Chapter 6: Cultural Resources

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter considers the potential for the proposed Route 9A Project to affect historic archaeological and architectural resources. The primary Route 9A corridor Area of Potential Effect (APE) for the project has been defined as the area bounded by North Moore Street to the north, Battery Place to the south, the limits of the Route 9A right-of-way to the west and Greenwich, Church and Washington Streets to the east (see Figure 6-1).

B. REGULATORY CONTEXT

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the consideration of potential impacts to historic resources. In addition, potential effects on historic resources are considered in conformance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), Section 4(f) of the United States Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (Section 4[f]), and the New York State Historic Preservation Act of 1980 (SHPA). In addition, the New York City Landmarks Law and potential impacts to New York City Landmarks (NYCLs) and New York City Historic Districts (NYCHDs) have been considered.

A Programmatic Agreement was established on March 14, 1994 among the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the New York State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) regarding the Reconstruction of Route 9A. The analysis of potential effects to archaeological resources and historic properties was completed pursuant to this document.

As part of the proposed Route 9A Project, an amendment to the 1994 Programmatic Agreement was established on October 13, 2004 among FHWA, SHPO, ACHP, and the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) because of the changes to this project resulting from the World Trade Center (WTC) disaster and the determination that the WTC Site is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The amendment addresses potential effects to the WTC Site; identifies additional historic resources located in the APE; includes treatment and documentation measures for the Hudson River Bulkhead; and increases the role of the consulting parties in the process (see Appendix C).

FHWA, NYSDOT, and SHPO concurred that the proposed undertaking would have no adverse effect on historic resources within the APE as described in the Finding Documentation dated April 9, 2004 which is included in Appendix C, “Cultural Resources.” Any additional work not specified in this Finding Documentation will be addressed under the Stipulations to the Amendment to the 1994 Programmatic Agreement. This agreement addresses any subsequent planning, design, and construction of the selected project alternatives regarding historic resources.
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NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT (SECTION 106)

NHPA requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. This process, commonly referred to as Section 106 review, provides for review of any federally licensed, financed, or assisted undertaking. Because funds from a federal agency (the United States Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration [FTA] and the FHWA) would be used to achieve the project, this assessment of cultural resources was prepared pursuant to Section 106 of NHPA.

The FHWA, the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation (LMDC) and the FTA coordinated the Section 106 process in determining the eligibility of the WTC Site due to the proximity to the WTC Site of their respective proposed undertakings: proposed project, WTC Memorial and Redevelopment Plan, and permanent WTC Port Authority Trans-Hudson (PATH) Terminal. A Determination of Eligibility regarding the WTC Site’s eligibility for inclusion in the National Register was prepared pursuant to Section 106 as part of this coordinated effort (see Appendix C). The coordinated process concluded with the Coordinated Determination of National Register Eligibility for the WTC Site (Coordinated DOE). Thereafter, each project will perform its own assessment of effects and mitigation measures, as necessary.

Section 106, as implemented by federal regulations appearing at 36 CFR Part 800, mandates that federal agencies take into account the effect of their actions on any properties listed on or determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NR) and afford the ACHP a reasonable opportunity to comment on such undertakings. Federal agencies, in consultation with SHPO, as well as other consulting parties where appropriate, must determine whether a proposed action would have any effects on the characteristics of a site that qualify it for the State and National Registers of Historic Places (S/NR) and seek ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate any adverse effects. The Section 106 process includes the following:

- All properties that may be affected by the project and that are included in or eligible for the National Register must be identified in consultation with SHPO. If properties are found that may be eligible for the National Register, but for which no determination has yet been made, the agency consults with SHPO to determine eligibility or ineligibility.

- If there are such properties, the potential effect of the proposed project on each property must be evaluated, in consultation with SHPO, to determine if the project would have adverse effects on them. The criteria of adverse effect (36 CFR § 800.5(a)) must be applied, in consultation with SHPO. In general, a proposed project is deemed to have an adverse effect if it would diminish any characteristics of the property that qualify it for inclusion in the National Register.

- If the analysis indicates that the proposed project would have an adverse effect, ACHP is notified, and SHPO and other consulting parties are consulted to seek agreement on ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate effects. This mitigation is typically implemented through either a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) or Programmatic Agreement. ACHP may choose to participate in the consultation when there are substantial effects on important historic properties, when a case presents important questions of policy or interpretation, when there is a potential for procedural problems, or when there are issues of concern to Indian tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations. ACHP must be invited to participate when the federal agency sponsoring the project requests ACHP’s involvement, when the project would have an adverse effect on a NHL, or when a Programmatic Agreement will be prepared. Programmatic Agreements may be used when effects on historic properties are similar and
repetitive or are multi-state or regional in scope, when effects on historic properties cannot be fully determined prior to approval of an undertaking, or where other circumstances warrant a departure from the normal Section 106 process, among other reasons. In addition, the federal agency sponsoring the project may request an advisory opinion if it wishes.

- Execution of the MOA or Programmatic Agreement and implementation of the terms therein satisfy the requirement of Section 106 that ACHP be given a reasonable opportunity to comment on the undertaking as well as demonstrates that the federal agency has taken into account the effects of the action.

The review under Section 106 can be conducted in coordination with analyses conducted for NEPA, and where consistent with the procedures set forth in 36 CFR Part 800, information developed for the NEPA environmental review may be used to meet the requirements of Section 106. The views of the public are essential to informed federal decision-making in the Section 106 process, and therefore, the public should be informed about, and given the opportunity to comment on, the project and its effects on historic properties. An agency may use its procedures for public involvement under NEPA if those procedures provide adequate opportunities for public involvement consistent with 36 CFR Part 800. In the case of the proposed action, NYSDOT is coordinating its Section 106 review with that of the other federal agencies carrying out Lower Manhattan recovery projects and using its NEPA review of the proposed action to provide additional opportunities for comment by the public, SHPO, ACHP, and a broad range of consulting parties.

In addition, Section 110 of NHPA addresses federal agencies’ responsibility to preserve and use historic properties. Section 110(f) mandates additional protection for NHLs by requiring that federal agencies exercise a higher standard of care when considering undertakings that may directly and adversely affect NHLs. Section 110(g) allows agencies to include costs of preservation as project costs. Further, Section 110(a)(2) requires, among other things, that an agency’s procedures for compliance with Section 106: (1) be consistent with ACHP’s regulations; and (2) provide a process for identification and evaluation of historic properties and development and implementation of agreements about how adverse effects on historic properties will be considered.

SECTION 4(F) OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ACT

Historic properties are also protected from adverse effects by Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966. Section 4(f) prohibits actions by the Secretary of Transportation that require “use” of a historic property that is listed on or eligible for inclusion on the National Register, unless a determination is made that there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of such land, and all possible planning has been undertaken to minimize harm to the 4(f) property. For historic properties, “use” includes direct physical impacts, such as demolition or removal of part of a historic property. It also includes adverse contextual impacts (these can result in “constructive use,” when changes caused by the project that are near the historic structure cause a substantial impairment in the historic resource’s important qualities). Constructive use could occur from such changes as noise, visual intrusion, or other such elements that would significantly alter the setting of the historic resource.

The Route 9A project would not result in the use of a historic property. As a result, an analysis under Section 4(f) was not required for historic properties.
STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT

SHPA closely resembles NHPA, and requires that state agencies consider the effect of their actions on properties listed on or determined eligible for listing on the State Register of Historic Places. Compliance with Section 106 satisfies the requirements of SHPA, set forth in Section 14.09 of the New York State Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation Law.

NEW YORK CITY LANDMARKS LAW

The New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) designates historically significant properties in NYCLs and/or NYCHDs, following the criteria provided in the Local Laws of the City of New York, New York City Charter, Administrative Code, Title 25, Chapter 3. Properties designated as NYCLs or NYCHDs are protected under the New York City Landmarks Law, which requires LPC review and approval before any alterations or demolition can occur. Although the New York City Landmarks Law is not applicable to the proposed project, potential impacts to NYCLs and NYCHDs have been considered.

C. METHODOLOGY

In general, potential effects on historic or architectural resources can include both direct physical effects (e.g., demolition, alteration, or damage from construction on nearby sites) and indirect, contextual effects, such as the isolation of a property from its surrounding environment, or the introduction of visual, audible, or atmospheric elements that are out of character with a property or that alter its setting. To assess the potential effect of a project, an APE is defined and an inventory of historic and architectural resources located in the APE is compiled.

This section describes the delineation of the APE, the inventory, and the assessment of potential effects of the proposed action.

AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECT

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

For archaeological resources, the APE is generally the area to be excavated by the proposed action, since this is the area where any artifacts or features could be disturbed. For the proposed project, the APE for archaeological resources includes: (1) the right-of-way for the Route 9A roadway alignment between West Thames Street and Chambers Street; (2) streets intersecting Route 9A for a distance of 50 feet east of Route 9A; (3) locations where construction may occur outside of the Route 9A right-of-way (e.g., foundations of potential pedestrian bridges).

Archaeological resources are typically evaluated through a three-step process. The first step, Phase 1, consists of documentary research into the history of the site to determine the likelihood that archaeological resources may be present within the APE. Often, this step is divided into two phases: Phase 1A, which requires identifying areas that may contain archaeological resources, and Phase 1B, which involves subsurface testing to try to determine whether any resources are actually present. The second step, Phase 2, consists of more extensive subsurface investigations (if Phase 1B testing indicated that resources are present) and additional research to establish the age, integrity and research potential of the resources, and whether they may be eligible for the Registers. The third step, Phase 3, is considered the mitigation phase; mitigation may consist of either avoidance of the resource or data recovery in the form of a full-scale excavation and documentation.
ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES

To account for contextual and visual effects, as well as possible construction-related structural damage, the primary Route 9A corridor APE for architectural resources is the area bounded by North Moore Street to the north, Battery Place to the south, the limits of the Route 9A right-of-way to the west and Greenwich, Church and Washington Streets to the east (see Figure 6-1). Battery Park City (BPC) was excluded from the APE since it was created less than 30 years ago.

IDENTIFICATION OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Once the APE is defined, a list of officially recognized historic resources within the APE is compiled. This includes NHLs; other properties or districts listed on the S/NR or properties determined eligible for such listing; and NYCLs or NYCHDs, or properties pending NYCL or NYCHD designation. A list of potential historic resources within the APE is also compiled. These are identified based on field surveys of the APE and, where available, information from historic societies or preservation organizations with knowledge of the area. Potential historic resources comprise properties that may be eligible for listing on the S/NR and/or designation as NYCLs.

The National Register Criteria for Evaluation are found in 36 CFR Part 60. Following these criteria, districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects are eligible for the S/NR if they possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

- That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Properties that have been constructed within the last 50 years are ordinarily not eligible. Determinations of eligibility are made by SHPO. Generally, all properties that are listed on the National Register are listed on the State Register, which has similar criteria.

Buildings, properties, or objects are eligible for designation as a NYCL or NYCHD when a part is at least 30 years old. Landmarks have a special character or special historical or aesthetic interest or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the city, state, or nation. There are four types of landmarks: individual, interior, historic district, and scenic.

The identification of historic resources for the proposed project was unique due to the historic events of September 11, 2001. As described above, FHWA, LMDC and FTA issued a Coordinated DOE regarding the WTC Site's eligibility for inclusion in the National Register (see Appendix C). SHPO concurred with this determination and found the WTC Site eligible for listing in the National Register (see Appendix C).

In addition to the resources with official designation or status, a number of other potential historic resources have been identified by the Lower Manhattan Emergency Preservation Fund (LMEPF), a consortium of historic preservation organizations that was formed in response to the events of September 11, 2001. This consortium includes the Municipal Art Society, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the New York Landmarks Conservancy, the Preservation League
of New York State, and the World Monuments Fund. The LMEPF produced a map, entitled *Corridors of Concern,* which shows the potential historic resources in addition to the officially recognized (or known) resources. (The map is available online at http:\\www.nycpreservation911.org.) Information obtained from this map was used to assist in the identification of potential historic resources. SHPO and LPC have determined some of these resources to be S/NR-eligible and NYCL-eligible, and these resources have been included in Table 6-1.

Table 6-1
Known Resources in the Area of Potential Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>NHL</th>
<th>S/NR</th>
<th>S/NR-eligible</th>
<th>NYCL</th>
<th>NYCL-eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Hudson River Bulkhead</td>
<td>Battery Place to West 59th Street</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>25-41 Harrison Street*</td>
<td>25-41 Harrison Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Lamppost 89</td>
<td>Southeast corner of Washington and Warren Streets</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Barclay-Vesey Building*</td>
<td>140 West Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>WTC Site</td>
<td>Bounded by Vesey, Church and Liberty Streets and Route 9A</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>90 West Street*</td>
<td>90 West Street</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>New York Evening Post Building</td>
<td>75 West Street</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>40 Rector Street Building</td>
<td>40 Rector Street</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Frasch Building</td>
<td>56 West Street</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Crystal Building</td>
<td>47-49 West Street</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>74-80 Washington Street</td>
<td>74-80 Washington Street</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Lamppost 15</td>
<td>Adjacent to 21-23 Morris Street, overlooking depressed roadway of exit ramp of Brooklyn Battery Tunnel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Lamppost 78</td>
<td>East side of Western Union International Plaza between Morris Street and Battery Place overlooking tunnel entrance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>21 West Street Building</td>
<td>21 West Street</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Downtown Athletic Club</td>
<td>19 West Street</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Whitehall Building*</td>
<td>17 Battery Place</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Corresponds to Figure 6-1.

NHL: National Historic Landmark.


NYCL: New York City Landmark.

NYCL-eligible: LPC has determined that the site appears eligible for NYCL designation.

* Identified as a known resource in the 1994 FEIS.

Known historic resources as well as potential resources are identified below in “Conditions in the Affected Environment Since September 11, 2001.”

**ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTS**

Once the historic resources in the APE are identified, the effects of the project on those resources are assessed. As described above, project effects on known historic resources and
those potential resources determined to meet eligibility criteria for listing on the National Register identified in this section may include both physical and contextual effects. Direct effects could include physical destruction, damage, or alteration of a historic resource. In addition, visual effects, such as changes in the appearance of a historic resource or in its setting—including introduction of incompatible visual, audible, or atmospheric elements to a resource’s setting—are considered.

D. DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

PRE-SEPTEMBER 11, 2001 BASELINE CONDITIONS

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The archaeological sensitivity of Route 9A was previously considered in extensive documentation for the Westway Project and the Route 9A Reconstruction Project. In particular, reports consulted included: Cultural Resources Summary Report, April 1996 and Appendix C: Cultural Resources to the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), May 1994.

The 1996 Cultural Resources Summary Report included a matrix of archaeological sites (see Appendix C). Based on this matrix, all but 16 archaeological sites identified in the 1994 FEIS were eliminated from further study. As of September 11, 2001, these resources included the following:

- Nine of these sites were prehistoric resources located in the Route 9A roadbed between Morris Street and Chambers Street. These sites are listed on page 10 of the 1996 Summary Report matrix and include Site Numbers 8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 25, 29, and 38.
- Five of these sites were located in the vicinity of Morris and Edgar Streets, outside of the current project APE. These sites are listed on pages 1, 5 and 10 of the 1996 Summary Report matrix and include Site Numbers 170, 171, 172, 169, and 168.
- Two of these sites were located in the vicinity of Battery Place and State Street, outside of the current project APE. These sites are listed on page 1 of the 1996 Summary Report matrix and include Site Numbers 1 and 2.

One additional historic-period resource was identified subsequent to the 1996 Summary Report—the Hudson River Bulkhead (S/NR-eligible), buried underground along the western edge of Route 9A.

ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES

Project Site

The project site comprises the segment of Route 9A (also known as West Street) between Chambers and West Thames Street. The project site includes the roadway itself as well as the Class I bikeway and walkway which run along the western edge of Route 9A. Prior to September 11, 2001 there were no architectural resources located within the Route 9A roadway or bikeway and walkway.

Area of Potential Effect

In the pre-September 11, 2001 baseline conditions analysis, the 16-acre WTC, built by the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (PANYNJ) between 1966 and 1981, comprised six
buildings, including the 110-story Twin Towers (1 and 2 WTC). These 1,350-foot-tall aluminum-clad towers were the tallest buildings in the world when completed in 1972 and 1973. Other buildings located in the WTC included a 22-story hotel (3 WTC), two 9-story buildings (4 and 5 WTC), and an 8-story U.S. Customs House (6 WTC). These buildings were situated around the Austin J. Tobin Plaza, which was decorated with several sculptures by prominent artists. A concourse was located directly below the plaza and consisted of a retail mall and transportation hub. A pedestrian bridge over Route 9A connected the northern part of the WTC with the commercial core of BPC.

Prior to September 11, 2001, the block at the corner of Liberty Street and Route 9A was an active parking lot and the site of the St. Nicholas Greek Orthodox Church, destroyed on September 11, 2001. This small, Greek Orthodox church stood at 155 Cedar Street, south of the WTC. Established in 1917 by Greek immigrants, it was only 35 feet tall with a rooftop bell cote. The church was notable for its small scale and its icons, which were a gift from the last czar of Russia, Nicholas II. The block to the east was occupied by a 39-story office building at 130 Liberty Street. Located directly across Liberty Street from 2 WTC, it was a fully occupied office tower with ground-floor retail. It had a plaza with a fountain, above which was an additional plaza level that was originally intended to connect to the plaza level at the WTC.

As of September 11, 2001, no agency had determined that the WTC or any structure anywhere on the WTC Site was eligible for listing on the National Register or otherwise considered a historic resource. Buildings that were part of the WTC were evaluated in 1989 as part of the Route 9A Project and were determined ineligible for S/NR listing.

It is assumed that all historic buildings that were damaged on September 11, 2001 would not have been damaged and would still be occupied as they were on September 11, 2001. The Barclay-Vesey Building and the building at 90 West Street would be undamaged.

It is assumed that the identification of known and potential resources would be the same in the pre-September 11 baseline analysis as described below in “Conditions in the Affected Environment Since September 11, 2001.” Although several resources were listed on or determined eligible for listing on the National Register or designated as a NYCL or NYCHD after September 11, 2001, these resources would have been determined eligible or designated in any event because their characteristics that qualify them for listing were not altered.

CONDITIONS IN THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT SINCE SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

As described above, there is one known archaeological resource in the project site—the Hudson River Bulkhead (S/NR-eligible). It is located along the western edge of Route 9A, from the Battery to West 59th Street. The bulkhead and its associated structural systems were built between 1871 and 1936 by the New York City Department of Docks. The majority of the construction consisted of masonry walls on a variety of foundation systems, with quarry-faced ashlar granite block forming the visible face along most of the armored frontage. Design of the bulkhead was the responsibility of George B. McClellan, a Civil War general, who became the first Engineer-in-Chief of the Department of Docks. McClellan’s plans contemplated the creation of a 250-foot-wide marginal street, from which 60- to 100-foot-wide piers with cargo sheds would project 400 to 500 feet around 150- to 200-foot-wide slips. Initiated to respond to the deteriorated, congested, and silt-filled condition of the waterfront, the carefully built granite walls created a consistent monumental surface to the waterfront that reinforced an image of New
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York City’s commercial prominence. As property was acquired and as commerce warranted, the city built the bulkheads, built or rebuilt pier substructures, and leased redeveloped areas to private companies, which were usually responsible for piershed and headhouse construction. The bulkhead is listed in Table 6-1 and also mapped on Figure 6-1.

Analyses completed as part of the Final Generic EIS for the WTC Memorial and Redevelopment Plan concluded that the Route 9A corridor has no potential for prehistoric resources as such resources would have been destroyed by exposure to elements along the Hudson River shoreline (see Appendix C). Therefore, since there is no potential for prehistoric resources in the Route 9A roadbed, the nine prehistoric sites identified in the 1996 Summary Report (described above under “Pre-September 11, 2001 Baseline Conditions”) were eliminated from further study.

As the remaining seven sites from the 1996 Summary Report are outside of the project APE, it is not anticipated that they would be affected by project construction and no further study is recommended.

ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES

Project Site

The project site comprises the segment of Route 9A (also known as West Street) between Chambers and West Thames Street. The project site includes the roadway itself as well as the Class I bikeway and walkway which run along the western edge of Route 9A. There are no architectural resources located in the Route 9A roadway.

Area of Potential Effect

Known Resources. Known architectural resources located within the Route 9A corridor APE are listed in Table 6-1 and mapped on Figure 6-1. They are also described below.

25-41 Harrison Street (NYCL). These nine houses are located between Greenwich and West Streets and on a former section of Washington Street. They were constructed between 1796 and 1828. In the late 1960s they were incorporated into the Independence Plaza housing complex as part of an urban renewal project. Three houses were moved from Washington Street, including two houses designed by John McComb, Jr. The houses were extensively rehabilitated in the mid-1970s.

Lamppost 89 (S/NR-eligible, NYCL). Lamppost 89 is an example of ornamental lampposts that were erected in Lower Manhattan in the early 20th century. It is located on the sidewalk bordering the east side of the former Washington Street at the intersection with Warren Street. By the late 1880s, the first ornamental lampposts were installed on Fifth Avenue, between Washington Square Park and 59th Street. Beginning around 1900, ornamental arc lampposts were designed and the earliest of this form was the Bishop’s crook. Several variations of this style were produced, but the earliest incorporated a garland on the fluted shaft, a short ladder rest, and was made from a single iron casting up to the crook section. Lamppost 89 is believed to be an unknown bishop’s crook type. Probably built in the early 20th century, lamppost 89 would have been one of several similar lampposts that lined Washington Street when it was a

functioning city street. The original light has been replaced with a modern bucket light, and a small modern yellow light has been affixed to a bracket for the original street signs.

**Barclay-Vesey Building (S/NR-eligible, NYCL).** Built between 1923 and 1927, the Art Deco Barclay-Vesey Building (140 West Street) occupies the full block bounded by Barclay, Washington, and Vesey Streets and Route 9A and overlooks the WTC Site. Known as the Verizon Building, it is considered one of the most significant structures in the history of skyscraper design, since it was the first building in New York City to exploit the requirements of the 1916 Zoning Resolution, leading to the tower’s dramatic massing. Designed by Ralph Walker of McKenzie, Voorhees & Gmelin as an office building and switching center for the New York Telephone Company, this 32-story brick, limestone, and terra cotta structure consists of an 18-story parallelogram base and an 11-story square tower. For 10 stories, the base rises flush with the lot lines. Above the 10th floor, there are setbacks on the north and south façades and light courts on the east and west façades. Above the base, the tower is oriented to the Manhattan grid street pattern. Multiple setbacks above the 10th floor serve to further relieve the building’s bulk. Flat piers provide verticality, and on the tower they create buttresses that cap the structure. There are limestone cornices on each setback, and on the first two floors there are terra cotta spandrel panels, and window and door enframements of intricately carved reliefs of people, animals, and vegetation. The ground floor of the Vesey Street façade is an arcade.

The Barclay-Vesey Building suffered façade and structural damage as a result of the collapse of 1 WTC and 7 WTC. It has been restored and partially reopened.

**WTC Site (S/NR-eligible).** The WTC Site is an approximately 16-acre parcel bounded by Vesey, Church, and Liberty Streets, and Route 9A. As detailed in the Coordinated DOE, the WTC Site is significant as the location of the events of September 11, 2001 and the significance of those events and their aftermath to American history makes the WTC Site eligible for listing on the National Register. Although this eligibility does not depend on remaining elements at the site, some elements contribute to the significance of the events of September 11, 2001 and their aftermath. The Coordinated DOE identifies the following elements in particular as contributing to the significance of the WTC Site: the truncated box-beam column bases that help define the perimeter or “footprints” of the former Twin Towers; the slurry walls that form the sides of the underground bathtub for the Twin Towers; the remnants of the parking garage, containing slabs and interior columns charred with smoke; the beams forming a cross erected by recovery workers; the portion of the concrete steps and escalator ramp from Vesey Street to the subway; and the remaining portion of the passageway to the E subway line.

A large number of artifacts recovered from the WTC Site following the events of September 11, 2001 currently exist at off-site locations, including the New York State Museum and Hangar 17 at John F. Kennedy Airport. Because these off-site artifacts are not physically located within the APE, they are not included in the Coordinated DOE for this project. However, the SHPO has indicated to FHWA, FTA, LMDC and HUD that artifacts returned to the WTC Site in the future could be considered contributing elements of this historic property (see the Coordinated DOE in Appendix C for a discussion of off-site artifacts).

In addition, the Coalition of 9/11 Families has requested that the National Park Service (NPS), which administers the NHL program, consider the WTC Site for NHL status. The NHL program was authorized by the Historic Sites Act of 1935 (Public Law 74-292). NHL criteria (36 CFR § 65.4[a] and [b]) differ from National Register criteria. They set a stringent test for national significance and high historical integrity. NPS is considering that request.
90 West Street (S/NR-eligible, NYCL). Designed by Cass Gilbert and built in 1905–07, the 90 West Street Building is among the most important early 20th century skyscrapers in New York City, and the aesthetic precursor of Gilbert’s Woolworth Building from 1910–13. The 23-story former commercial office building is also the earliest example of the use of Gothic detail on a skyscraper with distinctly vertical massing. It has a C-shaped plan with a light court facing east and its primary façade fronting on Route 9A. Its north elevation faces the Southern Site and beyond that the WTC Site across Liberty Street. Above a two-story granite base, the façades of the shaft are clad in white terra cotta with modest marble and polychromed terra cotta trim. The shaft is articulated with recessed window bays and clustered columns that form piers. These piers, along with colonettes between the windows, rise uninterrupted for most of the building’s height, creating vertical emphasis. The building’s heavy three-story capital is ornately designed as an arcade with engaged columns. A mansard roof with dormers and pinnacles crowns the building. The building was covered in scaffolding for ongoing façade repair on September 11, 2001. It was heavily damaged due to burning debris from the WTC and the plane that hit Tower Two. It is being restored and renovated for residential use.

New York Evening Post Building (S/NR, NYCL-eligible). Located at 75 West Street, the New York Evening Post Building occupies the entire blockfront on Carlisle Street, between West and Washington Streets. Horace Trumbauer designed the 16-story Art Deco building in 1925. It has a two-story stone base with recessed window bays and an entablature with stylized balustrades. The upper floors are clad in brick, and massed with lights courts and a series of setbacks that form a central tower. Projecting brick piers with stone caps emphasize the verticality of the massing. Colorful panels of geometric tiles ornament the upper stories. Stone detailing is also used on the upper setbacks to add further emphasis to the verticality of the building’s design.

40 Rector Street Building (S/NR-eligible). The 17-story Renaissance Revival-style 40 Rector Street Building (also originally known as the Barrett Building) was designed in 1920–21 by Warren Wetmore as an office building on what was then the Hudson River waterfront. This large, boxy building with no setbacks has an eight-story wing at the southeast corner. It was originally L-shaped, wrapping around several old tenement buildings at 100-106 Washington Street. The building’s owners intended to tear them down when their leases expired and develop the site with a small park to protect the light to the 40 Rector Street Building’s east façade. Sometime after 1951, an addition was constructed on this parcel adjacent to the north of the eight-story wing. This addition does not replicate the original façade treatment. The original building is designed with a large, rusticated stone base and upper floors clad in brick. Tall arched and rectangular windows puncture the base on all three street façades, and a stone balustrade runs above the base. A brick and stone mezzanine transitions the design from the stone base to the brick upper floors. Metal spandrel panels and stone quoins add some detail to the office floors. The top two floors are designed as a loggia with stone pilasters. A stone entablature and projecting metal cornice crown the buildings. The Rector Street Bridge, a modern, metal pedestrian bridge over Route 9A constructed in the wake of September 11, 2001, abuts the west façade.

Fransch Building (S/NR-eligible). This narrow building is located at 56 West Street, at the corner of Rector Street. Designed by Henry Otis Chapman in 1921, it has a classically inspired tripartite design (base, shaft, capital). It has a four-story base with tan upper stories and stone cladding at the top floors. The building has a bracketed cornice with an attic story. A stone carved plaque on the Rector Street façade tells that the building was named for Herman Frasch (1851–1914), the founder and first president of the Union Sulphur Company.
Crystal Building (S/NR-eligible). The building at 47-49 West Street was once part of B.T. Babbitt’s soap making complex near the Hudson River. In 1882 an eight-story building designed by William Graul was constructed at 47-49 West Street. The building, as well as the adjacent building at 74-80 Washington Street, was sold to the real estate firm of B. Crystal & Son in 1911. Soon after, George and Edward Blum were retained for an alteration to the building, which likely involved the construction of the existing mansard roof. It appears that Crystal owned the building until at least 1949, when it installed a new entrance and lobby as part of an effort to market the building for office uses in the downtown area. In 1996, the top three floors of the building were remodeled for live-work space.

74-80 Washington Street (S/NR-eligible). Like the Crystal Building (described above) this building at 74-80 Washington Street was once part of B.T. Babbitt’s soap making complex. It was likely constructed before 1897. The building, as well as the adjacent Crystal Building, was sold to the real estate firm of B. Crystal & Son in 1911. George and Edward Blum were retained for an alteration to the building in 1911, which may have involved the design and construction of its current façade and cornice.

Lampposts 15 and 78 (S/NR-eligible, NYCL). As described above, several historic lampposts are located throughout Lower Manhattan. Lampposts 15 and 78 are examples of the same type of lamppost. They are simplified descendents of the mast arm post first used as part of the “Boulevard” lighting system. In 1908 the Boulevard lighting system was introduced on Broadway north of Columbus Circle and on Seventh Avenue north of Central Park. This system consisted of the first “mast-arm” post—a vertical shaft similar to the bishop’s crook with a ten-foot horizontal arm over the roadway. These lampposts featured elaborate scrollwork, with attached leaf-form castings, that filled the space between the horizontal arm and vertical shaft. None of these early lampposts survive, but Lampposts 15 and 78 are later versions of the mast-arm type.

21 West Street Building (S/NR, NYCL). Starrett & Van Vleck designed this 31-story Art Deco office building, constructed in 1929-31. It has a bold setback profile and detailed brickwork. Brick was chosen as the primary material for its varied color and textural interest. Similar to the adjacent building at 19 West Street, it is representative of New York skyscrapers built during the Jazz Age, and its massing was a result of the 1916 Zoning Resolution. It also features a recessed street-level shopping arcade and corner windows.

Downtown Athletic Club (NYCL). The Downtown Athletic Club at 19 West Street was built in 1929-30. Starrett & Van Vleck designed the 38-story Art Deco skyscraper for the Downtown Athletic Club, a membership association that attracted businessmen and lawyers who worked in lower Manhattan. The high cost of land and the small lot size led to the construction of a tall building with different functions and facilities of the club on separate floors. The building’s boxy shape and variety of setbacks were a result of the 1916 Zoning Resolution, but also indicate the various uses assigned to different sections of the building. Flat and angled brick, as well as chevron motifs were used on the building and symbolized the Jazz Age, when speed and energy were reflected in building designs.

Whitehall Building (S/NR-eligible, NYCL). The 20-story Whitehall Building at 17 Battery Place is a distinguished example of an early 20th-century skyscraper with Beaux Arts classical details. Completed in 1904, it was designed by Henry Hardenbergh, known for the Dakota Apartments and the Plaza Hotel. The building has a high base of rusticated limestone, which contrasts with the pinkish-red of its recessed central bay and the dark yellow brick of the flanking wings and side elevations. It is capped by a bold pediment with a central roundel. In 1908, an addition
designed by Clinton & Russell more than doubled the size of the structure. This addition also has a rusticated limestone base with brick walls above and terra cotta ornamentation.

Potential Resources. There is one potential resource located within the APE. The Green Exchange Building, located at 130 Cedar Street, was identified as a potential resource by the LMEPF. However, as part of the FGEIS for the WTC Memorial and Redevelopment Plan, SHPO found this property ineligible for listing on the S/NR.

E. FUTURE CONDITIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES

CONSTRUCTION PERIOD

Initial reconstruction activities associated with the WTC Memorial and Redevelopment Plan will be taking place. It is assumed that the temporary WTC PATH station will continue to operate as it does today. The Barclay-Vesey Building (S/NR-eligible, NYCL) will be repaired, renovated, and reopened. 90 West Street (S/NR-eligible, NYCL) will be converted to residential use, with street-level retail space and accessory parking. Most important, the façades of 90 West Street are expected to be restored in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

As discussed in Chapter 3, “Construction Practices,” elements of the permanent WTC PATH Terminal (e.g., pedestrian concourse, ventilation, and emergency egress) and the WTC Memorial and Redevelopment Plan (e.g., river water cooling lines, slurry wall extension) will require excavation and utility relocation in Route 9A even under the No Action Alternative.

PANYNJ-sponsored construction of the permanent WTC PATH Terminal, involving the pedestrian concourse, may require removal of short segments of the Hudson River Bulkhead, buried underground along the western edge of Route 9A.

OPENING YEAR (2009)

Some construction activities associated with the WTC Memorial and Redevelopment Plan as well as the Permanent WTC PATH Terminal will continue on the WTC Site. Otherwise, no specific potential projects have been identified in the APE for the 2009 time frame.

DESIGN YEAR (2025)

It is assumed that the full program for the WTC Site will be developed by 2015. Fulton and Greenwich Streets will run through the WTC Site and Freedom Tower will rise near the corner of Vesey Street and Route 9A. A proposed performing arts center will be located east of Freedom Tower. The Memorial area, the Memorial Center, September 11 Place, and other cultural institutions will occupy the southwest quadrant. Wedge of Light plaza will occupy a portion of the northeast and southeast quadrants. The PATH Plaza will be located in the southeast quadrant. Three towers will be complete on the east side of the WTC Site and a fifth tower will be located south of Liberty Street. A 65-story office building (Tower 2) and a 25-story hotel will be completed in the northeast quadrant. In the southeast quadrant, a 62-story office building (Tower 3) and a 58-story office building (Tower 4) will be completed. A 57-story office building (Tower 5) will be completed south of Liberty Street. In addition, the Permanent WTC PATH Terminal’s first phase will open in 2009; the entire terminal will be completed by 2010.
New York City’s *Vision for a 21st Century Lower Manhattan* calls for the creation of a park, Greenwich Square, over the Brooklyn Battery Tunnel ramps, and for the area to become a center of new residential uses that may renovate and occupy some of the historic structures. There are a number of historic resources in this area that may be altered in use or context.

**F. PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

This section describes conditions that are or would be expected to exist under the No Action and proposed action alternatives for the three analysis scenarios (Construction Period, Opening Year, and Design Year).

**CONSTRUCTION PERIOD**

All of the Route 9A Alternatives have been designed to avoid the currently exposed west slurry wall of the WTC Site. As discussed in Chapter 2, “Project Alternatives,” portions of the pre-September 11, 2001 roadway covered approximately 40 feet of the westernmost portion of the WTC “bathtub.” Now that the “bathtub” and western slurry wall are fully exposed, each Route 9A Alternative’s alignment has been shifted farther west than the previous roadway to avoid covering these elements at the WTC Site. This aspect of the Route 9A Project’s planning and design is a beneficial effect with respect to cultural resources.

**NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE**

Construction activities for the No Action Alternative would include removal of the temporary Rector Street pedestrian bridge (installed after September 11, 2001) and the temporary pedestrian bridge at Vesey Street (opened November 2003). A new bridge may be constructed at Murray Street. A replacement for the east end of the pedestrian bridge at Liberty Street which was destroyed on September 11, 2001, would be provided.

Between Albany and Barclay Streets, the roadway opened adjacent to the WTC Site in March 2002 would become permanent with minor modifications, such as the replacement of asphalt pavement with long-term concrete pavement. The concrete median barrier would be replaced with a narrow raised median. Between Barclay and Chambers Streets, four lanes in each travel direction would remain. Concrete pavement repair would be performed as needed.

**Project Site—Archaeological Resources**

Footings on the west side of Route 9A for the potential pedestrian bridge at Murray Street would be located to avoid effects on the Hudson River Bulkhead. None of the other NYSDOT highway work under the No Action Alternative is expected to affect the Hudson River Bulkhead.

**Area of Potential Effect—Architectural Resources**

Removal of the temporary pedestrian bridge at Vesey Street could result in construction damage to the Barclay-Vesey Building. Similarly, removal of the temporary Rector Street Bridge could result in construction damage to the New York Evening Post Building. In order to avoid adverse effects to these buildings, NYSDOT would implement construction protection provisions in accordance with Stipulation 6 of the 2004 amendment to the 1994 Programmatic Agreement.

The amendment to the 1994 Programmatic Agreement would be the basis of coordination between NYSDOT and SHPO to avoid or minimize any adverse effects to historic resources. In addition, as described in Section G, “Noise and Vibration Abatement” of Chapter 10, “Noise.”
special vibration protection measures would be implemented to protect historic resources from increased vibration levels associated with construction activities. Otherwise, it is not expected that there would be any physical takings, visual effects, increases in vibration levels from construction or construction traffic, access changes or noise impacts. In addition, the amendment to the 1994 Programmatic Agreement would be the basis of coordination among FHWA, NYSDOT, and SHPO in order to avoid or minimize any adverse effects to historic resources.

**AT-GRADE ALTERNATIVE**

As compared to Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative, there would be more extensive paving to increase the travel lanes from three in each direction to four in each direction. The roadway would be shifted to the west to allow for a wider east sidewalk especially in front of the WTC Site. This alternative would also require removal and replacement of the temporary roadway bridge over the southern projection of the PATH tubes.

The roadway and sidewalk grade between Cedar and Vesey Streets would be raised 5 feet to meet the grades of the WTC Site and to minimize the flooding potential of the WTC Site during a 100-year storm. At the northeast corner of Vesey Street and Route 9A where the Barclay-Vesey Building is located, the sidewalk areas would be widened. Grade changes at the building line that were previously considered have been eliminated.

Also as part of the construction work, the temporary pedestrian bridges at Rector Street and Vesey Street would be removed. The existing pedestrian bridge at Liberty Street would be modified or replaced. A potential new pedestrian bridge, currently under separate study, could be constructed at Morris Street, Rector Street, or between Murray and Warren Streets. It would be designed to avoid its footings affecting the Hudson River Bulkhead.

**Project Site—Archaeological Resources**

Construction of NYSDOT’s At-Grade Alternative would not affect the bulkhead. Reconstruction of the existing roadway bridge over the southern projection of the PATH tubes would not occur in an area considered sensitive for archaeological resources. The additional paving work involved in this alternative would not require deep excavation. The additional disturbance would take place on the west side of the roadway beyond the bulkhead in an area considered not sensitive for archaeological resources.

**Area of Potential Effect—Architectural Resources**

Construction of the At-Grade Alternative has the potential to cause damage to historic buildings through groundborne vibrations. Specifically, historic buildings or sites located within 90 feet of the project site include the Barclay-Vesey Building, the WTC Site, 90 West Street, New York Evening Post Building at 75 West Street, 40 Rector Street Building, the Frasch Building at 56 West Street, and the Crystal Building at 47-49 West Street. In addition, removal of the temporary pedestrian bridge at Vesey Street could result in construction damage to the Barclay-Vesey Building. Similarly, removal of the temporary Rector Street Bridge could result in construction damage to the New York Evening Post Building. Other historic resources are more distant from the project site and are not within the area that is expected to be affected by project construction.

In order to avoid construction period impacts to historic resources, NYSDOT would implement construction protection provisions in accordance with Stipulation 6 of the amendment to the 1994 Programmatic Agreement described above for the No Build Alternative. The amendment
to the 1994 Programmatic Agreement would be the basis of coordination among FHWA, NYSDOT, and SHPO to avoid, minimize, or mitigate any adverse effects to historic resources.

**SHORT BYPASS ALTERNATIVE**

This alternative would involve excavation and construction of a depressed roadway between Albany Street to the south and Murray Street to the north. The depressed roadway would require sewer and utility relocation.

The temporary pedestrian bridges at Rector and Vesey Streets as well as the Liberty Street Bridge damaged on September 11, 2001, would be removed. Possible future pedestrian bridges are under study for Rector/Carlisle Streets and Murray/Warren Streets.

Construction would shift the two northbound surface lanes further west of the WTC Site and slurry wall to create a larger east sidewalk.

**Project Site—Archaeological Resources**

Sewer and utility relocations would affect segments of the Hudson River Bulkhead, buried underground along the western edge of Route 9A. However, as illustrated in Figure 6-2, portions of the bulkhead have been removed as part of prior utility work related to development of BPC. As a result, the bulkhead sections that would be impacted by these sewer and utility relocations may have already experienced a loss of historic integrity due to prior utility work.

According to Stipulation 3 of the amendment to the 1994 Programmatic Agreement, archaeological monitoring will be conducted during construction in the location of the bulkhead. If it can be conclusively documented that this resource is no longer within the project’s area of potential effect, then monitoring would not be needed.

Although this alternative would require removal of the cooling water pipes and vehicular ramps under Route 9A that were part of the WTC, these elements were not identified as contributing resources to the significance of the WTC Site.

The amendment to the 1994 Programmatic Agreement would be the basis of coordination among FHWA, NYSDOT, and SHPO to avoid, minimize, or mitigate any adverse effects to historic resources.

**Area of Potential Effect—Architectural Resources**

Removal of the temporary pedestrian bridge at Vesey Street could result in construction damage to the Barclay-Vesey Building. Similarly, removal of the temporary Rector Street Bridge could result in construction damage to the New York Evening Post Building. In order to avoid an adverse effect to historic resources, NYSDOT would implement construction protection provisions in accordance with Stipulation 6 of the amendment to the 1994 Programmatic Agreement. (See description above under “No Action Alternative.”)

Construction of wider sidewalks at Vesey Street and Route 9A is not expected to have an adverse impact on the Barclay-Vesey Building. Relocation of ECS/Verizon conduits and cables would be necessary and would include the construction of new lines into the existing basement/vault area beneath the Barclay-Vesey Building’s arcade.
Hudson River Bulkhead
Areas Potentially Affected
with Short Bypass Alternative

FIGURE 6-2
Chapter 6: Cultural Resources

OPENING YEAR (2009)

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

All construction activities described above under “Construction Period” would be complete and the roadway would be open to vehicular traffic. It is not expected that this alternative would have any adverse visual or contextual effects on historic resources, as completed roadway would be very similar to the existing roadway that has become part of the urban context of these resources. It is also not expected that there would be any adverse effects due to increases in vibration levels from traffic operations.

AT-GRADE ALTERNATIVE

All construction activities described above under “Construction Period” would be complete and the roadway would be open to vehicular traffic.

Project Site—Archaeological Resources

Operation of the At-Grade Alternative would not have any effect on archaeological resources.

Area of Potential Effect—Architectural Resources

Widened sidewalks at Vesey Street and Route 9A would have a beneficial effect on the context of the Barclay-Vesey Building. There would be no change in grade or access to the building.

The 1994 FEIS determined that the reconstructed Route 9A would have no visual or contextual effects on historic resources. Since the At-Grade Alternative roadway would be similar, it is not anticipated that there would be any adverse contextual or visual effects. It is also not expected that there would be any adverse effects due to increases in vibration levels from traffic operations.

SHORT BYPASS ALTERNATIVE

Project Site—Archaeological Resources

Construction activities would be complete and the depressed and surface roadways would be open to vehicular traffic by 2009. Operation of the Short Bypass Alternative would not have any effect on archaeological resources.

Area of Potential Effect—Architectural Resources

The wider sidewalk at Vesey Street and Route 9A would have a beneficial effect on the context of the Barclay-Vesey Building. There would be no change in grade or access to the building.

As described above under the At-Grade Alternative, it is not anticipated that construction of the Short Bypass Alternative would have an adverse impact on other historic resources, as reconstruction activities associated with the proposed action are not expected to affect the characteristics of these properties that make them eligible for S/NR listing or NYCL designation. It is also not expected that there would be any adverse impacts due to increases in vibration levels from traffic operations. The depressed roadway would widen sidewalks near the WTC Site and decrease the vehicular traffic and related noise in the surrounding area. Although construction of the parapet walls would result in medium negative visual impacts, the amendment to the 1994 Programmatic Agreement would be the basis of coordination between NYSDOT and SHPO to avoid, minimize, or mitigate any adverse effects to historic resources.
DESIGN YEAR (2025)

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

Project Site. All work associated with the proposed action would have been completed for several years.

Area of Potential Effect. In the future, the status of historic resources may change. S/NR-eligible historic resources may be listed on the Registers, and properties pending designation as a NYCL may be designated. It is also possible, given the analysis year of 2025, that additional sites will be identified as historic resources and/or potential historic resources in this time frame.

Changes to the historic resources identified above or to their settings may occur irrespective of the proposed project. Future projects may also affect the settings of historic resources. It is possible that some historic resources in the APE may deteriorate, while others may be restored.

Historic resources that are listed on the S/NR or that have been found eligible for listing are given a measure of protection under Section 106 of the NHPA from the effects of projects sponsored, assisted, or approved by federal agencies. Although preservation is not mandated, federal agencies must attempt to avoid adverse effects on such resources through a notice, review, and consultation process. Properties listed on the Registers are similarly protected against effects resulting from projects sponsored, assisted, or approved by state agencies under the SHPA. However, private owners of properties eligible for, or even listed on, the Registers using private funds can alter or demolish their properties without such a review process. Privately owned properties that are NYCLs, in New York City Historic Districts, or pending designation as Landmarks are protected under the New York City Landmarks Law, which requires LPC review and approval before any alteration or demolition can occur. Publicly owned resources are also subject to review by LPC before the start of a project; however, LPC’s role in projects sponsored by other city or state agencies generally is advisory only.

In 2025, it is anticipated that there would be increased pedestrian and vehicular traffic in the area immediately surrounding the project site. However, this would not change the character of historic resources located in the APE as the context of the project site and surrounding area has historically been defined by transportation uses, first with the H&M Terminal and then with the WTC PATH Terminal. Thus, the APE has been characterized by transportation uses and pedestrian traffic and it is not anticipated that an increase in pedestrian traffic would have an adverse effect on historic resources. However, as shown in Chapter 8A, “Traffic,” the No Action Alternative would lead to a rather substantial increase in congestion in Lower Manhattan that could adversely affect accessibility to historic resources in the area.

It is not expected that there would be any vibrations from traffic operations that would adversely affect any historic resources. In addition, the amendment to the 1994 Programmatic Agreement would be the basis of coordination between NYSDOT and SHPO to avoid or minimize any adverse effects to historic resources.

AT-GRADE ALTERNATIVE

Project Site. All work associated with the proposed action would have been completed for several years. It is anticipated that there would be increased pedestrian and vehicular traffic on the project site as a result of the proposed action.
Area of Potential Effect. It is anticipated that conditions in the APE would be the same as described above for the No Action Alternative, with the exception that traffic conditions would be substantially improved over the No Action Alternative. This would provide better accessibility and mobility to cultural resources in Lower Manhattan.

SHORT BYPASS ALTERNATIVE

Project Site. All work associated with the proposed action would have been completed for several years. It is anticipated that there would be increased pedestrian and vehicular traffic on the project site as a result of the proposed action.

Area of Potential Effect. It is anticipated that conditions in the APE would be the same as described above for the At-Grade Alternative.