Phase IB report recommended no further archaeological investigations for the Development Parcel. Accordingly, the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts to archaeological resources.

In a letter dated March 23, 2012, OPRHP has concluded that the Proposed Project would have no impact upon cultural resources in or eligible for inclusion in the State and National Registers of Historic Places (see Appendix A, Agency Correspondence). The Dormitory Authority has similarly determined that the Proposed Project would have no significant adverse impacts upon cultural resources.