



EIGHT POINT WIND ENERGY CENTER

Case No. 16-F-0062

1001.20 Exhibit 20

Cultural Resources

Contents

Exhibit 20: Cultural Resources	1
20(a) Study of the Impacts of Construction and Operation on Archaeological Resources	2
(1) Summary of Probable Impacts on Archaeological Resources	2
(2) Phase IA Archaeological Study	3
(3) Phase IB Archaeological Survey	6
(4) Phase II Archaeological Studies	11
(5) List of All Recovered Artifacts	11
(6) Unanticipated Discovery Plan	12
(7) Shapefiles	13
20(b) Study of the Impacts on Historic Architectural Resources	13
20(c) Analysis of Potential Cumulative Impacts on Archeological and Historic Resources	21
References	23

Tables

Table 20-1. Previously Recorded Archaeological Sites in the Vicinity of the Project Area	4
Table 20-2. Summary of Archaeological Resources Identified during Phase I Survey and Potential Impacts	7
Table 20-3. Previously Identified Eligible Architectural Historic Properties Inside the Project APES	15
Table 20-4. Identified NRHP-Eligible Architectural Historic Properties Inside the Project APES	17

Appendices

Appendix 20-1. Phase 1A/1B Archaeological Survey Report	
Appendix 20-2. Historic Architecture Reconnaissance Survey	
Appendix 20-3. NYS OPRHP Correspondence	
Appendix 20-4. Archaeological Survey Report Addendum	

Exhibit 20: Cultural Resources

Introduction and Record of Consultation

This Exhibit addresses 16 NYCRR § 1001.20, which requires a study of the potential impacts of them construction and operation of the facility, interconnection and related facilities on cultural resources (archaeological and historic architecture). The New York Historic Preservation Act (NYHPA) of 1980 (Chapter 354 of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation Law) established a review process for State agency activities affecting historic or cultural properties, requiring consultation with the Commissioner of the Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation (OPRHP), which serves as the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). Under Section 14.09 of the NYHPA, the OPRHP review process follows Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations at 36 CFR § 800 (Public Law 89-665, as amended by Public Law 96-515; 16 USC 470 et seq.). Section 106 requires that agencies with jurisdiction over a proposed project take into account the effect of the undertaking on cultural resources listed in, or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and afford the SHPO and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) an opportunity to comment.

The NYHPA requires project sponsors to consult with OPRHP if it appears that a proposed project may cause any change, beneficial or adverse, in the quality of any historic, architectural, archaeological, or cultural property that is listed in the NRHP or in the State Register of Historic Places (SRHP), or that is determined by the Commissioner to be eligible for listing in the NRHP or SRHP. It requires that project sponsors, to the fullest extent practicable, be consistent with other provisions of the law; and fully explore all feasible and prudent alternatives to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse impacts.

Consistent with 16 NYCRR § 1001.20 and the OPRHP *Guidelines for Wind Farm Development Cultural Resources Survey Work (Guidelines; OPRHP, 2006)*, the Applicant, through its consultant, TRC Environmental Corporation (TRC), initiated formal consultation with the OPRHP to develop the scope and methodology for cultural resources studies for the Project. The consultants exceed the Secretary of the Interior's professional qualifications standards (36 CFR 61) for Archaeologists, Historians, and Architectural Historians, in their respective disciplines. To date, formal consultation with the OPRHP has included telephone and e-mail communications and submissions through OPRHP's Cultural Resources Information System (CRIS) website consisting of the following four technical documents for OPRHP review:

- *Request for Consultation Letter of February 4, 2016 : Proposed Eight Point Wind Energy Center, Towns of Canisteo, Greenwood, Hartsville, Hornellsville, Jasper, Troupsburg, and West Union, Steuben County;*
- *Research Design for Phase IA/IB Cultural Resources Survey of Proposed Eight Point Wind Energy Project Steuben County, New York (submitted February 4, 2016, revised February 29, 2016);*
- *Area of Potential Effects for Historic Properties Letter of March 6, 2017: Eight Point Wind Energy Center, Steuben County, New York; and*
- *Project shapefiles that present the preliminary Project layout.*

On February 29, 2016, the OPRHP provided comments on the Research Design and requested that the methodology for conducting the Phase IA/IB archaeological survey be modified to include selection of a subsample of each probability zone which would be tested at 5-m intervals, citing the importance for the identification of small upland sites, which are expected to predominate in the Project Area. Additionally, the OPRHP requested that, prior to historic architectural fieldwork, the Project's Architectural Historian meet with the OPRHP to delineate the Area of Potential Effects (APE) and Study Area, and discuss the methodology proposed for the study. On February 29, 2016, the Revised Research Design reflective of these changes was submitted to OPRHP via CRIS. In its March 29, 2016 review letter, the OPRHP concurred with the Revised Research Design for the cultural resources survey.

To date, the Applicant has completed all Phase IA background research and 100 percent of the Phase IB archaeological survey. As a result, two historic archaeological sites, one prehistoric archaeological site, seven isolated finds, and one historic geodetic marker have been identified in the Project Area. Additionally, the Applicant has completed both a viewshed analysis in conjunction with delineating the APE for visual effects to historic architectural resources and potential rural landscapes and a full Historic Architecture Reconnaissance Survey. As a result of the architecture survey, 15 historic properties eligible for listing in the NRHP have been identified.

Additional consultation with local organizations and individuals familiar with historic preservation in the Project Area is ongoing. Fieldwork for the reconnaissance-level architectural field survey took place between March 20 and April 7, 2017. Phase IB archaeological surveys were conducted in November and December 2016 and April, May, June, and October 2017. Details of the work completed are provided in this document. An Unanticipated Discovery Plan that identifies the actions to be taken in the unexpected event that resources of cultural, historical, or archaeological importance are encountered during the excavation process is included herein.

20(a) Study of the Impacts of Construction and Operation on Archaeological Resources

(1) Summary of Probable Impacts on Archaeological Resources

This section addresses Stipulation 20(a)(1), which requires a summary of the nature of the probable impact on any archaeological/cultural resources identified and addressing how those impacts shall be avoided or minimized. To date, approximately 90 percent of the Project Area has been surveyed for archaeological resources resulting in the identification of two historic archaeological sites, one prehistoric archaeological site, seven isolated finds, and one historic geodetic marker. Probable impacts to these resources from construction and operation of the Facility are reported in detail in the Phase IA/IB archaeological survey report (see Appendix 20-1) and summarized herein. Measures to avoid impacts to any potentially significant archaeological resources will be taken throughout Project design.

If such resources are identified within 100 feet (31 meters) of proposed Facility-related impacts, and can be avoided, the Applicant will identify their locations as "Environmentally Sensitive Areas" on the final Facility construction drawings, and mark them in the field by construction fencing with signs that restrict access. These measures are considered adequate to ensure that impacts to potentially significant

archaeological resources are avoided. With the adoption of these measures, the proposed Facility is not anticipated to adversely affect any significant archaeological resources.

(2) Phase IA Archaeological Study

This section addresses Stipulation 20(a)(2), which requires an archaeological/cultural resources review for the APE for the Facility site and any areas to be used for interconnections or related facilities, including a description of the methodology used for such study.

Phase IA Study Methods

Background research included examination of the site files and archives at the OPRHP, online CRIS database, New York State Library, New York State Museum (NYSM) in Albany, and the NRHP database. This research yielded information on recorded sites and previous cultural surveys in the surrounding area. Local histories, cartographic data, and other relevant information on the prehistoric and historic archaeological sites in the area were also reviewed. The USDA NRCS Soil Survey Geographic Database (SSURGO) was also examined to obtain information on soil types in the Project Area. The historical assessment of the Project Area included a review of historical maps, aerial photographs, a literature search, and a review of county historical documents located at the New York State and County repositories. This work was conducted in order to develop historic and prehistoric contexts of the Project Area which are presented in detail in the Phase IA survey report (see Appendix 20-1); a cultural synopsis is provided in the following section.

The OPRHP CRIS database indicates that the Facility Site and the greater surrounding area is located within an archaeologically sensitive area. The OPRHP records confirm there are no NRHP-listed or eligible archaeological sites within the APE for archaeological resources, which is defined as all potential ground-disturbance areas of the Project.

As part of the Phase IA study, a search of OPRHP records indicated that eight archaeological investigations have been conducted and 18 archaeological sites (NYSM and SHPO sites) have been previously recorded in the vicinity of the Project (see Table 20-1 below). Subsequent to revisions of the Project design, a second review of OPRHP records conducted in February 2017 indicated that no archaeological studies and no previously recorded archaeological sites are located within one mile of the newly revised Project boundaries.

Table 20-1. Previously Recorded Archaeological Sites in the Vicinity of the Project Area

Site Number	Site Name	Description	NRHP Status
A00321.000042	M. Happer Site	Precontact: lithic scatter	Unevaluated
A101-07-00009	Dunning Site	Precontact: lithic scatter	Unevaluated
A101-07-000010	Royce Kilmer Site	Precontact: Paleoindian through Late Woodland occupation Village site	Unevaluated
A10107-000031	Carter/Fall Creek	Precontact: lithic scatter	Unevaluated
A101-14-0001		Historic: bridge foundation	Unevaluated
A101-14-0002		Historic: foundation	Unevaluated
A10114.000016	McClay Store Site	Historic: nineteenth century store foundation	Unevaluated
A10114.000017	Richter Grocery Site	Historic: nineteenth century foundation	Unevaluated
A10114.000024	J. Davis Site	Historic: nineteenth century foundation	Unevaluated
A10114.000025	W. Burton Site	Historic: nineteenth century foundation	Unevaluated
A10114.000026	J. H. Ellison Site	Historic: nineteenth century foundation	Unevaluated
A10114.000027	C. Crane Site	Historic: nineteenth century foundation	Unevaluated
A101-25-0003	Hajea Site	Precontact: lithic scatter	Unevaluated
A101-25-0004	Heely Site	Historic: foundation	Unevaluated
A101-25-0005	E. Fenton Ashery Site	Historic: sawmill equipment	Unevaluated
A101-25-0006	19 th c Barn Ruin	Historic: barn	Unevaluated
A10125.000020	Field Site 04-47801-01	Historic: late nineteenth to twentieth century residence	Unevaluated
A10191.000785	Mill Trail Race	Historic	Unevaluated

Source: OPRHP site files February 2016.

The following section presents an overview of the prehistory and history of the Project region to provide a general context for archaeological sites and cultural resources that may exist in the general Project vicinity.

Cultural Synopsis

A synopsis of the prehistoric and historic periods is presented to provide a context for interpreting cultural resources of the Project Area. The west-central region of New York State has been occupied or used by humans since about 12,500 years ago. The prehistory of this region is conventionally divided into the Paleoindian, Archaic, Woodland, and Contact cultural periods. The history of the region ranges from early exploration and contact with the Iroquois, particularly the Seneca, through modern-day development.

Prehistoric Overview

The term “Paleoindian” has been used since the 1930’s to describe the earliest known inhabitants of North America. Paleo-Indian populations, who occupied the Susquehanna River drainage at the end of the Pleistocene, were highly mobile hunter-gatherers who specialized in hunting large game (Funk, 1976). Subsistence patterns included hunting of a variety of smaller game, as well as fishing and the exploitation of available plant foods (McNett, 1985; Nicholas, 1983, 1987). Fluted projectile points are characteristic of Paleoindian peoples. Paleoindian sites in this region have been classified as either camps or quarry workshops, although many “sites” consist merely of isolated fluted point finds (Ritchie and Funk, 1973:333).

The Archaic Period denotes the early cultures in the New York region that had not yet developed ceramic technology and were dependent on hunting, gathering, and fishing for subsistence (Ritchie, 1980:31; Ritchie and Funk, 1973:37). The subsistence and technological changes associated with the end of the Pleistocene are reflected in new technologies and tool types that define the increasing resource utilization of the Archaic Period. The Terminal Archaic, which some researchers date from 1700–700 BC, was a transitional period in which subsistence and settlement systems changed and new artifact types were introduced.

The Woodland Period is denoted by the appearance of new cultural traits, such as the widespread use of ceramics as well as the intensification of older traits that were carried over from the Late and Terminal Archaic subperiods (Ritchie, 1980:179; Ritchie and Funk, 1973:48). During the Woodland period (1000 BC – AD 1600), the adoption of horticulture played an integral part in population growth, subsistence, and settlement systems as well as in the establishment of large villages in mostly riverine settings.

The Iroquoian Seneca tribe inhabited the area that would become Steuben County at the time of European contact. Powerful both politically and economically, the Seneca hunted and traded throughout the mid-Atlantic colonies and played a significant role in colonial affairs and commerce from Virginia to New York with the English, French, Dutch, and Swedish colonies. The replacement of tools and other materials manufactured by Native American technologies by those manufactured by Europeans (brass kettles, iron knives, glass beads, etc.) defines the Contact Period. These sites are difficult to locate and often cannot be clearly distinguished as a result of scant material remains (Wray, 1973).

Historic Overview

The Seneca retained control of their traditional lands until after the Revolutionary War. Generally allied with the British, the Iroquois relationship with the French colony to their north was often strained leading to decades of hostilities. The Seneca allied with the British during the French and Indian War and again during the American Revolution. The Sullivan Expedition, an American offensive designed to destroy the Seneca homeland during the Revolution, broke the power of the Iroquois League and, combined with the American victory, opened the area to American settlement.

The area now known as Steuben County was purchased from the Iroquois by land speculators Oliver Phelps and Nathaniel Gorman by the Treaty of Buffalo Creek in July 1788 (Clayton, 1879). Steuben County was formed through an act of the Ontario County legislature on March 18, 1796 and was named after Frederic William Augustus "Baron Von Steuben", a German drill master in the Revolutionary War. Settlement was slow until the development of improved transportation such as railroads and canals. The

completion of the Erie Canal in 1825 spurred the construction of several branch canals including the Chemung Canal, the origin of which was in the city of Corning in Steuben County.

Primarily rural, the region saw little industrial development in the nineteenth century. At the time of settlement the region was densely forested and lumbering formed the basis of the local economy. Agriculture did not play a major commercial role in the county until after about 1850 when the lumbering industry collapsed due to over-production. After that date, the raising of grain crops became increasingly important (Near, 1911). At the close of the nineteenth century, Steuben County was known for the raising of sheep and poultry. Although agriculture was still the foundation of the local economy, the region became more industrialized during the early twentieth century. In addition to saw mills and the lumber industry, carding and woolen mills were established and many of the smaller villages were extensively engaged in the making of woolen products. As of the 2010 Census (US Census) there were roughly 98,000 residents of Steuben County which remains primarily rural.

(3) Phase IB Archaeological Survey

In November and December 2016, and April, May, June, and October 2017, TRC on behalf of the Applicant conducted Phase IB archaeological survey on 31 proposed wind turbine locations, 16.5 miles of transmission line (which is not part of the Project but will be permitted separately under Article VII of the New York PSL), 13.1 miles of access roads, 32 miles of buried and overhead collection circuits, two meteorological towers, one 8.8-acres substation, and 41.5 acres of construction laydown area.

Phase IB Study Methods

Field Methods

Phase IB field methods consisted of both pedestrian and shovel test pit (STP) survey to locate all archaeological resources within the Project APE. In areas of High and Moderate Probability, TRC excavated STPs at 15-meter (49.2 feet) intervals along survey transects in all proposed construction impact areas. In its Research Design, TRC identified areas of High Probability as areas in close proximity to previously recorded cultural resources or historic features, floodplains, stream confluences, areas adjacent to water sources (within 100 meters [328.1 feet]), headwater zones, prominent knolls, ridge fingers, benches, wetland edges, and rock overhangs. Areas of Moderate Probability included relatively level uplands displaced from perennial water sources (greater than 100 meters [328.1 feet]). Low Probability areas included moderate to steeply sloping surfaces and areas of existing ground disturbance.

To help ascertain the viability of the probability-defined field methods, TRC examined between 5 and 10 percent of all areas identified as High and Moderate Probability with a 5-meter (16.4 feet) STP interval. The locations of the smaller subset of close interval testing in High and Moderate Probability areas are based on suitable areas as determined in the field. The selection of size of the subset was determined by individual parcel configuration.

In areas of Low Probability, which consist predominantly of areas of steep slope, a combination of pedestrian survey and judgmental STP excavation was conducted. Pedestrian survey was conducted in lieu of shovel testing where steep slope, exposed bedrock, wetlands, and/or ground disturbance precludes the utility of shovel testing. Judgmental STPs were excavated in areas of micro-topography,

such as small level benches on steep slope, possible rock shelter locations, and narrow, ephemeral stream crossings.

Per OPRHP *Guidelines*, all STPs measured 30-50 centimeters (11.8-19.7 inches) in diameter, and were excavated to sterile subsoil. All excavated soil was screened through ¼-inch hardware cloth over tarps or plastic sheeting. Soil strata within each shovel test were recorded on standardized forms describing Munsell color and USDA soil types. All shovel tests were backfilled after completion. All shovel tests were recorded using a *Trimble* sub-meter accurate GPS unit and plotted on aerial photographs and Project maps. Per OPRHP *Guidelines*, when artifacts are discovered in an isolated shovel test context, a minimum of eight (8) additional shovel tests at 1-meter (3.3 feet) and 3-meter (10 feet) intervals are excavated. All work was conducted inside the Project APE. No deep testing is anticipated for this Project based on the absence of deep alluvial floodplains in the Project footprint.

Laboratory Methods and Curation

Photographs, field form records, field notes and maps were returned to TRC’s Lanham, Maryland office for processing. Although no artifacts have yet been recovered, should artifacts be recovered during the remaining survey, they will be cleaned, catalogued, and analyzed according to the *New York Archaeological Council Standards*, and selected items illustrated. All analysis will be conducted according to the OPRHP *Guidelines*, and the Secretary of the Interior’s *Standards and Guidelines for Curation* (36 CFR 79). Lab work will be undertaken to determine the age, function, cultural affiliation and significance of the identified sites. Deeds of gift will be obtained for any collections derived from this investigation prior to submittal to the NYSM or other identified repository for permanent curation at a state-approved facility (to be identified via consultation with the OPRHP).

Phase IB Study Results

To date, a total of 10,961 shovel tests have been excavated following the field methodology outlined in the previous section. As a result, two historic archaeological sites, one prehistoric archaeological site, seven isolated finds, and one historic geodetic marker have been identified in the Project Area. These archaeological resources are summarized in Table 20-2 and as follows.

Table 20-2. Summary of Archaeological Resources Identified during Phase I Survey and Potential Impacts

Site Name	Description	Location	Potential Impacts	Avoidance Measures
EPW-TRC-1	Historic Domestic Site and Outbuilding	Intersection of Kelly Road and Brown Hollow Road in Greenwood Township; approximately 1-mile south of Rock Creek	No potential impacts	Site avoided by Project design
EPW-TRC-2	Historic Domestic Site	260 meters (853.0 feet) west of Saunders Road in Rexville Township; approximately 0.8 miles northwest of North Fork Cowanesque River.	No potential impacts.	Site avoided by Project design.
EPW-TRC-3	Prehistoric	On County Route 61 in	Intersected	Site cannot be

Site Name	Description	Location	Potential Impacts	Avoidance Measures
	Artifact Scatter	Greenwood Township, 100 meters (328.1 feet) north of the intersection of County Route 61 and Dryden Hill Road	by proposed collection circuit between Turbines 3 and 5.	avoided.
EPW-IF-1	Isolated Historic Artifacts	Intersection of County Route 61 and Dryden Hill Road	Intersected by proposed collection circuit between Turbines 3 and 5.	Isolated Find cannot be avoided.
EPW-IF-2	Isolated Historic Artifact	On County Route 61 in Greenwood Township, 220 meters (721.8 feet) north of the intersection of County Route 61 and Pease Road.	Intersected by proposed collection circuit between Turbines 1 and 2	Isolated Find cannot be avoided.
EPW-IF-3	Isolated Prehistoric Artifact	475 meters (1558.4 feet) west of Downey Road in the Town of Rexville.	Intersected by proposed access road between Downey Road and Turbine 25	Isolated Find cannot be avoided.
EPW-IF-4	Isolated Prehistoric Artifact	625 meters (2050.5 feet) west of Downey Road in the Town of Rexville.	Intersected by Turbine 25	Isolated Find cannot be avoided.
EPW-IF-5	Isolated Historic Artifact	35 meters (114.8 feet) north of King Hill Road in Greenwood Township, approximately 0.4 miles east of the intersection of King Hill Road and Cemetery Hill Road.	Intersected by proposed access road between King Hill Road and Turbine 11	Isolated Find cannot be avoided.
EPW-IF-6	(not used)			

Site Name	Description	Location	Potential Impacts	Avoidance Measures
EPW-IF-7	Isolated Historic Artifact	On Irish Hill Road, approximately 200 meters (656.2 feet) from the intersection of Irish Hill Road and Shamrock Road in the Town of Rexville.	Intersected by proposed collection circuit between Turbines 17 and Alt 2	Isolated Find cannot be avoided.
EPW-IF-8	Isolated Historic Artifact	165 meters (541.3 feet) west of County Route 61 in the Town of Greenwood, just south of the intersection of County Route 61 and Dryden Hill Road	Located within proposed Laydown Area 1	Isolated Find cannot be avoided
N/A	1928 Geodetic Survey Marker	915 meters (3002.0 feet) north of Mahoney Road in the Town of Rexville.	Intersects with Turbine 16	Survey Marker to be removed with NOAA permission ahead of construction.

Archaeological Sites

- Site EPW-TRC-1

Site EPW-TRC-1 is near the intersection of Kelly Road and Brown Hollow Road in the Town of Greenwood. The site contains the remains of at least two structures dating to the mid- nineteenth to early twentieth century. One structure is represented by a field stone foundation built into the side of a man-made terrace. The second foundation is located approximately 100 meters (328 feet) from the first foundation. It consists of a partially intact concrete slab surface and disarticulated field stones.

Following site identification, Supplemental Phase IB Investigations were conducted to obtain additional information to assist with site interpretation. This fieldwork consisted of close-interval shovel testing and excavation of three 1-x-1-m test units. The combined field effort yielded a total of 555 artifacts, consisting of 361 Architectural items (machine-cut nails, window glass, hardware, and brick fragments), 145 Domestic items (historic ceramics and vessel glass), four Activity items (domestic implements), and one unidentified item; the remaining items (n=44) consist of modern and organic material. Eight different types of historic ceramics were identified including whiteware, American stoneware, and ironstone. Ceramic dating was conducted on the sample to provide a tentative mean ceramic date (MCD) of 1851.1, though almost 75 percent of the ceramics are commonly found throughout the mid nineteenth to early twentieth century.

Review of historic maps from 1857 and 1873 depict a structure in this approximate location associated with the name *A. J. Miller*; the structures continue to appear on 1926 and 1965 topographic maps and on a 1952 aerial photo. Initially, the site was interpreted as possible outbuilding remains associated with

a domicile east of the survey corridor. However, artifact analysis indicates a domestic occupation with the foundations likely representing a house site and barn. Artifacts collected are consistent with a mid to late nineteenth-century time frame. If the site cannot be avoided by project design, a Phase II investigation is recommended to determine NRHP eligibility and potential project impact and adverse effect.

- Site EPW-TRC-2

Site EPW-TRC-2 is located approximately 250 meters (820.2 feet) west of Saunders Road in the Town of Rexville and consist of the foundation remains of a circa late eighteenth through early twentieth-century domicile. A structure appears at this approximate location on the 1873 Beers Atlas of Steuben County associated with the name *J. Blair*; it is also depicted on the 1926 Greenwood and 1965 and 1976 Rexville USGS topographic quadrangle maps. Aerial imagery suggests the house was demolished between 2002 and 2004. Structural remains include a cellar hole lined with dressed stone and a stairwell. Later additions are evident, including a porch or patio composed of concrete and cinder blocks, and adjacent outbuilding, the latter indicated by a stone-lined footprint. Recovered artifacts include machine-cut nails, a clay tobacco pipe stem, and pearlware and whiteware ceramic sherds. The site will be avoided by new construction and therefore no project impacts or adverse effects are anticipated.

- Site EPW-TRC-3

Site EPW-TRC-3 is a low-density prehistoric lithic scatter of unknown cultural affiliation identified on the west side of County Route 61 in the Town of Greenwood, approximately 110 meters (360.9 feet) north of the intersection of County Route 61 and Dryden Hill Road. The site was identified based on the recovery of three chert flake fragments and one piece of chert shatter from two positive shovel test pits. The site was delineated by negative shovel tests to the north, south, and west, and by the road berm to the east. The scatter is located on a gently sloping hillside and approximately 70 meters (229.7 feet) north of an ephemeral drainage. Due to the low density of cultural material recovered at this location, the site has limited research value and no further work is recommended. The site cannot be avoided by project design; however it is considered ineligible for inclusion in the NRHP and thus no project impacts or adverse effects are anticipated.

Isolated Finds

By definition, the seven isolated finds consist of non-site, historic or prehistoric artifact find locations. The find locations cannot be avoided by project design; however, isolated finds are not considered eligible for inclusion in the NRHP and thus their removal is not considered a project impact or adverse effect to cultural resources.

1928 Geodetic Survey Marker

Construction of the Project may require the removal of the 1928 Geodetic Survey Marker, which would result in a Project impact. The Applicant has consulted with the Northeast Regional Geodetic Advisor from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Geodetic Survey, who has approved of the removal of the marker.

(4) Phase II Archaeological Studies

Where warranted, and based on the Phase IB study results and as determined in consultation with OPRHP, a Phase II archaeological study will be conducted to assess the boundaries, integrity, and significance of cultural resources identified in proposed construction impact areas. Any Phase II investigations will be designed to obtain detailed information on the integrity, limits, structure, function, and cultural/historic context of an archaeological site, as feasible, sufficient to evaluate its potential eligibility for listing in the SRHP or NRHP. The need for and scope of work for such investigations will be determined in consultation with the OPRHP and the Department of Public Service (DPS). Should the outcome of a Phase II investigation result in the determination that an impacted site is not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, then the proposed impact would not result in an adverse effect to cultural resources.

(5) List of All Recovered Artifacts

Artifacts Recovered During Phase IB Survey

TRC collected a total of 633 artifacts during the Phase 1B archaeological survey. The majority of the artifacts (n=555) were recovered from EPW-TRC-1; EPW-TRC-2 yielded 64 artifacts, and 14 artifacts were recovered as isolated finds. Historic artifacts constitute the majority of the sample (n=574), followed by modern (n=49), prehistoric (n=6), organic (n=3), and industrial (n=1). The Historic sample includes 68 ceramic sherds, 110 container glass sherds, 228 flat glass (window) sherds, and 142 pieces of iron (including 102 nails).

When artifacts were collected in the field, TRC archaeologists recorded standard provenience information and placed artifacts in sealed plastic bags per standard archaeological field practices. All recovered artifacts were washed, dried, and cataloged per standard archaeological laboratory procedures. Recovered artifacts were described to a level of detail sufficient to prepare an artifact inventory for inclusion in the Phase 1B archaeological report, which includes descriptions of each artifact's material, temporal or cultural/chronological associations (when possible to ascertain), style, and function. In addition, a selection of representative artifacts was photographed for inclusion in the report.

The Applicant understands that all artifacts recovered during this contract are the property of the land owner from which the artifacts were recovered. The Applicant also anticipates that the Facility's cultural resources consultant will curate any recovered artifacts in a manner consistent with professional standards. If appropriate, the consultant may identify local repositories (such as local historical societies or archaeological museums) for disposition of recovered artifacts. Collected artifacts have been processed in a manner consistent with professional standards, such as the New York Archaeological Council's (NYAC) Standards for Cultural Resource Investigations and Curation of Archaeological Collections in New York State (NYAC, 1994; the NYAC Standards).

A complete list of all recovered artifacts is included in the Phase 1B Archaeological Survey Report, included with this Application as Appendix 20-1.

(6) Unanticipated Discovery Plan

It is possible that archaeological resources could be discovered during construction phases at the Facility site. As such, this Unanticipated Discovery Plan presents the approach that would be employed to address such emergency discoveries to ensure that any potentially significant archaeological resources discovered are dealt with in full accordance with State and Federal requirements, including the most recent *Standards for Cultural Resource Investigations and Curation of Archaeological Collections in New York State*. This approach would also ensure that procedures and lines of communication with the appropriate government authorities are clearly established prior to the start of construction so that discoveries can be addressed in a timely manner, minimizing the impacts to the construction schedule to the extent possible.

At present, archaeological sites have been recorded within the Facility Site. Based on the background research conducted, the Facility Site is considered archaeologically sensitive, and a potential exists for identifying additional archaeological resources at the Facility site. Therefore, all involved personnel will follow standardized procedures in accordance with State and Federal regulations that are detailed below.

Both the environmental inspectors and the construction personnel would be provided with a preconstruction briefing regarding potential cultural resource indicators. These indicators would include items such as recognizable quantities of bone, unusual stone deposits and ash deposits, or black-stained earth that could be evident in spoil piles or trench walls during construction. In the event that potentially significant cultural resources or human remains are discovered during construction, the environmental monitors and construction personnel would be instructed to follow the specific requirements and notification procedures outlined below. Cultural resource discoveries that require reporting and notification include any human remains and any recognizable, potentially significant concentrations of artifacts or evidence of human occupation.

If cultural resources indicators are found by construction personnel, the construction supervisor would be notified immediately. The supervisor, in turn, would notify the environmental inspector, who would notify a designated archaeologist, who would be available to respond to this type of find. Based on the information provided, the archaeologist would determine if a visit to the area is required and, if so, would inform the construction crews. No construction work at the site that could affect the artifacts or site would be performed until the archaeologist reviews the site. The site would be flagged as being off-limits for work, but would not be identified as an archaeological site per se in order to protect the resources. The archaeologist would conduct a review of the site and would test the site as necessary. The archaeologist would determine, based on the artifacts found and on the cultural sensitivity of the area in general, whether the site is potentially significant and would consult with the OPRHP regarding site clearance.

Discovery of Human Remains

If Native American human remains are encountered, procedures for such discoveries would be followed in accordance with State and Federal regulations, including the *Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990* and its implementing regulations (43 CFR § 10). This will involve consultation with the SHPO or Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) and appropriate interested parties in an effort to identify and notify next of kin, closest lineal descendant, or the Indian tribes who may be

culturally affiliated with the remains, and to determine appropriate treatment and disposition of the remains.

When human remains are encountered, all work in the near vicinity of the remains would cease and reasonable efforts made to avoid and protect the remains from additional impact. In cases of inclement weather, the human remains would be protected with tarpaulins. The County Medical Examiner would be notified of the discovery. If the remains are found to be other than human, construction will be cleared to proceed. If the remains are human, and are less than 75 years old, the Medical Examiner and local law enforcement officials will assume jurisdiction.

If the remains are found to be human and older than 75 years, the OPRHP will be notified and may assume jurisdiction of the remains. If jurisdiction is assumed by the OPRHP, they will a) determine whether the human remains represent a significant archaeological resource, and b) make a reasonable effort to identify and locate persons who can establish direct kinship, tribal community, or ethnic relationship with the remains. If such a relationship cannot be established, then the OPRHP may consult with a committee to determine the proper disposition of the remains. This committee shall consist of a human skeletal analyst, Native American members of current State tribes recommended by the Governor's Council on Indian Affairs, and "an individual who has special knowledge or expertise regarding the particular type of the unmarked human burial."

A plan for the avoidance of any further impact to the human remains and/or mitigative excavation, re-interment, or a combination of these treatments will be developed in consultation with the OPRHP and if applicable, appropriate Native American tribes or closest lineal descendants. All parties will be expected to respond with advice and guidance in an efficient time frame. Once the plan is agreed to by all parties, the plan will be implemented.

The plan will include a provision for work stoppage upon the discovery of possible archaeological or human remains. Evaluation of such discoveries, if warranted, will be conducted by a professional archaeologist, qualified according to the NYAC *Standards*. The Unanticipated Discovery Plan will specify the degree to which the methodology used to assess any discoveries follows the NYAC *Standards*.

(7) Shapefiles

The Applicant will provide shapefiles of archaeological and historic resource survey locations, attribute data, and results, as requested to the appropriate agencies.

20(b) Study of the Impacts on Historic Architectural Resources

This section addresses Stipulation 20(b), which requires an identification, evaluation, and assessment of effects from the construction and operation of the Project and the interconnections and related facilities on architectural historic properties listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP, and a discussion of measures to minimize or mitigate adverse effects, if required. TRC completed a Historic Architecture Reconnaissance Survey for the Project, consistent with Section 106 of NHPA and OPRHP *Guidelines*. The goal of the survey was to document all previously recorded and newly identified above-ground architectural resources 50 years of age or older within the Project APE and evaluate their eligibility for listing in the NRHP in consultation with OPRHP. For those resources listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP, TRC provided a preliminary assessment of Project effects. The report must be submitted to the

OPRHP for its review and final concurrence. A copy of the complete draft report is located in Appendix 20-2. A summary of the survey methods, findings, and recommendations follows.

Consultation

Consultation with local organizations and individuals familiar with historic preservation took place in coordination with the preparation of the concurrent Visual Impacts Assessment (see Exhibit 24). Only one response pertained to architectural historic properties. The Director of Planning for Allegany County, by letter dated March 23, 2017, expressed concern over potential aesthetic impacts to the Village of Andover and the Village of Whitesville. To date, TRC has received no other public comment.

Definition of Area of Potential Effects (APE)

In consultation with the OPRHP, TRC received approval of its revised Research Design and survey methodology (dated February 29, 2016) on March 29, 2016. On January 24, 2017, TRC presented its approach to delineating the APE for both direct and indirect visual impacts in a telephone conversation with OPRHP staff. Following this discussion, and confirmed via email on January 25, 2017, the OPRHP agreed to waive both the in-person APE review meeting and the one-mile “ring” survey provisions of its *Guidelines*.

TRC delineated the APE for direct effects pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.16(d). This comprises the Project’s area of physical disturbance, including all building and substations sites, access roads, power line corridors, and turbine sites. Following OPRHP *Guidelines*, the APE for indirect visual effects extends outward in a five-mile radius from each turbine location and includes all areas within a straight line of sight of the turbines. For the proposed Article VII 16.5-mile transmission line corridor, TRC adopted a similar approach for the visual effects APE by using the 0.5-mile-radius APE standard employed by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) for cellular tower construction.

To locate and plot areas of visibility for both the turbine field and the Article VII transmission line, TRC conducted a viewshed analysis utilizing several computerized Geographical Information System (GIS) desktop analyses based on both straight topography and an average 50-foot tree cover. Coarsely plotted tree data, a result of the scales involved, was checked and refined using modern aerial photography. The results of the viewshed analyses were plotted on two sets of APE maps: one for the proposed turbine field and one for the proposed transmission line. Each map also plotted the location of previously identified historic properties listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP, as well as previously surveyed resources not yet evaluated or found not eligible for listing in the NRHP. Towns and villages with high concentrations of historic resources were called out separately in accompanying APE map attachments.

Background Research

In order to locate previously identified historic resources, TRC conducted an initial desktop analysis utilizing the OPRHP’s CRIS and NRHP online database. The initial review of previously identified resources located 0 listed and 21 eligible historic properties inside the APEs for both the turbine areas and transmission line. An additional 31 resources were previously recorded but unevaluated. The remainder of the previously identified resources listed in the CRIS system were determined not eligible and therefore not addressed during further investigation.

TRC submitted the APE maps to OPRHP for review and approval via an upload to CRIS on March 6, 2017. The OPRHP approved the APE delineation, and affirmed TRC’s one-time special exception to utilize both vegetation and topography for conducting its viewshed analysis in conjunction with delineating the APE for visual effects on March 20, 2017.

Following OPRHP initial approval of the APEs, subsequent revisions of the Project design resulted in a reduced overall survey area and revised APE. The revised APEs were then utilized to complete the architectural survey. A second review of OPRHP records revealed 0 listed and 18 eligible historic properties, along with 12 previously recorded but unevaluated resources inside the revised APEs for both the turbine field and transmission line. Table 20-3 lists all previously identified architectural historic properties.

Table 20-3. Previously Identified Eligible Architectural Historic Properties Inside the Project APEs

Item No.	USN# (Alt. USN#)	Name	Address *	Current NRHP Status
1	00321.000010		511 Main St Independence, NY	Eligible
2	00321.000015		531 Main St Independence, NY	Eligible
3	00343.000003	Andover Free Library	40 Main St Andover, NY	Eligible
4	00343.000054	Private Residence	47 East Greenwood St Andover, NY	Eligible
5	00343.000063		44 South Main St Andover, NY	Eligible
6	00343.000065		30 South Main St Andover, NY	Eligible
7	00343.000066 (00306.000005)		5 West Greenwood St Andover, NY	Eligible
8	10114.000006	Greenwood Methodist Church	2729 NY 248 Greenwood, NY	Eligible
9	10114.000007	Cross-Gable Residence	2707 NY 248 Greenwood, NY	Eligible
10	10114.000008	Commercial Building (Heckman Grocery-	2700 NY 248 Greenwood, NY	Eligible
11	10114.000009	Greek Revival Residence	2670 NY 248 Greenwood, NY	Eligible
12	10114.000010	Gothic Revival Residence	2667 NY 248 Greenwood, NY	Eligible
13	10114.000011	Italianate Residence	2721 NY 248 Greenwood, NY	Eligible
14	10114.000012	Brick Queen Anne Residence	2717 Main St Greenwood, NY	Eligible

Item No.	USN# (Alt. USN#)	Name	Address *	Current NRHP Status
15	10114.000013	Greek Revival Residence	2703 NY 248 Greenwood, NY	Eligible
16	10114.000014 (10114.000046)	Brick Queen Anne Residence	2635 NY 248 Greenwood, NY	Eligible
17	10114.000036		1467 Church Hill Rd Greenwood, NY	Eligible
18	10130.000001	Freberg	1750 Cemetery Hill Rd West Union, NY	Eligible

* Steuben County and Allegheny Counties

Architectural Field Survey

Consistent with OPRHP *Guidelines*, the historic architecture reconnaissance Survey re-examined the 18 previously identified NRHP-eligible historic properties, the 12 previously recorded but unevaluated resources, and all newly identified districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects 50 years of age or older within the Project APEs as determined by the viewshed analysis. Preparatory to fieldwork, TRC compared historic aerial photographs, 1960s-era USGS maps, and modern aerial photographs to pinpoint and plot the locations of all extant resources over 50 years of age using GIS. Building ages were then confirmed or corrected during the reconnaissance effort through a combination of visual observations and analysis of stylistic evidence, construction materials, historic photographs, personal communications with property owners, and the Steuben County and Allegheny County tax assessor's records.

Each resource was documented via photography and with field notes recording dates, form/style, current conditions, and locations. Generally, resources not in the line of sight were excluded from the visual effects APE and were not surveyed, subject to verification in the field. Resources located partially within the viewshed or adjoining the line-of-sight boundary were typically included in the survey out of an abundance of caution. In cases of potential historic districts or cultural landscapes, the reconnaissance survey recorded all potential contributing elements and identified general justifiable boundaries. If the boundaries of a potential historic district extended outside the visual effects APE for the present investigation, the architectural survey identified an overall general district boundary but limited survey efforts only to resources located inside the viewshed. The architectural survey examined 797 newly identified individual historic resources and 5 potential historic districts. None of the potential districts retained sufficient significance and/or integrity for NRHP eligibility and were recommended not eligible. Of the individual newly identified resources, nearly all comprised farmhouses, farmsteads, or residences reflecting common forms and lacking the required significance and/or integrity under NRHP Criteria of eligibility. Of the 797 newly identified resources, TRC selected 8 for more detailed analysis and evaluation based on their high potential significance and degree of integrity. Of these, three possessed the required significance and integrity and were recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP. The remaining five were recommended not eligible. An additional 10 were not accessible and could not be surveyed. The remaining 779 newly identified resources did not possess the required significance and/or integrity under the NRHP Criteria and were recommended not eligible.

Identification of Historic Properties

Significant historic properties include districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that are at least 50 years old and meet at least one NRHP criterion. For a property to be eligible for listing in the NRHP, it must possess the quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects 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.

Several additional Criteria Considerations can apply. These pertain to religious properties, moved properties, birthplaces or gravesites, cemeteries, reconstructed buildings, commemorative properties, and properties that have achieved significance within the past 50 years.

In addition to significance, a historic property must also possess integrity to convey its significance. The seven aspects of integrity include location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. To retain historic integrity, a property will always possess several, and usually most, of the seven aspects. Historic properties either retain integrity (that is, convey their significance) or they do not.

As a result of the architectural survey, TRC identified 15 historic properties eligible for listing in the NRHP inside the Project APE for the turbine field. This included 12 previously identified and 3 newly identified historic properties. No historic properties were identified inside the APE for the associated transmission line. Table 20-4 lists all identified architectural historic properties.

Table 20-4. Identified NRHP-Eligible Architectural Historic Properties Inside the Project APEs

Item No.	TRC ID No.	USN# (Alt. USN#)	Name	Address	Current NRHP Status	Current/ Recommended NRHP Criteria/ Significance	Recommended NRHP Status
1	N/A	00343.000003	Andover Free Library	40 Main St, Andover, NY	Eligible	Criterion C/Architecture	Eligible
2	N/A	00343.000054	Private Residence	47 East Greenwood St, Andover, NY	Eligible	Criterion C/Architecture	Eligible
3	N/A	00343.000063		44 South Main St, Andover, NY	Eligible	Criterion C/Architecture	Eligible
4	N/A	00343.000066 (00306.000005)		5 West Greenwood St, Andover, NY	Eligible	Criterion C/Architecture	Eligible

Item No.	TRC ID No.	USN# (Alt. USN#)	Name	Address	Current NRHP Status	Current/Recommended NRHP Criteria/Significance	Recommended NRHP Status
5	1894	N/A	Van Sickle House (Mustard Seed Inn Bed & Breakfast)	13 East Center St, Andover, NY	N/A	Criterion C/Architecture	Eligible
6	1588	N/A	Andover Presbyterian Church	34 East Greenwood St, Andover, NY	N/A	Criterion Consideration A/Architecture	Eligible
7	N/A	00321.000010		511 Main St, Independence, NY	Eligible	Criterion C/Architecture	Eligible
8	N/A	00321.000015		531 Main St, Independence, NY	Eligible	Criterion C/Architecture	Eligible
9	N/A	10114.000009	Greek Revival Residence	2670 SR 248, Greenwood, NY	Eligible	Criterion C/Architecture	Eligible
10	N/A	10114.000010	Gothic Revival Residence	2667 SR 248, Greenwood, NY	Eligible	Criterion C/Architecture	Eligible
11	N/A	10114.000011	Italianate Residence	2721 SR 248, Greenwood, NY	Eligible	Criterion C/Architecture	Eligible
12	N/A	10114.000013	Greek Revival Residence	2703 SR 248, Greenwood, NY	Eligible	Criterion C/Architecture	Eligible
13	N/A	10114.000014 (10114.000046)	Brick Queen Anne Residence	2635 SR 248, Greenwood, NY	Eligible	Criterion C/Architecture	Eligible
14	N/A	10114.000036		1467 Church Hill Rd, Greenwood, NY	Eligible	Criterion C/Architecture	Eligible
15	1851	N/A		SR 248, West Union, NY	N/A	Criterion C/Architecture	Eligible

Preliminary Assessment of Effects

In order to identify and summarize the nature of probable impacts on architectural historical resources pursuant to Section 106 and Article 10, TRC's historic architecture reconnaissance survey includes a preliminary assessment of effects to architectural historic properties. To assess Project effects, the consultant applied the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* in combination with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's *Criteria of Adverse Effect* (36 CFR § 800.5 (a)). Additional guidance derives from the Council of Environmental Quality's *Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act* (40 CFR § 1500 – 1508).

An adverse effect finding is found when an undertaking may alter, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of a historic property that would qualify it for inclusion in the NRHP, in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. Consideration is given to all qualifying characteristics of a historic property, including those that may have been identified subsequent to the original evaluation of the property's eligibility for the NRHP (or SRHP). Adverse effects may include reasonably foreseeable effects caused by the undertaking that may occur later in time, be further removed in distance, or be cumulative. Examples include, but are not limited to: physical destruction; alteration inconsistent with the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*; removal; change in character of use or setting; introduction of visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish integrity of significance; deterioration from neglect; and transfer by sale or lease out of federal ownership. An adverse effect finding may be addressed and resolved through agreed-upon measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate the adverse effect.

Identified historic properties were limited solely to the APE for the proposed turbine field. No historic properties were identified inside the APE for the proposed Article VII transmission line. The following discussion of Project affects is therefore confined to impacts associated with the turbine field.

At present, construction of the Project is not expected to require the demolition or physical alteration of any buildings or other potential historic resources. No direct physical impacts to architectural historic properties are anticipated as a result of the Project.

Because of the size of the turbines, the Project has the potential to create indirect visual effects on NRHP-listed and eligible historic properties inside the five-mile visual effects APE. Not all effects, however, are adverse. The Project's potential to effect any historic property depends primarily on the qualities that make that property significant and worthy of listing in the NRHP. If the setting of an historic property is less important than its historic or architectural qualities, then changes to the setting may not adversely diminish the qualities or character-defining features that qualify the historic property for inclusion in the NRHP and, therefore, have no adverse effect.

Potential visual effects are also highly variable. Intervening trees, foliage, buildings, objects, modern intrusions, and other visual clutter, such as telephone poles and advertisement signs, all impact setting and line-of-sight views from an historic property toward the Project. The optical effects of distance, diminishing perspective, and atmospheric conditions can also reduce overall visual impacts on historic properties, especially those located further away from the Project. In general, the turbines will have a greater potential for visual effects on historic properties located closest to Project elements (within approximately two miles) and a lesser potential for those located beyond that point.

For the purposes of this preliminary assessment, TRC finds that potential visual impacts on the six identified historic properties located near the periphery of the APE in the village of Andover (USN# 00343.000003; USN# 00343.000054; USN# 00343.000063; USN# 00343.000066 [00306.000005]); TRC# 1894; and TRC# 1588) are negligible. The nearest proposed turbine is approximately four miles distant. The presence of the proposed turbines will not diminish the identified architectural significance and qualifying characteristics of this or the other Andover historic properties. TRC concludes the Project will have no effect to these historic properties.

For the two historic properties located closer to the proposed turbines in the village of Whitesville (USN# 00321.000010 and USN# 00321.000015), the potential for visibility increases with the nearest

proposed turbine over 3 miles away. However, the effects of distance and perspective will greatly reduce the overall presence of the turbines along the horizon and, therefore, the potential for indirect visual impacts. The presence of the proposed turbines will not diminish the identified architectural significance and qualifying characteristics of the Whitesville historic properties. TRC concludes that while the Project may produce a visual impact, this will have no adverse effect to these historic properties.

For the six historic properties located in the village of Greenwood (USN# 10114.000009; USN# 10114.000010; USN# 10114.000011; USN# 10114.000013; USN# 10114.000014 [10114.000046]; and USN# 10114.000036), the nearest proposed turbine is located approximately 1.6 miles away. While the effects of distance and perspective are less effective in minimizing visibility at these distances, most identified historic properties stand at the foot of a wooded hill, which furnishes a high vegetative screen during leaf-on conditions and general camouflage in leaf-off conditions. This screen helps to reduce the proposed turbine's overall visibility. In two cases (USN# 10114.000009 and USN# 10114.000010), the historic properties are more exposed to visibility because of changes in topography and nearby cleared land. While these historic properties will have a more pronounced view of the proposed turbines, their presence will not diminish the identified architectural significance and qualifying characteristics of these or of other Greenwood historic properties. TRC concludes that while the Project may produce a visual impact, this will have no adverse effect to these historic properties.

For the one identified historic property in the village of Rexville (TRC# 1851), the nearest turbine is located approximately 1.4 miles away. An evergreen hedge along CR 248 masks a portion of the property, but minimal surrounding tree cover reduces the screening ability of nearby vegetation. The effects of distance and perspective are less able to minimize visibility in this case. The presence of the proposed turbines within the viewshed, however, will not diminish the building's identified architectural significance and qualifying characteristics. TRC concludes that while the Project may produce a visual impact, this will have no adverse effect to the historic property.

Regarding reasonably foreseeable effects occurring later in time, the Project, once built, is not expected to require additional land acquisition, construction, or alteration, routine maintenance and repair excepted. Future project effects to historic properties are typically the result of changing land use patterns and shifting populations attributable back to the undertaking. TRC concludes that the potential for effects caused by the Project later in time is low and the Project will have no reasonably foreseeable future effect to historic properties.

In summary, TRC's preliminary assessment of effects concludes that the proposed Project will not alter, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics, significance, and/or integrity of identified historic properties that qualifies them for inclusion in the NRHP. Accordingly, TRC offers preliminary recommendations of no effect and no adverse effect to historic properties.

Mitigation

TRC concludes the project will have no effect and no adverse effect to historic properties listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP. As currently designed, no avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required.

Further Actions

The full results of the architectural survey have been compiled in a technical report for submission to OPRHP for review and concurrence (see Appendix 20-3). The report and associated GIS shapefiles will be

uploaded directly into CRIS. Individual records and photographs of all resurveyed previously identified eligible and unevaluated resources, as well as TRC's list of newly identified eligible historic properties will be entered individually into CRIS pursuant to OPRHP survey requirements. Shapefiles will also be provided to requesting regulatory agencies, as needed.

Following OPRHP's review of the architectural survey report and recommendations of eligibility, and at OPRHP's direction, TRC may be required to conduct additional architectural survey or submit a revised assessment of Project effects for OPRHP review and concurrence. Any additional required documents or addendums will be submitted as part of a future amendment to this Article 10 Application.

20(c) Analysis of Potential Cumulative Impacts on Archeological and Historic Resources

This section addresses Stipulation 20(c), which requires an analysis of potential cumulative impacts on archeological and historic resources. Cumulative impacts are any significant impacts that result from the incremental or increased impacts of the Project when the impacts of the Project are added to the impacts of the construction/operation of the associated transmission line, other existing or proposed wind farm projects in the area, including the Canisteo Wind Energy Center (Canisteo project), and other existing wind projects in the area.

TRC's archeological and historic resources reconnaissance survey included the transmission line as part of its overall investigation. It found no identified archeological or historic properties associated with the proposed transmission line and hence no related incremental or cumulative impacts when considered together with the proposed turbine field.

Regarding reasonably foreseeable cumulative effects caused by the Project, past and present undertakings are a good indicator of probable future actions. TRC utilized the OPRHP's on-line CRIS database to identify known past and present projects with the potential to affect archeological and historic resources inside the turbine field APE. The CRIS database shows no existing or proposed overlapping wind farm projects inside the two architectural APEs, although nearby wind projects are proposed, including the Canisteo project directly east of the Applicant's Project.

The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) instructs that "assessment of cumulative impacts should be limited to consideration of reasonably foreseeable impacts, not speculative ones" (NYSDEC, The SEQRA Handbook at 83 (3d Ed. 2010)). Design for the Canisteo project is not complete and the location of any potential transmission and collection lines associated with that project are unknown at this time. The location of turbines for the Canisteo project is preliminary and the type of turbine that will be used and the height of those turbines are unknown to the Applicant. Additionally, given transmission system constraints and other variables that could halt development such as land availability and permitting, construction of the Canisteo project is currently speculative. Because information on important and relevant aspects of the Canisteo project is not available, an attempt to assess potential cumulative impacts of the Canisteo project and the Applicant's Project would be speculative and non-meaningful.

Future actions, including the development of other wind projects will need to take similar kinds of cultural resource analysis and undertakings as those completed herein. Because the identified historic

properties in the area are significant mainly for their architectural merit, future changes in setting are less consequential. TRC concludes that the potential for incremental effects caused by the Project to archaeological and historic resources from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions is low and the Project will have no reasonably foreseeable cumulative effect.

References

- Clayton, W. W. (1879). *History of Steuben County, New York with Illustrations and Biographical Sketches of Some of Its Prominent Men and Pioneers*. Lewis, Peck & Co., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Funk, R. E. (1976). *Recent Contributions to Hudson Valley Prehistory*. New York State Museum and Science Service Memoir 22. New York State Museum, Albany.
- McNett, C. (editor) (1985). *Shawnee-Minisink: A Paleoindian-Early Archaic Site in the Upper Delaware Valley of Pennsylvania*. Academic Press, New York.
- Near, I. W. (1911). *A History of Steuben County, New York and its People*. Lewis Publishing Company, Chicago, Illinois.
- New York Archaeological Council [NYAC] (1994). *Standard for Cultural Resource Investigations and the Curation of Archeological Collections in New York State*. Adopted by the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation.
- Nicholas, G. P. (1983). A Model for the Early Postglacial Settlement of the Central Merrimack River Basin, New Hampshire. *Man in the Northeast*, 25: 43–63.
- Nicholas, G. P. (1987). Rethinking the Early Archaic. *Archaeology of Eastern North America*, 15: 99–124.
- Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation, New York State [OPRHP] (2006). *OPRHP Guidelines for Wind Farm Development Cultural Resources Survey Work*.
- Ritchie, W. A. (1980). *The Archaeology of New York State* (revised edition). Harbor Hill Books, Harrison, New York
- Ritchie, W. A., and R. E. Funk (1973). *Aboriginal Settlement Patterns in the Northeast*. New York State Museum and Science Service Memoir No. 20. New York State Museum, Albany.
- United States Census (2010). Profile of General Population and Housing Characteristics: 2010. Electronic source, <https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview/xhtml?src=bkmk>, accessed November 2016
- Wray, C. F. (1973). *Manual for Seneca Iroquois Archaeology*. Cultures Primitives, Inc., Rochester.