



Phase 1A Historic Architectural Resources Survey & Work Plan

Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton, Chautauqua County, New York

Prepared for:

EverPower Wind Holdings, Inc.
1251 Waterfront Place, 3rd Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15222
www.everpower.com

Prepared by:

Environmental Design & Research,
Landscape Architecture, Engineering & Environmental Services, D.P.C.
217 Montgomery Street, Suite 1000
Syracuse, New York 13202
P: 315.471.0688
F: 315.471.1061
www.edrdpc.com



everpower

Phase 1A Historic Architectural Resources Survey & Work Plan

Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton, Chautauqua County, New York

Prepared for:



EverPower Wind Holdings, Inc.

1251 Waterfront Place, 3rd Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15222

www.everpower.com

Prepared by:



**Environmental Design & Research,
Landscape Architecture, Engineering, & Environmental Services, D.P.C.**

217 Montgomery Street, Suite 1000
Syracuse, New York 13202

www.edrdpc.com

June 2015

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

SHPO Project Review Number:	15PR02730
Involved State and Federal Agencies:	Department of Public Service (DPS), Article 10 Application
Phase of Survey:	Phase 1A Historic Architectural Resources Survey
Location Information:	Towns of Arkwright, Charlotte, Cherry Creek, and Stockton Chautauqua County
Survey Area:	
Project Description:	Up to 70 wind turbines and associated infrastructure 5.5-mile-long 115kV transmission line
Project Area:	Approximately 297 square miles
USGS 7.5-Minute Quadrangle Map:	<i>Cassadaga, Hamlet, Cherry Creek and Forestville, NY</i>
Historic Resources Survey Overview:	Two properties (the Leon United Methodist Church and Leon Grange #795) listed on the NRHP is located within the APE. There are 67 properties within the APE that were previously determined to be NRHP-eligible and 15 properties whose NRHP-eligibility is undetermined.
Report Authors:	Grant Johnson; Patrick Heaton, RPA
Date of Report:	June 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Purpose of the Investigation	1
1.2	Project Location and Description.....	2
1.3	NYSOPRHP Consultation	2
1.4	Project's Area of Potential Effect (APE) and Study Area.....	4
2.0	BACKGROUND AND SITE HISTORY	6
2.1	Previous Historic Architectural Resources Surveys within the Study Area.....	6
2.2	Previously Identified Historic-Architectural Resources	6
2.3	History of the Project Site	10
2.4	Existing Conditions	16
3.0	HISTORIC RESOURCES SURVEY WORK PLAN	18
3.1	Criteria for Evaluating the Significance of Historic Resources.....	18
3.2	Historic Resources Survey	18
3.3	Historic Resources Survey Report	20
4.0	SUMMARY	22
4.1	Summary of Historic Architectural Survey Work Plan.....	22
5.0	REFERENCES	24

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Historic Resources Located in the Vicinity of the Project	7
--	---

LIST OF INSETS

Inset 1. 1817 Lay Map of the State of New York (left).....	11
Inset 2. 1829 Burr Map of the County of Chautauque (right)	11
Inset 3. 1867 Stewart New Topographical Atlas of Chautauqua County, village of Sinclearville (left)	13
Inset 4. 1867 Stewart New Topographical Atlas of Chautauqua County, village of Cherry Creek (right).....	13
Inset 5. 1867 Stewart New Topographical Atlas of Chautauqua County, Town of Arkwright.....	14
Inset 6. 1867 Stewart New Topographical Atlas of Chautauqua County, Town of Stockton.....	15

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.	Regional Project Location
Figure 2.	Project Site Topography
Figure 3.	Project Study Area and Area of Potential Effect
Figure 4.	Previously Identified Cultural Resources
Figure 5.	1854 Keeney <i>Map of Chautauqua County, New York</i>
Figure 6.	1881 F.W. Beers & Co. <i>Atlas of the County of Chautauqua</i>
Figure 7.	1900 USGS <i>Cherry Creek, NY</i> and <i>Dunkirk, NY</i> Topographic Quadrangle Maps
Figure 8.	1941 USGS <i>Cherry Creek, NY</i> and 1943 USGS <i>Dunkirk, NY</i> Topographic Quadrangles
Figure 9.	Historic Architectural Survey Work Plan

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A.	NYSOPRHP Correspondence
Appendix B.	Site Photographs

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of the Investigation

On behalf of EverPower Wind Holdings, Inc., Environmental Design & Research, Landscape Architecture, Engineering, & Environmental Services, D.P.C. (EDR) prepared a Phase 1A historic architectural survey and work plan for the proposed Cassadaga Wind Project (or the Project), located in the Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright and Stockton, Chautauqua County, New York. The Phase 1A survey was prepared in support of a Preliminary Scoping Statement (PSS) being prepared as part of review of the Project under Article 10 (Certification of Major Electrical Generating Facilities) of the New York State Public Service Law. The information and recommendations included in this report are intended to assist the Department of Public Service (DPS) and the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (NYSOPRHP) in their review of the proposed Project in accordance Article 10. Please note that this report addresses only historic-architectural resources; information concerning the Project's potential effect on archaeological resources is being provided to NYSOPRHP under separate cover.

As described in 16 NYCRR § 1001.20 (Exhibit 20: Cultural Resources), an Article 10 application must include:

(b) A study of the impacts of the construction and operation of the facility and the interconnections and related facilities on historic resources, including the results of field inspections and consultation with local historic preservation groups to identify sites or structures listed or eligible for listing on the State or National Register of Historic Places within the viewshed of the facility and within the study area, including an analysis of potential impact on any standing structures which appear to be at least 50 years old and potentially eligible for listing in the State or National Register of Historic Places, based on an assessment by a person qualified pursuant to federal regulation (36 C.F.R. 61).

The purpose of the Phase 1A historic architectural survey and work plan is to:

- define the Project's area of potential effect (APE) relative to historic-architectural resources;
- determine whether previously identified historic architectural resources are located in the APE; and,
- propose a methodology to identify historic architectural resources within the APE, evaluate their eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and assess the potential effect of the Project on those resources.

All cultural resources studies undertaken by EDR in association with the Project have been conducted by professionals who satisfy the qualifications criteria per the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation (36 CFR 61). The Phase 1A report was prepared in accordance with the *New York State Historic Preservation Office Guidelines for Wind Farm Development Cultural Resources Survey Work* (the *SHPO Wind Guidelines*; NYSOPRHP, 2006) and applicable portions of NYSOPRHP's *Phase 1 Archeological Report Format Requirements* (NYSOPRHP, 2005).

1.2 Project Location and Description

EverPower Wind Holdings, Inc. is proposing to construct an up to 126 megawatt (MW) wind-generating facility (or the Project), portions of which will be located in the Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright and Stockton, in Chautauqua County, New York (see Figures 1 and 2). The Project will be located on leased private land that is rural in nature. The actual footprint of the proposed facilities will be located within the leased land, and will enable farmers and landowners to continue with farming operations or other land uses.

The proposed Project consists of the construction and operation of a commercial-scale wind power project, including the installation and operation of up to 70 wind turbines¹, together with the associated collection lines (below grade and overhead), access roads, meteorological towers, and operation and maintenance (O&M) building. All of the proposed wind turbines will be located within the Towns of Arkwright, Charlotte and Cherry Creek. The Project also includes a proposed 5.5-mile 115 kV transmission line that will extend through portions of the Towns of Charlotte and Stockton. To deliver electricity to the New York State power grid, the Applicant proposes to construct a collection substation, a 115 kilovolt (kV) electrical transmission line and an interconnection substation, which will interconnect with National Grid's Dunkirk-Moon 115 kV transmission line.

1.3 NYSOPRHP Consultation

16 NYCRR § 1001.20 indicates that the scope of cultural resources studies for a major electrical generating facility should be determined in consultation with NYSOPRHP. In addition, the *SHPO Wind Guidelines* request that cultural resources surveys for wind energy projects include consultation with NYSOPRHP to determine the scope and methodology to identify and evaluate historic resources. A copy of all NYSOPRHP correspondence for the Project to date is included as Appendix A.

EDR initiated consultation with NYSOPRHP via the Cultural Resources Information System (CRIS) website on June 1, 2015. The consultation submission included the following attachments:

- A copy of the Public Involvement Program Plan (PIP) prepared as part of the Article 10 process, and released in January 2015². The PIP is designed to initiate the Article 10 process, and includes consultation with the affected agencies and other stakeholders; pre-application activities to encourage stakeholders to participate at the earliest opportunity; activities designed to educate the public as to the specific proposal and the Article

¹ The wind turbine model that will be utilized for the Project has not been determined at this time.

² The Project's Public Involvement Program Plan (PIP) is available on DPS' website here: <http://documents.dps.ny.gov/public/Common/ViewDoc.aspx?DocRefId={34972B4A-D254-4D7B-B0BB-65B3DC1C75E2}>.

10 review process, including the availability of funding for municipal and local parties; the establishment of a website to disseminate information to the public and updates regarding the Project and the Article 10 process; notifications to affected agencies and other stakeholders; and activities designed to encourage participation by stakeholders in the certification and compliance process.

- A copy of the letter submitted to NYSOPRHP May 6, 2015 (see Appendix A), regarding visual impact to New York State Parks, including a copy of the visual outreach letter that was circulated to municipal planning representatives in April 2015 to request their assistance in identification of additional visually sensitive resources within the study area. The results of feedback received from the visual outreach letter as well as desktop analysis conducted by EDR will provide a comprehensive inventory of significant visually sensitive resources in the Project vicinity. The letter submitted to NYSOPRHP reviewed the results of preliminary viewshed analysis of the Project relative to New York State Parks located within 10 miles of the Project. The results of this conservative viewshed analysis indicate the following with respect to State Parks:
 - From Midway Park, the Project will be fully screened from view by intervening topography.
 - From Long Point State Park, the Project will be fully screened from view by intervening topography.
 - From Lake Erie State Park, the proposed turbines may be visible from some locations. However, due to the slender profile of the turbines and the effects of distance (the nearest proposed turbine in the conceptual layout is 10.4 miles from the park boundary), it is not anticipated that the Project would have a significant visual effect. Because the park is located so far away from the Project, Lake Erie State Park may ultimately fall outside of the visual study area as it is refined.

On May 8, 2015, Diana Carter - NYSOPRHP's Director of Planning – provided the following response regarding the Project's potential visual effect on State Parks:

I received the hardcopy of the letter/study that you attached to your email. With your assurance that this information will be included and refined in Exhibit 24 of the Article 10 application, it will demonstrate how our resources will not be adversely impacted by the visual effects of the project's wind turbines. Upon my review of the materials, OPRHP is satisfied and concurs with this analysis. We will have no further concerns regarding visual impacts to state park resources.

As you note below you will still be required to continue your consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office regarding Cultural Resource impacts (Carter, 2015; see Appendix A).

On June 24, 2015, NYSOPRHP provided a response to EDR's June 1, 2015 consultation submission. NYSOPRHP's response requested the following additional information (see Appendix A):

Please submit a Historic Resources Study to address potential visual impacts to properties 50 years or older within a five-mile radius of the APE.

[and]

The SHPO will be pleased to offer archaeological recommendations once we receive a map of the direct Area of Potential Effects. An attachment token has been provided to facilitate this request.

This Phase 1A historic architectural survey report and work plan is being prepared in response to NYSOPRHP correspondence dated June 24, 2015, which requests that a historic architectural resources survey be conducted for the Project. Following submission and review of this work plan by NYSOPRHP, EDR anticipates that a subsequent historic-architectural resources survey will be conducted, as described herein. As state in Section 1.1, this report addresses only historic-architectural resources; information concerning the Project's potential effect on archaeological resources is being provided to NYSOPRHP under separate cover.

1.4 Project's Area of Potential Effect (APE) and Study Area

The Project's potential effect on a given historic property would be a change (resulting from the introduction of wind turbines) in the property's visual setting. Therefore, the APE for visual effects on historic resources must include those areas where Project components (including wind turbines) will be visible and where there is a potential for a significant visual effect. Per the requirements set forth in 16 NYCRR § 1000.2(ar), the study area to be used for analysis of major electric generating facilities is defined as:

(ar) Study Area: an area generally related to the nature of the technology and the setting of the proposed site. For large facilities or wind power facilities with components spread across a rural landscape, the study area shall generally include the area within a radius of at least five miles from all generating facility components, interconnections and related facilities and alternative location sites. For facilities in areas of significant resource concerns, the size of a study area shall be configured to address specific features or resource issues.

Per the *SHPO Wind Guidelines*, the APE for visual impacts on historic properties for wind projects is defined as those areas within 5 miles of proposed turbines which are within the potential viewshed (based on topography) of a given project (NYSOPRHP, 2006). The five-mile-radius study area for the Project includes parts of the Towns of Pomfret, Arkwright, Villanova, Stockton, Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Ellery, Gerry, and Ellington in Chautauqua County, and South Dayton, Leon, and Conewango in Cattaraugus County (Figure 3).

A preliminary topographic viewshed analysis for the Project using USGS digital elevation model (DEM) data, the location and height of proposed turbines based on a preliminary project layout³, an assumed viewer height of 5.5 feet,

³ The preliminary viewshed analysis shown in Figure 3 is based on the Nordex N131 wind turbine, which is the tallest wind turbine model currently under consideration for the Project and therefore represents the "worst case" assessment of potential visibility. The total turbine height for a Nordex N131 (i.e., height at the highest blade tip position) is approximately 540 feet.

and ESRI ArcGIS® software with the Spatial Analyst extension. To supplement the preliminary topographic viewshed analysis, a vegetation viewshed was also prepared to illustrate the potential screening provided by forest vegetation (as mapped in the USGS 2011 National Land Cover Dataset [NLCD]). Based on standard visual assessment practice, the mapped locations of forest land were assigned a conservative assumed height of 40 feet (even though most forest vegetation within the study area exceeds this height), and added to the DEM. The viewshed analysis was then re-run and the areas covered by the forest vegetation layer were designated as “not visible” on the resulting data layer. During the growing season the forest canopy will block views of the proposed turbines from these areas, and such views will typically be almost completely obscured, or at least significantly screened, even under “leaf-off” conditions. The preliminary topographic and vegetation viewsheds for the Project are shown in Figure 3.

Preliminary viewshed results (based solely on topography) indicate that one or more wind turbines may be visible from approximately 85% of the 5-mile study area. However, when the potential screening effect of forest vegetation is taken into consideration, the model predicts that turbines may be visible from only 31.5% of the 5-mile visual study area (see Figure 3). Because the combined topography/vegetation viewshed accounts for the screening provided by mapped forest stands, it is a much more accurate representation of potential Project visibility. However, it is worth noting that screening provided by buildings and street/yard trees, as well as characteristics of the proposed turbines that influence visibility (color, narrow profile, distance from viewer, etc.), are not taken consideration in the analysis and, consequently, being within the preliminary viewshed does not necessarily equate to actual Project visibility.

The Project’s APE relative to historic-architectural resources includes the areas of potential Project visibility based on the topographic viewshed located within 5 miles of the Project, as shown in Figure 3. This area represents a conservative, “worst case” assessment of potential Project visibility. However, as noted previously, the preliminary viewshed analysis included herein is based on a preliminary Project layout, which is anticipated to change during the development and permitting of the Project. Therefore, the Project’s APE relative to historic-architecture resources may be revised in association with subsequent layout changes during the permitting process. However, because conservative assumptions were employed in the development of the preliminary viewshed analysis, EDR anticipates that subsequent Project changes are likely to result in a reduction in the size of the APE presented herein.

2.0 BACKGROUND AND SITE HISTORY

2.1 Previous Historic Architectural Resources Surveys within the Study Area

One previous historic architectural resources survey has been undertaken within the study area that identified NRHP-eligible historic resources within the current Project study area (see Figure 4). An *Historic Architectural Resources Investigation 5-Mile Ring Study* (Tetra Tech, 2009) was conducted in 2008 and 2009 for the proposed Arkwright Summit Wind Farm in Chautauqua County, New York (NYSOPRHP Project Review #08PR0564). The survey included identification of all properties previously determined eligible or listed on the NRHP, as well the evaluation of potential NRHP-eligible historic properties in a five-mile radius study area that included portions of the Towns of Arkwright, Charlotte, Dunkirk, Hanover, Pomfret, Sheridan, and Villenova, as well as the City of Dunkirk and City of Cassadaga. The study resulted in identification of 100 properties and three historic districts previously determined eligible or listed on the NRHP, and the recommendation of 184 properties and two historic districts eligible for listing on the NRHP. NYSOPRHP concurred with all of the above recommendations except for six (6) buildings, for a total of 278 resources and five (5) historic districts previously listed in or determined eligible for the NRHP.

As indicated on Figure 4, a significant portion of the five-mile-radius study area for the proposed Cassadaga Wind Project was surveyed as part of permitting studies for the Arkwright Summit Wind Farm project. Of the NRHP-eligible properties identified during the Arkwright Summit survey, 37 are located within the Project's study area. None of the proposed historic districts identified in the 2009 survey are located within the Project's study area.

2.2 Previously Identified Historic-Architectural Resources

EDR reviewed the Cultural Resources Information System (CRIS) website maintained by NYSOPRHP to identify significant historic buildings and/or districts located within five miles of the Project. The "Previously Identified Historic Architectural Resources" map (Figure 4) indicates the locations of historic architectural resources identified during the 2009 architectural survey conducted in support of the Arkwright Summit Wind Farm (Tetra Tech, 2009), as well as those resources identified through review of the Project APE using the CRIS database. There are two properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), 67 properties determined eligible for listing on the NRHP, and 15 properties whose NRHP eligibility is currently undetermined within five miles of the Project (see Table 1 and Figure 4). Of the NRHP-eligible properties within the Project study area, 37 were surveyed as part of the 2009 Arkwright Summit *5-Mile Ring Study* (Tetra Tech, 2009), and 30 were identified using the CRIS database. All of the properties within the Project study area whose NRHP eligibility is currently undetermined were identified using the CRIS database.

Table 1. Historic Resources Located in the Vicinity of the Project

USN	Name	Address	NRHP Eligibility Determination
00NR01685	Leon United Methodist Church	Jct. of Co. Route 6 and State Route 62, Leon, NY	NRHP-Listed
13NR06483	Leon Grange #795	6800 State Route 62, Leon, NY	NRHP-Listed
00906.000091	Residence (c. 1930), 27 Cherry Street	27 Cherry St., Dayton, NY	NRHP-Eligible
00917.000028	Residence, 6658 West Road	6658 West Rd., Leon, NY	NRHP-Eligible
00954.000007	Corkwell's Garage, 107 Pine Street	107 Pine St., South Dayton, NY	NRHP-Eligible
00954.000035	Commerical (c. 1877), 1 Park Street	1 Park St., South Dayton, NY	NRHP-Eligible
00954.000036	Wilson Hale & Co./ Post Office (c. 1877), 5 Park Street	5 Park St., South Dayton, NY	NRHP-Eligible
00954.000037	County Bank (c. 1920), 7 Park Street	7 Park St., South Dayton, NY	NRHP-Eligible
00954.000038	Commercial (c. 1900), 9 Park Street	9 Park St., South Dayton, NY	NRHP-Eligible
00954.000039	Commercial (c. 1890), 11 Park Street	11 Park St., South Dayton, NY	NRHP-Eligible
00954.000040	Commercial (c. 1910), 13 Park Street	13 Park St., South Dayton, NY	NRHP-Eligible
00954.000041	Commercial (c. 1900), 15 Park Street	15 Park St., South Dayton, NY	NRHP-Eligible
00954.000044	The Valley House/South Dayton Hotel (c. 1877), 203 Pine Street	203 Pine St., South Dayton, NY	NRHP-Eligible
00954.000045	Commercial (c. 1930), 205 Pine Street	205 Pine St., South Dayton, NY	NRHP-Eligible
00954.000046	Commercial (c. 1900), 207 Pine Street	207 Pine St., South Dayton, NY	NRHP-Eligible
00954.000050	Residence (c. 1860), 62 Main Street	62 Main St., South Dayton, NY	NRHP-Eligible
00954.000051	Residence (c. 1890), 203 Maple Street	203 Maple, South Dayton, NY	NRHP-Eligible
00954.000052	Residence (c. 1910), 212-214 Maple Street	212/214 Maple St., South Dayton, NY	NRHP-Eligible
00954.000054	Residence (c. 1860), 227 Oak Street	227 Oak St, South Dayton, NY	NRHP-Eligible
00954.000055	Sears Farmhouse & Complex (c. 1920), 8143 Oaks Road	8143 Oaks Rd., South Dayton, NY	NRHP-Eligible
00954.000057	Residence (c. 1910), 309 Pine Street	309 Pine St., South Dayton, NY	NRHP-Eligible
00954.000059	Residence (c. 1900), 312 Pine Street	312 Pine St., South Dayton, NY	NRHP-Eligible
00954.000060	Residence (c. 1890). 319 Pine Street	319 Pine St., South Dayton, NY	NRHP-Eligible
00954.000061	Commercial (c. 1920), 413 Pine Street	413 Pine St., South Dayton, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01301.000022	Residence (c.1847), 8129 Griswold Road	8129 Griswold Road, Arkwright, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01301.000023	Rose Farm (c. 1870), 1936 Rutenbur Road	1936 Rutenbur Road, Arkwright, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01301.000024	Arkwright Grange (c. 1900), 2667 Route 83	2667 Route 83, Arkwright, NY	NRHP-Eligible

USN	Name	Address	NRHP Eligibility Determination
01301.000027	Farm Complex (c. 1870), 2083 NY 83	2083 NY 83 Arkwright, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01301.000029	Christian Cemetery, Corner of Shumla and Tarbox Roads	Corner of Shumla and Tarbox Roads, Arkwright, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01301.000030	Residence (c. 1840), 2151 Bard Road	2151 Bard Road, Arkwright, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01301.000031	Residence (c. 1880), 2391 Bard Road	2391 Bard Road, Arkwright, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01301.000032	Burnham Hollow Cemetery, Bard Road	Bard Road, Arkwright, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01301.000033	Farmstead (c. 1850), 8903 Farrington Hollow Road	8903 Farrington Hollow Road, Arkwright, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01301.000034	Arkwright Summit Cemetery, Farrington Hollow Road	Farrington Hollow Road, Arkwright, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01301.000037	Cowdens Corner Cemetery, Route 83 and Miller Road	Route 83 and Miller Road, Arkwright, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01304.002062	Pickett Cemetery, Corner of Smith Road and County Route 75	Smith Road and County Route 75, Arkwright, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01304.002063	Luce Hill Cemetery, N Hill Road	N Hill Road, Charlotte, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01304.002064	Residence (c. 1875), 2726 Hooker Road	2726 Hooker Road, Charlotte, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01304.002065	Charlotte Center Cemetery, Charlotte Center Road	Charlotte Center Road, Charlotte, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01304.002066	Charlotte Center Church, 6956 Charlotte Center Road	6956 Charlotte Center Road, Charlotte, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01304.002067	Farmstead (c. 1865-1890), 6749 Charlotte Center Road	6749 Charlotte Center Road, Charlotte, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01311.000043	Farman Free Library, 760 Thornton Road	760 Thornton Rd., Ellington, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01311.000057	Residence, 812 West Main Street	812 West Main St., Ellington, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01311.000089	Residence, 4980 Route 62	4980 Rte. 62, Ellington, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01320.000036	Residence (c. 1890), 9453 Route 60	9453 Route 60, Pomfret, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01320.000037	Residence (c. 1890), 9460 Route 60	9460 Route 60, Pomfret, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01320.000038	Residence (c. 1875), 3728 Route 83	3728 Route 83, Pomfret, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01325.000087	Residence, 7255 CR 380	7255 CR 380, Stockton, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01326.000041	Residence (c. 1840), 1141 NY 83	1141 NY 83, Villenova, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01326.000067	Farm Complex (c. 1920), 8025 NY 83	8025 NY 83, Villenova, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01326.000068	Farm Complex (c. 1860), 8562 NY 83	8562 NY 83, Villenova, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01326.000069	Forestville Wesleyan Church Complex (c. 1858), 9495 Prospect Road	9495 Prospect Road, Villenova, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01326.000070	Farm Complex (c. 1830), 307 Philips Road	307 Philips Rd., Villenova	NRHP-Eligible
01326.000075	Villenova Grange Hall/South Dayton Grange Hall, 1150 NY 83	1150 NY 83, Villenova, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01326.000080	Residence (c. 1865-1890), 1394 Route 83	1394 Route 83, Villenova, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01326.000081	Hamlet Cemetery, South side of Route 83	South side of Route 83, Villenova, NY	NRHP-Eligible

USN	Name	Address	NRHP Eligibility Determination
01326.000083	Independent Order of Odd Fellows Lodge (c. 1890), 1112 Route 83	1112 Route 83, Villenova, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01326.000084	Hamlet United Methodist Church (c. 1875), 1119 Route 83	1119 Route 83, Villenova, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01326.000085	School/Residence (c. 1881), 8520 School Street	8520 School Street, Villenova, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01326.000086	Residence (c. 1840-1865), 691 Route 83	691 Route 83, Villenova, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01326.000087	Villenova Cemetery, Cemetery Road	Cemetery Road, Villenova, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01349.000015	Residence (c. 1910), 8999 Glasgow Road	8999 Glasgow Road, Pomfret, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01349.000016	Residence (c. 1865), 60 North Main Street	60 North Main Street, Cassadaga, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01349.000017	Residence (c. 1890-1920), 31 North Main Street	31 North Main Street, Cassadaga, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01349.000018	Residence (c. 1860), 35 North Main Street	35 North Main Street, Cassadaga, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01349.000019	Residence (c. 1900), 60 High Street	60 High Street, Cassadaga, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01351.000004	Bungalow, 6689 Main Street	6689 Main Street, Cherry Creek, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01351.000005	Bungalow, 6687 Main Street	6687 Main Street, Cherry Creek, NY	NRHP-Eligible
01351.000006	Former Electric Light Station, 6676 Main Street	6676 Main Street, Cherry Creek, NY	NRHP-Eligible
00905.000009	Conewango Bridge No. 6, Cowens Corners Road	Cowens Corners Rd, Conewango, NY	NRHP-Undetermined
00917.000024	Residence, 7662 Route 62	7662 NY 62, Leon, NY	NRHP-Undetermined
00917.000026	Residence, 7163 Smith Road	7163 Smith Rd, Leon, NY	NRHP-Undetermined
01301.000003	County Bridge #843, CR 307	CR 307 Arkwright, NY	NRHP-Undetermined
01301.000014	Residence, 2063 Route 83	2063 Rt. 83, Arkwright, NY	NRHP-Undetermined
01311.000015	Residence, 25 Elm Street	25 Elm St., Ellington, NY	NRHP-Undetermined
01311.000039	Legacy Farms, 5274 North Hill Road	5274 North Hill Rd, Ellington, NY	NRHP-Undetermined
01311.000040	Champlin Farmstead, 5469 North Hill Road	5469 North Hill Rd., Ellington, NY	NRHP-Undetermined
01313.000027	Residence, 3058 Terry Road	3058 Terry Rd., Gerry, NY	NRHP-Undetermined
01320.000009	Residence, 8912 Shumla Road	8912 Shumla Rd., Pomfret, NY	NRHP-Undetermined
01320.000020	Chautauqua County Bridge #993 (BIN 3325430)	Dale Drive, Pomfret, NY	NRHP-Undetermined
01325.000081	Rowley Residence, 4194 Bruyer Road	4194 Bruyer Road., Stockton, NY	NRHP-Undetermined
01349.000001	Denny Mansion, 91 Frisbee Road	91 Frisbee Rd., Cassadaga, NY	NRHP-Undetermined
01349.000002	Sahloff Residence, 114 Dale Drive	114 Dale Drive, Cassadaga, NY	NRHP-Undetermined
01349.000003	Fern Island House, 209 Dale Drive	209 Dale Drive, Cassadaga, NY	NRHP-Undetermined

The Leon United Methodist Church (00NR01685) Leon Grange #795 (13NR06483) are located in the hamlet of Leon at the eastern edge of the five-mile study area (see Figure 4). The Leon United Methodist Church was constructed in 1836 at the “four corners” intersection of the hamlet, and enlarged in 1858 with the addition of a sanctuary and bell tower. The building exterior remains largely unaltered with many early wood details still extant (see Appendix B, Photograph 35). The church was listed in the NRHP in 2000 (LHS, 2015).

The Leon Grange #795 was constructed in 1903 just north of the hamlet center, and operated as a grange building until 1977, when the building was purchased by the Leon Historical Society. It was listed in NRHP in 2013 under Criterion A for its role in the agricultural history of the hamlet of Leon, and Criterion C for its architectural form that follows the form of other rural grange buildings (Bartos, 2013). The Leon Grange remains well-preserved with minimal loss of historic character or integrity, as it has been owned and maintained by the Leon Historical Society for almost four decades (see Appendix B, Photograph 36).

The NRHP-Eligible properties within the study area include residences, churches, cemeteries, fraternal and agricultural society buildings, and commercial structures. Numerous nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century structures (primarily residences and farmsteads) are located within the study area that have not been previously evaluated by NYSOPRHP to determine if they are NRHP-eligible. These types of resources are typically determined NRHP-eligible under NRHP Criterion C (i.e., they “embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction” [CFR, 2004a]), and often derive their significance from being representative examples of vernacular nineteenth-century architectural styles that retain their overall integrity of design and materials. Within the study area, many nineteenth-century farmhouses were originally Greek Revival or Greek Revival-inspired vernacular houses with modest details, with some pockets of Gothic Revival-inspired houses. The architectural integrity of historic resources throughout the five-mile radius study area is highly variable, with many showing noticeable alteration, or deterioration due to the elements.

2.3 History of the Project Site

Archives and repositories consulted during EDR’s research for the Project included EDR’s in-house collection of reference materials, and online digital collections of the New York State Library, Ancestry.com, New York Heritage, David Rumsey Map Collection, and USGS. Sources reviewed for the Project included the *History of Chautauqua County* (Young, 1875), and the *History of Chautauqua County New York and Its People* (Downs and Hedley, 1921). Historic maps reproduced in the report include Keeney’s 1854 *Wall Map of Chautauqua County, NY* (Figure 5), the 1881 F.W. Beers & Co. *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Chautauqua, New York* (Figure 6), the 1900 USGS *Cherry Creek, NY* and *Dunkirk, NY* topographic quadrangles (Figure 7), and 1941 USGS *Cherry Creek, NY* and 1943 USGS *Dunkirk, NY* topographic quadrangle maps (Figure 8).


The Project is located primarily in the towns of Charlotte and Cherry Creek, and includes portions of the Towns of Stockton and Arkwright in central Chautauqua County, New York. At the time of European contact and colonization in the eighteenth century, the Project site was located within the territory of the Seneca Nation of the Iroquois Confederacy, though it was previously territory of the Erie Nation. Erie territory encompassed modern-day Chautauqua County, extending westward along the southern shore of Lake Erie, and eastward toward the lands of the Iroquois Confederacy. From 1654 to 1656, it is reported that between one and two thousand Iroquois warriors invaded Erie territory, and began an assault so brutal that it destroyed the Erie Nation entirely. For the next century, this remained primarily Seneca territory (Downs and Hedley, 1921; Kirst, 2005).

The French began utilizing the western end of Chautauqua Lake by 1679, setting the stage for later European land claims. By the eighteenth century, France had claimed the land around Chautauqua Lake for their own, which they ceded to Great Britain in 1763. By 1797, the land had been bought by the Holland Land Company, which subdivided and sold it to early European American settlers. Chautauqua County was created in 1811 after being split from Genesee County along with the land that is now Niagara County in 1808. Within a decade, major settlements began to form adjacent to water bodies, including Dunkirk and Portland along Lake Erie, Mayville at the northern end of Chautauqua Lake, and Jamestown along the Chadakoin River in the southern part of the county (Inset 1). In 1829, several new towns were formed from existing early town parcels, establishing the general land patterns that would define Chautauqua County throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Inset 2). The opening of the Erie Canal to the north brought new trade and settlers to western New York, and by 1835, the population of Chautauqua County had reached 35,000, concentrated along the borders of the Chautauqua Lake and Lake Erie (Beers, 1881; Kirst, 2005).



Inset 1. 1817 Lay Map of the State of New York (left)

By 1817, most parts of Chautauqua County had begun to be settled, though there were only a few organized townships. Much of the town remained rural throughout the subsequent decade (Lay, 1817; collections of David Rumsey).




Inset 2. 1829 Burr Map of the County of Chautauque (right)

By 1829, several new towns had been formed, and laid out in a generally grid-like pattern (Burr, 1829; collections of David Rumsey).

Chautauqua County experienced slow economic growth throughout the early nineteenth century, as an extensive transportation system was not in place until the 1850s. In addition to a road network across the northern half of the county, rail service was constructed along Lake Erie included the New York and Erie Railroad (later known as the Erie Railroad) and the Buffalo and State Line Railroad (later known as the New York Central Railroad) beginning in 1850. The Erie Railroad allowed Brooks Locomotive Works to be established in Dunkirk, which facilitated growth of the city's population and encouraged expansion of the steel and textile industries at the northern end of the county. Economic development in smaller towns and rural areas in the southern portions of the county included creameries, sawmills, tanneries, peach and grape crops, fishermen, wool mills, furniture factories, paper mills, canning plants and basket works. Northern Chautauqua County is particularly known for its grape crop, as part of the largest Concord grape belt in the northeastern United States. The Town of Westfield was home to Welch's Grape Juice Co. from 1897-1983 (Young, 1875; Downs and Hedley, 1921; Kirst, 2005).


The Town of Charlotte was formed in 1829 from the Town of Gerry. Although the area comprising the town was initially settled as early as 1809, remnants of fourteenth and fifteenth-century Native American villages have been discovered within the limits of the town (Henry, 2005a). Initial European settlement centered on the villages of Charlotte Center and Sinclairville (original Sinclearville after early prominent settler Major Samuel Sinclear) beginning in 1809. Early industry focused on wool production, and mills constructed on creeks. The first sawmill was constructed in Sinclairville in 1810 and the first grist mill the following year. Settlement was slow until the opening of the Erie Canal to the north in 1824. With the opening of the canal, Charlotte Center and Sinclairville began to grow, with numerous new commercial enterprises including various stores operating by the 1830s. By 1867, Sinclearville (which would change its name just two years later) included multiple tanneries, a cheese factory, cooper shop, and shoe, drug and leather stores, among other businesses, and a strong concentration of residences at the village center, which radiated east from Mill Creek (Inset 3). The village of Sinclairville incorporated in 1887. The county remained predominantly agricultural throughout the twentieth century (Stewart, 1867; Downs and Hedley, 1921; Henry, 2005a).

The Town of Cherry Creek was initially settled in 1815, and formed from Ellington in 1829. The town was originally known as Puckrum, but was renamed for the creek located within the town as well as the abundance of cherry trees once found there (Shults, 1900). Early industry focused on charcoal, cheese boxes, and iron, though the town remained predominantly rural in character throughout the nineteenth century. By 1867, the Village of Cherry Creek included a hotel, machine shop and planing mill, harness shop, and multiple grocery stores among other businesses (Inset 4). The construction of the Buffalo and Southwestern Railroad through town in 1875 encouraged further settlement, and the village of Cherry Creek was incorporated in 1893. The opening of the Cherry Creek Canning Company in 1900 provided jobs to hundreds of local residents during the growing season (Stewart, 1867; Downs and Hedley, 1921).



Inset 3. 1867 Stewart New Topographical Atlas of Chautauqua County, village of Sinclearville (left)

By 1867, Sinclearville was the main population center within the Town of Charlotte (Stewart, 1867; collections of SUNY Fredonia).



Inset 4. 1867 Stewart New Topographical Atlas of Chautauqua County, village of Cherry Creek (right)

By 1867, the village of Cherry Creek was the center of commerce for the town of the same name (Stewart, 1867; collections of SUNY Fredonia).

Dairy farming and agriculture are the primary industries in the twenty-first century. The Cockaigne Ski Area is a prominent winter recreation destination in the town (Chase, 2005).

The Town of Arkwright was formed from the Towns of Pomfret and Villanova in 1829, though the area had been settled since 1807. In 1818 it saw the development of the first of several sawmills. Dairy was an early and important industry of Arkwright, helped by Asahel Burnham, who built the first cheese factory in the county in 1861, and was known as the "Cheese King" for his successes in cheese production in Chautauqua County throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. By 1867, the town was still predominantly rural and agricultural in nature compared to neighboring towns, with only a few centers of population, such as the hamlets of Arkwright and Arkwright Summit (Inset 5). The town has since relied primarily on agriculture for livelihood, particularly the dairy and beef industry, though maple sugar production and farming of horses, deer and elk have also become important sources of livelihood in recent years (Stewart, 1867; Beers, 1881; Downs and Hedley, 1921; Curtin, 2005).

The Town of Stockton was formed from Chautauqua in 1821, but was initially settled circa 1810. The first sawmill and gristmill were constructed circa 1817, and additional steam and other mills soon followed throughout the town in the 1820s. Dairy was an early important industry of the town, which included numerous butter and cheese factories by the 1830s. The original area of the town was increased in 1850, annexing land from the adjacent Town of Ellery. By 1867, settlement was concentrated in multiple hamlets throughout the town, including Cassadaga on the north and South Stockton in the south part of the town (Inset 6) (Beers, 1881; Downs and Hedley, 1921).



Inset 5. 1867 Stewart New Topographical Atlas of Chautauqua County, Town of Arkwright.

By 1867, settlement within the Town of Arkwright was fairly scattered, with only the hamlets of Arkwright and Arkwright Summit serving as notable centers of population (Stewart, 1867; collections of SUNY Fredonia).

By the late nineteenth century, cement production was a major industry in the town, spear-headed by the Chautauqua Cement Company. A grape basket factory was also a major employer in the early twentieth century, though dairy remained the dominant industry into the twenty-first century (Henry, 2005b).

Throughout Chautauqua County, manufacturing and large industry greatly decreased by the late-twentieth century, and with it the population of the county. Agriculture and maple syrup have remained as major industries in Chautauqua County. Education also plays a large role in the local economy, due to the locations of SUNY Fredonia, Jamestown Community College, the Chautauqua Institution, and BOCES (Kirst, 2005).



Inset 6. 1867 Stewart New Topographical Atlas of Chautauque County, Town of Stockton.

By 1867, settlement within the Town of Stockton was focused adjacent to water bodies such as Cassadaga Lake and Cassadaga Creek that provided water power and resources necessary for industry (Stewart, 1867; collections of SUNY Fredonia).

Historic maps reflect the nineteenth century settlement and expansion of the towns within the county and the Project area, and the relative lack of population growth throughout the twentieth century. The 1854 Keeney *Map of Chautauque County, New York* (Figure 5) shows populations within the Project study area concentrated around the villages of Charlotte Center and Sinclearville (Sinclairville) in the Town of Charlotte, and the village of Cherry Creek in the Town of Cherry Creek. The 1888 Beers *Historical Atlas of the County of Chautauque, New York* (Figure 6) reflects the grid-like agricultural settlement of the towns of Charlotte and Cherry Creek outside of areas of concentrated settlement,

with houses noted to be located along roadways and large, rectangular lots likely used for dairy and crops located behind the structures. The 1900 USGS *Cherry Creek, NY* and *Dunkirk, NY* topographic quadrangle maps (Figure 7) do not reflect a significant change from the previous historic map, though the 1941 USGS *Cherry Creek* and 1943 USGS *Dunkirk, NY* topographic quadrangle maps (Figure 8) show a moderate increase in the number of structures located along major roads within the towns of Charlotte and Cherry Creek within the Project area. The portions of the Project study area located within the towns of Arkwright and Stockton contain no hamlets or villages, few roads and structures, and do not reflect any significant growth or change during the periods represented by the historic maps herein.

2.4 Existing Conditions

Existing conditions within the Project site were observed and photographed during a reconnaissance-level field visits on April 24 and June 9, 2015. The field visit included observations and photography from public rights of way, except where participating parcels within the Project site were surveyed. Representative existing conditions within the Project study area are shown in Figure 3 and in photographs included in Appendix B. General observations of existing conditions within the Project site include the following:

- The Project site is characterized by a patchwork of forested woodlots, open agricultural fields (primarily hay), pasture, reverting former agricultural lands in various stages of secondary succession, and scattered residences and farms (Photographs 1-6).
- No areas of concentrated settlement occur within the Project site. The hamlet of Charlotte is the only named hamlet present within the Project site, and is comprised of a church, cemetery and scattered residences at the intersection of County Route 49 and Hooker Road (Photographs 7-9).
- The area within five miles of the Project site is for the most part rural and lightly populated, and the majority of homeowners appear to be long-time residents. Older homes and farms are typically spaced at regular intervals along roadways and include houses in a variety of vernacular traditions (primarily Greek Revival, with some Queen Anne and Gothic Revival residences present) and traditional agricultural buildings, intermixed with modern houses and farm facilities (Photographs 10-11).
- Housing is concentrated in rural hamlets and villages, with houses usually clustered around a four-way intersection or town square (Photograph 12-13), with gas stations, automobile repair garages and other commercial operations often present (Photograph 14).
- Significant areas of concentrated settlement within the five-mile study area include the villages of Cassadaga (Photographs 15-16), Sinclairville (Photographs 17-18), Cherry Creek (Photographs 19-20), and South Dayton (Photographs 21-22), many of which contain historic architectural resources previously determined NRHP-eligible (see Figure 4).

- Additional areas of settlement within the five-mile study area include Stockton (Photographs 23-24), Lily Dale (and Lily Dale Spiritual Assembly) (Photographs 25-26), Villenova Hamlet (Photograph 27), Gerry (Photograph 28), and Ellington (Photographs 29-30) in Chautauqua County, and Conewango Valley (Photographs 31-32) and Leon (Photographs 33-34) in Cattaraugus County.
- Two NRHP-listed properties are located within the Project study areas. The Leon United Methodist Church (Photograph 35) and Leon Grange #795 (Photograph 36) are located in the hamlet of Leon in Cattaraugus County, at the eastern edge of the five-mile study area.

3.0 HISTORIC RESOURCES SURVEY WORK PLAN

3.1 Criteria for Evaluating the Significance of Historic Resources

Historically significant properties are defined herein to include buildings, districts, objects, structures and/or sites that have been listed on the NRHP, as well as those properties that NYSOPRHP has formally determined are eligible for listing on the NRHP. Criteria set forth by the National Park Service for evaluating historic properties (36 CFR 60.4) state that a historic building, district, object, structure or site is significant (i.e., eligible for listing on the NRHP) if the property conveys (per CFR, 2004a; NPS, 1990):

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association and:

- (A) that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- (B) that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- (C) 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
- (D) that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

As noted in Section 1.1 of this report, historic resources surveys undertaken by EDR in association with the Project will be conducted by professionals who satisfy the qualifications criteria per the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation (36 CFR 61). Our staff are thoroughly familiar with vernacular architectural styles, architectural traditions, historic settlement and land use patterns, and relevant historic contexts for rural western New York State.

3.2 Historic Resources Survey

The *SHPO Wind Guidelines* suggest the completion of a preliminary historic resources survey of the areas located within one mile of the turbines where viewshed analysis indicates the Project is potentially visible, and then schedule a meeting with NYSOPRHP staff in Albany to review the results of the preliminary survey. The purpose of this meeting is to allow NYSOPRHP the opportunity to verify the evaluation criteria being used by the consultant to determine NRHP-eligibility. However, EDR's cultural resources staff have successfully undertaken numerous previous historic resources surveys for energy projects in New York State, including wind energy projects, in close consultation with NYSOPRHP staff. In these previous surveys, NYSOPRHP staff have concurred with EDR staff recommendations regarding the

potential NRHP-eligibility of historic resources without the need for additional survey or justification. In recent correspondence related to other wind energy projects in New York, NYSOPRHP staff have confirmed that EDR does not need to conduct this initial one-mile survey and confirmation of methodology. Therefore, a one-mile survey and initial consultation with NYSOPRHP to review the results of the one-mile survey are not proposed herein.

The Project's APE is defined in Section 1.4 of this report. However, it is worth noting that significant portions of the study area for the Project are located within the area previously surveyed for the Arkwright Summit Wind Farm project (see Section 2.1 and Figure 4). As a result EDR assumes that no additional historic architectural resources survey will be necessary within this recently surveyed area, and proposes only conducting a survey within the remaining portions of the study area that have not been formally surveyed for historic architectural resources.

EDR will conduct a historic resources survey the Project's APE (with the exception of the area noted above). The historic resources survey will be conducted by a qualified architectural historian who meets the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation Projects (36 CFR Part 61). The historic resources survey will identify and document those buildings within the study area that, in the opinion of EDR's architectural historian, appear to satisfy National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility criteria. In addition, the survey will also be conducted for the purpose of providing updated photographs and recommendations of eligibility for NRHP-eligible resources, as well as previously surveyed resources within the APE whose NRHP eligibility has not formally been determined (see Section 2.2 and Table 1).

Historic resources survey fieldwork will include systematically driving all public roads within the study area to evaluate the NRHP-eligibility of structures and properties within the study area. When sites that appeared to satisfy NRHP-eligibility criteria are identified, the existing conditions of the property will be documented by EDR's architectural historian. This includes photographs of the building(s) (and property) and field notes describing the style, physical characteristics and materials (e.g., number of stories, plan, external siding, roof, foundation, and sash), condition, physical integrity, and other noteworthy characteristics for each resource.

EDR's evaluation of historic resources within the study area will focus on the physical condition and integrity (with respect to design, materials, feeling, and association) to assess the potential architectural significance of each resource. If deemed appropriate, individual buildings located within villages and hamlets will not be documented as individual properties, but instead will be described collectively as clusters or districts. For previously surveyed historic properties, EDR will make a recommendation of NRHP-eligibility for structures and properties within the study area previously determined NRHP-eligible or whose NRHP eligibility has not formally been determined. An updated

photograph (or photographs) of previously surveyed properties will be taken, and an updated recommendation of NRHP-eligibility will occur where applicable.

If significant changes to materials or form are found to have occurred, or if a property is found to no longer be standing, an updated recommendation of NRHP eligibility will be provided. Previously identified resources whose NRHP eligibility has not formally been determined will be given an updated recommendation of NRHP eligibility.

Note that all properties included in the historic resources survey will be photographed and assessed from public rights of way. The condition and integrity of all resources will be evaluated based solely on the visible exterior of the structures. No inspections or evaluations requiring access to the interior of buildings, or any portion of private property, will be conducted as part of this assessment. In accordance with the *SHPO Wind Guidelines*, and based on previous consultation with NYSOPRHP for previous wind projects,⁴ buildings that are not sufficiently old (i.e., are less than 50 years in age), that lack architectural integrity, or otherwise were evaluated by EDR's architectural historian as lacking historical or architectural significance will *not* be included in or documented during the survey.

Based on previous NYSOPRHP consultation for other wind projects, it is assumed that no additional documentation of resources of the area previously surveyed for the Arkwright Summit Wind Farm will be necessary.⁵ The five-mile study area for the Project includes approximately 297 square miles.⁶ The previous five-mile survey for Arkwright Summit Wind Farm included approximately 108 square miles (36 percent) of the Project study area, leaving approximately 189 square miles (64 percent) to be surveyed. The previously surveyed area as well as the proposed area to be surveyed are depicted in Figure 9. EDR proposes to conduct a historic resources survey of *only* unsurveyed areas within the Project study boundary using the methodology described above.

3.3 Historic Resources Survey Report

The methods and results of the survey will be summarized in an illustrated report, along with an annotated properties table that will include an entry for each identified property. The annotated properties table will include one or more photographs of each property, a brief description of the property (name, address, estimated age, architectural style, materials, etc.), an assessment of its condition, and an evaluation of significance.

⁴ See Historic Resources Survey for Copenhagen Wind Farm (12PR02853) (EDR, 2014).

⁵ EDR recently completed a Historic Resources Survey for the Copenhagen Wind Farm in Lewis County, New York (12PR02853; EDR, 2014), where a significant portion of the Project APE had previously been surveyed as part of an adjacent wind project. NYSOPRHP concurred with EDR that no additional survey was required within the previously surveyed portions of the study area.

⁶ Based on the current Project boundary, which is likely to change as the Project layout is refined. The final survey area will reflect a five-mile buffer around the final Project layout, which will be specified in the Historic Resources Survey Report.

The report will also include an analysis of the potential visual effect of the Project on identified properties, including consideration of distance and the effect of vegetation and other landscape features that may screen or minimize views of the Project from historic resources. Although historic properties identified as part of the *5-Mile Ring Study* (Tetra Tech, 2009) conducted for the Arkwright Summit Wind Farm will *not* be surveyed as a part of the historic resources survey for the Cassadaga Wind Project, the visual effect on historic properties identified in association with the Arkwright Summit study will be considered as part of the visual effects analysis prepared for the Project.

16 NYCRR § 1001.24 (Exhibit 24: Visual Impacts) describes the necessary components of a Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) that must be conducted as part of the Article 10 application. The VIA must include “identification of visually sensitive resources, viewshed mapping, confirmatory visual assessment fieldwork, visual simulations (photographic overlays), cumulative visual impact analysis, and proposed visual impact mitigation”. In addition, 16 NYCRR § 1001.24 requires that “the applicant shall confer with municipal planning representatives, DPS, DEC, OPRHP, and where appropriate, APA in its selection of important or representative viewpoints” (Article 10, Exhibit 24, Part 1001.24[b][4])⁷. To address this requirement, the historic resources survey report will identify those historic resources where visual setting is an important factor in their significance and where viewshed analysis indicates potential visibility of the Project. The report will recommend those historic resources where preparation of a visual simulation would be appropriate to assess the Project’s potential effect.

The final report will be provided to NYSOPRHP via the CRIS website. EDR also anticipates adding historic resources identified during the survey to the CRIS database as part of submitting the report to NYSORPHP. The report will also include recommendations for mitigation efforts, if appropriate.

⁷ Note: “DPS” is the New York State Department of Public Service, “DEC” is the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, “OPRHP” is the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation, and “APA” is the Adirondack Park Agency.

4.0 SUMMARY

4.1 Summary of Historic Architectural Survey Work Plan

On behalf of EverPower Wind Holdings, Inc. EDR has prepared a Phase 1A Historic Architectural Resources Survey and Work Plan for the proposed Cassadaga Wind Project, located in the Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright and Stockton, Chautauqua County, New York. Per the *SHPO Wind Guidelines*, the APE for visual impacts on historic properties for wind projects is defined as those areas within five miles of proposed turbines which are within the potential viewshed (based on topography) of the project (NYSOPRHP, 2006).

A total of 84 previously-identified historic architectural resources are located within the five-mile study area for the Cassadaga Wind Project:

- Two properties listed on the NRHP (Leon United Methodist Church and Leon Grange #795) are located within the APE.
- There are 67 properties located within the APE that have been previously determined eligible by NYSOPRHP, and 15 properties whose NRHP-eligibility is currently undetermined.
- Of the NRHP-eligible properties within the Project study area, 37 were surveyed as part of the 2009 Arkwright Summit *5-Mile Ring Study* (Tetra Tech, 2009), and 30 were identified using the CRIS database. All of the properties within the Project study area whose NRHP eligibility is currently undetermined were identified using the CRIS database.

As part of the historic resources work plan for the Cassadaga Wind Project:

- EDR will conduct a historic resources survey of the five-mile-radius visual study area of the Project, and provide photographs and a brief description of all properties determined to be NRHP-eligible
- In addition, EDR will provide updated recommendations of NRHP eligibility for properties within the study area previously determined eligible, as well as properties whose NRHP eligibility has not yet been determined
- A significant portion of the five-mile-radius study area for the Project was surveyed as part of permitting studies for the Arkwright Summit Wind Farm project (08PR0564). EDR assumes that the area previously surveyed as part of the Arkwright Summit Wind Farm will not need to be resurveyed.
- EDR provide a historic resources survey report to NYSOPRHP via the CRIS website. The report will also include an analysis of the potential visual effect of the Project on identified properties, recommendations for historic resources where the preparation of visual simulations would be useful to help assess potential visual impacts, and recommendations for mitigation efforts, if appropriate.

EDR has provided this work plan to NYSOPRHP in advance of conducting the historic architectural resources survey to confirm the visual APE for the project and to ensure that the proposed scope of the survey is consistent with NYSOPRHP's expectations. Please provide a formal response indicating NYSOPRHP's concurrence with and/or comments on the work plan described herein.

5.0 REFERENCES

Bartos, Virginia. 2013. *Leon Grange #795*. National Register of Historic Places Registration Form. On file, New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation, Waterford, NY.

Beers, F.W. & Co. 1881. *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Chautauqua, New York*. F.W. Beers & Co., New York, NY. Available at www.ancestry.com.

Beauchamp, W.M. 1900. *Aboriginal Occupation of New York*. Bulletin of the New York State Museum No. 32 Vol. 7. The University of the State of New York, Albany.

Burr, David. 1829. *An Atlas of the State of New York*. Published by the Surveyor General of New York State. Available at <http://www.davidrumsey.com/>.

Carter, Diana. 2015. Email Correspondence to Patrick Heaton (EDR) Re: Cassadaga Wind Project. New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation, Albany, NY. [included herein in Appendix A].

Chase, Joyce. 2005. Cherry Creek. In *The Encyclopedia of New York State*, edited by P. Eisenstadt, p. 320. Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, NY.

Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). 2004a. Title 36 - Parks, Forests, and Public Property, Chapter I - National Park Service, Department of the Interior, Part 60 - National Register of Historic Places, Section 60.4 - Criteria For Evaluation. http://ecfr.gpoaccess.gov/cgi/t/text/text-idx?c=ecfr&tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title36/36cfr60_main_02.tpl.

CFR. 2004b. 36 CFR 800 – Protection of Historic Properties [incorporating amendments effective August 5, 2004]. <http://www.achp.gov/regs-rev04.pdf>.

Curtin, B.H. 2005. Arkwright. In *The Encyclopedia of New York State*, edited by P. Eisenstadt, p. 117. Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, NY.

Dewitt, Simeon. 1804. *Map of the State of New York*. Simeon Dewitt, Albany, NY. Available at <http://www.davidrumsey.com/>.

Downs, John P. and Fenwick Y. Hedley, Ed. 1921. *History of Chautauqua County, New York and Its People*. American Historical Society, Inc., Boston, MA.

Environmental Design & Research, D.P.C. (EDR). 2014. *Historic Resources Survey: Copenhagen Wind Farm, Lewis County, NY*. EDR, Syracuse, NY.

Henry, Michelle. 2005a. Charlotte. In *The Encyclopedia of New York State*, edited by P. Eisenstadt, p. 305. Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, NY.

Henry, Michelle. 2005b. Stockton. In *The Encyclopedia of New York State*, edited by P. Eisenstadt, p. 1490. Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, NY.

Keeney, Collins G. 1854. *Wall Map of Chautauqua County, New York*. Collins G. Keeney, Philadelphia, PA. Available at <http://www.rootsweb.ancestry.com/~nychauta/HISTORY/1854Atlas/WallMapOfChautauquaCounty1854.html>.

Kirst, Pam. 2005a. Chautauqua County. In *The Encyclopedia of New York State*, edited by P. Eisenstadt, p. 306-309. Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, NY.

Kirst, Pam. 2005b. Welch Foods. In *The Encyclopedia of New York State*, edited by P. Eisenstadt, p. 1682-1683. Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, NY

Lay, Amos. 1812. *Map of the Northern Part of the State of New York. Compiled From Actual Survey*. Amos Lay, New York, NY. Available at <http://www.davidrumsey.com/>.

Lay, Amos. 1817. *Map of the State of New York with part of the States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, &c.* Amos Lay, New York, NY. Available at <http://www.davidrumsey.com/>.

Leon Historical Society (LHS). 2015. Some Information on Leon. Available at <http://leonhistoricalsociety.webs.com/didyouknow.htm>.

National Park Service (NPS). 1990. *How to Apply the National Register of Historic Places Criteria for Evaluation*. National Register Bulletin No. 15. National Register Branch, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. <http://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/pdfs/nrb15.pdf>.

Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 2014. *Web Soil Survey*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C. <http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/>.

New York Archaeological Council (NYAC). 1994. *Standards for Cultural Resources Investigations and the Curation of Archaeological Collections in New York State*. New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation, Waterford, NY.

New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation (NYSOPRHP). 2005. *New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) Phase 1 Archaeological Report Format Requirements*. New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation, Waterford, NY.

NYSOPRHP. 2006. *New York State Historic Preservation Office Guidelines for Wind Farm Development Cultural Resources Survey Work*. New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation, Waterford, NY.

Parker, A.C. 1922. *The Archaeological History of New York State, Part 2*. New York State Museum Bulletin Nos. 237 and 238. The University of the State of New York, Albany.

Rand McNally Company. 1916. *Wall Map of Chautauqua County, New York*. Rand McNally, New York, NY. Available at: <http://www.rootsweb.ancestry.com/~nychauta/HISTORY/ChautauquaCountyWallMap1916/ChautauquaMap1916.html>.

Shults, Charles J. 1900. *Historical and Biographical Sketch of Cherry Creek, Chautauqua County, New York*. G.M. Hausauer (printer), Buffalo, NY.

Soil Conservation Service (SCS). 1994. *Soil Survey of Chautauqua County, New York*. United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

Stewart, William. 1867. *New Topographical Atlas of Chautauqua County, New York*. William Stewart, Philadelphia, PA.

Tetra Tech Cultural Resources Services Group (Tetra Tech). 2009. *Historic Architectural Resources Investigation 5-Mile Ring Study, Arkwright Summit Wind Farm, Towns of Arkwright, Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Dunkirk, Hanover, Pomfret, Sheridan, Stockton, and Villenova, the Villages of Cassadaga, Fredonia and Forestville, and the City of*

Dunkirk, Chautauqua County, New York, OPRHP 08PR0564. Tetra Tech Cultural Resources Services Group. Report on file, New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation, Waterford, NY.

United States Geological Survey (USGS). 1900. *Cherry Creek Quadrangle*. New York. 15 Minute Series (Topographic). United States Department of the Interior, Geological Survey, Washington, D.C.


USGS. 1900. *Dunkirk Quadrangle*. New York. 15 Minute Series (Topographic). United States Department of the Interior, Geological Survey, Washington, D.C.

USGS. 1941. *Cherry Creek Quadrangle*. New York. 15 Minute Series (Topographic). United States Department of the Interior, Geological Survey, Washington, D.C.

USGS. 1943. *Dunkirk Quadrangle*. New York. 15 Minute Series (Topographic). United States Department of the Interior, Geological Survey, Washington, D.C.

Young, Andrew M. 1875. *History of Chautauqua County, New York, From its First Settlement to the Present Time*. Matthews & Warren, Buffalo, NY

Figures




Cassadaga Wind Project


Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright and Stockton - Chautauqua County, New York

Figure 1: Project Location Map

June 2015

Notes: 1. Basemap: ESRI ArcGIS Online "World Shaded Relief" Map Service and ESRI StreetMap North America, 2008.
2. This is a color graphic. Reproduction in grayscale may misrepresent the data.





Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauqua County, New York

Figure 2: Project Site Topography

June 2015

Notes: 1. Basemap: ESRI ArcGIS Online "USA Topo Maps" Map Service.

2. This is a color graphic. Reproduction in grayscale may misrepresent the data.

 Project Area



www.edrdpc.com

The wind turbine layout and model that will be utilized for the Project has not been determined at this time. The preliminary viewshed analysis shown here is based on a preliminary layout featuring 70 Nordex N131 wind turbines, which is the tallest wind turbine model currently under consideration for the Project. The preliminary viewshed therefore represents a "worst case" assessment of potential visibility. The total turbine height for a Nordex N131 (i.e., height at the highest blade tip position) is approximately 540 feet.

Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauqua County, New York

Figure 3: Project Study Area and Area of Potential Effect


June 2015

- ★ Hamlet
- City/Village
- Town Boundary
- County Boundary
- Project Boundary
- 5-Mile Study Area
- Vegetative Viewshed
- Topographic Viewshed

Notes:
1. Project visibility based on viewshed results accounting for screening by topography and mapped forest vegetation.
2. Basemap: ESRI StreetMap North America, 2008.
3. This is a color graphic. Reproduction in grayscale may misrepresent the data.



www.edrdpc.com



Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauqua County, New York

Figure 4:
Previously Identified Historic Architectural Resources

June 2015


- NRHP-Eligible Resources
- NRHP-Eligibility Undetermined
- NRHP-Listed Site
- ▭ Previously Surveyed Area (Arkwright Summit Wind Farm)
- ▭ Project Area
- ▭ 5-Mile Study Area

Notes:
1. Basemap: ESRI ArcGIS Online "World Imagery" Map Service.
2. This is a color graphic. Reproduction in grayscale may misrepresent the data.



www.edrdpc.com

Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, increment P Corp., NRCAN, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri (Thailand), TomTom, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community



Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauqua County, New York

Figure 5: 1854 Keeney *Map of Chautauqua County, New York*


June 2015

 Project Area

Notes:
1. Basemap: 1854 Keeney *Map of Chautauqua County, New York*.
2. This historic map has been geo-referenced with modern map features. Potential sources of error inherent in this process include cartographic inaccuracies, differences in scale, and changes in the modern landscape. The geo-referenced map therefore presents approximate locations of historic map-documented features, and is not intended to depict survey-accurate information.
3. This is a color graphic. Reproduction in grayscale may misrepresent the data.



www.edrpsc.com



Cassadaga Wind Project


Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauqua County, New York

Figure 6: 1881 Beers *Atlas of the County of Chautauqua, New York*.


June 2015


 Project Area

- Notes:
1. Basemap: 1881 F.W. Beers and Co. *Atlas of the County of Chautauqua, New York*.
 2. This historic map has been geo-referenced with modern map features. Potential sources of error inherent in this process include cartographic inaccuracies, differences in scale, and changes in the modern landscape. The geo-referenced map therefore presents approximate locations of historic map-documented features, and is not intended to depict survey-accurate information.
 3. This is a color graphic. Reproduction in grayscale may misrepresent the data.



www.edrdpc.com





Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauqua County, New York

Figure 7:
1900 USGS *Cherry Creek, NY*
and *Dunkirk, NY* Topographic
Quadrangle Maps


June 2015

 Project Area

- Notes:
1. Basemap: 1900 USGS *Cherry Creek, NY* and *Dunkirk, NY* Topographic Quadrangle Maps.
 2. This historic map has been geo-referenced with modern map features. Potential sources of error inherent in this process include cartographic inaccuracies, differences in scale, and changes in the modern landscape. The geo-referenced map therefore presents approximate locations of historic map-documented features, and is not intended to depict survey-accurate information.
 3. This is a color graphic. Reproduction in grayscale may misrepresent the data.



www.edrdpc.com



Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauque County, New York

Figure 8:
1941 USGS *Cherry Creek, NY*
and 1943 *Dunkirk, NY*
Topographic Quadrangle Maps


June 2015

 Project Area

- Notes:
1. Basemap: 1941 *Cherry Creek, NY* and 1943 *Dunkirk, NY* Topographic Quadrangle Maps.
 2. This historic map has been geo-referenced with modern map features. Potential sources of error inherent in this process include cartographic inaccuracies, differences in scale, and changes in the modern landscape. The geo-referenced map therefore presents approximate locations of historic map-documented features, and is not intended to depict survey-accurate information.
 3. This is a color graphic. Reproduction in grayscale may misrepresent the data.



www.edrdpc.com



The wind turbine layout and model that will be utilized for the Project has not been determined at this time. The preliminary viewshed analysis shown here is based on a preliminary layout featuring 70 Nordex N131 wind turbines, which is the tallest wind turbine model currently under consideration for the Project. The preliminary viewshed therefore represents a "worst case" assessment of potential visibility. The total turbine height for a Nordex N131 (i.e., height at the highest blade tip position) is approximately 540 feet.

Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauque County, New York

Figure 9:
Historic Architectural Survey
Work Plan

June 2015

- Previously Surveyed Area (Arkwright Summit Wind Farm)
- Topographic Viewshed
- Project Area
- 5-Mile Study Area

Notes:
1. Potential Project visibility based on viewshed results accounting for screening by topography and mapped forest vegetation.
2. Basemap: ESRI StreetMap North America, 2008.
3. This is a color graphic. Reproduction in grayscale may misrepresent the data.



www.edrdpc.com

Appendix A:
NYSOPRHP Correspondence



Environmental Design & Research,
Landscape Architecture, Engineering & Environmental Services, D.P.C.
217 Montgomery Street, Suite 1000, Syracuse, New York 13202
P. 315.471.0688 • F. 315.471.1061 • www.edrdpc.com

May 6, 2015

Diana Carter
Director of Planning
New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation
625 Broadway
Albany, New York 12238

RE: Cassadaga Wind Project
EDR Project No. 14048

Dear Ms. Carter:

This letter is in response to your email correspondence with Jim Muscato of Young/Sommer LLC regarding potential visual impacts of the proposed Cassadaga Wind Project ("the Project") on New York State Parks. In addition, this letter is in furtherance of the Project's stakeholder consultation mandated by NY Public Service Law Article 10. As you noted, the closest State Parks to the Project are three State Parks located approximately 10 miles from the proposed Project boundary: Midway State Park, Long Point State Park, and Lake Erie State Park. These parks are located 9.5 miles, 9.6 miles and 10.4 miles from the nearest proposed wind turbine, respectively.

The area within five miles of proposed wind turbines is typically considered an adequate study area for wind project visual impact analysis. However, Article 10 regulations require that the visual study area be defined based on the location of all proposed infrastructure (as opposed to wind turbines alone; 16 NYCRR § 1000.2[ar]). Since the locations of the proposed infrastructure are yet to be determined, the Project boundary was used as the basis of defining the visual study area rather than the project components themselves at this preliminary stage in visual impact analysis. Furthermore, the Article 10 regulations indicate that an area larger than 5 miles may be appropriate in areas of significant resource concerns (16 NYCRR § 1000.2[ar]). Therefore, a preliminary viewshed analysis was conducted for areas within 10 miles of the Cassadaga Wind Project boundary in order to assist in determining whether a 5-mile radius study area is appropriate for this Project. A 5-mile-radius has been deemed acceptable for assessing visibility at many of the operating wind farm projects in the State. It is anticipated that the visual study area for the Cassadaga Wind Project will likely decrease in size as the Project moves forward in the Article 10 application process.

A preliminary viewshed analysis was conducted based on a conceptual wind turbine layout and the tallest turbine model under consideration (the Nordex N131 with a maximum blade tip height of 540 feet). This analysis accounts for the screening provided by intervening topography as well as screening by mapped forest vegetation (based on the 2011 National Land Cover Dataset and assuming a vegetation height of 40 feet in forested areas). The results of this conservative viewshed analysis indicate the following with respect to State Parks:

- From Midway Park, the Project will be fully screened from view by intervening topography.
- From Long Point State Park, the Project will be fully screened from view by intervening topography.

- From Lake Erie State Park, the proposed turbines may be visible from some locations. However, due to the slender profile of the turbines and the effects of distance (the nearest proposed turbine in the conceptual layout is 10.4 miles from the park boundary), it is not anticipated that the Project would have a significant visual effect. Because the park is located so far away from the Project, Lake Erie State Park may ultimately fall outside of the visual study area as it is refined.

Visual impacts associated with the Cassadaga Wind Project, including potential impacts to visually sensitive resources such as State Parks, will be more fully evaluated in the Project's Visual Impact Assessment (VIA), which will be included as Exhibit 24 of the Article 10 application. The VIA will include "identification of visually sensitive resources, viewshed mapping, confirmatory visual assessment fieldwork, visual simulations (photographic overlays), cumulative visual impact analysis, and proposed visual impact mitigation" pursuant to the requirements of Article 10.

As a courtesy, we are also providing you the enclosed attachment, which includes an outreach letter that was circulated to municipal planning representatives to request their assistance in identification of additional visually sensitive resources within the study area and their recommendation for viewpoints to be used in the development of visual simulations. The attachment includes a table of visually sensitive resources inventoried thus far as well as the preliminary viewshed results for each resource. Additionally, Figure 3 of the attachment depicts the viewshed analysis overlaid on the identified visually sensitive resources. We have received responses from some of these municipal planning representatives and will include the sites they identify in the analyses included in Exhibit 24 of the Article 10 application.

Please note that with respect to historic/cultural resources, we are reviewing NYSOPRHP's Cultural Resources Information System (CRIS) database and will initiate consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) portion of your office separately via the CRIS on-line consultation system.

If you require additional information regarding anticipated visual impacts to New York State Parks, please do not hesitate to contact me at 315-471-0688.

Sincerely,



Patrick Heaton, Director of Cultural Resources
Environmental Design & Research, Landscape Architecture, Engineering, & Environmental Services, D.P.C.
On behalf of Cassadaga Wind, LLC

Contents of Attachment:

- Visual Outreach Letter
- Table 1. Visually Sensitive Resources
- Figure 1. Project Area
- Figure 2. Study Area
- Figure 3. Visually Sensitive Resources and Viewshed Analysis
- Notarized Distribution List for Visual Outreach Letter



Environmental Design & Research,
Landscape Architecture, Engineering & Environmental Services, D.P.C.
217 Montgomery Street, Suite 1000, Syracuse, New York 13202
P. 315.471.0688 • F. 315.471.1061 • www.edrdpc.com

April 1, 2015

**MUNICIPAL PLANNING REPRESENTATIVES
PER ATTACHED DISTRIBUTION LIST**

**RE: Cassadaga Wind Project
 Identification of Visually Sensitive Resources**

Dear MUNICIPAL PLANNING REPRESENTATIVE:

As you may be aware, Cassadaga Wind, LLC is proposing to construct a 126 megawatt (MW) wind power project ("the Project") in the Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton, in Chautauqua County, New York (Figure 1). The proposed Project is subject to the rules for siting a major electric generating facility under Article 10 of the New York State Public Service Law ("PSL"). In accordance with the Article 10 regulations, a Public Involvement Program "PIP" plan for this Project was released in January 2015 and is available on the Project's website at http://everpower.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/2015-01-05_PIP_FINAL.pdf. Please refer to the PIP for additional details regarding the proposed Project.

A number of studies are now underway to assist in evaluating the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Project in support of the Article 10 application. One such study is the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA), which will be included as Exhibit 24 of the Article 10 application. The VIA must include "identification of visually sensitive resources, viewshed mapping, confirmatory visual assessment fieldwork, visual simulations (photographic overlays), cumulative visual impact analysis, and proposed visual impact mitigation" pursuant to the requirements identified in Exhibit 24 of Article 10. The purpose of this letter is to help address the requirement that "the applicant shall confer with municipal planning representatives, DPS, DEC, OPRHP, and where appropriate, APA in its selection of important or representative viewpoints" (Article 10, Exhibit 24, Part 1001.24[b][4])¹. The information presented in this letter and its enclosures is intended to provide stakeholders with sufficient context and information to assist with the identification of visually sensitive resources and the selection of important and/or representative viewpoints.

Visual Study Area

Per the requirements set forth in 16 NYCRR § 1000.2(ar), the visual study area to be used for analysis of major electric generating facilities is defined as "an area generally related to the nature of the technology and the setting of the

¹ Note: "DPS" is the New York State Department of Public Service, "DEC" is the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, "OPRHP" is the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation, and "APA" is the Adirondack Park Agency.

proposed site. For large facilities or wind power facilities with components spread across a rural landscape, the study area shall generally include the area within a radius of at least five miles from all generating facility components, interconnections and related facilities and alternative location sites. For facilities in areas of significant resource concerns, the size of a study area shall be configured to address specific features or resource issues.”

For the purposes of this consultation, visually sensitive resources have been identified within 10 miles of the proposed Project boundary. In general terms, a 5-mile-radius study area for a VIA is typically considered adequate for wind projects because the area within 5 miles of a Project typically represents the area within which significant visual effects may occur. The purpose of including areas between 5 and 10 miles from the Project was to identify any regionally significant areas or resources of concern and to assist in determining whether a 5-mile radius study area is appropriate for this Project. The 5-mile and 10-mile visual study area boundaries for the Project are depicted on Figure 2.

Preliminary viewshed analyses have been prepared for the Project (see Figure 3)². Preliminary viewshed results indicate that one or more wind turbines may be visible from approximately 31.5% of the 5-mile visual study area and from approximately 12% of the area that falls between the 5 and 10 mile study area boundaries (see Figure 3: Sheet 1). However, screening provided by buildings and street/yard trees, as well as characteristics of the proposed turbines that influence visibility (color, narrow profile, distance from viewer, etc.), are not taken consideration in the analysis and, consequently, being within the preliminary viewshed does not necessarily equate to actual Project visibility.

Visually Sensitive Resources

Aesthetic resources of statewide significance are formally defined by the Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) in the Program Policy entitled *Assessing and Mitigating Visual Impacts*³ (the “DEC Visual Policy”). EDR conducted a desktop inventory of visually sensitive resources of potential statewide significance within 10 miles of the proposed Project and a more detailed inventory (including potential locally significant resources) within the 5-mile visual study area. Aesthetic resources of statewide significance located within 10 miles of the proposed Project include 11 sites and four districts listed on the National Register of Historic Places; the Seaway Trail National Scenic Byway, three state parks (Lake Erie State Park, Long Point State Park and Midway State Park), the Concord Grape Belt New York State Heritage Area, the Canadaway Creek Nature Sanctuary, six wildlife management areas, and Conewango Creek (included in the National Rivers Inventory for “Outstandingly Remarkable Value” due to the large adjacent ecologically/botanically significant swamp). While water bodies are not typically considered resources of statewide significance, Chautauqua Lake and Lake Erie are included in this inventory due to their regional significance with respect to recreation and tourism. Figure 3, Sheet 1 illustrates the location of each of these resources and Table 1 provides information about each site, including name, distance to the nearest proposed turbine, and the potential visibility of the Project based on preliminary viewshed analysis.

² The wind turbine model that will be utilized for the Project has not been determined at this time. The preliminary viewshed analysis shown in Figure 3 is based on the Nordex N131 wind turbine, which is the tallest wind turbine model currently under consideration for the Project and therefore represents the “worst case” assessment of potential visibility. The total turbine height for a Nordex N131 (i.e., height at the highest blade tip position) is approximately 540 feet.

³ The DEC Program Policy *Assessing and Mitigating Visual Impacts* was issued on July 31, 2000 and can be reviewed here: http://www.dec.ny.gov/docs/permits_ej_operations_pdf/visual2000.pdf.

Resources located within the 5-mile visual study area that may be regionally or locally significant/sensitive, include the Villages of South Dayton, Cassadaga, Cherry Creek, and Sinclairville; 11 hamlets; four local parks; three trails; four state forests and one state fishing access point; three public schools; four state highways and one US highway; and several recreational water resources. The 5-mile visual study area also includes 44 sites that have previously been determined to be eligible for listing on the NRHP. Each of these resources are shown on Figure 3, Sheet 2 and included in Table 1. Cassadaga Wind, LLC believes that the list of aesthetic resources included herein represents a comprehensive inventory of the significant visually sensitive resources in the Project vicinity.

Selection of Viewpoints for Preparation of Visual Simulations

It is anticipated that preparation of the VIA will also include a field review (site visit) to obtain photographs for subsequent use in the development of photographic simulations. Photographs will be taken from representative viewpoints within the study area, including visually sensitive resources identified by local stakeholders in response to this letter. Photographs taken from each viewpoint during field review will be used to illustrate typical potential visibility of the proposed Project from various distances and visual settings within the study area.

A subset of the viewpoints photographed during the field review effort will be selected for the development of visual simulations. In addition to requiring consultation with municipal planning representatives, DPS, DEC and OPRHP in the viewpoint selection process; Article 10, Exhibit 24, Part 1001.24(b)(4) states:

“Viewpoint selection is based on the following criteria:

- i. representative or typical views from unobstructed or direct line of-sight views;
- ii. significance of viewpoints, designated scenic resources, areas or features (which features typically include, but are not limited to: landmark landscapes; wild, scenic or recreational rivers administered respectively by either the DEC or the APA pursuant to ECL Article 15 or Department of Interior pursuant to 16 USC Section 1271; forest preserve lands, scenic vistas specifically identified in the Adirondack Park State Land Master Plan, conservation easement lands, scenic byways designated by the federal or state governments; Scenic districts and scenic roads, designated by the Commissioner of Environmental Conservation pursuant to ECL Article 49 scenic districts; Scenic Areas of Statewide Significance; state parks or historic sites; sites listed on National or State Registers of Historic Places; areas covered by scenic easements, public parks or recreation areas; locally designated historic or scenic districts and scenic overlooks; and high-use public areas;
- iii. level of viewer exposure, i.e., frequency of viewers or relative numbers, including residential areas, or high volume roadways;
- iv. proposed land uses;
- v. input from local public sources; and
- vi. building/structure data collected for each potentially eligible property prepared in a format acceptable to OPRHP and DPS and submitted to OPRHP and DPS for review prior to completing the viewpoint selection.”

It is not anticipated that photo simulations will be prepared from every visually sensitive resource or area of concern identified by local stakeholders or from every area with potential Project visibility within the study area. Instead, it is

anticipated that a subset of representative viewpoints will be selected that will provide a set of simulations that illustrate the appearance of the Project from a range of distances and representative visual settings within the study area.

Feedback Request

In accordance with Article 10, Exhibit 24, Part 1001.24(b)(4); Cassadaga Wind, LLC is formally requesting the feedback of municipal planning representatives in the identification of important or representative viewpoints in the Project vicinity. Please review the inventory of visually sensitive resources included as Table 1 and depicted on Figure 3. Cassadaga Wind, LLC believes that the list of aesthetic resources included herein represents a comprehensive inventory of the significant visually sensitive resources in the Project vicinity. Please consider whether there are any additional significant visually sensitive sites that are not included in the inventory, and if so please provide Cassadaga Wind, LLC with:

- 1) The name and location of additional visually sensitive resources (not identified in Table 1) that you feel should be included in the inventory of aesthetic resources and subsequent evaluation of potential visual impacts. Additional resources should include:
 - a. Locally significant visually sensitive resources or areas within the 5 mile visual study area (i.e. areas where visually sensitive views are experienced primarily by local residents), and
 - b. Regionally significant visually sensitive resources or areas within the 10 mile visual study area (i.e. visually sensitive tourist attractions or other visually sensitive areas that draw visitors from other parts of the region or state).
- 2) Your recommendations for viewpoints that you feel would be strong candidates for the development of visual simulations, with an explanation of why you feel that view or location is important to consider.

Please provide this information by April 30, 2015 to Cassadaga Wind, LLC:

- Via email through a link on the Project website at: <http://everpower.com/contact/>. Please type "Cassadaga Wind - Visual Resources" in the subject line.
- Via written letter to:
Attn: Bill Spencer
Cassadaga Wind Project
c/o EverPower Wind Holdings, Inc.
1251 Waterfront Place, 3rd Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15222

We sincerely appreciate your assistance helping us to identify locally and regionally significant sensitive sites and areas.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, reading "Patrick J. Heaton". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending from the end of the name.

Patrick Heaton, Director of Cultural Resources
Environmental Design & Research, Landscape Architecture, Engineering, & Environmental Services, D.P.C.
On behalf of Cassadaga Wind, LLC

List of Enclosures:

- Table 1. Visually Sensitive Resources
- Figure 1. Project Area
- Figure 2. Study Area
- Figure 3. Visually Sensitive Resources and Viewshed Analysis

Visually Sensitive Resource	Location		Distance ¹	Distance Zone	Project Visibility		
	Town	County	Miles from Nearest Turbine	<div>● Foreground</div> <div>● Midground</div> <div>● Background</div>	+Visible	- Not Visible	+/- Partially Visible
					Preliminary Topographic/Vegetation Viewshed		
1. Properties Listed in the National or State Register of Historic Places							
Leon United Methodist Church	Leon	Cattaraugus	5.4	●	-		
Leon Grange # 795	Leon	Cattaraugus	5.4	●	-		
Fredonia Commons Historic District	Pomfret	Chautauqua	7.6	●	+/-		
US Post Office--Fredonia	Pomfret	Chautauqua	7.7	●	+		
Midway State Park	Ellery	Chautauqua	9.5	●	-		
Point Chautauqua Historic District	Chautauqua	Chautauqua	10.0	●	-		
Brocton Arch	Portland	Chautauqua	10.4	●	-		
Bemis Point Site	Ellery	Chautauqua	10.7	●	-		
Randolph Historic District	Randolph	Cattaraugus	10.1	●	+/-		
US Post Office--Dunkirk	Dunkirk	Chautauqua	10.2	●	+		
School No. 7	Dunkirk	Chautauqua	10.5	●	+		
Chautauqua Institution Historic District	Chautauqua	Chautauqua	10.8	●	+/-		
Miller, Lewis, Cottage, Chautauqua Institution	Chautauqua	Chautauqua	11.1	●	-		
Pennsylvania Railroad Station	Chautauqua	Chautauqua	11.8	●	-		
Gladden Windmill	Napoli	Cattaraugus	11.9	●	-		
Properties Eligible for Listing in the National or State Register of Historic Places							
5. Residential 1847, 8129 Griswold Rd, Arkwright	Arkwright	Chautauqua	0.8	●	-		
10. Rose Farm c. 1870, 1936 Ruttenbur Rd., Arkwright	Arkwright	Chautauqua	1.2	●	-		
2. Bungalow, 6687 Main St	Cherry Creek	Chautauqua	1.7	●	+/-		
3. Bungalow, 6689 Main St	Cherry Creek	Chautauqua	1.7	●	+/-		
1. Former Electric Light Station, 6676 Main St	Cherry Creek	Chautauqua	1.7	●	+		
4. Farm Complex c. 1920, 8025 NY 83, Villenova	Cherry Creek	Chautauqua	2.2	●	+		
38. Residential c. 1840, 1141 NY 83, Villenova	Villenova	Chautauqua	2.3	●	+		
39. Villenova Grange Hall, 1150 NY 83, Villenova	Villenova	Chautauqua	2.3	●	+/-		

Visually Sensitive Resource	Location		Distance ¹ Miles from Nearest Turbine	Distance Zone ● Foreground ● Midground • Background	Project Visibility		
	Town	County			+Visible	- Not Visible	+/- Partially Visible
					Preliminary Topographic/Vegetation Viewshed		
11. Farm Complex c. 1860, 8562 NY 83, Villenova	Villenova	Chautauqua	3.0	●	+		
36. Hamlet Cemetery, 558 NY 83, Villenova	Villenova	Chautauqua	3.5	●	+		
40. Farm Complex c. 1870 Barns & Pre-Civil War House, 2083 NY 83 Arkwright	Arkwright	Chautauqua	3.5	●	+/-		
8. 812 West Main St., Ellington	Ellington	Chautauqua	3.7	•	+/-		
7. Farman Free Library, 760 Thronton Rd., Ellington	Ellington	Chautauqua	3.7	•	-		
41. Residential circa 1915, 2667 NY 83, Arkwright	Arkwright	Chautauqua	3.8	•	-		
6. 4980 Rte. 62, Ellington	Ellington	Chautauqua	3.9	•	+		
12. 6658 West Rd., Leon	Leon	Cattaraugus	4.1	•	+		
13. Sears Farmhouse & Complex c. 1920, 8143 Oaks Rd., South Dayton	Dayton	Cattaraugus	4.1	•	+		
35. Farm Complex c. 1830, 307 Philips Rd., Villenova	Villenova	Chautauqua	4.3	•	+		
14. Residential c. 1860, 62 Main St., South Dayton	Dayton	Cattaraugus	4.5	•	+		
15. Residential c. 1860, 227 Oak St, South Dayton	Dayton	Cattaraugus	4.5	•	+/-		
16. Commercial c. 1920, 413 Pine St., South Dayton	Dayton	Cattaraugus	4.6	•	+		
17. Residential c. 1890, 319 Pine St., South Dayton	Dayton	Cattaraugus	4.6	•	+		
18. Residential c. 1910, 309 Pine St., South Dayton	Dayton	Cattaraugus	4.6	•	+		
19. Residential c. 1900, 312 Pine St., South Dayton	Dayton	Cattaraugus	4.6	•	+		
20. Residential c. 1890, 203 Maple, South Dayton	Dayton	Cattaraugus	4.6	•	+		
21. Residential c. 1910, 212/214 Maple St., South Dayton	Dayton	Cattaraugus	4.6	•	+		
23. Corkwell's Garage, 107 Pine St., South Dayton	Dayton	Cattaraugus	4.6	•	+		
24. Commercial c. 1930, 205 Pine St., South Dayton	Dayton	Cattaraugus	4.6	•	+		
25. The Valley House/ S. Dayton Hotel 1877, 203 Pine St., South Dayton	Dayton	Cattaraugus	4.6	•	+		
26. Commercial c. 1900, 207 Pine St., South Dayton	Dayton	Cattaraugus	4.6	•	+		
27. Commerical 1877, 1 Park St., South Dayton	Dayton	Cattaraugus	4.6	•	+		
9. 7255 CR 380, Stockton	Stockton	Chautauqua	4.6	•	-		

Location			Distance ¹	Distance Zone	Project Visibility
			Miles from Nearest Turbine	● Foreground ● Midground ● Background	+Visible - Not Visible +/- Partially Visible
Visually Sensitive Resource	Town	County			Preliminary Topographic/Vegetation Viewshed
22. Residential c. 1930, 27 Cherry St., Dayton	Dayton	Cattaraugus	4.7	•	+
28. Wilson Hale & Co./ Post Office 1877, 5 Park St., South Dayton	Dayton	Cattaraugus	4.7	•	+
29. County Bank c. 1920, 7 Park St., South Dayton	Dayton	Cattaraugus	4.7	•	+
30. Commercial c. 1900, 9 Park St., South Dayton	Dayton	Cattaraugus	4.7	•	+
31. Commercial c. 1890, 11 Park St., South Dayton	Dayton	Cattaraugus	4.7	•	+
32. Commercial c. 1910, 13 Park St., South Dayton	Dayton	Cattaraugus	4.7	•	+
33. Commercial c. 1900, 15 Park St., South Dayton	Dayton	Cattaraugus	4.7	•	+
42. Residential c. 1890, 9460 Route 60, Pomfret	Pomfret	Chautauqua	5.3	•	-
43. Residential c. 1890, 9453 Route 60, Pomfret	Pomfret	Chautauqua	5.3	•	-
44. Residential 1875, 3728 Route 83, Pomfret	Pomfret	Chautauqua	5.3	•	-
37. Forestville Wesleyan Church Complex c. 1858, Includes Cemetery & School, 9495 Prospect Rd., Villenova	Villenova	Chautauqua	5.3	•	+
34. Small Church c. 1850s, 8551 Rt. 62, Dayton	Dayton	Cattaraugus	7.1	•	+
2. State Parks					
Midway State Park	Ellery	Chautauqua	9.5	•	-
Long Point State Park	Ellery	Chautauqua	9.6	•	-
Lake Erie State Park	Portland	Chautauqua	10.4	•	+/-
3. Urban Cultural Parks/Heritage Areas					
	Dunkirk, Stockton, Sheridan, Chautauqua, Hanover, Portland, Pomfret, Perrysburg, Arkwright, Villenova	Chautauqua, Cattaraugus	2.5	●	+/-
4. State Forest Preserves					
None in Study Area					
5. National Wildlife Refuges, State Game Refuges and State Wildlife Management Areas					


Visually Sensitive Resource	Location		Distance ¹ Miles from Nearest Turbine	Distance Zone ● Foreground ● Midground • Background	Project Visibility
	Town	County			+Visible - Not Visible +/- Partially Visible Preliminary Topographic/Vegetation Viewshed
Canadaway Creek WMA	Arkwright	Chautauqua	0.6	●	+/-
Kabob WMA	Stockton	Chautauqua	2.6	●	+/-
Conewango Swamp WMA	Conewango, Randolph	Cattaraugus	6.8	•	+/-
Hartson Swamp WMA	Poland	Chautauqua	9.0	•	-
Clay Pond WMA	Poland	Chautauqua	9.5	•	-
Chautauqua Lake WMA	North Harmony, Ellery	Chautauqua	10.7	•	-
6. National Natural Landmarks					
None in Study Area					
7. National Parks, Recreation Areas, Seashores and/or Forests					
None in Study Area					
8. National or State Designated Wild, Scenic, or Recreational Rivers					
Conewango Creek (Potentially Eligible)	Poland, Conewango, Randolph	Chautauqua, Cattaraugus	5.5	•	+/-
9. Sites, Areas, Lakes, Reservoirs or Highways Designated or Eligible as Scenic					
Seaway Trail National Scenic Byway	Dunkirk, Portland, Pomfret	Chautauqua	10.1	•	+/-
10. Scenic Areas of Statewide Significance					
None in Study Area					
11. State and Federally Designated Trails					
None in Study Area					
12. Adirondack Park Scenic Vistas					
None in Study Area					
13. State Nature and Historic Preserve Areas					
Canadaway Creek Nature Sanctuary	Dunkirk	Chautauqua	10.3	•	-
14. Palisades Park					
None in Study Area					
15. Bond Act Properties for Exceptional Beauty or Open Space					

Visually Sensitive Resource	Location		Distance ¹ Miles from Nearest Turbine	Distance Zone ● Foreground ● Midground ● Background	Project Visibility		
	Town	County			+Visible	- Not Visible	+/- Partially Visible
					Preliminary Topographic/Vegetation Viewshed		
None in Study Area							
Other Resources of Statewide or Regional Significance							
Chautauqua Lake	Jamestown, Ellicott, North Harmony, Ellery, Chautauqua	Chautauqua	9.4	●	-		
Lake Erie	Dunkirk, Portland, Pomfret	Chautauqua	10.5	●	+/-		
Locally Important Resources							
Areas of Intensive Land Use (City, Village, Hamlet)							
Village of Sinclairville	Charlotte, Gerry	Chautauqua	0.3	●	+/-		
Village of Cherry Creek	Cherry Creek	Chautauqua	0.9	●	+/-		
Hamlet of Charlotte Center	Charlotte	Chautauqua	1.0	●	+/-		
Hamlet of Hamlet	Villanova	Chautauqua	2.1	●	+/-		
Village of Cassadaga	Stockton	Chautauqua	3.0	●	+/-		
Hamlet of Ellington	Ellington	Chautauqua	3.6	●	+/-		
Hamlet of Conewango Valley	Conewango, Ellington	Chautauqua, Cattaraugus	3.6	●	+/-		
Hamlet of Burnhams	Stockton	Chautauqua	3.8	●	+/-		
Hamlet of Lily Dale	Pomfret	Chautauqua	3.9	●	+/-		
Village of South Dayton	Dayton	Cattaraugus	4.0	●	+/-		
Hamlet of Clear Creek	Conewango, Ellington	Chautauqua, Cattaraugus	4.5	●	+/-		
Hamlet of Stockton	Stockton	Chautauqua	4.5	●	-		
Hamlet of Leon	Leon	Cattaraugus	5.2	●	-		
Hamlet of Conewango	Conewango	Cattaraugus	5.0	●	+/-		
Hamlet of Gerry	Gerry	Chautauqua	5.4	●	+/-		
Major Transportation Corridors							
SR 60	Stockton, Charlotte, Gerry, Pomfret	Chautauqua	1.1	●	+/-		
SR 83	Cherry Creek, Ellington, Pomfret, Arkwright, Villanova	Chautauqua	1.4	●	+/-		

Visually Sensitive Resource	Location		Distance ¹ Miles from Nearest Turbine	Distance Zone ● Foreground ● Midground ● Background	Project Visibility
	Town	County			+Visible - Not Visible +/- Partially Visible Preliminary Topographic/Vegetation Viewshed
SR 322	Dayton, Villenova	Chautauqua, Cattaraugus	3.6	●	+/-
US 62	Dayton, Leon, Conewango, Ellington, North Collins, Collins, Persia	Erie, Chautauqua, Cattaraugus	3.8	●	+/-
SR 241	Conewango	Cattaraugus	5.2	●	+/-
Recreation Resources					
<i>Local Parks and Playgrounds</i>					
Cassadaga Beach & Park	Stockton	Chautauqua	3.4	●	-
Ellington Town Square Park	Ellington	Chautauqua	3.7	●	+/-
Larson Memorial Park	Gerry	Chautauqua	5.5	●	+/-
Ellery Town Park	Ellery	Chautauqua	11.1	●	-
<i>Lakes and Rivers</i>					
Canadaway Creek	Charlotte, Dunkirk, Pomfret, Arkwright	Chautauqua	<0.1	●	+/-
Conewango Creek	Dayton, Leon, Cherry Creek, Poland, Conewango, Randolph, Ellington, New Albion	Chautauqua, Cattaraugus	0.4	●	+/-
Clear Creek	Cherry Creek, Conewango, Charlotte, Ellington	Chautauqua, Cattaraugus	0.5	●	+/-
Cassadaga Creek	Stockton, Ellery, Charlotte, Gerry	Chautauqua	1.4	●	+/-
Conewango Dredge	Leon, Cherry Creek, Conewango, Ellington	Chautauqua, Cattaraugus	2.9	●	+/-
Middle Lake	Stockton, Pomfret	Chautauqua	3.5	●	+/-
Upper Lake	Pomfret	Chautauqua	3.9	●	+/-
Bear Lake	Stockton, Pomfret	Chautauqua	6.2	●	-
<i>Trails</i>					
Earl Cardot Eastside Overland Trail	Cherry Creek, Charlotte, Gerry, Ellington, Arkwright	Chautauqua	<0.1	●	+/-

Visually Sensitive Resource	Location		Distance ¹ Miles from Nearest Turbine	Distance Zone ● Foreground ● Midground ● Background	Project Visibility
	Town	County			+Visible - Not Visible +/- Partially Visible
Harris Hill State Forest Mountain Bike Trail	Gerry	Chautauqua	3.7	●	-
The Amish Trail	Dayton, Leon, Conewango, Randolph, Collins, Persia	Erie, Cattaraugus	4.6	●	+/-
<i>NYSDEC Lands</i>					
Boutwell Hill State Forest	Cherry Creek, Charlotte, Arkwright	Chautauqua	<0.1	●	+/-
Clear Creek Fishing Access	Cherry Creek, Ellington	Chautauqua	0.6	●	+/-
Hatch Creek State Forest	Gerry	Chautauqua	0.6	●	+/-
Harris Hill State Forest	Gerry, Ellington	Chautauqua	0.8	●	+/-
Stockton State Forest	Stockton	Chautauqua	4.4	●	+/-
Schools and Colleges					
Sinclairville Elementary School	Gerry	Chautauqua	1.6	●	+/-
Cassadaga Valley Middle High School	Gerry	Chautauqua	1.8	●	+/-
Pine Valley Central Schools	Cherry Creek	Chautauqua	1.8	●	+/-

¹ For large areas and linear sites, approximate distance to the nearest turbine was measured from the respective area's closest point.



Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauqua County, New York

Figure 1: Project Area

April 2015


Notes: 1. Basemap: ESRI ArcGIS Online "USA Topo Maps" Map Service.

2. This is a color graphic. Reproduction in grayscale may misrepresent the data.

 Project Area



www.edrdpc.com



Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauque County, New York

Figure 2: Visual Study Area

April 2015

Notes: 1. Basemap: ESRI StreetMap North America, 2008.

2. This is a color graphic. Reproduction in grayscale may misrepresent the data.

- Project Area
- 5-Mile Study Area
- 10-Mile Study Area
- City/Village Boundary
- Town Boundary
- County Boundary



www.edrjpc.com

[illegible]

Figure 3: Visually Sensitive
Resources and Viewshed
Analysis
Sheet 1 of 2: 10-mile Study Area
April 2015

- Notes:
1. Project visibility based on viewshed results accounting for screening by topography and mapped forest vegetation.
 2. Basemap: ESRI StreetMap North America, 2008.
 3. This is a color graphic. Reproduction in grayscale may misrepresent the data.




The wind turbine layout and model that will be utilized for the Project has not been determined at this time. The preliminary viewshed analysis shown here is based on a preliminary layout featuring 70 Nordex N131 wind turbines, which is the tallest wind turbine model currently under consideration for the Project. The preliminary viewshed therefore represents a "worst case" assessment of potential visibility. The total turbine height for a Nordex N131 (i.e., height at the highest blade tip position) is approximately 540 feet.

Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauqua County, New York

Figure 3: Visually Sensitive Resources and Viewshed Analysis
Sheet 2 of 2: 5-mile Study Area

April 2015



- ▲ NRHP-Eligible Site
- ★ Hamlet
- Nationwide Rivers Inventory
- National Scenic Byway
- Trail
- NRHP-Listed Site
- State Park
- State Forest/Fishing Access
- State Heritage Area
- Wildlife Management Area
- Local Park
- School
- City/Village
- Town Boundary
- County Boundary
- Project Boundary
- 5-Mile Study Area
- Potential Project Visibility

Notes:
1. Project visibility based on viewshed results accounting for screening by topography and mapped forest vegetation.
2. Basemap: ESRI StreetMap North America, 2008.
3. This is a color graphic. Reproduction in grayscale may misrepresent the data.



www.edrdpc.com



Environmental Design & Research,
Landscape Architecture, Engineering & Environmental Services, D.P.C.
217 Montgomery Street, Suite 1000, Syracuse, New York 13202
P. 315.471.0688 • F. 315.471.1061 • www.edrdpc.com

memorandum

To: Seth Wilmore
Cassadaga Wind, LLC
EDR Project No: 14048
From: Pat Heaton, Ben Brazell
Date: April 1, 2015
Reference: Cassadaga Wind Project
Visual Outreach Letter – Distribution List

Comments:

William Young, Town Supervisor
Town of Cherry Creek
PO Box 98
6845 Main Street
Cherry Creek, NY 14723

Sharon Sweeting, Town Historian
Town of Cherry Creek
PO Box 98
6845 Main Street
Cherry Creek, NY 14723

Kenneth Bochmann, Town Supervisor
Town of Charlotte
PO Box 994
8 Lester Street
Sinclairville, NY 14782

Joanne Marsh, Town Historian
Town of Charlotte
6183 Route 60
Sinclairville, NY 14782

Frederic Norton, Town Supervisor
Town of Arkwright
8743 Center Road
Cassadaga, NY 14718

Ruth Nichols, Town Historian
Town of Arkwright
2383 Route 83
Fredonia, NY 14063

David Wilson, Town Supervisor
Town of Stockton
7344 Route 380
Stockton, NY 14784

Helen Pierson, Town Historian
Town of Stockton
4513 Railroad Avenue
PO Box 69
Stockton, NY 14784

Bruce Fisher, Mayor
Village of Cherry Creek
PO Box 26
6763 Main Street
Cherry Creek, NY 14723

Kenneth France, Mayor
Village of Sinclairville
PO Box 469
8 Lester Street
Sinclairville, NY 14782

Betty Jean Ridout, Village Historian
Village of Sinclairville
2 Kent Street
Sinclairville, NY 14782

Leeann Lazarony, Mayor
Village of Cassadaga
PO Box 286
22 Mill Street
Cassadaga, NY 14718

Cassadaga Wind Project – Visual Outreach Letter Distribution List
April 1, 2015

John Sipos, Jr., Village Historian
Village of Cassadaga
PO Box 392
Cassadaga, NY 14718

Scott Kerr, Mayor
Village of South Dayton
PO Box 320
311 Pine Street
South Dayton, NY 14138

Arden Johnson, Town Supervisor
Town of Ellery
PO Box 429
25 Sunnyside Avenue
Bemus Point, NY 14712

Cherrie Clark, Town Historian
Town of Ellery
4818 Ellery-Centralia Road
Bemus Point, NY 14712

Laura Cronk, Town Supervisor
Town of Ellington
PO Box 344
813 West Main Street
Ellington, NY 14732

Elizabeth Dickerson, Town Historian
Town of Ellington
Ellington Town Hall
PO Box 344
Ellington, NY 14732

John Crossley, Town Supervisor
Town of Gerry
PO Box 15
4519 Route 60
Gerry, NY 14740

Kenneth Asel II, Planning Board Chairman
Town of Gerry
PO Box 15
4519 Route 60
Gerry, NY 14740

Peggy Heath, Town Historian
Town of Gerry
4030 Route 60
Gerry, NY 14740

Donald Steger, Town Supervisor
Town of Pomfret
9 Day Street
Fredonia, NY 14063

James Joy, Planning Board Chairman
Town of Pomfret
9 Day Street
Fredonia, NY 14063

Todd Langworthy, Town Historian
Town of Pomfret
18 Johnson Street
Fredonia, NY 14063

Yvonne Park, Town Supervisor
Town of Villenova
1094 Butcher Road
South Dayton, NY 14138

Barbara Wise, Town Historian
Town of Villenova
1129 Route 83
South Dayton, NY 14138

Wayne McGuire, Town Supervisor
Town of Conewango
4662 Route 241
Randolph, NY 14772

Mark Smith, Town Supervisor
Town of Dayton
9932 Nashville Road
South Dayton, NY 14138

Ruth Bennett, Town Historian
Town of Dayton
9922 Cottage Road
South Dayton, NY 14138

Erika Zollinger, Town Supervisor
Town of Leon
12550 Smith Road
South Dayton, NY 14138

Patricia Bromley, Town Historian
Town of Leon
12195 Leon-New Albion Road
Conewango Valley, NY 14726

Kevin Sanvidge, Director
Chautauqua County Department of Planning and Economic Development
200 Harrison Street
Jamestown, NY 14701

Michelle Henry, Chautauqua County Historian
Historian's Advisory Committee
1 North Erie Street
PO Box 170
Mayville, NY 14757

Andrew Jackson, Director
Chautauqua County Visitors' Bureau
P.O. Box 1441
Chautauqua, NY 14722

Richard Zink, Executive Director
Southern Tier West Regional Planning & Development Board
4039 Route 219, Suite 200
Salamanca, NY 14779

Andrew Dufresne, Executive Director
Concord Grape Belt Heritage Association
PO Box 194
Westfield, NY 14787

Doug Conroe, Chair
Chautauqua County Environmental Management Council
200 Harrison Street
Jamestown, NY 14701

Seneca Nation of Indians
Cattaraugus Reservation
12837 Route 438
Irving, New York 14081

Copies To: File.

On April 2, 2015 - 38 packets were metered and mailed to the 38 recipients listed on this document, USPS.

Mary E. Vanelli
MARY E. VANELLI
Notary Public - State of New York
No. 01VA6197320
Qualified in Madison County
My Commission Expires Nov. 24, 2016

Pat Heaton

From: Carter, Diana (PARKS) <Diana.Carter@parks.ny.gov>
Sent: Friday, May 08, 2015 12:57 PM
To: Pat Heaton
Cc: Martens, Kathleen (PARKS); Krish, Nathan (PARKS); Alworth, Tom (PARKS); Bonafide, John (PARKS); James Muscato; Seth Wilmore; Kevin Sheen; Bill Spencer; Benjamin Brazell
Subject: RE: Cassadaga Wind Project

Hi Pat,

I received the hardcopy of the letter/study that you attached to your email. With your assurance that this information will be included and refined in Exhibit 24 of the Article 10 application, it will demonstrate how our resources will not be adversely impacted by the visual effects of the project's wind turbines. Upon my review of the materials, OPRHP is satisfied and concurs with this analysis. We will have no further concerns regarding visual impacts to state park resources.

As you note below you will still be required to continue your consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office regarding Cultural Resource impacts.

Thanks
Diana

Diana Carter

Director of Planning

New York State Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation

Resource and Facility Planning Bureau
625 Broadway, Albany, NY 12238
Phone: (518) 474-8288 | Fax: (518) 474-7013
www.nysparks.com



From: Pat Heaton [mailto:PHeaton@edrdpc.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 06, 2015 12:19 PM
To: Carter, Diana (PARKS)
Cc: Martens, Kathleen (PARKS); Krish, Nathan (PARKS); Alworth, Tom (PARKS); Bonafide, John (PARKS); James Muscato; Seth Wilmore; Kevin Sheen; Bill Spencer; Benjamin Brazell
Subject: RE: Cassadaga Wind Project

Hi Diana,

Following up on the emails below from Jim Muscato, the attached letter addresses potential visual impacts of the proposed Cassadaga Wind Project ("the Project") on New York State Parks. We prepared a preliminary viewshed analysis based on the current conceptual wind turbine layout for the project. The attached letter describes the anticipated

visibility of the Project from Midway, Long Point, and Lake Erie State Parks (located 9.5 miles, 9.6 miles and 10.4 miles from the nearest proposed wind turbine, respectively). In addition, this attachment describes our outreach strategy to engage local stakeholders to help identify visually sensitive resources of local significance.

Please note that with respect to historic/cultural resources, we are reviewing NYSOPRHP's Cultural Resources Information System (CRIS) database and will initiate consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) portion of your office separately via the CRIS on-line consultation system.

Please let me know if you have any questions or if we can provide additional information.

Sincerely,

Patrick Heaton

Principal, Director of Cultural Resources

Environmental Design & Research,
Landscape Architecture, Engineering & Environmental Services, D.P.C.
217 Montgomery Street, Suite 1000, Syracuse, New York 13202
P. 315.471.0688 :: C. 315.391.3021 :: F. 315.471.1061
E. pheaton@edrdpc.com :: www.edrdpc.com

EDR is a certified WBE/DBE/SBE.

You can also check out what we're up to on [Facebook](#) and [LinkedIn](#).

From: James Muscato [<mailto:JMuscato@youngsommer.com>]

Sent: Thursday, April 30, 2015 4:07 PM

To: Carter, Diana (PARKS)

Cc: Martens, Kathleen (PARKS); Krish, Nathan (PARKS); Alworth, Tom (PARKS); Bonafide, John (PARKS)

Subject: RE: Cassadaga Wind Project

Hi Diana,

Thank you for your email below regarding the Cassadaga Wind Project. The consulting team is working on preparing a submission that assessing whether the State Parks you identified below are outside the visible range of the Project. I agree with you, that if we can confirm this, that a meeting is probably not necessary. We will be following up with you in this regard.

Feel free to let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,
Jim

James A. Muscato II

Young / Sommer LLC

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Executive Woods, Five Palisades Drive, Albany, NY 12205

office: 518.438.9907 Ext. 243

fax: 518.438.9914

jmuscato@youngsommer.com

www.youngsommer.com

From: Carter, Diana (PARKS) [<mailto:Diana.Carter@parks.ny.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2015 3:13 PM
To: James Muscato
Cc: Martens, Kathleen (PARKS); Krish, Nathan (PARKS); Alworth, Tom (PARKS); Bonafide, John (PARKS)
Subject: RE: Cassadaga Wind Project

Hi Jim,

I apologize for not getting back to you sooner. I had not heard of this project so I've been doing some research on the location and searching out any documentation. John mentioned to me that you were asking about meeting with Parks staff regarding the Cassadaga Wind Project sometime around April 20th or 22nd. The 22nd may be more accommodating for our staff.

John also indicated to me that he and his staff do not need to be present at this meeting because their review is handled through CRIS.

The Parks & Recreation side of the Agency would have interest in physical and visual impacts to our State Parks. From my initial research it looks as though there are no direct physical impacts to State Parks and possibly only some minor visual impacts to the surrounding parks. These would be Lake Erie State Park, Midway State Park, and Long Point on Chautauqua Lake State Park. I think the project is far enough away from Allegany State Park to be out of the range of visual impacts.

I noted that Lake Erie, Midway and Long Point State Parks are outside the 5-mile study area of the project depicted in the Public Involvement Program (PIP). If this puts the parks outside the visual range of the project (given vegetation and topography) then, I think, we would have no concerns from a Parks perspective and would not require a meeting.

That being said I think our primary request would be to see the results of a visual impact analysis on the surrounding parks. If you have additional information regarding visual impacts to State Parks we would be willing to review it and provide written comment to you, the company and the PSC.

Thanks
Diana

Diana Carter
Director of Planning

New York State Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation

Resource and Facility Planning Bureau
625 Broadway, Albany, NY 12238
Phone: (518) 474-8288 | Fax: (518) 474-7013
www.nysparks.com



From: James Muscato [<mailto:JMuscato@youngsommer.com>]
Sent: Thursday, March 26, 2015 8:43 AM
To: Carter, Diana (PARKS)
Subject: Cassadaga Wind Project

Good morning Diana,

I am writing regarding the proposed Cassadaga Wind Project in the towns of Cherry Creek and Charlotte in Chautauqua County. Cassadaga is proceeding with development of the Project through PSL Article 10, has filed a PIP, and is preparing its PSS. I spoke with John yesterday regarding setting up a meeting to discuss historic, cultural and state park resources near the Project and the scope of studies that are being proposed as part of the PSS (visual etc). John Bonafide thought you would be a good person to reach out to. Please let me know when you will be available sometime in mid-to-late April to sit down with the Company and discuss the PSS. I anticipate sending you something to take a look at in the next two weeks in advance of the meeting. Perhaps a call between us makes sense so I can fill you in on more of the details regarding the Project and an agenda for the meeting. You can reach me at the number below if need be.

I look forward to speaking with you,
Thanks,
Jim

James A. Muscato II
Young/Sommer LLC
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
Executive Woods, Five Palisades Drive, Albany, NY 12205
office: 518.438.9907 Ext. 243
fax: 518.438.9914
jmuscato@youngsommer.com
www.youngsommer.com

This e-mail is sent by a law firm and may contain information that is privileged or confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete the e-mail and any attachments and notify us immediately.

Project 15PR02730: Cassadaga Wind Project (UJ91NB2J7WBR)



[View Project](#)

Please accept the following information below as the consolidated response from NYS SHPO for the above referenced submission.

Review Responses

Reviewer	Review Type	Response
Daria Merwin	Survey and Evaluation	In order for SHPO to complete our evaluation of the historic significance of all buildings/structures/districts within or adjacent to your project area, we need further information. Please review the specific information request(s) below and click the Process button to respond to each request.
Nancy Herter	Archaeology	In order for SHPO to complete our evaluation of the Archaeological sensitivity of your project, we need further information. Please review the specific information request(s) below and click the Process button to respond to each request.

Information Requests

Process	Status	Reviewer	Review Type	Request Type	Request Entity	Request Item	Request Description
	Information Requested	Daria Merwin	Survey and Evaluation	Request a New Attachment, Photo, or Survey for this Consultation Project	Survey	Please submit a Historic Resources Study to address potential visual impacts to properties 50 years or older within a five-mile radius of the APE.	
	Information Requested	Nancy Herter	Archaeology	Request a New Attachment, Photo, or Survey for this Consultation Project	Attachment	The SHPO will be pleased to offer archaeological recommendations once we receive a map of the direct Area of Potential Effects. An attachment token has been provided to facilitate this request.	

Attachments

Attachment	Reviewer	Review Type	Type	Name	Description
No Attachment Records					

Appendix B:
Site Photographs



Photograph 01:

Representative view of agricultural context within Project site.



Photograph 02:

Representative view of agricultural context within Project site.

Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauqua County, New York

Appendix B: Site Photographs

June 2015

Sheet 1 of 18





Photograph 03:

Representative view of agricultural context within Project site.



Photograph 04:

Representative view of agricultural context and farm buildings within Project site.

Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauqua County, New York

Appendix B: Site Photographs

June 2015

Sheet 2 of 18





Photograph 05:

Representative view of forested area within Project site.



Photograph 06:

Representative view of forested area within Project site.

Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauqua County, New York

Appendix B: Site Photographs

June 2015

Sheet 3 of 18



Photograph 07:

Charlotte Center United Methodist Church, County Route 49, view to the north.



Photograph 08:

Charlotte Center Cemetery, County Route 49, view to the southwest.

Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauqua County, New York

Appendix B: Site Photographs

June 2015



Photograph 09:

Hamlet of Charlotte Center
County Route 49, view to the
south.



Photograph 10:

Representative view of Gothic
Revival, Queen Anne and
vernacular architecture, hamlet
of Stockton, view to the east.

Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauqua County, New York

Appendix B: Site Photographs

June 2015

Sheet 5 of 18



Photograph 11:

Representative view of vernacular Queen Anne architecture, hamlet of Gerry, view to the west.



Photograph 12:

View of settlement around intersection, hamlet of Gerry, view to the north.

Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauqua County, New York

Appendix B: Site Photographs

June 2015



Photograph 13:

View of residential settlement adjacent to town square/village green, hamlet of Ellington, view to the west.



Photograph 14:

View of commercial operations adjacent to main intersection, hamlet of Ellington, view to the east.

Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauqua County, New York

Appendix B: Site Photographs

June 2015

Sheet 7 of 18



Photograph 15:

Village of Cassadaga,
intersection of High Street and
County Route 58, view to the
north.



Photograph 16:

Village of Cassadaga,
intersection of High Street and
County Route 58, view to the
south.

Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauqua County, New York

Appendix B: Site Photographs

June 2015



Photograph 17:

Village of Sinclairville, County
Route 49, view to the east.



Photograph 18:

Village of Sinclairville,
Jamestown Street, view to the
southwest.

Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauqua County, New York

Appendix B: Site Photographs

June 2015

Sheet 9 of 18





Photograph 19:

Village of Cherry Creek,
Main Street, view to the north.



Photograph 20:

Village of Cherry Creek,
Southside Avenue, view to the
east.

Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauqua County, New York

Appendix B: Site Photographs

June 2015

Sheet 10 of 18



Photograph 21:

Village of South Dayton, Park Street and Pine Street, view to the north.



Photograph 22:

Village of South Dayton, intersection of Railroad Street and State Route 322, view to the east-northeast.

Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauqua County, New York

Appendix B: Site Photographs

June 2015

Sheet 11 of 18



Photograph 23:

Hamlet of Stockton, County
Route 70, view to the south.



Photograph 24:

Hamlet of Stockton, County
Route 70, view to the north.

Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauqua County, New York

Appendix B: Site Photographs

June 2015



Photograph 25:

Entry gate, Lily Dale Assembly,
Dale Drive, view to the north.



Photograph 26:

Lily Dale, Cleveland Avenue,
view to the northeast.

Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauqua County, New York

Appendix B: Site Photographs

June 2015

Sheet 13 of 18



Photograph 27:

Hamlet of Villenova Hamlet,
Intersection of County Route
72 and County Route 83, view
to the east-northeast.



Photograph 28:

Hamlet of Gerry, intersection of
Main Street and County Route
604, view to the northwest.

Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauqua County, New York

Appendix B: Site Photographs

June 2015

Sheet 14 of 18



Photograph 29:

Hamlet of Ellington, village green, view to the northwest.



Photograph 30:

Hamlet of Ellington, Mill Street, view to the north.

Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauqua County, New York

Appendix B: Site Photographs

June 2015

Sheet 15 of 18



Photograph 31:

Hamlet of Conewango Valley,
intersection of State Route 62
and County Route 83, view to
the northwest.



Photograph 32:

Hamlet of Conewango Valley,
State Route 62, view to the
east.

Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauqua County, New York

Appendix B: Site Photographs

June 2015



Photograph 33:

Hamlet of Leon, State Route 62, view to the south.



Photograph 34:

Hamlet of Leon, State Route 62, view to the north-northwest.

Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauqua County, New York

Appendix B: Site Photographs

June 2015



Photograph 35:

Leon United Methodist Church (00NR01685), County Route 6, view to the northwest.



Photograph 36:

Leon Grange #795 (13NR06483), State Route 62, view to the northwest.

Cassadaga Wind Project

Towns of Charlotte, Cherry Creek, Arkwright, and Stockton - Chautauqua County, New York

Appendix B: Site Photographs

June 2015