ChatGPT

Subterranean Masonry and Hidden Urban Infrastructure in Early American Cities

Research scope and evidentiary standard

This report is designed as a white-paper-ready research base for a longer study under the authorship line **Noel Michael Conrad and OpenAI**. Because no queryable “arch 3.0 project folder” documents were accessible in this session, the synthesis below relies on public archival, municipal, preservation, engineering, and peer-reviewed material. The research emphasis is deliberately conservative: it privileges documented construction practice, municipal engineering logic, preserved fabric, and scholarly interpretation over folklore, tourism copy, or unsupported claims about hidden societies. Where the evidence supports only a deduction rather than a confirmed fact, that inference is labeled as such. [1]

The strongest pattern to emerge is that the “city beneath the city” in the United States was not usually a single secret network. It was a layered assemblage of distinct but overlapping systems: raised street grades, sidewalk vaults and areaways, culverted streams, sewer interceptors, water conduits, basement workrooms, freight passages, and later utility vaults. Those systems arose from highly practical urban pressures—flood control, drainage, sanitation, real-estate maximization, freight handling, and daylighting—not from a single occult or conspiratorial design. Seattle, Chicago, Sacramento, New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Portland each preserve a different combination of those pressures and responses. [2]

A defensible white paper on this subject, then, should frame subterranean masonry as a form of **hydraulic urbanism**: cities used masonry, fill, iron, and later concrete to stabilize unstable ground, move water by gravity, create rentable volume below grade, and separate or hide dirty, wet, noisy, or dangerous urban functions from the civic surface. That framing accommodates architectural history, engineering, ecological design, labor history, and postmodern anthropological analysis without romanticizing unsupported legends. [3]

Street elevation and the making of the city beneath the city

Nineteenth-century American street-raising projects took two major forms. In **Chicago** and parts of **Sacramento**, existing buildings and blocks were physically lifted so gravity sewers and new street grades could be installed beneath or around them. In **Seattle**, the better-documented pattern around Pioneer Square was different: after the Great Seattle Fire, streets were widened and raised to improve drainage because sewers emptied into Elliott Bay and backed up during high tides, while rebuilt sidewalks and shopfronts produced the now-famous subterranean passages. Chicago’s sewer plan under Ellis S. Chesbrough raised downtown by about ten feet; Sacramento raised its business district roughly ten to twelve feet, and some official flood-history summaries say as much as fourteen feet in areas east of the Sacramento River; Seattle’s raised streets left parts of earlier storefront levels below the new sidewalk plane. [4]

Chicago is the clearest case of **live structural lifting**. ASCE and PBS both identify the sewer scheme as a response to epidemic disease and inadequate drainage, and later summaries note that George Pullman's early success came from jackscrew-based building raising. Smithsonian adds that the system could be smooth enough for businesses to remain open while foundations were shored and the structure was lifted. State-history summaries also remember the use of both jackscrews and hydraulic jacks. For the purposes of the white paper, this is important because it shows that grade-shift architecture was not merely demolition followed by rebuilding; it could be a carefully staged load-transfer operation that preserved commercial continuity. [5]

Sacramento demonstrates a related but more flood-driven strategy. California State Parks educational materials note that after the catastrophic floods of 1861–62, wagonloads of dirt and gravel were dumped into the city, the street levels in the business district were raised between ten and twelve feet, whole buildings were raised to the new street level, and new sidewalks were built, prompting newspapers to call Sacramento "a city on stilts." The Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency's historical timeline places the major street-raising campaign between 1862 and 1872 and states that grades east of the river to about 12th Street were lifted as much as fourteen feet. Sacramento's official museum interpretation still emphasizes that the process created the historic basements, raised storefronts, and "underground hollow sidewalks" seen in Old Sacramento today. [6]

Seattle's Pioneer Square preserves a different but equally important street-elevation logic. Official district guidance treats **areaways** and **sidewalk prism lights** as defining historic fabric and requires their retention; the city's preservation documents explicitly point back to a 2001 Seattle Department of Transportation areaway survey as the preservation baseline. Contemporary review documents also confirm that some of these surviving underground spaces remain part of working utility networks, including Seattle City Light vaults, showing how commercial subgrade space later transitioned into infrastructural service space. This transition—from storefront undercroft to electrical vault or protected utility room—is a crucial example of how subterranean architecture can change function across generations without losing its structural usefulness. [7]

A simplified section helps clarify the shared architectural logic:

```
street-raising sequence

old grade
 ──────────────────────────
 storefront / cellar / service room

new grade after fill or lifting
 ══════════════════════════
 sidewalk with prism lights
 subsidewalk vault / areaway
 retained older wall or newly underpinned foundation
 drainage / sewer / utility corridor below
```

In Chicago, the key act was lifting the superstructure while new grade and foundations were made. In Sacramento, fill and new elevated sidewalks created a raised commercial ground plane. In Seattle, the

rebuilt, higher sidewalks and streets generated areaways and underground passages beneath the new public realm. Those are three variations on one broader phenomenon: an urban environment that became subterranean because the civic surface moved upward while parts of the older service and structural layer remained in place. [8]

The continued public interpretation of these spaces matters because it confirms that the fabric is not merely speculative. Official Seattle district listings currently advertise underground tours beneath sidewalks and streets in Pioneer Square, and the Sacramento History Museum still runs Old Sacramento underground tours that interpret the 1860s–1870s street-raising campaign. These public programs do not prove every legend attached to such places, but they do confirm that preserved, visitable subgrade spaces are a real and ongoing urban condition. [9]

Buried waterways and hydraulic urbanism

If street-raising shows cities moving the surface, buried streams show cities moving the water. In **Manhattan**, an archaeological documentary study prepared for New York City states that **Minetta Brook** still runs below the surface even though its path has long been built over. In the **Bronx**, New York City's designation report for the **Old Croton Aqueduct Walk** describes the aqueduct as a water system constructed between 1837 and 1842 that brought the first direct water supply to the city; the visible embankment walls and park above it demonstrate how a below-ground conduit could remain legible in urban form long after its original infrastructural role changed. In **Boston**, official open-space planning documents explain that the confluence of the Muddy River and Stony Brook became a sanitary problem in the late nineteenth century, and that the response included tidal gates, a sewage interceptor, and reshaped parkland. In **Philadelphia**, Water History PHL identifies **Dock Creek** as the city's first stream to be placed into an underground sewer, covered under a brick arch in stages in 1765 and 1784. [10]

These cases reinforce a central thesis for the white paper: **water often determined urban geometry more than abstract planning did**. Chicago's own sewer and property-value history shows how sensitive infrastructure timing and cost were to minute changes in elevation. NBER research on late nineteenth-century Chicago finds that water and sewer access increased property values by more than a factor of two, a vivid reminder that underground hydraulic works were not peripheral conveniences but city-making capital assets. More broadly, urban-drainage histories show that by the mid-nineteenth century engineers increasingly relied on empirical design aids and catchment-based calculations, such as Roe's Table and related methods, to connect rainfall, catchment area, and sewer size. In other words, buried creeks and sewers were not just ad hoc voids; they were part of an increasingly quantified hydraulic landscape. [11]

The catch, and one of the most important cautionary themes for an ecological reading, is that buried water does not stop behaving like water. Philadelphia's **Mill Creek** is a textbook example. The Philadelphia Water Department explains that after the sewer was built, the land was filled roughly thirty feet above the original stream bed and rowhouse urbanization followed. Later records and neighborhood histories document repeated cave-ins caused by breaks in the sewer carrying Mill Creek underground, and Anne Whiston Spirn's work on Mill Creek notes that older gardeners and residents remembered buildings sinking and foundations being undermined by subsiding fill in the buried floodplain. The structural lesson is severe: masonry and fill can suppress surface hydrology, but they do not abolish it. They merely force hydrostatic pressure, erosion, settlement, and failure into less visible forms. [12]

A second text-only diagram captures the historical sequence:

```
stream urbanization sequence

open brook
 → stone or brick culvert
 → culvert integrated with sewer network
 → fill above former floodplain
 → streets / houses / warehouses on top
 → later risks: surcharge, seepage, settlement, cave-ins
```

That sequence is not universal, but it appears often enough across Philadelphia, Boston, and New York to justify treating it as a recurring American pattern of nineteenth-century urban expansion. The city grows by covering the brook, then forgetting the brook, then paying for the brook's memory in maintenance, dampness, odor, collapse, or expensive rehabilitation. [13]

From an ecological-design standpoint, the strongest contemporary counterpoint is **stream daylighting**. A 2022 review in *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution* argues that buried streams were often covered to gain space for roads or houses or to carry wastewater, but that restoration is now being integrated into blue-green planning because urban streams hold ecological and social value for climate resilience. The review also notes that culverts with limited drainage capacity are poorly suited to increasing extreme-rain events, while American Rivers' daylighting report identifies water-quality improvement, flood mitigation, and community revitalization as major benefits. The white paper can therefore make a nuanced argument: nineteenth-century burial solved real public-health and land-development problems, but twenty-first-century resilience often requires selective reversal, separation, or re-expression of those hidden waters. [14]

Vault lights, daylight, and the architecture of subterranean work

The most architecturally distinctive of these systems may be the **sidewalk vault light**. The National Park Service states that sidewalk vault lights became common from the 1850s onward in America's manufacturing districts. These cast-iron panels, fitted with small glass lenses and set into the sidewalk, admitted daylight to basements or "vaults" extending beneath the sidewalk and thereby created more usable or rentable space. NPS also explains that each panel was attached to a cast-iron saddle and iron framework spanning the vault below, with molded iron knobs around each lens to protect the glass and improve footing. This is a compact but revealing description of a hybrid system in which optics, iron founding, pedestrian safety, and structural spanning all meet at the sidewalk surface. [15]

Prismatic glass expanded that logic. NPS's preservation note on prismatic transoms explains that these systems, introduced in the 1890s, redirected daylight deeper into interiors and were marketed as a practical way to reduce reliance on light wells and artificial illumination. At their peak, more than a dozen manufacturers offered competing tile patterns. For the American context, the major corporate name is **Luxfer**. A National Register nomination summarized by the National Park Service states that although several firms produced prismatic glass, the leading manufacturer was Chicago's **Luxfer Co.**, founded in 1896 and renamed the Luxfer Prism Company in 1897. The *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* likewise describes the Luxfer firms as the inventors and most prominent producers of the material. [16]

The social function of these below-grade rooms was mixed. NPS's Broadway case study in New York says the basement there was likely used for a combination of **light manufacturing and storage**, not storage alone. That matters because it supports a broader conclusion: the rooms under prism-lit sidewalks were not only dead storage cavities but active work environments in at least some districts. Seattle's official Pioneer Square tour descriptions similarly characterize the surviving underground as former roadways and first-floor storefronts rather than purely sealed basements. What emerges is a spectrum of use—storage, handling, repair, small-scale manufacture, circulation, and service access—rather than a single programmatic type. [17]

The same daylighting logic also entered early mass transit. NPS notes that vault lights were employed in the early 1900s construction of New York City's first subway system, where they were built into ceilings above platforms to make underground space more inviting to a public still unaccustomed to subterranean travel. This is a powerful precedent for your white paper because it extends the argument from lodging and commerce to public civic experience: daylight below grade was not only a technical solution but an urban-psychological one. The city had to teach the public that the underground could be habitable, legible, and even elegant. [15]

One of your research questions asks whether prism colors correlated with manufacturers or function. The strongest answer I can support is cautious: **I did not find evidence for a universal American functional color code**. Seattle's preservation guidance instead requires that replacement prism color match the "aged glass color" found in the district, while the NPS Smith Tower example in Seattle describes new glass with a pinkish tint chosen specifically to replicate historic **solarized** lenses. The safe inference is that at least some of the colored appearance seen today comes from aging, solarization, and preservation matching rather than from a standardized original code that told pedestrians or workers what a given subsidewalk room was for. [18]

Why the masonry endured

The endurance of nineteenth-century subterranean masonry is best explained not by mystery but by a tight convergence of material logic and structural form. The Association for Preservation Technology defines a masonry arch as an assembly of wedge-shaped units that redirects gravity load to its supports; once the geometry is right, the system works primarily in **compression**, masonry's strongest mode. This is why arches, vaults, culvert barrels, and embankment walls recur throughout durable underground infrastructure: they convert vertical load into manageable thrust rather than demanding the tensile performance that historical masonry handles poorly. [19]

Mortar behavior is equally important. The National Park Service's guidance on repointing historic masonry stresses that high-lime mortars are more vapor-permeable than dense cement mortars and that, historically, mortar functioned more like a bedding or sacrificial joint than a rigid glue. Moisture could migrate through the mortar joints and evaporate there, protecting the brick or stone units. That preservation principle aligns closely with the findings of Lubelli, Nijland, and van Hees, whose 2011 study concludes that lime-based mortars possess a genuine self-healing capacity through dissolution, transport, and re-precipitation of calcium compounds, and that wet-dry cycles are a key factor in the occurrence of that healing. This combination—compressive form plus sacrificial, permeable, partially self-healing joints—is a persuasive explanation for the longevity of many subgrade systems. [20]

That durability should not be mistaken for invulnerability. Water remains both the ally and the enemy of subterranean masonry. The same Lubelli study notes that self-healing requires moisture but also drying; too much water without proper release can still damage the assembly. NPS's vault-light case study describes how broken lenses and failed seals allowed water infiltration, cracking, patching, and trip hazards, and how restoration had to account for modern load requirements by adding supplemental steel framing beneath the preserved panels. A recent structural study of masonry tunnel linings likewise notes that many such tunnels have remained in operation for more than a century while accumulating damage from aging and prolonged water infiltration. The correct lesson is not that old masonry is indestructible, but that it is often **repairable**, **modular**, and **failure-tolerant** when maintained. [21]

A simple structural sketch may help express the physics in plain language:

```
masonry arch logic

surface load
    ↓
  [voussoirs]
  \        /
   \______/   ← arch ring in compression
   /      \
abutment  abutment
   ↓          ↓
 load transferred outward and downward
```

For the white paper, this diagram can support a broader argument about "redundant structure." Thick embankments, gravity-fed conduits, masonry arches, permeable lime joints, and incremental repair all favored longevity. What often failed first was not the original arch itself but the urban context around it: overloaded sidewalks, broken waterproofing, altered drainage, or modern utility conflicts. [22]

Labor, secrecy, and myth

Below-grade architecture also organized labor. New York City's own water-history page notes that nearly **4,000 immigrants** worked on the Old Croton system beginning in 1837. More generally, the Library of Congress describes late nineteenth-century urban growth as deeply tied to immigration and industrial expansion, while the National Park Service's labor-archeology framework argues that industrial-period labor is often preserved in sites and systems that standard narrative history undervalues. Taken together, these sources support an important social claim for the paper: subterranean systems were not just technical artifacts; they were workplaces made and maintained by migrants, laborers, and service workers whose visibility in civic memory is often much lower than the visibility of the buildings those systems sustained. [23]

The anthropological literature sharpens that point. Infrastructure scholars describe infrastructure as embedded, often invisible support structures that mediate the circulation of goods, people, knowledge, and power. Contemporary ethnographic work on water maintenance likewise characterizes underground repair as a form of largely unrecognized care work occurring in the urban backstage. Applied historically, that perspective is productive: the vault below the sidewalk, the culverted brook, the sewer intercepting waste,

and the basement receiving freight are all examples of urban value created by keeping the most necessary processes largely out of sight. That invisibility was practical, but it was also social. Dirty work, dangerous work, and maintenance work were commonly displaced below grade and away from the monumental surface city. [24]

The grimmer side of this story is public health and environmental inequity. Chicago's sewer-grade crisis was driven by cholera, dysentery, and standing water. Philadelphia spent decades discharging raw waste into the same rivers used for drinking water, and the city's buried-stream landscapes later became sites of recurrent infrastructure failure and neighborhood distress, as Mill Creek's sinkholes and subsidence demonstrate. These are not side notes; they are structurally central to the history. The undercity was partly a machine for removing filth and risk from sight, but not always from circulation. Often the burden merely shifted—toward downstream water users, toward workers inside the system, or toward residents living on unstable reclaimed ground. [25]

Your outline also raises "masonry or Masonic techniques" and trade secrecy. Here the evidence supports a careful distinction. Britannica explains that modern **Freemasonry** grew historically out of the guild world of **operative stonemasons**, but became a symbolic or speculative fraternity rather than a building trade. A National Park Service preservation podcast adds that masons historically guarded trade secrets, used mason's marks, and carried knowledge systems that later trailed into Masonic tradition. The white paper can therefore discuss craft secrecy, marks, and transmission of practical knowledge, but it should not collapse operative masonry and symbolic Freemasonry into the same thing unless a city-specific archival source justifies that move. [26]

Portland is the clearest case where myth must be separated from documented history. Oregon Encyclopedia states plainly that historians have found **no evidence** substantiating the existence of a secret tunnel network built to facilitate shanghaiing, even though the myth has been persistent since the 1970s. At the same time, Portland's official visitor materials describe underground passages used to move goods from river docks to the basements of Old Town hotels and businesses. The responsible conclusion is not that "nothing existed below Portland," but that the documented parts are basement connections, goods-handling passages, and waterfront understructures, while the kidnapping network narrative is best treated as folklore, moral panic, or tourism reconstruction unless stronger evidence appears. That distinction should be one of the white paper's methodological signatures. [27]

White-paper-ready thesis and chapter architecture

The strongest thesis emerging from this research is the following: **nineteenth-century subterranean masonry in American cities was not a marginal curiosity but a mainstream urban operating system that joined water management, structural compression, daylight transfer, logistics, sanitation, and social hierarchy into durable below-grade environments**. In that system, water was usually the first organizer, masonry the stabilizer, iron and glass the light-modulating enablers, and hidden labor the sustaining force. Folklore later accumulated around these spaces because they were physically real, socially obscured, and structurally difficult to read from the street. [28]

A persuasive chapter progression would move from **surface problem to subterranean solution**, then from **technical solution to social meaning**. The opening chapter should establish the city beneath the city as a repeatable American pattern rather than a sequence of isolated curiosities. The next chapters should turn to hydraulic urbanism and the primacy of streams, marshes, tides, and river crossings; then to street raising

and filled grades in Chicago, Seattle, and Sacramento; then to vault lights, prism systems, and the invention of habitable underground workrooms; then to masonry physics and material endurance; and finally to the social consequences of below-grade circulation, sanitation, and hidden labor. The mythology chapter should come late, after the reader has learned enough engineering and archival context to recognize exactly where documented history ends and legend begins. [29]

The paper's interpretive rule should be strict and explicit: when discussing supposed trade secrecy, hidden passages, vice economies, or symbolic meanings, **state whether the passage is documented, repeated but unverified, or inferred from physical evidence and engineering logic**. That rule will let you write imaginatively without sliding into conspiracy. It will also strengthen the architectural voice of the project, because architects and preservation scholars are usually most persuasive when they move from fabric, section, and load path outward into social interpretation, not the other way around. [30]

A final forward-looking claim is worth making in the white paper's conclusion. The nineteenth century often buried streams, enclosed labor, and thickened the ground in pursuit of sanitation, commerce, and expansion. The twenty-first century faces a different mandate: resilience, repair, climate adaptation, and social legibility. That does not mean simply undoing the nineteenth century. It means learning from its robust compressive forms, long-lived materials, and systems thinking while also correcting the ecological and social costs of buried hydrology and invisible maintenance. The most compelling contemporary lesson is therefore not nostalgia for the undercity, but a more honest, ecologically literate urban section. [31]

Works Cited

Burian, Steven J., and Findlay G. Edwards. "Historical Perspectives of Urban Drainage." *Global Solutions for Urban Drainage*, American Society of Civil Engineers, 2002. [32]

Coury, Michael, Toru Kitagawa, Allison Shertzer, and Matthew Turner. "The Value of Piped Water and Sewers: Evidence from 19th Century Chicago." *NBER Working Paper* 29718, 2022, rev. 2023. [33]

Eccles, Sarah. *Old Croton Aqueduct Walk Designation Report*. New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission, 2024. [34]

Engeman, Richard. "Shanghaiing in Portland and the Shanghai Tunnels Myth." *The Oregon Encyclopedia*. Portland State University and Oregon Historical Society, 2022. [35]

Levine, Adam. "Dock Creek Sewer in 1849: A Report on Its Condition Made to City Councils." *Water History PHL*. Philadelphia Water Department and Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 2023. [36]

Levine, Adam. "Sewers, Pollution, and Public Health in 19th Century Philadelphia." *Water History PHL*. Philadelphia Water Department and Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 2023. [37]

Lubelli, B., T. G. Nijland, and R. P. J. van Hees. "Self-Healing of Lime Based Mortars: Microscopy Observations on Case Studies." *HERON*, vol. 56, no. 1/2, 2011. [38]

Mack, Robert C., and John P. Speweik. *Preservation Brief 2: Repointing Mortar Joints in Historic Masonry Buildings*. National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services, 1998. [39]

New York City Department of Environmental Protection. “History of New York City’s Drinking Water.” *NYC DEP*. 40

Randl, Chad. *Repair and Reproduction of Prismatic Glass Transoms*. National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services, 2002. 41

Stachelberg, Cas, and Chad Randl. *Repair and Rehabilitation of Historic Sidewalk Vault Lights*. National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services, 2003. 42

“Street Grades, Raising.” *The Encyclopedia of Chicago*. Chicago History Museum and Newberry Library. 43

Wantzen, Karl M., et al. “Back to the Surface: Daylighting Urban Streams in a Global North–South Comparison.” *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*, vol. 10, 2022. 44

“Freemasonry.” *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 45

“Lesson Three: Water, Water, Everywhere.” *California State Parks*. 46

“Pioneer Square Preservation District Public Realm Guidelines.” City of Seattle, 2022 draft guidance and board materials. 47

“Sacramento Streets Raised.” Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency historical timeline. 48

“The First New York City Subway Delivers Speed.” *Civil Engineering Source*, American Society of Civil Engineers, 2024. 49

“The Great Seattle Fire, Part 2.” *HistoryLink*. 50

“The Luxfer Prism Companies—And Their Contribution to Early Twentieth-Century Architecture.” *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, vol. 54, no. 1, 1995. 51

---

1 23 40 https://www.nyc.gov/site/dep/water/history-of-new-york-citys-drinking-water.page
https://www.nyc.gov/site/dep/water/history-of-new-york-citys-drinking-water.page

2 4 5 8 29 https://www.asce.org/about-civil-engineering/history-and-heritage/notable-civil-engineers/ellis-sylvester-chesbrough
https://www.asce.org/about-civil-engineering/history-and-heritage/notable-civil-engineers/ellis-sylvester-chesbrough

3 https://www.asce.org/publications-and-news/civil-engineering-source/article/2021/07/06/civil-engineering-almanac-ellis-s-chesbrough-is-born
https://www.asce.org/publications-and-news/civil-engineering-source/article/2021/07/06/civil-engineering-almanac-ellis-s-chesbrough-is-born

6 46 https://www.parks.ca.gov/pages/735/files/GovMansion_4Lesson3.pdf
https://www.parks.ca.gov/pages/735/files/GovMansion_4Lesson3.pdf

7 18 47 https://www.seattle.gov/documents/departments/neighborhoods/historicpreservation/historicdistricts/pioneersquare/meetingdocuments/pspb081022glsection5.pdf
https://www.seattle.gov/documents/departments/neighborhoods/historicpreservation/historicdistricts/pioneersquare/meetingdocuments/pspb081022glsection5.pdf

9 https://pioneersquare.org/businesses/bill-speidels-underground-tour/
https://pioneersquare.org/businesses/bill-speidels-underground-tour/

10 https://s-media.nyc.gov/agencies/lpc/arch_reports/1355.pdf
https://s-media.nyc.gov/agencies/lpc/arch_reports/1355.pdf

11 33 https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w29718/w29718.pdf
https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w29718/w29718.pdf

12 https://water.phila.gov/blog/archives-mill-creek-sewer-under-construction-1883/
https://water.phila.gov/blog/archives-mill-creek-sewer-under-construction-1883/

13 36 https://waterhistoryphl.org/articles/dock-creek-sewer-in-1849/
https://waterhistoryphl.org/articles/dock-creek-sewer-in-1849/

14 31 44 https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/ecology-and-evolution/articles/10.3389/fevo.2022.838794/full
https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/ecology-and-evolution/articles/10.3389/fevo.2022.838794/full

15 17 42 https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/tech-note-glass-02-sidewalk-vault-lights.pdf
https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/tech-note-glass-02-sidewalk-vault-lights.pdf

16 41 https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/tech-note-glass-01-prismatic-glass-transoms.pdf
https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/tech-note-glass-01-prismatic-glass-transoms.pdf

19 22 https://www.apti.org/assets/Publications/PracticePoints/Practice%20Point%2022.pdf
https://www.apti.org/assets/Publications/PracticePoints/Practice%20Point%2022.pdf

20 39 https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/preservation-brief-02-repointing.pdf
https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/preservation-brief-02-repointing.pdf

21 38 https://heronjournal.nl/56-12/5.pdf
https://heronjournal.nl/56-12/5.pdf

24 https://d-nb.info/1185578994/34
https://d-nb.info/1185578994/34

25 28 https://www.pbs.org/video/american-experience-elevating-city/
https://www.pbs.org/video/american-experience-elevating-city/

26 30 45 https://www.britannica.com/topic/Freemasonry
https://www.britannica.com/topic/Freemasonry

27 35 https://www.oregonencyclopedia.org/articles/shanghai_tunnels_myth/
https://www.oregonencyclopedia.org/articles/shanghai_tunnels_myth/

32 https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228877768_Historical_Perspectives_of_Urban_Drainage
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228877768_Historical_Perspectives_of_Urban_Drainage

34 https://s-media.nyc.gov/agencies/lpc/lp/2673.pdf
https://s-media.nyc.gov/agencies/lpc/lp/2673.pdf

37 https://waterhistoryphl.org/articles/sewers-pollution-public-health/
https://waterhistoryphl.org/articles/sewers-pollution-public-health/

43 https://www.encyclopedia.chicagohistory.org/pages/1202.html
https://www.encyclopedia.chicagohistory.org/pages/1202.html

48 https://www.safca.org/about/history/
https://www.safca.org/about/history/

49 https://www.asce.org/publications-and-news/civil-engineering-source/civil-engineering-magazine/issues/magazine-issue/article/2024/05/the-first-new-york-city-subway-delivers-speed
https://www.asce.org/publications-and-news/civil-engineering-source/civil-engineering-magazine/issues/magazine-issue/article/2024/05/the-first-new-york-city-subway-delivers-speed

50 https://www.historylink.org/file/21099
https://www.historylink.org/file/21099

51 https://online.ucpress.edu/jsah/article/54/1/24/58696/The-Century-s-Triumph-in-Lighting-The-Luxfer-Prism
https://online.ucpress.edu/jsah/article/54/1/24/58696/The-Century-s-Triumph-in-Lighting-The-Luxfer-Prism